

Climate change and population declines in a long-distance migratory bird

Christiaan Both^{1,2}, Sandra Bouwhuis^{1†}, C. M. Lessells¹ & Marcel E. Visser¹

Phenological responses to climate change differ across trophic levels^{1–3}, which may lead to birds failing to breed at the time of maximal food abundance. Here we investigate the population consequences of such mistiming in the migratory pied flycatcher, *Ficedula hypoleuca*⁴. In a comparison of nine Dutch populations, we find that populations have declined by about 90% over the past two decades in areas where the food for provisioning nestlings peaks early in the season and the birds are currently mistimed. In areas with a late food peak, early-breeding birds still breed at the right time, and there is, at most, a weak population decline. If food phenology advances further, we also predict population declines in areas with a late food peak, as in these areas adjustment to an advanced food peak is insufficient⁴. Mistiming as a result of climate change is probably a widespread phenomenon¹, and here we provide evidence that it can lead to population declines.

Ongoing climate change leaves a clear global fingerprint on ecosystems. Many organisms bring forward the timing of their seasonal activities, whether it be flowering in plants, budding of trees, emergence of insects or breeding in birds^{5–7}. Despite this general advancement, some species may not cope with climate change because their response differs from the response of organisms at lower levels of the food chain^{1–4,8,9}, leading to a mismatch between the timing of reproduction and the main food supply¹⁰. This mistiming can have a clear effect on species population dynamics and ecosystem functioning^{2,11}. In general, we expect the populations that are most mistimed to decline most in number. Here we show how populations of a small passerine bird have declined as a consequence of climate change, because the phenology of their main food supply during breeding has advanced more than the birds' breeding date.

We studied the population ecology of the long-distance migratory passerine, the pied flycatcher *Ficedula hypoleuca*, and its caterpillar food supply. We have previously shown in this long-term study in the Netherlands that the flycatchers have advanced their laying date but not the timing of their spring arrival in the Netherlands, and that the advancement in laying date was not sufficient to track the advancement of spring, leading to increased selection for early breeding⁴. The temperate forest habitat of our study area is characterized by a clear peak in caterpillar abundance in spring, and caterpillars are an important food source for nestling flycatchers^{12,13}. The timing of this caterpillar peak differs between areas (see Supplementary Information) and years, with a clear shift forward over the past 20 years in our main study population¹⁴.

We predicted that areas with increased mismatch between the timing of the birds and the peak availability of their prey would show a strong population decline. To test this prediction, we collated annual population counts between 1987 and 2003 from ten nest box populations in the Netherlands that differed strongly in population

trends. If increased mistiming is the cause of population declines, we predict that populations in the areas with the earliest food peak will have declined most strongly. This is because these long-distance migrants have a relatively fixed spring migration programme¹⁵, and in early food phenology areas these birds have a shorter period between their arrival and the time of the food peak. A short time interval between arrival and breeding may act as a constraint, because the birds can not shorten this much further. We expect that populations in these areas of early food peak might also react less flexibly to increases in temperature, and consequently decline in number.

We found strong support for our hypothesis: pied flycatchers have declined by about 90% in areas with the earliest food peaks, but have only declined by about 10% in areas with the latest food peaks (Fig. 1a). Because we measured the caterpillar peak date in only one year (2003, at the end of the study period), we used the percentage of great tits producing a second brood over a six-year period (1985–1990) as a second measure of the phenological state of the area, because great tits produce second broods only if caterpillar peaks are late¹⁶. Flycatcher populations declined most in areas with




Figure 1 | Population trends of Dutch pied flycatcher populations. **a, b**, Trends in response to the local date of the caterpillar peak (in days since 31 March) (Spearman rank correlation: $r_s = 0.80$, $n = 9$, $P = 0.013$) (**a**), and the slope of annual median laying date on spring (16 April–15 May) temperature ($r_s = -0.86$, $n = 7$, $P = 0.03$) (**b**). Populations of pied flycatchers with an early food peak and a weak response declined most strongly. Population trend is the slope of the regression of the log number of breeding pairs against year. In **b**, the x axis shows the slope of a linear regression of median laying date against mean temperature from 16 April–15 May. Error bars represent the standard errors of the slopes of the regression lines. All points in **b** are also in **a**, except for one point, for which we had no data regarding the caterpillar peak.

¹Netherlands Institute of Ecology (NIOO-KNAW), PO Box 40, 6666ZG Heteren, The Netherlands. ²Animal Ecology Group, Centre for Ecological and Evolutionary Studies, University of Groningen, PO Box 14, 9750AA Haren, The Netherlands. †Present addresses: Behavioural Biology Group, University of Groningen, PO Box 14, 9750AA Haren, The Netherlands, and The Edward Grey Institute, Department of Zoology, University of Oxford, South Parks Road, Oxford OX1 3PS, UK.

the lowest percentage of great tit second broods (Spearman rank correlation: $r_s = 0.94$, $n = 6$ populations, $P = 0.003$), confirming our result based on direct measures of caterpillar peak dates.

If migration timing does act as a constraint, we expect that the flycatcher breeding would be least able to advance with increasing temperatures in areas with the earliest food phenology. Indeed, the populations that adjusted their laying date least to temperature were the ones with the strongest decline in population numbers (Fig. 1b). This is probably not due to genetic differences in reaction norms between populations because such differences were not found in a related species¹⁷, and the exchange of ringed birds occurs between some of our study populations. The population declines in areas with early food peaks and in populations least flexible to increasing temperatures thus strongly support the idea that these declines are attributable to insufficient adjustment of arrival and laying dates to climate change.

The decline in the number of pied flycatcher breeding pairs in areas with an early food phenology was not due to general deterioration of the habitat, because caterpillar biomass was highest in areas with an early food peak (Spearman rank correlation between caterpillar peak abundance and peak date: $r_s = -0.695$, $n = 9$, $P < 0.05$), and population trends of resident great tits (*Parus major*) breeding in the same nest boxes were unrelated to the date of the caterpillar peak (linear regression: $F_{1,6} = 0.38$, $P = 0.56$; slopes differed between species: $F_{1,13} = 11.66$, $P = 0.013$), despite their dependence on caterpillars for feeding chicks¹⁸.

We have thus clearly shown that climate-change-induced mistiming leads to population declines in a migratory songbird. One possible reason why pied flycatchers have not adjusted sufficiently to climate change is that their arrival from their wintering grounds has not advanced and probably acts as a constraint on laying dates^{4,19}. Because we have also shown this mistiming in an area with a late food phenology^{4,20}, we expect flycatcher populations in these areas to decline if the food peak advances further. The decline in areas with an early food phenology is probably not just the result of changed habitat selection, because in two-thirds of the Netherlands declines of about 50% were reported between 1986 and 1999 in the Dutch common bird census²¹, which is in agreement with the general decline in European long-distance migrants²². Furthermore, since 1988 declines have been reported in 45 out of 62 nest box areas in the UK (J. Wright and the British Trust for Ornithology, personal communication), suggesting that these declines are more widespread, but differ across sites. In general, we expect climate change to be a greater threat to long-distance migrants than to resident species, and to species breeding in strongly seasonal environments than to species living in less seasonal habitats²³. Apart from a mismatch due to an advance in the timing of their food, the duration of high food availability may decrease because caterpillars grow faster and advance pupation at higher temperatures²⁴. The general decline in many long-distance migratory species in both Europe²² and North America²⁵ may thus be particularly pronounced in seasonal habitats and may be exacerbated by climate change, which can exaggerate the temporal mismatch between avian predators and their prey.

METHODS

We studied ten pied flycatcher populations in the Netherlands separated by 3–150 km (see Supplementary Information). Population size (the number of pairs using the nest boxes) was analysed from 1987 (the first year for which we have data for all populations) until 2003. The number of pairs using the nest boxes is used here as a population size for the area, because in the Netherlands about 90% of the species breeds in nest boxes, and in nest box areas more than 98% of flycatcher pairs breed in the boxes (unpublished observation). The population trend is the slope of the regression with $\log_{10}(\text{population size} + 1)$ the dependent variable and year as the independent variable, and is a measure of the relative growth or decline of the population.

Laying date was known for six populations, and we calculated the annual median laying date from 1980–2002. Previous work has shown that laying date correlates strongly with spring temperature, and we used the slope of the linear

regression of the annual median laying date (dependent variable) and mean temperature from 16 April–15 May (independent variable) as measure of the plasticity of laying date⁴. The median laying date in the early part of the study is 15 May, and we showed that laying date is strongly correlated with temperature over this period in 25 study areas across Europe²⁶. Areas differed in the period for which laying dates were available; we used all the available data in order to get the most accurate measure of plasticity. We calculated median laying dates only for years in which more than seven pairs bred in each population.

In 2003, we measured the caterpillar peak for two pedunculate oak *Quercus robur* trees in each of nine areas. Representative trees were selected in the main breeding areas of the pied flycatchers. We placed a 50 cm × 50 cm cloth net under each tree to catch caterpillar droppings, and collected the samples in the nets every five days. Caterpillar biomass in the trees was estimated from the dry weight of the droppings²⁷ and the caterpillar peak date was defined as the middle day in the five-day period for which caterpillar biomass was maximal. In the Netherlands, 2003 was a warm spring, and the caterpillar peak in our main study area was the third-earliest since we started measuring it in 1985 (ref. 14). Using a regression slope, the peak advanced 16 days from 1985 to 2003.

As a second approximation of the general phenological state of each area, we used the percentage of great tits producing second broods. This species is known to produce more second broods if the caterpillar peak is late¹⁶, and the percentage of second broods is thus a measure of whether caterpillar peaks are early or late. We took the average of the annual proportions for the years 1985–1990, which was at the start of our flycatcher population analysis, because as a result of climate change the proportion of great tits producing second broods has declined in some habitats²⁸. The proportion of second broods was known for six of the ten study populations.

Received 17 October; accepted 22 December 2005.

1. Visser, M. E. & Both, C. Shifts in phenology due to global climate change: the need for a yardstick. *Proc. R. Soc. B* **272**, 2561–2569 (2005).
2. Stenseth, N. C. *et al.* Ecological effects of climate fluctuations. *Science* **297**, 1292–1296 (2002).
3. Merila, J., Kruuk, L. E. B. & Sheldon, B. C. Cryptic evolution in a wild bird population. *Nature* **412**, 76–79 (2001).
4. Both, C. & Visser, M. E. Adjustment to climate change is constrained by arrival date in a long-distance migrant bird. *Nature* **411**, 296–298 (2001).
5. Walther, G. R. *et al.* Ecological responses to recent climate change. *Nature* **416**, 389–395 (2002).
6. Parmesan, C. & Yohe, G. A globally coherent fingerprint of climate change impacts across natural systems. *Nature* **421**, 37–42 (2003).
7. Root, T. L. *et al.* Fingerprints of global warming on wild animals and plants. *Nature* **421**, 57–60 (2003).
8. Visser, M. E., van Noordwijk, A. J., Tinbergen, J. M. & Lessells, C. M. Warmer springs lead to mistimed reproduction in great tits (*Parus major*). *Proc. R. Soc. Lond. B* **265**, 1867–1870 (1998).
9. Visser, M. E. & Holleman, L. J. M. Warmer springs disrupt the synchrony of oak and winter moth phenology. *Proc. R. Soc. Lond. B* **268**, 289–294 (2001).
10. Visser, M. E., Both, C. & Lambrechts, M. M. Global climate change leads to mistimed avian reproduction. *Adv. Ecol. Res.* **35**, 89–110 (2004).
11. McLaughlin, J. F., Hellmann, J. J., Boggs, C. L. & Ehrlich, P. R. Climate change hastens population extinctions. *Proc. Natl Acad. Sci. USA* **99**, 6070–6074 (2002).
12. von Haartman, L. Der Trauerfliegenschnäpper. 3. Die Nahrungsbiologie. *Ann. Zool. Fenn.* **83**, 1–95 (1954).
13. Sanz, J. J. Effect of habitat and latitude on nestling diet of Pied Flycatchers *Ficedula hypoleuca*. *Ardea* **86**, 81–88 (1998).
14. Visser, M. E., Holleman, L. J. M. & Gienapp, P. Shifts in caterpillar biomass phenology due to climate change and its impact on the breeding biology of an insectivorous bird. *Oecologia* **147**, 164–172 (2006).
15. Gwinner, E. Circannual clocks in avian reproduction and migration. *Ibis* **138**, 47–63 (1996).
16. Verboven, N., Tinbergen, J. M. & Verhulst, S. Food, reproductive success and multiple breeding in the Great Tit, *Parus major*. *Ardea* **89**, 387–406 (2001).
17. Brommer, J. E., Merila, J., Sheldon, B. C. & Gustafsson, L. Natural selection and genetic variation for reproductive reaction norms in a wild bird population. *Evolution Int. J. Org. Evolution* **59**, 1362–1371 (2005).
18. van Balen, J. H. A comparative study of the breeding ecology of the Great Tit *Parus major* in different habitats. *Ardea* **61**, 1–93 (1973).
19. Both, C., Bijlsma, R. G. & Visser, M. E. Climatic effects on timing of spring migration and breeding in a long-distance migrant, the pied flycatcher *Ficedula hypoleuca*. *J. Avian Biol.* **36**, 368–373 (2005).
20. Both, C. & Visser, M. E. The effect of climate change on the correlation between avian life-history traits. *Glob. Change Biol.* **11**, 1606–1613 (2005).
21. Boele, A., van Dijk, A. J., Hustings, F. & Zoetebier, D. Regional differences in the development of European Pied Flycatcher *Ficedula hypoleuca* numbers. *Limosa* **74**, 103–115 (2001).

22. Berthold, P., Fiedler, W., Schlenker, R. & Querner, U. 25-year study of the population development of Central European songbirds: a general decline, most evident in long-distance migrants. *Naturwissenschaften* **85**, 350–353 (1998).
23. Winkler, D. W., Dunn, P. O. & McCulloch, C. E. Predicting the effects of climate change on avian life-histories. *Proc. Natl Acad. Sci. USA* **99**, 13595–13599 (2002).
24. Buse, A., Dury, S. J., Woodburn, R. J. W., Perrins, C. M. & Good, J. E. G. Effects of elevated temperature on multi-species interactions: the case of Pedunculate Oak, Winter Moth and Tits. *Funct. Ecol.* **13** (suppl.), 74–82 (1999).
25. Sauer, J. R., Pendleton, G. W. & Peterjohn, B. G. Evaluating causes of population change in North American insectivorous songbirds. *Cons. Biol.* **10**, 465–478 (1996).
26. Both, C. *et al.* Large-scale geographical variation confirms that climate change causes birds to lay earlier. *Proc. R. Soc. Lond. B* **271**, 1657–1662 (2004).
27. Tinbergen, J. M. & Dietz, M. W. Parental energy expenditure during brood rearing in the Great Tit (*Parus major*) in relation to body mass, temperature, food availability and clutch size. *Funct. Ecol.* **8**, 563–572 (1994).
28. Visser, M. E. *et al.* Variable responses to large-scale climate change in European *Parus* populations. *Proc. R. Soc. Lond. B* **270**, 367–372 (2003).

Supplementary Information is linked to the online version of the paper at www.nature.com/nature.

Acknowledgements The long-term data on the Hoge Veluwe were collected under the directorships of H. van Balen and A. van Noordwijk, and the database was managed by J. Visser, B. van der Brink, B. Blaauw, H. and A. Dekhuijzen, H. Jansen, and J. van Laar provided population data. We are grateful to Nationaal Park de Hoge Veluwe, Staatsbosbeheer, Natuurmonumenten and Het Geldersch Landschap for permission to work on their properties. Comments made by J. Harvey, T. Piersma, D. Winkler and J. Wright improved the manuscript.

Author Information Reprints and permissions information is available at npg.nature.com/reprintsandpermissions. The authors declare no competing financial interests. Correspondence and requests for materials should be addressed to C.B. (C.Both@rug.nl).