1 **Gaze sensitivity: function and mechanisms from sensory and cognitive perspectives**

2 Gabrielle L. Davidson[a,*], Shannon Butler[b], Esteban Fernández-Juricic[b], Alex Thornton[a,c],

3 Nicola S. Clayton[a]

4

5 * Correspondence: Gabrielle Davidson, Department of Psychology, University of Cambridge,

6 Downing Street, Cambridge CB2 3EB, United Kingdom

7 Email: gd339@cam.ac.uk

8 Telephone: +44 (0)1223 741801

9 Fax: +44 (0)1223 741802

10

11 a. Department of Psychology, University of Cambridge, Cambridge, CB2 3EB, UK.

12 b. Department of Biological Sciences, Purdue University, West Lafayette, IN 47907, USA.

13 c. Centre for Ecology and Conservation – Biosciences, University of Exeter, Penryn, TR10

14 9EZ, UK.

15

16 Word count: 9 902 (excluding figures)

17

18

19

20

21

ABSTRACT

Sensitivity to the gaze of other individuals has long been a primary focus in socio-cognitive research on humans and other animals. Information about where others are looking may often be of adaptive value in social interactions and predator avoidance, but studies across a range of taxa indicate there are substantial differences in the extent to which animals obtain and use information about other individuals' gaze direction. As the literature expands, it is becoming increasingly difficult to make comparisons across taxa as experiments adopt and adjust different methodologies to account for differences between species in their socio-ecology, sensory systems and possibly also their underlying cognitive mechanisms. Furthermore, as more species are described to exhibit gaze sensitivity, more terminology arises to describe the behaviours. In order to clarify the field, we propose a restricted nomenclature that defines gaze sensitivity in terms of observable behaviour, independent of the underlying mechanisms. This is particularly useful in non-human animal studies where cognitive interpretations are ambiguous. We then describe how socio-ecological factors may influence whether species will attend to gaze cues, and suggest links between ultimate factors and proximate mechanisms such as cognition and perception. In particular, we argue that variation in sensory systems, such as retinal specialisations and the position of the eyes, will determine whether gaze cues (e.g. head movement) are perceivable during visual fixation. We end by making methodological recommendations on how to apply these variations in socio-ecology and visual systems to advance the field of gaze research.

Keywords: cognition; gaze following; gaze aversion, gaze sensitivity; retina; visual fixation; visual fields

INTRODUCTION

Attending to where others are looking may offer important information about the location of food and predators, as well as social relationships between conspecifics. Humans employ gaze sensitivity in many contexts: we can accurately follow where others are looking in space (e.g. Bock et al. 2008), and appreciate that others may have different fields of view or perspectives. We use our own gaze as a form of communication to inform or mislead others, and use the gaze of others to interpret their mental states (e.g. Teufel et al. 2010).

A number of other species including mammals, birds and reptiles have also been reported to show sensitivity to gaze. Sensitivity to gaze can result in many different responses, such as avoiding gaze because it is associated with the approach of a predator, or co-orientating with another's gaze to spot objects of interest. Behavioural and sensory ecologists have sought to determine the socio-ecological contexts in which gaze sensitivity occurs, and to identify features of cues which are most important for eliciting gaze sensitivity responses (e.g. Burger et al. 1991; Hampton 1994; Watve et al. 2002; Carter et al. 2008). Numerous experimental paradigms have also been developed to test whether these responses are simply reflexive, and therefore bound to one stimulus in one context, or whether they involve further information processing (e.g. Bugnyar et al. 2004; von Bayern & Emery 2009a; Loretto et al. 2010). The study of this information processing has been of great interest to cognitive psychologists (e.g. Povinelli & Eddy 1996; Call et al. 1998). Many tasks have been designed to identify the cognitive mechanisms by which information from another's direction of attention is processed, and whether these mechanisms allow subjects to apply gaze information flexibly in different contexts, and/or through different behavioural responses. As a result, a plethora of experimental paradigms have been developed to address gaze behaviours in a multitude of different species and contexts.

The aim of this review is two-fold. The first goal is to present a standardised set of nomenclature which brings together all aspects of gaze research (gaze preference, gaze

following and gaze aversion), and defines these behaviours independently from cognitive

mechanisms. We hope that this nomenclature brings clarity to the gaze sensitivity literature,

and facilitates a bridge between various aspects of gaze research across many disciplines.

The second goal is to illustrate how socio-ecological pressures and proximate anatomical,

sensory and cognitive factors can influence the occurrence of gaze sensitivity across taxa.

These factors can vary substantially between species, and as the breadth of species studied

in gaze contexts increases, it is important to consider this variability when interpreting

results, designing gaze sensitivity experiments, and choosing appropriate study species.

DEFINING GAZE BEHAVIOURS

A number of different gaze behaviours have been described in the literature and, as a

result, this has brought a sense of confusion because many species are studied in different

contexts and some definitions carry with them an assumption of the underlying cognitive

processing. For example, an animal may orientate their gaze with another individual

because they understand the referential nature of looking, i.e. that another individual can *see*

something. Alternatively, an animal may orientate their gaze in response to another

individual's gaze because having done so in the past resulted in seeing an interesting object.

These two scenarios are guided by different processes (discussed in more detail below), but

elicit the same observable behaviour. It is therefore useful, particularly in non-human

research where mental processes are difficult to ascertain, to describe gaze behaviours

purely in terms of the observable behaviour. The terminology used should be independent

from any assumptions about the cognitive processes, be it a reflexive response, or one

which requires further information processing (see Thornton & Raihani 2008 and Thornton &

McAuliffe 2012 for similar arguments concerning the definition of teaching). This is

particularly useful in a field where multiple disciplines study gaze sensitivity. For those

studying underlying cognition, experimental paradigms can be applied to specifically test

96   information processing mechanisms underlying gaze behaviours (as defined below). Here

97   we present nomenclature derived from the literature which we propose be restricted to the

98   following definitions.

99

100 *Gaze Sensitivity*

101 We propose that all instances whereby an individual attends to gaze stimuli should

102 be classed under the umbrella category of gaze sensitivity. Sensitivity to gaze is a pre-

103 requisite for all gaze response-behaviours defined below. Whether an individual is sensitive

104 to the gaze of others may be dependent on a number of factors which are discussed

105 throughout this review, including sociality, ecology, cognition and visual architecture. Gaze

106 sensitivity is also dependent upon the gaze cues available.

107

108 *Gaze cues*

109 Gaze sensitivity and the resulting gaze behaviours are reliant on an observable gaze

110 cue. Gaze cues include the presence or orientation of the eyes or head, and may be

111 presented as static or moving stimuli. The head and the eyes can be presented in alignment

112 (congruent), or in opposing directions (incongruent), and may also be relative to body

113 positioning. Direct gaze (Fig. 1a) refers to an individual's gaze directed towards another

114 individual, whereas averted gaze refers to an individual's gaze directed away from another

115 individual. Direct and averted gaze can refer to the cues given, but may also be described as

116 gaze responses (e.g. an individual averts their gaze in response to direct gaze, Fig. 1b). In

117 some cases gaze cues and responses occur between conspecifics, or between

118 heterospecifics (e.g. human demonstrator presenting cues to an animal subject, or a

119 predator presenting cues to an animal subject). We now describe gaze behaviours typically

120 observed in response to gaze cues.

121

Gaze responses

123 Gaze sensitivity can result in a number of different gaze responses. These include gaze

124 preference, gaze aversion and gaze following responses. Gaze preference refers to an

125 individual's preference for looking at a particular gaze cue. For example, an individual may

126 spend more time looking at another individual that is looking towards them (direct gaze) than

127 one that is looking away from them (averted gaze), or vice versa. Gaze aversion refers to

128 aversive behaviour in response to the presence of gaze cues. For example, an individual

129 moving away from another individual that is looking towards them. Gaze following refers to

130 the act of orientating one's gaze in the direction of another's gaze (Fig. 1c). For example,

131 one individual moves its head to look to the side, and in response, a second individual

132 moves its head in a similar direction. Gaze preference, gaze aversion and gaze following

133 can be further subdivided within these responses (Fig. 2).

134

Gaze preference

136 Gaze preference responses refer to looking behaviour from the subject. When

137 presented with a choice between demonstrators exhibiting different gaze cues, an individual

138 may spend more time looking at an individual showing a preferred gaze cue. Gaze

139 preferences may also result in shorter latencies for spotting individuals in a crowd displaying

140 particular gaze cues. For instance, Tomonaga & Imura (2010) showed that when an adult

141 chimpanzee was presented with a screen of many human faces, the subject was faster at

142 detecting a face with direct eye gaze than a face with averted eye gaze. When presented

143 with only one demonstrator, gaze preference may be directed to a specific area of the face

144 such as the eyes rather than the head in general. The demonstrator and the subject may

145 engage in mutual gaze, where both individuals look at one another (Fig. 1a).

146

Gaze aversion

In gaze aversion, the possible behaviours may be reliant on the context in which the gaze cues are presented. A sudden appearance or approach of gaze cues can elicit aversive escape responses, generally associated with anti-predator responses such as fleeing, crouching or tonic immobility. Similar responses such as fleeing or looking away may also occur between conspecifics, for instance between individual territory holders, or within dominance hierarchies. Gaze aversion can also include behaviours in which an animal is approaching, as opposed to when it is moving away. We refer to aversive approach if a gaze cue is directed towards a desired object such as food, and the subject alters its behaviour by delaying its approach, or approaching only when the gaze cue is averted or hidden.

157

Gaze following

In gaze following, individuals may orientate their gaze in the same direction, but this does not imply they are necessarily looking at the same thing. In its simplest form, gaze following refers to the co-orientation of gaze with another towards a similar point in space (Emery 1997). Following Emery (1997; 2000), we distinguish gaze following from joint attention. In the latter, an individual not only orientates their gaze in the same direction of another's, but as a result, both individuals' gaze are directed towards the same object (Fig. 1d). This does not suggest that those engaging in joint attention must appreciate the visual attention of others. Further testing would be necessary to pinpoint the cognitive mechanisms (see below). As well as orientating one's gaze with another, an individual may need to re-position itself to be in the same line of sight as the demonstrator. In geometric gaze, an individual repositions itself around a barrier to follow the gaze of another individual (Fig.1e). Geometric gaze may result in joint attention if both individuals subsequently gaze at the same thing behind the barrier.

(Please insert Figure 1 and Figure 2 approximately here)

This terminology serves to bring together all aspects of gaze research. Behaviours such as gaze aversion and gaze following are often studied separately (but see von Bayern & Emery 2009a), yet are inter-related in that they rely on/are based on animals' responses to gaze cues. Therefore it is useful to use the term gaze sensitivity when discussing responses to gaze cues in a broad context, and useful to use the additional behavioural definitions when discussing more specific responses to gaze. Our nomenclature describes the basic components of gaze tasks in terms of behaviours without assumptions about unobservable underlying mechanisms. Once behavioural responses have been observed and categorised, tests can be designed to tease apart the underlying processes which guide these behaviours (c.f. Thornton & Raihani 2008; Thornton & McAuliffe 2012). For instance, do individuals consider where another individual's direction of attention is focused? Might they recognise that another individual's line of sight may be different from their own? Can they use another individual's gaze to infer that individual's intention towards an object? Are individuals able to use gaze flexibly by applying different behavioural responses or cognitive mechanisms across different contexts (e.g. to detect predator gaze, to follow conspecific gaze to find food, and to find predators), or are they bound to one particular response in one particular context? An individual's gaze response may also be dependent upon the availability of gaze cues and their characteristics. For instance, some species may be more sensitive to head direction because they move their head more than their eyes when scanning for or fixating on objects. Alternatively, some species may gain more information from the eyes than the head. Species differences in gaze cues available (e.g., rate and/or orientation of eye or head movement) are highly dependent upon the configuration of the animal's visual system.

Carefully designed experiments allow us to 1) determine how the sensory system of a given species gathers gaze information and 2) establish the cognitive requirements for different gaze behaviours. These proximate mechanisms may help to explain why we see variation in gaze following and gaze aversion behaviours across species. It is equally

8

199 important to consider ultimate mechanisms, namely socio-ecological factors which will

200 determine whether attending to gaze cues is beneficial to the observer. Variability in socio-

201 ecological pressures may in fact drive species to process gaze cues such that they can be

202 applied across various contexts. Because this may also be a function of the species'

203 underlying cognition and sensory system, we expect proximate and ultimate mechanisms of

204 gaze sensitivity to be linked, and therefore should be studied in concert.

205

206 **SOCIO-ECOLOGY AND CUE INFORMATION**

207   Consideration of socio-ecological factors is essential to understand the selective

208 pressures driving the evolution of different forms of gaze sensitivity behaviours. Moreover,

209 socio-ecological considerations also provide critical information into the proximate basis of

210 gaze sensitivity. We expect sensitivity to gaze to occur only if cues are discernible and

211 provide useful information on which the observer can act. Therefore there is often interplay

212 between socio-ecological contexts and the features of the gaze cues available. For instance,

213 predator detection may be dependent on the salience of the predator's eyes, or the prey's

214 capacity to perceive the gaze cues of a heterospecific. There may be a selection pressure

215 for predators to evolve less conspicuous eyes, or to evolve visual configurations that are

216 different from their prey species, making detection of predator gaze more difficult. Similarly,

217 experiments testing for gaze sensitivity often differ in their use of heterospecific (human,

218 predator) or conspecific demonstrators, which may affect whether the subject is motivated to

219 attend to the demonstrator (Emery et al. 1997; Tomasello et al. 1998; Bugnyar et al. 2004;

220 Bräuer et al. 2005). Therefore socio-ecology can give insight into the underlying

221 mechanisms which facilitate the occurrence of gaze behaviours.

222

223 *Gaze cues from predators*

A predator's gaze may give prey species accurate information about the necessity of escape. By accurately assessing where a predator is looking, species may ultimately benefit from increased foraging opportunities (Carter et al. 2008) or more frequent nest visits (Watve et al. 2002). Risk perception may be influenced by the properties of the gaze cue provided by the predator, such as the positioning of the head or eyes, and the colour, shape and size of the eyes (Scaife 1976a; Coss 1979; Jones 1980; Burger et al. 1991). Enhancing or presenting contradictory cues can help experimenters isolate important stimuli for aversive escape responses. Sparrows, *Passer domesticus*, fly away most when a human model is facing towards them, but attend only to head orientation rather than eye orientation (Hampton 1994). Black iguanas, *Ctenosaura similis*, for example, move away sooner when a human face is visible, rather than covered with hair during approach (Burger & Gochfeld 1993). Similar increases in vigilant behaviours are found when the eyes are made to appear larger (Burger et al. 1991). Two eye-like stimuli horizontally placed side-by-side elicit the most fearful responses in jewel fish, *Hemichromis bimaculatus*, (Coss 1979), while in domestic chicks, *Gallus gallus,* the pairing of an iris with a pupil-shape (i.e. having the features of an eye) increases aversive responses (e.g. freezing, distress calls, number of approaches) (Jones 1980) in comparison to other spot arrangements such as no iris or only one eye. However, when testing small passerine predator's preference for invertebrates, there is evidence to suggest that any conspicuous shape, such as a square or triangle on the wings of moths, may be as effective as eye-shaped spots in deterring predation. (Stevens et al. 2007).

Gaze cues that elicit fearful responses may also be important if an animal must approach an object or area where a dangerous agent (e.g. unfamiliar human or predator) is gazing. The conflict paradigm tests whether the subject attends to the orientation of the experimenter's head or eyes by measuring an animal's latency to approach a desired item such as food. If subjects refrain from approaching the food for some time this suggests they are fearful of the experimenter and potentially regard them as a threat. If the subject is

attending to gaze, the latency to approach is expected to be longest when the experimenter

is looking towards the object (e.g. Carter et al. 2008; von Bayern & Emery 2009a). This

paradigm has mainly been tested on birds, perhaps due to their vigilant, flighty behaviour in

the presence of a dangerous agent (typically a human experimenter) alongside their

willingness to approach food. Green bee-eaters, *Merops orientalis*, approach their nest sites

less (Watve et al. 2002) and starlings, *Sturnus vulgaris*, (Carter et al. 2008) are less likely to

approach food sources when a human experimenter is looking. Jackdaws, *Corvus*

monedula, show similar responses to starlings, but only if the experimenter is unfamiliar (von

Bayern & Emery 2009a). Starlings and jackdaws attend specifically to eye orientation of a

different species, not just head orientation.

Assessing a predator's gaze is likely constrained by distance effects, which reduce

visual contrast and thus limit the ability to perceive subtle cues (Fernández-Juricic &

Kowalski 2011) such as gaze. Individuals may need to get closer to a predator to determine

its gaze direction, which could increase predation risk. Consequently, we would expect that

sensitivity to predator eye gaze would be more likely in species with high visual acuity (i.e.

large eye size relative to body mass, presence of a fovea) as they would be able to resolve

at farther distance variations in predator behaviour without incurring too much risk.

The studies cited above examine differential responses to head or eye movement

between heterospecifics (i.e. between the subject and the predator or unfamiliar human), but

there are also instances of aversive responses between conspecifics. Chimpanzees, *Pan*

troglodytes, (Hare et al. 2000) and common marmosets, *Callithrix jacchus*, (Burkart & Heschl

2007) prefer to approach food that a dominant individual does not have visual access to.

However, the gaze cues available between conspecifics may not reflect the cues available

between heterospecifics (i.e. prey and predator). For instance, chimpanzees and common

marmosets may be less sensitive to information from the eyes of conspecifics than humans

are, perhaps because many primates have morphological features thought to conceal gaze

direction (i.e. dark or no exposed sclera) (Kobayashi & Kohshima 1997; Kobayashi &

278 Kohshima 2001; Tomasello et al. 2007). Characterising the features of a species' sensory

279 system is necessary in determining what gaze cues are available between conspecifics and

280 heterospecifics.

281

282 *Gaze cues from group members in predator detection*

283   Information about potential predation risk may be gained not only from the predator

284 itself, but also from the gaze of other group members. Many theoretical models of predator

285 avoidance in monospecific and heterospecific groups assume that collective detection is

286 behind the transfer of information between individuals about potential predator attacks (e.g.

287 Lima 1987). One possibility is that this transfer of information may also occur through gaze

288 following. When animals are farther away in a group, they orient their heads more towards

289 group mates possibly to gather information (Fernández-Juricic et al. 2005). Studies on

290 primates (Tomasello et al. 1998), birds (Loretto et al. 2010; Kehmeier et al. 2011), goats,

291 *Capra hircus*, (Kaminski et al. 2005) and the red-footed tortoise, *Chelonoidis carbonaria*,

292 (Wilkinson et al. 2010) show that individuals follow the gaze of conspecifics looking up,

293 suggesting they attend to conspecifics as a means to detect aerial predators. Following

294 group-member look-ups may be particularly important for animals that forage by grazing or

295 pecking on the ground. Direction of attention would be divided between food sources (on the

296 ground), predators (e.g. on the horizon or in the sky), and possibly conspecific behaviours

297 (e.g. vigilant look-ups). The necessity of relying on conspecific gaze to detect predators and

298 the availability of information from group members will depend on the animal's visual field.

299 Species with larger visual fields may be able to spot predators when their head is down,

300 while other species may need to look up in order to scan for predators (Fernández-Juricic et

301 al. 2004).

302   We have described two aspects of gaze sensitivity which may function in predator

303 avoidance. Both gaze aversion and gaze following behaviours have been reported across a

304 broad spectrum of taxonomic groups, from primates to turtles, and it has been suggested

305 that gaze sensitivity may have been present in a common vertebrate ancestor (Fitch et al.

306 2010). However, we note that few studies have yet to investigate predator gaze sensitivity

307 (but see Stevens et al. 2007), for instance, whether predators prefer to approach prey with

308 averted gaze rather than direct gaze. It also remains unclear whether within-species gaze

309 sensitivity is a prerequisite to between-species gaze sensitivity, and whether gaze aversion

310 is a prerequisite to gaze following, or if they are all independent processes. Studies which

311 consider the visual architecture of a species, and apply a variety of paradigms to the same

312 study species using conspecifics and heterospecifics will help decipher whether gaze

313 preference, gaze aversion and gaze following involve the same proximate mechanisms, and

314 whether they evolved dependently or independently.

315

316 *Social contexts of gaze following*

317   Individuals may gain information from group members by co-orientate their gaze with

318 others, and many species including all great apes (Bräuer et al. 2005), macaques, *Macaca*

319 *mulatta*, (Emery et al. 1997), rooks, *Corvus frugilegus*, (Schmidt et al. 2011) and ravens,

320 *Corvus corax*, (Bugnyar et al. 2004) have been reported to adjust their head direction to

321 match that of a demonstrator. To establish whether individuals are in fact taking into account

322 another individual's visual perspective (as opposed to, for example, behavioural coordination

323 of head movements) experimenters have used the geometric gaze task. In this task, subjects

324 must re-orientate themselves so they are in line with another individual's field of view, rather

325 than stopping at the first object in sight (i.e. the barrier) (Povinelli & Eddy 1996; Tomasello et

326 al. 1999). One interpretation is that geometric gaze may be useful for species that conceal

327 information or attempt to obtain hidden information from conspecifics. Geometric gaze has

328 been demonstrated in all five great apes (Tomasello et al. 1999; Bräuer et al. 2005), in spider

329 monkeys, *Ateles geoffroyi*, and capuchin monkeys, *Cebus apella*, (Amici et al. 2009),

330   domestic dogs, *Canis lupus familiaris*, (Bräuer et al. 2004), and in ravens (Bugnyar et al.

331   2004). In contrast, Northern bald ibises, *Geronticus eremita*, (Loretto et al. 2010) and

332   gibbons, *Hylobates spp. and Symphalangus syndactylus*, (Liebal & Kaminski 2012) did not

333   gaze behind barriers, indicating that this behaviour is not as widespread as basic gaze

334   following, nor can it be explained by phylogeny as lower apes do not show geometric gaze,

335   while some monkeys do (however, see sensory caveats with regards to gaze sensitivity

336   below). Primates living in competitive social groups may conceal information, for instance, by

337   withholding food calls (e.g. Hauser 1992) or concealing extra pair copulations (le Roux et al.

338   2013). Gibbons live in small monogamous family groups which may reduce the necessity to

339   conceal actions by group members, although occasional extra-pair copulations have been

340   reported (Sommer & Reichard 2000). The importance of concealment of visual information

341   could be tested by studying geometric gaze in primate species where same-species

342   individuals may vary in their social dynamics (e.g. male bachelor groups vs. family groups).

343   Other lineages known to conceal information from conspecifics include the corvids;

344   therefore, geometric gaze following may be particularly relevant when engaging in caching

345   and pilfering behaviours (Bugnyar et al. 2004; Schloegl et al. 2007).

346   Some food-caching corvids have been reported to withhold visual and auditory

347   information from potential pilferers (e.g. Bugnyar & Kotrschal 2002; Dally et al. 2005; Stulp et

348   al. 2009; Shaw & Clayton 2012; Shaw & Clayton 2013), or gain visual information from

349   cachers by preferentially watching conspecifics that are caching, as opposed to conspecifics

350   engaged in non-caching behaviours (Grodzinski et al. 2012). In a caching paradigm with

351   ravens, a subject observed a human cache two items, while a demonstrator raven was

352   visible to the subject during both caching events, yet had visual access to only one caching

353   event due to the positioning of a curtain. When given the opportunity to pilfer before their

354   competitor (the demonstrator), subjects preferred to retrieve the food item that was cached

355   when the competitor had visual access, and had no preference when the competitor had no

356   visual access (Bugnyar 2010). Although these studies did not test behaviour specifically in

357   response to gaze cues, they highlight the importance of a competitor's line of sight during

358   caching and pilfering. Determining if ravens use gaze cues to find food has been explored

359   explicitly using the object-choice task (Schloegl et al. 2008a; Schloegl et al. 2008b).

360   In the object-choice task, a subject must find food hidden in one of two locations,

361   often under cups or behind barriers. A demonstrator looks in the direction of where the food

362   is hidden, and subjects may attend to the direction of the experimenter or conspecific

363   demonstrator's gaze to determine where food is hidden (e.g. Call et al. 2000; Schloegl et al.

364   2008a). Ravens were unsuccessful in the object-choice paradigm regardless of whether the

365   demonstrator is a conspecific or a human (Schloegl et al. 2008a). Rhesus macaques and

366   capuchin monkeys were also unsuccessful in the object-choice task when presented with

367   human gaze cues, though capuchins and some macaques choose above chance when

368   given pointing cues (Anderson et al. 1995; Anderson et al. 1996). Chimpanzees also

369   typically perform poorly, perhaps because the experiment is presented in a cooperative

370   framework (Hare & Tomasello 2004). Chimpanzees are accustomed to frequent competition

371   with group members for access to food (e.g. Hauser et al. 1993; Hare et al. 2006), and may

372   not use altruistic, communicative gaze cues. Modifications to the object-choice task can

373   often influence success rates, for instance ensuring the demonstrator, rather than the cups,

374   is the main target of the subject's attention. In a meta-analysis of existing object-choice tasks

375   using gaze cues (and pointing gestures), success rates were higher if the subject was kept

376   at a distance, or restrained until the cues have been presented for a given period of time

377   before allowing the subject to make a choice (Mulcahy & Hedge 2012). Therefore

378   performance levels may be attributed to methodological issues involving the salience of the

379   cue or the configuration of the sensory system (see below), rather than a species' cognitive

380   capacity to pass the object-choice task.

381   The object-choice task first requires joint attention behaviour as the subject must

382   attend to the same object as the experimenter. Looking at the same cup as the demonstrator

383   (i.e. joint attention) may be achieved by gaze following, and then by visually fixating on the

384 nearest object in sight. Alternatively, looking at the same cup as the demonstrator may be

385 achieved through shared attention, a mechanism involving awareness that one shares

386 attention with another individual towards the same object (Baron-Cohen 1994; Emery 2000).

387 In addition to fixating on a particular cup, subjects tested in the object-choice task must also

388 use this information to subsequently choose a cup to obtain the hidden reward. A number of

389 researchers have proposed that social interactions involving shared attention may also

390 involve joint intention, a mechanism allowing others to be perceived as intentional agents,

391 and enabling one to form a cognitive representation of one's own intention as well as

392 another individuals' intention towards the same object or goal (Tomasello et al. 2005,

393 Tomasello & Carpenter 2005). Together, shared attention and joint intention can enable

394 shared intentionality in which individuals engage in collaborative interactions (Tomasello et

395 al. 2005). Shared attention and joint intention may have evolved in humans as a means to

396 communicate and cooperate with others through gaze following, and is thought to have

397 influenced the evolution of human eye morphology to expose the white sclera around the iris

398 (Kobayashi & Kohshima 1997). Having a conspicuous eye that makes gaze easier to track

399 would benefit those engaging in shared intentionality.

400   Unlike other corvids, jackdaws have pale irises that may facilitate the ability to track

401 eye/head movements. Von Bayern & Emery (2009a) have suggested that the pale iris may

402 have evolved as a salient signal specifically to communicate within monogamous pairs

403 where successful reproduction may be dependent on coordinating actions such as finding

404 food, nest building and defence or feeding young. In support of this proposal, jackdaws

405 presented with an object-choice task chose the correct food location only when paired with

406 their mated partner, suggesting this task was performed cooperatively between pairs (von

407 Bayern & Emery 2009b). Ravens, which have dark eyes, failed a same-species object-

408 choice task (although it should be noted that ravens in monogamous pairs were not tested in

409 a cooperative framework as the jackdaws were) (Schloegl et al. 2008a). It is unknown why

410 some birds have evolved pale or brightly coloured irises, and no relationship has been found

16

between breeding system and iris colour in passerine birds (Craig & Hulley 2004), although this conclusion must remain tentative as the study did not control for phylogeny. There are also not enough comparative studies available to investigate whether sensitivity to gaze is more prominent in birds with brightly coloured eyes, or in monogamous species. One possibility is that jackdaws evolved pale irises independently of gaze following or breeding system. Therefore, rather than being a signal that evolved specifically between sender and receiver for the purpose of communication, the pale iris may be a cue (information can be extracted by the receiver) which could enhance gaze sensitivity between conspecifics. Alternatively, iris colour may not be related to jackdaw success in gaze following tasks. It is also unclear if the cues given by the demonstrator jackdaw in the object-choice task were from the eyes, head movement or body positioning, illustrating the lack of information in the literature regarding the cues that conspecifics may or may not be using in these tasks. In fact, we will argue that animals with laterally placed eyes will have difficulty using eye movements from conspecifics for cues in gaze following (see following section).

Ultimate factors such as predation rates, individual experience, foraging behaviours, social systems and mating systems may influence proximate mechanisms including the cognitive processes by which an animal processes information obtained from gaze cues. The dynamics of social interactions may select for the evolution of cognitive mechanisms enabling more flexible, complex forms of gaze following. Studies on conspecific gaze following in various social contexts may thus enable us to examine the interaction between sociality and cognition.

Animals' responses during experiments will also often be dependent on the specific gaze cues presented (e.g. head orientation, size, colour or shape of the eyes), as demonstrated in many gaze aversion tasks (e.g. Scaife 1976b; Jones 1980; Burger et al. 1991; Carter et al. 2008). However, gaze following tasks often assume that the cues presented to subjects reflect those the study species uses for gaze following under natural conditions, which may not be the case. Confounding factors, such as species differences in

438   visual configuration and hence different responses to the experimental stimuli used as gaze

439   cues, should also be considered when interpreting results from the existing literature, and

440   when designing gaze following experiments.

441

442   **SENSORY ARCHITECTURE AND CUE INFORMATION**

443   Consideration of sensory systems is essential to understanding instances of gaze

444   sensitivity across taxa. For example, gaze sensitivity tasks initially designed to test

445   underlying cognitive mechanisms in humans and other primates were designed for species

446   with very specific visual systems: having forward-facing eyes allows gaze cues to be

447   presented as head turning and orientating in a fixed direction, or presented as the orientation

448   of both eyes in one direction. Whilst there is extensive work on the gaze cues used by

449   primates (Tomasello et al. 2007), and how the eyes have evolved as a signal in humans

450   (Kobayashi & Kohshima 1997; Kobayashi & Kohshima 2001), little is known about how other

451   animal's visual system is configured and how they respond to different cues that could be

452   used in gaze sensitivity contexts (e.g. eye and head movements). This is particularly

453   important as the number of species tested in gaze sensitivity tasks broadens. Existing

454   studies include mammals with laterally placed eyes (i.e. goats, Kaminski et al. 2005; horses,

455   *Equus caballus*, Proops & McComb 2010), as well as reptiles (e.g. Wilkinson et al. 2010)

456   and birds (e.g. Loretto et al. 2010; Kehmeier et al. 2011). All these species have very

457   different visual systems. These differences are likely to influence whether test subjects can

458   perceive the gaze cues presented in experiments. We use birds as models to discuss the

459   influence of visual architecture on gaze sensitivity because of the relatively large

460   comparative literature on the avian visual system. However, when possible, we discuss the

461   visual systems of other vertebrates. Birds show a high degree of inter-specific variability in

462   visual systems (Meyer 1977; Martin 2007) that is also present in other taxa (i.e. several

463   species of birds, mammals and reptiles have laterally placed eyes, while others have

464 frontally placed eyes). Therefore, the conclusions derived from the following discussion can

465 be applied to other vertebrate taxa subject to gaze sensitivity studies. Our main argument is

466 that our understanding of gaze sensitivity would benefit enormously if behavioural and

467 cognitive studies are accompanied by a detailed characterisation of the study species' visual

468 architecture. This will determine what cues are available to indicate gaze direction and

469 hence what cues conspecifics or heterospecifics are sensitive to.

470

471 *Visual architecture*

472   Of the many components of the visual system, the following are likely to play a

473 particularly relevant role in gaze sensitivity: position of the orbits, visual field configuration,

474 degree of eye movements, and type, position and number of retinal specialisations. We

475 briefly explain each of these sensory components. Different species vary in their degree of

476 orbit convergence (i.e. position of orbits in the skull) and thus in the extent of their binocular,

477 lateral, and blind fields around their heads (i.e. visual field configuration) (Martin 2007;

478 Iwaniuk et al. 2008). The placement of the orbits affects the general position of gaze in visual

479 space as well as where other animals can detect gaze from. Bird species with more frontally

480 placed eyes would tend to have wider binocular fields than species with more laterally

481 placed eyes, when the eyes are at rest (Iwaniuk et al. 2008). A similar pattern has been

482 found in mammals (Heesy 2004). However, the degree of eye movement varies substantially

483 between species (Martin 2007; Fernández-Juricic et al. 2010), which can lead to variations in

484 the visual field configuration. For example, some species can barely move their eyes (e.g.

485 owls; Martin 1984), whereas others with laterally placed eyes can converge and diverge their

486 eyes (towards and away from their bills respectively) to the point that they can have

487 binocular fields the size of those with frontally placed eyes and extremely narrow blind areas

488 that increase their fields of view around their heads (sparrows, Fernández-Juricic et al. 2008;

489 Fernández-Juricic et al. 2011). Similar ranges in the degree of eye movement can be found

19

490   in other vertebrates. For instance, chameleons can move their eyes about 180º, whereas

491   guinea pigs can only move their eyes about 2º (Ott 2001; Kim 2013). These visual field

492   configuration changes have important functional implications for enhancing food search (i.e.

493   widening binocular fields) and predator detection (i.e. widening lateral areas), two relevant

494   cues in gaze following scenarios.

495   The position of the orbits on the head also affects where potential gaze cues are

496   available, and therefore whether other animals can perceive eye movements. For animals

497   with frontally placed eyes, eye movements can best be perceived from the front, where both

498   eyes can be seen (Figure 3a). In contrast, eye movements in laterally-eyed animals can best

499   be perceived from the side, making only one eye visible from this perspective (Figure 3a).

500   This has important implications if an animal with laterally placed eyes is trying to detect the

501   gaze of a conspecific who can move their eyes. If the animal is looking at the conspecific

502   from the side, only one eye is visible. The position of the other eye is unknown to the

503   conspecific and this can lead to ambiguity of gaze direction (Figure 3a).

504   Nevertheless, the size of the visual field only describes the volume of visual space

505   animals can perceive around their heads as a result of the projection of their retinas, but not

506   the quality of vision. Visual performance varies in different parts of the visual field because of

507   changes in the density of photoreceptors (i.e. involved in phototransduction) and retinal

508   ganglion cells (i.e. involved in the transfer of information from the retina to visual centres in

509   the brain) across the retina (Hughes 1977). Areas of the retina with higher density of

510   photoreceptors and retinal ganglion cells are known as retinal specialisations. These retinal

511   specialisations project into a specific part of the visual field and provide higher quality

512   information (e.g. higher visual resolution) than other parts of the retina (Collin 1999). The

513   retinal specialisations are thought to be the centres of visual attention (Bisley 2011). In other

514   words, when an animal detects a visual stimulus in a sector of the visual field that is outside

515   of the retinal specialisation, it will move its head and eyes to align the retinal specialisation

516   with that object and collect high quality information.

517   Retinal specialisations vary in type, size, position, and number (Meyer 1977). For

518   instance, the fovea is a retinal specialisation characterised by an invagination of the retinal

519   tissue whose centre provides the highest visual resolution (Walls 1942). Foveae are present

520   in many vertebrates (Walls 1942; Duijm 1959; Hughes 1977) such as some primates and

521   birds, but also in some canids and fish (Packer et al. 1989; Curcio et al. 1991; Peichl 1992;

522   Collin et al. 2000; Dolan & Fernandez-Juricic 2010;). The fovea projects into a smaller

523   portion of the visual field than the visual streak, which is another retinal specialisation that

524   consists of an enlargement of the retinal tissue forming a horizontal band of high visual

525   resolution across the central axis of the whole retina (Walls 1942). Different vertebrate

526   species have been found to have visual streaks (Hughes 1977), such as horses, goats, and

527   dogfish (Hughes & Whitteridge 1973; Bozzano 2004; Querubin et al. 2009). Additionally, the

528   position and number of retinal specialisations can affect the direction of gaze. For instance,

529   some Passeriformes tend to have a single fovea projecting into the lateral field (Fernández-

530   Juricic et al. 2011), making individuals use their lateral fields (i.e. aligning their heads

531   laterally in relation to the object of visual interest) to explore visually objects (e.g. zebra finch,

532   *Taeniopygia guttata*; Bischof 1988). However, some diurnal raptors have two foveae, one

533   central projecting to the lateral field and one temporal projecting into the binocular field (Fite

534   & Rosenfield-Wessels 1975; Reymond 1985). During a chase, raptors align the fovea

535   projecting frontally into the binocular field with the prey when close to catching it (Tucker

536   2000). Thus, depending on the configuration of the visual field and the retina, the behaviours

537   associated with gaze direction would vary between species. Variations in the number and

538   position of the retinal specialisations are also present in other vertebrates; for instance,

539   wolves, *Canus lupus*, have a horizontal streak with a temporally placed fovea (Peichl 1992)

540   whereas the pigtail macaque, *Macaca nemestrina*, has a single fovea (Packer et al. 1989).

541

542   *Visual perception in a gaze following context*

543   Two of the most important visual tasks for animals are visual search (i.e. looking for

544   an object in visual space that is absent; such as searching for predators) and visual fixation

545   (i.e. focusing gaze on an object that is present in visual space and gathering high quality

546   visual information from it with the retinal specialisation; such as tracking a predator

547   approaching). From the perspective of gaze sensitivity, visual fixation is a key process as it

548   indicates the main centre of visual attention (Bisley 2011). Visual fixation is associated with

549   specific behavioural patterns (e.g. eye and head movements); which are expected to be the

550   cues that other animals would use during gaze detection. However, variations in the visual

551   architecture mentioned above are likely to modify these behavioural patterns (or cues) in

552   different ways depending on the position of the projection of the retinal specialisation in

553   visual space. Therefore, understanding visual system configuration and fixation should be

554   two essential elements when determining the gaze cues to which animals are sensitive.

555   **(Please insert Figure 3 approximately here)**

556   For example, humans have frontally placed orbits with a large degree of eye

557   movement. In humans, the fovea is positioned at approximately the centre of the retina,

558   hence projecting into the binocular field (Fig. 3a). When humans fixate, both foveae align

559   with the object of interest with a steady gaze (Fig. 3b). When an object is static, human

560   fixation is associated with a decrease in head movements and is fine-tuned with the eyes

561   'locked' on the target of attention (although the eyes still engage in very subtle movements;

562   Martinez-Conde 2005). A similar visual fixation strategy is present in other vertebrates such

563   as dogs (Somppi et al. 2012). The ocular fine-tuning in humans is facilitated by eye

564   colouration, in which the iris surrounded by a clear sclera becomes a salient cue that

565   facilitates gaze detection (Kobayashi & Kohshima 1997). Overall, this visual and

566   morphological configuration in humans reduces ambiguity in gaze direction cues.

567   However, in many species with laterally placed-eyes (e.g. most birds, goats, horses;

568   Fig. 3a), the type of retinal specialisation, along with its projection, varies enormously

569   between species. Additionally, their visual fixation strategies are not as well understood. Two

570   visual fixation strategies have been proposed for birds with laterally placed eyes (Fig. 3b): 1)

571   fixating only one fovea on a visual target using monocular vision (Maldonado et al. 1988),

572   and 2) quickly alternating between the two foveae using the monocular fields of both eyes

573   (Dawkins 2002). The first strategy is similar to human fixation in that it locks the gaze (in this

574   case with only one eye) on the object of interest, thus reducing head movements (Fig. 3b).

575   The second strategy actually increases head movements by having each eye check the

576   object of interest repeatedly (Fig. 3b). Furthermore, there is evidence that fixation may also

577   occur within the binocular field in species with laterally placed eyes when objects are very

578   close by (Bloch et al. 1984; Dawkins 2002); however, it is not known whether this occurs by

579   animals converging their eyes and thus projecting their retinal specialisation into the

580   binocular field. There is a major gap in comparative data as to how fixation strategies vary in

581   vertebrates with different visual architecture, which would influence the cues other

582   individuals use to assess gaze direction.

583   We can, however, make some predictions about the combination of sensory traits

584   that could favour (or not) gaze sensitivity in species with laterally placed eyes and a single

585   fovea. A large number of the species belonging to the most diverse avian Order,

586   Passeriformes, surveyed to date have a single fovea that is centro-temporally placed

587   (Fernández-Juricic 2012), which generally projects into the lateral visual field, but not far

588   from the edge with the binocular field. These species have, however, different degrees of

589   eye movement. If birds use eye movement as gaze direction cues as humans do, we would

590   expect sensitivity to gaze cues to be more prevalent in species with larger degree of eye

591   movement (Fig. 3b), and particularly the ones in which the eye is visually salient due to a

592   differently coloured iris (e.g. jackdaws).

593   Even in species with salient (i.e. brightly coloured) eyes, there is a fundamental

594   challenge: some bird species show coordinated eye movements whereas in others the two

595   eyes move independently of one another (Bloch et al. 1984; Voss & Bischof 2009). The

23

596   implication is that during fixation, the movement of one eye would predict the movement of

597   the other eye in some species, but not in others (Fig. 4). This uncertainty could translate into

598   an ambiguous gaze direction cue, which may not favour gaze detection using *only* eye

599   movement cues (Fig. 4). Evidence in species with laterally placed eyes supports the view

600   that birds tend to move their heads more than their eyes when changing the direction of

601   gaze (Gioanni 1988). Consequently, we propose that in species with laterally placed eyes

602   and a single fovea, species are more likely to be sensitive to head movement cues (e.g.

603   head orientation, rate of change in head position, etc.) rather than eye movement cues. In

604   those species that fixate by 'locking' their gaze to an object with a single fovea, the gaze cue

605   is expected to be a pronounced decrease in head movement rate associated with a single

606   head position aligned with the visual target. Conversely, in those species that fixate by using

607   both foveae alternatively, the gaze cue would be an increase in head movement rate

608   associated with at least two main head orientations in which each eye aligns with the visual

609   target.

610   **(Please insert Figure 4 approximately here)**

611   Determining gaze cues (i.e. eye, head, body orientation postures that indicate where

612   a conspecific is looking at) in bird species with a visual streak (e.g. anseriformes) as the

613   retinal specialisation may be even more challenging. Most of the sensory issues described

614   above apply, but additionally these species have a lower need to move their heads and eyes

615   as the visual streak provides high visual resolution in a larger proportion of the visual field

616   (the whole horizontal axis) than in species with fovea (Collin 1999). We expect that species

617   with visual streaks may be less sensitive to gaze cues, or would rely on less ambiguous

618   cues, such as moving the head sideways to fixate the object with the retinal specialisation of

619   each eye alternatively; therefore, relying more on head orientation than head movement

620   rate. Overall, we propose that visual architecture will influence not only the ability to perceive

621   gaze cues, but also the types of cues associated with gaze direction that conspecifics and

622   heterospecifics may use.

623 .

COGNITION IN GAZE SENSITIVITY

625   A species' visual system may influence the information made available to individuals

626 in the form of gaze cues, and socio-ecological factors may determine whether adaptive

627 information can be gained from attending to gaze cues (e.g. the location of food). Once it

628 has been established that gaze cues are available to the subject and that they elicit a gaze

629 response, we can investigate the cognitive mechanisms involved in processing gaze cue

630 information which generate behavioural outputs.

631

632   The difficulty in interpreting the cognitive mechanisms a species is applying to gaze

633 tasks is two-fold. First, if the sensory system of an animal is not considered, it is difficult to

634 be certain that a negative result is due to the lack of a particular cognitive mechanism as

635 opposed to a lack of sensitivity to a particular cue. Second, if a gaze cue is available and

636 does cause a response, it remains difficult to disentangle whether a particular action (e.g.

637 gaze following) is driven primarily by the stimulus (e.g. eye, head movement), or if it is also

638 driven by cognitive mechanisms that enable the subject to understand something about what

639 the demonstrator can see. Seemingly complex behaviour may often be underpinned by

640 relatively simple mechanisms. For example, stimulus-driven visual fixation processes in

641 praying mantises generate complex, coordinated movements of the head, abdomen and

642 prothorax when pinpointing the exact location of prey (Rossel et al. 1980; Yamawaki et al.

643 2011). Similarly, the body and eye movements apparent when vertebrates redirect their

644 visual attention in joint attention, gaze following or geometric gaze tests may also be driven

645 by simple stimulus-response processes. One cannot ascribe the presence of gaze sensitivity

646 to cognitive mechanisms such as perspective taking or attention attribution (see below)

647 simply based on the complexity of behaviours observed when animals gather visual

648 information. Instead, carefully designed experiments are essential if we are to discriminate

649 between alternative cognitive explanations. Often this means that authors must present

650 alternate interpretations in the form of 'low-level' (e.g. simple behavioural responses, or

651 associative learning mechanisms) and 'high-level' mechanisms (e.g. perspective taking or

652 attention attribution) because it is not always definitive which are driving the observable

653 behaviours (e.g. Povinelli & Eddy 1996; Call et al. 1998).

654

655 *Alternative interpretations*

656 The majority of studies of the cognitive processing underlying gaze responses have

657 employed gaze following paradigms, (but see Call et al. 2003; Flombaum & Santos 2005;

658 von Bayern & Emery 2009a for examples of cognitive tasks applying gaze aversion

659 paradigms). Often these studies are unable to discount alternative cognitive interpretations

660 for observed behaviour. For instance, individuals may succeed in a gaze-following task by

661 learning to associate finding food or an interesting object with seeing a particular gaze cue

662 and then performing a gaze following behaviour. Alternatively, the subject may apply

663 mechanisms such as shared attention or attention attribution. Attention attribution is similar

664 to shared attention in that the subject appreciates where the demonstrator's attention is

665 focused, but does not necessarily involve attending to the same object (e.g. von Bayern &

666 Emery 2009a).

667 Gaze following behaviours also raise the question of whether animals are capable of

668 perspective taking. Perspective taking has been described as the ability to infer that others

669 may see different things than what oneself sees (Flavell 1974; Flavell 1977). For instance, in

670 the geometric gaze task, a subject might take into account another individual's line of sight

671 as being different from one's own in order to adjust its positioning around a barrier. In the

672 literature on non-human gaze following, mechanisms such as shared attention, attention

673 attribution and perspective taking are typically defined as distinct from Theory of Mind (the

674 ability to reason about other individual's mental states, separate from one's own). Although

675 Theory of Mind may guide gaze responses in humans, tasks in non-human animals cannot

676 test for this when applying paradigms which involve behavioural cues such as eye gaze.

677 Such tasks are unable to distinguish between responses to gaze cues themselves, as

678 opposed to responses to another individual's mental states. The most compelling evidence

679 for perspective taking in gaze-related tasks comes from experiments which control for gaze

680 cues, or in fact, any behavioural cue. For example, in studies of food-caching corvids,

681 subjects have been presented with individuals which differ only in whether they had visual

682 access to an object (i.e. food) or an event (i.e. caching) (e.g. Emery & Clayton 2001; Dally et

683 al. 2006; Bugnyar 2010), not in the gaze cues presented. Even so, it remains possible that

684 demonstrators may provide subtle behavioural cues that indicate whether or not they saw

685 food. Controlling for behavioural cues may be possible using robot models or video playback

686 (Fernández-Juricic et al. 2006; Bird & Emery 2008; Woo & Rieucau 2012; see also below).

687

688 *Interpreting negative results*

689   If negative results are obtained in gaze tasks, we should not always presume the

690 absence of cognitive mechanisms in the context of gaze sensitivity. Instead, failure to

691 perform successfully in gaze tasks may occur because the appropriate gaze cues were not

692 available to the subject. Information on sensory systems is critical to determine whether the

693 species is capable of attending to the demonstrators' gaze cues. If it is known that a species'

694 visual configuration presents ambiguous gaze cues or none at all, then we should rule out

695 mechanisms such as shared attention or perspective taking, at least in the context of gaze

696 following. Similarly, if the available gaze cues within a species have not been identified

697 correctly, experimenters may be expecting to measure a behaviour that does not match the

698 species' actual response-type, given their visual architecture. For example, if both gaze cues

699 and gaze responses within a species are very subtle (e.g. small eye movements), eye

700 movement responses may be overlooked if head movements are the expected measure.

701   Only once observable cues are shown to elicit measureable gaze responses can further

702   behavioural data be collected to test for cognitive mechanisms. For example, behaviours

703   such as turning back to face the demonstrator, presumably to confirm where they are looking

704   (all great apes, Bräuer et al. 2005), or placing distractor objects close to the subject, but not

705   in the demonstrator's line of sight (chimpanzees, Tomasello et al. 1999) may provide some

706   support for shared attention. This may require the subject reliably attend to where the

707   demonstrator is looking, rather than stopping at the first interesting object.

708   With all this uncertainly, which tasks are the most informative for testing underlying

709   cognitive mechanisms? Overall, the geometric gaze task may be a good test for complex

710   processing in a gaze-following context as it requires the subjects not only follow the gaze of

711   others, but also act by adjusting their vantage point. This task also has the benefit of being

712   ecologically relevant, as individuals may often encounter and move around barriers

713   occluding their line of sight, or as we have seen, may be important in species engaging in

714   cache protection and pilfering (e.g. Bugnyar et al. 2004; Dally et al. 2006; Schloegl et al.

715   2007).

716

717   **APPLICATIONS FOR GAZE RESEARCH**

718   The socio-ecological, anatomical, sensory and cognitive features we discussed may

719   influence the occurrence of gaze behaviours across taxa, but these factors are seldom

720   considered together when designing and interpreting gaze tasks. To address this gap and

721   gain a better understanding of the mechanisms underlying gaze sensitivity, we propose a

722   new approach that consists of the following steps. Following these steps could improve our

723   ability to interpret results, particularly in studies which show null results, while also

724   contributing to comparative data available to gaze researchers to test how the features of an

725   animal's visual system may be associated with the gaze cues and responses.

726   1) Gaze researchers should study key components of the visual system of the study

727   species (i.e. orbit orientation, visual field configuration, and type, position and number of

728   retinal specialisations, see http://www.retinalmaps.com.au for retinal topography maps) to

729   establish the projections of the areas of acute vision into the visual field. This may be

730   possible by studying species that are phylogenetically closely related to the ones with

731   existing data available, or if limited in available study species, by collaborating with

732   researchers that study visual systems. This will aid in making predictions regarding the

733   degree of eye and head movement expected during visual fixation, and where possible, to

734   target species expected to display more pronounced gaze cues (e.g. head movement rates).

735   2) The behavioural mechanisms of visual fixation (e.g. head/eye orientation, movement rate,

736   etc. when gaze is locked in an object) in the study species should be determined. This may

737   involve observational data of the study species when presented with objects of interest in

738   their line of sight, and at different distances to identify head or eye movement associated

739   with viewing these objects (Bossema & Burgler 1980; Dawkins 2002). Observational data in

740   this context will further our understanding of how specific features of an animal's visual

741   architecture relate to observable gaze cues. 3) It is also important to characterise the

742   behaviours associated with visual fixation in different contexts, for instance, are the gaze

743   cues during food search and predator detection the same? 4) Once the gaze cues produced

744   by the gazer are characterised, it should be established whether the cues identified in the

745   previous step generate a gaze sensitivity response, and whether this differs depending on

746   the social-ecological context of the task (e.g. avoiding predator gaze versus the cooperative

747   and competitive contexts when following conspecific gaze). In order to do so in a gaze

748   following context, it may be beneficial to use conspecifics. This is important for those testing

749   behaviour or cognition. If a species visual fixation strategy differs from humans, the subjects

750   may not associate human gaze in the same way they would a conspecific's gaze (but see

751   von Bayern & Emery 2009a where subjects were hand-raised by and had extensive

752   interactions with humans prior to testing). Therefore, failure in a task may be measuring a

753   lack of cue perception rather than a lack of a given cognitive mechanism. We recognise that

754   some species are often not studied in a within-species context mostly due to logistical

755   difficulties in manipulating gaze following cues. We suggest waiting until the appropriate

756   gaze cue has been displayed by the demonstrator before recording subject gaze response.

757   We also now have interesting tools at our disposal such as video playback, which has been

758   successful for assessing same-species social preferences in rooks (Bird & Emery 2008).

759   Gaze cues can be manipulated by using animated video playback, which has been shown to

760   be a successful stimulus for many species of fish, some bird species (e.g. *Lonchura*

761   *punctulata*, *Gallus gallus, Taeniopygia guttata*) and Jacky dragons, *Amphibolurus muricatus*,

762   (see Woo & Rieucau 2012 for review). Cue manipulation could also be applied using robotic

763   animals (e.g. birds, Fernández-Juricic et al. 2006). This empirical approach can be easily

764   adjusted to test the relative role of eye vs. head movements in species with frontally and

765   laterally placed eyes, the role of eye colour on gaze detection in birds, the relative role of

766   different gaze following rules, etc. Alternatively, peep holes (a small hole in a wall or barrier

767   through which the subject can look) are an effective method of determining what subjects

768   are attending to and for how long (Bird & Emery 2010; Grodzinski et al. 2012), and could be

769   implemented to control what cues are observable by using different sized peep holes

770   exposing only the head or the eyes, or restricting species to use monocular vision only. Peep

771   holes should be adjusted to the relative size of the species, as larger species (i.e. larger eye

772   sizes) have higher visual acuity (Kiltie 2000). This could be particularly relevant in studies

773   comparing the performance of gaze sensitivity between species (e.g. territorial vs. social).

774   Once gaze behaviours (i.e. gaze aversion, gaze following) have been established in

775   response to characterised gaze cues, these can be applied to more complex tasks. For

776   example, a task can be structured using the appropriate cue and a barrier to test geometric

777   gaze. Although the gaze cue itself does not test cognitive mechanisms directly,

778   understanding the gaze characteristics of the study species ensures that negative results are

779   not due to the lack of cue perception.

780

CONCLUSION

781

782   In this review, we have proposed several socio-ecological, anatomical, sensory, and

783   cognitive factors which may explain the variation in gaze following or gaze aversion

784   responses across species. We argue that it is critical to consider an animal's visual

785   architecture as it will directly affect their ability to detect the targets of gaze. Gaze cues can

786   differ between contexts within the same species, for instance, whether the visual fixation

787   strategy used by a conspecific is being presented as a cue during food search or as a cue

788   during predator scanning. Furthermore, the gaze cues detectable between conspecifics may

789   be different from gaze cues presented by heterospecifics or predators. Therefore it is crucial

790   to ensure that appropriate cues are chosen to match the context of the task. This presents

791   researchers with a unique opportunity to test how variations in sensory systems can affect

792   the occurrence of gaze sensitivity across species. Finally, establishing the gaze cues that

793   each species attends to, and under what conditions, will provide robust experimental designs

794   for gaze tasks testing cognitive mechanisms.

795

796

797

798 References
799
800 **Amici,F., Aureli,F., Visalberghi,E. & Call,J.** 2009. Spider monkeys (*Ateles geoffroyi*) and

801 capuchin monkeys (*Cebus apella*) follow gaze around barriers: evidence for perspective

802 taking? *Journal of Comparative Psychology*, **123,** 368-374.

803 **Anderson,J.R., Montant,M. & Schmitt,D.** 1996. Rhesus monkeys fail to use gaze direction

804 as an experimenter-given cue in an object-choice task. *Behavioural Processes*, **37,** 47-55.

805 **Anderson,J.R., Sallaberry,P. & Barbier,H.** 1995. Use of experimenter-given cues during

806 object-choice tasks by capuchin monkeys. *Animal Behaviour*, **49,** 201-208.

807 **Baron-Cohen,S.** 1994. How to build a baby that can read minds: Cognitive mechanisms in

808 mindreading. *Cahiers de Psychologie Cognitive*, **13,** 513-552.

809 **Bird,C.D. & Emery,N.J.** 2008. Using video playback to investigate the social preferences of

810 rooks, *Corvus frugilegus. Animal Behaviour*, **76,** 679-687.

811 **Bird,C.D. & Emery,N.J.** 2010. Rooks perceive support relations similar to six-month-old

812 babies. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B.*, **277,** 147-151.

813 **Bischof,H.J.** 1988. The visual field and visually guided behavior in the zebra finch

814 (*Taeniopygia guttata*). *Journal of Comparative Physiology*, **163,** 329-337.

815 **Bisley,J.W.** 2011. The neural basis of visual attention. *Journal of Physiology*, **589,** 49-57.

816 **Bloch,S., Rivaud,S. & Martinoya,C.** 1984. Comparing frontal and lateral viewing in the

817 pigeon. III. Different patterns of eye movements for binocular and monocular fixation.

818 *Behavioural Brain Research*, **13,** 173-182.

819 **Bock,S.W., Dicke,P. & Thier,P.** 2008. How precise is gaze following in humans? *Vision*

820 *Research*, **48,** 946-957.

821 **Bossema,I. & Burgler,R.R.** 1980. Communication during monocular and binocular looking

822 in European jays (*Garrulus g. glandarius*). *Behaviour*, **74,** 274-283.

823 **Bozzano,A.** 2004. Retinal specialisations in the dogfish *Centroscymnus Coelolepsis* from

824 the Mediterranean deep-sea. *Scientia Marina*, **68,** 185-195.

825 **Bräuer,J., Call,J. & Tomasello,M.** 2004. Visual perspective taking in dogs (*Canis familiaris*)

826 in the presence of barriers. *Applied Animal Behaviour Science*, **88,** 299-317.

827 **Bräuer,J., Call,J. & Tomasello,M.** 2005. All great ape species follow gaze to distant

828 locations and around barriers. *Journal of Comparative Psychology*, **119,** 145-154.

829 **Bugnyar,T.** 2010. Knower-guesser differentiation in ravens: others' viewpoints matter.

830 *Proceedings of the Royal Society B.*, **278,** 634-640.

831 **Bugnyar,T. & Kotrschal,K.** 2002. Observational learning and the raiding of food caches in

832 ravens, *Corvus corax*: is it 'tactical' deception? *Animal Behaviour*, **64,** 185-195.

833 **Bugnyar,T., Stowe,M. & Heinrich,B.** 2004. Ravens, *Corvus corax*, follow gaze direction of

834 humans around obstacles. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B.*, **271,** 1331-1336.

835 **Burger,J., Gochefeld,M. & Murray Jr,B.G.** 1991. Role of a predator's eye size in risk

836 perception by basking black iguana, *Ctenosaura similis*. *Animal Behaviour*, **42,** 471-476.

837 **Burger,J. & Gochfeld,M.** 1993. The Importance of the Human Face in Risk Perception by

838 Black Iguanas, *Ctenosaura similis*. *Journal of Herpetology*, **27,** 426-430.

839 **Burkart,J.M. & Heschl,A.** 2007. Understanding visual access in common marmosets,

840 *Callithrix jacchus*: perspective taking or behaviour reading? *Animal Behaviour*, **73,** 457-469.

841 **Call,J., Hare,B.A. & Tomasello,M.** 1998. Chimpanzee gaze following in an object-choice

842 task. *Animal Cognition*, **1,** 89-99.

843 **Call,J., Agnetta,B. & Tomasello,M.** 2000. Cues that chimpanzees do and do not use to find

844 hidden objects. *Animal Cognition*, **3,** 23-34.

845 **Call,J., Brauer,J., Kaminski,J. & Tomasello,M.** 2003. Domestic dogs (*Canis familiaris*) are

846 sensitive to the attentional state of humans. *Journal of Comparative Psychology*, **117,** 257-

847 263.

848 **Carter,J., Lyons,N.J., Cole,H.L. & Goldsmith,A.R.** 2008. Subtle cues of predation risk:

849 starlings respond to a predator's direction of eye-gaze. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B.*,

850 **275,** 1709-1715.

851 **Collin,S.P.** 1999. Behavioural ecology and retinal cell topography. In: *Adaptive Mechanisms*

852 *in the Ecology of Vision* (Ed. by S.Archer, M.Djamgoz, E.Loew, J.C.Partridge & S.Vallerga),

853 pp. 509-535. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

854 **Collin,S.P., Lloyd,D.J. & Wagner,H.J.** 2000. Foveate vision in deep-sea teleosts: a

855 comparison of primary visual and olfactory inputs. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal*

856 *Society B.*, **355,** 1315-1320.

857 **Coss,R.G.** 1979. Delayed plasticity of an instinct: recognition and avoidance of 2 facing eyes

858 by the jewel fish. *Developmental Psychobiology*, **12,** 335-345.

859 **Craig,A.J.F.K. & Hulley,P.E.** 2004. Iris colour in passerine birds: why be bright-eyed? *South*

860 *African Journal of Science*, **100,** 584-588.

861 **Curcio,C.A., Allen,K.A., Sloan,K.R., Lerea,C.L., Hurley,J.B., Klock,I.B. & Milam,A.H.**

862 1991. Distribution and morphology of human cone photoreceptors stained with anti-blue

863 opsin. *Journal of Comparative Neurology*, **312,** 610-624.

864 **Dally,J.M., Emery,N.J. & Clayton,N.S.** 2005. Cache protection strategies by western scrub-

865 jays, *Aphelocoma californica*: implications for social cognition. *Animal Behaviour*, **70,** 1251-

866 1263.

867 **Dally,J.M., Emery,N.J. & Clayton,N.S.** 2006. Food-caching western scrub-jays keep track

868 of who was watching when. *Science*, **312,** 1662-1665.

869 **Dawkins,M.** 2002. What are birds looking at? Head movements and eye use in chickens.

870 *Animal Behaviour*, **63,** 991-998.

871 **Dolan,T. & Fernandez-Juricic,E.** 2010. Retinal ganglion cell topography of five species of

872 ground-foraging birds. *Brain, Behaviour and Evolution*, **75,** 111-121.

873 **Duijm,M.** 1959. On the position of a ribbon-like central area in the eye of some birds.

874 *Archives Ne'erlandaises de Zoologie*, **13,** 145.

875 **Emery,N.J.** 2000. The eyes have it: the neuroethology, function and evolution of social

876 gaze. *Neurosciences and Biobehavioral Reviews*, **24,** 581-604.

877 **Emery,N.J. & Clayton,N.S.** 2001. Effects of experience and social context on prospective

878 caching strategies by scrub jays. *Nature*, **414,** 443-446.

879 **Emery,N.J., Lorincz,E.N., Perrett,D.I., Oram,M.W. & Baker,C.I.** 1997. Gaze following and

880 joint attention in rhesus monkeys (*Macaca mulatta*). *Journal of Comparative Psychology*,

881 **111,** 286-293.

882 **Fernández-Juricic,E.** 2012. Sensory basis of vigilance behavior in birds: synthesis and

883 future prospects. *Behavioural Processes*, **89,** 143-152.

884 **Fernández-Juricic,E. & Kowalski,V.** 2011. Where does a flock end from an information

885 perspective? A comparative experiment with live and robotic birds. *Behavioral Ecology*, **22**:

886 1304-1311.

887 **Fernandez-Juricic,E., Erichsen,J.T. & Kacelnik,A.** 2004. Visual perception and social

888 foraging in birds. *Trends in Ecology and Evolution*, **19**, 25-31.

889 **Fernández-Juricic,E., Smith,R. & Kacelnik,A.** 2005. Increasing the costs of conspecific

890 scanning in socially foraging starlings affects vigilance and foraging behaviour. *Animal*

891 *Behaviour*, **69,** 73-81.

892 **Fernández-Juricic,E., Gilak,N., Mcdonald,J.C., Pithia,P. & Valcarcel,A.** 2006. A dynamic

893 method to study the transmission of social foraging information in flocks using robots. *Animal*

894 *Behaviour*, **71,** 901-911.

895 **Fernández-Juricic,E., Gall,M.D., Dolan,T., Tisdale,V. & Martin,G.** 2008. The visual fields

896 of two ground-foraging birds, house finches and house sparrows, allow for simultaneous

897 foraging and anti-predator vigilance. *Ibis*, **150,** 779-787.

898 **Fernández-Juricic,E., O'Rourke,C. & Pitlik,T.** 2010. Visual coverage and scanning

899 behavior in two corvid species: American crow and Western scrub jay. *Journal of*

900 *Comparative Physiology A.*, **196,** 879-888.

901 **Fernández-Juricic,E., Gall,M.D., Dolan,T., O'Rourke,C.T., Thomas,S. & Lynch,J.R.** 2011.

902 Visual systems and vigilance behaviour of two ground-foraging avian prey species: white-

903 crowned sparrows and California towhees. *Animal Behaviour*, **81,** 705-713.

904 **Fitch,W.T., Huber,L. & Bugnyar,T.** 2010. Social cognition and the evolution of language:

905 constructing cognitive phylogenies. *Neuron*, **65,** 795-814.

906 **Fite,K.V. & Rosenfield-Wessels,S.** 1975. A comparative study of deep avian foveas. *Brain,*

907 *Behaviour and Evolution*, **12,** 97-115.

908 **Flavell,J.** 1974. The development of inferences about others. In: *Understanding Other*

909 *Persons* (Ed. by T.Mischel), pp. 66-116. Oxford: Blackwell.

910 **Flavell,J.** 1977. The development of knowledge about visual perception. *The Nebraska*

911 *Symposion on Motivation*, **25,** 43-76.

912 **Flombaum,J.I. & Santos,L.R.** 2005. Rhesus monkeys attribute perceptions to others.

913 *Current Biology*, **15,** 447-452.

914 **Gioanni,H.** 1988. Stabilizing gaze reflexes in the pigeon (*Columba livia*). I. Horizontal and

915 vertical optokinetic eye (OKN) and head (OCR) reflexes. *Experimental Brain Research*, **69,**

916 567-582.

917 **Grodzinski,U., Watanabe,A. & Clayton,N.S.** 2012. Peep to pilfer: what scrub-jays like to

918 watch when observing others. *Animal Behaviour*, **83,** 1253-1260.

919 **Hampton,R.R.** 1994. Sensitivity to information specifying the line of gaze of humans in

920 sparrows (*Passer domesticus*). *Behaviour*, **130,** 41-51.

921 **Hare,B. & Tomasello,M.** 2004. Chimpanzees are more skilful in competitive than in

922 cooperative cognitive tasks. *Animal Behaviour*, **68,** 571-581.

923 **Hare,B., Call,J., Agnetta,B. & Tomasello,M.** 2000. Chimpanzees know what conspecifics

924 do and do not see. *Animal Behaviour*, **59,** 771-785.

925 **Hare,B., Call,J. & Tomasello,M.** 2006. Chimpanzees deceive a human competitor by

926 hiding. *Cognition*, **101,** 495-514.

927 **Hauser,M.D. 1992.** Costs of deception: cheaters are punished in rhesus monkeys (*Macaca*

928 *mulatta*). *Proceedings of the National Academy of Science. U. S. A*, **89,** 12137-12139.

929 **Hauser,M.D., Teixidor,P., Fields,L. & Flaherty,R.** 1993. Food-elicited calls in

930 chimpanzees: effects of food quantity and divisibility. *Animal Behaviour*, **45,** 817-819.

931 **Heesy,C.P.** 2004. On the relationship between orbit orientation and binocular visual field

932 overlap in mammals. *The Anatomical Record Part A: Discoveries in Molecular, Cellular,*

933 *and Evolutionary Biology*, **281,** 1104-1110.

Hughes,A. 1977. The topography of vision in mammals of contrastic life style: comparative optics and retinal organisation. In: *The Visual System in Vertebrates* (Ed. by F.Crescitelli), pp. 615-756. New York: Springer-Verlag.

Hughes,A. & Whitteridge,D. 1973. The receptive fields and topographical organization of goat retinal ganglion cells. *Vision Research*, **13,** 1101-1114.

Iwaniuk,A.N., Heesy,C.P., Hall,M.I. & Wylie,D.R. 2008. Relative Wulst volume is correlated with orbit orientation and binocular visual field in birds. *Journal of Comparative Physiology A.*, **194,** 267-282.

Jones,R.B. 1980. Reactions of male domestic chicks to two-dimensional eye-like shapes. *Animal Behaviour*, **28,** 212-218.

Kaminski,J., Riedel,J., Call,J. & Tomasello,M. 2005. Domestic goats, *Capra hircus*, follow gaze direction and use social cues in an object choice task. *Animal Behaviour*, **69,** 11-18.

Kehmeier,S., Schloegl,C., Scheiber,I. & Weiß,B. 2011. Early development of gaze following into distant space in juvenile Greylag geese (*Anser anser*). *Animal Cognition*, **14,** 477-485.

Kiltie,R.A. 2000. Scaling of visual acuity with body size in mammals and birds. *Functional Ecology*, **14,** 226-234.

Kim,J. 2013. Tonic eye movements induced by bilateral and unilateral galvanic vestibular stimulation (GVS) in guinea pigs. *Brain Research Bulletin*, **90,** 72-78.

Kobayashi,H. & Kohshima,S. 1997. Unique morphology of the human eye. *Nature*, **387,** 767-768.

955 **Kobayashi,H. & Kohshima,S.** 2001. Unique morphology of the human eye and its adaptive

956 meaning: comparative studies on external morphology of the primate eye. *Journal of Human*

957 *Evolution*, **40,** 419-435.

958 **le Roux,R.A., Snyder-Mackler,N., Roberts,E.K., Beehner,J.C. & Bergman,T.J.** 2013.

959 Evidence for tactical concealment in a wild primate. *Nature Communications*, **4,** 1462.

960 **Liebal,K. & Kaminski,J.** 2012. Gibbons (*Hylobates pileatus, H. moloch, H. lar,*

961 *Symphalangus syndactylus*) follow human gaze, but do not take the visual perspective of

962 others. *Animal Cognition*, **15,** 1211-1216.

963 **Lima,S.L.** 1987. Vigilance while feeding and its relation to the risk of predation. *Journal of*

964 *Theoretical Biology*, **124,** 303-316.

965 **Loretto,M.C., Schloegl,C. & Bugnyar,T.** 2010. Northern bald ibises follow others' gaze into

966 distant space but not behind barriers. *Biology Letters*, **6,** 14-17.

967 **Maldonado,P.E., Maturana,H. & Varela,F.J.** 1988. Frontal and lateral visual system in

968 birds. Frontal and lateral gaze. *Brain, Behaviour and Evolution*, **32,** 57-62.

969 **Martin,G.R.** 1984. The visual fields of the tawny owl, *Strix aluco L. Vision Research*, **24,**

970 1739-1751.

971 **Martin,G.** 2007. Visual fields and their functions in birds. *Journal of Ornithology*, **148,** 547-

972 562.

973 **Martinez-Conde,S.** 2005. The role of eye movement during visual fixation. *Barrow*

974 *Quarterly*, **21,** 44-48.

975 **Meyer,D.B.C.** 1977. The avian eye and its adaptations. In: *The Visual System of*

976 *Vertebrates. Handbook of Sensory Physiology* (Ed. by F.Crescitelli), pp. 549-612. New York:

977 Springer.

978 **Mulcahy,N.J. & Hedge,V.** 2012. Are great apes tested with an abject object-choice task?

979 *Animal Behaviour*, **83,** 313-321.

980 **Ott,M.** 2001. Chameleons have independent eye movements but synchronise both eyes

981 during saccadic prey tracking. *Experimental Brain Research*, **139,** 173-179.

982 **Packer,O., Hendrickson,A.E. & Curcio,C.A.** 1989. Photoreceptor topography of the retina

983 in the adult pigtail macaque (*Macaca nemestrina*). *Journal of Comparative Neurology*, **288,**

984 165-183.

985 **Peichl,L.** 1992. Topography of ganglion cells in the dog and wolf retina. *Journal of*

986 *Comparative Neurology*, **324,** 603-620.

987 **Povinelli,D.J. & Eddy,T.J.** 1996. Chimpanzees: joint visual attention. *Psychological*

988 *Science*, **7,** 129-135.

989 **Proops,L. & McComb,K.** 2010. Attributing attention: the use of human-given cues by

990 domestic horses (*Equus caballus*). *Animal Cognition*, **13,** 197-205.

991 **Querubin,A., Lee,H.R., Provis,J.M. & O'Brien,K.M.** 2009. Photoreceptor and ganglion cell

992 topographies correlate with information convergence and high acuity regions in the adult

993 pigeon (*Columba livia*) retina. *Journal of Comparative Neurology*, **517,** 711-722.

994 **Reymond,L.** 1985. Spatial visual acuity of the eagle *Aquila audax*: a behavioural, optical

995 and anatomical investigation. *Vision Research*, **25,** 1477-1491.

996 **Rossel, S.** 1980. Foveal fixation and tracking in the praying mantis. *Journal of Comparative*

997 *Physiology*, **139,** 307–331.

998 **Scaife,M.** 1976a. The response to eye-like shapes by birds. I. The effect of context: A

999 predator and a strange bird. *Animal Behaviour*, **24,** 195-199.

Scaife,M. 1976b. The response to eye-like shapes by birds II. The importance of staring, pairedness and shape. *Animal Behaviour*, **24,** 200-206.

Schloegl,C., Kotrschal,K. & Bugnyar,T. 2007. Gaze following in common ravens, *Corvus corax*: ontogeny and habituation. *Animal Behaviour*, **74,** 769-778.

Schloegl,C., Kotrschal,K. & Bugnyar,T. 2008a. Do common ravens (*Corvus corax*) rely on human or conspecific gaze cues to detect hidden food? *Animal Cognition*, **11,** 231-241.

Schloegl,C., Kotrschal,K. & Bugnyar,T. 2008b. Modifying the object-choice task: is the way you look important for ravens? *Behavioural Processes*, **77,** 61-65.

Schmidt,J., Scheid,C., Kotrschal,K., Bugnyar,T. & Schloegl,C. 2011. Gaze direction - a cue for hidden food in rooks (*Corvus frugilegus*)? *Behavioural Processes*, **88,** 88-93.

Shaw,R.C. & Clayton,N.S. 2012. Eurasian jays, *Garrulus glandarius*, flexibly switch caching and pilfering tactics in response to social context. *Animal Behaviour*, **84,** 1191-1200.

Shaw,R.C. & Clayton,N.S. 2013. Careful cachers and prying pilferers: Eurasian jays *(Garrulus glandarius)* limit auditory information available to competitors. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B.*, **280,** 20122238.

Sommer,V. & Reichard,U. 2000. Rethinking monogamy: the gibbon case. In: *Primate Males: Causes and Consequences of Variation in Group Composition.* (Ed. by P.M.Kappeler), pp. 159-168. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Somppi,S., Tornqvist,H., Hanninen,L., Krause,C. & Vainio,O. 2012. Dogs do look at images: eye tracking in canine cognition research. *Animal Cognition*, **15,** 163-174.

Stevens,M., Hopkins,E., Hinde,W., Adcock,A., Connolly,Y., Troscianko,T. & Cuthill,I.C. 2007. Field experiments on the effectiveness of 'eyespots' as predator deterrents. *Animal Behaviour*, **74,** 1215-1227.

1023 **Stulp,G., Emery,N.J., Verhulst,S. & Clayton,N.S.** 2009. Western scrub-jays conceal

1024 auditory information when competitors can hear but cannot see. *Biology Letters*, **5,** 583-585.

1025 **Teufel,C., Alexis,D.M., Clayton,N.S. & Davis,G.** 2010. Mental-state attribution drives rapid,

1026 reflexive gaze following. *Attention, Perception Psychophysics*, **72,** 695-705.

1027 **Thornton,A. & Raihani,N.J.** 2008. The evolution of teaching. *Animal Behaviour*, **75,** 1823-

1028 1836.

1029 **Thornton,A. & McAuliffe,K.** 2012. Teaching can teach us a lot. *Animal Behaviour*, **83,** e6-

1030 e9.

1031 **Tomasello,M. & Carpenter,M.** 2005. The emergence of social cognition in three young

1032 chimpanzees. *Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development*, **70,** vii-132.

1033 **Tomasello,M., Call,J. & Hare,B.** 1998. Five primate species follow the visual gaze of

1034 conspecifics. *Animal Behaviour*, **55,** 1063-1069.

1035 **Tomasello,M., Hare,B. & Agnetta,B.** 1999. Chimpanzees, *Pan troglodytes*, follow gaze

1036 direction geometrically. *Animal Behaviour*, **58,** 769-777.

1037 **Tomasello,M., Carpenter,M., Call,J., Behne,T. & Moll,H.** 2005. Understanding and sharing

1038 intentions: the origins of cultural cognition. *Behavioural and Brain Sciences*, **28,** 675-691.

1039 **Tomasello,M., Hare,B., Lehmann,H. & Call,J.** 2007. Reliance on head versus eyes in the

1040 gaze following of great apes and human infants: the cooperative eye hypothesis. *Journal of*

1041 *Human Evolution*, **52,** 314-320.

1042 **Tomonaga,M. & Imura,T.** 2010. Visual search for human gaze direction by a Chimpanzee

1043 (*Pan troglodytes*). *PLOS One*, **5**, e9131.

1044 **Tucker,V.A.** 2000. The deep fovea, sideways vision and spiral flight paths in raptors. *Journal*

1045 *of Experimental Biology*, **203,** 3745-3754.

1046 **von Bayern,A.M. & Emery,N.J.** 2009a. Jackdaws respond to human attentional states and

1047 communicative cues in different contexts. *Current Biology*, **19,** 602-606.

1048 **von Bayern,A.M. & Emery,N.J.** 2009b. Bonding, mentalising and rationality. In: *Irrational*

1049 *Humans, Rational Animals* (Ed. by S.Watanabe), pp. 287-303. Tokyo: Keio University Press.

1050 **Voss,J. & Bischof,H.J.** 2009. Eye movements of laterally eyed birds are not independent.

1051 *Journal of Experimental Biology*, **212,** 1568-1575.

1052 **Walls,L.** 1942. The vertebrate eye and its adaptive radiation. *Cranbrook Institute of Science*,

1053 Bulletin no. 19.

1054 **Watve,M., Thakar,J., Kale,A., Puntambekar,S., Shaikh,I., Vaze,K., Jog,M. &**

1055 **Paranjape,S.** 2002. Bee-eaters (Merops orientalis) respond to what a predator can see.

1056 *Animal Cognition*, **5,** 253-259.

1057 **Wilkinson,A., Mandl,I., Bugnyar,T. & Huber,L.** 2010. Gaze following in the red-footed

1058 tortoise (Geochelone carbonaria). *Animal Cognition*, **13,** 765-769.

1059 **Woo,K.L. & Rieucau,G.** 2012. From dummies to animations: a review of computer-

1060 animated stimuli used in animal behavior studies. *Behavioral Ecology and Sociobiology*, **65,**

1061 1671-1685.

1062   **Yamawaki, Y., Uno,K., Ikeda,R. & Toh,Y.** 2011. Coordinated movements of the head and

1063 body during orienting behaviour in the praying mantis *Tenodera artifolia. Journal of Insect*

1064 *Physiology*, **57,** 1010-1016.

1065

Figure 1. Gaze cues and behaviours. Arrows depict direction of gaze. a) direct gaze (single arrow) and mutual gaze (double arrow); b) direct gaze cue resulting in averted gaze response; c) gaze following; d) joint attention; e) geometric gaze.

Figure 2. Diagram depicting proposed gaze nomenclature. Gaze sensitivity is reliant on the gaze cues available. Sensitivity to gaze cues will result in gaze behaviours which are described within the categories of gaze preference, gaze aversion and gaze following.

Figure 3. a) In animals with frontally placed eyes, the orientation of both eyes (as cues for gaze following) is most easily seen from a frontal view, whereas in animals with laterally placed eyes, eye orientation is more salient from the side but is partial as only one eye can be seen. b) Visual fixation strategies proposed for bird species with laterally placed eyes. (I) locking the gaze on a object with a single fovea using the monocular field of one eye; (II) quickly alternating between the two foveae using the monocular fields of both eyes (see text for details).

Figure 4. Gaze direction cues may have different degree of ambiguousness in animals with laterally placed depending on whether a species has conjugate or non-conjugate eye movements. (I) Conjugate eye movements with eyes converging towards the bill. (II) Conjugate eye movements with both eyes looking to the right. (III) non-conjugate eye movements where the left eye looks forward and the left eye is at rest towards the left side.

1096 Figure 1

1097

1098

1099

1100

1101

1102   Figure 2

Gaze cues
(direct gaze, averted gaze)

↓

Gaze sensitivity

Gaze preference   **Gaze following**

Looking time;   Mutual   **Gaze aversion**   Gaze   Joint   Geometric
Latency to look gaze   following   attention   gaze

Aversive   Aversive
escape   approach

1103

1104   Figure 3

(a)

Frontally-placed eyes   Laterally-placed eyes

Frontal view

Side view

(b)

Visual fixation   Visual fixation

Object   Object   Object

I   II

1105

46

1106   Figure 4

Position of Left Eye
(side view)

Projected Gaze
(Top view)

Position of Right Eye
(side view)

I

II

III

1107