



HAL
open science

Effect of embryonic light exposure on laterality and sociality in quail chicks (*Coturnix coturnix japonica*)

Isabelle George, Noémie Lerch, Christelle Jozet-Alves, Sophie Lumineau

► To cite this version:

Isabelle George, Noémie Lerch, Christelle Jozet-Alves, Sophie Lumineau. Effect of embryonic light exposure on laterality and sociality in quail chicks (*Coturnix coturnix japonica*). *Applied Animal Behaviour Science*, 2021, 236, pp.105270. 10.1016/j.applanim.2021.105270 . hal-03145313

HAL Id: hal-03145313

<https://univ-rennes.hal.science/hal-03145313v1>

Submitted on 12 Mar 2021

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.


L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

Isabelle George, Noémie Lerch, Christelle Jozet-Alves, Sophie Lumineau.
Effect of embryonic light exposure on laterality and sociality in quail chicks
(*Coturnix coturnix japonica*). Applied Animal Behaviour Science, Elsevier,
2021, 236, pp.105270. ⟨hal-03145313⟩

Authors' post-print

Editor's version available at the following:

<https://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.applanim.2021.105270>



1 Effect of embryonic light exposure on laterality
2 and sociality in quail chicks (*Coturnix coturnix*
3 *japonica*)

4 Isabelle George^{1,*}, Noémie Lerch¹, Christelle Jozet-Alves^{1,2}, Sophie Lumineau¹

5 ¹Univ Rennes, Normandie Univ, CNRS, EthoS (Éthologie animale et humaine) - UMR 6552, F-35000
6 Rennes, France

7 ²Normandie Univ, Unicaen, CNRS, EthoS, 14000 Caen, FRANCE

8 *Corresponding author:

9 Isabelle GEORGE

10 UMR 6552 - EthoS

11 263 avenue du Général Leclerc

12 Campus de Beaulieu – Bâtiment 25

13 35042 Rennes cedex, France

14 isabelle.george@univ-rennes1.fr, +33223236863

15 **ABSTRACT**

16 Lateralization is the ascendancy of one side of the body or the brain to control and perform motor or
17 perceptual functions. Light exposure during prenatal life can modulate the expression of visual
18 lateralization (strength and direction) in a variety of species, including birds. Individual lateralization
19 provides cognitive advantages, but the function of lateralization at the population level is less
20 obvious. Recent studies support the hypothesis that intra-specific population-level lateralization may
21 favour coordination between asymmetrical individuals during synergistic (cooperative) social
22 interactions. Since cohesion requires a good coordination, one can therefore imagine that a higher
23 alignment of lateralization within a group, by making coordination between individuals easier, may
24 promote social cohesion. Our study investigated the effect of light on laterality and social behaviour
25 in Japanese quail chicks (*Coturnix coturnix japonica*). We compared chicks coming from eggs exposed
26 to light during incubation to chicks coming from eggs maintained in complete darkness. We expected
27 light-exposed (LE) chicks to be more aligned than dark-incubated (DI) ones and we wanted to test
28 whether the most aligned chicks were also the most coordinated. We assessed laterality, social
29 motivation, synchronization and spatial cohesion within groups of LE and DI chicks. The prenatal light
30 conditions did not affect either laterality or chicks' social behaviour, and there was no turning bias at
31 the group level. An absolute laterality index characterizing the alignment of chicks living together
32 showed that the groups with the highest indices were not necessarily the groups with the greatest
33 synchronization and spatial cohesion. This suggests that light does not consistently induce laterality
34 in Japanese quail chicks and that the alignment of the chicks' turning bias does not influence their
35 social cohesion. Quails are widely used in farm industry and scientific research and better knowledge
36 of the consequences of incubation conditions on their behavioural asymmetries and sociality could
37 help improve their handling and welfare.

38 Keywords: turning bias; visuo-motor lateralisation; prenatal experience; lateralisation level;
39 behavioural synchronization; spatial cohesion

40 1 INTRODUCTION

41 Laterality is when one side of the body takes advantage over the other one to perform motor or
42 sensory activities (Glick, 1985). It exists in humans and most animal species, including invertebrates
43 (e.g. see Güntürkün et al., 2020; Rogers et al., 2013; Versace and Vallortigara, 2015 for recent
44 reviews). Among behavioural asymmetries, visual lateralization has been widely studied in birds
45 because their eyes are placed laterally and the optic nerves decussate almost completely (Ehrlich and
46 Mark, 1984; Remy and Güntürkün, 1991; Takatsuji et al., 1983; Weidner et al., 1985). This makes
47 them natural “split-brain” models whose eyes and each contralateral hemisphere can be tested
48 independently, which may help in understanding the brain asymmetries that govern lateralization.

49 Light is known to modulate visual lateralization and hence visually guided behaviours, particularly in
50 birds (e.g. domestic chicks: Casey and Karpinski, 1999; Rogers, 1990, 1982; bobwhite quail: Casey and
51 Lickliter, 1998; pigeons: Güntürkün, 1993; for a review see Chiandetti, 2017). Asymmetrical
52 stimulation of the right eye due to the position of the embryo in the egg (which causes the left eye to
53 be occluded because it is oriented towards the body) is decisive for several forms of visual
54 lateralization (Chiandetti, 2017). In the domestic chick, over-exposure of the right eye to light can
55 reinforce the population bias whereas exposure of the left eye can induce a reversal of this bias.
56 Incubation in the dark can suppress the development of some forms of lateralization at the
57 population level (Rogers, 1990).

58 Individual lateralization (when each individual favours one side over the other) can give a cognitive
59 advantage, but the function of lateralization at the population level (when most individuals favour
60 the same side) is less obvious (see Vallortigara and Rogers, 2020 for a review of costs and benefits of
61 these two degrees of lateralization). According to some authors, the alignment of individuals’ biases
62 may have evolved as an evolutionary stable strategy in which asymmetrical individuals must
63 coordinate their behaviour with that of other asymmetrical individuals (Ghirlanda et al., 2009;
64 Ghirlanda and Vallortigara, 2004; Vallortigara, 2006; Vallortigara and Rogers, 2020, 2005). For

65 Ghirlanda et al. (2009), population-level lateralization could be advantageous in intra-specific social
66 interactions by making coordination easier. Thus, synergistic activities could favour individuals with
67 the same lateralization because they can, for instance, have an easier time coordinating physical
68 activities (see also Frasnelli and Vallortigara, 2018). Here we wanted to check whether groups made
69 of individuals with the same lateralization would indeed have an easier time synchronizing their
70 activities and staying cohesive.

71 Although the domestic chick and the pigeon have been the two most popular models since
72 researchers began studying visual lateralization in birds, more recently Japanese quails have also
73 been studied more extensively (e.g. Casey and Sleight, 2014; Valenti et al., 2003; Zucca and Sovrano,
74 2008). Japanese quails have been domesticated for centuries (Cheng et al., 2010). Because of their
75 relatively small size and fast development, they quickly became popular in both farm industry and
76 scientific research. Although quails are difficult to observe in the wild due to their small size and their
77 secretive habits, several studies have shown that, during the breeding season, they live in small
78 family groups or single pairs, in areas where they hardly tolerate other quails (Farris, 1964; Nichols,
79 1991; Wetherbee, 1961). Japanese quail chicks do not naturally exhibit turning bias and footedness
80 (Casey, 2005; Casey and Sleight, 2001). However, the chicks, but not the adults, are lateralized in the
81 “pebble floor” task (which consists in distinguishing edible grains from pebbles stuck to the ground)
82 (Valenti et al., 2003). Adult quails, on the other hand, appear to be lateralized in a detour task using a
83 social target (Zucca and Sovrano, 2008) and when they are trained to run across either a left- or a
84 right-turning runway to obtain sexual access to a conspecific of the opposite sex (Gülbetekin et al.,
85 2009, 2007). Recently, by manipulating prenatal visual stimulation after having removed the shell
86 and inner-shell membrane of the egg, Casey and Sleight (2014) managed to induce individual- and
87 population-level motor lateralization in Japanese quail chicks. Stimulated chicks showed a turning
88 bias that unstimulated chicks did not show. Although embryonic exposure to light is likely to be
89 reduced in wild quails, stimulating embryos with light could be useful to manipulate lateralization, at

90 the individual as well as at the population level, and to better understand the link between
91 lateralization and social behaviour.

92 Here, to test the effect of light on population-level laterality and social behaviour, and to determine
93 whether the alignment of behavioural asymmetries can facilitate social interactions between
94 individuals, we compared the turning bias, temporal synchronisation, spatial cohesion and social
95 motivation of groups of quail chicks coming from eggs that had been either incubated in the dark or
96 temporarily exposed to light before the end of incubation. We expected that exposure to light would
97 create differences in visuo-motor lateralization between exposed and unexposed chicks, and we
98 wanted to see if the most lateralized chicks were also the most coordinated and socially motivated.

99 2 MATERIAL AND METHODS

100 All the experiments were carried out in accordance with the European Communities Council Directive
101 of 22th September 2010 (2010/63/EU) and were approved by the regional ethics committee (French
102 “Comité Rennais d’Ethique en matière d’Expérimentation Animale / n°7”, permit number:
103 APAFIS#17476-2018110716226608 v2).

104 2.1 Incubation

105 We placed commercial fertilized Japanese quail eggs (“Les cailles de Chanteloup”, Corps-Nuds,
106 France) in two incubators (Ova-Easy Advance 380, Brinsea). From day 1 of incubation to day 15,
107 incubation parameters were the same for all eggs: 37.7 °C, 45% humidity and a rotation of 45
108 degrees every 30 minutes, and both incubators were in the dark. After 15 days of incubation, to
109 induce hatching, we changed the parameters of both incubators to 37.7°C, 65% humidity and no
110 rotation. At the same time, we interchanged half of the eggs of each incubator in order to avoid any
111 incubator bias. From that moment, the eggs of one of the incubators were lit continuously for 41
112 hours by a “daylight” led (6400°K, 600 lumens) placed in front of the incubator while the eggs of the
113 second incubator stayed in the dark. After the 41 hours of exposition to light, we again placed all the


114 eggs in the dark until hatching on day 17 to 18, that is within 24 hours after the end of the
115 stimulation. Since light intensity within the incubator was 20-30 Lux, luminous exposure was 2.9×10^6
116 to 4.4×10^6 lx.s (for comparison, luminous exposure was 0.7×10^6 to 3.6×10^6 in Rogers, 1982). Japanese
117 quail's eggs have brown spots that may reduce the amount of light that reaches the embryo. We
118 therefore decided to stimulate the eggs longer, and thus started the stimulation earlier, than in the
119 study of Casey and Sleigh (2014) on quails. However, the end of the stimulation was similar to theirs.

120 2.2 Maintenance of the chicks

121 The day of hatching (day 1, D1), we weighed the chicks, ringed them with one plastic ring on each
122 leg, and placed them in heated plastic cages (L90xI40xH30cm) with a plastic net and wood shavings
123 on the floor. We provided food and water ad libitum. Dark-incubated (DI) and light-exposed (LE)
124 chicks were in the same room but not in the same cages. At post-hatching day 3 (D3), we separated
125 120 of the chicks that had hatched in 2x10 groups of six chicks (n=60 DI and 60 LE chicks). At this age
126 chicks cannot be sexed so we have constituted the groups without knowing their sex ratio. After 3
127 weeks, we sexed the birds and found that the sex ratio did not differ between DI and LE birds (DI:
128 females = 36, males = 23; LE: females = 31, males = 27; Fisher's exact test, $p=0.46$,
129 <https://biostatgv.sentiweb.fr/?module=tests/fisher>).

130 On the day of hatching, when we took all the chicks that had hatched, DI chicks (n=106) were heavier
131 than LE chicks (n=104) (mean \pm SD: DI chicks' weight = 10.51 ± 0.93 g, LE chick's weight = 10.26 ± 0.79 g;
132 Student $t=2.03$, $ddl=208$, $p\text{-value}=0.04$), but the effect was small (Hedges' $g = (10264 - 10507) /$
133 $862.06 = 0.28$; <https://www.socscistatistics.com/effectsize/default3.aspx>). Anyway, by mixing chicks
134 of different weights within each experimental group, we constituted groups of DI and LE chicks
135 whose average weights were not significantly different (n=60 chicks in each group, DI chicks' weight =
136 10.43 ± 0.68 g, LE chicks' weight = 10.28 ± 0.66 g; Student $t=1.17$, $ddl=118$, $p=0.24$). We placed all the
137 six-chick groups in the same room in separate metal cages (L100xI70xH65cm) equipped with a
138 heating lamp, a feeder and a drinking trough (Figure 1). The different groups could hear but not see

139 each other. Room temperature was 20 to 25°C and the artificial light followed a L:D rhythm of 12:12.
140 During the first week of life, we provided green light during the night to enable the chicks to see the
141 feeder and drinking trough if they need to eat or drink. We counterbalanced the positions of the DI
142 and LE chicks' groups in the room in order to avoid a bias due to the position of the cage. We also
143 counterbalanced the positions of the feeder and the drinking trough within the cages. We turned off
144 heating lamps after 15 days. Under natural conditions, quail chicks are able to regulate their body
145 temperature and they become independent by 11 days after hatching, (Mills et al., 1997; Orcutt, Jr.
146 and Orcutt, 1976).




147
148 **Figure 1:** Schematic representation of a home cage. The dotted lines show the virtual boundaries we
149 used to locate the chicks during behavioural observations.

150 2.3 Laterality tests

151 On D3, once the six-chick groups were formed, we tested the turning bias of the 120 chicks by placing
152 each of them once in a T-maze (Figure 2). The T-maze was in a soundproof room homogeneously
153 lighted. We regularly changed the orientation of the maze in the room (90° turn each time) so that a
154 quarter of the chicks (n=15 DI and 15 LE chicks) passed the test in each of the four positions. At the
155 beginning of each test, the experimenter placed a chick in the longest, stem branch of the T-maze,

156 facing the wall, and stood still behind this branch. The chick was free to move in the maze during 3
157 minutes. The test stopped as soon as the chick turned in one of the distal branches (i.e. both legs
158 were in the branch; see Figure 2) or after 3 minutes, and the experimenter noted which side (left or
159 right) the chick chose. We also tested all the chicks in the same way on D10-11 and D22-23. In order
160 to adapt to their growth, we used a larger maze (Figure 2). We also had to conduct the tests over two
161 days because they moved much less at these ages (Figure 3).



162
163 **Figure 2:** T-maze that we used to test the laterality of the chicks. The smallest dimensions correspond
164 to the size of the maze that we used on D3, and the largest dimensions to the size of the maze that
165 we used on D10-11 and D22-23. We considered that the chick had chosen one branch of the maze
166 when both legs crossed one of the two virtual lines represented here as dotted lines.

167 2.4 Behavioural observations

168 In order to evaluate the spatial cohesion and the temporal coordination of each group of six chicks,
169 we observed the chicks directly in their home cage with the instantaneous scan-sampling method.
170 Each group was observed 60 times during 12s in two 135-min sessions (one from 8:00 h to 10:15 h
171 and one from 15:30 h to 17:45 h), with an interval of 4min30s between two consecutive scans of the
172 same group. We noted the behaviour (resting, moving, exploring, eating, drinking, observing,
173 vocalising, preening and touching another chick) and position of all the chicks in each group. To
174 position the chicks, we virtually divided the cage into six 34x34cm squares (Figure 1). Behavioural

175 observations were made on D4, D7, D9, D11 and D15, amounting to 300 scans for each group of 6
176 chicks.

177 2.5 Social motivation test

178 On D16 and D17, the chicks were isolated one by one in their home cage to test their social
179 motivation. We removed all the chicks from the same home cage and then put them back one by one
180 in this cage. There was only one chick at a time in the home cage and the other chicks were kept
181 together in a room far enough away so that the isolated chick could not hear them. When they lose
182 visual contact with peers, quail chicks usually try to re-establish contact by emitting distress calls that
183 are calls of high social value (Guyomarc'h and Guyomarc'h, 1996). These calls are loud calls that are
184 easily recognisable and they are the only loud calls that are produced when quail chicks are isolated.
185 We noted the latency of the first distress call and the total number of calls during 3 minutes. After
186 these 3 minutes, the isolated chick was removed, placed back with the others and another chick was
187 placed alone in the cage for 3 minutes, until all six chicks had been tested.

188 This test measures both social motivation and emotivity. However, by leaving the tested chick in the
189 home cage, that is in a familiar environment, we tried to make it feel as safe as possible. This allowed
190 us to avoid an emotional or fear response due to novelty and a supposedly dangerous situation and
191 to thus preferentially measure the social dimension of the chicks' response.

192 2.6 Statistical analyses

193 We compared the number of DI and LE chicks having turned (left or right) or not in the T-maze, and
194 the number of chicks turning left and right, using Chi-squared tests within (goodness of fit) and
195 between (homogeneity) the experimental conditions, using Microsoft Excel 2019.

196 To evaluate social behaviour, we calculated two indices from the scans (Lumineau et al., 2001). The
197 first index was a temporal synchronisation (TS) index. To calculate this index, we distinguished two
198 types of behaviours: high-energy behaviours (eating, drinking, moving, exploring and vocalising) and

199 low-energy behaviours (resting, observing, preening and pecking another chick). If, for one day of
200 observation, A is the number of chicks of the same group having high-energy behaviours in one scan
201 “i”, R is the number of chicks having low-energy behaviours in the same scan and N the total number
202 of chicks per group (6) multiplied by the total number of scans per day (60), then: $TS = \sum_{i=1}^{60} \frac{|Ai - Ri|}{N}$. TS
203 was 1 when all the chicks of the group were having the same type of behaviour (either high- or low-
204 energy) in all the scans and 0 when half of the chicks were having one type of behaviour while the
205 other half was having the other one. We obtained one TS value per group of 6 chicks and per day of
206 observation. The second index was a spatial cohesion (SC) index. In each scan, there was n_1 chicks in
207 the virtual square 1, n_2 in the virtual square 2... and n_6 in the virtual square 6. Using these values, we
208 calculated the ratio between the variance and the mean number of chicks per virtual square per
209 scan. This ratio was 6 when all the chicks were in the same square, and 0 when there was one chick
210 in each square. We then averaged the values of the 60 scans to obtain one SC value per group of six
211 chicks and per day of observation. We compared DI and LE chicks’ TS and SC indices obtained for all
212 days with permutation tests using `Rd_kheradPajouh_renaud` to handle nuisance variables and 50000
213 permutations (R v4.0.0 with `permuco` package; Frossard and Renaud, 2019; R Core Team, 2020).

214 To compare the social motivation of the two experimental groups, we performed Mann-Whitney
215 tests with the latency of the first distress call and the total number of calls as variables (R v4.0.0; R
216 Core Team, 2020).

217 Finally, in order to see if there was a correlation between the alignment of laterality and the social
218 cohesion within the groups of 6 chicks, we calculated for every group and for each test day in the T-
219 maze an absolute laterality index (AbsLI) whose formula was: $|L-R|/L+R$ where L was the number of
220 chicks who turned left and R the number of chicks who turned right. This index was 1 when all the
221 chicks turned on the same side and 0 when half of the chicks turned on one side and the other half
222 on the other side. We kept only the groups in which at least three of the six chicks chose to turn into

223 one of the two arms during the test for further analyses. We used AbsLI values to make linear
 224 regressions and calculate correlation coefficients with TS and SC indices.


225 3 RESULTS

226 3.1 Effect of light exposure

227 3.1.1 Laterality (T-maze) tests

228 At D3 and D22-23, there were significantly more chicks that turned left or right than chicks that did
 229 not turn (Figure 3A; see Table 1 for statistical results). At D10-11, since many chicks did not turn (54%
 230 of the DI chicks and 43% of the LE ones), this difference was not significant (Figure 3A).

231 Whatever the day, there was no within- or between-group difference in the number of chicks turning
 232 left and those turning right (Table 1; Figure 3B).



234 **Figure 3:** Summed results of the laterality tests at D3, D10-11 and D22-23. (A) Number of chicks that
 235 turn or did not turn in the T-maze; (B) Number of chicks that turned left and right. DI: Dark-Incubated
 236 chicks; LE: Light-Exposed chicks. * Goodness of fit Chi-squared test, p<0.001.

237 **Table 1:** Comparisons within and between the experimental conditions (DI and LE) of the number of
 238 chicks turning or not turning, and turning left or right in the T-maze. Results of goodness of fit (within
 239 experimental conditions) and homogeneity (between experimental conditions) Chi-squared tests.

Turn/	DI	LE	DI/LE
No turn			

D3	X²=32.27	df=1	p<0.001	X²=38.40	df=1	p<0.001	X ² =0.32	df=1	p>0.05
D10-11	X ² =0.42	df=1	p>0.05	X ² =1.07	df=1	p>0.05	X ² =1.42	df=1	p>0.05
D22-23	X²=10.59	df=1	p<0.001	X²=11.65	df=1	p<0.001	X ² =0.02	df=1	p>0.05
Left/Right		DI		LE			DI/LE		
D3	X ² =0.69	df=1	p>0.05	X ² =0.07	df=1	p>0.05	X ² =0.62	df=1	p>0.05
D10-11	X ² =0.93	df=1	p>0.05	X ² =1.88	df=1	p>0.05	X ² =2.67	df=1	p>0.05
D22-23	X ² =0.00	df=1	p>0.05	X ² =0.09	df=1	p>0.05	X ² =0.05	df=1	p>0.05

240 D: Day; DI: Dark-Incubated chicks; LE: Light-Exposed chicks. Significant results are in bold.

241 3.1.2 Temporal synchronisation

242 Temporal synchronisation decreased with time regardless of the experimental condition (DI/LE:

243 F=0.59, p=0.45; Day: F=42.12, p<0.0001; interaction: F=1.06, p=0.38). The older the chicks were, the


244 less synchronized they were (Figure 4). There was a significant decrease after D4 and temporal

245 synchronization at D15 was significantly lower than at D7 and D9 (Pairwise comparisons using

246 permutation t tests; D4 compared to the other days: p=0.02 in all cases; D15 compared to D7 and D9:

247 p=0.04 in both cases). A Bayes factor analysis confirmed a strong effect of time but a negligible effect

248 of the experimental condition and of its interaction with time (supplementary Table 1).



249


250 **Figure 4:** Temporal synchronization index (TS) of dark-incubated (DI, grey boxes) and light-exposed

251 (LE, white boxes) chicks during development (D=post-hatching day). Boxplot: middle line=median,

252 lower limit of the box=1st quartile, upper limit of the box=3rd quartile, whiskers=1.5 inter-quartile
253 range. Cross: mean.

254 3.1.3 Spatial cohesion


255 After a significant decrease between D4 and D7, spatial cohesion remained relatively stable over
256 time, regardless of the experimental condition (DI/LE: $F=0.00$, $p=0.98$; Day: $F=5.54$, $p<0.001$;
257 interaction: $F=0.87$, $p=0.49$; Pairwise comparisons using permutation t tests; D4 significantly different
258 of all other days except D15: $p=0.02$ for D7, D9 and D11 and 0.30 for D15; no other significant
259 difference; Figure 5). Again, a Bayes factor analysis confirmed an effect of time but a negligible effect
260 of the experimental condition and of its interaction with time (supplementary Table 1).



261
262 **Figure 5:** Spatial cohesion index (SC) of dark-incubated (DI, grey boxes) and light-exposed (LE, white
263 boxes) chicks during development (D=post-hatching day). Boxplot: middle line=median, lower limit of
264 the box=1st quartile, upper limit of the box=3rd quartile, whiskers=1.5 inter-quartile range. Cross:
265 mean.

266 3.1.4 Social motivation


267 There was no difference in social motivation between the two experimental conditions as measured
268 by the latency before the first distress call (Mann-Whitney $W=1757.5$, $n_{DI}=59$, $n_{LE}=60$, $p=0.95$) or the
269 total number of calls (Mann-Whitney $U=1625.5$, $n_{DI}=59$, $n_{LE}=60$, $p=0.44$) (Figure 6).



270 **Figure 6:** (A) Latency before the first distress call (s) and (B) total number of calls of dark-incubated
 271 (DI, grey boxes) and light-exposed (LE, white boxes) chicks during the social motivation test. For
 272 better readability, chicks that did not vocalize (n=2 DI and n=2 LE chicks), and therefore had a latency
 273 score of 180 s, were excluded from the latency graph. Boxplot: middle line=median, lower limit of the
 274 box=1st quartile, upper limit of the box=3rd quartile, whiskers=1.5 inter-quartile range. Crosses:
 275 mean.

276 3.2 Correlation between laterality alignment and social cohesion

277 The AbsLI index measured the extent to which the chicks living in the same cage turned in the same
 278 direction in the T-maze test. Whatever the day, there was no correlation between AbsLI and
 279 temporal synchronisation or spatial cohesion (Figure 7). This means that the most aligned chicks
 280 were not necessarily the most synchronized and cohesive. Since social motivation was only measured
 281 once in each chick, we could not test the correlation between AbsLI and the number and latency of
 282 distress calls.



283

284 Figure 7: Correlations between AbsLI and (A,B) temporal synchronization (TS) and (C,D) spatial

285 cohesion (SC), at (A,C) D3-4 and (B,D) D10-11. Dotted line: linear regression.

286 4 DISCUSSION

287 By comparing laterality (at the group level and as measured by turning bias) and social behaviour of
 288 groups of chicks exposed or not to light at the end of incubation, we studied both the effect of light
 289 on the development and alignment of lateralization and the link between laterality and sociality.

290 Since the degree, the direction and the alignment of lateralization of some visually-guided

291 behaviours can be modulated by the amount of light received during incubation in a variety of

292 species such as zebra fish, topminnows, pigeons and domestic chicks (see Chiandetti, 2017 for a

293 review), we expected light exposure to influence the alignment of visuo-motor lateralization and to

294 create a difference between our two experimental conditions. However, our protocol of exposure to

295 light during incubation had no effect either on the alignment of turning bias or on spatial cohesion,

296 temporal synchronisation and social motivation of our groups of chicks.

297 Exposure to light during incubation had no significant effect on chicks' visuo-motor laterality in the T-
298 maze test. Yet, in the domestic hen and the bobwhite quail, two species that are closely related to
299 the Japanese quail, exposure to light before hatching can reinforce visual (Rogers, 1982) and motor
300 (Casey and Karpinski, 1999; Casey and Lickliter, 1998) lateralization at the population level. This
301 effect is thought to be due to the position of the embryo in the egg: in the egg, the embryo's body
302 occludes the left eye and only the right eye can receive light. Since the avian visual system crosses
303 almost completely, the left hemisphere is therefore more stimulated than the right one (Rogers,
304 1990). Occluding the right eye and stimulating the left one (therefore the right hemisphere) can
305 reverse the group bias (Casey and Karpinski, 1999; Casey and Lickliter, 1998; Rogers, 1990). Thus,
306 asymmetrical light stimulation in the egg can create a bias. Here, we observed no group turning bias
307 in our chicks, even after exposing them to light during incubation. This suggests that light stimulation
308 through the shell does not modulate the particular visuo-motor lateralization that we measured in
309 the Japanese quail. Casey and Sleight (2014) recently obtained an effect of light during incubation, but
310 they had to open the eggshell and to take out the head of the chick to directly stimulate one of its
311 eyes. It is therefore possible that our light stimulation was not strong enough to play a role in the
312 development of visuo-motor asymmetries. In the domestic hen, a stimulation of 250 to 350 lux of the
313 egg (which corresponds to values as low as 25 to 35 lux for the embryo) is enough to obtain an effect
314 on visual lateralization (Rogers, 1990). But, while hens' eggshells are white, those of Japanese quail
315 have brown spots that may reduce the amount of light that reaches the embryo. Light stimulation
316 did have an effect though: dark-incubated chicks were significantly heavier than light-exposed chicks
317 on the day of hatching. This weight difference may be because light-exposed chicks began to hatch a
318 bit earlier (no more than 9 hours) than dark-incubated chicks. Previous research has shown that
319 exposing eggs to white light can alter the time of hatching (Narahari et al., 1988). This happens
320 especially when light stimulation is too strong (Fairchild and Christensen, 2000; Siegel et al., 1969).
321 Considering this, it might be possible that in our study an excess of light stimulation has made

322 hatching earlier in the light-exposed group, which might have somehow disrupted the full
323 development of lateralization.

324 Another explanation could be that we made our stimulation outside the sensitive period of the
325 Japanese quail. In the domestic chick, the embryos need to be exposed to light during the last two
326 days of incubation to obtain an effect. Although two hours of stimulation are sufficient to create a
327 group bias, stimulation has to last between 2.5 to 6 hours to consolidate this bias, so that it does not
328 change if the other eye is stimulated (Rogers, 1990). More recently, an early sensitive period has
329 been discovered in the domestic chick: light exposure occurring well before the development of a
330 functional visual system also plays a role in the development of visual lateralization (Chiandetti et al.,
331 2013; Chiandetti and Vallortigara, 2019). Since no data about sensitive periods to light (either late or
332 early) are available for the Japanese quail, it remains to be determined whether our stimulation was
333 within or outside a light-sensitive period.

334 To determine individual lateralization, you have to test each individual several times, and to
335 determine population-level lateralization, you have to test many individuals at least once. Because
336 quail chicks grow very fast, our logistical conditions did not allow us to repeat the laterality tests
337 enough times in a short period of time to determine individual lateralization during the first days of
338 life. We therefore decided to focus on laterality at the population-level by testing more chicks but
339 only once. Even if there is no evidence of a motor population bias in Japanese quail chicks, Casey
340 (2005) showed that about 50% of the individuals show a turning bias (either to the left or to the
341 right, in equal proportion). Although there was no turning bias at the group level, it is therefore
342 possible that the number of individually lateralized chicks differed between the two experimental
343 groups. Moreover, lateralization is task-specific. We therefore cannot exclude that chicks would have
344 shown a group bias in other tasks such as the pebble floor task, for which a transitory visual
345 lateralization has already been evidenced (Valenti et al., 2003).

346 Exposure to light had no effect on social cohesion and motivation either. It has also been shown that
347 exposure of the embryo to light has no effect on dispersal in domestic chicks (Wichman et al., 2009).
348 However, when domestic chicks are exposed to light during incubation, they tend to be more
349 aggressive and to peck more at conspecifics than dark-incubated chicks (Rogers, 1982). Moreover,
350 whereas dark-incubated chicks peck more at unfamiliar than at familiar individuals, light-exposed
351 chicks show no preference (Riedstra and Grootuis, 2004). Since the two eyes do not play the same
352 role in social recognition (Rogers and Andrew, 2002; Vallortigara and Andrew, 1994), this light-
353 induced effect on the distinction between familiar and unfamiliar individuals is likely due to an
354 alteration of the way each hemisphere process visual information. However, no effect of light
355 exposure during incubation was shown on some social behaviours such as individual recognition or
356 choice behaviour between familiar and unfamiliar chicks (Deng and Rogers, 2002). Since these
357 behaviours are more influenced by postnatal light experience (Deng and Rogers, 2002), we might
358 have obtained different results by manipulating exposure to light after hatching.

359 Regardless of prenatal treatment, we observed a decrease in chicks' temporal synchronisation.
360 Chicks are not able to regulate their body temperature before 11 days of life (Orcutt, Jr. and Orcutt,
361 1976). To keep warm, they thus sleep close from each other, which requires them to synchronize
362 their activities (Formanek et al., 2011). Then, they become more and more independent with time
363 and they show less and less social motivation (François et al., 1998). This could explain the decrease
364 that we observed in our study. Spatial cohesion, on the other hand, remained relatively stable over
365 time. This means that chicks stayed relatively close from each other while doing various activities.
366 This might be explained by the fact that they spent a lot of time resting under the heater at the
367 beginning of the experiment, and then spent more time close to the feeder and the drinking trough
368 (without necessarily eating or drinking). In large aviaries (25-30 m²) reproducing semi-natural
369 conditions, spatial cohesion decreases between the age of 4 and 15 days (Lumineau et al., 2001). Our
370 home cages might therefore have been too small for the chicks to disperse. It could also have
371 something to do with the absence of any visual barriers in the home cage, since opaque barriers

372 appear to be important for the development of spatial cognition and its lateralization in the domestic
373 chick (Freire and Rogers, 2005). In addition, as they had nowhere to hide, there may have been no
374 incentive for the chicks to move away from other chicks.

375 Finally, by using an index that could measure the degree of alignment of chicks independently of
376 prenatal treatment, we could check whether there was a correlation between group lateralization
377 and social cohesion (i.e. temporal synchronization and spatial cohesion). The results showed that
378 chicks that were more aligned were not necessarily better synchronized and more cohesive. This
379 suggests that there may be no modulation of social behaviour by group lateralization in the Japanese
380 quail. In a complementary way, Versace et al. (2020) have just shown that social environment can
381 modulate individual- but not population-level lateralization in fruit flies (*Drosophila melanogaster*).
382 The link between lateralization and social interactions is therefore probably not so straightforward
383 and more studies are definitely needed to better understand it. The Japanese quail could be useful to
384 explore this issue further, and, since it is a domestic species, and although our study is primarily
385 fundamental, such studies could also help to better understand the consequences of domestication
386 and to improve handling and welfare of species used in laboratory and farm industries. Respect for
387 animal welfare is a major issue in farm industries. In animal husbandry, in order to withstand high
388 densities, animals must be more socially tolerant and less emotive. Understanding the mechanisms
389 for the development of sociality and emotivity is therefore an essential prerequisite for the
390 adaptation of animals to farming conditions.

391 **ACKNOWLEDGMENTS**

392 We thank Catherine Blois-Heulin, Cécilia Houdelier and Emmanuel de Margerie for their advice,
393 Marion Charrier for her help with experiments, Virginie Durier, Nathalie George and Matthias
394 Rousseau for helping us analyse the data, and Céline Nicolle for taking care of the birds.

395 **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST:**

396 None

397 **FUNDING**

398 This research did not receive any specific grant from funding agencies in the public, commercial, or
399 not-for-profit sectors.

400 **REFERENCES**

- 401 Casey, M.B., 2005. Asymmetrical hatching behaviors: The development of postnatal motor laterality in
402 three precocial bird species. *Dev. Psychobiol.* 47, 123–135. <https://doi.org/10.1002/dev.20078>
- 403 Casey, M.B., Karpinski, S., 1999. The Development of Postnatal Turning Bias is Influenced by Prenatal
404 Visual Experience in Domestic Chicks (*Gallus gallus*). *Psychol. Record* 49.
- 405 Casey, M.B., Lickliter, R., 1998. Prenatal visual experience influences the development of turning bias
406 in bobwhite quail chicks (*Colinus virginianus*). *Dev. Psychobiol.* 32, 327–338.
407 [https://doi.org/10.1002/\(SICI\)1098-2302\(199805\)32:4<327::AID-DEV7>3.0.CO;2-P](https://doi.org/10.1002/(SICI)1098-2302(199805)32:4<327::AID-DEV7>3.0.CO;2-P)
- 408 Casey, M.B., Sleigh, M.J., 2014. Prenatal visual experience induces postnatal motor laterality in
409 Japanese quail chicks (*Coturnix coturnix japonica*). *Dev. Psychobiol.* 56, 489–497.
410 <https://doi.org/10.1002/dev.21116>
- 411 Casey, M.B., Sleigh, M.J., 2001. Cross-species investigations of prenatal experience, hatching behavior,
412 and postnatal behavioral laterality. *Dev. Psychobiol.* 39, 84–91.
413 <https://doi.org/10.1002/dev.1032>
- 414 Cheng, K.M., Bennett, D.C., Mills, A.D., 2010. The Japanese Quail, in: Hubrecht, R., Kirkwood, J. (Eds.),
415 The UFAW Handbook on the Care and Management of Laboratory and Other Research
416 Animals. John Wiley & Sons, Ltd, pp. 655–673. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781444318777.ch42>
- 417 Chiandetti, C., 2017. Manipulation of Strength of Cerebral Lateralization via Embryonic Light
418 Stimulation in Birds, in: Rogers, L.J., Vallortigara, G. (Eds.), *Lateralized Brain Functions:
419 Methods in Human and Non-Human Species, Neuromethods*. Springer, New York, NY, pp. 611–
420 631. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4939-6725-4_19
- 421 Chiandetti, C., Galliussi, J., Andrew, R.J., Vallortigara, G., 2013. Early-light embryonic stimulation
422 suggests a second route, via gene activation, to cerebral lateralization in vertebrates. *Sci. Rep.*
423 3, 2701. <https://doi.org/10.1038/srep02701>
- 424 Chiandetti, C., Vallortigara, G., 2019. Distinct effect of early and late embryonic light-stimulation on
425 chicks' lateralization. *Neuroscience* 414, 1–7.
426 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroscience.2019.06.036>
- 427 Deng, C., Rogers, L.J., 2002. Social recognition and approach in the chick: lateralization and effect of
428 visual experience. *Anim. Behav.* 63, 697–706.
- 429 Ehrlich, D., Mark, R., 1984. An atlas of the primary visual projections in the brain of the chick *Gallus*
430 *gallus*. *J. Comp. Neurol.* 223, 592–610. <https://doi.org/10.1002/cne.902230410>
- 431 Fairchild, B.D., Christensen, V.L., 2000. Photostimulation of turkey eggs accelerates hatching times
432 without affecting hatchability, liver or heart growth, or glycogen content1. *Poultry Sci.* 79,
433 1627–1631. <https://doi.org/10.1093/ps/79.11.1627>

434 Farris, H.E., 1964. Behavioral development, social organization, and conditioning of courting behavior
435 in the Japanese quail *Coturnix coturnix japonica*. Michigan State University.
436 <https://doi.org/10.25335/M55D8NT88>

437 Formanek, L., Richard-Yris, M.-A., Houdelier, C., Lumineau, S., 2011. Rhythmic birds show a better
438 social integration than arrhythmic birds. *Chronobiol. Int.* 28, 48–57.
439 <https://doi.org/10.3109/07420528.2010.532264>

440 François, N., Mills, A.D., Faure, J.M., 1998. Place preferences of Japanese quail given a permanent
441 choice between a social or a non-social but enriched situation. *Behav. Processes* 43, 163–170.
442 [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0376-6357\(98\)00010-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0376-6357(98)00010-2)

443 Frasnelli, E., Vallortigara, G., 2018. Individual-Level and Population-Level Lateralization: Two Sides of
444 the Same Coin. *Symmetry* 10, 739. <https://doi.org/10.3390/sym10120739>

445 Freire, R., Rogers, L.J., 2005. Experience-induced modulation of the use of spatial information in the
446 domestic chick. *Animal Behaviour* 69, 1093–1100.
447 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.anbehav.2004.09.009>

448 Frossard, J., Renaud, O., 2019. permuco: Permutation Tests for Regression, (Repeated Measures)
449 ANOVA/ANCOVA and Comparison of Signals.

450 Ghirlanda, S., Frasnelli, E., Vallortigara, G., 2009. Intraspecific competition and coordination in the
451 evolution of lateralization. *Phil. Trans. R. Soc. B* 364, 861–866.
452 <https://doi.org/10.1098/rstb.2008.0227>

453 Ghirlanda, S., Vallortigara, G., 2004. The evolution of brain lateralization: a game-theoretical analysis
454 of population structure. *Proc. R. Soc. Lond. B* 271, 853–857.
455 <https://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2003.2669>

456 Glick, S.D. (Ed.), 1985. *Cerebral Lateralization in Nonhuman Species*. Academic Press.
457 <https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-12-286480-3.X5001-0>

458 Gülbetekin, E., Güntürkün, O., Dural, S., Çetinkaya, H., 2009. Visual asymmetries in Japanese quail
459 (*Coturnix japonica*) retain a lifelong potential for plasticity. *Behav. Neurosci.* 123, 815–821.
460 <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0016406>

461 Gülbetekin, E., Güntürkün, O., Dural, S., Çetinkaya, H., 2007. Asymmetry of visually guided sexual
462 behaviour in adult Japanese quail (*Coturnix japonica*). *Laterality* 12, 321–331.
463 <https://doi.org/10.1080/13576500701307080>

464 Güntürkün, O., 1993. The ontogeny of visual lateralization in pigeons. *German J. Psychol.* 17, 276–287.

465 Güntürkün, O., Ströckens, F., Ocklenburg, S., 2020. Brain Lateralization: A Comparative Perspective.
466 *Physiol. Rev.* 100, 1019–1063. <https://doi.org/10.1152/physrev.00006.2019>

467 Guyomarc'h, J.-C., Guyomarc'h, C., 1996. Vocal communication in European quail; Comparison with
468 Japanese quail. *Comptes rendus de l'Académie des sciences. Série III, Sciences de la vie* 319,
469 827–834.

470 Lumineau, S., Guyomarc'h, C., Richard, J.-P., 2001. Ultradian Rhythm of Activity in Japanese Quail
471 Groups under Semi-Natural Conditions during Ontogeny: Functional Aspects and Relation to
472 Circadian Rhythm. *Biol. Rhythm Res.* 32, 373–400.
473 <https://doi.org/10.1076/brhm.32.3.373.1339>

474 Mills, A.D., Crawford, L.L., Domjan, M., Faure, J.M., 1997. The behavior of the Japanese or domestic
475 quail *Coturnix japonica*. *Neurosci. Biobehav. Rev.* 21, 261–281.
476 [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0149-7634\(96\)00028-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0149-7634(96)00028-0)

477 Narahari, D., Mujeer, K.A., Thangavel, A., Ramamurthy, N., Viswanathan, S., Mohan, B.,
478 Muruganandan, B., Sundararasu, V., 1988. Traits influencing the hatching performance of
479 Japanese quail eggs. *British Poultry Sci.* 29, 101–112.
480 <https://doi.org/10.1080/00071668808417031>

481 Nichols, C.R., 1991. A comparison of the reproductive and behavioural differences in feral and
482 domestic Japanese quail. University of British Columbia. <https://doi.org/10.14288/1.0098657>

483 Orcutt, Jr., F.S., Orcutt, A.B., 1976. Nesting and Parental Behavior in Domestic Common Quail. *The Auk*
484 93, 135–141.

485 R Core Team, 2020. R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing. R Foundation for
486 Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria.

487 Remy, M., Güntürkün, O., 1991. Retinal afferents to the tectum opticum and the nucleus opticus
488 principalis thalami in the pigeon. *Journal of Comparative Neurology* 305, 57–70.
489 <https://doi.org/10.1002/cne.903050107>

490 Riedstra, B., Groothuis, T.G.G., 2004. Prenatal light exposure affects early feather-pecking behaviour
491 in the domestic chick. *Anim. Behav.* 67, 1037–1042.
492 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.anbehav.2003.10.009>

493 Rogers, L.J., 1990. Light input and the reversal of functional lateralization in the chicken brain. *Behav.*
494 *Brain Res.* 38, 211–221. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0166-4328\(90\)90176-F](https://doi.org/10.1016/0166-4328(90)90176-F)

495 Rogers, L.J., 1982. Light experience and asymmetry of brain function in chickens. *Nature* 297, 223–225.
496 <https://doi.org/10.1038/297223a0>

497 Rogers, L.J., Andrew, R.J. (Eds.), 2002. *Comparative vertebrate lateralization*. Cambridge University
498 Press, New York.

499 Rogers, L.J., Vallortigara, G., Andrew, R.J., 2013. *Divided brains: The biology and behaviour of brain*
500 *asymmetries*. Divided brains: The biology and behaviour of brain asymmetries. Cambridge
501 University Press, New York, NY, US. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511793899>

502 Siegel, P.B., Isakson, S.T., Coleman, F.N., Huffman, B.J., 1969. Photoacceleration of development in
503 chick embryos. *Comp. Biochem. Physiol.* 28, 753–758. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0010-406X\(69\)92108-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/0010-406X(69)92108-2)

505 Takatsuji, K., Ito, H., Masai, H., 1983. Ipsilateral retinal projections in Japanese quail, *Coturnix coturnix*
506 *japonica*. *Brain Res. Bull.* 10, 53–56. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0361-9230\(83\)90074-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/0361-9230(83)90074-6)

507 Valenti, A., Sovrano, V.A., Zucca, P., Vallortigara, G., 2003. Visual lateralisation in quails (*Coturnix*
508 *coturnix*). *Laterality: Asymmetries of Body, Brain and Cognition* 8, 67–78.
509 <https://doi.org/10.1080/713754470>

510 Vallortigara, G., 2006. The evolutionary psychology of left and right: Costs and benefits of
511 lateralization. *Dev. Psychobiol.* 48, 418–427. <https://doi.org/10.1002/dev.20166>

512 Vallortigara, G., Andrew, R.J., 1994. Differential involvement of right and left hemisphere in individual
513 recognition in the domestic chick. *Behavioural Processes* 33, 41–57.
514 [https://doi.org/10.1016/0376-6357\(94\)90059-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/0376-6357(94)90059-0)

515 Vallortigara, G., Rogers, L.J., 2020. A function for the bicameral mind. *Cortex* 124, 274–285.
516 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cortex.2019.11.018>

517 Vallortigara, G., Rogers, L.J., 2005. Survival with an asymmetrical brain: advantages and disadvantages
518 of cerebral lateralization. *Behav. Brain Sci.* 28, 575–589.
519 <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0140525X05000105>

520 Versace, E., Caffini, M., Werkhoven, Z., de Bivort, B.L., 2020. Individual, but not population
521 asymmetries, are modulated by social environment and genotype in *Drosophila melanogaster*.
522 *Scientific Reports* 10, 4480. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-020-61410-7>

523 Versace, E., Vallortigara, G., 2015. Forelimb preferences in human beings and other species: multiple
524 models for testing hypotheses on lateralization. *Front. Psychol.* 6.
525 <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2015.00233>

526 Weidner, C., Repérant, J., Miceli, D., Haby, M., Rio, J.P., 1985. An anatomical study of ipsilateral retinal
527 projections in the quail using radioautographic, horseradish peroxidase, fluorescence and
528 degeneration techniques. *Brain Res.* 340, 99–108. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0006-8993\(85\)90778-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/0006-8993(85)90778-4)

529

530 Wetherbee, D.K., 1961. *Investigations in the Life History of the Common Coturnix*. Amer. Midland
531 Naturalist 65, 168–186. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2423011>

532 Wichman, A., Rogers, L.J., Freire, R., 2009. Visual lateralization and development of spatial and social
533 spacing behaviour of chicks (*Gallus gallus domesticus*). *Behavioural Processes* 81, 14–19.
534 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.beproc.2008.12.006>

535 Zucca, P., Sovrano, V.A., 2008. Animal lateralization and social recognition: Quails use their left visual
536 hemifield when approaching a companion and their right visual hemifield when approaching
537 a stranger. *Cortex* 44, 13–20. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cortex.2006.01.002>

Author's post-print

538 Supplementary Table 1: Bayes factor analysis of temporal synchronization and spatial dispersion

539 -----

540 Temporal synchronisation

541 -----

542 [1] Experimental condition (DI/LE) + Cage: $0.3211489 \pm 0.86\%$

543 [2] Time (Day) + Cage: $3.81146e+16 \pm 0.63\%$

544 [3] Experimental condition (DI/LE) + Time (Day) + Cage: $1.611854e+16 \pm 1.12\%$

545 [4] Experimental condition (DI/LE) + Time (Day) + Experimental condition (DI/LE):Time (Day) + Cage:

546 $4.681978e+ 15 \pm 4.07\%$

547 Against denominator: Temporal Synchronisation ~ Cage

548 -----

549 Spatial cohesion

550 -----

551 [1] Experimental condition (DI/LE) + Cage: $0.279752 \pm 0.86\%$

552 [2] Time (Day) + Cage: $129.6506 \pm 0.45\%$

553 [3] Experimental condition (DI/LE) + Time (Day) + Cage: $37.23607 \pm 1.27\%$

554 [4] Experimental condition (DI/LE) + Time (Day) + Experimental condition (DI/LE):Time (Day) + Cage:

555 $9.711455 \pm 6.99\%$

556 Against denominator: Spatial Cohesion ~ Cage

557 -----

558 Bayes factor type: BFlinearModel, JZS