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ABSTRACT

Over a century ago workers such as J. Lubbock and K. von Frisch developed behavioural criteria for establishing that non-human animals see colour. Many animals in most phyla have since then been shown to have colour vision. Colour is used for specific behaviours, such as phototaxis and object recognition, while other behaviours such as motion detection are colour blind. Having established the existence of colour vision, research focussed on the question of how many spectral types of photoreceptors are involved. Recently, data on photoreceptor spectral sensitivities have been combined with behavioural experiments and physiological models to study systematically the next logical question: ‘what neural interactions underlie colour vision?’ This review gives an overview of the methods used to study animal colour vision, and discusses how quantitative modelling can suggest how photoreceptor signals are combined and compared to allow for the discrimination of biologically relevant stimuli.
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I. INTRODUCTION

Human colour science and psychophysics became established during the nineteenth century, and people began to ask whether animals see colour. Lubbock (1888) in his book *On the senses, instincts and intelligence of animals* demonstrated to his satisfaction that *Daphnia* sp. see colour, using the fact that they are both positively phototactic, and prefer yellow to white light which is more intense across the entire spectrum (see Section V.1c). Lubbock (1888) also made a good case that honeybees (*Apis mellifera*) can associate colour with food, but did not rule out their using brightness. It was left to von Frisch (1914) to confirm honeybee colour vision. At the same time the problem of equating human colour sensations with animal behaviour was well recognized. One critic (Anonymous, 1889) of Lubbock’s book doubted that one can conclude that animals enjoy the sensation of, and hence can truly be said to see, colour (Cogan, 1995; Stoerig, 1998). Nonetheless, given the behavioural criteria of Lubbock and von Frisch (see Section III.1) it is evident that many animals use colour for tasks such as phototaxis where spectral composition identifies a light source, and for detecting and discriminating objects (Menzel, 1979; Jacobs, 1981; Mollon, 1989).

This review deals with three main questions, much as suggested by Menzel (1979): (1) Is colour vision used for a particular task? (2) How many spectral types of photoreceptor are involved? (3) What can be said about the post-receptoral neural mechanisms of colour discrimination, such as chromatic opponency?

Concepts in colour vision are mostly derived from human perception and psychophysics. Human trichromacy was proposed first in the eighteenth century (Mollon, 1997), and models relating our colour discrimination to underlying receptor responses and neural mechanisms are over a century old (Maxwell, 1860; Hering, 1878; Helmholtz, 1896). When human cone spectral sensitivities were first directly measured (Bowmaker & Dartnall, 1980), they closely matched psychophysical predictions (Smith & Pokorny, 1975). As animals are more difficult to test than humans, most work has aimed simply to establish the existence of colour vision, rather than to determine receptor inputs and neural mechanisms.

When Jacobs (1981) wrote his book *Comparative Color Vision* most studies that went beyond demonstrating the existence of colour vision were from mammals, although there was also important work on honeybees (Daumer, 1956; von Helversen, 1972). Work on non-mammalian species is now becoming easier thanks to increasing numbers of measurements of photoreceptor spectral sensitivities (Table 1). The history of human colour vision can be reversed; once spectral inputs to the receptors are known (Fig. 1, stage 1) it is possible to study neural processing of signals arising from a single stimulus (Fig. 1, stage 2), and the mechanisms comparing signals from different stimuli (Fig. 1, stage 3).

We review two types of tests of colour discrimination. Firstly, tests of the ability to make a discrimination (Section V), and secondly measurements of discrimination thresholds (Section VI).
Before looking at experimental data we outline the diversity of visual photoreceptors that underlie colour vision (Section II), introduce some ideas relevant to understanding colour and how it is studied (Section III), and discuss the roles of achromatic and chromatic signals (Section IV).

II. PHOTORECEPTOR SIGNALS

(1) Diversity of receptors

Knowing photoreceptor spectral sensitivities simplifies the study of colour vision, and phylogenetic comparisons give insight into its evolutionary origins and function. For example, haplorrhine primates (i.e. monkeys and apes) often have three spectral types of cone, compared to two in most other mammals. Perhaps then trichromacy is an adaptation to the primates’ particular diurnal lifestyle and frugivorous diet (Mollon, 1989). On the other hand, the fact that many bees and wasps have a similar set of three photoreceptors to the honeybee implies that honeybee trichromacy is not a specific adaptation to its being a generalist pollinator, being evolutionarily older than the life-style (Peitsch et al., 1992). Swallowtail butterflies (Papilio sp.) might have evolved a fourth receptor type (sensitive to very long wavelengths) as an adaptation to oviposition on green leaves rather than to flower detection (Kelber, 1999).

Data on visual pigment and photoreceptor spectral sensitivities are increasing, especially for vertebrates. Microspectrophotometry (MSP) can be used where intracellular recording is difficult. Molecular genetics shows how opsin pigments or photopigments have been described (Collin, Potter & Brackevelt, 1999). Only two receptor types (sensitive to very long wavelengths) as an adaptation to oviposition on green leaves rather than to flower detection (Kelber, 1999).

Photoreceptor nomenclature is complicated, and potentially confusing. Receptors have been named according to the part of the spectrum to which they are absolutely or relatively most sensitive: ‘red’, ‘green’, ‘blue’, ‘UV’ etc., or by their sensitivity relative to other receptors in the eye for example ‘long’ (L), ‘short’ (S) and ‘medium’ (M) wavelength sensitive. This nomenclature is satisfactory for referring to a given species or closely related group of species, but is less satisfactory and potentially confusing for more general comparisons. Moreover, given that four main gene families of vertebrate cone opsins have been recognized (Hisatomi et al., 1994; Bowmaker & Hunt, 1999), it seems desirable to use the terms VS (‘very short’), S, M and L to refer to the opsin gene family, and to specify the spectral sensitivity maximum of the photopigment (see also Bowmaker & Hunt, 1999). For invertebrate photopigments we simply specify the spectral sensitivity maxima of each species’ visual pigments or photoreceptors (Table 1).

Of invertebrates, Octopus vulgaris like most other cephalopod molluscs has a single spectral type of receptor. Some spiders and crustaceans have two types. Daphnia magna and perhaps jumping spiders (Salticidae) have four, while stomatopod crustaceans have up to 16. Among insects, cockroaches (Blatodea) and some ants have two spectral receptor types, while most bees and wasps have three (Peitsch et al., 1992). Dragonflies (Odonata) and sawflies (Tenthri-dinidae) have four spectral types of receptor, and some flies (Diptera) and butterflies have five or more (Table 1; reviewed by Briscoe & Chittka, 2001).

In vertebrates, the two main types of visual photoreceptor cell, rods and cones, are distinguished by a number of morphological and physiological features (Cohen, 1972). Normally, rods are active at low (scotopic) light intensities, and cones at high (photopic) intensities. Colour vision uses mainly cone signals, but goldfish (Carassius auratus) may use rods and red (L) cones in dim light (down to 1 or 2 log units above absolute threshold: Powers & Easter, 1978b), and rods contribute to colour vision in amphibians (Muntz, 1963) and humans (Wyszecki & Stiles, 1982).

Of the more primitive vertebrates, lampreys have one rod and two anatomically distinct types of cone (Collin, Potter & Brackevelt, 1999), but only two photopigments have been described (Table 1). Many teleost fishes, reptiles and birds have one rod and four cone opsins. These form five families defined by amino acid sequences and characterized by the locations of their spectral sensitivity maxima (Table 1; Hisatomi et al., 1994; Bowmaker, 1998; Bowmaker & Hunt, 1999): rod, very short (VS, or ultraviolet), short (S, or blue), medium (M, or green) and long (L, or red). Rana spp. frogs also have up to five receptor types, however two of them are rods (a ‘red’ rod and a ‘green’ rod, Table 1). Vertebrate lineages often lose visual photopigments, for example many teleost fish along with most mammals have only two cone pigments, while snakes, crocodiles and geckos have three.

Mammals lost two cone opsin families, probably during an early ‘nocturnal’ phase of evolution,
Table 1. Examples of receptors in different animal classes, other reviews listed give additional information about specific taxa. We give the species names, the method used to determine sensitivity, and sensitivity maxima. Vertebrate receptors are classified according to the probable gene family of their opsin (see Section II): VS (very short wavelength or UV receptor), S (short wavelength), M (medium wavelength), L (long wavelength). For invertebrates, sensitivity maxima are mostly of receptors in vivo, whereas for vertebrates (other than ERG) they are generally sensitivities of isolated receptors, and do not take account of intraocular filtering. *Methods: E, electrophysiological recording, mostly intracellular for invertebrates and suction electrode recordings for vertebrates; ERG, electoretinogram; MSP, microspectrophotometry of photoreceptors or (MSP-G) artificially expressed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Animal group</th>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Sensitivity maxima (nm)</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Molluscs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bivalva (Tridacna sp.)</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>360 490 540</td>
<td>Wilkens (1984)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Octopus (Octopus vulgaris)</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>470</td>
<td>Messenger (1981)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Firefly squid (Watasenia scintillans)</td>
<td>MSP</td>
<td>470 485 500</td>
<td>Matsui et al. (1988)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spiders</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jumping spider (Plexippus validus)</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>360 520</td>
<td>Blest et al. (1981)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jumping spider (Menemerus confusus)</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>360 490 520 580</td>
<td>Yamashita &amp; Tateda (1976)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ctenid spider (Cupiennius salei)</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>340 480 520</td>
<td>Walla et al. (1996)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crustaceans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water flea (Daphnia magna)</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>348 434 525 608</td>
<td>Smith &amp; Macagno (1990)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isopod (Ligia exotica)</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>340 470 520</td>
<td>Hariyama et al. (1993)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crayfish (Procambarus clarkii)</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>460 560 600</td>
<td>Nosaki (1969)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cockroach (Periplaneta americana)</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>365 510</td>
<td>Mote &amp; Goldsmith (1970)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dragonfly (Symptrum rubicundum)</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>330 430 490 520 620</td>
<td>Meinertzhagen et al. (1983)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House fly (Musca domestica)</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>335 355 460 490 530</td>
<td>Hardie (1986)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honeybee (Apis mellifera)</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>344 436 556</td>
<td>Menzel &amp; Blakers (1976); Peitsch et al. (1992)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butterfly (Papilio xuthus)</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>360 400 440 520 600</td>
<td>Arikawa et al. (1987)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lamprey (Lampetra lamperata)</td>
<td>MSP</td>
<td>515 555</td>
<td>Govardovskii &amp; Lychakov (1984)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sturgeon (Acipenser baeri)</td>
<td>MSP</td>
<td>549 465 549 613</td>
<td>Govardovskii et al. (1991)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goldfish (Carrassius auratus)</td>
<td>MSP/E</td>
<td>522 356 447 537† 623†</td>
<td>Bowmaker et al. (1991); Palacios et al. (1998)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cichlid (Aequidens pulcher)</td>
<td>MSP</td>
<td>500 453 530† 570†</td>
<td>Kröger et al. (1999)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amphibians*</td>
<td>MSP/ERG</td>
<td>430 431 502 562</td>
<td>Liebman &amp; Entine (1968); Govardovsii &amp; Zueva (1974); Koskelainen et al. (1994)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salamander (Ambystoma tigrinum)</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>506 400 444 610</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Animal Colour Vision

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Animal</th>
<th>Cone Type</th>
<th>Wavelengths (nm)</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reptiles</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crocodile (Alligator mississippiensis)</td>
<td>MSP</td>
<td>501 444 535 566†</td>
<td>Sillman et al. (1991)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turtle (Pseudymys scripta)</td>
<td>MSP</td>
<td>360 450 518 620</td>
<td>Baylor &amp; Hodgkin (1973); Loew &amp; Govardovskii (2001)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lizard (Anolis carolinensis)</td>
<td>MSP-G</td>
<td>358 437 495 560</td>
<td>Kawamura &amp; Yokoyama (1998)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gecko (Gekko gekko)</td>
<td>MSP</td>
<td>364 467 521</td>
<td>Loew (1994)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Birds†</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicken (Gallus gallus)</td>
<td>MSP</td>
<td>506 418 455 507 569</td>
<td>Bowmaker et al. (1997)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pekin robin (Leiothrix lutea)</td>
<td>MSP</td>
<td>500 355 454 499 568</td>
<td>Maier &amp; Bowmaker (1993)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mammals</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dolphin (Tursiops truncatus)</td>
<td>MSP-G</td>
<td>488 524</td>
<td>Fasick et al. (1998)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Squirrel (Spermophilus sp.)</td>
<td>ERG</td>
<td>500 436</td>
<td>Jacobs (1993)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human</td>
<td>MSP/E</td>
<td>498 437 533‡ 564‡</td>
<td>Bowmaker &amp; Dartnall (1980); Schnapf et al. (1987)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Some vertebrates including various fish and amphibia express both retinal and dehydroxyretinal as the chromophore in a single class of photoreceptor or even a single cell (e.g. Firsov et al., 1994; Partridge & Cummins, 1999). Dehydroxyretinal red-shifts the spectral sensitivity by over 50 nm for long-wavelength-sensitive opsins. Where receptors may use both types of chromophore we give the value for the retinal-bearing variant.
† Bird double cones contain the long-wavelength-sensitive visual pigment and are not thought to contribute to colour vision, fishes can use double cones for colour vision and the pigments of the principle and accessory cones are given.
‡ Primate M and L receptor pigments are both derived from the mammal L pigment. They are named M and L for convenience.
Fig. 1. (A) Diagram of a four-stage model of colour discrimination by a trichromatic eye (modified from Brandt & Vorobyev, 1997). Stage 1: responses of receptors \((r, r')\) sensitive to short \((S)\), medium \((M)\) and long \((L)\) wavelengths of light, to reference and test stimuli. Stage 2: achromatic and/or chromatic interactions between signals. Three mechanisms are needed to represent all the information \((x, x', x''')\) encoded by three receptor types. Stage 3: \(\Delta S\) represents the distance of the two stimuli in colour space, this distance depends on the metrics (see Figs 3, 4). At stage 4, either the test or the reference stimulus is selected with a probability \(P_{\text{corr}}\). (B) Model that does not include stage 2 mechanisms; many models are of this type, see Figs 3B, C, 4C, and 5A, ii and iii.

leaving them with L and VS opsins (Jacobs, 1993; Bowmaker, 1998; Bowmaker & Hunt, 1999). Mammalian VS photopigment and cones are commonly called ‘S’ (i.e. short-wavelength sensitive). This S cone opsin is probably absent from dolphins and seals (Peichl, Behrmann & Kröger, 2001) and from nocturnal species including raccoons \((Procyon spp.)\) and owl monkey \((Aotus sp.; Ahnelt & Kolb, 2000)\); these species are cone monochromats. Conversely, many primates, including all known Old-World monkeys (Catarrhini), have recovered three types of cone pigment by evolving separate ‘L’ (red) and ‘M’ (green) opsin genes (Bowmaker, 1998; Nathans, 1999).

(2) Spectral tuning of receptors

(a) Measurement of receptor sensitivities

A photoreceptor’s spectral sensitivity is given by the relative likelihood of absorption of a photon incident on the cornea, as a function of its wavelength. Once a photon is absorbed, the electrical responses of visual photoreceptors are (so far as is known) independent of its wavelength. This ‘principle of univariance’ (Rushton, 1965) means that the intensities of two visible spectra can always be adjusted to give equal responses, so that individual photoreceptors are ‘colour blind’.

Spectral sensitivities can be established in various ways (Table 1). In invertebrates, the usual and direct method is by intracellular recording from photoreceptors \(\textit{in vivo}\) the response to (typically) monochromatic stimuli of known intensity (Autrum & von Zwehl, 1964; Peitsch et al., 1992). In vertebrates, suction electrode recording of isolated receptors is often more practical (Schnapf, Kraft & Baylor, 1987). Electroretinograms (ERG) combined with selective adaptation are widely used with vertebrates (Jacobs, 1993), but may be difficult to interpret when there are three or more spectral types of receptor. Alternatively, absorption spectra of photopigments, and other visual media can be measured by spectrophotometry, and receptor spectral sensitivities can be estimated from these spectra. Spectrophotometry can be performed either in photoreceptors (Liebman & Entine, 1968; Cronin & Marshall, 1989; Bowmaker et al., 1997), or artificial expression systems (Asenjo, Rim & Oprian, 1994; Fasick et al., 1998; Nathans, 1999). Finally, spectral sensitivity of some vertebrate pigments can now be predicted from the amino acid composition of the opsin (Asenjo et al., 1994; Nathans, 1999; Bowmaker & Hunt, 1999).

(b) Visual pigments

Visual photopigments are G-protein-coupled receptors, which comprise an opsin protein and a carotenoid chromophore. When a chromophore absorbs a photon it isomerizes, and this causes the opsin to change conformation to activate phototransduction (Aidley, 1998). The visual pigment’s spectral sensitivity depends both upon the chromophore and the opsin, but for a given chromophore the shape of the curve is a predictable function of the peak wavelength (Dartnall, 1953; Govardovskii et al., 2000). The commonest chromophore is retinal, the
aldehyde derivative of vitamin A1, but fishes, amphibians and reptiles sometimes have 3,4-dehydroxyretinal, the derivative of vitamin A2 (porphyropsin; Wald, 1939; Provençal, Loew & Foster, 1992), and many insects use 3-hydroxyretinal, a derivative of xanthophylls (Vogt & Kirschfeld, 1984). Substitution of A2 for A1 red-shifts sensitivity, and this underlies some variation in fish and amphibians (Liebman & Entine, 1968). The squid Watasenia scintillans is remarkable for having three visual pigments based on one opsin and three types of chromophore (Matsui et al., 1988). Normally though, the main source of variability in spectral sensitivities is the opsin. For A1-based visual pigments, sensitivity maxima range from approximately 310 nm to 570 nm, and for A2-based pigments up to 635 nm (Provençal et al., 1992).

Usually a single photoreceptor cell contains one type of visual pigment, but there are exceptions, the best known being the presence of mixtures of A1 and A2 visual pigments in fish and amphibians (Firsov, Govardovskii & Donner, 1994). Mouse (Mus musculus), and possibly wallaby (Macropus eugenii) express two different opsins in the same cone photoreceptor (Röhlisch, van Veen & Szel, 1994; Hemmi & Grünert, 1999; Neitz & Neitz, 2001). The swallowtail butterfly (Papilio xuthus) has a complex set of photoreceptors, some of which co-express two opsin genes (Kitamoto et al., 1998). Other receptors in this butterfly express a single opsin, but adopt different sensitivities depending on the presence of 3-hydroxyretinol, which works as a UV-absorbing screening pigment (Arikawa et al., 1999). On the other hand, flies use 3-hydroxyretinol as an antennal pigment, which broadens spectral sensitivity by adding a UV peak (Hardie, 1986; Vogt, 1989).

(c) Filters

Receptor sensitivities depend primarily on their visual pigments, but ocular filters often have a marked effect (Walls, 1942; Douglas & Marshall, 1999). Yellow lenses of diurnal mammals and some fishes absorb UV and violet light. The coloured oil droplets in cone inner segments of many diurnal reptiles and birds are of particular interest (Walls, 1942; Partridge, 1989; Goldsmith, 1991; Hart, 2001). These droplets vary in colour, and early workers attributed a variety of functions to them, most notably as a basis for colour vision in animals assumed to have only a single visual pigment (e.g. Walls, 1942; King-Smith, 1969). For vertebrates this latter theory was doubted by Walls (1942), and now seems unlikely because, at least in turtles and birds four types of oil droplets are each associated with a specific type of single cone photopigment (Bowmaker et al., 1997; Loew & Govardovskii, 2001). Typically, oil droplets cut off light of short wavelengths from a value around the sensitivity maximum of the opsin (Hart, 2001), and this appreciably sharpens spectral tuning. Model calculations have recently provided clear evidence that this sharpening indeed benefits colour vision (Vorobyev et al., 1998).

In the grasshopper Phaeoba sp., corneal filters over a single spectral type of photopigment may indeed provide a basis for colour vision (Kong, Fung & Wasserman, 1980). Corneal filters are common in tachinid flies, but it is uncertain how they affect spectral sensitivities. More generally, invertebrates have a wide variety of intraocular filters using photostable pigments (Douglas & Marshall, 1999). Also, some compound eyes such as those of butterflies and stomatopods have ‘tiered retinae’ where light passes first through ‘distal’ receptor cells in an ommatidium, and so is filtered, before it reaches the proximal cells (Cronin & Marshall, 1989; Douglas & Marshall, 1999). In compound eyes, there is also ‘lateral’ filtering, where several photoreceptor spectral types combine to form a single light-guiding rhabdom and hence compete for photons (see Section II.3).

(3) Modelling receptor signals

The physical stimulus for vision is the number of quanta absorbed by a receptor per unit time (e.g. receptor integration time). Due to the availability of cheaper spectrophotometers large numbers of biologically relevant stimuli have recently been measured and used for modelling. Where the spectral distribution of a light stimulus, I(λ), is known, the quantum catch, Q_i, of a receptor type i, with spectral sensitivity, R_i(λ), is given by:

\[ Q_i = \int I(\lambda) R_i(\lambda) \, d\lambda, \]

where integration is over the visible spectrum. Stimulus intensity can be given either in quantum or in energy units, but the units of light stimulus and spectral sensitivity must correspond. Quantum units are commonly used in animal studies, and are appropriate since photoreceptors act as quantum counters. In human psychophysics, energy units are more often used. If E(λ) is the spectrum of a light stimulus in energy units, then the spectrum in quantal units, I(λ), is given by:
\[ I(\lambda) = \frac{\lambda}{hc} E(\lambda), \quad (2) \]

where \( h \) is Planck’s constant and \( c \) the velocity of light. Similarly, the relationship of spectral sensitivity in quantum units, \( R_i(\lambda) \), to that in energy units, \( R_i^E(\lambda) \) is given by:

\[ R_i(\lambda) = \frac{hc}{\lambda^2} R_i^E(\lambda). \quad (3) \]

Usually relative rather than absolute sensitivity is important, in which case the constant \( hc \) is omitted, and spectral sensitivity is transformed from energy to quantum units by dividing by wavelength. To derive spectral sensitivity from spectrophotometric measurements, let \( F_i(\lambda) \) be the attenuation of incoming light by optical filters in the light path to the visual pigments, and \( k_i(\lambda) \) the extinction coefficient (absorption in a thin layer) of a pigment \( i \), and \( x \) the length of a photoreceptor. Then the receptor response, \( R_i(\lambda) \), is given by:

\[ R_i(\lambda) = CF_i(\lambda) \{1 - \exp[-k_i(\lambda)x]\}. \quad (4) \]

\( C \) is a proportionality factor that describes the receptor’s absolute sensitivity. The second term in eqn (4) describes ‘self-screening’ by the visual pigment, which being spectrally selective, removes the wavelengths to which it most sensitive so that the long receptor has a broadened spectral sensitivity. Warrant and Nilsson (1998) give a simplified expression for this term. When \( x \) is small \( 1 - \exp(-k_i(\lambda)x) \cong k_i(\lambda)x \). For arthropod eyes optical modelling is complicated, because light may be filtered as it travels along the rhabdom (photoreceptors). In fused rhabdams, the visual pigments of different receptor types act as filters for each other thus narrowing the spectral sensitivity of each receptor type. If sensitivities of the pigments are known, spectral sensitivities can be calculated (Snyder, Menzel & Laughlin, 1973).

III. COLOUR VISION CONCEPTS

(1) What is colour vision?

Understanding colour starts from our own subjective experience. Colours have the qualities of hue, saturation and brightness. Brightness is the value on the dark to light scale. Saturation describes a colour’s similarity to a neutral grey or white: a grey object with a small reddish tint has low saturation, whereas a red object with little white or grey tint is highly saturated. Hue refers to colour differences other than those of brightness and saturation, and is the attribute denoted by terms such as red, yellow, green or purple (Wyszecki & Stiles, 1982; Byrne & Hilbert, 1997; Backhaus, Kliegl & Werner, 1998). Brightness is the achromatic aspect of colour, and hue and saturation are chromatic aspects. There is no evidence that animals perceive hue, saturation or brightness as separate qualities, or that they categorize colours as yellow, red etc. Indeed some workers insist that colour perception requires consciousness; what we call colour vision, on behavioural criteria, Stoerig (1998) recognizes as ‘wavelength information processing’.

A comprehensive definition of colour from the standard handbook of colour science (Wyszecki & Stiles, 1982, p. 487) is ‘that aspect of visual perception by which an observer may distinguish differences between two structure-free fields of view of the same size and shape, such as may be caused by differences in the spectral composition of the radiant energy …’. The advantage of this definition is that it is not based on the human sensation of colour but on a physical measurement – ‘the spectral composition of radiant energy’ – therefore it can be applied to animals. Paradoxically, by this definition, the ability to discriminate colours does not entail colour vision.

Humans discriminate colours by means of chromatic (hue, saturation) as well as achromatic (brightness) signals. Colour-blind people (monochromats, including all humans in very dim light intensities) discriminate many colours by means of brightness. Colour vision, in humans, therefore means the ability to discriminate colours by their chromatic aspect, even though achromatic signals contribute to human colour perception, i.e. subjects with colour vision can discriminate colours of equal brightness. We do not know whether animals perceive brightness or hue, thus a general working definition for colour vision needs to be based on a physical criterion. Brightness relates to the sensitivity of the achromatic channel in a visual system. A light of 700 nm wavelength of high intensity might look as bright as a light of 550 nm at low intensity. Intensity is measured as the number of quanta incident on the eye per unit area, angle in space and unit time interval. For monochromats, it is always possible to adjust the intensities of two spectral stimuli to yield equal sensations. For humans with colour vision, colours with different saturation or hue cannot be made indistinguishable by adjusting stimulus intensity.

When describing animal colour vision we will refer to intensity-related cues as achromatic cues,
and to the signal they generate in the animal’s visual system, as the achromatic signal. In humans, this signal leads to the perception of brightness. We conclude that an animal has colour vision if it can discriminate two lights of different spectral composition, regardless of their relative intensity (e.g. DeValois & DeValois, 1997; Menzel, 1979; Neumeyer, 1991; Goldsmith, 1991; Byrne & Hilbert, 1997). Section V describes experiments required to test colour vision.

(2) Colour spaces, and the number of receptor types used for colour vision

As we have just seen, animals with a single spectral type of photoreceptor are monochromats in that it is always possible to adjust the relative intensities of two spectra to give identical responses (Rushton, 1965). If more than one light, or primary, is needed to match colour the animal has colour vision. Colour vision is classified as dichromatic, trichromatic, tetrachromatic etc., according to the number of lights required to match any spectral light. This number cannot exceed the number of receptor types in the eye but may be fewer, and needs to be established behaviourally. Most vertebrates, for example, normally do not use rods for colour vision. Flies have two anatomically separate visual pathways; one of these is probably used for colour vision and receives input from four of their five receptor types (Troje, 1993).

Normal human observers are trichromats, because any spectrum can be matched by a unique combination of three primary spectra. Trichromacy was first proposed in the eighteenth century by Lomonosov, Palmer and Young (Mollon, 1997), and established experimentally by Maxwell (1860). The intensities of the three primaries that match a given light are called ‘tristimulus values’, and these give a quantitative description of its colour. Tristimulus values are linearly related to the quantum catches in the three types of cone (Fig. 2B; Wyszecki & Stiles, 1982). Hence, for humans colour can be specified either by the intensities of three known spectra required for a match, or by the quantum catches \( Q_i \) of the three receptor types. A colour can then be represented geometrically, as a point \( Q \) in a colour space, whose dimensionality is given by the number of primaries required for a colour match, or by the number of receptor types involved (Fig. 2, Appendix A). Colour matching establishes directly the dimensionality of colour vision, and thus the number of receptors used independently for colour discrimination (see Section V.2). Colour matching includes the possibility that one of the primaries is added negatively – i.e. it is added to the colour that one tries to match instead of the other primaries. Otherwise it is not possible to match colours that lie outside the polygon in the colour space set by the primaries.

For humans, spectral sensitivities of the cardinal axes of commonly used colour spaces (e.g. RGB, XYZ; Wyszecki & Stiles, 1982) were chosen before the cone sensitivities were known. Likewise, Daumer (1956) proposed a trichromatic colour space for honeybees from colour-matching experiments. But Daumer’s work is an exception, and in most animal studies the cardinal axes of colour spaces represent receptor responses (Appendix 1; Menzel & Backhaus, 1991; Neumeyer, 1991; Goldsmith, 1991; Brandt & Vorobyev, 1997; Vorobyev & Menzel, 1999; Osorio, Mikloši & Gonda, 1999a; Osorio, Vorobyev & Jones, 1999b).

In practice, the dimensionality of colour vision has been studied in few animals. Many mammals are dichromats save primates which are often trichromats (Jacobs 1981, 1993), as are bees (Daumer, 1956). Goldfish, turtle (Pseudemys scripta elegans), pigeon (Columba livia) and chicken (Gallus gallus) are probably tetrachromats (Arnold & Neumeyer, 1987; Neumeyer, 1992; Palacios & Varela, 1992; Osorio et al., 1999b).

(3) Achromatic and chromatic signals

The existence of multiple spectral types of photoreceptor is not sufficient for colour vision. Subsequent neural stages (Fig. 1, stages 2 and 3) are necessary, and we are generally interested in the behavioural manifestations of these neural mechanisms (Fig. 1, stage 4). In the simplest arrangement, behaviour is directly driven by the response of one or more receptors to a stimulus (Fig. 1B). When only one receptor is involved, behaviour is colour blind, and the corresponding channel is called achromatic. When signals of several receptors are directly used to discriminate stimuli behaviour is no longer colour blind – even if no chromatic interaction occurs. Alternatively, receptor signals may interact (Fig. 1A; stage 2). Visual neurons may either sum photoreceptor signals, or compare them by some type of inhibitory interaction to give the ratio or difference of receptor signals. Chromatic mechanisms involve the comparison of receptor outputs, while achromatic mechanisms involve only additive
Fig. 2. Relative sensitivities of photoreceptors (left), receptor spaces (middle), and chromaticity diagrams with monochromatic loci (right) for representative di- (A), tri- (B) and tetrachromatic eyes (C). Colour is represented as a point \( Q \) in the receptor space, where each co-ordinate axis corresponds to the quantum catches of very short- (VS), short- (S), medium- (M) and long-wavelength-sensitive (L) receptors. Receptor spaces thus have \( n \) dimensions for visual systems with \( n \) receptors; the four-dimensional receptor space cannot be visualized. Chromaticity diagrams (right) where \( \Sigma Q_i = 1 \) are projections of the receptor space to \( n-1 \) dimensions. A line (dashed) connecting \( Q \) with the origin intersects the chromaticity diagram (a line, for dichromats; a plane, for trichromats, and a three-dimensional space, for tetrachromats) in a point \( q^c \). The vertices of chromaticity diagrams (VS, S, M, L) represent colours that are represented on the axes of the colour spaces (middle). Colour loci of monochromatic lights are represented by the dashed line, and plotted points every 10 nm (A, B) or 50 nm (C). NP in A indicates the neutral point of a dichromat, i.e. the wavelength of light that has the same chromaticity coordinates as white light. See Appendix A for details of receptor spaces, and the corresponding chromaticity diagrams.

Historically, Helmholtz (1896) proposed that human colour vision did not require interactions between the three receptor mechanisms, and many subsequent models of colour vision implement his hypothesis. Hering (1878), on the other hand, argued that interactions are essential, and that two opponent channels – yellow-blue and red-green – underlie human colour sensations. Helmholtz and Hering models can be reconciled by recognizing that colour vision is a multistage process (Fig. 1; see
Animal colour vision

Chapter 8 in Wyszecki & Stiles, 1982). Psycho-
physical evidence indicates that humans combine
their three receptor signals to give one achromatic
(or luminance) signal, and two chromatic signals
(Jameson & Hurvich, 1955; Krauskopf, Williams &
Heeley, 1982). The achromatic aspect of colour –
brightness – is mediated by non-opponent mechan-
isms, whereas the chromatic aspects of colour – hue
and saturation – are mediated by opponent mechan-
isms. Regardless of whether animals perceive
saturation, hue and brightness, we can hypothesize
that they have similar chromatic and achromatic
mechanisms. Nonetheless, care is required to in-
terpret behavioural experiments as evidence for
post-receptoral (stage 2) interactions, and we return
to this subject in Section VI.

It should be possible to relate psychophysically
defined mechanisms to neural responses, but even for
primates this is not easy. Macaque (Macaca macaca)
retinal ganglion cells, which transmit signals up the
optic nerve, do fall into three main spectral types:
those coding mainly luminance, yellow-blue op-
ponent cells, and the cells of the parvocellular
pathway, which probably represent the red-green
signal (Dacey, 2000). Ganglion cell spectral sensi-
tivities do not however match psychophysical predic-
tions, for example they fail to predict the redness of
short wavelength (violet) light. There are recordings
for spectral opponent neurons in many other species,
which we cannot review here. However, it is worth
noting that Backhaus (1991) relates electrophysio-
logical recordings from colour opponent neurons in
honeybees to opponent mechanisms proposed from
behavioural studies (see Section V.2c).

IV. USES OF CHROMATIC SIGNALS

Colour vision seems to be useful. Most eyes have
multiple spectral types of photoreceptor (Table 1),
and most animals have colour vision (Table 2), but
it is not easy to specify the costs and benefits. Costs
arise because colour vision compromises absolute
sensitivity and (often) spatial resolution (van
Moreover, many processes such as directional mo-
tion detection are generally colour blind. Various
theoretical studies have considered the consequences
of varying the numbers and tuning of spectral
photoreceptor types (Barlow, 1982; Maloney, 1986;
van Hateren, 1993), but no theory accounts well
for the diversity in numbers and spectral tuning
of photoreceptors across the animal kingdom
(Table 1).

Despite the lack of a satisfactory quantitative
model, intuitively it seems reasonable that chromatic
signals are useful for object detection and identifi-
cation. Under shadows and patchy illumination as in
forests or shallow water, variations in light intensity
cause large variations in receptor signals from a
given surface. The ratio of signals from two receptor
types is however comparatively robust with respect
to illumination, and hence a better indicator of
object properties (Rubin & Richards, 1982; Mollon,
1989; Maximov, 2000). According to this argument
chromatic signals should ideally represent this ratio
of receptor responses, making them insensitive to
variations in intensity, but other signals such as the
differences of receptor responses would also be useful.
Even so, variable illumination will affect chromatic
signals, making it necessary to ‘discount’ the
illuminant by colour constancy (Hurlbert, 1998).
Many animals have colour constancy but we do not
deal here with this subject, which was reviewed
recently by Neumeyer (1998).

Given the capacity of nervous systems to combine
signals with different weightings, and to perform a
large variety of operations, the coding of colour
should reflect the fact that chromatic and achromatic
signals are useful for different purposes. This means
that when achromatic cues are used, as for motion
detection, chromatic signals are disregarded, and
when chromatic signals are used, as for the recog-
nition of the colour of food sources, achromatic
information may often be disregarded because it is
unreliable. As we have said, one might expect a wide
range of animals to have chromatic mechanisms
whose responses are independent of intensity.

Honeybees are an example of a species with
intensity-independent colour vision (see Section VI).
In his pioneering work, von Frisch (1914) trained
bees to feed from a sugar solution presented on a blue
(or a yellow) card, and found that they could dis-

...
Table 2. Animal species (excluding primates) that have been shown to use colour vision in different behavioural experiments. As in the Introduction, we pose three questions, is colour vision used for a particular behaviour (q1)? How many spectral types of receptor are involved (q2)? How many chromatic mechanisms are found (q3)? Only experiments which give an answer (or at least an indication) to one of the questions are listed here. We note whether colour vision has been proved (yes to q1) or there is only a strong indication (ind.) for colour vision. For example, spectral sensitivity curves per se do not provide proof of colour vision. The number of receptors and post-receptoral mechanisms (Fig. 1, stage 2) used for colour vision is given if it was determined by behavioural tests and/or model calculations (q2 and q3). Some experiments gave evidence that a specific receptor (VS, very short wavelength receptor; S short wavelength receptor; M medium wavelength receptor; L, long wavelength receptor) is involved, this is mentioned in the comment. Under method we give the type of experiment, the behaviour used to test the animal and whether spontaneous or trained behaviour was used. We refer to other review articles for some animal groups. For detailed descriptions of methods, see Sections V and VI.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Animal species</th>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>q1</th>
<th>q2</th>
<th>q3</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mites</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water mite (Unionicola intermedia)</td>
<td>Monochromatic stimuli, phototaxis</td>
<td>Dimmock &amp; Davids (1985)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spiders</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jumping spider (Hasarius adansoni)</td>
<td>Grey card experiment, heat avoidance reaction</td>
<td>Nakamura &amp; Yamashita (2000)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>First clear evidence for colour vision in spiders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crustaceans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common shrimp (Crangon vulgaris)</td>
<td>Grey card experiment, camouflage</td>
<td>Koller (1927)</td>
<td>Ind.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hermit crabs (Clibanarius misanthropus, Eupa-gurus anachoretus)</td>
<td>Grey card experiment, spontaneous choices of shell homes</td>
<td>Koller (1928)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiddler crab (Uca pugilator)</td>
<td>Monochromatic stimuli, phototaxis</td>
<td>Hyatt (1975)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water flea (Daphnia magna)</td>
<td>Broadband stimuli, phototaxis</td>
<td>Lubbock (1888), von Frisch &amp; Kupfelwiser (1913)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mantis shrimp (Odontodactylus scyllaris)</td>
<td>Monochromatic stimuli, phototaxis</td>
<td>Koehler (1924), Storz &amp; Paul (1998)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grasshopper (Phaeba sp.)</td>
<td>Broadband stimuli, phototaxis</td>
<td>Kong et al. (1980)</td>
<td>Ind.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aphid (Myzodes persicae)</td>
<td>Monochromatic stimuli, oviposition</td>
<td>Moericke (1950)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reviews: Mazokhin-Porshnyakov (1969); Menzel (1979)

Eye bands with different screening pigments
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Animal colour vision</th>
<th>Grey card experiment</th>
<th>von Frisch (1914)</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>First evidence for UV sensitivity in bees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Honeybee (Apis mellifera)</td>
<td>Monochromatic stimuli, food training</td>
<td>Kühn (1927)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grey card experiment, food training</td>
<td>Lotmar (1933)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grey card experiment *, food training</td>
<td>Mazokhin-Porshnyakov (1969)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spectral sensitivity, food training</td>
<td>Helversen (1972)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2 *</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wavelength discrimination, food training</td>
<td>Helversen (1972)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colour mixture, food training</td>
<td>Daumer (1956)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multidimensional scaling (MDS) *, Food training</td>
<td>Backhaus (1991)</td>
<td>Yes*</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German wasp (Paravespula germanica)</td>
<td>Grey card experiment, food training</td>
<td>Beier &amp; Menzel (1972)</td>
<td>Yes *</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hornet (Vespa rufa)</td>
<td>Grey card experiment, food training</td>
<td>Schremmer (1941b)</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desert ant (Cataglyphis bicolor)</td>
<td>Monochromatic stimuli, food training</td>
<td>Wehner &amp; Toggweiler (1972)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eight species of hymenoptera</td>
<td>Colour discrimination*</td>
<td>Chittka et al. (1992)</td>
<td>Yes*</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hummingbird hawkmoth (Macroglossum stellatarum)</td>
<td>Grey card experiment, food training</td>
<td>Knoll (1922)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Striped hawkmoth (Hyles livornica)</td>
<td>Monochromatic stimuli, spontaneous choices, feeding</td>
<td>Kelber (1997)</td>
<td>Ind.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gamma fly (Autographa gamma)</td>
<td>Monochromatic stimuli, food training</td>
<td>Kelber &amp; Hénique (1999)</td>
<td>Yes *</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swallowtail butterfly (Papilio xuthus)</td>
<td>Grey card experiment, food training</td>
<td>Knoll (1926)</td>
<td>Ind.</td>
<td>Few observations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orchard butterfly (Papilio aegeus)</td>
<td>Grey card experiment</td>
<td>Schremmer (1941a)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monochromatic stimuli, food training</td>
<td>Kelber et al. (1999)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paper colours*, spontaneous choices, oviposition</td>
<td>Kelber &amp; Pfaff (1999)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Use of different shades of colour instead of grey</td>
<td>Kelber (1999)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* First colour discrimination model in bees (see Sections V2.c and VI.3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animal species</td>
<td>Method</td>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>q1</td>
<td>q2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Insects (cont.)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tortoiseshell (Aglais urticae),</td>
<td>Grey card experiment,</td>
<td>Ilse (1928)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>peacock butterfly (Inachis io),</td>
<td>spontaneous choices, feeding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fritillary (Argynnis paphia),</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cabbage white (Pieris brassicae),</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>brimstone (Gonepteryx rhamni)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Heliconius erato</em></td>
<td>Grey card experiment,</td>
<td>Crane (1955)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>spontaneous choices, feeding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Zebra</em> (Heliconius charotonius)</td>
<td>Grey card experiment food</td>
<td>Swihart (1971)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>training</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Cabbage white</em> (P. brassicae)</td>
<td>Monochromatic stimuli,</td>
<td>Scherer &amp; Kolb (1987)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>spontaneous choices, feeding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and oviposition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Tortoiseshell caterpillars</em> (Aglais</td>
<td>Grey card experiment,</td>
<td>Süffert &amp; Götz (1936)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>urticae)</td>
<td>phototaxis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Blowfly</em> (Lucilia cuprina)</td>
<td>Grey card experiment,</td>
<td>Fukushi (1990)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>spontaneous choices, feeding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wavelength discrimination,</td>
<td></td>
<td>Troje (1993)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>spontaneous choices, feeding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Olive fruit fly</em> (Dacus oleae)</td>
<td>Grey card experiment,</td>
<td>Prokopy <em>et al.</em> (1975)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>spontaneous choices,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>oviposition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Bee fly</em> (Bombylius fuliginosus)</td>
<td>Grey card experiment,</td>
<td>Knoll (1921)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>feeding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Drone fly</em> (Eristalis tenax)</td>
<td>Grey card experiment,</td>
<td>Ilse (1949)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>food training</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Vertebrates Fishes</em></td>
<td>Grey card experiment,</td>
<td>Kugler (1950)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>spontaneous choices,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monochromatic stimuli,</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lunau &amp; Wacht (1994)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>spontaneous choices, feeding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Minnow</em> (Phoxinus laevis)</td>
<td>Grey card experiment,</td>
<td>von Frisch (1912, 1913a)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>spontaneous colour change</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grey card experiment food</td>
<td>von Frisch (1913b)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>training</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wavelength discrimination,</td>
<td>Wolfe (1925)</td>
<td>Ind.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>food training</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animal Colour Vision</td>
<td>Grey Card Experiment, Spontaneous Colour Change</td>
<td>von Frisch (1913a)</td>
<td>Ind.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wrasse (<em>Crenilabrus melops</em>)</td>
<td>Monochromatic Stimuli, Food Training</td>
<td>Schiemenz (1923)</td>
<td>Yes *</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stickleback (<em>Gasterosteus aculeatus</em>)</td>
<td>Grey Card Experiment, Escape Response</td>
<td>Schiemenz (1923)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tench (<em>Tinca tinca</em>), Golden Orfe (<em>Idus melanotus</em>)</td>
<td>Grey Card Experiment</td>
<td>Burkamp (1923)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goldfish (<em>Carassius auratus</em>)</td>
<td>Spectral Sensitivity, Heart Rate Conditioning, Bright Light</td>
<td>Beauchamp &amp; Rowe (1977)</td>
<td>Ind. 4 *</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spectral Sensitivity, Respiration Rate Conditioning in Dim Light</td>
<td>Powers &amp; Easter (1978a)</td>
<td>Ind. 2 *</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Monochromatic Lights, Respiration Rate Conditioning in Dim Light</td>
<td>Powers &amp; Easter (1978b)</td>
<td>Yes 2 *</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spectral Sensitivity, Food Training, Dim Light</td>
<td>Neumeyer &amp; Arnold (1989)</td>
<td>Ind. 3 *</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Colour Matching, Food Training</td>
<td>Neumeyer (1985, 1992)</td>
<td>Yes 4 *</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wavelength Discrimination, Food Training</td>
<td>Neumeyer (1985, 1986)</td>
<td>Yes* 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Amphibians</td>
<td>Grey Card Experiment, Dishabituation of Turning Response</td>
<td>Meng (1958)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Common Toad (<em>Bufo bufo</em>)</td>
<td>Grey Card Experiment, Mate Choice</td>
<td>Gnyubkin et al. (1975)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kondrashev et al. (1976)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dimentman et al. (1978)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Indication for a VS receptor
*The high sensitivity in UV was measured but taken as 'aberrant'
*Rod and L cone colour vision in dim light for respiration rate conditioning
*Rod and L cone colour vision in dim light for the task
*Only VS, S and M cones contribute to colour vision for the task under dim light
*First direct evidence for tetrachromatic colour vision in an animal
*Maxima of discrimination curve are narrower than those of receptor curves
Table 2 (cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Animal species (cont.)</th>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>q1</th>
<th>q2</th>
<th>q3</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grey toad (<em>Bufo viridis</em>)</td>
<td>Grey card experiment, mate choice</td>
<td>Orlov &amp; Maximov (1982)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arrow poison frog (<em>Dendrobates pumilo</em>)</td>
<td>Broadband stimuli, spontaneous mate choice</td>
<td>Summers et al. (1999)</td>
<td>Ind.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common frog (<em>Rana temporaria</em>)</td>
<td>Broadband stimuli, phototaxis</td>
<td>Muntz (1962, 1963)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common frog (<em>Rana temporaria</em>), Crested newt (<em>Triturus cristatus</em>), Fire salamander (<em>Salamandra salamandra</em>)</td>
<td>Grey card experiment, food training</td>
<td>Kasperczyk (1971)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire salamander (<em>S. salamandra</em>), newts (<em>T. alpestris, T. cristatus, T. vulgaris</em>)</td>
<td>Grey card experiment, prey catching*</td>
<td>Himstedt (1972)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire salamander (<em>S. salamandra</em>)</td>
<td>Spectral sensitivity, detection of moving prey dummy</td>
<td>Przyrembel et al. (1995)</td>
<td>Ind.</td>
<td>3*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caspian terrapin (<em>Clemmys caspica</em>)</td>
<td>Wavelength discrimination, food training</td>
<td>Wojtusiak (1932)</td>
<td>Ind.</td>
<td>4*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giant turtles (<em>Testudo elephantopus, T. gigantea</em>)</td>
<td>Wavelength discrimination, food training</td>
<td>Wojtusiak (1932)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshwater turtle (<em>Pseudemys scripta</em>)</td>
<td>Spectral sensitivity, food training</td>
<td>Neumeyer &amp; Jäger (1985)</td>
<td>Ind.</td>
<td>3*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wavelength discrimination, food training</td>
<td>Arnold &amp; Neumeyer (1987)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Motion vision involved but object detection task used for tests
*Deduced from the number of maxima in sensitivity curve
*Three maxima in discrimination curve
*Deduced from four maxima in the sensitivity curve
*Gap in wavelength discrimination function due to oil droplet absorption
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Animal colour vision</th>
<th>Grey card experiment, food training</th>
<th>Wagner (1932)</th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anole lizard (Anolis cristellatus)</td>
<td>Moving coloured stimuli, visual fixation reflex</td>
<td>Fleishman &amp; Persons (2001)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birds</td>
<td>Spectral sensitivity, food training</td>
<td>Remy &amp; Emmerton (1989)</td>
<td>Yes 4 2*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columba livia (pigeon)</td>
<td>Wavelength discrimination</td>
<td>Emmerton &amp; Delius (1980)</td>
<td>Ind. 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Colour mixture</td>
<td>Palacios et al. (1990); Palacios &amp; Varela (1992)</td>
<td>Ind.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pekin robin (Leiithrix lutea)</td>
<td>Spectral sensitivity, food training</td>
<td>Maier (1992)</td>
<td>Yes 4 2*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pied flycatcher (Muscicapa hypoleuca)</td>
<td>Grey card experiments, nest recognition</td>
<td>Derim-Oglu et al. (1987); Derim-Oglu &amp; Maximov (1994)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great tit (Parus major)</td>
<td>Grey card experiments, nest recognition</td>
<td>Derim-Oglu &amp; Maximov (1994)</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tree sparrow (Passer montanus)</td>
<td>Purple card experiment, food training</td>
<td>Plath (1935)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budgerigar (Melopsittacus undulatus)</td>
<td>Grey card experiment, food training</td>
<td>Osorio et al. (1999)</td>
<td>Yes 4 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chick males (Gallus gallus)</td>
<td>Grey card experiment with adjusted light spectra, food training</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jay (Garullus glandarius)</td>
<td>Grey card experiment food training</td>
<td>Hertz (1928)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hummingbird (Archilochus alexandri)</td>
<td>Wavelength discrimination, food training</td>
<td>Goldsmith et al. (1981)</td>
<td>Yes *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tawny owl (Strix aluco)</td>
<td>Grey card experiment, food training</td>
<td>Ferens (1947)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Monochromatic stimuli, food training</td>
<td>Martin (1974)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little owl (Athene noctua)</td>
<td>Grey card experiment, food training</td>
<td>Meyknecht (1941)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mammals</td>
<td>Monochromatic stimuli, food training</td>
<td>Friedman (1967)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possum (Didelphis virginiana)</td>
<td>Monochromatic stimuli, food training</td>
<td>Flah (1967)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tammar wallaby (Macropus eugenii)</td>
<td>Monochromatic stimuli, food training</td>
<td>Hemmi (1999)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Neutral point, food training</td>
<td>Hemmi (1999)</td>
<td>Yes 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animal species</td>
<td>Method</td>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>q1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mammals (cont.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Neutral point, food training</td>
<td>Jacobs &amp; Neitz (1986)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tree shrew (<em>Tupaia glis</em>)</td>
<td>Spectral sensitivity, food training</td>
<td>Polson (1968)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dog (<em>Canis lupus familiaris</em>) *</td>
<td>Grey card experiment, food training</td>
<td>Orbeli (1909)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grey card experiment, food training</td>
<td>Rosengren (1969)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spectral sensitivity, food training</td>
<td>Neitz <em>et al.</em> (1989)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wavelength, discrimination, food training</td>
<td>Neitz <em>et al.</em> (1989)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Neutral point, food training</td>
<td>Neitz <em>et al.</em> (1989)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wolf (<em>Canis lupus</em>)</td>
<td>Grey card experiment, food training</td>
<td>Eisfeldt (1967)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cat (<em>Felis sylvestris</em>) *</td>
<td>Grey card experiment, playing behaviour</td>
<td>Buchholtz (1952)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Monochromatic stimuli, food training</td>
<td>Bonaventure (1961)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coloured lights, food training</td>
<td>Sechzer &amp; Brown (1964)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coloured lights, food training</td>
<td>Mello &amp; Peterson (1964)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spectral sensitivity, food training</td>
<td>Loop <em>et al.</em> (1987)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adjusted spectra, food training</td>
<td>Kezeli <em>et al.</em> (1987)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mongoose (<em>Mungos ichneumon</em>)</td>
<td>Grey card experiment, food training</td>
<td>Ducker (1957)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian civet (<em>Viverricula indica</em>)</td>
<td>Grey card experiment, food training</td>
<td>Ducker (1957)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Sciurus vulgaris</em> (Common squirrel)</td>
<td>Grey card experiment, food training</td>
<td>Meyer-Oehme (1957)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grey squirrel (<em>Sciurus griseus</em>) Fox squirrel (<em>S. niger</em>)</td>
<td>Wavelength discrimination, food training</td>
<td>Jacobs (1976)</td>
<td>Ind.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animal colour vision</td>
<td>Monochromatic stimuli, food training</td>
<td>Spectral sensitivity, white point, wavelength discrimination, food training</td>
<td>Spectral sensitivity, food training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ground squirrel (Spermophilus tridecemlineatus, S. mexicanus, S. lateralis) Prairie dog (Cynomys ludovicianus)</td>
<td>Ground squirrel (Spermophilus beecheri)</td>
<td>Spectral sensitivity, food training</td>
<td>Spectral sensitivity, food training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manatee (Trichechus manatus)</td>
<td>Grey card experiment, food training</td>
<td>Griebel &amp; Schmid (1996)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sea lion (Zalophus Californicus)</td>
<td>Grey card experiment, food training</td>
<td>Griebel &amp; Schmid (1992)</td>
<td>Yes*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fur seal (Arctocephalus sp.)</td>
<td>Grey card experiment, food training</td>
<td>Busch &amp; Ducker (1987)</td>
<td>Yes*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horse (Equus caballus)</td>
<td>Grey card experiment, food training</td>
<td>Grzimek (1952)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zebu (Bos indicus)</td>
<td>Grey card experiment, food training</td>
<td>Hoffmann (1952)</td>
<td>Ind.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Peichl et al. (2001) showed that sea lions and seals have only one cone type, the basis of their colour discrimination ability therefore remains uncertain.
V. TESTS OF COLOUR VISION

Von Frisch (1914) successfully differentiated the uses of chromatic and achromatic signals by bees. Although bees and birds do not usually learn achromatic signals, mammals usually have comparatively poor colour vision, and may prefer to use achromatic cues (Jacobs, 1981, 1993). For that reason, many researchers failed to train mammals like cats or dogs to discriminate colours, and until the 1960s it was not certain if they could see colour (Rosengren, 1969; Jacobs, 1981).

An early method of excluding achromatic information was to present an animal with two stimuli of different colours that were matched in brightness, meaning that intensities were adjusted so they appeared equally bright. Early work used human brightness, but it was recognized that the animal’s spectral sensitivity could differ from ours, and needed to be measured. Stimulus intensities could then be adjusted appropriately for the test species (see Section V.2). There are several difficulties with this approach. First, spectral sensitivity may depend upon behavioural context (Jacobs 1981; Neumeyer, 1991). The spectral sensitivity of goldfish, for example, differs depending upon whether they are trained to prefer a coloured target over a dark one, or a dark target over a coloured one (Neumeyer, 1991). More fundamentally, for light-adapted eyes behavioural spectral sensitivities often are mediated by chromatic, not achromatic mechanisms. Adjusting intensities according to these sensitivities does not then exclude achromatic signals (see Fig. 5; Section VI.3). Finally, where two or more receptor types contribute to the achromatic mechanism, and are randomly arranged (as in primates) spectral differences can locally lead to an achromatic signal even if the intensities are properly adjusted for the average. Given the difficulties of excluding achromatic signals, a more practical method is to make intensity unreliable by testing discrimination for a range of relative intensities, or by adding intensity noise.

Colour vision tests must refer to a specific behavioural context. In dim light, many vertebrates lack colour vision, and directional motion vision is often based on signals from one spectral type of receptor (Schlieper, 1927; bees: Lehrer, 1993; goldfish: Schaerer & Neumeyer, 1996). Behaviours tested include feeding, mating, escape, phototaxis, movement detection, camouflage, nest orientation and oviposition. Both spontaneous and learned behaviour can be studied. However, the most usual way of testing colour vision is by associative learning with a food reward. Here, we list general methods according to the stimulus design and give examples of the behavioural context in which these have been used. Table 2 gives an extensive, but still incomplete list, of experiments (for older reviews see Mazokhin-Porshnyakov, 1969; Autrum & Thomas, 1973; Menzel, 1979; Jacobs, 1981, 1993).

Three related methods for demonstrating colour vision are described below (Section V.1), all of which predate the knowledge of receptor sensitivities: (a) discrimination of a fixed colour from a series of grey shades; (b) discrimination of monochromatic colours, which can be changed in intensity; (c) discrimination of two broadband stimuli that can be adjusted such that either one or the other emits more photons over the entire spectrum. If an animal selects a stimulus according to its wavelength distribution it must have colour vision.

Section V.2 describes investigations that set out to study which receptors and neural mechanisms underlie colour vision. These include: (a) colour-matching experiments, the only direct test of the number of receptors; (b) discrimination tests with stimuli specially adjusted to test hypotheses on receptors; and (c) models of colour choices based on discrimination tests.

Knowledge of discrimination thresholds allows quantitative description of colour vision, and is discussed in Section VI. In recent years, quantitative models have emerged as powerful tools for understanding the biological relevance of colour discrimination.

(1) Evidence for colour vision

(a) Grey card experiments

Von Frisch’s (1914) ‘grey-card’ experiment with bees is a convincing demonstration of colour vision. An animal learns to associate a reward with a colour, and then chooses between this colour and many shades of grey. It is assumed that at least one grey gives a sufficiently similar achromatic signal to the trained colour, so that if all are discriminable from the colour the animal is not relying on achromatic cues. Von Frisch (1913b) also tested European minnows (Phoxinus phoxinus), and his influence led to many similar studies, especially in Germany during the 1920s and 30s (Table 2).

There have been some interesting variants on the grey card method. Swihart (1971) noted that Heliconius charitonius butterflies cannot associate a medium shade of grey with food, always choosing...
Animal colour vision

the brightest, but could learn successively two yellowish colours. Since both yellows could not both have been the brightest, the butterflies could not have been using achromatic cues. An alternative explanation is that the butterflies have a preference for yellow, and this directs their attention to the intensity of yellow objects so that they can learn the achromatic signal; but this too requires colour vision.

Apart from associative learning, spontaneous preferences have long been used to test colour vision. Ilse (1928) found that butterflies (various Nymphalidae, Papilionidae, Pieridae and Satyridae) prefer both blue and yellow to any achromatic shade including white. On the other hand when hermit crabs (Eupagurus anachoretus) select a new home they prefer achromatic shells of any intensity from black to white over blue or yellow alternatives (Koller, 1928).

Control of body coloration by fish (von Frisch, 1913a) and crustaceans also uses colour vision. To match their background brown shrimps (Crangon vulgaris) selectively dilate red, yellow and sepia-brown pigmented chromophores. In tanks surrounded by yellow paper the yellow pigment was more expanded than with any shade of grey surround (Koller, 1927). In contrast, cuttlefish (Sepia officinalis) seem to be colour blind when selecting body pattern on coloured gravels (Marshall & Messenger, 1996).

Amphibians have multiple types of spectral receptor, but are often difficult to train by operant conditioning, so alternative methods are needed to test colour vision. For example, toads (Bufo bufo) jump towards coloured cards that resemble prey, but the response habituates. Meng (1958) found that toads react again if they see a novel colour, but not a different shade of grey. The urodeles Salamandra salamandra and Triturus spp. also respond to moving prey, and to test them Himstedt (1972) used an elongated window divided into two fields that differed in colour or intensity. The border separating the fields moved sinusoidally. A jump towards the target indicated that the amphibian saw the border. The salamanders reacted much more strongly to a border between a coloured and any grey field than they did to a border between two similar shades of grey indicating that they used colour to make the discrimination. Fleishman & Persons (2001) used a similar method, testing responses of lizards (Anolis cristellatus) to movement of coloured cards that resembled the displays of conspecifics.

A variation of the grey card technique is to add intensity noise to the training colours, making brightness an unreliable cue. This technique is widely used when testing human colour vision, and is a feature of Ishihara’s (1917) tests. Such patterns can be displayed on a monitor (which excludes ultraviolet) or printed out as paper stimuli. Osorio et al. (1999b) trained chicks to find food in small paper containers covered with such patterns, and demonstrated tetrachromatic colour vision in this bird.

(b) Monochromatic stimuli

Monochromatic stimuli can be precisely defined in physical terms, and thus have long been used in human psychophysics (e.g. Maxwell, 1860) and with animals. If changes in relative intensity of two monochromatic lights do not influence an animal’s choice, it must be using colour vision. Monochromatic (or narrow-band) lights can be produced with monochromators, interference filters, or light-emitting diodes (LEDs). There are three basic procedures:

(i) If the spectral sensitivity of a species is known, the intensities of the stimuli can be adjusted to give equal achromatic signals, but other than with humans this is not easy. In a careful study, Powers & Easter (1978b) classically conditioned goldfish (conditioned stimulus: respiration rate; unconditioned stimulus: electric shock) to discriminate lights of 532 nm and 636 nm whose intensities were adjusted according to a previously determined detection threshold (using separate curves for photopic and scotopic sensitivities). To ensure that discrimination was not made by achromatic cues, both lights were varied over 0.5 log units. Goldsmith et al. (1981) used a similar method to test spectral discrimination by black-chinned hummingbirds (Archilochus alexandri), with stimulus intensities adjusted for the photopic sensitivity of the pigeon. This study demonstrated hummingbird colour vision, because they did not discriminate stimuli differing only in intensity.

(ii) When spectral sensitivity is unknown – as is usual – training can be done using equal (or arbitrarily chosen) physical intensities. After training, intensities in unrewarded tests have then to be varied over an (often inconveniently) large range of several log units (e.g. Quaranta, 1952 for giant tortoises, Testudo spp.; Kelber & Pfaff, 1999 for the butterfly Papilio aegeus).

(iii) In operant conditioning, training can involve intensity variations, and no subsequent unrewarded tests are needed. This was how Schiemenz (1923) demonstrated that European minnow and threespined stickleback (Gasterosteus aculeatus) see UV light
and have colour vision. Operant training with narrow-band lights is commonly used with mammals (Table 2; Jacobs 1981, 1993). For the tammar wallaby (Macropus eugenii), Hemmi (1999) adjusted stimulus intensities to give equal signals for the L cone, and went on to vary both rewarded and unrewarded training intensities widely. It was clear that the wallabies have colour vision because they preferred the rewarded colour to black, but black to the colour that was unrewarded during training.

Spontaneous preferences for food sources or oviposition substrates have been studied using monochromatic lights in butterflies (Scherer & Kolb, 1987) and hoverflies (Lunau & Wacht, 1994). Narrowband spectral stimuli have long been used to study Daphnia sp. phototaxis with controversial results (Koehler, 1924), but a recent careful study (Storz & Paul, 1998) shows that Daphnia magna phototaxis is specific to wavelength, and independent of intensity, over a large intensity range.

(c) Broadband stimuli at different intensities

When Lubbock (1888) studied Daphnia sp. he first found that they are positively phototactic (up to some intensity limit), and then that they prefer a light source filtered with a yellow filter to the unfiltered alternative. As the unfiltered light had a higher intensity at all wavelengths, Lubbock (1888) could conclude that the Daphnia sp. have colour vision, preferring yellow to white light. He speculated that this preference arises because the algae that Daphnia sp. eat colour water yellow. Subsequent experiments on phototaxis in frogs (Rana spp.), toads and grasshoppers (Phaeoba sp.) resembled Lubbock’s, trading a preference for a particular waveband against a general preference for high intensities (Muntz, 1962; Jaeger & Hailman, 1971; Kong et al., 1980). Unlike Daphnia sp., both grasshoppers and amphibians preferred short to long wavelengths. For frogs, Muntz’s (1962) critical test was to present the more attractive colour together with a mixture of this light and the less attractive colour. The mixture then had a higher intensity than the preferred colour. Since the less intense stimulus was chosen in these experiments, it was concluded that a chromatic mechanism overrode the preference for the more intense stimulus. Jaeger & Hailman (1971), on the other hand, showed that even when the stimulus with the less attractive colour was more intense than the other at all wavelengths it remained less attractive. A similar stimulus design, but with operant conditioning, was used successfully to show that dogs have colour vision (Orbeli, 1909).

(2) Tests of visual mechanisms

We now turn from simple demonstrations of colour vision to tests of the underlying physiological mechanisms. Firstly, we discuss colour matching as a direct test of the number of receptors used for colour vision, which can be done without knowledge of receptor spectral sensitivities, and secondly tests of receptor inputs to visual behaviour based on knowledge of receptor sensitivities.

(a) Colour matching

Colour matching is the direct test for dimensionality of colour vision. It is based on the principle (see Section II.2) that if \( n \) receptor signals are compared in colour vision, any spectral stimulus can be matched with a specific mixture of \( n \) primaries. For a dichromat, a mixture of two primary spectra can match white light, a trichromat requires three and so on.

Following Maxwell (1860), colour matching has been used widely with mammals, which are di- or trichromatic (Jacobs, 1981, 1993). Things are more complicated with increasing numbers of receptors, but colour-matching experiments have shown that honeybees are trichromats (Daumer, 1956), and goldfish and pigeon tetrachromats (Neumeyer, 1985, 1992; Palacios et al., 1990; Palacios & Varela, 1992). It seems unrealistic to test butterfiles for possible pentachromatic vision (Arikawa, Inokuma & Eguchi, 1987), and impossible to test a mantis shrimp with 12 spectral types of photoreceptors (Cronin & Marshall, 1989; Marshall & Oberwinkler, 1999). Even with goldfish, a two-step procedure was applied (Neumeyer, 1992). First, three lights were used to match ‘human-white’ light missing UV and second, it was shown that goldfishes can discriminate UV-containing white from UV-missing white.

A special case of colour matching can be used to demonstrate dichromacy (Fig. 2A; Jacobs, 1981). For a dichromatic eye all colours are represented by quantum catches of two receptor types. For any broadband stimulus, including a white one, it is possible to find a wavelength and intensity of monochromatic light, which will match the quantum catches of both receptors. Thus, a dichromat confuses light of a specific wavelength – called the neutral point – with white light (Jacobs, 1981, 1993; Hemmi, 1999).
(b) Discrimination of specially adjusted stimuli

If photoreceptor spectral sensitivities are known photoreceptor quantum catches can be calculated (see Section II.3), and it is possible to design stimuli giving known quantum catches in the different receptor types. For instance, two stimuli can be chosen to give equal quantum catches in one or even two spectral types of receptor. If an animal is still able to discriminate the two colours, this is good evidence that an additional receptor type is involved.

This approach has provided evidence for trichromacy in cats, which are commonly thought to be cone dichromats (Loop, Millican & Thomas, 1987; Jacobs, 1993). Electrophysiological evidence indicates that in photopic conditions cat ganglion cells receive input from three spectral types of photoreceptor, maximally sensitive at 450 nm, 555 nm (typical mammalian S and L cones), and at 500 nm, which is typical for rods (Ringo et al., 1977; Crocker et al., 1980). To find out whether the 500 nm receptor is used for colour vision, Kezeli et al. (1987) trained cats to discriminate a group of green from a group of purple stimuli. Both groups of colour occupied the same area in the cat’s two-dimensional dichromatic colour space given by S and L cones, but differed substantially for a putative 500 nm receptor. To take account of differences between calculated and actual cone sensitivities, stimulus colours were varied so that for any reasonable hypothesis about S and L sensitivities a dichromat would fail to discriminate at least some of the green stimuli from the purple. In fact, cats reliably discriminated purple from green, implicating a third input. Kezeli et al. (1987) argued for a 500 nm cone type (photopic) receptor, but rods cannot be excluded.

Where spectral sensitivities of receptors are known and do not overlap too much it is possible to adjust illumination so that only a subset of receptors are active in an experiment. Osorio et al. (1999a) used this method with domestic chicks, choosing stimuli and illumination so that only two receptor types were active in each experiment. They found that chicks probably use all four single cone types for colour vision, and that the receptors drive at least three chromatic mechanisms.

(c) Receptor-based models of colour choices

Given receptor sensitivities it is possible to establish the receptor inputs to visual responses and the underlying achromatic and/or chromatic mechanisms. Specifically, the strength of a behavioural response can be related to receptor signals by general linear models.

One such model has been used to study mate choice in toads (Bufo viridis). Relative preferences for a series of pairs of coloured toad-like objects were measured in dual-choice tests (Orlov & Maximov, 1982). Colour preferences were fitted by a model (Losev & Maximov, 1982), which assumed that preference \( X \) depends on a weighted sum of receptor quantum catches. It was found that excitation of the ‘green’ rods (see Table 1) increases attractiveness, while excitation of long (L) and medium (M) cones decreases it. A linear model nicely explained the preferences:

\[
X = 0.1 q_{SR} - 0.22 q_M - 0.1 q_L, \quad (5)
\]

where \( q_{SR} \), \( q_M \) and \( q_L \) are quantum catches of the toad’s green rod, M and L cones, respectively.

Backhaus (1991) trained bees to coloured stimuli and tested them with several similar colours simultaneously. A multidimensional scaling procedure was used, and choice proportions assumed to depend on the distance in colour space, \( \Delta S \), between the stimuli, which in turn was dependent on the linear combinations of receptor signals. Two scales, \( A \) and \( B \), were needed to describe the data. The distance is given by:

\[
\Delta S = |A| + |B|, \quad (6)
\]

where

\[
A = -9.86 E_S + 7.70 E_M + 2.16 E_L, \quad (7)
\]

\[
B = -5.17 E_S + 20.25 E_M - 15.08 E_L, \quad (8)
\]

and \( E_i = q_i/(1 + q_i) \) denotes the receptor excitations, which are related by non-linear transformations to receptor quantum catches \( q_i \). The scales \( A \) and \( B \) describe chromatic mechanisms, because receptor signals are combined with opposite signs.

Finally, Kelber (1999, 2001) studied oviposition in a butterfly (Papilio aegeus), and found that preferences amongst a number of colours are described by a model assuming that choice proportions depend on only one linear mechanism \( \eta \) receiving signals from three receptor types such that:

\[
\eta = -1.24 q_S + q_M - 0.77 q_L. \quad (9)
\]

VI. MODELLING THRESHOLDS FOR COLOUR DISCRIMINATION

Section V discussed the existence of colour vision and studies based on comparing relative preferences for different colours. Models have been found to be
helpful in describing colour vision mechanisms in various behavioural contexts. If models fit the behavioural data well, we can then look for a physiological correlate of the postulated neural mechanisms. At the same time, quantitative models can be used to test hypotheses about the evolution and the ecological value of specific colour vision systems.

An advantage of studying thresholds for colour discrimination is that it is generally easier to establish whether or not an animal can discriminate two colours than to ask how different they look. Also, non-linearities are usually less important near threshold. This makes it easier to fit quantitative models to behavioural data, which may reveal the neural mechanisms underlying colour vision and how they limit behavioural judgements.

(1) Measuring thresholds

Generally, it is more difficult to measure accurate thresholds for animals than for humans, thus behavioural thresholds have been measured only in a small number of species (see Table 2), including several mammals (Jacobs, 1981, 1993), honeybees (von Helversen, 1972) and goldfish (Neumeyer, 1984, 1985, 1986, 1992). The measurements require precise stimulus intensities and spectra, such as monochromatic lights. Thresholds are usually measured in one of two ways, either as spectral sensitivity or as wavelength discrimination. Spectral sensitivity is given by the minimal intensity of monochromatic light that can be detected, on either a dark or an achromatic background, sensitivity being the inverse of threshold intensity. In physiological measurements, absolute sensitivity is often measured; in behavioural tests, an achromatic background is more appropriate since many animals would not respond in complete darkness. In effect the task is to detect very unsaturated colours. Wavelength discrimination ($\Delta \lambda/\lambda$ function) is defined as the smallest wavelength difference that can be discriminated using two monochromatic stimuli. Monochromatic stimuli might be discriminated by both chromatic and achromatic signals, but studies of wavelength discrimination are generally intended to isolate chromatic mechanisms, in which case stimulus intensities are adjusted to remove achromatic signals, although this adjustment is difficult (Section V.1b).

On the whole, spectral sensitivity is better suited to quantitative analysis than wavelength discrimination. Firstly, spectral sensitivity gives thresholds about one point in colour space (normally the achromatic point), while wavelength discrimination gives thresholds about many points. This means that modelling spectral sensitivity does not require assumptions about changes of threshold values across colour space (Appendix A; Section VI.3). Secondly, the highly saturated colours used for wavelength discrimination may saturate opponency mechanisms, as they do in humans (Mollon & Estévez, 1988). Saturation introduces non-linearities, which complicates modelling.

(2) Interpretations of the shapes of threshold sensitivity curves

Data on discrimination can give information about the mechanisms of colour vision. Early analysis of behavioural spectral sensitivity and wavelength discrimination asked questions about receptor mechanisms, rather than subsequent neural processing (von Helversen, 1972; Maier, 1992). These interpretations assumed that: (i) local maxima of behavioural spectral sensitivity correspond to maxima of receptor sensitivities; and (ii) wavelength discrimination is best where the sensitivities of receptors overlap, i.e. midway between receptor sensitivity peaks. The number of receptors, and their spectral tuning can then be inferred from spectral sensitivity and wavelength discrimination functions. In honeybee, goldfish and turtle this method has allowed determination of the number of receptors involved in colour vision, before the corresponding photoreceptors were directly recorded (Daumer, 1956; Neumeyer, 1984, 1985; Neumeyer & Jäger, 1985). Bees have three maxima in their spectral sensitivity curve and two minima in the wavelength discrimination curve indicating that they use three receptor types. Goldfish and turtle have four maxima in their spectral sensitivity curve and three minima in their wavelength discrimination functions, which indicated that they had a fourth VS receptor, which was then unknown (Neumeyer, 1985, 1986, 1992; Neumeyer & Jäger, 1985). The UV maximum in spectral sensitivity had previously been attributed to the $\beta$-peak of the other (S, M and L) visual pigments (Beauchamp & Rowe, 1977).

As well as identifying receptor types, behavioural spectral sensitivities (without quantitative modelling) can implicate neural interactions between receptor outputs. The simplest possibility is that receptor signals from two stimuli (Fig. 1, stage 3) are compared without opponency (Fig. 1B). This predicts that peaks of the behavioural spectral sensitivity curves should be at least as broad as the receptor...
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Fig. 3. Diagrams of contours of equal colour discrimination in trichromatic receptor space. Different contours are predicted by three models that have been used to fit experimental data (Fig. 5; Brandt & Vorobyev, 1997). The axes of the space correspond to quantum catches of short (S), medium (M) and long (L) wavelength-sensitive receptors. (A) One achromatic mechanism is used for colour discrimination, where the distance in colour space $\Delta S$ is given by $\Delta S = (k_S \Delta q_S + k_M \Delta q_M + k_L \Delta q_L)^2$. The three positive coefficients (i.e. $k_S$, $k_M$, $k_L$) denote the weights of the inputs of receptors to a mechanism, that might be deduced by fitting the model to experimental data (see Fig. 5). The dotted line indicates the axis in the colour space corresponding to this mechanism. The two planes orthogonal to the mechanism’s axis give contours of equal discriminability. (B) Discrimination is limited by noise in the three receptor mechanisms, with stage 2 mechanisms (see Fig. 1A) absent or not adding noise. This is a Helmholtz line element. Distance in this colour space is given by $\Delta S = g_{SS} \Delta q_S^2 + g_{MM} \Delta q_M^2 + g_{LL} \Delta q_L^2$. The three positive coefficients (i.e. $g_{SS}$, $g_{MM}$, $g_{LL}$) denote the components of metric tensor fitted to experimental data.

(3) Metric spaces and quantitative analysis of threshold data

Helmholtz (1896) introduced quantitative modelling of thresholds (Wyszecki & Stiles, 1982). The theory assumes that discriminability of any two colours is given by their separation in some colour space, $\Delta S$, and that the behavioural response, $P_{corr}$ (Fig. 1, stage 4), depends on $\Delta S$ alone. Where $\Delta S$ is below a threshold value, colours are assumed to be indistinguishable. In two-alternative forced-choice tests $P_{corr}$ can vary from 0 (random choice) to 1 (100% reliable choice), and threshold is usually assumed to correspond to $P_{corr} = 0.75$. It is important to note that distances ($\Delta S$) refer to discriminability of stimuli, and say nothing about perceptual similarity of stimuli that are 100% discriminable. In a given space, the rule for calculating distance between points is called the ‘metric’ of the space. Different metrics make different assumptions about the processing of receptor signals (Fig. 1, stage 2), and about the comparison of neural signals corresponding to two colours (stage 3). Many models have been developed to explain human colour discrimination, some of which have been applied to animals.

A given metric model is fitted to colour discrimination data by describing a contour of equal discriminability, corresponding to a given value of $P_{corr}$, about each location in a colour space. That is, all points on the contour are equally well discriminated from the central colour. Different metric models predict different contours (Figs 3, 4). The positive coefficients (i.e. $g_{SS}$, $g_{MM}$, $g_{LL}$) denote the components of metric tensor fitted to experimental data. A contour of equal discriminability is ellipsoidal with axes parallel to the receptor axes. (C) Discrimination is limited by the most sensitive receptor mechanism. This is an upper envelope model without interactions between receptor mechanisms. Distance in this colour space is given by $\Delta S = Max(\{k_i \Delta q_i\})$, where the three positive coefficients, $k_i$ (i = S, M, L), denote the sensitivities of receptor mechanisms. Contours of equal discriminability are described by a parallelepiped with sides parallel to the receptor axes.
Fig. 4. Contours of equal discriminability in the chromaticity diagram of a trichromatic receptor space. (A) Colour (Maxwell) triangle (see Fig. 2B) specified by the surface in receptor space of a plane crossing receptor axes (representing quantum catches of receptors, \(q_S\), \(q_M\) and \(q_L\)), at coordinates \((1,0,0)\), \((0,1,0)\) and \((0,0,1)\). The chromaticity locus, \(q^*\), of a colour is the intersection of a line connecting the location of the colour in the receptor space, \(Q\), with the origin and the triangle. (B) Spectral loci (in nm) for the honeybee in a colour triangle. See Fig. 2B. Axes \(X_1\) and \(X_2\) of the chromaticity diagram are given in Appendix A, equations (A3) and (A4). (C) Contours of equal discriminability plotted in the colour triangle shown in B. The ellipse is predicted by a line element model (Fig. 3B), where the distance in the colour space is: \(\Delta S^2 = g_{11} \Delta X_1^2 + 2g_{12} \Delta X_1 \Delta X_2 + g_{22} \Delta X_2^2\). \(\Delta X_i\) (with \(i = 1, 2\)) denotes the difference in the chromaticity co-ordinates, and \(g_{ik}\) (with \(i, k = 1, 2\)) the components of a metric tensor that can be fitted to experimental data (see Fig. 5). The parallelogram describes the contours of equal discriminability predicted by dominance and city-block metrics. The dominance metric predicts a parallelogram with its sides (and axes, dashed lines) parallel to the axes of the mechanisms mediating discrimination (e.g. receptor or colour opponent signals). Alternatively, the city block metric postulates that diagonals of the parallelogram correspond to these axes (dotted lines). A parallelogram can be defined by four parameters describing the length and orientation of its sides. Consequently, dominance and city-block metrics for trichromatic colour space have four parameters, while an elliptic model has three. (D) A chromaticity diagram corresponding to a receptor-noise-limited colour opponent model (see Section VI.3b; Appendix B). The axis \(X_1\) is collinear to the base of colour triangle (in B), while the orientation of \(X_2\) in the triangle plane depends on the noise in receptor mechanisms. For thresholds plotted in this chromaticity diagram (see eqns A3 and A4), the model predicts circular contours of equal discriminability.

most parsimonious approach to calculating distance, known as a line element, uses a Riemann metric, which is a generalized Euclidean metric (Wyszecki & Stiles, 1982). Line element models predict ellipsoidal contours (Figs 3B, 4C). On the other hand, two types of Minkowski metric predict polygonal contours (Figs 3C, 4C), these are dominance (Sperling & Harwerth, 1971; Nuboer & Moed, 1983) and city block metrics (Backhaus, 1991).

(a) Inferring neural mechanisms from threshold data

An important reason for fitting metric models to behavioural threshold data is that, in principle, they can give information about neural mechanisms at
Fig. 5. (A) Predictions of models of colour discrimination (solid lines) fitted to honeybee spectral sensitivity data (filled circles; von Helversen, 1972). Geometrical interpretations of the models are illustrated in Figs 3 and 4. In each case, curves are least-squared best-fits for the model in question. (i) Discrimination by an achromatic mechanism (Fig. 3A). (ii) Discrimination limited by receptor noise without interactions between receptors (Fig. 3B). (iii) Discrimination limited by the most sensitive receptor mechanism, without interactions between receptors (Fig. 3C). (iv) Discrimination by two chromatic mechanisms (ellipse in Fig. 4C), and also dominance and city block models (parallelogram in Fig. 4C), which are indistinguishable for these data (see Section VI.3). Modified from Brandt & Vorobyev 1997. Only curve iv accurately describes the honeybee’s colour thresholds. (B) Spectral sensitivities of three vertebrates as predicted by the receptor-noise-limited colour opponent model (as curve iv above; see Appendix B): a dichromat, the tree shrew (*Tupaia belangeri*; Jacobs & Neitz, 1986); a trichromat, human (Sperling & Harwerth, 1971); and a tetrachromat, Pekin robin, (*Leiothrix lutea*; Maier, 1992). Each study had two subjects, indicated by separate symbols (o, +). Curves are displaced on the vertical axis for clarity. Modified from Vorobyev & Osorio (1998).

the stage in the visual pathway that limits performance. In practice, however, different models—that might implicate quite different physiological mechanisms—often make similar predictions, so that very accurate behavioural measurements are needed to distinguish between them (Fig. 5). Sufficiently accurate measurements are hard to obtain from most animals.

A key question is whether limits to colour discrimination are imposed at the receptor stage (Fig. 1, stage 1), or by subsequent neural stages (stages 2, 3). When noise originating in the receptors limits the discriminability, the shape of threshold contours says nothing about the receptor inputs to stage 2 mechanisms. For the models where discrimination thresholds are described by polygonal contours (dominance metric and city block metric models; Figs 3, 4), the receptor inputs to neural mechanisms can be derived from the orientation of the sides of polygons in the colour space (Brandt & Vorobyev, 1997). However, for models where the discrimination thresholds are described by ellipsoidal contours (Riemann metric; Fig. 3B), the receptor inputs to neural mechanisms cannot be derived from the orientation of the main axes of the ellipse. This is because an appropriate transformation of the colour
space maps the ellipsoid onto a sphere, whose main axes are not defined (Fig. 4D; Brandt & Vorobyev, 1997).

Ellipsoid models (Riemann metric) make very general assumptions about neural mechanisms of colour discrimination. They are valid if: (i) post-receptoral neural interactions (Fig. 1, stages 2 and 3) are smooth functions, and threshold stimuli are reasonably close together in receptor space (Brandt and Vorobyev, 1997, Appendix A); or (ii) behavioural thresholds are set by noise in neural mechanisms (Vorobyev & Osorio, 1998, Appendix A).

Of the polygonal models, the dominance metric is one of the earliest models of colour vision, postulating that the receptors do not interact (stage 2 is absent; Fig. 1B). Colour vision can then be described without assuming opponent interactions. This model proposes that the most sensitive receptor mechanism is used for detection of any given stimulus. The upper envelope of the receptor sensitivities then describes behavioural spectral sensitivity (Pirenne, 1962). The dominance metric – with or without interactions between the receptors – is the simplest case of a probability summation model whereby the probability of detection (discrimination) is given by the sum of probabilities of detection by independent mechanisms. In the city block metric model, the absolute values of the differences in the neural signals are summed and this sum is taken as a measure for the discriminability of two stimuli.

Polygonal models have been used to find stage 2 mechanisms. Sperling & Harwerth (1971) fitted a dominance metric model to monkey and human spectral sensitivities. Later Nuboer & Moed (1983) used a similar approach to make inferences about post-receptoral mechanisms from spectral sensitivity in the rabbit (Oryctolagus cuniculus). Backhaus (1991) fitted a city block metric model to honeybee colour discrimination (Section V.2c; Fig. 5).

Polygonal models of colour thresholds have more parameters than ellipsoid models. Therefore, before invoking a polygonal model, it is desirable to show that thresholds are significantly less well fitted by an ellipsoid (Figs 3B, 4C). In reality, given the scatter of experimental data, it is difficult to distinguish between ellipsoidal and polygonal models (Fig. 5). For example, ellipsoidal models fit the thresholds for both humans (Poirson & Wandell, 1990) and bees (Brandt & Vorobyev, 1997) almost as well as polygonal models (Fig. 5).

Brandt & Vorobyev (1997) tested a number of models on von Helversen’s (1972) measurements of honeybee spectral sensitivity (Fig. 5). Models that assume that receptor signals do not interact (Fig. 1B) fail to explain the data. This implies that receptor signals are integrated by some neural mechanism (Fig. 1, stage 2) before responses to different stimuli are compared (stage 3). Likewise, single-mechanism models – such as those described in Section V.2.c – do not fit the data. To explain honeybee spectral sensitivity one needs to assume at least two stage 2 mechanisms, which must be insensitive to intensity variation, and involve chromatic interactions between receptor signals.

(b) Receptor noise and colour thresholds

The best vision can do is to meet a limit set by the noise originating in the photoreceptors. Actual performance is worse than this limit because receptor signals are corrupted by noise originating more proximally in the visual pathway. One may expect receptor noise to set thresholds because phototransduction is metabolically costly (Laughlin, de Ruyter van Steveninck & Anderson, 1998), so that if it were not limiting selection would simply reduce expenditure on phototransduction. In this context, it is perhaps surprising that the predictions of classical line element models (Helmholtz, 1896) that invoke receptor limits to colour discrimination do not in fact fit experimental data (Figs 3B, 5A).

A new model of colour discrimination thresholds (Fig. 5A) suggesting a minor modification of the noise-limited models discussed so far (Vorobyev & Osorio, 1998; Appendix B) fits experimental data well. It takes account of the ‘ecological’ consideration that chromatic signals are more reliable than achromatic. We have mentioned that both bees and birds use chromatic signals for colour discrimination (Section IV). Accordingly, the model assumes that performance is limited by receptor noise, but also that colour is coded exclusively by opponent (chromatic) mechanisms that are insensitive to intensity differences. Noise in the opponent signals is set by (or equals) receptor noise. The only model parameters are the noise levels in the receptor signals, which can either be measured physiologically or estimated from the relative number of photoreceptor cells. Consequently, the model has no free parameters, and its predictions can be compared directly with behavioural data. It does indeed fit behavioural spectral sensitivities of birds, mammals and insects (Fig. 5; Vorobyev & Osorio, 1998). For the honeybee, the model predicts the absolute value of thresholds from noise measured by electrophysiology (Vorobyev et al., 2001).
The applicability of this receptor-noise-limited colour opponent model indicates that its assumptions hold for a variety of animals. However, for vertebrates the model often fails to predict thresholds in dim light (above cone threshold), almost certainly because the achromatic signal is used (Vorobyev & Osorio, 1998).

(4) Threshold models as a tool to study the biological relevance of colour vision

The traditional use of threshold models is to test hypotheses about physiological mechanisms, although as we have seen (Fig. 5) different mechanisms can give quite similar predictions. A second use is to investigate the ecology, evolution and design of colour vision. For example, it is now easy to measure spectra of natural objects such as food plants or bird plumage. Given an accurate model of performance, one can compare the suitability of different types of eye for tasks such as discriminating among a set of spectra, or detecting them against the background. This is especially worthwhile if performance is limited by photoreceptor noise, because photoreceptor spectral sensitivities are known for many different animals (Table 1), and one can often make a reasonable estimate of their relative noise levels (Vorobyev & Osorio, 1998).

For example, recent studies have asked how well dichromatic and trichromatic eyes would serve a primate looking for fruit against a background of leaves (Osorio & Vorobyev, 1996; Sumner & Mollon, 2000). Pursuing this idea one can also model the performance of hypothetical eyes, where for example visual pigment spectral sensitivities are shifted, e.g. in birds without oil droplets (Vorobyev et al., 1998). Finally, we can also ask how a specific light habitat could influence the evolution of receptor sensitivities (Chiao et al., 2000).

VII. CONCLUSIONS

(1) Animals of all major phyla have multiple visual pigments and photoreceptor types.
(2) Most animals with multiple receptors use colour vision.
(3) Achromatic signals and chromatic signals probably yield different types of information in natural conditions, and may generally be represented by separate neural mechanisms. Chromatic signals and colour vision are important for recovering object surface properties under variable illumination.
(4) A variety of methods can demonstrate colour vision without knowledge of underlying receptors or neural mechanisms.
(5) Knowledge of photoreceptor sensitivities permits the use of simple experimental methods to demonstrate colour vision, to determine the number of receptors involved and to investigate subsequent neural processing.
(6) Knowledge of photoreceptor sensitivities, behaviourally measured spectral sensitivities and models together build a powerful tool for studies of the ecology and evolution of colour vision.
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IX. APPENDIX A: COLOUR SPACES

Graphical representation of colour is useful for describing experimental data and for modelling colour thresholds. (Such representations do not predict thresholds.) Since colour can be defined by the set of receptor quantum catches it can be represented as a point in the \( n \)-dimensional colour space (Fig. 2). For trichromatic vision, colour can be presented as a point \( \mathbf{Q} \) in the three-dimensional receptor space, where quantum catches of the long-wavelength \( Q_L \), middle-wavelength \( Q_M \) and short-wavelength \( Q_S \) are placed along the coordinate axes. Where receptor sensitivities are known quantum catches can be easily calculated for any light stimulus (equation 1). Generally, it is convenient to use a co-ordinate system \( \{ q_i \} \), where quantum catches for stimuli are divided by those for a reference stimulus or the background, \( Q_i^0 \), to give a receptor contrast space (Cole, Hine & McIlhagga, 1993):

\[
q_i = \frac{Q_i}{Q_i^0}.
\]
If the reference corresponds to a background of a colour stimulus, equation A1 is a model of chromatic adaptation. It is the simplest algorithm of correction for changes of illumination (colour constancy), allowing independent rescaling of receptor signals, (von Kries, 1905), and is used widely to model colour constancy (Hurlbert, 1998; Dorr & Neumeyer, 2000). This is because for an eye viewing a reflecting surface, quantum catches change with changes of illumination but the rescaled receptor signal (equation A1) changes substantially less.

Instead of the receptor space, ‘chromaticity’ diagrams are often useful (Fig. 2; Wyszecki & Stiles, 1982). In these diagrams, the intensity or achromatic dimension is removed so that the location of a light stimulus does not depend on its intensity, consequently they have one dimension less than the corresponding colour space. Chromaticity diagrams were introduced because humans perceive chromatic aspects of colour (hue and saturation) to be substantially independent of intensity. Nonetheless, chromaticity diagrams reduce the information about substantial independent of intensity. Nonetheless, chromaticity diagrams reduce the information about colour, and are useful only for animals with separate chromaticity diagrams. Generalisation of this diagram uses log-transformed axes (Regan & Hunt, 1998). Unfortunately, for other species the directions of opponency mechanisms are unknown. MacLeod & Boynton (1979) proposed a two-dimensional diagram, with axes corresponding to ‘red–green’ and ‘yellow–blue’ mechanisms:

\[
\frac{\langle L-M \rangle}{\langle L+M \rangle} = \frac{Q_{L} - Q_{M}}{Q_{M} + Q_{L}},
\]

\[
S/\langle L+M \rangle = Q_{S}/(Q_{M} + Q_{L}).
\]

Maxwell’s triangle is the most commonly used diagram used in studies of trichromatic animals. However, in physiologically oriented studies it may be convenient to use axes corresponding to opponency mechanisms. For humans and trichromatic primates the luminance mechanism is driven by the summed M and L cone signals; the ‘yellow–blue’ opponency mechanism compares signals of S cones with signals of both L and M cones, and the ‘red–green’ mechanism compares L and M signals. The existence of separate pathways corresponding to these three mechanisms is established by psycho-physical and physiological studies of trichromatic primates (Jameson & Hurvich, 1955; Krauskopf et al., 1982; Dacey, 2000). Unfortunately, for other species the directions of opponency mechanisms are unknown. MacLeod & Boynton (1979) proposed a two-dimensional diagram, with axes corresponding to ‘red–green’ and ‘yellow–blue’ mechanisms:

\[
X_{1} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(q_{L}^{c} - q_{M}^{c}),
\]

\[
X_{2} = \frac{\sqrt{2}}{\sqrt{3}} \left( q_{S}^{c} - \frac{(q_{L}^{c} + q_{M}^{c})}{2} \right).
\]
X2 = V2 3(qs' - (qa' + qM')) 2), (A10)
X3 = V3 2(qvs' - (qa' + qS' + qM')) 3). (A11)

The X1 and qS' co-ordinates are related by transformation of rotation. The vertices of this colour tetrahedron are located at:

VS: \(0, 0, \frac{V3}{2}\); S: \(0, \frac{V2}{V3}, -\frac{1}{2V3}\);
M: \(-\frac{1}{V2}, -\frac{V2}{2V3}, -\frac{1}{2V3}\);
L: \(\frac{1}{V2}, -\frac{V2}{2V3}, -\frac{1}{2V3}\). (A12)

Commercial software can plot three-dimensional coordinates (Fig. 2C).

X. APPENDIX B. RECEPTOR-NOISE-LIMITED COLOUR OPPONENT MODEL

The model (Vorobyev & Osorio, 1998) is based on three assumptions: (i) For a visual system with n receptor channels colour is coded by n - 1 unspecified opponent mechanisms, the achromatic signal is disregarded. (ii) Opponent mechanisms give zero signal for stimuli that differ from background only in intensity. (iii) Thresholds are set by receptor noise, and not by opponent mechanisms.

The model has the following mathematical formulation. Let fi be the signal of receptor mechanism i, \(\Delta fi\) the difference in receptor signals between two stimuli, and \(\Delta x\) the difference in colour opponent mechanism, x. Generally, \(\Delta x\) is given by a linear combination of the differences of receptor signals, i.e.

\[\Delta x = \sum_{i=1}^{n} F_{xi} \Delta fi\] (B1)

where the coefficient \(F_{xi}\) describes the input of receptor i to opponent mechanism x. If opponent signals only are used for discrimination, then the distance between stimuli, \(\Delta S\), is given by a function of the noise and differences in opponent signals, \(\Delta x\). Assuming that receptor noise is dominant, stimulus discriminability does not depend on how receptor signals combine to form opponent signals. Consequently, the expression for the distance between stimuli depends only on \(\Delta fi\) and the standard deviation of the noise in the receptor mechanism, \(\epsilon\), and need not contain \(F_{xi}\). For stimuli close to an achromatic background, if assumptions i–iii hold, colour distance is given by the following equations (Vorobyev & Osorio, 1998):

\[(\Delta S)^2 = \frac{(\Delta f_i - \Delta f_j)^2}{(\epsilon_S^2 + \epsilon_L^2)}, \quad (B2)\]
\[(\Delta S)^2 = \frac{e_S^2(\Delta f_i - \Delta f_M)^2 + e_M^2(\Delta f_i - \Delta f_S)^2 + e_L^2(\Delta f_S - \Delta f_M)^2}{(e_S^2 + e_L^2)^2}, \quad (B3)\]
\[(\Delta S)^2 = \frac{(e_S e_M)(\Delta f_i - \Delta f_M)^2 + (e_S e_S)(\Delta f_i - \Delta f_S)^2 + (e_L e_L)(\Delta f_S - \Delta f_M)^2}{(e_S^2 + e_L^2)^2}, \quad (B4)\]

for di-, tri- and tetra-chromatic vision, respectively.

Receptor signals are functions of the receptor quantum catches, and two simple models relating the receptor signals to quantum catches can be considered: (i) a linear relationship (Vorobyev & Osorio, 1998); (ii) a log-linear relationship (Vorobyev et al., 1998, 2001). Because results of the model calculations do not depend on the units in which receptor signals are measured, receptor signals can be re-scaled so that they are related to quantum catches, \(q_i\) (equation A1) by \(f_i = q_i / f_i = \ln(q_i)\) for the linear or log-linear models respectively. Note that for stimuli which are close to a reference, both models make the same predictions. For the log-linear model, noise in the receptor mechanism, \(\epsilon\), equals the Weber fraction of the corresponding mechanism, \(\omega\) (Vorobyev et al., 2001).

If receptor signals are linearly related to quantum catches, modeled chromatic signals remain insensitive to stimulus intensity only in the vicinity of the achromatic point. A logarithmic transformation makes chromatic processing insensitive to changes of stimulus intensity throughout colour space. Consequently, this logarithmic version of the model gives a chromaticity diagram, where colour loci are independent of the stimulus intensity, and Euclidean distance corresponds to the distance given by equations B2–B4. For trichromatic vision the
following axes can be used to plot colour loci (Hempel de Ibarra, Giurfa & Vorobyev, 2001):

\[
X_1 = A (f_l - f_M),
X_2 = B (f_s - (a f_L + b f_M)),
\]

where:

\[
A = \sqrt{\frac{1}{(o_M)^2 + (o_L)^2}},
B = \sqrt{\frac{(o_M)^2 + (o_L)^2}{(o_M o_M)^2 + (o_M o_L)^2 + (o_L o_L)^2}},
\]

\[
a = \frac{(o_M)^2}{(o_M)^2 + (o_L)^2},
b = \frac{(o_L)^2}{(o_M)^2 + (o_L)^2},
\]

\[f_i = \ln(q_i), \text{ and } o_i \text{ is the Weber fraction of mechanism } i. \]

Then the distance in the colour space given by equation B3 can be expressed as

\[
\Delta S^2 = \Delta X_1^2 + \Delta X_2^2,
\]

where \(X_1\) and \(X_2\) are given by equation B5.
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