# **Behavioural responses of a transhemispheric migrant to climate oscillation** 1  $\overline{2}$

## **Abstract** 3

4

Large scale climatic fluctuations, such as the El Niño-Southern Oscillation (ENSO), can have dramatic effects on ocean ecosystem productivity. Many mobile species breeding in temperate or higher latitudes escape the extremes of seasonal climate variation through longdistance, even trans-global migration, but how they deal with, or are affected by, such longer-phased climate fluctuations is less understood. To investigate how a long-lived migratory species might respond to such periodic environmental change we collected and analysed a 13-year biologging dataset for a trans-equatorial migrant, the Manx shearwater (*Puffinus puffinus*). Our primary finding was that in El Niño years, nonbreeding birds were at more northerly (lower) latitudes than in La Niña years, a response attributable to individual flexibility in migratory destination. Daily time spent foraging varied in concert with this latitudinal shift, with birds foraging less in El Niño years. Secondarily, we found that in subsequent breeding, a hemisphere away, El Niño years saw a reduction in foraging time and chick provisioning rates: effects that could not be attributed to conditions at their breeding grounds in the North Atlantic. Thus, in a highly migratory animal, individuals may adjust to fluctuating non-breeding conditions, but still experience cascading carry over effects on subsequent behaviour. 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24

- 25
- 26

**Key Words;** Behaviour, Biologging, Climate, El Niño-Southern Oscillation, Migration, Seabird 27 28

## **Introduction**

Migration can be a mechanism to escape the extremes of seasonal climate variation through long-distance, trans-hemispheric movements (1). How these movements respond to, or are affected by, longer-phased climate fluctuations that affect environmental productivity at migratory destinations is still poorly understood. One of the major drivers of climate is the El Niño Southern Oscillation (ENSO), a climatic pattern that alternates between an El Niño state, where Pacific trade winds weaken, and the reverse, La Niña, both of which alter winds and temperatures globally (2,3). With a periodicity of 3-7 years, both ENSO phases can influence the distribution of food resources at foraging grounds (4). The extent to which individual animals can adapt their foraging distributions in response to shifting ENSO phases between years remains unclear, necessitating the utilization of long-term datasets of highly mobile species (5). 

Long distance migrants such as seabirds often spend non-breeding periods in productive regions, far from their high latitude or temperate breeding grounds. Breeding is energetically demanding for seabirds, which invest large amounts of parental care into rearing a small number of chicks, with breeding periods often lasting many months (6–8). Nonbreeding foraging is important for restoring condition and preparing for the following breeding season (9,10). Both ENSO phases have been 

shown to affect seabirds adversely during the breeding season, reducing survival in Cory's shearwaters (*Calonectris borealis*) during La Niña (11) causing an increase in birds skipping breeding in El Niño years for redfooted boobies (*Sula sula*) (12) and changing the at-sea breeding distribution of multiple species of tropical petrel (13). However, it is not well understood how non-breeding ENSO conditions might impact subsequent breeding across hemispheres, where a different set of environmental conditions are encountered. Events in one season that impact behaviour in the next are termed carry-over effects (14,15), and can occur at any stage of the annual cycle. There are many documented cases of carry-over effects in seabirds, including breeding success affecting non-breeding phenology (8,16), and increased non-breeding mass (10,17) and foraging success (18) improving breeding performance. 64 65 66 67 68 69 70 71 72 73 74 75 76 77

The Manx shearwater (*Puffinus puffinus*), a small (400-gram) Procellariform seabird breeding mainly in northern Europe, is a species particularly suited to studying individual responses to ENSO owing to its high breeding site philopatry, high year-to-year survival and tolerance of bird- and nest-borne instrumentation (19). In addition, carry-over effects are thought to be especially important for migratory species such as Manx shearwaters that undergo a long, and potentially costly transequatorial migration to the Patagonian shelf (20,21), and link pelagic ecology at a global scale. Manx shearwaters are long-lived with protracted breeding seasons, so must balance reproductive and survival decisions from year to year (19). Shearwaters that spent more time foraging during the non-breeding period were found to be more likely to skip breeding that year (22). This increased the likelihood of rearing a chick successfully in the following breeding season. In turn, breeding season conditions are known to carry-over to non-breeding behaviour and future breeding success in this species, with experimentally shortened or extended breeding seasons in Manx shearwaters having knock-on consequences that can be measured using geolocators (10) . 78 79 80 81 82 83 84 85 86 87 88 89 90 91 92 93 94 95

To understand individual responses to ENSO, and whether these responses carry over into future seasons, long-term datasets of annual movements are essential (23). To determine whether, and if so how, ENSO phase predicts non-breeding latitude, we analyse a 13-year dataset of geolocator logger-derived migratory positions and behavioural activity in the Manx shearwater. We investigate the mechanistic drivers of ENSO-related shifts by employing a mixed-effects model to assess whether birds exhibit latitude shifts in tandem with peaks in chlorophyll distribution, serving as an indicator of resource distribution. Further, we take advantage of long-term tracking of individuals, parsing out withinindividual effects to investigate whether individuals are flexibly adjusting their location between years with ENSO (24). Secondarily, we predict that effects of ENSO on shearwater non-breeding location and behaviour will themselves carry-over into the subsequent breeding season's foraging, chick provisioning behaviour and phenology. To explore how ENSO affects shearwater north- and south-bound migration and breeding behaviour we use a path analysis approach, allowing us to simultaneously assess multiple temporally linked correlations between phenology, nonbreeding location, foraging behaviour and environmental covariates (25). Lastly, to distinguish carry-over effects from correlations between local conditions at the non-breeding and breeding sites, we construct a mixed effects model to investigate variation in breeding season foraging with the North Atlantic Oscillation, the major determinant of local conditions in the northern hemisphere (26). To summarise a set of environmental predictors (e.g. sea surface temperature, precipitation, sea surface level etc) attributable to oscillations, we use large-scale climate indexes; the Southern Oscillation Index (SOI) (an indicator of ENSO conditions) and the North Atlantic Oscillation Index (NAO) (27,28). 97 98 99 100 101 102 103 104 105 106 107 108 109 110 111 112 113 114 115 116 117 118 119 120 121 122 123 124

125

126

### **Methods** 128

# 129

#### **Fieldwork** 130

To determine the migratory timing, routes and destinations of individual breeding birds, from 2007 to 2021, 770 geolocator (GLS) devices were deployed and retrieved from Manx shearwaters breeding at multiple colonies across the core breeding range of the species: Rum (Scotland) (57.01°N, -6.33 °E); Skomer (Wales) (51.74°N, -5.29°E); Ramsey (Wales) (51.74°N, 5.29°E); Copeland (Northern Ireland) (54.68°N, -5.53°E); Nolsoy (Faroes) (61.98°N, -6.65°E), and Lundy (England) (51.18°N, - 4.67°E). To estimate daily foraging, resting and flight behaviour, we used devices that incorporated a salt-water immersion logger. Models of GLS included BAS Mk 6, 9, 15, 19 (2.5g), BAS Mk 13, 14, 18 (1.5g) and MigrateTech intigeo C330, C250 (3.3g), C65, C65-Super (1g) combined immersion and light loggers. With average bird mass being 400g (19), all models weighed <1% of the birds' total body weight. GLS devices were attached to a custom made darvic leg ring, using cable ties and a small amount of super glue. Handling time was typically 5 to 10 minutes per deployment. Although GLS devices typically can record 3 years of data, most devices were retrieved, downloaded, and redeployed each year to maximise data collection. For a subset of Skomer birds, chick peak masses were obtained by daily chick weighing from 2012 to 2019 (n=63 chicks). 131 132 133 134 135 136 137 138 139 140 141 142 143 144 145 146 147 148 149 150

151

#### **Processing Position Data** 152

153

All processing and statistical analyses were carried out in RStudio version 4.0.2 (R Core Team, 2021). Light data were processed using the "geolight" package to calculate position from twilight events defined by a light intensity threshold of 10 lux (30). Day length was used to estimate latitude, and the timing of midday/midnight was used for longitude. As light sensors may differ between geolocator models, the sun elevation angle used to define twilight events was selected independently for each 154 155 156 157 158 159 160

individual track. Latitude versus time plots were analyzed across a range of sun elevation angles to identify the one that best calculated latitudes matching the accurate breeding latitude during the summer months (31). The selected sun elevation angle ranged from -3 to -5. A rolling 3 day mean was applied to both longitude and latitude to smooth out error (32). Following the filtering of data to include only those that had complete tracks of north and south-bound migration there were 423 birdyears available from 222 individuals. Mean January position was used to represent non-breeding foraging ground location, as it is a mid-point month where position is least likely to be affected by birds arriving from or departing on southbound and northbound migration, respectively (see supplementary materials 3 for more information on shearwater phenology). Given the noise associated with GLS position estimates, latitude and longitude outliers were removed using the interquartile range method, retaining the lower and upper bounds of data (33). Migration phenology was determined using changes in longitude, rather than changes in overall position, as it is not subject to equinox error. Migration dates were determined from visual inspection of longitude (as in supplementary figure 1). 161 162 163 164 165 166 167 168 169 170 171 172 173 174 175 176 177 178 179

180

#### **Processing Immersion Data** 181

182

Saltwater immersion data recorded at 10-minute intervals were used to measure behavioural activity. Saltwater immersion was recorded every 3 seconds and summarised every 10 minutes to form an immersion score from 0 (completely dry) to 200 (completely immersed). Geolocator models that recorded immersion at alternate bin frequencies were excluded from analysis of behaviours due to concerns over differences in observed sensitivity between devices leaving 229 complete immersion tracks, 89 of which had a consecutive year in which to assess carry over effects due to limitations of the immersion logger memory. For the times when the bird was at sea (see below for how colony visits were determined during breeding), immersion bins were classified into three 183 184 185 186 187 188 189 190 191 192 193

states; a dry state (flying) where immersion score equalled zero, a wet state (resting/preening) where immersion score equalled its maximum and an intermediate score (foraging) that represented all values inbetween. Three behavioural states have previously been identified for Manx shearwaters using immersion data in a number of different studies, with the intermediate state representing foraging (20,34,35). Simultaneously deployed dive logger, GPS and GLS devices validate these behaviour states, showing foraging behaviours assigned from immersion data do indeed contain most diving (36). Foraging effort (proportion of daily time spent foraging) was obtained for non-breeding birds during January and breeding birds during August (chick rearing period). Chick rearing birds were included in the path analysis if there was evidence that breeding was successfully attempted. When direct evidence of breeding at the colony was not available, immersion data were carefully reviewed for signs of regular incubation stints, identified by characteristic extended dry periods (of at least 3 days) prior to chick rearing excluding 9 non-breeding individuals. Of these, 4 had loggers attached during the previous non-breeding season, and they were included in a supplementary analysis exploring the relationship between skipped breeding seasons and non-breeding foraging behaviour. Manx shearwaters are known to primarily forage during daylight hours (37– 39). To standardise foraging effort for variation in day length, the number of hours at sea spent foraging were divided by day length at each bird's mean monthly position for January foraging, and per the mean number of daylight hours at each breeding colony in August. 194 195 196 197 198 199 200 201 202 203 204 205 206 207 208 209 210 211 212 213 214 215 216 217 218

219

Colony visitation during August (a month when breeding adults across all colonies will be chick-rearing) was obtained from the immersion data to indicate chick provisioning rates. Manx shearwaters only arrive at or depart from the colony during the night, when it is dark enough to avoid predation (19,40). If they remain present in their burrow during daylight hours, they are unlikely to depart until it is night. Therefore, during the day if there was a continuous dry period for 6 hours or more, it was 220 221 222 223 224 225 226

assumed that the bird was in its burrow. Sunrise and sunset times were derived from the R suncalc package (41). Determining night visits to the colony required a different approach, as dark and dry periods at night could be easily confused with night flight. For each night, immersion bins were defined as 'wet' if any immersion was recorded and summed to calculate the number of wet events per night (42,43);. A normal Expectation Maximisation (EM) mixture model, a model used to identify the distribution to which observations belong, was applied to distinguish nights with colony visits from nights at sea using the mixtools package (44). Two distinct distributions were identified and hence used to identify colony visitation by assigning colony visits to nights that had higher probability of belonging to the drier peak (see supplementary materials 2 for more details). 227 228 229 230 231 232 233 234 235 236 237 238 239

- 240
- 241

#### **Environmental Variables** 242

243

Non-breeding conditions were described using the Southern Oscillation Index (SOI), whilst breeding conditions were described via the North Atlantic Oscillation (NAO) index, both provided by NOAA (28). The SOI describes a standardised difference between the barometric pressures at observation sites in Darwin and Tahiti. When the pressure difference weakens, El Niño conditions occur, indicated by negative index values. For this analysis, the SOI index was taken as a mean for the months of October, November and December. These months coincide with the peak of an El Niño/ La Niña event and phytoplankton blooms in the Southwestern Atlantic that dictate non-breeding conditions (45). The NOA index describes the pressure difference between the Azores and Iceland. NAO is most pronounced in winter and can have effects in subsequent seasons (46). Summer NAO has an effect on European climate but it is less understood (47). Therefore, in this analysis, winter NAO (December-March) and summer NAO (June-August) were both considered as drivers of climate around the breeding colony. We used 244 245 246 247 248 249 250 251 252 253 254 255 256 257 258 259

Aqua MODIS-derived chlorophyll a data provided by NASA to determine which latitude in the Patagonian shelf area (a box of coordinates -35°N, -63°E : -45°N, -59E°) had the maximum chlorophyll per January each year (48). 260 261 262 263

264

#### **Statistical analysis** 265

266

We implemented a path analysis model to link behavioural responses from one season to the next via a path of correlated events (25,49). This approach refines and expands on earlier work that described links across the annual behavioural cycle of this species using structural equation models, undertaken on a much smaller dataset (Kirk 2017, PhD thesis). Path analysis was conducted via the r package Lavaan to investigate links between the SOI and previous breeding season behaviour to nonbreeding latitude, phenology and foraging effort (50). These variables were then linked to the following breeding season's behaviour via colony visitation and foraging effort during August (figure 1). Significance levels were Bonferroni adjusted for structural equation modelling (51); 267 268 269 270 271 272 273 274 275 276 277

 $\alpha$  (*per test*) =  $\frac{0.05}{0.1}$ where k is equal to the number of tests and r to the  $k^{1-\sqrt{|r|}}$ , where k is equal to the correlation coefficient. To avoid model overfitting, and because our analysis focuses on within individual changes between years, we did not include colony as a factor. As we were interested in determining the environmental factors causing latitudinal variation between years, and these are confounded with time, the year itself was not included in the path analysis model. 278 279 280 281 282 283 284

285

Path analysis relies on several, rather than a single statistical test to assess model fit to the data. As chi squared ( $\chi^2$ ) p values are known to be uninterpretable with large sample sizes, we instead used the relative/normed chi-square ( $\chi^2$ /df) to assess fit (52). The  $\chi^2$ /df value was 2.49, which was suitably below the recommended maximum ratio of 5. Both the comparative fit index (CFI) and the Tucker-Lewis Index (TLI) of 286 287 288 289 290 291

the path analysis were 0.9. The Root Mean Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA) and the Standardized Root Mean Square Residual (SRMR) which both relate to model residuals, were 0.05 and 0.07 respectively. All of the above statistics were, therefore, well within the accepted thresholds for suitable model fit (53). 292 293 294 295 296

297

Separate to our path analysis, the relationship between August colony visits and chick peak mass was tested. This was to validate whether GLSderived colony visits are indicative of chick provisioning rates in this study, following previous validation in a study using mixture models to indicate chick provisioning (42). Chick peak mass data were available only for a subset of Skomer geolocator birds over the years of this study (n=63), so all available August chick peak mass data on Skomer were pooled to increase the sample size and analysed separately using a mixed effects model in the r package lme4 with burrow as a random effect (54). The date the peak mass was taken was included as a fixed effect to assure that any correlations between colony visitation and peak mass were not occurring as a function of peak mass being obtained later in some birds. We also implemented a binomial generalised linear model in a supplementary analysis of whether January foraging increased the likelihood of skipping breeding. Additionally, to test for local environmental conditions during breeding, the relationship between the North Atlantic Oscillation (NAO) and August foraging was tested in 2 mixed effects models: one for winter and one for summer NAO, with individual as a random effect. A mixed effects model was also used to test whether any variation in mean January non-breeding latitude with changing ENSO conditions occurred as a result of individual adjustment. Between-individual and within-individual responses to ENSO conditions were separated using the Subject Centring Method from Van de Pol and Wright, exact details of which can be found in (24). Finally, we implemented a mixed effects model to assess whether birds adjusted their non-breeding latitude to the latitude with the maximum chlorophyll in the Patagonian shelf from that year, with individual as a random effect. 298 299 300 301 302 303 304 305 306 307 308 309 310 311 312 313 314 315 316 317 318 319 320 321 322 323 324



- 
- 

# **Figures**





**Figure 1.** A diagram illustrating path analysis correlations between environmental, behavioural and phenological factors. All significant effects are represented in green and non-significant paths in black. Dotted lines indicate negative relationships and path estimates ( $\beta \pm SE$ ) are given for each significant path. 

- 
- 
- 
- 
- 



**Figure 2**. The effect of the El Niño Southern Oscillation index on nonbreeding latitude. **A)** Variation in mean non-breeding latitude (n=422) between years with 95% confidence intervals, where each point represents a mean of all individuals. **B)** Smoothed January latitude (°) and longitude (°) for all individuals are plotted for a strong El Niño year in orange (2009) ( $n=36$ ) and a strong La Niña year in blue (2014) ( $n=37$ ). **C)** Variation in mean non-breeding latitude with the SOI index (NOAA, 2023). Grey lines connect individuals tracked in multiple years to visualize individual adaptation to varying ENSO conditions. The regression line is derived from the path analysis model. **D)** The relationship between the latitude at which the maximum chlorophyll was centred for a given year against mean January latitude. Chlorophyll data were taken from the Aqua-MODIS project (48). The regression line is derived from the mixed effects model. 

- 
- 



**Figure 3.** The correlative effects of January latitude on non-breeding and breeding foraging activity. **A)** The proportion of the day spent foraging in January plotted against mean January latitude (n =226). **B)** The proportion of the day spent foraging in August during chick rearing plotted against the previous January's foraging time (n=87). For both, proportions are derived from foraging hours divided by the available daylight hours at the foraging site. 

- 
- 
- 
- 
- 



**Figure 4.** The correlative effects of foraging activity on colony visitation and chick peak mass. **A)** The proportion of the day spent foraging in August (foraging hours divided by the available daylight hours at the foraging site) plotted against the number of colony visits in year 0 (n =214). **B)** The number of colony visits plotted against chick peak mass for Skomer birds only (n=63). Regression lines are derived from A) path analysis and B) a mixed effects model. 

 



- 419
- 420

**Figure 5.** Correlations between Southbound (Autumn) and subsequent Northbound migration (Spring). **A)** Northbound/spring migration start date plotted against previous southbound/autumn migration start date (n=421). **B)** Northbound/spring migration end date plotted against northbound/spring migration start date (n=419). Regression lines are derived from the path analysis model. 422 423 424 425 426 427

- 428
- 429
- 430
- 431
- 432
- 433
- 434
- 435
- 436
- 437
- 438
- 439

## **Results** 440

441

The mean January latitude for non-breeding birds showed non-linear variation between 2008 to 2020, oscillating in a wave-like pattern (figure 2). Consecutive years were more similar, with overlap between 95% confidence intervals. This suggests that latitudinal shifts occur relative to the previous year, and birds are responding to a periodic environmental variable. Path analysis (figure 1) suggested this pattern may exist as a result of changes in ENSO; where a significant correlation existed between the SOI and non-breeding latitude  $(\beta = -0.331, \text{ se} = 0.084, \text{ z} = -0.084)$ 3.944, p<0.001). Birds were observed further north during non-breeding in El Niño years (figure 2). To determine whether shifts occurred via individual flexibility in foraging latitude with ENSO, we implemented a mixed effects model via the Subject Centring Method, to find both significant between (β= -0.77, 95%CI [-1.29, -0.28], *χ* <sup>2</sup>1=8.89, p<0.01) and within individual effects (β= -0.30, 95%CI[-0.49, -0.12], *χ* <sup>2</sup>1=10.00, p< 0.01) (24). There was, however, no significant difference in the within- and between-individual latitudinal change (95%CII-1.01, 0.05], p>0.05), suggesting that the effect of El Niño on non-breeding latitude is best explained by within-individual plasticity than between-individual turnover. We also implemented a separate mixed effects model that indicated birds adjust their non-breeding latitude to where the maximum chlorophyll that year was centred (β =2.41,  $\chi^2$ 1=47.24, 95% CI[1.71, 3.06],  $p < 0.0001$ ). Therefore, birds appear to adjust their non-breeding latitude in response to shifting resource distributions. 442 443 444 445 446 447 448 449 450 451 452 453 454 455 456 457 458 459 460 461 462 463 464

465

Variation in non-breeding latitude had a significant effect on the proportion of daylight hours spent foraging with foraging effort decreasing at lower latitudes  $(\beta = 0.0154 \text{ se} = 0.006, z = -2.517)$ p<0.01).Therefore, ENSO-induced changes in January latitude appear to cause foraging effort to vary. When January foraging effort was higher, it correlated with an increase in the proportion of time spent foraging in the following August (β=0.216, se=0.080, z=2.696, p<0.01, figure 3). To 466 467 468 469 470 471 472

summarise, northward shifts in foraging latitude as a result of El Niño conditions correlated with a reduction in non-breeding and subsequent foraging behaviour during breeding. Additionally, although based on a small sample size of non-breeders (n=4), supplementary analysis indicated that reduced non-breeding (January) foraging effort may increase the propensity of birds to skip breeding ( $\beta$ = 12.87, se=5.67,  $z=2.27$ ,  $p<0.05$ ; supplementary 4). Foraging during August in year 0 had a positive relationship with the following January's foraging  $(\beta=0.940)$ , se=0.146,  $z= 6.450$ ,  $p<0.001$ ). We found no evidence of environmental conditions directly affecting foraging during breeding. We didn't detect significant effects of ENSO on August foraging, nor winter ( $\beta$ = 0.06, 95%CI [-0.010, 0.018], *χ* <sup>2</sup>1=0.39, p>0.05) or summer NAO (β= 0.01, 95%CI [-0.006, 0.03], *χ* <sup>2</sup>1=2.20, p> 0.05). 473 474 475 476 477 478 479 480 481 482 483 484 485

486

An increase in foraging during August also increased the number of colony visits during this time  $(β = 12.681, se = 4.831, z = 2.625, p < 0.01)$ . We implemented a separate mixed effects model using chick peak mass measurements available from Skomer island (n=63), to validate that the number of GLS derived colony visits appear indicative of chick provisioning rates (β= 2.13, 95%CI [0.69, 3.60], *χ* <sup>2</sup>1= 8.82, p<0.01). There was no significant effect of the date peak mass was reached on the peak mass measurement (β= -9.52, 95%CI [-26.04, 8.38], *χ* <sup>2</sup>1= 1.29, p=0.2), indicating that varying breeding phonologies were not biasing August colony visitation rates. Therefore, increased colony visitation rates over August are correlated with higher chick peak body mass. Neither foraging effort nor the number of colony visits in August had a significant effect on departure date from the colony (figure 1). Autumn southbound migration start date was, however, significantly related to the start date of the next spring's northbound migration ( $\beta$ =0.352, se=0.045,  $z=7.808$ ,  $p<0.001$ ), which defined return date to the colony in the following breeding season ( $\beta$ =0.712, se=0.035, z=20.491, p<0.001). Therefore, individuals departing later on southbound migration from the colony appeared to return later next year. Neither the SOI nor non-487 488 489 490 491 492 493 494 495 496 497 498 499 500 501 502 503 504 505

breeding foraging effort had a significant effect on spring migration start date (figure 1). Migratory phenology, therefore, appeared separate to the effects of environmental variability via ENSO. 506 507 508

509

## **Discussion** 510

511

Our main finding is that a long-distance migrant can adjust its nonbreeding destination in response to large scale oscillations in climate (ENSO). During El Niño years, birds did not travel as far south or spend as much time foraging during the non-breeding period as they did during La Niña. As we tracked individual birds across multiple years, we were able to demonstrate that this spatial response is primarily mediated by individuals flexibly adjusting their position with environmental conditions (and not the result of individual turn-over in our sample compounded by some sampling bias propagating through the annual cycle). Nevertheless, despite individual adjustments in position, reduced non-breeding foraging went on to impact the subsequent breeding attempt 10,000 km away, correlating with reduced foraging effort and colony visitation during chick-rearing (figure 2). These results suggest that El Niño conditions present losses in non-breeding foraging effort that may reduce physical condition during chick provisioning. Reduced non-breeding foraging effort may additionally increase the propensity of birds to skip breeding (supplementary figure 4), a result contrary to previous work that found the opposite effect in shearwaters (22), but examined data over a smaller number of years (and therefore ENSO conditions). 512 513 514 515 516 517 518 519 520 521 522 523 524 525 526 527 528 529 530

531

Reduced non-breeding foraging effort may plausibly occur via several mechanisms, for example El Niño conditions may lower resource availability (56) or unfavourable environmental conditions may create reduced opportunities for foraging (57). ENSO summarises pressure differences that can equate to a range of environmental conditions including changes in sea level, ocean acidification, storms, sea surface 532 533 534 535 536 537

temperature and precipitation; all known to impact seabird behaviour (4,58). Such indices can allow ecologists to infer how seabirds might respond to climate without multiple hypothesis testing, with potentially more predictive power than local variables (59). However, a northward shift in chlorophyll distribution has been documented along the Patagonian shelf during El Niño years and thought to be partially driven by wind anomalies (45). We therefore conducted a secondary analysis (figure 2) using Aqua MODIS-derived chlorophyll a data that suggested birds are significantly shifting their latitude with where the maximum chlorophyll in the southwest Atlantic is centred (48). Despite the limitations of using chlorophyll content as a proxy for prey distribution (60), this suggests that observed shifts in latitude are driven by prey availability (39). Understanding how birds vary their behaviour with shifting resource distribution is important in terms of understanding current and future climatic changes, with future ENSO events predicted to become more extreme under greenhouse warming (61). 538 539 540 541 542 543 544 545 546 547 548 549 550 551 552 553

554

Many avian species are seeing changes in breeding phenology so as to align breeding with peak prey availability (62). However, we did not find any convincing effects of ENSO on migratory timings in Manx shearwaters (figure 2). Interestingly, migratory dates were highly correlated with one another (figure 5). We found that birds that leave earlier on southbound autumn migration do not have longer nonbreeding periods, but instead returned to the colony earlier next year. Breeding earlier is linked to higher success in many avian taxa, including shearwaters (63), so migratory timing may already be under strong directional selection (64–66). 555 556 557 558 559 560 561 562 563 564

565

Despite carry-over effects now being well documented in various taxa (15,67–69), including Manx shearwaters, (22,34), the effects of global shifting environmental conditions are not well understood (70–72). Here we tie carry over effects to ENSO, yet do not find an influence of the NAO, a major driver of European climate, on breeding season behaviour. 566 567 568 569 570

ENSO can influence northern hemisphere weather, and potentially even the NAO (73), so further research is needed to understand how environmental oscillations in different hemispheres, may interact across the annual cycle of trans-global migrants. 571 572 573 574

- 575
- 576
- 577

## **References** 578

579

1. Pelletier D, Seyer Y, Garthe S, Bonnefoi S, Phillips RA, Guillemette M. So far, so good. . . Similar fitness consequences and overall energetic costs for short and long-distance migrants in a seabird. PLoS One. 2020;15(3):1–23. 2. Philander SGH. El Niño Southern Oscillation phenomena. Nature. 1983;302:295–301. 3. Ayarzagüena B, Ineson S, Dunstone NJ, Baldwin MP, Scaife AA. Intraseasonal effects of El Niño-Southern Oscillation on North Atlantic climate. J Clim. 2018;31(21):8861–73. 4. Quillfeldt P, Masello JF. Impacts of climate variation and potential effects of climate change on South American seabirds - a review. Marine Biology Research. 2013;9(4):337–57. 5. Bogdanova MI, Butler A, Wanless S, Moe B, Anker-nilssen T, Frederiksen M, et al. Multi-colony tracking reveals spatio-temporal variation in carryover effects between breeding success and winter movements in a pelagic seabird. Mar Ecol Prog Ser. 2017;578:167–81. Kim Y, Priddel D, Carlile N. Incubation routine and associated changes in body mass of gould's petrel (Pterodroma leucoptera). Emu. 2017;118(2):193–200. 7. Hunter S. Breeding biology and population dynamics of giant petrels Macronectes at South Georgia (Aves: Procellariiformes). J Zool. 1984;203(4):441–60. 8. Gatt MC, Versteegh M, Bauch C, Tieleman BI, Granadeiro JP, Catry P. Costs of reproduction and migration are paid in later return to the colony, not in physical condition, in a long-lived seabird. Oecologia [Internet]. 2020;195(2):287–97. Available from: https://doi.org/10.1007/s00442-020-04775-w 580 581 582 583 584 585 586 587 588 589 590 591 592 593 594 595 596 597 598 599 600 601 602 603 604 605 606 607 608 609 610 611 612 613

- 614
- 9. Alerstam T, Hedenstrom A. The Development of Bird Migration Theory. J Avian Biol. 1998;29(4):343–69. 615 616
- 617
- Fayet AL, Freeman R, Shoji A, Kirk HL, Padget O, Perrins CM, et al. 618
- Carry-over effects on the annual cycle of a migratory seabird: an 619
- experimental study. Journal of Animal Ecology. 2016;85(6):1516–27. 620
- 621
- Brichetti P, Foschi UF, Boano G. Does El Nino affect survival rate of 622
- mediterranean populations of Cory's Shearwater? Waterbirds. 2000;23(2):147–54. 623 624
- 625
- 12. Cubaynes S, Doherty PF, Schreiber EA, Gimenez O. To breed or not to breed: A seabird's response to extreme climatic events. Biol Lett. 626 627
- 2011;7(2):303–6. 628
- 629
- 13. Ballance LT, Pitman RL, Fiedler PC. Oceanographic influences on 630
- seabirds and cetaceans of the eastern tropical Pacific: A review. Prog 631
- Oceanogr. 2006;69(2–4):360–90. 632
- 633
- 14. O'connor CM, Norris DR, Crossin GT, Cooke SJ. Biological carryover 634
- effects: Linking common concepts and mechanisms in ecology and evolution. Ecosphere. 2014;5(3). 635 636
- 637
- 15. Harrison XA, Blount JD, Inger R, Norris DR, Bearhop S. Carry-over 638
- effects as drivers of fitness differences in animals. Journal of Animal 639
- Ecology. 2011;80(1):4–18. 640
- 641
- 16. Bogdanova MI, Daunt F, Newell M, Phillips RA, Harris MP, Wanless S. 642
- Seasonal interactions in the black-legged kittiwake, rissa tridactyla: 643
- Links between breeding performance and winter distribution. 644
- Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences. 645
- 2011;278(1717):2412–8. 646
- 647
- 17. Whelan S, Hatch SA, Irons DB, McKnight A, Elliott KH. Increased 648
- summer food supply decreases non-breeding movement in black-legged 649
- kittiwakes. Biol Lett. 2020;16(1). 650
- 651
- 18. Desprez M, Jenouvrier S, Barbraud C, Delord K, Weimerskirch H. Linking 652
- oceanographic conditions, migratory schedules and foraging behaviour 653
- during the non-breeding season to reproductive performance in a longlived seabird. Funct Ecol. 2018;32(8):2040–53. 654 655
- 656
- Storey A, Brooke M. The Manx Shearwater. Vol. 14, Colonial Waterbirds. 1991. p. 66. 657 658
- 659
- Guilford T, Meade J, Willis J, Phillips RA, Boyle D, Roberts S, et al. 660
- Migration and stopover in a small pelagic seabird, the Manx shearwater 661

Puffinus puffinus: Insights from machine learning. Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences. 2009;276(1660):1215–23. 21. Norris DR, Taylor CM. Predicting the consequences of carry-over effects for migratory populations. Biol Lett. 2006;2(1):148–51. 22. Shoji A, Aris-Brosou S, Culina A, Fayet A, Kirk H, Padget O, et al. Breeding phenology and winter activity predict subsequent breeding success in a trans-global migratory seabird. Biol Lett. 2015;11(10). 23. Moe B, Frederiksen M, Steen H, Bogdanova MI, Butler A, Wanless S, et al. Multi-colony tracking reveals spatio-temporal variation in carry-over effects between breeding success and winter movements in a pelagic seabird. Mar Ecol Prog Ser. 2017;578:167–81. van de Pol M, Wright J. A simple method for distinguishing within-versus between-subject effects using mixed models. Anim Behav. 2009;77(3):753–8. 25. Shipley B. Cause and correlation in biology: A user's guide to path analysis, structural equations and causal inference with R. 2016. 26. Forchhammer MC, Post E, Stenseth NC, Forchhammer MC, Postf E, Stensethi NCHR. North Atlantic Oscillation Timing of Long- and Short-Distance Migration. British Ecological Society. 2019;71(6):1002–14. 27. Forchhammer MC, Post E. Using large-scale climate indices in climate change ecology studies. Popul Ecol. 2004;46(1):1–12. NOAA. NOAA [Internet]. 2023. Available from: https://www.ncei.noaa.gov/access/monitoring/products/ Team RC. R: A language and environment for statistical computing. R Foundation for Statistical Computing,. Vienna, Austria: R Core Team; 2021. Lisovski S, Hahn S. GeoLight - processing and analysing light-based geolocator data in R. Methods Ecol Evol. 2012;3(6):1055–9. 31. Bråthen VS, Moe B, Amélineau F, Ekker M, Fauchald P, Helgason HH, et al. An automated procedure (v2.0) to obtain positions from light-level geolocators in large-scale tracking of seabirds A method description for the SEATRACK project. 2021. 1–51 p. 32. Phillips RA, Silk JRD, Croxall JP, Afanasyev V, Briggs DR. Accuracy of geolocation estimates for flying seabirds. Mar Ecol Prog Ser. 2004;266:265–72. 662 663 664 665 666 667 668 669 670 671 672 673 674 675 676 879. 678 679 680 681 682 683 684 685 686 687 688 689 690 691 692 693 694 695 696 697 698 699 700 701 702 703 704 705 706 707 708 709

33. Liechti F, Bauer S, Dhanjal-Adams KL, Emmenegger T, Zehtindjiev P, Hahn S. Miniaturized multi-sensor loggers provide new insight into yearround flight behaviour of small trans-Sahara avian migrants. Mov Ecol. 2018;6(1):1–10. 34. Fayet AL, Freeman R, Shoji A, Kirk HL, Padget O, Perrins CM, et al. Carry-over effects on the annual cycle of a migratory seabird: an experimental study. Journal of Animal Ecology. 2016;85(6):1516–27. 35. Freeman R, Dean B, Kirk H, Leonard K, Phillips RA, Perrins CM, et al. Predictive ethoinformatics reveals the complex migratory behaviour of a pelagic seabird, the Manx Shearwater. J R Soc Interface. 2013;10(84). 36. Dean B, Freeman R, Kirk H, Leonard K, Phillips RA, Perrins CM, et al. Behavioural mapping of a pelagic seabird: Combining multiple sensors and a hidden Markov model reveals the distribution of at-sea behaviour. J R Soc Interface. 2013;10(78). Darby J, Clairbaux M, Bennison A, Quinn JL, Jessopp MJ. Underwater visibility constrains the foraging behaviour of a diving pelagic seabird. Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences. 2022;289(1978). 38. Shoji A, Dean B, Kirk H, Freeman R, Perrins CM, Guilford T. The diving behaviour of the Manx Shearwater Puffinus puffinus. Ibis. 2016;158(3):598–606. 39. Kane A, Pirotta E, Wischnewski S, Critchley EJ, Bennison A, Jessopp M, et al. Spatio-Temporal patterns of foraging behaviour in a wide-ranging seabird reveal the role of primary productivity in locating prey. Mar Ecol Prog Ser. 2020;646:175–88. 40. Riou S, Hamer KC. Predation risk and reproductive effort: impacts of moonlight on food provisioning and chick growth in Manx shearwaters. Anim Behav. 2008;76(5):1743–8. Teets DA. Predicting Sunrise and Sunset Times. The College Mathematics Journal. 2003;34(4):317. Padget O. Navigation in Procellariiform Seabirds. University of Oxford; 2017. 43. Gillies N. The mechanisms and consequences of parental coordination in Procellariiform seabirds. University of Oxfordth; 2021. 44. Benaglia T, Chauveau D, Hunter DR, Young DS. mixtools : An R Package for Analyzing Finite. J Stat Softw. 2009;32(6). 710 711 712 713 714 715 716 717 718 719 720 721 722 723 724 725 726 727 728 729 730 731 732 733 734 735 736 737 738 739 740 741 742 743 744 745 746 747 748 749 750 751 752 753 754 755 756

Machado I, Barreiro M, Calliari D. Variability of chlorophyll-a in the Southwestern Atlantic from satellite images: Seasonal cycle and ENSO influences. Cont Shelf Res. 2013;53:102–9. 46. Stenseth NC, Ottersen G, Hurrell JW, Mysterud A, Lima M, Chan KS, et al. Studying climate effects on ecology through the use of climate indices: The North Atlantic Oscillation, El Niño Southern Oscillation and beyond. Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences. 2003;270(1529):2087–96. 47. Barnagaud JY, Crochet PA, Magnani Y, Laurent AB, Menoni E, Novoa C, et al. Short-term response to the North Atlantic Oscillation but no longterm effects of climate change on the reproductive success of an alpine bird. J Ornithol. 2011;152(3):631–41. 48. NASA. Moderate-resolution Imaging Spectroradiometer (MODIS) Aqua [Internet]. 2023. Available from: https://oceancolor.gsfc.nasa.gov/data/aqua/ 49. Lleras C. Path Analysis. Vol. 3, Encyclopedia of Social Measurement. 2005. p. 25–30. 50. Roseel Y. lavaan: An R Package for Structural Equation Modeling. J Stat Softw. 2012;48(2):1–36. Smith CE, Cribbie RA. Multiplicity Control in Structural Equation Modeling: Incorporating Parameter Dependencies. Structural Equation Modeling. 2013;20(1):79–85. 52. Hooper D, Coughlan J, Mullen MR. Structural equation modelling: Guidelines for determining model fit. Electronic Journal of Business Research Methods. 2008;6(1):53–60. 53. Hu L, Bentler PM. Cutoff criteria for fit indexes in covariance structure analysis: Conventional criteria versus new alternatives. Stuctual Equation Modeling: A Multidisciplinary Journal. 2009;6:1–55. 54. Bates D, Mächler M, Bolker BM, Walker SC. Fitting linear mixed-effects models using lme4. J Stat Softw. 2015;67(1). 55. Gelman A, Hill J. Data Analysis Using Regression and Multilevel/Hierarchical Models (Analytical Methods for Social Research). Cambridge: Cambridge University Pres; 2006. 56. Grémillet D, Boulinier T. Spatial ecology and conservation of seabirds facing global climate change: A review. Mar Ecol Prog Ser. 2009;391(2):121–37. 457. 758 759 760 461. 762 763 764 765 766 467. 768 769 770 771 772 773 774 775 776 777 778 779 780 781 782 783 784 785 786 787 788 789 790 791 792 793 5944 795 796 597. 798 799 800 801 802 803 804

57. Weimerskirch H, Prudor A. Cyclone avoidance behaviour by foraging seabirds. Sci Rep. 2019;9(1):1–9. 58. Risaro DB, Chidichimo MP, Piola AR. Interannual Variability and Trends of Sea Surface Temperature Around Southern South America. Front Mar Sci. 2022;9(March):1–20. Szostek KL, Becker PH. Survival and local recruitment are driven by environmental carry-over effects from the wintering area in a migratory seabird. Oecologia. 2015;178(3):643–57. 60. Lyngsgaard MM, Markager S, Richardson K, Møller EF, Jakobsen HH. How Well Does Chlorophyll Explain the Seasonal Variation in Phytoplankton Activity? Estuaries and Coasts. 2017;40(5):1263–75. 61. Cai W, Santoso A, Collins M, Dewitte B, Karamperidou C, Kug JS, et al. Changing El Niño–Southern Oscillation in a warming climate. Nat Rev Earth Environ. 2021;2(9):628–44. 62. Gordo O. Why are bird migration dates shifting? A review of weather and climate effects on avian migratory phenology. Clim Res. 2007;35(1–2):37– 58. 63. Perrins CM, Harris MP, Britton CK. Survival of manx shearwaters. Ibis. 1973;115:535–48. 64. Schaper S V., Dawson A, Sharp PJ, Caro SP, Visser ME. Individual variation in avian reproductive physiology does not reliably predict variation in laying date. Gen Comp Endocrinol. 2012;179(1):53–62. 65. Winkler DW, Hallinger KK, Pegan TM, Taff CC, Verhoeven MA, Chang van Oordt D, et al. Full lifetime perspectives on the costs and benefits of lay-date variation in tree swallows. Ecology. 2020;101(9):1–19. Lambrechts MM, Blondel J, Maistre M, Perret P. A single response mechanism is responsible for evolutionary adaptive variation in a bird's laying date. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A. 1997;94(10):5153–5. 67. Fayet AL, Freeman R, Anker-Nilssen T, Diamond A, Erikstad KE, Fifield D, et al. Ocean-wide Drivers of Migration Strategies and Their Influence on Population Breeding Performance in a Declining Seabird. Current Biology. 2017;27(24):3871-3878.e3. Finch T, Pearce-Higgins JW, Leech DI, Evans KL. Carry-over effects from passage regions are more important than breeding climate in determining the breeding phenology and performance of three avian migrants of conservation concern. Biodivers Conserv. 2014;23(10):2427– 44. 805 806 807 808 809 810 811 812 813 814 815 816 817 818 819 820 821 822 823 824 825 826 827 828 829 830 831 832 833 834 835 836 837 838 839 840 841 842 843 844 845 846 847 848 849 850 851 852 853

- Calvert AM, Walde SJ, Taylor PD. Nonbreeding-Season Drivers of
- Population Dynamics in Seasonal Migrants: Conservation Parallels Across
- Taxa. Avian Conservation and Ecology. 2009;4(2).
- 
- 70. Remisiewicz M, Underhill LG. Large‐Scale Climatic Patterns Have
- Stronger Carry‐Over Effects than Local Temperatures on Spring
- Phenology of Long‐Distance Passerine Migrants between Europe and
- Africa. Animals. 2022;12(13).
- 
- 71. Horn LC, Remmel TK, Stutchbury BJM. Weak evidence of carry-over
- effects of overwinter climate and habitat productivity on spring passage
- of migratory songbirds at a northern stopover site in Ontario.
- Ornithological Applications. 2021;123(1):1–16.
- 
- 72. Ottersen G, Planque B, Belgrano A, Post E, Reid PC, Stenseth NC.
- Ecological effects of the North Atlantic Oscillation. Oecologia.
- 2001;128(1):1–14.
- 
- 73. Mokhov II, Smirnov DA. El Niño-Southern Oscillation drives North
- Atlantic Oscillation as revealed with nonlinear techniques from climatic
- indices. Geophys Res Lett. 2006;33(3):2–5.
- 
- 
- 
-