

Dynamics of Information Exchange in Zebrafish: The Role of U-Turns in Visual Communication and Behavior Modulation

C. K. Chan^a and Hao-Yun Hsu

*Institute of Physics, Academia Sinica,
Nankang, Taipei 115, Taiwan, R.O.C.*

(Dated: December 31, 2024)

Abstract

Motions of visually coupled zebrafish pairs are studied to understand the effects of information exchange on their behavior as a function of their minimal separation (d). We find that when d is small, the pair can display a leader-follower relation (LFR) with trajectories of almost synchronized form. However, with larger d , although the same LFR is still maintained, the originally similar trajectories turn into different forms. Detailed analysis of their motion trajectories suggests that the pair might be using U-turns (UTs) to exchange information and to maintain a LFR at the same time. A simulation model based on UTs with inferred and proposed rules is able to reproduce prominent features of observed trajectories; indicating that the transition of trajectories can be understood as the result of a change in information exchange between the fish as d increases. Our finding that UTs as important visual signals is consistent with the fact that UTs can induce a large amount of firings in retinas of observing fish.

PACS numbers: 87.18.-h,07.05.Tp,87.19.rh,02.50.Ey

^a ckchan@gate.sinica.edu.tw

Emergence of complex phenomena [1] from interacting agents has fascinated physicists for a long time. The traditional goal is to uncover the underlying rules to understand the observed complexity and the universality induced. This approach has been successful in phenomena such as phase transition [2] and has been applied to flocks of birds [3] and shoals of fish [4]. A classic example is the Vicsek [5] model to understand the flocking of birds. In such models, there are usually some ad hoc forces acting on the agents. However, for animals, obviously no such forces exist. Instead, information exchange [6] between the animals is the fundamental cause of their changes in motions and therefore the emerging complexity. However, very little is known about how information is being exchanged between the animals and how this information is responsible for the observed behavior [7].

Zebrafish are known to perform U-turns (UTs) during escape behaviors, exploration, or when navigating environments [8]. Presumably, these UTs might also serve as signals to other fish. In fact, it is reported that member fish in a group detect and perform UTs[9] during their group coordination and leadership maintenance in their collective motion. However, there is still no basic understanding of dynamics of these UTs. When these UTs are observed in a group with close proximity of other fish, it is difficult to single out the causal relation between the UTs performed by a pair of fish because information can come from multiple sources at various distance which is known to affect interaction between two fish [10].

Here we report the results of our experiments designed to probe the information exchange between a pair of visually coupled zebrafish at different minimal distance (d). We find that when d is small, the pair can display a LFR with trajectories of similar forms. However, with larger d , although the same LFR is still maintained, the originally similar trajectories turn into different forms. Detailed analysis of their trajectories suggests that the pair might use UTs to exchange information and to maintain a LFR. The transition of their trajectories into different forms can be understood as the result of a decrease in information exchange as d is increased. A simulation model with these inferred and some proposed UTs rules is able to reproduce prominent features in observed trajectories. Our finding that UTs as important visual signals is consistent with the fact that UTs can induce a large amount of firings in retinas of observing fish [11]. Our study not only advances our understanding of zebrafish social interactions but also contributes to broader insights into the physical principles governing animal communication.

Our experiments were carried out in a rectangular ($23\text{cm} \times 15\text{cm}$) tank with three channels formed by two parallel windows (0.2 cm thick) d apart and each zebrafish from a pair is placed on each of the lateral channels. The two fish can see each other but they are kept at a minimum distance of d (upper inset of Figure 1). The water levels in all the three channels are 2 cm. Motions of the two fish are recorded by a CCD camera at 30 frames per second with a spatial resolution of 0.214 mm/pixel. To start an experiment, a fish pair is obtained randomly from a tank with 50 fish and the pair will be returned to the tank after experiment. We find that a settlement time of 0, 2.5, 5 and 10 minutes before the start of an experiment recording did not affect the results. A total of 77 experiments with 13 pairs of fish have been performed with successful trajectories extraction by `idtrackerai` [12]. For the health of the fish, the total experiment period per day is limited to 60 minutes. All experiments were performed at 25°C . Since we cannot compare or average results obtained from different fish pair, results reported below are based on a series of experiments performed with the same pair of fish in the same day to avoid variability. However, the results reported below are the general features common to these 13 pairs of fish.

When the fish pair interact through the transparent windows, their trajectories can be classified as EE, EL and LL. In the EE type (inset of Figure 1) both fish are always moving close the barrier trying reach for the other fish. As they are swimming mostly along the length of the barrier (x-axis), their trajectories are dominated by their x-coordinates and denoted as $X_1(t)$ and $X_2(t)$ for Fish 1 and Fish 2 respectively as shown in Figure 1. Clearly, the dynamics of X_1 and X_2 are almost synchronized and their trajectories are consisted of fast gliding parts in the middle and oscillating parts close the to ends of the channel (lower inset of Figure 1). This mutual engaging (EE) interaction is often seen when $d = 0.4\text{cm}$.

In the EL type (Figure 2), there is only one engaging fish (E-fish) which always moves close the barrier while the less-engaging fish (L-fish) is not; leading to significance difference in dynamics between X_1 and X_2 . The trajectory of the L-fish is now mostly gliding along the length of the channel and no oscillatory motions close to the ends of the channel. Interestingly, the E-fish is seen to be following the L-fish but with a faster speed because the E-fish sometimes reverses its direction a couple of times. This EL type is often seen when $d > 0.4$ or 1.4 cm. The LL type (not shown) is that both fish are of the less engaging type when d is even larger.

Obviously, the change in information exchange between the fish causes the transition from




FIG. 1. Time course $X_1(t)$ and $X_2(t)$ in an experiment with $d = 0.4$ cm. Upper inset: trajectories of the two fish in the two channels (not correct aspect ratio); the green lines are the two windows which is d apart. Lower inset: enlarged view of $X_1(t)$ and $X_2(t)$ showing fluctuations near the end of the channel.




FIG. 2. Time course $X_1(t)$ and $X_2(t)$ in an experiment with $d = 3.4$ cm. Upper inset: trajectories the two fish in the two channels (not correct aspect ratio); the green lines are the two windows which is d apart. Lower inset: enlarged view of $X_1(t)$ and $X_2(t)$ showing the difference in the dynamics of Fish1 and Fish 2.

EE to EL type when d is increased. In order to find out how information is being shared between the two fish as a function of d , we have computed time lag mutual information (cross-TLMI) [13] between X_1 and X_2 as shown in Figure 3. From the figure, we find that one fish is a leader because the peak positions of the cross-TLMI are always located at positive time lags and the leader fish is the L-fish (Fish 2). This observation is supported by the insets in Figure 1 and 2 in which one can see clearly that the trajectories of Fish 2 is leading those from Fish 1. The peak characteristics in Figure 3 indicate further that

the roles of the two fish in the LFR remain unchanged even when d increases. However, their shared information (peak height in cross-TLMI) decreases with increasing d . Thus, the E-fish is following the L-fish by receiving position information of the L-fish but this information decreases as d increases.




FIG. 3. Effects of separation distance on the cross-TLMI between $X_1(t)$ and $X_2(t)$. In all the TLMI measurements here and below, the noise level of our data are estimated by the TLMI obtained by random shuffling of data and we find that the noise level never exceeds 2% of the peak of the corresponding TLMI. Both X_1 and X_2 are discretized with a 2 bit resolution. Insets show the auto-TLMI. All the trajectories are EL type except for $d = 0.4$ and 1.4 cm which are EE type.




FIG. 4. Effects of detrending on the form of cross-TLMI between $x_1(t)$ and $x_2(t)$. Insets show the auto-TLMI. The data used are the same as those shown in Figure 3 but with the data being detrended with $t_s = 1s$. A shorter t_s will give smaller cross-TLMI peaks.

The TLMIs reported above are dominated by the large fluctuations in $X_1(t)$ and $X_2(t)$ and are not sensitive to the relatively small fluctuations (UTs) around their mean trajectories. We use detrending to expose these fluctuations [14]. The detrended version of $X_1(t)$ is

defined as: $x_1(t) \equiv X_1(t) - S(X_1(t), t_s)$ where $S(X_1(t), t_s)$ is the smoothed version $X_1(t)$ with a smoothing window of size t_s and similarly for $x_2(t)$. Obviously, $x_1(t)$ will contain mainly the fast fluctuations or the UTs shown in the insets of Figure 1 and 2.

Figure 4 shows the cross-TLMI obtained between $x_1(t)$ and $x_2(t)$. There are two main differences between the TLMI shown in Figure 3 and Figure 4. First, for the auto-TLMI, the decay is much faster in the detrended version as the slow mean motion is removed. Second, there are now side peaks on both side of the central zero lag peak of their auto-TLMI; indicating that there are quasi-periodic fluctuations (UTs) in both $x_1(t)$ and $x_2(t)$. For Fish 1, the side peaks appear for all the d while there are side peaks only for $d = 0.4$ and 1.4 cm for Fish 2. Since the leader is Fish 2, it is reasonable to assume that the side peaks (UTs) are signals used by the fish to get attention from other fish to get engagement. That is: the leader fish wants attentions from the follower fish only for small d . This assumption is consistent also with the observation that Fish 2 are always engaging (swims close to the barrier) and has side peaks in all the auto-TLMI for various d . With this assumption, it does not come as a surprise that only for $d = 0.4$ and 1.4 cm, the cross-TLMI between $x_1(t)$ and $x_2(t)$ have significant peaks. That is: the two fish is exchanging information with each other only when d is small. Similar to the finding in their non-detrended version, the cross-TLMI of $x_1(t)$ and $x_2(t)$ also indicated that the Fish 2 is the leading fish. That is: the information embedded in both positions and UTs of Fish 2 are ahead of those from Fish 1.

The picture emerges from discussions above is that there is a LFR between the fish pair and the leader is the L-fish while the follower is E-fish. Also, the transition in the form of their trajectories are most likely due the changes in information exchange between the fish pair as d is varied. Presumably, for large d , the leader ignores the follower; swims in a straight line and reverses its direction only when it is close to the boundaries. However, the follower is always following the leader and performing UTs at the same time. Since UTs are not needed just for following, most likely the UTs of the follower are also used as signals to acknowledge its detection of the leader. This assumption is not only consistent with the fact that no UTs of leader in large d but also with the the observations that the leader starts to perform UTs when it reverses its direction close to the boundaries for small d because the leader will then see the follower. Once this happens, the two fish will engage in mutual UTs responses seen in Figure 1 close to the boundaries. Here, d is important because we assume that the leader will ignore the follower when d is large.

With the above picture, a phenomenological simulation model is developed to understand our data based on the UTs as both signals and slow down mechanism for the interaction of the two fish. In this model, the follower (Fish 1) and leader (Fish 2) move always with constant speeds v_1 and v_2 respectively and they are moving in the interval $[0,1]$. When they reach the boundaries of $[0,1]$ they will reverse their directions. Both fish can slow down but still maintain their direction by performing two successive U-turns (2UTs) with a time separation between the two UTs being τ_u . These 2UTs are also signals used to exchange information between the two fish. In the model, the update rule is: $X_i(n+1) = X_i(n) + \lambda_i(n)v_i$ ($i = 1$ or 2) where $X_i(n)$ is the position of the Fish i and $\lambda_i(n)$ is the direction indicator which can be ± 1 at the n -th step. UTs are implemented by appropriate changes in $\lambda_i(n)$.

Since the leader will slow down when it is close to the boundaries, these slow down is implemented as spontaneous 2UTs with a probability of P_s per simulation step. In the simulation, the leader will be performing spontaneous 2UTs when it is within a certain distance (slow-down zone) from the boundaries d_s while the follower will be responding to these 2UTs with its own 2UTs with a time delay τ_d to account for reaction time. Finally, in order to maintain the LFR, the follower will perform 2UTs to slow down when it needs to maintain the LFR with a minimal separation of d_{min} from the leader.

Figure 5 are the typical results of this simulation model for the case of small d . It can be seen that the trajectories for both fish are almost synchronized with a LFR. Although v_1 and v_2 are equal in Figure 5, a LFR can still be observed because the follower will execute 2UTs to wait for the leader to lead. These waiting UTs can be seen clearly at time zero in Figure 5. Similar to the experimental observations for small d , the simulated trajectories are consisted of two parts; linear part in the middle of the $[0,1]$ and fluctuations close to two end of the interval $[0,1]$. These fluctuations are the 2UTs performed by the the leader because P_s is set to 0.15 here and the follower is also responding with its own 2UTs with a time delay of $\tau_d = 13$ steps. The engagement of these mutual UTs stops when the leader moves out of the slow-down zone where $P_s = 0$.

The cross-TLMI of the detrended trajectories obtained from the simulation is also shown in the lower inset of Figure 5. Similar to that from the experiment (Figure 4), the cross-TLMI has multiple peaks because of the quasi-periodic nature of the correlated UTs from the leader and follower. The location of the main (tallest) peak is determined by the delay in the response of the follower to the UTs of the leader.




FIG. 5. Simulated trajectories of the follower (Fish 1) and leader (Fish 2) in the interval $[0,1]$ for the case of small d . Parameters are: $v_1 = v_2 = 0.003$, $\tau_d = 13$, $d_s = 0.2$, $d_{min} = 0.05$ and $P_s = 0.15$. Lower inset: the cross-TLMI for this small d case and the time delay of tallest peak is determined by τ_d between the UTs of the α and follower. Upper inset: simulated trajectories for the case of large d . Parameters are the same as stated above except for $v_2 = 0.005$ and $v_1 = 0.009$ and $P_s = 0$.

For the case of large d , shown in the upper inset of Figure 5, the leader is not engaging with the follower and it will not perform any spontaneous 2UTs. In this case, $P_s = 0$ and therefore the leader will be moving with a linear trajectory. As for the follower, we need to set a higher speed for it because it will then perform 2UTs to implement to LFR as observed in the experiment. There would be more 2UTs shown in the inset if the difference in v_1 and v_2 were larger. Figure 5 reproduces the essential features of the observed trajectories shown in Figure 1 and 2.

From the discussions above, it is clear that the apparent complex transition of the trajectories of fish pair when d is changed can be understood from our simulation with simple rules. Of course, not all the features of the trajectories can be reproduced. For example, the form of the trajectories of the follower fish between 100 to 140s in Figure 2 are not reproduced. Presumably, interactions between animals are complex and our simple rules probably work only in a very specific situation seen in our experiments. Of all the simple rules, the most interesting one is the 2UTs inspired by the quasi-periodic nature of the cross-TLMI in Figure 4. Since the fish can only communicate visually, our assumption that these UTs are signals is consistent with the fact that motion reversal will trigger a large amount of firing in retina [11] of the observing fish. Therefore, these 2UTs can serve both as a speed controller and a signal generator. There is asymmetry in the simulation rules because of the

directional nature of the LFR and the visual information transfer when the leader cannot see the follower.

We do not model the response of the leader to the UTs of follower because the leader cannot see the follower if they are swimming in the same direction. When they are both performing UTs close to the boundaries as shown in Figure 1, they should be able to see each other. However, we do not have any evidence that the leader-fish is responding the UTs of the follower because the UTs from the leader are always ahead of those of follower as seen in Figure 4. Finally, we must stress that the situation in our experiment is quite different from the normal case when the fish are swimming and interacting freely. The UTs modeled here might not be the same the UTs [9] seen in the coordination of freely moving fish groups.

This work has been supported by the MOST of ROC under the grant number 111-2112-M-001-032.

-
- [1] T. Vicsek and A. Zafeiris, *Physics reports* **517**, 71 (2012).
 - [2] H. E. Stanley, *Phase transitions and critical phenomena* (Clarendon Press, Oxford, AD-DRESS, 1971), Vol. 7.
 - [3] T. Mora *et al.*, *Nature physics* **12**, 1153 (2016).
 - [4] Y. Katz *et al.*, *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* **108**, 18720 (2011).
 - [5] T. Vicsek *et al.*, *Physical review letters* **75**, 1226 (1995).
 - [6] I. D. Couzin *et al.*, *Advances in the Study of Behavior* **32**, 10 (2003).
 - [7] G. Rieucau, A. Fernö, C. C. Ioannou, and N. O. Handegard, *Reviews in Fish Biology and Fisheries* **25**, 21 (2015).
 - [8] V. Lecheval *et al.*, *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences* **285**, 20180251 (2018).
 - [9] V. Lecheval *et al.*, *BioRxiv* 138628 (2017).
 - [10] J. K. Parrish and L. Edelstein-Keshet, *Science* **284**, 99 (1999).
 - [11] G. Schwartz *et al.*, *Neuron* **55**, 958 (2007).
 - [12] S. Van der Walt *et al.*, *PeerJ* **2**, e453 (2014).
 - [13] P.-Y. Chou *et al.*, *Physical Review E* **103**, L020401 (2021).

- [14] H. Robert *et al.*, Time Series Analysis and Its Applications With R Examples Second Edition, 2006.