

<https://helda.helsinki.fi>

Changes in wetland habitat use by waterbirds wintering in Czechia are related to diet and distribution changes

Musilova, Zuzana

2022-02

Musilova , Z , Musil , P , Zouhar , J , Senkyrova , A , Pavon-Jordan , D & Nummi , P 2022 , ' Changes in wetland habitat use by waterbirds wintering in Czechia are related to diet and distribution changes ' , Freshwater Biology , vol. 67 , no. 2 , pp. 309-324 . <https://doi.org/10.1111/fwb.13842>

<http://hdl.handle.net/10138/350542>

<https://doi.org/10.1111/fwb.13842>

acceptedVersion

Downloaded from Helda, University of Helsinki institutional repository.

This is an electronic reprint of the original article.

This reprint may differ from the original in pagination and typographic detail.

Please cite the original version.

Changes in wetland habitat use by waterbirds wintering in Czechia are related to diet and distribution changes

Zuzana Musilová¹  | Petr Musil¹  | Jan Zouhar^{1,2}  | Adéla Šenkýřová¹  |
Diego Pavón-Jordán³  | Petri Nummi⁴ 

¹Faculty of Environmental Sciences, Czech University of Life Sciences Prague, Prague, Czechia

²Department of Econometrics, Prague University of Economics and Business, Prague 3—Žižkov, Czechia

³Department of Terrestrial Ecology, Norwegian Institute for Nature Research (NINA), Trondheim, Norway

⁴Department of Forest Sciences, University of Helsinki, Helsinki, Finland

Correspondence

Zuzana Musilová, Faculty of Environmental Sciences, Czech University of Life Sciences Prague, Kamýcká 129, Praha Suchbát, Prague CZ-165 21, Czechia.
Email: musilovaz@fzp.czu.cz

Funding information

Technology Agency of the Czech Republic; Internal Grant Agency of FES CULS; EEA Grants/Norway Grants

Abstract

1. Understanding species habitat use and factors affecting changes in their distributions are necessary to promote the conservation of any biological community. We evaluated the changes in wetland use of the non-breeding waterbird community. Based on long-term citizen-science data (1988–2020), we tested the hypotheses that wetland use is associated with species diet and potential range-shift drivers (the tendency to occupy the same sites in consecutive years—site affinity—and the species' average temperature across its wintering range—species temperature index).
2. We analysed species-specific wetland use of 25 species of waterbirds wintering in Czechia over a period of 33 years. The analyses explained variability in trends in numbers of the studied waterbird species across four inland wetland types: reservoirs; fishponds; industrial waters created by flooding of former mining sites; and running waters.
3. Trends in waterbird abundance positively correlated with species' diet on fishponds, industrial and running waters. Among the diet groups, invertivores showed the largest increase in abundances on industrial waters, closely followed by herbivores. Herbivores showed the largest increase in abundances in fishponds, and piscivores did so in running waters. Regarding range-shift drivers, species with higher site affinity showed higher abundances on running waters, while species with low species temperature index (i.e. wintering on average in sites with lower temperature) were more abundant on reservoirs. The abundance of both warm-dwelling and species with low site affinity increased on fishponds and industrial waters.
4. Our findings suggest that the increased importance of the wetland types considered here for wintering waterbirds is likely to be linked to diet related changes in habitat use and changes in species distributions; and highlight that wintering waterbirds are expected to select sites with higher availability of food, higher energy content, and lower foraging cost.
5. Recent and rapid changes in species distributions may lead to a decrease in the effectiveness of national and international conservation efforts. When planning

conservation measures, it should be kept in mind that climate change does not only imply large-scale north/north-eastwards shifts of entire waterbird distributions, but can also modify the use of the habitats by waterbird species inside their traditional wintering range.

KEYWORDS

artificial wetlands, long-term monitoring, range-shift drivers, waterbirds, wetland type

1 | INTRODUCTION

Acquiring information regarding habitat use of different species (including temporal changes) is crucial for proposing effective conservation measures (Angert et al., 2011; Davis et al., 2014; Dawson et al., 2011; Pullin, 2002). Such information is especially relevant in the context of ongoing climate-driven changes in species distributions (Chen et al., 2011; Maclean et al., 2008; Pavón-Jordán et al., 2019; Podhrázký et al., 2017).

The non-breeding distribution and habitat use of many waterbirds have changed considerably during recent decades, with new important wintering areas being established in northern and eastern Europe (Lehikoinen et al., 2013; Nuijten et al., 2020). This phenomenon has been linked to climate-driven range changes and redistribution of abundances (Maclean et al., 2008; Musilová et al., 2018a; Nilsson, 2008; Pavón-Jordán et al., 2015, 2019; Thomas et al., 2012).

In addition to using newly available northern coastal areas around the Baltic Sea (Lehikoinen et al., 2013), many wintering waterbirds are progressively using inland waters in east and central Europe to a greater extent when compared to the 1990s (Musilová et al., 2018a; see also Guillemain & Hearn, 2017; Pavón-Jordán et al., 2020). Climate warming is shifting the zero-degree isotherm (i.e. average aerial temperature of 0°C in January) and thus increasing also the availability of free-ice inland freshwater wetlands in this region (Musilová et al., 2018a; Pavón-Jordán et al., 2015, 2019). Some species are rapidly responding to this phenomenon and increasingly using the newly available wetlands in central and east Europe by altering their migratory behaviour (Adam et al., 2015; Beekman et al., 2019; Gunnarsson et al., 2012; Podhrázký et al., 2017; Sauter et al., 2010; Švažas et al., 2001). This has several advantages such as lowering the high mortality risk and energetic cost of a long migration (Newton, 2007) as well as reducing energy expenditure for thermoregulation in regions that were formerly hostile during winter (Dalby et al., 2013; Musil et al., 2008; Ridgill & Fox, 1990).

Although the most important wintering requirements of food resources and safety from predation are relatively well known (Guillemain et al., 2000, 2002; Schummer et al., 2010; Snow & Perrins, 1998), long-term studies revealing the drivers of inland wetland use by waterbirds are absent in the literature, especially in the context of climate-driven changes in distributions. Food supply

and availability of ice-free, open water in the wintering grounds are likely to be the most important limiting factors (Lewis et al., 2019; Newton, 1998, 2013) shaping waterbirds wintering distribution (Dalby et al., 2013; Guillemain et al., 2015), followed by predation and air temperature (thermoregulation) (Adam et al., 2015; Maclean et al., 2008; Ridgill & Fox, 1990). Hence, temperature alone does not simply explain the distribution pattern of wintering waterbirds (Dalby et al., 2013). The competition for food is likely to increase during winter, when individuals from low density breeding sites in the vast boreal and tundra areas in Fennoscandia and Russia congregate in their common wintering grounds further down the flyway (Brochet et al., 2012; Guillemain et al., 2002). This behaviour thus presents an ideal opportunity to investigate how resource availability and competition for food and space drive habitat use by waterbirds during the wintering season.

In our study, we evaluate species-specific changes in the use of four different wetland types. We hypothesise that the habitat use of species among the investigated wetland types is driven by the species diet and that wetland types differ in their food supply (Čížková et al., 2013; Kameníková & Rajchard, 2013; Kloskowski et al., 2009; Lewis et al., 2019). We expect a different speed of change in the use of fishponds by the different diet groups, because this particular type of wetland is characterised by high density of stocked fish. Thus, we expect a shift of invertivores from fishponds to other wetland types due to competition for invertebrates with a high density of fish (especially common carp *Cyprinus carpio*). By contrast, fishponds constitute a food-rich habitat for piscivorous species (Musil, 2006; Nummi et al., 2016).

We also defined two species-specific determinants to outline the distribution of species regarding the four wetland types (later named range shift drivers): (1) a species' site affinity (the tendency to occupy the same sites in consecutive years); and (2) the species temperature index (STI) as a measure of the species thermal affinity (warm-dwelling or cold-dwelling species; see description below. See also Devictor et al., 2008; Jiguet et al., 2007). Based on these two species-specific traits and current climate warming (Hurrell & Deser, 2009), we predict increasing wintering abundances of species with low site affinity (i.e. species that show low site fidelity and thus show greater potential to change wintering sites) as well as species with high STI (i.e. with high average winter temperature across its wintering distribution) as the winter weather conditions become

more favourable for them to expand towards these previously unsuitable regions; see e.g. Gaget et al., 2021.

2 | METHODS

2.1 | Study region

The study region covers the Czech Republic, which lies in central Europe. In total, 1,169 monitored sites were classified according to the four wetland types considered: 68 reservoirs; 443 fishponds; 108 industrial waters; and 550 running waters (Figure 1).

Note that there are only a few small natural glacial lakes in the study region (Chytil et al., 1999; Tucker & Evans, 1997), which are located in mountains; these are usually frozen in winter and are therefore not included in the monitoring scheme. Thus, the four types included in the analysis essentially cover all wetland sites available for wintering waterbirds (see Chytil et al., 1999; Musil et al., 2001). The set of available sites in the study region remained unchanged throughout the whole study period (Figure 2); all major changes in water bodies brought about by human activity in the study region had occurred before 1988, the beginning of the study period.

2.2 | Waterbird monitoring data

Site-specific count data of waterbird abundances (in total 492,297 observations) were obtained from the results of the International Waterbird Census (IWC) in the Czech Republic between 1988 and 2020. IWC is a worldwide citizen-science census with a standardised methodology (see further details in Delany, 2005, 2010) managed by the national coordinator in each country and globally coordinated by Wetlands International (www.wetlands.org). Censuses are carried out in mid-January each winter because it is generally the coldest period of winter when the effect of food resources on waterbird distribution is considered most apparent due to limited site availability (Wetlands International, 2006, 2021).

Waterbird counts were performed on a site during a day according to a complete and predefined list of species on predetermined dates and sites with the aim to maximise synchrony in the following years (Gilissen et al., 2002). Census participants also recorded zero counts of individual species as well as zero counts of all species on a site. About 350 experienced volunteer birdwatchers contributed annually to the monitoring in Czechia. The most important element of IWC methodology is standardisation: it requires a single count at each site each winter, optimally conducted by the same person in consecutive winters in order to make the comparisons between




FIGURE 1 Distribution of monitored wetland sites in the Czech Republic between 1988 and 2020




FIGURE 2 Proportion of monitored sites by wetland type and year. Transparent horizontal lines show the proportion of the given wetland type among all 1,169 monitored sites. IWC, International Waterbird Census

years straightforward and valid. Each site (up to a few km² of standing water or a few km of a course of running water) established on the list of sites was defined by boundaries (such as bridges, weirs or dam on rivers and streams) known by the census participants. Observers used a telescope or binoculars from the shoreline to look for flocks and/or individuals of waterbirds, usually moving from one observation site to another by foot. Running waters were monitored using line transects along the shore. The number of census participants per site (one, two, or a group) and the duration of survey were designated according to bird abundance on each site, species and size of the water surface area, and weather (Bibby et al., 2007; Sutherland et al., 2004). The counts at dawn were recommended for geese. Observations taken under extreme weather conditions (fog, rain, snow fall, strong wind) categorised as *strong effect* by the observer and incomplete observations were excluded from the dataset prior to the analysis.

A repeated scanning of the flocks and shoreline observations were used to increase the detectability of counted species. Census records were submitted to the national coordinator, who compiles the submitted records and checks their validity using the participants' feedback if necessary. The quality of the IWC data has been verified in recently published studies (e.g. Amano et al., 2018; Fox et al., 2010; Gaget et al., 2020; Lehikoinen et al., 2013; Musilová et al., 2018a, 2018b; Pavón-Jordán et al., 2019, 2020). Monitoring methodology did not change over the study period.

The IWC targets all waterbirds, a group ecologically dependent on wetlands (Delany, 2010), i.e. swans, geese, ducks, grebes, cormorants, herons, rallids, waders, and gulls. However, in this study, we only include 25 the most common wintering waterbird species, namely those exceeding 50 individuals in Czechia annually (see also Musil et al., 2011; Musilová et al., 2014; see Table 1 for an overview of the species). We followed Gill and Donsker (2018) for the species taxonomy.

2.3 | Wetland types

The wetland types included in this study differ with regard to their origin, age, and management practices (Chytil et al., 1999). *Fishponds* represent shallow water bodies with a small stream or canal for water inflow. As commercial subjects aimed at stocking and production of fish (mostly carp), fishponds were formed in the Middle Ages (mostly in the 16th century), have artificially managed water levels, chemistry, and nutrient input. *Reservoirs* have been built more recently (after 1900) and represent deep waterbodies with inflow from larger rivers (compared to fishponds). The fish stock in reservoirs are not managed for the purpose of commercial fisheries but rather managed by angling associations (recreation). The most recent wetland type are *industrial waters*, which were created by flooding of former mining, sand-pit, or gravel-pit areas, or are sedimentary pools built in industrial areas since the 1960s (Hrdinka, 2007). Among all standing water wetland types described above, there is a gradient of decreasing probability of complete ice-cover in winter with increasing depth: from fishponds (the shallowest) to industrial waters and finally to reservoirs (the deepest). High-density fish stocks are most intensively managed in fishponds, followed by reservoirs and the least managed in industrial waters (Musil, 2006; Oertli et al., 2005; UNEP, 2017).

The trophic state of the wetland types ranges from oligotrophic waters (a low nutrient content), through mesotrophic and eutrophic waters to hypereutrophic waters, which present an extremely high nutrient content (Carlson, 1977). Among the four monitored wetland types, running waters contain the lowest content of nutrients, and fishponds are mostly eutrophic, sometimes hypertrophic (Chytil et al., 1999; Čížková et al., 2013; Musil, 2006; Seiche et al., 2012). The distribution of the monitored sites is shown in Figure 1.

TABLE 1 List of investigated species and its species-specific variables (diet, species temperature index and site affinity)

Species		Diet	Species temperature index	Site affinity
Mute swan	<i>Cygnus olor</i>	Herbivore	1.27	0.771
Tundra bean goose	<i>Anser serrirostris</i>	Herbivore	-2.51	0.139
White-fronted goose	<i>Anser albifrons</i>	Herbivore	2.53	0.462
Greylag goose	<i>Anser anser</i>	Herbivore	4.47	0.516
Eurasian wigeon	<i>Mareca penelope</i>	Herbivore	16.53	0.468
Gadwall	<i>Mareca strepera</i>	Herbivore	11.73	0.468
Eurasian teal	<i>Anas crecca</i>	Omnivore	12.72	0.572
Mallard	<i>Anas platyrhynchos</i>	Omnivore	-0.02	0.747
Northern pintail	<i>Anas acuta</i>	Omnivore	16.9	0.412
Common pochard	<i>Aythya ferina</i>	Omnivore	11.34	0.576
Tufted duck	<i>Aythya fuligula</i>	Invertivore	10.45	0.816
Greater scaup	<i>Aythya marila</i>	Invertivore	0.43	0.487
Velvet scoter	<i>Melanitta fusca</i>	Invertivore	0.69	0.366
Common goldeneye	<i>Bucephala clangula</i>	Invertivore	-1.11	0.627
Smew	<i>Mergellus albellus</i>	Piscivore	-1.58	0.515
Common merganser	<i>Mergus merganser</i>	Piscivore	-0.50	0.643
Little grebe	<i>Tachybaptus ruficollis</i>	Invertivore	3.54	0.689
Great crested grebe	<i>Podiceps cristatus</i>	Piscivore	3.70	0.486
Great cormorant	<i>Phalacrocorax carbo</i>	Piscivore	3.25	0.612
Great egret	<i>Ardea alba</i>	Piscivore	5.41	0.543
Grey heron	<i>Ardea cinerea</i>	Piscivore	4.32	0.757
Common moorhen	<i>Gallinula chloropus</i>	Omnivore	5.61	0.775
Eurasian coot	<i>Fulica atra</i>	Omnivore	5.86	0.758
Black-headed Gull	<i>Chroicocephalus ridibundus</i>	Omnivore	6.58	0.691
Mew gull	<i>Larus canus</i>	Omnivore	1.62	0.294

Note: *Species temperature index*: the long-term average January temperature (1950–2000) experienced by individuals of any given species across the species' entire wintering distribution (Devictor et al., 2008; Jiguet et al., 2007). *Site affinity*: a measure of year-to-year variation in geographical distribution of the species across the study region. The measure is bounded between 0 and 1, with the actual range of values being 0.14–0.82 in our data set. See species-specific variables in methods for details.

2.4 | Species-specific variables

All 25 investigated waterbird species were described by the following three species-specific variables (*diet*, *STI*, and *site affinity*), which could explain the temporal pattern in the wetland type use.

- (i) All species were classified into *diet* groups based on their preferred food items in the wintering season: piscivorous; invertivorous; omnivorous; and herbivorous (based on data and diet classification in Kear, 2005; Snow & Perrins, 1998; Šťastný & Hudec, 2016).
- (ii) The *STI* (see Devictor et al., 2008; Jiguet et al., 2007 for details of *STI* calculation) reflects the long-term average January temperature (1950–2000) experienced by individuals of any given

species across the species' entire wintering distribution. Species distribution maps were downloaded from BirdLife International and HBW (2017) and all temperature data from the regions included in each species' wintering range (above) were downloaded from www.worldclim.org. For each species, all grid cells (5 × 5 degrees) with temperature data within a species' wintering range (BirdLife International & HBW, 2017) were downloaded and averaged.

- (iii) For each species, we calculated a measure of year-to-year variation in geographical distribution of the species across the study region (called *site affinity*). Thus, the species' fidelity to the wintering sites constitutes the basis of the covariate *site affinity*, which is bounded between 0 and 1, with the actual range of values being 0.14–0.82 in our data set. Values close to 1 indicate

TABLE 2 Changes in abundances of individual species in four wetland types (the overall area is also included)

Species	Reservoirs (overall slope \pm SE)		Fishponds (overall slope \pm SE)		Industrial waters (overall slope \pm SE)		Running waters (overall slope \pm SE)		All wetlands (overall slope \pm SE)		Difference in wetl. types trends (Wald test)	
	Trend		Trend		Trend		Trend		Trend		Trend	
Mute swan	0.04 \pm 0.01	MI**	-0.01 \pm 0.00	S	0.03 \pm 0.01	S	MI*	-0.04 \pm 0.00	MD**	-0.03 \pm 0.00	MD**	200.65***
Tundra bean goose	0.01 \pm 62.66	U	0.09 \pm 0.11	U	-0.06 \pm 0.05	U	U	-0.04 \pm 0.02	MD*	0.02 \pm 0.02	S	0.00 ns.
White-fronted goose	0.20 \pm 4.75	U	0.24 \pm 0.51	U	0.23 \pm 0.05	U	SI**	0.08 \pm 0.02	MI**	0.16 \pm 0.02	SI**	676.92***
Greylag goose	0.16 \pm 0.44	U	0.19 \pm 0.06	SI*	0.09 \pm 0.03	SI*	MI**	0.01 \pm 0.01	S	0.13 \pm 0.00	SI**	334.18***
Eurasian wigeon	0.07 \pm 0.07	U	0.14 \pm 0.09	U	0.16 \pm 0.03	U	SI**	0.02 \pm 0.018	MI**	0.07 \pm 0.01	SI**	170.32***
Gadwall	0.20 \pm 0.11	U	0.15 \pm 0.04	SI*	0.28 \pm 0.21	U	SI**	0.13 \pm 0.02	SI**	0.16 \pm 0.02	SI**	320.61***
Eurasian teal	0.00 \pm 0.03	U	0.01 \pm 0.01	S	0.07 \pm 0.02	S	MI**	-0.01 \pm 0.01	MD*	0.00 \pm 0.00	S	2.24 ns.
Mallard	0.01 \pm 0.01	S	0.01 \pm 0.00	MI**	-0.04 \pm 0.01	MD**	MD**	-0.01 \pm 0.00	S	0.00 \pm 0.00	S	2.23 ns.
Northern pintail	0.06 \pm 0.07	U	0.11 \pm 0.16	U	0.03 \pm 0.04	U	U	-0.01 \pm 0.02	S	0.04 \pm 0.01	MI*	19.85***
Common pochard	0.03 \pm 0.07	U	-0.08 \pm 0.01	SD*	0.11 \pm 0.027	SD*	SI**	-0.14 \pm 0.02	SD**	-0.05 \pm 0.00	MD**	284.35***
Tufted duck	0.11 \pm 0.03	SI*	0.00 \pm 0.01	S	0.10 \pm 0.02	S	SI**	-0.03 \pm 0.00	MD**	0.01 \pm 0.00	MI*	4.10*
Greater scaup	0.17 \pm 0.13	U	0.01 \pm 0.09	U	0.13 \pm 0.08	U	U	-0.03 \pm 0.03	U	0.06 \pm 0.02	MI**	33.99***
Velvet scoter	0.11 \pm 0.09	U	-	U	0.07 \pm 0.05	U	U	-0.10 \pm 0.20	U	0.06 \pm 0.02	MI**	31.97***
Common goldeneye	0.09 \pm 0.02	SI**	0.05 \pm 0.02	MI**	0.11 \pm 0.02	MI**	SI**	-0.01 \pm 0.00	MD*	0.05 \pm 0.00	MI**	203.16***
Smew	0.05 \pm 0.07	U	0.03 \pm 0.07	U	0.13 \pm 0.04	U	MI**	0.00 \pm 0.01	S	0.03 \pm 0.01	MI**	18.18***
Common merganser	0.03 \pm 0.01	MI**	0.07 \pm 0.01	SI*	0.07 \pm 0.01	MI**	MI**	0.02 \pm 0.00	MI**	0.03 \pm 0.00	MI**	151.26***
Little grebe	0.03 \pm 0.02	U	-0.03 \pm 0.02	MD*	0.01 \pm 0.02	MD*	S	0.01 \pm 0.00	MI**	0.01 \pm 0.00	MI**	40.12***
Great crested grebe	0.05 \pm 0.01	MI**	0.08 \pm 0.04	MI*	0.07 \pm 0.02	MI**	MI**	-0.03 \pm 0.01	MD*	0.05 \pm 0.01	MI**	133.15***
Great cormorant	0.04 \pm 0.01	MI**	0.08 \pm 0.01	SI*	0.08 \pm 0.01	SI*	SI*	0.04 \pm 0.00	MI**	0.05 \pm 0.00	MI**	296.69***
Great egret	0.22 \pm 0.23	U	0.14 \pm 0.01	SI**	0.19 \pm 0.03	SI**	SI**	0.11 \pm 0.01	SI**	0.14 \pm 0.01	SI**	795.25***
Grey heron	-0.02 \pm 0.01	MD**	0.03 \pm 0.00	MI**	0.02 \pm 0.01	MI**	S	-0.01 \pm 0.00	MD*	0.01 \pm 0.00	MI**	13.81***
Common moorhen	0.02 \pm 0.04	U	0.02 \pm 0.01	MI*	0.05 \pm 0.02	MI*	MI*	-0.01 \pm 0.01	S	0.00 \pm 0.00	S	7.22**
Eurasian coot	0.07 \pm 0.01	SI*	0.01 \pm 0.01	S	0.08 \pm 0.01	S	SI**	-0.07 \pm 0.00	SD**	-0.02 \pm 0.00	MD**	129.51***
Black-headed gull	0.07 \pm 0.04	U	-0.01 \pm 0.01	S	-0.06 \pm 0.01	S	MD**	-0.02 \pm 0.002	MD**	-0.01 \pm 0.00	MD**	19.73***
Mew gull	0.06 \pm 0.07	U	0.01 \pm 0.02	U	0.02 \pm 0.01	S	S	0.02 \pm 0.01	S	0.04 \pm 0.01	MI**	85.90***

Note: (i) * $p < 0.05$; ** $p < 0.01$; *** $p < 0.001$. (ii) Categories of trends: SI, strong increase; MI, moderate increase; S, stable; MD, moderate decrease; SD, strong decrease; U, uncertain.

that the same sites are occupied in successive years, and with the same intensity; values close to zero imply large year-to-year variation in the selection of wintering sites. These values are based on Earth mover's distance (see Kranstauber et al., 2017 for further details).

The pairwise correlation of continuous species-specific variables is 0.06, implying there is little collinearity (Hair et al., 1995; Rogerson, 2001). The values of species-specific variables are listed in Table 1.

2.5 | Statistical analysis

Our analyses proceeded in two stages, differing in the level of detail at which the count data were aggregated. In the first stage, we studied how trends in abundances of different species vary across wetland types. We first used a log-linear Poisson regression analysis to impute any missing waterbird count data from the long-term data series (in 1988–2020) using TRends and Indices for Monitoring data software (TRIM; Statistic Netherlands version 3.52, Pannekoek & Van Strien, 2005). Regression parameters were estimated using

TABLE 3 Results of a random-effects negative binomial regression explaining total abundances

	Reservoirs	Fishponds	Industrial	Running
Herbivores	−0.202 (0.866)	0.895 (1.227)	−0.635 (1.118)	0.370 (0.928)
Omnivores	Ref.	Ref.	Ref.	Ref.
Invertivores	−0.898 (0.731)	−1.996** (0.740)	0.282 (0.570)	0.113 (0.725)
Piscivores	−0.597 (0.746)	0.172 (1.138)	0.549 (1.059)	0.593 (0.978)
Site affinity (standardised)	0.206 (0.423)	0.627 (0.521)	0.360 (0.511)	1.290** (0.444)
STI (standardised)	−0.914* (0.370)	−0.248 (0.485)	−0.0483 (0.447)	−0.415 (0.352)
Year (base = 2020)	0.0557* (0.0270)	0.0147 (0.0218)	0.0232 (0.0199)	−0.0226 (0.0150)
Diet × year				
Herbivores × year	0.0220 (0.0357)	0.0967* (0.0377)	0.0882** (0.0280)	0.0456 (0.0298)
Invertivores × year	0.0155 (0.0327)	−0.0113 (0.0225)	0.0847* (0.0393)	0.000531 (0.0172)
Piscivorous × year	−0.00951 (0.0374)	0.0714* (0.0308)	0.0718** (0.0244)	0.0504* (0.0222)
Site affinity × year	0.000514 (0.0171)	−0.0204* (0.0103)	−0.0238* (0.0114)	0.00214 (0.0103)
STI × year	−0.000489 (0.0124)	0.0198* (0.00967)	0.0275** (0.0103)	0.00853 (0.00814)
Constant	6.448*** (0.624)	5.694*** (0.888)	5.765*** (0.921)	5.918*** (0.725)
log(α)	−0.0724 (0.121)	−0.0724 (0.121)	−0.0724 (0.121)	−0.0724 (0.121)
var(species random effect)	4.088*** (1.041)	4.088*** (1.041)	4.088*** (1.041)	4.088*** (1.041)
Observations	3,267	3,267	3,267	3,267
p(Different trends by diet)	0.63292	0.00002	0.00512	0.01802

Note: (i) The model specification contains the interactions of *wetland type* with all other covariates. To enhance readability, coefficients are presented in four columns, each related to one wetland type; moreover, the coefficients have been transformed to show the covariate effects on the given *wetland type*. (ii) Robust (Huber–White sandwich) standard errors in parentheses. (iii) * $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$, *** $p < 0.001$. STI, species temperature index

generalised estimating equations. Missing data were usually the result of incomplete coverage due to limited availability of observers in some years. The proportion of missing counts varied between 33% and 65% in the whole dataset, which is regarded as tolerable (Soldaat et al., 2017).

In this first stage, after imputing any missing data, we estimated the species-specific long-term trends in abundances (i.e. the change in abundance indices from one year to the next) at each of the four wetland types and assessed differences in these trends between the wetland types based on the rate of change: a strong increase or decrease ($\geq 5\%$ per year); a moderate increase or decrease ($< 5\%$ per year); a stable (trend was not significant and confidence intervals were sufficiently narrow) or an uncertain trend (see also Fouque et al., 2009; Musil et al., 2011; Musilová et al., 2018b). Then, a Wald test was used to assess the significance of differences in the trends in the four wetland types. Furthermore, we used wetland type and site as covariates in the linear trend models (see also Musilová et al., 2018b; Pavón-Jordán et al., 2015).

In the second stage, we studied the effect of species-specific variables on population trends at different wetland types. As in the first step in this species-level analysis (above), we also used TRIM to fill the gaps in the data due to incomplete monitoring coverage. For each species, we obtained the TRIM-imputed *total abundance* by year and wetland type, producing a dataset of 3,267 observations (25 species, 33 years, four wetland types). Velvet scoter (*Melanitta fusca*) was not recorded on fishponds and was therefore excluded from the analyses.

Next, we explained these total abundances estimated with TRIM and their trends with species-specific variables in a regression approach. As the time abundances exhibited substantial overdispersion, we used negative binomial regression rather than the canonical Poisson distribution. The fact that observations for a species are repeated across years and wetland types led us to include species as a random effect in the model, meaning we fitted a generalised linear mixed model. Moreover, to allow for: (1) heteroskedasticity both between and within species; and (2) arbitrary correlation within a species' values, we used a cluster-robust estimator of the standard errors in statistical inference, clustered at the species level (Cameron & Miller, 2015). To facilitate coefficient interpretation, all continuous variables were z-standardised (i.e. centred around the mean and divided by the standard deviation) prior to running the regressions.

For simplicity, our model specification assumes linear time trends in total abundances; we do nevertheless expect these trends to vary systematically with species-specific characteristics and across wetland types. Therefore, we included interactions of year and wetland types with all species-specific variables in our model. All regression models were estimated in Stata 16 (StataCorp, College Station, TX, U.S.A.).

3 | RESULTS

This study included 492,297 observations from 25 species in 1,169 wetlands between 1988 and 2020. The mean annual abundance for

four diet groups was: herbivores ($23,467 \pm 2,897$ SE); omnivores ($219,234 \pm 3,264$ SE); invertivores ($6,295 \pm 240$ SE); and piscivores ($15,136 \pm 933$ SE). The first stage of our analysis revealed significant differences in abundance trends between the four wetland types in 22 out of the 25 investigated species (Table 2). Prevailing decreasing (10 species) or stable trends (six species) were found in running waters while significant increasing trends in the abundance of 15 species were found in standing waters (reservoirs, fishponds, and industrial waters). The significant differences (according to results of Wald test) in species trends among analysed wetland types were found in five of six herbivore species, in six of eight omnivore species, in all five invertivore species, and in all six piscivore species. Increasing trend in abundances was found in all herbivores on reservoirs and in almost all species in industrial waters (Table 2).

The results from our generalised linear mixed model showed that species exhibiting higher site affinity (i.e. low year-to-year variation in geographical distribution of the species across the study region) recorded the highest total abundances on running waters (Table 3). Similarly, cold-dwelling species (identified by a lower value of average temperature across its wintering range—STI) were more abundant in reservoirs (Table 3).

The effects of the interaction terms between species-specific variables and year showed the extent at which the trends in abundances on different wetland types varied with species-specific variables. For instance, the coefficient on year in the reservoirs column ($\beta = 0.056$) implied that the predicted yearly increase in total abundances in an omnivorous species (i.e. the reference diet group) with average values of site affinity and STI is about 5.6%; the coefficient on herbivorous \times year ($\beta = 0.022$) indicated that for a herbivorous species with average values of site affinity and STI, the annual increase was larger by c. 2.2%, i.e. about 8% in total. The species' diet significantly affected the species trends on fishponds and industrial and running waters. In fishponds, herbivorous species showed the largest (positive) trend in total abundances (more than 11% per year at average values of site affinity and STI), followed closely by piscivores. In industrial waters, omnivores increased at the slowest pace by c. 7%–9% slower than the other three diet groups. In running waters, piscivores increased at the fastest rate during the 1990s and early 2000s, followed closely by herbivores (Figures 3–5). Warm-dwelling and species with low site affinity showed the largest trend on fishponds and industrial waters.

4 | DISCUSSION

To promote the protection of wetland birds, the knowledge of species habitat use and facilitation of species distribution changes should be considered the cornerstones for effective adaptive management (Musilová et al., 2018b; see also Pullin, 2002; Sutherland et al., 2004; Sinclair et al., 2006; Musilová et al., 2015; Holopainen et al., 2015; Gaget et al., 2020; Pavón-Jordán et al., 2020). This study contributes to the identification of these cornerstones by demonstrating diet-specific changes in habitat use, and of species with high




FIGURE 3 Yearly total abundances and their trends (obtained by LOESS smoothing) at individual wetland types, by diet group. This figure presents the underlying data on total abundances, along with trend curves obtained via scatterplot smoothing using LOESS

probability of range changes, based on long-term nonbreeding data of wintering waterbirds.

4.1 | Changes in habitat use in different diet groups

Generally, food supply is of high importance for waterbirds (Guillemain et al., 2015; Holopainen et al., 2015) due to its subsequent effect on breeding success, adult survival and also overall flyway population dynamics (Jørgensen et al., 2016; Newton, 1998, 2013). Use of feeding habitat is a hierarchical process, influencing the species geographical distribution and the choice of a particular wetland (Green, 1998). Here, we demonstrated long-term changes in wetland type use among diet groups in fishponds and industrial and running waters, but not in reservoirs. Increased use of industrial waters was found in invertivore species, which predominantly used running waters in the beginning of the study period and progressively switch to industrial waters. Invertebrate biomass, which provides the majority of the food of invertivores, tend to be highest

in early successional wetlands (Nummi & Holopainen, 2014; Petrie et al., 2016), such as industrial waters. Furthermore, heterogeneity in the physical characteristics of foraging areas can affect foraging behaviour (Fernández & Lank, 2008) and therefore affect the species habitat use. Consistent with this, diving ducks represent most of the invertivore species; they feed at greater depths during the non-breeding period (Hughes & Green in Kear, 2005) and industrial waters probably provide favourable depths for their foraging behaviour. Lower foraging costs (Wood, et al., 2013) in industrial waters compared to higher water velocities in running waters can make foraging more profitable for invertivores. The same effect could cause increased use of industrial waters in herbivores (almost in the same degree as in invertivores).

The a priori assumption of a low increase in abundances of invertivores in fishponds was confirmed. Invertebrates are fundamental to both terrestrial and aquatic food webs, and drastic decreases have been shown in terrestrial insects on a global level (Dirzo et al., 2014; Wagner et al., 2021). Long-term studies on aquatic invertebrates are currently scarce (Gozlan et al., 2019), but some indicate changes




FIGURE 4 Predicted total abundances at individual wetland types and for different diet groups at mean values of species temperature index and site affinity (based on the regression presented in Table 3)

in aquatic invertebrate community structure (Fried-Petersen et al., 2020; van der Lee et al., 2021; Pilotto et al., 2020) associated with increasing levels of eutrophication and brownification as one of the most important driver of these changes (Arzel et al., 2020; Jackson et al., 2016; Lind et al., 2018). Fishponds are commercial habitats with artificially managed nutrient input that increases the level of eutrophication (Roy et al., 2020) and are aimed at stocking and breeding fish (mostly carp). The artificial nutrient input has resulted in hypertrophy of fishponds, especially since World War II (Pechar, 2000; Seiche et al., 2012) and therefore these ponds exceeded the nutrient level of other wetland types in the study region. It has been shown that high stocks of carp in fishponds create an environment with extremely high competition for invertebrate food with invertivorous waterbird species during the breeding season (Musil, 2006; Musil et al., 2001). In this study, we show that this effect is also significant during the wintering season by a lower increase in the use of fishponds by invertivores.

Indeed, herbivores stood out as the most increasing diet group in fishponds, probably keeping outside the carp–waterbird food competition. The importance of artificial fishponds as alternative

sites for wintering herbivorous and omnivorous ducks was shown also in Doñana, Spain (Kloskowski et al., 2009). However, some species of the herbivorous group (geese, mute swan, and Eurasian wigeon) are not strictly feeding inside of wetlands like invertivores and piscivores and may feed both aquatically and terrestrially (Fox et al., 2005; Jacobsen & Ugelvik, 1994; Wood, et al., 2013). Therefore, the changes in wetland type use are less strongly related to wetland food supply in this group. In particular, due to the characteristics of the census protocol (dawn counts), variation in geese abundances is likely to be affected by this daily dynamic between the roosting and feeding sites. In the study region, geese have traditionally congregated in high numbers during winter and use reservoirs as a roosting sites and nearby fields as a dominant feeding sites, especially in south-Moravian lowland (Czech IWC data: <http://www.waterbirdmonitoring.cz/vysledky/iwc20/>). Conversely, other herbivorous species are counted during the daylight activities in the wetlands and thus do not include individuals that have left the wetlands (roosting sites) to forage in the fields. In addition, some waterbirds may often be feeding at different places during the night, such as omnivorous mallards in the Netherlands




FIGURE 5 Wetland type use according to diet and range shift determinants of the species

(Kleyheeg et al., 2017) and granivorous dabbling ducks feeding on rice fields in the Mediterranean (Brogi et al., 2015; Guillemain et al., 2010; Parejo et al., 2019). Nevertheless, this nocturnal behaviour is probably difficult to quantify (Tourenq et al., 2001) and any obvious suitable nocturnal feeding wetlands are not known from the study region.

On the species level, prevailing decreasing or stable trends in abundances were found in running waters, which represent the traditional wintering grounds in the study region (Adam et al., 2015; Musilová et al., 2015, 2018a). It is worth noting that running waters fulfil one of the most important habitat requirements for wintering waterbirds: to avoid unfavourable winter harshness and destructive winter extremes in the zero-degree-isotherm area (Musilová et al., 2015, 2018a). In recent decades, milder winter conditions in Central Europe (IPCC, 2014) probably provide an increased availability of new wintering areas, i.e. standing waters with reduced ice cover. Still, running waters remain as suitable wintering sites, as revealed in this study, especially for piscivores and herbivores. Recent climate and land use changes affect the fish assemblages, diversity, and distribution (Comte et al., 2013) as well as diversity and distribution of invertebrates (Haase et al., 2019) with predicted up- and downstream direction of shifts in the fish species in rivers (Radinger et al., 2017); hence,

the use of rivers by piscivores is probably in accordance with these changes in fish distribution.

4.2 | Wetland type use in species changing distribution

Generally, there is a trade-off between the cost and benefit of the wintering site use (Adam et al., 2015; Musilová et al., 2015; Ridgill & Fox, 1990). Importantly, there is a gradient among the four investigated wetland types in the level of the winter harshness risk, i.e. the sensitivity to cold weather and freezing (running waters considered the most stable compared to standing waters, see above), in the level of habitat change risk (fishponds considered the most artificially affected), in the level of succession in freshwater communities (industrial waters considered as an early successional stages), and trophic status (the highest nutrient content in fishponds); see the methods for details.

The nature of these differences reflected the use of wetland types in species with more or less probable range shifts and/or distribution changes. Species with high site affinity (i.e. species with low year-to-year variation in geographical distribution across the study region) revealed higher use of running waters. Higher

stability in cold and extreme weather conditions, low level of habitat change risk caused by possible management of running waters are likely to be important for these species with lower probability of range changes. However, saturation of traditional wintering grounds was suggested to occur in the Czech Republic (Musilová et al., 2015), which could increase the competition for resources (Newton, 1998, 2013). In addition, higher water velocities in running waters compared to standing waters increase the foraging costs (Wood, et al., 2013).

Furthermore, our study indicates the high importance of man-made standing wetlands (fishponds and industrial waters) for species more likely to undergo range shifts, i.e. species with low site affinity and warm-dwelling (higher average temperature across its wintering range—high STI) species. Wintering waterbird populations are clearly changing their distribution (Lehikoinen et al., 2013; Musilová et al., 2018a; Pavón-Jordán et al., 2015, 2019, 2020). These distribution changes could be associated with changes in ice cover, food availability, habitat, and hunting pressure (Dalby et al., 2013; Guillemain et al., 2015; Newton, 2013; Pavón-Jordán et al., 2020; this study). Species with low site affinity increase the use of these newly available wetlands that are also considered less stable as wintering sites (higher winter harshness and habitat change risk, higher trophy in fishponds and lower succession in industrial waters). It seems that species with low site affinity grasp the benefits of milder climate in recent decades (Hurrell & Deser, 2009) and responded by increasingly use these alternative wetlands. The tendency of species with low site affinity to annually change the wintering sites implies that they may be useful early-warning indicators of changing use of wintering sites (see also Green & Elmsberg, 2014).

The thermal affinity was determined as an important trait explaining the species distribution and range changes leading by climate change (Devictor et al., 2008; Gaget et al., 2020). The changes of nonbreeding distribution of waterbirds seems highly affected by climate warming (Gaget et al., 2018; Pavón-Jordán et al., 2015). Our study reveals the use of reservoirs by cold-dwelling species (mostly sea ducks), while reservoirs represent deeper water bodies with inflow from larger rivers and have the lowest probability of complete ice-cover in winter among standing waters. In the light of climate warming, related north-eastwards shifts of species distributions (Gaget et al., 2020; Lehikoinen et al., 2013; Pavón-Jordán et al., 2015, 2020), and consequent decline and even local extinction of cold-dwelling species caused by distribution change (Devictor et al., 2008; Gaget et al., 2020; Tayleur et al., 2016), we assume that reservoirs could serve as a refuges for cold-dwelling species in the near future. Larger stochasticity and frequency of extreme weather events are also predicted by most climate change scenarios and thus such deep and large wetlands with stable temperature conditions suitable for benthic invertebrates will provide the resources required by these species. However, the overall increase in abundances of cold-dwelling species in the study region indicate that this issue could be much complex, as temperature is not the only driver of species distribution changes (Dalby et al., 2013). Conversely, warm-dwelling species increase the use of both fishponds and industrial waters. The

availability of these shallower man-made wetlands may be likely to increase due to climate warming (Hurrell & Deser, 2009). The *wintering strategy* of warm-dwelling species is driven by the geographic avoidance of the zero-degree isotherm to reduce winter harshness risk (Gaget et al., 2020), therefore warm-dwelling species probably do not reflect the difference in wetland types in terms of winter harshness risk and increase the use of industrial waters and fishponds with higher winter harshness risk. Increasing our knowledge of the habitat use of warm-dwelling species is of high importance since they are more likely to expand in the coming decades (Devictor et al., 2008; Gaget et al., 2020; Tayleur et al., 2016). Indeed, we can expect increasing concern of farmers and fishermen followed by the distribution changes of the warm-dwelling species, while some of them are already conflict species such as greylag goose or herons.

5 | CONCLUSION

Our study highlights the general pattern that wintering waterbirds are expected to select sites with higher food availability (Chatterjee et al., 2020; Fox et al., 1995; Green, 1998; Green et al., 1999; Guillemain et al., 2000), higher energy content (van Eerden, 1984), and lower foraging cost (Wood, et al., 2013) to balance the costs and benefits of feeding site choice during wintering (Aharon-Rotman et al., 2016; Newton, 1998, 2013). The effort to meet these requirements resulted in a considerable change of the habitat use in the given species.

Understanding the role of habitat use in the context of changing distributions of different species is of high importance for conservation (see e.g. Janke et al., 2017), especially since the climate-driven range changes are already underway (e.g. Lehikoinen et al., 2013; Musilová et al., 2018a; Pavón-Jordán et al., 2015, 2019, 2020) and may lead to the decrease of effectiveness of the conservation efforts (Musilová et al., 2018b). Consistent with this view, increasing use of industrial waters and fishponds for warm-dwelling and species with low site affinity exhibiting more probable range shifts and/or distribution changes, and conversely use of reservoirs by cold-dwelling species and running waters by species with high site affinity indicates importance of individual wetland types as wintering grounds, which should be considered in future conservation planning and effective management. The development and implementation of measures to increase the suitability of existing modified habitats for wildlife appears essential to conserve biodiversity (Navedo et al., 2017; Sinclair et al., 2006). The implementation should be based on the core knowledge of the species habitat use and distribution changes (Musilová et al., 2018b). Climate-driven changes in species distributions should not necessarily have the north/eastwards direction (see e.g. Lehikoinen et al., 2013, 2016; Pavón-Jordán et al., 2015, 2020), but could also modify the use of habitats within species' current ranges.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We are indebted to all those who have volunteered in IWC counts as well as to the census IWC co-ordinators in the Czech Republic (i.e. Bohuslav Urbánek, Vladimír Fiala, Čestmír Folk, Josef Křen,

Ivana Kožená and Jitka Pellantová). We are also grateful to Carolyn Pimm for language improvements and Matyáš Adam for his help with the map. This study was supported by the project EHP-CZ02-OV-1-027-2015 entitled *The reduction of habitat fragmentation consequences in various types of landscape in the Czech Republic*, the project TH 04030185 of Technology Agency of the Czech Republic entitled *Identification of important wintering sites of waterbirds, with a focus on the presence of conflict species and in the context of site protection, habitat characteristics and climate change* and the project No. 20194209 of Internal Grant Agency of FES CULS entitled *Waterbirds as bioindicators of wetlands health: food specialisation determines the waterbird response to climatic and environmental changes*.

DATA AVAILABILITY STATEMENT

The data that support the findings of this study are available from the corresponding author upon reasonable request.

ORCID

Zuzana Musilová  <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5344-7445>

Petr Musil  <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8147-4336>

Jan Zouhar  <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1164-7948>

Adéla Šenkýřová  <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2848-2086>

Diego Pavón-Jordán  <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5105-3426>

Petri Nummi  <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1452-4633>

REFERENCES

- Adam, M., Musilová, Z., Musil, P., Zouhar, J., & Romportl, D. (2015). Long-term changes in habitat selection of wintering waterbirds: High importance of cold weather refuge sites. *Acta Ornithologica*, 50, 127–138. <https://doi.org/10.3161/00016454AO2015.50.2.001>
- Aharon-Rotman, Y., Buchanan, K. L., Clark, N. J., Klaassen, M., & Buttemer, W. A. (2016). Why fly the extra mile? Using stress biomarkers to assess wintering habitat quality in migratory shorebirds. *Oecologia*, 182, 385–395. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00442-016-3679-1>
- Amano, T., Székely, T., Sandel, B., Nagy, S., Mundkur, T., Langendoen, T., ... Sutherland, W. J. (2018). Successful conservation of global waterbird populations depends on effective governance. *Nature*, 553, 199–202. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nature25139>
- Angert, A. L., Crozier, L. G., Rissler, L. J., Gilman, S. E., Tewksbury, J. J., & Chunco, A. J. (2011). Do species' traits predict recent shifts at expanding range edges? *Ecology Letters*, 14, 677–689. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1461-0248.2011.01620.x>
- Arzel, C., Nummi, P., Arvola, L., Pöysä, H., Davranche, A., Rask, M., Olin, M., & Manninen-Johansen, S. (2020). Invertebrates are declining in boreal aquatic habitat: The effect of brownification? *Science of the Total Environment*, 724, 138199. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitoenv.2020.138199>
- Beekman, J., Koffijberg, K., Wahl, J., Kowallik, C., Hall, C., Devos, K., ... Rees, E. C. (2019). Long-term population trends and shifts in distribution of Bewick's Swans *Cygnus columbianus bewickii* wintering in northwest Europe. *Wildfowl, Special Issue*, 5, 73–102.
- Bibby, C. J., Burgess, N. D., & Hill, D. A. (2007). *Bird census techniques*. Academic Press.
- BirdLife International & HBW (2017). *Bird species distribution maps of the world*. Version 7.0. <http://datazone.birdlife.org/species/requestdis>
- Brochet, A.-L., Dessborn, L., Legagneux, P., Elmer, J., Gauthier-Clerc, M., Fritz, H., & Guillemain, M. (2012). Is diet segregation between dabbling ducks due to food partitioning? A review of seasonal patterns in the Western Palearctic. *Journal of Zoology*, 286, 171–178. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1469-7998.2011.00870.x>
- Brogi, A., Pernollet, C. A., Gauthier-Clerc, M., & Guillemain, M. (2015). Waterfowl foraging in winter-flooded ricefields: Any agronomic benefits for farmers? *Ambio*, 44, 793–802. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13280-015-0678-0>
- Cameron, A. C., & Miller, D. L. (2015). A practitioner's guide to cluster-robust inference. *Journal of Human Resources*, 50(2), 317–372. <https://doi.org/10.3368/jhr.50.2.317>
- Carlson, R. E. (1977). A trophic state index for lakes. *Limnology and Oceanography*, 22, 361–369.
- Chatterjee, A., Adhikari, S., Pal, S., & Mukhopadhyay, S. K. (2020). Foraging guild structure and niche characteristics of waterbirds wintering in selected sub-Himalayan wetlands of India. *Ecological Indicators*, 108, 105693. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolind.2019.105693>
- Chen, I.-C., Hill, J. K., Ohlemüller, R., Roy, D. B., & Thomas, C. D. (2011). Rapid range shifts of species associated with high levels of climate warming. *Science (New York, N.Y.)*, 333, 1024–1026. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1206432>
- J. Chytil, P. Hakrová, K. Hudec, J. Jandová, & J. Pellantová (Eds.) (1999). *Wetlands of the Czech Republic - Inventory of wetlands in the Czech Republic*. Czech Ramsar Committee.
- Čížková, H., Květ, J., Comín, F. A., Laiho, R., Pokorný, J., & Pithart, D. (2013). Actual state of European wetlands and their possible future in the context of global climate change. *Aquatic Sciences*, 75, 3–26. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00027-011-0233-4>
- Comte, L., Buisson, L., Daufresne, M., & Grenouillet, G. (2013). Climate-induced changes in the distribution of freshwater fish: Observed and predicted trends. *Freshwater Biology*, 58, 625–639. <https://doi.org/10.1111/fwb.12081>
- Dalby, L., Fox, A. D., Petersen, I. K., Delany, S., & Svenning, J.-C. (2013). Temperature does not dictate the wintering distributions of European dabbling duck species. *Ibis*, 155, 80–88. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1474-919X.2012.01257.x>
- Davis, J. B., Guillemain, M., Kaminski, R. M., Arzel, C., Eadie, J. M., & Rees, E. C. (2014). Habitat and resource use by waterfowl in the northern hemisphere in autumn and winter. *Wildfowl*, 4, 17–69.
- Dawson, T. P., Jackson, S. T., House, J. I., Prentice, I. C., & Mace, G. M. (2011). Beyond predictions: Biodiversity conservation in a changing climate. *Science*, 332, 53–58. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1200303>
- Delany, S. (2005). *Guidelines for national coordinators of the International Waterbird census*. Wetlands International.
- Delany, S. (2010). *Guidance on Waterbird monitoring methodology: Field protocol for waterbird counting*. Wetlands International.
- Devictor, V., Julliard, R., Couvet, D., & Jiguet, F. (2008). Birds are tracking climate warming, but not fast enough. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, 275, 2743–2748. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2008.0878>
- Dirzo, R., Young, H. S., Galetti, M., Ceballos, G., Isaac, N. J. B., & Collen, B. (2014). Defaunation in the Anthropocene. *Science*, 345, 401–406. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1251817>
- Fernández, G., & Lank, D. B. (2008). Foraging behaviour of non-breeding western sandpipers *Calidris mauri* as a function of sex, habitat and flocking. *Ibis*, 150, 518–526. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1474-919X.2008.00812.x>
- Fouque, C., Guillemain, M., & Schricke, V. (2009). Trends in the numbers of coot *Fulica atra* and wildfowl Anatidae wintering in France, and their relationship with hunting activity at wetland sites. *Wildfowl*, 2, 42–59.
- Fox, A. D., Ebbinge, B. S., Mitchell, C., Heinicke, T., Aarvak, T., Colhoun, K., ... Van der Jeugd, H. (2010). Current estimates of goose population sizes in western Europe, a gap analysis and an assessment

- of trends. *Ornis Svecica*, 20, 115–127. <https://doi.org/10.34080/os.v20.19922>
- Fox, A. D., Kahlert, J., Ettrup, H., Nilsson, L., & Hounisen, J. P. (1995). Moulting greylag geese *Anser anser* on the Danish island of Saltholm; numbers, phenology, status and origins. *Wildfowl*, 46, 16–30.
- Fox, A. D., Madsen, J., Boyd, H., Kuijken, E., Norriss, D. W., Tombre, I. M., & Stroud, D. A. (2005). Effects of agricultural change on abundance, fitness components and distribution of two arctic-nesting goose populations. *Global Change Biology*, 11, 881–893. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2486.2005.00941.x>
- Fried-Petersen, H. B., Araya-Ajoy, Y. G., Futter, M. N., & Angeler, D. G. (2020). Drivers of long-term invertebrate community stability in changing Swedish lakes. *Global Change Biology*, 26, 1259–1270. <https://doi.org/10.1111/gcb.14952>
- Gaget, E., Galewski, T., Jiguet, F., & Le Viol, I. (2018). Waterbird communities adjust to climate warming according to conservation policy and species protection status. *Biological Conservation*, 227, 205–212. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biocon.2018.09.019>
- Gaget, E., Le Viol, I., Pavón-Jordán, D., Cazalis, V., Kerbiriou, C., Jiguet, F., ... Galewski, T. (2020). Assessing the effectiveness of the Ramsar Convention in preserving wintering waterbirds in the Mediterranean. *Biological Conservation*, 243, 108485. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biocon.2020.108485>
- Gaget, E., Pavón-Jordán, D., Johnston, A., Lehtikoinen, A., Hochachka, W. M., Sandercock, B. K., ... Brommer, J. E. (2021). Benefits of protected areas for nonbreeding waterbirds adjusting their distributions under climate warming. *Conservation Biology*, 35, 834–845. <https://doi.org/10.1111/cobi.13648>
- Gilissen, N., Haanstra, L., Delany, S., Boere, G., & Hagemeyer, W. (2002). Numbers and distribution of wintering waterbirds in the Western Palearctic and Southwest Asia in 1987, 1988 and 1999. Results from the International Waterbird Census. Wetlands International Global Series No. 11. Wetlands International.
- F. Gill, & D. Donsker (Eds.) (2017). *IOC world bird list (v 7.1)*. <https://www.worldbirdnames.org>
- Gozlan, R. E., Karimov, B. K., Zadereev, E., Kuznetsova, D., & Brucet, S. (2019). Status, trends, and future dynamics of freshwater ecosystems in Europe and Central Asia. *Inland Waters*, 9, 78–94. <https://doi.org/10.1080/20442041.2018.1510271>
- Green, A. J. (1998). Comparative feeding behaviour and niche organization in a Mediterranean duck community. *Canadian Journal of Zoology*, 76, 500–507. <https://doi.org/10.1139/z97-221>
- Green, A. J., & Elmberg, J. (2014). Ecosystem services provided by waterbirds. *Biological Reviews*, 89, 105–122. <https://doi.org/10.1111/brv.12045>
- Green, A. J., Fox, A. D., Hughes, B., & Hilton, G. M. (1999). Time–activity budgets and site selection of white-headed ducks *Oxyura leucocephala* at Burdur Lake, Turkey in late winter. *Bird Study*, 46, 62–73. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00063659909461115>
- Guillemain, M., Champagnon, J., Massez, G., Pernollet, C. A., George, T., Momerency, A., Simon, G., & Thibert, M. (2015). Becoming more sedentary? Changes in recovery positions of mallard *Anas platyrhynchos* ringed in the Camargue, France, over the last 50 years. *Wildfowl*, 65, 51–63.
- Guillemain, M., Elmberg, J., Gauthier-Clerc, M., Massez, G., Hearn, R., Champagnon, J., & Simon, G. (2010). Wintering French mallard and teal are heavier and in better body condition than 30 years ago: Effects of a changing environment? *Ambio*, 39, 170–180.
- Guillemain, M., Fritz, H., & Duncan, P. (2002). Foraging strategies of granivorous dabbling ducks wintering in protected areas of the French Atlantic coast. *Biodiversity & Conservation*, 11, 1721–1732. <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1020322032114>
- Guillemain, M., Fritz, H., Guillon, N., & Guillon, N. (2000). Foraging behavior and habitat choice of wintering northern shoveler in a major wintering quarter in France. *Waterbirds: The International Journal of Waterbird Biology*, 23, 353–363. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1522173>
- Guillemain, M., & Hearn, R. (2017). Ready for climate change? Geographic trends in the protection status of critical sites for western Palearctic ducks. *Biodiversity and Conservation*, 26, 2347–2360. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10531-017-1359-z>
- Gunnarsson, G., Waldenström, J., & Fransson, T. (2012). Direct and indirect effects of winter harshness on the survival of Mallards *Anas platyrhynchos* in northwest Europe. *Ibis*, 154, 307–317. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1474-919X.2011.01206.x>
- Haase, P., Pilotto, F., Li, F., Sundermann, A., Lorenz, A. W., Tonkin, J. D., & Stoll, S. (2019). Moderate warming over the past 25 years has already reorganized stream invertebrate communities. *Science of the Total Environment*, 658, 1531–1538. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitoenv.2018.12.234>
- Hair, J. F. Jr, Anderson, R. E., Tatham, R. L., & Black, W. C. (1995). *Multivariate data analysis* (3rd ed.). Macmillan.
- Holopainen, S., Arzel, C., Dessborn, L., Elmberg, J., Gunnarsson, G., Nummi, P., ... Sjöberg, K. (2015). Habitat use in ducks breeding in boreal freshwater wetlands: A review. *European Journal of Wildlife Research*, 61, 339–363. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10344-015-0921-9>
- Hrdinka, T. (2007). Typology and potential utilization of anthropogenic lakes in mining pits in the Czech Republic. *Limnological Review*, 7, 29–35.
- Hurrell, J. W., & Deser, C. (2009). North Atlantic climate variability: The role of the North Atlantic Oscillation. *Journal of Marine Systems*, 78, 28–41. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jmarsys.2008.11.026>
- IPCC (2014). Climate change 2014: Synthesis report. In Core Writing Team, R. K. Pachauri, & L. A. Meyer (Eds.), *Contribution of Working Groups I, II and III to the fifth assessment report of the intergovernmental panel on climate change* (151 pp.). IPCC.
- Jackson, M. C., Loewen, C. J. G., Vinebrooke, R. D., & Chimimba, C. T. (2016). Net effects of multiple stressors in freshwater ecosystems: A meta-analysis. *Global Change Biology*, 22, 180–189. <https://doi.org/10.1111/gcb.13028>
- Jacobsen, O. W., & Ugelvik, M. (1994). Grazing and vigilance behaviour of breeding Eurasian wigeon *Anas penelope* in relation to distance from water. *Wildfowl*, 45, 119–123.
- Janke, A. K., Anteau, M. J., & Stafford, J. D. (2017). Long-term spatial heterogeneity in mallard distribution in the Prairie pothole region. *Wildlife Society Bulletin*, 41(1), 116–124. <https://doi.org/10.1002/wsb.747>
- Jiguet, F., Gadot, A.-S., Julliard, R., Newson, S. E., & Couvet, D. (2007). Climate envelope, life history traits and the resilience of birds facing global change. *Global Change Biology*, 13, 1672–1684. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2486.2007.01386.x>
- Jørgensen, P. S., Böhning-Gaese, K., Thorup, K., Tøttrup, A. P., Chylarecki, P., Jiguet, F., ... Rahbek, C. (2016). Continent-scale global change attribution in European birds - Combining annual and decadal time scales. *Global Change Biology*, 22, 530–543. <https://doi.org/10.1111/gcb.13097>
- Kameníková, M., & Rajchard, J. (2013). Seasonal occurrence and abundance of waterbirds in sandpits and fishponds. *European Journal of Environmental Sciences*, 3, 48–63. <https://doi.org/10.14712/23361964.2015.23>
- Kear, J. (2005). *Ducks, Geese and Swans: General chapters, species accounts (Anhima to Salvadorina)*. Oxford University Press.
- Kleyheeg, E., van Dijk, J. G. B., Tsovolglou-Gkina, D., Woud, T. Y., Boonstra, D. K., Nolet, B. A., & Soons, M. B. (2017). Movement patterns of a keystone waterbird species are highly predictable from landscape configuration. *Movement Ecology*, 5, 2. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40462-016-0092-7>
- Kloskowski, J., Green, A. J., Polak, M., Bustamante, J., & Krogulec, J. (2009). Complementary use of natural and artificial wetlands by waterbirds wintering in Doñana, south-west Spain. *Aquatic*

- Conservation: Marine and Freshwater Ecosystems*, 19, 815–826. <https://doi.org/10.1002/aqc.1027>
- Kranstauber, B., Smolla, M., & Safi, K. (2017). Similarity in spatial utilization distributions measured by the earth mover's distance. *Methods in Ecology and Evolution*, 8(2), 155–160. <https://doi.org/10.1111/2041-210X.12649>
- Lehikoinen, A., Foppen, R. P. B., Heldbjerg, H., Lindström, Å., van Manen, W., Piirainen, S., ... Butchart, S. H. M. (2016). Large-scale climatic drivers of regional winter bird population trends. *Diversity and Distributions*, 22, 1163–1173. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ddi.12480>
- Lehikoinen, A., Jaatinen, K., Vähätalo, A. V., Clausen, P., Crowe, O., Deceuninck, B., ... Fox, A. D. (2013). Rapid climate driven shifts in wintering distributions of three common waterbird species. *Global Change Biology*, 19, 2071–2081. <https://doi.org/10.1111/gcb.12200>
- Lewis, B. S., Eichholz, M. W., Yerkes, T., & Coluccy, J. (2019). Food resources for wintering and spring staging American black ducks. *Journal of Fish and Wildlife Management*, 10, 492–499. <https://doi.org/10.3996/102018-JFWM-096>
- Lind, L., Schuler, M. S., Hintz, W. D., Stoler, A. B., Jones, D. K., Mattes, B. M., & Relyea, R. A. (2018). Salty fertile lakes: How salinization and eutrophication alter the structure of freshwater communities. *Ecosphere*, 9, e02383. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ecs2.2383>
- Maclean, I. M. D., Austin, G. E., Rehfish, M. M., Blew, J., Crowe, O., Delany, S., ... Wahl, J. (2008). Climate change causes rapid changes in the distribution and site abundance of birds in winter. *Global Change Biology*, 14, 2489–2500. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2486.2008.01666.x>
- Musil, P. (2006). Effect of intensive fish production on waterbird breeding population: Review of current knowledge. In G. C. Boere, C. A. Galbraith, & D. A. Stroud (Eds.), *Waterbirds around the world* (pp. 520–521). TSO Scotland Ltd.
- Musil, P., Cepák, J., Hudec, K., & Zárbynický, J. (2001). *The long-term trends in the breeding waterfowl populations in the Czech Republic*. OMPO & Institute of Applied Ecology.
- Musil, P., Darolová, A., Jureček, J., Musilová, Z., Podhrázký, M., & Slabeyová, K. (2008). The long-term trends in numbers of wintering geese in the Czech Republic and Slovakia in 1991–2007. *Tichodroma*, 20, 61–67.
- Musil, P., Musilová, Z., Fuchs, R., & Poláková, S. (2011). Long-term changes in numbers and distribution of wintering waterbirds in the Czech Republic, 1966–2008. *Bird Study*, 58, 450–460. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00063657.2011.603289>
- Musilová, Z., Musil, P., Zouhar, J., & Adam, M. (2018a). Changes in habitat suitability influence non-breeding distribution of waterbirds in central Europe. *Ibis*, 160, 582–596. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ibi.12559>
- Musilová, Z., Musil, P., Zouhar, J., Adam, M., & Bejček, V. (2018b). Importance of Natura 2000 sites for wintering waterbirds: Low preference, species' distribution changes and carrying capacity of Natura 2000 could fail to protect the species. *Biological Conservation*, 228, 79–88. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biocon.2018.10.004>
- Musilová, Z., Musil, P., Zouhar, J., Bejček, V., Šťastný, K., & Hudec, K. (2014). Numbers of wintering waterbirds in the Czech Republic: Long-term and spatial-scale approaches to assess population size. *Bird Study*, 61, 321–331. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00063657.2014.919573>
- Musilová, Z., Musil, P., Zouhar, J., & Romportl, D. (2015). Long-term trends, total numbers and species richness of increasing waterbird populations at sites on the edge of their winter range: Cold-weather refuge sites are more important than protected sites. *Journal of Ornithology*, 156(4), 923–932. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10336-015-1223-4>
- Navedo, J. G., Fernández, G., Valdivia, N., Drever, M. C., & Masero, J. A. (2017). Identifying management actions to increase foraging opportunities for shorebirds at semi-intensive shrimp farms. *Journal of Applied Ecology*, 54, 567–576.
- Newton, I. (1998). *Population limitation in birds*. Academic Press.
- Newton, I. (2007). *The migration ecology of birds* (1st ed.). Academic Press.
- Newton, I. (2013). *Bird populations* (1st ed.). William Collins.
- Nilsson, L. (2008). Changes in numbers and distribution of wintering waterfowl in Sweden during forty years, 1967–2006. *Ornis Svecica*, 18, 135–226. <https://doi.org/10.34080/os.v18.21852>
- Nuijten, R. J. M., Wood, K. A., Haitjema, T., Rees, E. C., & Nolet, B. A. (2020). Concurrent shifts in wintering distribution and phenology in migratory swans: Individual and generational effects. *Global Change Biology*, 26, 4263–4275. <https://doi.org/10.1111/gcb.15151>
- Nummi, P., & Holopainen, S. (2014). Whole-community facilitation by beaver: Ecosystem engineer increases waterbird diversity. *Aquatic Conservation: Marine and Freshwater Ecosystems*, 24, 623–633. <https://doi.org/10.1002/aqc.2437>
- Nummi, P., Väänänen, V.-M., Holopainen, S., & Pöysä, H. (2016). *Duck-fish competition in boreal lakes - A review*. 93, (67–76).
- Oertli, B., Biggs, J., Céréghino, R., Grillas, P., Joly, P., & Lachavanne, J. B. (2005). Conservation and monitoring of pond biodiversity: Introduction. *Aquatic Conservation: Marine and Freshwater Ecosystems*, 15(6), 535–540. <https://doi.org/10.1002/aqc.752>
- Pannekoek, J., & Van Strien, A. J. (2005). *TRIM 3 manual (Trends and indices for monitoring data)*. Statistics Netherlands.
- Parejo, M., Gutiérrez, J. S., Navedo, J. G., Soriano-Redondo, A., Abad-Gómez, J. M., Villegas, A., ... Masero, J. A. (2019). Day and night use of habitats by northern pintails during winter in a primary rice-growing region of Iberia. *PLoS One*, 14, e0220400. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0220400>
- Pavón-Jordán, D., Abdou, W., Azafzaf, H., Balaž, M., Bino, T., Borg, J. J., ... Lehikoinen, A. (2020). Positive impacts of important bird and biodiversity areas on wintering waterbirds under changing temperatures throughout Europe and North Africa. *Biological Conservation*, 246, 108549. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biocon.2020.108549>
- Pavón-Jordán, D., Clausen, P., Dagys, M., Devos, K., Encarnação, V., Fox, A. D., ... Lehikoinen, A. (2019). Habitat- and species-mediated short- and long-term distributional changes in waterbird abundance linked to variation in European winter weather. *Diversity and Distributions*, 25, 225–239. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ddi.12855>
- Pavón-Jordán, D., Fox, A. D., Clausen, P., Dagys, M., Deceuninck, B., Devos, K., ... Lehikoinen, A. (2015). Climate-driven changes in winter abundance of a migratory waterbird in relation to EU protected areas. *Diversity and Distributions*, 21, 571–582. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ddi.12300>
- Pechar, L. (2000). Impacts of long-term changes in fishery management on the trophic level water quality in Czech fish ponds. *Fisheries Management and Ecology*, 7, 23–31. <https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1365-2400.2000.00193.x>
- Petrie, M. J., Fleskes, J. P., Wolder, M. A., Isola, C. R., Yarris, G. S., & Skalos, D. A. (2016). Potential effects of drought on carrying capacity for wintering waterfowl in the Central Valley of California. *Journal of Fish and Wildlife Management*, 7, 408–422. <https://doi.org/10.3996/082015-JFWM-082>
- Pilotto, F., Kühn, I., Adrian, R., Alber, R., Alignier, A., Andrews, C., ... Haase, P. (2020). Meta-analysis of multidecadal biodiversity trends in Europe. *Nature Communications*, 11, 3486. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-020-17171-y>
- Podhrázký, M., Musil, P., Musilová, Z., Zouhar, J., Adam, M., Závora, J., & Hudec, K. (2017). Central European greylag geese *Anser anser* show a shortening of migration distance and earlier spring arrival over 60 years. *Ibis*, 159, 352–365. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ibi.12440>
- Pullin, A. S. (2002). *Conservation biology*. Cambridge University Press.
- Radinger, J., Essl, F., Hölker, F., Horký, P., Slavík, O., & Wolter, C. (2017). The future distribution of river fish: The complex interplay of climate and land use changes, species dispersal and movement barriers. *Global Change Biology*, 23, 4970–4986. <https://doi.org/10.1111/gcb.13760>

- Ridgill, S. C., & Fox, A. D. (1990). *Cold weather movements of waterfowl in Western Europe*. International Waterfowl and Wetlands Research Bureau.
- Rogerson, P. A. (2001). *Statistical methods for geography*. Sage.
- Roy, K., Vrba, J., Kaushik, S. J., & Mraz, J. (2020). Feed-based common carp farming and eutrophication: Is there a reason for concern? *Reviews in Aquaculture*, 12, 1736–1758. <https://doi.org/10.1111/raq.12407>
- Sauter, A., Korner-Nievergelt, F., & Jenni, L. (2010). Evidence of climate change effects on within-winter movements of European mallards *Anas platyrhynchos*. *Ibis*, 152, 600–609. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1474-919X.2010.01028.x>
- Schummer, M. L., Kaminski, R. M., Raedeke, A. H., & Graber, D. A. (2010). Weather-related indices of autumn-winter dabbling duck abundance in middle North America. *The Journal of Wildlife Management*, 74, 94–101. <https://doi.org/10.2193/2008-524>
- Seiche, E. K., Gerdeaux, D., Gwiazda, R., Lévai, F., Musil, P., Nemenonoks, O., Strod, T., & Carss, D. N. (2012). *Cormorant-fisheries conflicts in carp ponds areas in Europe and Israel - An INTERCAFE overview* (112 pp). COST Action 635 final report. COST ESF Bussel.
- Sinclair, A. R. E., Fryxell, J. M., & Caughley, G. (2006). *Wildlife ecology, conservation and management*. Wiley.
- Snow, D. W., & Perrins, C. M. (1998). *The birds of the Western Palearctic*. Concise Edition OUP.
- Soldaat, L. L., Pannekoek, J., Verweij, R. J. T., van Turnhout, C. A. M., & van Strien, A. J. (2017). A Monte Carlo method to account for sampling error in multi-species indicators. *Ecological Indicators*, 81, 340–347. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolind.2017.05.033>
- Štaštný, K., & K. Hudec (Eds.) (2016). *Fauna ČR. Ptáci 1* (790 pp.). Academia, Praha.
- Sutherland, W. J., Pullin, A. S., Dolman, P. M., & Knight, T. M. (2004). The need for evidence-based conservation. *Trends in Ecology & Evolution*, 19(6), 305–308. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tree.2004.03.018>
- Švažas, S., Meissner, W., Serebryakov, V., Kozulin, A., & Grishanov, G. (2001). *Changes of wintering sites of waterfowl in central and eastern Europe*. OMPO & Institute of Ecology.
- Tayleur, C. M., Devictor, V., Gazezere, P., Jonzen, N., Smith, H. G., & Lindstrom, A. (2016). Regional variation in climate change winners and losers highlights the rapid loss of cold-dwelling species. *Diversity and Distributions*, 22, 468–480. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ddi.12412>
- Thomas, C. D., Gillingham, P. K., Bradbury, R. B., Roy, D. B., Anderson, B. J., Baxter, J. M., ... Hill, J. K. (2012). Protected areas facilitate species' range expansions. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, 109, 14063–14068. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1210251109>
- Tourenq, C., Bennetts, R. E., Kowalski, H., Vialet, E., Lucchesi, J.-L., Kayser, Y., & Isenmann, P. (2001). Are ricefields a good alternative to natural marshes for waterbird communities in the Camargue, southern France? *Biological Conservation*, 100, 335–343. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0006-3207\(01\)00037-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0006-3207(01)00037-4)
- Tucker, G. M., & Evans, M. I. (1997). *Habitats for birds in Europe. A conservation strategy for the wider environment*. BirdLife International.
- United Nations Environment Programme (2017). *Lakes and reservoirs - Similarities, differences and importance*. http://www.unep.or.jp/ietc/Publications/Short_Series/LakeReservoirs-1/index.asp
- van der Lee, G. H., Vonk, J. A., Verdonschot, R. C. M., Kraak, M. H. S., Verdonschot, P. F. M., & Huisman, J. (2021). Eutrophication induces shifts in the trophic position of invertebrates in aquatic food webs. *Ecology*, 102(3), e03275. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ecy.3275>
- van Eerden, M. R. (1984). Waterfowl movements in relation to food stocks. In P. R. Evans, J. D. Goss-Custard, & W. G. Hale (Eds.), *Coastal waders and wildfowl in winter* (pp. 84–100). Cambridge Univ. Press.
- Wagner, D. L., Grames, E. M., Forister, M. L., Berenbaum, M. R., & Stopak, D. (2021). Insect decline in the Anthropocene: Death by a thousand cuts. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, 118(2), e2023989118. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.2023989118>
- Wetlands International (2006). *Waterbird population estimates* (4th ed.). Wetlands International.
- Wetlands International (2021). *Waterbird population estimates*. wpe.wetlands.org.
- Wood, K. A., Stillman, R. A., Coombs, T., McDonald, C., Daunt, F., & O'Hare, M. T. (2013). The role of season and social grouping on habitat use by mute swans (*Cygnus olor*) in a lowland river catchment. *Bird Study*, 60, 229–237. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00063657.2013.776003>
- Wood, K. A., Stillman, R. A., Wheeler, D., Groves, S., Hambly, C., Speakman, J. R., ... O'Hare, M. T. (2013). Go with the flow: Water velocity regulates herbivore foraging decisions in river catchments. *Oikos*, 122, 1720–1729. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1600-0706.2013.00592.x>

How to cite this article: Musilová, Z., Musil, P., Zouhar, J., Šenkýřová, A., Pavón-Jordán, D., & Nummi, P. (2021). Changes in wetland habitat use by waterbirds wintering in Czechia are related to diet and distribution changes. *Freshw Biol*, 00, 1–16. <https://doi.org/10.1111/fwb.13842>