

Title	Stable isotope analysis reveals biases in the performance of a morphological method to distinguish the migratory behaviour of European Robins <i>Erithacus rubecula</i>
Authors	de la Hera, Iván;Fandos, Guillermo;Fernández-López, Javier;Onrubia, Alejandro;Pérez-Rodríguez, Antón;Pérez-Tris, Javier;Tellería, José Luis
Publication date	2017-07
Original Citation	de la Hera, I., Fandos, G., Fernández-López, J., Onrubia, A., Pérez-Rodríguez, A., Pérez-Tris, J. and Tellería, J. L. (2017) 'Stable isotope analysis reveals biases in the performance of a morphological method to distinguish the migratory behaviour of European Robins <i>Erithacus rubecula</i> ', <i>Ardeola</i> , 64(2), pp. 377-386. doi:10.13157/arla.64.2.2017.sc1
Type of publication	Article (peer-reviewed)
Link to publisher's version	<a href="https://doi.org/10.13157/arla.64.2.2017.sc1">https://doi.org/10.13157/arla.64.2.2017.sc1</a> - <a href="https://doi.org/10.13157/arla.64.2.2017.sc1">10.13157/arla.64.2.2017.sc1</a>
Rights	© 2017, SEO/BirdLife. All rights reserved.
Download date	2024-07-19 15:19:08
Item downloaded from	<a href="https://hdl.handle.net/10468/7016">https://hdl.handle.net/10468/7016</a>

**STABLE ISOTOPE ANALYSIS REVEALS BIASES IN THE  
PERFORMANCE OF A MORPHOLOGICAL METHOD TO  
DISTINGUISH THE MIGRATORY BEHAVIOUR OF EUROPEAN  
ROBINS *ERITHACUS RUBECULA***

***EL ANÁLISIS DE ISÓTOPOS ESTABLES REVELA SESGOS EN EL  
FUNCIONAMIENTO DE UN MÉTODO MORFOLÓGICO PARA DIFERENCIAR EL  
COMPORTAMIENTO MIGRATORIO DE LOS PETIRROJOS ERITHACUS  
RUBECULA***

Iván de la Hera<sup>1,2</sup>, Guillermo Fandos<sup>1</sup>, Javier Fernández-López<sup>1,3</sup>, Alejandro Onrubia<sup>4</sup>, Antón Pérez-Rodríguez<sup>1,5</sup>, Javier Pérez-Tris<sup>1</sup> and José Luis Tellería<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Departamento de Zoología y Antropología Física, Universidad Complutense de Madrid, E-28040 Madrid, Spain.*

<sup>2</sup> *School of Biological, Earth and Environmental Sciences, University College Cork, Cork, Ireland.*

<sup>3</sup> *Real Jardín Botánico de Madrid, Spanish National Research Council, E-28014 Madrid, Spain*

<sup>4</sup> *Fundación Migres, E-11380 Tarifa, Spain.*

<sup>5</sup> *UMR 6282 'Biogéosciences', CNRS - Univ. Bourgogne Franche-Comté, F-21000 Dijon, France.*

\* *Corresponding author: [ivan.delahera@ucc.ie](mailto:ivan.delahera@ucc.ie)*

Field Code Changed

**Short title:**  $\delta^2H_f$  values and the migratory behaviour of wintering robins

**Key words:** Campo de Gibraltar, Deuterium, discriminant functions, rectrix feathers, sympatric interactions

**Word count:** 2776 (excluding summaries, acknowledgments and references)

**Type of article:** Short Communication

1 SUMMARY.- Morphological methods to distinguish avian groups of research interest (*e.g.* sex,  
2 population or cryptic species distinction) need to be externally validated to ensure a reliable  
3 performance across situations. In this study, we used hydrogen stable isotope ratios of  
4 feathers ( $\delta^2H_f$ ) to test the validity of morphological classification functions (MCFs)  
5 previously designed to assess the migratory behaviour of European Robins *Erithacus*  
6 *rubecula* wintering in southern Iberia. Our results showed that a great number of migrants  
7 (mostly females and juveniles) were erroneously assigned as sedentary, which could  
8 compromise the reliability of previous ecological studies that made use of these MCFs. The  
9 development of improved MCFs or the use of alternative differentiation methods ( $\delta^2H_f$ ) could  
10 help us to gain a more realistic insight into the habitat distribution and ecological interactions  
11 of sympatric migratory and sedentary robins overwintering in southern Iberia.

12  
13 RESUMEN.- Los métodos morfológicos para distinguir grupos de aves con interés de  
14 investigación (*e.g.* distinción de sexos, poblaciones o especies crípticas) requieren de  
15 validación independiente para asegurar su funcionamiento adecuado de forma consistente. En  
16 este estudio, usamos la relación de isótopos estables del hidrógeno en las plumas ( $\delta^2H_f$ ) para  
17 comprobar la validez de las funciones de clasificación morfológicas (MCFs) diseñadas con  
18 anterioridad para identificar el comportamiento migratorio de los petirrojos *Erithacus*  
19 *rubecula* invernantes en el sur ibérico. Los resultados revelaron que un gran número de  
20 migrantes (sobre todo hembras y jóvenes) fueron clasificados erróneamente como  
21 sedentarios, lo que podría comprometer la fiabilidad de los estudios ecológicos previos que  
22 han hecho uso de estas MCFs. El desarrollo de MCFs mejoradas o el uso de métodos de  
23 diferenciación alternativos ( $\delta^2H_f$ ) podrían ayudarnos a obtener una idea más realista acerca de  
24 la distribución entre hábitats e interacciones ecológicas de los petirrojos migratorios y  
25 sedentarios que invernán en simpatría en el sur ibérico.

26

27 Discriminant function analyses (DFA) -and other similar statistical approaches- based on  
28 avian morphological traits are a readily accessible method to separate morphologically  
29 discrete groups of birds (Ellrich *et al.*, 2010; Tellería *et al.*, 2013). They are particularly  
30 useful to identify males and females in monochromatic -but still morphologically dimorphic-  
31 species (Arizaga *et al.*, 2008; Bertolero *et al.*, 2016). With mixed success, they have also  
32 been implemented in the identification of cryptic species (Wilson *et al.*, 2012; Gordo *et al.*,  
33 2017), as well as to identify populations within the same species differing in morphological  
34 traits (Wennerberg *et al.*, 2002; Maggini *et al.*, 2016). In many cases, morphology is now  
35 clearly outweighed by more novel techniques (Webster *et al.* 2002). For example, molecular  
36 genetics can provide unambiguous sex and species identifications (Griffiths *et al.*, 1998;  
37 Bensch *et al.*, 2002), while methods based on bird morphology are normally subject to  
38 variable degree of uncertainty in their assignments. In any case, under budget constraints,  
39 logistical limitations (e.g. permits for biological samples collection) and/or when these  
40 alternative techniques do not substantially improve the classification potential of  
41 morphology, the latter still can be the most cost-effective way to satisfactorily differentiate  
42 among avian groups of research interest (De la Hera *et al.*, 2012). In any case, given the  
43 potential uncertainty associated with the use of morphology, it is essential to validate the  
44 reliability of morphological methods using independent approaches, which can be very useful  
45 to reveal previously unnoticed flaws in their performance.

46 The study of the sympatric interactions between local sedentary birds and  
47 overwintering conspecific migrants in southern Iberia has greatly benefitted from the use of  
48 morphological classification functions (MCFs) that are one of the outcomes of DFA  
49 (StatSoft, 2004). It is well known that natural selection favours longer and more pointed  
50 wings in migrants compared to sedentary counterparts (Piersma *et al.*, 2005), and this  
51 variation is sometimes large enough for developing effective MCFs to distinguish each other.  
52 For instance, MCFs built from Iberian breeding populations of known migratory behaviour  
53 provided a 90 and an 80 percent of correct assignments of the migratory behaviour for the  
54 Eurasian Blackcap (*Sylvia atricapilla*) and European Robin (*Erithacus rubecula*),  
55 respectively (Pérez-Tris *et al.*, 1999; Pérez-Tris *et al.*, 2000). However, these MCFs have  
56 only been optimized for distinguishing among a few Iberian breeding populations, and these  
57 constitute only a small fraction of the wintering population occurring in Southern Iberia.  
58 Consequently, whether these MCFs can successfully be applied to distinguish among  
59 wintering birds of unknown origin needs to be explicitly corroborated (Ellrich *et al.*, 2010).

60 Most of the migratory blackcaps and robins wintering in Iberia originate from further  
61 Northeast in Europe, so they would have a more migratory-like morphology than any Iberian  
62 counterpart (Cramp, 1992; Korner-Nievergelt *et al.*, 2014). This should ensure an even better  
63 performance of these MCFs for the migratory group when they are applied to seasonally  
64 sympatric populations wintering in Southern Iberia. This has been confirmed for blackcaps  
65 (De la Hera *et al.*, 2007) and validated using a well-known pattern of stable isotope variation  
66 for the Palaearctic region (De la Hera *et al.*, 2012). However, the validity of the MCFs  
67 designed for distinguishing between migratory and sedentary robins remains to be tested  
68 using an independent control. Unlike blackcaps, robins show a great within-population  
69 variation in wing morphology, with male and adult robins having on average longer wings  
70 than females and juveniles, respectively (Ellrich *et al.*, 2010; De la Hera *et al.*, 2014). In this  
71 respect, there are two main concerns that could affect the performance of MCFs during  
72 winter. First, female and juvenile robins are more prone to migrate (Adriaensen & Dhondt,  
73 1990) and hence more likely to reach southern Iberia for overwintering, where their short  
74 wings might overlap in size with those of local sedentary robins, particularly with males  
75 (Ellrich *et al.*, 2010). On the other hand, juveniles were overrepresented in the Iberian robin  
76 sample used to develop these MCFs, and the sex ratio of the sample was unknown (Pérez-  
77 Tris *et al.*, 2000), which raises the possibility that the error rate would change if testing a  
78 wintering population with a different population composition.

79 To clarify the accuracy of the MCFs proposed by Pérez-Tris *et al.* (2000) for  
80 distinguishing between sedentary and migratory robins during the wintering period in  
81 southern Iberia, we took advantage of the predicted geographic variation in the hydrogen  
82 stable isotope signals of robin feathers ( $\delta^2H_f$ ; Catry *et al.*, 2016). We first characterized  
83 isotopically the sedentary robin population of research interest in southern Iberia, as well as  
84 one migratory population in northern Iberia. We then made predictions on how the  $\delta^2H_f$  of  
85 wintering robins, classified as migratory or sedentary by the MCFs, should vary in relation to  
86 the values of these two breeding populations of known migratory behaviour if the MCFs  
87 worked well (see premises 1 and 2 below).

88 We determined the  $\delta^2H_f$  signature of the sedentary population occurring in the Campo  
89 de Gibraltar (Cádiz, South Spain) by sampling one tail feather (one rectrix number 5; Jenni &  
90 Winkler, 1994) from robins captured during August 2006 (after moulting period) and May  
91 2014 (before moulting period). Robins were trapped in two woodland sites (36°09'48"N,  
92 5°34'56"W and 36°09'54"N, 5°34'55"W) located in 'Los Alcornocales' Natural Park. In  
93 parallel, we also sampled feathers from robins breeding in Álava (Northern Spain

94 42°54'02"N, 2°32'07"W), where the robin population is considered migratory (De la Hera *et*  
95 *al.*, 2014).

96 On the other hand, wintering robins in Gibraltar were trapped between mid-November  
97 and mid-February during two different winters (2006-07 and 2013-14). Winter sampling took  
98 place in the two abovementioned woodland localities, as well as in two nearby shrubland  
99 areas (36°09'03"N, 5°37'54"W and 36°05'11"N, 5°42'09"W) that host robins only during the  
100 winter period (Tellería *et al.*, 2001). Each trapped robin was aged as adult or juvenile using  
101 plumage characteristics (Jenni & Winkler, 1994). We also recorded the eighth primary (P8)  
102 length (being P1 the innermost primary) and the so-called wing formula (Svensson, 1992):  
103 the primary distances of the 9 longest primaries (excluding the vestigial outermost primary:  
104 P10). 'Primary distance' was defined as the distance from the tip of each primary to the tip of  
105 the longest primary with the wing folded, with a value of zero for the primary (or primaries)  
106 constituting the wingtip. All morphological measurements were taken by two standardized  
107 ringers in 2006-07 (IdH, JP-T) and only by one of these in 2013-14 (IdH). Additionally, we  
108 used a syringe to extract a sample of blood from the jugular vein that was used for molecular  
109 sexing (Griffiths *et al.*, 1998), and collected one rectrix number 5. Note that feathers of both  
110 breeding and wintering sampled birds had grown in the same season: the previous summer  
111 (either 2006 or 2013), providing thus comparable feather samples with their corresponding  
112 winter.

113 Feather samples were sent to the Colorado Plateau Stable Isotope Laboratory  
114 (<http://www.isotope.nau.edu/>), where their hydrogen isotopic ratios were measured by  
115 coupled pyrolysis/isotope-ratio mass spectrometry.  $\delta^2H_f$  values were expressed in units per  
116 mil (‰), and normalized according to the VSMOW-SLAP scale using the values obtained for  
117 three keratin standards (Keratin-SC Lot SJ, Caribou hoof and Kudo horn). The  $\delta^2H_f$  values of  
118 20 individuals were measured a second time to estimate analytical repeatability (Lessells &  
119 Boag, 1987), which was highly significant ( $r_i = 0.98$ ;  $F_{19,20} = 130.9$ ;  $P < 0.001$ ) supporting the  
120 reliability of obtained  $\delta^2H_f$  measurements.

121 We used the same DFA that gave rise to the MCFs detailed in Pérez-Tris *et al.* (2000)  
122 to classify as either migratory or sedentary the 149 robins captured during winters 2006-07  
123 and 2013-14. From this DFA, we obtained, for each wintering individual, the probability of  
124 being migratory ( $P_{C_{mig.}}$ ) or sedentary ( $P_{C_{sed.}}$ ) according to its morphology (StatSoft, 2004).  
125 The sum of  $P_{C_{mig.}}$  plus  $P_{C_{sed.}}$  equals 1, so that the migratory behaviour assigned to each  
126 particular robin will be that for which the  $P_c$  is higher, which accurately matches with the  
127 outcome of MCFs assignments (Pérez-Tris *et al.*, 2000). We then tested the reliability of

Field Code Changed

128 these MCFs by comparing the  $\delta^2H_f$  values of the wintering robins assigned as migratory  
129 ( $P_{cmig.} > 0.5$ ) or sedentary ( $P_{cmig.} < 0.5$ ) with the  $\delta^2H_f$  values of robins captured in Álava  
130 (migratory) and Gibraltar (sedentary) during the breeding period. Given the lack of  
131 homogeneity of variances between the four groups of birds, we used Welch t-tests with  
132 separate variance estimates to make comparisons among them (Fig. 1). We predicted that a  
133 good performance of the MCFs will be supported by the fulfilment of two premises: 1)  
134 wintering robins assigned as sedentary by the MCFs and breeders captured in Gibraltar would  
135 have similar  $\delta^2H_f$  scores; and 2) the  $\delta^2H_f$  values of wintering robins assigned as migratory  
136 should be at least similar to Álava breeders or smaller (reflecting a more Northern origin;  
137 Hobson *et al.*, 2004). This last assumption is based on the observation that most of the  
138 migratory robins wintering in Gibraltar should come from farther North-Northeast than Álava  
139 (Bueno, 1998; Korner-Nievergelt, *et al.* 2014), since the breeding densities of the species  
140 south of Álava are relatively low compared to North and Central European migratory  
141 populations, and sedentariness is to be expected in many Iberian populations (Purroy, 2003;  
142 Tellería, 2012).

143  $\delta^2H_f$  values greatly varied among the four groups of robins compared, (Fig. 1). Thus,  
144 robins captured in Gibraltar during the breeding period showed higher  $\delta^2H_f$  scores than  
145 conspecifics captured in Álava ( $t_{40} = -8.64$ ,  $P < 0.001$ ; Fig. 1), with their ranges of values  
146 overlapping only very marginally ( $\delta^2H_f$  range for Gibraltar: [-40.4, -16.3];  $\delta^2H_f$  range for  
147 Álava: [-82.5, -40.3]). Out of the 149 wintering robins captured in Gibraltar region, 53 were  
148 assigned as migratory and 96 as sedentary by the MCFs. Wintering robins assigned as  
149 migratory by the MCFs showed the most negative  $\delta^2H_f$  scores of the four groups for  
150 comparison (Fig. 1). These values were significantly lower than those displayed by the  
151 wintering robins assigned as sedentary ( $t_{147} = -2.76$ ,  $P = 0.006$ ), Gibraltar breeders ( $t_{75} =$   
152  $10.26$ ,  $P < 0.001$ ) or Álava breeders ( $t_{69} = 2.54$ ,  $P = 0.013$ ; Fig. 1). However, birds classified  
153 as sedentary by the MCFs also differed markedly in their  $\delta^2H_f$  values from the local birds  
154 captured during summer in Gibraltar ( $t_{118} = 5.42$ ,  $P < 0.001$ ), contrary to what would be  
155 expected if the MCFs were operating correctly. In contrast, their  $\delta^2H_f$  values were similar to  
156 the ones displayed by the robins breeding in Álava ( $t_{112} = 0.15$ ,  $P = 0.877$ ; Fig. 1).

157 Given the marginal overlap in the  $\delta^2H_f$  values between robins breeding in Álava and  
158 Gibraltar, we decided to use -40‰ as an arbitrary  $\delta^2H_f$  threshold to separate sedentary from  
159 migratory robins in our study site during winter and to analyse in further detail the  
160 performance of the MCFs. This -40‰ threshold should tell apart most of the sedentary  
161 population in our study site (mean  $\pm$  SD for Gibraltar breeders,  $-27.59 \pm 6.62$ ,  $N = 24$ ), but it

162 is likely to assign erroneously to the sedentary group some North and Central Iberian  
163 migrants that would show similar or less negative values than Alava breeders (mean  $\pm$  SD for  
164 Álava breeders,  $-53.75 \pm 12.75$ ,  $N = 18$ ). According to the probability density functions of  
165 Álava and Gibraltar breeders, we would expect that 14 of the wintering robins with less  
166 negative values than  $-40\%$  were actually migrants. Accordingly, the analyses shown below  
167 should be taken with caution..

168 Using abovementioned criteria, we estimated that the rate of correct classifications of  
169 the MCFs was 92% for sedentary birds (3 erroneous assignments out of 38 birds with  $\delta^2H_f >$ -  
170  $40\%$ ; see right quadrant in Fig. 2) and a 45% for migrants (61 errors out of 111 birds with  
171  $\delta^2H_f < -40\%$ ; left quadrant in Fig. 2), with significant differences in the error rate between  
172 populations (Chi-squared:  $\chi^2_1 = 25.6$ ,  $P < 0.001$ ). Thus, the MCFs worked better than random  
173 detecting sedentary birds (Chi-squared:  $\chi^2_1 = 26.95$ ,  $P < 0.001$ ), but did not perform  
174 differently from chance for migrants (Chi-squared:  $\chi^2_1 = 1.09$ ,  $P = 0.296$ ). Our data also  
175 revealed clear age and sex-related biases in the distribution of the MCFs errors. The three  
176 sedentary birds classified erroneously as migrants were all males (two adults and one  
177 juvenile; Fig. 2), while the 61 migrants incorrectly assigned to the sedentary group were all  
178 females or juveniles (only 7 males within the 40 errors made on juveniles, and none of the 17  
179 migratory adult males was misclassified; see Fig. 2). Among the migrants wrongly assigned  
180 as sedentary ( $n = 61$ ) errors were not homogeneously distributed between sex and age  
181 categories (Chi-squared:  $\chi^2_3 = 17.11$ ,  $P < 0.001$ ).

182 Our results showed that the mean  $\delta^2H_f$  values of wintering robins assigned as  
183 sedentary by the MCFs were lower than those shown by Gibraltar breeders (Fig. 1), which  
184 refuted one of the main assumptions that supported the validity of these MCFs. In general,  
185 this classification method worked well to identify sedentary robins (92% of correct  
186 assignments), but its performance was virtually random on migrants (55% of them were  
187 incorrectly classified as sedentary). MCFs are based on the existing differences in wing size  
188 and shape between migratory and sedentary robins (Pérez-Tris *et al.*, 2000), but both  
189 populations show marked sex and age-related variation in these characteristics that caused a  
190 relatively large morphological overlap between populations. This situation was  
191 further aggravated by the fact that the migratory population occurring during winter in  
192 Campo de Gibraltar region is overrepresented by juveniles (Chi-squared:  $\chi^2_1 = 6.19$ ,  $P =$   
193  $0.013$ ) and females (Chi-squared:  $\chi^2_1 = 5.23$ ,  $P = 0.022$ ) when compared to the sedentary  
194 fraction, and these two population groups have more chances of being misclassified as  
195 sedentary according to their wing morphology (Fig. 2). Such circumstance, in combination



196 with a potential bias in the representation of the different age and sex categories in the sample  
197 of Iberian breeders used to develop the MCFs, might have led to an unrealistic 80% of correct  
198 assignments (Pérez-Tris *et al.*, 2000) that is effectively less when applied to the wintering  
199 population. New MCFs that incorporated the sex of the individuals in their construction –  
200 something initially overlooked in the development of the original MCFs– would significantly  
201 increase their ability to distinguish migratory and sedentary robins in their sympatric  
202 wintering grounds.

203 Supporting this idea, updated MCFs obtained from a new DFA that considered the sex  
204 of the individuals and was developed using the -supposedly- 111 migratory and 38 sedentary  
205 robins from our winter sample (Table 1), assigned correctly over 93% of individuals to their  
206 respective groups (Wilks' Lambda: 0.39;  $F_{11,137} = 19.7$ ,  $P < 0.001$ ). This result supports the  
207 view that morphological characterisation can still be a useful tool for discriminating between  
208 migratory and sedentary robins, under the condition that individuals need to be sexed first.  
209 However, we discourage a broad use of these newly proposed MCFs before their  
210 performance is properly tested using independent samples. Likewise, we acknowledge that  
211 our MCFs are based on the study of only two breeding populations, so that a more extensive  
212 sampling of Iberian Robins would be necessary to extrapolate the classification method to  
213 other wintering areas of Robin sympatric occurrence and to have a better characterization of  
214 the isotopic signals of Iberian migrants.

215 Our study is another good example of the potential problems that researchers can find  
216 when applying morphology-based differentiation methods on populations different from the  
217 ones used to develop the technique (Ellrich *et al.*, 2010). Isotopic signatures revealed that the  
218 MCFs available to distinguish migratory and sedentary robins in sympatric wintering grounds  
219 of southern Iberia did not work properly, but overestimated the number of local sedentary  
220 birds. This suggests that previously described between-habitat patterns of sedentary robins in  
221 Gibraltar region might be biased by the misclassification of many migratory females and  
222 juveniles as sedentary, providing a misleading picture of how these birds are spatially  
223 distributed during winter in southern Iberia (Pérez-Tris *et al.*, 2000). Values of  $\delta^2H_f$  seem to  
224 be a more reliable method than morphology to assess the migratory behaviour of robins  
225 (although this is not the case in other species; De la Hera *et al.*, 2012), and could be used to  
226 re-assess whether sedentary robins are really outcompeted from woodlands during winter by  
227 arriving migratory counterparts (as MCFs initially suggested; Tellería *et al.*, 2001; Tellería &  
228 Pérez-Tris, 2004) or, alternatively, they are able to remain in their breeding habitats year-  
229 round as it is the case for other species (i.e. Blackcaps; Pérez-Tris & Tellería, 2002). This is

230 an important question in areas where individuals with different migratory behaviour occur in  
231 sympatry during winter, since it can help us to assess the vulnerability of some of these  
232 wintering populations that are currently facing a drastic decline as a consequence of global  
233 warming and other anthropogenic alterations (Herrero & Zavala, 2015; Tellería, 2015).

234

235

236 ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.- This research was funded by the Spanish Ministry of Economy and  
237 Competitiveness (Project CGL2011- 22953/BOS to JLT, CGL2007-62937/BOS and CGL2013-  
238 41642-P/BOS to JP-T, and PhD grants to JFL and GF). The regional governments of ‘Junta de  
239 Andalucía’ and ‘Diputación Foral de Álava’ issued the permits to capture birds and collect biological  
240 samples. We also want to thank members of Evolution and Conservation Biology group of  
241 Universidad Complutense de Madrid for their help in different stages of the project, and members of  
242 Txepetxa ringing group for their assistance during fieldwork. We are also grateful to three anonymous  
243 reviewers that provided valuable comments on an early version of the manuscript.

244

245

## 246 REFERENCES

247

248 Adriaensen, F. & Dhondt, A. A. (1990). Population dynamics and partial migration of the  
249 European Robin (*Erithacus rubecula*) in different habitats. *Journal of Animal Ecology*, 59:  
250 1077-1090.

251 Arizaga, J., Aidalur, A., Herrero, A. & Galicia, D. (2008). Sex differentiation of Yellow-  
252 legged Gull (*Larus michahellis lusitanicus*): the use of biometrics, bill morphometrics and  
253 wing tip coloration. *Waterbirds*, 31: 211-219.

254 Bensch, S., Helbig, A. J., Salomon, M. & Siebold, I. (2002). Amplified fragment length  
255 polymorphism analysis identifies hybrids between two subspecies of warblers. *Molecular*  
256 *Ecology*, 11: 473-481.

257 Bertolero, A., Rivaes, S., Mougeot, F., Sánchez-Barbudo, I. S., Andree, K. B. & Ibáñez, C.  
258 (2016). Sexing and ageing the Purple Swamphen *Porphyrio porphyrio* by plumage and  
259 biometry. *Ardeola*, 63: 261-277.

260 Bueno, J. M. (1998). Migración e invernada de pequeños turdinos en la Península Ibérica. V.  
261 Petirrojo (*Erithacus rubecula*). *Ardeola*, 45: 193-200.

262 Catry, P., Campos, A. R., Granadeiro, J. P., Neto, J. M., Ramos, J., Newton, J. & Bearhop, S.  
263 (2016). Provenance does matter: links between winter trophic segregation and the  
264 migratory origins of European robins. *Oecologia*, 182: 985–994.

265 Cramp, S. (Ed.). (1992). *The Birds of the Western Palearctic. Vol VI*. Oxford University  
266 Press. Oxford.

267 De la Hera, I., Gómez, J., Andrés, T., González-Ocio, P., Salmón, P., Salvador, M., Unanue,  
268 A., Zufiaur, F., & Onrubia, A. (2014). Inferring the migratory status of woodland birds  
269 using ringing data: the case of a constant-effort site located in the Iberian highlands.  
270 *Ardeola*, 61: 77-95.

271 De la Hera, I., Pérez-Tris, J. & Tellería, J. L. (2007). Testing the validity of discriminant  
272 function analyses based on bird morphology: the case of migratory and sedentary  
273 blackcaps *Sylvia atricapilla* wintering in southern Iberia. *Ardeola*, 54: 81-91.

274 De la Hera, I., Pérez-Tris, J. & Tellería, J. L. (2012). Habitat distribution of migratory and  
275 sedentary Blackcaps *Sylvia atricapilla* wintering in southern Iberia: a morphological and  
276 biogeochemical approach. *Journal of Avian Biology*, 43: 333-340.

277 Ellrich, H., Salewski, V. & Fiedler, W. (2010). Morphological sexing of passerines: not valid  
278 over larger geographical scales. *Journal of Ornithology*, 151: 449-458.

279 Gordo, O., Arroyo, J. L., Rodríguez, R. & Martínez, A. (2017). Inability of biometry to  
280 discriminate Iberian and Common Chiffchaffs during the autumn migration period.  
281 *Ardeola*, 64: 49-65. .

282 Griffiths, R., Double, M. C., Orr, K. & Dawson, R. J. G. (1998). A DNA test to sex most  
283 birds. *Molecular Ecology*, 7: 1071-1075.

284 Herrero, A. & Zavala, M. A. (2015). *Los Bosques y la Biodiversidad frente al Cambio*  
285 *Climático: Impactos, Vulnerabilidad y Adaptación en España. Documento de Síntesis*.  
286 Ministerio de Agricultura, Alimentación y Medio Ambiente. Madrid.

287 Hobson, K. A., Bowen, G. J., Wassenaar, L. I., Ferrand, Y. & Lormee, H. (2004). Using  
288 stable hydrogen and oxygen isotope measurements of feathers to infer geographical  
289 origins of migrating European birds. *Oecologia* 141: 477 – 488.

290 Jenni, L. & Winkler, R. (1994). *Moult and ageing of European Passerines*. Academic Press.  
291 London.

292 Korner-Nievergelt, F., Liechti, F., & Thorup, K. (2014). A bird distribution model for ring  
293 recovery data: where do the European Robins go? *Ecology & Evolution*, 4: 720–731.

294 Lessels, C. M. & Boag, P. T. (1987). Unrepeatable repeatabilities: a common mistake. *Auk*,  
295 104: 116-121.

296 Maggini, I., Metzger, B., Voss, M., Voigt, C. C. & Bairlein, F. (2016). Morphometrics and  
 297 stable isotopes differentiate wintering populations of a migratory bird. *Movement Ecology*,  
 298 4: UNSP 20.

299 Pérez-Tris, J. & Tellería, J. L. (2002). Migratory and sedentary blackcaps in sympatric non-  
 300 breeding grounds: implications for the evolution of avian migration. *Journal of Animal*  
 301 *Ecology*, 71: 211-224.

302 Pérez-tris, J., Carbonell, R. & Tellería, J. L. (1999). A method for differentiating between  
 303 sedentary and migratory Blackcaps *Sylvia atricapilla* in wintering areas of southern Iberia.  
 304 *Bird Study*, 46: 299-304.

305 Pérez-Tris, J., Carbonell, R. & Tellería, J. L. (2000). Identificación e importancia poblacional  
 306 de los Petirrojos *Erithacus rubecula* locales durante la invernada en el sur de España.  
 307 *Ardeola*, 47: 9-18.

308 Piersma, T., Pérez-Tris, J., Mouritsen, H., Bauchinger, U. & Bairlein, F. (2005). Is there a  
 309 “migratory syndrome” common to all migrant birds? *Annals of the New York Academy of*  
 310 *Sciences*, 1046: 282-293.

311 Purroy F. J. (2003). Petirrojo. In R. Martí & J. C. Del Moral (Eds.): Atlas de las aves  
 312 reproductoras de España, pp. 416-417. SEO/BirdLife y Dirección General de  
 313 Conservación de la Naturaleza. Madrid

314 Statsoft, Inc. (2004) STATISTICA user manual. StatSoft, Inc. Tulsa..

315 Svensson, L. (1992). Identification guide to European Passerines. L. Svensson, Stockholm.

316 Tellería, J. L. (2012). Petirrojo europeo *Erithacus rubecula*. In, SEO/BirdLife: Atlas de las  
 317 aves en invierno en España 2007-2010, pp. 36-47. Ministerio de Agricultura,  
 318 Alimentación y Medio Ambiente-SEO/Birdlife. Madrid

319 Tellería, J. L. (2015). The decline of a peripheral population of the European Robin *Erithacus*  
 320 *rubecula*. *Journal of Avian Biology*, 45: 159-166.

321 Tellería, J. L. & Pérez-Tris, J. (2004). Consequences of the settlement of migrant European  
 322 Robins *Erithacus rubecula* in wintering habitats occupied by conspecific residents. *Ibis*,  
 323 146: 258-268.

324 Tellería, J. L., de la Hera, I. & Pérez-Tris, J. (2013). Morphological variation as a tool for  
 325 monitoring bird populations: a review. *Ardeola*, 60: 191-224.

326 Tellería, J. L., Pérez-Tris, J., Ramírez, A., Fernández-Juricic, E. & Carbonell, R. (2001).  
 327 Distribution of robins (*Erithacus rubecula*) in wintering grounds: effects of conspecific  
 328 density, migratory status and age. *Ardea*, 89: 363-373.

- 329 Webster, M. S., Marra, P. P., Haig, S. M., Bensch, S. & Holmes, R. T. (2002). Links between  
330 worlds: unraveling migratory connectivity. *Trends in Ecology and Evolution*, 17: 76-83.
- 331 Wennerberg, L., Klaassen, M. & Lindstrom, A. (2002). Geographical variation and  
332 population structure in the White-rumped Sandpiper *Calidris fuscicollis* as shown by  
333 morphology, mitochondrial DNA and carbon isotope ratios. *Oecologia*, 131: 380-390.
- 334 Wilson, R. E., Eaton, M. D. & McCracken, K. G. (2012). Plumage and body size  
335 differentiation in Blue-winged Teal and Cinnamon Teal. *Avian Biology Research*, 5: 107-  
336 116.

337 Table 1. Classification functions obtained from a Discriminant Function Analysis that  
 338 considered the 149 wintering robins whose migratory behaviour was estimated using  $\delta^2H_f$   
 339 values. New individuals will be assigned to the group (migratory or sedentary) for which the  
 340 corresponding function provides the highest value. For each individual, equations are solved  
 341 by adding the value of the constant to the sum of products of each coefficient multiplied by  
 342 its morphological trait. Males and females were coded as 1 and 2, respectively.

343 *Tabla 1. Funciones de clasificación obtenidas a partir de un Análisis de Funciones*  
 344 *Discriminantes que consideró 149 petirrojos invernantes cuyo comportamiento migratorio*  
 345 *fue estimado empleando valores de  $\delta^2H_f$ . Los nuevos individuos serán asignados al grupo*  
 346 *(migratorio o sedentario) para el que su función correspondiente proporciona el valor más*  
 347 *alto. Para cada individuo, las ecuaciones se resuelven sumando los valores de la constante a*  
 348 *la suma de los productos de cada coeficiente multiplicado por el valor correspondiente del*  
 349 *rasgo morfológico. Machos y hembras fueron codificados como 1 y 2, respectivamente.*

350

	Migratory	Sedentary
Constant	-1036.74	-939.15
Sex	89.11	83.86
P8 length	35.30	33.58
Primary distance to P9	-4.14	-3.36
Primary distance to P8	21.88	21.63
Primary distance to P7	3.85	4.05
Primary distance to P6	4.90	7.83
Primary distance to P5	-5.87	-6.02
Primary distance to P4	13.72	11.72
Primary distance to P3	-4.57	-5.02
Primary distance to P2	-4.93	-5.05
Primary distance to P1	2.41	3.21

351

352

353

354 **Figure legends.**

355

356 Figure 1. Variation in  $\delta^2H_f$  values between robins captured during breeding in Álava and  
357 Gibraltar that are known to be migratory and sedentary (left quadrant), respectively; and  
358 values for the wintering robins assigned as migratory ( $P_{cmig} > 0.5$ ) or sedentary ( $P_{cmig} < 0.5$ )  
359 by their morphology (right quadrant). Graph shows medians (black dots), percentiles 25-75  
360 (boxes) and percentiles 1-99 (whiskers).


361 *Figura 1. Variación en los valores de  $\delta^2H_f$  entre petirrojos capturados durante la*  
362 *reproducción en Álava y Gibraltar para los que se sabe que son migratorios y sedentarios*  
363 *(cuadrante izquierdo), respectivamente; y valores para los petirrojos invernantes asignados*  
364 *como migratorios ( $P_{cmig} > 0.5$ ) y sedentarios ( $P_{cmig} < 0.5$ ) a partir de su morfología*  
365 *(cuadrante derecho). La gráfica muestra medianas (puntos negros), percentiles 25-75*  
366 *(rectángulos) y percentiles 1-99 (segmento de líneas).*

367

368 Figure 2. Variation in the posterior classification probabilities of being migratory ( $P_{cmig.}$ )  
369 between different age and sex categories of wintering robins assigned as migratory or  
370 sedentary according to their  $\delta^2H_f$  values. Individuals above the dashed line ( $P_{cmig.} > 0.5$ ) were  
371 assigned as migratory by the MCFs, while individuals below it ( $P_{cmig.} < 0.5$ ) were classified as  
372 sedentary.

373 *Figura 2. Variación en las probabilidades posteriores de clasificación de ser migratorio*  
374 *( $P_{cmig.}$ ) entre diferentes categorías de edad y sexo de los petirrojos invernantes asignados*  
375 *como migratorios o sedentarios de acuerdo a sus valores de  $\delta^2H_f$ . Los individuos sobre la*  
376 *línea discontinua ( $P_{cmig.} > 0.5$ ) fueron asignados como migradores por las MCFs, mientras*  
377 *que los individuos bajo esa misma línea ( $P_{cmig.} < 0.5$ ) fueron clasificados como sedentarios.*

378




379

380

De la Hera et al. Figure 1.  $\delta^2H_f$  values and the migratory behaviour of robins.

381





382

383

384

De la Hera et al. Figure 2.  $\delta^2H_f$  values and the migratory behaviour of robins.

385