

Vocalisation in wild-living mountain gazelles (*Gazella gazella*): structure and context of acoustical signals

Amir Arnon^{1,2}, Nicola F. Koyama³ & Torsten Wronski^{3,4}

(¹ Department of Evolutionary and Environmental Biology, University of Haifa, Mt Carmel, Haifa 3498838, Israel; ² Ramat Hanadiv Nature Park, Zikhron Yaakov 30900, Israel; ³ Faculty of Science, School of Biological and Environmental Sciences, Liverpool John Moores University, Liverpool L3 3AF, UK) ⁴ corresponding author's email address: t_wronski@gmx.de

Summary

Describing vocalisations of species in the wild is an important step to understanding their function. A wild-living population of mountain gazelles (*Gazella gazella*) was monitored in Israel, using camera traps, thereby providing a first detailed description of the acoustic repertoire. We described six acoustical signals that were either reported by previous authors or that were hitherto not reported. Acoustic signals were categorised according to behavioural context as alarm calls, courtship calls or threat calls and—if possible—characterised by four acoustic variables, i.e., duration, maximum amplitude frequency, three power quartiles and fundamental frequency. Vocalisations were illustrated as spectrograms supplemented by full video sequences to show the acoustical signal in its environmental, social, and behavioural context. Given the rather inconspicuous character of many acoustic signals, we proposed further in-depth studies of vocalisation in mountain gazelles and other Antilopine species to unravel new insights into their behaviour and social organisation.

Keywords: agonistic behaviour, vigilance, courtship behaviour, nasal/oral calls, Antilopini

Short title: Vocalisation in mountain gazelles

Introduction

Describing the vocalisations produced by animals in the wild is an important initial step in understanding their function and can aid the conservation of endangered species through acoustic population monitoring (Browning et al., 2017). In social, group living mammals, acoustic communication plays an essential role. Acoustic signals are widely used in different

33 social contexts such as courtship, mother-infant relations, or agonistic interactions (Fitch &
34 Hauser, 2003; Fitch, 2006). Factors controlling the structure of acoustic signals are numerous,
35 including the anatomy and morphology of the larynx and the oral and nasal cavities (Frey et
36 al., 2008a; 2011), but also environmental and functional factors such as the species' habitat, its
37 sociability, and the type of social organisation (Fitch, 2006; Charlton et al., 2019; Stein &
38 Rachlow, 2023). Ungulates represent an interesting group with a comparatively wide repertoire
39 of acoustic signals (Kiley, 1972; Walther, 1984; Vannoni et al., 2005; Volodina et al., 2018;
40 Blank, 2021). Vocalisation in bovids and cervids was studied in many species, including the
41 oral and nasal alarm and courtship calls of deer (Vannoni et al., 2005) and many antelopes
42 (Estes 1991, Bro-Jørgensen 2010), but also locomotion-induced sounds, such as the knee-kicks
43 of male eland antelopes (Bro-Jørgensen & Dabelsteen, 2008). According to Kiley (1972), and
44 more recently Blank (2021), the bovine acoustic repertoire is characterised by five types of
45 vocal communications, mainly of nasal, but also of oral origin: i) contact calls, i.e., mainly
46 mother-infant communications, ii) advertisement calls, iii) threat calls, iv) courtship calls
47 (including mating, herding and driving calls), and most common v) alarm calls.

48 For the Antilopini tribe (*sensu* Bärmann et al., 2013), some early studies summarised acoustic
49 communications mainly referring to the alarm and courtship calls of gerenuk (*Litocranius*
50 *walleri*; Schomber 1966), blackbuck (*Antilope cervicapra*; Walther, 1959), Thomson's gazelle
51 (*Eudorcas thomsonii*), dorcas gazelle (*Gazella dorcas*), Speke's gazelle (*G. spekei*), Grant's
52 gazelle (*Nanger granti*; Walther, 1968) and springbok (*Antidorcas marsupialis*; Walther, 1981).
53 More recently, several studies have explored the vocalisation of goitered gazelles (*Gazella*
54 *subgutturosa*), Mongolian gazelles (*Procapra guttorosa*), impala (*Aepyceros melampus*), and
55 saigas (*Saiga tatarica*), focusing on the anatomy and function of the larynx, which is used to
56 produce the sonorous roaring of adult males (Frey et al., 2007; 2008a, b; 2011, Blank et al.,
57 2014; Frey et al., 2020, Volodin et al., 2021). Other studies were centred on contact calls
58 between mothers and their calves (Volodin et al., 2011, Volodin et al., 2014), on neonate
59 distress and discomfort calls (Volodin et al., 2017a, b), or on the development and ontogeny of
60 acoustic signals (Efremova et al., 2010; 2011a, b) and their individuality (Lapshina et al., 2012;
61 Volodin et al., 2017c).

62 The only references addressing acoustic communication in mountain gazelles (*Gazella gazella*)
63 come from Fritz Walther and colleagues (Grau & Walther, 1976; Walther, 1968; Walther et al.,
64 1983), describing distress and alarm calls, snort-like threat calls, and a driving call that is either
65 produced when a territorial male chases an oestrous female or another adult male. Mendelssohn

66 et al. (1995) described a sneeze-like call serving as a warning call, a low snoring call produced
67 by females to call their fawn, and a strong bleating distress call. These authors further
68 emphasised that most vocalisations produced by male gazelles during agonistic encounters are
69 rather soft, only audible in captivity when a human is taking up the role of an opponent (Walther
70 et al., 1983).

71 In our descriptive study, we present a selection of nasal, and presumably oral, call samples
72 arbitrarily recorded from wild-living mountain gazelles in Israel, using camera traps. We
73 provide a first description of the acoustic features of six call types that were either reported by
74 previous studies (see above) or that were hitherto not observed. Acoustic signals were
75 categorised, depending on behavioural context, as alarm calls, courtship calls or threat calls
76 and—if possible—characterised by four acoustic variables, i.e., duration, maximum amplitude
77 frequency (f_{peak}), three power quartiles (q_{25} , q_{50} and q_{75}) and the range ($f_0(\text{min})$ and $f_0(\text{max})$)
78 of the fundamental frequency (f_0). Furthermore, vocalisations were illustrated as spectrograms,
79 supplemented by full video sequences to show acoustical signals in their environmental, social,
80 and behavioural context.

81

82 **Methods**

83 *Study location and species*

84 Acoustical signals of mountain gazelles were recorded in Ramat Hanadiv Nature Park (RHNP)
85 in north-central Israel (32°30'N; 34°57'E). For details regarding geography, climate, and
86 vegetation see Geffen et al. (1999). The mountain gazelle occurs predominantly in Israel (Yom-
87 Tov et al., 2020), but small populations are reported from Jordan and Turkey (Amr, 2012;
88 Kankiliç et al., 2012). Mountain gazelles reproduce throughout the year, with a strong peak in
89 late spring (May to June; Baharav, 1983; Geffen, 1999). They are most active at dusk and dawn
90 but shift their active phase towards night-time if predation pressure is high (Arnon et al.,
91 unpublished data). The social structure encompasses territorial males holding territories of
92 about 50 ha (Grau & Walther, 1976), and matrilineal female groups with an average home
93 range size of 16.5 ± 0.51 ha (Geffen et al., 1999). Both sexes show a strong site fidelity (Grau
94 & Walther, 1976). In addition, non-territorial, solitary males are organized in small, loose
95 bachelor groups, trying to displace a territorial male. Adult territorial males vigorously defend
96 their territories against such intruders and mark territorial boundaries through the deposition of

97 excreta at localised defecation sites (Wronski & Plath, 2010) or by object horning, i.e., the
98 deposition of glandular secretions from the frontal gland (Walther et al., 1983).

99

100 *Data collection*

101 Camera traps (Spec Ops Edge: Browning Trail Cameras Inc., ATC 128X: A.T.C. Trail Camera
102 Technologies Ltd.) were employed at 10 locations known to be frequently visited by gazelles,
103 i.e., localised defecation sites, day- and night-time bedding sites as well as preferred feeding
104 sites. Camera trapping was carried out from March 2018 to July 2021 for consecutive periods
105 of one to 20 days, resulting into a total of about 80 trapping days. Vocalisations were recorded
106 at seven camera trapping locations during 14 events (site visits with vocalisation) at four to six
107 meters from the recorder, including six males and four females (individuals were recorded in
108 different years and at different points of recording). Typically, individuals could not be reliably
109 distinguished, however, at one location where cameras captured an ongoing territorial dispute
110 it was possible to individually distinguish the two males involved (horn size and shape, body
111 stature). Cameras recorded short video sequences lasting either 10, 20, 30, 60 or 120 seconds
112 with audio sampling rates of either 32 kHz or 48 kHz and resolution ranging from 115 to 770
113 kbps.

114

115 *Data processing and spectrograms*

116 Vocalisations were coincidentally detected while repeatedly screening the video footage for
117 other purposes (i.e., calibration of drive count data; Arnon et al. unpublished data). From the
118 calls identified in the recordings, those that were not superimposed with other noises and where
119 the acoustic structure was visible were selected for analysis. Calls were analysed in Raven Pro
120 1.6 (Cornell Lab of Ornithology, Cornell University), using a sampling frequency of 44.1 kHz,
121 Hamming window, a FFT length of 512, and an overlap of 50%. The following variables were
122 measured for each call: duration, the peak frequency at maximum amplitude (f_{peak}) and three
123 quartiles (q_{25} , q_{50} and q_{75}) representing 25%, 50% and 75% of the energy within call
124 respectively, and where visible, the fundamental frequency ($f_0(\text{min})$ and $f_0(\text{max})$) using the
125 standard marker cursor. At this point, it should be noted that in audio recordings of camera
126 traps the filter for low frequencies might be turned on by default, and thus values of peak
127 frequency and quartiles could be enhanced relative to those which could be obtained using
128 professional audio equipment. For the threat calls which were an exchange between two males,

129 we also calculated mean call interval. In cases with more than one call in a video recording,
130 mean measurements per individual were taken. Because of the quality of recordings, we used
131 visually guided analyses to measure all variables in each recording. For example, we did not
132 use an automatic algorithm to detect the maximum or minimum f_0 but used placement of the
133 cursor by human eye. All measurements calculated in Raven Pro 1.6 were visually checked
134 with reference to the power spectra. To analyse for differences in the acoustic structure of calls
135 between identifiable males, call duration, f_{peak} , $f_0(\text{min})$ and $f_0(\text{max})$ were compared using an
136 independent samples permutation test (R package *coin*) in R statistical software version 4.1.2
137 (R core team, 2020), except for threat calls or when only one sample was available. Permutation
138 or randomisation tests make no assumptions about the underlying distribution of the dependent
139 variable and are relatively robust when applied to data sets with small sample sizes (e.g., Craig
140 and Fisher, 2019). Only for representative audio files, the calls were amplified in Audacity
141 2.4.2 by normalising to zero decibels relative to full scale (dBFS), i.e., the maximum peak level.
142 Based on the social and behavioural context, calls were categorised as i) threat calls (male-to-
143 male), ii) courtship calls (male-to-female), and iii) alarm calls (both sexes; Kiley, 1972; Blank,
144 2021).

145

146 **Results and discussion**

147 *Threat calls*

148 The most frequently recorded call type was the male threat call that was captured a total of 72
149 times from two males, in five recordings on three days from one camera trapping location. Of
150 these 72 threat calls, 52 calls (9 and 43 calls for each male, respectively) were analysed for
151 peak frequency and quartiles (Table 1; ESM: S1, S2, S3, S4, and S5), and additionally, it was
152 possible to extract fundamental frequency for 24 calls (ESM: S1).

153 Threat calls were short, sharp nasal calls lasting around one tenth of a second. The 52 analysed
154 vocalisations were obtained from three recordings of territorial border conflicts between two
155 adult males (Figure 1a; ESM S1, S2, S3). One male produced audibly lower frequency threats
156 (9 calls) than the other (43 calls) and we therefore analysed the two males' calls separately
157 (Table 1). The mean \pm SD call interval was 3.7 ± 1.3 seconds. The calls of male B (seen e.g.,
158 in ESM S1 as the left male producing the second call) were significantly lower frequency calls
159 than those of male C (f_{peak} : $z = 3.48$, $p < 0.001$). Male B had a maximum call amplitude at
160 1699 ± 416 Hz (Figure 1b), ranging from 1723 to 2210 Hz, whilst the calls of male C (seen

161 e.g., in video 5 as the right male who produced the first call), were emitted at higher frequencies
162 with a maximum amplitude at 3206 ± 369 Hz (Figure 1c), ranging from 1852 to 4565 Hz. The
163 duration of the calls of male C (0.095 ± 0.011 seconds) was longer than those of male B (0.083
164 ± 0.008 seconds; $z = 2.5, p < 0.02$). As in most ruminants (for review see Volodina et al., 2018),
165 snorts were explosive, short and sharp expirations without visible fundamental frequency
166 (Figure 1b, c), and thus $f_0(\text{min})$ and $f_0(\text{max})$ were not established.

167 ([Figure 1 here](#))

168 The recorded threat calls largely correspond to the nasal snorts described by Walther et al.
169 (1983) as a repeated 'pshorre', mostly performed when taking an erect posture with the nose
170 levelled (*sensu* Estes, 1991) or slightly raised (Nase nach vorne oben heben, *sensu* Walther,
171 1968). Hereby, both males show a lateral presentation of the body, turning the heads away, or
172 performing nodding motions such as headshaking or vegetation-horning (see ESM S1, S2, S3).
173 The encounter continued with high horn presentation, attack, clash-fighting, front-pressing, and
174 aircushion fighting (Schlagwechsellkampf *sensu* Walther, 1968).

175

176 *Alarm calls*

177 Twenty-two alarm calls were recorded (three from females and 19 from males) in six videos
178 (ESM S6, S7, S8, S9, S10, and S11) obtained at four camera trapping locations. Of all calls
179 captured, 16 could be analysed, three from females and 13 from males (Table 1). Female alarm
180 calls (Figure 2; ESM S7 and S11) were short calls lasting around one fifth of a second (mean
181 \pm SD = 0.21 ± 0.18 seconds), with maximum call amplitude (f_{peak}) at 3919 ± 61 Hz. The
182 fundamental frequency of female calls was $f_0(\text{min}) = 297 \pm 176$ Hz and $f_0(\text{max}) = 612 \pm 84$
183 Hz. Male alarm calls (Figure 3; ESM S6, S8, S9 and S10) were similarly short calls (mean \pm
184 SD = 0.18 ± 0.06 seconds; $z = 1.06, p = 0.3$), with a maximum call amplitude (f_{peak}) at 2428
185 ± 1190 Hz, that was not significantly different from that produced by females ($z = 0.95, p =$
186 0.3). The fundamental frequency of male calls was also similar to that of females ($f_0(\text{min}) =$
187 264 ± 22 Hz and $f_0(\text{max}) = 635 \pm 55$ Hz) with no significant difference in $f_0(\text{min})$ ($z = -0.41,$
188 $p = 0.7$) or $f_0(\text{max})$ ($z = -1.57, p = 0.1$) when compared to females.

189 ([Figure 2 & 3 here](#))

190 Alarm calls were expected to be of nasal origin since they were accompanied by strong flank
191 twitching (pressing large amounts of air off the lungs) whilst having the mouth closed. These
192 alarm calls correspond to snorting calls described by Estes (1991) for the Antilopini tribe as

193 well as the ‘kwueff’ sound mentioned by Walther (1968) for Thomson gazelle (*Gazella*
194 *thomsoni*). However, spectrograms and call measurements were comparable to those reported
195 from klipspringer (*Oreotragus oreotragus*; Tilson & Norton, 1981) and goitered gazelle
196 (Efremova et al., 2011). Contextually, these snorts are similar to snorts produced by male topi
197 (*Damaliscus lunatus*) in both, courtship and alarm situations (Bro-Jorgensen & Pangle, 2010).
198 In topi, rutting and alarm snorts are acoustically identical and snorts aim to capture the attention
199 of receptive females. By contrast, rutting snorts of male impalas were longer and had higher
200 upper quartile values than alarm snorts (Volodin et al., 2021). Although we did not observe
201 rutting snorts in mountain gazelles, the use of snorts across different contexts is intriguing and
202 may represent another example of mate guarding through sensory exploitation.

203 Apart from these ‘normal’ alarm calls, another stage of arousal could be distinguished in alerted
204 mountain gazelles, i.e., a series of short calls, whereby each call corresponds to a single jump
205 whilst performing stotting (or pronking *sensu* Walther, 1968; ESM S6, S9). As the male in
206 ESM S9 is moving rapidly away from the camera with increasing distance as he emits these
207 calls, only the first call was analysed.

208

209 *Courtship calls*

210 Courtship calls are usually produced by males, directed towards a female (Figure 4a). A total
211 of 15 calls were recorded from eight video samples obtained from four camera trapping
212 locations. However, of all calls captured, only three could be analysed (one from ESM S12 and
213 two from ESM S13), mainly because of poor sound quality, strong back-ground noise, and the
214 remarkably soft and inconspicuous nature of the calls. Three call types appearing in a courtship
215 context were distinguished (Table 1), one short and sharp call lasting only 0.04 seconds with
216 $f_{\text{peak}} = 1494$ Hz (Figure 4b) and two calls lasting 0.09 ± 0.01 seconds with $f_{\text{peak}} = 1895 \pm$
217 244 Hz and a staccato-like structure (Figure 4c). Prior to the actual call, the male makes a
218 chewing movement with his lower jaw (ESM S13), suggesting an oral output. Therefore, this
219 call seems to be different to the sputtering, nasal sound described by Estes (1991) for the
220 Antilopini tribe. However, with respect to the behavioural context, the recorded calls occur
221 during the demonstrative driving phase, a part of courtship during which the male makes the
222 female stand up (hoch-machen, *sensu* Walther, 1968) and performs repeated foreleg-lifting
223 (Laufschlag, *sensu* Walther, 1968; Estes, 1991).

224 ([Figure 4 here](#))

225 In one case, a yet undescribed courtship call could be documented (ESM S14). This weeping
226 call was the longest call recorded (0.65 seconds; Figure 5). It appeared to be produced at a
227 much lower fundamental frequency ($f_0(\text{min}) = 288$ and $f_0(\text{max}) = 442$) than those of the short
228 ($f_0(\text{min}) = 895$ and $f_0(\text{max}) = 1211$), and long ($f_0(\text{min}) = 1378 \pm 318$ and $f_0(\text{max}) = 2246 \pm$
229 227 ; Table 1) courtship calls. The weeping call was produced while an adult male was
230 advancing a camera trap, performing a low stretch approach. The low stretch approach is
231 usually directed towards a female, signalling that the approaching male wants to test the
232 reproductive status of the female (genital testing *sensu* Estes, 1991), and is therefore
233 characteristic for the initial contact and testing phase of Antilopine courtship (Walther, 1968;
234 Walther et al., 1983; Estes, 1991). Although the male's head was out of sight when producing
235 the call (ESM S14), there is confidence that this call was produced by the gazelle since the
236 timing of the call is perfectly synchronised with its abdominal flank movement. However, since
237 this call was recorded only on one occasion the origin and analysis is preliminary and should
238 be viewed with caution.

239 ([Figure 5 here](#))

240

241 **Conclusion and limitations**

242 Since the call repertoire presented in our study was entirely based on arbitrary observations
243 recorded by camera traps, poor sound quality, strong back-ground noise, and remarkably soft
244 calls, a detailed analysis of acoustic signals was often difficult, if not completely impossible.
245 We were thus only able to analyse and/or describe six types of vocalisations, a threat call
246 associated with agonistic interactions between adult, territorial males, male and female alarm
247 calls, and three calls relating to courtship behaviour. Except for the threat and alarm calls,
248 sample sizes were extremely low, meaning that only one or two samples could be analysed for
249 each type of vocalisation. Two calls were previously mentioned (or roughly described) by
250 previous authors (Grau & Walther, 1976; Walther, 1968; Walther et al., 1983), including the
251 threat calls produced by two displaying adult males (Figure 1) and the short, sharp alarm call
252 produced by both, vigilant males, and females (Figure 2, 3). Thus, the reliability of our
253 vocalisation measurements is limited, and further recordings are needed to obtain better
254 measurements and confirm our findings. .

255

256 The frequency of greatest amplitude (f_{peak}) and the fundamental frequency (both $f_0(\text{min})$ and
257 $f_0(\text{max})$) were similar in both sexes, indicating no difference between male and female alarm

258 calls. Not unexpected was the discovery of individual threat calls produced by adult, territorial
259 males as the fundamental frequency ($f_0(\text{min})$) was significantly lower for one male than for the
260 other. Several studies on various mammal species have provided evidence that acoustic signals
261 can provide the receiver of a signal with a plethora of socially and physiologically relevant
262 information such as the senders reproductive ability, hormonal state, or body size (ungulates:
263 Clutton-Brock & Albon, 1979; Reby & McComb, 2003; Reby et al., 2005; primates: Fitch,
264 1997; carnivores: Pfefferle et al., 2007; Charlton et al., 2010). To empirically prove this theory
265 in mountain gazelles, repeated recordings of threat calls from individually known territorial
266 adult males in captivity would be needed and related to the hormone concentration and body
267 size of the respective male.

268
269 Another three acoustic signals were completely unknown from mountain gazelles and were
270 here described for the first time, including the pronking snorts (Figure 3), and the short and
271 long courtship call (Figure 4c). In particular, the courtship calls were extremely unobtrusive
272 and future studies may unravel more yet unobserved and undescribed signals. Interesting is the
273 observation of the staccato-like structure of the long courtship call that was observed in
274 conjunction with foreleg-lifting. Here, the male made a characteristic chewing movement with
275 the lower jaw, suggesting that this sound was of oral, rather than of nasal origin. Several studies
276 have highlighted the importance of oral sounds in Antilopines, especially for the group-living
277 and migrative goitered and Mongolian gazelle (Frey et al., 2008a, b; 2011; Blank et al., 2014).
278 Our study provides the first indication that oral signals produced by the larynx also play an
279 important role in the communication of sedentary, territorial gazelles, although to a much lower
280 extent than that observed in *Procapra* or the vagrant species of *Gazella* such as *G. subgutturosa*
281 or *G. marica* (Kingswood & Blank, 1996).

282
283 Finally, a word of caution regarding the pros and cons of using camera traps in acoustic analysis:
284 An evident advantage of using camera traps, is the opportunity to view the acoustic signals in
285 the social and behavioural context. The main limitation, on the other hand, is the non-calibrated
286 recording of audio signals, often with cruel filtration of lower frequencies, resulting in the
287 incomparability with recordings obtained from professional sound recording equipment.
288 Comparison of camera trapping footage is further complicated by different brands and models
289 with differing audio settings. Despite these shortcomings, we believe that our preliminary
290 results make a substantial contribution to the understanding of gazelle behaviour and thus the
291 *in situ* and *ex situ* conservation of gazelles. Given the remarkably soft and inconspicuous calls

292 coincidentally obtained during this study, we propose further in-depth studies of vocalisation
293 in wild and captive mountain gazelles (and other Antilopine species), using high-end camera
294 trapping technology in combination with directional microphones (e.g., in the mountain gazelle
295 breeding enclosure at Hai-Bar Carmel Nature Reserve in northern Israel).

296

297 **Acknowledgements**

298 We thank the management and staff of Ramat Hanadiv for their continued practical and
299 logistic support to our field work. The study was financially supported by Ramat Hanadiv
300 Nature Park.

301

302 **Ethical approval**

303 Ethical approval was obtained from the Review Group for the Use of Non-regulated Animals
304 of Liverpool John Moores University (approval number: TW/2023-8).

305

306 **References**

307 Amr, Z.S. (2012). Mammals of Jordan. — Royal Society for Conservation of Nature, Amman.

308 Baharav, D. (1983). Reproductive strategies in female Mountain and Dorcas gazelles (*Gazella*
309 *gazella* and *Gazella dorcas*). — J. Zool. Lond. 200: 445-453.

310 Bärmann, E.V., Rössner, G.E. & Wörheide, G. (2013). A revised phylogeny of Antilopini
311 (Bovidae, Artiodactyla) using combined mitochondrial and nuclear genes. — Mol. Phylogenet.
312 Evol. 67: 484-493.

313 Blank, D.A. (2021). Artiodactyl vocalization. — In: Neuroendocrine regulation of animal
314 vocalization - mechanisms and anthropogenic factors in animal communication (Rosenfeld,
315 C.S. & Hoffmann, F., eds). Academic Press, Oxford, p. 159-188.

316 Blank, D.A., Ruckstuhl, K. & Yang, W. (2014). Roaring function in male goitered gazelles. —
317 Behav. Processes 106: 152-159.

318 Bro-Jørgensen, J. (2010). Dynamics of multiple signalling systems: animal communication in
319 a world in flux. — Trends Ecol. Evol. 25: 292-300.

320 Bro-Jørgensen, J. & Dabelsteen, T. (2008). Knee-clicks and visual traits indicate fighting
321 ability in eland antelopes: multiple messages and back-up signals. — BMC Biol. 6: 47.

322 Bro-Jørgensen, J. & Pangle, W.M. (2010). Male topi antelopes alarm snort deceptively to
323 retain females for mating. Am. Nat. 176: E33-39.

324 Browning, E., Gibb, R., Glover-Kapfer, P. & Jones, K.E. (2017). — WWF Conservation
325 technology series 1(2) - Acoustic monitoring. WWF-UK, Woking.

326 Charlton, B.D., Keating, J.L., Kersey, D., Rengui, L., Huang, Y. & Swaisgood, R.R. (2010).
327 Vocal cues to male androgen levels in giant pandas. — Biol. Lett. 7: 71-74.

- 328 Charlton, B.D., Owen, M.A. & Swaisgood, R.R. (2019). Coevolution of vocal signal
329 characteristics and hearing sensitivity in forest mammals. *Nat. Commun.* 10: 2778.
- 330 Clutton-Brock, T.H. & Albon, S.D. (1979). Roaring of red deer and the evolution of honest
331 advertisement. — *Behaviour* 69: 145-170.
- 332 Craig, A.R. & Fisher, W.W. (2019). Randomization tests as alternative analysis methods for
333 behavior-analytic data. — *J. Exp. Anal. Behav.* 111: 309-328.
- 334 Efremova, K.O., Lapshina, E.N., Volodin, I.A. & Soldatova, N.V. (2010). Structural diversity
335 of calls of goitred gazelle calves (*Gazella subgutturosa*) and changes in their occurrence along
336 ontogenesis. — In: *Current problems of ecology and evolution in the studies of young scientists*
337 *Rojnov, V.V. ed.*) KMK Scientific Press, Moscow, p. 108-113. (in Russian)
- 338 Efremova, K.O., Volodin, I.A., Volodina, E.V., Frey, R., Soldatova, N.V., Lapshina, E.N.,
339 Makarov, I.S. & Gorbunov, K.S. (2011a). Sex and age effects on the structural features of nasal
340 calls and body size in the goitred gazelle, *Gazella subgutturosa* (Artiodactyla, Bovidae) calves.
341 — *Zool. Zhurnal* 90: 603-615. (in Russian)
- 342 Efremova, K.O., Volodin, I.A., Volodina, E.V., Frey, R., Lapshina, E.N. & Soldatova, N.V.
343 (2011b). Developmental changes of nasal and oral calls in the goitred gazelle *Gazella*
344 *subgutturosa*, a nonhuman mammal with a sexually dimorphic and descended larynx. *Sci. Nat.*
345 98: 919-931.
- 346 Estes, R.D. (1991). *The behavior guide to African mammals.* — University of California Press,
347 Berkeley.
- 348 Fitch, W.T. (1997). Vocal tract length and formant frequency dispersion correlate with body
349 size in rhesus macaques. — *J. Acoust. Soc. Am.* 102: 1213-1222.
- 350 Fitch, W.T. (2006). Production of vocalizations in mammals. — In: *Encyclopedia of Language*
351 *and Linguistics* (Brown, K., ed.) Elsevier, Oxford, p. 115-121.
- 352 Fitch, W.T. & Hauser, M.D. (2003). Unpacking ‘honesty’: vertebrate vocal production and the
353 evolution of acoustic signals. — In: *Acoustic Communication* (Simmons, A., Fay, R.R. &
354 Popper, A.N., eds.) Springer, New York, p. 65-137.
- 355 Frey, R., Volodin, I. & Volodina, E. (2007). A nose that roars: anatomical specializations and
356 behavioural features of rutting male saiga. — *J. Anat.* 211: 717-736.
- 357 Frey, R., Gebler, A., Olson, K.A., Odonkhuu, D., Fritsch, G., Batsaikhan, N. & Stuermer, I.W.
358 (2008a). Mobile larynx in Mongolian gazelle: retraction of the larynx during rutting barks in
359 male Mongolian gazelle (*Procapra gutturosa* Pallas, 1777). — *J. Morphol.* 269: 1223-1237.
- 360 Frey, R., Gebler, A., Olson, K.A., Odonkhuu, D., Fritsch, G., Batsaikhan, N. & Stuermer, I.W.
361 (2008b). Head anatomy of male and female Mongolian gazelle - striking example of sexual
362 dimorphism. — In: *Anatomical Imaging— Towards a New Morphology* (Endo, H. & Frey, R.,
363 eds.) Springer, Tokyo, p. 1-13.
- 364 Frey, R., Volodin, I., Volodina, E., Soldatova, N.V. & Juldachev, E.T. (2011). Descended and
365 mobile larynx, vocal tract elongation and rutting roars in male goitered gazelles (*Gazella*
366 *subgutturosa* Guldenstaedt, 1780). — *J. Anat.* 218: 566-585.
- 367 Frey, R., Volodin, I.A., Volodina, E.V., Efremova, K.O., Menges, V., Portas, R., Melzheimer,
368 J., Fritsch, G., Gerlach, C. & von Dörnberg, K. (2020). Savannah roars: The vocal anatomy

369 and the impressive rutting calls of male impala (*Aepyceros melampus*) - highlighting the
370 acoustic correlates of a mobile larynx. — J. Anat. 236: 398-424.

371 Geffen, H., Perevolotzky, A., Geffen, E. & Yom-Tov, Y. (1999). Use of space and social
372 organisation of female mountain gazelles (*Gazella gazella gazella*) in Ramat HaNadiv, Israel.
373 — J. Zool. Lond. 246: 113-119.

374 Grau, G.A. & Walther, F.R. (1976). Mountain gazelle agonistic behaviour. — Anim. Behav.
375 24: 626-636.

376 Kankiliç, T., Ozüt, D., Gürler, S., Kence, M., Bozkayam F, & Kence, A. (2012). Rediscovery
377 of a new mountain gazelle population and clarification of taxonomic status of the genus *Gazella*
378 in Turkey using mtDNA sequencing. — Folia. Zool. 61: 129-137.

379 Kiley, M. (1972). The vocalizations of ungulates, their causation and function. — Z.
380 Tierpsychol. 31: 171-222.

381 Kingswood, S.C & Blank, D.A. (1996) *Gazella subgutturosa*. Mamm. Species 518: 1-10.

382 Lapshina, E.N., Volodin, I.A., Volodina, E.V., Frey, R., Efremova, K.O. & Soldatova, N.V.
383 (2012). The ontogeny of acoustic individuality in the nasal calls of captive goitred gazelles,
384 *Gazella subgutturosa*. — Behav. Processes 90: 323-330.

385 Mendelssohn, H., Yom-Tov, Y. & Groves, C.P. (1995). *Gazella gazella*. — Mamm. Species
386 490: 1-7.

387 Pfefferle, D., West, P.M., Grinnell, J., Packer, C. & Fischer, J. (2007). Do acoustic features of
388 lion, *Panthera leo*, roars reflect sex and male condition? — J. Acoust. Soc. Am. 121: 3947-
389 3953.

390 R Core Team (2021). R: A language and environment for statistical computing. — R
391 Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna.

392 Reby, D. & McComb, K. (2003). Anatomical constraints generate honesty: acoustic cues to
393 age and weight in the roars of red deer stags. — Anim. Behav. 65: 519-530.

394 Reby, D., McComb, K., Cargnelutti, B., Darwin, C., Fitch, W.T. & Clutton-Brock, T. (2005).
395 Red deer stags use formants as assessment cues during intrasexual agonistic interactions. —
396 Proc. R. Soc. B 272: 941-947.

397 Schomber, H.W. (1966). Giraffengazelle und Lamagazelle. — Neue Brehm Bücherei,
398 Wittenberg-Lutherstadt. (in German)

399 Stein, R.M. & Rachlow, J.L. (2023), Acoustic ecology of terrestrial mammals: a new Signaller–
400 Receiver Conceptual Framework. Mam Rev, 53: 143-157.

401 Tilson, R.L & Norton, P.M. (1981). Alarm duetting and pursuit deterrence in an African
402 antelope. Am. Nat. 118: 455-462.

403 Vannoni, E., Torriani, M.V.G. & McElligott, A.G. (2005). Acoustic signalling in cervids: a
404 methodological approach for measuring vocal communication in fallow deer. — Cogn. Brain
405 Behav. 9: 551-566.

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

- 409 Volodin, I.A., Volodina, E.V., Lapshina, E.N., Efremova, K.O. & Soldatova, N.V. (2014).
410 Vocal group signatures in the goitred gazelle *Gazella subgutturosa*. *Anim. Cogn.* 17: 349-357.
- 411 Volodin, I.A., Efremova, K.O., Frey, R., Soldatova, N.V. & Volodina, E.V. (2017a). Vocal
412 changes accompanying the descent of the larynx during ontogeny from neonates to adults in
413 male and female goitred gazelles (*Gazella subgutturosa*). — *Zoology* 120: 31-41.
- 414 Volodin, I.A., Sibiryakova, O.V., Frey, R., Efremova, K.O., Soldatova, N.V., Zuther, S.,
415 Kisebaev, T.B., Salemgareev, A.R. & Volodina, E.V. (2017b). Individuality of distress and
416 discomfort calls in neonates with bass voices: wild- living goitred gazelles (*Gazella*
417 *subgutturosa*) and saiga antelopes (*Saiga tatarica*). — *Ethology* 123: 386-396.
- 418 Volodin, I.A., Volodina, E.V., Frey, R., Kirilyuk, V.E. & Naidenko, S.V. (2017c). Unusually
419 high-pitched neonate distress calls of the open-habitat Mongolian gazelle (*Procapra gutturosa*)
420 and their anatomical and hormonal predictors. — *Sci. Nat.* 104: 50.
- 421 Volodina, E.V., Volodin, I.A., Chelysheva, E.V. & Frey, R. (2018). Hiss and snort call types
422 of wild-living giraffes *Giraffa camelopardalis*: acoustic structure and context. *BMC Res Notes*
423 11: 12.
- 424 Volodin, I.A., Volodina, E.V. & Frey, R. (2021). Rutting vocal display in male impala
425 (*Aepyceros melampus*) and overlap with alarm context. *Front. Zoo.* 18: 2.
- 426 Walther, F.R. (1959). Beobachtungen zum Sozialverhalten der Sasin (Hirschziegenantilope,
427 *Antilope cervicapra* L.). — *Jahrbuch des Georg von Opel-Freigehege* 2: 64-78. (in German)
- 428 Walther, F.R. (1968). Verhalten der Gazellen. — *Neue Brehm Bücherei*, Wittenberg-
429 Lutherstadt. (in German)
- 430 Walther, F.R. (1981). Remarks on behaviour of springbok, *Antidorcas marsupialis*
431 Zimmermann 1790. — *Zool. Gart.* 51: 81-103. (in German)
- 432 Walther, F.R. (1984). Communication and Expression in Hoofed Animals. — *Indiana*
433 *University Press*, Bloomington.
- 434 Walther, F.R., Mungall, E.C. & Grau, G.H. (1983). Gazelles and their relatives. — *Noyes*
435 *Publications*, New Jersey.
- 436 Wronski, T. & Plath, M. (2010). Characterization of the spatial distribution of latrines in
437 mountain gazelles: Do latrines demark female group home ranges? — *J. Zool. Lond.* 280: 92-
438 101.
- 439 Yom-Tov, Y., Balaban, A., Hadad, E., Weil, G. & Roll, U. (2020). The plight of the endangered
440 mountain gazelle *Gazella gazella*. — *Oryx* 55: 771-778.

Tables

Table 1. Mean \pm SD values for acoustic measurements of threat, alarm, and courtship calls: duration (seconds), f_{peak} – maximum amplitude (Hz), q_{25} , q_{50} , q_{75} – lower, medium and upper quartiles (Hz), and $f_0(\min)$ and $f_0(\max)$ (Hz).

Call type	Number of calls	Duration	f_{peak} (Hz)	q_{25} (Hz)	q_{50} (Hz)	q_{75} (Hz)	$f_0(\min)$ (Hz)	$f_0(\max)$ (Hz)	Video number
Threat (Male B)	9	0.07 \pm 0.01	1699 \pm 416	1640 \pm 204	2045 \pm 159	2889 \pm 541	n/a	n/a	ESM: S1-5
Threat (Male C)	43	0.08 \pm 0.01	3206 \pm 369	1977 \pm 128	2737 \pm 154	3918 \pm 35	n/a	n/a	ESM: S1-5
Female alarm	3	0.21 \pm 0.18	3919 \pm 61	1357 \pm 1370	2885 \pm 1523	5168 \pm 1340	297 \pm 176	612 \pm 84	ESM: S7, S11
Male alarm	18	0.18 \pm 0.06	2428 \pm 1190	1994 \pm 799	2629 \pm 1205	3587 \pm 1010	264 \pm 22	635 \pm 55	ESM: S6, S8, S9, S10
Courtship - short	1	0.04	1464	1205	1378	1550	895	1211	ESM: S12
Courtship - long	2	0.09 \pm 0.01	1895 \pm 244	1895 \pm 244	1895 \pm 244	2067 \pm 244	1378 \pm 318	2246 \pm 227	ESM: S13
Courtship - weeping	1	0.65	430	344	430	430	288	442	ESM: S14

Figure legends

Figure 1. a) Two adult male mountain gazelles displaying lateral presentation and turning heads away while each producing an individual threat call type (ESM S1), b) spectrogram illustrating call type 1 (the second call in ESM S1 produced by the left male), c) spectrogram illustrating call type 2 (the first call in ESM S1 produced by the right male). Spectrograms were created with the settings: Hamming window, 22,050 Hz sampling rate, FFT 512 points, frame 50% and overlap 50%. Annotations show maximum amplitude (fpeak).

Figure 2. a) An adult female mountain gazelle in alert posture producing two single alarm calls, b) spectrogram showing two single alarm calls produced by an adult female in ESM S11. The spectrogram was created with the settings: Hamming window, 22,050 Hz sampling rate, FFT 512 points, frame 50% and overlap 50%. Annotations show maximum amplitude (fpeak) as well as minimum and maximum fundamental frequencies (f0(min) and f0(max)).

Figure 3. a) An adult male mountain gazelle producing a series of short calls, whereby each call corresponds to a single jump whilst stotting, b) spectrogram showing the series of calls performed during stotting (ESM S6) The spectrogram was created with the settings: Hamming window, 22,050 Hz sampling rate, FFT 512 points, frame 50% and overlap 50%. Annotations show maximum amplitude (fpeak) as well as minimum and maximum fundamental frequencies (f0min and f0max).

Figure 4. a) An adult male mountain gazelle prompts a female to stand up by performing foreleg-lifting, b) spectrogram showing a single courtship call and c) two courtship calls produced by the male while performing foreleg-lifting with a staccato-like structure (ESM S13). The spectrogram was created with the settings: Hamming window, 22,050 Hz sampling rate, FFT 256 points, frame 50% and overlap 50%. Annotations show maximum amplitude (fpeak) as well as minimum and maximum fundamental frequencies (f0(min) and f0(max)).

Figure 5. a) An adult male mountain gazelle performing a low-stretch approach while producing a long weeping call, b) spectrogram illustrating the long courtship call in ESM S14. The spectrogram was created with the settings: Hamming window, 22,050 Hz sampling rate, FFT 512 points, frame 50% and overlap 50%. Annotations show maximum amplitude (fpeak) as well as minimum and maximum fundamental frequencies (f0(min) and f0(max)).

Video captions

ESM S1. Two adult male mountain gazelles (*Gazella gazella*) engaged in a territorial border conflict near a localised defecation site. Both males produce a series of short, sharp nasal threat calls whilst taking an erect posture with the nose levelled or slightly raised. Both males show a lateral presentation of the body, turning the heads away, and performing nodding motions such as headshaking. The encounter continues with high horn presentation, attack, clash-fighting, front-pressing, and aircushion fighting. Ramat Hanadiv Nature Park, Israel, 12.11.2020, AVI format, 363 MB.

ESM S2. The same two adult male mountain gazelles (*Gazella gazella*) as in ESM S1 engaged in a territorial border conflict. Both males produce a series of short, sharp nasal threat calls whilst showing lateral presentation of the body, turning the heads away, and performing vegetation-horning. Ramat Hanadiv Nature Park, Israel, 01.07.2021, AVI format, 369 MB.

ESM S3. The same two adult male mountain gazelles (*Gazella gazella*) as in ESM S1 engaged in a territorial border conflict. While producing a series of short, sharp nasal threat calls, the male on the right is performing nodding motions such as headshaking and vegetation-horning. The encounter continues with high horn presentation, attack, clash-fighting, front-pressing, and aircushion fighting. Ramat Hanadiv Nature Park, Israel, 01.07.2021, AVI format, 369 MB.

ESM S4. An adult male mountain gazelle (*Gazella gazella*; presumably one of the two males in ESM S1) producing a series of short, sharp nasal threat calls whilst performing nodding motions or taking an erect posture with the nose levelled or slightly raised. The behaviour and call were performed near a localised defecation site at the boundary between two adult males' territories. Ramat Hanadiv Nature Park, Israel, 12.09.2020, AVI format, 185 MB.

ESM S5. The same two adult male mountain gazelles (*Gazella gazella*) as in ESM S1 engaged in a territorial border conflict (out of sight). Short, sharp nasal threat calls are clearly audible, and accompanied by strong flank twitching (pressing large amounts of air off the lungs) whilst having the mouth closed. Ramat Hanadiv Nature Park, Israel, 12.09.2020, AVI format, 185 MB.

ESM S6. An adult male mountain gazelle (*Gazella gazella*) producing a series of short alarm calls, whereby each call corresponds to a single jump whilst performing stotting or pronking behaviour (jumping into the air, lifting all four feet off the ground simultaneously, whereby the legs are held in a relatively stiff position). Ramat Hanadiv Nature Park, Israel, 01.10.2021, AVI format, 369 MB.

ESM S7. An adult female mountain gazelle (*Gazella gazella*) producing a single alarm call (in second 30) after being alerted by an approaching golden jackal (*Canis aureus*). Ramat Hanadiv Nature Park, Israel, 10.09.2019, MP4 format, 59.5 MB.

ESM S8. An adult male mountain gazelle (*Gazella gazella*) producing a series of alarm calls, which appears to be triggered by a conspecific male (or another strange object or noise) rather than by a predator. Ramat Hanadiv Nature Park, Israel, 12.07.2020, AVI format, 185 MB.

ESM S9. An adult male mountain gazelle (*Gazella gazella*) producing a series of short alarm calls, whereby each call corresponds to a single jump whilst performing stotting or pronking behaviour (see ESM S7). Ramat Hanadiv Nature Park, Israel, 12.08.2020, AVI format, 61.8 MB.

ESM S10. An adult male mountain gazelle (*Gazella gazella*) producing a strong, single alarm call before fleeing. Ramat Hanadiv Nature Park, Israel, 02.12.2021, AVI format, 40 MB.

ESM S11. An adult female mountain gazelle (*Gazella gazella*) producing two alarm call (in seconds 27 and 31) whilst taking the alert posture. Note that alarm calls are accompanied by strong flank twitching (pressing large amounts of air off the lungs) while having the mouth closed, suggesting that alarm calls are of nasal output. Ramat Hanadiv Nature Park, Israel, 31.03.2022, MP4 format, 229 MB.

ESM S12. An adult male mountain gazelle (*Gazella gazella*) performing a low-stretch approach towards a female. Prior to genital testing the male produces a courtship call (in second 3), barely audible due to the soft and inconspicuous nature of the vocalisation. Ramat Hanadiv Nature Park, Israel, 20.12.2019, MOV format, 5.25 MB.

ESM S13. An adult male mountain gazelle (*Gazella gazella*) during the demonstrative driving phase, a part of courtship during which the male makes the female stand up while performing repeated foreleg-lifting and producing courtship calls (in seconds 21 and 28). Ramat Hanadiv Nature Park, Israel, 19.10.2018, MP4 format, 66 MB.

ESM S14. An adult male mountain gazelle (*Gazella gazella*) advancing the camera whilst performing a low stretch approach. The low stretch approach is usually directed towards a female, signalling that the approaching male wants to test the reproductive status of the female (genital testing). A courtship call (weeping call) was produced in second 8, just after the male passed the camera. Ramat Hanadiv Nature Park, Israel, 20.12.2019, MOV format, 5.25 MB.