Does enhanced Sensory Processing across species require a greater Bio-Energetic Load?

Yes, **enhanced sensory processing** requires greater bio-energetic load across species, though organisms employ strategies to mitigate these costs.

Does enhanced sensory processing across species require a greater bio-energetic load?

Requires at least 5 papers that directly answer your question. Try adjusting your query to find more papers.

FIGURE 1 Research consensus on sensory processing and bio-energetic load across species

Enhanced sensory processing imposes substantial energetic costs at multiple biological scales, from single-neuron signaling to whole-organism metabolic budgets, and these costs act as a selective pressure shaping the evolution of sensory systems (Niven & Laughlin, 2008; Laughlin, 2001; MacIver et al., 2010).

Cellular and Neural Costs

At the single-neuron level, higher-performance sensory cells consume disproportionately more energy. Fly photoreceptors with greater information rates incur higher fixed costs, total signaling costs, and unit costs per bit, following a **law of diminishing returns** that penalizes excess capacity (Niven et al., 2007). Neuronal energy consumption is largely driven by ion movements across membranes via Na^+/K^+ ATPase activity, which maintains resting potentials and restores them after signaling (Niven & Laughlin, 2008). In the human brain, evolutionarily expanded cortical regions involved in higher-order processing have up to **67% higher energetic costs** than sensory-motor regions, driven by metabolically expensive G-protein-coupled neuromodulator signaling (Castrillon et al., 2023).

At the thermodynamic level, sensory adaptation is inherently dissipative, requiring continuous energy consumption to stabilize the adapted state (Lan et al., 2012). A general energy-speed-accuracy tradeoff governs this process: greater energy dissipation enables faster and more accurate adaptation, as demonstrated in *E. coli* chemotaxis (Lan et al., 2012). Measuring environmental changes is intrinsically energetically costly, while erasing memory of the past is free but irreversible (Sartori et al., 2014). These thermodynamic costs apply universally across feedback and feedforward adaptation topologies (Sartori et al., 2014).

Active Sensing and Whole-Organism Costs

Active sensing systems impose some of the most dramatic energetic burdens. In weakly electric fish, electrogenesis consumes up to **one-quarter of the daily energy budget**, and doubling sensory range would require sixteen times more energy (Markham et al., 2016; MacIver et al., 2010). Because electric fish signal continuously, their 24-hour signaling costs rival or exceed those of the most expensive acoustic displays in other animals (Markham et al., 2016). Metabolic stress from hypoxia or food restriction directly degrades electric signal amplitude, compromising both sensory and communication performance (Markham et al., 2016).

Sensory System	Energetic Cost	Key Finding
Fly photoreceptors	Higher unit cost per bit in high-performance cells	Diminishing returns penalize overcapacity (Niven et al., 2007)

Sensory System	Energetic Cost	Key Finding
Electric fish electrogenesis	Up to 25% of daily energy budget	Doubling range requires 16× more energy (Markham et al., 2016; MacIver et al., 2010)
Bat echolocation	Higher BMR with higher peak frequency	Positive relationship across bat families (Acosta-Luzuriaga et al., 2026)
Human cortical regions	Up to 67% higher cost than sensory-motor areas	Neuromodulator signaling drives cost (Castrillon et al., 2023)
E. coli chemotaxis	Continuous ATP dissipation required	Energy-speed-accuracy tradeoff (Lan et al., 2012)

FIGURE 2 Comparison of energetic costs across sensory systems and species

Echolocating bats show a significant positive relationship between basal metabolic rate and echolocation peak frequency, linking the metabolic cost of sound production directly to sensory performance (Acosta-Luzuriaga et al., 2026). In mormyrid electric fish, individuals increase the proportion of their energy budget allocated to sensory sampling as oxygen levels drop, demonstrating a direct trade-off between sensory information acquisition and other physiological functions (Clarke et al., 2020). Movement-based sensing adds further energetic overhead: electric fish expend approximately **four times more mechanical energy** during tracking in weak-signal conditions, with diminishing returns as energy investment increases (Chen et al., 2020).

Evolutionary Trade-offs and Mitigation Strategies

- Energy limitations have driven **trade-offs between sensory modalities**, causing reductions or losses of visual structures in energy-limited environments such as caves and islands (Niven & Laughlin, 2008).
- In bats, sensory brain regions (auditory nuclei) are constrained by body-size allometry and optimized for neural efficiency under energy constraints, while cognitive regions are shaped by ecological selection (Zhong et al., 2026).
- Brains are among the most energetically expensive tissues, and cognitive abilities can only drive brain size evolution where they improve the organism's energy balance through favorable ecological preconditions (Heldstab et al., 2022).
- Drosophila studies reveal that investment in visual structures correlates with **increased food consumption**, supporting the idea that costly sensory structures are positively selected only when food is abundant (Collin & Marshall, 2019).

Organisms deploy several strategies to offset sensory energetic costs. Efficient coding and wiring schemes reduce energy expenditure and have shaped the morphological features of numerous sensory systems (Niven & Laughlin, 2008; Laughlin, 2001). Sensory systems adapt resource allocation at the earliest processing stages to maximize fitness-relevant objectives while accounting for metabolic costs (Polanía et al., 2024). Decoupling sensorium movement from whole-body movement, as seen in independently movable eyes and pinnae, provides significant energy savings compared to repositioning the entire body (MacIver et al., 2010). In electric fish, cellular, endocrine, and behavioral adaptations have evolved to restrain the metabolic costs of electrogenesis (Markham et al., 2016). Gamma-wave generation for awareness and consciousness is energetically highly cost-intensive, and can only be evolutionarily maintained when species gain significant reproductive fitness advantages (Ehret & Romand, 2022).

Enhanced sensory processing across species consistently requires greater bio-energetic investment, whether measured at the level of single neurons, active sensing signals, whole-organism metabolic budgets, or brain-wide information processing. The evidence spans insects, fish, bats, and humans, with costs scaling from ATP molecules per bit to substantial fractions of total metabolic rate. Organisms mitigate but do not eliminate these costs through efficient coding, modality trade-offs, and adaptive resource allocation, confirming that the energetic burden of enhanced sensing is a fundamental evolutionary constraint rather than an incidental byproduct.

References

Acosta-Luzuriaga, E., Medina-Bello, K. I., & Ayala-Berdon, J. (2026). Linking energy metabolism and echolocation: the relationship between basal metabolic rate and peak frequency in bats. *Bioacoustics, 35*, 203 - 219. https://doi.org/10.1080/09524622.2026.2623235

Castrillon, G., Epp, S. M., Bose, A., Fraticelli, L., Hechler, A., Belenya, R., Ranft, A., Yakushev, I., Utz, L., Sundar, L., Rauschecker, J., Preibisch, C., Kurcyus, K., & Riedl, V. (2023). An energy costly architecture of neuromodulators for human brain evolution and cognition. *Science Advances, 9*. https://doi.org/10.1126/sciadv.adi7632

Chen, C., Murphey, T., & MacIver, M. A. (2020). Tuning movement for sensing in an uncertain world. *eLife, 9*. https://doi.org/10.7554/elife.52371

Clarke, S. B., Chapman, L., & Krahe, R. (2020). The effect of normoxia exposure on hypoxia tolerance and sensory sampling in a swamp-dwelling mormyrid fish.. *Comparative biochemistry and physiology. Part A, Molecular & integrative physiology*, 110586. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cbpa.2019.110586

Collin, S., & Marshall, N. (2019). Neuroethology Meets Brain, Behavior and Evolution: Promoting the Study of the Neural Basis of Behavior. *Brain, Behavior and Evolution, 94*, 5 - 6. https://doi.org/10.1159/000504428

Ehret, G., & Romand, R. (2022). Awareness and consciousness in humans and animals – neural and behavioral correlates in an evolutionary perspective. *Frontiers in Systems Neuroscience, 16*. https://doi.org/10.3389/fnsys.2022.941534

Heldstab, S., Isler, K., Graber, S. M., Schuppli, C., & Van Schaik, C. V. (2022). The economics of brain size evolution in vertebrates.. *Current biology : CB, 32 12*, R697-R708. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cub.2022.04.096

Lan, G., Sartori, P., Neumann, S., Sourjik, V., & Tu, Y. (2012). The energy-speed-accuracy tradeoff in sensory adaptation. *Nature physics, 8*, 422 - 428. https://doi.org/10.1038/nphys2276

Laughlin, S. (2001). Energy as a constraint on the coding and processing of sensory information.. *Current opinion in neurobiology, 11 4*, 475-80. https://doi.org/10.1016/s0959-4388(00)00237-3

MacIver, M. A., Patankar, N., & Shirgaonkar, A. (2010). Energy-Information Trade-Offs between Movement and Sensing. *PLoS Computational Biology, 6*. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pcbi.1000769

Markham, M., Ban, Y., McCauley, A., & Maltby, R. (2016). Energetics of Sensing and Communication in Electric Fish: A Blessing and a Curse in the Anthropocene?. *Integrative and comparative biology, 56 5*, 889-900. https://doi.org/10.1093/icb/icw104

Niven, J., & Laughlin, S. (2008). Energy limitation as a selective pressure on the evolution of sensory systems. *Journal of Experimental Biology, 211*, 1792 - 1804. https://doi.org/10.1242/jeb.017574

Niven, J., Anderson, J. C., & Laughlin, S. (2007). Fly Photoreceptors Demonstrate Energy-Information Trade-Offs in Neural Coding. *PLoS Biology, 5*. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pbio.0050116

Polanía, R., Burdakov, D., & Hare, T. A. (2024). Rationality, preferences, and emotions with biological constraints: it all starts from our senses.. *Trends in cognitive sciences*. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tics.2024.01.003

Sartori, P., Granger, L., Lee, C., & Horowitz, J. (2014). Thermodynamic Costs of Information Processing in Sensory Adaptation. *PLoS Computational Biology, 10*. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pcbi.1003974

Zhong, M., Wang, J., Feng, J., & Lin, A. (2026). Energy Constraints and Ecological Adaptation Drive Divergent Evolution of Sensory and Cognitive Brain Regions in Bats.. *Integrative zoology*. https://doi.org/10.1111/1749-4877.70057