



Hackett, T. D., Holderied, M. W., & Korine, C. (2017). Echolocation call description of 15 species of Middle-Eastern desert dwelling insectivorous bats. *Bioacoustics*, 26(3), 217-235.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/09524622.2016.1247386>

Peer reviewed version

License (if available):
Unspecified

Link to published version (if available):
[10.1080/09524622.2016.1247386](https://doi.org/10.1080/09524622.2016.1247386)

[Link to publication record in Explore Bristol Research](#)
PDF-document

This is the author accepted manuscript (AAM). The final published version (version of record) is available online via WILEY at <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/09524622.2016.1247386>. Please refer to any applicable terms of use of the publisher.

University of Bristol - Explore Bristol Research

General rights

This document is made available in accordance with publisher policies. Please cite only the published version using the reference above. Full terms of use are available:
<http://www.bristol.ac.uk/pure/about/ebr-terms>

1 **Acoustic identification of bats in the Arava desert (rift valley)**

2

3 Talya D. Hackett¹, Marc W. Holderied¹ and Carmi Korine²

4 *1: Department of Biological Sciences, University of Bristol, UK*

5 *2: Mitrani Department of Desert Ecology, Swiss Institute for Dryland Environmental and*
6 *Energy Research, Jacob Blaustein Institutes for Desert Research, Ben-Gurion University of*
7 *the Negev, Sede Boqer Campus 84990, Midreshet Ben-Gurion, Israel.*

8

9 Corresponding Author:

10 Dr Talya D. Hackett

11 University of Bristol

12 School of Biological Sciences

13 Life Sciences Building

14 Bristol BS8 1TQ

15 UK

16 Talya.Hackett@bristol.ac.uk

17 **Acoustic identification of bats in the Arava desert (rift valley)**

18 Modern advances in acoustic technology have made possible new and broad ranges of
19 research in bioacoustics, particularly with regard to echolocating bats. In the present
20 study we present an acoustic guide to the calls of 15 species of bats in the Arava (rift
21 valley), Israel, with a focus on their bioacoustics, habitat use and explaining
22 differences between similar species. We also describe a potential case of frequency
23 separation where four bat species using six call types appear to separate the
24 frequencies of their calls to minimise overlap. The studied community of bat species
25 is also found in other Middle Eastern deserts including the deserts of Jordan, Syria
26 and Saudi Arabia and we hope that data gathered will benefit other bat researchers in
27 the region.

28 Key Words: Insectivorous desert bats; echolocation; acoustic separation

29

30 **Introduction**

31 The ability to determine the activity and richness of species in a given area is essential to
32 assess habitats and ecosystems. Many echolocating bats have species specific calls and are
33 relatively easy to monitor acoustically (Fenton and Bell 1981). Combined with the ecosystem
34 services they provide (Kunz et al. 2011), this makes them ideal bioindicators for habitat
35 assessment (Jones et al. 2009, Russo and Jones 2015).

36 Bat species' echolocation calls can be divided broadly into two temporal categories: high
37 duty cycle (HDC) and low duty cycle (LDC). HDC calls are longer in duration and have a
38 shorter inter pulse interval resulting in the majority of a sequence being occupied by the call
39 of the bat, thus a higher duty cycle. Conversely, LDC calls are short in duration and have
40 long inter pulse intervals, because the bat calls and waits to listen for the returning echo,
41 resulting in longer periods of silence (Fenton 1999). Calls can also be defined by shape.
42 Constant frequency (CF) calls have a typically large portion of the call with no change in
43 frequency and are synonymous with HDC calls. Narrowband calls have little change in
44 frequency over time and are sometimes called quasi-constant frequency (QCF). Conversely,
45 frequency modulated (FM) calls are broadband and sweep through a range of frequencies in a
46 short period of time. Narrowband calls are best suited to detection in open space foraging
47 while broadband calls are better for localising an object and tend to be used more by gleaning
48 bats (Neuweiler 1989, 1990, Jones and Rydell 2003, Schnitzler et al. 2003). Individual calls
49 can contain components of multiple shapes; for instance a "hockey-stick" shaped call typical
50 of Pipistrelles has a FM portion followed by a narrowband QCF component (Kalko and
51 Schnitzler 1993, Russo and Jones 2002). Moreover, during a sequence of calls there may be
52 distinct differences between search, detection, approach and attack phases of call sequence. A
53 typical Pipistrelle bat will use a more QCF call during the search phase, then FM-QCF during

54 detection and approach, finally emitting a rapid “buzz” of FM calls with an increased call rate
55 during the attack phase (Jones and Rydell 2003).

56 Identification of species is typically based on common parameters both temporal (e.g. call
57 duration and inter pulse interval) and spectral (e.g. start, end and peak frequency) as well as
58 the overall frequency modulation pattern (FM, CF, QCF) of the call. However, individual
59 species do not always use just one fixed call type. An individual will alter its call in different
60 habitats and with changing distance to obstacles (Kalko and Schnitzler 1993, Bartonicka and
61 Rehak 2005) as well as depending on whether there are other bats nearby (Obrist 1995,
62 Ratcliffe et al. 2004, Ulanovsky et al. 2004, Gillam et al. 2007, Bates et al. 2008, Amichai et
63 al. 2015). Some species show age and sex differences within the population as well as distinct
64 changes due to the individual calling (Masters et al. 1995), while populations of the same
65 species in different global regions may have different call structures (Thomas et al. 1987,
66 Murray et al. 2001). Finally, some species have such similar calls that identifying the calls
67 from one another becomes less reliable (Barclay 1999).

68 Because acoustic monitoring is a passive technique that does not require continuous user
69 input and does not interfere with the normal activity of the study animal, most modern
70 systems can be set before dusk and left recording unattended until dawn. This tends to result
71 in very large data sets with minimal collection effort. However, manually identifying the
72 species in such large sets of recordings can be time consuming, particularly at sites with high
73 activity and diversity. As a result of this there have been attempts to automate the process.
74 Automatic call identification falls into three categories: analysis that is based on predefined
75 echolocation call parameters both spectral and temporal (Vaughan et al. 1997, Parsons and
76 Jones 2000, Obrist et al. 2004, Basil et al. 2014), using automated speech recognition
77 (Skowronski and Harris 2006) and machine learning tools where a computer program is
78 trained on a library of calls and then uses learned parameters to classify future calls. In the

79 case of the latter tactic there are currently three methods in use: artificial neural networks
80 (ANN) (Parsons and Jones 2000, Parsons 2001, Jennings et al. 2008, Walters et al. 2012) ,
81 classification trees (Adams et al. 2010) or automated speech recognition (Skowronski and
82 Harris 2006).

83 In the deserts of the Middle East there has been only one comprehensive study on the
84 identification of the bat species in the region. Benda (2008) produced an acoustic key for bats
85 in the Sinai, but it is based on few individuals from each species; with five species only being
86 recorded once. Benda et al. (2010) provide a description of echolocation calls for species of
87 bats found in Jordan. Dietz and von Helversen (2004) produced a morphological key with a
88 description of echolocation calls for bats in Europe. This relies on caught bats and all
89 recorded calls are from the hand, and the description of calls is only based on end frequency
90 and a rough shape of the call; no spectrograms are presented to aid in acoustic identification.
91 More recently, Walters et al. (2012) produced an automatic identification system for the bats
92 of Europe based on a large library of calls. Both of these keys do not include many species
93 found in the Middle East.

94 In this paper we present a guide to the acoustic identification based on predefined
95 echolocation call parameters of all insectivorous bat species in the Arava desert in Israel. We
96 aim to clarify distinctions between similar/easily misidentified species. We also provide the
97 parameters to an automatic identification system and discuss the acoustic separation of the
98 frequency range by the QCF bats in the region.

99

100 **Methods**

101 During the spring and summers of 2008-2010 we recorded bat echolocation calls in the Arava
102 rift valley between the Dead Sea and the Red Sea in Israel (30°45N 35°15E) using a
103 BatCorder automatic acoustic monitoring device (EcoObs, Nuremberg, Germany @ 500 kHz
104 and 16 bit). The BatCorder is a direct recording system that provides full spectral and
105 temporal information for all calls in real time, yielding accurate acoustic data. We hung this
106 device from a tree 1-2 m from the ground, and at sites where no trees were suitable, from a
107 1m-high stand. Once set the BatCorder can be left unattended, recording until retrieved,
108 automatically triggering to record upon detection of a bat call, and continuing to record until
109 800 ms after the triggering event. The recordings were made in both natural desert sites and
110 man-made villages or date palm fields.

111 *Automatic identification parameters*

112 We initially analysed calls from 2008 manually to identify bats in the region and create a call
113 library using SasLab Pro v. 4.40 (Avisoft Bioacoustics, Berlin, Germany). Recorded calls
114 were identified to species initially from published acoustic identification guides (Dietz and
115 von Helversen 2004, Benda et al. 2008, Dietz et al. 2009). We manually deleted the echoes
116 and any noise, and used the automatic measurements feature to calculate start frequency, end
117 frequency, peak frequency, call duration and inter-pulse interval.

118 We then selected peak frequency at the start, end and at the maximum amplitude of the call as
119 parameters for automatic identification using the automatic measurements feature of SasLab
120 Pro to classify the calls in each file. We omitted call duration and interval from this process
121 as the frequent overlap of the call with its echo meant it was too error-prone. Using axis-
122 parallel thresholds we set a range of values for each parameter based on the extracted
123 frequencies; if a call adhered to all the variables it was identified as the defined species. We
124 then expanded the defined range of the frequencies for each species until all typical search

Commented [TH1]: The additional papers are not acoustic id guides and/or we did not use them to identify species so I have removed them from the methods.

125 calls from the library were identified, including any calls with echo overlap. Additional bat
126 species' calls that had not been originally recorded in 2008 (which would have been marked
127 as unidentified) were identified manually. The calls of at least five passes (typically the first
128 five recordings) were added to the library and used for automatic identification classification
129 and the rest were used to test the defined set of identification parameters.

130 There are specific limitations to this approach. As catching bats in the hand was often not
131 possible due to the open nature of the study area, most calls in the library are from free flying
132 bats. However, the known differences in the acoustic parameters of calls of bat species found
133 in the region (Dietz and von Helversen 2004, Ulanovsky et al. 2004, Holderied et al. 2005,
134 Berger-Tal et al. 2007, Bayefshy-Anand et al. 2008, Benda et al. 2008, Dietz et al. 2009,
135 Benda et al. 2010) allowed a reasonable assumption of positive identification of all passes in
136 the library.

137 *Bat pass analysis*

138 As with all acoustic monitoring there are drawbacks to relying on calls to measure bat
139 activity. There is a strong species specific bias against whispering bats as louder bats will be
140 recorded over greater distances than quieter ones (Adams et al. 2012), and we could not
141 correct for that bias in this study. Acoustic monitoring also does not provide an accurate
142 estimate of the number of individuals in a region. While it is possible to identify recordings
143 containing calls from one single individual from temporal or spectral differences, there is no
144 way to reliably estimate the exact number when two or more individuals are flying together.
145 Moreover, there is no way to distinguish one bat flying back and forth through a monitored
146 area from multiple individuals foraging together. For this reason, we tested automatic species
147 identification performance on passes rather than individual calls.

148 *Similar species and manual confirmation*

149 The frequency of *Rhinopoma hardwickii* and *Rhinopoma microphyllum* calls overlap slightly.
150 From looking at the call library and literature (Dietz and von Helversen 2004, Levin et al.
151 2007, Dietz et al. 2009), we selected a cut-off frequency of 30.2 kHz to differentiate between
152 the two species. To confirm this cut-off we needed a large sample size of both species so we
153 selected all recordings from 2009 that had only one individual of either species (1,125
154 passes), extracted the end frequency of all calls, and created a frequency histogram of the
155 mean end frequency for each pass. On the frequency histogram there are four peaks (Figure
156 3A). Based on the evidence for anatomical sexual dimorphism in the genus *Rhinopoma*
157 (Levin et al. 2013) as well as differences in call peak frequency (Levin 2005) we interpreted
158 these as the gender specific peaks of call distribution of the two species. We classified the
159 two peaks with lower frequency as the larger species, *R. microphyllum*, and the other two
160 peaks as *R. hardwickii*. The midpoint between the two central peaks is at 30.2 kHz which
161 corroborates our decision to use this as the cut-off frequency between the two species.

162 *Pipistrellus rueppellii* and *Hypsugo bodenheimeri* overlap slightly in all call parameters;
163 however until 2010 no calls with an end frequency over 50 kHz were recorded. Moreover, *H.*
164 *bodenheimeri* was one of the most commonly recorded species both acoustically and in mist
165 nets, while *P. rueppellii* was never captured in the hand. Therefore we assumed that *P.*
166 *rueppellii* was not present until 2010 and unless the end frequency was over 50 kHz we could
167 not reliably identify an individual as *P. rueppellii*. Hence, calls were considered to be *H.*
168 *bodenheimeri* when the end frequency was below 50 kHz and only marked as *P. rueppellii*
169 when above this threshold.

170 *Otonycteris hemprichii* and *Plecotus christii* overlap in all used parameters so distinction
171 between them had to be made manually. We did this based on the overlap of the call and the
172 harmonic combined with the ratio of call duration and end frequency. While doing so we
173 extracted the end frequency and duration of all the calls without the echoes. We calculated

174 the mean value for each pass and used discriminate function analysis (DFA) to determine the
175 ability of these variables in determining the difference between the two species; it was able to
176 separate 98.6% of the passes accurately ([Figure 4. Spectrograms of HDC bats. A: *Asellia*](#)
177 [tridens, B: *Rhinolophus hipposideros* and C: *Rhinolophus clivosus*. Spectrogram parameters:](#)
178 [FFT length 512, Hamming window, overlap 96.87%](#)
179 [Figure 5. Spectrograms of Pipistrelle-type bat calls. A: *Pipistrellus rueppellii*, B: *Hypsugo*](#)
180 [bodenheimeri, C: *Pipistrellus kuhlii* D: *Eptesicus bottae* and E: *Tadarida teniotis*.](#)
181 [Spectrogram parameters: FFT length 512, Hamming window, overlap 96.87.](#)
182 [Figure 6. Spectrogram of *Barbastella leucomelas* alternating between the two call types.](#)
183 [Spectrogram parameters: FFT length 512, Hamming window, overlap 96.87%](#)
184 [Figure 7. Spectrograms of bats with a *Plecotus*-type call. A: *Otonycteris hemprichii*, B:](#)
185 [Plecotus christii and C: *Nycteris thebaica*. Spectrogram parameters: FFT length 512,](#)
186 [Hamming window, overlap 96.87%](#)
187 [Figure Figure 8\).](#) All other species were different enough from any other species that no further
188 alterations to the defined frequency ranges were necessary.

189 When establishing the frequency ranges for the automatic parameters, errors typically
190 occurred in two cases. Noise (e.g. wind, footsteps) was occasionally identified as bats that
191 call at lower frequencies (below 25 kHz: *O. hemprichii*, *P. christii*, and *Tadarida teniotis*). To
192 reduce this error we looked at all files that were marked as any of these bat species to ensure
193 that they were indeed bat passes. This is also the point at which we differentiated *O.*
194 *hemprichii* and *P. christii*. Because three common species had an approximate end frequency
195 of 30 kHz (*Eptesicus bottae*, *R. hardwickii*, and *R. microphyllum*), occasional calls in a pass
196 were sometimes misidentified. Hence, we manually confirmed the automatic identification

197 when two or fewer of these bats were identified in a file. Additionally, in order not to miss
198 new bat species we manually checked files where no bat was identified in a file. The number
199 of files that had to be manually confirmed varied depending on the amount of noise that
200 triggered the BatCorder, but typically it was less than 10%.

201 **Data analysis**

202 Due to variability of bat calls within a pass, we were only interested in identifying the whole
203 pass of an individual as a guide of activity levels and not all individual calls. We defined a
204 pass as ending after 800 ms of silence or at the end of a file. We therefore tested the
205 identification success as correctly identifying all bat passes, or all the bats present in a file
206 and not all individual calls.

207 We compared the automatic identification to human classification on three days (total of 722
208 passes) from 2008 that had not been used to create the library. Compared to manual
209 identification the automatic identification was correct in $95.39 \pm 0.76\%$ passes. Errors were
210 predominantly due to missing quiet calls that were below the analysis threshold, rather than
211 due to misclassification as another species. To examine the frequency division in the
212 *Rhinopoma*-type species we plotted a fast fourier transform (FFT) of one call from both sexes
213 of *Rhinopoma* species as well as both species of *Taphozous* present in desert regions of
214 Israel: *T. nudiventris* and *T. perforatus* (Yom-tov et al. 1992, Korine and Pinshow 2004).

215 We used the R-2.13.2 statistical environment (The R Foundation for Statistical Computing,
216 2008) for all statistical tests and graphs. We manually deleted echoes and noise and created
217 all spectrogram figures in SasLab Pro (v4.4, Avisoft Bioacoustics, Berlin, Germany).

218

219 **Results**

220 **Identified bats**

221 Over the three years we recorded 15 species of insectivorous bats in the area from five
222 families ([Error! Reference source not found, Figure 1](#)). In total we recorded 27,053 bat passes over
223 160 nights usually recording at two sites a night. 119 passes were marked as unidentified bats
224 that needed to be added to the library.

225 **Rhinopoma-type (QCF) calls**

226 We recorded three species of bats with narrow bandwidth calls: *T. nudiventris*, *R. hardwickii*
227 and *R. microphyllum*, although *T. nudiventris* was only recorded in 2010. All three species of
228 bats produce multi-harmonic calls with anywhere between 1 and 5 harmonics detectable and
229 the most energy in the second harmonic ([Error! Reference source not found, Figure 2](#)).
230 *T. nudiventris* typically calls with the second harmonic at 22-25 kHz, *R. hardwickii* with the
231 second harmonic at 32-35 kHz, and *R. microphyllum* with the second harmonic at 27-31 kHz;
232 however, there is overlap between the latter two ([Error! Reference source not found, Table 1](#)). Both
233 *R. hardwickii* and *R. microphyllum* appear to show sexual dimorphism in the frequency of the
234 calls as expected for this genus (Levin 2005). The presumed female calls 2 kHz higher than
235 the male of the same species and a further 2 kHz difference between the presumed male *R.*
236 *hardwickii* and female *R. microphyllum* (as indicated by the arrows in [Error! Reference](#)
237 [source not found, Figure 3A](#)).

238 **CF (HDC) calls**

239 We recorded three species of bats that have FM aspects of the call at either ends with a CF
240 component in the middle, the latter making up the bulk of the call: *Asellia tridens*,
241 *Rhinolophus hipposideros* and *R. clivosus*. All three species have one dominant harmonic (the
242 2nd) and show high-duty cycle call behaviour ([Error! Reference source not found, Figure 4](#)). These

243 species are easily separated by the CF frequency. *A. tridens* has echolocation calls with the
244 CF component of the call at around 118 kHz, *R. hipposideros* around 108 kHz and *R. clivosus*
245 at approximately 85 kHz ([Error! Reference source not found, Table 4](#)).

246 ***Pipistrellus-type calls***

247 We recorded five species of bats with an FM-QCF call shape typical of Pipistrelle bats: *P.*
248 *rueppellii*, *H. bodenheimeri*, *Pipistrellus kuhlii*, *Eptesicus bottae* and *T. teniotis* ([Error!](#)
249 [Reference source not found, Figure 5](#)) which typically have one dominant fundamental frequency;
250 but, depending on the loudness of the call, often the 2nd and occasionally 3rd harmonic is
251 discernible. The five species are distinguishable primarily through their end frequency: *P.*
252 *rueppellii* typically has an end frequency of 50-53 kHz; *H. bodenheimeri* 45-47 kHz; *P. kuhlii*
253 38-41 kHz; *E. bottae* 29-31 kHz; and *T. teniotis* 14-16 kHz ([Error! Reference source not](#)
254 [found, Table 4](#)).

255 ***Barbastella leucomelas***

256 *B. leucomelas* is unique among the recorded bats as it alternates between two call types
257 ([Figure 4. Spectrograms of HDC bats. A: *Asellia tridens*, B: *Rhinolophus hipposideros* and](#)
258 [C: *Rhinolophus clivosus*. Spectrogram parameters: FFT length 512, Hamming window,](#)
259 [overlap 96.87%](#)
260 [Figure 5. Spectrograms of Pipistrelle-type bat calls. A: *Pipistrellus rueppellii*, B: *Hypsugo*](#)
261 [bodenheimeri, C: *Pipistrellus kuhlii* D: *Eptesicus bottae* and E: *Tadarida teniotis*.](#)
262 [Spectrogram parameters: FFT length 512, Hamming window, overlap 96.87.](#)
263 [Figure 6](#)). Type I is a short (1.81 ± 0.11 s), FM call often with 2 harmonics detectable, similar to
264 the calls emitted by the FM bats (below). The call sweeps from 36 kHz to 30 kHz. Type II is
265 an easily identifiable and unique FM convex curved call that starts at 42 kHz and ends at 32

266 kHz. Only type II was used for automatic identification because type I overlapped with *E.*
267 *bottae* a much more commonly recorded bat.

268 ***Plecotus*-type calls**

269 We recorded three species of bats with FM calls typical of *Plecotus* species: *O. hemprichii*, *P.*
270 *christii* and *Nycteris thebaica* (Figure 4. Spectrograms of HDC bats. A: *Asellia tridens*, B:
271 *Rhinolophus hipposideros* and C: *Rhinolophus clivosus*. Spectrogram parameters: FFT length
272 512, Hamming window, overlap 96.87%

273 Figure 5. Spectrograms of Pipistrelle-type bat calls. A: *Pipistrellus rueppellii*, B: *Hypsugo*
274 *bodenheimeri*, C: *Pipistrellus kuhlii* D: *Eptesicus bottae* and E: *Tadarida teniotis*.
275 Spectrogram parameters: FFT length 512, Hamming window, overlap 96.87.

276 Figure 6. Spectrogram of *Barbastella leucomelas* alternating between the two call types.
277 Spectrogram parameters: FFT length 512, Hamming window, overlap 96.87%

278 Figure 7). The calls of all three species are multi-harmonic, but *O. hemprichii* and *P. christii*
279 have two discernible harmonics with the most energy in the 1st harmonic while *N. thebaica*
280 has two or more harmonics with either approximately equal energy across the 5th and 6th
281 harmonic or most energy in the 5th; the first 4 harmonics are not discernible. The
282 echolocation call of *N. thebaica* is very short in duration (1.35 ± 0.13 s) and the dominant
283 harmonic sweeps down from 78 kHz to 63 kHz (**Error! Reference source not found.** Table 1).
284 Because it was only recorded once and has equal energy across two broadband harmonics,
285 the automatic measurements of *N. thebaica* were too variable to be identified automatically;
286 however the calls would have been marked as unidentified and therefore identified manually.

287 *Otonycteris hemprichii* has a short broadband call with an end frequency of between 18 kHz
288 and 22 kHz; the duration of its call tends to longer and more variable than *P. christii* which

289 has a typically shorter and higher frequency call with an end frequency of between 21 kHz
290 and 25 kHz (**Error! Reference source not found.** Table 2), thus these species of bats overlap in call
291 frequency parameters. We distinguished them manually through the ratio of the end
292 frequency to duration of the call, with *O. hemprichii* typically emitting calls greater than 3 ms
293 and less than 22 kHz while *P. christii* called for less than 2 ms and above 22 kHz (Figure 4.
294 Spectrograms of HDC bats. A: *Asellia tridens*, B: *Rhinolophus hipposideros* and C:
295 *Rhinolophus clivosus*. Spectrogram parameters: FFT length 512, Hamming window, overlap
296 96.87%
297 Figure 5. Spectrograms of Pipistrelle-type bat calls. A: *Pipistrellus rueppellii*, B: *Hypsugo*
298 *bodenheimeri*, C: *Pipistrellus kuhlii* D: *Eptesicus bottae* and E: *Tadarida teniotis*.
299 Spectrogram parameters: FFT length 512, Hamming window, overlap 96.87.
300 Figure 6. Spectrogram of *Barbastella leucomelas* alternating between the two call types.
301 Spectrogram parameters: FFT length 512, Hamming window, overlap 96.87%
302 Figure 7. Spectrograms of bats with a *Plecotus*-type call. A: *Otonycteris hemprichii*, B:
303 *Plecotus christii* and C: *Nycteris thebaica*. Spectrogram parameters: FFT length 512,
304 Hamming window, overlap 96.87%
305 Figure Figure 8). We also distinguished them in the spectrogram where there is a significant overlap
306 of the 1st and 2nd harmonics in *O. hemprichii* while *P. christii* showed very little if any
307 overlap (Figure 4. Spectrograms of HDC bats. A: *Asellia tridens*, B: *Rhinolophus*
308 *hipposideros* and C: *Rhinolophus clivosus*. Spectrogram parameters: FFT length 512,
309 Hamming window, overlap 96.87%

310 [Figure 5. Spectrograms of Pipistrelle-type bat calls. A: *Pipistrellus rueppellii*, B: *Hypsugo*](#)
311 [bodenheimeri, C: *Pipistrellus kuhlii* D: *Eptesicus bottae* and E: *Tadarida teniotis*.](#)

312 [Spectrogram parameters: FFT length 512, Hamming window, overlap 96.87.](#)

313 [Figure 6. Spectrogram of *Barbastella leucomelas* alternating between the two call types.](#)

314 [Spectrogram parameters: FFT length 512, Hamming window, overlap 96.87%](#)

315 [Figure ~~Figure~~ 7A and B\).](#)

316

317 **Discussion**

318 The validity of the automatic acoustic identification depends on the number and quality of the
319 calls recorded, as well as the variability of the calls of each species. The *Rhinopoma spp.*
320 were both numerous and have relatively consistent calls between passes. While the two
321 species overlap in call parameters, the cut-off frequency of 30.2 kHz falls at the half-way
322 point between the histogram peaks of the presumed female *R. microphyllum* and the male *R.*
323 *hardwickii*. It is highly likely that some passes were misclassified, but only in the minority of
324 cases. *T. nudiventris* while not as common in the study area as the other two species has calls
325 that do not vary extensively so we are confident in the identification of its passes.

326 Likewise, the HDC bats were not recorded extensively, but all species in the region have
327 unique species-specific calls. Hence, the identification of these calls is reliable. Conversely,
328 the bats with *Pipistrellus*-type calls were typically common. However, they vary aspects of
329 their calls considerably with changes in habitat, prey type and over the course of an attack
330 sequence (Kalko and Schnitzler 1993). To combat this latter variability, we aimed to identify
331 passes as a whole, and typically within a sequence the majority of calls were in the search
332 phase. Thus the overall pass was reliably identified. With the exception of *P. rueppellii* and

333 *H. bodenheimeri* there was no overlap in the calls of these bats (*P. kuhlii*, *E. bottae*, *T.*
334 *teniotis*) so the identification of these species is robust. It is possible that some of the *H.*
335 *bodenheimeri* passes are actually *P. rueppellii* but as *H. bodenheimeri* was recorded
336 consistently over the three years and is so much more prevalent in the region (Yom-tov et al.
337 1992, Hackett et al. 2013, Korine et al. 2015), it is unlikely to be a common misidentification.
338 Alternatively, *P. rueppellii* was overlooked for two years, but as it was only in 2010 that calls
339 over 50 kHz were first recorded it is more likely that it was absent prior to this.

340 The rarer bats such as *B. leucomelas* and *N. thebaica* have unmistakable calls, but the library
341 is based on only one pass/individual. *N. thebaica* was not included in the automatic
342 identification and *B. leucomelas* was identified only four more times. It is to be assumed that
343 these species are substantially underrepresented because of their low call amplitudes, but
344 were unambiguously identified, either manually (*N. thebaica*) or automatically (*B.*
345 *leucomelas*). Since there is no other bat call similar to either, we are confident of the
346 classification. Similarly, the slightly more common whispering bats *O. hemprichii* and *P.*
347 *christii* were checked manually and distinguished from one another in the spectrogram after
348 being identified automatically as a group.

349 The call parameters we present here are in line with those previously reported. Benda et al.
350 (2008) described the echolocation calls of *R. hardwickii* (identified as the subspecies *R.*
351 *cystops*), *R. clivosus*, *R. hipposideros*, *A. tridens*, *E. bottae*, *H. bodenheimeri* (identified by
352 the authors as a conspecific of *H. ariel*), *O. hemprichii*, *P. christii* and *T. teniotis*. Three
353 species' descriptions were from solitary individuals. As *R. microphyllum* was not recorded in
354 the Sinai, Benda does not discuss the difference between the two *Rhinopoma* species. *O.*
355 *hemprichii* was recorded only once and *P. christii* was recorded three times and only in the
356 hand or upon release. Likewise, *P. rueppellii* was not recorded in the Sinai so distinctions

357 between that and *H. bodenheimeri* were not described. Other species (e.g. *B. leucomelas* and
358 *N. thebaica*) have not been described in such detail in the region before.

359 In general, the automatic identification allows for a reliable and efficient processing of the
360 large data sets recorded during acoustic monitoring. Manually checking files where errors in
361 the automatic identification are most likely and separating similar calls manually significantly
362 decreases the likelihood of misclassification, but it will never be possible to gain a 100%
363 identification rate even manually.

Commented [TH2]: Delete?

364 **Identified bats**

365 We recorded and identified 15 species of insectivorous bats in the Arava rift valley; *T.*
366 *perforatus* is the only desert-dwelling insectivorous bat species in Israel that was absent.
367 These species occupy a wide range of ecological niches hunting different prey and utilizing
368 varying foraging tactics in a range of habitats.

369 Occasionally hunting in groups *R. hardwickii*, the Lesser Mouse-Tailed Bat, forages in open
370 habitats (Feldman et al. 2000) mostly on Coleoptera (Whitaker and Yom-Tov 2002). They
371 have a characteristic gliding flight that uses the updrafts common near cliff edges
372 (Habersetzer 1981). *R. microphyllum*, the Greater Mouse Tailed Bat, feed mostly on
373 Coleoptera and ants at height above vegetation and over water (Sharifi and Hemmati 2002,
374 Whitaker and Yom-Tov 2002, Korine and Pinshow 2004, Levin et al. 2009). *T. nudiventris*,
375 the Naked-Rumped Tomb Bat, mostly prey on Coleoptera and fly high in open areas (Yom-
376 Tov 1993, Korine and Pinshow 2004, Whitaker and Karatas 2009). *Asellia tridens*, the
377 Trident Leaf-nosed Bat forages in a vegetation-rich, cluttered environment, catching
378 Coleoptera, Heteroptera, Diptera and Lepidoptera flying close to vegetation (Jones et al.
379 1993, Feldman et al. 2000, Dietz et al. 2009, Amichai et al. 2013). *R. hipposideros*, the
380 Lesser Horseshoe Bat, forages typically by aerial-hawking with agile flight often in dense

381 vegetation, but is also able to glean insects from vegetation (Jones and Rayner 1989, Feldman
382 et al. 2000, Bontadina et al. 2002, Korine and Pinshow 2004, Zahn et al. 2008, Dietz et al.
383 2009). They feed mainly on Lepidoptera, Diptera, Hymenoptera and Neuroptera (Arlettaz et
384 al. 2000, Feldman et al. 2000). *R. clivosus*, Geoffroy's Horseshoe Bat, has been reported
385 either as specialising on Coleoptera (Feldman et al. 2000) or as more of a generalist (Whitaker
386 et al. 1994, Benda et al. 2010) and typically forages in a cluttered environment (Feldman et
387 al. 2000, Korine and Pinshow 2004).

388 *P. kuhlii*, Kuhl's Pipistrelle, is an aerial-hawker that typically forages in urban areas or over
389 water and in edge spaces, predominantly on Diptera, Hymenoptera and Coleoptera. They are
390 attracted to villages by artificial lighting and are likely to only be in the area as a result of
391 these villages (Feldman et al. 2000, Korine and Pinshow 2004). *P. rueppellii*, Rüppell's
392 Pipistrelle Bat, also feeds mostly on Diptera, Coleoptera and small Lepidoptera through
393 aerial-hawking and is typically recorded over water and in edge spaces (Whitaker et al. 1994,
394 Feldman et al. 2000). *H. bodenheimeri* forages in edge spaces of cliffs and vegetation. It is a
395 generalist aerial-hawker feeding on Lepidoptera, Trichoptera, Coleoptera, Diptera,
396 Hymenoptera and Homoptera (Whitaker et al. 1994, Feldman et al. 2000, Riskin 2001,
397 Korine and Pinshow 2004). *E. bottae*, Botta's Serotine Bat, are generalists that prey
398 predominantly on Coleoptera and Hymenoptera, but depending on the season will also take
399 Hemiptera, Diptera and Orthoptera; it typically forages at the edges of cliffs and vegetation
400 (Feldman et al. 2000, Korine and Pinshow 2004, Holderied et al. 2005, Dietz et al. 2009). *T.*
401 *teniotis*, European Free-tailed Bat, is a fast flier (65km/h) that aerial-hawks high above the
402 ground (10-300m) allowing a broad range of habitats away from most obstacles (Bayefshy-
403 Anand et al. 2008, Dietz et al. 2009). They predominantly feed on Lepidoptera, but will
404 opportunistically take Diptera, Coleoptera, Neuroptera and Hymenoptera (Rydell and
405 Arlettaz 1994).

406 Almost nothing is known about the foraging behaviour and diet of *B. leucomelas*, Eastern
407 Barbastelle Bat, and it is rarely recorded in the region. The closely related *B. barbastellus* is a
408 specialist preying upon eared moths which it catches by low-amplitude stealth hawking
409 (Goerlitz et al. 2010). *O. hemprichii*, Hemprich's Long-eared Bat, are passive gleaners that
410 rely on prey generated acoustic cues (e.g. rustling sounds) of non-aerial arthropods such as
411 Coleoptera and Arachnids. They typically fly close to the ground (40-100 cm) land for 2-5
412 sec to catch prey which they consume while in a slow, gliding and widely circling flight 3-7
413 m above the ground (Arlettaz et al. 1995, Holderied et al. 2011). Little is known about *P.*
414 *christii*, Lappet-eared Bat, with regard to foraging behaviour as it is a recently isolated
415 species (Spitzenberger et al. 2006). However, Feldman et al. (2000) noted that *P. austriacus*
416 foraging in a location now known to have only *P. christii* and not *P. austriacus* were
417 Lepidopteran specialists. Finally *N. thebaica*, Egyptian Slit-faced Bat, is a generalist and
418 opportunistic feeder preying upon Lepidoptera, Coleoptera, Diptera, Hymenoptera and
419 Hemiptera primarily in open savannah woodland areas (Gray et al. 1999). It is a gleaning
420 bat, that can hunt during continuous flight or from perches whereby it listens for prey while
421 hanging from a roost, then directs its head toward the sound and rapidly moves its ears back
422 and forth before attacking (Fenton et al. 1983, Gray et al. 1999).

423 ***Frequency separation***

424 The separation of frequencies evident in the FFT of the QCF bats provides an interesting
425 insight into the acoustic niche separation of a group of bats (**Error! Reference source not**
426 **found, Figure 3B**). The apparent sexual dimorphism of the calls in the two recorded *Rhinopoma spp.*
427 results in the peak frequencies of the dominant harmonic being spread evenly with 2 kHz
428 between them. Interestingly when *T. nudiventris* is included, the 3rd harmonic of its call falls
429 between the presumed male and female of *R. hardwickii*; this is not the dominant harmonic
430 but often also contains a substantial amount of energy. *T. perforatus*, not recorded in the

431 Arava, but common in the adjacent Negev desert (Korine and Pinshow 2004) and around the
432 Dead Sea (Yom-Tov 1993) similarly has its dominant harmonic between the presumed male
433 and female *R. microphyllum*. Between the four species and six call types, the peak
434 frequencies in the relatively narrow range of 26-34 kHz appear to be divided with apparently
435 little conflict. It is important to note that this is a representation based on just one call from
436 each individual. The situation is likely to be more complicated when considered at the
437 community level where there will be greater intraspecific variation.

438 Frequency separation has been examined before, but predominantly with regard to
439 Rhinolophid species, and in the tropics where bat communities can consist of 50 species
440 (Heller and Helversen 1989, Kingston et al. 2000, Kingston and Rossiter 2004, Thabah et al.
441 2006). Yet there is still debate within the field. For instance, Heller and Helversen (1989)
442 described a frequency separation among 12 species of bats in Malaysia that was more evenly
443 distributed than expected by chance. However, when Kingston et al. (2000) returned to the
444 same site they were unable to replicate the results. Interestingly, the frequency separation that
445 we present is opposite to Kingston and Rossiter's (2004) findings in two of the three morphs
446 of *Rhinolophus philippinensis*. They describe "harmonic hopping" in the bats' echolocation
447 calls where the calls of different morphs of the species occur at different frequencies. The CF
448 components of the calls line up such that the 2nd (dominant) harmonic of the large morph
449 corresponds to the 1st harmonic of the small morph; the 4th and 2nd harmonics likewise line
450 up. Conversely, the harmonics of the intermediate morph fall in between the harmonics of the
451 other two morphs, similar to our findings of frequency separation.

452 This division of the frequency range is potentially a form of character displacement, and may
453 serve to deepen our understanding of geographic changes in species' echolocation calls. In
454 the absence of a species with a similar call type and frequency, another species would
455 potentially be able to exploit a wider range of frequencies or perhaps even shift. Indeed,

456 Russo et al. (2007) found that *R. hipposideros* and *R. euryale* emitted calls with higher and
457 lower frequencies, respectively, when flying with *R. mehelyi*. Since *R. mehelyi* calls in
458 between *R. hipposideros* and *R. euryale* the authors concluded that this shift was a character
459 displacement in order to avoid overlapping frequencies and aid in species recognition.

460 **Acknowledgements**

461 We collected data with the invaluable help of field assistants, primarily Melia Nafus, Helen
462 Hedworth and Lauren Holt. Rangers from the Israel Nature and Park Authority were very
463 helpful and friendly, particularly Yoram Hemo, Harel Ben Shahaar, Roy Talbi and Asaf Tsoar.
464 This study was supported by the Israeli Ministry of Science and Technology (to CK), The
465 Explorers Club Exploration Fund (to TDH), European Commission Dryland Research
466 Specific Support Action Plan (to TDH). This is publication no. XXX of the Mitrani
467 Department of Desert Ecology.

468 **References**

- 469 Adams, A. M., M. K. Jantzen, R. M. Hamilton, and M. B. Fenton. 2012. Do you hear what I
470 hear? Implications of detector selection for acoustic monitoring of bats. *Methods Ecol Evol*
471 3:992-998.
- 472 Adams, M. D., B. S. Law, and M. S. Gibson. 2010. Reliable automation of bat call
473 identification for eastern New South Wales, Australia, using classification trees and
474 AnaScheme software. *Acta Chiropterol* 12:231-245.
- 475 Amichai, E., G. Blumrosen, and Y. Yovel. 2015. Calling louder and longer: how bats use
476 biosonar under severe acoustic interference from other bats. *P R Soc B* 282.
- 477 Amichai, E., E. Levin, N. Kronfeld-Schor, U. Roll, and Y. Yom-Tov. 2013. Natural history,
478 physiology and energetic strategies of *Asellia tridens* (Chiroptera). *Mamm Biol* 78:94-103.
- 479 Arlettaz, R., G. Dandliker, E. Kasybekov, J. M. Pillet, S. Rybin, and J. Zima. 1995. Feeding-
480 Habits of the Long-Eared Desert Bat, *Otonycteris hemprichi* (Chiroptera, Vespertilionidae). *J*
481 *Mammal* 76:873-876.
- 482 Arlettaz, R., S. Godat, and H. Meyer. 2000. Competition for food by expanding pipistrelle bat
483 populations (*Pipistrellus pipistrellus*) might contribute to the decline of lesser horseshoe bats
484 (*Rhinolophus hipposideros*). *Biol. Conserv.* 93:55-60.
- 485 Barclay, R. M. R. 1999. Bats are not birds - A cautionary note on using echolocation calls to
486 identify bats: A comment. *J Mammal* 80:290-296.
- 487 Bartonicka, T., and Z. Rehak. 2005. Variability in echolocation calls of *Pipistrellus pygmaeus*
488 (Chiroptera : Vespertilionidae) during search flight in different habitats. *Acta Theriologica*
489 50:145-160.

490 Basil, G. S., J. Vanitharani, and J. K. 2014. An extensive review of methods of identification
491 of bat species through acoustics. *International Journal of Computer Applications Technology
492 and Research* 3:186-192.

493 Bates, M. E., S. A. Stamper, and J. A. Simmons. 2008. Jamming avoidance response of big
494 brown bats in target detection. *J Exp Biol* 211:106-113.

495 Bayefshy-Anand, S., M. D. Skowronski, M. B. Fenton, C. Korine, and M. W. Holderied.
496 2008. Variations in the echolocation calls of the European free-tailed bat. *J Zool* 275:115-
497 123.

498 Benda, P., C. Dietz, M. Andreas, J. Hotovy, R. K. Lucan, A. Maltby, K. Meakin, J. Truscott,
499 and P. Vallo. 2008. Bats (Mammalia: Chiroptera) of the Eastern Mediterranean and Middle
500 East. Part 6. Bats of Sinai (Egypt) with some taxonomic, ecological and echolocation data on
501 that fauna. *Acta Soc. Zool. Bohem* 72:1-103.

502 Benda, P., R. K. Lučan, J. Obuch, A. Reiter, M. Andreas, P. Bačkor, T. Bohnenstengel, E. K.
503 Eid, M. Ševčík, V. Peter, and Z. S. Amr. 2010. Bats (Mammalia: Chiroptera) of the Eastern
504 Mediterranean and Middle East. Part 8. Bats of Jordan: fauna, ecology, echolocation,
505 ectoparasites. *Acta Societatis Zoologicae Bohemicae* 74:185-353.

506 Berger-Tal, O., R. Berger-Tal, C. Korine, M. W. Holderied, and M. B. Fenton. 2007.
507 Echolocation calls produced by Kuhl's pipistrelles in different flight situations. *J Zool*:1-6.

508 Bontadina, F., H. Schofield, and B. Naef-Daenzer. 2002. Radio-tracking reveals that lesser
509 horseshoe bats (*Rhinolophus hipposideros*) forage in woodland. *J Zool* 258:281-290.

510 Dietz, C., O. v. Helversen, and D. Nill. 2009. Bats of Britain, Europe & Northwest Africa,
511 London, UK.

512 Dietz, C., and O. von Helversen. 2004. Illustrated identification key to the bats of Europe.
513 Tuebingen & Erlangen, Germany.

514 Feldman, R., J. O. J. Whitaker, and Y. Yom-Tov. 2000. Dietary composition and habitat use
515 in a desert insectivorous bat community in Israel. *Acta Chiropterol* 2:15-22.

516 Fenton, M. B. 1999. Describing the echolocation calls and behaviour of bats. *Acta*
517 *Chiropterologica* 1:127-136.

518 Fenton, M. B., and G. P. Bell. 1981. Recognition of species of insectivorous bats by their
519 echolocation calls. *Journal of Mammalogy* 62:233-243.

520 Fenton, M. B., C. L. Gaudet, and M. L. Leonard. 1983. Feeding behaviour of the bats
521 *Nycteris grandis* and *Nycteris thebaica* (Nycteridae) in captivity. *J Zool* 200:347-354.

522 Gillam, E. H., N. Ulanovsky, and G. F. McCracken. 2007. Rapid jamming avoidance in
523 biosonar. *Proc. R. Soc. B.* 274:651-660.

524 Goerlitz, H. R., H. M. ter Hofstede, M. R. K. Zeale, G. Jones, and M. W. Holderied. 2010.
525 An aerial-hawking bat uses stealth echolocation to counter moth hearing. *Curr. Biol.*
526 20:1568-1572.

527 Gray, P. A., M. B. Fenton, and V. V. Cakenberghe. 1999. *Nycteris thebaica*. Pages 1-8
528 *Mamalian Species*. The American Society of Mammalogists.

529 Habersetzer, J. 1981. Adaptive echolocation sounds in the bat *Rhinopoma hardwickei* - a field
530 study. *Journal of Comparative Physiology - A* 144:559-566.

531 Hackett, T. D., C. Korine, and M. W. Holderied. 2013. The importance of acacia trees for
532 insectivorous bats and arthropods in the arava desert. *Plos One* 8.

533 Heller, K.-G., and O. v. Helversen. 1989. Resource partitioning of sonar frequency bands in
534 Rhinolophoid bats. *Oecologia* 80:178-186.

535 Holderied, M., C. Korine, and T. Moritz. 2011. Hemprich's long-eared bat (*Otonycteris*
536 *hemprichii*) as a predator of scorpions: whispering echolocation, passive gleaning and prey
537 selection. *Journal of Comparative Physiology a-Neuroethology Sensory Neural and*
538 *Behavioral Physiology* 197:425-433.

539 Holderied, M. W., C. Korine, M. B. Fenton, S. Parsons, S. Robson, and G. Jones. 2005.
540 Echolocation call intensity in the aerial hawking bat *Eptesicus bottae* (Vespertilionidae)
541 studied using stereo videogrammetry. *J. Exp. Biol.* 208:1321-1327.

542 Jennings, N., S. Parsons, and M. J. O. Pocock. 2008. Human vs. machine: identification of
543 bat species from their echolocation calls by humans and by artificial neural networks. *Can. J.*
544 *Zool.* 86:371-377.

545 Jones, G., D. S. Jacobs, T. H. Kunz, M. R. Willig, and P. A. Racey. 2009. Carpe noctem: the
546 importance of bats as bioindicators. *Endanger. Species Res.* 8:93-115.

547 Jones, G., M. Morton, P. M. Hughes, and R. M. Budden. 1993. Echolocation, Flight
548 Morphology and Foraging Strategies of Some West-African Hipposiderid Bats. *J Zool*
549 230:385-400.

550 Jones, G., and J. M. V. Rayner. 1989. Foraging Behavior and Echolocation of Wild
551 Horseshoe Bats *Rhinolophus ferrumequinum* and *Rhinolophus hipposideros* (Chiroptera,
552 Rhinolophidae). *Behav Ecol Sociobiol* 25:183-191.

553 Jones, G., and J. Rydell. 2003. Attack and Defense: Interactions between Echolocating Bats
554 and Their Insect Prey. Pages 301-345 in T. H. K. a. M. B. Fenton, editor. *Bat Ecology*. The
555 University of Chicago Press, Chicago.

556 Kalko, E. K. V., and H. U. Schnitzler. 1993. Plasticity in echolocation signals of European
557 pipistrelle bats in search flight - implications for habitat use and prey detection. *Behavioral*
558 *Ecology and Sociobiology* 33:415-428.

559 Kingston, T., G. Jones, A. Zubaid, and T. H. Kunz. 2000. Resource partitioning in
560 rhinolophoid bats revisited. *Oecologia* 124:332-342.

561 Kingston, T., and S. J. Rossiter. 2004. Harmonic-hopping in Wallacea's bats. *Nature* 429:654-
562 657.

563 Korine, C., A. M. Adams, U. Shamir, and A. Gross. 2015. Effect of water quality on species
564 richness and activity of desert-dwelling bats. *Mamm Biol* 80:185-190.

565 Korine, C., and B. Pinshow. 2004. Guild structure, foraging space use, and distribution in a
566 community of insectivorous bats in the Negev Desert. *J Zool* 262:187-196.

567 Kunz, T. H., E. Braun de Torrez, D. Bauer, T. Lobova, and T. H. Fleming. 2011. Ecosystem
568 services provided by bats. *Ann. N. Y. Acad. Sci.* 1223:1-38.

569 Levin, E. 2005. Aspects in the biology and diet of insectivorous bats (Microchiroptera) in
570 Northern Israel. Tel-Aviv University, Tel-Aviv, Israel.

571 Levin, E., A. Barnea, and Y. Yom-Tov. 2007. Ant-eating bats. *Bat Res. News* 48:248-249.

572 Levin, E., U. Roll, A. Dolev, Y. Yom-Tov, and N. Kronfeld-Shcor. 2013. Bats of a Gender
573 Flock Together: Sexual Segregation in a Subtropical Bat. *Plos One* 8.

574 Levin, E., Y. Yom-Tov, and A. Barnea. 2009. Frequent summer nuptial flights of ants
575 provide a primary food source for bats. *Naturwissenschaften* 96:477-483.

576 Masters, W. M., K. A. S. Raver, and K. A. Kazial. 1995. Sonar signals of Big Brown Bats,
577 *Eptesicus fuscus*, contain information about individual identity, age and family affiliation.
578 *Animal Behaviour* 50:1243-1260.

579 Murray, K. L., E. R. Britzke, and L. W. Robbins. 2001. Variation in search-phase calls of
580 bats. *J Mammal* 82:728-737.

581 Neuweiler, G. 1989. Foraging ecology and audition in echolocating bats. *Trends in Ecology*
582 *& Evolution* 4:160-166.

583 Neuweiler, G. 1990. Auditory adaptations for prey capture in echolocating bats. *Physiol. Rev.*
584 70:615-641.

585 Obrist, M. K. 1995. Flexible bat echolocation - the influence of individual, habitat and
586 conspecifics on sonar signal design. *Behav Ecol Sociobiol* 36:207-219.

587 Obrist, M. K., R. Boesch, and P. F. Fluckiger. 2004. Variability in echolocation call design of
588 26 Swiss bat species: consequences, limits and options for automated field identification with
589 a synergetic pattern recognition approach. *Mammalia* 68:307-322.

590 Parsons, S. 2001. Identification of New Zealand bats (*Chalinolobus tuberculatus* and
591 *Mystacina tuberculata*) in flight from analysis of echolocation calls by artificial neural
592 networks. *J Zool* 253:447-456.

593 Parsons, S., and G. Jones. 2000. Acoustic identification of twelve species of echolocating bat
594 by discriminant function analysis and artificial neural networks. *J Exp Biol* 203:2641-2656.

595 Ratcliffe, J. M., H. M. ter Hofstede, R. Avila-Flores, M. B. Fenton, G. F. McCracken, S.
596 Biscardi, J. Blasko, E. Gillam, J. Orprecio, and G. Spanjer. 2004. Conspecifics influence call
597 design in the Brazilian free-tailed bat, *Tadarida brasiliensis*. *Can. J. Zool.* 82:966-971.

598 Riskin, D. K. 2001. *Pipistrellus bodenheimeri*. Pages 1-3 Mammalian Species. American
599 Society of Mammalogists.

600 Russo, D., and G. Jones. 2002. Identification of twenty-two bat species (Mammalia :
601 Chiroptera) from Italy by analysis of time-expanded recordings of echolocation calls. J Zool
602 258:91-103.

603 Russo, D., and G. Jones. 2015. Bats as bioindicators: an introduction. Mamm Biol 80:157-
604 158.

605 Russo, D., M. Mucedda, M. Bello, S. Biscardi, E. Pidinchedda, and G. Jones. 2007.
606 Divergent echolocation call frequencies in insular rhinolophids (Chiroptera): a case of
607 character displacement? J. Biogeogr. 34:2129-2138.

608 Rydell, J., and R. Arlettaz. 1994. Low-frequency echolocation enables the bat *Tadarida*
609 *teniotis* to feed on tympanate insects. Proceedings of the Royal Society of London Series B-
610 Biological Sciences 257:175-178.

611 Schnitzler, H. U., C. F. Moss, and A. Denzinger. 2003. From spatial orientation to food
612 acquisition in echolocating bats. Trends Ecol Evol 18:386-394.

613 Sharifi, M., and Z. Hemmati. 2002. Variation in the diet of the Greater Mouse-tailed Bat,
614 *Rhinopoma microphyllum* (Chiroptera: Rhinopomatidae) in south-western Iran. Zool. Middle
615 East 26:65-70.

616 Skowronski, M. D., and J. G. Harris. 2006. Acoustic detection and classification of
617 microchiroptera using machine learning: Lessons learned from automatic speech recognition.
618 J. Acoust. Soc. Am. 119:1817-1833.

619 Spitzenberger, F., P. P. Strelkov, H. Winkler, and E. Haring. 2006. A preliminary revision of
620 the genus *Plecotus* (Chiroptera, Vespertilionidae) based on genetic and morphological results.
621 *Zoologica Scripta* 35:187-230.

622 Thabah, A., S. J. Rossiter, T. Kingston, S. Zhang, S. Parsons, K. Mya, A. Zubaid, and G.
623 Jones. 2006. Genetic divergence and echolocation call frequency in cryptic species of
624 *Hipposideros larvatus s.l.* (Chiroptera : Hipposideridae) from the Indo-Malayan region. *Biol.*
625 *J. Linnean Soc.* 88:119-130.

626 Thomas, D. W., G. P. Bell, and M. B. Fenton. 1987. Variation in echolocation call
627 frequencies recorded from North American Vespertilionid bats - a cautionary note. *Journal of*
628 *Mammalogy* 68:842-847.

629 Ulanovsky, N., M. B. Fenton, A. Tsoar, and C. Korine. 2004. Dynamics of jamming
630 avoidance in echolocating bats. *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London Series B-*
631 *Biological Sciences* 271:1467-1475.

632 Vaughan, N., G. Jones, and S. Harris. 1997. Identification of British bat species by
633 multivariate analysis of echolocation call parameters. *Bioacoustics* 7:189-207.

634 Walters, C. L., R. Freeman, C. Dietz, M. B. Fenton, G. Jones, A. Collen, M. K. Obrist, S.
635 Puechmaille, T. Sattler, B. M. Siemers, S. Parsons, and K. E. Jones. 2012. A continental-scale
636 tool for acoustic identification of European bats. *Journal of Applied Ecology*.

637 Whitaker, J. O., and A. Karatas. 2009. Food and feeding habits of some bats from Turkey.
638 *Acta Chiropterologica* 11:393-403.

639 Whitaker, J. O., B. Shalmon, and T. H. Kunz. 1994. Food and Feeding-Habits of
640 Insectivorous Bats from Israel. *Zeitschrift Fur Saugetierkunde-International Journal of*
641 *Mammalian Biology* 59:74-81.

642 Whitaker, J. O. J., and Y. Yom-Tov. 2002. The diet of some insectivorous bats from northern
643 Israel. *Mamm Biol* 67:378-380.

644 Yom-Tov, Y. 1993. Character displacement among the insectivorous bats of the Dead Sea
645 area. *J Zool* 230:347-356.

646 Yom-tov, Y., D. Makin, and B. Shalmon. 1992. The Insectivorous Bats (Microchiroptera) of
647 the Dead-Sea Area, Israel. *Israel J Zool* 38:125-137.

648 Zahn, A., J. Holzhaider, E. Kriner, A. Maier, and A. Kayikcioglu. 2008. Foraging activity of
649 *Rhinolophus hipposideros* on the island of Herrenchiemsee, Upper Bavaria. *Mamm Biol*
650 73:222-229.

651

652

653 **Figure Legends**

654 Figure 1. Representative echolocation call from each of the 15 species of insectivorous bats
655 recorded in the Arava. *T.n.*: *Taphozous nudiventris*, *R.h.*: *Rhinopoma hardwickii*, *R.m.*:
656 *Rhinopoma microphyllum*, *N.t.*: *Nycteris thebaica*, *A.t.*: *Asellia tridens*, *Rh.c.*: *Rhinolophus*
657 *clivosus*, *Rh.h.*: *Rhinolophus hipposideros*, *P.r.*: *Pipistrellus rueppellii*, *H.b.*: *Hypsugo*
658 *bodenheimeri*, *P.k.*: *Pipistrellus kuhlii*, *E.b.*: *Eptesicus bottae*, *B.l.*: *Barbastella leucomelas*,
659 *Pl.c.*: *Plecotus christii*, *O.h.*: *Otonycteris hemprichii*, *Ta.t.*: *Tadarida teniotis*. Spectrogram
660 parameters: FFT length 512, Hamming window, overlap 96.87%.

661 Figure 2. Spectrograms of bats with narrow bandwidth *Rhinopoma*-type calls. A: *Taphozous*
662 *nudiventris*, B: *Rhinopoma hardwickii* and C: *Rhinopoma microphyllum*. Spectrogram
663 parameters: FFT length 512, Hamming window, overlap 96.87%.

664 Figure 3. A: Frequency histogram of the mean call end frequencies of *Rhinopoma hardwickii*
665 and *Rhinopoma microphyllum*. Black arrows indicate peaks on the histogram that correspond
666 to the frequencies (from left to right) for *R. microphyllum* presumed male and female and *R.*
667 *hardwickii* presumed male and female. B: Exemplary power spectra for all narrow bandwidth
668 bats found in the Negev and the Arava, Israel. *Taphozous perforatus* in the Arava, but it is
669 included here as the ranges are likely to overlap.

670 Figure 4. Spectrograms of HDC bats. A: *Asellia tridens*, B: *Rhinolophus hipposideros* and C:
671 *Rhinolophus clivosus*. Spectrogram parameters: FFT length 512, Hamming window, overlap
672 96.87%

673 Figure 5. Spectrograms of Pipistrelle-type bat calls. A: *Pipistrellus rueppellii*, B: *Hypsugo*
674 *bodenheimeri*, C: *Pipistrellus kuhlii* D: *Eptesicus bottae* and E: *Tadarida teniotis*.
675 Spectrogram parameters: FFT length 512, Hamming window, overlap 96.87.

676 Figure 6. Spectrogram of *Barbastella leucomelas* alternating between the two call types.

677 Spectrogram parameters: FFT length 512, Hamming window, overlap 96.87%

678 Figure 7. Spectrograms of bats with a *Plecotus*-type call. A: *Otonycteris hemprichii*, B:

679 *Plecotus christii* and C: *Nycteris thebaica*. Spectrogram parameters: FFT length 512,

680 Hamming window, overlap 96.87%

681 Figure 8. Scatterplot of the mean end frequency and mean duration for each individual

682 *Otonycteris hemprichii* and *Plecotus christii* pass.