



Detecting climate signals cascading through levels of biological organization

Marlène Gamelon, Stéphanie Jenouvrier, Melanie Lindner, Bernt-Erik Sæther,
Marcel E Visser

► To cite this version:

Marlène Gamelon, Stéphanie Jenouvrier, Melanie Lindner, Bernt-Erik Sæther, Marcel E Visser. Detecting climate signals cascading through levels of biological organization. *Nature Climate Change*, In press, 10.1038/s41558-023-01760-y . hal-04184284

HAL Id: hal-04184284

<https://cnrs.hal.science/hal-04184284>

Submitted on 22 Aug 2023

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

Detecting climate signals cascading through levels of biological organization

Marlène Gamelon^{1,2}, Stéphanie Jenouvrier³, Melanie Lindner^{4,5}, Bernt-Erik Sæther², Marcel E. Visser^{4,5}

¹Laboratoire de Biométrie et Biologie Evolutive UMR 5558, CNRS, Université Claude Bernard Lyon 1, Villeurbanne, France

²Department of Biology, Centre for Biodiversity Dynamics, Norwegian University of Science and Technology, Trondheim, Norway

³Biology Department, Woods Hole Oceanographic Institution, Woods Hole

⁴Department of Animal Ecology, Netherlands Institute of Ecology (NIOO-KNAW), P.O. Box 50, 6700 AB Wageningen, the Netherlands

⁵Chronobiology Unit, Groningen Institute for Evolutionary Life Sciences (GELIFES), University of Groningen, Groningen, The Netherlands

* Corresponding author. E-mail: marlene.gamelon@cns.fr

Abstract

Threats to species under climate change can be understood as a time at which the signal of climate change in ecological processes emerges from the noise of ecosystem variability, defined as ‘time of emergence’ (ToE). Here, we show that ToE for the great tit (*Parus major*) will occur earlier at the level of population size than trait (laying date) and vital rates (survival, recruitment) under the RCP 8.5 scenario, suggesting amplified climate change signal at the population level. ToE thus varies across levels of biological organization that filter trends and variability in climate differently. This has implications for the detection of climate impacts on wild species, as a shift in population size may precede changes in traits and vital rates. Further work would need to identify the ecological level that may experience an earlier detection of the climate signal for species with contrasting life histories and climate trends and variability.

Main Text

The impact of anthropogenic climate change on wildlife populations is a topic of profound concern. Climate change occurs in the context of broad-band natural climate variability, often making it difficult to discern the explicit effects of long-term change driven by forced response to greenhouse gases. In addition, ecological responses to environmental variation are stochastic with multiple sources of variation, including observed and unobserved variability in abiotic and biotic factors that interact with natural climate variability. Accordingly, detecting responses to anthropogenically-forced changes in climate is challenging¹. This is, however, crucial for the detection and attribution of ecological responses to climate change because changes in climate have direct impacts on ecosystem processes and society².

To detect changes in climate, climatologists have extensively used the concept of time of emergence in climate (ToE_{climate})^{3,4}. It defines the point in time when the signal of climate change emerges from the noise of natural climate variability. It has been applied for instance on changes in temperatures³, rainfall⁵ and in polar climate^{1,4}. Here, we apply this concept, for the first time, across levels of ecological organization to identify the time at which the signal of climate change in ecological processes emerges from the stochastic noise associated with natural climate and ecological variability (time of emergence, ToE). We assess the ToE from trait (ToE_{trait}), to vital rates (e.g. survival, recruitment) (ToE_{vital}), and population size (ToE_{pop}) (Fig. 1) to study how the climate signal cascades through the levels of biological organization. Climate-induced changes in resources, that influence fitness-related traits, are expected to generate changes in vital rates, which lead to population-level responses. We may thus expect that the time of emergence is delayed across levels of biological organization, occurring earlier for traits than for vital rates and population size⁶⁻⁸. However, those responses depend on the sensitivity of vital rates to climate variation and the sensitivity of population growth rate to changes in vital rates, potentially driving more complex patterns across levels of biological organization^{1,8,9}.

There are not many systems for which this hypothesis can be tested because it requires long-term data at various levels of biological organization. Here, we use one of the best long-term ecological time series study system on the great tit (*Parus major*) at the Hoge Veluwe National Park (the Netherlands) from 1985 to 2020 (Fig. 1). The great tit is a short-lived small passerine bird species abundant in European gardens and woodlands and it is not migratory. Global warming influences this population in several ways. In spring, warmer temperatures lead to an advanced peak date of caterpillar biomass, an important food resource for great tits for feeding their offspring during the breeding season. However, the advancement in laying dates is slower than the advancement in food peak date, leading to a phenological mismatch between offspring requirements and food peak¹⁰. This mismatch influences the vital rates of great tits¹¹. In summer, warmer temperatures are expected to influence the intensity and frequency of beechnut production (*Fagus sylvatica*)^{12,13}, an important food resource for great tits in winter, also affecting their vital rates¹⁴. Taking advantage of this unique system to quantify the ToE across biological levels of organization, we identified the point in time when climate-driven signals in trait (laying date), vital rates (survival, recruitment) and population dynamics can be distinguished from noise by constructing prediction intervals of ecological projections using the Community Earth System Model Large Ensemble (CESM-LE)¹⁵.

We first quantified the ToE in caterpillar peak dynamics ($\text{ToE}_{\text{caterpillar}}$). Using the established relationship between spring temperatures and caterpillar peak (period 1985 – 2020)¹⁶, we projected caterpillar peak dynamics under a high emission climate scenario with no policy intervention (RCP 8.5 scenario), back in the past and into the future, from 1920 to 2100. The peak date of caterpillar biomass advanced over time¹⁶, with an expected $\text{ToE}_{\text{caterpillar}}$ in 2034, if we only account for climate natural variability (Fig. 2). When many sources of ecological stochasticity were included in the projections, such as uncertainty in parameter estimates and process variance corresponding to unexplained temporal environmental stochasticity beyond that explained by climate, $\text{ToE}_{\text{caterpillar}}$ was detected later, in 2049 (Extended Data Fig. 1).

Second, we quantified the ToE in trait dynamics, namely laying date ($\text{ToE}_{\text{laying}}$). Using the established relationship between spring temperatures and laying dates (period 1985 – 2020)¹⁶, we projected laying dates dynamics from 1920 to 2100. Laying occurred earlier and earlier over years, with an expected $\text{ToE}_{\text{laying}}$ in 2045 and 2068 (with climate natural variability only and with all sources of uncertainties, respectively) (Fig. 2, Extended Data Fig. 1). Under warmer spring conditions, directional selection for earlier laying has been reported in plethora of species^{17–24}. The shift in laying date has been interpreted as a phenotypic plastic response to increasing temperatures, tracking the advance in the phenology of the food peak^{25–28}. Our results demonstrate that the difference between laying dates and date of the food peak, the so-called phenological mismatch (Fig. 1), might not be detectable before 2100 when including many sources of ecological uncertainties in the projections (Extended Data Fig. 1). However, when only climate natural variability was accounted for in the modelling, $\text{ToE}_{\text{mismatch}}$ was detectable and expected to occur in 2049 (Fig. 2). Increasing ecological complexity delays the $\text{ToE}_{\text{mismatch}}$ as we expected, but mainly through the interaction with environmental stochasticity.

Third, thanks to the individual long-term monitoring of great tits, we estimated annual age-specific great tits vital rates (survival, recruitment) using a state-of-the-art integrated population model^{29–32} (period 1985 – 2020, Extended Data Fig. 2). Annual vital rates were linked to past beechnut production, mismatch and density (period 1985 – 2020, Table S1). Then, we projected age-specific vital rates by 2100 under expected future conditions of mismatch and beechnut production and quantified the ToE in vital rates ($\text{ToE}_{\text{vital}}$). Beechnut production is expected to change in the future^{33–35}, but there is currently no predictive model available for this food resource. Therefore, we simulated two extreme scenarios, one of decreasing beechnut production by 2100 and another of increasing production (Extended Data Fig. 3). Under the scenario of decreasing beechnut production (scenario 1), we found a decrease in vital rates over time, with a $\text{ToE}_{\text{vital}}$ between 2050 and 2060 for most of the ages when we only accounted for climate natural variation (Fig. 3, Extended Data Fig. 4). When all sources of ecological uncertainties were accounted for, $\text{ToE}_{\text{vital}}$ was not detectable before 2100 (Fig. 3, Extended Data Fig. 5). Similarly, under the scenario of increasing beechnut production (scenario 2), we found an increase in vital rates over time, with a $\text{ToE}_{\text{vital}}$ between 2054 and 2084 for most of them when we accounted for climate natural variability only (Fig. 3, Extended Data Fig. 6). Interestingly, the $\text{ToE}_{\text{vital}}$ occurred earlier for survival than recruitment rates because of a stronger signal on survival. While the $\text{ToE}_{\text{vital}}$ did not differ much between the two scenarios for survival, it is delayed up to 20 years for recruitment under the scenario of increasing, compared to decreasing, beechnut production. The climate-driven signals in recruitment rates by beechnut production were obscured by density dependence, which plays a stronger role under favorable conditions

(i.e. when there are more years with a high beech crop) and weaker under poor conditions. As expected, when all sources of ecological uncertainties were accounted for, ToE_{vital} was undetectable (Fig. 3, Extended Data Fig. 7).

Finally, to quantify the ToE in population size (ToE_{pop}), we projected the great tit population size from 1920 to 2100 by parametrizing a stochastic age-structured population model with the projected vital rates (Extended Data Fig. 4-7). Under the scenario of decreasing beechnut production, population size decreased with a ToE_{pop} in 2028 when we accounted for climate natural variability only, whereas population size increased under the scenario of increasing beechnut production with a ToE_{pop} in 2055 (Fig. 3). When all sources of ecological uncertainties were accounted for, ToE_{pop} occurred later, in 2069 under the first scenario and in 2074 under the second scenario (Fig. 3).

Remarkably, for any scenario of beech crop production, the ToE_{pop} occurred earlier than the ToE_{vital} when all sources of uncertainties were accounted for. This is consistent with previous work based on numerical simulations that has shown that under a fast rate of environmental change and low predictability, a population can decline before any apparent change in mean value of the trait⁸. Similarly, in an experimental design, a fast change in prey availability resulted in the decline of a protozoan ciliate population preceding a shift in mean body size⁸. Therefore, the ToE_{pop} can occur earlier than ToE_{vital} and the detection of ToE depends on the level of biological organization considered, its sensitivity to climate (i.e. magnitude and shape of the functional relationship between climate and ecological variable), but also on the amount of variability both in the climate and ecological systems.

Climate trends and variability are differently filtered by the vital rates (survival, reproduction) and the ages¹. In addition, density dependence may prolong the ToE_{pop} ¹ as illustrated here with our two scenarios of changes in beech crop production. Under the scenario of decreasing beech crop production (scenario 1), both survival and recruitment rates decrease, the magnitude of this decrease being age-specific. Competition also decreases, allowing for more immigrants. The negative influence of beech crop on vital rates, only partially compensated by an increase in the number immigrants, leads to a rapid population decline, with an early ToE. Under the scenario of increasing beech crop production (scenario 2), survival and recruitment rates increase. However, competition also increases, leading to a weak positive effect of beech crop on recruitment rates, the latter being density-regulated³⁶. Similarly, the number of immigrants joining the population are positively influenced by beech crop, but strongly regulated by density, resulting in fewer immigrants. The positive influence of beech crop on survival rates, counterbalanced by a strong density regulation acting on the number immigrants and on recruitment rates leads to a moderate increase in population size, and a later ToE_{pop} .

Ecological variability is also key to detect ToE. We found that ToE in mismatch and vital rates are not detectable before 2100 when ecological variability is accounted for, emphasizing the difficulties to detect climate change signals in ecological processes. Thankfully, some of this noise from sampling and process errors can be reduced by increasing monitoring effort and improving our understanding of how the biological systems respond to biotic and abiotic factors.

The detection of ToE across levels of biological organization is context-specific, and the earlier detection at the population level we showed here is unlikely for semelparous species, or if

climate affects primarily fertility¹. In addition, several climate variables with different ToE may affect the various ecological organizational levels, hence making difficult to predict which ecological level may experience an earlier detection of the climate signal. Future studies could build upon our analysis to better understand and detect when climate-driven changes in ecosystems will clearly emerge from the “noise” of variability across species with contrasting life histories inhabiting different environments (e.g. various climate variability and trends)¹. This is particularly urgent as ecosystems have a limited ability to adapt, and large changes outside past experience could be particularly devastating^{37,38}.

Acknowledgements: We are grateful to all those who have collected data and Louis Vernooij and Judith Risse for maintaining the long-term great tit database. We thank the board of the National Park of Hoge Veluwe for permission to carry out our research in their Park. This work was supported by the Research Council of Norway through its Centres of Excellence funding scheme, project number 223257, and by the CNRS.

Author Contributions Statement: Conceptualization: MG, SJ, ML, BES, MEV; Methodology: MG, SJ; Formal analysis: MG, SJ; Data acquisition: MEV; Funding acquisition: MEV, BES; Writing – original draft: MG; Writing – review & editing: MG, SJ, ML, BES, MEV; Visualization: MG.

Competing Interests Statement: The authors declare no competing interests.

Inclusion & Ethics Statement: The research was carried out under licence AVD801002017831 of the Centrale Commissie Dierexperimenten (CCD) in the Netherlands. Fieldwork at the National Park de Hoge Veluwe was carried out with permission of the Park.

Figure Legends

Fig. 1. Schematic illustration of the general approach. The first panel shows forecasted caterpillar peak dates, great tit laying dates, mismatch between caterpillar peak date and laying date, as well as beech crop production (two scenarios) in the studied great tit population expected from 1920 to 2100. From the ecological time series, the points in time when climate-driven signals in food peak, laying and mismatch can be distinguished from noise (ToE) are identified. On the second panel, great tit life cycle showing age-specific vital rates (survival S_i , recruitment R_i) and the number of immigrants joining the population (N_{im}) as functions of mismatch, beech crop and density N . On the third panel, forecasted vital rates and great tit population size from 1920 to 2100 according to expected mismatch under global warming and beech crop (two scenarios). From the time series of vital rates and population sizes, the points in time when climate-driven signals in vital rates (ToE_{vital}) and population size (ToE_{pop}) can be distinguished from noise are identified.

Fig. 2. Caterpillar peak dates, great tit laying dates, and mismatch forecasted under global warming in the studied great tit population between 1920 and 2100. Each line corresponds to one climate scenario (40 in total), and the black line corresponds to the mean. Vertical dotted lines indicate the historical period (1922-1950), horizontal line indicates the lower bound of the 66% interval during that period. Vertical red line corresponds to the time of emergence (ToE). In thick blue, annual observed values between 1985 and 2020.

Fig. 3. Times of Emergence (ToE) from caterpillar peak dates to population size in the Hoge Veluwe great tit population. Columns show the ToE for the two scenarios of beech crop production (scenario 1: decreasing production by 2100; scenario 2: increasing production) for the different levels of biological organization (in rows). In red, ToE when only climate uncertainty is accounted for, and in grey ToE when all sources of ecological uncertainties are accounted for.

References:

1. Jenouvrier, S. *et al.* Detecting climate signals in populations across life histories. *Glob. Change Biol.* **28**, 2236–2258 (2022).
2. Malhi, Y. *et al.* Climate change and ecosystems: threats, opportunities and solutions. *Philos. Trans. R. Soc. B Biol. Sci.* **375**, 20190104 (2020).
3. Mahlstein, I., Knutti, R., Solomon, S. & Portmann, R. W. Early onset of significant local warming in low latitude countries. *Environ. Res. Lett.* **6**, 034009 (2011).
4. Landrum, L. & Holland, M. M. Extremes become routine in an emerging new Arctic. *Nat. Clim. Change* **10**, 1108–1115 (2020).
5. Rojas, M., Lambert, F., Ramirez-Villegas, J. & Challinor, A. J. Emergence of robust precipitation changes across crop production areas in the 21st century. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.* **116**, 6673–6678 (2019).
6. Clements, C. F., Blanchard, J. L., Nash, K. L., Hindell, M. A. & Ozgul, A. Body size shifts and early warning signals precede the historic collapse of whale stocks. *Nat. Ecol. Evol.* **1**, 1–6 (2017).
7. Clements, C. F. & Ozgul, A. Including trait-based early warning signals helps predict population collapse. *Nat. Commun.* **7**, 10984 (2016).
8. Baruah, G., Clements, C. F., Guillaume, F. & Ozgul, A. When Do Shifts in Trait Dynamics Precede Population Declines? *Am. Nat.* **193**, 633–644 (2019).
9. Hilde, C., H. *et al.* The demographic buffering hypothesis: evidence and challenges. *Trends Ecol. Evol.* **35**, 523–538 (2020).
10. Visser, M. E., Noordwijk, A. J. van, Tinbergen, J. M. & Lessells, C. M. Warmer springs lead to mistimed reproduction in great tits (*Parus major*). *Proc. R. Soc. Lond. B Biol. Sci.* **265**, 1867–1870 (1998).

- 245 11. Reed, T. E., Jenouvrier, S. & Visser, M. E. Phenological mismatch strongly affects
246 individual fitness but not population demography in a woodland passerine. *J. Anim. Ecol.* **82**,
247 131–144 (2013).
- 248 12. Övergaard, R., Gemmel, P. & Karlsson, M. Effects of weather conditions on mast year
249 frequency in beech (*Fagus sylvatica* L.) in Sweden. *For. Int. J. For. Res.* **80**, 555–565
250 (2007).
- 251 13. Nussbaumer, A. *et al.* Patterns of mast fruiting of common beech, sessile and common oak,
252 Norway spruce and Scots pine in Central and Northern Europe. *For. Ecol. Manag.* **363**, 237–
253 251 (2016).
- 254 14. Perdeck, A. C., Visser, M. E. & Van Balen, J. H. Great tit *Parus major* survival and the
255 beech-crop cycle. *Ardea* **88**, 99–106 (2000).
- 256 15. Kay, J. E. *et al.* The Community Earth System Model (CESM) Large Ensemble Project: a
257 community resource for studying climate change in the presence of internal climate
258 variability. *Bull. Am. Meteorol. Soc.* **96**, 1333–1349 (2015).
- 259 16. Visser, M. E., Lindner, M., Gienapp, P., Long, M. C. & Jenouvrier, S. Recent natural
260 variability in global warming weakened phenological mismatch and selection on seasonal
261 timing in great tits (*Parus major*). *Proc. R. Soc. B Biol. Sci.* **288**, 20211337 (2021).
- 262 17. Both, C. & Visser, M. E. Adjustment to climate change is constrained by arrival date in a
263 long-distance migrant bird. *Nature* **411**, 296–298 (2001).
- 264 18. Porlier, M. *et al.* Variation in phenotypic plasticity and selection patterns in blue tit breeding
265 time: between- and within-population comparisons. *J. Anim. Ecol.* **81**, 1041–1051 (2012).

- 266 19. Reed, T. E., Jenouvrier, S. & Visser, M. E. Phenological mismatch strongly affects
267 individual fitness but not population demography in a woodland passerine. *J. Anim. Ecol.* **82**,
268 131–144 (2013).
- 269 20. Gamelon, M. *et al.* Environmental drivers of varying selective optima in a small passerine: a
270 multivariate, multiepisodic approach. *Evolution* **72**, 2325–2342 (2018).
- 271 21. Marrot, P., Charmantier, A., Blondel, J. & Garant, D. Current spring warming as a driver of
272 selection on reproductive timing in a wild passerine. *J. Anim. Ecol.* **87**, 754–764 (2018).
- 273 22. Le Vaillant, J., Potti, J., Camacho, C., Canal, D. & Martínez-Padilla, J. Fluctuating selection
274 driven by global and local climatic conditions leads to stasis in breeding time in a migratory
275 bird. *J. Evol. Biol.* **34**, 1541–1553 (2021).
- 276 23. Vátka, E., Orell, M., Rytönen, S. & Merilä, J. Effects of ambient temperatures on
277 evolutionary potential of reproductive timing in boreal passerines. *J. Anim. Ecol.* **90**, 367–
278 375 (2021).
- 279 24. Sæther, B.-E., Engen, S., Gustafsson, L., Grøtan, V. & Vriend, S. J. G. Density-dependent
280 adaptive topography in a small passerine bird, the collared flycatcher. *Am. Nat.* **197**, 93–110
281 (2021).
- 282 25. Charmantier, A. *et al.* Adaptive phenotypic plasticity in response to climate change in a wild
283 bird population. *Science* **320**, 800–804 (2008).
- 284 26. Matthysen, E., Adriaensen, F. & Dhondt, A. A. Multiple responses to increasing spring
285 temperatures in the breeding cycle of blue and great tits (*Cyanistes caeruleus*, *Parus major*).
286 *Glob. Change Biol.* **17**, 1–16 (2011).
- 287 27. Charmantier, A. & Gienapp, P. Climate change and timing of avian breeding and migration:
288 evolutionary versus plastic changes. *Evol. Appl.* **7**, 15–28 (2014).

- 289 28. Villemereuil, P. de *et al.* Fluctuating optimum and temporally variable selection on breeding
290 date in birds and mammals. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.* **117**, 31969–31978 (2020).
- 291 29. Besbeas, P., Freeman, S. N., Morgan, B. J. T. & Catchpole, E. A. Integrating mark-
292 recapture-recovery and census data to estimate animal abundance and demographic
293 parameters. *Biometrics* **58**, 540–547 (2002).
- 294 30. Schaub, M. & Abadi, F. Integrated population models: a novel analysis framework for
295 deeper insights into population dynamics. *J. Ornithol.* **152**, 227–237 (2011).
- 296 31. Brooks, S. P., King, R. & Morgan, B. J. T. A Bayesian Approach to Combining Animal
297 Abundance and Demographic Data. *Anim. Biodivers. Conserv.* **27**, 515–529 (2004).
- 298 32. Schaub, M. & Kéry, M. *Integrated population models: Theory and ecological applications*
299 *with R and JAGS*. (Elsevier Science, 2021).
- 300 33. Drobyshev, I., Niklasson, M., Mazerolle, M. J. & Bergeron, Y. Reconstruction of a 253-year
301 long mast record of European beech reveals its association with large scale temperature
302 variability and no long-term trend in mast frequencies. *Agric. For. Meteorol.* **192–193**, 9–17
303 (2014).
- 304 34. Bogdziewicz, M., Kelly, D., Thomas, P. A., Lageard, J. G. A. & Hacket-Pain, A. Climate
305 warming disrupts mast seeding and its fitness benefits in European beech. *Nat. Plants* **6**, 88–
306 94 (2020).
- 307 35. Bogdziewicz, M. *et al.* Climate warming causes mast seeding to break down by reducing
308 sensitivity to weather cues. *Glob. Change Biol.* **27**, 1952–1961 (2021).
- 309 36. Reed, T. E., Grøtan, V., Jenouvrier, S., Sæther, B.-E. & Visser, M. E. Population growth in a
310 wild bird is buffered against phenological mismatch. *Science* **340**, 488–491 (2013).

- 311 37. Beaumont, L. J. *et al.* Impacts of climate change on the world's most exceptional ecoregions.
312 *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.* **108**, 2306–2311 (2011).
- 313 38. Hawkins, E. *et al.* Observed emergence of the climate change signal: from the familiar to the
314 unknown. *Geophys. Res. Lett.* **47**, (2020).
- 315

Methods

General overview

To detect climate signals cascading through levels of biological organization, we build a reproducible three-step approach (Fig. S1). First, long-term data should be collected from trait values, to vital rates and population size. In parallel, environmental variables should be available. Different methods can be used to estimate annual vital rates and population size when the detection probability is lower than 1, e.g. capture-recapture models or integrated population models (IPM). When the detection probability equals to 1, other methods such as population census or generalized linear models can be used. Second, the effects of environmental covariates on annual variation in trait values, vital rates and population size is assessed. This can be done using linear mixed models (see methods section). Third, these established relationships permit projecting time series of trait values, vital rates and population size under various environmental scenarios in the past and in the future to quantify the time of emergence (Fig. S1) by linking ecological models to climate models.

Our methodological approach is divided into several objectives:

- (1) Our first objective is to determine the point in time when climate-driven signals in caterpillar peak dates timing can be distinguished from noise ($ToE_{caterpillar}$).
- (2) Our second objective is to determine the point in time when climate-driven signals in great tit laying dates can be distinguished from noise (ToE_{laying}).
- (3) Our third objective is to determine the point in time when climate-driven signals in mismatch (between laying dates and food peak) can be distinguished from noise ($ToE_{mismatch}$).
- (4) Our fourth objective is to determine the point in time when climate-driven signals in vital rates can be distinguished from noise (ToE_{vital} for each age-specific vital rate).
- (5) Our fifth objective is to determine the point in time when climate-driven signals in population can be distinguished from noise (ToE_{pop}).

To achieve objectives 1-3, we use functional relationships linking caterpillar peak dates, laying dates and mismatch to temperatures¹⁶. To achieve objectives 4-5, we built an IPM to estimate annual age-specific vital rates. We then estimated the functional relationships between environmental variables and vital rates using linear mixed models. Finally, to project the great tit population dynamics from 1920 to 2100, we simulated two beech crop production scenarios.

Study site and data collection

The studied population is located at Hoge Veluwe National Park in the Netherlands (52°02'N, 5°51'E), a wood of 171 ha. Great tits (*Parus major*) are short-lived small passerine birds, abundant in European gardens and woodlands and, in the Netherlands, not migratory. They are cavity-nesters and readily accept nest boxes as nesting sites, making it possible to monitor the entire breeding population. They produce one or two clutches each year³⁹. In the study area, very few females bred in natural cavities and most of them bred in nest boxes⁴⁰. The population is open to immigration and emigration¹¹.

The data used in this study were collected between 1985 and 2020. Nest boxes were visited during the breeding season and laying dates were recorded (1st egg laid). In addition, three types of demographic data were recorded. First, the total number of breeding females (C_t). As most females start to breed at one year of age, the breeding population size is a good proxy for the total number of females⁴¹. Second, fledglings were marked with a uniquely numbered leg-ring, ringed mothers identified and unringed mothers given a ring to allow for future identifications. These unringed mothers were assumed to have immigrated into the population during the year in question. The following year, they are then considered to be local females. Overall, 2,204 breeding females of known age (local and immigrant) were monitored, providing capture-recapture (CMR) data of known age females. We grouped the breeding birds of known age into four age classes: 1, corresponding to the first year of breeding (i.e., second calendar year of life); 2, corresponding to the second year of breeding; 3 corresponding to the third year of breeding; and 4, which groups breeding females in their fifth calendar year of life and older. Third, ringed fledglings were recorded as recruited to the breeding population if they were caught breeding in a subsequent year. From the monitoring of breeding females of known age, we reported for each year t the observed number of breeding females in age class i ($B_{i,t}$) and also the observed number of locally recruited females produced per age class i ($J_{i,t}$). In total, this type of demographic data based on reproductive success consisted of 3,675 breeding events.

Environmental data collection: food peak, mismatch, beech crop index and temperatures

Between 1985 and 2020 (except 1991), annual peak dates of caterpillar biomass (hereafter food peak) were determined⁴². The annual mismatch corresponded to the difference in mean laying date for great tits minus the food peak plus 33. These 33 days accounted for incubation duration and assumed that nestlings have the highest energy demand 10 days after hatching¹⁶. In addition to caterpillars, beech mast is an important food resource for great tits, especially during winter when other resources are scarce. It is also indicative of seed production of other tree species^{14,40}. The beech crop index (BCI), measured as the net weight of all nuts per m², was recorded annually as a three-level index (1, 2 or 3).

Annual temperatures were recorded. Previous work showed that laying dates in this great tit population depended on spring temperatures from 11 March to 20 April (hereafter Temp_{laying}), whereas temperatures from 6 March to 14 May had the strongest influence on food peaks (hereafter Temp_{caterpillar})¹⁶. We thus recorded mean daily temperatures during these two time windows. We standardized Temp_{laying} and Temp_{caterpillar} with the mean and the variance of Temp_{laying} and Temp_{peak} observed during this period, so Temp_{laying} and Temp_{caterpillar} were transformed as z-scores. Temperature data were obtained from the De Bilt station of the KNMI (Royal Dutch Meteorological Institute), less than 50 km from the Hoge Veluwe field site.

Objective 1: Forecasting food peak and estimating ToE_{caterpillar}

In this population, food peak dates (in Julian date) are linked to temperatures (Temp_{caterpillar}) through this relationship¹⁶:

$$food\ peak = 138.379\ (se: 0.629) - 7.162\ (se: 0.629) \times Temp_{caterpillar} + 3.719$$

Eqn. 1

From this relationship, we estimated past (1920-2019) and future (2020-2100) food peak dates according to the RCP 8.5 climate scenario that considers no policy intervention. This scenario brings together 40 ensemble members diagnosing the influence of internal climate variability on projections¹⁵, and it is the preferred choice for assessing climate change impacts risks throughout the mid-century⁴³. The mean and the standard deviation over 1985-2020 of all members were used to transform temperatures ($Temp_{caterpillar}$) into z-scores. Thus, the mean and the standard deviation used for standardizing each of the members was the mean of means and the mean of standard deviations calculated for each member. Such a rescaling allowed observed temperatures in the study site and climate scenarios (on average across all 40 of them) to be aligned between 1985 and 2020 so that they had the same mean and variance. From Eqn. 1, we performed 100 simulations, parameters in the equation being drawn from normal distributions. This resulted in 100 simulations per member, that is 4,000 simulations from 1920 to 2100. This gave us expected food peak dates when all sources of ecological uncertainties were accounted for, including parameter uncertainty and process variance corresponding to unexplained temporal variation in parameters beyond that explained by climate.

After having visually controlled for a good match between observed food peak dates and predicted dates (period 1985-2020, Figure 2), we selected an historical time window during which food peak dates were stable over time (1922-1950, slope of the regression between food peak dates and years during this time window: 0.032 (SE: 0.025)). We computed the lower bound ($LB_{caterpillar}$) of the 66% prediction interval for food peak dates during this historical period, and determined the point in time when the upper bound ($UB_{caterpillar}$) of the 66% prediction interval for food peak dates became lower than $LB_{caterpillar}$. This point corresponded to the time of emergence for food peak ($ToE_{caterpillar}$). In addition, we forecasted food peak dates but we only accounted for climate uncertainty in the projections. To do so, we turned off standard errors and σ (the last term) in Eqn. 1 to obtain 40 projections of food peak dates from 1920 to 2100, i.e. one projection per member.

Objective 2: Forecasting laying dates and estimating ToE_{laying} ($=ToE_{trait}$)

We replicated the same procedure for laying dates. In this population, laying dates (in Julian date) are linked to temperatures ($Temp_{laying}$) through this relationship¹⁶:

$$laying\ date = 110.980\ (se: 0.582) - 4.947\ (se: 0.590) \times Temp_{laying} + 3.493 \quad Eqn. 2$$

We estimated the expected annual laying dates between 1920 and 2100 according to the RCP 8.5 climate scenario, with all sources of uncertainty, and when only climate uncertainty was accounted for. We selected an historical time window during which laying dates were stable over time (1922-1950, slope of the regression between laying dates and years during this time window: 0.019 (SE: 0.017)), and we identified the time of emergence for laying dates (ToE_{laying}).

Objective 3: Forecasting mismatch and estimating $ToE_{mismatch}$

We then calculated the mismatch between laying dates and food peak from 1920 to 2100 as the difference in expected annual laying dates minus the expected annual food peak plus 33¹⁶. This was done for the 4,000 simulations accounting for all sources of uncertainties, and for the

40 simulations accounting for climate uncertainty only. In both cases, we identified the time of emergence for mismatch ($\text{ToE}_{\text{mismatch}}$).

Objectives 4-5: Forecasting vital rates and population dynamics and estimating $\text{ToE}_{\text{vital}}$ and TOE_{pop}

1- Estimating annual age-specific vital rates and densities

For populations with a recapture rate of 1, population census can be used as a proxy of population size, and survival rates can simply be estimated using generalized linear model with binomial link function, based on whether or not the individual has been observed. Here, we used an integrated population model (IPM) to obtain accurate and precise estimates of annual population size and age-specific vital rates. Even if the recapture probability is high on the study site¹¹, still not all females may be recaptured, resulting in biased estimates of vital rates and number of individuals. There was also a possibility of double counts, for instance if one female has produced two broods but was only identified in one of them (because she has deserted one of the clutches), and a possibility that some clutches are missed (because females have bred in natural cavities). To estimate age-specific demographic rates and density while accounting for these issues, we integrated the recorded number of breeding females (C_t), CMR data of females of known age, and data on reproductive success (i.e., $B_{i,t}$ and $J_{i,t}$) into an IPM³⁰ (Figure S2). This framework allowed us to obtain the posterior median of age-specific vital rates (survival $S_{i,t}$, recruitment $R_{i,t}$), the number of local (N_{local}) and immigrant (N_{im}) breeding females in each age class N_i and total N (total density) for each year t with improved precision and free of observation error^{29–32,44}. The joint analysis of these three datasets thus allowed us to account for observation error associated with the recorded number of counted breeding females⁴⁵. It also allowed us to account for the incomplete information on age structure in the monitoring data (e.g. some females are of unknown age), for imperfect detection (e.g. recapture probability is not 1) and for demographic stochasticity⁴⁶.

The likelihood of the IPM corresponds to the product of the likelihoods of the three different datasets, namely CMR data, reproductive success data and population counts⁴⁴. For CMR data of breeding females of known age, we used the Cormack-Jolly-Seber model⁴⁷ which allows estimation of annual survival between age class i and $i+1$ ($S_{i,t}$) and annual recapture (p_t) probabilities. For data on reproductive success, the observed number of daughters locally recruited per age class i ($J_{i,t}$) is Poisson distributed with $J_{i,t} \sim \text{Poisson}(B_{i,t} \times R_{i,t})$, where R is the recruitment rate of females of age class i at year t . For the population count data, we used a state-space model⁴⁸ that consisted of a process model describing how the population size and structure changed over time as well as an observation model²⁹. We considered a pre-breeding age-structured model with the four pre-defined age classes.

The model was fitted within a Bayesian framework using NIMBLE (version 0.9.1)⁴⁹. We ran four independent chains with different starting values for 200,000 MCMC iterations, with a burn-in of 150,000 iterations, thinning every 100th observation and resulting in 2,000 posterior samples. We used the Brooks and Gelman diagnostic \hat{R} to assess the convergence of the simulations and used the rule $\hat{R} < 1.1$ to determine whether convergence was reached⁵⁰. For a full description of the IPM, the priors used and the R code to fit the IPM, see Gamelon et al.⁵¹.

2- Linking vital rates to BCI, mismatch and density

The IPM was used to estimate annual age-specific vital rates and densities. Once these were estimated, we linked annual age-specific vital rates and annual number of immigrants joining the local population as response variables to annual density, BCI and mismatch (from 1985 to 2020) (see life cycle on Fig. 1). The same approach has been done in previous studies^{52–54} that first used an IPM to estimate vital rates and density, and then used regressions to link vital rates to density and/or environmental covariates. As the annual vital rates and densities are estimated in the IPM model, they are not obscured by sampling variance and observation errors and thus this approach does not lead to spurious detection of density dependence^{51,55,56}. In detail, survival between two successive breeding seasons t and $t+1$ could be affected by BCI at time t . Therefore, we linked age-specific survival rates $S_{i,t}$ (on a logit-scale) to BCI at t . Because the effect of BCI on survival may be age-specific, we included the interaction between age and BCI. To account for the non-independence of the survival rates among age classes of a given year, we included the year as a random effect. The linear-mixed model (LMM) took the following form:

$$\text{logit}(S_{i,t}) = \mu + \beta_{1,i} a + \beta_2 BCI_t + \beta_{3,i} [a \times BCI_t] + \beta_{year} year + \varepsilon_{S_{i,t}} \quad \text{Eqn. 3}$$

where μ is the intercept, a is the age class (i.e. 1, 2, 3 and 4), β are the regression coefficients, $year$ is the random effect and $\varepsilon_{S_{i,t}}$ corresponds to the residuals of the LMM. Note that the LMM was weighted by the inverse of the variance of the survival rates (on a logit-scale) to account for the uncertainty associated with the survival rates estimated with the IPM.

The recruitment rate of a given breeding season t could be affected by the number of breeding females at time t in the population (density at t) and by BCI at time t . Therefore, we linked the age-specific recruitment rates $R_{i,t}$ (on a log-scale) to density at t N_t and to BCI at t . Because the effect of BCI and density on recruitment may be age-specific, we included the interaction between age and BCI and between age and density. The LMM took the following form:

$$\log(R_{i,t}) = \nu + \beta_{1,i}' a + \beta_2' BCI_t + \beta_3' N_t + \beta_{4,i}' [a \times BCI_t] + \beta_{5,i}' [a \times N_t] + \beta_6' year + \varepsilon_{R_{i,t}} \quad \text{Eqn. 4}$$

where ν is the intercept, a is the age class, β' are the regression coefficients, and $\varepsilon_{R_{i,t}}$ corresponds to the residuals of the LMM. As done for survival rates, the LMM was weighted by the inverse of the variance of the recruitment rates (on a log-scale) to account for the uncertainty associated with the recruitment rates estimated with the IPM.

The number of immigrants joining the population during the breeding season $t+1$ may be influenced by BCI and mismatch as well as the number of local breeding females N_{local} at t . Therefore, we linked the number of immigrant breeding females Nim_{t+1} to the number of local breeding females $N_{local,t}$, BCI and mismatch at t using a generalized linear model (GLM) with Poisson distribution:

$$Nim_{t+1} = \eta + \beta_{I,1} BCI_t + \beta_{I,2} Mism_t + \beta_{I,3} N_{local,t} + \varepsilon_{I_{t+1}} \quad \text{Eqn. 5}$$

where η is the intercept, β_I are the regression coefficients, and $\varepsilon_{I_{t+1}}$ corresponds to the residuals of the GLM.

3- Building the population model

For given conditions of BCI, mismatch and densities, age-specific survival and

recruitment rates as well as the number of immigrants joining the local population may be simulated (hereafter denoted $S_{sim\ i,t}$, $R_{sim\ i,t}$ and $Nim_{sim,t+1}$). As a result, the number of breeding females in the population $N_{sim,t}$ may be simulated.

In detail, the total number of breeding females in the population at time $t+1$ $N_{sim,t+1}$ corresponded to the sum of breeding females in each age class i $N_{sim\ i,t+1}$ at time $t+1$ (Figure 1):

$$N_{sim,t+1} = N_{sim\ 1,t+1} + N_{sim\ 2,t+1} + N_{sim\ 3,t+1} + N_{sim\ 4,t+1} \quad \text{Eqn. 6}$$

(i) As most of the immigrant breeding females were females of age class 1, we assumed that $N_{sim\ 1,t+1}$ corresponded to the sum of the number of daughters that were locally recruited into the population $n_{sim,t+1}$ (i.e. produced by the breeding females of each age class) and also of the number of immigrants $Nim_{sim,t+1}$ arriving into the population:

$$N_{sim\ 1,t+1} = n_{sim,t+1} + Nim_{sim,t+1} \quad \text{Eqn. 7}$$

$n_{sim,t+1}$ was modeled using a Poisson distribution to include demographic stochasticity:

$$n_{sim,t+1} \sim \text{Poisson}(N_{sim\ 1,t} \times R_{sim\ 1,t}) + \text{Poisson}(N_{sim\ 2,t} \times R_{sim\ 2,t}) + \text{Poisson}(N_{sim\ 3,t} \times R_{sim\ 3,t}) + \text{Poisson}(N_{sim\ 4,t} \times R_{sim\ 4,t}) \quad \text{Eqn. 8}$$

(ii) $N_{sim\ 2,t+1}$ corresponded to the number of females of age class 1 that survived from time t to time $t+1$, and was modeled using a binomial process to include demographic stochasticity:

$$N_{sim\ 2,t+1} \sim \text{Bin}(N_{sim\ 1,t}, S_{sim\ 1,t}) \quad \text{Eqn. 9}$$

(iii) $N_{sim\ 3,t+1}$ and $N_{sim\ 4,t+1}$ corresponded to the number of females in the previous age class that survived from time t to time $t+1$:

$$N_{sim\ 3,t+1} \sim \text{Bin}(N_{sim\ 2,t}, S_{sim\ 2,t}) \quad \text{Eqn. 10}$$

$$N_{sim\ 4,t+1} \sim \text{Bin}(N_{sim\ 3,t}, S_{sim\ 3,t}) + \text{Bin}(N_{sim\ 4,t}, S_{sim\ 4,t}) \quad \text{Eqn. 11}$$

Therefore, for given conditions of BCI, mismatch and densities, $S_{sim\ i,t}$, $R_{sim\ i,t}$ and $Nim_{sim,t+1}$ may be computed. We accounted for sources of environmental stochasticity due to processes other than covariates included in the model with a covariance matrix Σ of “random year effect + $\varepsilon_{S_{i,t}}$ ” and “random year effect + $\varepsilon_{R_{i,t}}$ ”. The covariance matrix was estimated and new residuals were generated from a multivariate normal distribution with covariance matrix equal to Σ . Then, $N_{sim\ 1,t+1}$, $N_{sim\ 2,t+1}$, $N_{sim\ 3,t+1}$ and $N_{sim\ 4,t+1}$, functions of $S_{sim\ i,t}$, $R_{sim\ i,t}$ and $Nim_{sim,t+1}$ may be computed and finally, the density $N_{sim,t+1}$ may be simulated.

4- Forecasting vital rates and population size and estimating ToE_{vital} and ToE_{pop}

Using the age-structured population model described above, that accounted for the effects of BCI, mismatch and density on vital rates, we forecasted the great tit population under two simulated beech crop production scenarios.

a) Forecasting beech crop index under two scenarios

BCI is a categorical variable with three levels (1 (low), 2 (medium) and 3 (high production)). We simulated two extreme scenarios of beech crop production by 2100.

In the first scenario, we simulated a decrease in beech crop production in the future. The probability of having a year of low production ($P(\text{BCI}=\text{level } 1)$) increased over time, from 0.005 in 1920 to 0.9 in 2100. The probability of having a year of medium production ($P(\text{BCI}=\text{level } 2)$) was set to 0.1, the average observed between 1985 and 2020. The probability of having a year of high production ($P(\text{BCI}=\text{level } 3)$) corresponded to $1 - P(\text{BCI}=\text{level } 1) - P(\text{BCI}=\text{level } 2)$ and thus ranged from 0.895 to 0 from 1920 to 2100 (Extended Data Fig. 3, left panel). For each year, we

performed 100 draws from a three-category multinomial distribution with probabilities $P(\text{BCI}=\text{level } 1)$, $P(\text{BCI}=\text{level } 2)$, $P(\text{BCI}=\text{level } 3)$. This resulted in 100 simulated time-series of BCI between 1920 and 2100. These projections of BCI expressed as levels (1, 2 and 3) were used afterwards to project the great tit population size.

In the second scenario, we simulated an increase in beech crop production in the future. The probability of having a year of high production ($P(\text{BCI}=\text{level } 3)$) increased over time, from 0.005 in 1920 to 0.9 in 2100. The probability of having a year of medium production ($P(\text{BCI}=\text{level } 2)$) was set to 0.1. The probability of having a year of low production ($P(\text{BCI}=\text{level } 1)$) corresponded to $1 - P(\text{BCI}=\text{level } 2) - P(\text{BCI}=\text{level } 3)$ and thus ranged from 0.895 to 0 from 1920 to 2100 (Extended Data Fig. 3, right panel). For each year, we performed 100 draws from a three-category multinomial distribution with probabilities $P(\text{BCI}=\text{level } 1)$, $P(\text{BCI}=\text{level } 2)$, $P(\text{BCI}=\text{level } 3)$. This resulted in 100 simulated time-series of BCI between 1920 and 2100.

b) Forecasting vital rates and great tit population size

Using trajectories of mismatch expected from 1920 to 2100 under the RCP 8.5 scenario that accounted for all sources of uncertainties (see objective 3) and simulated trajectories of BCI simulated according to the first scenario (decreasing beech crop production) as well as the age-specific densities in 1987 estimated with the IPM, we simulated 100 stochastic trajectories in vital rates and population sizes per ensemble member from 1920 to 2100, resulting in a total of 4,000 stochastic trajectories. We computed the 95% and 66% prediction intervals of the predicted age-specific vital rates, number of immigrants and total population size. We then selected an historical time window during which population size was stable over time (1922 – 1950, slope of the regression between population size and years during this time window: 0.092 (SE: 0.217)) and estimated the time of emergence for population size (ToE_{pop}) and vital rates ($\text{ToE}_{\text{vital}}$). In addition, we forecasted the great tit population but accounted for climate uncertainty only in the projections. To do so, we used trajectories of mismatch expected from 1920 to 2100 that accounted for climate uncertainty only, and turned off stochasticity in Eqn. 8-11 as well as the covariance matrix, to obtain 40 projections of age-specific vital rates and population sizes from 1920 to 2100, i.e. one projection per member.

We replicated the exact same procedure with trajectories of BCI simulated according to the second scenario (increasing beech crop production) to obtain forecasted time-series of vital rates and population size.

All of these analyses were performed with R software⁵⁷.

Data availability: Data used in the analysis are available at

https://github.com/marleng/ToE_greattit⁵⁸.

Data on past observed beech crop index, past observed mismatch between laying dates and food peaks, expected spring temperature according to the RCP 8.5 scenario, past observed annual age-specific population size and vital rates and their variance are provided.

Code availability: R code used for the analysis is available at

https://github.com/marleng/ToE_greattit⁵⁸.

Methods-only references:

39. Husby, A., Kruuk, L. E. B. & Visser, M. E. Decline in the frequency and benefits of multiple brooding in great tits as a consequence of a changing environment. *Proc. R. Soc. B Biol. Sci.* **276**, 1845–1854 (2009).
40. Grøtan, V. *et al.* Spatial and temporal variation in the relative contribution of density dependence, climate variation and migration to fluctuations in the size of great tit populations. *J. Anim. Ecol.* **78**, 447–459 (2009).
41. Dhondt, A. A., Adriaensen, F., Matthysen, E. & Kempenaers, B. Nonadaptive clutch sizes in tits. *Nature* **348**, 723–725 (1990).
42. Ramakers, J. J. C., Gienapp, P. & Visser, M. E. Comparing two measures of phenological synchrony in a predator–prey interaction: Simpler works better. *J. Anim. Ecol.* **89**, 745–756 (2020).
43. Schwalm, C. R., Glendon, S. & Duffy, P. B. RCP8.5 tracks cumulative CO2 emissions. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.* **117**, 19656–19657 (2020).
44. Kéry, M. & Schaub, M. *Bayesian Population Analysis using WinBUGS: A hierarchical perspective*. (Academic Press, 2012).
45. Lebreton, J.-D. & Gimenez, O. Detecting and estimating density dependence in wildlife populations. *J. Wildl. Manag.* **77**, 12–23 (2013).
46. Lande, R. *et al.* Estimating density dependence from population time series using demographic theory and life-history data. *Am. Nat.* **159**, 321–337 (2002).
47. Lebreton, J.-D., Burnham, K. P., Clobert, J. & Anderson, D. R. Modeling survival and testing biological hypotheses using marked animals: a unified approach with case studies. *Ecol. Monogr.* **62**, 67–118 (1992).

48. de Valpine, P. & Hastings, A. Fitting population models incorporating process noise and observation error. *Ecol. Monogr.* **72**, 57–76 (2002).
49. Valpine, P. de *et al.* Programming With Models: Writing Statistical Algorithms for General Model Structures With NIMBLE. *J. Comput. Graph. Stat.* **26**, 403–413 (2017).
50. Brooks, S. P. & Gelman, A. General methods for monitoring convergence of iterative simulations. *J. Comput. Graph. Stat.* **7**, 434–455 (1998).
51. Gamelon, M. *et al.* Density dependence in an age-structured population of great tits: identifying the critical age classes. *Ecology* **97**, 2479–2490 (2016).
52. Hansen, B. B. *et al.* More frequent extreme climate events stabilize reindeer population dynamics. *Nat. Commun.* **10**, 1616 (2019).
53. Abadi, F. *et al.* Estimating the strength of density dependence in the presence of observation errors using integrated population models. *Ecol. Model.* **242**, 1–9 (2012).
54. Gamelon, M. *et al.* Interactions between demography and environmental effects are important determinants of population dynamics. *Sci. Adv.* **3**, e1602298 (2017).
55. Freckleton, R. P., Watkinson, A. R., Green, R. E. & Sutherland, W. J. Census error and the detection of density dependence. *J. Anim. Ecol.* **75**, 837–851 (2006).
56. Schaub, M., Jakober, H. & Stauber, W. Strong contribution of immigration to local population regulation: evidence from a migratory passerine. *Ecology* **94**, 1828–1838 (2013).
57. R Development Core Team. R: A language and environment for statistical computing. (2017).
58. Data and code availability: https://github.com/marleng/ToE_greattit