

How can birds find their way across an ocean?

Juan Segurolo · All Rights Reserved

QUE · Article 039 · Simple Questions, Deep Answers · Version 0.1 EN

An ocean may look nearly featureless to a human passenger while offering information that matters to a seabird. The absence of visible road signs is not the absence of navigational cues. The challenge is to discover which information a particular bird uses, under which conditions, and how an experiment can distinguish navigation from simply maintaining a direction.

A compass answers “which way?” A map-like system supplies information about location relative to a destination. A bird can possess one without a complete version of the other. After an unexpected displacement, keeping its previous heading may be precisely the wrong response. That is why displacement experiments are especially informative.

1. Return is an outcome, not a mechanism

A tracking record can show that a bird returned to its colony. It does not, by itself, identify the cue responsible. Several sensory explanations may predict roughly the same route when they provide compatible information. A successful arrival therefore supports navigational competence without uniquely identifying its machinery.

A stronger test changes access to a proposed cue and compares the result with suitable controls. The inference still needs care. A manipulation might affect motivation, health or flight as well as information. The relevant question is not merely whether one group returned, but whether the pattern specifically supports the proposed navigational function.

2. An ocean displacement experiment

Gagliardo and colleagues displaced Cory's shearwaters nesting in the Azores and released them in the open ocean about 800 kilometres from their colony. Birds deprived of smell were strongly impaired in orientation and homing; magnetically disturbed birds performed similarly to unmanipulated controls under that experiment. [1]

This supports a role for olfactory information in that homing task. It does not establish that all seabirds use the same system, that magnetic information is irrelevant to every journey, or that a bird can directly smell its colony from the release site. The negative magnetic-manipulation result belongs to the species, treatment and circumstances tested.

The difference between smelling a destination and using distributed odour information is important. A navigation system could learn how environmental odours vary over space, then use encountered combinations to constrain its position. That is a map-like proposal. It requires evidence about geographical patterns and their use, not simply proof that smell matters.

3. What a flight pattern can add

Reynolds and colleagues analysed seabird flight patterns in relation to olfactory-map hypotheses. Their paper explicitly notes that impaired homing after loss of smell suggests an olfactory role without, by itself, demonstrating the full map mechanism. [2] This distinction prevents an experimental intervention from doing more explanatory work than it can bear.

Movement statistics can test predictions of a candidate search or navigation model. But consistency is weaker than exclusivity. If another mechanism generates similar tracks, a fit cannot identify one uniquely. Wind, the distribution of usable information and the bird's behavioural state can all affect the observed path, so a model must say which features are diagnostic.

A hypothetical geometry makes the ambiguity clear. A bird 800 kilometres from home that maintains a direction ten degrees away from the correct straight-line bearing would be about 139 kilometres laterally displaced after flying 800 kilometres, since $800 \sin(10 \text{ degrees})$ is about 139. This ignores wind, curvature and course corrections. It illustrates why a compass bearing and a means of correcting positional error are different requirements, not the accuracy achieved in the shearwater experiment.

4. A magnetic molecule is not yet a complete navigator

There is also experimental evidence relevant to magnetic sensing. Xu and colleagues showed that cryptochrome 4 from the European robin had magnetically sensitive photochemistry *in vitro*. The study compared proteins and examined mutations relevant to radical-pair processes. [3]

"*In vitro*" limits the inference. A molecular response outside the animal is evidence for a candidate physical mechanism, not a complete demonstration of how a freely flying bird extracts a direction, combines it with other cues or chooses a route. The chain from molecule to behaviour has multiple links.

It would be equally mistaken to ignore the molecular result because those links remain incomplete. A proposed receptor mechanism becomes more testable when its chemistry can be manipulated. The distinction is between evidence for a component and closure of the whole navigational explanation.

5. Several questions remain open at once

Which cues are available depends on species, location, weather, experience and the task. Evidence from an ocean displacement cannot automatically be transferred to a young songbird's first migration or to a bird navigating close to a familiar coast. The conditions that make a cue informative can matter as much as the ability to detect it.

Even the word map should not be taken to imply a human-style internal chart. An animal could combine learned gradients, directional references and local recognition without representing latitude and longitude. A functional map-like capacity is defined by what it enables the bird to do, while its internal representation remains an empirical question.

The answer is therefore plural but not vague. Experiments show that specific birds can exploit information invisible to a casual human observer, and manipulations can identify contributions from particular senses. For Cory's shearwaters in the cited displacement experiment, olfaction was especially important. The open question is how such information is represented and combined to guide a changing journey. Calling the ability instinct names neither the cue nor the mechanism.

References

[1] Gagliardo, A., et al. Oceanic navigation in Cory's shearwaters: evidence for a crucial role of olfactory cues for homing after displacement. *Journal of Experimental Biology* 216, 2798–2805 (2013).
<https://doi.org/10.1242/jeb.085738>

[2] Reynolds, A. M., et al. Pelagic seabird flight patterns are consistent with a reliance on olfactory maps for oceanic navigation. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B* 282, 20150468 (2015).
<https://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2015.0468>

[3] Xu, J., et al. Magnetic sensitivity of cryptochrome 4 from a migratory songbird. Nature 594, 535–540 (2021). <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-021-03618-9>

Related reading

Article 040: How do we recognise intelligence in an animal very different from us?