

Composite random search strategies based on non-proximate sensory cues

Travis M. Hinkelman^{a,1}, Ben C. Nolting^{b,1,*}, Chad E. Brassil^a, Brigitte Tenhumberg^{a,b}

^a*School of Biological Sciences, 348 Manter Hall, University of Nebraska, Lincoln, Nebraska 68588-0188, USA*

^b*Department of Mathematics, 203 Avery Hall, University of Nebraska, Lincoln, Nebraska 68588-0130, USA*

Abstract

Many foraging animals find food using composite random search strategies, which consist of intensive and extensive search modes. Models of composite search can generate predictions about how optimal foragers should behave in each search mode, and how they should determine when to switch between search modes. Most of these models assume that foragers use resource encounters to decide when to switch between search modes. Empirical observations indicate that a variety of organisms use non-proximate sensory cues to identify areas that warrant intensive search. These cues are not precise enough to allow a forager to directly orient itself to a resource, but can be used as a criterion to determine the appropriate search mode. We developed a model of composite search based on non-proximate sensory cues. With simulations, we compared the search efficiencies of composite foragers that use resource encounters as their mode-switching criterion with those that use non-proximate sensory cues. Non-proximate sensory foragers had higher search efficiencies across a range of different resource distributions, and were more robust to changes in resource distribution. Our results suggest that current assumptions about the role of resource encounters in models of optimal composite search should be re-examined. We also explore how the search strategies predicted by our model can help bridge the gap between random search theory and traditional patch-use foraging theory.

Keywords: area-restricted search, composite search, giving-up time, Lévy walk, ballistic motion, Brownian motion, optimal foraging

1. Introduction

For many organisms, the ability to efficiently find food resources is a key determinant of fitness (Bell, 1991). It is advantageous for foraging animals to focus search effort on resource rich areas and minimize energy spent searching resource poor areas (Viswanathan et al., 2011). This search tactic has been termed composite search (Plank and James, 2008), area-restricted search (Weimerskirch et al., 2007), area-concentrated search (Benhamou, 1992), or intermittent search (Bénichou et al., 2011). A forager using a composite search strategy alternates between intensive and extensive search modes. In intensive mode, a forager thoroughly searches resource rich areas by making short moves and reorienting frequently; in extensive mode, it moves directly across resource poor areas by making long, straight-line moves with few interruptions.

Composite search behavior is widespread, observed in taxa as diverse as slime moulds (Latty and Beekman, 2009), beetles (Ferran et al., 1994), honeybees (Tyson et al., 2011), fish (Hill et al., 2003), birds (Nolet and Mooij, 2002), ungulates (Tyson et al., 2011), turtles (Tyson et al., 2011), and weasels (Haskell, 1997). Given the ubiquity of composite search, an important question arises: how should a forager determine when to switch from intensive to extensive mode, and vice versa? Questions about optimal foraging have traditionally been addressed with patch models that envision intensive search taking place within patches and

*Corresponding author. Tel.: +1 402 613 1733; Fax: +1 402 472 8466.

Email addresses: travis.hinkelman@gmail.com (Travis M. Hinkelman), bnolting2@math.unl.edu (Ben C. Nolting), cbrassil@unl.edu (Chad E. Brassil), btenhumberg2@unl.edu (Brigitte Tenhumberg)

¹Contributed equally to this work

extensive search as movement between patches (Charnov, 1976; Oaten, 1977). These models are not directly applicable to cases where resources do not occur in well-defined patches, and instead take on more general spatial distributions (Arditi and Dacorogna, 1988). Optimal foraging on such landscapes is more properly addressed using random search theory (James et al., 2010; Reynolds and Rhodes, 2009; Viswanathan et al., 2011). In random search models, resources are represented as points, and animal movement is modeled with stochastic processes. Unlike patch models, random search models are spatially explicit; resource locations in these models can be specified according to any spatial point pattern and are not limited to the case of clearly defined patches.

Recently, many studies have compared the efficiencies of different random search movement patterns (James et al., 2008, 2011; Reynolds and Bartumeus, 2009), and composite searches have been a particular focus (Plank and James, 2008; Reynolds, 2009, 2010). The criteria that foragers use to switch between modes have received far less attention. Most analyses of optimal composite search presume that foragers use a “giving-up time” (GUT) as their mode-switching criterion (Plank and James, 2008; Reynolds, 2009, 2010). A forager using this criterion switches from extensive to intensive mode upon encountering a resource. It then stays in intensive mode until a fixed amount of time (the GUT) has elapsed without a subsequent resource encounter. GUT models accurately describe some foraging situations, such as ladybird beetle larvae (*Coccinella septempunctata*) feeding on aphids (Carter and Dixon, 1982) and houseflies (*Musca domestica*) feeding on sucrose drops (Bell, 1990).

Rather than keeping track of time, many animals use sensory cues to determine when to switch between intensive and extensive mode. Parasitoids like *Nemeritis canescens* (Waage, 1979), *Venturia canescens* (Bell, 1990), and *Cardiochiles nigriceps* (Strand and Vinson, 1982) use chemical cues to determine when to search intensively for hosts. When deciding when to leave a foraging site, wolf spiders rely more heavily on visual and vibratory cues than elapsed time since their last prey encounter (Persons and Uetz, 1997). Procellariiform seabirds use chemicals like dimethyl sulfide to identify where to engage in intensive search (Nevitt, 2000). Further examples of animals that use sensory cues to determine search mode include ciliates like *Paramecium* and *Tetrahymena* (Leick and Hellung Larsen, 1992; Levandowsky and Klafter, 1988), bacteria, like *Escherichia coli* and *Salmonella typhimurium* (Adler, 1975; Dusenbery, 1998; Moore and Crimaldi, 2004), cod larvae (Døving et al., 1994), and fruit flies (Dalby-Ball and Meats, 2000).

In many situations, sensory cues are not precise enough to allow a forager to immediately locate and travel to resources; instead, the forager uses the cues to determine whether an area is profitable enough to warrant intensive search. For this reason, we refer to these mode-switching cues as non-proximate. When a forager’s search brings it very close to a resource, it can use proximate cues to directly move to the resource and consume it. In random search models, proximate cues are only available within a small distance, called the proximate radius, from a resource. Proximate cues lead a forager to deterministically move to the resource, while non-proximate cues determine the type of stochastic movement pattern the forager executes at a larger scale. Proximate and non-proximate cues may represent different sensory modalities (e.g., non-proximate olfactory cues and proximate visual cues) or different levels of precision for a single sensory modality (e.g., non-proximate olfactory cues at the landscape scale and more precise olfactory gradient following at closer range). For many microorganisms, like bacteria and plankton, the proximate cue is simply coming into physical contact with a resource. Non-proximate cues are particularly important when limited sensory capabilities, very dilute cues, or turbulent and unpredictable signal profiles prevent foragers from directly orienting toward a resource (Hein and McKinley, 2012).

Most theoretical work on composite random search strategies has focused on GUT as the only mode-switching criterion. The role of non-proximate sensory cues as potential mode-switching criteria has been largely ignored (but see Hein and McKinley, 2012). In this study, we introduce a modeling framework that describes two classes of composite search strategies: those with mode transitions triggered by resource encounters and elapsed time (the GUT criterion), and those with mode transitions triggered by non-proximate sensory cues. This modeling framework includes the added flexibility of incorporating a full spectrum of random movement patterns for both intensive and extensive mode. We used large simulations to compare the efficiencies of different search strategies. Searching efficiency depends in part on the spatial distribution of resources (Cianelli et al., 2009), so we compared search strategies on a variety of landscape types, characterized by different levels of resource aggregation and density. Further, we examined the performance

of the search strategies in response to changes in resource aggregation to test the robustness of the search strategies to environmental change. We found that the search strategy based on non-proximate sensory cues outperformed the search strategy based on resource encounters across all landscape types, and was more robust to changes in resource aggregation.

2. Modeling Framework

2.1. Model overview

In our modeling framework, resources are represented as points distributed across a landscape, and a forager is represented as a moving point with a small fixed proximate radius. When a resource falls within the forager’s proximate radius, the forager moves in a straight line to the resource and consumes it; otherwise, it implements a random search strategy. Random search strategies consist of a set of probabilistic movement rules. Although the resulting movement patterns are stochastic, the probability distributions that generate the movement provide a structure for the search. Random search strategies are often used in foraging models because they agree with the movement patterns observed in many foraging animals, and because few animals possess the capability to execute a purely systematic search (Viswanathan et al., 2011).

2.2. Movement patterns

Lévy walks are stochastic processes that provide a versatile tool for modeling animal movement (Bartumeus et al., 2013; Reynolds and Rhodes, 2009). A Lévy walk with parameter μ is a random walk with step lengths l drawn from a Pareto distribution, $p(l) \sim l^{-\mu}$, $1 < \mu \leq 3$. Different values of μ produce different types of random walks. As $\mu \rightarrow 1$, the resulting random walk approaches ballistic (i.e., straight-line) motion. For random walks with step lengths drawn from a Pareto distribution with $\mu \geq 3$, the generalized central limit theorem shows that the resulting random walk converges to Brownian motion at sufficiently large temporal and spatial scales (for details, see Appendix A). Thus, Lévy walks can be seen as spanning a spectrum of movement behavior, ranging from ballistic motion ($\mu = 1$) on one extreme to Brownian-like motion ($\mu = 3$) on the other.

Our model deals with both non-composite and composite foragers. Non-composite foragers move by Lévy walks with parameter μ . Composite foragers switch between extensive and intensive search modes. In extensive search mode, foragers move according to a Lévy walk with parameter μ_{ext} . In intensive search mode, foragers move according to a Lévy walk with parameter μ_{int} . Previously, composite searches have been modeled with Brownian motion in the intensive mode and ballistic motion in the extensive mode (Plank and James, 2008). This was later generalized to consider a full range of Lévy walks in extensive mode (Reynolds, 2009). Our model represents a further generalization, and is the first work that allows a full range of Lévy walks for both intensive and extensive search modes.

2.3. Mode-switching criteria

Our model considers two type of composite foragers: GUT foragers, which use resource encounters as their search mode criterion, and sensory foragers, which use non-proximate sensory cues as their search mode criterion. A GUT forager switches from extensive to intensive search when it encounters a resource. After encountering a resource, the forager reverts to extensive search as soon as a specified time (the GUT) elapses without a subsequent resource encounter.

For the sensory forager, we created a generalized non-proximate sensory field. We denote the intensity of non-proximate sensory cues generated by a resource i detected at a location x by $f_i(x)$. The shape of the function $f_i(x)$ will depend on the particular sensory mechanisms involved; here, in order to make the model as general as possible, we assume that the strength of non-proximate sensory cues generated by a resource follows a Gaussian distribution with variance σ^2 centered at that resource. This is particularly appropriate if, for example, the sensory cues are chemical signals that travel via diffusion. The total non-proximate sensory field is obtained by superimposing the fields produced by each resource, $f(x) = \sum_i f_i(x)$. The non-proximate sensory forager monitors this field at the end of every step in its random walk. If the value of the field is below a specified threshold, the forager engages in extensive search; if it is above the threshold, it engages in intensive search (Fig. 1).




Figure 1: A schematic representation of the behavior of a non-proximate sensory forager. Resources are black dots on the two-dimensional landscape (bottom). The radius of a dot is the forager’s proximate radius. A non-proximate sensory field (red surface) is generated by the resources. A non-proximate sensory forager has a fixed threshold (green plane) that it uses as a mode-switching criterion. When a forager reaches the end of a step-length, it assess the sensory field; if the field is above the threshold value (circled areas on landscape), the forager engages in intensive search. The forager’s movement is represented by the blue line. In this case, it eventually consumes a resource (red disk).

3. Model Simulation

3.1. Simulation objectives

Using the modeling framework above and Netlogo (Wilensky, 1999), we simulated three classes of foraging strategies: non-composite, GUT, and non-proximate sensory. Within each of these strategy classes, we sought to identify the movement parameters and mode-switching threshold that maximized search efficiency (defined as the number of resources consumed divided by the total distance moved). For the non-composite foragers, this amounted to optimizing the movement parameter μ . For GUT foragers, we optimized μ_{int} , μ_{ext} , and the GUT. For non-proximate sensory foragers, we optimized μ_{int} , μ_{ext} , and the level of the sensory field that would trigger switches in search mode (i.e., sensory field threshold, SFT). Using an optimization algorithm (see Appendix B.1), we found the optimal parameter combination for each class of forager on each type of landscape, and compared the efficiencies of these optimal foragers. Then, we examined the sensitivity of search efficiency to each of the optimized parameters (see Appendix B.2). We also explored how a forager optimized to one type of landscape would fare in another; we quantified this ability with a measure called robustness (see Appendix B.3). The sensitivity and robustness analyses were conducted with R (R Development Core Team, 2011).

3.2. Landscape characteristics

The landscape was simulated as square, 111 units in length and width. The units in NetLogo simply offer a spatial scale; coordinates are floating point numbers, and are not restricted to discrete values. Resources were distributed across the landscape according to a Neyman-Scott process (see Appendix B.4). We selected this point process because it allowed us to adjust both the intensity and aggregation of the process. The distribution of the number of points in sample sets closely resembles a negative binomial distribution (Zillio and He, 2010), but there is no stationary spatial point process that directly generates a negative binomial

distribution of points in its sample sets (Diggle, 2003). The resource distributions were specified by two parameters: the radius of the clusters of resources and the total initial number of resources. We used 100, 400, 700, and 1000 as our initial resource levels, and cluster radii of 4, 8, 16, 32, and 64.

3.3. Forger characteristics

Foragers in our simulations traveled with a uniform speed of 0.25 units per time step and had a proximate radius of 0.5 units. When a forager consumed a resource, it stayed at that point for one unit of time. Consumed resources were not replaced; hence our simulations represent destructive foraging (resource depletion). If a forager encountered a resource during a step of a random walk, that step was truncated. The non-proximate sensory field was composed of Gaussian distributions with variance one.

4. Results

4.1. Optimal parameters

The optimal search parameters of the non-proximate sensory foragers displayed a different pattern than those of the GUT foragers. For all degrees of resource aggregation, the best non-proximate sensory foraging strategies involved Brownian motion in intensive mode ($\mu_{\text{int}} = 3$). The optimal non-proximate sensory foragers used an extensive mode that depended on the landscape (although these extensive modes were always ballistic or close to ballistic). Thus, optimal non-proximate sensory foragers used intensive and extensive movement parameters that are consistent with conventional composite search (although the criteria they use for mode-switching distinguishes them from previous composite search models). The optimal parameter

Table 1: Parameter combinations for three different search strategies producing the highest mean searching efficiency for different resource densities and cluster radii. Resource aggregation decreases with increasing cluster radius.

Resource Density	Cluster Radius	NCS ¹	GUT Strategy			NPS Strategy ²		
		μ	μ_{ext}	μ_{int}	GUT	μ_{ext}	μ_{int}	SFT ³
100	4	1.6	1.0	3.0	250	1.2	3.0	0.0005
100	8	1.4	1.0	3.0	400	1.4	3.0	0.0005
100	16	1.2	1.0	2.6	250	1.6	3.0	0.0005
100	32	1.4	1.0	1.8	150	1.4	3.0	0.0005
100	64	1.2	1.0	1.4	100	1.6	3.0	0.0005
400	4	1.6	1.0	3.0	150	1.2	3.0	0.0005
400	8	1.6	1.0	3.0	150	1.2	3.0	0.0020
400	16	1.4	1.0	2.6	150	1.0	3.0	0.0010
400	32	1.2	1.0	2.0	100	1.0	3.0	0.0010
400	64	1.2	1.0	1.6	50	1.2	3.0	0.0040
700	4	1.6	1.0	3.0	100	1.2	3.0	0.0020
700	8	1.4	1.0	3.0	100	1.0	3.0	0.0010
700	16	1.4	1.0	2.6	50	1.2	3.0	0.0160
700	32	1.2	1.0	2.0	50	1.0	3.0	0.0320
700	64	1.0	1.0	1.0	—	1.0	3.0	0.0320
1000	4	1.8	1.0	3.0	100	1.0	3.0	0.0005
1000	8	1.6	1.0	3.0	100	1.0	3.0	0.0005
1000	16	1.4	1.0	2.4	50	1.0	3.0	0.0320
1000	32	1.4	1.0	2.0	50	1.0	3.0	0.0640
1000	64	1.0	1.0	1.0	—	1.0	2.8	0.0640

¹Non-composite search strategy

²Non-proximate sensory search strategy

³Sensory field threshold

for non-composite search generally ranged from $\mu = 1.0$ on landscapes with low resource aggregation to $\mu = 1.8$ on landscapes with high resource aggregation (Table 1). Although optimizing the parameter for non-composite Lévy walks is a well-studied problem, the case of destructive foraging on patchily distributed resources is not; such situations were once assumed to be equivalent to non-destructive foraging on uniform

landscapes, but this is not true (Reynolds, 2010). Our non-composite results are largely in agreement with previous results about destructive searches on landscapes generated by cellular automata (Reynolds, 2010).

The optimal search parameters for composite foragers showed several interesting patterns. Conventional composite search strategies, which use ballistic motion in extensive search and Brownian motion in intensive search (Plank and James, 2008), provide a useful baseline for comparison. For all degrees of resource aggregation, the best GUT foraging strategies involved ballistic motion in extensive mode ($\mu_{\text{ext}} = 1$) (Table 1). The optimal intensive mode for GUT foragers depended on the degree of resource aggregation. On landscapes with a high degree of resource aggregation, optimal GUT foragers used Brownian motion in intensive mode ($\mu_{\text{int}} = 3$). Thus, the optimal GUT foragers for landscapes with a high degree of resource aggregation behaved as a conventional composite searcher. The optimal GUT foragers for other landscapes used the conventional extensive strategy but deviated from the conventional intensive strategy ($\mu_{\text{int}} < 3$).

4.2. Search strategy comparisons

After identifying optimal parameters for non-composite, GUT, and non-proximate sensory foragers, we compared the search efficiencies of these foraging strategies. The composite search strategies outperformed the non-composite search strategy when resources were highly aggregated, and the relative advantage of composite search increased with the degree of resource aggregation (Fig. 2). Composite search also produced lower variability in search efficiency than non-composite search when resources were highly aggregated (Fig. 3). For all search strategies, both search efficiency (Fig. 2) and variability in search efficiency (Fig. 3) increased with degree of resource aggregation.




Figure 2: Normalized searching efficiency for three search strategies across 5 levels of resource aggregation and 4 levels of resource density: (A) 100, (B) 400, (C) 700, (D) 1000. Searching efficiency was normalized for comparison across resource densities. Resource aggregation decreases with increasing cluster radius. Error bars represent 95% confidence intervals. The x-axis is presented on the log₂ scale.

The non-proximate sensory strategy performed better than the GUT strategy across the full spectrum of resource aggregation (Fig. 2). At first glance, this result may seem obvious; having sensory capabilities is clearly better than not having them at all. Recall, however, that the non-proximate sensory forager is not simply an enhanced GUT forager. The GUT forager has the ability to keep track of time since the last resource encounter, an ability that the non-proximate sensory forager lacks.

The non-proximate sensory forager's performance advantage over the GUT forager can be attributed to two main causes. First, the sensory forager has more opportunities to switch search mode. The GUT forager only switches mode upon encountering resources or when the time threshold expires. The sensory forager examines the sensory field at every resource encounter and at the end of every step of its random walk; this happens very frequently when move lengths are short (i.e., when μ is close to 3.0). When the sensory forager engages in intensive mode, it is not making a large time commitment, because it has frequent opportunities to revert to extensive mode. When the GUT forager engages in intensive search, it is stuck in that mode until the time threshold elapses. Second, the GUT foragers search strategy relies on the spatial autocorrelation of resources. When a GUT forager encounters a resource, it enters intensive search, under the assumption that other resources are nearby. In contrast, the sensory forager can be triggered into intensive search by local deviations in the sensory field, which is beneficial regardless of the spatial autocorrelation of the resources. This effect is evident in Figure 2, where the advantage of sensory search over GUT search increases slightly as landscapes become more dispersed.




Figure 3: Coefficient of variation in searching efficiency for three search strategies across 5 levels of resource aggregation and 4 levels of resource density: (A) 100, (B) 400, (C) 700, (D) 1000. Resource aggregation decreases with increasing cluster radius. The x-axis is presented on the log₂ scale.

4.3. Sensitivity

For both composite search classes, searching efficiency was most sensitive to movement behavior in extensive mode, μ_{ext} (Fig. 4). The difference in searching efficiency between the optimal μ_{ext} and the worst μ_{ext} was up to 70%. In contrast, the difference in searching efficiency between the optimal μ_{int} and the worst μ_{ext} was no more than 45%.

Setting the threshold parameter (the time threshold for GUT foragers, the sensory field threshold for non-proximate sensory foragers) below the optimal value caused greater decreases in efficiency than when these parameters were set above the optimal value. When the time threshold is set too low, the GUT forager spends too much time in extensive mode; in the extreme, setting the time threshold to zero leads to a reduction in efficiency of nearly 40%. When the sensory field threshold is set too low, the non-proximate sensory forager spends too much time in intensive search; in the extreme, setting this threshold to zero leads to a reduction in efficiency of over 60% (Figure 4).




Figure 4: Representative example of sensitivity analysis for the three parameters associated with giving-up time and non-proximate sensory search strategies (resource density = 400; cluster radius = 4). Points represent proportional difference in searching efficiency for a single run relative to the mean searching efficiency produced by the optimal parameter combination. Parameter values were normalized for comparison. μ_{int} is the intensive movement parameter, μ_{ext} is the extensive movement parameter, GUT is the giving-up time, and SFT is the sensory field threshold. Lines represent smoothing splines fitted to the relationship. Sensitivity analysis based on 100 runs of the model for each parameter value. See Appendix B.2 for additional details.

4.4. Robustness

Our robustness analysis (explained in detail in Appendix B.3) allowed us to determine how a forager optimized for a particular level of resource aggregation would fare in landscapes with different levels of resource aggregation. The non-proximate sensory strategy was less affected by changes in resource aggregation than the GUT strategy, particularly for foragers that were optimized for dispersed resources (black lines in Fig. 5). The optimal GUT strategy for harvesting dispersed resources approximated non-composite

search behavior (i.e., the values for μ_{ext} and μ_{int} converged) (Table 1). Placing these foragers in landscapes with more aggregated resources drastically reduced their searching efficiency (black dashed lines in Fig. 5). In contrast, GUT foragers optimized for clumped resources were relatively robust to decreasing degrees of resource aggregation (grey dashed lines in Fig. 5). The non-proximate sensory strategy was relatively robust to deviations from the resource distribution pattern to which a forager was optimized (solid lines in Fig. 5).




Figure 5: Robustness of non-proximate sensory (NPS) and giving-up time (GUT) search strategies across 5 levels of resource aggregation and 4 levels of resource density: (A) 100, (B) 400, (C) 700, (D) 1000. The performance of foragers that evolved in landscapes with clumped (grey lines) or dispersed (black lines) resources was tested in landscapes with different degrees of resource aggregation. Robustness was calculated as the proportional difference in mean searching efficiency between a forager that is new to a landscape type and a forager that evolved in that landscape type. Points represent the mean proportional difference in searching efficiency, D_R , and error bars represent the 2.5% and 97.5% quantiles of the bootstrapped data set. See Appendix B.3 for additional details. Resource aggregation decreases with increasing cluster radius. Points are offset from x-coordinates for clarity of presentation. The x-axis is presented on the \log_2 scale.

5. Discussion

Composite search strategies, which consist of extensive and intensive search modes, help foragers focus search effort on resource rich regions and devote less effort to resource poor regions. The central objective of this study was to compare the efficiency of two possible criteria for switching search modes: giving-up time (GUT) and non-proximate sensory cues. To our knowledge, GUT is the only mode-switching mechanism previously used in composite search models (e.g., James et al., 2011; Plank and James, 2008; Reynolds, 2009), and our model with mode-switching based on non-proximate sensory cues is novel. As discussed in the introduction, composite searches based on non-proximate cues are a general tactic used by a wide variety of organisms, and hence this model has broad applications.

Our simulations revealed that non-proximate sensory foragers outperformed GUT foragers across a full spectrum of resource distributions, ranging from highly aggregated to highly dispersed. In addition, non-proximate sensory foragers were more robust to changes in resource distribution, implying that they would

be better able to cope with environmental change. These results indicate that it is better to inform search behavior with a non-directional sensory cue than with resource encounters and elapsed time. Together with empirical evidence indicating that sensory cues are more important than recent resource encounters in determining foraging mode (Persons and Uetz, 1997), our simulations suggest that the existing GUT composite search paradigm should be considered as only a subset of a broader class of composite search strategies.

In an attempt to keep our model as general as possible, we have neglected several important ecological factors. First, we did not consider the costs involved in the evolution or development of the cognitive and sensory abilities foragers would need to detect non-proximate cues versus the cost to keep track of time. Second, we only considered non-proximate sensory fields that were Gaussian; the exact shape of these fields will depend on the specific environment and cues under examination. For example, chemical cues are often transported via prevailing winds (Reynolds, 2012). Third, our simulation was done in two dimensions; for many species, especially marine organisms, a three-dimensional model would be more appropriate. Finally, we did not take into account factors like cooperative foraging, interspecific competition, or predation risk. The balance between food acquisition and predation risk is a particularly important determinant of a forager's fitness (Brown and Kotler, 2004). Following Reynolds (2010), we could incorporate proxies for predation risk in our model, such as forcing GUT searchers to use giving-up-times that are shorter than optimal, or by making resource detection within the proximal radius imperfect (under the assumption that vigilance against predators detracts from a forager's ability to consistently detect resources). However, in some situations (Visser and Kiørboe, 2006), more convoluted movement exposes a forager to less predation risk, not more. One solution would be to directly and spatially explicitly include predators in the model. For our non-proximate sensory foragers, the sensory field generated by resources could be combined with an inhibitory field generated by predators, so that intensive search is encouraged by proximity to resources, but discouraged by proximity to predators. The aim of this study, though, is to understand baseline foraging behavior before considering how it interacts with predation risk.

The modeling framework outlined in this study has the potential to help bridge the gap between two traditionally disparate fields of study: random search theory and classic patch use theory. The former focuses on animal movement patterns, the latter on patch use decisions (Bartumeus and Catalan, 2009). Recent work (Bartumeus et al., 2013) has sought to establish a stochastic optimal foraging theory to unify these approaches; our model could contribute to that effort. One of the foundational results of classic foraging theory is Charnov's Marginal Value Theorem (MVT), which dictates that an optimal forager should deplete patches so that the intake rate in each patch is equal to the expected intake rate averaged over the rest of the environment (Charnov, 1976). The predictions of the MVT provide a useful benchmark to measure real-world foragers against. Unfortunately, the MVT is not easily translated to the realm of random search theory, where resources have arbitrary spatial distributions (hence patches are not well-defined) and resource encounters are typically discrete events (hence instantaneous intake rate is not well-defined).

On landscapes where resources are distributed as points, the best possible forager would solve a famous optimization problem known as the traveling salesman problem. The traveling salesman problem essentially asks: given a set of points, what is the shortest possible route that visits each point exactly once? Many books are devoted to solution algorithms for this challenging problem (Applegate et al., 2007; Johnson and Papadimitriou, 2009), and it is unlikely that animals solve this problem to arrive at the optimal strategy. Therefore, the question of how to best describe optimal foraging on spatially distributed point resources remains. If the MVT could successfully be translated into the context of random search, then we would have a useful null-model for such landscapes.

Plank and James (2008) proposed an analogue between patch-use models and composite random search models: within patch harvesting corresponds to intensive search, while between-patch travel corresponds to extensive search. They further suggested that optimal GUT composite searchers represent the random search version of MVT optimal foragers. There are important differences between the optimal behavior predicted by these two models, though. MVT optimal foragers make decisions based on the current local and global resource levels. They are omniscient, and hence have no need to use past experience or memory. This contrasts with GUT optimal foragers, whose behavior is highly dependent on stochastic resource encounters. The non-proximate sensory optimal foragers introduced in this paper might provide

a better analogue to MVT optimal foragers. Like MVT optimal foragers, non-proximate sensory optimal foragers make instantaneous assessments of local and global resource conditions to determine when to switch behavioral modes. Just as MVT optimal foragers provide a useful null-model for foraging on landscapes with resource patches, non-proximate sensory optimal foragers could provide a useful null-model for foraging on landscapes with resources distributed as arbitrary point patterns. The non-proximate sensory forager model predicts areas that warrant intensive search; by overlaying this with observed animal movement trajectories, one could determine how close those animals come to optimal behavior.

6. Acknowledgements

This work was supported in part by NSF DEB 0953766 to CEB. The supercomputing resources provided by the Holland Computing Center at the University of Nebraska-Lincoln greatly facilitated the collection of simulation data. Robert Gibson, Sara Reynolds, Jean Philippe Gibert, Joseph Phillips and two anonymous reviewers provided helpful comments on earlier versions of this manuscript.

Appendix A. Lévy Walks with $\mu = 3$

In this section, we examine the properties of Lévy walks with $\mu = 3$. Many studies about random search strategies, including this one, use Lévy walks with parameters $\mu \in (1, 3]$ to represent a spectrum of movement types, ranging from ballistic motion on one extreme to Brownian motion on the other (James et al., 2008; Reynolds, 2009; Reynolds and Bartumeus, 2009). It is thus important to verify that the $\mu = 3$ case can indeed be characterized as Brownian. The categorization of Lévy walks with $\mu = 3$ has been treated with ambiguity in the ecological literature. James et al. (2008); Plank and James (2008); Reynolds (2008) and Reynolds and Rhodes (2009) all label Lévy walks with $\mu = 3$ as Brownian motion. Bartumeus et al. (2013); Reynolds (2010); Smouse et al. (2010) and James et al. (2011) state that power-law walks with $\mu > 3$ are Brownian, and either classify the $\mu = 3$ case as superdiffusive or do not mention it at all. We seek to provide clarification here.

The categorization of a stochastic process depends on how its mean-square displacement, $\langle x^2 \rangle$, scales with time. For Brownian motion, $\langle x^2 \rangle \sim t$, while for superdiffusion, $\langle x^2 \rangle \sim t^\alpha$, $\alpha > 1$. As we explain below, Lévy walks with $\mu = 3$ scale as $\langle x^2 \rangle \sim \ln(t)t$, a marginal case between Brownian motion and superdiffusion. Ecology papers rarely remark on this $\langle x^2 \rangle \sim \ln(t)t$ scaling behavior, and, to our knowledge, never provide a mathematical explanation. In this section, we provide a concise derivation for ecological readers. Our approach follows the continuous time random walk framework presented in Zumofen and Klafter (1993), where a similar scaling relationship was derived for random walks on a spatial lattice. We examine the one-dimensional case for simplicity, but the same arguments carry over to higher dimensions.

Let $\phi(x, t)$ be the probability density function for a random walk to be located at position x at time t . The jump probability density function, $h(x, t)$, determines the probability of transitioning from one position to another. The probability that a walker makes a jump of distance between x and $x + \Delta x$ in the time between t and $t + \Delta t$ is $\int_x^{x+\Delta x} \int_t^{t+\Delta t} h(y, \tau) d\tau dy$. For a Lévy walk with $\mu = 3$, constant velocity v , and proximate radius l_0 , the jump probability density function is

$$h(x, t) = \frac{1}{2} p(t) \delta(|x| - vt)$$

$$p(t) = \begin{cases} 2l_0^2 t^{-3} & t \geq l_0 \\ 0 & t < l_0 \end{cases}.$$

The choice of velocity and proximate radius do not affect the scaling relationship, so we choose $v = l_0 = 1$. The delta function couples the length of a step with the time it takes to execute it, so taking a step of length $|x|$ requires time $t = |x|$. Therefore, the probability density for the step times, $p(t)$, determines both the distance and duration of steps. The factor of $\frac{1}{2}$ arises because the walker can take a step to either the left or right.

Consider the probability that a walker arrives at position x at time t at the exact end of a step-length. The associated probability density function, $\omega(x, t)$, satisfies the equation

$$\omega(x, t) = \delta(t) \delta(x) + \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \int_0^t \omega(y, \tau) h(x - y, t - \tau) d\tau dy. \quad (\text{A.1})$$

The first term on the right hand side arises because the walker starts at the origin. The second term sums all contributions from steps that start at position y and time τ and end at position x at time t . This is not quite an equation for the probability density $\phi(x, t)$; for that, we must consider that a walker can pass a given position during a step. The probability that a walker passes position x at time t in a single step from the origin is given by the density function

$$g(x, t) = \frac{1}{2} \delta(|x| - t) \int_t^{\infty} p(\tau) d\tau = \frac{1}{2} \delta(|x| - t) t^{-2}.$$

With this, we can obtain an equation for $\phi(x, t)$:

$$\phi(x, t) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \int_0^t g(y, \tau) \omega(x - y, t - \tau) d\tau dy. \quad (\text{A.2})$$

This accounts for all possible ways of finishing the previous step at exactly position $x - y$ at time $t - \tau$, then passing position x at time t during the next step. We next take both Fourier and Laplace transforms of (A.1) and (A.2). A capital letter for a function name and a switch in the argument from t to s will indicate a Laplace transform; a carat over the function and a switch in the argument from x to k will indicate a Fourier transform. Using convolution properties, we find $\hat{\Omega}(k, s) = \frac{1}{1 - \hat{H}(k, s)}$ and $\hat{\Phi}(k, s) = \hat{G}(k, s) \hat{\Omega}(k, s)$, so

$$\hat{\Phi}(k, s) = \frac{\hat{G}(k, s)}{1 - \hat{H}(k, s)}. \quad (\text{A.3})$$

The Fourier-Laplace transformed function $\hat{\Phi}(k, s)$ is particularly useful, because the following relationship yields the Laplace transform of the mean-square displacement:

$$\langle \hat{x}^2 \rangle = \int_0^{\infty} x^2 \Phi(x, s) e^{-ikx} dx = -\frac{\partial^2 \hat{\Phi}}{\partial k^2}(0, s). \quad (\text{A.4})$$

To find $\hat{\Phi}(k, s)$, we need to calculate the Fourier-Laplace transforms of $h(x, t)$ and $g(x, t)$. For the former,

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{H}(k, s) &= \int_1^{\infty} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \delta(|x| - t) t^{-3} e^{-st} e^{-ikx} dx dt \\ &= \int_1^{\infty} t^{-3} e^{-t(s+ik)} dt + \int_1^{\infty} t^{-3} e^{-t(s-ik)} dt. \end{aligned}$$

Let $z = s + ik$, $\lambda(z) = \int_1^{\infty} t^{-3} e^{-tz} dt$, and observe that $\hat{H}(k, s) = \lambda(s + ik) + \lambda(s - ik)$. To calculate $\lambda(z)$, we perform integration by parts twice and obtain

$$\lambda(z) = \frac{1}{2} (e^{-z} - ze^{-z} - z^2 Ei(-z)),$$

where $Ei(z)$ is the exponential integral function, which can be written as $Ei(-z) = \gamma + \ln(z) - \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{(-1)^{k+1} z^k}{k k!}$. Performing a small z expansion for $\lambda(z)$ yields

$$\lambda(z) = \frac{1}{2} (1 - 2z - z^2 \ln(z)) + O(|z|^2).$$

A similar approach can be used to calculate $\hat{G}(k, s)$. Letting $z = s + ik$ and $\psi(z) = \frac{1}{2} \int_1^{\infty} t^{-2} e^{-tz} dt$, we have $\hat{G}(k, s) = \psi(s + ik) + \psi(s - ik)$. To calculate $\psi(z)$, note that $\psi(z) = \frac{1}{z} \left(\frac{e^{-z}}{2} - \lambda(z) \right)$, so

$$\psi(z) = \frac{1}{2} (e^{-z} + z Ei(-z)),$$

and the small z expansion is

$$\psi(z) = \frac{1}{2} (1 + (\gamma - 1)z + z \ln(z)) + O(|z|^2).$$

The small z expansions for $\lambda(z)$ and $\psi(z)$ give small k and s expansions for $\hat{H}(k, s)$ and $\hat{G}(k, s)$, respectively, and, by (A.3), for $\hat{\Phi}(k, s)$. Using (A.4), we obtain, for small s

$$\langle \hat{x}^2 \rangle \simeq -\frac{1 + 3s(\gamma - 1) + 2 \ln(s) + 2s\gamma \ln(s) + 2s(\ln(s))^2}{s^2(2 + s \ln(s))^2}.$$

The Tauberian theorems (Feller, 1971) relate the asymptotic behavior of a function as $t \rightarrow \infty$ to the behavior of its Laplace transform as $s \rightarrow 0$. In this case, for large t ,

$$\langle x^2 \rangle \simeq \frac{t \ln(t)}{2} - \frac{1}{4}t + \frac{1}{4}(3 - 3\gamma - \ln(t) + 2\gamma \ln(t)),$$

Keeping only the largest term and ignoring constants,

$$\langle x^2 \rangle \simeq t \ln(t).$$

Therefore, even though simulation studies like this one loosely refer to Lévy walks with $\mu = 3$ as Brownian, they actually represent marginal behavior between the diffusive and superdiffusive regimes.

It's important to note the difference between Lévy flights, in which a walker takes instantaneous jumps, and Lévy walks, in which a walker moves continuously with finite velocity along each step (James et al 2011). For the former case, central limit theorems can be used to categorize how mean-square displacement scales with the number of steps. For power-law step-length distributions with $\mu > 3$, the standard central limit theorem implies convergence to Brownian motion; for $\mu = 3$, Gnedenko and Kolmogorov's generalized central limit theorem implies that the random walk's distribution is in the (confusingly named) non-normal domain of attraction of the normal distribution (Gnedenko and Kolmogorov, 1954). The continuous time random walk approach used above allows for the analysis of actual Lévy walks instead of their Lévy flight cousins.

Appendix B. Model details

Appendix B.1. Parameter Optimization

We used a grid-based search to explore the searching efficiency associated with large regions of the parameter space of our simulation model. A non-composite forager is characterized by a single parameter μ . We ran non-composite simulations using parameter values $\mu = 1.0, 1.2, 1.4, \dots, 3.0$ on each landscape type (specified by initial resource distribution and resource aggregation). For the composite foragers, we examined 4 initial resource densities, 5 cluster radii, 2 search strategies (GUT and non-proximate sensory), and 11 values for each of the 3 search parameters (μ_{ext} , μ_{int} , switching threshold). In the first sweep of the parameter space, we conducted 100 runs for each parameter combination for a total of 5,324,000 runs (4 densities * 5 radii * 2 strategies * $11^3 = 1331$ search parameter combinations * 100 runs). Each run of the model consisted of 20,000 discrete time steps. The full grid-based search produced a rough fitness surface based on the searching efficiency of each parameter combination. The fitness surface allowed us to exclude regions of the parameter space that led to poor searching efficiency, thereby focusing our computational resources on increasing replication in regions of the parameter space that were likely to contain the optimal parameter combination. We used an iterative process (described below) to narrow the regions of the parameter space selected for increased replication. The iterative process did not produce a finer-scale resolution of the

parameter space but rather increased the replication for subsets of the parameter combinations used in the full grid-based search. Within each landscape type, we used the mean searching efficiency from the full grid-based search to select the top 13 of the 1331 (1%) possible parameter combinations. For each parameter, we used the range of values found within the top 1% to reduce the parameter space. For example, suppose the top 1% parameter combinations included μ_{ext} values that ranged from 1.0-1.4, μ_{int} values from 2.6-3.0, and GUT values from 100-200. Then we would have increased replication for the 27 parameter combinations ($\mu_{\text{ext}}, \mu_{\text{int}}, \text{GUT}$) that represented parameter values within those ranges: $\mu_{\text{ext}} = 1.0, 1.2, 1.4$; $\mu_{\text{int}} = 2.6, 2.8, 3.0$; $\text{GUT} = 100, 150, 200$. For some landscape types, this approach did not reduce the parameter space substantially. Thus, we conducted 200 runs for each parameter combination in the reduced parameter space and again calculated the top 1% of the parameter combinations to further reduce the parameter space. This process was repeated until the optimal parameter combination was comprised of at least 500 runs because preliminary exploration of the model indicated that 500 runs produced good estimates of mean searching efficiency.

Appendix B.2. Sensitivity

We examined the sensitivity of searching efficiency to each search parameter by varying one search parameter while holding the other two parameters at their optimal values. μ_{ext} and μ_{int} ranged from 1 to 3, GUT ranged from 0 to 500, and the sensory field threshold ranged from 0 to 0.256 (Table B.2). The μ parameters have a naturally bounded range, but the threshold parameters have arbitrary upper bounds, which were selected based on preliminary explorations of parameter space. We normalized the parameter values to fall between 0 and 1 to facilitate comparisons across the different ranges of the parameters. We calculated the proportional difference in searching efficiency as $D_S = (y - \bar{y}_o) / \bar{y}_o$, where y was the searching efficiency for a single run and \bar{y}_o was the mean searching efficiency for the optimal parameter combination. We fitted smoothing splines to the relationship between D_S and the normalized value of each parameter for each landscape type. The shape of the smoothing splines provided an indication of the sensitivity of searching efficiency to changes in each parameter. In two cases (see Table 1), the optimal μ_{ext} and μ_{int} were the same, which made the best giving-up time parameter irrelevant. Thus, those landscape types were excluded from the sensitivity analysis.

Table B.2: Parameter values used in the simulation model

Parameter	Value
Resources	
Initial number of resources	100, 400, 700, 1000
Number of clusters ¹	15
Radius of resource cluster ²	4, 8, 16, 32, 64
Forager	
Speed (distance/time step)	0.25
Detection radius	0.5
Lévy exponent (μ)	
Extensive search mode	1.0, 1.2, 1.4, 1.6, ..., 3.0
Intensive search mode	1.0, 1.2, 1.4, 1.6, ..., 3.0
Mode-switching criteria ³	
Giving-up time	0, 50, 100, 150, 200, ..., 500
Sensory field threshold	0, 0.0005, 0.001, 0.002, ..., 0.128, 0.256

¹Poisson random variable with an expected value of 15

²Resource aggregation decreases with increasing cluster radius

³Forager employs only one mode-switching criteria in a run of the simulation

Appendix B.3. Robustness

To assess the robustness of the optimal strategies to changes in resource aggregation, we examined how a search strategy that maximized the searching efficiency for one landscape type performed in landscape types with different degrees of resource aggregation. Specifically, we calculated robustness as $D_R = (\bar{y}_{i,j} - \bar{y}_{i,i}) / \bar{y}_{i,i}$,

where $\bar{y}_{i,j}$ was the mean searching efficiency in landscapes of type i for a forager that was optimized for a landscape of type j . In this formula, landscape types are indexed by cluster radius. We examined how foragers optimized for very clumped and very disperse landscapes ($j = 4$ and $j = 64$, respectively) performed on a full range of landscape types ($i = 4, 8, 16, 32, 64$). This analysis was done on four different levels of resource density (100, 400, 700, 1000). Then we resampled the data with replacement (i.e., bootstrap method) 500 times for each landscape type and calculated the mean and 2.5% and 97.5% quantiles of the distribution of robustness values.

Appendix B.4. Resource distribution

Resources were distributed across landscapes according to Neyman-Scott processes (Illian et al., 2008). The algorithm involved randomly drawing the number of resource aggregations, or clusters, from a Poisson distribution with an expected value of 15 (Table B.2). The center of each cluster was randomly assigned to a point in the landscape (i.e., parent point). Then resources were sequentially assigned to a random parent and randomly placed within a specified radius (i.e., cluster radius) of the parent point until all resources were distributed among the parents. Thus, for each run of the simulation, the algorithm randomly determined the number of clusters and the number of resources per cluster, but the initial total resource density and the cluster radius were fixed. By changing a single parameter (i.e., cluster radius), we were able to vary the degree of aggregation of resources, which ranged from tightly clumped (cluster radius = 4) to dispersed (cluster radius = 64).

Appendix B.5. Boundary conditions

Landscape boundary conditions play an important role in individual-based models (Berec, 2002). Most simulations use one of three types of boundary conditions: reflecting, periodic, or absorbing. Reflecting boundaries are appropriate for modeling animals that live in a restricted environment, like animals on an island, but are otherwise unrealistic (Berec, 2002). Reflecting boundary conditions can also be interpreted as having a new forager enter the landscape at the exact place where the previous forager left it. This biases the initial conditions for the new forager and creates edge effects.

Periodic boundary conditions can be interpreted in three different ways. First, the landscape is literally a torus; this tends not to occur in nature. Second, the landscape is infinite, but repeating; this is problematic when resource consumption is destructive, and a forager's actions at one point on a landscape affect an infinite number of other points. Third, a new forager enters the landscape at a point determined by where the original forager left it; like with reflecting boundary conditions, this has the potential to create edge effects. Our modeling framework presents a few additional problems associated with periodic boundary conditions. The resource distributions and the sensory field are generated under the assumptions that the topology of the landscape is a plane; periodic boundary conditions would mean that resources on opposite ends of the landscape are close to each other, leading to logical inconsistencies.

In our model we implemented a modified version of absorbing boundary conditions. The major challenge with absorbing boundary conditions is that a forager could leave the landscape by chance almost immediately after entering it. The performance of such a forager would not provide much information about the efficiency of the strategy it employed. Therefore, we chose to force each forager to spend 20,000 discrete time steps foraging on the landscape. If the forager was absorbed by a boundary, it was randomly dropped back into the landscape to resume foraging. This can be interpreted as a forager leaving the landscape, then returning later to resume foraging. We chose 20,000 time steps, because this was a sufficient time for foragers to appreciably deplete landscapes. Finally, we included a small resource-free buffer zone at the edge of the landscape. The entire landscape was a square 111 units long and 111 units wide, but only the 101 unit long, 101 unit wide square in the center contained resources. Resource-free buffer zones occupied 5 unit thick strips at the top, bottom, left, and right edges of the landscape. This ensured that all resources could be approached from every direction, and that no resources were protected by edge effects.

References

Adler, J., 1975. Chemotaxis in bacteria. *Annual Review of Biochemistry* 44, 341–356.

- Applegate, D.L., Bixby, R.E., Chvatal, V., 2007. The Traveling Salesman Problem: A Computational Approach. Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ.
- Arditi, R., Dacorogna, B., 1988. Optimal foraging on arbitrary food distributions and the definition of habitat patches. *Am Nat* 131, 837–846.
- Bartumeus, F., Catalan, J., 2009. Optimal search behavior and classic foraging theory. *J. Phys. A: Math. Theor.* 42, 434002.
- Bartumeus, F., Viswanathan, G.M., Raposo, E.P., da Luz, M.G.E., 2013. Stochastic Optimal Foraging Theory, in: Lewis, M.A., Maini, P.K., Petrovskii, S. (Eds.), *Dispersal, Individual Movement and Spatial Ecology*, Lecture Notes in Mathematics. Springer-Verlag Berlin Heidelberg, pp. 3–32.
- Bell, W.J., 1990. Searching behavior patterns in insects. *Annu Rev Entomol* 35, 447–467.
- Bell, W.J., 1991. *Searching Behaviour: The Behavioural Ecology of Finding Resources*. Chapman and Hall, New York, NY, USA.
- Benhamou, S., 1992. Efficiency of area-concentrated searching behavior in a continuous patchy environment. *J Theor Biol* 159, 67–81.
- Bénichou, O., Loverdo, C., Moreau, M., Voituriez, R., 2011. Intermittent search strategies. *Rev. Mod. Phys.* 83, 81–130.
- Berec, L., 2002. Techniques of spatially explicit individual-based models: construction, simulation, and mean-field analysis. *Ecol Model* 150, 55–81.
- Brown, J.S., Kotler, B.P., 2004. Hazardous duty pay and the foraging cost of predation. *Ecol Lett* 7, 999–1014.
- Carter, M.C., Dixon, A.F.G., 1982. Habitat quality and the foraging behaviour of coccinellid larvae. *J Anim Ecol* 51, 865–878.
- Charnov, E.L., 1976. Optimal foraging, the marginal value theorem. *Theor Popul Biol* 9, 129–136.
- Cianelli, D., Uttieri, M., Strickler, J.R., Zambianchi, E., 2009. Zooplankton encounters in patchy particle distributions. *Ecol Model* 220, 596–604.
- Dalby-Ball, G., Meats, A., 2000. Influence of the odour of fruit, yeast and cue lure on the flight activity of the Queensland fruit fly, *Bactrocera tryoni* (Froggatt)(Diptera: Tephritidae). *Australian Journal of Entomology* 39, 195–200.
- Diggle, P.J., 2003. *Statistical Analysis of Spatial Point Patterns*. Academic Press, London, UK.
- Døving, K.B., Mårstøl, M., Andersen, J.R., Knutsen, J.A., 1994. Experimental evidence of chemokinesis in newly hatched cod larvae (*Gadus morhua* L.). *Mar Biol* 120, 351–358.
- Dusenbery, D.B., 1998. Spatial sensing of stimulus gradients can be superior to temporal sensing for free-swimming bacteria. *Biophys J* 74, 2272–2277.
- Feller, W., 1971. *An Introduction To Probability Theory and Its Applications*. volume 2. Wiley, New York.
- Ferran, A., Ettifouri, M., Clement, P., Bell, W.J., 1994. Sources of variability in the transition from extensive to intensive search in coccinellid predators (Homoptera: Coccinellidae). *J Insect Behav* 7, 633–647.
- Gnedenko, B.V., Kolmogorov, A.N., 1954. *Limit Distributions for Sums of Independent Random Variables*. Addison-Wesley, Reading, MA.
- Haskell, D.G., 1997. Experiments and a model examining learning in the area-restricted search behavior of ferrets (*Mustela putorius furo*). *Behav Ecol* 8, 448–455.
- Hein, A.M., McKinley, S.A., 2012. Sensing and decision-making in random search. *P Natl Acad Sci USA* 109, 12070–12074.
- Hill, S.L., Burrows, M.T., Hughes, R.N., 2003. The efficiency of adaptive search tactics for different prey distribution patterns: a simulation model based on the behaviour of juvenile plaice. *J Fish Biol* 63, 117–130.
- Illian, J., Penttinen, A., Stoyan, H., Stoyan, D., 2008. *Statistical Analysis and Modelling of Spatial Point Patterns*. volume 70. John Wiley and Sons, Ltd., West Sussex, UK.
- James, A., Pitchford, J.W., Plank, M.J., 2010. Efficient or inaccurate? Analytical and numerical modelling of random search strategies. *Bull Math Biol* 72, 896–913.
- James, A., Plank, M., Brown, R.A., 2008. Optimizing the encounter rate in biological interactions: Ballistic versus Lévy versus Brownian strategies. *Phys Rev E* 78, 051128.
- James, A., Plank, M.J., Edwards, A.M., 2011. Assessing Lévy walks as models of animal foraging. *J R Soc Interface* 8, 1233–1247.
- Johnson, D.S., Papadimitriou, C.H., 2009. The traveling salesman problem: A guided tour of combinatorial optimization, in: Lawler, E.L., Lenstra, J.K., Rinnooy Kan, A.H.G., Shmoys, D.B. (Eds.), *Computational Complexity*. John Wiley and Sons, Ltd., Chichester, UK, pp. 37–87.
- Latty, T., Beekman, M., 2009. Food quality affects search strategy in the acellular slime mould, *Physarum polycephalum*. *Behav Ecol* 20, 1160–1167.
- Leick, V., Hellung Larsen, P., 1992. Chemosensory behaviour of *Tetrahymena*. *BioEssays* 14, 61–66.
- Levandowsky, M., Klafter, J., 1988. Feeding and swimming behavior in grazing microzooplankton. *Journal of Eukaryotic Microbiology* 35, 243–246.
- Moore, P., Crimaldi, J., 2004. Odor landscapes and animal behavior: tracking odor plumes in different physical worlds. *J Marine Syst* 49, 55–64.
- Nevitt, G.A., 2000. Olfactory foraging by Antarctic procellariiform seabirds: life at high Reynolds numbers. *Biol Bull* 198, 245–253.
- Nolet, B.A., Mooij, W.M., 2002. Search paths of swans foraging on spatially autocorrelated tubers. *J Anim Ecol* 71, 451–462.
- Oaten, A., 1977. Optimal foraging in patches: a case for stochasticity. *Theor Popul Biol* 12, 263–285.
- Persons, M.H., Uetz, G.W., 1997. Foraging patch residence time decisions in wolf spiders: Is perceiving prey as important as eating prey? *Ecoscience* 4, 1–5.
- Plank, M.J., James, A., 2008. Optimal foraging: Lévy pattern or process? *J R Soc Interface* 5, 1077–1086.
- R Development Core Team, 2011. *R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing*. R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria.

- Reynolds, A.M., 2008. How many animals really do the Lévy walk? Comment. *Ecology* 89, 2347–2351.
- Reynolds, A.M., 2009. Adaptive Lévy walks can outperform composite Brownian walks in non-destructive random searching scenarios. *Physica A* 388, 561–564.
- Reynolds, A.M., 2010. Balancing the competing demands of harvesting and safety from predation: Lévy walk searches outperform composite Brownian walk searches but only when foraging under the risk of predation. *Physica A* 389, 4740–4746.
- Reynolds, A.M., 2012. Olfactory search behaviour in the wandering albatross is predicted to give rise Lévy flight movement patterns. *Anim Behav* 83, 1225–1229.
- Reynolds, A.M., Bartumeus, F., 2009. Optimising the success of random destructive searches: Lévy walks can outperform ballistic motions. *J Theor Biol* 260, 98–103.
- Reynolds, A.M., Rhodes, C.J., 2009. The Lévy flight paradigm: random search patterns and mechanisms. *Ecology* 90, 877–887.
- Smouse, P.E., Focardi, S., Moorcroft, P.R., Kie, J.G., Forester, J.D., Morales, J.M., 2010. Stochastic modelling of animal movement. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B* 365, 2201–2211.
- Strand, M.R., Vinson, S.B., 1982. Behavioral response of the parasitoid *Cardiochiles nigriceps* to a kairomone. *Entomol Exp Appl* 31, 308–315.
- Tyson, R.C., Wilson, J.B., Lane, W.D., 2011. Theoretical Population Biology. *Theor Popul Biol* 79, 70–81.
- Visser, A.W., Kjørboe, T., 2006. Plankton motility patterns and encounter rates. *Oecologia* 148, 538–546.
- Viswanathan, G.M., da Luz, M.G.E., Raposo, E.P., Stanley, H.E., 2011. *The Physics of Foraging: An Introduction to Random Searches and Biological Encounters*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK.
- Waage, J.K., 1979. Foraging for patchily-distributed hosts by the parasitoid, *Nemeritis canescens*. *J Anim Ecol* 48, 353–371.
- Weimerskirch, H., Pinaud, D., Pawlowski, F., Bost, C.A., 2007. Does prey capture induce arearestricted search? A finescale study using GPS in a marine predator, the wandering albatross. *Am Nat* 170, 734–743.
- Wilensky, U., 1999. *Netlogo*. Center for Connected Learning and Computer-Based Modeling, Northwestern University, Evanston, IL USA.
- Zillio, T., He, F., 2010. Modeling spatial aggregation of finite populations. *Ecology* 91, 3698–3706.
- Zumofen, G., Klafter, J., 1993. Scale-invariant motion in intermittent chaotic systems. *Physical Review E* 47, 851–864.