

1 **Wall following in *Xenopus laevis* is passive**

2 **Running title:** Wall following in *Xenopus laevis*

3

4 Sara Hänzi^{1,2*}, Hans Straka¹

5 ¹Department Biology II, Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität München, Großhaderner Str. 2, Planegg, Germany

6 ²Graduate School of Systemic Neurosciences, Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität München, Großhaderner Str. 2,

7 Planegg, Germany

8

9 *Corresponding author:

10 Sara Hänzi

11 Department Biology II

12 Ludwig-Maximilians-University Munich

13 Großhaderner Str. 2

14 82152 Planegg

15 Germany

16 Tel: +49 (0)89 / 2180 74356

17 Fax: +49 (0)89 / 2180 74304

18 E-mail address: haenzi@bio.lmu.de

19

20

21 **Key words:** locomotion, wall following, *Xenopus laevis*, thigmotaxis, centrophobism, swimming

22

23 **Summary statement:** *Xenopus laevis* tadpoles and froglets tend to swim along the walls of a square tank; but this
24 wall following is passive – in a convex tank, they leave the wall.

25

26

27 **Abstract**

28 The tendency of animals to follow boundaries within their environment can serve as a strategy for spatial learning or
29 defence. We examined whether animals of *Xenopus laevis* employ such a strategy by characterizing their swimming
30 behaviour. We also investigated potential developmental changes, the influence of tentacles, which some of the
31 developmental stages possess, and whether wall-following is active (animals seek out wall contact) or passive.
32 Animals' swimming movements were recorded with a camera from above in a square tank with shallow water and
33 their trajectories were analysed especially for proximity to the nearest wall. With the exception of young larvae, in
34 which wall following was less strong, the vast majority of animals – tadpoles and froglets – spent more time near the
35 wall than what would be expected from the proportion of the area near the wall. The total distance covered was not a
36 confounding factor. Wall following was also not influenced by whether the surrounding of the tank was black or
37 white, illuminated by infrared light, or by the presence or absence of tentacles. Animals were stronger wall followers
38 in smaller tanks. When given a choice in a convex tank to swim straight and leave the wall or turn to follow the wall,
39 the animals consistently left the wall, indicating that wall following in *Xenopus laevis* is passive. This implies that
40 wall following behaviour in *Xenopus* derives from constraints imposed by the environment (or the experimenter)
41 and is unlikely a strategy for spatial learning or safety-seeking.

42 **Introduction**

43 The exploratory behaviour of animals in unfamiliar environments is often characterized by a tendency to
44 follow walls or distinct borders. Such wall following has been described in mice and rats (Simon et al., 1994; Treit
45 and Fundytus, 1988), where it is often experimentally used as a readout for the level of the animal's anxiety (Prut
46 and Belzung, 2003; Walsh and Cummins, 1976). Well-studied examples of wall following also include fruit flies
47 and blind cavefish (Besson and Martin, 2005; Goetz and Biesinger, 1985; Liu et al., 2007; Teyke, 1989).

48 Different potential functions have been ascribed to wall following behaviours. In some cases, wall
49 following might be a defensive strategy; for instance avian predators likely have more difficulties catching e.g. a rat
50 when the latter is moving along a wall compared to when it is moving across an open field (Grossen and Kelley,
51 1972). This explanation is supported by the fact that rats increase wall following in aversive situations (Grossen and
52 Kelley, 1972), and thus legitimate the use of wall following in rodents as an indicator of anxiety (Gentsch et al.,
53 1987; Simon et al., 1994; Treit and Fundytus, 1988). On the other hand, wall following can also serve as a strategy
54 to learn the spatial setting of an environment. Blind cavefish, which live in dark caves without vision, explore
55 unfamiliar environments by swimming along vertical borders and thereby memorize the layout of the surrounding
56 (Teyke, 1989). A similar spatial learning has also been described in crayfish (Basil and Sandeman, 1999) and
57 humans (Kallai et al., 2005; Kallai et al., 2007), suggesting that wall following is widely used for spatial orientation
58 in vertebrates as well as invertebrates.

59 However, wall following does not necessarily imply that animals use this behaviour explicitly as a
60 defensive or exploratory strategy. In particular, simply observing a freely moving animal in a concave tank does not
61 indicate whether the animal actively seeks the proximity to the wall. A convex tank, on the other hand, can be used
62 to clearly distinguish between active and passive wall following (Creed and Miller, 1990). The convex curvature
63 allows the animal to choose to either continue straight and leave the wall, or to turn and follow the wall; the latter is
64 then termed active wall following. Accordingly, an animal might appear to be a strong wall follower in a square tank
65 simply because it has no option to make large turns and therefore continues to pursue the border (Creed and Miller,
66 1990).

67 To determine whether larvae and adults of the amphibian *Xenopus laevis* tend to swim along the walls of a
68 tank, we quantified the swimming behaviour of these animals in a square concave tank. In addition, tadpole
69 locomotion was recorded in square tanks of different sizes to assess the influence of the size of the environment.
70 Animals at different developmental stages – from small tadpoles (stage 46) to froglets – were employed to estimate
71 the effect of different locomotor styles as well as the role of mechanoreceptive tentacles, which are transiently
72 present at mid-larval stages, in wall following. Finally, a convex tank allowed discriminating between active and
73 passive wall following.

74

75 **Materials and methods**

76 *Animals*

77 Experiments were performed on tadpoles and froglets of the South African clawed toad *Xenopus laevis* ($n =$
78 92) of either sex at developmental stage 46 to 66 (according to Nieuwkoop and Faber, 1956). Stages were identified
79 based on morphological features in freely moving animals in a petri dish under a dissection microscope. All animals
80 were obtained from in-house breeding at the Biocenter of the Ludwig-Maximilians-University Munich, where
81 animals were kept in aerated tanks at 17°C on a 12:12 hour light:dark cycle. All behavioural observations complied
82 with the "Principles of animal care", publication No. 86-23, revised 1985 of the National Institute of Health.
83 Permission for experiments subjected to approval was granted by the Regierung von Oberbayern (55.2-1-54-2532.3-
84 59-12).

85 *Image data acquisition - hardware and software*

86 Image data were acquired with two different monochrome cameras from Point Grey (Richmond, Canada; now
87 FLIR Integrated Imaging Solutions) and Point Grey image acquisition software (Fly Capture). The camera was
88 placed in the centre above the tank to record the animal's movements in the horizontal plane. Videos obtained earlier
89 in the course of the study were acquired using a Grasshopper Firewire camera (GRAS-03K2M-C) with a 640 x 480
90 resolution at 15 frames per second (fps). These videos were saved as JPG-compressed AVI files. Videos obtained
91 later in the course of the study were acquired using a Grasshopper3 USB camera (GS3-U3-23S6M-C) with a
92 maximum resolution of 1200 x 1200 pixels. The resolution was adjusted depending on animal and tank size and
93 varied from 600 x 600 to 1200 x 1200 pixels with a frame rate of either 15 or 30 fps. Acquired images were saved as
94 LZW-compressed TIFF files. All image data was visually inspected in FIJI (Schindelin et al., 2012; Schindelin et
95 al., 2015), which was also used to create overlays. Further data analysis was performed using Python 3 (Python
96 Software Foundation, <https://www.python.org/>, see below for details).

97 *Image data acquisition - experimental conditions*

98 *Standard procedure.* One animal at a time was observed in a 19 x 19 cm Plexiglas tank with a water level of
99 0.5 to 1.4 cm (0.5 cm only for the smallest animals, otherwise 1.2 - 1.4 cm) at room temperature (20 - 24°C). The
100 vertical walls (20 cm high) of the tank were surrounded on the outer surface by white paper, and the tank was lit
101 from below with four cold light sources placed on either side (ZLED CLS6000, ZETT OPTICS GmbH, Germany)
102 or with a light box (Kaiser slimlite LED, Kaiser Fototechnik, Buchen, Germany) that created an evenly lit area of
103 46.0 x 20.5 cm. After 1 min adaptation to the environment, a 10 min video sequence was recorded for each of the 92
104 animals.

105 *Tank size.* In addition to the recordings of swimming behaviour in the 19 x 19 cm tank, a group of animals ($n =$
106 9, developmental stages 47 - 50) was also tested in a smaller square tank with floor dimensions of 7 x 7 cm. Animals
107 were filmed for 10 min in each tank; the order of the tank sizes was small first for half of the tested animals, and
108 large first for the other half. All images were acquired with the Point Grey Grasshopper3 camera at 15 fps.

109 *Alterations in the illumination.* To test for a potential influence of vision, a group of animals ($n = 10$,
110 developmental stages 50 - 65) were filmed successively with both a white and a black paper surrounding the tank,
111 for 10 min each, at a frame rate of 15 fps with the Grasshopper3 camera. The order of black/white was white first for

112 five animals and black first for the other five. A separate group of animals ($n = 40$, developmental stages 53 - 66)
113 was filmed for 10 min both under normal light conditions (see above) and with infrared (IR) illumination (IR
114 Illuminator, TV6700, EcoLine, 850 nm). Because the IR lights also emitted some red light (visible to a human
115 observer), the IR condition most likely was not entirely dark for the animals, but represented a considerably reduced
116 light condition. Half of the animals experienced the normal light condition first, whereas the other half started with
117 IR illumination. Original IR videos lasted 10.5 min and were reduced afterwards to 10 min by removing the first 30
118 s. The extra 30 s allowed the experimenter to leave the recording room without creating any potentially disturbing
119 light during the 10 min test period.

120 *Convex tank.* For the analysis of the swimming behaviour of animals in a convex tank, two of the straight walls
121 of the 19 x 19 cm tank were covered with curvatures. Since the number of swimming episodes along the curved
122 walls was limited, image acquisition was manually started and stopped. Occasionally, animals were gently touched
123 at the tail to stimulate swimming towards the convex curvatures and to redirect the swimming trajectory once the
124 animals got arrested in the concave part of the tank. Images were acquired with the Grasshopper3 camera at a frame
125 rate of 15 fps. Unlike the remaining data (see below), videos were not automatically tracked but visually inspected
126 by the experimenter. A ‘trial’ was considered as an animal following the wall and swimming past a convex curve,
127 either following the wall or leaving it. Trials were included independent of the body angles of the animal relative to
128 the wall prior to reaching the curve. Trials were excluded if the animal left the wall before reaching the peak of the
129 convex curve. The remaining trials were scored as ‘going straight’ if the animal departed from the wall at the curve,
130 and as ‘following the wall’ if the animal continued to follow the wall. The proportion of trials in which the animal
131 swam straight was then calculated for all animals with at least 4 trials.

132 *Tracking of swimming trajectories*

133 Data analysis was carried out by custom-written scripts using Python 3 in the spyder environment
134 (<https://github.com/spyder-ide/spyder>, version 2.3.8). The main packages included openCV 3
135 (<http://docs.opencv.org/3.0-beta/index.html>, version 3.1.0), matplotlib (<http://matplotlib.org/>, version 1.5.1), numpy
136 (<http://www.numpy.org/>, version 1.10.4), pandas (<http://pandas.pydata.org/>, version 0.18.0) and scipy
137 (<http://scipy.org/>, version 0.17.0). Due to the variety of image file types, image resolution, animal size, illumination
138 conditions and compression quality, the strategy for tracking the animal differed between different sets of
139 experiments. The main difference was that in some cases, background subtraction was carried out before
140 thresholding the image, whereas in other cases images were thresholded directly, either using a simple or a Gaussian
141 threshold.

142 In contrast, the following steps applied to all cases. The contours of the animals were extracted and the largest
143 contour was taken as the animal. X-Y positions were then calculated relative to the tank geometry. This
144 transformation was achieved by warping the images to the four corners of the tank, which were manually
145 determined. After trajectories were visually inspected, a plot of forward velocity and a video with the animal’s
146 position were generated to ensure that the animal was tracked faithfully. Erroneously tracked frames were identified
147 by visual inspection and spuriously high forward velocities, and their X-Y coordinates were interpolated. Such

148 corrections were necessary in 36 video sequences, 22 of which were animals in the standard condition, with
149 maximally 16 frames to interpolate. In some cases, none of the tracking strategies proved successful, leading to an
150 exclusion of 9 animals in the standard condition.

151 *Further data analysis*

152 From the X-Y position in the tank-warped images, parameters such as the distance covered during the
153 swimming and the distance to the nearest wall were calculated. To avoid including jitter as animal movement, the
154 trajectories were simplified with the Ramer-Douglas-Peucker algorithm (using the rdp python package,
155 <https://github.com/fhirschmann/rdp>). The epsilon parameter, which determines the degree of simplification, was set
156 to 10 in a 900 x 900 pixel video, and was scaled linearly to adjust for changes in the resolution. The simplified
157 trajectory was then used to calculate the total distance the animal covered during swimming. Only animals that
158 covered a distance of at least one side length of the tank were included in the analysis; in the standard condition, this
159 led to the exclusion of four animals. A threshold of 15 mm was chosen to define a ‘near wall’ area, and the
160 proportion of time that the animal spent near the wall was calculated. While it is desirable to keep the ‘near wall’
161 threshold as small as possible, 15 mm was chosen to ensure that the tracked centroid of the large animals was still
162 within that threshold when the animal was near a wall. With 15 mm, the ‘near wall’ area constituted 29.1% of the 19
163 x 19 cm tank.

164 When comparing different tank sizes (7 and 19 cm side length), the animals were compared with a 15 mm
165 ‘near wall’ threshold – which might indicate the attractiveness of the wall independent of the size of the tank.
166 However, since the ‘near wall’ area in the 7 x 7 cm tank constitutes 67.3% of the whole tank, the distribution of
167 distances to the wall in both tanks were normalised to the maximum distance, and a threshold was chosen to define
168 the ‘near wall’ area as intermediate in the proportion between the 29.1% and 67.3% that resulted from the 15 mm
169 threshold. Therefore, 0.28 of the maximal distance from the wall was chosen as a threshold for defining the ‘near
170 wall’ area independent of the tank’s size, yielding a ‘near wall’ area of 48% in both tanks, which was intermediate
171 between the ‘near wall’ proportions based on the 15 mm threshold in the two differently sized tanks.

172 *Code and data availability*

173 The python code used to analyse the data and the tracked data can be found on figshare (Hänzi and Straka,
174 2017a; Hänzi and Straka, 2017b; Hänzi and Straka, 2017c).

175 *Statistics and figures*

176 Parameters of interest were tested for normality using a Shapiro-Wilk test; the appropriate parametric or non-
177 parametric tests were chosen accordingly, using an alpha value of 0.05. The distribution of the proportion of time
178 spent near the wall of all animals in the standard condition was not normally distributed; therefore Spearman rank
179 correlations were used to test relationships to other parameters. Figures were assembled in Adobe Illustrator (Adobe
180 Systems Incorporated, San Jose, USA).

181

182 **Results**

183 *Swimming trajectories of tadpoles and young adult Xenopus*

184 The swimming behaviour of animals in a square tank between pre-metamorphic stage 47 (larvae) and post-
185 metamorphic stage 66 (froglets) was quantified by monitoring the animals' trajectories over a period of 10 minutes
186 in each individual (Fig. 1). Examples of animals at different developmental stages revealed a variety of swimming
187 behaviours with respect to the walls of the tank. Independent of developmental stage, some animals exhibited
188 trajectories that appeared to cover the entire tank (Fig. 2A-C), while others swam preferentially along the walls of
189 the tank (e.g. Fig. 2D,G). To visualise the extent of wall following, the cumulative frequency of distances to the
190 nearest wall over the 10 minutes period of swimming was plotted (see Fig. 1B). This graphical presentation is
191 equivalent to a histogram of distances to the nearest wall that are summed up along the X-axis.

192 The cumulative frequencies of distances to the nearest wall for all animals ($n = 79$) are shown in Figure 3A.
193 The proportion of time that the animals spent near the wall (within 15 mm of the wall) was taken as a measure of the
194 strength of wall following. As a group, the 79 animals differed significantly from the proportion that could be
195 expected from the 'near wall' area (29%, Fig. 3B, Wilcoxon signed rank test, $p < 0.0001$). Five animals, however,
196 spent less than 29% of their time near the wall, which is the proportion of the 'near wall' area. Four of these were of
197 developmental stage 48 or below and this tied in well with the impression that the strength of wall following
198 increased with developmental stage (Fig. 3C, Spearman's rank correlation between stage and proportion near the
199 wall, $\rho = 0.48$, $p < 0.0001$, $n = 79$), suggesting that *Xenopus* larvae/froglets become stronger wall followers during
200 ontogeny.

201 To reveal potential changes in wall following behaviour in individual animals over the 10 minute test period,
202 the respective proportions of time spent near the wall were separately calculated for the four quarters of the
203 swimming period (Fig. 3D). Since the proportions of the four quarters were not significantly different from each
204 other (Fig. 3B, Friedman test, $p = 0.29$), the individual wall following strategy of a particular animal persisted over
205 the entire test period. Moreover, the total distance covered within the 10 minutes was no confounding factor for wall
206 following, since the rank correlation between the total length of the trajectory and the proportion of time spent near
207 the wall was not significant (Fig. 3E, Spearman's rank correlation, $\rho = 0.03$, $p = 0.77$).

208 *Role of tentacles in wall following behaviour*

209 During larval development between stage 51 and 60, *Xenopus laevis* tadpoles transiently possess a mobile pair
210 of rod-like appendages that protrude from the corners of their mouths (Nieuwkoop and Faber, 1956). These
211 appendages might be necessary or at least advantageous for wall following, given the presence of Merkel cells,
212 potentially assigning a tactile function to these tentacles (Ovalle, 1979; Ovalle et al., 1998). However, contrasting
213 with normal development, a number of animals from our breeding facility failed to naturally develop noticeable
214 tentacles. This allowed to directly test the influence of tentacles on the degree of wall following. Accordingly, the
215 swimming behaviour of a population of tadpoles at developmental stages 54 - 60 without appendages ($n = 11$) was
216 compared with that of an age-matched group of tadpoles ($n = 13$) that possessed tentacles with a length of at least 3

217 mm.

218 Statistical analysis of the swimming behaviour as reported above indicated that both populations of animals
219 had a similar propensity for wall following (blue and red traces in Fig. 4A). This is demonstrated by the overlapping
220 distributions of the cumulative frequencies of distances to the nearest wall in animals with and without tentacles
221 (blue and red traces in Fig. 4A). The proportions of time that these animals spent near the wall were not significantly
222 different between animals with and without tentacles (Fig. 4B, Mann-Whitney-*U* test, $p = 0.09$). If anything, animals
223 without tentacles were located closer to the wall than animals with tentacles (see blue and red traces in inset in Fig.
224 4A). This likely derives from the fact that the presence of tentacles creates an additional distance of the tadpole with
225 respect to the wall that is not present in animals without tentacles. Tentacles are therefore no prerequisite for wall
226 following. This, however, does not exclude that tentacles are used as tactile probes; rather it shows that despite the
227 absence of tentacles, tadpoles follow the walls of a tank and potentially use facial skin areas as tactile probes.

228 *Wall following under different luminance conditions*

229 The wall following of *Xenopus* larvae/froglets analysed above was further examined during swimming under
230 different illumination conditions, which could have facilitated or impaired wall detection. A potential influence of
231 the visual system was therefore evaluated in a separate set of experiments where the swimming of stage 50 - 65
232 tadpoles/froglets ($n = 10$) was compared in a tank in which the four walls were covered on the outside by a white or
233 a black background (Fig. 5A,B). Analysis of the swimming behaviour indicated that the propensity for wall
234 following was not related to the background (Fig. 5B) based on the proportions of time that each animal spent near
235 the wall in the two conditions (paired t-test, $p = 0.59$). This suggests that the visual system exerts no apparent
236 influence on the tendency of *Xenopus* for wall following. This conclusion was confirmed by another set of
237 experiments in which the swimming behaviour of tadpoles/froglets ($n = 30$, stage 53-66) was tested under both
238 white light (cold light source) and infrared illumination (850 nm, Fig. 5C,D). Analysis of the proportion of time
239 spent near the wall revealed no significant difference between the two conditions (Fig. 5D, paired Wilcoxon signed-
240 rank test, $p = 0.47$), indicating that the reduced light condition during infrared illumination had no effect on wall
241 following.

242 *Influence of tank size on wall following*

243 Wall following might be influenced by the size of the environment. To test whether the wall is equally
244 attractive independent of the size of the tank, animals of developmental stages 47 – 50 ($n = 9$) were tested both in a
245 19 x 19 cm and in a 7 x 7 cm tank. The cumulative frequency distributions of distances to the nearest wall suggest
246 that the animals spend more time near the wall in the smaller tank (Fig. 6A). This is confirmed by comparing the
247 proportion of time that the animals spent near the wall (within 15 mm of the wall) in the two tanks: the proportions
248 in the small tank are significantly larger (Fig. 6B, paired Wilcoxon signed rank test, $p = 0.0078$). This suggests that
249 the wall is more attractive in the smaller tank. However, the ‘near wall’ area (within 15 mm of the wall) is also
250 relatively larger in the smaller tank (67.3% of the total area in the 7 x 7 cm tank vs. 29.1% of the total area in the 19
251 x 19 cm tank). To compare wall following on the same scale, the distances to the wall were normalised to their
252 maximum, and a threshold was chosen that resulted in an intermediate ‘near wall’ area (threshold of 28% of the

253 maximal distance to the wall, resulting in a ‘near wall’ area of 48% of the total tank area; Fig. 6C). The proportion
254 of time spent in these area-normalised ‘near wall’ areas was again significantly larger in the smaller tank (Fig. 6D,
255 paired Wilcoxon signed rank test, $p = 0.0078$). The animals are therefore stronger wall followers in the smaller tank
256 also when taking into account the differences in area.

257 *Wall following is passive*

258 Wall following might be either active such as in blind cavefish (Patton et al., 2010) or passive (distinction
259 according to Creed and Miller, 1990). To distinguish between the two possibilities for wall following in larval and
260 adult *Xenopus*, the swimming behaviour was tested in a specifically designed tank (Fig. 7A,B). The use of a tank in
261 which two of the four walls had convex curvatures allowed testing if tadpoles seek wall touch during swimming
262 actively or follow concave walls passively (red and blue arrows in Fig. 7A). The proportion of trials when animals
263 swam straight after encountering a convex curve (Fig. 7B) was evaluated from visual inspection by the
264 experimenter. The majority of tested tadpoles swam straight in all trials (Fig. 7B) more or less independent of their
265 developmental stage (Fig. 7C,D, $n = 22$), leading to the conclusion that wall following in *Xenopus* is passive.

266

267 **Discussion**

268 *Xenopus laevis* – from small tadpoles to froglets – tend to follow the wall when swimming in a square tank.
269 The strength of wall following increases with progressive development and smaller tank size and is not confounded
270 by the total distance that an animal covers. The transient presence of mechanosensory tentacles at mid-larval stages
271 does not lead to stronger wall following compared to animals that naturally do not develop these appendages. Also,
272 vision is unlikely a main driver of wall following, as surrounding the tank by black or white paper or changing the
273 light to infrared illumination does not change the strength of wall following. Wall following is passive as indicated
274 by straight swimming in a tank with convex curvatures. This indicates that wall following in *Xenopus* is likely
275 imposed by the concave environment. Wall following being passive might also explain why it persists across
276 metamorphosis and is present in both tadpoles and froglets, independent of their very different locomotor styles.

277 *Classification and different types of wall following*

278 Wall following in concave environments has been described for a wide variety of animals: from
279 crustaceans such as crayfish (Basil and Sandeman, 1999) to insects such as *Drosophila* (Besson and Martin, 2005;
280 Martin, 2004), or cockroaches (Camhi and Johnson, 1999; Jeanson et al., 2003; Okada and Toh, 2000), to fishes
281 such as zebrafish (Anichtchik et al., 2004; Colwill and Creton, 2011), goldfish (Kato et al., 1996), salmon (Clements
282 et al., 2002) or blind cavefish (Patton et al., 2010; Teyke, 1985; Teyke, 1989), to several rodent species including
283 voles, rats and mice (Eilam, 2004; Perrot-Sinal et al., 1999; Simon et al., 1994; Treit and Fundytus, 1988; Webster et
284 al., 1979; Wilson et al., 1976). In many cases, these examples of wall following behaviours have been described in
285 the context of thigmotaxis and centrophobism, and in relation to the level of anxiety. Thigmotaxis is a term that
286 describes the motion of an organism relative to a touch stimulus; it is often used as shorthand for positive
287 thigmotaxis, which means that animals actively seek out touch stimulation as they move. Centrophobism, on the

288 other hand, is a tendency of animals to avoid open spaces, for instance the centre of an open test field for mice or
289 rats (Martínez et al., 2002). Some authors use the term centrophobism when the avoidance of open spaces is related
290 to vision (Cardenas et al., 2001). For instance common spiny mice move much more often into an open space in the
291 dark than in the light (Eilam, 2004), though some authors use the term centrophobism without necessarily implying
292 a visual mechanism. Thus, centrophobism and thigmotaxis are two potential but not mutually exclusive mechanisms
293 that can lead to the avoidance of open spaces and the following of environmental boundaries. Wall following is
294 therefore a neutral term to describe the tendency of an animal to follow vertical walls in its environment without a
295 reference to the underlying mechanism. An environment with convex borders allows distinguishing between passive
296 and active wall following (Creed and Miller, 1990). Animals perform active wall following when voluntarily
297 seeking out the proximity to a wall and turn in order to remain near the wall. Passive wall following occurs when
298 animals leave the wall at a convex curve but follow the walls in a concave environment. When wall following is
299 active, thigmotaxis, centrophobism or a combination of the two can be the underlying mechanism.

300 *Potential uses of wall following*

301 Thigmotaxis has been described both as a defensive strategy (Grossen and Kelley, 1972) as well as a spatial
302 exploration strategy (Kallai et al., 2007). Animals might be safer near a vertical wall compared to the open; for
303 instance it has been suggested that avian predation on rats likely is lower near a wall than in the open (Grossen and
304 Kelley, 1972). Mice increase thigmotaxis in the presence of a potential predator (Bonsignore et al., 2008). Other
305 rodents such as the common spiny mouse only venture in the centre of an open field if there are objects that might
306 serve as shelter, or if it is dark (Eilam, 2004). Moreover, thigmotaxis has been related to anxiety, and is commonly
307 used as a simple behavioural readout of anxiety levels in mice and rats (Prut and Belzung, 2003; Simon et al., 1994;
308 Treit and Fundytus, 1988). Some authors argue that fear of open spaces is not only driven by touch but also by
309 vision (Martínez et al., 2002), which suggests that wall hugging and avoidance of open spaces is a combination of
310 thigmotaxis and centrophobism. Independent of the underlying mechanisms, the use as a defensive strategy is clear.
311 Moreover, wall following can also serve as a useful spatial exploration strategy. Especially under conditions when
312 long-range sensing such as vision is not available, exploration of the environment based on touch along its borders
313 can provide the basis for the formation of a cognitive map (Kallai et al., 2007; Yaski et al., 2009) and serve as a
314 reference frame for later exploration (Kallai et al., 2005). However, this is only useful as an initial strategy; if it is
315 used excessively it can even prevent further spatial learning (Kallai et al., 2007). Such initial wall following as a
316 means for spatial learning has been observed in various species such as crayfish (Basil and Sandeman, 1999), blind
317 cavefish (Teyke, 1989), and blind mole rats (Avni et al., 2008).

318 *Persistence of wall following with development in *Xenopus**

319 In this study we examined a range of developmental stages of *Xenopus* – from small to large tadpoles
320 immediately prior to metamorphosis as well as froglets after metamorphosis has been completed. Wall following in
321 a square tank was present at all developmental stages; the strength of wall following was weakest, however, in the
322 smallest tadpoles, stronger, with considerable variations in larger tadpoles and consistently strong in froglets. This
323 persistence suggests that wall following is not a behavioural strategy only employed by tadpoles or frogs, and is not

324 linked to a particular locomotor style such as undulatory tail-based propulsion or leg-based swimming. Moreover,
325 wall following in a convex tank was passive in all animals tested (see below). The weaker wall following in young
326 larvae is noticeable and might be related to the somewhat different swimming style of these animals (see Fig. 3A in
327 Hänzi and Straka, 2017), where the rotation axis of the left-right head undulations oscillates between positions
328 outside the animal; this is at variance with the situation in larger tadpoles where the head oscillations during
329 swimming occur around a single central axis (Lambert et al., 2009). This difference in swimming style might
330 facilitate turns away from a vertical wall in young larvae and explain the weaker wall following.

331 At intermediate developmental stages examined in this study (stage 51-60 according to Nieuwkoop and
332 Faber, (1956)), tadpoles normally possess a pair of mobile appendages protruding from the corners of their mouths,
333 which are retracted during undulatory swimming (Hänzi et al., 2015). These tentacles – like other skin areas –
334 possess mechanoreceptive Merkel cells (Nurse et al., 1983; Ovalle, 1979; Ovalle et al., 1998), and therefore the
335 tentacles likely serve a tactile function when the animal is stationary or cruising slowly with tentacles extended
336 forward. We hypothesised that these tentacles might be used to explore the environment in a way that is similar to
337 rodents' whiskers but simpler because the structure is not as specialised. However, younger larvae and older animals
338 at metamorphic climax (>stage 61) that do not possess any tentacles were overall similar in their wall following
339 tendencies, as were animals that for unknown reasons did not develop tentacles (Fig. 4). While this does not exclude
340 that – when present – tentacles are used for tactile exploration, it shows at least that tentacles are not necessary for
341 wall following, and if tactile exploration is needed, tadpoles might also use their facial skin.

342 *Effects of vision*

343 As mentioned above, some rodents leave the walls and venture much more into open space in darkness than
344 in light; this is true not only for the common spiny mouse (Eilam, 2004) but also for rats (Nasello et al., 1998), some
345 types of gerbil (Zadicario et al., 2005) and wild-caught prairie deer mice (Brillahart and Kaufman, 1991). Some
346 rodents also adjust their foraging behaviour in laboratory or natural conditions such that they venture more into the
347 open in the dark (Diaz, 1992; Price et al., 1984; Vasquez, 1996), and some authors also assign a role of vision in the
348 avoidance of open spaces by rats (Cardenas et al., 2001; Martínez et al., 2002). However, tadpoles and froglets of
349 *Xenopus laevis* did not show stronger wall following in light than under infrared illumination. While the IR lamps
350 used here did not produce pure infrared light, IR illumination nevertheless is a condition with considerably reduced
351 light and influence of vision. Centrophobism or visually driven fear of open spaces is therefore very unlikely to be
352 the driving force behind wall following in *Xenopus*. The wall following strategy might rather be a side effect of
353 locomotion in the mostly murky aquatic environment of the natural habitat of *Xenopus* (Nieuwkoop and Faber,
354 1956) independent of the developmental stage.

355 *Effects of the size of the environment*

356 A range of different arena sizes have been used in rodent open field tests (Walsh and Cummins, 1976), and
357 the geometry of the environment has shown to influence path shapes of rats not only at the perimeter but also at the
358 centre of an environment (Yaski et al., 2011). A wall can exert both a guiding and attracting influence on mouse
359 behaviour from quite some distance (Horev et al., 2007). Two studies explicitly examined the proportion of time that

360 social voles spend near the wall in arenas of different sizes (Eilam, 2003; Eilam et al., 2003). These animals are very
361 active, and spend more time near the wall in larger arenas – possibly because the larger open space is perceived as
362 more dangerous than a smaller, more enclosed open space. This contrasts with the behaviour of *Xenopus* described
363 here, which are stronger wall followers in smaller tanks. It therefore seems likely that wall following in *Xenopus* is
364 imposed by the constraints of the environment, whereas wall following in social voles serves as a defensive strategy.
365 Moreover, thigmotaxis is unlikely to be the main mechanism behind wall following in either of the two cases, since
366 different tank/arena sizes would have no impact on wall following if thigmotaxis was the underlying cause (Eilam et
367 al., 2003) – with thigmotaxis as the main mechanism, the walls would be equally attractive independent of the arena
368 size.

369 *Passive versus active wall following*

370 The studies ascribing protection or exploration as the function of wall following have used the terms
371 thigmotaxis or centrophobism for a reason: wall following can only be protective or exploratory if it is active.
372 Passive wall following such as observed in this study in *Xenopus laevis* is rather unlikely to serve these purposes. To
373 the best of our knowledge, no other study described passive wall following so far. Potential reasons include that only
374 few studies use convex tanks, and that passive wall following might be considered a negative finding and not be
375 reported. The few following studies did use convex enclosures to discriminate active from passive wall following:
376 In blind cavefish, for instance, wall following is clearly active (Patton et al., 2010; Sharma et al., 2009). These
377 animals are blind, live in dark caves and use their lateral line system as a near range sense to obtain information
378 about their environment. In a convex tank they actively follow the wall because they would not be able to orient
379 otherwise. Adult fruit flies, on the other hand, leave the wall in more than 50% of the trials; their preference for
380 walls in circular arenas seems to derive from a preference for the boundaries of the environment rather than from
381 thigmotaxis or centrophobism (Soibam et al., 2012). In contrast to fruit flies, cockroaches have antennae that can be
382 longer than their body (Camhi and Johnson, 1999). These animals use these mechanoreceptive sensors to gain
383 information about their nearby environment. Cockroaches thus have been described as thigmotactic in concave
384 environments (Camhi and Johnson, 1999; Jeanson et al., 2003) and show positive thigmotaxis towards objects that
385 are touched by the antennae (Okada and Toh, 2000). When running along a wall these animals constantly touch the
386 wall with one of their antennae (Camhi and Johnson, 1999). However, when arriving at a convex curve, they leave
387 the curve in about 50% of the trials (Creed and Miller, 1990).

388 Active wall following in blind cavefish certainly serves as a spatial exploration and spatial learning strategy
389 (Teyke, 1989), and to a certain extent this might also be true for cockroaches or fruit flies. In contrast, wall
390 following in *Xenopus laevis* is passive and therefore unlikely to serve as a specific protective or exploratory strategy
391 or a behaviour that is related to anxiety. A number of factors potentially influencing wall following such as changes
392 in illumination or the presence of tentacles were shown to play no major role for wall following in *Xenopus*. Instead,
393 passive wall following in these animals might be due to the particularity of the rather unnatural and concave test
394 environment. This thus suggests that spatially more complex and natural environments likely would yield richer
395 behaviours (see also Benjamini et al., 2010; Cheng, 2005).

396

397 **List of abbreviations:** IR: infrared.

398 **Acknowledgements**

399 The authors thank all members of the Straka lab for feedback and discussion.

400 **Competing interests**

401 No competing interests are declared.

402 **Author contributions**

403 Investigation, Software, Visualization: S.H.; Supervision, Project administration, Funding acquisition: H.S.;

404 Conceptualization, Writing: S.H. and H.S.

405 **Funding**

406 This study was funded by the German Science Foundation (STR 478/3-1) and the German Federal Ministry of

407 Education and Research under the grant number 01 EO 0901.

408

409 **Figure legends**

410 **Figure 1. Example swimming trajectory and cumulative frequency distribution of a *Xenopus* tadpole's**
411 **distance to the nearest wall.** (A) Minimum intensity projection showing the entire trajectory of a stage 54 tadpole
412 (body length 3.6 cm) during swimming in a 19 x 19 cm tank over a 10 min period at a temporal resolution of 3 fps.
413 (B) Cumulative frequency distribution of the animal's distance to the nearest wall; note that the animal spent over
414 75% of the time within 15 mm of the nearest wall (dashed lines); the inset shows the tracked trajectory.

415 **Figure 2. Example swimming trajectories of larval and adult *Xenopus* at different developmental stages.** (A-
416 H) Reconstructed trajectories during swimming in a 19 x 19 cm tank over a 10 min period of two animals,
417 respectively, at stage 48 (A,B), stage 56 (C,D), stage 59 (E,F) and of two froglets at stage 66 (G,H). Note the
418 variability of the trajectories of animals at the same developmental stage. The size of the animal schemes on the left
419 (from Hänzi and Straka, 2016) is not related to the spatial dimensions of the trajectories.

420 **Figure 3. Characterisation of wall following of larval and young adult *Xenopus* during swimming in a square**
421 **tank.** (A) Cumulative frequency distributions of the distance to the nearest wall during swimming of tadpoles and
422 froglets ($n = 79$) for 10 min in a 19 x 19 cm tank; traces are colour-coded with respect to developmental stage
423 (colour-code on the right); dashed black line indicates the threshold of the 'near wall' area (15 mm). (B) Proportion
424 of time that the animals spent near the wall from the data shown in A, as colour-coded dots and as a boxplot. The
425 expectation of how much time the animals would spend near the wall based on the 'near wall' area as a proportion
426 of the total area is shown on the right. The animals' proportions were significantly different from this expectation
427 (Wilcoxon signed rank test, $p < 0.0001$, $n = 79$). (C) Relationship between proportion of time that the animals spent
428 near the wall and the developmental stage of the tested animals ($n = 79$); note the significant Spearman's rank
429 correlation between stage and one-sample KS statistics ($n = 79$, $\rho = 0.48$, $p < 0.0001$), indicating that older
430 animals are stronger wall followers. (D) Separate proportion of the time that the animal spent near the wall for each
431 quarter of the 10 min swimming episode shown in A ($n = 79$, colour-coded for developmental stage). The median
432 across all animals is shown as a thick black line. These proportions did not change significantly across the four
433 quarters of the 10 min swimming period (Friedman test, $p = 0.29$). (E) Relationship between the proportion the

434 animals spent near the wall and the total distance covered by an animal over the 10 min swimming period (colour-
435 coded for developmental stage). The absence of significance (Spearman's rank correlation, $\rho = 0.03$, $p = 0.77$)
436 indicates that total covered distance is not a confounding factor for the degree of wall following as measured by the
437 proportion of the time spent near the wall. The dashed line in C-E indicates the 'near wall' area as a proportion of
438 the total tank area. Schemes of *Xenopus* in A from (Hänzi and Straka, 2016).

439 **Figure 4. Influence of tentacles on wall following during swimming in *Xenopus* larvae.** (A) Cumulative
440 frequency distributions of the distance to the nearest wall of animals with tentacles (red, $n = 13$) and of animals
441 without tentacles (blue, $n = 11$) between developmental stages 54 – 60; the inset is a higher magnification of the
442 initial part of the cumulative frequency distribution and shows that tadpoles without tentacles (blue) align closer
443 with the wall compared to tadpoles with tentacles (red). (B) Proportion of the time that the animals with and without
444 tentacles spent near the wall; the two groups were not significantly different (Mann-Whitney U test, $p = 0.09$).

445 **Figure 5. Influence of illumination conditions on wall following during swimming in *Xenopus* larvae.** (A)
446 Cumulative frequency distributions of the distance to the nearest wall during swimming of stage 53 – 65
447 tadpoles/froglets ($n = 10$) over a 10 min period in a 19 x 19 cm tank surrounded by black (black traces) or white
448 paper (white traces). (B) Proportion of time that the animals spent near the wall (within 15 mm) for swimming in the
449 tank surrounded by black (left) or white (right) paper. The proportions in these two conditions were not significantly
450 different (paired t-test, $p = 0.59$). (C) Cumulative frequency distributions of the distance to the nearest wall during
451 swimming of stage 50 – 65 tadpoles/froglets ($n = 30$) over a 10 min period in a 19 x 19 cm tank illuminated either
452 with cold light (light, black traces) or infrared light (IR, red traces). (D) Proportion of the time that the animals spent
453 near the wall (within 15 mm) for swimming in the tank with cold light (left) or IR light (right). The proportions in
454 these two illumination conditions were not significantly different (paired Wilcoxon signed-rank test, $p = 0.47$).

455 **Figure 6. Influence of tank size on wall following.** (A) Cumulative frequency distributions of the distance to the
456 nearest wall during swimming of stage 47 – 50 tadpoles ($n = 9$) over a 10 min period in a 7 x 7 cm tank (green) and
457 in a 19 x 19 cm tank (blue). The 'near wall' threshold (15 mm) is shown as a black dashed line. The trajectories of a
458 stage 50 tadpole (3.2 cm body length) are shown as insets (B) Proportion of time that the animals in A spend near
459 the wall (within 15 mm); the two groups were significantly different (paired Wilcoxon signed rank test, $p = 0.0078$,
460 $n = 9$). (C) Same data as in A but normalised to the maximal distance to the wall. The black dashed line indicates the
461 threshold (28% of the maximal distance to the wall) that yields a 'near wall' area intermediate to what 15 mm yields
462 in the 7 and 19 cm tank (see Methods). (D) Proportion of time the animals spend near the wall (within 28% of the
463 maximal distance) in the tanks with a side length of 7 and 19 cm; the two groups were significantly different (paired
464 Wilcoxon signed rank test, $p = 0.0078$, $n = 9$).

465 **Figure 7. Wall following is passive.** (A) Tank (19 x 19 cm) with two convex walls to distinguish if wall following
466 is active (red arrows) or passive (blue arrows). (B) Minimum intensity overlay (at a frame rate of 3 fps) of two
467 swimming trajectories along the curved walls of a stage 55 tadpole; blue arrows indicate the animal's direction of
468 swimming. (C) Proportion of trials with straight swimming and departure from the wall in animals at different
469 developmental stages. (D) Boxplot of the proportion of straight swimming across all animals ($n = 22$). In C and D,
470 only animals with at least 4 trials were included.

471 **References**

- 472 **Anichtchik, O. V, Kaslin, J., Peitsaro, N., Scheinin, M. and Panula, P.** (2004). Neurochemical and behavioural
473 changes in zebrafish *Danio rerio* after systemic administration of 6-hydroxydopamine and 1-methyl-4-phenyl-
474 1,2,3,6-tetrahydropyridine. *J. Neurochem.* **88**, 443–453.
- 475 **Avni, R., Tzvaigrach, Y. and Eilam, D.** (2008). Exploration and navigation in the blind mole rat (*Spalax*
476 *ehrenbergi*): global calibration as a primer of spatial representation. *J. Exp. Biol.* **211**, 2817–2826.
- 477 **Basil, J. and Sandeman, D.** (1999). Crayfish (*Cherax destructor*) use tactile cues to detect and learn topographical
478 changes in their environment. *Ethology* 136–148.
- 479 **Benjamini, Y., Lipkind, D., Horev, G., Fonio, E., Kafkafi, N. and Golani, I.** (2010). Ten ways to improve the
480 quality of descriptions of whole-animal movement. *Neurosci. Biobehav. Rev.* **34**, 1351–1365.
- 481 **Besson, M. and Martin, J. R.** (2005). Centrophobism/thigmotaxis, a new role for the mushroom bodies in
482 *Drosophila*. *J. Neurobiol.* **62**, 386–396.
- 483 **Bonsignore, L. T., Chiarotti, F., Alleva, E. and Cirulli, F.** (2008). Assessing the interplay between fear and
484 learning in mice exposed to a live rat in a spatial memory task (MWM). *Anim. Cogn.* **11**, 557–62.
- 485 **Brillhart, D. B. and Kaufman, D. W.** (1991). Influence of illumination and surface structure on space use by
486 prairie deer mice (*Peromyscus maniculatus bairdii*). *J. Mammal.* **72**, 764–768.
- 487 **Camhi, J. M. and Johnson, E. N.** (1999). High-frequency steering maneuvers mediated by tactile cues: antennal
488 wall-following in the cockroach. *J. Exp. Biol.* **202**, 631–43.
- 489 **Cardenas, F., Lamprea, M. R. and Morato, S.** (2001). Vibrissal sense is not the main sensory modality in rat
490 exploratory behavior in the elevated plus-maze. *Behav. Brain Res.* **122**, 169–174.
- 491 **Cheng, K.** (2005). Reflections on geometry and navigation. *Conn. Sci.* **17**, 5–21.
- 492 **Clements, S., Schreck, C. B., Larsen, D. A. and Dickhoff, W. W.** (2002). Central administration of corticotropin-
493 releasing hormone stimulates locomotor activity in juvenile chinook salmon (*Oncorhynchus tshawytscha*).
494 *Gen. Comp. Endocrinol.* **125**, 319–327.
- 495 **Colwill, R. M. and Creton, R.** (2011). Locomotor behaviors in zebrafish (*Danio rerio*) larvae. *Behav. Processes*
496 **86**, 222–229.
- 497 **Creed, R. P. and Miller, J. R.** (1990). Interpreting animal wall-following behavior. *Experientia* **46**, 758–761.
- 498 **Diaz, M.** (1992). Rodent seed predation in cereal crop areas of central Spain: effects of physiognomy, food
499 availability, and predation risk. *Ecography (Cop.)*. **15**, 77–85.
- 500 **Eilam, D.** (2003). Open-field behavior withstands drastic changes in arena size. *Behav. Brain Res.* **142**, 53–62.
- 501 **Eilam, D.** (2004). Locomotor activity in common spiny mice (*Acomys cahirinuse*): the effect of light and
502 environmental complexity. *BMC Ecol.* **4**, 16.
- 503 **Eilam, D., Dank, M. and Maurer, R.** (2003). Voles scale locomotion to the size of the open-field by adjusting the
504 distance between stops: A possible link to path integration. *Behav. Brain Res.* **141**, 73–81.
- 505 **Gentsch, C., Lichtsteiner, M. and Feer, H.** (1987). Open field and elevated plus-maze: A behavioural comparison
506 between spontaneously hypertensive (SHR) and Wistar-Kyoto (WKY) rats and the effects of
507 chlordiazepoxide. *Behav. Brain Res.* **25**, 101–107.
- 508 **Goetz, K. G. and Biesinger, R.** (1985). Centrophobism in *Drosophila melanogaster*. *J. Comp. Physiol. A* **156**, 319–
509 327.
- 510 **Grossen, N. E. and Kelley, M. J.** (1972). Species-specific behavior and acquisition of avoidance behavior in rats. *J.*
511 *Comp. Physiol. Psychol.* **81**, 307–310.
- 512 **Hänzi, S. and Straka, H.** (2016). Schemes of *Xenopus laevis* tadpoles. *figshare*
513 <https://dx.doi.org/10.6084/m9.figshare.3841173>.

- 514 **Hänzi, S. and Straka, H.** (2017a). Convex data and code for Wall following in *Xenopus laevis*. *figshare*
515 <https://doi.org/10.6084/m9.figshare.4868993>.
- 516 **Hänzi, S. and Straka, H.** (2017b). Data for Wall following in *Xenopus laevis*. *figshare*
517 <https://doi.org/10.6084/m9.figshare.4869026>.
- 518 **Hänzi, S. and Straka, H.** (2017c). Code for wall following in *Xenopus laevis*. *figshare*
519 <https://doi.org/10.6084/m9.figshare.4869041>.
- 520 **Hänzi, S. and Straka, H.** (2017d). Developmental changes in head movement kinematics during swimming in
521 *Xenopus laevis* tadpoles. *J. Exp. Biol.* **220**, 227–236.
- 522 **Hänzi, S., Banchi, R., Straka, H. and Chagnaud, B. P.** (2015). Locomotor corollary activation of trigeminal
523 motoneurons: coupling of discrete motor behaviors. *J. Exp. Biol.* **218**, 1748–1758.
- 524 **Horev, G., Benjamini, Y., Sakov, A. and Golani, I.** (2007). Estimating wall guidance and attraction in mouse free
525 locomotor behavior. *Genes, Brain Behav.* **6**, 30–41.
- 526 **Jeanson, R., Blanco, S., Fournier, R., Deneubourg, J. L., Fourcassié, V. and Theraulaz, G.** (2003). A model of
527 animal movements in a bounded space. *J. Theor. Biol.* **225**, 443–451.
- 528 **Kallai, J., Makany, T., Karadi, K. and Jacobs, W. J.** (2005). Spatial orientation strategies in Morris-type virtual
529 water task for humans. *Behav. Brain Res.* **159**, 187–196.
- 530 **Kallai, J., Makany, T., Csatho, A., Karadi, K., Horvath, D., Kovacs-Labadi, B., Jarai, R., Nadel, L. and**
531 **Jacobs, J. W.** (2007). Cognitive and affective aspects of thigmotaxis strategy in humans. *Behav. Neurosci.*
532 **121**, 21–30.
- 533 **Kato, S., Tamada, K., Shimada, Y. and Chujo, T.** (1996). A quantification of goldfish behavior by an image
534 processing system. *Behav. Brain Res.* **80**, 51–55.
- 535 **Lambert, F. M., Beraneck, M., Arama, J., Homa, A., Vidal, P. P., Eskiizmirliler, S. and Straka, H.** (2009).
536 Differential swimming dynamics during *Xenopus* ontogeny: implications for gaze stabilization. *Soc. Neurosci.*
537 *Abstr* **35**, 813.13.
- 538 **Liu, L., Davis, R. L. and Roman, G.** (2007). Exploratory activity in *Drosophila* requires the kurtz nonvisual
539 arrestin. *Genetics* **175**, 1197–1212.
- 540 **Martin, J. R.** (2004). A portrait of locomotor behaviour in *Drosophila* determined by a video-tracking paradigm.
541 *Behav. Processes* **67**, 207–219.
- 542 **Martínez, J. C., Cardenas, F., Lamprea, M. and Morato, S.** (2002). The role of vision and proprioception in the
543 aversion of rats to the open arms of an elevated plus-maze. *Behav. Processes* **60**, 15–26.
- 544 **Nasello, A. G., MacHado, C., Bastos, J. F. and Felicio, L. F.** (1998). Sudden darkness induces a high activity-low
545 anxiety state in male and female rats. *Physiol. Behav.* **63**, 451–454.
- 546 **Nieuwkoop, P. D. and Faber, J.** (1956). *Normal table of Xenopus laevis (Daudin)*. Amsterdam: North-Holland
547 Publishing Company. Guilders.
- 548 **Nurse, C. A., Mearow, K. M., Holmes, M., Visheau, B. and Diamond, J.** (1983). Merkel cell distribution in the
549 epidermis as determined by quinacrine fluorescence. *Cell Tissue Res.* **228**, 511–524.
- 550 **Okada, J. and Toh, Y.** (2000). The role of antennal hair plates in object-guided tactile orientation of the cockroach
551 (*Periplaneta americana*). *J. Comp. Physiol. A* **186**, 849–857.
- 552 **Ovalle, W.** (1979). Neurite complexes with Merkel cells in larval tentacles of *Xenopus laevis*. *Cell Tissue Res.* **204**,
553 233–241.
- 554 **Ovalle, W., Shinn, S. and Nahirney, P.** (1998). Ultrastructure of the larval tentacle and its skeletal muscle in
555 *Xenopus laevis*. *Tissue Cell* **30**, 216–225.
- 556 **Patton, P., Windsor, S. and Coombs, S.** (2010). Active wall following by Mexican blind cavefish (*Astyanax*
557 *mexicanus*). *J. Comp. Physiol. A* **196**, 853–867.

- 558 **Perrot-Sinal, T. S., Ossenkopp, K. P. and Kavaliers, M.** (1999). Effects of repeated exposure to fox odor on
559 locomotor activity levels and spatial movement patterns in breeding male and female meadow voles (*Microtus*
560 *pennsylvanicus*). *J. Chem. Ecol.* **V25**, 1567–1584.
- 561 **Price, M. V, Waser, N. M. and Bass, T. A.** (1984). Effects of Moonlight on Microhabitat Use by Desert Rodents.
562 *J. Mammal.* **65**, 353–356.
- 563 **Prut, L. and Belzung, C.** (2003). The open field as a paradigm to measure the effects of drugs on anxiety-like
564 behaviors: A review. *Eur. J. Pharmacol.* **463**, 3–33.
- 565 **Schindelin, J., Arganda-Carreras, I., Frise, E., Kaynig, V., Longair, M., Pietzsch, T., Preibisch, S., Rueden,**
566 **C., Saalfeld, S., Schmid, B., et al.** (2012). Fiji: an open-source platform for biological-image analysis. *Nat.*
567 *Methods* **9**, 676–682.
- 568 **Schindelin, J., Rueden, C. T., Hiner, M. C. and Eliceiri, K. W.** (2015). The ImageJ ecosystem: An open platform
569 for biomedical image analysis. *Mol. Reprod. Dev.* **82**, 518–529.
- 570 **Sharma, S., Coombs, S., Patton, P. and De Perera, T. B.** (2009). The function of wall-following behaviors in the
571 Mexican blind cavefish and a sighted relative, the Mexican tetra (*Astyanax*). *J. Comp. Physiol. A* **195**, 225–
572 240.
- 573 **Simon, P., Dupuis, R. and Costentin, J.** (1994). Thigmotaxis as an index of anxiety in mice. Influence of
574 dopaminergic transmissions. *Behav. Brain Res.* **61**, 59–64.
- 575 **Soibam, B., Mann, M., Liu, L., Tran, J., Lobaina, M., Kang, Y. Y., Gunaratne, G. H., Pletcher, S. and**
576 **Roman, G.** (2012). Open-field arena boundary is a primary object of exploration for *Drosophila*. *Brain*
577 *Behav.* **2**, 97–108.
- 578 **Teyke, T.** (1985). Collision with and avoidance of obstacles by blind cave fish *Anoptichthys jordani* (Characidae). *J.*
579 *Comp. Physiol. A* **157**, 837–843.
- 580 **Teyke, T.** (1989). Learning and remembering the environment in the blind cave fish *Anoptichthys jordani*. *J. Comp.*
581 *Physiol. A* **164**, 655–662.
- 582 **Treit, D. and Fundytus, M.** (1988). Thigmotaxis as a test for anxiolytic activity in rats. *Pharmacol. Biochem.*
583 *Behav.* **31**, 959–962.
- 584 **Vasquez, R. A.** (1996). Patch utilization by three species of Chilean rodents differing in body size and mode of
585 locomotion. *Ecology* **77**, 2343–2351.
- 586 **Walsh, R. N. and Cummins, R. A.** (1976). The open-field test: A critical review. *Psychol. Bull.* **83**, 482–504.
- 587 **Webster, D. G., Baumgardner, D. J. and Dewsbury, D. A.** (1979). Open-field behaviour in eight taxa of muroid
588 rodents. *Bull. Psychonom. Soc.* **13**, 90–92.
- 589 **Wilson, R. C., Vacek, T., Lanier, D. L. and Dewsbury, D. A.** (1976). Open-field behavior in muroid rodents.
590 *Behav. Biol.* **17**, 495–506.
- 591 **Yaski, O., Portugali, J. and Eilam, D.** (2009). The dynamic process of cognitive mapping in the absence of visual
592 cues: human data compared with animal studies. *J. Exp. Biol.* **212**, 2619–2626.
- 593 **Yaski, O., Portugali, J. and Eilam, D.** (2011). Arena geometry and path shape: When rats travel in straight or in
594 circuitous paths? *Behav. Brain Res.* **225**, 449–454.
- 595 **Zadicario, P., Avni, R., Zadicario, E. and Eilam, D.** (2005). “Looping” - An exploration mechanism in a dark
596 open field. *Behav. Brain Res.* **159**, 27–36.
- 597

Figure 1




Figure 2




Figure 3





Figure 4

A



B




Figure 5







Figure 6







Figure 7

