- 1 Running head: Cross-species synchrony in survival
- 2 Title:

3 Synchrony in adult survival is remarkably strong among common

4 temperate songbirds across France

5 Authors:

6 MANON GHISLAIN,^{*1,2} TIMOTHÉE BONNET,^{*3} UGOLINE GODEAU,^{1,2,4} OLIVIER DEHORTER,²

7 OLIVIER GIMENEZ,⁵ AND PIERRE-YVES HENRY^{1,2}

8 * These authors contributed equally to this work.

9

¹Mécanismes adaptatifs et évolution (MECADEV UMR 7179), Muséum National d'Histoire

11 Naturelle, Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique, 1 avenue du Petit Château, 91800

12 Brunoy, France.

13 ²Centre de Recherches sur la Biologie des Populations d'Oiseaux (CRBPO), Centre d'Ecologie et

14 des Sciences de la Conservation (CESCO UMR 7204), Muséum National d'Histoire Naturelle,

15 Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique, Sorbonne Université, CP135, 43 rue Buffon, 75005

16 Paris, France.

17 ³ Division of Ecology and Evolution, Research School of Biology, ANU College of Science, The

- 18 Australian National University, Canberra, ACT 2600, Australia.
- ⁴ Institut national de Recherche en Sciences et Technologies pour l'Environnement et
- 20 l'Agriculture, Ecosystèmes Forestiers (UR EFNO), Domaine des Barres, 45290 Nogent-Sur-

21 Vernisson, France.

22	⁵ Centre d'Ecologie Fonctionnelle et Evolutive (CEFE UMR 5175), Centre National de la
23	Recherche Scientifique, Université de Montpellier, Université Paul-Valéry Montpellier, Ecole
24	Pratique des Hautes Etudes, 1919 Route de Mende, 34293 Montpellier Cedex 5, France.
25	
26	Corresponding Author: Pierre-Yves Henry
27	⁷ E-mail : pierre-yves.henry@mnhn.fr
28	

30 Abstract

Synchronous variation in demographic parameters across species destabilizes populations, 31 metapopulations and metacommunities and increases extinction risks. Revealing the processes 32 that synchronize population dynamics across species allows to identify trans-specific 33 demographic processes that are subject to environmental forcing of overarching importance. 34 Using a Bayesian, hierarchical multi-site, multi-species mark-recapture model, we investigated 35 synchrony in annual adult local survival across 16 species of songbirds over France for the period 36 37 2001–2016, and the contributions of winter and spring weather conditions to synchrony. Adult annual survival was largely synchronous among species (73% [47–94] of Species-by-Year 38 variance), despite species differing in ecological niche and life-histories. This result was robust to 39 40 differences in migratory strategy among species, uneven species sample sizes, and time de-41 trending. Shared synchrony across migratory strategy suggests that environmental forcing during 42 the 4-month temperate breeding season has large-scale, cross-specific impacts among songbirds. At a scale ~1000 km a likely proximate mechanism of synchronization is forcing by weather-43 44 driven variation in resources, which, in particular, determines the cost of reproduction. However, 45 the strong synchrony was not easily explained by climate, with spring weather variables explaining only about 1.4% [0.01–5.5] of synchrony, while the contribution of large-scale winter 46 47 weather indices may be stronger, but uncertain (12% [0.3–37]). Future research should up-scale these results to community dynamics, to understand compensatory intra- and inter-specific 48 demographic processes that preserve meta-communities from synchronization. 49

50

51 *Keywords : adult survival; common songbirds; demography; mark-recapture; migration;*52 *Moran effect; precipitation; synchrony; temperature.*

3

5

54 **INTRODUCTION**

Synchrony corresponds to the coincident change in individual, population or species state over 55 extended areas (up to thousands of km, Liebhold et al. 2004). Understanding the causes of 56 57 synchronous variations in population size is of importance in ecology and conservation because the higher the synchrony, the higher the risk of population, metapopulation, and metacommunity 58 extinction (Liebhold et al. 2004, Koenig and Liebhold 2016). Indeed, synchronous populations go 59 60 down in numbers simultaneously, increasing the risk of synchronous local extinctions, and 61 reducing opportunity for subsequent demographic rescue through immigration (Tavecchia et al. 62 2016). If this extinction process undergoes simultaneously for multiple co-occurring species, it 63 can ultimately result in disruptions of ecosystem functioning (Loreau and de Mazancourt 2008, Kahilainen et al. 2018). However, differences in niche and life-histories among the species of a 64 community should decrease synchrony and thereby the risk of extinction (Pandit et al. 2013). 65 Spatial synchrony has mainly been investigated across populations within species, i.e., as the 66 spatial covariance in temporal changes of population properties (Liebhold et al. 2004). There, a 67 major theoretical and empirical challenge is to reveal the respective role of the three processes 68 that can cause spatial synchrony. The most intuitive, and commonly reported, process is extrinsic 69 forcing: individuals that share a common environment are exposed to the same constraints (the 70 71 Moran effect, Liebhold et al. 2004, Olmos et al. 2019). A first process is climate forcing, where 72 temperatures, precipitations, or other weather properties, drive directly variation in survival and reproduction (Post and Forchhammer 2004, Cattadori et al. 2005, Hansen et al. 2013, Sheppard 73 et al. 2015, Koenig and Liebhold 2016, Black et al. 2018, Kahilainen et al. 2018, but see Vik et 74 al. 2004), in particular by affecting the cost of thermoregulation (Root, 1988, Boyles et al. 2011). 75 A second process is synchronization through interactions with another trophic level, e.g. through 76 synchronous fluctuations in shared preys (e.g., synchronous mast-seeding for seed-eating species; 77

5

Liebhold et al. 2004, Klapwijk et al. 2018), predators (Huitu et al. 2004) or parasites (Cattadori et
al. 2005), which may themselves be driven by climate forcing (Dubos et al. 2018). The third
process is dispersal. Dispersal synchronizes fluctuations in size of connected populations
proportionally to dispersal distance (over c. 65 kms in common songbirds, Paradis et al. 1999,
Liebhold et al. 2004, Martin et al. 2017). But interpopulation dispersal can also desynchronize
population fluctuations (Sanz-Aguilar et al. 2016, Tavecchia et al. 2016).
Disentangling these three causes of synchrony is a notoriously complex topic in ecology.

Cross-specific synchrony (or "interspecific synchrony", Liebhold et al. 2004). Evidence 85 86 accumulates that a few taxa can show a strong degree of synchrony over wide areas, even when 87 they are ecologically, functionally and phylogenetically divergent (Post and Forchhammer 2004, Hansen et al. 2013, Black et al. 2018). Interspecific synchrony has been mainly revealed in two 88 systems that are subject to trivial environmental forcing: species thriving in cold-driven 89 environments (Post and Forchhammer 2004, Jones et al. 2003, Hansen et al. 2013, Koenig and 90 Liebhold 2016, with cyclic dynamics, e.g. Huitu et al. 2004, Liebhold et al. 2004), and predatory 91 marine seabirds that aggregate at a few colonies surrounding shared areas of high oceanic 92 productivity (Lahoz-Monfort et al. 2011, 2013, 2017, Robinson et al. 2013). Evidence of cross-93 specific synchronous demography across a wide range of species are very few, and come from 94 95 large-scale census of common wintering birds (6 species from UK, Swallow et al. 2016; 49 96 species from North-America, Koenig and Liebhold 2016).

Population size fluctuations can be asynchronous despite synchrony in some vital rates.
Indeed, vital rates taken separately are expected to be more commonly synchronized than
population sizes, due to life-history trade-offs (e.g. increased fecundity may decrease survival due
to the cost of reproduction) and to demographic buffering, when the synchronous vital rate has a
limited contribution to the population growth rate (Schaub et al. 2015, Saether et al. 2016).

6

Dispersal can also desynchronize population sizes (Tavecchia et al. 2016). Identifying synchrony 102 in some vital rates, rather than in population size, is nonetheless important because it points 103 towards a demographic weakness: if the compensatory mechanism was to fail, then synchrony 104 105 may scale-up to population size, increasing the risk of extinction (Sanz-Aguilar et al. 2016). To the best of our knowledge, until recently, cross-species synchrony in vital rates had been 106 studied only for a small number of species (2 to 6) at a single site or region : one on two duck 107 108 species (Péron and Koons 2012), two on two salmon species (Malick and Cox 2016, Malick et al. 2017), all others on marine predatory birds (Lahoz-Monfort et al. 2011, 2013, 2017, Robinson et 109 110 al. 2013). The reduced taxonomic coverage in those studies may have facilitated the detection of 111 cross-species synchrony. Recently, Telensky et al. (2020) estimated the synchronizing effect of weather variables on breeding sites and winter sites for migrants for the survival of 16 songbird 112 species and 42 sites located in the Czech Republic during 2004–2014. In addition, Morrisson et 113 al. (2021), studied patterns of demographic and vital rates changes across European songbirds 114 and in particular estimated the covariation in population trends, reproductive rates and survival 115 between migrant species vs. resident species using 26 songbird species across 10 areas 116 comprising 336 sites. These two studies did not explicitly estimate synchrony in vital rates 117 though. The lack of research on cross-species synchrony of vital rates likely results from (i) the 118 119 lack of theories and methods to root (meta)community dynamics in processes operating at individual level (but see Lahoz-Monfort et al. 2017), and (ii) the complexity and computational 120 intensiveness of pioneer methods to analyze multi-species, multi-site, long-term vital rate dataset 121 122 (Grosbois et al. 2009, Lahoz-Monfort et al. 2011, 2013, 2017, Swallow et al. 2016). The reward for by-passing these limits is that evidencing cross-specific demographic processes reveal 123 regulating mechanisms of overarching importance. 124

13

14

125 In the present study, we investigated synchrony in yearly fluctuations in annual adult local survival across a set of common songbirds (16 species), at a country level (242 sites across 126 France, see Fig. 1), over a period of 16 years. Cross-specific synchrony was analyzed using the 127 128 variance partitioning method of Lahoz-Monfort et al. (2011), splitting between-year variance into a synchronous component, common to all species, and a species-specific, asynchronous 129 component. We expected annual variations of survival to be largely species-specific (i.e. 130 131 asynchronous) since our analyses involved a large number of species with distinct niches (Table S1; the higher the diversity, the lower the expected synchrony, Pandit et al. 2013). These species 132 differ in terms of migratory strategy and wintering range: 9 species are resident or short-distance 133 134 migrants, with year-round exposure to temperate climate, whereas 7 species are trans-Saharan migrants that winter under the west-African climate. Therefore, we expected that synchrony 135 would be stronger within migratory strategy and that migratory strategy would explain a 136 significant portion of year-to-year variation among species. If that was the case, it would point to 137 a role of conditions on wintering grounds. Winter harshness is commonly proposed to explain a 138 large proportion of year-round mortality in small organisms like songbirds (Grosbois et al. 2006, 139 Robinson et al. 2007, Salewski et al. 2013, Johnston et al. 2016, Saether et al. 2016), including in 140 migratory songbirds (Robinson et al. 2007, Woodworth et al. 2017b). Factors explaining winter 141 142 mortality could include water availability in arid wintering areas (Telenský et al. 2020) and the cost of thermoregulation in extreme cold or hot conditions (Boyles et al. 2011). 143 144 On the other hand, if survival was to covary more synchronously and across migration strategies, it would point towards a role of conditions on the breeding grounds, and climate 145 forcing during the breeding season would be a likely synchronizing process. In addition to factors 146 that explain mortality during winter, climate forcing during the breeding season could 147 synchronize species through its effect on primary and secondary productivity. During nestling 148 8 15

rearing, all songbirds feed their chicks exclusively with invertebrates. High precipitations and 149 mild to hot temperatures favor high invertebrate production (Eglington et al. 2015, Dubos et al. 150 2018, 2019), minimizing the foraging effort for chick rearing by breeding adults, and decreasing 151 152 exposure to predators (Eglington et al. 2015). Aphids and Lepidoptera are subject to spatial synchronization of their abundance by climate forcing (Jones et al. 2003, Sheppard et al. 2015, 153 154 Kahilainen et al. 2018). A remarkable food-supplementation experiment demonstrated that food 155 availability during breeding has a direct effect on annual adult survival in a long-distance migratory species: simply increasing food availability during reproduction (i.e. over 4–5 months) 156 157 increased survival by 5% (Seward et al. 2013). Moreover, in highly productive years, a higher 158 proportion of adults engage in rearing a second brood (Visser et al. 2003), potentially at a supplementary cost in terms of survival (Woodworth et al. 2017a). If facultative multi-brooding 159 species (62% of studied species; Appendix S1) are synchronous in their choice to lay a second 160 brood, their adult survival could be synchronized by the cost of reproduction. Schaub et al. 161 (2015) demonstrated that the probability of double brooding was actually the most synchronous 162 vital rates across the 9 populations of an aerial insectivorous songbird, the Barn Swallow 163 (Hirundo rustica). All these lines of evidence support that the environmental conditions during 164 the short period of reproduction could have a major incidence on year-round survival in 165 166 temperate songbirds.

To assess the respective role of climate forcing during the breeding (i.e. common to all species) *vs.* non-breeding seasons (i.e. common to species wintering in the same climatic region), we tested for the dependence of survival on local temperatures and precipitations at the breeding sites during the breeding season, and on global climate indices related to conditions on the wintering grounds during the non-breeding season (the winter North Atlantic Oscillation and the summer Sahel rainfalls, see Methods). We predicted that, if climate exerts forcing on adult

9

mortality during the breeding season, survival probability variations should be synchronous to
some extent across species. These synchronous peaks of mortality or high survival should depend
on spring weather conditions. On the other hand, if climate forcing operates mainly during the
'harsh' season (winter), survival variations should be synchronous among species sharing the
same migratory behavior (but not across all species), and should depend on yearly fluctuations in
winter harshness indices.

179

180 METHODS

181 *Study site and species*

182 Mark-recapture data were collected by volunteer bird ringers under the French Constantringing-Effort-Site (CES) banding scheme (Julliard and Jiguet 2002) over the period 2001–2016, 183 with the goal of estimating annual local survival and recapture probabilities. We consider "local 184 survival", rather than "true survival", as our data cannot distinguish between mortality and 185 186 permanent emigration. At each CES site, the local bird community is sampled 3.17 ± 1.06 SD times per breeding season (first session in May 21 ± 15 days) and July (last session in July 4 ± 12 187 188 days), with 14 ± 7 mist nets (12-m long), spread over an area of ~ 3 hectares (4 to 5 mist nets per 189 hectare). A capture session typically starts at dawn, and lasts until midday. For every site, the 190 number, dates and hours of capture sessions, as well as the mist net locations, are held constant 191 across sessions and years. Sites are monitored for an average of six \pm four years. Sites are typically located in low canopy habitats such as shrub lands, open woodlands and reed beds, 192 193 where birds are easily trapped with 3.5-m high mist nets. Each captured bird is marked with a metal band bearing a unique identifier, identified at the species level, aged (juvenile or adult), 194 sexed (Svensson 1992), and released at the point of capture. All recaptures of marked individuals 195

are recorded. To secure minimal robustness of site-level estimates, we retained only those species
with at least five individuals captured, on average, per year. Juvenile mortality is highly
confounded with dispersal and was not considered (Johnston et al. 2016). Overall, our markrecapture dataset consists of 20,912 adults from 16 species, including 5,198 individuals
recaptured across years at least once (see Appendix S1) and 242 sites (Fig. 1 and Appendix S10
Fig. S1), over a period of 16 years (Dehorter and CRBPO 2017).

202 Bayesian survival data analysis

We modelled annual local survival and recapture probabilities using mark-recapture history of 203 204 individual birds with species- and time-dependent Cormack-Jolly-Seber (CJS) models (Lahoz-Monfort et al. 2011). Inter-annual adult local survival probability (ϕ) is the probability that a bird 205 206 alive in year (t) is still alive and present at the same CES site in year (t+1). The recapture 207 probability (p) is the probability that a bird alive and present in the same CES site where it was formerly captured (year (t-1) or before) is recaptured in year (t). Transient individuals that do not 208 pertain to the local population (i.e. that were captured only once, Johnston et al. 2016) were 209 discarded by starting capture history only at the second capture of each individual. We also 210 attempted to retain transients and model them, but the models were prohibitively long to run. 211 212 Goodness-of-fit tests for the general group-by-time-dependent CJS model were then run separately for each species using the R2ucare package (Gimenez et al. 2018; Appendix S2). 213 We built a Bayesian formulation of the CJS model applying a Markov Chain Monte Carlo 214 215 (MCMC) sampling procedure (Lahoz-Monfort et al. 2011) implemented in JAGS (Plummer 2003) called from R version 3.5.1 (R Development Core Team 2015) using the R-package R2jags 216 version 4.2.0 (Su and Yajima 2015). We chose weakly informative priors for all parameters 217 218 (Appendix S3). Details on specification of prior distributions for the parameters and satisfactory

convergence criteria are provided in Appendix S3. All models accounted for the variation of local 219 survival and recapture probabilities between sexes (effect common to all species), species and 220 sites (see Appendix S3). We addressed only synchrony across all sites, ignoring the spatio-221 222 temporal (i.e. Site: Year random variance) and the species-specific spatio-temporal variances (i.e. Species: Site: Year random variance) in local adult survival probability. Such a full, hierarchical 223 partitioning of variance was not achievable with the amount of mark-recapture data available 224 within year-site-species. We report posterior modes as point estimates and 95% highest posterior 225 density credible intervals to show estimation uncertainty. 226

227 Temporal synchrony in survival across species

We estimated the between-year synchrony in annual survival probability across species using 228 two complementary random effects (as in Grosbois et al. 2009): a Year random variance (σ_{δ}^2) that 229 quantifies the amount of between-year variation that is common to all species, across all sites 230 (synchronous, country-scale, inter-annual variation) and a Year-by-Species random variance (σ_{ϵ}^2) 231 that quantifies the between-year variation that differs between species (asynchronous, country-232 scale, inter-annual variation). Note that σ_{δ}^2 and σ_{ε}^2 are unique parameters common to all species. 233 From estimates of σ_{δ}^2 and σ_{ϵ}^2 , we calculate a between-species intra-class correlation (ICC) of 234 235 temporal variation to quantify national-level, between-year synchrony in adult survival across species, on the logit scale, defined as $ICC = \frac{\sigma_{\delta}^2}{\sigma_{\delta}^2 + \sigma_{\epsilon}^2}$. The model description up until now defines 236 model 1. 237

The approach used for model 1 differs from Lahoz-Monfort et al. (2011) in that we define σ_{ε}^2 and *ICC* common to all species, while Lahoz-Monfort et al. (2011) estimated species-specific

240 parameters, $\sigma_{\varepsilon species}^2$ and $ICC_{species} = \frac{\sigma_{\delta}^2}{\sigma_{\delta}^2 + \sigma_{\varepsilon species}^2}$. We also fitted the model corresponding to Lahoz-

Monfort et al. (2011) and name it model 2. From model 2, we calculated the average of the 16 *ICC*_{species}point estimates to compare it to the global *ICC* calculated from model 1. We now explain the pros and cons of model 1 and model 2.

Our main goal was to quantify synchrony across species as a single value. A single value for 244 synchrony corresponds directly to the parameterization of model 1 where synchrony is captured 245 by a single ICC. In contrast, in model 2, to obtain the overall measure of synchrony, we need to 246 average 16 species-specific $ICC_{species}$, which is conceptually similar to our question of synchrony 247 248 across species, but less direct. Further, we rely on sparse, hard to collect, mark-recapture data, and sample size limits the precision of estimates. In model 1, the ICC is estimated from all the data, 249 while in model 2 the $ICC_{species}$ are each estimated from a fraction of the data only and therefore 250 less precisely. The lack of data to estimate some $ICC_{species}$ may be a special concern in the 251 Bayesian framework since the prior may influence estimation of parameters informed by fewer 252 253 data points. Finally, model 2 has more variance parameters than model 1, which makes estimation 254 more difficult algorithmically, although these extra parameters are not of direct interest for the estimation of synchrony. We observed that extensions of model 2 exploring factors contributing to 255 synchrony (see below models 3-5) had difficulties converging, while the same extensions of 256 257 model 1 converged.

On the other hand, model 1 assumes that species-specific time deviations came from a single distribution, with a variance common to all species. However, this assumption may lead to a poor fit to the data and may bias estimates when sample sizes vary among species. Model 2 relaxes the assumption and provides a sanity check: if the estimation of synchrony in model 1 is robust to the

assumption of common distribution, then most species-specific $ICC_{species}$ in model 2 should be in the range of values, and the average of $ICC_{species}$ should be similar to the *ICC* estimated in model 1.

In summary, model 2 is useful to illustrate the variability, or lack of variability in ICC across species, and to check the statistical robustness to the imbalance of species sample sizes. Nevertheless, we favor model 1 as it provides a more direct measure of synchrony and, given sparse data as available here, allows a more powerful estimation of synchrony and test of the factors contributing to synchrony. Below we describe how, building on model 1, we were able to assess specific hypotheses about the contributions of weather and migratory type.

271 *Yearly weather covariates (models 3 and 4)*

272 Spring – early summer weather conditions were characterized for each site and year by daily mean temperature and daily sum precipitation (as in Grosbois et al. 2006, Eglington et al. 2015, 273 Gaüzère et al. 2015, Dubos et al. 2018) from the E-OBS meteorological dataset (available at 274 https://www.ecad.eu/) during the breeding period (from April to July), with a 0.25° pixel 275 (approximately 20Km by 28Km) resolution using the R-package climateExtract (available at 276 https://github.com/RetoSchmucki). Since organisms are expected to be adapted to average local 277 278 conditions (e.g. Dubos et al. 2019), we tested for an effect of departure from local average weather conditions, i.e. local spring weather anomalies. Anomalies were computed for each 279 variable, site and year, as the difference between the local value for a given spring and the mean 280 over the 2001–2016 period (as in Dubos et al. 2018). For the effect sizes for temperature and 281 precipitation to be comparable, anomalies were standardized (i.e. divided by the standard 282 283 deviation across all sites and years). However, we then used the yearly averages of anomalies 284 across all sites to capture the synchronizing effect of weather variables (Appendix S8 Fig. S1).

To explain between-species synchrony in annual survival variations that could be attributed to 285 large-scale fluctuations in spring weather conditions, we fitted Model 3, identical to Model 1 but 286 including fixed effects for the linear and quadratic effect of spring temperatures and precipitation, 287 288 as well as the four pairwise interactions. Here we fitted multiple weather covariates known to explain variation in passerine vital rates, allowing non-linear and interactive effects as such non-289 additive effects are known to explain bird survival (Boyles et al. 2011, Pomara & Zuckerberg 290 291 2017). This approach should be seen as an attempt to estimate the variance, and synchrony, related to weather, rather than an attempt to test the potential causal effects of weather presented 292 in introduction. 293

Following Nakagawa and Schielzeth (2013) we estimated the synchronous variance explained by spring weather (σ_{sw}^2) as the variance in partial model predictions (that is, the linear

combination of the products of each parameter estimate by the corresponding weather variable):

297 $\sigma_{sw}^2 = var\left(\sum_{h=1}^8 \beta_h \bar{x}_{ht}\right)$ where *h* indexes the eight model parameters related to spring weather, β_h is 298 the parameter estimate for the effect of *h*, and x_{ht} is the mean value of the weather variable *h* on

299 year t (across all sites). By definition σ_{sw}^2 captures only synchronous variation. Therefore we

300 calculated the proportion of synchronous variation related by spring weather as $\frac{\sigma_{sw}^2}{\sigma_{\delta}^2 + \sigma_{sw}^2}$, and the

301 new
$$ICC = \frac{\sigma_{sw}^2 + \sigma_{\delta}^2}{\sigma_{sw}^2 + \sigma_{\delta}^2 + \sigma_{\varepsilon}^2}$$
. As always, calculations were integrated over the model posterior

302 distribution to propagate uncertainty.

In Model 4, we added covariates related to winter weather to Model 1. For resident and shortdistance migrants, that winter in western Europe or North-Africa, we used the North Atlantic Oscillation during winter (wNAO, averaged from December to March, available at

http://www.cru.uea.ac.uk/~timo/datapages/naoi.htm). The wNAO captures broad scale weather 306 variation in Western Europe and North Africa (Forchhammer & Post 2004), which explains 307 variations in over-winter survival in several European bird species (Robinson et al. 2007, 308 309 Salewski et al. 2013). For long-distance migrants that winter in Western Africa, we used the Sahel Rainfall during summer (sSR, averaged from July to September, available at 310 http://research.jisao.washington.edu/data sets/sahel/). The sSR is often used as an proxy of 311 312 winter Sahel suitability for wintering songbirds, considering that habitat quality in December-February is driven by rainfall during the previous summer (Robinson et al. 2007, Salewski et al. 313 2013). As done for spring weather covariates, we fitted linear and quadratic effects for wNAO 314 and sSR. We estimated the synchronous variance explained by winter weather (σ_{ww}^2) as the 315 316 variance in partial model predictions from the linear and quadratic effects of wNAO and sSR, $\sigma_{ww}^2 = var \left(p \left(\beta_{sSR} sSR + \beta_{sSR2} sSR^2 \right) + (1 - p) \left(\beta_{wNAQ} wNAQ + \beta_{wNAQ2} wNAQ^2 \right) \right)$ where p is the 317 proportion of long-distance migratory species. This variance captures the weighed synchronous 318 319 variance among migratory species due to sSR, added to the weighed synchronous variance 320 among resident species due to wNAO, minus the asynchronous variance due to the small negative covariance between sSR and wNAO (the two indices are expected to be independent, but the 321 322 empirical correlation was -0.12 [-0.58;0.40], p-value=0.66). The proportion of synchronous

323 variance related to winter weather was calculated as
$$\frac{\sigma_{ww}^2}{\sigma_{\delta}^2 + \sigma_{sw}^2}$$
, and the $ICC = \frac{\sigma_{ww}^2 + \sigma_{\delta}^2}{\sigma_{ww}^2 + \sigma_{\delta}^2 + \sigma_{\varepsilon}^2}$

324 *Migratory strategy (model 5)*

Because of shared wintering conditions among species, migratory strategy could reduce the 325 326 overall synchrony in annual survival. To quantify the importance of this effect, we fitted Model 327 5, a variation of Model 1 with a random effect for the interaction Year-by-Migratory behavior (sixteen times two levels, resident or short-distance migrants vs. long-distance migrants). We thus 328 31 16

modeled a Migratory-class-by-Year variance σ_m^2 , while σ_δ^2 remained the Year-variance common 329 to migratory classes and species, and $\sigma_{\varepsilon w}^2$ was the within migratory-class species-specific year 330 variance. The proportion of species-specific variance that depended on migratory-class (i.e. 331 asynchrony between migratory class among species) was estimated as $\frac{\sigma_m^2}{\sigma^2 + \sigma^2}$. This index will 332 approach 1 if migratory strategy explains most of the asynchronous variation. The synchrony 333 within migratory-class was estimated as $\frac{\sigma_{\delta}^2}{\sigma_s^2 + \sigma^2}$. If migratory strategy explains most of the 334 asynchronous variation, this index will approach 1, whereas if migratory strategy explains no 335 asynchronous variation, this index will approach the ICC value calculated from model 1. 336 All parameter estimates for all models are provided in Appendix S11. 337

338

339 **Results**

340 Cross-species temporal synchrony of annual adult local survival

Inter-annual variation in adult local survival probabilities was largely synchronous across the
16 studies species (Fig. 2). The ICC of 73% [47–94], indicates that most of the temporal variance
in apparent survival probability (at national scale) was common to all species (Table 1: Model 1).
Conversely, this implies that only 27% [6–53] of temporal fluctuations of survival probabilities
were species-specific.

346 Species showed considerable variation in $ICC_{species}$ (Fig. 3), although estimates came with

347 broad credible intervals. Using linear regression integrated over the posterior distribution of

348 $ICC_{species}$, there was no significant association between the value of $ICC_{species}$ and migratory type

349 (Fig. 3; pMCMC=0.48) nor with species sample size (pMCMC=0.31). More qualitatively, we also

did not see any pattern linking the values of $ICC_{species}$ and the species characteristics. The mean of the 16 point estimates for $ICC_{species}$ was 76%.

This strong synchrony was robust to (i) the uneven contributions of species to the mark-352 recapture dataset (ICC = 65% [28–90], Appendix S4), (ii) the removal of the part of synchrony 353 354 due to a potential linear trend in survival probability (ICC = 56% [23–86], Appendix S5; note that this calculation necessarily excludes some true synchrony), (iii) prior distribution (Appendix 355 356 S6), and (iii) the effects of weather and migratory behavior presented here below. 357 Graphically (Fig. 2), some years seemed to deviate more from the mean survival probability, 358 and may have contributed more to synchrony: estimates of survival probability between the years 359 2001–2002, 2002–2003 were larger than average while estimates for the years 2005–2006 and 360 2008–2009 were particularly low (Appendix S7: Fig. S2). However, our ad hoc approach using 361 model estimates (Appendix S7) failed at identifying statistical support for variability in yearly contributions to synchrony. 362

363 *Contributions of weather effects to survival probability synchrony*

According to Model 3, spring weather variables taken together explained only 1.4% [0.01–5.5] 364 365 of synchrony, whereas according to Model 4, the winter weather variables explained 12% [0.3-366 37] of the synchrony. Assuming independence of spring and winter weather variables, they 367 explain 13% [0.8–39] of synchrony together (and explain 10% [0.6–23] of the total temporal variance, Table 1). There was no clear evidence for an effect of any of the weather-related 368 369 parameters on survival probability with all credible intervals overlapping zero (across all species, 370 i.e. additive effects; Appendix S8: Table S1). Higher spring precipitation and more extreme spring temperatures tended to increase survival probability (Appendix S8: Fig. S1). For winter 371 weather covariates, survival probability appeared a bit higher for high sSR values, while there 372

was no discernible effect of wNAO (across all species, i.e. additive effects; Appendix S8: Fig.S2).

375 *Contributions of migratory strategy to survival probability synchrony*

The interaction between year and migratory strategy captured only a small amount of asynchronous-variation in survival among species (9% [0–30], Table 1). The synchrony estimated from model 4, after removing the species:year variation related to migratory type (i.e., synchrony corrected for migratory type) was 79% [42–97]. This approximate lack of dependence of synchrony on migratory behavior is apparent in Fig. 2 and Fig. 3.

381

382 **DISCUSSION**

Unexpectedly, annual fluctuations in adult local survival proved to be largely (and robustly, 383 384 Appendices S4, S5, S6) synchronous across the 16 songbird species that dominate bird communities in France: 73% [47–94] of between-year variance in survival probability was 385 common to all species. This result is all the more remarkable given that these species differ in 386 various life-history traits that concern local survival: they cover the range of songbird migratory 387 388 behavior, body mass (8 to 88 g) and number of broods per year, and they partly differ in habitat 389 use (terrestrial and humid shrub lands) and specialization (Appendix S1). Moreover, our estimates represent 'minimal synchrony' since they are not controlled for potentially 390 391 desynchronizing factors, like intra- and inter-specific negative density dependence, that is, 392 estimated synchrony should be higher if we could control for those factors (Péron and Koons 393 2012, Swallow et al. 2016). This value of synchrony is as high as for spatial synchrony in local 394 survival probability across populations of a same species (67% and 71% in two long-lived birds,

Jenouvrier et al. 2009, Grosbois et al. 2009), and higher than survival synchrony observed across 395 two syntopic ducks (49%, Péron and Koons 2012). Short-lived organisms (Appendix S1) are 396 under stronger environment-dependence than long-lived species (Saether et al. 2016), which may 397 398 contribute to the observed high inter-specific synchrony in the studied set of species. The speciesspecific synchronies ($ICC_{species}$) varied from very high to low (Figure 4). This means that some 399 species (such as Cettia cetti) had considerable species-specific temporal variability in adult 400 survival, probably due to its high sensitivity to winter harshness (Moussus 2010), whereas in others 401 (such as *Sylvia atricapilla*) the temporal variability in adult survival corresponded almost entirely 402 403 to the average variability across the 16 species. We did not find clear patterns explaining 404 differences in synchrony among species (i.e., migration type, sample size, habitat), and speciesspecific synchronies were estimated with broad confidence intervals. Therefore the determinants 405 406 of species synchrony with the rest of the community remain to be identified with a larger dataset, involving more species (i.e. more diversity in life history traits) and more years. We can conclude 407 that, at a country scale, the drivers of annual variations of average adult apparent survival 408 409 probability are largely common to many species. Drivers that actually differ between species and determine local population dynamics must occur and operate at site or regional level (Giraud et 410 al. 2013, Gaüzère et al. 2015, Cayuela et al. 2019, Morrison et al. 2013, 2021). 411

The presence of strong synchrony in adult survival among songbirds at the country scale reveals a demographic risk for metapopulation and metacommunity (Liebhold et al. 2004, Koenig and Liebhold 2016), but also offers an opportunity to identify key drivers of survival that are common to many species and thereby inform conservation (Morrisson et al. 2021, 2022). Below, we discuss the potential mechanisms driving synchronous survival, and whether those mechanisms are more likely to act during the breeding season or rather in winter on non-breeding grounds.

- 39
- 40

Climate forcing could be responsible for cross-species synchronous events of high 419 mortality/survival, either through direct or indirect effects. The few former studies on common 420 songbirds concluded that climate forcing was responsible for (a part of) the observed cross-421 422 species synchrony in abundances or vital rates (Jones et al. 2003, Grosbois et al. 2006, Koenig and Liebhold 2016, Swallow et al. 2016, Telenský et al. 2020). However, within-species neither 423 broad scale climatic variables nor local weather variables explained synchronous survival 424 425 variation in blue tits populations (Bastianelli et al. 2021), and synchronous survival in little auk populations was likely explained by trophic interactions rather than climate (Reiertsen et al. 426 427 2021). In the present study we failed to identify a statistically significant role for any climatic 428 variables and the spring and winter variables explained only 13% [0.8–39] of the synchrony together (and 10% [0.6–23] of the total temporal variance). Nevertheless, we likely 429 underestimated the importance of climate. First, the variables we use do not explicitly consider 430 weather properties such as extreme temperature or precipitation events, or species-specific 431 periods of sensitivity to weather (van de Pol et al. 2016). Second, we used climatic variables 432 averaged either over spring or winter, which is unlikely to represent the cumulative effect of 433 climatic variations experienced throughout the year. Finally, our modeling investigated the direct 434 effects of weather whereas indirect or delayed effects may be more influential, particularly 435 436 weather-driven primary and secondary productivity and their effects on the cost of reproduction.

What other mechanisms than direct climate forcing could synchronize annual adult local
survival across species? First, environmentally-driven, community-level density-dependency of
adult survival probability could also generate cross-species synchrony. To rear their offspring,
common songbird species rely on very similar preys (larvae and soft invertebrates). The hotter
the year, the higher bird productivity (i.e. juvenile production per adult) for most of these same

41 42

species (Eglington et al. 2015, Dubos et al. 2019). Hence, intra- and interspecific competition for 442 shared resources is likely to operate at local community-level in common songbirds, potentially 443 resulting in large-scale, weather-driven density-dependent regulations of adult survival. But 444 445 intraspecific density-dependence can also be a source of asynchrony across species (Péron and Koons 2012, Martin et al. 2017). The actual role of community-level density-dependence at 446 synchronizing adult survival probability across species remains to be properly investigated 447 448 (Swallow et al. 2016). Second, breeding dispersal could contribute to cross-species synchrony in adult local survival (also named apparent survival). Local survival results from survival and 449 450 residency (i.e. absence of dispersal, Saracco et al. 2010) at the scale of study sites. If individuals 451 of different species tend to synchronously disperse more in some years than in others, then dispersal-induced fluctuations in adult local survival would be synchronous across species at 452 national level. Following bad reproductive experience at one location (e.g., weather-driven early 453 reproductive failure), a higher proportion of adults settle away in the following year (e.g., Arlt & 454 Part 2008). However, synchronous breeding dispersal seems unlikely to induce such a high 455 synchrony in adult local survival because adults are typically reported to disperse in low 456 proportion (1–10% order of magnitude) between breeding events, even in long-distance migrants 457 (Greenwood and Harvey 1982). Moreover, males, the sex that dominates in our dataset (64%), 458 459 are the most resident sex in birds (Amrhein et al. 2012).

460 Could conditions during the non-breeding season explain the high synchrony in adult 461 survival across songbirds in France? Across both long-distance migrants, short-distance migrants 462 and residents, we found that winter conditions explained 9% [0.2-27] of the variation in annual 463 survival (12% [0.3–37] of the synchrony). This proportion is relatively weak, but potentially 464 significant biologically, and as already explained it is likely that we underestimate the

43 44

synchronizing importance of weather. Winter harshness is commonly proposed to explain a large 465 proportion of year-round mortality in small organisms like songbirds (Grosbois et al. 2006, 466 Robinson et al. 2007, Salewski et al. 2013, Johnston et al. 2016, Saether et al. 2016), including in 467 468 migratory songbirds (Robinson et al. 2007, Woodworth et al. 2017b). Recent studies on multispecies population synchrony have also emphasized a major role of winter climate forcing, 469 but these few studies were biased towards cold-driven ecosystems, like high latitude (>45°) 470 471 populations that are subject to extreme winter events (Post & Forchhammer 2004, Jones et al. 2003, rain-on-snow icing events in Hansen et al. 2013, Pomara & Zuckerberg 2017). Restricting 472 473 the analysis to long-distance migrant species only, Telenský et al (2020) found that water 474 availability on the wintering grounds explained 15% of the variation in temporal survival but the result was statistically non-significant. Overall, it seems likely that conditions on the non-475 breeding grounds, especially climate, contribute somewhat to the synchrony in adult survival, 476 even though the 16 studied species spread from France to Central Africa during the winter. This 477 conclusion has profound implications for conservation planning for common habitats: breeding 478 habitat degradation is a major cause of ongoing massive, synchronous population declines 479 (Eglington and Pearce-Higgins 2012, including in migratory species (Morrison et al. 2013). 480 Ecosystem functionality over breeding areas should be the primary focus of conservation in 481 482 western countries with highly degraded habitats (Morrison et al. 2013), not waiting for other countries along the migratory flyways or at wintering grounds to take actions to improve 483 environmental conditions for migratory birds (Morrison et al. 2013). 484

485 Differences in migratory strategy explained very little temporal variation in survival
486 probability. Instead, synchrony within migratory strategy was similar to synchrony across
487 migratory strategies (Table 1: Model 5). Although they did not explicitly quantify synchrony, this

45 46

result is qualitatively supported by Morrisson et al. (2021) who found a positive covariation
between the survival of resident species and that of long-distance migrant species, at least those
spending winter in humid areas. Resident and long-distance migrants winter on two different
continents (at a distance of 2000–3000 km and 35–45° apart in latitude) in which variation in
environmental conditions are unlikely to be correlated.

At least graphically (Fig. 2), environmental forcing seems to be stronger in some years, 493 and much weaker in later years (from 2009 and after). Synchrony is actually expected to be 494 495 heterogeneous across years, or even transitory (Klapwijk et al. 2018), and to be largely 496 attributable to the occurrence of environmental disturbances in some years (Cattadori et al. 2005, Keitt 2008). For instance, Jenouvrier et al. (2009) showed that the high synchrony (71%) in 497 498 Scopoli's shearwater adult local survival was attributed to only two 'low' years out of 8. In 499 'normal' years, species specificities (e.g. ecological niche differentiation) would dominate 500 (Liebhold et al. 2004, Robinson et al. 2013). As climate warms and increasingly fluctuates through time and space with stronger and more frequent out-of-norm weather events, spatial and 501 502 cross-species synchrony is likely to increase in strength (Post and Forchhammer 2004, Hansen et 503 al. 2013, Koenig and Liebhold 2016, Hansen et al. 2020) over wider spatial scales (Black et al. 2018). To properly assess the yearly contributions to synchrony (and trends) requires longer time 504 505 series than the present dataset. Analytical methods are also not yet readily implementable to such multi-year, multi-site, multi-species mark-recapture dataset (Cattadori et al. 2005, Lahoz-Monfort 506 et al. 2017). Our conclusions on cross-species synchrony in adult local survival now need to be 507 up-scaled to population and community levels, to understand compensatory intra- and inter-508 509 specific demographic processes (Péron and Koons 2012, Tavecchia et al. 2016, Lahoz-Monfort et

47 48

al. 2017) that may regulate meta-communities and preserve them from extinction risks due tosynchronization.

512

513 ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

514	We are grateful to the 226	volunteer ringers who collected t	he data (Appendix S9), to CRBPC
-----	----------------------------	-----------------------------------	---------------------------------

515 for coordination of bird banding in France, to C. Vansteenwegen and R. Julliard for past scheme

516 coordination, to F. Jiguet, N. Dubos, I. Le Viol, A. Besnard and C. Barbraud for inspiring

517 discussions, to Muséum National d'Histoire Naturelle, Centre National de la Recherche

518 Scientifique, and the French Ministry for Environment for continuous financial support, and to

519 Région Nord-Pas de Calais, Fondation pour la Recherche sur la Biodiversité and Agence

520 *Nationale de la Recherche* (grant ANR-16-CE02-0007) for funding the present research.

521

522 LITERATURE CITED

Amrhein, V., B. Scaar, M. Baumann, N. Minéry, J. P. Binnert, and F. Korner-Nievergelt. 2012.
Estimating adult sex ratios from bird mist netting data. Methods in Ecology and Evolution
3:713–720.

526 Bastianelli, O., A. Robert, C. Doutrelant, C. de Franceschi, P. Giovannini and A. Charmantier.

527 2021.Identifying drivers of spatio-temporal variation in survival in four blue tit populations.

528 Peer Community Journal 1. <u>ttps://doi.org/10.24072/pcjournal.17</u>.

529 Black, B. A., P. van der Sleen, E. Di Lorenzo, D. Griffin, W. J. Sydeman, J. B. Dunham, R. R.

- 530 Rykaczewski, M. Garcia-Reyes, M. Safeeq, I. Arismendi, and S. J. Bograd. 2018. Rising
- 49 50

- synchrony controls western North American ecosystems. Global Change Biology 24:2305–
 2314.
- Boyles, J.G., F. Seebacher, B. Smit, and A. E. McKechnie. 2011. Adaptive
- 534 Thermoregulation in Endotherms May Alter Responses to Climate Change, Integrative and
- 535 Comparative Biology, 51: 676–690.
- 536 Cattadori, I. M., D. T. Haydon, and P. J. Hudson. 2005. Parasites and climate synchronize red
 537 grouse populations. Nature 433:737.
- 538 Cayuela, H., R. A. Griffiths, N. Zakaria, J. W. Arntzen, P. Priol, J.-P. Léna, A. Besnard and P
- 539Joly. Drivers of amphibian population dynamics and asynchrony at local and continental
- 540 scales. BioRxiv 592683. doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/592683
- 541 Dehorter, O. and CRBPO. 2017. Bird ringing and movement database for France. Muséum
 542 National d'Histoire Naturelle, Paris, France. https://crbpo.mnhn.fr/.
- 543 Dubos, N., O. Dehorter, P.-Y. Henry, and I. Le Viol. 2019. Thermal constraints on body size
- depend on the population position within the species' thermal range in temperate songbirds.
- 545 Global Ecology and Biogeography 28:96–106.
- 546 Dubos, N., I. Le Viol, A. Robert, C. Téplitsky, M. Ghislain, O. Dehorter, R. Julliard, and P.-Y.
- 547 Henry. 2018. Disentangling the effects of spring anomalies in climate and net primary
- 548 production on body size of temperate songbirds. Ecography 41:1319–1330.
- 549 Eglington, S. M., R. Julliard, G. Gargallo, H. P. van der Jeugd, J. W. Pearce-Higgins, S. R.
- 550 Baillie, and R. A. Robinson. 2015. Latitudinal gradients in the productivity of European
- 551 migrant warblers have not shifted northwards during a period of climate change. Global
- Ecology and Biogeography 24:427–436.

51

52

553	Eglington, S. M., and J. W. Pearce-Higgins. 2012. Disentangling the relative importance of
554	changes in climate and land-use intensity in driving recent bird population trends. PLoS One
555	7 [.] e30407

- Giraud, C., R. Julliard, and E. Porcher. 2013. Delimiting synchronous populations from
 monitoring data. Environmental and Ecological Statistics 20:337–352.
- Gaüzère, P., F. Jiguet, and V. Devictor. 2015. Rapid adjustment of bird community compositions
 to local climatic variations and its functional consequences. Global Change Biology
- **560 21:3367–3378**.

Gimenez, O., J. D. Lebreton, R. Choquet, and R. Pradel. 2018. R2ucare: An r package to perform
goodness-of-fit tests for capture–recapture models. Methods in Ecology and Evolution
9:1749–1754.

- Greenwood, P. J., and P. H. Harvey. 1982. The natal and breeding dispersal of birds. Annual
 Review of Ecology and Systematics 13:1–21.
- 566 Grosbois, V., M. P. Harris, T. Anker-Nilssen, R. H. McCleery, D. N. Shaw, B. J. T. Morgan, and
- 567 O. Gimenez. 2009. Modeling survival at multi-population scales using mark-recapture data.
 568 Ecology 90:2922–2932.
- 569 Grosbois, V., P.-Y. Henry, J. Blondel, P. Perret, J.-D. Lebreton, D. W. Thomas, and M. M.
- 570 Lambrechts. 2006. Climate impacts on Mediterranean blue tit survival: an investigation
- across seasons and spatial scales. Global Change Biology 12:2235–2249.
- 572 Hansen, B. B., V. Grøtan, R. Aanes, B. E. Sæther, A. Stien, E. Fuglei, R. A. Ims, N. G. Yoccoz,

- and Ashild Ø Pedersen. 2013. Climate events synchronize the dynamics of a resident
- vertebrate community in the high Arctic. Science 339:313–315.

575	Hansen, B. B., V. Grøtan, I. Herfindal, and A. M. Lee. 2020. The Moran effect revisited: spatial
576	population synchrony under global warming. Ecography 43: 1591–1602.

577 Houslay, T.M. and A.J. Wilson. 2017. Avoiding the misuse of BLUP in behavioural ecology.

- 578 Behavioural Ecology 28:948-952.
- 579 Huitu, O., K. Norrdahl, and E. Korpimäki. 2004. Competition, predation and interspecific

580 synchrony in cyclic small mammal communities. Ecography 27:197–206.

Jenouvrier, S., J. C. Thibault, A. Viallefont, P. Vidals, D. Ristow, J. L. Mougin, P. Brichetti, J. J.

Borg, and V. Bretagnolle. 2009. Global climate patterns explain range-wide synchronicity in

583 survival of a migratory seabird. Global Change Biology 15:268–279.

Johnston, A., R. A. Robinson, G. Gargallo, R. Julliard, H. P. van der Jeugd, and S. R. Baillie.

585 2016. Survival of Afro-Palaearctic passerine migrants in western Europe and the impacts of
586 seasonal weather variables. Ibis 158:465–480.

- Jones, J., P. J. Doran, and R. T. Holmes. 2003. Climate and food synchronize regional forest bird
 abundances. Ecology 84:3024–3032.
- Julliard, R., and F. Jiguet. 2002. Un suivi intégré des populations d'oiseaux communs en France.
 Alauda 70:137–147.

591 Kahilainen, A., S. van Nouhuys, T. Schulz, and M. Saastamoinen. 2018. Metapopulation

- dynamics in a changing climate: increasing spatial synchrony in weather conditions drives
 metapopulation synchrony of a butterfly inhabiting a fragmented landscape. Global Change
 Biology 24:4316–4329.
- 595 Keitt, T. H. 2008. Coherent ecological dynamics induced by large-scale disturbance. Nature

596 454:331.

597	Klapwijk, M. J., J. A. Walter, A. Hirka, G. Csoka, C. Bjorkman, and A. M. Liebhold. 2018.
598	Transient synchrony among populations of five foliage-feeding Lepidoptera. Journal of
599	Animal Ecology 87:1058–1068.
600	Koenig, W. D., and A. M. Liebhold. 2016. Temporally increasing spatial synchrony of North
601	American temperature and bird populations. Nature Climate Change 6:614–618.
602	Lahoz-Monfort, J. J., M. P. Harris, S. Wanless, S. N. Freeman, and B. J. T. Morgan. 2017.
603	Bringing it all together: multi-species integrated population modelling of a breeding
604	community. Journal of Agricultural, Biological and Environmental Statistics 22:140–160.
605	Lahoz-Monfort, J. J., B. J. T. Morgan, M. P. Harris, F. Daunt, S. Wanless, and S. N. Freeman.
606	2013. Breeding together: modeling synchrony in productivity in a seabird community.
607	Ecology 94:3–10.
608	Lahoz-Monfort, J. J., B. J. T. Morgan, M. P. Harris, S. Wanless, and S. N. Freeman. 2011. A
609	capture-recapture model for exploring multi-species synchrony in survival. Methods in
610	Ecology & Evolution 2:116–124.
611	Liebhold, A., W. D. Koenig, and O. N. Bjornstad. 2004. Spatial synchrony in population
612	dynamics. Annual Review of Ecology Evolution and Systematics 35:467–490.
613	Loreau, M., and C. de Mazancourt. 2008. Species Synchrony and its drivers: neutral and
614	nonneutral community dynamics in fluctuating environments. The American Naturalist
615	172:E48–E66.

616 Malick, M. J., and S. P. Cox. 2016. Regional-Scale Declines in Productivity of Pink and Chum

1		-
О	1	1

Salmon Stocks in Western North America. PLOS ONE 11: e0146009.

618	Malick, M. J., S. P. Cox, F. J. Mueter, B. Dorner, and R. M. Peterman. 2017. Effects of the North
619	Pacific Current on the Productivity of 163 Pacific Salmon Stocks. Fisheries Oceanography
620	26: 268–81.

- Martin, A. E., J. W. Pearce-Higgins, and L. Fahrig. 2017. The spatial scale of time-lagged
 population synchrony increases with species dispersal distance. Global Ecology and
 Biogeography 26:1201–1210.
- McKechnie, A. E., A. R. Gerson, T. J. McWhorter, E. K. Smith, W. A. Talbot, and B. O. Wolf.
- 625 2017. Avian Thermoregulation in the Heat: Evaporative Cooling in Five Australian
- Passerines Reveals within-Order Biogeographic Variation in Heat Tolerance. Journal of
 Experimental Biology 220: 2436–44.
- Morrison, C. A., R. A. Robinson, J. A. Clark, K. Risely, and J. A. Gill. 2013. Recent population
- declines in Afro-Palaearctic migratory birds: the influence of breeding and non-breeding
 seasons. Diversity and Distributions 19:1051–1058.
- Morrison, C. A., S. J. Butler, R. A. Robinson, J. A. Clark, J. Arizaga, A. Aunins, O. Baltà, J.
- 632 Cepák, T. Chodkiewicz, V. Escandell, R. P. B. Foppen, R. D. Gregory, M. Husby, F.
- Jiguet, J. A. Kålås, A. Lehikoinen, Å. Lindström, C. M. Moshøj, K. Nagy, A. L. Nebot, M.
- 634 Piha, J. Reif, T. Sattler, J. Škorpilová, T. Szép, N. Teufelbauer, K. Thorup, C. van
- Turnhout, T. Wenninger and J. A. Gill 2021. Covariation in Population Trends and
- 636 Demography Reveals Targets for Conservation Action. Proceedings of the Royal Society
- 637 B: Biological Sciences 288: 20202955.
- 638 Morrison, C. A., S. J. Butler, J. A. Clark, J. Arizaga, O. Baltà, J. Cepák, A. L. I Nebot, M. Piha,
- 59 60

639	K. Thorup, T. Wenninger, R. A. Robinson and J. A. Gill. 2022. Demographic Variation in
640	Space and Time: Implications for Conservation Targeting. Royal Society Open Science 9
641	(3): 211671.
642	Moussus, JP. (2010). Influences du climat sur la démographie des passereaux communs (p.
643	318). PhD thesis, Université Pierre et Marie Curie, Paris, France.
644	https://crbpo.mnhn.fr/IMG/pdf/moussus_2010_phd_thesis_bird_demography_climate_chan
645	<u>ge.pdf</u>
646	Nakagawa, S., and H. Schielzeth. 2013. A general and simple method for obtaining R2 from
647	generalized linear mixed-effects models. Methods in Ecology and Evolution 4:133-142.
648	Olmos, M, F. Massiot-Granier, E. Prévost, G. Chaput, I. R. Bradbury, M. Nevoux, E. Rivot.
649	2019. Evidence for spatial coherence in time trends of marine life history traits of Atlantic
650	salmon in the North Atlantic. Fish and Fisheries 20: 322-342.
651	Pandit, S. N., J. Kolasa, and K. Cottenie. 2013. Population synchrony decreases with richness and
652	increases with environmental fluctuations in an experimental metacommunity. Oecologia
653	171:237–247.
654	Paradis, E., S. R. Baillie, W. J. Sutherland, and R. D. Gregory. 1999. Dispersal and spatial scale
655	affect synchrony in spatial population dynamics. Ecology Letters 2:114-120.
656	Peron, G., and D. N. Koons. 2012. Integrated modeling of communities: parasitism, competition,
657	and demographic synchrony in sympatric ducks. Ecology 93:2456–2464.
658	Plummer, M. 2003. JAGS: A program for analysis of Bayesian graphical models using Gibbs
659	sampling. Proceedings of the 3rd international workshop on distributed statistical computing
660	124: 10–18.
61 62	31

661	van de Pol, M., Bailey, L. D., McLean, N., Rijsdijk, L., Lawson, C. R., & Brouwer, L. (2016).
662	Identifying the best climatic predictors in ecology and evolution. Methods in Ecology and
663	Evolution, 7(10), 1246–1257.
664	Pomara, L. Y., and B. Zuckerberg. 2017. Climate variability drives population cycling and

- synchrony. Diversity and Distributions 23:421–434.
- Post, E., and M. C. Forchhammer. 2004. Spatial synchrony of local populations has increased in
 association with the recent Northern Hemisphere climate trend. Proceedings of the National
 Academy of Sciences of the United States of America 101:9286–9290.
- 669 R Development Core Team. 2015. R: A language and environment for statistical computing. R
- 670 Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria. <u>http://www.R-project.org</u>
- 671 Reiertsen, T. K., K. Layton-Matthews, K. E. Erikstad, K. Hodges, M. Ballesteros, T. Anker-
- 672 Nilssen, R. T. Barrett, S. Benjaminsen, M. Bogdanova, S. Christensen-Dalsgaard, F. Daunt,
- 673 N. Dehnhard, M. P. Harris, M. Langset, S.-H. Lorentsen, M. Newell, V. S. Bråthen, I.
- 674 Støyle-Bringsvor, G.-H. Systad, S. Wanless. 2021. Inter-Population Synchrony in Adult
- 675 Survival and Effects of Climate and Extreme Weather in Non-Breeding Areas of Atlantic
- 676 Puffins. Marine Ecology Progress Series 676: 219–31.
- 677 Robinson, J. P. W., M. Dornelas, and A. F. Ojanguren. 2013. Interspecific synchrony of seabird
- population growth rate and breeding success. Ecology and Evolution 3:2013–2019.
- 679 Robinson, R. A., S. R. Baillie, and H. Q. P. Crick. 2007. Weather-dependent survival:
- 680 implications of climate change for passerine population processes. Ibis 149:357–364.
- Root, T. 1988. Energy Constraints on Avian Distributions and Abundances', Ecology, 69(2),
- 682 pp. 330–339. doi:<u>10.2307/1940431</u>.
- 63 64

- 683 Saether, B. E., V. Grotan, S. Engen, T. Coulson, P. R. Grant, M. E. Visser, J. E. Brommer, B.
- Rosemary Grant, L. Gustafsson, B. J. Hatchwell, K. Jerstad, P. Karell, H. Pietiainen, A.
- Roulin, O. W. Rostad, and H. Weimerskirch. 2016. Demographic routes to variability and
- regulation in bird populations. Nature Communications 7:12001.
- Salewski, V., W. M. Hochachka, and W. Fiedler. 2013. Multiple weather factors affect apparent
 survival of European passerine birds. PLoS One 8:e59110.
- 689 Sanz-Aguilar, A., J. M. Igual, G. Tavecchia, M. Genovart, and D. Oro. 2016. When immigration
- 690 mask threats: the rescue effect of a Scopoli's shearwater colony in the Western
- 691 Mediterranean as a case study. Biological Conservation 198:33–36.
- Saracco, J. F., Royle, J. A., DeSante, D. F., & Gardner, B. (2010). Modeling spatial variation in
 avian survival and residency probabilities. Ecology, 91(7), 1885–1891.
- 694 Schaub, M., J. von Hirschheydt, and M. U. Grüebler. 2015. Differential contribution of
- demographic rate synchrony to population synchrony in barn swallows. Journal of Animal
 Ecology 84:1530–1541.
- Seward, A. M., C. M. Beale, L. Gilbert, T. H. Jones, and R. J. Thomas. 2013. The impact of
 increased food availability on survival of a long-distance migratory bird. Ecology 94:221–
 230.
- Sheppard, L. W., J. R. Bell, R. Harrington, and D. C. Reuman. 2015. Changes in large-scale
 climate alter spatial synchrony of aphid pests. Nature Climate Change 6:610.
- Su, Y. S., and M. Yajima. 2015. R2jags: Using R to Run "JAGS." Cran.r-project.org, Vienna,
 Austria.

- Svensson, L. 1992. Identification guide to European Passerines. 4th rev. Lars Svensson,
 Stockholm.
- Swallow, B., R. King, S. T. Buckland, and M. P. Toms. 2016. Identifying multispecies synchrony
 in response to environmental covariates. Ecology and Evolution 6:8515–8525.
- Tavecchia, G., S. Tenan, R. Pradel, J. M. Igual, M. Genovart, and D. Oro. 2016. Climate-driven
 vital rates do not always mean climate-driven population. Global Change Biology 22:3960–
 3966.
- 711 Telenský, T., P. Klvaňa, M. Jelínek, J. Cepák, and J. Reif. 2020. The Influence of Climate
- Variability on Demographic Rates of Avian Afro-Palearctic Migrants. Scientific Reports
 10: 17592.
- Vik, J. O., N. C. Stenseth, G.Tavecchia, A. Mysterud, and O. C. Lingjærde. 2004. Living in
 Synchrony on Greenland Coasts? Nature 427: 697–98.
- 716 Visser, M. E., F. Adriaensen, J. H. van Balen, J. Blondel, A. A. Dhondt, S. van Dongen, du F.
- 717 Chris, E. V Ivankina, A. B. Kerimov, J. de Laet, E. Matthysen, R. McCleery, M. Orell, and
- D. L. Thomson. 2003. Variable responses to large-scale climate change in European Parus
- populations. Proceedings of the Royal Society of London. Series B: Biological Sciences
- 720 270:367–372.

67

- Woodworth, B. K., N. T. Wheelwright, A. E. M. Newman, and D. R. Norris. 2017a. Local
 density regulates migratory songbird reproductive success through effects on doublebrooding and nest predation. Ecology 98:2039–2048.
- Woodworth, B. K., N. T. Wheelwright, A. E. Newman, M. Schaub, and D. R. Norris. 2017b.
- 725 Winter temperatures limit population growth rate of a migratory songbird. Nature
 - 34

726 Communications 8:14812.

727 Table

728 TABLE 1. Variance component estimates for survival probability under different assumptions

- 729 (models). Model 1 is the base model and captures all of the synchrony in the Year variance
- parameter. Other models include various effects that may or may not explain some of the
- synchrony, thus leaving a corrected synchrony as the Year variance parameter. Estimates are
- 732 posterior modes and 95% highest probability density credible intervals.

Variance	Model 1 (base)	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Model 5
component		(Species-specific	(Spring weather)	(Winter	(Migration:Year)
		Year:Species)		weather)	
Year	0.098	0.090	0.091	0.092	0.091
(synchrony)	[0.031-0.234]	[0.016-0.203]	[0.023–0.216]	[0.019-0.214]	[0.009–0.205]
Model-specific	-	16 species	Spring weather ²	Winter weather ²	-
synchrony term		specific variances	0.001	0.008	
			[<0.001-0.0029]	[<0.001-0.020]	
Year:Species	0.034	Mean across	0.034	0.036	0.032
(asynchrony)	[0.012-0.068]	species 0.026	[0.007-0.062]	[0.010-0.066]	[0.007-0.065]
Model-specific	-	-	-	-	Migration:Year
asynchrony					0.011
term					[0-0.036]
Site	0.155	0.157	0.156	0.152	0.152
	[0.076-0.232]	[0.088-0.237]	[0.081-0.232]	[0.087–0.226]	[0.085–0.226]
Variance sum ³	0.287	-	0.287	0.286	0.286

	ICC ¹	73% [47–94]	Mean 76%	72% [47-93]	68% [36-95]	79% [42–97]
733	Notes: 1. Intra-cl	ass correlations (s	ee Methods) are	estimates of synch	nrony across spec	eies, i.e., the
734	proportion of Ye	ar variance over '	total' temporal va	ariance, which var	ies across models	s. 2.
735	Weather variable	s were introduced	as fixed effects	and the variance the	hey explain was o	computed
736	post-hoc, while a	ll other variance o	components were	directly estimated	l as random effec	ets. 3. The
737	sum of the variances is expected to be constant, but may vary a bit due to rounding, and because					
738	survival is not di	rectly observed bu	it predicted as a l	atent variable (i.e.	, survival does no	ot have a
739	defined variance	observable indepe	endently of a mo	del).		

741 Figure legend

FIG. 1. Spatial distribution of the 242 sites across continental France used in this study. Color indicates the duration of a site, in years, corresponds to the number of years for which we estimated year survival in our models. The true duration of the monitoring of the site is always at least one more year. Point size indicates the average number of individuals, used in analyses, per year of monitoring for a given site.

747 FIG. 2. Inter-annual fluctuation of local survival probabilities by species for adult individuals.

Estimates were obtained independently for each species (with resident males as intercept) from a
model with fully Year-dependent survival and explicitly modelling an interaction between Year
and Migratory behavior (resident/short-distance migrants *versus* long-distance migrants, i.e.

751 model 5).

FIG. 3. Synchrony for each species and overall. Estimates of Intra-Class Correlations measuring synchrony in adult survival, for each species separately (see appendix 1 for species details), and across all species taken together. Lower species-specific synchrony means that mean survival probability is more variable in that species. Species-specific estimates were obtained from model 2, while the overall estimate was obtained from model 1. Yellow lines represent short-distance migrants, blue lines represent long-distance migrants. Filled circles represent posterior modes, empty circles posterior means, thick lines 50% quantile CI and thin lines 95% HPD CI.

759

Figure 1



Figure 2



