University of
Zurich^{UZH}

Zurich Open Repository and
Archive

University of Zurich
University Library
Strickhofstrasse 39
CH-8057 Zurich
www.zora.uzh.ch

Year: 2021

Effect of group size and experience on the ontogeny of sentinel calling behaviour in meerkats

Rauber, Ramona ; Manser, Marta B

Abstract: Increased vulnerability to predation results in young individuals of many species experiencing higher predation pressure than adults. Consequently, the production of antipredator-related calls by young can differ from that of the same vocalizations given by adults. Sentinel behaviour is a coordinated vigilance behaviour, where one individual climbs on an elevated position and scans the surroundings for predators, while the rest of the group is mainly foraging. Meerkat, *Suricata suricatta*, sentinels produce six distinct sentinel call types, which inform other group members about the perceived predation risk, resulting in the adjustment of personal vigilance behaviour in foraging group members. Here, we investigated the onset of sentinel behaviour and the ontogeny of the different sentinel call types as well as the development of individual vocal signatures in meerkats. We found that meerkats started acting as a sentinel around 200 days of age, but this was highly dependent on group size, with individuals from smaller groups exhibiting sentinel behaviour earlier than individuals from larger groups. All six sentinel call types were already present in the repertoire upon first emergence of the behaviour; however, call rates of 'all-clear' calls increased while 'warning' calls decreased with increasing experience as sentinel. Analysis of one of the most frequent sentinel calls, the double note calls, indicated that fundamental frequency, mean amplitude, duration and entropy differed consistently between individuals, but we found no effect of age. Rather, our results provide evidence that individual signatures in this call type were already developed when young meerkats first started to act as sentinel and changed little with age. To conclude, we showed little ontogenetic change in overall sentinel behaviour as well as in its vocal coordination, indicating potentially high selection pressures on antipredator behaviours, such as the sentinel system, resulting in consistent behavioural responses upon first emergence.

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.anbehav.2020.11.014>

Posted at the Zurich Open Repository and Archive, University of Zurich

ZORA URL: <https://doi.org/10.5167/uzh-200690>

Journal Article

Accepted Version

The following work is licensed under a Creative Commons: Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International (CC BY-NC-ND 4.0) License.

Originally published at:

Rauber, Ramona; Manser, Marta B (2021). Effect of group size and experience on the ontogeny of sentinel calling behaviour in meerkats. *Animal Behaviour*, 171:129-138.

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.anbehav.2020.11.014>

Effect of group size and experience on the ontogeny of sentinel calling behaviour in meerkats

R. Rauber^{1,2*} & M. B. Manser^{1,2,3,4}

¹ Animal Behaviour, Department of Evolutionary Biology and Environmental Studies, University of Zurich, Zurich, Switzerland

² Kalahari Meerkat Project, Kuruman River Reserve, Van Zylsrus, Northern Cape, South Africa

³ Mammal Research Institute, University of Pretoria, Pretoria, South Africa

⁴ Center for the Interdisciplinary Study of Language Evolution (ISLE), University of Zurich, Zurich

*Corresponding author: Ramona Rauber

Animal Behaviour, Department of Evolutionary Biology and Environmental Studies, University of Zurich, Winterthurerstrasse, Zurich, Switzerland

HIGHLIGHTS

- Meerkats started acting as sentinels as subadults around 200 days of age.
- They produced all six sentinel call types when they first acted as sentinel.
- Call rate of the different sentinel call types changed with experience.
- The acoustics of the common double note calls differed between individuals.
- Meerkats showed individual distinctiveness when they first acted as sentinel.

Effect of group size and experience on the ontogeny of sentinel calling behaviour in meerkats

ABSTRACT

Increased vulnerability to predation results in young individuals of many species experiencing higher predation pressure than adults. Consequently, the production of antipredator-related calls by young can differ from the same vocalisations given by adults. Sentinel behaviour is a coordinated vigilance behaviour, where one individual climbs on an elevated position and scans the surroundings for predators, while the rest of the group is mainly foraging. Meerkat (*Suricata suricatta*) sentinels produce six distinct sentinel call types, which inform other group members about the perceived predation risk, resulting in the adjustment of personal vigilance behaviour in foraging group members. Here, we investigated the onset of sentinel behaviour and the ontogeny of the different sentinel call types as well as the development of individual vocal signatures in meerkats. Our results demonstrate that meerkats started acting as a sentinel around 200 days of age, but this was highly dependent on group size, with individuals from smaller groups exhibiting sentinel behaviour earlier than individuals from larger groups. All six sentinel call types were already present in the repertoire upon first emergence of the behaviour, however, call rates of 'all-clear' calls increased while 'warning' calls decreased with increasing experience as sentinel. Analysis of one of the most frequent sentinel calls, the double note calls, indicated that fundamental frequency, mean amplitude, duration and entropy differed consistently between individuals, but we found no effect of age. Rather, our results provide evidence that individual signatures in this call type were already developed when young meerkats first started to act as sentinel and changed little later on in age. To conclude, we show that overall sentinel behaviour as well as its vocal coordination undergo little ontogenetic change, indicating potentially high selection pressures on antipredator behaviours, such as the sentinel system, resulting in consistent behavioural response upon first emergence.

28

29

Keywords: acoustic communication, individual vocal signature, ontogeny, sentinel
behaviour

32

33 INTRODUCTION

34 As a consequence of living in groups, some animals have evolved specific coordinated
35 antipredator defence mechanisms (Krause & Ruxton, 2002; Kruuk, 1964; Zoratto,
36 Santucci, & Alleva, 2009), such as sentinel behaviour (Horrocks & Hunte, 1986; Manser,
37 1999; McGowan & Woolfenden, 1989). Sentinel behaviour is a coordinated vigilance
38 behaviour mostly seen in cooperative breeders, where one individual climbs onto an
39 elevated position and scans the surrounding for predators while the rest of the group is
40 foraging (Bednekoff, 2015; Clutton-Brock, O'Riain, et al., 1999; Horrocks & Hunte, 1986;
41 McGowan & Woolfenden, 1989; Ridley & Raihani, 2006; Wright, Berg, De Kort, Khazin, &
42 Maklakov, 2001; Zahavi, 1990). Sentinels have been demonstrated to detect predators
43 more frequently and from greater distances than foraging group members (Manser, 1999;
44 Wright, Berg, de Kort, Khazin, & Maklakov, 2001) and foraging group members show a
45 higher foraging efficiency when a sentinel is on guard (Hollén, Bell, & Radford, 2008;
46 Manser, 1999).

47 When sentinels spot a predator, they produce alarm calls, allowing group
48 members to initiate the proper antipredator behaviour (Bednekoff, 2001; Manser, 2001;
49 Manser, Bell, & Fletcher, 2001; McGowan & Woolfenden, 1989; Rasa, 1989). Alarm calls
50 represent a common antipredator strategy (Caro, 2005; Sherman, 1977), and are thought
51 to be under strong selection. However, selection pressures can vary between different
52 group members, and are generally higher for younger individuals than adults. Thus,
53 offspring environment, including the mobility of young to move away from the nesting
54 site or the presence of siblings (Berg, Beissinger, & Bradbury, 2013), as well as differences
55 in predation risk due to higher vulnerability to predation in general or a different set of
56 predators than adults, result in selection pressures that can be very different from those
57 of adults. Consequently, alarm calls produced by young individuals have been
58 demonstrated to differ from calls produced by adults on three levels: i) vocal production:

the development of species-specific calls with a specific set of acoustic properties; ii) vocal usage: the correct choice of call types given the context; and iii) response: the development of the appropriate response to conspecific calls (Hollén & Radford, 2009; Seyfarth & Cheney, 1986). In meerkats (*Suricata suricatta*), for example, it has been shown that young produce higher pitched and longer calls (Hollén & Manser, 2007), they call more often in response to non-threatening stimuli (Hollén, Clutton-Brock, & Manser, 2008) and newly emerged young show stronger responses to alarm calls which over the course of ontogeny become more and more adult-like (Hollén & Manser, 2006).

Animals with individually distinct calls including some birds (Jouventin & Aubin, 2002; Lefevre, Gaston, & Montgomerie, 2001; Radford & Ridley, 2008), primates (Cleveland & Snowdon, 1982; Miller & Thomas, 2012; Salmi, Hammerschmidt, & Doran-Sheehy, 2014; Snowdon & Cleveland, 1980), hyenas (Theis, Greene, Benson-Amram, & Holekamp, 2007) and social mongooses (Jansen, Cant, & Manser, 2012; Manser, 1999; Sharpe, Hill, & Cherry, 2013) provide another aspect of vocal ontogeny: the ontogenetic development of acoustic individuality. Individually distinct vocalisations allow receivers to adjust their behavioural response to the caller identity (Salmi et al., 2014). In the context of mother offspring behaviour, discrimination among individuals based on vocal signals provides the potential for reliable recognition of dependent offspring and therefore offspring survival while avoiding misdirected maternal care (Briefer & McElligott, 2011; Volodin, Lapshina, Volodina, Frey, & Soldatova, 2011). In the context of anti-predatory behaviours, group members of various species have been demonstrated to adjust the response to alarm calls depending on the identity of the caller (or some characteristics of the caller) and the associated quality and relevance of the provided information (Blumstein & Daniel, 2004; Blumstein, Verneyre, & Daniel, 2004; Hare & Atkins, 2001; Ramakrishnan & Coss, 2000). However, whether individuals already possess individually distinctive calls when they first start producing the relevant call

types, such as alarm calls, or whether this is something that develops during vocal ontogeny often remains unknown (but see (Schneiderova et al., 2015).

In addition to alarm calls, sentinels in some species continuously produce specific sentinel calls, in social mongooses also referred to as “Watchman’s song”, which allow foraging group members to obtain acoustic information about the presence of a sentinel individual (Hollén, Bell, et al., 2008; Manser, 1999; Rasa, 1986). The structure and information content of sentinel vocalisations varies greatly, with some species producing one type of sentinel call to announce their presence (pied babbler (*Turdoides bicolor*): (Hollén et al., 2011)). In contrast, others produce graded information contained in the call rate of one (dwarf mongoose (*Helogale parvula*): (Kern & Radford, 2013)) to several sentinel call types (meerkats): (Rauber, Kranstauber, & Manser, 2020; Rauber & Manser, 2017)), which informs the rest of the group about temporary changes in the perceived predation risk. However, little is known about the ontogeny of sentinel behaviour (Bednekoff, 2015), and nothing about the ontogeny of sentinel vocalisations. Thus, it remains unknown at what age the different sentinel calls are exhibited and whether and how sentinel calls produced by young differ from those produced by adults.

In this study we investigated the onset and vocal ontogeny of sentinel behaviour in meerkats. Meerkats are small, highly sociable mongoose occurring in the Kalahari Desert in southern Africa (Clutton-Brock, Gaynor, et al., 1999; Clutton-Brock & Manser, 2016). They are cooperative breeders living in groups of three to 50 individuals (average 17), containing one dominant breeding pair and multiple subordinate helpers, which help to rear the dominant’s offspring by providing them with food and protection (Clutton-Brock et al., 1998; Clutton-Brock, Gaynor, et al., 1999; Clutton-Brock & Manser, 2016). Although all members of a group contribute to sentinel behaviour, individual contributions vary within and between groups (Clutton-Brock, O’Riain, et al., 1999; Rauber & Manser, 2018), whereby individuals from smaller groups have a higher daily likelihood to act as sentinels (30%) compared to individuals from larger groups (10%)

(Rauber, Clutton-Brock, & Manser, 2019). Meerkats on sentinel duty produce six different sentinel call types (Manser, 1999; Rauber & Manser, 2017) and in case a predator is detected they give functionally referential alarm calls (Manser, 1999, 2001; Manser et al., 2001). The six described, discrete sentinel call types all differ in their acoustic structure and include: single note, double note, triple note, multiple note, di-drrr and wheek calls (Fig. 1, Fig. A1.) (Manser, 1999). Previous work on the function of sentinel calls in meerkats has demonstrated that sentinel calming calls, including single- and double note calls, are produced when no predator is in sight and function as an 'all-clear' signal, leading to an increase in foraging behaviour and a decrease in vigilance behaviour by the foraging group members (Rauber & Manser, 2017). In contrast, sentinel warning calls, which contain di-drrr and wheek calls, are emitted when the sentinel individual experiences an increase in perceived risk and function as a pre-stage of alarm calls, leading to an increase in vigilance behaviour and a decrease in foraging by receivers (Rauber & Manser, 2017). Furthermore, alarm calls contain information about different urgency levels of a flight response as well as information about the predator type, i.e. terrestrial or aerial (Manser, 2001; Manser et al., 2001; Manser, Seyfarth, & Cheney, 2002). Moreover, meerkat sentinel calls are individually distinct (Manser, 1999) and foraging group members adjust their behavioural response to sentinel calming calls based on the experience levels of the caller (Rauber & Manser, 2018). Having these varying levels of urgency, i.e. sentinel calming calls, sentinel warning calls, and alarm calls, all produced by the individual on sentinel guard, allows us to compare vocal ontogeny of sentinel calls with that of alarm calls regarding potential differences between subadults and adults in terms of vocal usage and development of individual signatures.

In this study we investigated at what age meerkats begin to act as sentinels and whether and how group size may influence the onset of this behaviour. Individual contribution to sentinel behaviour decreases with increasing group size (Clutton-Brock, O'Riain, et al., 1999). Accordingly, individuals in smaller groups might have to contribute

to this coordinated vigilance behaviour at a younger age than individuals from larger groups. Alternatively, it is possible that in larger groups, which have on average more often an individual on raised guard (Clutton-Brock, O'Riain, et al., 1999), individuals learn more quickly from other group members, and perform the behaviour at a younger age. Secondly, we determined the age when different sentinel call types were first produced by young meerkats and how call rates changed with increasing experience as a sentinel. Based on the different urgency levels of sentinel calming and warning calls and due to the higher vulnerability of young individuals to predation, we expected young individuals to produce more warning calls and less calming calls. Lastly, focusing on double note calls, one of the two most commonly produced sentinel call types, we examined how individual distinctiveness in this call type changed with increasing age of the signaller.

METHODS

Study site and population

This study was carried out between February and July 2017 at the Kalahari Meerkat Project (KMP) located at the Kuruman River Reserve in South Africa. Additionally, the analyses relied on long term data collected for the KMP between 1996 and 2017 (see next methods section: *Behavioural data from long term database*). The study site has a semi-arid climate and is characterised by perennial grasses, shrubs and trees as main vegetations (see (Clutton-Brock, Gaynor, et al., 1999; Doolan & Macdonald, 1996) for more information about the habitat and climate at the study site). All animals recorded during this study were habituated to close human observations and sound recording equipment, allowing for recording distances of less than 1m from the calling meerkat. Information about individual identity, age, as well as the frequency of sentinel behaviour was collected as part of the KMP's long-term data collection. In total, we recorded sentinel calls emitted by young meerkats from eight groups with group size varying between nine

and 24 individuals (mean±sd=14.1±6.25). Age classes were characterised as following: individuals younger than 3 months, i.e. pups, are for the most part dependent on food provisioning and protection from adult group members. Juveniles, 3-6 months, start to forage on their own, but still get complementary feeds from adults. Subadults, 6-12 months, forage independently and show more adult like behaviours, including offspring care or burrow maintenance. Individuals over 12 months of age are sexually mature and considered adults.

Behavioural data from the long-term database

As part of the daily data collection at the KMP, researchers observe groups of meerkats for three hours while foraging in the morning and one to two hours in the evening conducting adlib observations whenever they see a specific behaviour. Each group is observed for four to five days a week, whereby over a whole month observation durations are equalized across all groups. We extracted the age at the first sentinel bout equal or longer than one minute for all meerkats born between 1996 and 2017, resulting in a total of 1411 individuals from 39 different groups ($N=755$ males, $N=656$ females). One minute was chosen to exclude individuals that were just climbing up an object and were mistakenly noted down as sentinel individual. When individuals stay in the raised position (at least 0.1m higher than the surrounding area) for a minute or longer, we can assume that this individual is acting as a sentinel and not just exploring its surroundings. To compare the onset of sentinel behaviour with the onset of the other cooperative behaviours we also extracted the age when they first participated in pup feeding and babysitting (Clutton-Brock & Manser, 2016) from the same set of individuals and time period used to analyse the onset of sentinel behaviour.

Acoustic recordings

We recorded a total of 189 sentinel events in eight groups (5-69 recordings per group; mean=21) containing 7119 calls from 48 different individuals between 112 and 380 days old. Recordings were conducted during naturally occurring sentinel bouts using a Sennheiser directional microphone (ME66/K6) connected to a Marantz PMD-670 solid-state recorder (Marantz Japan Inc.; sampling frequency 44.2 kHz, 16 bits accuracy). A windshield (Rainhardt, W200) was attached to the microphone to ensure high quality recordings under variable wind conditions. The microphone was attached to a 1.5m telescopic pole in order not to disturb the calling meerkats by keeping a distance of 1m between the meerkat and the recording person, while at the same time the recording distance was <0.5m and thus allowing for high signal-to-background ratio.

Extraction of acoustic parameters

Each vocalisation in the recordings was manually assigned to one of the six described sentinel call types (Fig.1) or alarm calls using a combination of visual inspection of the spectrogram and acoustic classification of calls in Adobe Audition (2015.0 Release) (Manser, 1999; Rauber & Manser, 2017). Previous work on meerkat call combinations demonstrated that silence intervals between calls are significantly shorter than within call combinations, such as the double or triple note calls (Collier, Townsend, & Manser, 2017), allowing us to categorize each call by visual and audio inspection as one of the six described sentinel call types. To extract acoustic parameters of one of the two most commonly produced sentinel call types, the double note call, we used Avisoft SASLab Pro (version 5.2.12). Upon loading the sound file into the program, we first removed noise levels below 250Hz applying a high-pass domain finite impulse response (FIR) filter. Afterwards we created spectrograms (FFT length=512, overlap=87%) and visually checked the tracking of the fundamental frequency (F0), which for sentinel double note calls is the same as the peak frequency, and the duration of first note of the call. Calls that

were not of high enough signal to noise quality and thus were not tracked correctly by the program were removed from the analysis. The minimum number of high quality calls we collected from the same individual was 16 (range 16-106, mean = 58.6), recorded from at least three independent sentinel events (min=3, max=7, mean=4.6), resulting in a sample size of 72 recordings containing 937 double note calls from 18 individuals. Fundamental frequency (which was equal to peak frequency in the measured calls), peak amplitude and entropy were measured at 10 regular segments throughout the first note of each double note call. Similar to work on transmission characteristics in primate vocalisations (Maciej, Fischer, & Hammerschmidt, 2011) only measurements 2-9 were used to calculate the means as the very beginning and end of calls were often most imprecise and affected by background noise. Duration was measured for the complete first note of each double note call.

Statistical analysis

All statistical analyses were done using R Version 3.3.0 (R Core Team, 2018). To analyse the effect of group size on the age at first sentinel bout, we applied a linear mixed model (LMM) with age (in days) as a response and sex and group size as fixed effect. Group identity was included as a random factor. As the proportion of time that individuals spend on sentinel guard is higher in smaller groups compared to larger groups (Clutton-Brock, O'Riain, et al., 1999), the acquisition of experience gained by acting as a sentinel may likely differ depending on group size rather than absolute age, whereby individuals from smaller groups are expected to gain experience faster than individuals in larger groups. Hence, for further analysis of the ontogeny of sentinel vocalisations, we used "GuardSum" as a proxy for experience, which has been calculated as the total duration of all sentinel events of a given individual until the day of the recording. To test whether the presence of a given call type in the recordings was affected by experience, we used a generalized

linear mixed model (GLMM) with the presence of a call type as binomial response variable and group size and GuardSum as fixed effects. Sentinel ID nested in group ID and date were used as random factors. To determine whether the fixed effects had any significant effect on the response variable, we used likelihood ratio tests (LRT) to compare whether the model with the fixed effect included differed significantly from the same model with the fixed effect excluded (Crawley, 2012). To analyse the development of call rates (total number of calls for each call type divided by the duration of the sentinel bout) with increasing experience, while at the same time reducing the number of multiple testing, we grouped the six sentinel calls into categories, which have been previously demonstrated to represent functionally distinct call categories: single and double note calls together as sentinel calming calls and didrrr and wheek calls as warning calls (Rauber & Manser, 2017). The last two call types, the triple- and multiple note calls were grouped together as 'middle calls'. This was done to reduce the number of multiple testing. We then used all recordings where the call rate of each of these categories was above zero and log transformed them to use as response variable in a GLMM. Again, we used GuardSum (our proxy for experience), group size and the potential interaction between them as fixed effects as well as sentinel ID nested in group ID and date as random factors. To investigate how the acoustic parameters produced in the first note of double note calls changed with increasing age, we conducted a LMM with the mean fundamental frequency, mean peak amplitude, duration and mean entropy as response variables, age as fixed effect and Sentinel ID as well as a unique recording ID as random factors. Following the methods used in (Salmi et al., 2014) we also compared the variation between the first note of the double note calls of different individuals to the variation measured within individuals to assess whether calls show the potential for individual coding (PIC). To do this we measured the acoustic variability of each acoustic parameter (derived for each first note of a double note call) by calculating the inter-individual variation means ($MEAN_{inter}$ = average mean of the measured parameter over the calls of

all individuals) and the standard deviation (SD_{inter} = sd of the measured parameter over the calls of all individuals). Then we calculated the coefficients of variation between individuals ($CV_{inter} = 100 * SD_{inter} / MEAN_{inter}$) and within individuals (CV_{intra} = mean of individual CV values; with $CV = 100 * SD / MEAN$ for each individual). PIC was calculated as CV_{inter} / CV_{intra} , whereby values above 1 indicate higher variation between individuals than within individuals and thus the potential for this variable to encode individual information (Salmi et al., 2014). To test for any changes in individual distinctiveness across ontogeny, we used discriminant function analysis (DFA; (Klecka & Iversen, 1980)) on the measured acoustic variables of ten individuals, when they were younger than 250 days, and ten individuals at the age between 250 and 380 days of age to get the percentage of correct assignment of calls to individuals, using the leave-one-out cross validation method (Hair, Anderson, Tatham, & Black, 1995; McGarigal, Cushman, & Stafford, 2013; Mundry & Sommer, 2007). Since we had 13 individuals between 250 and 380 days with enough high quality calls, of which five were the same as in the younger category (younger than 250 days) and eight were different individuals, we randomly selected ten of these 13 using the sample function in R. For both age categories we used 16 calls per individual resulting in 160 calls each. Whenever we had more than 16 calls from an individual, we randomly selected 16 calls using the sample function in R. To calculate the chance level correct assignment, we used a randomisation approach, whereby correct assignment by chance was averaged from DFAs conducted on 1'000 randomised permutations of the dataset (separately for younger and older individuals) (McGarigal et al., 2013; Solow, 1990).

Ethical note

All the recordings and observations used in this study were conducted with the permission of the ethical committee of Pretoria University and the Northern Cape Conservation Service, South Africa (Permit Number: ECO31-13).

RESULTS

Starting age to act as sentinel

Mean age when meerkats first began to act as sentinel for one minute or longer was 202.12 ± 65.4 days (mean $\pm$ std. dev.). Young meerkats in larger groups conducted their first sentinel bout at a later age than meerkats in smaller groups (LRT: $\chi^2_1 = 161.53$, $P < 0.001$; LMM: $\beta = 0.12$, $se = 0.009$, $P < 0.001$; Fig. 2). Males did not differ significantly from females in the age at first sentinel bout (LRT: $\chi^2_1 = 0.511$, $P = 0.475$; LMM: $\beta = -0.07$, $se = 0.10$, $P = 0.475$). Comparing the starting age to act as sentinels with the starting age of other cooperative behaviours for the same set of individuals showed that age when meerkats first demonstrated pup feeding at 191.43 ± 73.84 days and the first babysitting at 211.77 ± 76.44 days were similar.

Likelihood to produce different sentinel call types and call rates

All six described sentinel call types were present in recordings of the youngest individuals (112-127 days old; see Fig. A1. for spectrograms of the six sentinel call types produced by subadults). Accordingly, the likelihood to find any of the six sentinel call types in a given recording was not affected by the sentinel experience, i.e. the total amount of time (GuardSum in minutes) an individual had been recorded as sentinel (Table 1; Fig. 3). However, the call rates of sentinel calming calls (single and double note calls) and sentinel warning calls (didrrr and wheek calls) emitted during sentinel behaviour changed with experience of the calling individuals (Table 2). Calming calls significantly increased with

increasing experience as sentinel, i.e. GuardSum, whereby individuals in larger groups had shallower slopes than individuals in smaller groups (Table 2.). In contrast, the call rate of warning calls decreased with increasing experience of the caller. Again, this effect was smaller in larger groups, i.e. individuals in smaller groups decreased the call rate of sentinel warning calls faster than individuals in larger groups.

Acoustic parameters and individuality

Visual inspection of the plotted mean fundamental frequency (f_0), mean peak amplitude (ampl), duration and mean entropy of the first note of the double note calls showed high variation in the amount (total difference between first and last recording) and degree of change (slopes) for different individuals over age (Fig. 4). Accordingly, we found consistent individual differences in the mean of all measured parameters (different intercepts; LRT, f_0 : $\chi^2_1=46.47$, $P < 0.001$; ampl: $\chi^2_1=14.71$, $P < 0.001$; duration: $\chi^2_1=63.09$, $P < 0.001$; entropy: $\chi^2_1=8.90$, $P = 0.003$), but no general effect of age (Table 3; Fig. 4). Due to the current data structure we were unable to test whether individuals also differed from each other across age (different slopes). The potential for individual coding (PIC) of all measured variables was above 1 (duration: PIC=1.65; mean fundamental frequency: PIC=1.46; mean peak amplitude: PIC=1.46; mean entropy: PIC=1.22), thus all variables had the potential to be individually distinct. DFA analysis resulted in 65% correct assignment of ten individuals younger than 250 days, which was significantly higher than expected by chance (C.I.=0.57-0.72, mean $\pm$ sd chance correct assignment = 10% $\pm$ 5%, $P < 0.001$). Call analysis of 10 individuals between 250 and 400 days showed a correct assignment of 57.7% (C.I. = 0.57-0.77, mean $\pm$ sd chance correct assignment = 10% $\pm$ 5%, $P < 0.001$), which suggests consistent individual distinctiveness when individuals first act as sentinels up to six months later.

DISCUSSION

This study addressed the ontogeny of sentinel behaviour in meerkats, in particular the age at which they first start to act as sentinels, the likelihood to produce the six distinct sentinel call types and their respective call rates, as well as the acoustic properties and the development of individual signatures in sentinel calls. We demonstrate that the onset of acting as a sentinel guard was highly dependent on group size. Individuals from smaller groups exhibited sentinel behaviour at an earlier age than individuals from larger groups. This study also provides new evidence that, although all six described sentinel call types were already present in the repertoire upon first emergence of the behaviour, subadult meerkats increased the call rate of calming calls (single and double note calls) and decreased the call rate of warning calls (didrrr and wheek calls) with increasing experience as sentinel guard. For both categories of sentinel calls individuals from smaller groups demonstrated faster changes in call rates compared to individuals from larger groups given the same amount (total duration) of sentinel experience. Analysis of double note calls indicated that mean fundamental frequency, mean amplitude, duration and entropy differed consistently between individuals, but we found no general effect of age. Lastly, our results provide evidence that the individual signature of meerkats was already developed in their calls when they first started to go on sentinel guard and changed little later on in age.

The mean onset of sentinel behaviour of around 202 days of age was similar to the onset of the other cooperative behaviours including pup feeding (191 days) and babysitting (212 days). This might suggest that young individuals, which may be less efficient foragers and are still investing energy into growth did not have the necessary condition to contribute to the different cooperative behaviours. Supplementary feeding experiments of adult meerkats demonstrated that sentinel behaviour, as well as pup feeding, is highly condition dependent (Clutton-Brock et al., 2001; Clutton-Brock, O'Riain,

et al., 1999; Wright, Berg, de Kort, et al., 2001). However, it is also possible that acting as a sentinel requires individuals to have the necessary experience to correctly assess the surroundings regarding potential threats. In line with this, meerkats younger than six months have been demonstrated to produce fewer correct predator specific alarm calls compared to adults, suggesting that individuals gradually learn to associate specific external stimuli with the correct calls (Hollén & Manser, 2007). Our result that group size highly affected when young meerkats start to act as sentinels suggests that the development of sentinel behaviour is not related to absolute age or maturity, but highly dependent on the social environment. This is supported by previous work demonstrating that individual contribution to sentinel behaviour decreases with increasing group size (Clutton-Brock, O'Riain, et al., 1999). The risk of being predated is higher in smaller groups, and potentially therein even higher for young individuals (Clutton-Brock, Gaynor, et al., 1999). Therefore, young individuals benefit from acting as sentinel as this is supposed to be the safest position in the group (i.e. sentinels usually reach shelter first) (Bednekoff, 2001; Clutton-Brock, O'Riain, et al., 1999; Wright, Berg, de Kort, et al., 2001). Future research could investigate if in smaller groups young individuals that start acting as a guard might even be lighter in weight, but because of the higher predation pressure invest more into antipredator behaviours than same-aged and potentially heavier individuals from larger groups. We would like to encourage more work on the onset of sentinel behaviour and other cooperative behaviours in other species in order to enable cross-species comparisons of ontogenetic development of these behaviours.

The fact that all the six different sentinel call types were already produced when individuals first start to act as sentinels could be due to several reasons. First, sentinel call types might be innate and thus appear in their repertoire as soon as the context (sentinel behaviour) is shown by young meerkats. Second, sentinel call types are not exclusively used in the context of sentinel behaviour, but also in social and other vigilance contexts including allo-grooming and sunning behaviour in the morning and baby-sitting at the

burrow (Collier et al., 2017; Manser, 1998). Pups themselves already produce the single note calls within the first weeks of their life either as single calls or as units within longer call series (Manser, 1998). Consequently, by the time young meerkats start to go on guard, they have already learned how to produce the different call types in other contexts. Third, it is likely that young individuals pick up the different sentinel call types from an early age on, as they are exposed to these calls from the first days of foraging with the group when they are about four weeks old. Previous work on the ontogeny of the behavioural response to alarm calls showed mixed results: while some behavioural responses seemed to undergo the biggest ontogenetic changes before young become independent foragers (within three months), other characteristics, such as reaction time and response duration only developed later (Hollén & Manser, 2006). Further research, such as acoustic recordings of younger individuals, i.e. pups and juveniles, during different contexts, is needed to fully understand when and how young meerkats include acoustically similar or the same call types used in sentinel context in their vocal repertoire. Moreover, while we have accounted for potential differences among groups by adding group ID as a random effect, additional factors, including social learning from group members or habitat characteristics may further influence the ontogenetic development of sentinel behaviour, such as the likelihood to produce specific call types or the order of use of call types.

While previous work on the ontogeny of meerkat alarm calls demonstrates that young meerkats (<12months) show a high correct classification along the level of urgency (correct assignment of low and high urgency contexts) (Hollén & Manser, 2007), we found an increase in the call rate of sentinel calming calls (low perceived risk) and a decrease in the call rate of sentinel warning calls (higher perceived risk) with increasing experience of the caller. We did not find any change in call rates of sentinel middle calls, which may indicate that these changes are more subtle than changes of either sentinel calming calls or sentinel warning calls, thus requiring a larger sample size to be able to detect any potential change with increasing experience. In both cases where we see a change in call

rates, sentinel calming and warning calls, there was a significant interaction with group size, with smaller groups showing a faster increase or decrease in call rate compared to larger groups. The increase in calming calls, is likely due to meerkats becoming more confident in their assessment of urgency levels with more experience. The higher call rate of warning calls when individuals are younger, could be an overestimation of the perceived predation risk, similar to infant vervet monkeys (*Cercopithecus aethiops*), which frequently produce alarm calls to non-threatening stimuli and only restrict their alarm calls to actual predator species over time (Seyfarth & Cheney, 1986). In such situations, when young show a stronger reaction to non-threatening stimuli, the question is whether this represents an adaptive adjustment to age-dependent differences in predation risk, or whether young are just overreacting and still need to improve discrimination between threatening and non-threatening situations. As young meerkats did not show an increased fear response to predators that present a greater threat for young compared to adults (Hollén, Clutton-Brock, et al., 2008), this may indicate that in the context of sentinel behaviour higher call rates of warning calls may not necessarily be adaptive, but rather increasing experience improves the discrimination abilities between different levels of danger. This is supported by the results that young from smaller groups, which still experience higher relative predation pressures than young from larger groups, but are faster in accumulating experience as sentinels, show a faster decrease in warning calls and a faster increase in calming calls.

In line with the absence of changes in acoustic parameters of the double note calls, one of the two most frequently emitted, individually distinct sentinel calls (Manser, 1999), our results indicate that individual distinctiveness is already as high as in adults when individuals started to act as sentinels. This is in contrast to studies showing an increase in individuality with increasing age in domestic goat kids (*Capra hircus*; (Briefer & McElligott, 2011), goitred gazelles (*Gazella subgutturosa*; (Lapshina et al., 2012) and chicks of non-passerine birds (Insley, Phillips, & Charrier, 2003; Jones, Falls, & Gaston,

1987; Klenova, Volodin, & Volodina, 2009; Lefevre, Montgomerie, & Gaston, 1998). However, meerkats only started to act as sentinels when they were 200 days old, and it is therefore possible that they do undergo acoustic development and changes in individual distinctiveness at a younger age. This seems likely when considering that the double note calls are also produced in several other contexts which are shown before the onset of sentinel behaviour (Collier et al., 2017). Alternatively, it has been argued that discrimination among signallers may play an important role in particular in systems where callers have variable thresholds to call, such as for example in young or inexperienced individuals (Blumstein & Daniel, 2004) or where calls refer to the perceived risk of the caller (Blumstein & Armitage, 1997), potentially leading to an early development of individual distinctiveness for these calls. This supports recent work demonstrating that sentinel double note calls refer to the caller's perceived risk (Rauber & Manser, 2017), whereby individuals likely differ in their assessment of the level of risk. Moreover, foraging meerkats (adults and subadults) discriminate between the calming calls of different sentinel individuals and adjust the extent to which they rely on social information provided by these individuals (Rauber & Manser, 2018).

To conclude, we show that subadult meerkats started acting as sentinels when they were around 200 days old (simultaneous with other cooperative behaviours) and other than slight adjustments in call rates demonstrated little change in vocal call patterns with increasing age and experience. As the majority of sentinel calls are also produced in other contexts, it is possible that vocal ontogeny takes place at a younger age. Alternatively, but not mutually exclusive, our results may suggest strong selective pressures on antipredator behaviours such as the sentinel system, resulting in a fully functional behavioural and vocal response upon first emergence of sentinel behaviour. A third possibility is that the similar vocal calling behaviour of subadults and young adults may indicate that, in contrast to the alarm call system, which are directly related to the presence of a predator and show ontogenetic development (Hollén, Clutton-Brock, et al.,

2008; Hollén & Manser, 2006, 2007), individuals of different ages experience similar levels of risk when producing sentinel calls, i.e. in the absence of a predator, therefore showing the same behavioural and vocal responses. Further research on individual vocalisations of pups (up to three months) and juveniles (three to six months) is needed to understand the extent of ontogenetic development on the different call types and the roles of social environment and age specific selection pressure.

FUNDING

R.R., M.B.M., and research expenses were funded by the University of Zurich. The long-term field site KMP was financed by the Universities of Cambridge and Zurich, and the MAVA foundation. This article has relied on records of individual identities and/or life histories maintained by the KMP, which has been supported financially by the European Research Council (Grant No 294494 to Tim Clutton-Brock.) since 1 July 2012) and the University of Zurich, as well as logistically by the Mammal Research Institute of the University of Pretoria.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We thank the Kalahari Research Trust, and here in particular Tim Clutton-Brock, and the Northern Cape Conservation Authority for research permission (FAUNA 1020/2016). We also thank Dave Gaynor for organizing the field site as well as the managers and volunteers of the Kalahari Meerkat Project (KMP) for organizing and helping to collect the data about sentinel behaviour and life history of the meerkats. Furthermore, we thank Megan Wyman, Matthew Petelle, and two anonymous reviewers for their valuable input on the methodology and clarity of this article.

COMPETING INTERESTS

505 We declare we have no competing interests.

506

507 REFERENCES

508 Bednekoff, P. A. (2001). Coordination of safe, selfish sentinels based on mutual benefits.

509 *Annales Zoologici Fennici*, 38(1), 5-14.

510 Bednekoff, P. A. (2015). Sentinel Behavior: A Review and Prospectus. In M. Naguib, H. J.

511 Brockmann, J. C. Mitani, L. W. Simmons, L. Barrett, S. Healy, & P. J. B. Slater (Eds.),

512 *Advances in the Study of Behavior*, Vol 47 (Vol. 47, pp. 115-145). San Diego: Elsevier

513 Academic Press Inc.

514 Berg, K. S., Beissinger, S. R., & Bradbury, J. W. (2013). Factors shaping the ontogeny of

515 vocal signals in a wild parrot. *Journal of Experimental Biology*, 216(2), 338-345.

516 doi:10.1242/jeb.073502

517 Blumstein, D. T., & Armitage, K. B. (1997). Alarm calling in yellow-bellied marmots .1. The

518 meaning of situationally variable alarm calls. *Animal Behaviour*, 53, 143-171.

519 Blumstein, D. T., & Daniel, J. C. (2004). Yellow-bellied marmots discriminate between the

520 alarm calls of individuals and are more responsive to calls from juveniles. *Animal*

521 *Behaviour*, 68, 1257-1265.

522 Blumstein, D. T., Verneyre, L., & Daniel, J. C. (2004). Reliability and the adaptive utility of

523 discrimination among alarm callers. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B-Biological*

524 *Sciences*, 271(1550), 1851-1857. doi:10.1098/rspb.2004.2808

525 Briefer, E., & McElligott, A. G. (2011). Mutual mother-offspring vocal recognition in an

526 ungulate hider species (*Capra hircus*). *Animal cognition*, 14(4), 585-598.

527 Caro, T. M. (2005). Antipredator Defense in Birds and Mammals. *Antipredator Defense in*

528 *Birds and Mammals*.

529 Cleveland, J., & Snowdon, C. T. (1982). The Complex Vocal Repertoire of the Adult Cotton-

530 top Tamarin (*Saguinus oedipus oedipus*) 1. *Zeitschrift für Tierpsychologie*, 58(3),

531 231-270.

532 Clutton-Brock, T. H., Brotherton, P. N. M., O'Riain, M. J., Griffin, A. S., Gaynor, D., Kansky, R.,
 533 . . . McIlrath, G. M. (2001). Contributions to cooperative rearing in meerkats.
 534 *Animal Behaviour*, 61, 705-710. doi:10.1006/anbe.2000.1631
 535 Clutton-Brock, T. H., Gaynor, D., Kansky, R., MacColl, A. D. C., McIlrath, G., Chadwick, P., . . .
 536 Skinner, J. D. (1998). Costs of cooperative behaviour in suricates (*Suricata*
 537 *suricatta*). *Proceedings of the Royal Society B-Biological Sciences*, 265(1392), 185-
 538 190.
 539 Clutton-Brock, T. H., Gaynor, D., McIlrath, G. M., Maccoll, A. D. C., Kansky, R., Chadwick, P.,
 540 . . . Brotherton, P. N. M. (1999). Predation, group size and mortality in a
 541 cooperative mongoose, *Suricata suricatta*. *Journal of Animal Ecology*, 68(4), 672-
 542 683. doi:10.1046/j.1365-2656.1999.00317.x
 543 Clutton-Brock, T. H., & Manser, M. B. (2016). Meerkats: cooperative breeding in the
 544 Kalahari. *Cooperative breeding in vertebrates: Studies of ecology, evolution, and*
 545 *behavior*, 294-317.
 546 Clutton-Brock, T. H., O'Riain, M. J., Brotherton, P. N. M., Gaynor, D., Kansky, R., Griffin, A. S.,
 547 & Manser, M. (1999). Selfish sentinels in cooperative mammals. *Science*,
 548 284(5420), 1640-1644.
 549 Collier, K., Townsend, S. W., & Manser, M. B. (2017). Call concatenation in wild meerkats.
 550 *Animal Behaviour*, 134, 257-269.
 551 Crawley, M. J. (2012). *The R Book*. Jon Wiley & Sons Ltd., Chichester.
 552 Doolan, S. P., & Macdonald, D. W. (1996). Diet and foraging behaviour of group-living
 553 meerkats, *Suricata suricatta*, in the southern Kalahari. *Journal of Zoology*, 239,
 554 697-716.
 555 Hair, J. F., Anderson, R. E., Tatham, R. L., & Black, W. C. (1995). Multivariate data analysis
 556 New York. NY: Macmillan.

557 Hare, J. F., & Atkins, B. A. (2001). The squirrel that cried wolf: reliability detection by
 558 juvenile Richardson's ground squirrels (*Spermophilus richardsonii*). *Behavioral*
 559 *Ecology and Sociobiology*, 51(1), 108-112. doi:10.1007/s002650100414
 560 Hollén, L. I., Bell, M. B. V., & Radford, A. N. (2008). Cooperative sentinel calling? Foragers
 561 gain increased biomass intake. *Current Biology*, 18(8), 576-579.
 562 doi:10.1016/j.cub.2008.02.078
 563 Hollén, L. I., Bell, M. B. V., Russell, A., Niven, F., Ridley, A. R., & Radford, A. N. (2011). Calling
 564 by Concluding Sentinels: Coordinating Cooperation or Revealing Risk? *Plos One*,
 565 6(10).
 566 Hollén, L. I., Clutton-Brock, T., & Manser, M. B. (2008). Ontogenetic changes in alarm-call
 567 production and usage in meerkats (*Suricata suricatta*): adaptations or
 568 constraints? *Behavioral Ecology and Sociobiology*, 62(5), 821-829.
 569 doi:10.1007/s00265-007-0508-x
 570 Hollén, L. I., & Manser, M. B. (2007). Motivation before meaning: motivational information
 571 encoded in meerkat alarm calls develops earlier than referential information. *The*
 572 *American Naturalist*, 169(6), 758-767.
 573 Hollén, L. I., & Radford, A. N. (2009). The development of alarm call behaviour in mammals
 574 and birds. *Animal Behaviour*, 78(4), 791-800.
 575 Hollén, L. I., & Manser, M. B. (2006). Ontogeny of alarm call responses in meerkats,
 576 *Suricata suricatta*: the roles of age, sex and nearby conspecifics. *Animal Behaviour*,
 577 72(6), 1345-1353.
 578 Hollén, L. I., & Manser, M. B. (2007). Motivation before meaning: motivational information
 579 encoded in meerkat alarm calls develops earlier than referential information. *The*
 580 *American Naturalist*, 169(6), 758-767.
 581 Horrocks, J., & Hunte, W. (1986). Sentinel behaviour in vervet monkeys: who sees whom
 582 first? *Animal Behaviour*, 34(5), 1566-1568.

583 Insley, S., Phillips, A. V., & Charrier, I. (2003). A review of social recognition in pinnipeds.
584 *Aquatic Mammals*, 29(2), 181-201.

585 Jansen, D. A., Cant, M. A., & Manser, M. B. (2012). Segmental concatenation of individual
586 signatures and context cues in banded mongoose (*Mungos mungo*) close calls.
587 *BMC Biology*, 10(1), 97.

588 Jones, I. L., Falls, J. B., & Gaston, A. J. (1987). Vocal recognition between parents and young
589 of ancient murrelets, *Synthliboramphus antiquus* (Aves: Alcidae). *Animal*
590 *Behaviour*, 35(5), 1405-1415.

591 Jouventin, P., & Aubin, T. (2002). Acoustic systems are adapted to breeding ecologies:
592 individual recognition in nesting penguins. *Animal Behaviour*, 64(5), 747-757.

593 Kern, J. M., & Radford, A. N. (2013). Call of duty? Variation in use of the watchman's song
594 by sentinel dwarf mongooses, *Helogale parvula*. *Animal Behaviour*, 85(5), 967-
595 975.

596 Klecka, W. R., & Iversen, G. R. (1980). *Discriminant analysis* (Vol. 19): Sage.

597 Klenova, A. V., Volodin, I. A., & Volodina, E. V. (2009). The variation in reliability of
598 individual vocal signature throughout ontogenesis in the red-crowned crane *Grus*
599 *japonensis*. *Acta ethologica*, 12(1), 29-36.

600 Krause, J., & Ruxton, G. D. (2002). Living in groups. *Living in groups*, i.

601 Kruuk, H. (1964). Predators and anti-predator behaviour of the black-headed gull (*Larus*
602 *ridibundus* L.). *Behaviour. supplement*, III-129.

603 Lapshina, E. N., Volodin, I. A., Volodina, E. V., Frey, R., Efremova, K. O., & Soldatova, N. V.
604 (2012). The ontogeny of acoustic individuality in the nasal calls of captive goitred
605 gazelles, *Gazella subgutturosa*. *Behavioural processes*, 90(3), 323-330.

606 Lefevre, K., Gaston, A. J., & Montgomerie, R. (2001). Repertoire, structure, and individual
607 distinctiveness of Thick-billed Murre calls. *The Condor*, 103(1), 134-142.

608 Lefevre, K., Montgomerie, R., & Gaston, A. J. (1998). Parent-offspring recognition in thick-
609 billed murres (Aves: Alcidae). *Animal Behaviour*, 55(4), 925-938.

610 Maciej, P., Fischer, J., & Hammerschmidt, K. (2011). Transmission characteristics of
611 primate vocalizations: implications for acoustic analyses. *PloS one*, 6(8), e23015.

612 Manser, M. B. (1998). *The evolution of auditory communication in suricates, Suricata*
613 *suricatta* (Doctoral dissertation). Cambridge, UK: University of Cambridge.

614 Manser, M. B. (1999). Response of foraging group members to sentinel calls in suricates,
615 *Suricata suricatta*. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B-Biological Sciences*,
616 266(1423), 1013-1019. doi:10.1098/rspb.1999.0737

617 Manser, M. B. (2001). The acoustic structure of suricates' alarm calls varies with predator
618 type and the level of response urgency. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B-*
619 *Biological Sciences*, 268(1483), 2315-2324. doi:10.1098/rspb.2001.1773

620 Manser, M. B., Bell, M. B., & Fletcher, L. B. (2001). The information that receivers extract
621 from alarm calls in suricates. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B-Biological Sciences*,
622 268(1484), 2485-2491. doi:10.1098/rspb.2001.1772

623 Manser, M. B., Seyfarth, R. M., & Cheney, D. L. (2002). Suricate alarm calls signal predator
624 class and urgency. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, 6(2), 55-57. doi:10.1016/s1364-
625 6613(00)01840-4

626 McGarigal, K., Cushman, S. A., & Stafford, S. (2013). *Multivariate statistics for wildlife and*
627 *ecology research*: Springer Science & Business Media.

628 McGowan, K. J., & Woolfenden, G. E. (1989). A sentinel system in the Florida scrub jay.
629 *Animal Behaviour*, 37, 1000-1006.

630 Miller, C. T., & Thomas, A. W. (2012). Individual recognition during bouts of antiphonal
631 calling in common marmosets. *Journal of Comparative Physiology A*, 198(5), 337-
632 346.

633 Mundry, R., & Sommer, C. (2007). Discriminant function analysis with nonindependent
634 data: consequences and an alternative. *Animal Behaviour*, 74(4), 965-976.

635 R Core Team. (2018). R: A language and environment for statistical computing. R
636 Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria. 2012. URL [http://www.R-](http://www.R-project.org)
637 [project.org](http://www.R-project.org).

638 Radford, A. N., & Ridley, A. R. (2008). Close calling regulates spacing between foraging
639 competitors in the group-living pied babbler. *Animal Behaviour*, 75(2), 519-527.

640 Ramakrishnan, U., & Coss, R. G. (2000). Age differences in the responses to adult and
641 juvenile alarm calls by bonnet macaques (*Macaca radiata*). *Ethology*, 106(2), 131-
642 144. doi:10.1046/j.1439-0310.2000.00501.x

643 Rasa, O. A. E. (1986). Coordinated vigilance in dwarf mongoose family groups - the
644 watchmans song hypothesis and the costs of guarding. *Ethology*, 71(4), 340-344.

645 Rasa, O. A. E. (1989). The costs and effectiveness of vigilance behaviour in the dwarf
646 mongoose: implications for fitness and optimal group size. *Ethology Ecology &*
647 *Evolution*, 1(3), 265-282.

648 Rauber, R., Clutton-Brock, T. H., & Manser, M. B. (2019). Drought decreases cooperative
649 sentinel behavior and affects vocal coordination in meerkats. *Behavioral Ecology*,
650 30(6), 1558-1566.

651 Rauber, R., Kranstauber, B., & Manser, M. B. (2020). Call order within vocal sequences of
652 meerkats contains temporary contextual and individual information. *BMC*
653 *Biology*, 18(1), 119. doi:10.1186/s12915-020-00847-8

654 Rauber, R., & Manser, M. B. (2017). Discrete call types referring to predation risk enhance
655 the efficiency of the meerkat sentinel system. *Scientific reports*, 7, 44436.

656 Rauber, R., & Manser, M. B. (2018). Experience of the signaller explains the use of social
657 versus personal information in the context of sentinel behaviour in meerkats.
658 *Scientific Reports*, 8(1), 11506.

659 Ridley, A. R., & Raihani, N. J. (2006). Facultative response to a kleptoparasite by the
660 cooperatively breeding pied babbler. *Behavioral Ecology*, 18(2), 324-330.

661 Salmi, R., Hammerschmidt, K., & Doran-Sheehy, D. M. (2014). Individual distinctiveness in
662 call types of wild western female gorillas. *PloS one*, 9(7), e101940.

663 Schneiderova, I., Schnitzerova, P., Uhlíková, J., Brandl, P., Zouhar, J., & Matějů, J. (2015).
664 Differences in alarm calls of juvenile and adult European ground squirrels
665 (*Spermophilus citellus*): Findings on permanently marked animals from a semi-
666 natural enclosure. *Zoo biology*, 34(6), 503-512.

667 Seyfarth, R. M., & Cheney, D. L. (1986). Vocal development in vervet monkeys. *Animal*
668 *Behaviour*, 34(6), 1640-1658.

669 Sharpe, L. L., Hill, A., & Cherry, M. I. (2013). Individual recognition in a wild cooperative
670 mammal using contact calls. *Animal Behaviour*, 86(5), 893-900.

671 Sherman, P. W. (1977). Nepotism and the evolution of alarm calls. *Science*, 197(4310),
672 1246-1253.

673 Snowdon, C. T., & Cleveland, J. (1980). Individual recognition of contact calls by pygmy
674 marmosets. *Animal Behaviour*, 28(3), 717-727.

675 Solow, A. R. (1990). A randomization test for misclassification probability in discriminant
676 analysis. *Ecology*, 2379-2382.

677 Theis, K. R., Greene, K. M., Benson-Amram, S. R., & Holekamp, K. E. (2007). Sources of
678 variation in the long-distance vocalizations of spotted hyenas. *Behaviour*, 144(5),
679 557-584.

680 Volodin, I. A., Lapshina, E. N., Volodina, E. V., Frey, R., & Soldatova, N. V. (2011). Nasal and
681 oral calls in juvenile goitred gazelles (*Gazella subgutturosa*) and their potential to
682 encode sex and identity. *Ethology*, 117(4), 294-308.

683 Wright, J., Berg, E., De Kort, S. R., Khazin, V., & Maklakov, A. A. (2001). Cooperative sentinel
684 behaviour in the Arabian babbler. *Animal Behaviour*, 62, 973-979.
685 doi:10.1006/anbe.2001.1838

686 Wright, J., Berg, E., de Kort, S. R., Khazin, V., & Maklakov, A. A. (2001). Safe selfish sentinels
687 in a cooperative bird. *Journal of Animal Ecology*, 70(6), 1070-1079.
688 doi:10.1046/j.0021-8790.2001.00565.x
689 Zahavi, A. (1990). Arabian babblers: the quest for social status in a cooperative breeder.
690 *Cooperative breeding in birds*, 103-130.
691 Zoratto, F., Santucci, D., & Alleva, E. (2009). Theories commonly adopted to explain the
692 antipredatory benefits of the group life: the case of starling (*Sturnus vulgaris*). *Atti*
693 *della Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei Classe di Scienze Fisiche Matematiche e*
694 *Naturali Rendiconti Lincei Scienze Fisiche e Naturali*, 20(2), 163-176.
695

TABLES

Table 1: Effect of sentinel experience on the probability to produce each of the six sentinel call types.

Call Type	Call Category	Estimate	Std error	<i>P</i>
Single note (sn)	Calming calls	0.32	0.34	0.336
Double note (dn)	Calming calls	0.38	0.38	0.320
Triple note (tn)	Middle calls	-0.11	0.27	0.701
Multiple note (mn)	Middle calls	0.84	0.44	0.078
Di-drrr call (didr)	Warning calls	-0.49	0.32	0.123
Wheek (wh)	Warning calls	-0.03	0.24	0.908

Estimates, standard errors and p-values resulting from the GLMM.

Table 2: Effect of sentinel experience and group size on changes in call rate of the sentinel calming calls (single and double note calls), middle calls (triple and multiple note calls) and sentinel warning calls (didrrr and wheek calls).

CallType	Variable	Estimate	Standard error	<i>P</i>
Calming calls	GuardSum	1.01	0.43	0.023
	GroupSize	0.74	0.54	0.193
	GuardSum*GroupSize	-1.01	0.44	0.027
Middle calls	GuardSum	0.23	0.16	0.167
	GroupSize	0.39	0.54	0.472
Warning calls	GuardSum	-1.19	0.44	0.008
	GroupSize	-0.61	0.56	0.263
	GuardSum*GroupSize	1.05	0.43	0.018

Estimates, standard errors and p-values resulting from the LMM.

Table 3. Effect of age on mean fundamental frequency, mean peak amplitude, duration and mean entropy of the first note produced in double note calls.

Acoustic parameter	Est±se	t	<i>P</i>
Mean Fundamental Frequency	0.03±0.25	0.15	0.88
Mean Peak Amplitude	-0.03±0.02	-1.71	0.09
Duration	-0.01±0.01	-0.79	0.43
Mean Entropy	-0.02±0.02	-1.19	0.24

708 Estimates, standard errors and p-values resulting from the LMM.

FIGURE LEGENDS

Figure 1. Spectrograms of the six distinct sentinel call types produced by adult meerkats acting as sentinel: a) single note call, b) double note call, c) triple note call, d) multiple note call, e) di-drrr call, f) wheek call. Sentinel calming calls: a) and b), middle calls: c) and d) and sentinel warning calls: e) and f) (reproduced after Manser 1999, Figure 1, permission granted by MM).

Figure 2. Influence of group size on age when females (grey) and males (black) were first recorded to act as sentinels for at least one minute. Plotted are predicted values from the LMM, the shaded areas represent 95% confidence intervals.

Figure 3. Appearance of each of the six sentinel call types in sentinel recordings of meerkats between the age of six and 15 months in relation to sentinel experience, i.e. the total amount of time (GuardSum in minutes) an individual has been recorded as sentinel. Each panel shows one of the six described sentinel call types

Figure 4. Ontogenetic development of mean fundamental frequency, mean peak amplitude, duration and mean entropy of the first note produced in double note calls with increasing age of the caller. Colours and connecting lines indicate identity of the 18 individuals with three or more high quality recordings.

Figure A1. Spectrograms of the six distinct sentinel call types produced by subadult meerkats on sentinel guard. From left to right: single note call, double note call, triple note call, multiple note call, di-drrr call and wheek call.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We thank the Kalahari Research Trust, and here in particular Tim Clutton-Brock, and the Northern Cape Conservation Authority for research permission (FAUNA 1020/2016). We also thank Dave Gaynor for organizing the field site as well as the managers and volunteers of the Kalahari Meerkat Project (KMP) for organizing and helping to collect the data about sentinel behaviour and life history of the meerkats. Furthermore, we thank Megan Wyman, Matthew Petelle, and two anonymous reviewers for their valuable input on the methodology and clarity of this article.

Figure 1

[Click here to access/download;Figure;Figure 1_2Oct2020.jpg](#)

[Click here to access/download;Figure;Figure 2_2Oct2020.jpg](#)

Figure 3

[Click here to access/download;Figure;Figure 3_2Oct2020.tiff](#)

Figure 4

[Click here to access/download;Figure;Figure 4_02Oct2020.tiff](#)

Figure A.1.

[Click here to access/download;Figure;Figure A1.jpg](#)