

Article

Complexity in Animal Communication: Estimating the Size of N-Gram Structures

Reginald Smith ^{1,*}

¹ Citizen Scientists League, PO Box 10051, Rochester, NY 14610, USA

Version October 16, 2018 submitted to *Entropy*. Typeset by \LaTeX using class file *mdpi.cls*

Abstract: In this paper, new techniques that allow conditional entropy to estimate the combinatorics of symbols are applied to animal communication studies to estimate the communication's repertoire size. By using the conditional entropy estimates at multiple orders, the paper estimates the total repertoire sizes for animal communication across bottlenose dolphins, humpback whales, and several species of birds for N-grams length one to three. In addition to discussing the impact of this method on studies of animal communication complexity, the reliability of these estimates is compared to other methods through simulation. While entropy does undercount the total repertoire size due to rare N-grams, it gives a more accurate picture of the most frequently used repertoire than just repertoire size alone.

Keywords: animal communication; information theory; dolphin; humpback whale; bird song; phonology

1. Introduction The complexity of animal communication is a topic frequently discussed, but difficult to resolve. While it is beyond dispute that many species communicate, even the basic purposes of these communications—whether to communicate information or to just influence the behavior of others to increase their own fitness—is hotly debated [1–5]. Even if we conclude information is being communicated, does the faculty for language, the human ability to communicate complex information through spoken language, have wide and directly comparable analogs across the animal kingdom [6] or is the faculty for language and expressing abstract ideas uniquely human [7]?

The complexity of animal language has been studied using many methods including various techniques to estimate repertoire size such as curve-fitting [8,9] and capture-recapture [9–12]. Other methods use information theory either by measurements of conditional entropy [13,14] or using other

23 methods such as entropy rate and Lempel-Ziv complexity [15]. In this paper, we will focus on the
 24 methods using conditional entropy. Measuring animal communication in terms of the entropy in bits,
 25 these studies have attempted to look at the animal communication structure at various lengths (N-grams)
 26 in order to determine the structure of the communications and whether the tools of information theory
 27 can lend themselves to a better understanding of animal behavior and possibly what types of information
 28 can be communicated.

29 **2. Information Theory and Animal Communication**

30 After formulating information theory in 1948, Shannon was not long in turning its powers to shedding
 31 light on human language [16]. Shannon investigated the entropy of the English language using both
 32 frequency counts of letters from texts as well as human volunteers who played a guessing game of
 33 missing letters to establish bounds of the estimated entropy. This analysis of language mainly focused
 34 on the measure of what is now widely known as the conditional entropy. The conditional entropy of
 35 order N is defined with the probability of a given letter (j) coming after an N -gram sequence (b_i).

$$H_N = - \sum_{i,j} p(b_i, j) \log_2 p_{b_i}(j) \quad (1)$$

36 Where $p(b_i, j)$ is the joint probability of the sequence (b_i, j) and $p_{b_i}(j)$ is the conditional probability
 37 of j given b_i . The conditional entropy for $N = 2$ is often written as $H(X|Y)$ and can have a maximum
 38 value of $H(X)$. For $N=1$ this reduces to the well-known Shannon entropy.

$$H = - \sum_{i=1}^M p_i \log_2 p_i \quad (2)$$

39 Amongst the simplest methods for computing conditional entropies is from joint entropies. The joint
 40 entropy, $H(N)$, for a sequence of symbols (x_i) of length N is defined as

$$H(N) = - \sum_{x_1} \cdots \sum_{x_n} p(x_1, \dots, x_n) \log_2 p(x_1, \dots, x_n) \quad (3)$$

41 The conditional entropy of order N can be alternatively defined as $H_N = H(N) - H(N - 1)$ where
 42 $H(N)$ and $H(N - 1)$ are the joint entropies of order N and $N - 1$ respectively.

43 For the English alphabet of 27 letters (26 letters plus the space character), Shannon calculated the
 44 first order entropy at 4.14 bits, the second order conditional entropy at 3.56 bits, and the third order
 45 conditional entropy at 3.30 bits. The zero-th order entropy of 4.75 bits was based on $\log_2 M$ where
 46 $M=27$. Many other languages have been analyzed in this way across many language families. Data and
 47 analysis for a large group of these are given in [17,18].

48 Soon after human languages, animal communication of varying types were studied using entropy. One
 49 of the first citations explicitly analyzing animal communication by means of information theory was that
 50 of J.B.S. Haldane and H. Spurway [19] who did a short calculation to estimate the information entropy
 51 of bee (*Apis Mellifera*) dances at 2.54 bits. Many modern treatments of animal communication by
 52 information theory can be traced to the work of Chatfield & Lemon on cardinals (*Cardinalis cardinalis*)
 53 [20,21] and Lemon & Dobson on thrushes [13]. In particular, their work on analyzing different orders

54 of entropy to investigate the fundamental order of communication established a baseline on using
55 information theory to estimate the complexity of animal communication.

56 Further studies along this line include the analysis of the chickadee (*Parus atricapillus*) and (*P.*
57 *carolinensis*) by [22,23], European starlings (*Sturnus vulgaris*) [24], Rufous bellied thrushes (*Turdus*
58 *rufiventris*) [25], European skylarks (*Alauda arvensis L.*) [26], wood thrushes (*Hylocichla mustelina*)
59 and robins (*Turdus migratorius*) [13], bottlenose dolphins (*Tursiops truncatus*) [14,29–31], humpback
60 whales (*Megaptera novaeangliae*) [32–35], and male rock hyraxes (*Procavia capensis*) [36].

61 These studies are primarily focused on measuring information through entropy in bits in the first
62 order, and sometimes higher orders as well. For multiple orders, information graphs, plots of the bits
63 of conditional entropy by order, are sometimes used [13] to analyze the structure of the communication
64 and estimate the Markov order of the signal. While this provides a quantitative overall measure of
65 complexity, they have a limitation in that they do not provide resolution into how many, or what type, of
66 calls or songs that we should expect in two, three or more combined units. Using the values of entropy,
67 few conclusions can be deduced besides the order at which a signal becomes most repetitive: where its
68 value drops most sharply from one order to the next. To remedy this, we can use information theory with
69 combinatorics so that the size of the repertoire, at lengths longer than one, can be estimated with only
70 information about the conditional entropy for each order.


71 2.1. Information Graphs and Order Complexity

72 An information graph is the plot of the higher order conditional entropies by order. Some of the
73 first uses and analyses of information graphs in the context of Markov sequences are given in [37,38].
74 Information graphs were first used to analyze the order dependence of Markov sequences, the theory
75 being that when there is a large, negative slope between two orders to a relatively low value of conditional
76 entropy, the prior order is most likely the order of dependence of the Markov sequence to describe the
77 communication. However, [38] showed through simulation that a large decrease between two orders
78 of entropy in an information graph cannot be determined to be the fundamental order if the number of
79 symbols is high or the sample size is low. Since likelihood tests become unreliable at smaller sample sizes
80 with large symbol alphabets, the decrease in the information graph could be indicative of the inadequacy
81 of sample sizes at larger orders rather than the fundamental order of the underlying Markov process.

82 With these caveats, the information graphs will still be shown as an illustration of the results of the
83 studies on each animal communication and should be used with caution to establish the complexity of
84 sequences.

85 In general, the larger the order of dependence, the more “complex” the communication is deemed.
86 For example, many bird call sequences seem to show first order dependence, though this is unsure since
87 a sample size of multiples of the number of symbols squared is needed to confirm this (Figure 1). This is
88 much different than human written language. In a point first made in [22], English written letters show
89 a drop of less than 1 bit from the first to third order conditional entropies [16,29], much slower than the
90 drop in the chickadee information graphs and those of other birds.

Figure 1. Information graphs of communications by European skylarks [26] and European starlings [24] adjusted for minimum bias (see Table 3).



91 While information graphs are relatively easy to construct given the right data, there is a large issue of
 92 estimating entropy. Namely, entropy estimators can have large biases, that depend on the sample size,
 93 which typically underestimate the true value of entropy [39,40].

94 2.2. Bias Measures in Entropy Estimates

95 Because of the often large numbers of possible variables, entropy estimators can be very sensitive to
 96 sample size and introduce bias into measurements. This was first investigated in [39] where the following
 97 expression is the first order additive term to entropy estimates to correct for bias

$$H = \hat{H} + \frac{M - 1}{2S} \quad (4)$$

98 where, \hat{H} is the entropy estimator based on the data, M is the number of non-zero categories across
 99 which the probabilities are measured to calculate entropy and S is the sample size. This estimator was
 100 improved in [40] as

$$H = \hat{H} + \frac{M - 1}{2S \ln 2} \quad (5)$$

101 When dealing with actual data, it can be relatively straightforward to estimate M , though with smaller
 102 sample sizes it is questionable if you have captured all non-zero categories. However, when only sample
 103 sizes and values for entropies are available, calculating M accurately can be much more difficult. With
 104 little information available, we can estimate upper and lower bounds for the entropy bias. This will be
 105 described following the section on combinatorics.

106 3. Combinatorics of Information Theory and Repertoire Size

107 One of the lesser known, but extremely useful, facets of information theory is the way entropy can be
 108 used for combinatorics. In particular, the number of combinations of a symbol set can be more accurately
 109 estimated using the first-order entropy than can be done with an assumption of random likelihood. For
 110 example, if an alphabet has M symbols, the exact number of possible combinations of length N is the
 111 common result

$$W_N = M^N \quad (6)$$

112 Here, W_N is the total number of possible combinations of length N . This basic calculation assumes
 113 every combination appears with non-zero probability. This can be improved on, however, using the
 114 calculation from Shannon and Weaver [27] if we know the first order entropy. Here we can estimate the
 115 number of combinations that appear with probability 1 assuming the measurement of first order entropy
 116 is accurate:

$$W_N = M^{NH(\log M)} \quad (7)$$

117 Here H is the Shannon (first-order) entropy using logarithm of base M . This assumes that each
 118 symbol in the N-Gram appears with a rate based on the entropy of the symbol alphabet. Clearly, if each
 119 symbol is equally likely, H is at most 1 and we get Equation (6). The more familiar version (the one
 120 derived by Shannon and Weaver) calculates W_N using entropy in units of bits (log base 2)

$$W_N = 2^{NH(\log 2)} \quad (8)$$

121 Equations (7) and (8) improve on the assumptions of Equation (6) by incorporating the fact that every
 122 symbol is not equally likely but appears at a rate commensurate with the Shannon entropy of the overall
 123 signal. These derivations show that knowledge of the entropy of the signal allows us to reduce the number
 124 of combinations and more accurately estimate the number of combinations of length N . However, there
 125 is an additional element of error in this analysis.

126 Since H is the first-order entropy, this Shannon-Weaver model assumes that each symbol has an i.i.d.
 127 probability of appearing in each space in the N-Gram. If there is any correlation between symbols, the
 128 larger N becomes, the more likely W_N is inaccurate. However, in this model there is no co-dependence
 129 between symbols on which symbol is more likely to follow another and the base assumption is that in
 130 any N length string, the symbols for each position are chosen independent of all other symbols before
 131 them.

132 In order to improve on the estimate of W_N for $N > 1$, we must use the conditional entropy. In a result
 133 first demonstrated by Kolmogorov [28], W_N can be more accurately estimated by using conditional
 134 entropy to account for all possible pairs, without the overlap instances that are found in the Cartesian
 135 product (represented by joint entropy) of the alphabet spaces. Note that in his paper, Kolmogorov stated
 136 that $W_2 = 2^{H(X|Y)}$. However, a factor of two is necessary for the equation to reduce to the base case of
 137 Shannon and Weaver if $H(X|Y) = H(X)$.

$$W_2 = 2^{2H(X|Y)} \quad (9)$$

138 In the above $H(X|Y)$, also expressed as H_2 , is the conditional entropy in bits for the digram sequence
 139 XY . Given the inequality $H(X) \geq H(X|Y)$, Equation (9) reduces to Equation (8) at maximum
 140 conditional entropy where co-dependence disappears. Equation (9) was originally used to calculate the
 141 number of digrams but can be extended for $N > 2$ using higher order conditional entropies. If we designate
 142 conditional entropies of order N as H_N the upper bound estimate of the number of combinations of
 143 length L , W_L , where $N \leq L$ is

$$W_L = 2^{LH_N} \quad (10)$$

144 Since conditional entropy must monotonically decrease with each higher order, W_L is at a minimum
 145 where $N = L$ since H_L is smaller than all preceding conditional entropies. This can apply to language
 146 in some obvious ways. For example, an estimate of the number of distinct two-letter words in a language
 147 can be given by $W_2 = 2^{2H_2}$. For distinct three-letter words we can use $W_3 = 2^{3H_3}$ etc. This approach,
 148 along with a new statistical distributional approach, was demonstrated in [18]. Using these parameters
 149 then, it is an intriguing question if we can estimate the size of the repertoire of multiple symbols or
 150 sounds in non-human systems of communication.

151 3.1. Combinatorics and Entropy Bias Estimates

152 In addition to estimating the size of the repertoire, combinatorics can be used to estimate upper bounds
 153 for the entropy bias when details about the data set are unavailable. This is primarily through estimating
 154 M , the number of non-zero categories in Equations (4) and (5). The upper bound for M , given a specific
 155 order of entropy, H , can be estimated using the assumptions of Equation (8). The largest possible value
 156 for M for an order, N , of entropy H can be given by $M = 2^{NH}$. Therefore, if the bias of H using the
 157 number of symbols is acceptably low, $M = 2^{NH}$ can be used in calculations to find the largest possible
 158 bias expected for a given sample size.

159 In addition, one can estimate a lower bound for M using the combinatorics of conditional entropies.
 160 The lower bound for M should be $M = 2^{NH_N}$. With these two values of M , we can determine an
 161 appropriate band for the repertoire for any order. The largest problem can occur if H is relatively large
 162 with a low order of dependence. This can make the upper bound estimation of bias huge, with the lower
 163 bound relatively small. As will be seen later, this can be an issue with birds with a large repertoire of
 164 individual calls but with a relatively low (second order) dependence in their communication. As a final
 165 note, the bias corrections apply only to the first, second, and third order *joint* entropies. These are then
 166 subtracted from one another to find the bias corrected conditional entropies.

167 In the next section, we will investigate the complexity of several species including bottlenose
 168 dolphins, humpback whales, and several species of birds and investigate the size of their N-gram
 169 repertoires.

170 4. Animal Communication: Complexity and Repertoire Size

171 In this paper we will use entropy combinatorial techniques to estimate the N-gram repertoires of six
 172 species: bottlenose dolphins *Tursiops truncatus* [14,29–31], humpback whales *Megaptera novaeangliae*
 173 [32–35], European starlings *Sturnus vulgaris* [24], European skylarks *Alauda arvensis* L. [26], wood

174 thrushes *Hylocichla mustelina* and robins *Turdus migratorius* [25]. A brief summary of the research
175 for each is given below, followed by data from the papers, information graphs, and estimated N-gram
176 repertoire sizing.

177 4.1. Bottlenose Dolphins

178 In [41–43] McCowan and Reiss introduced a new method to categorize the whistles of bottlenose
179 dolphins, *Tursiops truncatus*, and organize these into sequences. This research was followed up in a
180 collaboration with Doyle [29] which analyzed these sequences in terms of information theory and Zipf's
181 Law calculating the conditional entropy up to order three, comparing this with human written language,
182 and calculating a Zipf exponent of nearly -1 for the rank-frequency distribution of dolphin whistle types.
183 This paper will use the data from [29] to investigate the dolphin whistles for N-grams for N in range one
184 to three.

185 4.2. Humpback Whales

186 One of the defining features of humpback whales, *Megaptera novaeangliae*, is their social
187 organization into groups called pods where they emit various cries, both alone and in sequence, to
188 communicate with other whales. These cries were investigated through the lens of information theory
189 in several papers [32–35]. Suzuki [32] and Miksis-Olds and collaborators [33,34] analyzed the structure
190 of humpback whale mating songs and found both that the sequences of whale cries were not stationary
191 and could not be represented well by a first order Markov chain model. Doyle and collaborators in [35]
192 investigate the entropy and conditional entropy of humpback whale cries under conditions of man-made
193 noise and relative quiescence in order to establish how anthropomorphic noise may affect whale cry
194 patterns. They found a significant effect where whale cries seemed to have a steeper entropic slope, and
195 are thus more repetitive, under high noise conditions, possibly to compensate for the more noisy channel.
196 For our analysis, we will use the results from the low noise data set.

197 4.3. Wood Thrushes and Robins

198 Dobson and Lemon [13] investigated the information structure of long call sequences amongst
199 a variety of American thrushes including wood thrushes *Hylocichla mustelina* and robins *Turdus*
200 *migratorius*. For each bird they measured multiple sequences and calculated entropies of the call
201 sequences to create information graphs. Being one of the earliest papers to use this technique on animal
202 communication, it established many methods such as the use of information graphs. In this paper, we
203 will look at the entropies based on the subjects of the paper, wood thrush 3 and robin 2.

204 4.4. European Skylarks

205 In [26], Briefer and collaborators measured the information entropy of European skylarks in both
206 France and Poland to test the hypothesis that habitat change, marked in France but not Poland, is having
207 a significant effect on the call patterns of *Alauda arvensis* L.. While songs were more shared amongst

208 different birds in the restricted habitat near Paris, song complexity was almost identical in both locations.
209 For this paper, we use the continuous habitat data from the Poland habitat.

210 4.5. *European Starlings*


211 In [24], Getner and Hulse investigated the ability of European starlings, *Sturnus vulgaris*, to recognize
212 individuals based on songs. As part of their analysis, they used a success-failure reward to access a food
213 hopper based on correctly distinguishing one starling call amongst a group of five. When they used
214 synthetic call sequences to test recognition, they found recognition was improved when sequences with
215 second or third order Markov dependence (more complex) were used versus first order dependencies
216 which randomly emitted sounds with a frequency to match first-order entropy. For this paper, we will
217 use the data from the entropy of song types in starling song bouts represented in an information graph in
218 the paper's Figure 3. Since the sample size was not explicitly mentioned in the paper, it was estimated
219 by using data from the paper. Namely, assuming a song type (syllable) average length of one second,
220 an average of about 39s per song bout, and 120 song bouts. This gives $S=4,680$. In addition, since
221 each bout had a standard error of 6s, we used the $2 * SE$ 95% confidence interval to add an additional
222 $2 * SE * \sqrt{120}$ seconds for a total sample time (and sample size) of 4,811.

223 5. Animal Communication Entropy Data and Repertoire Estimates


224 Here we use the data from these papers to reproduce graphically the information graphs for the
225 communications of each species (Figure 2) as well as to show the conditional entropy for the first three
226 orders, correct the conditional entropy for bias, and estimate the minimum and maximum size of the
227 animal N-gram repertoires given the bias corrected entropy values.

228 First, we will represent the minimum bias corrected conditional entropies as information graphs from
229 order 0, $\log M$ for the number of individual symbols, to the third order. Only the humpback whale data
230 stops at the second order due to a lack of data on the third order entropy.


Figure 2. Information graphs of animal communication conditional entropies for the species analyzed in this paper.




Bottlenose dolphins (*Tursiops truncatus*)




Humpback Whales (*Megaptera novaeangliae*)




European skylarks (*Alauda arvensis L.*)



European starlings (*Sturnus vulgaris*)




Wood thrushes (*Hylocichla mustelina*)



Robins (*Turdus migratorius*)

Figure 3. Information graph of written English letters based on [16,29]. The smaller negative slope as compared with bird song information graphs is evident as first shown in [22].



231 As can be seen in Figure 2, several species show a dramatic drop after the first or second order
 232 of entropy. For a basic comparison, the information graph for written English letters ([16,29]) shows
 233 a much more gradual decline and thus less repetition. Once again, it is difficult to make a definite
 234 interpretation of the order of the process with sample sizes that are not as large as or are barely larger
 235 than M^2 , especially with the large song type repertoire of birds.

236 In analyzing the data from the species and estimating repertoires it is essential to define sample sizes
 237 and correct for bias. In Table 1, the basic data from the papers is shown. One key issue to resolve is
 238 which sample size to use at each order. Sample sizes for higher order N-grams can be reduced if there are
 239 multiple discrete sequences. For example, if there are 500 individual symbols in a dataset, yet these are
 240 broken into 25 discrete sequences, the first order sample size is 500 while the second order must be 475
 241 since there is no overlap with the end of one sequence and the beginning of another. This information
 242 was not always available but for dolphins, humpback whales, and starlings, this methodology was used
 243 to calculate S_2 and S_3 .

244 In Table 2, the minimum bias and maximum bias for each species are given. For the maximum bias,
 245 there were exceptions where the symbol size dictated by H was so large that the bias correction would
 246 cause the conditional entropy to exceed the value of the previous order. In this case the bias was limited
 247 to the maximum possible value—that which would make the conditional entropy at this order (usually the
 248 third order) equal to that of the second order.

249 In Tables 3 and 4, the final estimates for the bias corrected conditional entropies and the derived
 250 repertoire sizes are given.

Table 1. The basic data on the information theory of animal communication from the species analyzed. M is the number of base symbols (songs, whistles, cries, etc.), S is the sample size of symbols analyzed, S_2 is the estimate (where available) of the number of 2-grams measured, S_3 is the estimate (where available) of the number of 3-grams measured, H , H_2 , and H_3 are the first, second, and third order conditional entropies respectively.

Species Name	Reference	M	S	S_2	S_3	H	H_2	H_3
<i>Tursiops truncatus</i>	[29]	27	493	346	346	1.92	1.15	0.56
<i>Megaptera novaeangliae</i>	[35]	6	202	195	N/A	2.15	2	N/A
<i>Alauda arvensis L.</i>	[26]	170	10000	10000	10000	7.05	1	0.29
<i>Sturnus vulgaris</i>	[24]	105	4811	4691	4691	6.03	1.47	0.81
<i>Hylocichla mustelina</i>	[13]	35	777	777	777	4.64	3.33	1.09
<i>Turdus migratorius</i>	[13]	44	2700	2700	2700	4.03	2.74	1.95

Table 2. The biases, minimum and maximum, calculated for the joint entropies of orders 1-3 according to the paper data. Values with asterisks indicate where the maximum bias assumption correction would have exceeded the previous order entropy and therefore the maximum bias is limited to the difference between the bias-corrected previous order entropy and the original entropy estimate.

Species Name	Bias Min			Bias Max		
	H	$H(X, Y)$	$H(X, Y, Z)$	H	$H(X, Y)$	$H(X, Y, Z)$
<i>Tursiops truncatus</i>	0.04	0.01	0.01	0.04	0.03	0.2
<i>Megaptera novaeangliae</i>	0.02	0.06	N/A	0.02	0.07	N/A
<i>Alauda arvensis L.</i>	0.01	0	0	0.01	1.26	1.96*
<i>Sturnus vulgaris</i>	0.02	0.0	0.0	0.02	0.66	1.3
<i>Hylocichla mustelina</i>	0.03	0.09	0.01	0.03	0.57	2.78*
<i>Turdus migratorius</i>	0.01	0.01	0.02	0.01	0.07	0.85*

Table 3. The corrected conditional entropies, minimum and maximum, calculated for the conditional entropies of orders 1-3 according to the paper data and values in Tables 1 and 2. Values with asterisks indicate where the maximum bias assumption correction would have exceeded the previous order entropy and therefore the maximum bias is limited at the bias-corrected previous order entropy.

Species Name	Bias Min			Bias Max		
	H	H_2	H_3	H	H_2	H_3
<i>Tursiops truncatus</i>	1.96	1.12	0.56	1.96	1.14	0.73
<i>Megaptera novaeangliae</i>	2.17	2.04	N/A	2.17	2.05	N/A
<i>Alauda arvensis L.</i>	7.06	0.99	0.29	7.06	2.25	2.25*
<i>Sturnus vulgaris</i>	6.05	1.46	0.81	6.05	2.11	2.09
<i>Hylocichla mustelina</i>	4.67	3.39	1.00	4.67	3.87	3.87*
<i>Turdus migratorius</i>	4.04	2.74	1.96	4.04	2.8	2.8*

Table 4. Estimates of total repertoire sizes for 1-gram, 2-gram, and 3-gram, minimum and maximum, for each species based on the bias corrected conditional entropies.

Species Name	Bias Min				Bias Max			
	1-gram	2-gram	3-gram	Total	1-gram	2-gram	3-gram	Total
<i>Tursiops truncatus</i>	27	5	4	36	27	5	5	37
<i>Megaptera novaeangliae</i>	6	17	N/A	23	6	18	N/A	24
<i>Alauda arvensis L.</i>	170	4	2	176	170	23	108*	301
<i>Sturnus vulgaris</i>	105	8	6	119	105	19	78	202
<i>Hylocichla mustelina</i>	35	110	8	153	35	214	3126*	3375
<i>Turdus migratorius</i>	44	45	59	148	44	49	338*	431

251 From these tables, especially Table 4, several things seem clear. First, for almost all of the species
 252 given, the bulk of their N-gram repertoire lies within the 1-gram individual symbols. The largest
 253 exceptions, for both the maximized and minimized bias, seem to be the wood thrush and robins. There
 254 could be exceptions, however. For example, in [29], the authors used only those dolphin whistles that
 255 occurred at least twice for entropy calculations giving an $M = 27$. There were a total of 102 distinct
 256 whistles detected, 75 only once, so adding these would give a total repertoire for the dolphins of 112 for
 257 the maximum bias and 111 for the minimum bias.


258 Clearly, we have a more accurate idea of total repertoire with those animals where the repertoire size
 259 differs very little from the maximum or minimum bias assumptions. These are dolphins, humpback
 260 whales, and European starlings. The other bird species have a large number of song types. This huge
 261 symbol size causes a large swing between the estimates for minimum and maximum bias. In these cases,
 262 the minimum bias estimate is more representative since the number of possible N-grams that first-order
 263 entropy would imply is enormous with such a large symbol set. In the end, the best way to accurately
 264 measure the repertoire sizes, particularly for dolphins and humpback whales, is to make a much larger
 265 measurement of sequences with S in the thousands.

266 6. Other Repertoire Counting Methods and Simulation

267 As stated in the introduction, apart from the information theory perspective, repertoire size has often
 268 been investigated using sampling methods such as curve-fitting and capture-recapture. These methods
 269 can be used if song bout data is available to predict repertoire size, their accuracy increasing with the
 270 number of samples. In order to compare the method developed in this paper with actual data and these
 271 two methods, a program was created that synthesized an arbitrary signal with a predefined entropy of the
 272 first, second, and third order.

273 Using this program, the number of N-grams was compared with the estimates using the entropy
 274 method for dolphins and humpback whales. For dolphins and whales respectively, 20,000 symbol and
 275 2,000 symbol sequences with matching conditional entropies were created and the number of N-grams
 276 from 1 to 3 were counted. Since the samples were so large, neither curve-fitting nor capture-recapture
 277 had an issue finding the total repertoire size since the exponential distribution of the total number of
 278 symbols (see Figure 4) reaches as asymptote. Part of the reason for the rapid symbol acquisition may

Figure 4. Exponential distribution of repertoire growth over time for bottlenose dolphin 3-grams and humpback whale 2-grams. Based on simulated sequences of 20,000 symbols with repertoire measured in bouts of 100 symbols for dolphins and a sequence of 2,000 symbols with bouts of 10 symbols for humpback whales.



279 be that the sequences, despite having the requisite entropy properties, were relatively stationary which is
 280 not always the case for real languages. For dolphins and whales, the charts in the tables were created by
 281 sampling new symbols in song ‘bouts’ of 100 and 10 symbols respectively.

282 For the humpback whales, the total number of simulated 2-grams exactly matched the prediction of
 283 a repertoire size of 18. This would seem to confirm the validity of the method. The dolphin story was
 284 more complex. With dolphins, the total number of simulated N-grams, exceeded the values estimated by
 285 the entropy estimations in all cases, however, the details tell a more complex story. While the repertoire
 286 is large in terms of N-grams, the frequency is very concentrated amongst the top N-grams. The top 5
 287 2-grams and 3-grams are 78% and 63% of all 2-grams (total: 46) and 3-grams (total: 89) respectively.
 288 Many of the 2-grams and 3-grams occurred only once in the 20,000 symbol sequence. While the bias in
 289 the dolphins is greater due to the relatively small sample size compared to the number of symbols, the
 290 repertoire exceeded even the maximum bias estimates for both 2-grams and 3-grams.

291 Therefore, we can conclude one major strength, but limitation, of the use of conditional entropy to
 292 measure the N-gram repertoire. For small repertoires, like the whales, it seems they can accurately
 293 estimate repertoires for small combinations such as 2-grams. For more complex repertoires, they seem
 294 to accurately measure the size of the most frequently used N-grams in the repertoire to give a reasonable
 295 estimate of the most functionally used N-grams. As a limit, however, conditional entropies can seriously
 296 undercount rare N-grams since their relatively small probabilities contribute to the calculations of
 297 entropy only weakly.

298 If collecting the entire size of the repertoire, ignoring the weighted heterogeneity of the symbols, is
 299 desired and samples are available, both curve-fitting and capture-recapture create a more detailed picture
 300 since they can pick up the rare occurrences, however, they do not give the same information about the
 301 relative skewed nature of the distribution of symbols the entropy method can provide.

302 7. Conclusions

303 Animal communication analyses through information theory have been useful, and while they cannot
304 answer all questions regarding the intent or possible meaning of such communications, they have shown
305 beyond a doubt that animal communication can have a complex structure that goes beyond random
306 sounds or even the structure of a first-order Markov process.

307 However, entropy based analyses alone hold only descriptive power. A logical next step from
308 observing and measuring communications complexity should be determining how to use that complexity
309 to search for communications structures that can help understand animal behavior. The methods outlined
310 in this paper assist in this effort by giving researchers a baseline to investigate further regarding 2-gram
311 or 3-gram call sequences. In particular, the size of the most frequent, and possibly functional, repertoire
312 is clearly enumerated using information theory methods. Similar to work by Getner on starlings [24],
313 these analyses can reveal that single songs or cries are poor substitutes for communication outside the
314 complete pattern. Assumptions of uniform probabilities for the repertoire are almost always wrong and
315 plain measures of repertoire size cannot reflect this as well as entropy values.

316 While the information theory methods are weaker in finding the exact repertoire size compared to
317 count based methods such as curve-fitting and capture-recapture, these methods offer an improved
318 understanding of the relationships that develop the syntax of the communication. The basic order of
319 communication, the clustering of “vocabulary”, and other detailed features cannot be understood just
320 by comparing repertoire sizes over time and across species. The importance of understanding syntax in
321 this matter has been frequently raised such as in [48] where it is recommended that more experiments
322 be carried out to ascertain if other species have phonological recognition similar to phonemes in human
323 speech.

324 It has long been known that auditory recognition abilities exist in a wide group of species from 2-gram
325 alarm calls in putty monkeys (*Cercopithecus nictitans*) [46,47] to pitch differentiation by moths [49,50].
326 How and why these abilities could possibly exist in disparate species such as birds and cetaceans while
327 possibly absent in some more closely related primates is a key question. Is this a frequent evolutionary
328 adaptation that can appear in almost any species or do the most elaborate and complex communications,
329 such as with dolphins, require high intelligence [51]?

330 Just like word length analyses in human language use syllables as the base unit [52], we may possibly
331 look at the average, or most frequent, length of N-grams of communication in animals to gauge the depth
332 and complexity of their communications. In this way, it is the author’s hope that information theory
333 analyses can help peel back the layers of complexity to show how closely such animal communication
334 matches—or is distinct from—human language.

335 Acknowledgments

336 I would like to thank Laurance Doyle for help gathering and understanding data from past papers. I
337 would also like to thank the anonymous referees for much helpful feedback.

338 Conflicts of Interest

339 The author has no conflicts of interest.

340 **References**

- 341 1. Dawkins, R.; Krebs, J.R.; Animal signals: information or manipulation. In: *Behavioural ecology:*
342 *An evolutionary approach*; Krebs, J.R.; Davies, N.B. Eds. Sinauer: Sunderland, MA, USA, 1978;
343 pp. 282–309.
- 344 2. Krebs, J.R.; Dawkins, R. Animal signals: mind-reading and manipulation. In: *Behavioural Ecology:*
345 *an evolutionary approach*; Krebs, J.R.; Davies, N.B. Eds. Sinauer: Sunderland, MA, USA, 1984; pp.
346 380–402.
- 347 3. Burghardt, G.M.; Defining communication. In: *Communication By Chemical Signals: Advances in*
348 *Chemoreception, Vol. 1*; Johnston, J.W.; Moulton, D.G.; Turk, A. Eds. Appleton Century Crofts:
349 New York, NY USA, 1970; pp. 5–18.
- 350 4. Owings, D.H.; Morton, E.S.; *Animal vocal communication: a new approach*. Cambridge University
351 Press: Cambridge, UK, 1998.
- 352 5. Carazo, P.; Font, E. Putting information back into biological communication. *J. Evo. Bio.* **2010**, *23*,
- 353 661–669.
- 354 6. Pinker, S.; Jackendoff, R. The faculty of language: what’s special about it? *Cogn.* **2005**, *95*, 201–236.
- 355 7. Hauser, M.; Chomsky, N.; Tecumseh Fitch, W. The faculty of language: what is it, who has it, and
356 how did it evolve? *Sci.* **2002**, *298*, 1569–1579.
- 357 8. Wildenthal, J.L. Structure in primary song of the mockingbird (*Mimus polyglottos*). *Auk* **1965**, *82*,
- 358 161–189.
- 359 9. Catchpole, C.K.; Slater, P.J.B. *Bird Song: Biological Themes and Variations*; Cambridge University
360 Press: Cambridge, UK, 1995; pp. 45–56.
- 361 10. Garamszegi, L.Z., et. al. The estimation of size and change in composition of avian song
362 repertoires. *Anim. Behav.* **2002**, *63*, 623–630.
- 363 11. Garamszegi, L.Z., et. al. Estimating the complexity of bird song by using capture-recapture
364 approaches from community ecology. *Behav. ecol. sociobiol.* **2005**, *57*, 305–317.
- 365 12. Botero, C. A., et. al. How reliable are the methods for estimating repertoire size. *Ethol.* **2008**, *114*,
- 366 1227–1238.
- 367 13. Dobson, C.W.; Lemon, R.E. Markov sequences in songs of American thrushes. *Behav.* **1979**, *68*,
- 368 86–105.
- 369 14. McCowan, B.; Doyle, L.R.; Hanser, S.F. Using information theory to assess the diversity,
370 complexity, and development of communicative repertoires. *J. Comp. Psych.* **2002**, *116*, 166–172.
- 371 15. Kershenbaum, A. Entropy rate as a measure of animal vocal complexity. *Bioacous.* **2013**,
- 372 DOI:10.1080/09524622.2013.850040.
- 373 16. Shannon, C.E. Prediction and entropy of printed English. *Bell Sys. Tech. J.* **1951**, *30*, 50–64.
- 374 17. Yaglom, A.M.; Yaglom, I.M.; Jain, V.K. (trans.) *Probab. and Inf.*; D. Reidel: Dordrecht,
375 Netherlands, 1983.
- 376 18. Smith, R.D. Distinct word length frequencies: distributions and symbol entropies. *Glottometr.*
377 **2012**, *23*, 7–22.
- 378 19. Haldane, J.B.; Spurway, H. A statistical analysis of communication in “*Apis mellifera*” and a
379 comparison with communication in other animals. *Insectes Soc.* **1954**, *1*, 247–283.

- 380 20. Chatfield, C.; Lemon, R.E. Analysing sequences of behavioural events. *J. Theo. Biol.* **1970**, *29*
381 427–445.
- 382 21. Chatfield, C.; Lemon, R.E. Organization of song in cardinals. *Anim. Behav.* **1971**, *19*, 1–17.
- 383 22. Hailman, J.P.; Ficken, M.S.; Ficken, R.W.; The “chick-a-dee” calls of *Parus atricapillus*: A
384 recombinant system of animal communication compared with written English. *Semiot.* **1985**, *56*,
385 191–224.
- 386 23. Freeberg, T.M.; Lucas, J.R. Information theoretical approaches to chick-a-dee calls of Carolina
387 chickadees (*Poecile carolinensis*). *J. Comp. Psych.* **2012**, *126*, 68–81.
- 388 24. Gentner, T.Q.; Hulse, S.H. Perceptual mechanisms for individual vocal recognition in European
389 starlings, *Sturnus vulgaris*. *Anim. Behav.* **1998**, *56*, 579–594.
- 390 25. Da Silva, M.L. et. al. Using Shannon Entropy on measuring the individual variability in the Rufous-
391 bellied Thrush *Turdus rufiventris* vocal communication. *J. Theo. Biol.* **2000**, *207*, 57–64.
- 392 26. Briefer, E. et. al. Are bird song complexity and song sharing shaped by habitat structure? An
393 information theory and statistical approach. *J. Theo. Biol.* **2010**, *262*, 151–164.
- 394 27. Weaver, W.; Shannon, C.E. *The Mathematical Theory of Communication*. Univ. of Illinois Press:
395 Urbana-Champaign, IL, 1963.
- 396 28. Kolmogorov, A.N. Three approaches to the quantitative definition of information. *Probl. Info.*
397 *Transm.* **1965**, *1*, 4–7.
- 398 29. McCowan, B.; Hanser, S.F.; Doyle, L.R. Quantitative tools for comparing animal communication
399 systems: information theory applied to bottlenose dolphin whistle repertoires. *Anim. Behav.* **1999**,
400 *57*, 409–419.
- 401 30. Ferrer-i-Cancho, R.; McCowan, B. A law of word meaning in dolphin whistle types. *Entropy* **2009**,
402 *11*, 688–701.
- 403 31. Ferrer-i-Cancho, R.; McCowan, B. The span of correlations in dolphin whistle sequences. *J. Stat.*
404 *Mech.* **2012**, P06002.
- 405 32. Suzuki, R.; Buck, J.R.; Tyack, P.L. Information entropy of humpback whale songs. *J. Acoust. Soc.*
406 *Am.* **2006**, *119*, 1849–1866.
- 407 33. Miksis-Olds, J.L.; Buck, J.R.; Noad, M.J.; Cato, D.H.; Stokes, M.D. Analysis of Australian
408 humpback whale song using information theory. *J. Acoust. Soc. Am.* **2006**, *120*, 3228–3229.
- 409 34. Miksis-Olds, J.L.; Buck, J.R.; Noad, M.J.; Cato, D.H.; Stokes, M.D. Information theory analysis of
410 Australian humpback whale song. *J. Acoust. Soc. Am.* **2008**, *124*, 2385–2393.
- 411 35. Doyle, L.R.; McCowan, B.; Hanser, S.F.; Chyba, C.; Bucci, T.; Blue, J.E. Applicability of
412 information theory to the quantification of responses to anthropogenic noise by southeast Alaskan
413 humpback whales. *Entropy* **2008**, *10*, 33–46.
- 414 36. Kershenbaum, A.; Ilany, A.; Blaustein, L.; Geffen, E. Syntactic structure and geographical dialects
415 in the songs of male rock hyraxes. *Proc. R. Soc. B: Biol. Sci.* **2012**, *279*, 2974–2981.
- 416 37. Chatfield, C. Statistical inference regarding Markov chain models. *J. R. Stat. Soc. ser. C (Appl.*
417 *Stat.)* **1973**, *22*, 7–20.
- 418 38. Morgan, B.J.T. Markov properties of sequences of behaviours. *J. R. Stat. Soc. ser. C (Appl. Stat.)*
419 **1976**, *25*, pp. 31–36.

- 420 39. Miller, G. Note on the bias of information estimates. In: *Information theory in psychology II-B*.
421 Quastler, H. Eds. Free Press: Glencoe, IL, 1955; pp. 95–100
- 422 40. Panzeri, S.; Treves, A. Analytical estimates of limited sampling biases in different information
423 measures. *Netw.* **1996**, *7*, 87–107.
- 424 41. McCowan, B. A new quantitative technique for categorizing whistles using simulated signals and
425 whistles from captive bottlenose dolphins (Delphinidae, *Tursiops truncatus*). *Ethol.* **1995**, *100*,
426 177–193.
- 427 42. McCowan, B.; Reiss, D. Quantitative comparison of whistle repertoires from captive adult
428 bottlenose dolphins (Delphinidae, *Tursiops truncatus*): a re-evaluation of the signature whistle
429 hypothesis. *Ethol.* **1995**, *100*, 194–209.
- 430 43. McCowan, B.; Reiss, D. Whistle contour development in captive-born infant bottlenose dolphins
431 (*Tursiops truncatus*): role of learning. *J. Comp. Psych.* **1995**, *109*, 242–260.
- 432 44. McCowan, B.; Doyle, L.R.; Jenkins, J.M.; Hanser, S.F. The appropriate use of Zipf’s law in animal
433 communication studies. *Anim. Behav.* **2005**, *69*, 1–7.
- 434 45. Suzuki, R.; Tyack, P.L.; Buck, J.R. The use of Zipf’s law in animal communication analysis. *Anim.*
435 *Behav.* **2005**, *69*, F9–F17.
- 436 46. Arnold, K.; Zuberbühler, K. Semantic combinations in primate calls. *Nat.* **2006**, *441*, 303.
- 437 47. Arnold, K.; Zuberbühler, K. The alarm-calling system of adult male putty-nosed monkeys,
438 *Cercopithecus nictitans martini*. *Anim. Behav.* **2006**, *72*, 643–653.
- 439 48. Yip, M.J. The search for phonology in other species. *TRENDS in Cogn. Sci.* **2006**, *10*, 442–446.
- 440 49. Turner, C.H.; Schwarz, E. Auditory powers of the Catocala moths; an experimental field study.
441 *Biol. Bull.* **1914**, *27*, 275–293.
- 442 50. Turner, C.H. An experimental study of the auditory powers of the giant silkworm moths
443 (*Saturniidae*). *Biol. Bull.* **1914**, *27*, 325–332.
- 444 51. Lilly, J.C. *The Mind of the Dolphin: A Nonhuman Intelligence*. Avon: New York, NY, USA, 1969.
- 445 52. Grotjahn, R.; Altmann, G. Modeling the distribution of word length: Some methodological
446 problems. In: *Contributions to Quantitative Linguistics: Proceedings of the First International*
447 *Conference on Quantitative Linguistics, QUALICO, Trier* Köhler, R. Rieger, B.B. Eds. Kluwer
448 Academic: Dordrecht, Netherlands, 1993; pp. 141–153.

449 © October 16, 2018 by the author; submitted to *Entropy* for possible open access
450 publication under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution license
451 <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/3.0/>.