

**UCC Library and UCC researchers have made this item openly available.
 Please [let us know](#) how this has helped you. Thanks!**

Title	Stopover ecology of autumn-migrating Bluethroats (<i>Luscinia svecica</i>) in a highly anthropogenic river basin
Author(s)	Fontanilles, Philippe; de la Hera, Iván; Sourdrille, Kevin; Lacoste, Florent; Kerbiriou, Christian
Publication date	2019-09-28
Original citation	Fontanilles, P., de la Hera, I., Sourdrille, K., Lacoste, F. and Kerbiriou, C. (2019) 'Stopover ecology of autumn-migrating Bluethroats (<i>Luscinia svecica</i>) in a highly anthropogenic river basin', <i>Journal of Ornithology</i> . doi: 10.1007/s10336-019-01717-z
Type of publication	Article (peer-reviewed)
Link to publisher's version	http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10336-019-01717-z Access to the full text of the published version may require a subscription.
Rights	© 2019, Deutsche Ornithologen-Gesellschaft e.V. Published by Springer Nature Switzerland AG. This is a post-peer-review, pre-copyedit version of a paper published as Fontanilles, P., De la Hera, I., Sourdrille, K., Lacoste, F. and Kerbiriou, C. (2019) 'Stopover ecology of autumn-migrating Bluethroats (<i>Luscinia svecica</i>) in a highly anthropogenic river basin', <i>Journal of Ornithology</i> , doi: 10.1007/s10336-019-01717-z. The final authenticated version is available online at: https://doi.org/10.1007/s10336-019-01717-z
Embargo information	Access to this article is restricted until 12 months after publication by request of the publisher.
Embargo lift date	2020-09-28
Item downloaded from	http://hdl.handle.net/10468/8994

Downloaded on 2021-11-27T10:34:52Z

1 Stopover ecology of autumn-migrating Bluethroats (*Luscinia svecica*) in a highly 2 anthropogenic river basin

3 Philippe Fontanilles^{1,*}, Iván de la Hera^{1,2}, Kevin Sourdrille¹, Florent Lacoste¹, Christian Kerbiriou^{3,4}

4
5 ¹ Observatoire d'Intérêt Scientifique Ornithologique (OISO), Cami deth Sailhetou, 65400 Lau Balagnas, France

6 ² School of Biological, Earth and Environmental Sciences, University College Cork, Cork T23XA50,
7 Ireland.

8 ³ Centre d'Ecologie et des Sciences de la Conservation, UMR7204 MNHN-CNRS-UPMC-Sorbonne Université,
9 55 Rue Buffon, 75005 Paris, France

10 ⁴ Station de Biologie Marine Place de la croix, 29900 Concarneau, France

11
12 Corresponding author, email: fontanilles.oiso@laposte.net

13
14 **Short title:** Stopover ecology of Bluethroats

15 **Key words:** *Luscinia svecica*, home range, body condition, habitat selection, corn crop, diet, trophic resources.

16 17 Summary

18 Wetlands are highly productive habitats used by many avian species as stopover sites during their migrations.
19 However, these habitats are highly threatened by anthropogenic activities, such as land use changes, the
20 introduction of exotic species and global warming. Further understanding on the spatiotemporal use of wetlands
21 and their surrounding areas by migrating birds is essential to predict how these changes might affect avian *en*
22 *route* ecology. We selected a habitat-generalist passerine, the Bluethroat *Luscinia svecica*, as model of how
23 migratory birds exploit a highly anthropogenic river basin in southwestern France (i.e. Barthes de la Nive)
24 during autumn migration. We captured and radiotracked 29 young Bluethroats in this region to shed light on
25 different aspects of their stopover ecology and behaviour, such as stopover duration, habitat selection and home
26 range size. We also characterized Bluethroat diet and arthropod availability in different habitats. Bluethroats
27 positively selected pure or mixed reedbeds (associated with sedge), hydrophilous tall grasslands and corn crops.
28 Birds staying more than just one day 8.4 days on average, used preferably corn crops. Home range sizes were on
29 average 5.8 ha (fixed kernels K95) and high occupancy area (K50) was 1.36 ha with large individual variation.
30 Bluethroats stopping over with low fuel loads tended to have larger home ranges and used preferentially corn
31 crops, wet or mesotrophic grasslands and rural paths. Reedbeds were typically used as roosting habitat for the
32 majority of birds, being on average 397 m apart from their daytime core areas. Short-staying birds tended to
33 show higher fuel loads and restricted their activities to a smaller home range (1 ha) in pure and mixed reedbeds.
34 The diet of Bluethroats was dominated by ants, spiders and beetles that were particularly abundant in corn crops.
35 The use of corn crops by autumn-migrating Bluethroats in our study site seems a reasonable solution in a highly
36 altered environment. Reducing the use of insecticides in these crops and delaying the harvesting time after mid-
37 October are two supplemental measures that, together with a good management of the remaining wetland
38 patches, could greatly favour Bluethroats and other migratory species in this region.

39
40 **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS** – This work was supported by the Conseil Départemental des Pyrénées Atlantiques,
41 Syndicat Nive Maritime, Villefranque and Bayonne councils. We are particularly grateful to F. Esnault, S.
42 Valles, R. Damestoy and R. Dufourcq. We are extremely thankful to L. Delalande, F. Delfour, A. Glad, M.
43 Janczyszyn-Le Goff, T. Sarraude, for their commitment in the collection of the radiotracking data, to L. Julien
44 for invertebrate sampling, and members of OISO association who made this research possible, especially F.
45 Lartigau. National Museum of Natural History authorized the bird-ringing and radio-tracking scheme. The
46 experiments complied with the current laws of the country in which they were performed. We also thank two
47 anonymous reviewers who gave insightful comments that improved an early version of the manuscript.

48
49 **Author contributions:** All of the authors contributed to data collection. K.S. prepared the habitat map, F.L. and
50 C.K. gathered data on bird diet and arthropod availability. P.F., I.H. and C.K. analysed the data, designed the
51 methods and conducted the research. All of the authors took part in the formulation of the questions and
52 hypotheses. P.F. wrote the paper in cooperation with I.H. and C.K.

53 **Conflict of interest:** The authors declare that they have no conflicts of interest.

54 **Ethics statement:** All data and information from external sources used for the analyses and preparation of the
55 manuscript are properly cited. The conclusions are entirely based on our own results. All applicable
56 international, national, and/or institutional guidelines for the care and use of animals were followed.

57 Introduction

58
59 The global conservation of migratory birds not only relies on the protection of their breeding and wintering
60 habitats, but also on the presence of suitable stopover sites along their migratory routes (Hutto 2000, Yong 1998
61 Newton 2008). Coastal marshes, estuaries and other types of wetlands are highly productive habitats largely used
62 during migration by waterbirds and other avian species, constituting key conservation areas (Czech and Parsons
63 2002). Wetland habitats experienced a dramatic reduction and an increased fragmentation during the 20th
64 century, mainly as a consequence of the pressure of human activities, such as urbanization and the drainage for
65 agricultural use (von Behren 2007; Whited et al 2000; Czech and Parsons 2002). As a result, wetlands usually
66 remain now embedded in a complex and highly-altered human matrix, where every year migrating birds rest and
67 search for food to undertake their next flight bout.
68

69 The wetland remnants that many birds use as stopover sites are normally small and face some common problems
70 that, in some cases, can be mitigated by human intervention. For example, many wetland managers implement
71 measures to avoid clogging, which could lead to bush encroachment and the progressive disappearance of marsh
72 vegetation (Clark and Wilson 2001). The control of invasive and exotic species, that can alter wetland
73 biodiversity and functioning, is also a common practice (Fontanilles et al. 2014; Arizaga et al. 2013). These
74 measures would increase the quality and carrying capacity of the wetlands, which would be very beneficial for
75 migrating birds (e.g. fuel deposition; Delingat and Dierschke 2000). Another aspect that has hitherto received
76 little attention is the potential management and planning of the areas surrounding the wetland. These adjacent
77 areas might be intensively used by migrants given the restricted size of wetland patches and the potential high
78 intra and interspecific competition with other migratory and resident individual birds. This situation could be
79 particularly exacerbated during the migration peaks, when large number of individuals can co-occur in a single
80 location (Newton, 2004). Such circumstance predicts that many migrants will be forced to expand their home-
81 ranges and use alternative habitats out of the wetland. In this context, identifying which alternative habitats are
82 positively selected by migrating birds during their brief stopovers would be essential to design buffer areas that
83 best meet the requirements for these migrants *en route*. However, this knowledge is limited in many key
84 stopover areas..
85

86 In this study, we analysed the stopover ecology of migrating Bluethroats *Luscinia svecica* in Barthes de la Nive
87 (France) during autumn migration. Barthes de la Nive is a mosaic of wetlands, riparian woodlands and farmlands
88 located near the Adour River mouth in the Southwestern Atlantic coast of France. The scattered wetlands in this
89 region attract a large diversity of both aquatic and non-aquatic birds during migration periods (Fontanilles et al.
90 2011). The only radiotracking study carried out in this area so far showed that the globally endangered Aquatic
91 Warbler *Acrocephalus paludicola* had a strong preference for reedbeds but, to a lesser extent, it also made use of
92 some farmlands (Fontanilles et al. 2014). This highlights the relevance that the surrounding matrix might have
93 even for a wetland specialist as the Aquatic Warbler. Conversely, Bluethroats are migratory birds that can use a
94 large range of habitats, mainly reedbeds and marshlands (Arizaga et al. 2006; Musseau et al. 2017), but also
95 bushlands, woodland and farming habitats (Cramp 1988; Cornulier et al. 1997; Chiron, 2017, Berndt and Hölzel
96 2012), making it an interesting model to study its stopover ecology and habitat selection during migration.
97 Arizaga et al. (2011) radiotracked 20 autumn-migrating Bluethroats in Txingudi (North Spain), a wetland located
98 less than 30km away from Barthes de la Nive. Their results showed a strong selection for reedbeds, low-
99 halophytic vegetation and tidal flats. However, Txingudi is located in a more urbanized environment that
100 probably restricts bird movements, and its proximity to the river mouth allows the presence of habitats that are
101 lacking in Barthes de la Nive (e.g. halophytic vegetation). On the other hand, bird ringing information obtained
102 for both wetlands during autumn migration showed dramatic differences in the number of within-season
103 recoveries, which are much more usual in Txingudi than in Barthes de la Nive (Arizaga et al. 2011; Fontanilles
104 unpublished data). These differences could be a consequence of a longer stopover duration of Bluethroats in
105 Txingudi than in Barthes de la Nive, but they could also be caused by the existence of larger home ranges in
106 Barthes de la Nive, something that would be possible in its much less urbanized surrounding. All these aspects
107 suggest a different stopover ecology and behaviour of Bluethroats between both wetlands in spite of their
108 geographic proximity that remains still unresolved.
109

110 In order to better understand the stopover ecology of the Bluethroat in Barthes de la Nive, we performed a
111 radiotracking study during autumn migration that aims to shed light on (1) the stopover duration and the
112 proximate factors that affect it, (2) habitat selection and home range sizes, and (3) we complemented the study
113 with an analysis of Bluethroat diet and the availability of food resources. Although Bluethroats are not globally
114 threatened, some populations have been considered to be under high risk of extinction (Huntley et al. 2007).
115 Consequently, we expect that the spatial information generated in this study could be valuable for the competent
116 authorities to design management practices contributing to the conservation of Bluethroats and other birds during
117 their migrations.
118

119
120

121
122 **MATERIALS AND METHODS**
123

124 **Study area and vegetation map**

125 Barthes de la Nive (43°27'N; 01°28'W) is a 442-ha mosaic of natural and anthropogenic habitats (Fig. A1),
126 whose remaining wetlands have been maintained safe from complete drainage due to its role in reducing the risk
127 of flooding in Bayonne city. The wetlands are connected to the Adour river by channels, so that its hydrology is
128 influenced by the flow of the river and the tidal regimes. However, its natural influence and ecologic functions in
129 Adour estuary were drastically affected to urbanize the city, to develop port facilities and dykes, which virtually
130 destroyed the original mudflats and intertidal areas. Our study site is now a protected area included in the
131 European Natura 2000 network (FR7200786). The non-urban areas near the river have been widely used for
132 pasture, as hay meadows and other agricultural purposes, being corn plantations the primary crop nowadays.
133 Farming in the region uses a reasonably low quantity of fertilizers and no insecticide. Field abandonment and
134 lack of management is increasing gradually bush and tree encroachment, which is changing dramatically the
135 landscape. A vegetation map was obtained from photo-interpretation and field validation for summer 2014 and
136 2015 (see Fig. A1 in Supplementary Material, Table1). This approach showed the relative importance of each
137 habitat in the region (see Table 1).
138
139

140 **Bluethroat trapping and body measurements**

141 Mist-netting sessions were performed from mid-August to late September when migrating Bluethroats stop over
142 in this region during their post-breeding migratory period. Note that Bluethroats do not breed in Barthes de la
143 Nive or use it for moulting (Fontanilles et al. 2011). Ringing sessions took place in five different locations across
144 the study area: four wetlands and one corn crop (see details in Supplementary Material Fig. A1, Ap. 3, Table 2).
145 These five sites were reasonably distant to each other (see Fig. A1) to reduce potential geographic bias and,
146 according to previous studies (Fontanilles et al. 2011, Fontanilles 2014), they represent the two main habitats
147 (i.e. reedbed, corn crops) where Bluethroats occur during their stopover at Barthes de la Nive.
148

149 To maximize the number of captures, we used one male song playback from 30 minutes before dawn (when
150 mist-nets were open) until a tagged bird was released (when mist-nets were furled; de la Hera et al. 2017). By
151 using the tape lures only 30 minutes before sunrise, we reduced the possibilities of forcing the landing of
152 migrating Bluethroats and we expected to capture only birds that decided voluntarily to stop over in our study
153 area (Schaub 1999; Arizaga et al. 2015). During our ringing sessions, we captured 58 Bluethroats (28 in 2014
154 and 30 in 2015).
155

156 Several morphological measurements were taken from each bird in order to obtain a composite index of bird
157 body size (Freeman and Jackson 1990, Tellería et al. 2013, see Supplementary Material). We also recorded body
158 mass (± 0.1 g) and standard scores of fat and muscle (Busse 2000). Body size-corrected measurements of body
159 mass were used to estimate individual fuel loads. This was done using a linear regression of body mass on body
160 size (see Supplementary Material Ap. 2, Fig. A2), where individuals with higher fuel loads showed more
161 positive residuals (Salewski et al. 2009).
162
163

164 **Radio tracking information**

165 Out of the 58 Bluethroats captured, 29 juveniles were equipped with a radio-transmitter, with a minimum of 4
166 radiotagged individuals in each of the 5 ringing sites (25 birds were trapped in the reedbeds and 4 in the corn
167 crops; see details in Supplementary Material, Ap. 3, Table A2). Life expectancy of the emitters is typically more
168 than 17 days and the average detection distance is 80-300 meters. We only tagged first-year birds because the
169 study site is mainly used by this age group, and because juveniles face their first autumn migration and,
170 consequently, their habitat choice cannot be influenced by previous experience (Piper 2011).

171 On the day of capture, monitoring of tagged Bluethroats started at least one hour after the bird was released in
172 order to avoid bias linked to potential stress behaviour. For birds that stayed in the area the following days after
173 capture (see below), they were normally monitored 8h per day during, normally, 3-4 days in long-staying
174 individuals. After this period, we checked their presence every day, but the intensity of the radiotracking
175 typically got reduced and depended on other duties associated with the project, particularly, the trapping and
176 monitoring of other individuals (see Supplementary Material Ap.3 for more details).

177 The positions of the birds were obtained normally by triangulation (3 vectors taken consecutively within less
178 than 10 minutes), but we used bi-angulation in those cases in which landscape barriers (like canals, rivers or
179 dense vegetation) impeded taking more than two informative vectors, or just one vector plus an estimation of the
180 actual distance to the bird when this was observed. We used Sika receivers (Biotrack Ltd) and Yagi antennas to
181 find the birds, and vectors were delimited using a GPS (to determine observer position; Garmin Ltd.) and a
182 compass (to obtain magnetic Azimuth). All this information was computerized using the software
183 Cartoexplorateur (Bayo Ltd.), and we considered the centroid of the triangle determined by the three
184 corresponding vectors as the most likely geographic position of the bird, or the intersections between lines when

185 two vectors were only available. Prior to the start of radiotracking, observers were trained in the study area and
186 the accuracy of the triangulation method was assessed. The average error found in the estimation of the positions
187 of transmitters hidden in the study area was 14.5 ± 1 m ($n=69$), which can be considered enough given the
188 purpose of studying main habitat selection.
189

190 **Stopover duration and its determinants**
191 We used the number of days spent by each Bluethroat after being tagged (assessed by the radiotracking survey)
192 as a proxy of stopover duration. This approach is expected to provide a better idea than ringing recaptures on
193 how long Bluethroats stopover in Barthes de la Nive, since ring-recovery data are spatially restricted, have a
194 lower detection probability and strongly depend on a good sampling strategy (Chernetsov 2012). According to
195 the non-Gaussian distribution of stopover durations (see Fig. A3), we performed non parametric tests (Wilcoxon
196 tests, Kruskal-Wallis tests and Spearman correlations) to evaluate which factors (year, sex, site, date of capture,
197 muscle development, fat accumulation and body condition) better correlated with the observed variation in
198 stopover duration.
199

200 **Habitat selection**
201 Initially, we tested whether Bluethroat locations were randomly distributed across habitats. We applied the
202 quadrats method (Zaminetti 2005) by defining a grid of K squares 100×100 m enveloping all the radio-tracking
203 points. The theoretical distribution $K_{th}(n)$ was obtained following the Poisson's law: $K_{th} = [K * (D^n/n!)] * \exp(-D)$
204 where n is the number of points per mesh, $K(n)$ the number of stitches having n points, N is the total number of
205 locations and D is the average density of locations by cell that is defined as N divided by K . The existence of
206 significant differences between the two distributions (i.e. $K(n)$ and $K_{th}(n)$) was assessed using a Kolmogorov-
207 Smirnov test.
208 Secondly, for assessing habitat selection, we calculated for each habitat the electivity index of Jacobs (1974) $I_h =$
209 $U - D / (U + D - 2U * D)$ where U is the proportion of locations in habitat h and D the proportion of this habitat in
210 the study area. The index ranges between -1 (strong rejection of a particular habitat) and 1 (strong selection). We
211 used the proportion of locations instead of the proportion of areas in core areas to take into account the edge
212 effects and to be more precise with the actual habitat used. We excluded habitats poorly represented showing
213 less than 5 locations.
214

215 **Home range estimates**
216 The overall home range size of each individual Bluethroat was estimated by the model of 95% kernel (K95;
217 Worton 1989). The K95 approach is usually used in this type of studies, which would allow between study
218 comparisons (Börger *et al.* 2006). Areas of high occupancy were also estimated using the 50% kernel (K50),
219 considered as a good estimator of core areas (Börger *et al.* 2006). We calculated the overall home range with all
220 the locations for each bird and also for each day when there was a minimum of 10 positions. Home range sizes
221 were processed using the Ranges 8v2.10 software (Anatrack Ltd).
222

223 **Home range analysis**
224 We explored whether overall home range size varied in relation to the proportion of habitats contained within it
225 (10 habitat variables, see Table 1), several metrics of heterogeneity (mean patch size, number of habitat or
226 Shanon index perform of patch size distribution) and individual-associated variables (body condition, sex and
227 stopover duration). For this purpose, we performed General Linear Models (GLM) using the home range size
228 (K50 and K95) as a response variable, while habitat cover and individual-associated variables were included as
229 explanatory variables. According to the distribution of home range size (positive long tail distribution), we
230 applied a negative binomial error distribution to the GLM in order to minimize issues related to the over-
231 dispersion ratio in the models (i.e. as close as possible to 1; Zuur *et al.* 2009). Following a multi model inference
232 (Burnham *et al.* 2011; Grueber *et al.* 2011), we generated a set of candidate models containing all possible
233 variable combinations and ranked them by corrected Akaike information criterion (AICc) using the dredge
234 function (R package MuMIn; Barton 2019). We only integrated the models complying with the following
235 conditions: (i) models do not include simultaneously correlated covariates ($R^2 > 0.7$) and (ii) models do not
236 include more than three variables to avoid over-parameterization due to the limited data set. Since the
237 simultaneous inclusion of habitat cover and measures of habitat heterogeneity generated important multi-
238 collinearity problems, we decided to perform two separate modelling: one with habitat cover within the home
239 range and individual-associated variables; and a second one, with measures of habitat heterogeneity and
240 individual-associated variables (results of this second modelling are shown in Appendix 5). We restricted this set
241 of models using a cut-off of 2 AICc. The modelling with habitat cover resulted in 4 and 3 top models for K50
242 and K95, respectively (see Supplementary Material Ap. 5, Table A3). The modelling with measures of habitat
243 heterogeneity resulted in 4 and 2 top models for K50 and K95, respectively (see Supplementary Material Ap. 5).
244 Following the same approach, we explored whether daily home range size (with a minimum of 10 positions)
245 varied in relation to habitat cover within home range and individual-associated variables. According to the
246 hierarchical structure of this data set (radio-tagged individuals survey each day), we treated the variable
247 "individual identity" as a random effect, while considering the other explanatory variables (home range and
248 individual-associated variables) as fixed effects (Zuur *et al.* 2009). Following a multi model inference using

249 General Linear Mixed Models with a negative binomial error distribution, the daily home range analyses resulted
250 in a total of 2 and 3 top models for the K50 and K95, respectively (see Supplementary Material Ap. 5, Table A).
251 We also used a secondary method based on PCA analysis detailed in Supplementary Material Ap. 6.

252

253 **Roosting habitat selection**

254 To provide information on roosting behaviour, we identified the habitats used between sunset and sunrise
255 (roosting locations) and also estimated their distance to the daytime areas where birds were potentially foraging.
256 We identified the habitat of all those locations on the vegetation map. We compared the proportions of roosting
257 locations occurring in each habitat to identify the most used by *a posteriori* Wilcoxon test. For birds flying to a
258 roosting location far away from the area used during daytime hours, we calculated the distance between the
259 centroid of the home range exploited during daytime hours and the core of roosting locations. We then compared
260 the proportions of habitats between these two areas (home range during daytime hours vs. roosting locations
261 core) by *a posteriori* Wilcoxon test.

262

263 **Diet of Bluethroat**

264 To elucidate why birds tend to select specific habitats, we analysed their diet and the invertebrate availability.
265 We collected 105 faecal samples during ringing operations for all sites in 2015 (n=52) and 2014 (n=30) and only
266 in Urdains in 2012 (n=23). All remains identified in faeces were used to estimate the minimum number of prey
267 items and the occurrence of each taxonomic group within each sample. While some bias in diet analyses was
268 possible because small or soft-bodied preys are less easily detected, a strong correlation has been found between
269 prey remains in droppings and the actual composition of the diet (Davies 1977a, 1977b). We also assessed prey
270 biomass using predictive models based on the relationship between body length and mass of terrestrial
271 arthropods (Hodar 1996; see Supplementary Material Ap. 7 for additional details). We explored which factors
272 influenced prey abundance, testing explicitly the effects of age (young vs adult birds), sex and day using a
273 Generalized Linear Model (GLM) with a Poisson error distribution. P-values were corrected for over-dispersion.
274 Only taxa representing more than 2% of the prey abundance were considered

275

276 **Invertebrate availability between habitats**

277 We estimated the variation in the abundance of (near) ground invertebrates (the main feeding substrate of
278 Bluethroats) between the two main habitats occupied by Bluethroats (corn crops and reedbeds). Given the large
279 extension of the study area, we decided to focus our invertebrate sampling on three of the five trapping areas: the
280 corn crop area, and Villefranque and Urdains reedbeds (Fig. A1). The corn crops in the other bank of the Nive
281 River had similar management practices, so they are expected to have a similar invertebrate availability. We
282 used 3 standardized coloured (yellow, white, blue) bowl traps and a pitfall glass per station (for a total of 12
283 stations, 6 in the corn crops, 3 in each reedbed). All stations were sampled simultaneously at 3 temporal stages in
284 August 2015. Traps were deployed for four days. For more details, see Supplementary Material Ap. 8. For
285 subsequent analyses, we pooled together the data of the three bowl traps of each station. We focused the analyses
286 on those taxa whose remains had been found in faeces of trapped Bluethroats. We compared invertebrate
287 availability, abundance and biomass between the two reedbeds and the corn crop using General Linear Models
288 with a Poisson error distribution.

289 Unless specified, mean values are given \pm se (standard error).

290

291

292 **RESULTS**

293

294 **Stopover duration and body condition effect**

295 Tagged Bluethroats stayed on average 5 ± 1 (range 1-20) days upon capture in Barthes de la Nive, but showing a
296 clearly non-Gaussian distribution where up to 13 individuals left the study area the next night after being
297 captured (Fig. A3). The remaining 16 Bluethroats stayed on average 8.4 ± 1.3 days (see Table A1, Fig. A3).
298 Observed variation in stopover duration did not differ significantly between years ($W=91$, $p=0.536$), sites
299 (Kruskal-Wallis $H(3, 29) = 1.11$, $p=0.774$), sex ($W=133$, $p=0.189$), date of capture (r Spearman = -0.11, $t_{27} = -$
300 0.59 , $p=0.558$) or muscle development (r Spearman = -0.17, $t_{27} = -0.92$, $p=0.365$). The fat score was significantly
301 associated with stopover duration (r Spearman = -0.40, $t_{27} = -2.24$, $p=0.034$). However, the individual trait that
302 better explained stopover duration was fuel load, which was estimated from the residuals of body mass on body
303 size (effects of body size on body mass: $\beta=0.888$, $F_{1,27}=100.9$, $p < 0.001$). Thus, Bluethroats with larger size-
304 corrected fuel loads left the Nive basin earlier on average (r Spearman = -0.59, $t_{27} = -3.78$, $p < 0.001$; Fig. 1) than
305 birds with smaller fuel stores. Additionally, we analysed whether stopover duration differed between habitats
306 used. Irrespective of where they were trapped, birds that used corn crops remained significantly ($W=23$,
307 $p < 0.001$) longer (10 days ± 1.1 se, $n=10$) in the area than those not using this habitat type (2.7 days ± 0.6 se, $n=19$;
308 see Fig. 2).

309

310 **Habitat selection**

311 The 29 radiotracked juvenile Bluethroats provided 1718 positions during their stay. Bluethroat locations were
312 not randomly distributed among habitats. Their distributions differed significantly from the theoretical null

distributions (Kolmogorov-Smirnov test $D = 0.896$, $p < 0.0001$). The main habitats used by all birds were corn crops and reedbeds, either pure or mixed (Fig. 3). The distribution differed between birds staying one day, which preferred pure reedbed ($W=55.5$, $p=0.034$), and the remaining, which positively selected the corn crops ($W=162$, $p=0.013$). Birds stopping over for just one day made use of less habitat types (2.2 ± 0.3 [1-4] habitats) than birds staying longer (4.7 ± 0.5 [2-10]; $W=180.5$, $p < 0.001$). However, during the first day of stay, there were no differences between them in the preferred habitat and number of them (tests Wilcoxon, $p > 0.05$, Fig.A4). Bluethroats positively selected pure and mixed reedbeds, corn crops and hydrophilous tall grasslands (Fig. 4). They moderately selected paths, wooded reedbeds and mesophic grasslands, while they avoided water, railways, ferns, wet grasslands, houses, woodlands and hay meadows.

Home range analysis

The average number of locations per individual was 59.2 ± 9 (22.5 ± 1.6 for birds staying one day, and 89 ± 12 for birds staying longer). The average overall K95 home range was 5.8 ± 1.8 ha with a large variation between individuals (range 0.016-46.5). The core area (i.e. K50) was on average 1.36 ± 0.35 ha (range 0.004-7.6). K95 areas were larger in birds staying more than one day (9.72 ± 3 ha) than in birds stopping over just one day (1.07 ± 0.46 ha; $W = 23$, $p < 0.001$). Similar results were obtained for the K50 core area: 0.28 ± 0.12 ha for long-staying birds, and 2.24 ± 0.53 ha for birds staying only 1 day ($W = 18$, $p < 0.001$).

Bluethroats with greater overall home range included more wet grassland, woodland and mesophilic grassland within their range, and also exhibited a longer stopover duration. On the other hand, Bluethroats with smaller overall home range exhibited larger quantities of body reserves and occupied areas with a higher proportion of reedbed (Table 2). Analyses performed for daily home ranges highlighted that Bluethroats with greater home range included more hay grasslands, open water, and woodlands; while Bluethroat with smaller daily home range occupied areas with a higher proportion of crop fields, natural paths and pure reedbeds (Table 2). In addition, analyses performed with measures of habitat heterogeneity, showed that Bluethroats with greater overall home range exhibited a more diversified home range (Appendix 5). According to AICc, measures of habitat heterogeneity performed better than habitat cover variables for K95, while it was the opposite for K50 (Appendix 5). A second analytical method based on PCA analysis gave similar results (see Supplementary Material Ap. 6).

Roosting habitat selection

We identified the overnight habitat ($n= 103$ nights) in 26 Bluethroats. Pure reedbed was the main roosting habitat, with 44.2% of the nights (Fig. 5). Mixed or wooded reedbeds were also well-represented within the roosting habitats, representing 17.5% and 16.8 %, respectively. So, reedbeds (pure, mixed and wood reedbed) were the preferred habitats for roosting ($80.1 \pm 8\%$ of nights) in 23 birds that stayed for at least one night. Corn crops were also used by 5 birds but less frequently than reedbeds: $13.1 \pm 6\%$ of nights.

83% of the birds that spent the night in reedbeds (pure, mixed and wood reedbed) occupied the same reedbed during the day. This took place in $59 \pm 9\%$ of the nights (Fig. 6). This particularly concerned the 13 Bluethroats which stopped over for just one day. Individuals staying for at least 2 days showed relatively predictable movements and selected repeatedly the same areas during the night. 27% of the birds (7) spent the night in a reedbed (Urdains or Villefranque) and normally moved during the day to a corn crop. This was noticed for $12.5 \pm 5\%$ of the nights. We calculated the distance between roosting core areas and daytime (foraging) core areas. Birds flew on average 397 ± 33 m to reach its roosting location ($n=10$, range 80- 692 m). Five birds also used corn crops to stay during the night after using it also during the daytime (19 nights).

Diet analysis and habitat-specific invertebrate availability We obtained 105 faecal samples: 84 faecal samples from first year birds and 21 from adults, 55 from males and 47 from females. A total of 431 prey items were identified, 4.1 ± 0.8 on average per dropping. We found 14 orders of invertebrates (2.2 ± 0.3 on average per sample). The diet of Bluethroats was dominated by ants (Hymenoptera Formicidae), representing 45.5 % of prey items and occurring in 54% of the samples (Table 3). Spiders (Araneidae) were the second most abundant group (20.4%) with a similar occurrence to ants (53%); and beetles (Coleoptera) were the third most common group (10.2% of all prey items and 31% of the samples). These two last taxa were the main contributors to the consumed biomass, representing 64.7 % and 14.9%, respectively. We did not detect any significant effects of Bluethroat age and sex on prey abundance (Table 3). We did also observe that leafhoppers (Cicadellidae) were less consumed over time (Table 3).

Corn crops hosted significantly more invertebrates and biomass than reedbeds for beetles, flies(Diptera) and spiders in pitfalls, and for leafhoppers in bowls (Table 4). Corn crops also had higher availability of non-Formicidae hymenopterans than Urdains in bowls, but less than Villefranque. Finally, ants were more abundant in Urdains than in the other two sites.

DISCUSSION

Variation in stopover duration and home range size

377 Bluethroats showed large variation in their stopover duration and home range size in Barthes de la Nive. The
378 observed mean differed from that obtained by Arizaga et al. (2013). Thus, stopover duration was shorter and
379 home range larger in Barthes de la Nive (mean stopover duration of 5 days and mean home range size of 5.8 ha)
380 than in Txingudi (9.6 days and 2 ha, respectively). Differences in stopover duration between these two sites were
381 mediated by the fact that 45% of the radiotracked Bluethroats in Barthes de la Nive apparently departed the
382 following night after capture, a circumstance that never took place in Txingudi (Fig. A3). If these short-staying
383 individuals were excluded from the calculations, the stopover duration in Barthes de la Nive (i.e. 8.4 days) would
384 conform better to the values obtained in Txingudi. After the signal of a bird disappeared from the place it was
385 last detected, we carefully explored the whole study area by car the following day in its search, and sporadically
386 during subsequent days. This makes us very confident that the stopover duration estimates obtained in Barthes de
387 la Nive are reliable. Likewise, the fact that only one of the 29 radiotracked Bluethroats stayed longer than the
388 life-expectancy of the transmitter would not alter these between-site differences or the general conclusions of our
389 study (see below). The number of Bluethroats whose stay reached the expected functional life of the transmitters
390 in Txingudi was slightly higher (3 out of 20) than in Barthes de la Nive, supporting the longer stopover duration
391 of Bluethroats in the former site.

392
393 It could be argued that the higher number of short-staying Bluethroats in Barthes de la Nive was caused by the
394 use of playbacks during the trapping sessions, which were not implemented in Txingudi. Although we cannot
395 rule out completely this confounding factor as an alternative explanation to observed results, current evidence
396 does not support this idea. Thus, the use of playbacks typically attracts Bluethroats with lower body reserves
397 (Arizaga et al. 2015) and, as our results show, birds with less fuel loads would tend to have longer stopover
398 durations (Alerstam and Lindström 1990; Salewski and Schaub 2007). This impact of playback on fuel loads of
399 autumn migrating Bluethroats was consistent in the three wetlands on the Bay of Biscay (Gironde, Txingudi,
400 Urdaibai) analysed by Arizaga et al. (2015) that are geographically very close to Barthes de la Nive. If
401 Bluethroats do show transient vs. non-transient divergent behaviours during migration as have been described for
402 other migratory species (Rappole and Warner 1976), playbacks might have also biased stopover duration
403 estimates if they do preferentially attract transient individuals. However, a study of stopover duration using tape
404 lures did not detect these transient Bluethroats during autumn migration (Arizaga et al. 2010). Likewise, neither
405 the results obtained by Arizaga et al. (2015) would support this possibility, since playbacks do not seem to affect
406 the number of Bluethroat recaptures, and this would be an expected outcome if playbacks promoted the capture
407 of more transient individuals that would have less recapture prospects. Likewise, and contrary to what would be
408 expected for their transient condition, these short-staying individuals did not move as much as would be
409 expected after being trapped in Barthes de la Nive, and their first-day home range did not differ significantly
410 from that observed for long-staying conspecifics.

411
412 Observed differences in stopover duration between Barthes de la Nive and Txingudi might explain the relatively
413 low number of recaptures obtained in Barthes de la Nive when compared to Txingudi and also other nearby sites
414 for which there is no radiotracking information so far (i.e. Gironde and Urdaibai; Arizaga et al. 2015).
415 Additionally, these differences in recapture rates could be also promoted by the existence of overall home ranges
416 that are nearly twice to three times larger in Barthes de la Nive than in Txingudi (Arizaga et al. 2013) and in
417 Gironde (Musseau et al. 2017). These contrasting differences between Txingudi and Barthes de la Nive are
418 potentially mediated by the strong differences in the degree of urbanization and habitat composition that seem to
419 have profound consequences in the stopover behaviour of Bluethroats between two relatively close locations.

420
421

422 **Habitat and roosting site selection**

423 Migrating Bluethroats in Barthes de la Nive strongly selected reedbeds (pure and mixed) and other hydrophilic
424 natural grasslands, which concurs with the favourite habitat that Arizaga et al. (2013) and Musseau et al. (2017)
425 found for migrating and moulting conspecifics, respectively. Much less known was the preference of migrating
426 Bluethroats for corn crops, although one study had detected this species in this crop type during migration
427 (Gottschalk & Cover 2016) and some populations of Bluethroats seem to thrive and even breed successfully in
428 some agricultural fields, such as oilseed rape crops (Cornulier et al. 1997; Berndt and Hölzel 2012, Chiron
429 2017). We did not find the preference of Bluethroats for tidal mudflats or low-halophytic vegetation described in
430 other studies (Arizaga et al. 2013; Godet et al. 2015; Musseau et al 2017), but the representation of these habitats
431 in Barthes de la Nive is relatively limited, which could explain this lack of use.

432
433 Our results showed that home-range size is smaller when birds occupied reedbeds (for overall home ranges) and
434 corn crops (for daily home ranges). A potential explanation for this result is that these habitats might offer more
435 trophic resources, which would prevent birds from making long foraging trips (Bibby and Green 1980;
436 Chernetsov et al. 2004). Another complementary hypothesis for the higher occurrence of Bluethroats in these
437 two habitat is that, given their dense structure, they could also provide a suitable shelter, not only for roosting
438 during the night but also to rest during daytime between migration flight bouts. The use of reedbeds as roosting
439 habitat has been described before in Bluethroats (Eybert et al. 2004; Harmange et al. 2016) and our study
440 confirmed this preference and suggested that corn crops might occasionally play a similar role. In contrast, long-

441 staying Bluethroats seem to expand their home range probably because they are in high demand of food for
442 refueling and, perhaps, because of the competition with conspecifics and other species (Chernetsov and Titov
443 2001; Fransson et al. 2008).

444 If home-range size is considered a proxy of habitat quality, inland reedbeds could be interpreted as a refuge or a
445 more optimal habitat than corn crops, which might represent the most-commonly available substitution habitat
446 (Godet et al. 2018), where birds needing to refuel would move due to competition and the limited availability of
447 reedbeds.

448 In our site, Bluethroats encounter also some potentially unsuitable habitats such as woodlands, open water,
449 mown grasslands and infrastructures (house, road, railway) that would explain why they had to fly away a
450 relatively long distance from their preferred roosts (Harmange et al. 2016), expanding their home range size.
451 Similar patterns have been shown in Briere for breeding Bluethroats (Godet et al. 2015).

452
453 We did not detect any difference between males and females in home range size, flight distance or stopover
454 duration. Typically, small-sized, young and female Bluethroats are subordinated to large, adult and male
455 conspecifics, respectively (Lindström et al. 1990, Moore et al. 2003). Our results suggest that Barthes de la Nive
456 was occupied, not under an ideal despotic distribution, but under an ideal free distribution, where home range
457 size would be determined by its habitat composition.

458 **Diet of birds and invertebrate availability**

460 The diet description for our study site fitted well with the trophic characterization made in other Bluethroat
461 studies (Allano et al. 1998; Orłowski *et al.* 2014; Musseau et al. 2017). In decreasing order of importance, our
462 study showed the relevance of ants (40.6% of prey; 8.7% of biomass), flies (resp. 14% and 6.5%), beetles
463 (13.7%, 40%) and spiders (9.4%, 22.5%). Bluethroats typically forage on the ground (Orłowski et al. 2014,
464 Allano et al. 1998, Cramp 1988) where ants are particularly abundant. As in other agricultural farms (Cornouiller
465 et al. 1997), corn crops showed a relatively high insect abundance and biomass, which could explain why
466 Bluethroats positively selected this habitat. Again and as a consequence of the relative scarcity of intertidal
467 habitats, arthropods such as amphipods (Malacostraca Amphipoda) were absent from the diet of Bluethroat in
468 Barthes de la Nive, although they have been found in other studies (Musseau et al. 2017; Allano et al. 1998).

469
470

471 **Habitat management implications**

472 Our study confirmed the importance of wetlands and their associated reedbeds in Barthes de la Nive for
473 migrating Bluethroats, as it was also shown for other bird species stopping over in the region (Fontanilles et al.
474 2014). This reaffirms the need to conserve and potentially expand these valuable habitats, whose largest
475 remnants in Southwestern France persist in the Nive/Adour river basin. These wetlands are mainly threatened by
476 clogging and bush encroachment, particularly by invasive exotic tree species (i.e. *Acer negundo*, *Baccharis*
477 *halimifolia*), so regular intervention is needed to maintain their characteristic aquatic vegetation.

478 Likewise, our results unexpectedly revealed a positive selection of corn crops by Bluethroats. The tall and dense
479 arrangement of corn plants resemble the habitat structure of reedbeds. However, corn crops do not seem to
480 constitute an ecological trap but a substitution habitat (Godet et al. 2018), a human-induced opportunity for
481 migrating birds. Anyway, further research would be required to further understand this selection process and
482 whether it also takes place in other sites. Our preliminary results suggest that corn crops would provide plenty of
483 food resources and a suitable shelter for birds stopping over in Barthes de la Nive. Our study using the
484 Bluethroat as model species raises the question of how other bird species respond to the presence of corn crops
485 during their stopovers. The corn crops of Barthes de la Nive are used by a large group of migratory species
486 (Fontanilles not published), so that measures to maintain or increase the suitability of this common crop for birds
487 around the limited wetland remnants should be encouraged. Among them, promoting organic farming and
488 postponing the harvesting time after mid-October, when most insectivorous migrants are in or near their southern
489 wintering quarters, would be relatively easy to implement and might have immediate payoff (Dänhardt et al.
490 2010).

REFERENCES

- 491
492
493 Alerstam T, Lindström C (1990). Optimal bird migration: the relative importance of time, energy and safety. In:
494 Gwinner E (eds). Bird migration: the physiology and ecophysiology. Springer-Verlag Heidelberg, Berlin, pp.
495 331–351.
496
497 Allano L, Bonnet P, Constant P, Eybert M (1988). Premières données sur le régime alimentaire des jeunes
498 gorgebleues (*Luscinia svecica namnetum*, Mayaud) au nid dans un marais salant exploité (Guérande, Loire-
499 Atlantique). C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris 306: 369–374.
500
501 Arizaga J, Alonso D, Campos F, Unamuno JM, Monteagudo A, Fernandez G, Carregal XM, Barba E (2006). Do
502 subspecies of bluethroat *Luscinia svecica* show a geographic segregation during the autumn migration period in
503 Spain? *Ardeola* 53:285–291.
504
505 Arizaga J, Barba E, Alonso D, Vilches A (2010). Stopover of Bluethroats (*Luscinia svecica cyaneacula*) in
506 northern Iberia during the autumn migration period. *Ardeola* 57:69–85
507
508 Arizaga J, Mendiburu A, Alonso D, Cuadrado JF., Jauregi JI, Sánchez JM (2011). A comparison of stopover
509 behavior of two subspecies of the Bluethroat (*Luscinia svecica*) in Northern Iberia during the autumn migration
510 period. *Ardeola* 58:251–265.
511
512 Arizaga J, Andueza M, Tamayo I (2013). Spatial behaviour and habitat use of first-year Bluethroats *Luscinia*
513 *svecica* stopping over at coastal marshes during the autumn migration period. *Acta Ornithol* 48:17-25.
514
515 Arizaga J, Musseau R, Laso M, Esparza X, Unamuno E, Azkona A & Fontanilles P (2015). Biases associated
516 with the use of a playback in stopover ecology studies in small passerine birds. *Bird study* 62:280-284.
517
518 Barg JJ, Jones J, Robertson RJ (2005). Describing breeding territories of migratory passerines: suggestions for
519 sampling, choice of estimator, and delineation of core areas. *J Anim Ecol* 74:139- 149.
520
521 Barton K (2019). MuMIn package: Multi-Model Inference. Available at [https://cran.r-](https://cran.r-project.org/web/packages/MuMIn/MuMIn.pdf)
522 [project.org/web/packages/MuMIn/MuMIn.pdf](https://cran.r-project.org/web/packages/MuMIn/MuMIn.pdf)
523
524 Berndt AM, Hölzel N (2012). Energy crops as a new bird habitat utilization of oilseed rape fields by the rare
525 Bluethroat (*Luscinia svecica*). *Biodivers Conserv* 21:527-541.
526
527 Bibby CJ, Green RE (1980). Foraging behaviour of migrant pied flycatchers, *Ficedula hypoleuca*, on temporary
528 territories. *J Anim Ecol* 49:507–521.
529
530 Börger L, Francon N, De Michele G, Gantz A, Meschi F, Manica A, Lovari S Coulson T (2006). Effects of
531 sampling regime on the mean and variance of home range size estimates. *J Anim Ecol* 75:1393–1405.
532
533 Both C, Bouwhuis S, Lessells CM, Visser ME (2006). Climate change and population declines in a long-distance
534 migratory bird. *Nature* 441:81-83.
535
536 Burnham KP, Anderson DR, Huyvaert KP (2011). AIC model selection and multimodel inference in behavioral
537 ecology: some background, observations, and comparisons. *Behav Ecol Sociobiol* 65:23-35.
538
539 Busse P (2000). Bird Station Manual. SE European Bird Migration Network, Gdansk
540
541 Chernetsov N (2012). Passerines migration: stopovers and Flight. Ed. Springer
542
543 Chernetsov N, Manukyan A (2000). Foraging strategy of the Sedge Warbler (*Acrocephalus schoenobaenus*) on
544 migration. *Vogelwarte* 40:189–197.
545
546 Chernetsov N, Titov NV (2001). Movement patterns of European reed warblers *Acrocephalus scirpaceus* and
547 sedge warblers *A. schoenobaenus* before and during autumn migration. *Ardea* 89:509–515.
548
549 Chernetsov N, Mukhin A, Ktitorov P (2004). Contrasting spatial behaviour of two long-distance passerine
550 migrants at spring stopovers. *Avian Ecol Behav* 12:53–61.
551
552 Chiron D, (2017). Range extension of the Bluethroat *Luscinia svecica namnetum* towards intensive farming
553 habitats in Central western France. *Alauda* 85:81-91.
554

555 Church JA, White NJ (2011). Sea-level rise from the late 19th to the early 21st century. *Surveys in Geophysics*
556 32:585–602.

557

558 Clark DL, Wilson MV (2001). Fire, mowing, and hand-removal of woody species in restoring a native wetland
559 prairie in the Willamette valley of Oregon. *Wetlands* 21:135-144.

560

561 Cornulier Th, Bernard R, De, Arroyo B, Bretagnolle V (1997). Extension géographique et écologique de la
562 Gorgebleue à miroir *Luscinia svecica* dans le Centre-Ouest de la France. *Alauda* 65:1-6.

563

564 Cramp S (1988). *The Birds of the Western Palearctic*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. Vol. 5.

565

566 Czech HA, Parsons CK (2002). Agricultural Wetlands and Waterbirds: A Review. *Waterbirds* 25:56-65.

567

568 Dänhardt J, Green M, Lindström Å, Rundlöf M, Smith HG (2010). Farmland as stopover habitat for migrating
569 birds effects of organic farming and landscape structure. *Oikos* 119:1114–1125.

570

571 Davies NB 1977a. Prey selection and the search strategy of the Spotted Flycatcher *Muscicapa striata*, a field
572 study on optimal foraging. *Animal Behav* 25:1016-1033.

573

574 Davies NB (1977b). Prey selection and social behaviour in wagtails (Aves: Motacillidae). *J Anim Ecol* 46:37-57.

575

576 De la Hera I, Fontanilles P, Delalande L, Glad A, and Sarraude T (2017). Attraction of other species by
577 bluethroat *Luscinia svecica* song playback during autumn migration: an experimental test using bird-ringing
578 data. *Ardeola* 64:91-99.

579

580 Delingat J, Dierschke V (2000). Habitat utilization by Northern Wheatears (*Oenanthe oenanthe*) stopping over
581 on an offshore island during migration. *Vogelwarte* 40:271–278.

582

583 Devictor V, Julliard R, Clavel J, et al. (2008). Functional biotic homogenization of bird communities in disturbed
584 landscapes. *Glob Ecol Biogeogr* 17:252–261.

585

586 Ellegren H (1990) Autumn migration speed in Scandinavian bluethroats *Luscinia s. svecica*. *Ringing &*
587 *Migration* 11:121-131.

588

589 Eybert MC, Bonnet P, Geslin T, Questiau S (2004). *La Gorgebleue*. Belin, 71 p

590

591 Fontanilles P, Laval B, Diribarne M (2014). Sélection des habitats et occupation spatiale du Phragmite
592 aquatique *Acrocephalus paludicola* sur une halte migratoire du sud-ouest de la France, mise en place d'une
593 gestion intégrée. *Alauda* 82:343-351.

594

595 Fontanilles P (2014). Migration et régime alimentaire de la Gorgebleue à miroir dans les Barthes de l'Adour,
596 Actes du séminaire "Conservation des espèces et gestion des zones humides", Bayonne, 31 janvier 2014.

597

598 Fontanilles P, Chanchus B, Chauby X, De Franceschi C, Dufresne L, Fourcade J.M, Lapios J.M, Lartigau F,
599 Legay P, Thouy P, Tillo S, Urbina-Tobias P, Short R & Williams H (2012). Bilan du baguage des passereaux
600 migrants et nicheurs sur les barthes de la Nive (Pyrénées-Atlantiques) en 2011. *Le Casseur d'os*, 12 :80-84.

601

602 Fransson T., Barboutis C., Mellroth R., Akriotis T (2008). When and where to refuel before crossing the Sahara
603 desert extended stopover and migratory fuelling in first-year garden warblers *Sylvia borin*. *J Avian Biol* 39:133–
604 138.

605

606 Freeman S, Jackson WM (1990). Univariate metrics are not adequate to measure avian body size. *Auk* 107:69-
607 74.

608

609 Geslin T, Lefeuvre J.C. Le Pajolec Y, Questiau S, Eybert MC (2002). Salt exploitation and landscape structure in
610 a breeding population of the threatened bluethroat (*Luscinia svecica*) in salt-pans in western France. *Biol Cons*
611 107:283–289.

612

613 Godet L, Marquet M, Eybert MC, Gregoire E, Monnet S, Fournier J (2015). Bluethroats *Luscinia svecica*
614 *namnetum* offset landscape constraints by expanding their home range. *J Ornithol* 156:591–600.

615

616 Godet L, Harmange C, Marquet M, Joyeux E, Fournier J (2018). Differences in home-range sizes of a bird
617 species in its original, refuge and substitution habitats: challenges to conservation in anthropogenic habitats.
618 *Biodivers Conserv* 27:719–732.

619
620 Gottschalk TK, Cover L (2016) Migratory and visiting birds in a maize field near Giessen, Germany in summer
621 and autumn. *Vogelwarte* 54:1-14.
622
623 Grueber CE, Nakagawa S, Laws RJ, Jamieson IG (2011). Multimodel inference in ecology and evolution:
624 challenges and solutions. *J Evol Biol* 24:699–711.
625
626 Harris S, Cresswell WJ, Forde PG, Trehwella WJ, Woollard T, Wray S (1990). Home-range analysis using
627 radio-tracking data - a review of problems and techniques particularly as applied to the study of mammals.
628 *Mammal Rev*:97-123.
629
630 Harmange C, Godet L, Marquet M, Dietrich J, Monnet S, Grégoire E, Eybert MC, Fournier J
631 (2016). [Unexpected movements of male Bluethroats *Luscinia svecica namnetum* during the breeding period]
632 Déplacements inattendus chez des mâles de Gorgebleue à miroir blanc *Luscinia svecica namnetum* en période de
633 nidification. *Alauda* 84:195-202.
634
635 Hóðar JA (1996). The use of regression equation for estimations of arthropod biomass in ecological studies. *Acta*
636 *Oecol* 17:421-433.
637
638 Hutto RL (2000). On the importance of en route periods to the conservation of migratory landbirds. *Studies in*
639 *Avian Biology* 20:109-114.
640
641 Jacobs J (1974). Quantitative measurement of food selection: a modification of the forage ratio and Ivlevs'
642 selectivity index. *Oecologia* 14:413-417.
643
644 Lindström C, Hasselquist D, Bensch S, Grahn M (1990). Asymmetric contests over resources for survival and
645 migration. A field experiment with Bluethroats. *Animal Behav* 40:453–461.
646
647 Millennium Ecosystem Assessment (MA) (2005). *Ecosystems and human well-being: Wetlands and Water*
648 *synthesis*. Washington, DC: World Resources Institute
649
650 Mohr CO (1947). Table of equivalent populations of North American small mammals. *Am Midl Nat* 37:223-
651 249.
652
653 Moore FR, Mabey S, Woodrey M (2003). Priority access to food in migratory birds: age, sex and motivational
654 asymmetries. In: Berthold P, Gwinner E, Sonnenschein E (eds). *Avian migration*. Springer-Verlag Heidelberg,
655 Berlin, pp. 281–291
656
657 Musseau R, Herrmann V, Kerbiriou C, Bénard S, Herault T, Kerbiriou E, Jiguet F (2014). Ecology of Aquatic
658 Warblers *Acrocephalus paludicola* in a fall stopover area on the Atlantic coast of France. *Acta Ornithol* 49:93-
659 105.
660
661 Musseau R, Beslic S, Kerbiriou C (2017). Importance of intertidal wetlands for the French coastal endemic
662 Bluethroat (*Cyanecula svecica namnetum*) and conservation implications in the context of global changes.
663 *Ardeola* 64:325-345.
664
665 Musseau R, Boutault L, Beslic S (2018). Rapid losses of intertidal salt marshes due to global change in the
666 Gironde estuary and conservation implications for marshland passerines. *J Coast Conserv* 22:443-451.
667
668 Newton I (2008). *The migration ecology of birds*. Academic Press, London. Peris S. J., Mendes
669
670 Newton I (2004). Population limitation in migrants. *Ibis* 146:197–226.
671
672 Orłowski G, Rusiecki S, Karg J (2014). Partial dietary segregation between adult and nestling Bluethroats
673 *Luscinia svecica*. *Acta Ornithol.* 49:107–118.
674
675 Pickering M, Wells N, Horsburgh K, Green J (2012). The impact of future sea-level rise on the European shelf
676 tides. *Cont Shelf Res* 35:1–15.
677
678 Piper WH (2011). Making habitat selection more “familiar”: a review. *Behav Ecol Sociobiol* 65:1329-1351.
679
680 Poulin B, Lefebvre G, Mauchamp A (2002). Habitat requirements of passerines and reedbed management in
681 southern France. *Biol Conserv* 107:315–325.
682

683 Provost P, Kerbirou K, Jiguet F (2010). Foraging range and habitat use by Aquatic Warblers *Acrocephalus*
684 *paludicola* during a fall migration stopover. *Acta Ornithol* 45:173–180.
685

686 Rappole JH, Warner DW (1976). Relationships between behavior, physiology and weather in avian transients at
687 a migration stopover site. *Oecologia* 26:193-212.
688

689 Saino N, Ambrosini R, Rubolini D, Harden-berg JV, Provenzale A, Huppop K, Huppop O, Lehikoinen A,
690 Lehikoinen E, Rainio K, Romano M, Sokolov L (2011). Climate warming, ecological mismatch at arrival and
691 population decline in migratory birds. *Proc R Soc Lond B* 278: 835-842
692

693 Salewski V, Kéry M, Herremans M, Liechti F, Jenni L (2009). Estimating fat and protein fuel from fat and
694 muscle scores in passerines. *Ibis* 151:640–653.
695

696 Salewski V, Schaub M (2007). Stopover duration of Palearctic passerine migrants in the Western Sahara;
697 independent of fat stores? *Ibis* 149:223–236.
698

699 Schaub M, Schwilch R, Jenni L (1999). Does tape-luring of migrating Eurasian Reed-Warblers increase number
700 of recruits or capture probability? *Auk* 116:1047–1053.
701

702 Tellería JL, de la Hera I, Pérez-Tris J (2013). Morphological variation as a tool for monitoring bird populations:
703 a review. *Ardeola* 60:191-224.
704

705 Tucker GM, Heath M (2004). *Birds in Europe: Population Estimates, Trends and Conservation Status*. BirdLife
706 International. Cambridge
707

708 von Behren CR (2007). Impact of agriculture and urban development on the community structure of wetland
709 birds in East Central Minnesota. Honors Projects. Paper 5
710

711 Whited D, Galatowitsch SM, Tester JR, Schik K, Lehtinen R, Husvethc J (2000). The importance of local and
712 regional factors in predicting effective conservation Planning strategies for wetland bird communities in
713 agricultural and urban landscapes. *Landscape Urban Plan* 49:49-65.
714

715 Yong W, Finch DM, Moore FR, Kelly JF (1998). Stopover ecology and habitat use of migratory Wilson's
716 Warblers. *Auk* 115:829–842.
717

718 Worton BJ (1989). Kernel methods for estimating the utilisation distribution in home range studies. *Ecology*
719 70:164-168.
720

721 Zanimetti JM (2005). *Statistique spatiale*. Ed Lavoisier
722

723 Zuur AF, Ieno EN, Walker N, Saveliev AA, Smith GM (2009). *Mixed Effects Models and Extensions in*
724 *Ecology with R*. Statistics for Biology and Health. Springer, New York, USA
725

726 cc

727 **Table 1:** Abbreviations for the different habitats available in Barthes de la Nive with its corresponding
728 percentage of cover in the study area.

729

Code	Area (ha)	Habitats
WAT	32.91	open water
PRB	19.35	pure reedbed <i>Phragmites australis</i> > 75%
MRB	11.89	reedbed mixture <i>Phragmites australis</i> (>25%) + <i>Carex sp</i>
WOR	14.63	wooded reedbed (wood < 50%)
WGR	21.37	wet grassland
MGR	64.04	mown grassland
CGR	10.79	mesophilic grassland
CRO	69.4	crop field
FER	0.84	fern
TAL	3.79	hydrophilous tall herb
WOL	171.5	wood land
PAT	12.05	natural path
HOU	7.64	house
RAW	1.54	railway

730

731

732

733

734 **Table 2:** Conditional average of estimates ($\beta_{cond.}$), adjusted SE ($SE_{adj.}$) and *P-value* for the variables included in
735 the model set for daily and global home ranges (K50 & K95), (-) indicated a variable unselected. Abbreviations:
736 crop field (CRO), mesophilic grassland (CGR), mown grassland (MGR), natural path (PAT), pure reedbed
737 (PRB), open water (WAT), wet grassland (WGR), wood land (WOL), stopover duration (SOD), fuel loads
738 (FUEL).
739

Home range	50 % kernel			95% kernel		
	$\beta_{cond.}$	$SE_{adj.}$	<i>P-value</i>	$\beta_{cond.}$	$SE_{adj.}$	<i>P-value</i>
<i>Global home range</i>						
CGR	0.485	0.151	0.001	-	-	-
PRB	-0.362	0.208	0.081	-0.876	0.250	<0.001
WGR	0.404	0.163	0.008	0.683	0.278	0.014
WOL	0.325	0.162	0.045	0.694	0.224	0.002
FUEL	-	-	-	-0.664	0.210	0.002
SOD	0.337	0.182	0.061	0.895	0.289	<0.001
<i>Daily home range</i>						
CRO	-	-	-	-1.532	0.278	<0.001
MGR	0.8355	0.2645	0.002	1.509	0.286	<0.001
PAT	-	-	-	-1.883	0.365	<0.001
PRB	-1.3473	0.3181	<0.001	-2.027	0.585	<0.001
WAT	0.6355	0.2279	0.005	-	-	-
WGR	-	-	-	0.683	0.269	0.014
WOL	0.6010	0.2229	0.007	-	-	-

740
741

742 **Table 3:** Percentage of each arthropod group in the faecal samples of 105 Bluethroats, occurrence frequency,
 743 proportion of total biomass and factors influencing the relative prey abundance (age: yearlings vs adults; sex and
 744 day). The number of prey items are given between brackets. "--" indicates no data available.
 745

Order	Family	Abundance %	Occurrence %	Biomass %	Age effect		Sex effect		Day effect	
					z	p	z	p	z	p
Hymenoptera	Formicidae	45.48 (196)	54.29	8.34	0.998	0.318	-1.218	0.223	0.868	0.386
Arachnida	Araneidae	20.42 (88)	53.33	14.92	-0.986	0.324	0.373	0.709	-1.326	0.185
Coleoptera		10.21 (44)	31.43	64.70	-0.466	0.641	0.385	0.700	-0.614	0.539
Diptera		7.42 (36)	28.57	2.39	-0.010	0.992	0.462	0.644	0.281	0.779
Hymenoptera	non Formicidae	4.41 (19)	15.24	4.73	-0.193	0.847	0.803	0.422	-0.705	0.481
Hemiptera	Cicadellidae	3.25 (14)	13.33	2.45	-1.388	0.165	0.549	0.583	-1.993	0.046
Crustacea		3.32 (10)	9.52	2.48	0.008	0.993	-0.872	0.383	-0.772	0.440
Gastropoda		1.62 (7)	5.71	--						
Lepidoptera		1.62 (7)	6.67	--						
Neuroptera	Myrmeleontidae	1.16 (5)	3.81	--						
Arachnida	Acarina	0.93 (4)	3.81	--						
Heteroptera		0.7 (3)	2.86	--						
Malacostraca		0.23 (1)	0.95	--						
Amphipoda		0.23 (1)	0.95	--						
Odonata		0.23 (1)	0.95	--						


746
 747
 748 **Table 4:** Abundance and biomass (mean \pm SE) of the most consumed invertebrates by Bluethroats in corn crops
 749 (Crop), Villefranque reedbed (Rv) and Urdains reedbed (Ru), which were trapped in pitfall and coloured bowls.
 750 Numbers in bold indicate the site for which the abundance or biomass was significantly higher than one of the
 751 other sites (site shown after a slash symbol) or the other two sites. . Two hyphens represent no data available.
 752

Order	Family	Trap	Abundance			Biomass (mg)		
			Crop	Ru	Rv	Crop	Ru	Rv
Hymenoptera	Formicidae	pitfall	0.2 \pm 0.1	1.1 \pm 0.3	0.2 \pm 0.1	0.04 \pm 0.02	0.6 \pm 0.2 /Crop	0.2 \pm 0.1
		bowl	0.3 \pm 0.1	--	0.6 \pm 0.2	0.03 \pm 0.02	0 \pm 0	0.2 \pm 0.1
Arachnida	Araneidae	pitfall	3.5 \pm 1	0.8 \pm 0.3	1.3 \pm 0.4	7.5 \pm 2	2.5 \pm 1	4.8 \pm 2.3
		bowl	1.9 \pm 0.4	1.2 \pm 0.5	2 \pm 0.6	3.4 \pm 0.8	5.9 \pm 2.9	9.4 \pm 3.7
Coleoptera		pitfall	52.8 \pm 12.2	0.1 \pm 0.1	2.1 \pm 0.5	2006.9 \pm 449.1	1.9 \pm 1.8	12.4 \pm 4.2
		bowl	5.5 \pm 1.4	0.7 \pm 0.3	3.8 \pm 1.1	49.2 \pm 40.7	0.9 \pm 0.6	8.2 \pm 3.7
Diptera		pitfall	10.3 \pm 5.1	0.3 \pm 0.2	1.1 \pm 0.3	17.9 \pm 7.1	0.8 \pm 0.8	1.1 \pm 0.5
		bowl	24.5 \pm 6	1.4 \pm 0.5	12.3 \pm 2.5	42.2 \pm 8.8	1.8 \pm 0.7	24.1 \pm 5
Hymenoptera	not Formicidae	pitfall	0.9 \pm 0.3	0.2 \pm 0.1	1.4 \pm 0.5 /Ru	0.7 \pm 0.3	0.1 \pm 0.1	2.7 \pm 1.3
		bowl	4.5 \pm 1	0.6 \pm 0.4	8.9 \pm 1.6	14.4 \pm 4.5	1.2 \pm 1.1	43.6 \pm 8.2
Hemiptera	Cicadellidae	pitfall	0.3 \pm 0.1	--	0.1 \pm 0.1	0.2 \pm 0.2	0 \pm 0	0 \pm 0
		bowl	2.7 \pm 0.7	0.1 \pm 0.1	0.7 \pm 0.3	4 \pm 1.9 /Ru	0 \pm 0	0.8 \pm 0.4

753
 754


755
756

Fig. 1. Relationship between size-corrected fuel loads and stopover duration in Barthes de la Nive, n=29.




757
758
759
760
761

Fig. 2. Variation in stopover duration between bluethroats that used corn crops and birds that did not in Barthes de la Nive, mean \pm SE.




762

763 **Fig. 3.** Proportion (mean \pm SE) of positions occurring in each habitat type of Barthes de la Nive for all
 764 Bluethroats, those staying one day and those staying more than one day. Abbreviations as in Table 1. The
 765 number of individual home ranges in which each habitat type was found is shown between brackets.
 766



767
 768
 769
 770
 771
 772
 773

Fig. 4. Jacobs index values for each habitat in the Bluethroats radiotracked in Barthes de la Nive. Values below 0 represent habitat rejection, while values above 0 represent positive selection.



774
 775
 776
 777
 778

