

Local interactions and their group-level consequences in flocking jackdaws

Hangjian Ling¹, Guillam E. McIvor², Kasper van der Vaart¹, Richard T. Vaughan³, Alex Thornton²,
Nicholas T. Ouellette¹

¹Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering, Stanford University, Stanford, CA USA;

²Center for Ecology and Conservation, University of Exeter, Penryn, UK;

³School of Computing Science, Simon Fraser University, Burnaby, Canada

Correspondence:

Alex Thornton, Email: alex.thornton@exeter.ac.uk

Nicholas T. Ouellette, Email: nto@stanford.edu

Abstract: As one of nature's most striking examples of collective behaviour, bird flocks have attracted extensive research. However, we still lack an understanding of the attractive and repulsive forces that govern interactions between individuals within flocks and how these forces influence neighbours' relative positions and ultimately determine the shape of flocks. We address these issues by analysing the three-dimensional movements of wild jackdaws (*Corvus monedula*) in flocks containing 2 to 338 individuals. We quantify the social interaction forces in large, airborne flocks and find that these forces are highly anisotropic. The long-range attraction in the direction perpendicular to the movement direction is stronger than that along it, and the short-range repulsion is generated mainly by turning rather than changing speed. We explain this phenomenon by considering the wingbeat frequency and the change in the kinetic and gravitational potential energy during flight, and find that changing the direction of movement is less energetically costly than adjusting speed for birds. Furthermore, our data show that collision avoidance by turning can alter local neighbour distributions and ultimately change the group shape. Our results illustrate the macroscopic consequences of anisotropic interaction forces in bird flocks, and help to draw links between group structure, local interactions, and the biophysics of animal locomotion.

Key words: Collective behaviour; Flocking; Social interactions; Biophysics of locomotion; Corvids; 3D imaging

33

34 **1. Introduction**

35 Highly coordinated collective motion is a cornerstone of many biological systems at all scales,
36 from cell colonies [1,2] to insect swarms [3–6], fish schools [7,8], bird flocks [9–11], ungulate
37 herds [12–14], and even human crowds [15,16]. Moving together in large groups and using
38 social information can provide numerous benefits, including enhanced predator avoidance [17–
39 19], more efficient resource exploitation [20,21], energy savings [22–24] and efficient learning of
40 migration routes [25,26]. Thus, understanding the mechanisms driving the emergence of
41 collectivity in natural systems has significant ecological, evolutionary, and cognitive implications
42 [27]. Over the past few decades, theoretical models [28–37] have demonstrated that global-level
43 collective motion can be generated by simple local interactions. However, verification of these
44 interaction rules using data from real moving animals has lagged behind due to measurement
45 challenges. Now that new measurement technologies have made it more feasible to track
46 animal movement, characterizing the local interactions in animal groups in natural environments
47 is critical for advancing our understanding of collective behaviour [38,39].

48

49 Bird flocks are one of the most striking and frequently studied examples of collective behaviour.
50 They are often modelled using agent-based frameworks [40–42] where individuals follow simple
51 interaction rules such as long-range attraction, short-range repulsion, and intermediate-range
52 alignment. These interactions are treated as social “forces” [43] imposed by the presence of
53 nearby neighbours that thus determine the acceleration of each agent. Although many empirical
54 measurements of bird flocks have been made [44,45,54–56,46–53], the fundamental interaction
55 rules assumed in the models have still not been fully tested. In particular, the effective attractive
56 and repulsive forces that birds experience while flying in large flocks has not been studied. It
57 thus remains unclear how interaction forces vary depending on the relative positions of
58 neighbouring individuals. Characterizing such interaction forces is, however, critical for

59 understanding the flock mechanics, since the forces acting on individuals will determine their
60 velocities, relative positions in the group, and ultimately the shape of the entire group [42,44].
61 Moreover, from an adaptive perspective, the morphology of animal groups and the distribution
62 of individuals within them influences group members' access to social information and
63 vulnerability to predation [42,57–59].

64

65 One way to infer the effective attractive and repulsive forces between group members is by
66 analysing the accelerations of individuals [60,61], since forces are proportional to accelerations.
67 Based on this idea, Katz *et al.* (2011) [60] used optical tracking to measure the acceleration of
68 individuals as a function of the distance to neighbours (known as a “force map”) in schools of
69 two or three captive fish, finding evidence for both long-range attraction and short-range
70 repulsion. Similarly, by fitting observational data to a zonal model [43] where individuals'
71 accelerations are explicitly related to the interaction forces, Lukeman *et al.* (2010) [50] found
72 long-range attraction and short-range repulsion in large flocks of sea ducks (surf scoters)
73 congregated on the surface of the sea. In airborne flocks, the only study of forces to date [44]
74 reported force maps for isolated pairs of homing pigeons based on GPS (Global Positioning
75 System) tracking, though the measured forces had large uncertainties, with a position
76 uncertainty of more than two times the bird body size. Thus, well-resolved force maps similar to
77 those measured in fish schools are currently unavailable for bird flocks in flight. More generally,
78 given the reliance of previous research on small groups of (often captive) animals, the
79 interaction forces at play in large, natural collective aggregations such as aerial bird flocks
80 remain unknown. Since birds interact with more than one other individual in large groups [48,55],
81 the forces measured in isolated pairs may not be representative of how birds interact in large
82 flocks.

83

84 Current research also tells us little about the mechanisms governing the side-by-side neighbour
85 structure seen in flocks of small birds (e.g. pigeons, starlings or jackdaws) [44,48,49,55], which
86 in turn may determine the overall shape of flocks. One hypothesis, proposed in previous studies
87 [44,62], is that the mechanism of short-range repulsion determines the local neighbour
88 distribution. This hypothesis is illustrated in figure 1: avoiding collisions by changing speed
89 (*speeding-based* repulsion) is thought to lead to a front-to-back distribution, while avoiding
90 collisions by turning (*turning-based* repulsion) should result in a side-by-side structure [42]. This
91 hypothesis has been verified in small groups of fish that use *speeding-based* repulsion
92 [60,62,63], and by pigeons in groups of two that use *turning-based* repulsion [44]. However, it is
93 not known whether birds in large groups avoid collisions by turning. Therefore, whether this
94 hypothesis explains the side-by-side neighbour structure observed in large bird flocks has yet to
95 be tested.

96
97 Moreover, the reason why birds flying in small groups prefer to use *turning-based* repulsion, as
98 reported in a previous study [44], is not fully understood. Previous researchers [38,44] have
99 suggested that the cause is due to the relative ease of turning as opposed to changing speed
100 when flying through a low-density fluid like air and contrasted this with schools of fish moving in
101 denser water, where changes in speed seem to be simpler [60,62–64]. This argument is
102 reasonable, since flight speed is directly related to power consumption for flapping flight [65,66].
103 However, the energetic cost difference between making turns and changing speed has not been
104 examined for birds flying in flocks. Whether turning is easier than changing speed and thus the
105 ultimate cause of birds' use of *turning-based* repulsion is unclear.

106
107 Finally, it remains unclear how the positions of neighbours determine the overall shape of flocks.
108 In fish schools, there is evidence that the local structure scales up to the school level, leading
109 the entire group to be elongated along the movement direction [62,64]. In contrast, the group-

110 level consequences of the side-by-side local structure typical of many bird flocks have yet to be
111 examined. Consequently, we lack an understanding of the connection between individual
112 interaction forces, local neighbour structures, and the overall shape of flocks.

113

114 Here, we address these open questions using jackdaws (*Corvus monedula*), a small corvid
115 species, as a model system. Jackdaws are an excellent system for testing movement
116 interactions since they are highly social on several levels [67]. They form long-term
117 monogamous pair bonds, and bonded pairs frequently fly together, but they also fly in large
118 groups of up to thousands of individuals during the winter roosting season [68]. Flock flight
119 paths are very predictable, allowing us to measure the three-dimensional (3D) trajectories of
120 individuals in these flocks using a ground-based stereo-imaging system [56]. Our uncertainty in
121 the measurement of bird position is about 0.04 m—much smaller than both the body size of a
122 jackdaw (0.3-0.4 m) and substantially lower than in previous studies [44]—allowing very
123 accurate acceleration measurements. Using these measurements, we are able to construct
124 well-resolved force maps and test for the existence of long-range attraction and short-range
125 repulsion in both isolated pairs and large flocks. We confirm that birds modulate their distance to
126 nearby neighbours primarily by turning rather than changing speed even in large flocks, and
127 therefore explain the side-by-side neighbour distribution. By measuring the wingbeat frequency,
128 we provide evidence that the dominance of turning-based interactions is likely due to the
129 biophysics of bird locomotion, as turning is energetically cheaper than changing speed. Finally,
130 we show that the side-by-side local structure does indeed scale up to the flock level, leading to
131 flocks that are elongated transverse to the direction of motion. These results give a more firm
132 foundation for the structure of local interactions in bird flocks, which can be used to develop
133 more accurate theoretical models.

134

135 **2. Materials and Methods**

136 (a) Data collection

137 We used a stereo-imaging system to measure the three-dimensional (3D) trajectories of each
138 individual bird within both isolated pairs and large flocks. The system used four synchronised,
139 high-speed USB-3 cameras (Basler ace acA2040-90um, pixel size of 5.5 μm , sensor resolution
140 of 2048 by 2048 pixels) with overlapping fields of view. We placed the imaging system along the
141 typical flight paths of flocks such that the birds flew directly over the camera array. The maximal
142 distance between cameras was between 50 and 60 m, which was on the same order of the
143 distance from the camera to the birds (~ 50 m). At a height of 50 m, we were able to image an
144 area of 60 by 60 m^2 and determine bird positions with an uncertainty of 0.04 m—much smaller
145 than the jackdaw body length (0.3~0.4 m). We recorded the birds' movement continuously for 3
146 to 20 seconds at 60 fps. Each flocking event consisted of 180 to 1200 frames. The imaging
147 locations were in the vicinity of winter roosts near Mabe and Gwennap, Cornwall, UK. More
148 details of the stereo-imaging system can be found in Ling *et al.* (2018) [56]. The camera
149 calibration procedure can be found in the *electronic supplementary material*.

150

151 After recording the image data, we reconstructed the trajectories of individual birds in 3D space
152 (details of the 3D reconstruction and tracking procedures can be found in the *electronic*
153 *supplementary material*). Along each bird's trajectory, we measured the position x_i , velocity v_i ,
154 and acceleration a_i corresponding to the bird bodies in a Cartesian coordinate system, where i
155 ranges from 1 to 3. The direction of gravity was aligned to $-x_3$. We use \mathbf{x} , \mathbf{v} , and \mathbf{a} to denote the
156 vectors of the corresponding quantities, and t to denote time. Moreover, following our previous
157 studies [55,56], we measured the time series of wingbeat frequency along each bird's trajectory,
158 denoted as f_{wb} (see *electronic supplementary material*). We also measured the total energy of
159 birds as $E=0.5|\mathbf{v}|^2+gx_3$, where $g=9.8$ m/s^2 is the gravitational acceleration. We defined the rate
160 of change of E as $E'=(E(t+dt)-E(t))/dt$, where dt is the time step. $E'>0$ indicates an increase of
161 power output, assuming a constant drag force.

162

163 (b) Flocking events

164 We recorded a number of flocking events from December 2017 to March 2018. The events
165 included groups consisting of as few as two to as many as several hundred individuals. We
166 defined two birds to be an isolated pair if (i) the two birds were not in a large group and (ii) the
167 distance to the closest third bird was larger than 20 m, five times the average distance
168 separating a pair of birds. We obtained 305 isolated pairs of jackdaws with mean trajectory
169 length of 4.0 s. Recorded bird images and reconstructed 3D trajectories for a sample isolated
170 pair are shown in figure 2a-c. More samples are shown in *electronic supplementary material*
171 *figure S1*.

172

173 We also recorded six flocks, which we label #1 to #6, consisting of 26 to 338 jackdaws. Criteria
174 for the selection of flocking events are provided in the *electronic supplementary material*.
175 Recorded bird images and reconstructed 3D trajectories for flock #1 are shown in figure 3a-c.
176 Trajectories for flocks #2 to #6 are shown in *electronic supplementary material figure S2*.
177 Statistics of the distance to nearest neighbours, flight speed, and acceleration are listed in Table
178 1. Since the flight speed was primarily in the horizontal plane ($v_3 \ll |\mathbf{v}|$), we neglect the
179 component in the gravity direction in the following analysis.

180

181 (c) Data analysis

182 As shown in figures 2 and 3, both speed and movement direction varied both in time and
183 between different birds. To understand how birds adjust their velocity, we adopt the force-based
184 approach used by Katz *et al.* (2011) [60]. We approximate the attraction or repulsion force \mathbf{F} of a
185 focal bird in response to a neighbouring bird by measuring the relative acceleration between the
186 two, so that $\mathbf{F} = \mathbf{a}^{\text{focal}} - \mathbf{a}^{\text{neighbour}}$, where the superscripts 'focal' and 'neighbour' denote quantities
187 measured for the focal and neighbour birds, respectively. We subtracted the neighbour

188 acceleration $\mathbf{a}^{\text{neighbour}}$ in order to remove the environmental effects acting similarly on both birds.
189 For example, when both birds are linearly accelerating, $\mathbf{a}^{\text{focal}}$ can be very large but does not
190 represent the force due to the neighbour. Only the relative quantity \mathbf{F} captures the interaction
191 between two birds.

192
193 Using the local coordinate system sketched in figure 4(a), we decompose \mathbf{F} into two
194 components: one projected in the movement direction of focal birds that we denote as a
195 ‘speeding force’ F_{Speed} , and one projected perpendicular to the flight direction that we denote as
196 a ‘turning force’ F_{Turn} . Therefore, positive (negative) F_{Speed} implies speeding up (slowing down),
197 and positive (negative) F_{Turn} implies turning right (left). For simplicity, we will call the direction
198 perpendicular to the movement direction the *wing direction*. We label distances in the wing
199 direction as d_{Wing} and distances in the movement direction as d_{Move} . Therefore, positive (negative)
200 d_{Wing} values mean that a neighbouring bird is located on the right (left), and positive (negative)
201 d_{Move} values mean that a neighbouring bird is located in the front (back). The details of our
202 calculation of two-dimensional force maps and one-dimensional force curves are described in
203 the *electronic supplementary material*.

204

205 **3. Results**

206 (a) Interaction forces

207 In isolated pairs, the turning force (F_{Turn}) strongly depends on d_{Wing} and is relatively insensitive to
208 d_{Move} (figure 4b). When plotting F_{Turn} as a function of d_{Wing} (figure 4d), long-range attraction
209 zones where the focal bird turned right (left) when a neighbour was far on the right (left) and
210 short-range repulsion zones where the focal bird turned left (right) when a neighbour was just on
211 the right (left) are clearly evident. F_{Turn} switches from repulsive to attractive at $|d_{\text{Wing}}|=0.9$ m (≈ 2.5
212 jackdaw body lengths). Conversely, the speeding force (F_{Speed}) strongly depends on d_{Move} and is

213 insensitive to d_{Wing} (figure 4c). Plotting F_{Speed} as a function of d_{Move} (figure 4d) reveals attraction
214 zones where the focal bird slowed down (sped up) when a neighbour was in back (front), but no
215 repulsion zones. The observation that repulsion is only present in the map of the turning force
216 indicates that birds avoid collisions mainly by turning. Moreover, the magnitude of the turning
217 force is about twice as large as the speeding force in the attraction zone. The anisotropy of the
218 force in the wing and movement directions is consistent with the observation that the standard
219 deviation of \mathbf{a} in the wing direction was larger than that in the movement direction (Table 1). We
220 also find that $|F_{Speed}|$ increases with the flight speed of focal birds, similar to fish [60], while $|F_{Turn}|$
221 does not show a clear relationship with speed (*electronic supplementary material figure S3*).

222

223 When flying in large flocks (flocks #1 to #6), the anisotropy of attraction and repulsion in the
224 wing and movement directions persists, with the absolute value of the turning forces larger than
225 that of the speeding forces and with repulsion governed by turning (figure 5). Note that the
226 anisotropy was independent of whether the entire group was making small turns (flock #1,
227 where \mathbf{a} in the wing direction was larger than in the movement direction) or changing speed
228 (flocks #2 to #6 where \mathbf{a} in the movement direction was larger than in the wing direction). The
229 results are also consistent for flock sizes ranging from 26 to 338 individuals (figure 5; Table 1).

230

231 (b) Neighbour structure and group shape

232 For both isolated pairs (figure 6a) and large flocks (figure 6b, *electronic supplementary material*
233 *figure S4*), we find that birds prefer to fly side by side, in that the most probable location for a
234 neighbouring bird was at $d_{Wing}=1.0$ m (≈ 2.8 jackdaw body lengths) and $d_{Move}=0$. In a previous
235 study [55], we found that these anisotropic spatial distributions of neighbours become isotropic
236 for large topological distance (as in starlings [48]), a feature that we used to estimate the
237 interaction range. We found that birds not part of a bonded pair typically interacted with 7 to 8
238 neighbours [55].

239

240 We then examined whether this local anisotropic structure scales up and causes the overall
241 shape of the flock to be elongated. As shown in figure 6(c) and *electronic supplementary*
242 *material figure S5*, entire flocks typically appear to consist of several distinguishable subgroups
243 separated along the movement direction. We thus partitioned each flock into N_s subgroups
244 using k -means clustering, where N_s was the number of distinguishable peaks in the distribution
245 of bird positions along the flight direction (figure 6(d), *electronic supplementary material figure*
246 *S5*). We considered the largest subgroup in each flock and calculated its extent in the
247 movement and wing directions, which we label as L_{Move} and L_{Wing} , respectively. We find that all
248 subgroups are elongated in the wing direction (figure 6e), indicating that the side-by-side local
249 structure does indeed percolate upscale and has group-level consequences. The generation of
250 multiple subgroups along the movement direction is likely due to weaker attractive forces in that
251 direction compared to the wing direction (figure 5). The flocks as a whole are however still
252 elongated in the wing direction (*electronic supplementary material figure S6*), though with a
253 smaller L_{Wing}/L_{Move} as compared to subgroups.

254

255 (c) Wingbeat frequency and flight power output

256 To understand why birds avoid collision mainly by turning instead of changing speed, we
257 examined the dependence of $df_{wb} = f_{wb}^{focal} - f_{wb}^{neighbour}$ as a function of d_{Wing} and d_{Move} , as shown
258 in figure 7(a) and (b), respectively. We also studied the dependence of $dE' = E'^{focal} - E'^{neighbour}$
259 on d_{Wing} and d_{Move} , as shown in figure 7(c) and (d), respectively. Both df_{wb} and dE' are close to
260 zero for all values of d_{Wing} , indicating that turning towards a neighbouring bird does not require a
261 change of wingbeat frequency and power output. However, df_{wb} is up to 10% of the mean
262 wingbeat frequency for large d_{Move} and dE' increases linearly with d_{Move} , indicating that focal
263 birds must increase their wingbeat frequency and power output to achieve a positive speeding
264 force when the neighbouring bird is far to the front. Our results suggest that turning is

265 energetically cheaper than changing speed, and thus provide a possible explanation for the
266 turning-based repulsion used by birds. Additionally, comparing between rear and front birds in
267 isolated pairs shows that rear birds are more likely to change their behaviour (e.g., to generate
268 positive speeding forces, rear birds are more likely to increase their wingbeat frequency and
269 speed up) in response to front birds (see details in *electronic supplementary material*).

270

271 **4. Discussion**

272 Characterizing the social interactions in large groups of birds is critical for understanding the
273 mechanisms of flocking behaviour. Here, by measuring the acceleration of a focal bird in
274 response to its neighbours, we quantified the social interaction forces in groups with sizes
275 ranging from two to hundreds of individuals. Our measurements of short-range repulsion and
276 long-range attraction in bird flocks agree with agent-based models [29–34,40,41,59] and
277 empirical measurements in insects [61,69,70], fish [8,60,71], birds [44,50] and mammals [72].
278 Moreover, we find that the effective attraction force (that is, the magnitude of the acceleration)
279 increases linearly with distance in a spring-like fashion, consistent with assumptions made in
280 theoretical models [33,34] and observational results from fish schools [60]. Critically, our
281 analyses reveal that the social forces are highly anisotropic: long-range attractive forces are
282 larger in the wing direction than in the movement direction, and short-range repulsive forces are
283 generated mainly by turning. Although similarly anisotropic forces have been reported
284 previously for pairs of pigeons [44], we show here that this effect extends to large flocks.

285

286 Thus, we also provide empirical support for the hypothesis [44,62] that the side-by-side
287 neighbour structures typical of pigeon and passerine bird flocks [44,48,49,55] are a result of the
288 turning-based repulsion mechanism. As shown in previous studies [10,55,56], both jackdaws
289 and pigeons flying in side-by-side configurations in large flocks expend more energy than they
290 do when flying alone. Therefore, the side-by-side neighbour structure is unlikely to arise from

291 aerodynamic interactions, in contrast with V-formation flight of some waterfowl and large
292 migratory birds [22,23,73].

293

294 Furthermore, by measuring the wingbeat frequency and the sum of the potential and kinetic
295 energy during flight for birds in isolated pairs, we give an explanation for why birds use turning-
296 based repulsion rather than the speeding-based repulsion seen in fish schools [60,62]. We find
297 that generating large speeding forces requires birds to change their wingbeat frequency and
298 power output, while producing a large turning force does not. Our results suggest that turning is
299 likely to be energetically cheaper than changing speed. This observation can be explained by
300 the physics of bird locomotion: as they travel through the air, birds have to maintain sufficient
301 speed to gain enough lift force and minimize the mechanical power output [65] (since both
302 increasing and reducing speeds may result in an increase of power output). On the other hand,
303 since the drag force in air is relatively small due to its low density, slightly adjusting the flight
304 direction (by, e.g., changing body posture [74,75]) will not cause a significant change of speed
305 and thus will require little additional power output. Therefore, it is likely that the physics of bird
306 locomotion make turning easier and energetically cheaper than changing speed, resulting in
307 dominantly turning-based repulsion, in contrast to the changes in speed that control repulsion in
308 fish moving through the higher density medium of water [60,62,63].

309

310 Finally, we demonstrate that the local side-by-side structure scales up to the global level,
311 making the entire flock elongated in the direction perpendicular to the movement. This is similar
312 to the way in which fish schools are elongated in the movement direction as a result of the front-
313 to-back local configuration of neighbours [42,62–64]. We note, however, that the elongated
314 group shape was observed here for birds traveling together in a particular direction (in this case,
315 towards evening roosts). Display flocks that make more complex manoeuvres (such as the
316 classic murmurations of starlings) may show different behaviour. For example, when a group of

317 starlings makes a turn, it was found that the group was initially elongated along the direction
318 perpendicular to the movement before the turn but became elongated along the traveling
319 direction after the turn [49].

320

321 In conclusion, although many previous models have assumed that interaction forces depend
322 only on the distance between neighbours, we show that due to the physics of bird locomotion
323 (and in particular that turning is easier than changing speed), the social interaction forces in real
324 animal groups are highly anisotropic. Such anisotropic forces have significant consequences
325 both for the local neighbour structure and the macroscopic group shapes, which ultimately
326 impact key functions such as information transfer [64] and predator avoidance [18]. We thus
327 strongly suggest that future models should consider the physics of animal locomotion and the
328 properties of the medium through which animals are traveling when formulating interaction rules.

329

330 **Ethical note**

331 All field protocols were approved by the Biosciences Ethics Panel of the University of Exeter (ref
332 2017/2080) and adhered to the Association for the Study of Animal Behaviour Guidelines for the
333 Treatment of Animals in Behavioural Research and Teaching.

334

335 **Data accessibility**

336 Data and code are available from the Dryad Digital Repository at:
337 <https://datadryad.org/review?doi=doi:10.5061/dryad.kb8js06> [76].

338

339 **Competing interests**

340 We declare we have no competing interests.

341

342 **Authors' contributions**

343 H.L., N.T.O, A.T., and R.T.V. conceived the ideas; H.L. and N.T.O. designed the methodology;
344 G.E.M. and A.T. collected the data; H.L., N.T.O, and K.V. analysed the data; All led the writing
345 of the manuscript. All authors contributed critically to the drafts and gave final approval for
346 publication.

347

348 **Acknowledgements**

349 We are grateful to Paul Dunstan, Richard Stone, and the Gluyas family for permission to work
350 on their land, and to Victoria Lee, Beki Hooper, Amy Hall, Paige Petts, Christoph Petersen, and
351 Joe Westley for their assistance in the field.

352

353 **Funding**

354 This work was supported by a Human Frontier Science Program grant to AT, NTO and RTV,
355 Award Number RG0049/2017.

356

357 **References**

358 1. Lushi E, Wioland H, Goldstein RE. 2014 Fluid flows created by swimming bacteria drive
359 self-organization in confined suspensions. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.* **111**, 9733–9738.

360 (doi:10.1073/pnas.1405698111)

361 2. Chen X, Dong X, Be'Er A, Swinney HL, Zhang HP. 2012 Scale-invariant correlations in
362 dynamic bacterial clusters. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **108**, 148101.

363 (doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.108.148101)

364 3. Sinhuber M, Ouellette NT. 2017 Phase Coexistence in Insect Swarms. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*
365 **119**, 178003. (doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.119.178003)

366 4. Cavagna A, Conti D, Creato C, Del Castello L, Giardina I, Grigera TS, Melillo S, Parisi L,

- 367 Viale M. 2017 Dynamic scaling in natural swarms. *Nat. Phys.* **13**, 914–918.
368 (doi:10.1038/nphys4153)
- 369 5. Attanasi A *et al.* 2014 Collective Behaviour without Collective Order in Wild Swarms of
370 Midges. *PLoS Comput. Biol.* **10**, e1003697. (doi:10.1371/journal.pcbi.1003697)
- 371 6. Méndez-Valderrama JF, Kinkhabwala YA, Silver J, Cohen I, Arias TA. 2018 Density-
372 functional fluctuation theory of crowds. *Nat. Commun.* **9**. (doi:10.1038/s41467-018-
373 05750-z)
- 374 7. Jolles JW, Boogert NJ, Sridhar VH, Couzin ID, Manica A. 2017 Consistent Individual
375 Differences Drive Collective Behavior and Group Functioning of Schooling Fish. *Curr. Biol.*
376 **27**, 2862-2868.e7. (doi:10.1016/j.cub.2017.08.004)
- 377 8. Hinz RC, de Polavieja GG. 2017 Ontogeny of collective behavior reveals a simple
378 attraction rule. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.* **114**, 2295–2300. (doi:10.1073/pnas.1616926114)
- 379 9. Sasaki T, Mann RP, Warren KN, Herbert T, Wilson T, Biro D. 2018 Personality and the
380 collective: bold homing pigeons occupy higher leadership ranks in flocks. *Philos. Trans. R.*
381 *Soc. B Biol. Sci.* **373**, 20170038. (doi:10.1098/rstb.2017.0038)
- 382 10. Usherwood JR, Stavrou M, Lowe JC, Roskilly K, Wilson AM. 2011 Flying in a flock comes
383 at a cost in pigeons. *Nature* **474**, 494–497. (doi:10.1038/nature10164)
- 384 11. Bajec IL, Heppner FH. 2009 Organized flight in birds. *Anim. Behav.* **78**, 777–789.
385 (doi:10.1016/j.anbehav.2009.07.007)
- 386 12. Inoue S, Yamamoto S, Ringhofer M, Mendonça RS, Pereira C, Hirata S. 2018 Spatial
387 positioning of individuals in a group of feral horses: a case study using drone technology.
388 *Mammal Res.* (doi:10.1007/s13364-018-0400-2)
- 389 13. Strandburg-Peshkin A, Farine DR, Crofoot MC, Couzin ID. 2017 Habitat and social
390 factors shape individual decisions and emergent group structure during baboon collective
391 movement. *Elife* **6**, e19505. (doi:10.7554/eLife.19505)
- 392 14. Strandburg-Peshkin A, Farine DR, Couzin ID, Crofoot MC. 2015 Shared decision-making

- 393 drives collective movement in wild baboons. *Science (80-.)*. **348**, 1358–1361.
394 (doi:10.1126/science.aaa5099)
- 395 15. Silverberg JL, Bierbaum M, Sethna JP, Cohen I. 2013 Collective motion of humans in
396 mosh and circle pits at heavy metal concerts. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **110**, 1–5.
397 (doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.110.228701)
- 398 16. Moussaïd M, Perozo N, Garnier S, Helbing D, Theraulaz G. 2010 The walking behaviour
399 of pedestrian social groups and its impact on crowd dynamics. *PLoS One* **5**, 1–7.
400 (doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0010047)
- 401 17. Ioannou CC, Guttal V, Couzin ID. 2012 Predatory Fish Select for Coordinated Collective
402 Motion in Virtual Prey. *Science (80-.)*. **337**, 1212–1215. (doi:10.1126/science.1218919)
- 403 18. Handegard NO, Boswell KM, Ioannou CC, Leblanc SP, Tjøstheim DB, Couzin ID. 2012
404 The Dynamics of Coordinated Group Hunting and Collective Information Transfer among
405 Schooling Prey. *Curr. Biol.* **22**, 1213–1217. (doi:10.1016/j.cub.2012.04.050)
- 406 19. Ward AJW, Herbert-Read JE, Sumpter DJT, Krause J. 2011 Fast and accurate decisions
407 through collective vigilance in fish shoals. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.* **108**, 2312–2315.
408 (doi:10.1073/pnas.1007102108)
- 409 20. Berdahl A, Torney CJ, Ioannou CC, Faria JJ, Couzin ID. 2013 Emergent Sensing of
410 Complex Environments by Mobile Animal Groups. *Science (80-.)*. **339**, 574–576.
411 (doi:10.1126/science.1225883)
- 412 21. Hein AM, Rosenthal SB, Hagstrom GI, Berdahl A, Torney CJ, Couzin ID. 2015 The
413 evolution of distributed sensing and collective computation in animal populations. *Elife* **4**,
414 1–43. (doi:10.7554/eLife.10955)
- 415 22. Portugal SJ, Hubel TY, Fritz J, Heese S, Trobe D, Voelkl B, Hailes S, Wilson AM,
416 Usherwood JR. 2014 Upwash exploitation and downwash avoidance by flap phasing in
417 ibis formation flight. *Nature* **505**, 399–402. (doi:10.1038/nature12939)
- 418 23. Weimerskirch H, Martin J, Clerquin Y, Alexandre P, Jiraskova S. 2001 Energy saving in

- 419 flight formation. *Nature* **413**, 697–698. (doi:10.1038/35099670)
- 420 24. Marras S, Killen SS, Lindström J, McKenzie DJ, Steffensen JF, Domenici P. 2015 Fish
421 swimming in schools save energy regardless of their spatial position. *Behav. Ecol.*
422 *Sociobiol.* **69**, 219–226. (doi:10.1007/s00265-014-1834-4)
- 423 25. Mueller T, O’Hara RB, Converse SJ, Urbanek RP, Fagan WF. 2013 Social Learning of
424 Migratory Performance. *Science (80-.)*. **341**, 999–1002. (doi:10.1126/science.1237139)
- 425 26. Couzin ID. 2018 Collective animal migration. *Curr. Biol.* **28**, R976–R980.
426 (doi:10.1016/j.cub.2018.04.044)
- 427 27. King AJ, Fehlmann G, Biro D, Ward AJ, Fürtbauer I. 2018 Re-wilding Collective
428 Behaviour: An Ecological Perspective. *Trends Ecol. Evol.* **33**, 347–357.
429 (doi:10.1016/j.tree.2018.03.004)
- 430 28. Vicsek T, Czirók A, Ben-Jacob E, Cohen I, Shochet O. 1995 Novel Type of Phase
431 Transition in a System of Self-Driven Particles. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **75**, 1226–1229.
432 (doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.75.1226)
- 433 29. Couzin ID, Krause J, James R, Ruxton GD, Franks NR. 2002 Collective Memory and
434 Spatial Sorting in Animal Groups. *J. Theor. Biol.* **218**, 1–11. (doi:10.1006/jtbi.2002.3065)
- 435 30. Strömbom D. 2011 Collective motion from local attraction. *J. Theor. Biol.* **283**, 145–151.
436 (doi:10.1016/j.jtbi.2011.05.019)
- 437 31. Romanczuk P, Schimansky-Geier L. 2012 Swarming and pattern formation due to
438 selective attraction and repulsion. *Interface Focus* **2**, 746–756.
439 (doi:10.1098/rsfs.2012.0030)
- 440 32. Grégoire G, Chaté H. 2004 Onset of Collective and Cohesive Motion. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **92**,
441 025702. (doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.92.025702)
- 442 33. Huepe C, Ferrante E, Wenseleers T, Turgut AE. 2015 Scale-Free Correlations in
443 Flocking Systems with Position-Based Interactions. *J. Stat. Phys.* **158**, 549–562.
444 (doi:10.1007/s10955-014-1114-8)

- 445 34. Grégoire G, Chaté H, Tu Y. 2003 Moving and staying together without a leader. *Phys. D*
446 *Nonlinear Phenom.* **181**, 157–170. (doi:10.1016/S0167-2789(03)00102-7)
- 447 35. Sumpter DJT. 2006 The principles of collective animal behaviour. *Philos. Trans. R. Soc.*
448 *B Biol. Sci.* **361**, 5–22. (doi:10.1098/rstb.2005.1733)
- 449 36. Vicsek T, Zafeiris A. 2012 Collective motion. *Phys. Rep.* **517**, 71–140.
450 (doi:10.1016/j.physrep.2012.03.004)
- 451 37. Bialek W, Cavagna A, Giardina I, Mora T, Silvestri E, Viale M, Walczak AM. 2012
452 Statistical mechanics for natural flocks of birds. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.* **109**, 4786–4791.
453 (doi:10.1073/pnas.1118633109)
- 454 38. Herbert-Read JE. 2016 Understanding how animal groups achieve coordinated
455 movement. *J. Exp. Biol.* **219**, 2971–2983. (doi:10.1242/jeb.129411)
- 456 39. Hughey LF, Hein AM, Strandburg-Peshkin A, Jensen FH. 2018 Challenges and solutions
457 for studying collective animal behaviour in the wild. *Philos. Trans. R. Soc. B Biol. Sci.* **373**,
458 20170005. (doi:10.1098/rstb.2017.0005)
- 459 40. Bode NWF, Franks DW, Wood AJ. 2011 Limited interactions in flocks: Relating model
460 simulations to empirical data. *J. R. Soc. Interface* **8**, 301–304.
461 (doi:10.1098/rsif.2010.0397)
- 462 41. Hemelrijk CK, Hildenbrandt H. 2011 Some Causes of the Variable Shape of Flocks of
463 Birds. *PLoS One* **6**, e22479. (doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0022479)
- 464 42. Hemelrijk CK, Hildenbrandt H. 2012 Schools of fish and flocks of birds: their shape and
465 internal structure by self-organization. *Interface Focus* **2**, 726–737.
466 (doi:10.1098/rsfs.2012.0025)
- 467 43. Levine H, Rappel W-J, Cohen I. 2000 Self-organization in systems of self-propelled
468 particles. *Phys. Rev. E* **63**, 017101. (doi:10.1103/PhysRevE.63.017101)
- 469 44. Pettit B, Perna A, Biro D, Sumpter DJT. 2013 Interaction rules underlying group decisions
470 in homing pigeons. *J. R. Soc. Interface* **10**. (doi:10.1098/rsif.2013.0529)

- 471 45. Chen D, Liu X, Xu B, Zhang H-T. 2017 Intermittence and connectivity of interactions in
472 pigeon flock flights. *Sci. Rep.* **7**, 10452. (doi:10.1038/s41598-017-09986-5)
- 473 46. Nagy M, Ákos Z, Biro D, Vicsek T. 2010 Hierarchical group dynamics in pigeon flocks.
474 *Nature* **464**, 890–893. (doi:10.1038/nature08891)
- 475 47. Nagy M, Vasarhelyi G, Pettit B, Roberts-Mariani I, Vicsek T, Biro D. 2013 Context-
476 dependent hierarchies in pigeons. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.* **110**, 13049–13054.
477 (doi:10.1073/pnas.1305552110)
- 478 48. Ballerini M *et al.* 2008 Interaction ruling animal collective behavior depends on topological
479 rather than metric distance: Evidence from a field study. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.* **105**,
480 1232–1237. (doi:10.1073/pnas.0711437105)
- 481 49. Ballerini M *et al.* 2008 Empirical investigation of starling flocks: a benchmark study in
482 collective animal behaviour. *Anim. Behav.* **76**, 201–215.
483 (doi:10.1016/j.anbehav.2008.02.004)
- 484 50. Lukeman R, Li Y-X, Edelstein-Keshet L. 2010 Inferring individual rules from collective
485 behavior. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.* **107**, 12576–12580. (doi:10.1073/pnas.1001763107)
- 486 51. Pearce DJG, Miller AM, Rowlands G, Turner MS. 2014 Role of projection in the control of
487 bird flocks. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.* **111**, 10422–10426. (doi:10.1073/pnas.1402202111)
- 488 52. Evangelista D, Ray D, Raja S, Hedrick T. 2017 Three-dimensional trajectories and
489 network analyses of group behaviour within chimney swift flocks during approaches to the
490 roost. *Proc R Soc B* **284**, 20162602. (doi:10.1098/rspb.2016.2602)
- 491 53. Cavagna A, Cimarelli A, Giardina I, Parisi G, Santagati R, Stefanini F, Viale M. 2010
492 Scale-free correlations in starling flocks. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.* **107**, 11865–11870.
493 (doi:10.1073/pnas.1005766107)
- 494 54. Mora T, Walczak AM, Castello LD, Ginelli F, Melillo S, Parisi L, Viale M, Cavagna A,
495 Giardina I. 2016 Local equilibrium in bird flocks. *Nat Phys* **12**, 1153–1157.
496 (doi:10.1038/nphys3846)

- 497 55. Ling H, Mclvor GE, van der Vaart K, Vaughan RT, Thornton A, Ouellette NT. 2019 Costs
498 and benefits of social relationships in the collective motion of bird flocks. *Nat. Ecol. Evol.*
499 (doi:10.1038/s41559-019-0891-5)
- 500 56. Ling H, Mclvor GE, Nagy G, MohaimenianPour S, Vaughan RT, Thornton A, Ouellette NT.
501 2018 Simultaneous measurements of three-dimensional trajectories and wingbeat
502 frequencies of birds in the field. *J. R. Soc. Interface* **15**, 20180653.
503 (doi:10.1098/rsif.2018.0653)
- 504 57. Sumpter D, Buhl J, Biro D, Couzin I. 2008 Information transfer in moving animal groups.
505 *Theory Biosci.* **127**, 177–186. (doi:10.1007/s12064-008-0040-1)
- 506 58. Fernandez-Juricic E, Kacelnik A. 2004 Information transfer and gain in flocks: the effects
507 of quality and quantity of social information at different neighbour distances. *Behav. Ecol.*
508 *Sociobiol.* **55**, 502–511. (doi:10.1007/s00265-003-0698-9)
- 509 59. Hogan BG, Hildenbrandt H, Scott-Samuel NE, Cuthill IC, Hemelrijk CK. 2017 The
510 confusion effect when attacking simulated three-dimensional starling flocks. *R. Soc. Open*
511 *Sci.* **4**, 160564. (doi:10.1098/rsos.160564)
- 512 60. Katz Y, Tunstrom K, Ioannou CC, Huepe C, Couzin ID. 2011 Inferring the structure and
513 dynamics of interactions in schooling fish. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.* **108**, 18720–18725.
514 (doi:10.1073/pnas.1107583108)
- 515 61. Puckett JG, Kelley DH, Ouellette NT. 2015 Searching for effective forces in laboratory
516 insect swarms. *Sci. Rep.* **4**, 4766. (doi:10.1038/srep04766)
- 517 62. Hemelrijk CK, Hildenbrandt H, Reinders J, Stamhuis EJ. 2010 Emergence of Oblong
518 School Shape: Models and Empirical Data of Fish. *Ethology* **116**, 1099–1112.
519 (doi:10.1111/j.1439-0310.2010.01818.x)
- 520 63. Hemelrijk CK, Hildenbrandt H. 2008 Self-organized shape and frontal density of fish
521 schools. *Ethology* **114**, 245–254. (doi:10.1111/j.1439-0310.2007.01459.x)
- 522 64. Kent MIA, Lukeman R, Lizier JT, Ward AJW. 2019 Speed-mediated properties of

- 523 schooling. *R. Soc. Open Sci.* **6**, 181482. (doi:10.1098/rsos.181482)
- 524 65. Tobalske BW. 2007 Biomechanics of bird flight. *J. Exp. Biol.* **210**, 3135–3146.
525 (doi:10.1242/jeb.000273)
- 526 66. Tobalske BW, Hedrick TL, Dial KP, Biewener AA. 2003 Comparative power curves in bird
527 flight. *Nature* **421**, 363–366. (doi:10.1038/nature01284)
- 528 67. Röell A. 1978 Social behaviour of the jackdaw, *Corvus monedula*, in relation to its niche.
529 *Behaviour* **64**, 1–124.
- 530 68. Jolles JW, King AJ, Manica A, Thornton A. 2013 Heterogeneous structure in mixed-
531 species corvid flocks in flight. *Anim. Behav.* **85**, 743–750.
532 (doi:10.1016/j.anbehav.2013.01.015)
- 533 69. Franks NR, Richardson T. 2006 Teaching in tandem-running ants. *Nature* **439**, 153.
534 (doi:10.1038/439153a)
- 535 70. Buhl J, Sword GA, Simpson SJ. 2012 Using field data to test locust migratory band
536 collective movement models. *Interface Focus* **2**, 757–763. (doi:10.1098/rsfs.2012.0024)
- 537 71. Herbert-Read JE, Perna A, Mann RP, Schaerf TM, Sumpter DJT, Ward AJW. 2011
538 Inferring the rules of interaction of shoaling fish. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.* **108**, 18726–18731.
539 (doi:10.1073/pnas.1109355108)
- 540 72. Torney CJ, Lamont M, Debell L, Angohiatok RJ, Leclerc LM, Berdahl AM. 2018 Inferring
541 the rules of social interaction in migrating caribou. *Philos. Trans. R. Soc. B Biol. Sci.* **373**.
542 (doi:10.1098/rstb.2017.0385)
- 543 73. Maeng JS, Park JH, Jang SM, Han SY. 2013 A modeling approach to energy savings of
544 flying Canada geese using computational fluid dynamics. *J. Theor. Biol.* **320**, 76–85.
545 (doi:10.1016/j.jtbi.2012.11.032)
- 546 74. Iriarte-Diaz J, Swartz SM. 2008 Kinematics of slow turn maneuvering in the fruit bat
547 *Cynopterus brachyotis*. *J. Exp. Biol.* **211**, 3478–3489. (doi:10.1242/jeb.017590)
- 548 75. Ros IG, Bassman LC, Badger MA, Pierson AN, Biewener AA. 2011 Pigeons steer like

549 helicopters and generate down- and upstroke lift during low speed turns. *Proc. Natl. Acad.*
550 *Sci.* **108**, 19990–19995. (doi:10.1073/pnas.1107519108)


551 76. Ling H, Mclvor G, van der Vaart K, Vaughan R, Thornton A, Ouellette N. Data from: Local
552 interactions and their group-level consequences in flocking jackdaws. Dryad Digital
553 Repository. (doi: 10.5061/dryad.kb8js06)

554

555


| Event | Total number of birds | Trajectory length (s) | <i>NND</i> (m) | $ v $ (m/s) | v_3 (m/s) | a_{Wing} (m/s ²) | a_{Move} (m/s ²) |
|----------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|----------------|-------------|-------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Isolated pairs | 610 | 4.0 ± 2.0 | 2.6 ± 1.7 | 9.4 ± 2.8 | -0.3 ± 1.5 | -0.3 ± 3.5 | -0.1 ± 1.6 |
| Flock #1 | 338 | 2.4 ± 1.1 | 1.6 ± 0.9 | 13.6 ± 1.7 | -0.9 ± 0.8 | -2.7 ± 3.3 | -0.7 ± 1.8 |
| Flock #2 | 112 | 3.1 ± 1.0 | 1.7 ± 0.8 | 13.8 ± 0.5 | -0.3 ± 0.6 | -0.4 ± 0.8 | 1.5 ± 1.8 |
| Flock #3 | 106 | 2.9 ± 1.4 | 1.7 ± 1.0 | 12.0 ± 0.7 | -0.6 ± 0.7 | -0.1 ± 1.1 | 0.8 ± 1.8 |
| Flock #4 | 81 | 4.5 ± 1.0 | 2.9 ± 2.7 | 10.1 ± 1.0 | -0.8 ± 0.8 | -0.4 ± 2.1 | -0.1 ± 1.4 |
| Flock #5 | 31 | 2.0 ± 1.2 | 1.3 ± 0.6 | 15.2 ± 0.8 | -1.4 ± 1.6 | -2.1 ± 4.3 | -1.2 ± 1.8 |
| Flock #6 | 26 | 3.4 ± 1.0 | 2.9 ± 2.7 | 9.3 ± 0.3 | 0.6 ± 0.4 | -1.0 ± 0.5 | -0.6 ± 0.7 |

556
557 Table 1. Statistics of bird flight in isolated pairs and in groups. *NND* denotes the first nearest neighbour
558 distance, v_3 denotes the velocity in the gravity direction, a_{Wing} and a_{Move} are the accelerations in the wing
559 and movement directions respectively. The values provided in the table are the means and standard
560 deviations. Positive (negative) values of a_{Move} mean speeding up (slowing down), and positive (negative)
561 a_{Wing} implies turning right (left).
562
563




564
565
566
567
568
569

Figure 1. Anisotropic neighbour structure caused by repulsion: (a) turning-based repulsion creating a side-by-side neighbour structure; (b) speeding-based repulsion forming a front-back neighbour distribution.




570
 571 Figure 2. (a) Recorded images for isolated pairs. The time step between two consecutive images of the
 572 same bird is 1/60 s. (b-c) Reconstructed 3D trajectories for birds shown in (a) coloured by flight speed $|v|$
 573 (b) and acceleration $|a|$ (c). More samples are provided in *electronic supplementary material figure S1*.
 574




575
 576
 577
 578
 579
 580

Figure 3. (a) Recorded images of birds in flock #1. The time step between two consecutive images of the same bird is $1/60$ s. (b-c) Reconstructed 3D trajectories of flock #1 projected onto the horizontal plane coloured by $|v|$ and $|a|$. For flocks #2 to #6, see *electronic supplementary material figure S2*.




581
 582 Figure 4. (a) Schematic of the measurement variables. We place the focal bird at the origin and measure
 583 the neighbour location denoted as (d_{Wing}, d_{Move}) and acceleration of focal bird relative to neighbour
 584 denoted as (F_{Turn}, F_{Speed}) . (b-c) F_{Turn} (b) and F_{Speed} (c) as a function of d_{Wing} and d_{Move} . (d) F_{Turn} as a
 585 function of d_{Wing} (circles), and F_{Speed} as a function of d_{Move} (triangles). Data in (b-d) were obtained from
 586 149,230 samples taken from 305 isolated pairs (see *electronic supplementary material*). 0.5 m/s² is much
 587 larger than average values of F_{Turn} and F_{Speed} for the 149,230 samples. Error bars are standard errors.
 588
 589
 590




591
 592
 593
 594
 595

Figure 5. F_{Turn} as a function of d_{Wing} (circles), and F_{Speed} as a function of d_{Move} (triangles) for birds flying in large groups. Error bars are standard errors.



596
 597
 598
 599
 600
 601
 602
 603
 604
 605
 606
 607

Figure 6. (a-b) Probability density distributions of the location of the first nearest neighbour bird in isolated pairs (a) and in a large flock (#1) (b). The focal bird is located at the origin. d_g is the distance in the gravity direction. (c) Distribution of bird locations (dots) projected on the horizontal plane for flock #1, showing two subgroups (one in red (grey) and one in blue (dark)) separated along the flight direction. The vectors are the movement directions of individual birds. (d) Corresponding histogram of bird positions along the flight direction (x_2). Data for flocks #2 to #6 can be found in *electronic supplementary material figure S4 and S5*. (e) Ratio of the subgroup size in the wing direction (L_{Wing}) to the subgroup size in the movement direction (L_{Move}).



608
 609 Figure 7. (a-b) df_{wb} as a function of d_{Wing} (a) and d_{Move} (b). (c-d) dE' as a function of d_{Wing} (c) and d_{Move} (d).
 610 Here, $df_{wb} > 0$ indicates that focal birds flap their wings faster than their neighbours, and $dE' > 0$ indicates
 611 that focal birds output more mechanical power than their neighbours. Results were obtained from 149,230
 612 samples taken from 305 isolated pairs. Error bars are standard errors.