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For studies of how birds control their altitude, seabirds are of particular interest because they forage offshore where the visual environment can be simply modelled by a flat world textured by waves then generating only ventral visual cues. This study suggests that optic flow, i.e. the rate at which the sea moves across the eye’s retina, can explain gulls’ altitude control over seas. In particular, a new flight model that includes both energy and optical invariants helps explain the gulls’ trajectories during offshore takeoff and cruising flight. A linear mixed model applied to 352 flights from 16 individual lesser black backed gulls (Larus fuscus) revealed a statistically significant optic flow set-point of ca 25° s⁻¹. Thereafter, an optic flow-based flight model was applied to 18 offshore takeoff flights from nine individual gulls. By introducing an upper limit in climb rate on the elevation dynamics, coupled with an optic flow set-point, the predicted altitude gives an optimized fit factor value of 63% on average (30–83% in range) with respect to the GPS data. We conclude that the optic flow regulation principle helps gulls to adjust their altitude over sea without having to directly measure their current altitude.

1. Introduction

Understanding how a bird adjusts its altitude during a specific manoeuvre is a difficult task because it is strongly dependent on the atmospheric conditions and flight capacity of the bird (see review [1]). Seabirds such as albatrosses and petrels flying close to the sea surface take advantage of the logarithmic increase in wind speeds to support dynamic soaring [2–5], which works only at very low altitudes of ca 0–10 m (see e.g. fig. 5 in [6]). Birds flying by flapping flight at low altitudes over the sea could also use this wind speed gradient to reduce their transport costs. Under tailwinds, birds should fly higher where wind speed is high, while under headwinds birds should fly lower where wind speed is low. In terms of energy, a bird minimizing its transport cost should adjust its airspeed with respect to wind by increasing it in headwinds and decreasing it in tailwinds [7,8]. This prediction comes from a U-shaped function between power required to fly and airspeed, which defines characteristic speeds for achieving minimum power $V_{mp}$ and maximum range $V_{mr}$. During migratory [9] and homing flights [10] birds utilize wind assistance to minimize the transport cost and adjust airspeed accordingly to fly at the wind dependent $V_{mr}$.

Groundspeed is the combined effect of airspeed and wind speed (actually the airspeed and wind vectors). Wind assistance alone cannot be used by the bird to select a given groundspeed and a flight altitude. The altitude could be set by surrounding visual information seen by the bird. A bird can access information about its own motion with respect to its surrounding environment via the optic flow field.
through its early visual processing [11], as flying insects do in similar situations [11,12]. The optic flow field perceived by an agent (a flying insect, a bird or a human) is particularly dependent on the structure of the environment [13–16]. Optic flow can be defined by a vector field of the apparent angular velocities of objects, surfaces and edges in a visual scene caused by the relative motion between the agent and the scene (figure 1). The translational optic flow component is particularly interesting for birds positioning in space because it depends on (i) the ratio between the relative linear groundspeed of an object in the scene with respect to the bird and (ii) the distance from obstacles in the surrounding environment. Consequently, optic flow requires neither groundspeed nor distance measurement, which is particularly useful to explain how birds perceive the world because birds are likely unable to sense directly their own groundspeed nor the three-dimensional structure of the environment in which the binocular vision plays a minor role [17]. In addition, using depth perception based on motion parallax firstly requires a background and a foreground, then a head motion in translation. However, it has been reported for long-necked birds (whooper swans [18] and herons [19]) that exhibit a stabilization of their head, which could be the same for short-necked birds (like seabirds) while flying over sea, where seabirds perceive only a background. Consequently, motion parallax should play a minor role in altitude perception.

During flight manoeuvres, various optic flow parameters (such as the magnitude, the direction, the focus of expansion, the time-to-contact of optic flow) can be collected by birds to control their lateral position in straight tunnels (in budgerigars [20]), to decrease their speed in a converging tunnel (in budgerigars [21]), to plunge into water (in gannets [22]), to hover (in hummingbirds [23,24]) and finally to land (in hawks [25] and in hummingbirds [26]).

In this study, we address the question of how seabirds control their altitude during offshore takeoffs and cruise flights with respect to wind. Here, two working hypotheses were compared about altitude control:

— a first hypothesis based on a direct measurement and regulation of optic flow that adjusts the altitude and

— a second hypothesis based on a direct measurement of the barometric pressure that directly regulates the altitude itself.

To test these alternative hypotheses, a statistical analysis of 352 flights comprising 16 individual lesser black-backed gulls (Larus fuscus) in various wind conditions was conducted. Then, 18 offshore takeoffs followed by a cruise flight were analysed by taking into account morphological parameters from 9 individual gulls.

2. Modelling the flight in terms of groundspeed and altitude; a theoretical approach

2.1. How is bird groundspeed deduced from aeraulic effects?

The relationship between:

— the bird’s groundspeed $V_g$
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To test these alternative hypotheses, a statistical analysis of 352 flights comprising 16 individual lesser black-backed gulls (Larus fuscus) in various wind conditions was conducted. Then, 18 offshore takeoffs followed by a cruise flight were analysed by taking into account morphological parameters from 9 individual gulls.

2. Modelling the flight in terms of groundspeed and altitude; a theoretical approach

2.1. How is bird groundspeed deduced from aeraulic effects?

The relationship between:

— the bird’s groundspeed $V_g$
— the bird’s airspeed $V_{air}$
— the wind speed $V_w$

is given by equation (2.1):

$$V_g = V_{air} + V_w.$$ (2.1)

The basis for deriving predictions about bird flight is the so-called flight mechanical theory, which combines the relationship between power output $P$ and airspeed $V_{air}$ in flapping flight as follows:

$$P(V_{air}) = a + b \cdot V_{air}^{-1} + c \cdot V_{air}^3$$ (2.2)

where $a$, $b$ and $c$ represent various physical, morphological and physiological properties of the bird and air [27–29]. If the objective is to minimize the energy cost per unit distance (i.e. cost of transport), the optimal flight speed is the maximum range speed $V_{mr}$ [7, 27]. The maximum range speed $V_{mr}$ is obtained from the U-shaped power curve [29–31] by the condition

$$\left(\frac{\partial P}{\partial V_{air}}\right)_{V_{air}=V_{mr}} = \frac{P(V_{mr})}{V_{mr}}.$$ (2.3)

Indeed, a gull’s homing flight is similar to a migratory flight, in that it is assumed that the flight’s objective is principally for transportation, as opposed to outbound foraging flights when the bird is likely also searching for food. Seabirds’ homing flight over the sea is therefore a directed flight between two locations. During transport flight gulls are expected to minimize overall energy expenditure or time, thus cost of travel per unit distance should be minimized rather than instantaneous energy expenditure. If minimizing the cost of travel per unit distance birds will travel at maximum range speed ($V_{mr}$) not minimum power airspeed ($V_{mp}$). $V_{mr}$ refers to $V_{air}$ rather than $V_g$. If a bird experiences a tailwind, its cost of travel per unit distance decreases, thus $V_{mr}$ also declines. Conversely under headwinds $V_{mr}$ increases. In a recent work, it was analysed how lesser black-backed gulls (and guillemots) modulate their airspeeds in relation to winds [32]. It was found that gulls increased airspeeds under headwinds and decreased airspeeds under tailwinds [32], and similar behaviour has been observed during longer distance homing flights [33]. These results suggest that gulls are flying at $V_{mr}$ rather than $V_{mp}$, since $V_{mp}$ should not be affected by winds like $V_{mr}$ [32].

### 2.2. Optic flow vector field generated by a bird in flight over sea

Consider a bird flying over the sea at an altitude $h$ and a groundspeed $V_g$ (neglecting vertical speed $V_z$) the magnitude of the ventral optic flow field $\omega$ can be expressed as follows:

$$\omega(\phi, \theta) = \frac{V_g}{h} \sin^2 \theta \times \cos \phi$$ (2.4)

with $\theta$ the elevation angle and $\phi$ the azimuth angle.

The magnitude of the ventral optic flow field is plotted in figure 1a with the projection of its elevation and azimuth angles over the sea. The larger projection of vector magnitude of optic flow over the sea is shown using a contour plot in figure 1c in the case of a bird flying at a height of 10 m. The bird may be able to perceive the optic flow maximum from a non-negligible area of its field of view (figure 1c). The maximum magnitude of the ventral optic flow is always vertically downwards from the bird in the direction of the sea:

$$\omega(\phi = 0^\circ, \theta = -90^\circ) = \frac{V_g}{h}.$$ (2.5)

### 2.3. How the model predicts the bird’s flight height from the ventral optic flow regulation principle

The ventral optic flow regulation principle tends to keep constant the vertically downward optic flow whatever the speed or height of flight by adjusting the altitude [34, 35]. Here, it introduces this asymptotic proportionality relationship for birds: the bird’s height of flight $h$ will always tend (through the bird dynamics) to be proportional to the bird’s ground speed $V_g$ (figure 1b) as

$$\omega_{hp} = \omega(\phi = 0^\circ, \theta = -90^\circ) = \frac{V_g}{h} = \text{constant},$$ (2.6)

where $\omega_{hp}$ is the ventral optic flow set-point. Besides, the wind profile power-law is often used to estimate the horizontal wind speed [36] as follows:

$$V_w = V_{ref} \cdot \left(\frac{h}{h_{ref}}\right)^\alpha$$ (2.7)

with the parameter $\alpha$ being the power-law exponent that is usually specified as a function of stability as well as the roughness of the surface, where $0 < \alpha < 1$ (here over seas $\alpha = 0.11$; see [37]). The speed $V_{ref}$ is the wind speed at a reference height $h_{ref}$ (10 m). By combining (2.6) and (2.7) into (2.1), we obtain

$$\omega_{hp} \cdot h = V_{air} + V_{ref} \cdot \left(\frac{h}{h_{ref}}\right)^\alpha - \omega_{hp} \cdot h.$$ (2.8)

To find the bird’s steady-state flight height $h$ reached during a takeoff as a function of the wind profile, it requires to solve the equation $f(h) = 0$ with the function $f$ defined as follows:

$$f(h) = V_{air} + V_{ref} \cdot \left(\frac{h}{h_{ref}}\right)^\alpha - \omega_{hp} \cdot h.$$ (2.9)

In the variation table of the function $f$ (electronic supplementary material, table S1), we observe that only one unique altitude $h$ exists, enabling $f(h) = 0$ during an offshore takeoff manoeuvre. We can therefore conclude that both the minimization of the rate of energy consumption and regulating the ventral optic flow enable a bird to fix both its groundspeed and its altitude above the sea. The bird’s steady-state flight height $h$ cannot be considered as a ‘target flight height’ or a ‘desired flight height’, but as an ‘optimal flight height’ because the bird’s altitude is adjusted as a function of the wind conditions (higher under tailwinds but lower under headwinds) and thereby maximizing positive effects as well as minimizing adverse effects of the wind gradient.

### 3. Materials and methods

#### 3.1. Gulls’ trajectory recording

Sixteen lesser black-backed gulls (Larus fuscus) were GPS tracked from their breeding colony on Stora Karlsö island, Sweden (17.972°E, 57.285°N) during May to September of 2013–2015.
The island is a small offshore island (2.5 km²) located in the western central Baltic Sea, sited 7 km west of the much larger island of Gotland (figure 2a). During breeding the gulls perform central-place foraging trips [38], flying out from their island to forage, either at sea or on land [39].

Gulls were caught during late incubation (late May) using walk-in traps set over their nests. They were weighed and sexed from museum collections, and the stomach was removed and examined for forage, either at sea or on land [39].

The continuous GPS tracks were segmented into foraging trips (figure 3b) where a foraging trip was assumed if the gull was on land at night and at sea (or vice versa) during the day. Foraging trips were identified where the gull flew over 500 km on one or more consecutive days. The minimum duration of a foraging trip was 24 h, which was considered necessary to be away from the colony. All foraging trips were segmented into inbound and outbound flights as defined previously [40].

3.2. Takeoff time series analysis: individually tuned parametric model

3.2.1. Parametric model estimation

The linear parametric models about each gull’s elevation dynamics were estimated with the System Identification Toolbox from the Matlab software (parameters: time constant \( \tau_h \) and static gain \( 1/\omega_{sp} \) in (3.2)). The maximum climbing speed \( \dot{h}_{max} \) was computed from \([8,30]\):

\[
\dot{h}_{max} = \frac{2.16 \cdot m_m \cdot f}{m} \cdot \frac{1.92 \cdot m^{2/3}}{\rho^{1/2} \cdot b^{3/2}},
\]

where \( m_m \) is the mass of the flight muscles, \( f \) is the observed flapping frequency (3.26 Hz on average; see [32, p. 162]), \( m \) is the total mass including any added load, \( \rho \) is the air density (1.205 kg m\(^{-3}\) at 20°C) and \( b \) is the wing span. The vertical wind is low over the sea, consequently in flight, we neglected the vertical wind. For each of the 18 offshore takeoffs followed by a cruise flight, we took into account the morphological parameters of each gull.
bird mass \(m\), because the bird mass was known without any prey load. The fit factor considered was the goodness of fit between optimized simulated data \(\theta_{opt}\) and actual GPS data \(\theta_{GPS}\) using a Matlab function with a normalized mean square error cost function (called NRMSE cost function). NRMSE fit factor varies between minus infinity (worse fit) to 1 (perfect fit).

According to table 15 in [46], the flight muscle ratio \(m_{m}/m\) is relatively constant across birds species at 0.18 \pm 0.05 (mean \pm s.d., with \(n = 221\)). Our simulated model has been adjusted with the flight muscle ratio in order to get the best fit factor, then adjusting the maximum climbing speed in the elevation dynamics model. For our group of 9 individual lesser black-backed gulls, we obtained the best fit factor with a corresponding flight muscle ratio \(m_{m}/m\) of 0.18 \pm 0.03, which is quite similar to prediction 9 from [30]. The optic flow-based control model takes into account the observed correlation between the groundspeed \(V_g\) and the altitude \(h\) coming from gulls’ GPS data. The proportionality factor is called here a ventral optic flow set-point \(\omega_{sp}\) (2.6). Once the best fit factor has been reached by adjusting the flight muscle fraction \(m_{m}/m\), each gull’s altitude is re-computed by considering an altitude control model that directly feeds the elevation dynamics with a ‘target flight altitude’, noted an altitude set-point \(h_{sp}\), which is computed when the gull reached its steady-state altitude.

### 3.2.3. Optic flow-based altitude control model

We consider two scales of time. The gull’s forward dynamics (figure 4a) responds faster than the gull’s upward dynamics (constrained by \(V_{g\text{max}}\) equation (3.1)); see figure 4b) because the height of flight arises from the response of a first order differential equation by considering the forward speed as a step input (3.2). The bird’s elevation dynamics is represented in figure 5\(a\), which includes both the first order upward dynamics (3.2) and the maximum climbing speed \(V_{g\text{max}}\) (3.1).

\[
\tau_h \cdot \frac{dh}{dt} + h(t) = \frac{1}{\omega_{sp}} \cdot V_g(t).
\]

An explicit solution of equation (3.2) can be written, if we consider a step response at a given positive amplitude \(V_{g0}\) value, as follows:

\[
h(t) = \frac{V_{g0}}{\omega_{sp}} \cdot (1 - e^{-t/\tau_h}).
\]

For each gull trajectory, we consider only one takeoff followed by a cruise flight, and then we perform a first order system identification described by the differential equation (3.2). In this model, a proportionality factor \(1/\omega_{sp}\) is introduced, which is the inverse of the ventral optic flow set-point \(\omega_{sp}\) (2.6), and the input of the upward dynamics (3.2) is the groundspeed \(V_g\) which correlates the altitude \(h\) and the groundspeed \(V_g\). If the gull’s groundspeed is constant during takeoff as well as during cruising flight, then the predicted altitude profile will be the same with both models.

The inter-flight variability of the climb time constant \(\tau_h = 97.3 \pm 68.0\ s\), with \(n = 18\) takeoffs in figure 4b) was derived on the basis of morphological properties of the birds (inter alia age, wingspan, body mass including the load of prey and sex).

### 3.2.4. Direct altitude control model

Here, the bird’s elevation dynamics is represented in figure 5\(b\), which includes both the first order upward dynamics (3.4) and the maximum climbing speed \(V_{g\text{max}}\) (3.1).

\[
\tau_h \cdot \frac{dh}{dt} + h(t) = h_{sp}.
\]

An explicit solution of equation (3.4) can be written, if we consider a step response at a given altitude \(h_{sp}\) value, as follows:

\[
h(t) = h_{sp} \cdot (1 - e^{-t/\tau_h}).
\]

The ‘target flight altitude’, also called the altitude set-point, is denoted \(h_{sp}\), which is computed from when the gull reached its steady-state altitude, i.e. the gull’s mean altitude when \(t > 3\tau_h\) or \(t > 5\tau_h\) depending on data availability. In this model, there is no correlation between altitude and groundspeed.
4. Results

4.1. Full flight dataset analysis: statistical model using wind data

The dataset here includes all inbound (returning to the island colony) over sea flights by the lesser black-backed gulls (383 flights, 16 gulls). The dataset is composed of median altitudes $h$ calculated per flight, median wind speed measured at 10 m height (from ECMWF data), $V_{\text{ref}}$, and the gull identifier. After excluding the flights endowed with a median altitude below zero metres, the data comprise 352 observations of 16 individual gulls (see electronic supplementary material, table S2).

A nonlinearity of wind profile power law (2.7) was introduced to estimate the wind speed $V_w(h)$ experienced by gulls at their median altitude $h$ calculated per flight. A linear mixed effect model was designed using lmer in R software for the ordinates ($\beta_i$ is the constant random effect) as follows:

$$h = \beta_1 \cdot V_w(h) + \beta_0 + \epsilon_i$$  \hspace{1cm} (4.1)

with the regression parameters: $\beta_1 = 2.2707$ and $\beta_0 = 32.0016$. The Kenward–Roger corrected F-test was used to calculate the significance level of the linear mixed model with numerator degrees of freedom: 1; denominator degrees of freedom: 347.89; F-value: 37.722; p-value: 2.2286 × 10$^{-9}$; F-scaling: 1).

The parameter $\beta_1$ was highly significant (figure 6). Using the coefficient $\beta_1 = 2.2707$, an identification of the ventral optic flow set-point $\omega_{\text{opt}}$ can be performed using equation (2.8) that includes the wind profile power law as follows:

$$\omega_{\text{opt}} = \frac{1}{\beta_1} = 0.4403 \text{ rad s}^{-1} = 25.23^\circ \text{ s}^{-1}. \hspace{1cm} (4.2)$$

Figure 5. The two models used to predict altitude. (a) Optic flow-based altitude control model including an individualized gull’s elevation dynamics. Once the gull has reached the minimum groundspeed to takeoff, groundspeed is then relatively constant during its flight, an optic-flow-based control system can be switched on and lead the gull to a given altitude depending on both its groundspeed and altitude. The altitude set-point $h_{\text{sp}}$ is an internal parameter used by the gull to select its ‘desired’ or ‘target’ flight altitude. (Online version in colour.)

Figure 6. Gull median altitude $h$ versus median wind assistance $V_w$ (head or tail wind) at median altitude $h$ for 352 flights (16 distinct gulls). The regression line using $\beta_1$ and $\beta_0$ is plotted in red. See electronic supplementary material, table S2 for dataset details. (Online version in colour.)
This statistical analysis tells us that gulls tend to maintain a ventral optic flow close to 25.23° s⁻¹ whatever the wind conditions are while flying above the sea.

4.2. Comparison between optic flow-based and direct altitude control models

In this section, 18 takeoffs are treated as independent observations despite these being recorded on 9 individual birds. Indeed, the weather, the wind, the state of the sea, the moment and the fishing area were uncontrolled and different from one flight to another (figure 2b).

A set of 18 trajectories representing 9 different gulls are individually shown in the horizontal plane in figure 2b. The set of GPS data are clustered and shown in figure 4 for the initial 400 s of each flight. It allows us not only to show the increase in speed during the gulls’ takeoff (figure 4a), but also their level flight along the vertical plane (figure 4b). Both groundspeed and altitude have been individually normalized by the steady state value reached by the gulls’ groundspeed and altitude, respectively (figure 4). Consequently, both curves reach a steady state close to a value of one (figure 4).

A linear first order parametric model on the data (18 trajectories) gives a fit factor value (i.e. a NRMSE cost function) of 40.4% on average (range: 10–80%). Then, by introducing a constraint on the climb rate according to prediction 10 in [8,30], a direct altitude control model based on a nonlinear first order parametric model combined with an altitude set-point $h_{sp}$ (see figure 5b for details) gives a fit factor of on average 57.1% (range: 11–77%). However, by adding to the previous model a correlation between groundspeed and altitude, which is linked to what we call an optic flow set-point $\omega_{sp}$ (see figure 5a for details), an optic flow-based control model gives a fit factor of 63.4% on average (range: 30–83%).

Examples comparing an optic flow-based control model to a direct altitude control model for one takeoff is given in figure 7b (the 17 other takeoffs are shown in electronic supplementary material, figures S4–S20). We observe that in each case the fit factor was higher with an optic flow-based control model (blue dots in figure 7b) rather than a direct altitude control model (red dots in figure 7b).

The set of normalized predicted altitudes ($n=18$) computed with an altitude control model (figure 5b) is shown in figure 8a, and with an optic flow-based control model (figure 5b) is shown in figure 8b. Residuals, which are the errors between altitudes coming from GPS data and predicted altitudes coming from models, are represented in figure 8c,d. We compared the residuals’ distribution between the two models in transient response (white shaded boxes in electronic supplementary material, figure S3) and in steady-state response (grey shaded boxes in electronic supplementary material, figure S3). The median value of the residuals (figure 8c,d) coming from the optic flow-based model was significantly higher in transient response (one-sided Wilcoxon rank sum test, $n=27$, $p \ll 0.001$) and was also significantly higher in steady-state response (one-sided Wilcoxon rank sum test, $n=27$, $p \ll 0.001$). Consequently for
all of which is computed by current predicted altitude to average predicted altitude (by removing the first 100 s) ratio. The optic flow-based control model (data in (figure 4)). (Online version in colour.)

Figure 8. Red dots (altitude control model) or blue dots (optic flow-based control model) represent predicted altitude (a,b) or residuals (c,d) at a same sampling time of 10 s (12 trajectories) or 15 s (six trajectories) like GPS data (see figure 4). Each dot represents the median value and shaded areas represent the median absolute deviation (MAD) of data (n = 18). The white shaded areas represent the transient response (time <200 s) during takeoff and ascent, and the grey shaded areas represent the steady state response (time >200 s) once in cruising flight. The duration 200 s ≈ 2 - 3s, represents about 86% of the step response of a first order dynamic system (see (3.3)). (a) Normalized predicted altitude using an altitude control model (figure 5a), which is computed by current predicted altitude to average predicted altitude (by removing the first 100 s) ratio h/(mean(h(100 s : end))). (b) Normalized predicted altitude using an optic flow-based control model (figure 5a), which is computed by current predicted altitude to average predicted altitude (by removing the first 100 s) ratio h/(mean(h(100 s : end))). (c) Residuals between GPS data (figure 4b) and altitude computed with the altitude control model (data in (a)). (d) Residuals between GPS data (figure 4b) and altitude computed with the optic flow-based control model (data in (b)). (Online version in colour.)

both parts, the response predicted by the optic flow-based control model was better than the response predicted by the altitude control model. Finally, the average values of the residuals coming from each control model in transient response, then in steady-state response, were compared to a normal distribution centred around zero. The distributions of residuals with the optic flow-based control model (white shaded boxes in electronic supplementary material, figure S3) were not significantly different from a normal distribution centred around zero (t-test, n = 27, p = 0.95 in transient response, and p = 0.07 in steady-state response). Residuals with the direct altitude control model (grey shaded boxes in electronic supplementary material, figure S3) were significantly different from a normal distribution centred around zero (t-test, n = 27, p ≪ 0.01 in transient response and p ≪ 0.001 in steady-state response). This statistical analysis shows that the optic flow-based control model is the most established model. Besides, for 13 out of 18 flights, we observe a significant correlation (Spearman’s test on GPS data) between groundspeed and altitude ($\rho$ from 0.22 to 0.83, 13 flights). We therefore conclude that our optic flow-based control model (figure 5a) better explains the gulls’ GPS tracking data than the direct altitude control model (figure 5b).

5. Discussion
5.1. Comparison of optic flow set-points identified by both analyses
We compared the distribution of ventral optic flow set-points coming from the tuned parametric model obtained from the takeoff time series ($\omega_{sp}$, $sp = 22$ ± 9°s$^{-1}$ with $n = 18$, Shapiro normality test: $p = 0.16$ and the parameter $\omega_{sp-liner} = 25.23$ s$^{-1}$ obtained from the linear mixed effect model (4.2), respectively. No significant difference was observed between the $\omega_{sp}$ distribution and the value $\omega_{sp-liner}$ (t-test, t-value: 1.5296, d.f.: 16, p-value: 0.1457). This suggests that both analyses identify optic flow set-points that are in the same range and not significantly different. As a consequence, both the takeoff time-series and the full dataset support the ventral optic flow regulation hypothesis in a consistent manner.

5.2. Effect of wind on the birds’ altitude
An additional outcome of the ventral optic flow regulation hypothesis [34,35] is that any increase in headwind will lead to a decrease in gull flight altitude in order to maintain the ventral optic flow constant (figure 9a). Conversely, any
increase in tailwind will lead to an increase in bird altitude (figure 9c). A bird can adjust its ground speed by adjusting its airspeed or its heading relative to ground (and wind), thus allowing it to minimize its cost of transport in flight. The altitude control system based on optic flow is therefore consistent with previous observations on speed adjustment with respect to winds in migrating birds [47].

The small Hellman exponent $a$ over relatively smooth surfaces, such as the sea, means that wind speed increases more rapidly than over a rough surface (e.g. a forest). Thus at higher altitudes (i.e. from 10 to 100 m) wind speed will not vary much, but below 10 m wind speed can double going from 1 to 10 m. Around the sea’s waves wind is deflected leading to a pattern of updraughts and downdraughts [2,3,48]. Together these effects are used by soaring seabirds in dynamic soaring, gust soaring or ‘sweeping flight’ [2,3,48], and the characteristic meandering flight style that results has been termed ‘wave-meandering wing-sailing’ [49]. Flapping seabirds can also use these features to gain a higher climb rate at the start of a takeoff manoeuvre, taking off facing into the wind in the updraught formed by the deflection of the wind over a wave (see [10,29, p. 268]), which therefore reduces the effort required to take off and accelerate to reach the maximum range speed $V_{max}$. Seabirds may also use the ‘ground effect’ while flying very close to the sea surface to reduce their energetic expenditure [50], which is helpful for takeoff at sea.

5.4. Are groundspeed and altitude still proportional at higher altitudes?
Birds making lower altitude flights (<100–150 m) will generate a detectable optic flow. However, when on long distance or migratory flights birds may fly higher at hundreds to thousands of metres (see above), optic flow values will then be extremely low, thus unlikely to be suitable for regulating a given optic flow set-point. This relates to the finding for common swifts (Apus apus) by Hedenström & Åkesson that the swifts did not compensate for head- and tail winds as expected from flight mechanical theory when flying at high altitudes (>1000 m), but they did so at low altitudes (<100 m) [51]. This was interpreted as a failure to detect small changes in optic flow due to winds by the swifts’ visual system at high altitudes. In addition, for altitudes higher than 400 m, lesser black-backed gulls were observed to compensate less for cross-wind disturbance than they did at lower altitudes: fractional compensations were observed to decrease from about 1.3 (on average) to less than 0.5 at 900 m height [33]. At altitudes above 400 m, gulls’ groundspeed may be highly dependent on the wind speed: no altitude increase or decrease can be predicted with respect to the optic flow-based control model as optic flow is low; thus its changes with altitude would be difficult to detect by the gulls’ visual system.

5.5. Can birds use barometric pressure to determine altitude?
Birds’ mechanoreceptive paratympanic organ (PTO) is located in the middle ear, and it is probably used by birds
to detect barometric pressure [52]. Birds appear to use the PTO not only as a barometer to predict the onset of inclement weather [52–54], but also as a genuine altimeter to adjust their flight altitude during migration. Birds can fly level within $\pm 20$ m for distances of 2–3 km at altitudes of 700–1100 m, even at night [55], i.e. without visual cues. However, it is still an open question whether birds can use changing barometric pressure directly to measure their current altitude in real time.

A mechanoreceptive scale sensory organ found in fish [56] may play the same sensory function as the PTO in birds. It is known that fish can determine their depth using hydrostatic pressure [57,58]. On this point, it was demonstrated that the dynamic depth sensing in fish is less than 1 m at a depth of 100 m [57]. However, water density is approximately 1000 times higher than air density, and the pressure gradient in flight is therefore particularly low generating extremely low frequencies in the feedback signal to the bird’s elevation dynamics. Therefore, it would be difficult to adjust the flight altitude for a short period of time, only being practical for long periods of time such as for example during longer distance migratory flights.

A bird does not have to compute its altitude from other physical or internal parameters than those from visual cues and the PTO. Birds could directly estimate altitude with a barometric measurement by means of their PTO, but with a relatively coarse resolution ($ca \pm 10$ m). The optimum airspeed $V_{mr}$ is an optimum in relation, not only to the physiology and the morphology of the bird, but also the environmental context (see §2). Consequently, a bird does not set its flight at a given $V_{mr}$. We argue it is almost the same thing for altitude, where the environmental context sets its trajectory mainly via its vision. The wind and the airspeed $V_{mr}$ set the bird’s groundspeed, and visual information coming from the ground (or sea) can help it to set its altitude up to hundreds of metres.

We tried to represent below the effect on ventral optic flow of a 10 m-altitude resolution during a gull’s cruise flight; such a 10 m-altitude resolution has been observed in pigeons’ PTO [59,60]. We consider here a gull flying at a groundspeed of 10.9 m s$^{-1}$ at an altitude of 25 m, which generates a ventral optic flow of 25° s$^{-1}$ (figure 10). The PTO will inform it that it is flying at 25 m ± 10 m, which corresponds in motion vision to a 25° s$^{-1}$ ± 16.6° s$^{-1}$ ventral optic flow range (figure 10). However, LM neurons are able to measure a ventral optic flow from 0.125° s$^{-1}$ to 34° s$^{-1}$ with a resolution of $ca$ 1 spike s$^{-1}$ per ° s$^{-1}$ [61,62]. Consequently, we can assume the gull’s motion vision is able to inform it at 25° s$^{-1}$ ± 1° s$^{-1}$, allowing it to stabilize its altitude at 25 m ± 1 m without 10 m oscillations as would result if based on PTO.

The GPS accuracy is $ca$ 2.5 m, which is above the optic flow-based altitude control accuracy of $ca$ 1 m at 25 m. Consequently in cruise flight, we did not observe any bird’s vertical oscillation in GPS data. However, at higher altitude, if a gull is flying at 15 m s$^{-1}$ at 78 m altitude, it will perceive an optic flow of 11° s$^{-1}$. With a 1° s$^{-1}$ resolution in optic flow measurement, it should be able to estimate its altitude at 78 m ± 6 m, which puts the motion vision’s altitude resolution closer to the PTO’s altitude resolution. Consequently, over hundreds of metres in altitude, birds cannot maintain a constant altitude with respect to their ventral optic flow’s objective, but will show small altitude oscillations, and neither will the bird be able to adapt its airspeed according to winds (also called wind flexibility behaviour; see [33]).

5.6. Can birds use their binocular vision for depth perception and then to control their altitude?

Martin [17,63, ch. 8, 9] explained that the primary role of binocular vision in birds is for the control of the bill tip. In addition, the binocular visual field of a seabird (the skimmer) is oriented around its bill tip and not really toward the ground [64]. Most seabirds have a maximum binocular field width in the 15°–30° range (about 120° in humans), which is limited, suggesting that binocular vision plays only a minor role in seabirds’ flight control system [17].

In particular, the state of scientific knowledge about the role of binocular vision in the distance perception and flight control of birds has been summarized [17]. ‘Exactly how birds do control their behaviour when landing is still not clear, but Davies & Green (1994) [65] suggest that a complex of multiple sources of information that may provide birds with distance cues to close
5.7. Effect of waves on the optic flow pattern

The flight model assumes that the sea surface, over which the gulls fly, provides a stationary reference frame: no data are currently available on the wave speed. Therefore, the optic flow experienced by the gulls is solely modelled as a function of their own movement (groundspeed and altitude). Previous studies on bird navigation over water suggest that the seascape (or more specifically the wavescape) is not a fixed reference frame [66], as the wave patterns move, usually in roughly the same direction as the wind but at a slower speed. Therefore, the perceived optic flow will be different from the physical optic flow. Alerstam & Petterson suggested that the motion of the wavescape allows birds to only partially compensate for wind-drift over the sea [67], thus presumably a similar constraint may apply to using the ventral optic flow for control of flight altitude.

Overall, the wave pattern will reduce the adjustment of altitude if a fixed optic flow set-point was used, as under headwinds perceived optic flow will be higher than otherwise, i.e. even as groundspeed approaches zero there will still be a perceived optic flow if the wavescape is moving, which would lead to higher flight altitudes than expected. While under tailwinds optical flow is somewhat reduced, as the sea surface pattern will be moving in the same direction as the bird, and hence lower than expected flight altitudes would result. The wave pattern distorts the ventral optic flow perceived: such disturbances could be added to the flight model once data or a methodology of how to obtain wave pattern become available.

However, for optic flow to be useful ripples above the sea are essential to form a textured surface. In fact, it was observed by Heran & Lindauer that a great number of honeybees plunged into the water when the water surface was mirror smooth [68]. An altitude control system based solely on a ventral optic flow regulation irrevocably pulls any flying animal down whenever its eye fails to measure an optic flow [35]. This did not happen in honeybees when the water surface was rippled [68,69] or when a floating bridge provided a visual contrast [68].

At this level of reasoning, we may wonder if the visual pattern produced by waves was textured enough during the gulls’ flights for an optic flow field to be perceived. To investigate this, knowing that the average significant wave height of the Baltic Sea in 1991–2015 was in the range 0.44–1.94 m [70], which corresponds to a Beaufort number of 3 (gentle breeze, mean wind speed equivalent from 3.4 to 5.4 m s$^{-1}$) to 4 (moderate breeze, mean wind speed equivalent from 5.5 to 7.9 m s$^{-1}$) [71]. We deduce that gulls could see scattered or fairly frequent white-crested waves at an effective height of 10 m above the sea level. However for Beaufort numbers from 0 to 2, the sea has a smooth appearance, which makes for poor visual conditions to perceive an optic flow field. Interestingly, the wind conditions corresponding to a Beaufort number from 3 to 4 fit not only with the wind conditions of gulls in flight (electronic supplementary material, figure S21), but also with their altitude (see [32, p. 166]). We can conclude that wind is an important parameter to generate an optic flow field cue, and to help gulls to control their flight above the sea.

The spatial acuity of seabirds can be more than four times lower than that in humans [72], with a maximum spatial acuity of about 60 cycles/degree in humans. Moreover, in seabirds, rods are evenly distributed across the entire retina [73], which allow them to conveniently detect the optic flow coming from the sea.

We conclude that the optic flow field is potentially the major visual cue used by seabirds to control their altitude above the sea.

5.8. Optic flow set-point: differences between honeybees and gulls

There are a number of differences in flight behaviours expressed by birds and flying insects [11]. Typically, the average maximum airspeed of honeybees is approximately 7.5 m s$^{-1}$ with a minimum power speed of their power U-curve at 3.3 m s$^{-1}$ [74]. In free-flight natural conditions, honeybees have been observed to fly from 3.3 to 5.1 m s$^{-1}$ [74]. However, lesser black-backed gulls typically fly at an air-speed in natural offshore conditions at an average of 12.3 m s$^{-1}$ ± 2 m s$^{-1}$ (see [32, p. 166]) with a minimum power speed of their power U-curve at 9.3 m s$^{-1}$ (computed for lesser black-backed gull; see [31]). Hence, lesser black-backed gulls can fly three times faster than honeybees by comparing their minimum power speed.

In honeybees, average maximal flight height is about 2.5 m over natural terrain [68,75]. In general, lesser black-backed gulls fly at an altitude over sea of up to 130 m with a distribution of 31 m ± 29 m on average (see [32, pp. 166–167]) during foraging flights. We conclude that lesser black-backed gulls fly much higher than honeybees during foraging flights, which reduces optic flow emanating from the sea.

Consequently, we can conclude from these two last points that the ventral optic flow set-point of lesser black-backed gulls is much lower than that typically experienced by honeybees, knowing that the ventral optic flow set-point of honeybees is close to 200° s$^{-1}$. Our statistical analysis estimates that the ventral optic flow set-point of lesser black-backed gulls is close to 25° s$^{-1}$ on average (see §4.1), which is a detectable value by the gulls’ visual system [17,63,76]. A recent review indicates that pigeons’ fast LM neurons (pretectal nucleus lentiformis mesencephali) respond to optic flow stimuli of their preferred backward direction (front to back visual stimuli: temporal to nasal on the retina) in this same angular velocities range [62].

6. Conclusion

A mathematical model of optic flow-based offshore takeoff control system in lesser black-backed gulls was developed in this study to understand what visual cue can be used by seabirds to control their takeoff and to cruise over a sea surface. This mathematical model introduced an optic flow set-point parameter, which aims to be maintained constant by seabirds during takeoff manoeuvres and cruising foraging flights. Besides, the model takes into account...
a bird’s individual morphology through its elevation dynamics. Finally, both analyses on the takeoff time-series and the full dataset support the ventral optic flow regulation hypothesis in a consistent manner.

We conclude that the optic flow regulation principle allows seabirds to control their altitude over sea at low flight altitudes without having to measure their current altitude directly by another method. To do this, they just have to measure the optic flow perceived from the sea to adjust their vertical thrust in order to maintain the ventral optic flow at a given value, called the optic flow set-point, as previously suggested for flying insects [34,35]. According to both the airspeed and altitude ranges of lesser black-backed gulls measured during flight in their natural environment, we demonstrate that gulls could control their altitude by regulating the ventral optic flow at a value of 25° s⁻¹ on average, allowing them to fly jointly up to 130 m in altitude at a groundspeed up to 20 m s⁻¹, while maintaining visual contact with the sea. The introduction of this asymptotic proportionality relationship for birds also accounts very nicely for the transient altitude response during takeoff. Overall, gulls need such accurate altitude control based on optic flow to optimize their energetic effort irrespectively of favourable or unfavourable unknown wind conditions while being robust to ground disturbances such as relief. This study cannot claim that ‘optic flow’ alone controls altitude in birds, but we think that multiple sensory systems with different resolution are implicated in the birds’ altitude control comprising visual cues and PTO. We hope this study will promote questions and investigations in other birds species.
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