BTO

Population overlap and habitat segregation in wintering Black-tailed Godwits *Limosa limosa*

JOSÉ A. ALVES[1]*, PEDRO M. LOURENÇO[2], THEUNIS PIERSMA[2,3], WILLIAM J. SUTHERLAND[4] and JENNIFER A. GILL[1]

[1]*School of Biological Sciences, University of East Anglia, Norwich, NR4 7TJ, UK,* [2]*Animal Ecology Group, Centre for Ecological and Evolutionary Studies, University of Groningen, PO Box 14, 9750 AA Haren, The Netherlands,* [3]*Department of Marine Ecology, Royal Netherlands Institute for Sea Research (NIOZ), PO Box 59, 1790 AB Den Burg, Texel, The Netherlands and* [4]*Conservation Science Group, University of Cambridge, Downing St., Cambridge, CB2 3EJ, UK*

Capsule Distinct breeding populations of migratory species may overlap both spatially and temporally, but differ in patterns of habitat use. This has important implications for population monitoring and conservation.

Aims To quantify the extent to which two distinct breeding populations of a migratory shorebird, the Black-tailed Godwit *Limosa limosa*, overlap spatially, temporally and in their use of different habitats during winter.

Methods We use mid-winter counts between 1990 and 2001 to identify the most important sites in Iberia for Black-tailed Godwits. Monthly surveys of estuarine mudflats and rice-fields at one major site, the Tejo estuary in Portugal in 2005–2007, together with detailed tracking of colour-ringed individuals, are used to explore patterns of habitat use and segregation of the Icelandic subspecies *L. l. islandica* and the nominate continental subspecies *L. l. limosa*.

Results In the period 1990–2001, over 66 000 Black-tailed Godwits were counted on average in Iberia during mid-winter (January), of which 80% occurred at just four sites: Tejo and Sado lower basins in Portugal, and Coto Doñana and Ebro Delta in Spain. Icelandic Black-tailed Godwits are present throughout the winter and forage primarily in estuarine habitats. Continental Black-tailed Godwits are present from December to March and primarily use rice-fields.

Conclusions Iberia supports about 30% of the Icelandic population in winter and most of the continental population during spring passage. While the Icelandic population is currently increasing, the continental population is declining rapidly. Although the estuarine habitats used by Icelandic godwits are largely protected as Natura 2000 sites, the habitat segregation means that conservation actions for the decreasing numbers of continental godwits should focus on protection of rice-fields and re-establishment of freshwater wetlands.

Distinct populations of migratory species can overlap in space and time during the non-breeding season, a period when energetic demands are high at temperate latitudes (Wiersma & Piersma 1994) and competition for food resources is strong. Overlapping populations of a species may differ in their use of habitats (Telleria *et al.* 2001, Pérez-Tris & Telleria 2002, Duijns *et al.* 2009), but this has rarely been documented (Baker & Baker 1973). In part, this might reflect different populations being difficult

to identify in the field (Pérez-Tris *et al.* 1999, Durell 2000), particularly during the non-breeding season when ornamental traits are kept to a minimum. Habitat segregation in overlapping populations can have important conservation implications (Durell 2000) and can potentially increase our understanding of key evolutionary and ecological processes, such as speciation and intra-specific competition (Newton 2008).

In migratory waders (shorebirds or Charadrii), the majority of species are restricted to a few suitable habitats, which comprise only a very small area of each

*Correspondence author. Email: j.alves@uea.ac.uk

continent. Open habitats with low vegetation (e.g. wet grasslands and arctic tundra) are typical breeding locations, while intertidal habitats and wetlands comprise the majority of the non-breeding habitats used by most species (van de Kam *et al.* 2004). At the species level, waders display a remarkable diversity of morphological traits, which has been suggested to facilitate resource partitioning in response to inter-specific competition (Zwarts & Wanink 1984). This adaptive radiation of body size, leg length and particularly bill shape in relation to different foraging strategies allows quite fine-tuned specialization to harvestable food types, and may reduce the need for spatial, temporal or habitat-based segregation among species in this community (Baker & Baker 1973, Zwarts & Wanink 1984). However, this foraging specialization may simultaneously limit the use of other habitats and associated food resources (Weller 1999), and thus constrain the capacity for within-species habitat or resource segregation. Within-species spatial segregation has been reported between age classes and sexes (Goss-Custard & Durell 1983, Cresswell 1994) and between distinct breeding populations (Burton *et al.* 2002). However, the extent to which populations concentrate their activity on different habitats is not often known (Baker & Baker 1973, Newton 2008). Without this information, protection and management of specific habitats may neglect some populations. Identifying which populations might be constrained to particular habitats is therefore likely to be of importance in identifying conservation priorities for populations. This is particularly relevant for migratory waders as many of the habitats on which they depend, such as estuarine flats and coastal wetlands, are currently heavily impacted by human activities both directly, for example through dredging, reclamation and overharvesting of shellfish (Piersma *et al.* 2001, van Gils *et al.* 2006), and indirectly, for example through climate change impacts (Watkinson *et al.* 2004).

Here we explore the non-breeding spatial and temporal overlap between two distinct breeding populations of Black-tailed Godwits *Limosa limosa* (Fig. 1). The continental population, *Limosa limosa limosa*, has its core breeding areas in the Netherlands and winters from Iberia to West Africa (Gill *et al.* 2002, Delany *et al.* 2009). The smaller population of Icelandic Black-tailed Godwits, *Limosa limosa islandica*, breeds almost entirely in Iceland and winters across western Europe, from Britain and Ireland in the north, to Iberia and Morocco in the south (Prater 1975, Gill *et al.* 2002). Both *limosa* and *islandica* subspecies are present in Iberia

during the non-breeding season (Stroud *et al.* 2004) and both overlap considerably in size and morphology (Prater 1975). The population trends of these subspecies are highly divergent at present, with the continental population declining severely, while the Icelandic population is undergoing a sustained increase (Gunnarsson, Gill, Petersen *et al.* 2005, Gill *et al.* 2007). In Iberia, Black-tailed Godwits make extensive use of estuarine mudflats and rice-fields, and it has previously been suggested that there may be some habitat segregation between the subspecies (Moreira 1995, Leitão *et al.* 1998). As the estuarine habitats are typically designated as Natura 2000 sites, while the rice-fields have no formal protection, habitat segregation could have important implications, particularly given the rapid decline of the continental godwit population for which loss and degradation of non-breeding habitat has been highlighted as a key issue (Gill *et al.* 2007).

We use mid-winter counts to determine the most important sites for Black-tailed Godwits in the Iberian overlap zone. We then use recent intensive survey information to describe the spatial and temporal overlap and the patterns of habitat use of the two subspecies. As the subspecies are almost impossible to identify accurately in winter plumage (Gunnarson, Gill, Goodacre *et al.* 2006, Kuiper *et al.* 2006), we capitalize on the recent development of extensive colour-ringing programmes on the breeding grounds for each population to assess their degree of habitat segregation throughout the winter. We conclude by recommending appropriate monitoring and conservation measures for the species in Iberia.

METHODS

The most important sites for Black-tailed Godwits within the Iberian Peninsula were identified based on count and census data compiled from national wetland surveys of Portugal and Spain, internal reports from governmental agencies, and published books and articles, covering the last three decades (CEMPA 1982, Rufino & Neves 1986, Rufino 1993, Rufino & Costa 1993, Costa & Rufino 1994, 1996a, 1996b, 1997, Martí & del Moral 2003). The majority of these counts originate from the pan-European waterbird survey scheme run by Wetlands International (Delany *et al.* 1999, Gilissen *et al.* 2002). Incomplete counts, either owing to bad weather conditions or low spatial coverage, were excluded from analyses. January count data from Spain were only available between 1990 and 2001, thus the Iberia-wide analysis is restricted to this period.

Figure 1. The distribution of the two European Black-tailed Godwit subspecies: *Limosa limosa limosa* (breeding range in grey and wintering range in grey lines); and *Limosa limosa islandica* (breeding range in black and wintering range in black lines). The overlap zone is confined to Morocco, Portugal, Spain and France where *islandica* overwinters and *limosa* occurs mostly on spring passage (crossed black lines). Left panels show study areas of Tejo (top) and Sado (bottom) lower basins and the areas of rice-fields (black) and estuarine mudflats (dark grey).

Intensive field surveys of godwit use of different habitats took place in the winters of 2005/06 and 2006/07 at two major sites within Iberia: the Tejo (38°44′N 8°59′W) and Sado (38°25′N 8°45′W) lower basins in western Portugal. During the first winter (December 2005–March 2006), the rice-fields of the Tejo lower basin were visited every fortnight and all Black-tailed Godwits counted. During the second winter (October 2006–March 2007), both the rice-fields of Tejo and Sado and the estuarine areas of Tejo were searched systematically and Black-tailed Godwits were counted simultaneously at least once a month on both habitats. Nocturnal foraging of Black-tailed Godwits on in this

area is rarely recorded (Lourenço *et al.* 2008), and so surveys were carried out during daylight hours only. Black-tailed Godwit flocks were regularly scanned for colour-ringed individuals before and after each count during the second winter. Only flocks containing one or more colour-ringed godwits from known breeding population were considered for this analysis (total number of sightings of individually marked godwits = 380, total number of separate observations of flocks = 170).

Colour-ringed Black-tailed Godwits of the *islandica* subspecies have been caught and ringed either on the Icelandic breeding grounds (Gunnarsson, Gill, Newton *et al.* 2005, Gunnarsson, Gill, Atkinson *et al.* 2006) or

during post-nuptial migration on the Wash estuary (Gill, Norris *et al.* 2001) on the east coast of England (total number of colour-ringed Icelandic godwits = 1639). Black-tailed Godwits of the *limosa* subspecies used in this study were caught and ringed during the breeding season (Roodbergen *et al.* 2008, van den Brink *et al.* 2008) in The Netherlands (total number of colour-ringed continental godwits = 384). Colour-ringing of these populations has taken place over several years, so the number of colour-ringed godwits estimated to be alive in the winter of 2006/07 was calculated from the annual totals (16–284 *islandica* colour-ringed each year between 1995 and 2006; 33–152 *limosa* colour-ringed each year between 2002 and 2006) and published estimates of the survival rates for chicks during the first year of life (*islandica*, 50%; *limosa*, 54%) and annual survival rates for adults (*islandica*, 93%; *limosa*, 83%) (Gill, Norris *et al.* 2001, Gill *et al.* 2007, Roodbergen *et al.* 2008). The ratio of marked birds from each population for winter 2006/07 was then compared with the ratio of marked birds from each population in each habitat (mudflats and rice-fields) in that year to assess the extent of habitat segregation between the populations and the proportion of godwits of each population using each habitat.

RESULTS

Key sites for Black-tailed Godwits in Iberia

From 1990 to 2001, Portugal supported an average of 30 000 Black-tailed Godwits in January, with almost all occurring within just five distinct wetland sites (Table 1). The Tejo and Sado river basins alone held about

88% of the total number of godwits recorded in Portugal between 1990 and 2001.

In Spain the situation is similar, with an average of 34 000 godwits recorded in January between 1990 and 2001, and two sites, Coto Doñana and Ebro Delta, holding about 81% of the godwits, although many more sites were used by the species over the census period. In some sites, such as Palazuelos rice-fields in Extremadura province and Odiel Marshes in Andaluzia province, godwits were recorded only during the initial years of the census period, as no published counts have taken place there since 1995. However, during recent years Masero and co-workers have recorded numbers averaging about 24 000 individuals during mid or late February on the recently developed rice-fields of Extremadura, making this a site of major importance for godwits in Iberia (Kuiper *et al.* 2006, Masero *et al.* 2010). At other sites, such as Santoña marshes, godwits have been increasing in numbers since 1994 (to a maximum of 300 in 2000) and are reported to have continued increasing since then (Navedo *et al.* 2007).

In the Iberian Peninsula, the four most important sites for the Black-tailed Godwits (Tejo and Sado lower basins both on the west coast of Portugal, Coto Doñana in southern Spain and Ebro Delta in eastern Spain; Fig. 2), all have large areas of two distinct habitats that are used by the species: rice-fields and estuarine mudflats (Martí & del Moral 2003).

Seasonal and geographic overlap of continental and Icelandic godwits

During the northward migration from West Africa, continental godwits make an extended stop-over in Iberia from

Table 1. January counts of Black-tailed Godwits on major sites in Portugal and Spain between 1990 and 2001.

Site	Min.	Max.	Average	National (%)	Cumulative (%)	Code
Portugal						
Tejo estuary & rice-fields	1020	48 980	23 929	75.10	75.10	1
Sado estuary & rice-fields	241	20 030	4331	13.59	88.69	2
Ria Formosa	551	4474	2455	7.71	96.41	3
Ria de Aveiro Delta	356	5022	485	1.52	97.93	4
Castro Marim saltpans	174	1570	528	1.66	99.59	5
Spain						
Coto Doñana	5000	55 190	24 638	71.55	71.55	6
Ebro Delta	0	4797	3474	10.09	81.63	7
Palazuelos rice-fields	0	9026	2257	6.55	88.19	8
Cadiz Bay	0	4250	1139	3.31	91.49	9
Odiel Marshes	102	722	381	1.11	92.60	10
Santa Pola Saltpans	0	756	343	1.00	93.60	11
Complex Umia-O Grove	23	491	237	0.69	94.28	12

All sites with two counts >500 individuals in any year are included, and also Umia-O Grove, which has fewer birds but is regularly used. Site codes are given for spatial reference of each site on Figure 2.

Figure 2. The location of important sites for Black-tailed Godwits in the Iberian Peninsula. Numbers refer to average January counts for the period 1990–2001. The 11 marked sites supported about 95% of the total number of godwits in the region during this period. Details of each site are given in Table 1.

late December to early March (Lourenço & Piersma 2008). During this period, several thousand Black-tailed Godwits join the wintering flocks at the major Iberian sites using both the mudflats and the rice-fields. Consequently, at the start of January, there are typically fewer than 10 000 godwits present on the Tejo and Sado lower basins, but numbers increase rapidly during January to over 50 000 individuals (Fig. 3A).

January counts varied greatly among years on the Tejo estuary (mean = 23 929, sd = 16 571, n = 11), Coto Doñana (mean = 24 638, sd = 16 008, n = 11) and Sado estuary (mean = 4341, sd = 5954, n = 11). On the Tejo estuary, the variance in counts was significantly lower during the first half of the month than during the second half (Brown–Forsythe Levene's test: W = 7.12, P = 0.016, n = 20; Fig. 3A). The same does not apply to the counts in the Sado (W = 1.24, P = 0.28, n = 18), probably owing to the lack of any counts in the first week of January, but the high variance in counts in late January was also apparent at this site (Fig. 3A).

The variation in counts at the Tejo and Sado lower basins (Fig. 3) is clearly a consequence of the timing of passage of the continental subspecies. Around 15 000 *islandica* godwits (for which the total population size is about 50 000) are believed to winter in the whole of Iberia (Gunnarsson, Gill, Potts *et al.* 2005). Thus the

January counts in Iberia comprise a large proportion of continental godwits.

Habitat segregation of continental and Icelandic godwits

A total of 231 sightings of individually marked Icelandic and 149 sightings of individually marked continental Black-tailed Godwits were recorded on the mudflats and rice-fields of Tejo and Sado during the winter of 2006/07. The distribution of these godwits across habitats in each month varied greatly, with 1.7– 5.5 times more colour-ringed Icelandic godwits than continental godwits using the estuarine mudflats (Fig. 4). By contrast, on the rice-fields, the number of colour-ringed continental godwits was 1.4–2.5 times higher than the number of Icelandic godwits (Fig. 4). The overall pattern of habitat segregation of the two populations was significantly different from an even distribution across the habitats, (χ^2_3 = 281.16, P < 0.01), and only three of the 37 colour-ringed individuals that were recorded on more than one occasion were seen on both habitats.

Simultaneous counts of Black-tailed Godwits at the Tejo rice-fields and estuary depict the different patterns of use of these habitats (Fig. 5A). While about 3000

Figure 3. Variation in numbers of Black-tailed Godwits recorded in (A) each of the first five weeks of the year between 1978 and 2006 at Tejo (top) and Sado (bottom); and (B) at the Tejo lower basin during two consecutive winters, 15 years apart: top, 1991–1992 (filled circles) and 1992–1993 (open circles); bottom, 2005–2006 (filled circles) and 2006–2007 (open circles).


Figure 4. Monthly variation in the ratio of *islandica:limosa* colour-ringed Black-tailed Godwits on the estuarine mudflats (black) and the rice-fields (grey) of Tejo and Sado during 2006–2007. The horizontal line indicates the population-wide ratio of colour-ringed *islandica:limosa* estimated for the winter of 2006–2007 (ratio = 3.8). No colour-ringed continental godwits were recorded on the estuary during December, and no colour-ringed godwits were recorded on the rice-fields prior to January.

Figure 5. Monthly variation on estuarine (left column) and rice-field (right column) habitats of (A) total numbers of Black-tailed Godwits on the Tejo lower basin during 2006–2007; (B) the proportion of colour-ringed Icelandic (black) and continental (grey) Black-tailed Godwits; and (C) the estimated numbers of each subspecies present on each habitat throughout the winter.

godwits are present on the mudflats throughout the winter period, counts on the rice-fields indicate that over 20 000 Black-tailed Godwits are present during a relatively short period in January and February. The influx of continental godwits into the Tejo lower basin during January and February therefore appears to have little effect on the number of godwits present on the estuarine mudflats.

The monthly ratio of colour-ringed individuals from each population using each habitat during the winter

was used to estimate the proportion of godwits from each population present on each habitat on a given month. On average, 76% of godwits on the estuarine mudflats are of the Icelandic population, whereas 90% of godwits on the rice-fields are of the continental population. These proportions vary seasonally (Fig. 5B), reflecting the phenology of both populations and the absence of rice-field usage prior to January. In October, the *c*. 3000 godwits on the estuary are estimated to comprise roughly equal proportions of both populations

(Fig. 5), as some Icelandic godwits have not yet arrived and some continental godwits stop off *en route* to West Africa. At this time of year the rice-fields areas are unharvested and too dry for godwits (Lourenço & Piersma 2008). From November to January, only around 500–1000 continental godwits are estimated to occur on the estuary, together with an estimated 2000–3000 Icelandic godwits (Fig. 5C). By contrast, the rice-fields are estimated to support more than 20 000 continental godwits in January but a maximum of only about 1000 Icelandic godwits (Fig. 5C).

DISCUSSION

Between 1990 and 2001, both Icelandic and continental Black-tailed Godwits in the Iberian Peninsula congregated on four major sites during the non-breeding season. Mid-winter counts show that the lower basins of Tejo and Sado in Portugal, together with Coto Doñana and Ebro Delta in Spain, held more than 80% of the Black-tailed Godwits recorded in Iberia between 1990 and 2001. All four sites contain a mosaic of estuarine mudflats and rice-fields, with individuals from both populations being present on both habitats. However, in the Tejo there is clear habitat segregation, with Icelandic godwits primarily occurring on mudflats and continental birds primarily using rice-fields. This pattern of habitat segregation might occur throughout the main Iberian sites.

Individuals from both Black-tailed Godwit populations are present in Iberia from October until March, but the overlap is most apparent when the massive flocks of continental godwits (about 15 000–45 000) arrive in the peninsula from late December, when the rice-fields become available (Lourenço & Piersma 2008), to early March and join the overwintering flocks (about 150–3000). It is noteworthy that comparison of peak counts in the Tejo lower basin during the early 1990s and 2005–07 indicates about a 50% decline in numbers of godwits in this area (Fig. 3B). This reduction is compatible with the major declines in numbers of continental godwits in recent years (Gill *et al.* 2007). Although counts made during the 1990s were carried out at dawn when godwits leave the estuarine roost towards the rice-fields, and the later counts were made by visiting all the rice-fields during day time, this is unlikely to contribute significantly to the different numbers in the two time periods as all suitable rice-fields were surveyed during the more recent counts.

In more recent years, godwits have occurred in increasing numbers in the inland rice-fields of Extremadura, western Spain (Sanchez-Guzman *et al.* 2007). Our estimate of the proportion of Icelandic godwits on the rice-fields (about 10%) is very similar to estimates from Extremadura (Masero *et al.* 2009), despite those inland rice-fields having no estuarine habitats in close proximity. Icelandic godwits, therefore, do not appear to be common on rice-fields, even when no other habitat is available.

Although godwits of both subspecies occur on mudflats and rice-fields, there is a clear tendency for Icelandic godwits to use the estuarine mudflats and continental godwits to use the rice-fields as foraging locations, even though prey resources do not appear to be limited on the estuarine habitats (Alves 2009). Given the morphological similarity of both subspecies, and the fact that some individuals move between the habitats, the reasons for this habitat segregation are not immediately obvious. Estuarine mudflats and rice-fields may provide structurally similar foraging conditions, as both comprise the soft, moist sediments that Black-tailed Godwits can probe to extract food items. However, whereas Black-tailed Godwits on estuarine mudflats are ingesting animal prey (Moreira 1995, Gill, Sutherland *et al.* 2001), godwits on the rice-fields forage almost exclusively on plant material, primarily rice seeds (Lourenço & Piersma 2008). It is therefore possible that there is a physiological basis to the habitat segregation and that switching between habitats may incur several costs: (1) changing between animal and plant diets is likely to require modifications of the gastrointestinal tract to process such different food types (Piersma *et al.* 1993, Dekinga *et al.* 2001), and to assimilate different nutrients efficiently (e.g. protein versus carbohydrates and fibre) (Starck 1999, Castro *et al.* 2008, Santiago-Quesada *et al.* 2009); (2) habitats with a higher saline load may require a larger salt gland (Staaland 1967, Rubega & Oring 2004) in order to excrete a more concentrated secretion, and thus tolerate higher salt loads (Staaland 1967); (3) estuarine and freshwater habitats may differ in the prevalence of pathogens and parasites (Piersma 1997, Mendes *et al.* 2005) or levels of toxic chemicals (Tavares *et al.* 2007), which may also require physiological adaptations and have longer-term implications for activation of the immune response or the bioaccumulation of toxic substances (Scheuhammer 1991, Hanssen *et al.* 2004).

Continental godwits use mostly freshwater habitats in the African winter grounds, particularly the rice-fields of Senegal and Guinea Bissau (Trèca 1994 , Gill *et al.* 2007, Zwarts *et al.* 2009). The costs associated with switching to a saline habitat, alongside an energetically demanding

migratory flight between West Africa and Europe, may explain why continental godwits avoid estuarine mud-flats in late winter. On departure from Iberia, both sub-species migrate to The Netherlands and, to a lesser extent, eastern England, where the continental godwits breed and the Icelandic godwits refuel before migrating to Iceland (Gill *et al.* 2007).

Conservation implications of habitat segregation in distinct godwit populations

The clear differences in habitat use and phenology of the two populations of Black-tailed Godwits in Iberia can inform targeted conservation and monitoring efforts. Firstly, although January is considered to be the month when migratory movements of waterfowl are less common (Martí & del Moral 2003, Stroud *et al.* 2004, Delany 2005), this is not the case in southwest Europe for this species. The extensive movement of continental godwits from Africa to Iberia during January and February results in huge variability in the mid-winter (January) counts. Effective monitoring of both godwit populations in Iberia therefore requires counting periods to be scheduled in accordance with the relevant migration patterns, as counts in December or early January will largely comprise Icelandic godwits whereas counts in late January and February will also record continental godwits. Secondly, the lack of any legal protection on more than 80% of the rice-field area in the lower basins of the Tejo and Sado rivers is of great concern given the huge proportion of the rapidly declining continental godwit population that depends on this habitat. Widespread drainage of wetlands has left rice-fields as virtually the only remaining freshwater habitat for foraging waders, and rice-fields are now of great importance for many species (Elphick 2000, Lourenço & Piersma 2009). Protection of key wetland sites (including rice-fields) in southern Europe and Africa is of critical importance in maintaining threatened populations that depend upon these habitats (Gill *et al.* 2007, Lourenço & Piersma 2009).

Habitat segregation of overlapping breeding populations during winter might be more common than is currently known, and might have important implications for the conservation of other migratory species. Detailed studies on habitat use of overlapping populations are scarce, but can inform the development of conservation policies. The present widespread decline of many wader species might also be influenced by threats to small patches of habitat with paramount importance for some species. This can be particularly acute for populations where conservation and habitat management actions already employed in some areas of the range have failed to reverse population declines, as is the case for breeding continental Black-tailed Godwits (Kleijn *et al.* 2001). Without detailed studies on overlapping populations we are unaware of such events and thus unable to protect these populations effectively.

REFERENCES

Alves, J.A. 2009. Implications of migration strategies and winter location in a migratory shorebird. PhD Thesis, University of East Anglia, UK.

Baker, M.C & Baker, E.M. 1973. Niche relationships among six species of shorebirds on their wintering and breeding ranges. *Eco. Monogr.* **43:** 193–212.

Burton, N.H.K., Dodd, S.G., Clark, N.A. & Ferns, P.N. 2002. Breeding origins of Redshank *Tringa totanus* wintering at two neighbouring sites on the Severn Estuary: evidence for partial race segregation. *Ring. Migr.* **21:** 1–6.

Castro, M., Masero, J.A., Megina, C., Amat, J.A. & Pérez-Hurtado, A. 2008. Energy and macronutrient assimilation efficiencies of Snowy Plover (*Charadrius alexandrinus*) feeding on the polychaete ragworm (*Nereis diversicolor*). *Auk* **125:** 368–373.

CEMPA. 1982. *Contagens de Aves Aquáticas. Jan. 1982.* Serviço de Estudos Ambiente, Lisbon.

Costa, L.T. & Rufino, R. 1994. Contagens de aves aquáticas em Portugal. Janeiro de 1994. *Airo* **5:** 8–16.

Costa, L.T. & Rufino, R. 1996a. Contagens de aves aquáticas em Portugal. Janeiro de 1995. *Airo* **7:** 36–43.

Costa, L.T. & Rufino, R. 1996b. Contagens de aves aquáticas em Portugal. Janeiro de 1996. *Airo* **7:** 69–76.

Costa, L.T. & Rufino, R. 1997. Contagens de aves aquáticas em Portugal. Janeiro de 1997. *Airo* **8:** 25–32.

Cresswell, W. 1994. Age-dependent choice of Redshank (*Tringa totanus*) feeding location: profitability or risk? *J. Appl. Ecol.* **63:** 589–600.

Dekinga, A., Dietz, M.W., Koolhaas, A. & Piersma, T. 2001. Time course and reversibility of changes in the gizzards of Red

Knots alternately eating hard and soft food. *J. Exp. Biol.* **204:** 2167–2173.

Delany, S. 2005. *Guidelines for Participants in the International Waterbird Census (IWC).* Wetlands International, Wageningen, The Netherlands.

Delany, S., Reyes, C., Hubert, E., Pihl, S., Rees, E., Haanstra, L. & van Strien, A. 1999. *Results from the International Waterbird Census in the Western Palearctic and Southwest Asia, 1995 and 1996.* Wetlands International, Wageningen, The Netherlands.

Delany, S., Scott, D. Dodman T. & Stroud D. 2009. *An Atlas of Wader Populations in Africa and Western Eurasia.* Wetlands International, Wageningen, The Netherlands.

Duijns, S., van Dijk, J.G.B., Spaans, B., Jukema, J., de Boer, W.F. & Piersma, T. 2009. Foraging site selection of two subspecies of Bar-tailed Godwit *Limosa lapponica*: time minimizers accept greater predation danger than energy minimizers. *Ardea* **97:** 51–59.

Durell, S.E.A.Le V.dit. 2000. Individual feeding specialization in shorebirds: population consequences and conservation implications. *Biol. Rev. Camb. Philos. Soc.* **75:** 503–518.

Elphick, C.S. 2000. Functional equivalency between rice fields and seminatural wetland habitats. *Conserv. Biol.* **14:** 181–191.

Gilissen, N., Haanstra, L., Delany, S., Boere, G. & Hagemeijer, W. 2002. *Numbers and Distribution of Wintering Waterbirds in the Western Palearctic and Southwest Asia in 1997, 1998 and 1999.* Wetlands International, Wageningen, The Netherlands.

Gill, J.A., Norris, K., Potts, P.M., Gunnarsson, T.G., Atkinson, P.W. & Sutherland, W.J. 2001. The buffer effect and large-scale population regulation in migratory birds. *Nature* **412:** 436–438.

Gill, J.A., Sutherland, W.J. & Norris, K. 2001. Depletion models can predict shorebird distribution at different spatial scales. *Proc. R. Soc. Lond., Ser. B: Biol. Sci.* **268:** 369–376.

Gill, J.A., Hatton, L. & Potts, P.M. 2002. Black-tailed Godwit. In Wernham, C.V., Toms, M.P., Marchant, J.H., Clark, J.A., Siriwardena, G.M., & Baillie, S.R., (eds) *The Migration Atlas: Movements of the birds of Britain and Ireland*: 323–325. T & AD Poyser, London.

Gill J.A., Langston, H.W., Alves, J.A., Atkinson, P.W., Bocher, P., Vieira, N.C, Crockford, N.J., Gélinaud, G., Groen, N., Gunnarsson, T.G., Hayhow, B., Hooijmeijer, J., Kentie, R., Kleijn, D. Lourenço, P.M., Masero, J.A., Meunier, F., Potts, P.M., Roodbergen, M., Schekkerman, H., Schröder, J. Wymenga, E. & Piersma, T. 2007. Contrasting trends in two Black-tailed Godwit populations: a review of causes and recommendations. *Wader Study Group Bull.* **114:** 43–50.

Goss-Custard, J.D. & Durell, S.E.A.Le V.dit. 1983. Individual and age differences in the feeding ecology of Oystercatchers, *Heamatopus ostralegus*, wintering on the Exe Estuary, Devon. *Ibis* **125:** 155–171.

Gunnarsson, T.G., Gill, J.A, Newton, J., Potts, P.M. & Sutherland, W.J. 2005. Seasonal matching of habitat quality and fitness in migratory birds. *Proc. R. Soc. Lond., Ser. B: Biol. Sci.* **272:** 2319–2323.

Gunnarsson, T.G., Gill, J.A., Petersen, A., Appleton, G.F. & Sutherland, W.J. 2005. A double buffer effect in a migratory population. *J. Anim. Ecol.* **74:** 965–971.

Gunnarsson, T.G. Gill, J.A., Potts, P.M., Atkinson, P.W., Croger, R.E., Gelinaud, G. Gardarsson, A. & Sutherland W.J. 2005. Estimating population size in Black-tailed Godwits *Limosa limosa islandica* by colour-marking. *Bird Study* **52:** 153–158.

Gunnarsson, T.G., Gill, J.A., Atkinson, P.W., Gélinaud, G., Potts, P.M., Croger, R.E., Gudmundsson, G.A., Appleton, G.F. & Sutherland, W.J. 2006. Population-scale drivers of individual arrival times in migratory birds. *J. Anim. Ecol.* **75:** 1119–1127

Gunnarsson, T.G., Gill, J.A., Goodacre, S.L., Gélinaud, G., Atkinson, P.W., Hewitt, G.M., Potts, P.M. & Sutherland, W.J. 2006. Sexing Black-tailed Godwits: a comparison of behavioural, molecular, biometric and field-based techniques. *Bird Study* **53:** 193–198.

Hanssen, S.A. Hasselquist, D. Folstad, I. & Erikstad, K.E. 2004. Costs of immunity: immune responsiveness reduces survival in a vertebrate. *Proc. R. Soc. Lond., Ser. B: Biol. Sci.* **271:** 925–930.

Kleijn, D. Berendse, F. Smit, R. & Gilissen, N. 2001. Agri-environment schemes do not effectively protect biodiversity on Dutch agricultural landscapes. *Nature* **413:** 723–725

Kuiper, D.P.J., Wymenga, E. Van Der Kamp, J. & Tanger, D. 2006. Wintering areas and spring migration of the Black-tailed Godwit. Bottlenecks and protection along the migration route. A&W Report No. 820. Altenburg & Wymenga, Veenwouden, The Netherlands.

Leitão, D., Catry, P., Costa, H., Elias, G.L & Reino, L.M. 1998. *As Aves do Estuário do Tejo.* ICN, Lisbon.

Lourenço, P.M. & Piersma, T. 2008. Stopover ecology of Black-tailed Godwits *Limosa limosa limosa* in Portuguese rice fields: a guide on where to feed in winter. *Bird Study* **55:** 194–202.

Lourenço, P.M. & Piersma, T. 2009. Waterbird densities in rice fields as a function of rice management. *Ibis* **151:** 96–99.

Lourenço, P.M., Silva, A., Santos, C.D., Miranda, A.C., Granadeiro, J.P. & Palmeirim, J.M. 2008. The energetic importance of night foraging for waders wintering in a temperate estuary. *Acta Oecol.* **34:** 122–129.

Martí, R. & del Moral, J.C. 2003. *La invernada de aves acuáticas en España.* Dirección General de Conservación de la Naturaleza-SEO/BirdLife, Madrid.

Masero, J.A., Santiago-Quesada, F., Sánchez-Guzmám, J.M., Abad-Gómez, J.M., Villegas, A. & Albano, N. 2009. Geographical origin, return rates, and movements of the near-threatened Black-tailed Godwits *Limosa limosa* staying at a major stopover site of Iberia. *Ardeola* **56:** 253–258.

Masero, J.A., Santiago-Quesada, F., Sánchez-Guzmán, J.M., Villegas, A., Abad-Gómez, J.M., Lopes, R.J., Encarnação, V., Corbacho, C. & Morán, R. 2010. Long lengths of stay, large numbers, and trenes of the Black-tailed Godwit *Limosa limosa* in rice fields during spring migration. *Bird Conserv. Int.* **20:** 1–13.

Mendes, L., Piersma, T., Lecoq, M., Spaans, B. & Ricklefs, R.E. 2005. Disease-limited distributions? Contrasts in the prevalence of avian malaria in shorebird species using marine and freshwater habitats. *Oikos* **109:** 396–404.

Moreira, F. 1995. Diet, prey-size selection and intake rates of Black-tailed Godwits *Limosa limosa* feeding on mudflats. *Ibis* **136:** 349–355.

Navedo, J.G., Masero, J.A. & Juanes, J.A. 2007. Updating waterbird population estimates within the East Atlantic Flyway: status and trends of migratory waterbirds in Santoña marshes. *Ardeola* **54:** 237–249.

Newton, I. 2008. *The Migration Ecology of Birds.* Academic Press, London.

Pérez-Tris, J. & Telleria, J.L. 2002. Migratory and sedentary blackcaps in sympatric non-breeding grounds: implications for the evolution of avian migration. *J. Anim. Ecol.* **71:** 211–224.

Pérez-Tris J., Carbonelli, R. & Telleria, J.L. 1999. A method for differentiating between sedentary and migratory Blackcaps *Sylvia atricapilla* in wintering areas of southern Iberia. *Bird Study* **43:** 299–304.

Piersma, T. 1997. Do global patterns of habitat use and migration strategies co-evolve with relative investments in immunocompetence due to spatial variation in parasite pressure? *Oikos* **80:** 623–631.

Piersma, T., Koolhaas, A. & Dekinga, A. 1993. Interactions between stomach structure and diet choice in shorebirds. *Auk* **110:** 552–564.

Piersma, T., Koolhaas, A., Dekinga, A., Beukema, J.J., Dekker, R. & Essink, K. 2001. Long-term indirect effects of mechanical cockle-dredging on intertidal bivalve stocks in the Wadden Sea. *J. Appl. Ecol.* **38:** 976–990.

Prater, A.J. 1975. The wintering population of the Black-tailed Godwit. *Bird Study* **22:** 169–176.

Roodbergen, M., Klok, C., & Schekkerman, H. 2008. Adult survival of Black-tailed Godwits *Limosa l. limosa* in The Netherlands 2002–2005 does not explain the ongoing decline of the breeding population. *Ardea* **96:** 207–218.

Rubega M.A & Oring, L.W. 2004. Excretory organ growth and implications for salt tolerance in hatchling America Avocets *Recurvirostra americana*. *J. Avian Biol.* **35:** 13–15.

Rufino, R. 1993. *Contagens das aves aquáticas invernantes. Janeiro 1992.* SNPRCN, Lisbon.

Rufino, R. & Costa, L.T. 1993. Contagens de aves aquáticas em Portugal. Janeiro de 1993. *Airo* **4:** 57–67.

Rufino, R. & Neves, R. 1986. *Contagens de aves aquáticas – Janeiro 1986.* SNPRCN, Lisbon

Sanchez-Guzman, J.M., Moran, R., Masero, J.A., Corbacho, C., Costillo, E., Villegas, A. & Santiago-Quesada, F. 2007. Identifying new buffer areas for conserving waterbirds in the Mediterranean basin: the importance of the rice fields in Extremadura, Spain. *Biodivers. Conserv.* **16:** 3333–3344.

Santiago-Quesada, F., Masero, J.A., Albano, N., Villegas, A., & Sánchez-Guzmán, J.M. 2009. Sex differences in digestive traits in sexually size-dimorphic birds. Insights from an assimilation efficiency experiment on Black-tailed Godwit. *Comp. Biochem. Physiol., A: Mol. Integr. Physiol.* **152:** 565–568.

Scheuhammer, A.M. 1991. Effects of acidification on the availability of toxic metals and calcium to wild birds and mammals. *Environ. Pollut.* **71:** 329–375.

Staaland, H. 1967. Anatomical and physiological adaptations of the nasal glands in charadriiformes birds. *Comp. Biochem. Physiol.* **23:** 933–944.

Starck, J.M. 1999. Phenotypic flexibility of the avian gizzard: rapid, reversible and repeated changes of organ size in response to changes in dietary fibre content. *J. Exp. Biol.* **202:** 3171–3179.

Stroud, D.A., Davidson, N.C., West, R., Scott, D.A., Haanstra, L., Thorup, O., Ganter, B. & Delany, S. 2004. Status of migratory wader populations in Africa and Western Eurasia in the 1990s. International Wader Studies 15.

Tavares, P.C., Kelly, A., Lopes, R.J., Pereira, M.E., Duarte, A.C. & Furness, R.W. 2007. The influence of dietary specialization and trophic status on mercury levels in two species using common coastal wetlands, *Himantopus himantopus* and *Sterna albifrons*. *Ardeola* **54:** 275–288.

Telleria, J.L. Pérez-Triz, J. Ramirez, A. Fernández-Judrici E. & Carbonell R. 2001. Distribution of Robins *Erithacus rubecula* in wintering grounds: effects of conspecific density, migratory status and age. *Ardea* **89:** 363–373.

Trèca, B. 1994. The diet of ruffs and Black-tailed Godwits in Senegal. *Ostrich* **65:** 256–263.

van de Kam, J., Ens, B.J., Piersma, T. & Zwarts, L. 2004. *Shorebirds. An Illustrated Behavioural Ecology.* KNNV Publishers, Utrecht, The Netherlands.

van den Brink, V., Schroeder, J., Both, C., Lourenço, P.M., Hooijmeijer, J.C.E.W. & Piersma, T. 2008. Space use by Black-tailed Godwits *Limosa limosa limosa* during settlement at a previous or a new nest location. *Bird Study* **55:** 188–193.

van Gils, J.A. Piersma, T. Dekinga, A. Spaans, B. & Kraan, C. 2006. Shellfish dredging pushes a flexible avian top predator out of a marine protected area. *PLoS Biol.* **4:** 2399–2404.

Watkinson A.R., Gill, J.A. & Hulme, M. 2004. Flying in the face of climate change: a review of climate change, past, present and future. *Ibis* **146**(Suppl. 1): 4–10.

Weller, M.W. 1999. *Wetland Birds: Habitat Resources and Conservation Implications.* Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK.

Wiersma, P. & Piersma, T. 1994. Effects of microhabitat, flocking, climate and migratory goal on energy expenditure in the annual cycle of the Red Knots. *Condor* **96:** 257–279.

Zwarts L. & Wanink J. 1984. How Oystercatchers and Curlew successively deplete clams. In Evans, P.R., Goss-Custard, J.D. & Hale, W.G. (eds) *Coastal Waders and Wildfowl in Winter*: 69–83. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK.

Zwarts, L., Bijlsma, R.G., van der Kamp, J and Wymenga, E. 2009. *Living on the Edge. Wetlands and Birds in a Changing Sahel.* KNNV Publishing, Zeist, The Netherlands.