

## Article (refereed) - postprint

---

Merkel, Benjamin; Descamps, Sébastien; Yoccoz, Nigel G.; Danielsen, Jóhannis; Daunt, Francis; Erikstad, Kjell E.; Ezhov, Aleksey V.; Grémillet, David; Gavriilo, Maria; Lorentsen, Svein-Håkon; Reiertsen, Tone K.; Steen, Harald; Systad, Geir H.; Þórarinnsson, Þorkell Lindberg; Wanless, Sarah; Strøm, Hallvard. 2019. **Earlier colony arrival but no trend in hatching timing in two congeneric seabirds (*Uria* spp.) across the North Atlantic.** *Biology Letters*, 15 (10), 20190634. 6, pp.  
<https://doi.org/10.1098/rsbl.2019.0634>

© 2019 The Royal Society

This version available <http://nora.nerc.ac.uk/id/eprint/525755/>

NERC has developed NORA to enable users to access research outputs wholly or partially funded by NERC. Copyright and other rights for material on this site are retained by the rights owners. Users should read the terms and conditions of use of this material at  
<http://nora.nerc.ac.uk/policies.html#access>

**This document is the author's final manuscript version of the journal article following the peer review process. Some differences between this and the publisher's version may remain. You are advised to consult the publisher's version if you wish to cite from this article.**

<https://royalsocietypublishing.org/journal/rsbl>

Contact CEH NORA team at  
[noracch@ceh.ac.uk](mailto:noracch@ceh.ac.uk)

1 Title: Earlier colony arrival but no trend in hatching timing in two congeneric seabirds (*Uria* spp.)  
2 across the North Atlantic

3 Authors: Benjamin Merkel<sup>1,2,\*</sup>, Sébastien Descamps<sup>1</sup>, Nigel G Yoccoz<sup>2</sup>, Jóhannis Danielsen<sup>3</sup>, Francis  
4 Daunt<sup>4</sup>, Kjell E Erikstad<sup>5,6</sup>, Aleksey V Ezhov<sup>7,8</sup>, David Grémillet<sup>9</sup>, Maria Gavrilov<sup>7,10</sup>, Svein-Håkon  
5 Lorentsen<sup>11</sup>, Tone K Reiertsen<sup>5</sup>, Harald Steen<sup>1</sup>, Geir H Systad<sup>12</sup>, Porkell Lindberg Þórarinnsson<sup>13</sup>, Sarah  
6 Wanless<sup>4</sup>, Hallvard Strøm<sup>1</sup>

7 Affiliations:

8 <sup>1</sup> Norwegian Polar Institute, Fram Centre, P.O. Box 6606 Langnes, 9296 Tromsø, Norway

9 <sup>2</sup> Department of Arctic and Marine Biology, University of Tromsø - The Arctic University of Norway, 9037 Tromsø,  
10 Norway

11 <sup>3</sup> University of the Faroe Islands, Vestarabryggja 15, FO-100 Tórshavn, Faroe Islands

12 <sup>4</sup> Centre for Ecology & Hydrology, Bush Estate, Penicuik, Midlothian EH26 0QB, UK

13 <sup>5</sup> Norwegian Institute for Nature Research, Fram Centre, P.O. Box 6606 Langnes, 9296 Tromsø, Norway

14 <sup>6</sup> Centre for Biodiversity Dynamics, Department of Biology, Norwegian University of Science and Technology, 7491  
15 Trondheim, Norway

16 <sup>7</sup> Association Maritime Heritage, Saint Petersburg, Russia

17 <sup>8</sup> Murmansk Marine Biological Institute, 17 str. Vladimirskaia, 183010 Murmansk, Russia

18 <sup>9</sup> Centre d'Ecologie Fonctionnelle et Evolutive, UMR 5175, CNRS - Université de Montpellier - Université Paul-Valéry  
19 Montpellier - EPHE, Montpellier, France. & FitzPatrick Institute, DST-NRF Centre of Excellence at the University of  
20 Cape Town, Rondebosch 7701, South Africa.

21 <sup>10</sup> National Park Russian Arctic, 57 Sovetskikh Kosmonavtovo ave., Archangelsk, Russia

22 <sup>11</sup> Norwegian Institute for Nature Research, P.O. Box 5685 Sluppen, 7485 Trondheim, Norway

23 <sup>12</sup> Norwegian Institute for Nature Research, Thormøhlensgate 55, 5006 Bergen, Norway

24 <sup>13</sup> Northeast Iceland Nature Research Centre, Hafnarstétt 3, 640 Húsavík, Iceland

25 \*Corresponding author, email: merkel.benjamin@gmail.com

26  
27 Authorship: BM conceived the study, conducted the data analysis and drafted the manuscript; SD, NGY and HStr  
28 supervised the study; all authors provided data, contributed to article drafts, approved the final version of this  
29 manuscript and agree to be held accountable for the content.

30 Ethics: All animal research was conducted in accordance with relevant in country protocols and were granted by:  
31 the County Governor of Nordland, the County Governor of Finnmark, the Governor of Svalbard, the Norwegian  
32 Food Safety Authority (FOTS ID: 6291, 8482, 15603), the National Museum of the Faroe Islands and the Icelandic  
33 Institute of Natural History.

34 Data accessibility: Data are available through the Norwegian Polar Data Centre (doi:  
35 [10.21334/npolar.2019.55169600](https://doi.org/10.21334/npolar.2019.55169600)), SEAPOP reports ([www.seapop.no/no/publikasjoner/](http://www.seapop.no/no/publikasjoner/)), and NNA reports  
36 ([nna.is/wp-content/uploads/2018/12/NNA1804-Bjargfuglavoktun2018\\_framvinduskysrsla2.pdf](http://nna.is/wp-content/uploads/2018/12/NNA1804-Bjargfuglavoktun2018_framvinduskysrsla2.pdf)).

37 Funding: Funding for this study was provided by the Norwegian Ministry for Climate and the Environment, the  
38 Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs and the Norwegian Oil and Gas Association through the SEATRACK project  
39 ([www.seapop.no/en/seatrack](http://www.seapop.no/en/seatrack)) as well as from the Research Council of Norway (project 216547), TOTAL E&P  
40 Norway and the TOTAL Foundation and the UK Natural Environment Research Council's National Capability.

41 Acknowledgements: We would like to thank Børge Moe, Hálfván Helgi Helgason and Vegard Sandøy Bråthen for  
42 the logistical support within SEATRACK as well as Mike Harris, Stephen Votier and Tim Guilford for insightful  
43 comments which improved the manuscript. This work would not have been possible without the combined effort  
44 and long term engagement of many researchers as well as numerous field assistants all across the Northeast  
45 Atlantic.

46 Keywords: guillemots, murrees, pre-laying period, timing of egg-laying, *Uria aalge*, *Uria lomvia*

## 47 Abstract

48 A global analysis recently showed that seabird breeding phenology (as timing of egg-laying and hatching)  
49 does not, on average, respond to temperature changes or advance with time [1]. This group, the most  
50 threatened of all birds, is therefore prone to spatio-temporal mismatches with their food resources. Yet,  
51 other aspects of the breeding phenology may also have a marked influence on breeding success, such as  
52 the arrival date of adults at the breeding site following winter migration. Here, we used a large tracking  
53 dataset of two congeneric seabirds breeding in 14 colonies across 18° latitudes, to show that arrival date  
54 at the colony was highly variable between colonies and species (ranging 80 days) and advanced 1.4  
55 days/year while timing of egg-laying remained unchanged, resulting in an increasing pre-laying duration  
56 between 2009 and 2018. Thus, we demonstrate that potentially not all components of seabird breeding  
57 phenology are insensitive to changing environmental conditions.

## 58 Introduction

59 Timing of life history events such as reproduction is predicted to have evolved to optimally utilize  
60 temporally favourable conditions in seasonal systems [2]. Breeding phenology is a key adaptation with  
61 direct consequences on reproductive success and population dynamics [3, 4]. Rapid climate change has  
62 led to an advancement of the annual cycle in many organisms in temperate and polar regions, while  
63 species that have not adjusted to climate change seem to be more prone to population declines [5, 6]. In  
64 seabirds, timing of egg-laying has been shown to be insensitive to changing climatic conditions globally,  
65 highlighting the vulnerability of this group to mismatches with lower-trophic-level resources [1]. Yet,  
66 spring arrival at the colony, and the pre-laying period – the time between arrival at the colony and egg-  
67 laying - are also important and rarely considered components affecting breeding success. This period  
68 allows birds to establish and defend nest sites [7], build up body condition [8, 9] and mate [10], which  
69 often starts months before egg-laying [11, 12].

70 Here, we took advantage of a large tracking dataset, enabling us to determine arrival dates in two  
71 seabird species, across nine years (2009 - 2018) and 14 colonies across a large latitudinal gradient (62°N -  
72 79°N), to test if arrival date also does not exhibit any trend across years, similar to timing of egg-laying  
73 [1]. This data was available for two colonial, congeneric species, the common (hereafter COGU, *Uria*  
74 *aalge*) and Brünnich's guillemot (hereafter BRGU, *Uria lomvia*). These species are long-distance migrants  
75 [13-15], have similar morphology and life history [16, 17], and exhibit no trend in breeding phenology  
76 [18], but contrasting population trends [19-21]. Their arrival date is hypothesized to be driven by timing  
77 of food availability in the vicinity of the colony [22, 23], which can be roughly approximated by latitude

78 [24], or by colony size through increasing pressure on nest site defence displayed as longer pre-laying  
79 periods in larger colonies [11, 25, 26]. We tested the hypothesis that arrival date is without trend across  
80 years, same as egg-laying date. Further, we examined if arrival date is delayed with latitude, similar to  
81 timing of egg-laying [24], or determined by colony size due to pressure on nest site defence.

82

## 83 Material and Methods

### 84 *Data acquisition*

85 The date of first arrival at the colony for each colony and species was estimated using salt water  
86 immersion data recorded by light-level geolocators deployed on adult breeders. Arrival date was here  
87 defined as the date when the pre-laying period commences. It was identified as the date when the  
88 majority of tracked individuals attended the colony for the first time after the non-breeding period, using  
89 the assumption that first arrival back at the colony is synchronized and independent of sex in guillemots  
90 [26-28] (details in SI). Using a colony-wide first arrival date rather than individual arrival dates resulted in  
91 more robust results due to limitations in logger data resolution and accuracy. Tracking data were  
92 available from 14 colonies (figure 1A), for one to eight years (in the period 2009 - 2018) [29]. BRGU and  
93 COGU breed sympatrically at five of these colonies. Three instances of estimated arrival dates could be  
94 validated with available time-lapse camera data at two colonies (figure S1). To estimate pre-laying  
95 duration as well as temporal changes in phenology, we gathered annual measures of breeding timing  
96 which were available as population-level mean hatching dates at twelve colonies (details in SI) for one to  
97 seven years (in the period 2009 - 2018) [24, 30-37]. To assess the potential consequences of variable  
98 arrival dates on reproductive success, we used annual breeding success for which data was available  
99 from five colonies (details in SI) for four to six years (in the period 2010 - 2017) [30-37].

### 100 *Data analysis*

101 *Temporal trends in breeding phenology and their consequences* - Colony- and species-specific inter-  
102 annual variation in arrival dates was quantified as standard deviation (SD) from mean arrival timing. To  
103 test if arrival date changes with year we applied a linear mixed effect model (LME, package `lme4`) with  
104 relative arrival dates (mean = 0) as response variable (n = 79), year and species as fixed effects and id (as  
105 combination of colony and species) as random intercept. The same model was applied on a subset of  
106 data for which mean hatching date data were available (n = 40). Using this subset, we applied the same  
107 fixed and random effects to relative pre-laying duration as well as relative mean hatching date as

108 response variables in order to assess if guillemot hatching timing and pre-laying duration have changed  
109 over time. Most parsimonious models were selected using Akaike information criterion [38], resulting in  
110 all instances in a removal of species and its interaction with year as predictor variables. We calculated  
111 the percentage of variance explained by the fixed effects (marginal  $R^2$ ) and fixed and random effects  
112 (conditional  $R^2$ ; [39]). In order to assess if a large-scale factor is driving temporal trends in arrival date,  
113 we assessed temporal synchrony as mean correlation of relative arrival dates between colonies using the  
114 `msynch` function (package `ncf` [40]). To test if potential temporal trends in arrival date had an effect on  
115 reproductive output, we applied a LME with standardized breeding success ( $SD = 1$ ,  $mean = 0$ ) as  
116 response variable, relative arrival date as fixed effect and `id` as random intercept ( $n = 33$ ).

117 *Effect of latitude and colony size on arrival date* - To test for the effect of latitude on arrival date at the  
118 colony, we applied a linear model with mean species- and colony-specific arrival date as the response  
119 variable ( $n = 19$ ) and latitude and species and their interaction as predictors. Further, if latitude drives  
120 arrival date, we would expect that colonies close to each other would exhibit similar arrival timing.  
121 Hence, we used a Mantel-correlation test with 1000 permutations (package `ade4`) to test if spatial  
122 proximity can explain mean arrival date in either species. Alternatively, to test if arrival date and  
123 consequently pre-laying duration can be instead linked to colony size, we applied a linear model with  
124 mean species- and colony-specific pre-laying duration as the response variable ( $n = 15$ ) and colony size  
125 on the log-scale and species as predictors. Population counts are taken from a similar time period to  
126 account for the contrasting population trends (table S1). To account for collinearity, we also tested  
127 latitude against colony size, but found no overall latitudinal trend (linear model,  $\beta_{\text{latitude}} = -0.10$  with  
128 standard error (SE) = 0.10,  $adj. R^2 = <-0.01$ ). R (version 3.5.1, [41]) was used for all statistical analyses.

129

## 130 Results

### 131 *Timing of colony arrival*

132 Annual arrival dates varied between January 28 and April 18 with considerable variation across the  
133 Northeast Atlantic (figure 1B). Most of this variation is found among colonies ( $SD = 21.6$  and  $16.2$  days  
134 for COGU and BRGU, respectively, figure S1) and species ( $SD = 12.8$  days across sympatric colonies),  
135 while colony- and species-specific inter-annual variation was significantly smaller (mean  $SD = 7.8$  and  $4.9$   
136 days for COGU and BRGU, respectively).

137 *Temporal variability in breeding phenology and its consequences*

138 Timing of hatching in guillemots showed no trend over time ( $\beta_{\text{year}} = -0.17$  with SE = 0.23, marg.  $R^2 = 0.01$ ,  
139 cond.  $R^2 = 0.01$ ; figure 2C). In contrast, arrival date at colony advanced by 1.4 days/year irrespective of  
140 species (full dataset:  $\beta_{\text{year}} = -1.4$  with SE = 0.28, marg.  $R^2 = 0.24$ , cond.  $R^2 = 0.24$ ; subset with available  
141 mean hatching data:  $\beta_{\text{year}} = -1.7$  with SE = 0.35, marg.  $R^2 = 0.39$ , cond.  $R^2 = 0.39$ ; figure 2A). This was also  
142 visible as prolonged pre-laying duration ( $\beta_{\text{year}} = 1.4$  with SE = 0.40, marg.  $R^2 = 0.23$ , cond.  $R^2 = 0.23$ ; figure  
143 2B) as arrival date and pre-laying duration were highly and negatively correlated (-0.86). Colony arrival  
144 dates did not display synchrony among each other for either species (COGU: mean correlation = 0.15  
145 with 95% confidence interval (CI) = -0.34 - 0.55 and BRGU: 0.09 with CI = -0.56 - 0.71). And, no  
146 consequence of an advancing arrival date was detectable in exhibited breeding success for either species  
147 ( $\beta_{\text{std. arrival}} = -0.005$  with SE = 0.02, marg.  $R^2 = <0.01$ , cond.  $R^2 = <0.01$ ; figure 2D).

148 *Does latitude or colony size predict arrival date?*

149 Mean arrival date at the colony could not be explained by latitude and the two species exhibited  
150 opposite trends ( $\beta_{\text{latitude BRGU}} = 1.63$  with SE = 1.24 and  $\beta_{\text{latitude * COGU}} = -2.73$  with SE = 2.19, adj.  $R^2 = 0.23$ ;  
151 figure 1B). Similarly, there was weak evidence for an effect of proximity on arrival dates for COGUs  
152 (Mantel correlation = 0.19,  $p = 0.14$ ), but somewhat stronger evidence in BRGUs (Mantel correlation =  
153 0.29,  $p = 0.034$ ). Contrastingly, pre-laying duration showed substantial variability among colonies (mean  
154 = 75 days, SD = 19, range = 49 - 102) and was highly correlated with colony size ( $\beta_{\log(\text{size})} = 6.96$  with SE =  
155 0.97, adj.  $R^2 = 0.82$ ; figure 1C).

156 Discussion

157 The main findings of our study are that timing of first arrival at the colony of both guillemot species and  
158 all colonies was highly variable and advanced through time despite no visible trend in mean hatching  
159 date. This advancement had apparently no effect on guillemot average breeding success. Further, the  
160 duration of the pre-laying period and hence timing of arrival is not determined by latitude, but is better  
161 explained by the size of the colony, being longer in large colonies.

162 Theoretically, the minimum pre-laying duration required in guillemots is five days, as females undertake  
163 a four day long pre-laying exodus away from the colony [42]. Yolk formation (usually 14-15 days [42])  
164 could also occur away from the colony and fertilization occurs very soon after ovulation, which in turn  
165 occurs 24 hours before the egg is laid [10]. So, copulation right before the pre-laying exodus should be  
166 sufficient. Nonetheless, here we identified extensive pre-laying periods of more than one and up to  
167 several months with large variability between colonies and species. In an extreme case of a population  
168 further south, most breeding birds arrive back at the colony already in the autumn and in at least some  
169 years birds attend the breeding sites throughout the winter [11, 43]. This variability may have costs and  
170 benefits associated with it. During the pre-laying period prospective breeders attend the colonies at  
171 regular intervals [26-28] which restricts them to quasi central place foraging. This in turn limits their  
172 available prey options and could even lead to local depletion of food resources before spring bloom at  
173 large colonies [44], decreasing their body condition and potentially breeding probability prior to  
174 breeding. Alternatively, early return to the breeding sites might help secure nesting sites, mating  
175 partners and facilitate courtship [23], or it might be a response to unfavourable conditions experienced  
176 by these migrants during the end of their non-breeding period, resulting in an earlier return to the  
177 colony.

178 We showed that colony arrival date advanced in both the Brünnich's and common guillemot across the  
179 study area, while their timing of hatching did not display any trend as shown previously in seabirds  
180 globally [1] and for alcids in the Atlantic and Pacific [18]. Contrary to these previous studies, concluding  
181 that breeding phenology is insensitive to short-term climatic change, we identified a clear trend in arrival  
182 dates across both species studied. This advancement resulted in an increasing pre-laying duration as  
183 mean hatching date did not advance, suggesting that part of breeding in these seabirds is indeed  
184 sensitive to changing conditions, although we cannot derive conclusions regarding the process driving  
185 this phenomenon or if it is an adaption to a changing environment. A potential explanation could be that



186 the cue used to time arrival across the North Atlantic is changing as has been shown in some passerine  
187 species [45], but could not be demonstrated in others [46, 47].

188 Although overall timing in both species exhibits the same trend, arrival time series were not  
189 synchronized between species and colonies. This indicates that short-term fluctuations in arrival date  
190 were not parallel through time among species and/or colonies, which suggests the interaction between  
191 large-scale environmental trends acting on the entire species combined with more local features.  
192 However, environmental conditions, although exhibiting the same trend, do not change homogenously  
193 across the genus' range [48], which encompasses most of the North Atlantic for these species breeding  
194 within the study area [13-15]. Hence, synchrony is not necessarily expected. As of now we could not  
195 detect any immediate consequences of advancing arrival dates on population-wide reproductive success.  
196 As we used adult breeders to estimate arrival times, we cannot make any inference of the potential  
197 effect of advancing arrival dates on breeding propensity. Not all birds breed every year [49, 50] and the  
198 egg laying and hatching dates as well as the recorded breeding success may reflect only individuals with  
199 sufficient body condition, i.e. the ones that managed to get enough energy during the pre-laying period  
200 in order to breed [8].

201 Pre-laying duration and hence arrival timing at the colony could be linked with colony size [11, 25, 26]  
202 rather than latitude. This could explain the displayed large-scale variability in arrival timings between  
203 colonies as well as the lack of synchronicity between time series. Although guillemots typically show high  
204 nest site fidelity, site changes are documented which usually increase nest site quality for the usurper  
205 and decrease it for the usurped [51] underlining the importance of nest site defence as potential driver  
206 of arrival date resulting in the pressure to arrive earlier in larger colonies [11, 25, 26]. But, the influence  
207 of environmental conditions on arrival timing cannot be ruled out, as unfavourable weather has already  
208 been shown to affect pre-laying colony attendance in BRGU [27] although the same could not yet be  
209 shown for arrival timing.

210 Our large-scale approach highlights the extent and importance of the pre-laying period in contributing to  
211 the challenges faced by colonial breeders in a changing environment. The advancing trend in arrival  
212 dates elucidates that not all parts of breeding phenology in seabirds are insensitive to change across  
213 years, although we cannot make inferences if this change is adaptive or not.

214 References


- 215 [1] Keogan, K., Daunt, F., Wanless, S., Phillips, R.A., Walling, C.A., Agnew, P., Ainley, D.G., Anker-Nilssen,  
216 T., Ballard, G., Barrett, R.T., et al. 2018 Global phenological insensitivity to shifting ocean temperatures  
217 among seabirds. *Nature Climate Change* **8**, 313-318. (doi:10.1038/s41558-018-0115-z).
- 218 [2] Varpe, Ø. 2017 Life History Adaptations to Seasonality. *Integrative and Comparative Biology* **57**, 943-  
219 960. (doi:10.1093/icb/ix123).
- 220 [3] Youngflesh, C., Jenouvrier, S., Li, Y., Ji, R., Ainley, D.G., Ballard, G., Barbraud, C., Delord, K., Dugger,  
221 K.M., Emmerson, L.M., et al. 2017 Circumpolar analysis of the Adélie Penguin reveals the importance of  
222 environmental variability in phenological mismatch. *Ecology* **98**, 940-951. (doi:10.1002/ecy.1749).
- 223 [4] McLean, N., Lawson, C.R., Leech, D.I. & van de Pol, M. 2016 Predicting when climate-driven  
224 phenotypic change affects population dynamics. *Ecology Letters* **19**, 595-608. (doi:10.1111/ele.12599).
- 225 [5] Walther, G.-R., Post, E., Convey, P., Menzel, A., Parmesan, C., Beebee, T.J.C., Fromentin, J.-M., Hoegh-  
226 Guldberg, O. & Bairlein, F. 2002 Ecological responses to recent climate change. *Nature* **416**, 389.  
227 (doi:10.1038/416389a).
- 228 [6] Møller, A.P., Rubolini, D. & Lehikoinen, E. 2008 Populations of migratory bird species that did not  
229 show a phenological response to climate change are declining. *Proceedings of the National Academy of*  
230 *Sciences* **105**, 16195-16200. (doi:10.1073/pnas.0803825105).
- 231 [7] Kokko, H., Harris, M.P. & Wanless, S. 2004 Competition for breeding sites and site-dependent  
232 population regulation in a highly colonial seabird, the common guillemot *Uria aalge*. *Journal of Animal*  
233 *Ecology* **73**, 367-376. (doi:doi:10.1111/j.0021-8790.2004.00813.x).
- 234 [8] Joël Bêty, Gilles Gauthier & Jean-François Giroux. 2003 Body Condition, Migration, and Timing of  
235 Reproduction in Snow Geese: A Test of the Condition-Dependent Model of Optimal Clutch Size. *The*  
236 *American Naturalist* **162**, 110-121. (doi:10.1086/375680).
- 237 [9] Sénéchal, É., Bêty, J., Gilchrist, H.G., Hobson, K.A. & Jamieson, S.E. 2011 Do purely capital layers exist  
238 among flying birds? Evidence of exogenous contribution to arctic-nesting common eider eggs. *Oecologia*  
239 **165**, 593-604. (doi:10.1007/s00442-010-1853-4).
- 240 [10] Birkhead, T.R., Johnson, S.D. & Nettleship, D.N. 1985 Extra-pair matings and mate guarding in the  
241 common murre *Uria aalge*. *Animal Behaviour* **33**, 608-619. (doi:[https://doi.org/10.1016/S0003-  
242 3472\(85\)80085-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0003-3472(85)80085-3)).
- 243 [11] Harris, M.P., Heubeck, M., Shaw, D.N. & Okill, J.D. 2006 Dramatic changes in the return date of  
244 Guillemots *Uria aalge* to colonies in Shetland, 1962–2005. *Bird Study* **53**, 247-252.  
245 (doi:10.1080/00063650609461439).
- 246 [12] Quillfeldt, P., Weimerskirch, H., Masello, J.F., Delord, K., McGill, R.A.R., Furness, R.W. & Cherel, Y.  
247 2019 Behavioural plasticity in the early breeding season of pelagic seabirds - a case study of thin-billed  
248 prions from two oceans. *Movement Ecology* **7**, 1. (doi:10.1186/s40462-019-0147-7).
- 249 [13] Frederiksen, M., Descamps, S., Erikstad, K.E., Gaston, A.J., Gilchrist, H.G., Grémillet, D., Johansen,  
250 K.L., Kolbeinsson, Y., Linnebjerg, J.F., Mallory, M.L., et al. 2016 Migration and wintering of a declining  
251 seabird, the thick-billed murre *Uria lomvia*, on an ocean basin scale: Conservation implications. *Biol.*  
252 *Conserv.* **200**, 26-35. (doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.biocon.2016.05.011>).
- 253 [14] McFarlane Tranquilla, L., Montevecchi, W.A., Hedd, A., Fifield, D.A., Burke, C.M., Smith, P.A.,  
254 Regular, P.M., Robertson, G.J., Gaston, A.J. & Phillips, R.A. 2013 Multiple-colony winter habitat use by  
255 murrens *Uria* spp. in the Northwest Atlantic Ocean: implications for marine risk assessment. *Marine*  
256 *Ecology Progress Series* **472**, 287-303. (doi:10.3354/meps10053).
- 257 [15] Linnebjerg, J.F., Frederiksen, M., Kolbeinsson, Y., Snaethórsson, A.Ö., Thórisson, B. & Thórarinsson,  
258 T.L. 2018 Non-breeding areas of three sympatric auk species breeding in three Icelandic colonies. *Polar*  
259 *Biology*. (doi:10.1007/s00300-018-2334-1).

- 260 [16] Benowitz-Fredericks, Z.M. & Kitaysky, A.S. 2005 Benefits and costs of rapid growth in common  
 261 murre chicks *Uria aalge*. *Journal of Avian Biology* **36**, 287-294. (doi:10.1111/j.0908-8857.2005.03357.x).
- 262 [17] Gaston, A.J. & Jones, I.L. 1998 Bird families of the world. The Auks Alcidae. (Oxford University Press,  
 263 Oxford).
- 264 [18] Descamps, S., Ramírez, F., Benjaminsen, S., Anker-Nilssen, T., Barrett, R.T., Burr, Z., Christensen-  
 265 Dalsgaard, S., Erikstad, K.E., Irons, D.B., Lorentsen, S.-H., et al. 2019 Diverging phenological responses of  
 266 Arctic seabirds to an earlier spring. *Global Change Biology*. (doi:10.1111/gcb.14780).
- 267 [19] JNCC. 2016 Seabird Population Trends and Causes of Change: 1986-2015 Report. (ed. JNCC), Joint  
 268 Nature Conservation Committee.
- 269 [20] Fauchald, P., Anker-Nilssen, T., Barrett, R.T., Bustnes, J.O., Bårdsen, B.-J., Christensen-Dalsgaard, S.,  
 270 Descamps, S., Engen, S., Erikstad, K.E., Hanssen, S.A., et al. 2015 The status and trends of seabirds  
 271 breeding in Norway and Svalbard. In *NINA Rapport* (ed. P. Fauchald), pp. 1-84. Trondheim, NINA.
- 272 [21] Garðarsson, A., Guðmundsson, G.A. & Lilliendahl, K. 2019 The numbers of large auks on the cliffs of  
 273 Iceland in 2006-2008. *Bliki* **33**, 35-46.
- 274 [22] Taylor, K. & Reid, J. 1981 Earlier colony attendance by Guillemots and Razorbills. *Scottish Birds* **11**,  
 275 173-180.
- 276 [23] Harris, M.P. & Wanless, S. 1989 Fall Colony Attendance and Breeding Success in the Common Murre.  
 277 *The Condor* **91**, 139-146. (doi:10.2307/1368157).
- 278 [24] Burr, Z.M., Varpe, Ø., Anker-Nilssen, T., Erikstad, K.E., Descamps, S., Barrett, R.T., Bech, C.,  
 279 Christensen-Dalsgaard, S., Lorentsen, S.-H., Moe, B., et al. 2016 Later at higher latitudes: large-scale  
 280 variability in seabird breeding timing and synchronicity. *Ecosphere* **7**, e01283. (doi:10.1002/ecs2.1283).
- 281 [25] Birkhead, T.R. 1978 ATTENDANCE PATTERNS OF GUILLEMOTS *URIA AALGE* AT BREEDING COLONIES  
 282 ON SKOMER ISLAND. *Ibis* **120**, 219-229. (doi:doi:10.1111/j.1474-919X.1978.tb06779.x).
- 283 [26] Hatchwell, B. 1988 Intraspecific variation in extra-pair copulation and mate defence in common  
 284 guillemots *Uria aalge*. *Behaviour* **107**, 157-185.
- 285 [27] Gaston, A.J. & Nettleship, D.N. 1981 *The thick-billed murre of Prince Leopold Island*, Canadian  
 286 Wildlife Service Ottawa.
- 287 [28] Wilhelm, S.I. & Storey, A.E. 2002 Influence of Cyclic Pre-Lay Attendance on Synchronous Breeding in  
 288 Common Murres. *Waterbirds: The International Journal of Waterbird Biology* **25**, 156-163.
- 289 [29] Merkel, B., Descamps, S., Yoccoz, N., Danielsen, J., Daunt, F., Erikstad, K.E., Ezhov, A., Grémillet, D.,  
 290 Gavriilo, M., Lorentsen, S.-H., et al. 2019 Data from: Earlier colony arrival but no trend in hatching timing  
 291 in two congeneric seabirds (*Uria* spp.) across the North Atlantic. Norwegian Polar Institute. (doi:  
 292 [10.21334/npolar.2019.55169600](https://doi.org/10.21334/npolar.2019.55169600))
- 293 [30] Barrett, R.T., Anker-Nilssen, T., Bustnes, J.O., Christensen-Dalsgaard, S., Descamps, S., Erikstad, K.-E.,  
 294 Lorentsen, S.-H., Strøm, H. & Systad, G.H. 2012 Key-site monitoring in Norway 2011. In *SEAPOP Short*  
 295 *Report*
- 296 [31] Barrett, R.T., Anker-Nilssen, T., Bustnes, J.O., Christensen-Dalsgaard, S., Descamps, S., Erikstad, K.-E.,  
 297 Lorentsen, S.-H., Lorentzen, E., Strøm, H. & Systad, G.H. 2013 Key-site monitoring in Norway 2012,  
 298 including Svalbard and Jan Mayen. In *SEAPOP Short Report*
- 299 [32] Barrett, R.T., Anker-Nilssen, T., Bustnes, J.O., Christensen-Dalsgaard, S., Descamps, S., Erikstad, K.-E.,  
 300 Hanssen, S.A., Lorentsen, S.-H., Lorentzen, E., Strøm, H., et al. 2014 Key-site monitoring in Norway 2013,  
 301 including Svalbard and Jan Mayen. In *SEAPOP Short Report*
- 302 [33] Barrett, R.T., Anker-Nilssen, T., Bustnes, J.O., Christensen-Dalsgaard, S., Descamps, S., Erikstad, K.E.,  
 303 Hanssen, S.A., Lorentsen, S.-H., Lorentzen, E., Reiertsen, T.K., et al. 2015 Key-site monitoring in Norway  
 304 2014, including Svalbard and Jan Mayen. In *SEAPOP Short Report*
- 305 [34] Barrett, R.T., Anker-Nilssen, T., Bustnes, J.O., Christensen-Dalsgaard, S., Descamps, S., Erikstad, K.E.,  
 306 Hanssen, S.A., Lorentsen, S.-H., Lorentzen, E., Reiertsen, T.K., et al. 2016 Key-site monitoring in Norway  
 307 2015, including Svalbard and Jan Mayen. In *SEAPOP Short Report*

- 308 [35] Anker-Nilssen, T., Strøm, H., Barrett, R., Bustnes, J.O., Christensen-Dalsgaard, S., Descamps, S.,  
309 Erikstad, K.-E., Hanssen, S.A., Lorentsen, S.-H., Lorentzen, E., et al. 2017 Key-site monitoring in Norway  
310 2016, including Svalbard and Jan Mayen. In *SEAPOP Short Report* (p. 14).
- 311 [36] Anker-Nilssen, T., Barrett, R., Christensen-Dalsgaard, S., Hanssen, S.A., Reiertsen, T.K., Bustnes, J.O.,  
312 Descamps, S., Erikstad, K.-E., Follestad, A., Langset, M., et al. 2018 Key-site monitoring in Norway 2017,  
313 including Svalbard and Jan Mayen. In *SEAPOP Short Report*
- 314 [37] Kolbeinsson, Y. & Þórarinnsson, Þ.L. 2018 Vöktun bjargfuglastofna 2018 -Framvinduskýrsla. Húsavík,  
315 Náttúrustofa Norðausturlands.
- 316 [38] Pinheiro, J.C. & Bates, D.M. 2000 *Mixed-effects models in S and S-PLUS*. New York, Springer; XVI, 528  
317 s. p.
- 318 [39] Nakagawa, S. & Schielzeth, H. 2013 A general and simple method for obtaining R<sup>2</sup> from generalized  
319 linear mixed-effects models. *Methods Ecol. Evol.* **4**, 133-142. (doi:10.1111/j.2041-210x.2012.00261.x).
- 320 [40] Bjørnstad, O.N., Ims, R.A. & Lambin, X. 1999 Spatial population dynamics: analyzing patterns and  
321 processes of population synchrony. *Trends Ecol. Evol.* **14**, 427-432. (doi:10.1016/S0169-5347(99)01677-  
322 8).
- 323 [41] R Development Core Team. 2019 R: A language and environment for statistical computing. (Vienna,  
324 Austria, R Foundation for Statistical Computing.
- 325 [42] Birkhead, T.R. & Nevo, A.J.D. 1987 Egg formation and the pre-laying period of the Common  
326 guillemot *Uria aalge*. *Journal of Zoology* **211**, 83-88. (doi:10.1111/j.1469-7998.1987.tb07454.x).
- 327 [43] Harris, M.P. & Wanless, S. 1990 Breeding Status and Sex of Common Murres (*Uria aalge*) at a Colony  
328 in Autumn. *The Auk* **107**, 603-605.
- 329 [44] Ashmole, N.P. 1963 THE REGULATION OF NUMBERS OF TROPICAL OCEANIC BIRDS. *Ibis* **103b**, 458-  
330 473. (doi:10.1111/j.1474-919X.1963.tb06766.x).
- 331 [45] Marra, P.P., Francis, C.M., Mulvihill, R.S. & Moore, F.R. 2005 The influence of climate on the timing  
332 and rate of spring bird migration. *Oecologia* **142**, 307-315. (doi:10.1007/s00442-004-1725-x).
- 333 [46] Both, C. & Visser, M.E. 2001 Adjustment to climate change is constrained by arrival date in a long-  
334 distance migrant bird. *Nature* **411**, 296. (doi:10.1038/35077063).
- 335 [47] Fraser, K.C., Silverio, C., Kramer, P., Mickle, N., Aeppli, R. & Stutchbury, B.J.M. 2013 A Trans-  
336 Hemispheric Migratory Songbird Does Not Advance Spring Schedules or Increase Migration Rate in  
337 Response to Record-Setting Temperatures at Breeding Sites. *PLoS One* **8**, e64587.  
338 (doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0064587).
- 339 [48] IPCC. 2013 *Climate Change 2013: The Physical Science Basis. Contribution of Working Group I to the*  
340 *Fifth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change*. Cambridge, United Kingdom  
341 and New York, NY, USA, Cambridge University Press; 1535 p.
- 342 [49] Harris, M.P. & Wanless, S. 1995 Survival and non-breeding of adult Common Guillemots *Uria aalge*.  
343 *Ibis* **137**, 192-197. (doi:10.1111/j.1474-919X.1995.tb03239.x).
- 344 [50] Reed, T.E., Harris, M.P. & Wanless, S. 2015 Skipped breeding in common guillemots in a changing  
345 climate: restraint or constraint? *Frontiers in Ecology and Evolution* **3**. (doi:10.3389/fevo.2015.00001).
- 346 [51] Jeschke, J.M., Harris, M.P., Wanless, S. & Kokko, H. 2007 How partnerships end in guillemots *Uria*  
347 *aalge*: chance events, adaptive change, or forced divorce? *Behavioral Ecology* **18**, 460-466.  
348 (doi:10.1093/beheco/arl109).


349

350 Figures



351

352 **Figure 1.** Panel A displays the colony locations of Common (red, COGU) and Brünnich's guillemots (blue, BRGU)  
353 included in the study. Panel B illustrates the relationship between mean arrival date and latitude, while panel C  
354 shows the correlation of mean pre-laying duration and colony size. Colonies with less certain pre-laying duration  
355 estimates are indicated as open circles. Bands in panels B and C indicate 95% confidence intervals for predicted  
356 values.



**Figure 2.** Temporal trends in arrival dates at the colony (Panel A), pre-laying duration (Panel B) and mean hatching date (Panel C). Dashed line in panel A represents linear mixed effect model predictions for the subset of data for which hatching timing information was available (squares), while the solid line in panel A illustrates the same model prediction for arrival date using the entire dataset (squares and dots). Panel D shows the relationship between advancing arrival date and breeding success. Bands in all panels indicate bootstrapped 95% confidence intervals for predicted values calculated using the `bootMer` function with 1000 simulations (package `lme4`). Red and blue symbols represent Common (COGU) and Brünnich's guillemots (BRGU), respectively.