

Changes in wetland habitat use by waterbirds wintering in Czechia are related to diet and distribution changes

Journal:	Freshwater Biology
Manuscript ID	FWB-P-Jun-21-0349.R1
Wiley - Manuscript type:	Original Article
Date Submitted by the Author:	17-Sep-2021
Complete List of Authors:	Musilova, Zuzana; Abia State University Faculty of Environmental Sciences Musil, Petr; Abia State University Faculty of Environmental Sciences Zouhar, Jan; Abia State University Faculty of Environmental Sciences Šenkýřová, Adéla; Abia State University Faculty of Environmental Sciences Pavon-Jordan, Diego; Norsk Institutt for Naturforskning Nummi, Petri; Department of Forest Sciences University of Helsinki PO Box 27 FI-00014 Finland
Keywords:	
Keywords:	wetland type, range-shift drivers, waterbirds, long-term monitoring, artificial wetlands
	·



1		
2		
3	1	Changes in wetland habitat use by waterbirds wintering in Czechia are related to diet and
4		
5	2	distribution changes
6		
/	3	
8		
9	4	Zuzana Musilová ^{1*} , Petr Musil ¹ , Jan Zouhar ^{1, 2} , Adéla Šenkýřová ¹ , Diego Pavón-Jordán ³ &
10		
11	5	Petri Nummi ⁴
12		
13	6	
14		
15	7	
17		
18	8	¹ Faculty of Environmental Sciences Czech University of Life Sciences Prague, Kamýcká
19	U	Tuonty of Environmental Sciences, electronicity of Ene Sciences Trague, Rainyeka
20	9	129 Praha Suchdol CZ-165 21 Czechia
20	5	12), I falla Suchdol, CE-103 21, CEccina
22	10	² Department of Econometrics, Prague University of Economics and Rusiness, W. Churchill
23	10	Department of Econometrics, Frague Oniversity of Economics and Business, w. Churchin
24	11	Sa 1029/4 120 67 Progue 2 Žižkov Czashie
25	11	Sq. 1930/4, 13007 Flague $3 - ZIZKOV, CZecilia$
26	10	³ Department of Tomostrial Eagland, Namuscian Institute for Nature Descenth (NINA) DO
27	12	³ Department of Terrestrial Ecology, Norwegian Institute for Nature Research (NINA), P.O.
28	40	Der 5(95 Tenender N 7495 Tree Heim Nemmer
29	13	Box 5685 Torgarden, N-7485 Trondneim, Norway
30		
31	14	⁴ Department of Forest Sciences, University of Helsinki, P.O. Box 27, FI-00014, Finland
32		
33	15	
34		
35	16	*Corresponding author: musilovaz@fzp.czu.cz; orcid: 0000-0001-5344-7445
36		
37	17	
38		
39	18	Keywords: wetland type; range-shift drivers; waterbirds; long-term monitoring; artificial
40		
41	19	wetlands
42		
43		
44		
45		
40 A7		
т, 48		
49		
50		
51		
52		
53		
54		
55		
56		

20 Abstract

Understanding species habitat use and factors affecting changes in their distributions are
 necessary to promote the conservation of any biological community. We evaluated the changes
 in wetland use of the non-breeding waterbird community. Based on long-term citizen-science
 data (1988–2020), we tested the hypotheses that wetland use is associated with species diet
 and potential range-shift drivers (the tendency to occupy the same sites in consecutive years site affinity and the species' average temperature across its wintering range – STI).

27 2. We analysed species-specific wetland use of 25 species of waterbirds wintering in Czechia
28 over a period of 33 years. The analyses explained variability in trends in numbers of the studied
29 waterbird species across four inland wetland types: reservoirs, fishponds, industrial waters
30 created by flooding of former mining sites, and running waters.

3. Trends in waterbird abundance positively correlated with species' diet on fishponds, industrial and running waters. Among the diet groups, invertivores showed the largest increase in abundances on industrial waters, closely followed by herbivores. Herbivores showed the largest increase in abundances in fishponds, and piscivores did so in running waters. Regarding range-shift drivers, species with higher site affinity showed higher abundances on running waters, while species with low STI (i.e. wintering on average in sites with lower temperature) were more abundant on reservoirs. The abundance of both warm-dwelling and species with low site affinity increased on fishponds and industrial waters.

4. Our findings suggest that the increased importance of the wetland types considered here for
wintering waterbirds is likely linked to diet related changes in habitat use and changes in
species distributions; and highlight that wintering waterbirds are expected to select sites with
higher availability of food, higher energy content and lower foraging cost.

5. Recent and rapid changes in species distributions may lead to a decrease in the effectiveness
of national and international conservation efforts. When planning conservation measures, it
should be kept in mind that, climate change does not only imply large-scale north/northeastwards shifts of entire waterbird distributions, but can also modify the use of the habitats
by waterbird species inside their traditional wintering range.

48 Introduction

Acquiring information regarding habitat use of different species (including temporal changes)
is crucial for proposing effective conservation measures (Pullin, 2002; Angert *et al.*, 2011;
Dawson *et al.*, 2011; Davis *et al.*, 2014). Such information is especially relevant in the context
of ongoing climate-driven changes in species distributions (Maclean *et al.*, 2008; Chen *et al.*,
2011; Podhrázský *et al.*, 2017; Pavón-Jordán *et al.*, 2019).

The non-breeding distribution and habitat use of many waterbirds have changed considerably
during recent decades, with new important wintering areas being established in northern and
eastern Europe (Lehikoinen *et al.*, 2013; Nuijten *et al.*, 2020). This phenomenon has been
linked to climate-driven range changes and redistribution of abundances (Maclean *et al.*, 2008;
Thomas *et al.*, 2012; Pavón-Jordán *et al.*, 2015; Musilová, Musil, Zouhar & Adam, 2018a;
Pavón-Jordán *et al.*, 2019).

In addition to using newly available northern coastal areas around the Baltic Sea (Lehikoinen et al., 2013), many wintering waterbirds are progressively using inland waters in east and central Europe to a greater extent when compared to the 1990s (Musilová, Musil, Zouhar & Adam, 2018a; see also Guillemain & Hearn, 2017; Pavón-Jordán et al., 2020). Climate warming is shifting the zero-degree isotherm (i.e. average aerial temperature of 0 °C in January) and thus increasing also the availability of free-ice inland freshwater wetlands in this region (Pavón-Jordán et al., 2015, 2019, Musilová, Musil, Zouhar & Adam, 2018a). Some species are rapidly responding to this phenomenon and increasingly using the newly available wetlands in central and east Europe by altering their migratory behaviour (Sauter et al., 2010; Gunnarsson, Waldenström & Fransson, 2012; Adam et al., 2015, Podhrazský et al., 2017). This has several advantages - for example lowering the high mortality risk and energetic cost of a long migration (Newton, 2007) as well as reducing energy expenditure for thermoregulation in regions that were formerly hostile during winter (Ridgill & Fox, 1990; Musil et al., 2008; Dalby et al., 2013).

 Although the most important wintering requirements of food resources and safety from predation are relatively well known (Snow & Perrins, 1998; Guillemain et al., 2000; Guillemain et al., 2002; Schummer, Kaminski, Raedeke & Graber, 2010), long-term studies revealing the drivers of inland wetland use by waterbirds are absent in the literature, especially in the context of climate-driven changes in distributions. Food supply and availability of ice-free, open water in the wintering grounds are likely the most important limiting factors (Newton, 1998; Newton, 2013; Lewis et al., 2019) shaping waterbirds wintering distribution (Dalby et al., 2013; Guillemain et al., 2015), followed by predation and air temperature (thermoregulation) (Ridgill & Fox, 1990; Maclean et al., 2008; Adam et al., 2015). Hence, temperature alone does not simply explain the distribution pattern of wintering waterbirds (Dalby et al., 2013). The competition for food likely increases during winter, when individuals from low density breeding sites in the vast boreal and tundra areas in Fennoscandia and Russia congregate in their common wintering grounds further down the flyway (Guillemain et al., 2002; Brochet et al., 2012). This behaviour, thus, presents an ideal opportunity to investigate how resource availability and competition for food and space drive habitat use by waterbirds during the wintering season.

In our study, we evaluate species-specific changes in the use of four different wetland types. We hypothesize that the habitat use of species among the investigated wetland types is driven by the species diet and that wetland types differ in their food supply (Kloskowski *et al.*, 2009; Kameníková & Rajchard, 2013; Čížková et al.; 2013; Lewis et al., 2019). We expect a different speed of change in the use of fishponds by the different diet groups, because this particular type of wetland is characterised by high density of stocked fish. Thus, we expect a shift of invertivores from fishponds to other wetland types due to competition for invertebrates with a high density of fish (esp. Common Carp Cyprinus Carpio). On the other hand, fishponds constitute a food-rich habitat for piscivorous species (Musil, 2006; Nummi, Väänänen, Holopainen & Pöysä, 2016).

101 We also defined two species-specific determinants to outline the distribution of species102 regarding the four wetland types (later named range shift drivers): (a) a species' site affinity

Freshwater Biology

2
3
4
5
6
0
7
8
9
10
11
10
12
13
14
15
16
17
10
10
19
20
21
22
23
2J 24
24
25
26
27
28
20
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
26
30
37
38
39
40
41
40 1
42
43
44
45
46
47
<u>1</u> 2
40
49
50
51
52
53
51
54
55
56
57
58
50

60

103 (the tendency to occupy the same sites in consecutive years) and (b) the species temperature 104 index (STI) as a measure of the species thermal affinity (warm-dwelling or cold-dwelling 105 species; see description below. See also Devictor et al., 2008; Jiguet et al., 2007). Based on 106 these two species-specific traits and current climate warming (Hurrel & Deser, 2009), we predict increasing wintering abundances of species with low site affinity (i.e. species that show 107 low site fidelity and thus show greater potential to change wintering sites) as well as species 108 109 with high Species Temperature Index (STI; i.e. with high average winter temperature across 110 its wintering distribution) as the winter weather conditions become more favourable for them to expand towards these previously unsuitable regions; see e.g. Gaget et al. 2021. 111

112

113

- 114 Methods
- 115 Study region

The study region covers the Czech Republic that lies in central Europe. In total, 1,169
monitored sites were classified according to the four wetland types considered: 68 reservoirs,
443 fishponds, 108 industrial waters and 550 running waters (Fig. 1).

Note that there are only a few small natural glacial lakes in the study region (Tucker & Evans, 119 1997; Chytil et al., 1999) which are located in mountains; these are usually frozen in winter 120 121 and are therefore not included in the monitoring scheme. Thus, the four types included in the 122 analysis essentially cover all wetland sites available for wintering waterbirds (see Chytil et al., 123 1999, Musil et al. 2001). The set of available sites in the study region remained unchanged throughout the whole study period (Fig. 2); all major changes in water bodies brought about 124 125 by human activity in the study region had occurred before 1988, the beginning of the study 126 period.

127

128 Waterbird monitoring data

129 Site-specific count data of waterbird abundances (in total 492,297 observations) were obtained

130 from the results of the International Waterbird Census (IWC) in the Czech Republic between

 131 1988 and 2020. IWC is a worldwide citizen-science census with a standardized methodology
132 (see further details in Delany, 2005; Delany, 2010) managed by the national coordinator in
133 each country and globally coordinated by Wetlands International (www.wetlands.org).
134 Censuses are carried out in mid-January each winter because it is generally the coldest period
135 of winter when the effect of food resources on waterbird distribution is considered most
136 apparent due to limited site availability.

Waterbird counts were performed on a site during a day according to a complete and predefined list of species on predetermined dates and sites with the aim to maximize synchrony in the following years (Gilissen et al., 2002). Census participants also recorded zero counts of individual species as well as zero counts of all species on a site. About 350 experienced volunteer birdwatchers contributed annually to the monitoring in Czechia. The most important element of IWC methodology is standardization: it requires a single count at each site each winter, optimally conducted by the same person in consecutive winters in order to make the comparisons between years straightforward and valid. Each site (up to a few km² of standing water or a few km of a course of running water) established on the list of sites was defined by boundaries (such as bridges, weirs or dam on rivers and streams) known by the census participants. Observers used a telescope or binoculars from the shoreline to look for flocks and/or individuals of waterbirds, usually moving from one observation site to another by foot. Running waters were monitored using line transects along the shore. The number of census participants per site (one, two or a group) and the duration of survey were designated according to bird abundance on each site, species and size of the water surface area, and weather (Bibby, Burgess & Hill, 2007; Sutherland, Pullin, Dolman & Knight, 2004). The counts at dawn were recommended for geese. Observations taken under extreme weather conditions (fog, rain, snow fall, strong wind) categorised as "strong effect" by the observer and incomplete observations were excluded from the dataset prior to the analysis.

A repeated scanning of the flocks and shoreline observations were used to increase the
detectability of counted species. Census records were submitted to the national coordinator,
who compiles the submitted records and checks their validity using the participants' feedback

if necessary. The quality of the IWC data has been verified in recently published studies (e.g.
Fox *et al.*, 2010; Lehikoinen *et al.*, 2013; Amano *et al.*, 2018; Musilová, Musil, Zouhar &
Adam, 2018a; Musilová *et al.*, 2018b; Pavón-Jordán *et al.*, 2019; Gaget *et al.*, 2020; PavónJordán *et al.*, 2020). Monitoring methodology did not change over the study period.

The IWC targets all waterbirds, a group ecologically dependent on wetlands (Delany, 2010), i.e. swans, geese, ducks, grebes, cormorants, herons, rallids, waders and gulls. However, in this study, we only include 25 the most common wintering waterbird species, namely those exceeding 50 individuals in Czechia annually (see also Musil *et al.*, 2011; Musilová *et al.*, 2014; see Table 1 for an overview of the species). We followed Gill & Donsker (2018) for the species taxonomy.

170 Wetland types

The wetland types included in this study differ with regard to their origin, age and management practices (Chytil et al., 1999). Fishponds represent shallow water bodies with a small stream or canal for water inflow. As commercial subjects aimed at stocking and production of fish (mostly Carp), fishponds were formed in the Middle Ages (mostly in the 16th century), have artificially managed water levels, chemistry and nutrient input. Reservoirs have been built more recently (after 1900) and represent deep waterbodies with inflow from larger rivers (compared to fishponds). The fish stock in reservoirs are not managed for the purpose of commercial fisheries but rather managed by angling associations (recreation). The most recent wetland type are *industrial waters*, which were created by flooding of former mining, sand-pit or gravel-pit areas, or are sedimentary pools built in industrial areas since 1960s (Hrdinka, 2007). Among all standing water wetland types described above, there is a gradient of decreasing probability of complete ice-cover in winter with increasing depth: from fishponds (the shallowest) to industrial waters and finally to reservoirs (the deepest). High density fish stocks are most intensively managed in fishponds, followed by reservoirs and the least managed in industrial waters (Oertli et al., 2005; Musil, 2006, UNEP, 2017).

The trophic state of the wetland types ranges from oligotrophic waters (a low nutrient content),
through mesotrophic and eutrophic waters to hypereutrophic waters, which present
an extremely high nutrient content (Carlson, 1977). Among the four monitored wetland types,
running waters contain the lowest content of nutrients, and fishponds are mostly eutrophic,
sometimes hypertrophic (Chytil *et al.*, 1999; Musil, 2006; Seiche *et al.*, 2012; Čížková *et al.*,
2013). The distribution of the monitored sites is shown in Fig. 1.

193 Species-specific variables

All 25 investigated waterbird species were described by the following three species-specific variables (*diet, species temperature index (STI*), and *site affinity*), which could explain the temporal pattern in the wetland type use.

(i) All species were classified into *diet* groups based on their preferred food items in the
wintering season: piscivorous, invertivorous, omnivorous and herbivorous (based on data
and diet classification in Snow & Perrins, 1998; Kear, 2005; Šťastný & Hudec, 2016).

(ii) Species temperature index (STI): The STI (see Devictor et al., 2008; Jiguet et al., 2007) for detailes of STI calculation) reflects the long-term average January temperature (1950-2000) experienced by individuals of any given species across the species' entire wintering distribution. Species' distribution maps were downloaded from BirdLife International & HBW (2017) and all temperature data from the regions included in each species' wintering range (above) were downloaded from www.worldclim.org. For each species, all grid cells (5x5 degrees) with temperature data within a species' wintering range (BirdLife International & HBW 2017) were downloaded and averaged.

(iii) For each species, we calculated a measure of year-to-year variation in geographical
distribution of the species across the study region (called *site affinity*). Thus, the species'
fidelity to the wintering sites constitutes the basis of the covariate *site affinity*, which is
bounded between 0 and 1, with the actual range of values being 0.14–0.82 in our data set.
Values close to 1 indicate that the same sites are occupied in successive years, and with
the same intensity; values close to zero imply large year-to-year variation in the selection

, ,	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
0 7	
/	
8	
9	
10	
11	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
10	
17	
18	
19	
20	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
25	
20	
27	
28	
29	
30	
21	
21	
32	
33	
34	
35	
26	
50	
37	
38	
39	
40	
/1	
41	
42	
43	
44	
45	
16	
40	
47	
48	
49	
50	
50 E 1	
21	
52	
53	
54	
55	
55	
50	
57	
58	
59	
60	
00	

of wintering sites. These values are based on Earth mover's distance (see Kranstauber,
Smolla & Safi, 2017 for further details).

The pairwise correlation of continuous species-specific variables is 0.06, implying there is
little collinearity (Hair, Anderson, Tatham & Black, 1995; Rogerson, 2001). The values of
species-specific variables are listed in Table 1.

219

220 Statistical analysis

221 Our analyses proceeded in two stages, differing in the level of detail at which the count data were aggregated. In the first stage, we studied how trends in abundances of different species 222 vary across wetland types. We first used a log-linear Poisson regression analysis to impute any 223 missing waterbird count data from the long-term data series (in 1988–2020) using TRends and 224 Indices for Monitoring data software (TRIM; Statistic Netherlands version 3.52, Pannekoek 225 & Van Strien, 2005). Regression parameters were estimated using generalized estimating 226 227 equations (GEE). Missing data were usually the result of incomplete coverage due to limited 228 availability of observers in some years. The proportion of missing counts varied between 33% 229 and 65% in the whole dataset, which is regarded as tolerable (Soldaat et al., 2017).

In this first stage, after imputing any missing data, we estimated the species-specific long-term 230 trends in abundances (i.e. the change in abundance indices from one year to the next) at each 231 232 of the four wetland types and assessed differences in these trends between the wetland types 233 based on the rate of change: a strong increase or decrease (\geq 5% per year); a moderate increase 234 or decrease (< 5% per year); a stable (trend was not significant and CIs were sufficiently narrow) or an uncertain trend (see also Fouque et al., 2009; Musil et al., 2011; Musilová et al., 235 236 2018b). Then, a Wald test was used to assess the significance of differences in the trends in 237 the four wetland types. Furthermore, we used wetland type and site as covariates in the linear trend models (see also Pavón-Jordán et al., 2015; Musilová et al., 2018b). 238

In the second stage, we studied the effect of species-specific variables on population trends at
different wetland types. As in the first step in this species-level analysis (above), we also used
TRIM to fill the gaps in the data due to incomplete monitoring coverage. For each species, we

obtained the TRIM-imputed *total abundance* by year and wetland type, producing a dataset of
3,267 observations (25 species, 33 years, 4 wetland types). Velvet Scoter (*Melanitta fusca*)
was not recorded on fishponds and, therefore, excluded from the analyses.

Next, we explained these total abundances estimated with TRIM and their trends with speciesspecific variables in a regression approach. As the time abundances exhibited substantial overdispersion, we used negative binomial regression rather than the canonical Poisson distribution. The fact that observations for a species are repeated across years and wetland types led us to include species as a random effect in the model, meaning we fitted a Generalized Linear Mixed Model (GLMM). Moreover, to allow for (i) heteroskedasticity both between and within species, and (ii) arbitrary correlation within a species' values, we used a cluster-robust estimator of the standard errors in statistical inference, clustered at the species level (Cameron & Miller, 2015). To facilitate coefficient interpretation, all continuous variables were z-standardized (i.e. centred around the mean and divided by the standard deviation) prior to running the regressions.

For simplicity, our model specification assumes linear time trends in total abundances; we do nevertheless expect these trends to vary systematically with species-specific characteristics and across wetland types. Therefore, we included interactions of year and wetland types with all species-specific variables in our model. All regression models were estimated in Stata 16 (StataCorp, College Station, TX).

263 Results

492,297 observations from 25 species in 1,169 wetlands between 1988 and 2020 were included in this study. The mean annual abundance for four diet groups was the following: herbivores $(23,467 \pm 2,897 \text{ SE})$, omnivores $(219,234 \pm 3,264 \text{ SE})$, invertivores $(6,295 \pm 240 \text{ SE})$ and piscivores $(15,136 \pm 933 \text{ SE})$. The first stage of our analysis revealed significant differences in abundance trends between the four wetland types in 22 out of the 25 investigated species (Table 2). Prevailing decreasing (10 species) or stable trends (six species) were found in

Freshwater Biology

running waters while significant increasing trends in the abundance of 15 species were found
in standing waters (reservoirs, fishponds and industrial waters). The significant differences
(according to results of Wald test) in species trends among analysed wetland types were found
in five of six herbivore species, in six of eight omnivore species, in all five invertivore species
and in all six piscivore species. Increasing trend in abundances was found in all herbivores on
reservoirs and in almost all species in industrial waters (Table 2).

The results from our GLMM showed that species exhibiting higher site affinity (i.e. low yearto-year variation in geographical distribution of the species across the study region) recorded the highest total abundances on running waters (Table 3). Similarly, cold-dwelling species (identified by a lower value of average temperature across its wintering range – STI) were more abundant in reservoirs (Table 3).

The effects of the interaction terms between species-specific variables and year showed the extent at which the trends in abundances on different wetland types varied with species-specific variables. For instance, the coefficient on year in the reservoirs column ($\beta = 0.056$) implied that the predicted yearly increase in total abundances in an omnivorous species (i.e. the reference diet group) with average values of site affinity and STI is about 5.6 per cent; the coefficient on herbivorous \times year ($\beta = 0.022$) indicated that for a herbivorous species with average values of site affinity and STI, the annual increase was larger by ca. 2.2 per cent, i.e. about 8 per cent in total. The species' diet significantly affected the species trends on fishponds, industrial and running waters. On fishponds, herbivorous species showed the largest (positive) trend in total abundances (over 11 per cent per year at average values of site affinity and STI), followed closely by piscivores. On industrial waters, omnivores increased at the slowest pace by ca. 7-9 % slower than the other three diet groups. On running waters, piscivores increased at the fastest rate during the 1990s and early 2000s, followed closely by herbivores (Figures 3 and 4). Warm-dwelling and species with low site affinity showed the largest trend on fishponds and industrial waters.

296 The differences in trends and abundances across diet groups and wetland types are visualized297 in Figures 3 and 4. Figure 3 presents the underlying data on total abundances, along with trend

curves obtained via scatterplot smoothing using LOESS. Figure 4 visualizes the trends
predicted by the regression for different diet groups at different wetland types. The apparent
discrepancies between Figure 3 and 4 are caused by the fact that in the regression that underlie
Figure 4 (i) we estimate a (log-) linear for simplicity (while some trends in Figure 3 show a
substantial degree of nonlinearity) and (ii) the predictions were obtained at fixed values of STI
and site affinity, which otherwise vary between different diet groups. Figure 5 summarizes the
findings in a graphical format.

- 307 Discussion

To promote the protection of wetland birds, the knowledge of species habitat use and facilitation of species distribution changes should be considered the cornerstones for effective adaptive management (Musilová et al., 2018b; see also Pullin, 2002; Sutherland, Pullin, Dolman & Knight, 2004; Sinclair, Fryxell & Caughley, 2006; Musilová et al., 2015; Holopainen et al., 2015; Gaget et al., 2020; Pavón-Jordán et al., 2020). This study contributes to the identification of these cornerstones by demonstrating diet-specific changes in habitat use, and of species with high probability of range changes (summarized in Fig. 5), based on long-term nonbreeding data of wintering waterbirds.

317 Changes in habitat use in different diet groups

Generally, food supply is of high importance for waterbirds (Guillemain et al., 2015; Holopainen et al., 2015) due to its subsequent effect on breeding success, adult survival and also overall flyway population dynamics (Newton, 1998; Newton, 2013; Jørgensen et al., 2016). Use of feeding habitat is a hierarchical process, influencing the species geographical distribution and the choice of a particular wetland (Green, 1998). Here, we demonstrated long-term changes in wetland type use among diet groups in fishponds, industrial and running waters, but not in reservoirs. Increased use of industrial waters was found in invertivore species, which predominantly used running waters in the beginning of the study period and

Freshwater Biology

progressively switch to industrial waters. Invertebrate biomass, which provides the majority of the food of invertivores, tend to be highest in early successional wetlands (Nummi & Holopainen, 2014; Petrie et al., 2016), such are industrial waters. Furthermore, heterogeneity in the physical characteristics of foraging areas can affect foraging behaviour (Fernández & Lank, 2008) and therefore affect the species habitat use. Consistent with this, diving ducks represent most of the invertivore species; they feed at greater depths during the non-breeding period (Hughes & Green in Kear, 2005) and industrial waters likely provide favourable depths for their foraging behaviour. Lower foraging costs (Wood et al., 2013a) in industrial waters compared to higher water velocities in running waters can make foraging more profitable for invertivores. The same effect could cause increased use of industrial waters in herbivores (almost in the same degree as in invertivores).

The *a priori* assumption of a low increase in abundances of invertivores in fishponds was confirmed. Invertebrates are fundamental to both terrestrial and aquatic food webs, and drastic decreases have been shown in terrestrial insects on a global level (Dirzo et al., 2014; Wagner et al., 2021). Long-term studies on aquatic invertebrates are currently scarce (Gozlan et al., 2019), but some indicate changes in aquatic invertebrate structure (Fried-Petersen *et al.*, 2020; Pilotto et al., 2020; van der Lee, Aray-Ajoy, Futter & Angeler, 2021) associated with increasing levels of eutrophication and brownification as one of the most important driver of these changes (Jackson, Loewen, Vinebrooke & Chimimba, 2016; Lind et al., 2018; Arzel et al., 2020). Fishponds are commercial habitats with artificially managed nutrient input that increase the level of eutrophication (Roy et al., 2020) and are aimed at stocking and breeding fish (mostly Carp). The artificial nutrient input have resulted in hypertrophy of fishponds, especially after the World War II (Pechar, 2000; Seiche et al., 2012) and therefore these ponds exceed the nutrient level of other wetland types in the study region. It has been shown that high stocks of Carp in fishponds create an environment with extremely high competition for invertebrate food with invertivorous waterbird species during the breeding season (Musil, 2006). In this study, we show that this effect is also significant during the wintering season by a lower increase in the use of fishponds by invertivores.

2
1
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
10
10
19
20
21
22
23
24
27
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
22
52
33
34
35
36
37
20
20
39
40
41
42
43
44
15
т.) ЛС
40
47
48
49
50
51
50
52 53
53
54
55
56
57
58
50
1 7

60

1 2

354	Indeed, herbivores stood out as the most increasing diet group in fishponds, likely keeping
355	outside the Carp-waterbird food competition. The importance of artificial fishponds as
356	alternative sites for wintering herbivorous and omnivorous ducks was shown also in Doñana,
357	Spain (Kloskowski et al., 2009). However, some species of the herbivorous group (geese,
358	Mute Swan and Eurasian Wigeon) are not strictly feeding inside of wetlands such as
359	invertivores and piscivores and may feed both aquatically and terrestrially (Jacobsen &
360	Ugelvik, 1994; Fox et al., 2005; Wood et al., 2013b). Therefore, the changes in wetland type
361	use are less strongly related to wetland food supply in this group. Especially, due to the
362	characteristics of the census protocol (dawn counts), variation in geese abundances are likely
363	to be affected by this daily dynamic between the roosting and feeding sites. In the study region,
364	geese have traditionally congregated in high numbers during winter and use reservoirs as a
365	roosting sites and nearby fields as a dominant feeding sites, especially in south-Moravian
366	lowland (Czech IWC data: http://www.waterbirdmonitoring.cz/vysledky/iwc20/).
367	Conversely, other herbivorous species are counted during the daylight activities in the
368	wetlands and thus do not include individuals that have left the wetlands (roosting sites) to
369	forage in the fields. In addition, some waterbirds may often be feeding at different places
370	during the night, such as omnivorous Mallards in the Netherlands (Kleyheeg et al., 2017) and
371	granivorous dabbling ducks feeding on rice fields in the Mediterranean (Guillemain et al.,
372	2010; Brogi, Pernollet, Gauthier-Clerc & Guillemain, 2015; Parejo et al., 2019). Nevertheless,
373	this nocturnal behaviour is likely difficult to quantify (Tourenq et al., 2001) and any obvious
374	suitable nocturnal feeding wetlands are not known from the study region.
375	On the species level, prevailing decreasing or stable trends in abundances were found in

running waters, which represent the traditional wintering grounds in the study region (Adam *et al.*, 2015; Musilová, Musil, Zouhar & Romportl, 2015; Musilová, Musil, Zouhar & Adam,
2018a). It is worth noting that running waters fulfil one of the most important habitat
requirements for wintering waterbirds: to avoid unfavourable winter harshness and destructive
winter extremes in the zero-degree-isotherm area (Musilová, Musil, Zouhar & Romportl,
2015; Musilová, Musil, Zouhar & Adam, 2018a). In recent decades, milder winter conditions

Freshwater Biology

in Central Europe (IPCC, 2014) likely provide an increased availability of new wintering areas, i.e. standing waters with reduced ice cover. Still, running waters still remain as suitable wintering sites, as revealed in this study, especially for piscivores and herbivorous. Recent climate and land use changes affect the fish assemblages, diversity and distribution (Comte et al., 2013) as well as diversity and distribution of invertebrates (Haase et al., 2019) with predicted up and downstream direction of shifts in the fish species in rivers (Radinger et al., 2017), hence the use of rivers by piscivores is likely in accordance with these changes in fish distribution.

391 Wetland type use in species changing distribution

Generally, there is a trade-off between the cost and benefit of the wintering site use (Ridgill & Fox, 1990; Adam et al., 2015; Musilová, Musil, Zouhar & Romportl, 2015). Importantly, there is a gradient among the four investigated wetland types in the level of the winter harshness risk, i.e. the sensitivity to cold weather and freezing (running waters considered the most stable compared to standing waters, see above), in the level of habitat change risk (fishponds considered the most artificially affected), in the level of succession in freshwater communities (industrial waters considered as an early successional stages), trophic status (the highest nutrient content in fishponds); see the methods for details.

The nature of these differences reflected the use of wetland types in species with more or less probable range shifts and/or distribution changes. Species with high site affinity (i.e. species with low year-to-year variation in geographical distribution across the study region) revealed higher use of running waters. Higher stability in cold and extreme weather conditions, low level of habitat change risk caused by possible management of running waters are likely important for these species with lower probability of range changes. However, saturation of traditional wintering grounds was suggested to occur in Czech Republic (Musilová, Musil, Zouhar & Romportl, 2015) that could increase the competition for resources (Newton, 1998; Newton, 2013). In addition, higher water velocities in running waters compared to standing waters increase the foraging costs (Wood et al., 2013a).

2
ך ע
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
∠∠ วว
∠⊃ ⊃4
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
21
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
то //1
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
50

60

1

410	Furthermore, our study indicates the high importance of man-made standing wetlands
411	(fishponds and industrial waters) for species more likely to undergo range shifts, i.e. species
412	with low site affinity and warm-dwelling (higher average temperature across its wintering
413	range - high STI -) species. Wintering waterbird populations are clearly changing their
414	distribution (Lehikoinen et al, 2013; Pavón-Jordán et al., 2015; Musilová, Musil, Zouhar &
415	Adam, 2018a; Pavón-Jordán et al., 2019; Pavón-Jordán et al, 2020). These distribution
416	changes could be associated with changes in ice cover, food availability, habitat and hunting
417	pressure (Dalby et al., 2013; Newton, 2013; Guillemain et al., 2015; Pavón-Jordán et al, 2020;
418	this study). Species with low site affinity increase the use of these newly available wetlands
419	that are also considered less stable as wintering sites (higher winter harshness and habitat
420	change risk, higher trophy in fishponds and lower succession in industrial waters). It seems
421	that species with low site affinity grasp the benefits of milder climate in recent decades (Hurrel
422	& Deser, 2009) and responded by increasingly use these alternative wetlands. The tendency
423	of species with low site affinity to annually change the wintering sites implies they may be
424	useful early-warning indicators of changing use of wintering sites (see also Green & Elmberg,
425	2014).

The thermal affinity was determined as an important trait explaining the species distribution 426 and range changes leading by climate change (Gaget et al., 2020; Devictor et al., 2008). The 427 428 changes of nonbreeding distribution of waterbirds seems highly affected by climate warming 429 (Pavón-Jordán et al., 2015; Gaget et al., 2018). Our study reveals the use of reservoirs by cold-430 dwelling species (mostly seaducks), while reservoirs represent deeper water bodies with inflow from larger rivers and have the lowest probability of complete ice-cover in winter 431 432 among standing waters. In the light of climate warming, related northeastwards shifts of 433 species distributions (Lehikoinen et al., 2013; Pavón-Jordán et al., 2015; Gaget et al., 2020; Pavón-Jordán et al., 2020), and consequent decline and even local extinction of cold-dwelling 434 species caused by distribution change (Devictor et al., 2008; Tayleur et al., 2016; Gaget et al., 435 2020), we assume that reservoirs could serve as a refuges for cold-dwelling species in the near 436 future. Larger stochasticity and frequency of extreme weather events are also predicted by 437

Page 17 of 93

Freshwater Biology

most climate change scenarios and thus such deep and large wetlands with stable temperature conditions suitable for benthic invertebrates will provide the resources required by these species. However, the overall increase in abundances of cold-dwelling species in the study region indicate that this issue could be much complex, as temperature is not the only driver of species distribution changes (Dalby et al., 2013). Conversely, warm-dwelling species increase the use of both fishponds and industrial waters. The availability of these shallower man-made wetlands may likely increase due to climate warming (Hurrel & Deser, 2010). The 'wintering strategy' of warm-dwelling species is driven by the geographic avoidance of the zero-degree isotherm to reduce winter harshness risk (Gaget et al., 2020), therefore warm-dwelling species likely do not reflect the difference in wetland types in terms of winter harshness risk and increase the use of industrial waters and fishponds with higher winter harshness risk. Increasing our knowledge of the habitat use of warm-dwelling species is of high importance since they are more likely to expand in the coming decades (Devictor et al., 2008; Tayleur et al., 2016; Gaget et al., 2020). Indeed, we can expect increasing concern of farmers and fishermen followed by the distribution changes of the warm-dwelling species, while some of them are already conflict species such as Greylag Goose or herons.

455 Conclusion

Our study highlight the general pattern that wintering waterbirds are expected to select sites
with higher food availability (Fox *et al.*, 1995; Green, 1998; Green, Fox, Hughes & Hilton,
1999; Guillemain, Fritz & Guillon *et al.* 2000; Chatterjee, Adhikari, Pal & Mukhopadhyay,
2020), higher energy content (van Eerden, 1984) and lower foraging cost (Wood *et al.*, 2013a)
to balance the costs and benefits of feeding site choice during wintering (Newton, 1998;
Newton, 2013; Aharon-Rotman, Clark, Klaassen & Buttemer, 2016). The effort to meet these
requirements resulted in a considerable change of the habitat use in the given species.

~

463 Understanding the role of habitat use in the context of changing distributions of different
464 species is of high importance for conservation (see e.g. Janke *et al.*, 2017), especially since the
465 climate-driven range changes are already underway (e.g. Lehikoinen *et al.*, 2013; Pavón-

Jordán et al., 2015, Musilová, Musil, Zouhar & Adam, 2018a; Pavón-Jordán et al., 2019; Pavón-Jordán et al, 2020) and may lead to the decrease of effectiveness of the conservation efforts (Musilová et al., 2018b). Consistent with this view, increasing use of industrial waters and fishponds for warm-dwelling and species with low site affinity exhibiting more probable range shifts and/or distribution changes, and conversely use of reservoirs by cold-dwelling species and running waters by species with high site affinity indicates importance of individual wetland types as wintering grounds, which should be considered in future conservation planning and effective management. The development and implementation of measures to increase the suitability of existing modified habitats for wildlife appears essential to conserve biodiversity (Sinclair, Fryxell & Caughley, 2006; Navedo, 2017). The implementation should be based on the core knowledge of the species habitat use and distribution changes (Musilová et al., 2018b). Climate-driven changes in species distributions should not necessarily have the north/eastwards direction (see e.g. Lehikoinen et al., 2013, 2016; Pavón-Jordán et al., 2015; Pavón-Jordán et al., 2020), but could also modify the use of habitats within species' current Perie ranges.

 Acknowledgments

We are indebted to all those who have volunteered in International Waterbird Census (IWC) counts as well as to the census IWC co-ordinators in the Czech Republic (i.e. Bohuslav Urbánek, Vladimír Fiala, Čestmír Folk, Josef Křen, Ivana Kožená and Jitka Pellantová). We are also grateful to Carolyn Pimm for language improvements and Matyáš Adam for his help with the map. This study was supported by the project EHP-CZ02-OV-1-027-2015 entitled "The reduction of habitat fragmentation consequences in various types of landscape in the Czech Republic", the project TH 04030185 of Technology Agency of the Czech Republic entitled "Identification of important wintering sites of waterbirds, with a focus on the presence of conflict species and in the context of site protection, habitat characteristics and climate change" and the project No.20194209 of Internal Grant Agency of FES CULS entitled

- 494 "Waterbirds as bioindicators of wetlands health: food specialisation determines the waterbird'
 - 495 response to climatic and environmental changes".

Cool of Review

1
2
- २
Δ
5
6
/
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
12
10
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
20
30 21
21
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
72 //2
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
55
50
5/
58
59

497 References

498	Adam M., Musilová Z., Musil P., Zouhar J. & Romportl D. (2015). Long-Term Changes in
499	Habitat Selection of Wintering Waterbirds: High Importance of Cold Weather Refuge
500	Sites. Acta Ornithologica 50, 127–138.
501	https://doi.org/10.3161/00016454AO2015.50.2.001
502	Aharon-Rotman Y., Buchanan K.L., Clark N.J., Klaassen M. & Buttemer W.A. (2016). Why
503	fly the extra mile? Using stress biomarkers to assess wintering habitat quality in
504	migratory shorebirds. Oecologia 182, 385-395. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00442-016-
505	<u>3679-1</u>
506	Amano T., Székely T., Sandel B., Nagy S., Mundkur T., Langendoen T., et al. (2018).
507	Successful conservation of global waterbird populations depends on effective
508	governance. Nature 553, 199-202. https://doi.org/10.1038/nature25139
509	Angert A.L., Crozier L.G., Rissler L.J., Gilman S.E., Tewksbury J.J. & Chunco A.J. (2011).
510	Do species' traits predict recent shifts at expanding range edges? Ecology Letters 14,
511	677-689. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1461-0248.2011.01620.x
512	Arzel C., Nummi P., Arvola L., Pöysä H., Davranche A., Rask M., et al. (2020). Invertebrates
513	are declining in boreal aquatic habitat: The effect of brownification? Science of The
514	Total Environment 724, 138199. <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2020.138199</u>
515	Beekman, J., et al. (2019). Long-term population trends and shifts in distribution of Bewick's
516	Swans Cygnus columbianus bewickii wintering in northwest Europe. Wildfowl, Special
517	Issue 5, 73-102.
518	Bibby, C. J., Burgess, N. D. & Hill, D. A. (2007). Bird Census Techniques. Academic Press,
519	London.
520	BirdLife International & HBW (2017). Bird species distribution maps of the world. Version
521	7.0. Available at http://datazone.birdlife.org/species/requestdis .

Freshwater Biology

2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
, o	
0	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
20 21	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
20	
27	
28	
29	
30	
31	
32	
22	
22	
34	
35	
36	
37	
38	
20	
27	
40	
41	
42	
43	
44	
45	
40	
47	
48	
49	
50	
51	
51	
52	
53	
54	
55	
56	
57	
57	
20	
L ()	

Brogi A., Pernollet C.A., Gauthier-Clerc M. & Guillemain M. (2015). Waterfowl foraging in 522 523 winter-flooded ricefields: Any agronomic benefits for farmers? Ambio 44, 793-802. https://doi.org/10.1007/s13280-015-0678-0 524

- Brochet A.-L., Dessborn L., Legagneux P., Elmberg J., Gauthier-Clerc M., Fritz H., et al. 525 (2012). Is diet segregation between dabbling ducks due to food partitioning? A review 526 of seasonal patterns in the Western Palearctic. Journal of Zoology 286, 171-178. 527 https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1469-7998.2011.00870.x 528
- 529 Cameron, A. C., & Miller, D. L. (2015). A practitioner's guide to cluster-robust inference. Journal of human resources, 50 (2), 317-372. 530
- Carlson, R. E. (1977). A trophic state index for lakes. Limnology and Oceanography 22: 361-531 532 369.
- Chatterjee A., Adhikari S., Pal S. & Mukhopadhyay S.K. (2020). Foraging guild structure and 533 534 niche characteristics of waterbirds wintering in selected sub-Himalayan wetlands of 535 India. Ecological Indicators 108, 105693.
 - https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolind.2019.105693 536
- Chen I.-C., Hill J.K., Ohlemüller R., Roy D.B. & Thomas C.D. (2011). Rapid range shifts of 537 species associated with high levels of climate warming. Science (New York, N.Y.) 333, 538 1024–1026. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1206432 539
- Chytil, J., Hakrová, P., Hudec, K., Jandová, J. & Pellantová, J. (eds) (1999). Wetlands 540 541 of the Czech Republic – inventory of wetlands in the Czech Republic. Czech Ramsar Committee, Mikulov, Czech Republic.Comte L., Buisson L., Daufresne M. & 542 Grenouillet G. (2013). Climate-induced changes in the distribution of freshwater fish: 543 544 observed and predicted trends. Freshwater Biology 58, 625-639. https://doi.org/10.1111/fwb.12081 545
- 59 60

546	Čížková H., Květ J., Comín F.A., Laiho R., Pokorný J. & Pithart D. (2013). Actual state of
547	European wetlands and their possible future in the context of global climate change.
548	Aquatic Sciences 75, 3–26. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00027-011-0233-4
549	Comte L., Buisson L., Daufresne M. & Grenouillet G. (2013). Climate-induced changes in the
550	distribution of freshwater fish: observed and predicted trends. Freshwater Biology 58,
551	625-639. https://doi.org/10.1111/fwb.12081
552	Dalby L., Fox A.D., Petersen I.K., Delany S. & Svenning JC. (2013). Temperature does not
553	dictate the wintering distributions of European dabbling duck species. Ibis 155, 80-
554	88. <u>https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1474-919X.2012.01257.x</u>
555	Davis J.B., Guillemain M., Kaminski R.M., Arzel C., Eadie J.M. & Rees E.C. (2014). Habitat
556	and resource use by waterfowl in the northern hemisphere in autumn and winter.
557	Wildfowl 0 , 17–69
558	Dawson T.P., Jackson S.T., House J.I., Prentice I.C. & Mace G.M. (2011). Beyond
559	Predictions: Biodiversity Conservation in a Changing Climate. Science 332, 53-58.
560	https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1200303
561	Delany, S. (2005). Guidelines for national Coordinators of the International Waterbird census.
562	Wetlands International.
563	Delany, S. (2010). Guidance on Waterbird Monitoring Methodology: Field Protocol for
564	Waterbird Counting. Wetlands International.
565	Devictor V., Julliard R., Couvet D. & Jiguet F. (2008). Birds are tracking climate warming,
566	but not fast enough. Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences 275,
567	2743-2748. https://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2008.0878
568	Dirzo R., Young H.S., Galetti M., Ceballos G., Isaac N.J.B. & Collen B. (2014). Defaunation
569	in the Anthropocene. Science 345, 401-406. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1251817

Freshwater Biology

c	
2	
3	
4	
5	
ر م	
6	
7	
8	
0	
9	
10	
11	
10	
12	
13	
14	
15	
15	
16	
17	
18	
10	
19	
20	
21	
21	
22	
23	
24	
ຼີ. ວ⊑	
25	
26	
27	
_, 20	
ZŎ	
29	
30	
21	
51	
32	
33	
21	
54	
35	
36	
27	
5/	
38	
39	
10	
40	
41	
42	
12	
د ب	
44	
45	
46	
40	
47	
48	
<u>4</u> 0	
+7	
50	
51	
50	
52	
53	
54	
55	
55	
56	
57	
58	
50	
59	
60	

570	Fernández G. & Lank D.B. (2008). Foraging behaviour of non-breeding Western Sandpipers
571	Calidris mauri as a function of sex, habitat and flocking. Ibis 150, 518-526.
572	https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1474-919X.2008.00812.x
573	Fouque C., Guilleman M. & Schricke V. (2009). Trends in the numbers of Coot Fulica atra
574	and wildfowl Anatidae wintering in France, and their relationship with hunting activity
575	at wetland sites. Wildfowl 0, 42-59
576	Fox A.D., Ebbinge B.S., Mitchell C., Heinicke T., Aarvak T., Colhoun K., et al. (2010).
577	Current estimates of goose population sizes in western Europe, a gap analysis and an
578	assessment of trends. Ornis Svecica 20, 115–127
579	Fox A.D., Kahlert J., Ettrup H., Nilsson L. & Hounisen J.P. (1995). Moulting Greylag Geese
580	Anser anser on the Danish island of Saltholm; numbers, phenology, status and origins.
581	Wildfowl 46, 16-30–30
582	Fox A.D., Madsen J., Boyd H., Kuijken E., Norriss D.W., Tombre I.M., et al. (2005). Effects
583	of agricultural change on abundance, fitness components and distribution of two
584	arctic-nesting goose populations. Global Change Biology 11, 881-893.
585	https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2486.2005.00941.x
586	Fried-Petersen H.B., Araya-Ajoy Y.G., Futter M.N. & Angeler D.G. (2020). Drivers of long-
587	term invertebrate community stability in changing Swedish lakes. Global Change
588	Biology 26, 1259–1270. https://doi.org/10.1111/gcb.14952
589	Gaget E., Galewski T., Jiguet F. & Le Viol I. (2018). Waterbird communities adjust to climate
590	warming according to conservation policy and species protection status. Biological
591	Conservation 227, 205–212. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biocon.2018.09.019
592	Gaget E., Le Viol I., Pavón-Jordán D., Cazalis V., Kerbiriou C., Jiguet F., et al. (2020).
593	Assessing the effectiveness of the Ramsar Convention in preserving wintering
594	waterbirds in the Mediterranean. Biological Conservation 243, 108485.

595 <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biocon.2020.108485</u>

2
3
4
5
6
7
/
8
9
10
11
12
12
15
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
20
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
31
24
35
36
37
38
39
40
<u>⊿0</u> ∕/1
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
<u>4</u> 8
40
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
55
50
57
58
59

1

Gaget E., Pavón-Jordán D., Johnston A., Lehikoinen A., Hochachka W.M., Sandercock B.K.,
et al. (2021). Benefits of protected areas for nonbreeding waterbirds adjusting their
distributions under climate warming. Conservation Biology 35, 834–845.
https://doi.org/10.1111/cobi.13648

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 1987, 1988 and 1999. Results from the International Waterbird Census. Wetlands
International Global Series No. 11, Wetlands International, Wageningen,
The Netherlands.

- 605 Gill, F. & Donsker, D. (eds). (2017). IOC World Bird List (v 7.1).
 606 <u>https://www.worldbirdnames.org</u>
- 607 Gozlan R.E., Karimov B.K., Zadereev E., Kuznetsova D. & Brucet S. (2019). Status, trends,
 608 and future dynamics of freshwater ecosystems in Europe and Central Asia. *Inland*609 *Waters* 9, 78–94. https://doi.org/10.1080/20442041.2018.1510271
- Green A.J. & Elmberg J. (2014). Ecosystem services provided by waterbirds. *Biological Reviews* 89, 105–122. <u>https://doi.org/10.1111/brv.12045</u>
- Green A.J. (1998). Comparative feeding behaviour and niche organization in a Mediterranean
 duck community. *Canadian Journal of Zoology* 76, 500–507.
 https://doi.org/10.1139/z97-221
- Green A.J. (1998). Comparative feeding behaviour and niche organization in a Mediterranean
 duck community. *Canadian Journal of Zoology* 76, 500–507.
 https://doi.org/10.1139/z97-221
- Green A.J., Fox A.D., Hughes B. & Hilton G.M. (1999). Time–activity budgets and site
 selection of White-headed Ducks Oxyura leucocephala at Burdur Lake, Turkey in late
 winter. *Bird Study* 46, 62–73. https://doi.org/10.1080/00063659909461115

Freshwater Biology

621	Guillemain M., Elmberg J., Gauthier-Clerc M., Massez G., Hearn R., Champagnon J., et al.
622	(2010). Wintering French Mallard and Teal Are Heavier and in Better Body Condition
623	than 30 Years Ago: Effects of a Changing Environment? Ambio 39, 170-80
624	Guillemain M. & Hearn R. (2017). Ready for climate change? Geographic trends in the
625	protection status of critical sites for Western Palearctic ducks. Biodiversity and
626	Conservation 26, 2347–2360. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10531-017-1359-z
627	Guillemain M., Fritz H. & Duncan P. (2002). Foraging strategies of granivorous dabbling
628	ducks wintering in protected areas of the French Atlantic coast. Biodiversity &
629	<i>Conservation</i> 11, 1721–1732.
630	http://dx.doi.org.ezproxy.is.cuni.cz/10.1023/A:1020322032114
631	Guillemain M., Fritz H. & Guillon N. (2000). Foraging Behavior and Habitat Choice of
632	Wintering Northern Shoveler in a Major Wintering Quarter in France. Waterbirds:
633	The International Journal of Waterbird Biology 23, 353–363.
634	https://doi.org/10.2307/1522173
635	Guillemain M., Champagnon J., Massez G., Pernollet C.A., George T., Momerency A., et al.
636	(2015). Becoming more sedentary? Changes in recovery positions of Mallard Anas
637	platyrhynchos ringed in the Camargue, France, over the last 50 years. Wildfowl 65,
638	51-63
639	Gunnarsson G., Waldenström J. & Fransson T. (2012). Direct and indirect effects of winter
640	harshness on the survival of Mallards Anas platyrhynchos in northwest Europe. Ibis
641	154, 307–317
642	Haase P., Pilotto F., Li F., Sundermann A., Lorenz A.W., Tonkin J.D., et al. (2019). Moderate
643	warming over the past 25 years has already reorganized stream invertebrate
644	communities. Science of The Total Environment 658, 1531–1538.
645	https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2018.12.234

2		
3	646	Hair, J. F. Jr., Anderson, R. E., Tatham, R. L. & Black, W. C. (1995). Multivariate Data
4 5	647	Analysis (3rd edition) New York: Macmillan
6	047	Analysis (51d cutton). New Tork, Machiman.
/ 8	648	Holopainen S., Arzel C., Dessborn L., Elmberg J., Gunnarsson G., Nummi P., et al. (2015).
9 10	649	Habitat use in ducks breeding in boreal freshwater wetlands: a review <i>Europagn</i>
11	049	mathat use in ducks breeding in borear neshwater wenands, a review. European
12 13	650	Journal of Wildlife Research 61, 339-363. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10344-015-0921-
14	651	9
15		_
10	652	Hrdinka, T. (2007). Typology and potential utilization of anthropogenic lakes in mining pits
18		
19 20	653	in the Czech Republic. Limnological Review 7, 29–35.
21	654	Unmall LW & Desar C (2000) North Atlantic climate marichility. The role of the North
22	654	Hurren J.w. & Deser C. (2009). North Atlantic climate variability. The role of the North
23 24	655	Atlantic Oscillation. Journal of Marine Systems 78, 28-41.
25		
26	656	https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jmarsys.2008.11.026
27 28	657	IDCC (2014) Climate Change 2014: Synthesis Depart Contribution of Working Crowns I. H.
29	057	IPCC (2014). Chinate Change 2014. Synthesis Report. Contribution of Working Groups I, II
30 31	658	and III to the Fifth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate
32	650	
33	659	Change [Core Writing Team, R.K. Pachauri and L.A. Meyer (eds.)]. IPCC, Geneva,
34 35	660	Switzerland, 151 pp.
36		
37	661	Jackson M.C., Loewen C.J.G., Vinebrooke R.D. & Chimimba C.T. (2016). Net effects of
38 39	662	
40	662	multiple stressors in freshwater ecosystems: a meta-analysis. Global Change Biology
41 42	663	22, 180–189. https://doi.org/10.1111/gcb.13028
43		
44	664	Jacobsen O.W. & Ugelvik M. (1994). Grazing and vigilance behaviour of breeding Eurasian
45 46		Wissen Anes neurologic in polation to distance from water Wildford 45, 110, 122
47	665	wigeon Anas penerope in relation to distance from water. <i>Wilajowi</i> 45, 119–125
48	666	Janko A.K. Antony M.J. & Stafford J.D. (2017) Long Term Spatial Haterogeneity in
49 50	000	Janke A.K., Anteau W.J. & Stanord J.D. (2017). Long-Term Spatial Heterogeneity in
51	667	Mallard Distribution in the Prairie Pothole Region. Wildlife Society Bulletin
52 53		
54	668	(2011-) 41, 116–124
55		
56 57		
58		

59

1

60

2	
2	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
0	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
1/	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
25	
20	
27	
28	
29	
30	
21	
51	
32	
33	
34	
35	
26	
50	
37	
38	
39	
40	
/1	
42	
42	
43	
44	
45	
46	
17	
4/	
48	
49	
50	
51	
57	
52	
53	
54	
55	
56	
57	
57	
28	
59	

60

669	Jiguet F., Gadot AS., Julliard R., Newson S.E. & Couvet D. (2007). Climate envelope, life
670	history traits and the resilience of birds facing global change. Global Change Biology
671	13 , 1672–1684. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2486.2007.01386.x

Jørgensen P.S., Böhning-Gaese K., Thorup K., Tøttrup A.P., Chylarecki P., Jiguet F., *et al.*(2016). Continent-scale global change attribution in European birds - combining
annual and decadal time scales. *Global Change Biology* 22, 530–543.
https://doi.org/10.1111/gcb.13097

- Kameníková M. & Rajchard J. (2013). Seasonal occurrence and abundance of waterbirds in
 sandpits and fishponds. *EUROPEAN JOURNAL OF ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENCES*
- **678 3**, 48–63
 - 679 Kear J. (2005). Ducks, Geese and Swans: General chapters, species accounts (Anhima to
 680 Salvadorina). Oxford University Press.
 - Kleyheeg E., van Dijk J.G.B., Tsopoglou-Gkina D., Woud T.Y., Boonstra D.K., Nolet B.A., *et al.* (2017). Movement patterns of a keystone waterbird species are highly
 predictable from landscape configuration. *Movement Ecology* 5, 2.
 <u>https://doi.org/10.1186/s40462-016-0092-7</u>
 - Kloskowski J., Green A.J., Polak M., Bustamante J. & Krogulec J. (2009). Complementary
 use of natural and artificial wetlands by waterbirds wintering in Doñana, south-west
 Spain. *Aquatic Conservation: Marine and Freshwater Ecosystems* 19, 815–826.
 <u>https://doi.org/10.1002/aqc.1027</u>
 - Kranstauber, B., Smolla, M., & Safi, K. (2017). Similarity in spatial utilization distributions
 measured by the earth mover's distance. *Methods in Ecology and Evolution* 8(2), 155–
 160.
 - Lehikoinen A., Foppen R.P.B., Heldbjerg H., Lindström Å., van Manen W., Piirainen S., *et al.* (2016). Large-scale climatic drivers of regional winter bird population trends. *Diversity and Distributions* 22, 1163–1173. https://doi.org/10.1111/ddi.12480

2
3
1
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
17
18
19
20
21
22
25
23
24
25
26
27
28
20
20
50
31
32
33
34
35
36
20
3/
38
39
40
41
42
/2
4J 44
44
45
46
47
48
⊿0
50 50
50
51
52
53
54
55
55
50
57
58
59

1

695	Lehikoinen A., Jaatinen K., Vähätalo A.V., Clausen P., Crowe O., Deceuninck B., et al.
696	(2013). Rapid climate driven shifts in wintering distributions of three common
697	waterbird species. Global Change Biology 19, 2071–2081.
698	https://doi.org/10.1111/gcb.12200
699	Lewis B.S., Eichholz M.W., Yerkes T. & Coluccy J. (2019). Food Resources for Wintering
700	and Spring Staging American Black Ducks. Journal of Fish and Wildlife Management
701	10, 492–499. https://doi.org/10.3996/102018-JFWM-096
702	Lind L., Schuler M.S., Hintz W.D., Stoler A.B., Jones D.K., Mattes B.M., et al. (2018). Salty
703	fertile lakes: how salinization and eutrophication alter the structure of freshwater
704	communities. Ecosphere 9, e02383. https://doi.org/10.1002/ecs2.2383
705	Maclean I.M.D., Austin G.E., Rehfisch M.M., Blew J., Crowe O., Delany S., et al. (2008).
706	Climate change causes rapid changes in the distribution and site abundance of birds in
707	winter. Global Change Biology 14, 2489-2500. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-
708	<u>2486.2008.01666.x</u>
709	Musil, P., Cepák, J, Hudec, K. & Zárybnický, J. (2001). The Long-Term Trends in the
710	Breeding Waterfowl Populations in the Czech Republic. OMPO & Institute of Applied
711	Ecology, Kostelec nad Černými lesy.
712	Musil P., Darolová A., Jureček J., Musilová Z., Podhrazský M. & Slabeyová K. (2008). The
713	long-term trends in numbers of wintering geese in the Czech Republic and Slovakia
714	in 1991–2007. Tichodroma 20, 61–67
715	Musil P., Musilová Z., Fuchs R. & Poláková S. (2011). Long-term changes in numbers and
716	distribution of wintering waterbirds in the Czech Republic, 1966–2008. Bird Study 58,
717	450-460. https://doi.org/10.1080/00063657.2011.603289
718	Musil, P. (2006). Effect of Intensive Fish Production on Waterbird Breeding Population:
719	Review of Current Knowledge. In: Boere G. C., Galbraith C. A. & Stroud D. A. (eds.),
720	Waterbirds around the world. TSO Scotland Ltd, Edinburgh, UK. pp 520–521.

Freshwater Biology

3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	
29	
30	
31	
32	
33	
34	
35	
36	
37	
38	
39	
40	
41	
42	
43	
44	
45	
46	
47	
48	
49	
50	
51	
52	
53	
54	
55	
56	
57	
58	
59	

60

721	Musilová Z., Musil P., Zouhar J. & Adam M. (2018a). Changes in habitat suitability influence
722	non-breeding distribution of waterbirds in central Europe. Ibis 160, 582-596.
723	https://doi.org/10.1111/ibi.12559

Musilová Z., Musil P., Zouhar J. & Romportl D. (2015). Long-term trends, total numbers and
 species richness of increasing waterbird populations at sites on the edge of their winter
 range: cold-weather refuge sites are more important than protected sites. *Journal of Ornithology*, 1–10. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10336-015-1223-4

- Musilová Z., Musil P., Zouhar J., Adam M. & Bejček V. (2018b). Importance of Natura 2000
 sites for wintering waterbirds: Low preference, species' distribution changes and
 carrying capacity of Natura 2000 could fail to protect the species. *Biological Conservation* 228, 79–88. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biocon.2018.10.004
- Musilová Z., Musil P., Zouhar J., Bejček V., Šťastný K. & Hudec K. (2014). Numbers of
 wintering waterbirds in the Czech Republic: long-term and spatial-scale approaches
 to assess population size. *Bird Study* 61, 321–331.
 https://doi.org/10.1080/00063657.2014.919573
- Navedo, J. G., Fernández, G., Valdivia, N., Drever, M. C. & Masero, J. A. (2017). Identifying
 management actions to increase foraging opportunities for shorebirds at semi-intensive
 shrimp farms. *Journal of Applied Ecology* 54: 567–576.
- 739 Newton I. (1998). *Population Limitation in Birds*. Academic Press.
- 740 Newton I. (2007). *The Migration Ecology of Birds*, 1 edition. Academic Press, Amsterdam.
- 741 Newton I. (2013). *Bird Populations*, First Edition edition. William Collins.
- Nilsson L. (2008). Changes in numbers and distribution of wintering waterfowl in Sweden
 during forty years, 1967–2006. *Ornis Svecica* 18, 135–226
- Nuijten R.J.M., Wood K.A., Haitjema T., Rees E.C. & Nolet B.A. (2020). Concurrent shifts
 in wintering distribution and phenology in migratory swans: Individual and

746	generational effects. Global Change Biology 26, 4263-4275.
747	https://doi.org/10.1111/gcb.15151
748	Nummi P. & Holopainen S. (2014). Whole-community facilitation by beaver: ecosystem
749	engineer increases waterbird diversity. Aquatic Conservation: Marine and Freshwater
750	Ecosystems 24, 623-633. https://doi.org/10.1002/aqc.2437
751	Nummi P., Väänänen VM., Holopainen S. & Pöysä H. (2016). Duck-fish competition in
752	boreal lakes - a review
753	Oertli, B., Biggs, J., Céréghino, R., Grillas, P., Joly, P & Lachavanne, J. B. (2005).
754	Conservation and monitoring of pond biodiversity: introduction. Aquatic Conservation:
755	Marine and Freshwater Ecosystems 15(6), 535–540
756	Pannekoek, J. & Van Strien, A. J. (2005). TRIM 3 Manual (TRends and Indices for Monitoring
757	Data). Statistics Netherlands, Voorburg, The Netherlands.
758	Parejo M., Gutiérrez J.S., Navedo J.G., Soriano-Redondo A., Abad-Gómez J.M., Villegas A.,
759	et al. (2019). Day and night use of habitats by northern pintails during winter in a
760	primary rice-growing region of Iberia. PLOS ONE 14, e0220400.
761	https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0220400
762	Pavón-Jordán D., Abdou W., Azafzaf H., Balaž M., Bino T., Borg J.J., et al. (2020). Positive
763	impacts of important bird and biodiversity areas on wintering waterbirds under
764	changing temperatures throughout Europe and North Africa. Biological Conservation
765	246, 108549. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biocon.2020.108549
766	Pavón-Jordán D., Clausen P., Dagys M., Devos K., Encarnaçao V., Fox A.D., et al. (2019).
767	Habitat- and species-mediated short- and long-term distributional changes in
768	waterbird abundance linked to variation in European winter weather. Diversity and
769	Distributions 25, 225–239. https://doi.org/10.1111/ddi.12855
770	Pavón-Jordán D., Fox A.D., Clausen P., Dagys M., Deceuninck B., Devos K., et al. (2015).
771	Climate-driven changes in winter abundance of a migratory waterbird in relation to

772	EU protected areas. Diversity and Distributions 21, 571-582.
773	https://doi.org/10.1111/ddi.12300
774	Pechar L. (2000). Impacts of long-term changes in fishery management on the trophic level
775	water quality in Czech fish ponds. Fisheries Management and Ecology 7, 23-31.
776	https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1365-2400.2000.00193.x
777	Petrie M.J., Fleskes J.P., Wolder M.A., Isola C.R., Yarris G.S. & Skalos D.A. (2016). Potential
778	Effects of Drought on Carrying Capacity for Wintering Waterfowl in the Central
779	Valley of California. Journal of Fish and Wildlife Management 7, 408-422.
780	https://doi.org/10.3996/082015-JFWM-082
781	Pilotto F., Kühn I., Adrian R., Alber R., Alignier A., Andrews C., et al. (2020). Meta-analysis
782	of multidecadal biodiversity trends in Europe. Nature Communications 11, 3486.
783	https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-020-17171-y
784	Podhrázský M., Musil P., Musilová Z., Zouhar J., Adam M., Závora J., et al. (2017). Central
785	European Greylag Geese Anser anser show a shortening of migration distance and
786	earlier spring arrival over 60 years. <i>Ibis</i> 159, 352–365.
787	https://doi.org/10.1111/ibi.12440
788	Pullin A.S. (2002). Conservation Biology. Cambridge University Press.
789	Radinger J., Essl F., Hölker F., Horký P., Slavík O. & Wolter C. (2017). The future distribution
790	of river fish: The complex interplay of climate and land use changes, species dispersal
791	and movement barriers. Global Change Biology 23, 4970–4986.
792	https://doi.org/10.1111/gcb.13760
793	Ridgill S.C. & Fox A.D. (1990). Cold Weather Movements of Waterfowl in Western Europe.
794	International Waterfowl and Wetlands Research Bureau.
795	Rogerson, P. A. (2001). Statistical methods for geography. London: Sage.

796	Roy K., Vrba J., Kaushik S.J. & Mraz J. (2020). Feed-based common carp farming and
797	eutrophication: is there a reason for concern? Reviews in Aquaculture 12, 1736–1758.
798	https://doi.org/10.1111/raq.12407
799	Sauter A., Korner-Nievergelt F. & Jenni L. (2010). Evidence of climate change effects on
800	within-winter movements of European Mallards Anas platyrhynchos. Ibis 152, 600-
801	609. <u>https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1474-919X.2010.01028.x</u>
802	Seiche, E. K., Gerdeaux, D., Gwiazda, R., Lévai, F., Musil, P., Nemenonoks, O., Strod, T. &
803	Carss, D. N. (2012). Cormorant-fisheries conflicts in Carp ponds areas in Europe and
804	Israel – an INTERCAFE overview. COST Action 635 Final Report, COST ESF
805	Bussel. 112 pp.
806	Schummer M.L., Kaminski R.M., Raedeke A.H. & Graber D.A. (2010). Weather-Related
807	Indices of Autumn-Winter Dabbling Duck Abundance in Middle North America. The
808	Journal of Wildlife Management 74, 94–101
809	Sinclair A.R.E., Fryxell J.M. & Caughley G. (2006). Wildlife Ecology, Conservation and
810	Management. Wiley.
811	Snow D.W. & Perrins C.M. (1998). The Birds of the Western Palearctic: Concise Edition
812	OUP. Oxford.
813	Soldaat L.L., Pannekoek J., Verweij R.J.T., van Turnhout C.A.M. & van Strien A.J. (2017). A
814	Monte Carlo method to account for sampling error in multi-species indicators.
815	Ecological Indicators 81, 340–347. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolind.2017.05.033
816	Sutherland W.J., Pullin A.S., Dolman P.M. & Knight T.M. (2004). The need for evidence-
817	based conservation. TRENDS in Ecology and Evolution 19
818	Šťastný, K., & Hudec, K. (eds) (2016). Fauna ČR. Ptáci 1. Academia, Praha, 790 pp.

Freshwater Biology

819 Švažas, S., Meissner, W., Serebryakov, V., Kozulin, A., Grishanov, G. (2001). Changes
of Wintering Sites of Waterfowl in Central and Eastern Europe. OMPO & Institute of
821 Ecology, Vilnius.
Tayleur C.M., Devictor V., Gauezere P., Jonzen N., Smith H.G. & Lindstrom A. (2016).
823 Regional variation in climate change winners and losers highlights the rapid loss of
cold-dwelling species. <i>Diversity and Distributions</i> 22, 468–480.
825 <u>https://doi.org/10.1111/ddi.12412</u>
Thomas C.D., Gillingham P.K., Bradbury R.B., Roy D.B., Anderson B.J., Baxter J.M., <i>et al.</i>
827 (2012). Protected areas facilitate species' range expansions. <i>Proceedings of the</i>
828 National Academy of Sciences 109, 14063–14068.
829 <u>https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1210251109</u>
830 Tourenq C., Bennetts R.E., Kowalski H., Vialet E., Lucchesi JL., Kayser Y., et al. (2001).
831 Are ricefields a good alternative to natural marshes for waterbird communities in the
832 Camargue, southern France? <i>Biological Conservation</i> 100 , 335–343.
833 <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/S0006-3207(01)00037-4</u>
Tucker, G. M., & Evans, M. I. (1997). Habitats for birds in Europe. Aconservation strategy
835 for the wider environment. BirdLife International, Cambridge.
836 United Nations Environment Programme. Lakes and reservoirs – similarities, differences and
837 importance. 2017. Retrieved from:
838 <u>http://www.unep.or.jp/ietc/Publications/Short_Series/LakeReservoirs-1/index.asp</u>
839 van der Lee G.H., Vonk J.A., Verdonschot R.C.M., Kraak M.H.S., Verdonschot P.F.M. &
840 Huisman J. Eutrophication induces shifts in the trophic position of invertebrates in
841 aquatic food webs. <i>Ecology</i> . <u>https://doi.org/10.1002/ecy.3275</u>
van Eerden, M. R. (1984). Waterfowl movements in relation to food stocks. In Coastal waders
and wildfowl in winter (ed. P.R. Evans, J.D. Goss-Custard and W.G.Hale), pp 84–100.
844 Cambridge Univ. Press.

3
4
5
6
7
, Q
0
9 10
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
20
29 40
40 1
41
4Z 42
45 44
44 15
45 16
40
47 //Q
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59

1 2

845	Wagner D.L., Grames E.M., Forister M.L., Berenbaum M.R. & Stopak D. (2021). Insect
846	decline in the Anthropocene: Death by a thousand cuts. Proceedings of the National
847	Academy of Sciences 118. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.2023989118

- 848 Wetlands International (2006). Waterbird population estimates. Fourth Edition. Wetlands
 849 International, Wageningen, The Netherlands.
- 850 Wetlands International (2018). Waterbird Population Estimates. Available
 851 at: wpe.wetlands.org (accessed 10 March 2018).
- 852 Wood K.A., Stillman R.A., Wheeler D., Groves S., Hambly C., Speakman J.R., *et al.* (2013a).

Go with the flow: water velocity regulates herbivore foraging decisions in river
catchments. *Oikos* 122, 1720–1729. <u>https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1600-</u>
0706.2013.00592.x

- Wood K.A., Stillman R.A., Coombs T., Mcdonald C., Daunt F. & O'hare M.T. (2013b). The
 role of season and social grouping on habitat use by Mute Swans (Cygnus olor) in a
 lowland river catchment. *Bird Study* 60, 229–237.
- 859 <u>https://doi.org/10.1080/00063657.2013.776003</u>
- 860

861 Data availability statement:

862 The data that support the findings of this study are available from the corresponding author863 upon reasonable request.

4.0

- 864
- 865 Additional Information:
- 866 The authors declare no competing interests.

Freshwater Biology


- Figure 2. Proportion of monitored sites by wetland type and year. Transparent horizontal lines
 - show the proportion of the given wetland type among all 1169 monitored sites.

















Figure 5. Wetland type use according to diet and range shift determinants of the species(graphical abstract).



3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	
29	
30	
31	
32	
33	
34	
35	
36	
37	
38	
39	
40	
41	
42	
43	
44	
45	
46	
47	
48	
49	
50	
51	
52	
53	
54	
55	
56	
5/	
58	

888	Table 1.	List	of	investigated	species	and	its	species-specific	variables	(diet,	species
889	temperatu	ire ind	lex a	and site affini	ty)						

Species		Diet	Species temperature index	Site affinity
Mute Swan	Cygnus olor	herbivore	1.27	0.771
Tundra Been Goose	Anser serrirostris	herbivore	-2.51	0.139
White-fronted Goose	Anser albifrons	herbivore	2.53	0.462
Greylag Goose	Anser anser	herbivore	4.47	0.516
Eurasian Wigeon	Mareca penelope	herbivore	16.53	0.468
Gadwall	Mareca strepera	herbivore	11.73	0.468
Eurasian Teal	Anas crecca	omnivore	12.72	0.572
Mallard	Anas platyrhynchos	omnivore	-0.02	0.747
Northern Pintail	Anas acuta	omnivore	16.9	0.412
Common Pochard	Aythya ferina	omnivore	11.34	0.576
Tufted Duck	Aythya fuligula	invertivore	10.45	0.816
Greater Scaup	Aythya marila	invertivore	0.43	0.487
Velvet Scoter	Melanitta fusca	invertivore	0.69	0.366
Common Goldeneye	Bucephala clangula	invertivore	-1.11	0.627
Smew	Mergellus albellus	piscivore	-1.58	0.515
Common Merganser	Mergus merganser	piscivore	-0.50	0.643
Little Grebe	Tachybaptus ruficollis	invertivore	3.54	0.689
Great Crested Grebe	Podiceps cristatus	piscivore	3.70	0.486
Great Cormorant	Phalacrocorax carbo	piscivore	3.25	0.612
Great Egret	Ardea alba	piscivore	5.41	0.543
Grey Heron	Ardea cinerea	piscivore	4.32	0.757
Common Moorhen	Gallinula chloropus	omnivore	5.61	0.775
Eurasian Coot	Fulica atra	omnivore	5.86	0.758
Black-headed Gull	Chroicoceph. ridibundus	omnivore	6.58	0.691
Mew Gull	Larus canus	omnivore	1.62	0.294

Notes: Species temperature index: the long-term average January temperature (1950–2000)
experienced by individuals of any given species across the species' entire wintering
distribution (Devictor *et al.*, 2008; Jiguet *et al.*, 2007). *Site affinity:* a measure of year-to-year
variation in geographical distribution of the species across the study region. The measure is
bounded between 0 and 1, with the actual range of values being 0.14–0.82 in our data set.See
species-specific variables in methods for details.

Freshwater Biology

896	Table 2. Changes in abundances	of individual species in four	wetland types (the overall	area is also included)
-----	--------------------------------	-------------------------------	----------------------------	------------------------

Species	Reservoirs (overall slope±SE)	trend	Fishponds (overall slope±SE)	trend	Industrial waters (overall slope±SE)	trend	Running waters (overall slope±SE)	trend	All wetlands (overall slope±SE)	Trend	Difference in wetl.types trend (Wald test)
Mute Swan	0.04±0.01	MI**	-0.01±0.00	S	0.03±0.01	MI*	-0.04±0.00	MD**	-0.03±0.00	MD**	200.65***
Tundra Been Goose	0.01±62.66	U	0.09±0.11	U	-0.06 ± 0.05	U	-0.04 ± 0.02	MD*	0.02 ± 0.02	S	0.00 ns.
White-fronted Goose	0.20±4.75	U	0.24±0.51	U	0.23±0.05	SI**	0.08±0.02	MI**	0.16±0.02	SI**	676.92***
Greylag Goose	0.16±0.44	U	0.19±0.06	SI*	0.09±0.03	MI**	0.01±0.01	S	0.13±0.00	SI**	334.18***
Eurasian Wigeon	0.07 ± 0.07	U	0.14±0.09	U	0.16±0.03	SI**	0.02±0.018	MI**	0.07 ± 0.01	SI**	170.32***
Gadwall	0.20±0.11	U	0.15 ± 0.04	SI*	0.28±0.21	U	0.13±0.02	SI**	0.16±0.02	SI**	320.61***
Eurasian Teal	0.00±0.03	U	0.01±0.01	S	0.07 ± 0.02	MI**	-0.01±0.01	MD*	0.00 ± 0.00	S	2.24 ns.
Mallard	0.01 ± 0.01	S	0.01±0.00	MI**	-0.04 ± 0.01	MD**	-0.01 ± 0.00	S	0.00 ± 0.00	S	2.23 ns.
Northern Pintail	0.06 ± 0.07	U	0.11±0.16	U	0.03±0.04	U	-0.01 ± 0.02	S	$0.04{\pm}0.01$	MI*	19.85***
Common Pochard	0.03 ± 0.07	U	-0.08±0.01	SD*	0.11±0.027	SI**	-0.14 ± 0.02	SD**	-0.05 ± 0.00	MD**	284.35***
Tufted Duck	0.11±0.03	SI*	$0.00{\pm}0.01$	S	0.10±0.02	SI**	-0.03 ± 0.00	MD**	0.01 ± 0.00	MI*	4.10*
Greater Scaup	0.17±0.13	U	0.01 ± 0.09	U	0.13±0.08	U	-0.03 ± 0.03	U	0.06 ± 0.02	MI**	33.99***
Velvet Scoter	0.11±0.09	U	-		0.07±0.05	U	-0.10±0.20	U	0.06 ± 0.02	MI**	31.97***
Common Goldeneye	0.09 ± 0.02	SI**	0.05 ± 0.02	MI**	0.11±0.02	SI**	-0.01 ± 0.00	MD*	0.05 ± 0.00	MI**	203.16***
Smew	$0.05 {\pm} 0.07$	U	0.03 ± 0.07	U	0.13±0.04	MI**	0.00±0.01	S	0.03 ± 0.01	MI**	18.18***
Common Merganser	0.03 ± 0.01	MI**	0.07 ± 0.01	SI*	0.07 ± 0.01	MI**	0.02 ± 0.00	MI**	0.03 ± 0.00	MI**	151.26***
Little Grebe	0.03 ± 0.02	U	-0.03 ± 0.02	MD*	0.01 ± 0.02	S	0.01±0.00	MI**	0.01 ± 0.00	MI**	40.12***
Great Crested Grebe	0.05 ± 0.01	MI**	0.08 ± 0.04	MI*	0.07 ± 0.02	MI**	-0.03±0.01	MD*	0.05 ± 0.01	MI**	133.15***
Great Cormorant	$0.04{\pm}0.01$	MI**	0.08 ± 0.01	SI*	0.08 ± 0.01	SI*	0.04 ± 0.00	MI**	0.05 ± 0.00	MI**	296.69***
Great Egret	0.22±0.23	U	0.14 ± 0.01	SI**	$0.19{\pm}0.03$	SI**	0.11±0.01	SI**	0.14 ± 0.01	SI**	795.25***
Grey Heron	-0.02 ± 0.01	MD**	0.03 ± 0.00	MI**	0.02 ± 0.01	S	-0.01 ± 0.00	MD*	0.01 ± 0.00	MI**	13.81***
Common Moorhen	$0.02{\pm}0.04$	U	0.02 ± 0.01	MI*	0.05 ± 0.02	MI*	-0.01 ± 0.01	S	0.00 ± 0.00	S	7.22**
Eurasian Coot	$0.07{\pm}0.01$	SI*	0.01 ± 0.01	S	0.08 ± 0.01	SI**	-0.07 ± 0.00	SD**	-0.02 ± 0.00	MD**	129.51***
Black-headed Gull	0.07 ± 0.04	U	-0.01 ± 0.01	S	-0.06 ± 0.01	MD**	-0.02 ± 0.002	MD**	-0.01 ± 0.00	MD**	19.73***

Freshwater Biology

	Mew Gull	0.06±0.07	U	0.01±0.02	U	0.02±0.01	S	0.02±0.01	S	0.04±0.01	MI**	85.90***
897 898	<i>Notes</i> : (i) * <i>p</i> < 0.05, ** SD – strong decrease, U	p < 0.01, *** p < – uncertain.	< 0.001. ((ii) Categories	of tren	ds: SI – strong	increase	, MI – moderat	e increa	use, S – stable,	MD – mo	oderate decrease,
						42						

899	Table 3. Results of a random-effects negative binomial regression explaining total

900 abundances.

Diet	Reservoirs	Fishponds	Industrial	Running
Harbivoras	0 202	0.895	0.635	0.370
Therofivores	-0.202	(1, 227)	(1, 118)	(0.928)
Omnivores	(0.800) ref	(1.227)	(1.110) ref	(0.928) ref
Ommvores	ICI.	101.	101.	101.
Invertivores	-0.898	-1.996**	0.282	0.113
	(0.731)	(0.740)	(0.570)	(0.725)
Piscivores	-0.597	0.172	0.549	0.593
	(0.746)	(1.138)	(1.059)	(0.978)
Site affinity	0.206	0.627	0.360	1.290**
(standardized)				
	(0.423)	(0.521)	(0.511)	(0.444)
STI (standardized)	-0.914*	-0.248	-0.0483	-0.415
· ·	(0.370)	(0.485)	(0.447)	(0.352)
Year (base = 2020)	0.0557*	0.0147	0.0232	-0.0226
	(0.0270)	(0.0218)	(0.0199)	(0.0150)
Diet × year	, ,	· · · ·	× ,	× ,
Herbivores × year	0.0220	0.0967^{*}	0.0882^{**}	0.0456
	(0.0357)	(0.0377)	(0.0280)	(0.0298)
Invertivores × year	0.0155	-0.0113	0.0847*	0.000531
-	(0.0327)	(0.0225)	(0.0393)	(0.0172)
Piscivorous × year	-0.00951	0.0714*	0.0718**	0.0504*
-	(0.0374)	(0.0308)	(0.0244)	(0.0222)
Site affinity \times year	0.000514	-0.0204*	-0.0238*	0.00214
	(0.0171)	(0.0103)	(0.0114)	(0.0103)
$STI \times year$	-0.000489	0.0198*	0.0275**	0.00853
-	(0.0124)	(0.00967)	(0.0103)	(0.00814)
Constant	6.448***	5.694***	5.765***	5.918***
	(0.624)	(0.888)	(0.921)	(0.725)
$\log(\alpha)$	-0.0724	-0.0724	-0.0724	-0.0724
	(0.121)	(0.121)	(0.121)	(0.121)
var(species random effect)	4.088***	4.088***	4.088***	4.088***
· - · · ·	(1.041)	(1.041)	(1.041)	(1.041)
Observations	3267	3267	3267	3267
p(Different trends by diet)	0.63292	0.00002	0.00512	0.01802

901 Notes: (i) The model specification contains the interactions of *wetland type* with all other 902 covariates. To enhance readability, coefficients are presented in four columns, each related to 903 one wetland type; moreover, the coefficients have been transformed to show the covariate 904 effects *on the given wetland type*. (ii) Robust (Huber-White sandwich) standard errors in 905 parentheses. (iii) * p < 0.05, ** p < 0.01, *** p < 0.001.











	1 Changes in wetland habitat use by waterbirds wintering in Czechia are related to diet and
	2 distribution changes
	3
	4 Zuzana Musilová ^{1*} , Petr Musil ¹ , Jan Zouhar ^{1, 2} , Adéla Šenkýřová ¹ , Diego Pavón-Jordán ³ &
	5 Petri Nummi ⁴
	6
	7
	8 ¹ Faculty of Environmental Sciences, Czech University of Life Sciences Prague, Kamýcká
	9 129, Praha Suchdol, CZ-165 21, Czechia
1	² Department of Econometrics, Prague University of Economics and Business, W. Churchill
1	.1 Sq. 1938/4, 130 67 Prague 3 – Žižkov, Czechia
1	³ Department of Terrestrial Ecology, Norwegian Institute for Nature Research (NINA), P.O.
1	3 Box 5685 Torgarden, N-7485 Trondheim, Norway
1	⁴ Department of Forest Sciences, University of Helsinki, P.O. Box 27, FI-00014, Finland
1	.5
1	.6 *Corresponding author: musilovaz@fzp.czu.cz; orcid: 0000-0001-5344-7445
1	.7
1	8 Keywords: wetland type; range-shift drivers; waterbirds; long-term monitoring; artificial
1	.9 wetlands
	1

2
3
1
4
5
6
7
0
0
9
10
11
12
12
13
14
15
16
17
17
18
19
20
 21
∠ ı 22
22
23
24
25
20
20
27
28
29
20
50
31
32
33
31
25
35
36
37
38
20
39
40
41
42
12
-T-J
44
45
46
47
10
40
49
50
51
52
52
53
54
55
55
56
56 57
56 57
56 57 58

1

20	Abstract	
21	1. Understanding species habitat use and factors affecting changes in their distributions are	
22	necessary to promote the conservation of any biological community. We evaluated the changes	
23	in wetland use of the non-breeding waterbird community. Based on long-term citizen-science	
24	data (1988-2020), we tested the hypotheses that wetland use is associated with species diet	
25	and potential range-shift drivers (the tendency to occupy the same sites in consecutive years -	
26	site affinityconservatism and the species' average temperature across its wintering range -	
27	<u>STI</u>).	
28	2. We analysed species-specific wetland use of 25 species of waterbirds wintering in Czechia	
29	over a period of 33 years. The analysesdata explained variability in trends in numbers of the	_
30	studied waterbird species across four inland wetland types: reservoirs, fishponds, industrial	
31	waters created by flooding of former mining sites, and running waters.	
32	3. Trends in waterbird abundance positively correlated with sSpecies' diet significantly	
33	correlated with their trends in numbers on fishponds, industrial and running waters. Among	
34	the diet groups, iInvertivores showed the largest increase in abundancesnumbers among the	
35	diet groups oin industrial waters, closely followed by herbivores. Herbivores showed the	
36	largest increase in abundancesnumbers in fishponds, and piscivores did so in running waters.	
37	Regarding range-shift drivers, sSpecies with higher site affinityeonservatism showed higher	
38	abundancesnumbers on running waters, while eold dwelling species with low STI (i.e.	
39	wintering on average in sites with lower temperature) were more abundant on reservoirs. The	_
		1

40 <u>abundancenumber</u> of both warm-dwelling and <u>less conservative</u> species <u>with low site affinity</u>

41 increased on fishponds and industrial waters.

- 42 4. Our findings suggest that the increased importance <u>offer the inland-wetland typess</u>
- 43 <u>considered here</u> for wintering waterbirds is likely linked to <u>diet related</u> food-driven changes in
- 44 habitat use and changes in species distributions; and highlight the general pattern that
- 45 wintering waterbirds are expected to select sites with higher availability of food, higher energy
- 46 content and lower foraging cost.

Commented [ZM1]: AG2: data don't explain anything. Your analyses may.

Commented [MP2R2]: The sentence was amended.

Commented [ZM3]: AG3: the reader cannot know what you mean, unless you define your measure properly above

Commented [DPJ4R4]: We have defined STI above, and it is also explained here again between brackets.

Comme	ented [ZM8R8]: The sentence was amended.
Comme food supply. I	ented [ZM7]: AG5: you don't study changes in Maybe "diet related changes"
Comme	ented [MP6R6]: The sentence was amended.
your wetland	s are "inland"?
Comme	ented IZM51: AG4: these seems wrong here. All

5. Recent and rapid changes in species distributions may lead to a decrease in the effectiveness
of national and international conservation efforts. When planning conservation measures, it
should be kept in mind that, climate change does not only imply only-large-scale north/northeastwards shifts of entire waterbird_distributions, but can also modify the use of the habitats
and their use by waterbird species inside their wintering-traditional wintering range.

54 Introduction

55	The extent of wetland habitats of natural origin has decreased worldwide, especially during
56	the last century (Davidson, 2014; Kingsford, Basset & Jackson, 2016; O'Hare et al., 2018). In
57	Europe, for example, two thirds of all natural wetlands have disappeared in the past century
58	(Čižková et al., 2013). Although the loss of natural inland wetlands has been partially offset
59	by the creation of man-made inland freshwater wetlands such as fishponds, reservoirs, and
60	industrial waters (including gravel lakes, sandpit lakes, flooded areas after mining, and settling
61	ponds), these differ in their physical and ecological characteristics (Tucker & Evans, 1997).
62	The importance of inland freshwater wetlands is increasing because elimate warming is
63	shifting the zero-degree isotherm (i.e. average aerial temperature of 0 °C in January) (Pavón-
64	Jordán et al., 2015, 2019, Musilová, Musil, Zouhar & Adam, 2018a). Some species are rapidly
65	responding to this phenomenon by altering their migratory behaviour (Sauter et al., 2010;
66	Gunnarsson, Waldenström & Fransson, 2012; Podhrazský et al., 2017, Adam et al., 2015) to
67	adjust to the new environmental conditions, consequently reducing the high mortality risk and
68	energetic cost of a long migration (Newton, 2007) to minimise energy expenditure for
69	thermoregulation during winter (Ridgill & Fox, 1990; Musil et al., 2008; Dalby et al., 2013a).
70	This is especially evident in central European inland wetlands (both natural and of man-made
71	origin), which have become increasingly important for wintering waterbirds in recent decades
72	(Fox et al., 2010; Musil, Musilová, Fuchs & Poláková, 2011; Beekman et al., 2019), due to
73	the redistribution of the abundance of many species (Ridgill & Fox 1990, Rainio et al., 2006,
74	Podhrázský et al., 2017; Pavón-Jordán et al., 2019) and range shifts (Lehikoinen et al., 2013) 3

2
2
3
4
5
6
7
/
8
9
10
11
12
12
13
14
15
16
17
17
18
19
20
21
י <u>-</u> רר
22
23
24
25
26
20
27
28
29
30
21
21
32
33
34
35
26
50
37
38
39
40
лто Л 1
41
42
43
44
45
46
40
47
48
49
50
50
21
52
53
54
55
55
56
57
58
59
~ ~

1

 probably linked to the above-mentioned behavioural changes in response to climate change. These wetlands attract about four million waterbirds every winter (Wetlands International, 2018, see also http://www.wetlands.org). Moreover, wintering waterbird numbers have increased in this region in the past decades (Keller, 2011; Musil, Musilová, Fuchs & Poláková, 2011, Wetlands International, 2018). Hence, recent changes in central European winter weather creates favourable conditions that likely provide adequate foraging and safety opportunities throughout the wintering period (Svazas <i>et al.</i>, 2001; Nilsson, 2008)] Acquiring linformation regarding habitat use of different species (including and the temporal changes). taking place in the habitat use is crucial for-proposing effective conservation measures (Pullin, 2002; Angert <i>et al.</i>, 2011; Dawson <i>et al.</i>, 2011; Davis <i>et al.</i>, 2014). Such information is especially. The relevantee in the context of ongoing of thise issue knowledge of habitat use increases, especially now-when species are undergoing-climate-driven changes in species distributions ehanges (Maclean <i>et al.</i>, 2008; Chen <i>et al.</i>, 2011; Podhrázský <i>et al.</i>, 2017; Pavón-Jordán <i>et al.</i>, 2019). The non-breeding distribution and habitat use of many waterbirds have changed considerably during recent decades, with new important wintering areas being established in northern and eastern Europe (Lehikoinen <i>et al.</i>, 2013; Nuijten <i>et al.</i>, 2012; Pavón-Jordán <i>et al.</i>, 2015; Musilová, Musil, Zouhar & Adam, 2018a; Tavón-Jordán <i>et al.</i>, 2020, It is assumed that tThis development-phenomenon has been is-linked to climate-driven range changes and redistribution of abundances (Maclean <i>et al.</i>, 2008; Thomas <i>et al.</i>, 2012; Pavón-Jordán <i>et al.</i>, 2015; Musilová, Musil, Zouhar & Adam, 2018a; Pavón-Jordán <i>et al.</i>, 2020. Climate<th></th><th></th>		
 These wetlands attract about four million waterbirds every winter (Wetlands International, 2018; see also http://www.wetlands.org). Moreover, wintering waterbird numbers have increased in this region in the past decades (Keller, 2011; Musil, Musilová, Fuchs & Poláková, 2011; Wetlands International, 2018). Hence, recent changes in central European winter weather creates favourable conditions that likely provide adequate foraging and safety opportunities throughout the wintering period (Svažas <i>et al.</i>, 2001; Nilsson, 2008). Acquiring linformation regarding habitat use of different species (including and the temporal changes) -taking place in the habitat use is crucial for - proposing effective conservation measures (Pullin, 2002; Angert <i>et al.</i>, 2011; Dawson <i>et al.</i>, 2011; Davis <i>et al.</i>, 2014). Such information is especially The relevantee in the context of ongoing of thise issue knowledge of habitat use increases, especially now when species are undergoing climate-driven changes in species distributions ehanges (Maclean <i>et al.</i>, 2008; Chen <i>et al.</i>, 2011; Podhrázský <i>et al.</i>, 2017; Pavón-Jordán <i>et al.</i>, 2013; Nuijten <i>et al.</i>, 2020). It is assumed that This development phenomenon has been is linked to climate-driven range changes and redistribution of abundances (Maclean <i>et al.</i>, 2008; Thomas <i>et al.</i>, 2012; Pavón-Jordán <i>et al.</i>, 2015; Musilová, Musil, Zouhar & Adam, 2018a; Pavón-Jordán <i>et al.</i>, 2020). Climate fin addition to using newly available northern coastal areas around the Baltic Sea (Lehkoinen et al., 2013), many wintering waterbirds are progressively using inland waters in east and central Europe to a greater extent when compared to the 1990s (Musilová, Musil, Zouhar & Adam, 2018a; see also Guillemain & Heam, 2017; Pavón-Jordán <i>et al.</i>, 2020). Climate warming is shifting the zero-degree isotherm (i.e. avera	75	probably linked to the above-mentioned behavioural changes in response to climate change.
772018; see-also http://www.etlands.org). Moreover, wintering waterbird numbers have78increased in this region in the past decades (Keller, 2011, Musil, Musilová, Fuchs & Poláková,792011; Wetlands International, 2018). Hence, recent changes in central European winter80weather creates favourable conditions that likely provide adequate foraging and safety81opportunities throughout the wintering period (Svažas <i>et al.</i> , 2001; Nilsson, 2008).82Acquiring Ijnformation regarding habitat use of different species (including and the temporal83changes)_taking-place in the habitat use is crucial for-proposing effective conservation84measures (Pullin, 2002; Angert <i>et al.</i> , 2011; Dawson <i>et al.</i> , 2011; Davis <i>et al.</i> , 2014). Such85information is especially. The relevantee in the context of ongoing of thise issue knowledge of86habitat use increases, especially now when species are undergoing climate-driven changes in87species distributions changes (Maclean <i>et al.</i> , 2008; Chen <i>et al.</i> , 2011; Podhrázský <i>et al.</i> , 2017;88Pavón-Jordán <i>et al.</i> , 2019).89The non-breeding distribution and habitat use of many waterbirds have changed considerably90during recent decades, with new important wintering areas being established in northern and91eastern Europe (Lehikoinen <i>et al.</i> , 2013; Nuijten <i>et al.</i> , 2020). It is assumed that -tThis92development phenomenon has been ise linked to climate-driven range changes and93redistribution of abundances (Maclean <i>et al.</i> , 2008; Thomas <i>et al.</i> , 2012; Pavón-Jordán <i>et al.</i> ,942015; Musilová, Musil, Zouhar & Adam, 2018a; Pa	76	These wetlands attract about four million waterbirds every winter (Wetlands International,
78increased in this region in the past decades (Keller, 2011, Musil, Musilová, Fuche & Poláková,792011, Wetlands International, 2018). Hence, recent changes in central European winter80weather creates favourable conditions that likely provide adequate foraging and safety81opportunities throughout the wintering period (Svažas <i>et al.</i> , 2001, Nilsson, 2008)]82Acquiring Ijnformation regarding habitat use of different species (including and the temporal83changes)_taking place in the habitat use of different species (including and the temporal84changes)_taking place in the habitat use of curve at al., 2011; Davis <i>et al.</i> , 2014). Such85information is especially. The relevantee in the context of ongoing of thise issue knowledge of86habitat use increases, especially now when species are undergoing climate-driven changes in87species distributions changes (Maclean <i>et al.</i> , 2008; Chen <i>et al.</i> , 2011; Podhrázský <i>et al.</i> , 2017;88Pavón-Jordán <i>et al.</i> , 2019).89The non-breeding distribution and habitat use of many waterbirds have changed considerably90during recent decades, with new important wintering areas being established in northern and91eastern Europe (Lehikoinen <i>et al.</i> , 2013; Nuijten <i>et al.</i> , 2020). H is assumed that (This92development—phenomenon has been is—linked to climate-driven range changes and93reditribution of abundances (Maclean <i>et al.</i> , 2008; Thomas <i>et al.</i> , 2012; Pavón-Jordán <i>et al.</i> ,942015; Musilová, Musil, Zouhar & Adam, 2018a; Pavón-Jordán <i>et al.</i> , 2020). Climate98Adam, 2018a; see also Guillemain & Hearn, 2017; Pavón-Jo	77	2018; see also http://iwc.wetlands.org). Moreover, wintering waterbird numbers have
 2011; Wetlands International, 2018). Hence, recent changes in central European winter weather creates favourable conditions that likely provide adequate foraging and safety opportunities throughout the wintering period (Sva2as <i>et al.</i>, 2001; Nilsson, 2008). Acquiring Ijnformation regarding habitat use of different species (including and the temporal changes) taking place in the habitat use is crucial for proposing effective conservation measures (Pullin, 2002; Angert <i>et al.</i>, 2011; Dawson <i>et al.</i>, 2011; Davis <i>et al.</i>, 2014). Such information is especially The relevantee in the context of ongoing of thise issue knowledge of habitat use increases, especially now when species are undergoing climate-driven changes in species distributions ehanges (Maclean <i>et al.</i>, 2008; Chen <i>et al.</i>, 2011; Podhrázský <i>et al.</i>, 2017; Pavón-Jordán <i>et al.</i>, 2019). [The non-breeding distribution and habitat use of many waterbirds have changed considerably during recent decades, with new important wintering areas being established in northern and eastern Europe (Lehikoinen <i>et al.</i>, 2013; Nuijten <i>et al.</i>, 2012; Pavón-Jordán <i>et al.</i>, 2015; Musilová, Musil, Zouhar & Adam, 2018a; Pavón-Jordán <i>et al.</i>, 2019). In addition to using newly available northern coastal areas around the Baltic Sea (Lehikoinen et al., 2013), many wintering waterbirds are progressively using inland waters in east and central Europe to a greater extent when compared to the 1990s (Musilová, Musil, Zouhar & Adam, 2018a; see also Guillemain & Hearn, 2017; Pavón-Jordán <i>et al.</i>, 2020). Climate warming is shifting the zero-degree isotherm (i.e. average aerial temperature of 0 °C in January) and thus increasing also the availability of free-ice [The increased use of importance of inland freshwater wetlands is now feasibleincreasing because— in this region elimate warmin	78	increased in this region in the past decades (Keller, 2011; Musil, Musilová, Fuchs & Poláková,
 weather creates favourable conditions that likely provide adequate foraging and safety opportunities throughout the wintering period (Svažas <i>et al.</i>, 2001; Nilsson, 2008) <u>Acquiring</u> Iinformation regarding habitat use of different species (including and the temporal changes) taking place in the habitat use is crucial for proposing effective conservation measures (Pullin, 2002; Angert <i>et al.</i>, 2011; Dawson <i>et al.</i>, 2011; Davis <i>et al.</i>, 2014). Such information is especially The relevantee in the context of ongoing of thise issue knowledge of habitat use increases, especially now when species are undergoing climate-driven changes in species distributions ehanges (Maclean <i>et al.</i>, 2008; Chen <i>et al.</i>, 2011; Podhrázský <i>et al.</i>, 2017; Pavón-Jordán <i>et al.</i>, 2019). The non-breeding distribution and habitat use of many waterbirds have changed considerably during recent decades, with new important wintering areas being established in northern and eastern Europe (Lehikoinen <i>et al.</i>, 2013; Nuijten <i>et al.</i>, 2012; Pavón-Jordán <i>et al.</i>, 2015; Musilová, Musil, Zouhar & Adam, 2018a; Pavón-Jordán <i>et al.</i>, 2019). In addition to using newly available northern coastal areas around the Baltic Sea (Lehikoinen et al., 2013), many wintering waterbirds are progressively using inland waters in east and central Europe to a greater extent when compared to the 1990s (Musilová, Musil, Zouhar & Adam, 2018a; see also Guillemain & Hearn, 2017; Pavón-Jordán <i>et al.</i>, 2020). Climate warming is shifting the zero-degree isotherm (i.e. average aerial temperature of 0 °C in January) and thus increasing also the availability of free-ice [The increased use of importance of -inland freshwater wetlands -is now feusibleinerasing because - in this region elimate warming is shifting the zero-degree isotherm (i.e. average aerial temperature of 0 °C in 	79	2011; Wetlands International, 2018). Hence, recent changes in central European winter
 apportunities throughout the wintering period (Švažas <i>et al.</i>, 2001, Nilsson, 2008) Acquiring linformation regarding habitat use of different species (including and the-temporal changes)taking-place-in-the-habitat-use-is crucial for_proposing effective conservation measures (Pullin, 2002; Angert <i>et al.</i>, 2011; Dawson <i>et al.</i>, 2011; Davis <i>et al.</i>, 2014). Such information is especially The-relevante in the context of ongoing of thise issue knowledge of habitat-use-increases, especially now when species are undergoing-climate-driven changes in species distributions ehanges (Maclean <i>et al.</i>, 2008; Chen <i>et al.</i>, 2011; Podhrázský <i>et al.</i>, 2017; Pavón-Jordán <i>et al.</i>, 2019). The non-breeding distribution and habitat use of many waterbirds have changed considerably during recent decades, with new important wintering areas being established in northern and eastern Europe (Lehikoinen <i>et al.</i>, 2013; Nuijten <i>et al.</i>, 2020). It is assumed that tThis development_phenomenon has been is—linked to climate-driven range changes and redistribution of abundances (Maclean <i>et al.</i>, 2008; Thomas <i>et al.</i>, 2012; Pavón-Jordán <i>et al.</i>, 2015; Musilová, Musil, Zouhar & Adam, 2018a; Pavón-Jordán <i>et al.</i>, 2019). In addition to using newly available northern coastal areas around the Baltic Sea (Lehikoinen et al., 2013), many wintering waterbirds are progressively using inland waters in east and central Europe to a greater extent when compared to the 1990s (Musilová, Musil, Zouhar & Adam, 2018a; see also Guillemain & Hearn, 2017; Pavón-Jordán <i>et al.</i>, 2020). Climate warming is shifting the zero-degree isotherm (i.e. average aerial temperature of 0 °C in January) and thus increasing also the availability of free-ice The increased use of importance of inland freshwater wetlands is now feasibleincreasing because— in this region elimate to the term of 0 °C in January) and thus increasing also the availability of free-ice The increased use of importance of this is shifting the zero-degree isotherm	80	weather creates favourable conditions that likely provide adequate foraging and safety
Acquiring Iinformation regarding habitat use of different species (including and the-temporal changes)taking place in the habitat use is crucial forproposing effective conservation measures (Pullin, 2002; Angert <i>et al.</i> , 2011; Dawson <i>et al.</i> , 2011; Davis <i>et al.</i> , 2014). Such information is especially The-relevantee in the context of ongoing of thise issue knowledge of habitat use increases, especially now when species are undergoing climate-driven changes in species distributions ehanges (Maclean <i>et al.</i> , 2008; Chen <i>et al.</i> , 2011; Podhrázský <i>et al.</i> , 2017; Pavón-Jordán <i>et al.</i> , 2019). The non-breeding distribution and habitat use of many waterbirds have changed considerably during recent decades, with new important wintering areas being established in northern and eastern Europe (Lehikoinen <i>et al.</i> , 2013; Nuijten <i>et al.</i> , 2020). It-is-assumed that-tThis development_phenomenon has been is-linked to climate-driven range changes and redistribution of abundances (Maclean <i>et al.</i> , 2018a; Pavón-Jordán <i>et al.</i> , 2019). In addition to using newly available northern coastal areas around the Baltic Sea (Lehikoinen et al., 2015; Musilová, Musil, Zouhar & Adam, 2018a; Pavón-Jordán <i>et al.</i> , 2019). In addition to using newly available northern coastal areas around the Baltic Sea (Lehikoinen et al., 2013), many wintering waterbirds are progressively using inland waters in east and central Europe to a greater extent when compared to the 1990s (Musilová, Musil, Zouhar & Adam, 2017; Pavón-Jordán <i>et al.</i> , 2020). Climate warming is shifting the zero-degree isotherm (i.e. average aerial temperature of 0 °C in January) and thus increasing also the availabileincreasing because— in this region elimate warming is shifting the zero-degree isotherm (i.e. average aerial temperature of 0 °C in January) and thus increasing also the availability of free-ice [The increased use of importance of infinite is shifting the zero-degree isotherm (i.e. average aerial temperature of 0 °C in January) and thus inc	81	opportunities throughout the wintering period (Švažas et al., 2001; Nilsson, 2008).
 changes) <u>taking place in the habitat use is crucial for proposing effective conservation</u> measures (Pullin, 2002; Angert <i>et al.</i>, 2011; Dawson <i>et al.</i>, 2011; Davis <i>et al.</i>, 2014). Such information is especially The relevantee in the context of ongoing of thise issue knowledge of habitat use increases, especially now when species are undergoing climate-driven changes in species distributions ehanges (Maclean <i>et al.</i>, 2008; Chen <i>et al.</i>, 2011; Podhrázský <i>et al.</i>, 2017; Pavón-Jordán <i>et al.</i>, 2019). The non-breeding distribution and habitat use of many waterbirds have changed considerably during recent decades, with new important wintering areas being established in northern and eastern Europe (Lehikoinen <i>et al.</i>, 2013; Nuijten <i>et al.</i>, 2020). It is assumed that tThis development phenomenon has been is linked to climate-driven range changes and redistribution of abundances (Maclean <i>et al.</i>, 2008; Thomas <i>et al.</i>, 2012; Pavón-Jordán <i>et al.</i>, 2015; Musilová, Musil, Zouhar & Adam, 2018a; Pavón-Jordán <i>et al.</i>, 2019). In addition to using newly available northern coastal areas around the Baltic Sea (Lehikoinen et al., 2013), many wintering waterbirds are progressively using inland waters in east and central Europe to a greater extent when compared to the 1990s (Musilová, Musil, Zouhar & Adam, 2018a; see also Guillemain & Hearn, 2017; Pavón-Jordán <i>et al.</i>, 2020). Climate warming is shifting the zero-degree isotherm (i.e. average aerial temperature of 0 °C in January) and thus increasing also the availability of free-ice [The increased use of importance of inland freshwater wetlands is now feasibleincreasing because in this region climate warming is shifting the zero degree isotherm (i.e. average aerial temperature of 0 °C in 	82	Acquiring Information regarding habitat use of different species (including and the temporal
 measures (Pullin, 2002; Angert <i>et al.</i>, 2011; Dawson <i>et al.</i>, 2011; Davis <i>et al.</i>, 2014). Such information is especially The-relevantee in the context of ongoing of thise issue knowledge of habitat use increases, especially now when species are undergoing climate-driven changes in species distributions ehanges (Maclean <i>et al.</i>, 2008; Chen <i>et al.</i>, 2011; Podhrázský <i>et al.</i>, 2017; Pavón-Jordán <i>et al.</i>, 2019). The non-breeding distribution and habitat use of many waterbirds have changed considerably during recent decades, with new important wintering areas being established in northern and eastern Europe (Lehikoinen <i>et al.</i>, 2013; Nuijten <i>et al.</i>, 2020). It is assumed that tThis development phenomenon has been is—linked to climate-driven range changes and redistribution of abundances (Maclean <i>et al.</i>, 2008; Thomas <i>et al.</i>, 2012; Pavón-Jordán <i>et al.</i>, 2015; Musilová, Musil, Zouhar & Adam, 2018a; Pavón-Jordán <i>et al.</i>, 2019). In addition to using newly available northern coastal areas around the Baltic Sea (Lehikoinen et al., 2013), many wintering waterbirds are progressively using inland waters in east and central Europe to a greater extent when compared to the 1990s (Musilová, Musil, Zouhar & Adam, 2018a; see also Guillemain & Hearn, 2017; Pavón-Jordán <i>et al.</i>, 2020). Climate warming is shifting the zero-degree isotherm (i.e. average aerial temperature of 0 °C in January) and thus increasing also the availability of free-ice [The increased use of importance of-inland freshwater wetlands-is now feasibleincreasing hecause_ in this region climate warming is shifting the zero-degree isotherm (i.e. average aerial temperature of 0 °C in 	83	changes) - taking place in the habitat use is crucial for - proposing effective conservation
 information is especially The relevantee in the context of ongoing of thise issue knowledge of habitat use increases, especially now when species are undergoing climate-driven changes in species distributiong ehanges (Maclean <i>et al.</i>, 2008; Chen <i>et al.</i>, 2011; Podhrázský <i>et al.</i>, 2017; Pavón-Jordán <i>et al.</i>, 2019). The non-breeding distribution and habitat use of many waterbirds have changed considerably during recent decades, with new important wintering areas being established in northern and eastern Europe (Lehikoinen <i>et al.</i>, 2013; Nuijten <i>et al.</i>, 2020). It is assumed that tThis development phenomenon has been is linked to climate-driven range changes and redistribution of abundances (Maclean <i>et al.</i>, 2008; Thomas <i>et al.</i>, 2012; Pavón-Jordán <i>et al.</i>, 2015; Musilová, Musil, Zouhar & Adam, 2018a; Pavón-Jordán <i>et al.</i>, 2019). In addition to using newly available northern coastal areas around the Baltic Sea (Lehikoinen et al., 2013), many wintering waterbirds are progressively using inland waters in east and central Europe to a greater extent when compared to the 1990s (Musilová, Musil, Zouhar & Adam, 2018a; see also Guillemain & Hearn, 2017; Pavón-Jordán <i>et al.</i>, 2020). Climate warming is shifting the zero-degree isotherm (i.e. average aerial temperature of 0 °C in January) and thus increasing also the availability of free-ice The increased use of importance of inland freshwater wetlands is now feasibleinereasing because in this region elimate 	84	measures (Pullin, 2002; Angert et al., 2011; Dawson et al., 2011; Davis et al., 2014). Such
 habitat use increases, especially now when species are undergoing climate-driven changes in species distributions changes (Maclean <i>et al.</i>, 2008; Chen <i>et al.</i>, 2011; Podhrázský <i>et al.</i>, 2017; Pavón-Jordán <i>et al.</i>, 2019). The non-breeding distribution and habitat use of many waterbirds have changed considerably during recent decades, with new important wintering areas being established in northern and eastern Europe (Lehikoinen <i>et al.</i>, 2013; Nuijten <i>et al.</i>, 2020). It is assumed that tThis development—phenomenon has been is—linked to climate-driven range changes and redistribution to abundances (Maclean <i>et al.</i>, 2008; Thomas <i>et al.</i>, 2012; Pavón-Jordán <i>et al.</i>, 2015; Musilová, Musil, Zouhar & Adam, 2018a; Pavón-Jordán <i>et al.</i>, 2019). In addition to using newly available northern coastal areas around the Baltic Sea (Lehikoinen et al., 2013), many wintering waterbirds are progressively using inland waters in east and central Europe to a greater extent when compared to the 1990s (Musilová, Musil, Zouhar & Adam, 2018a; see also Guillemain & Hearn, 2017; Pavón-Jordán <i>et al.</i>, 2020). Climate warming is shifting the zero-degree isotherm (i.e. average aerial temperature of 0 °C in January) and thus increasing also the availability of free-ice The increased use of importance of inland freshwater wetlands is now feasibleincreasing because— in this region elimate warming is shifting the zero-degree isotherm (i.e. average aerial temperature of 0 °C in 	85	information is especially The relevantee in the context of ongoing of thise issue knowledge of
 species distributions ehanges (Maclean et al., 2008; Chen et al., 2011; Podhrázský et al., 2017; Pavón-Jordán et al., 2019). The non-breeding distribution and habitat use of many waterbirds have changed considerably during recent decades, with new important wintering areas being established in northern and eastern Europe (Lehikoinen et al., 2013; Nuijten et al., 2020). It is assumed that tThis development phenomenon has been is linked to climate-driven range changes and redistribution of abundances (Maclean et al., 2008; Thomas et al., 2012; Pavón-Jordán et al., 2015; Musilová, Musil, Zouhar & Adam, 2018a; Pavón-Jordán et al., 2019). In addition to using newly available northern coastal areas around the Baltic Sea (Lehikoinen et al., 2013), many wintering waterbirds are progressively using inland waters in east and central Europe to a greater extent when compared to the 1990s (Musilová, Musil, Zouhar & Adam, 2018a; see also Guillemain & Hearn, 2017; Pavón-Jordán et al., 2020). Climate warming is shifting the zero-degree isotherm (i.e. average aerial temperature of 0 °C in January) and thus increasing also the availability of free-ice [The increased use of importance of inland freshwater wetlands-is now feasibleincreasing because- in this region elimate warming is shifting the zero-degree isotherm (i.e. average aerial temperature of 0 °C in 	86	habitat use increases, especially now when species are undergoing climate-driven changes in
 Pavón-Jordán <i>et al.</i>, 2019). The non-breeding distribution and habitat use of many waterbirds have changed considerably during recent decades, with new important wintering areas being established in northern and eastern Europe (Lehikoinen <i>et al.</i>, 2013; Nuijten <i>et al.</i>, 2020). It is assumed that (This development phenomenon has been is—linked to climate-driven range changes and redistribution of abundances (Maclean <i>et al.</i>, 2008; Thomas <i>et al.</i>, 2012; Pavón-Jordán <i>et al.</i>, 2015; Musilová, Musil, Zouhar & Adam, 2018a; Pavón-Jordán <i>et al.</i>, 2019). In addition to using newly available northern coastal areas around the Baltic Sea (Lehikoinen et al., 2013), many wintering waterbirds are progressively using inland waters in east and central Europe to a greater extent when compared to the 1990s (Musilová, Musil, Zouhar & Adam, 2018a; see also Guillemain & Hearn, 2017; Pavón-Jordán <i>et al.</i>, 2020). Climate warming is shifting the zero-degree isotherm (i.e. average aerial temperature of 0 °C in January) and thus increasing also the availability of free-ice The increased use of importance of -inland freshwater wetlands is now feasibleincreasing because - in this region elimate warming is shifting the zero-degree isotherm (i.e. average aerial temperature of 0 °C in 	87	species distributions ehanges (Maclean et al., 2008; Chen et al., 2011; Podhrázský et al., 2017;
 The non-breeding distribution and habitat use of many waterbirds have changed considerably during recent decades, with new important wintering areas being established in northern and eastern Europe (Lehikoinen <i>et al.</i>, 2013; Nuijten <i>et al.</i>, 2020). It is assumed that tThis development phenomenon has been is linked to climate-driven range changes and redistribution of abundances (Maclean <i>et al.</i>, 2008; Thomas <i>et al.</i>, 2012; Pavón-Jordán <i>et al.</i>, 2015; Musilová, Musil, Zouhar & Adam, 2018a; Pavón-Jordán <i>et al.</i>, 2019). In addition to using newly available northern coastal areas around the Baltic Sea (Lehikoinen et al., 2013), many wintering waterbirds are progressively using inland waters in east and central Europe to a greater extent when compared to the 1990s (Musilová, Musil, Zouhar & Adam, 2018a; see also Guillemain & Hearn, 2017; Pavón-Jordán <i>et al.</i>, 2020). Climate warming is shifting the zero-degree isotherm (i.e. average aerial temperature of 0 °C in January) and thus increasing also the availability of free-ice The increased use of importance of inland freshwater wetlands is now feasibleincreasing because in this region elimate warming is shifting the zero-degree isotherm (i.e. average aerial temperature of 0 °C in 	88	Pavón-Jordán et al., 2019).
 during recent decades, with new important wintering areas being established in northern and eastern Europe (Lehikoinen <i>et al.</i>, 2013; Nuijten <i>et al.</i>, 2020). It is assumed that tThis development phenomenon has been is linked to climate-driven range changes and redistribution of abundances (Maclean <i>et al.</i>, 2008; Thomas <i>et al.</i>, 2012; Pavón-Jordán <i>et al.</i>, 2015; Musilová, Musil, Zouhar & Adam, 2018a; Pavón-Jordán <i>et al.</i>, 2019). In addition to using newly available northern coastal areas around the Baltic Sea (Lehikoinen et al., 2013), many wintering waterbirds are progressively using inland waters in east and central Europe to a greater extent when compared to the 1990s (Musilová, Musil, Zouhar & Adam, 2018a; see also Guillemain & Hearn, 2017; Pavón-Jordán <i>et al.</i>, 2020). Climate warming is shifting the zero-degree isotherm (i.e. average aerial temperature of 0 °C in January) and thus increasing also the availability of free-ice The increased use of importance of-inland freshwater wetlands is now feasibleinereasing because in this region elimate warming is shifting the zero-degree isotherm (i.e. average aerial temperature of 0 °C in 	89	The non-breeding distribution and habitat use of many waterbirds have changed considerably
 eastern Europe (Lehikoinen <i>et al.</i>, 2013; Nuijten <i>et al.</i>, 2020). It is assumed that tThis development phenomenon has been is—linked to climate-driven range changes and redistribution of abundances (Maclean <i>et al.</i>, 2008; Thomas <i>et al.</i>, 2012; Pavón-Jordán <i>et al.</i>, 2015; Musilová, Musil, Zouhar & Adam, 2018a; Pavón-Jordán <i>et al.</i>, 2019). In addition to using newly available northern coastal areas around the Baltic Sea (Lehikoinen et al., 2013), many wintering waterbirds are progressively using inland waters in east and central Europe to a greater extent when compared to the 1990s (Musilová, Musil, Zouhar & Adam, 2018a; see also Guillemain & Hearn, 2017; Pavón-Jordán <i>et al.</i>, 2020). Climate warming is shifting the zero-degree isotherm (i.e. average aerial temperature of 0 °C in January) and thus increasing also the availability of free-ice The increased use of importance of inland freshwater wetlands-is now feasibleincreasing because- in this region elimate warming is shifting the zero-degree isotherm (i.e. average aerial temperature of 0 °C in 	90	during recent decades, with new important wintering areas being established in northern and
 development phenomenon has been is linked to climate-driven range changes and redistribution of abundances (Maclean <i>et al.</i>, 2008; Thomas <i>et al.</i>, 2012; Pavón-Jordán <i>et al.</i>, 2015; Musilová, Musil, Zouhar & Adam, 2018a; Pavón-Jordán <i>et al.</i>, 2019). In addition to using newly available northern coastal areas around the Baltic Sea (Lehikoinen et al., 2013), many wintering waterbirds are progressively using inland waters in east and central Europe to a greater extent when compared to the 1990s (Musilová, Musil, Zouhar & Adam, 2018a; see also Guillemain & Hearn, 2017; Pavón-Jordán <i>et al.</i>, 2020). Climate warming is shifting the zero-degree isotherm (i.e. average aerial temperature of 0 °C in January) and thus increasing also the availability of free-ice [The increased use of importance of inland freshwater wetlands is now feasibleincreasing because in this region elimate warming is shifting the zero-degree isotherm (i.e. average aerial temperature of 0 °C in 	91	eastern Europe (Lehikoinen et al., 2013; Nuijten et al., 2020). It is assumed that tThis
 redistribution of abundances (Maclean <i>et al.</i>, 2008; Thomas <i>et al.</i>, 2012; Pavón-Jordán <i>et al.</i>, 2015; Musilová, Musil, Zouhar & Adam, 2018a; Pavón-Jordán <i>et al.</i>, 2019). In addition to using newly available northern coastal areas around the Baltic Sea (Lehikoinen et al., 2013), many wintering waterbirds are progressively using inland waters in east and central Europe to a greater extent when compared to the 1990s (Musilová, Musil, Zouhar & Adam, 2018a; see also Guillemain & Hearn, 2017; Pavón-Jordán <i>et al.</i>, 2020). Climate warming is shifting the zero-degree isotherm (i.e. average aerial temperature of 0 °C in January) and thus increasing also the availability of free-ice The increased use of importance of inland freshwater wetlands is now feasibleincreasing because in this region elimate warming is shifting the zero-degree isotherm (i.e. average aerial temperature of 0 °C in January) and thus increasing also the availability of free-ice The increased use of importance 	92	development phenomenon has been is linked to climate-driven range changes and
 2015; Musilová, Musil, Zouhar & Adam, 2018a; Pavón-Jordán <i>et al.</i>, 2019). In addition to using newly available northern coastal areas around the Baltic Sea (Lehikoinen et al., 2013), many wintering waterbirds are progressively using inland waters in east and central Europe to a greater extent when compared to the 1990s (Musilová, Musil, Zouhar & Adam, 2018a; see also Guillemain & Hearn, 2017; Pavón-Jordán <i>et al.</i>, 2020). Climate warming is shifting the zero-degree isotherm (i.e. average aerial temperature of 0 °C in January) and thus increasing also the availability of free-ice [The increased use of importance] of-inland freshwater wetlands-is now feasibleincreasing because- in this region elimate warming is shifting the zero-degree isotherm (i.e. average aerial temperature of 0 °C in January) and thus increasing also the availability of free-ice [The increased use of importance] 	93	redistribution of abundances (Maclean et al., 2008; Thomas et al., 2012; Pavón-Jordán et al.,
In addition to using newly available northern coastal areas around the Baltic Sea (Lehikoinen et al., 2013), many wintering waterbirds are progressively using inland waters in east and central Europe to a greater extent when compared to the 1990s (Musilová, Musil, Zouhar & Adam, 2018a; see also Guillemain & Hearn, 2017; Pavón-Jordán <i>et al.</i> , 2020). Climate warming is shifting the zero-degree isotherm (i.e. average aerial temperature of 0 °C in January) and thus increasing also the availability of free-ice The increased use of importance of -inland freshwater wetlands is now feasibleincreasing because – in this region elimate warming is shifting the zero-degree isotherm (i.e. average aerial temperature of 0 °C in January) and thus increasing also the availability of free-ice The increased use of importance of -inland freshwater wetlands is now feasibleincreasing because – in this region elimate warming is shifting the zero-degree isotherm (i.e. average aerial temperature of 0 °C in January)	94	2015; Musilová, Musil, Zouhar & Adam, 2018a; Pavón-Jordán et al., 2019).
 et al., 2013), many wintering waterbirds are progressively using inland waters in east and central Europe to a greater extent when compared to the 1990s (Musilová, Musil, Zouhar & Adam, 2018a; see also Guillemain & Hearn, 2017; Pavón-Jordán <i>et al.</i>, 2020). Climate warming is shifting the zero-degree isotherm (i.e. average aerial temperature of 0 °C in January) and thus increasing also the availability of free-ice [The increased use of importance of-inland freshwater wetlands is now feasibleincreasing because - in this region elimate warming is shifting the zero-degree isotherm (i.e. average aerial temperature of 0 °C in 	95	In addition to using newly available northern coastal areas around the Baltic Sea (Lehikoinen
 97 central Europe to a greater extent when compared to the 1990s (Musilová, Musil, Zouhar & 98 Adam, 2018a; see also Guillemain & Hearn, 2017; Pavón-Jordán <i>et al.</i>, 2020). Climate 99 warming is shifting the zero-degree isotherm (i.e. average aerial temperature of 0 °C in 100 January) and thus increasing also the availability of free-ice [The increased use of importance 101 of inland freshwater wetlands is now feasibleincreasing because in this region elimate 102 warming is shifting the zero-degree isotherm (i.e. average aerial temperature of 0 °C in 103 January) and thus increasing also the availability of free-ice [The increased use of importance] 104 January) and thus increasing also the availability of free-ice [The increased use of importance] 105 of inland freshwater wetlands is now feasibleincreasing because in this region elimate 102 warming is shifting the zero-degree isotherm (i.e. average aerial temperature of 0 °C in 103 January 	96	et al., 2013), many wintering waterbirds are progressively using inland waters in east and
 Adam, 2018a; see also Guillemain & Hearn, 2017; Pavón-Jordán <i>et al.</i>, 2020). <u>Climate</u> warming is shifting the zero-degree isotherm (i.e. average aerial temperature of 0 °C in January) and thus increasing also the availability of free-ice The increased use of importance of-inland freshwater wetlands is now feasible increasing because - in this region elimate warming is shifting the zero-degree isotherm (i.e. average aerial temperature of 0 °C in 	97	central Europe to a greater extent when compared to the 1990s (Musilová, Musil, Zouhar &
 99 warming is shifting the zero-degree isotherm (i.e. average aerial temperature of 0 °C in 100 January) and thus increasing also the availability of free-ice The increased use of importance 101 of inland freshwater wetlands is now feasibleincreasing because in this region elimate 102 warming is shifting the zero-degree isotherm (i.e. average aerial temperature of 0 °C in 4 	98	Adam, 2018a; see also Guillemain & Hearn, 2017; Pavón-Jordán et al., 2020). Climate
 January) and thus increasing also the availability of free-ice The increased use of importance of-inland freshwater wetlands-is now feasibleincreasing because in this region elimate warming is shifting the zero degree isotherm (i.e. average aerial temperature of 0 °C in 4 	99	warming is shifting the zero-degree isotherm (i.e. average aerial temperature of 0 °C in
 101 <u>of-inland freshwater wetlands is now feasibleincreasing because</u> in this region elimate 102 <u>warming is shifting the zero-degree isotherm (i.e. average aerial temperature of 0 °C in</u> 4 	100	January) and thus increasing also the availability of free-ice The increased use of importance
102 warming is shifting the zero degree isotherm (i.e. average aerial temperature of 0 °C in 4	101	of-inland freshwater wetlands-is now feasibleincreasing because- in this region elimate
	102	warming is shifting the zero degree isotherm (i.e. average aerial temperature of 0 °C in 4

Commented [ZM9]: AG7: these ideas are very similar to those in teh paragraph below, where they are easier to follow. I suggest you merge these paragraphs Commented [MP10R10]: We have changed the

introduction to avoid redundant parts.

Commented [ZM11]: AG6: compared to what? Coastal wetlands in other countries?

Commented [MP12R12]: The text was removed.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
/ 0
0
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
20
27
25
20
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
10
40 //1
40
+∠ ∕2
45
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59

103	January) (Pavón-Jordán et al., 2015, 2019, Musilová, Musil, Zouhar & Adam, 2018a). Some
104	species are rapidly responding to this phenomenon and increasingly using the newly available
105	wetlands in central and east Europe by altering their migratory behaviour (Sauter et al., 2010;
106	Gunnarsson, Waldenström & Fransson, 2012; Adam et al., 2015, Podhrazský et al., 2017;
107	Adam et al., 2015). This has several advantages - for example lowering-to adjust to the new
108	environmental conditions, consequently reducing the high mortality risk and energetic cost of
109	a long migration (Newton, 2007) as well as to-reducingminimise energy expenditure for
110	thermoregulation-during winter in regions that were formerly hostile during winter (Ridgill &
111	Fox, 1990; Musil et al., 2008; Dalby et al., 2013a),
112	even Although the most important wintering requirements of food resources and safety from
113	predation are relatively well known (Snow & Perrins, 1998; Guillemain et al., 2000;
114	Guillemain et al., 2002; Schummer, Kaminski, Raedeke & Graber, 2010). long-term studies
115	revealing _In spite of the rapidity of these distribution changes, Ddetailed long term studies
116	revealing the drivers of inland wetland use by waterbirds in light of their recent distribution
117	change during the non-breeding season are absent in the literature, especially in the context of
117 118	change during the non-breeding season are absent in the literature, especially in the context of climate-driven changes in distributions remain scarceeven though the most important
117 118 119	change during the non-breeding season-are absent in the literature, especially in the context of climate-driven changes in distributions.remain scarceeven though the most important wintering requirements of food resources and safety from predation are relatively well known
117 118 119 120	change during the non-breeding season-are absent in the literature, especially in the context of climate-driven changes in distributions.remain scarceeven though the most important wintering requirements of food resources and safety from predation are relatively well known (Snow & Perrins, 1998; Guillemain <i>et al.</i> , 2000; Guillemain <i>et al.</i> , 2002; Schummer,
117 118 119 120 121	change during the non-breeding season-are absent in the literature, especially in the context of climate-driven changes in distributions,remain scarceeven though the most important wintering requirements of food resources and safety from predation are relatively well known (Snow & Perrins, 1998; Guillemain <i>et al.</i> , 2000; Guillemain <i>et al.</i> , 2002; Schummer, Kaminski, Raedeke & Graber, 2010).
117 118 119 120 121 122	change during the non-breeding season are absent in the literature, especially in the context of climate-driven changes in distributions,remain searceeven though the most important wintering requirements of food resources and safety from predation are relatively well known (Snow & Perrins, 1998; Guillemain <i>et al.</i> , 2000; Guillemain <i>et al.</i> , 2002; Schummer, Kaminski, Raedeke & Graber, 2010).
 117 118 119 120 121 122 123 	 change during the non-breeding season are absent in the literature, especially in the context of climate-driven changes in distributions, remain searceeven though the most important wintering requirements of food resources and safety from predation are relatively well known (Snow & Perrins, 1998; Guillemain <i>et al.</i>, 2000; Guillemain <i>et al.</i>, 2002; Schummer, Kaminski, Raedeke & Graber, 2010). Food supply and availability of ice-free, open water in the wintering grounds are likely the most important limiting factors (Newton, 1998; Newton, 2013; Lewis <i>et al.</i>, 2019) shaping
 117 118 119 120 121 122 123 124 	change during the non-breeding season are absent in the literature, especially in the context of climate-driven changes in distributions,remain scarceeven though the most important wintering requirements of food resources and safety from predation are relatively well known (Snow & Perrins, 1998; Guillemain <i>et al.</i> , 2000; Guillemain <i>et al.</i> , 2002; Schummer, Kaminski, Raedeke & Graber, 2010). Food supply and availability of ice-free, open water in the wintering grounds are likely the most important limiting factors (Newton, 1998; Newton, 2013; Lewis <i>et al.</i> , 2019) shaping waterbirds wintering distribution (Dalby <i>et al.</i> , 2013; Guillemain <i>et al.</i> , 2015), followed by p-
 117 118 119 120 121 122 123 124 125 	 change during the non-breeding season are absent in the literature, especially in the context of climate-driven changes in distributions, remain scarceeven though the most important wintering requirements of food resources and safety from predation are relatively well known (Snow & Perrins, 1998; Guillemain <i>et al.</i>, 2000; Guillemain <i>et al.</i>, 2002; Schummer, Kaminski, Raedeke & Graber, 2010). Food supply and availability of ice-free, open water in the wintering grounds are likely the most important limiting factors (Newton, 1998; Newton, 2013; Lewis <i>et al.</i>, 2019) shaping waterbirds wintering distribution (Dalby <i>et al.</i>, 2013; Guillemain <i>et al.</i>, 2015), followed by p-Predation and air temperature (thermoregulation) are also be important factors affecting
 117 118 119 120 121 122 123 124 125 126 	change during the non-breeding season are absent in the literature, especially in the context of climate-driven changes in distributions,remain scarceeven though the most important wintering requirements of food resources and safety from predation are relatively well known (Snow & Perrins, 1998; Guillemain <i>et al.</i> , 2000; Guillemain <i>et al.</i> , 2002; Schummer, Kaminski, Raedeke & Graber, 2010). Food supply and availability of ice-free, open water in the wintering grounds are likely the most important limiting factors (Newton, 1998; Newton, 2013; Lewis <i>et al.</i> , 2019) shaping waterbirds wintering distribution (Dalby <i>et al.</i> , 2013; Guillemain <i>et al.</i> , 2015), followed by propredation and air temperature (thermoregulation) are also be important factors affecting waterbird distribution (Ridgill & Fox, 1990; Maclean <i>et al.</i> , 2008; Adam <i>et al.</i> , 2015).
 117 118 119 120 121 122 123 124 125 126 127 	change during the non-breeding season are absent in the literature, especially in the context of climate-driven changes in distributions,remain scarceeven though the most important wintering requirements of food resources and safety from predation are relatively well known (Snow & Perrins, 1998; Guillemain <i>et al.</i> , 2000; Guillemain <i>et al.</i> , 2002; Schummer, Kaminski, Raedeke & Graber, 2010). [Food supply and availability of ice-free, open water in the wintering grounds are likely the most important limiting factors (Newton, 1998; Newton, 2013; Lewis <i>et al.</i> , 2019) shaping waterbirds wintering distribution (Dalby <i>et al.</i> , 2013; Guillemain <i>et al.</i> , 2015), followed by p: Predation and air temperature (thermoregulation) are also be important factors affecting waterbird distribution (Ridgill & Fox, 1990; Maclean <i>et al.</i> , 2008; Adam <i>et al.</i> , 2015). HoweverHence, temperature alone does not simply explain the distribution pattern of
 117 118 119 120 121 122 123 124 125 126 127 128 	 change during the non-breeding season are absent in the literature, especially in the context of climate-driven changes in distributions,remain searceeven though the most important wintering requirements of food resources and safety from predation are relatively well known (Snow & Perrins, 1998; Guillemain <i>et al.</i>, 2000; Guillemain <i>et al.</i>, 2002; Schummer, Kaminski, Raedeke & Graber, 2010). Food supply and availability of ice-free, open water in the wintering grounds are likely the most important limiting factors (Newton, 1998; Newton, 2013; Lewis <i>et al.</i>, 2019) shaping waterbirds wintering distribution (Dalby <i>et al.</i>, 2013; Guillemain <i>et al.</i>, 2015), followed by pr Predation and air temperature (thermoregulation) are also be important factors affecting waterbird distribution (Ridgill & Fox, 1990; Maclean <i>et al.</i>, 2008; Adam <i>et al.</i>, 2015). HoweverHence, temperature alone does not simply explain the distribution pattern of wintering waterbirds (Dalby <i>et al.</i>, 2013a). The competition for food likely increases during
 117 118 119 120 121 122 123 124 125 126 127 128 129 	 change during the non-breeding season are absent in the literature, especially in the context of climate-driven changes in distributions, remain searceeven though the most important wintering requirements of food resources and safety from predation are relatively well known (Snow & Perrins, 1998; Guillemain <i>et al.</i>, 2000; Guillemain <i>et al.</i>, 2002; Schummer, Kaminski, Raedeke & Graber, 2010). Food supply and availability of ice-free, open water in the wintering grounds are likely the most important limiting factors (Newton, 1998; Newton, 2013; Lewis <i>et al.</i>, 2019) shaping waterbirds wintering distribution (Dalby <i>et al.</i>, 2013; Guillemain <i>et al.</i>, 2015), followed by p: Predation and air temperature (thermoregulation) are also be important factors affecting waterbird distribution (Ridgill & Fox, 1990; Maclean <i>et al.</i>, 2008; Adam <i>et al.</i>, 2015). HoweverHence, temperature alone does not simply explain the distribution pattern of wintering waterbirds (Dalby <i>et al.</i>, 2013a). The competition for food likely increases during winter, when individuals from low density breeding sites in the vast boreal and tundra areas in

Commented [ZM13]: AG8: merge this paragraph with the above one. This one is better explained. Commented [ZM14R14]: We have changed the introduction to avoid redundant parts.

131 flyway (Guillemain *et al.*, 2002; Brochet *et al.*, 2012). This behaviour, thus, presents an ideal

132 opportunity to investigate how resource availability and competition for food and space drive

133 habitat use by waterbirds during the wintering season.

In our study, we evaluate species-specific changes in the use of four different wetland types. including man-made wetlands. We hypothesize that the habitat use distribution of species among the investigated wetland types is driven by the species diet and that wetland types differ in their food supply (Kloskowski et al., 2009; Kameníková & Rajchard, 2013; Čížková et al., 20193; Lewis et al., 2019). We expect a different speed of change in the use of fishponds by individual the different diet groups, because this particular type of wetlandey which isare characterised by high density of stocked fishes stock. Hence, with increasing fish density, TIn fishponds, hus, we expect a shift of invertivores from fishponds to other wetland types habitats due to higher level of competition for invertebrates with a high density of fish stock (esp. Common Carp Cyprinus Carpio). On the other hand, fishponds constitute a food-rich habitat and on the contrary higher food availability for piscivorous species (Musil, 2006; Nummi, Väänänen, Holopainen & Pöysä, 2016).

We also defined two species-specific determinants to outline the distribution of species in regard toregarding man-madethe four wetland types (later named range shift drivers): (a) a species' site affinity conservatism (the tendency to occupy the same sites in consecutive years) and (b) the species temperature index (STI) as a measure of the species thermal affinity (warm-dwelling or cold-dwelling species; see description below. See also Devictor et al., 2008; Jiguet et al., 2007)). Based on these two species-specific traits and current climate warming (Hurrel & Deser, 201009), wWe predicted that the changes in use of different wetland types differ according to range shift drivers, i.e. an increasing wintering abundancesnumbers probability of wintering in recently ice-free standing waters of in species with low site affinity (i.e. species that show low site fidelity and thus show greater potential to change wintering sites) and as well as warm-dwelling_species with high Species Temperature Index (STI; i.e. with high average winter temperature across its wintering distribution) as the winter weather conditions become more favourable for them to expand towards these previously unsuitable regions; see

Commented [ZM15]: AG9: these last two paragraphs need improvements to the objectives and hypotheses Commented [ZM16R16]: The paragraphs were amended.

Commented [ZM17]: AG10: but you don't study competition directly, so explain what you expect to see. A shift from ponds into other habitats...

Commented [MP18R18]: The sentence was amended.

e.g. Gaget et al. 2021. species species with more probable range shifts and/or distribution changes (i.e. low-conservative and warm-dwelling species) as a consequence of climate warming (Hurrel & Deser, 2010)...

The study region covers the Czech Republic that lies in central Europe. In total, 1,169

monitored sites were classified according to the four wetland types considered: 68 reservoirs,

Methods

Study region

Commented [ZM19]: AG11: this is unclear. Why should warmdwelling species be shifting more, if you also have sites

which are now ice free? It sounds like you already know that "warm-dwelling species" have expanded more in Czechia?

Commented [ZM20R20]: The sentence was amended.

443 fishponds, 108 industrial waters and 550 running waters (Fig. 1). Running waters include rivers and streams; they were defined as river sections with well-defined boundaries, such as bridges, weirs or dams (see Chytil et al., 1999, for the list of wetland habitats in the Czech Republic). Note that there are only a few small natural glacial lakes in the study regionarea (Tucker & Evans, 1997; Chytil et al., 1999) which are located in mountains; these are usually frozen in winter and are therefore not included in the monitoring scheme. Thus, the four types included in the analysis essentially cover all wetland sites available for wintering waterbirds (see Chytil et al., 1999, Musil et al. 2001). The set of available sites in the study arearegion remained unchanged throughout the whole study period (Fig. 2); all major changes in water bodies brought about by human activity in the study regionarea had occurred before 1988, the beginning of the study period.

Waterbird monitoring data

Site-specific count data of waterbird abundancesnumbers (in total 492,297 observations) were obtained from the results of the International Waterbird Census (IWC) in the Czech Republic between 1988 and 2020. IWC is a worldwide citizen-science census with a standardized methodology (see further details in Delany, 2005; Delany, 2010) managed by the national coordinator in each country and globally coordinated by Wetlands International

(www.wetlands.org). Censuses are carried out in mid-January each winter because it is
generally the coldest period of winter when the effect of food resources on waterbird
distribution is considered most apparent due to limited site availability.

The counts of wWaterbird numbers counts wereare performed on a site during a day according to a complete and predefined list of species on predetermined dates and sites with the aim to maximize synchrony in the following years (Gilissen et al., 2002). Census participants also recorded zero counts of individual species as well as zero counts of all species on a site. About 350 experienced volunteer birdwatchers contributed annually to the monitoring in Czechia. The most important element of IWC methodology is standardization: it requires a single count at each site each winter, optimally conducted by the same person in consecutive winters in order to make the comparisons between years straightforward and valid. Each site (up to a few km² of standing water or a few km of a course of running water) established on the list of sites iswas defined by boundaries (such as bridges, weirs or dam on rivers and streams) known by the census participants. Observers used a telescope or binoculars from the shoreline to look for flocks and/or individuals of waterbirds, usually moving from one observation site to another by foot. Running waters weare monitored using line transects along the shore. The number of census participants per site (one, two or a group) and the duration of survey arwere designated according to bird abundance on each site, species and size of the water surface area, and weather (Bibby, Burgess & Hill, 2007; Sutherland, Pullin, Dolman & Knight, 2004). The counts at dawn arweree recommended for geese. Observations taken under extreme weather conditions (fog, rain, snow fall, strong wind) categorised as "strong effect" by the observer and incomplete observations were excluded from the dataset prior to the analysis. A repeated scanning of the flocks and shoreline observations arewere used to increase the

detectability of counted species. Census records arewere submitted to the national coordinator,
who compiles the submitted records and checks their validity using the participants' feedback
if necessary. The quality of the IWC data has been verified in recently published studies (e.g.
Fox *et al.*, 2010; Lehikoinen *et al.*, 2013; Amano *et al.*, 2018; Musilová, Musil, Zouhar &

Adam, 2018a; Musilová et al., 2018b; Pavón-Jordán et al., 2019; Gaget et al., 2020; Pavón-Jordán et al., 2020). Monitoring methodology did not change over the study period. The IWC targets all waterbirds, a group ecologically dependent on wetlands (Delany, 2010), i.e. grebes, cormorants, herons, swans, geese, ducks, grebes, cormorants, herons, rallids, waders and gulls. However, in this study, we only include 25 the most common wintering waterbird species, namely those exceeding 50 individuals in Czechia annually (see also Musil et al., 2011; Musilová et al., 2014; see Table 1 for an overview of the species). We followed Gill & Donsker (2018) for the species taxonomy.

223 Wetland types

The wetland types included in this study differ with regard to their origin, age and management practices (Chytil et al., 1999). Fishponds represent shallow water bodies with a small stream or canal for water inflow. As commercial subjects aimed at stocking and production of fish (mostly Carp Cyprinus carpio), fishponds were formed in the Middle Ages (mostly in the 16th century), have artificially managed water levels, chemistry and nutrient input. Reservoirs have been built more recently (after 1900) and represent deep waterbodies with inflow from larger rivers (compared to fishponds). The fish stock in reservoirs are not managed for the purpose of commercial fisheries but rather managed by angling associations (recreation). The most recent wetland type are *industrial waters*, which were created by flooding of former mining, sand-pit or gravel-pit areas, or are sedimentary pools built in industrial areas since 1960s (Hrdinka, 2007). Among all standing water wetland types described above, there is a gradient of decreasing probability of complete ice-cover in winter with increasing depth: from fishponds (the shallowest) to industrial waters and finally to reservoirs (the deepest). High density firsh stocks are most intensively managed in fishponds, followed by reservoirs and the least managed in industrial waters (Oerthli et al., 2005; Musil, 2006, UNEP, 2017). The trophic state of the wetland types ranges from oligotrophic waters (a low nutrient content), through mesotrophic and eutrophic waters to hypereutrophic waters, which present

an extremely high nutrient content (Carlson, 1977). Among the four monitored wetland types,

Commented [ZM21]: AG12: but what is important is density or biomass, so talk about that

Commented [MP22R22]: The sentence was amended.

> running waters contain the lowest content of nutrients, and fishponds are mostly eutrophic, sometimes hypertrophic (Chytil et al., 1999; Musil, 2006; Seiche et al., 2012; Čížková et al., 20193). The distribution of the monitored sites is shown in Fig. 1. Species-specific variables All 25 investigated waterbird species were described by the following three species-specific variables (diet, species temperature index (STI), and site affinityconservatism), which could explain the temporal pattern in the wetland type use. The values of species-specific variables are listed in Table 1. We followed Gill & Donsker (2018) for the species taxonomy. All species were classified into *diet* groups based on their preferred food items in the (i) wintering season: piscivorous, invertivorous, omnivorous and herbivorous (based on data and diet classification in Snow & Perrins, 1998; Kear, 2005; Šťastný & Hudec, 2016). Species temperature index (STI): The STI (see Devictor et al., 2008; Jiguet et al., 2007 (ii) for detailes of STI calculation) reflects the long-term average January temperature (1950-2000) experienced by individuals of any given species across the species' entire wintering distribution. Species' distribution maps were downloaded from BirdLife International & HBW (2017) and all temperature data from the regions included in each species' wintering range (above) were downloaded from www.worldclim.org. For each species, all grid cells (5x5 degrees) with temperature data within a species' wintering range (BirdLife International & HBW 2017) were downloaded and averaged. (iii) For each species, we calculated a measure of year-to-year variation in geographical distribution of the species across the study regionarea (called site affinity conservatism hereafter). Considering the nature of this variableThus, the species' fidelity to the wintering -sites fidelity of individuals-constitutes the basis serves as a main driver-of the covariate site affinity, which. The measure is bounded between 0 and 1, with the actual range of values being 0.14-0.82 in our data set. Values close to 1 indicate that the same sites are occupied in successive years, and with the same intensity; values close to zero imply large year-to-year variation in that the selection of wintering sites varies a lot over

Commented [ZM23]: AG13: but a basic question is if there are consistent patterns between species within each guild. E.g. do different herbivores behave in a similar way. Your paper seems to assume that, but not test it. You should discuss this somewhere. What evidence do you have that different guild members behave in a similar way?

Commented [MP24R24]: Trends in numbers were calculated for each species and wetland types. These are included in Table 2 together with the value of Wald test-testing differences in trends among analysed wetland types. The table shows e.g. positive trend in numbers in all herbivores on reservoirs, increasing trends in numbers in almost all species in industrial water.

270	time. These values aree calculation is based on Earth mover's distance; (see (Kranstauber,		
271	Smolla & Safi, 2017 see Zouhar, Musil, Musilová, in prep.) for further details).	_	Comn
272	The Ppairwise correlations of continuous species-specific variables were all below 0.30 is 0.06,		Earth r
273	implying there is little collinearity (Hair, Anderson, Tatham & Black, 1995; Rogerson, 2001).	$\langle \rangle$	with a explair
274	Hence all variables were included in our regression analysis (see e.g. Lehikoinen et al., 2016).	/	distrib Comn
275	The values of species-specific variables are listed in Table 1.		must provid
276			Comn
277	Statistical analysis		two variabl
278	Our analyses proceeded in two stages, differing in the level of detail at which the monitoring		Comn
279	count data were aggregated. In the first stage, we studied how the trends in abundancesnumber		
280	of different species vary across wetland types. We first used a log-linear Poisson regression		
281	analysis to impute any missing waterbird count data from the long-term data series (in 1988-		
282	2020) using TRends and Indices for Monitoring data software (TRIM; Statistic Netherlands		
283	version 3.52, Pannekoek & Van Strien, 2005). Regression parameters were estimated using		
284	generalized estimating equations (GEE). Missing data were usually the result of incomplete		
285	coverage due to limited availability of observers in some seasonsyears. The proportion of		
286	missing counts varied between 33% and 65% in the whole dataset, which is regarded as		
287	tolerable (Soldaat et al., 2017). Consequently, we obtained the trend in numbers of adult		
288	individuals for each investigated species for each wetland type.		
289	In this first stage, after imputing any missing data, we estimated the species-specific long-term		
290	trends in <u>abundancesnumbers</u> (i.e. the change in <u>abundance</u> indices from one year to the next)		
291	at each of the four wetland types and assessed differences in these trends between the four		
292	wetland types based on the rate of change: a strong increase or decrease ($\geq 5\%$ per year); a		
293	moderate increase or decrease (< 5% per year); a stable (trend was not significant and CIs were		
294	sufficiently narrow) or an uncertain trend (see also Fouque et al., 2009; Musil et al., 2011;		
295	Musilová et al., 2018b). Then, a Wald test was used to assess the significance of differences		
296	in the trends rate of changes in numbers in the four wetland types. We also used the imputed		
297	eounts referred to as <i>time totals</i> in TRIM in our figures. Furthermore, we used wetland 11		

Commented [J25]: We replaced the citation of our unpublished manuscript – that focuses on the application of Earth mover's distance (EMD) specifically on the year-toyear changes in spatial distribution of waterbird species – with a citation of a more general (but published) paper that explains how EMD is applied in the comparison of spatial distributions in general.

Commented [ZM26]: AG14: This is not enough. You must provide a better explanation of this, since your other manuscript is not accessible Commented [ZM27]: AG15: seems wrong, there are only two variables, conservatism and STI

commented [MP28R28]: The value was changed.

type and site as covariates in the linear trend models (see also Pavón-Jordán et al., 2015; Musilová et al., 2018b). In the second stage, we studied the effect of species-specific variables on population trends at different wetland types. As in the first step in this species-level analysis (above), we also used TRIM to fill the gaps in the data due to incomplete monitoring coverage. For each species, we obtained the TRIM-imputed total abundance time totals or yearly total abundance (later termed total numbers) by year and wetland type, producing a dataset of 3,267 observations (25 species, 33 years, 4 wetland types). Velvet Scoter (Melanitta fusca) was not recorded on fishponds and, therefore, excluded from the analyses.

Next, we explained these total abundancesnumbers estimated with TRIM and their trends with species-specific variables in a regression approach. As the time abundances totals (i.e. total number of individuals) exhibited substantial overdispersion, we used negative binomial regression rather than the canonical Poisson distribution. The fact that observations for a species are repeated across years and wetland types led us to include species as a random effect in the model, meaning we fitted a Generalized Linear Mixed Model (GLMM). Moreover, to allow for (i) heteroskedasticity both between and within species, and (ii) arbitrary correlation within a species' values, we used a cluster-robust estimator of the standard errors in statistical inference, clustered at the species level (Cameron & Miller, 2015). To facilitate coefficient interpretation, all continuous variables were z-standardized (i.e. centred around the mean and divided by the standard deviation) prior to running the regressions.

For simplicity, our model specification assumes linear time trends in total abundancesnumbers; we do nevertheless expect these trends to vary systematically with species-specific characteristics and across wetland types. Therefore, we included interactions of year and wetland types with all species-specific variables in our model. All regression models were estimated in Stata 16 (StataCorp, College Station, TX).

Results

326	492,297 observations from 25 species in 1,169 wetlands between 1988 and 2020 were include
327	in this study. The mean annual abundance for four diet groups was the following: herbivor
328	$(23,4667.8 \pm 2,8976.9 \text{ SE}),$ omnivores $(219,234.0 \pm 3,264.4 \text{ SE}),$ invertivore
329	$(6,295.2 \pm 240.2 \text{ SE})$ and piscivores $(15,1365.5 \pm 933.2 \text{ SE})$. The first stage of our analys
330	revealed significant differences in abundance trends between the four wetland types in 22 o
331	of the 25 investigated species (Table 2). Prevailing decreasing (10 species) or stable trend
332	(six species) were found in running waters while significant increasing trends in the abundance
333	of 15 species were found in standing waters (reservoirs, fishponds and industrial waters). The species were found in standing waters (reservoirs, fishponds and industrial waters).
334	significant differences (according to results of Wald test) in species trends among analyse
335	wetland types were found in five of six herbivore species, in six of eight omnivore species,
336	all five invertivore species and in all six piscivore species. Increasing trend in abundances w
337	found in all herbivores on reservoirs and in almost all species in industrial waters (Table 2).
338	The results from our GLMM showed that species exhibiting higher site affinity conservatis
339	(i.e. low year-to-year variation in geographical distribution of the species across the stud
340	region) recorded the highest total abundancesnumbers on running waters (Table 3). Similarl
341	cold-dwelling species (identified by a lower value of average temperature across its winterin
342	range – STIspecies temperature index) were more abundant in reservoirs (Table 3).
343	The effects of the interaction terms between species-specific variables and year showeds the
344	extent at which the trends in <u>abundancesnumbers</u> on different wetland types varied wi
345	species-specific variables. For instance, the coefficient on year in the reservoirs column (β
346	0.056) implieds that the predicted yearly increase in total abundancesnumbers in a
347	omnivorous species (i.e. the reference diet group) with average values of si
348	affinity conservatism and STI is about 5.6 per cent; the coefficient on herbivorous \times year (β
349	0.022) indicatesd that for a herbivorous species with average values of si
350	affinityconservatism and STI, the annual increase iswas larger by ca. 2.2 per cent, i.e. about
351	per cent in total. The species' diet significantly affected the species trends on fishpond
352	industrial and running waters. On fishponds, herbivorous species showed the largest (positiv
353	trend in total <u>abundancesnumbers</u> (over 11 per cent per year at average values of site <u>affini</u> 13

conservatism—and STI), followed closely by piscivores. On industrial waters, omnivores
increased at the slowest pace by ca. 7–9 % slower than the other three diet groups. On running
waters, piscivores increased at the fastest rate during the 1990s and early 2000s, followed
closely by herbivores (Figures 3 and 4). Warm-dwelling and less conservative-species with
low site affinity showed the largest trend on fishponds and industrial waters.

The differences in trends and abundancesnumbers across diet groups and wetland types are visualized in Figures 3 and 4. Figure 3 presents the underlying data on total abundancesnumbers, along with trend curves obtained via scatterplot smoothing using LOESS. Figure 4 visualizes the trends predicted by the regression for different diet groups at different wetland types. The apparent discrepancies between Figure 3 and 4 are caused by the fact that in the regression that underlie Figure 4 (i) we estimate a (log-) linear for simplicity (while some trends in Figure 3 show a substantial degree of nonlinearity) and (ii) the predictions arewere obtained at fixed values of STI and site affinityconservatism, which otherwise vary between different diet groups. Figure 5 summarizes the findings in a graphical format.

371 Discussion

To promote the protection of wetland birds, the knowledge of species habitat use and facilitation of species distribution changes areshould be considered the cornerstones for effective_adaptive_management (Musilová et al., 2018b; see also Pullin, 2002; Sutherland, Pullin, Dolman & Knight, 2004; Sinclair, Fryxell & Caughley, 2006; Musilová et al., 2015; Holopainen et al., 2015; Gaget et al., 2020; Pavón-Jordán et al., 2020). This study contributes to the identification of these cornerstones by demonstrating diet-specific changes in habitat use, and of species with high probability of range changes (summarized in Fig. 5), based on long-term nonbreeding data of wintering waterbirds.

381 Changes in habitat use in different diet groups

Commented [ZM29]: AG16: I don't see that as a consensus. Many people just think about the need to conserve key sites with large numbers of waterbirds, e.g. Ramsar aites

Commented [ZM30R30]: The sentence was amended.

Generally, food supply is of high importance for waterbirds (Guillemain et al., 2015; Holopainen et al., 2015) due to its subsequent effect on breeding success, adult survival and also overall flyway population dynamics (Newton, 1998; Newton, 2013; Jørgensen et al., 2016). Use of feeding habitat is a hierarchical process, influencing the species geographical distribution and the choice of a particular wetland (Green, 1998). Here, we demonstrated longterm changes in wetland type use among diet groups in fishponds, industrial and running waters, but not in reservoirs. Increased use of industrial waters was demonstrated found in invertivorcous species, which predominantly used running waters in the beginning of the study period and progressively switch to industrial waters. Invertebrate biomass, which provides the majority of the food of invertivores, tend to be highest in early successional wetlands (Nummi & Holopainen, 2014; Petrie et al., 2016), such are industrial waters. Furthermore, heterogeneity in the physical characteristics of foraging areas can affect foraging behaviour (Fernández & Lank, 2008) and therefore affect the species habitat use. Consistent with this, diving ducks represent most of the invertivoreous species; they feed at greater depths during the non-breeding period (Hughes & Green in Kear, 2005) and industrial waters likely provide favourable depths for their foraging behaviour. Lower foraging costs (Wood et al., 2013a) in industrial waters compared to higher water velocities in running waters can make foraging more profitable for invertivores. The same effect could cause increased use of industrial waters in herbivores (almost in the same degree as in invertivores). Assumed The a priori assumption of a low increase in abundancesnumbers of invertivores in

fishponds was confirmed in fishponds. In invertebrates are fundamental to , an important element of both terrestrial and aquatic food webs, and drastic decreases have been was shown in terrestrial insects on a global level (Dirzo et al., 2014; Wagner et al., 2021). Long-term studies on aquatic invertebrates are currently scarce (Gozlan et al., 2019), but some indicate changes in aquatic invertebrate structure (Fried-Petersen et al., 2020; Pilotto et al., 2020; van der Lee, Aray-Ajoy, Futter & Angeler, 2021) associated with increasing levels of eutrophication and brownification as one of the most important driver of these changes (Jackson, Loewen, Vinebrooke & Chimimba, 2016; Lind et al., 2018; Arzel et al., 2020).

> Fishponds are commercial habitatssubjects with artificially managed nutrient input that increase the level of eutrophication (Roy et al., 2020) and are aimed at stocking and breeding fish (mostly Carp). The artificial nutrient input have been resulted in hypertrophy of fishponds, especially after the World War II (Pechar, 2000; Seiche et al., 2012) and therefore these ponds exceed the nutrient level of other wetland types in the study regionarea. It is noteworthyhas been shown that high stocks of Carp in fishponds create an environment with extremely high competition cause the competition for invertebrate food with invertivorous waterbird species induring the breeding season (Musil, 2006). In this study, we show that, whereas this effect is also noticeable significant in this study during the wintering season by a lower increase in the use of fish-ponds by invertivores.

> Indeed, herbivores stood outrevealed as the most increasing diet group in fishponds, likely keepingstanding outside the Carp-waterbird food competition. The alternative-importance of artificial fishponds as alternative sites for wintering herbivorous and omnivorous ducks was shown also in Doñana National Park, Spain (Kloskowski et al., 2009). However, some species of the herbivorous group (geese, Mute Swan and Eurasian Wigeon) are not strictly feeding inside of wetlands such as invertivores and piscivores and may feed both aquatically and terrestrially (Jacobsen & Ugelvik, 1994; Fox et al., 2005; Wood et al., 2013b). Therefore, the changes in wetland type use are less stronglyaccurate related to wetland food supply in this group. Especially, due to the characteristics of the census protocol (dawn counts), variation in geese abundancesnumbers are more likely to be affected by this daily dynamic this issue due to dawn counts onbetween the roosting and feeding sites the roost sites. In the study regionarea, geese have traditionally congregated in high numbers during winter and use the traditional wintering grounds of high aggregations of geese are reservoirs as a roosting sites and nearby fields as a dominant feeding sites, especially in south-Moravian lowland (Czech IWC data-http://www.waterbirdmonitoring.cz/vysledky/iwc20/). Conversely, other herbivorous species are counted during the daylight activities in the wetlands and thus do not include individuals that leave have left the wetlands (roosting sites) to forage in the fields. In addition, some

> 437 waterbirds may often be feeding at different places during the night, such as omnivorous

Commented [ZM31]: AG17: the ponds are not in the National Park

Commented [MP32R32]: The sentence was amended.

Mallards in the Netherlands (Kleyheeg *et al.*, 2017) and granivorous dabbling ducks feeding
on rice_fields in the Mediterranean (Guillemain *et al.*, 2010; Brogi, Pernollet, Gauthier-Clerc
& Guillemain, 2015; Parejo *et al.*, 2019). Nevertheless, this nocturnal behaviour is likely
difficult to quantify (Tourenq *et al.*, 2001) and any obvious suitable nocturnal feeding wetlands
are not known from the study arearegion.

On the species level, prevailing decreasing or stable trends in abundancesnumbers were found in running waters, which represent the traditional wintering grounds in the study regionarea (Adam et al., 2015; Musilová, Musil, Zouhar & Romportl, 2015; Musilová, Musil, Zouhar & Adam, 2018a). It is worth noting that running waters fulfil one of the most important habitat requirements for wintering waterbirds: to avoid unfavourable winter harshness and destructive winter extremes in the zero-degree-isotherm area (Musilová, Musil, Zouhar & Romportl, 2015; Musilová, Musil, Zouhar & Adam, 2018a). In recent decades, milder winter conditions in Central Europe (IPCC, 2014) likely provide an increased availability of new wintering areas, i.e. standing waters with reduced ice cover. ConverselyStill, running waters still remain as suitable wintering sites, as revealed in this study, especially for piscivores and herbivorous. Recent climate and land use changes affect the fish assemblages, diversity and distribution (Comte et al., 2013) as well as diversity and distribution of invertebrates (Haase et al., 2019) with predicted up and downstream direction of shifts in the fish species in rivers (Radinger et al., 2017), hence the use of rivers by piscivores is likely in accordance with these changes in fish distribution.

459 Wetland type use in species changing distribution

Generally, there is a trade-off between the cost and benefit of the wintering site use (Ridgill & Fox, 1990; Adam et al., 2015; Musilová, Musil, Zouhar & Romportl, 2015). Importantly, there is a gradient among the four investigated wetland types in the level of the winter harshness risk, i.e. the sensitivity to cold weather and freezing (running waters considered the most stable compared to standing waters, see above), in the level of habitat change risk (fishponds considered the most artificially affected), in the level of succession in freshwater communities (industrial waters considered as an early successional stages), trophic statusy (the highest nutrient content in fishponds); see the methods for details. The nature of these differences reflected the use of wetland types in species with more or less probable range shifts and/or distribution changes. High-conservative sSpecies with high site affinity (i.e. species with lower year-to-year variation in geographical distribution across the study arearegion) revealed higher use of running waters. Higher stability in cold and extreme weather conditions, low level of habitat change risk caused by possible management and high level of succession of running waters are likely important for these conservative species with lower probability of range changes. However, saturation of traditional wintering grounds was suggested to occur in Czech Republic (Musilová, Musil, Zouhar & Romportl, 2015) that could increase the competition for resources (Newton, 1998; Newton, 2013). In addition, higher water velocities in running waters compared to standing waters increase the foraging costs (Wood et al., 2013a). ConverselyFurthermore, our study indicates the high importance of man-made standing wetlands (fishponds and industrial waters) for species with more likely to undergo probable range shifts, i.e. species with low site affinity low-conservative and warm-dwelling (higher average temperature across its wintering range - high STI -) species. Wintering waterbird populations are clearly changing their distribution (Lehikoinen et al, 2013; Pavón-Jordán et al., 2015; Musilová, Musil, Zouhar & Adam, 2018a; Pavón-Jordán et al., 2019; Pavón-Jordán et al, 2020). These distribution changes could be associated with changes in ice cover, food availability, habitat and hunting pressure (Dalby et al., 2013; Newton, 2013; Guillemain et al., 2015; Pavón-Jordán et al, 2020; this study). Low-conservative sSpecies with low site affinity increase the use of these newly available wetlands that are also considered less stable as wintering sites (higher winter harshness and habitat change risk, higher trophy in fishponds and lower succession in industrial waters). It seems that low conservative species with low site affinity grasp the benefits of milder climate in recent decades (Hurrel & Deser, 2009) and responded by increasingly use these alternative wetlands. The tendency of less conservative

493 species with low site affinity to annually change the wintering sites implies they may be useful Commented [ZM33]: AG18: I do not understand what you mean by succession here Commented [MP34R34]: The sentence was amended.

Commented [ZM35]: AG19: if you can identify which these are from earlier work, perhaps you should do that more clearly at the beginning of the paper

Commented [MP36R36]: The sentence was amended.

494	early-warning indicators as a pilot species to indicateof changing use of wintering sites (see	
495	also Green & Elmberg, 2014).	
496	The thermal affinity was determined as an important trait explaining the species distribution	
497	and range changes leading by climate change (Gaget et al., 2020; Devictor et al., 2008). The	
498	changes of nonbreeding distribution of waterbirds seems highly affected by climate warming	
499	(Pavón-Jordán et al., 2015; Gaget et al., 2018). Our study reveals the use of reservoirs by cold-	
500	dwelling species (mostly seaducks), while reservoirs represent deeper water bodies with	
501	inflow from larger rivers and have the lowest probability of complete ice-cover in winter	
502	among standing waters. In the light of climate warming, related northeastwards shifts of	
503	species distributions (Lehikoinen et al., 2013; Pavón-Jordán et al., 2015; Gaget et al., 2020;	
504	Pavón-Jordán et al., 2020),-and consequent decline and even local extinction of cold-dwelling	
505	species caused by distribution change (Devictor et al., 2008; Tayleur et al., 2016; Gaget et al.,	
506	2020), we assume that reservoirs could serve as a refuges for cold-dwelling species in the near	
507	future. Larger stochasticity and frequency of extreme weather events are also predicted by	
508	most climate change scenarios and thus such-as a-deep and large wetlands with stable	
509	temperature conditions suitable forfor survival of benthic invertebrates will provide the	
510	resources required by these species. However, the overall increase in abundancesnumbers of	_
511	cold-dwelling species in the study regionarea indicate that this issue could be much	
512	complicated complex, as temperature is not the only driver hence the temperature do not simply	
513	explain theof species distribution changes (Dalby et al., 2013). Conversely, warm-dwelling	
514	species increase the use of both fishponds and industrial waters. The availability of these	
515	shallower man-made wetlands may likely increase in recent years due to climate warming	
516	(Hurrel & Deser, 2010). The 'wintering strategy' of warm-dwelling species is driven by the	
517	geographic avoidance of the zero-degree isotherm to reduce winter harshness risk (Gaget et	
518	al., 2020), therefore warm-dwelling species likely do not reflect the difference in wetland types	
519	in terms of winter harshness risk and increase the use of industrial waters and fishponds with	
520	higher winter harshness risk. Increasing our knowledge of the habitat use of warm-dwelling	
521	species habitat use is of high importance due to its forecasted since they are more likely to	
I.	19	

Commented [ZM37]: AG20: explain why. Is it because they are deeper and so have a cooler temperature? Commented [ZM38R38]: The sentence was amended. <u>expandimerease</u> in the coming decades (Devictor *et al.*, 2008; Tayleur *et al.*, 2016; Gaget *et al.*, 2020). Indeed, we can expect increasing concern of farmers and fishermen followed by the
distribution changes of the warm-dwelling species, while some of them are already conflict
species such as Greylag Goose or herons.

527 Conclusion

Our study highlight the general pattern that wintering waterbirds are expected to select sites with higher food availability (Fox et al., 1995; Green, 1998; Green, Fox, Hughes & Hilton, 1999; Guillemain, Fritz & Guillon et al. 2000; Chatterjee, Adhikari, Pal & Mukhopadhyay, 2020), higher energy content (van Eerden, 1984) and lower foraging cost (Wood et al., 2013a) to balance the costs and benefits of feeding site choice during wintering (Newton, 1998; Newton, 2013; Aharon-Rotman, Clark, Klaassen & Buttemer, 2016). The effort to meet these requirements resulted in a considerable change of the habitat use in the given species. Based on the flyway-level waterbird data, dramatic changes in relative abundances are expected (see e.g. Pavón-Jordán et al., 2020) with temperature-dependent inter-annual and long-term north-eastwards shift of the species distribution (Pavón-Jordán et al., 2019). Understanding the role of habitat use in theis context of changing distributions of different species is of high importance for conservation (see e.g. Janke et al., 2017), especially since the climate-driven range changes are already underway (e.g. Lehikoinen et al., 2013; Pavón-Jordán et al., 2015, Musilová, Musil, Zouhar & Adam, 2018a; Pavón-Jordán et al., 2019; Pavón-Jordán et al, 2020) and may lead to the decrease of effectiveness of the conservation efforts (Musilová et al., 2018b). Consistent with this view, increasing use of industrial waters and fishponds for warm-dwelling and low-conservative species with low site affinity withexhibiting more probable range shifts and/or distribution changes, and conversely use of reservoirs by cold-dwelling species and running waters by high-conservative species with high site affinity_indicates importance of individual wetland types as wintering grounds, which should be considered in future conservation planning and effective management. The development and implementation of measures to increase the suitability of existing modified

Commented [ZM39]: AG21: this is not a conclusión from your work

Commented [ZM40R40]: The sentence was removed.

habitats for wildlife appears essential to conserve biodiversity (Sinclair, Fryxell & Caughley,
2006; Navedo, 2017). The implementation should be based on the core knowledge of the
species habitat use and distribution changes (Musilová *et al.*, 2018b). <u>CThe-elimate-driven</u>
changes in the species distributions should not necessarily have the north/eastwards direction
(see e.g. Lehikoinen *et al.*, 2013, 2016; Pavón-Jordán *et al.*, 2015; Pavón-Jordán *et al.*, 2020),
but elimate changes could also modify the use of habitats and their use withininside the
species' current ranges.

Commented [ZM41]: AG22: but you have not presented any results on changes within each of the four habitats Commented [MP42R42]: The sentence was amended.

559 Acknowledgments

We are indebted to all those who have volunteered in International Waterbird Census (IWC) counts as well as to the census IWC co-ordinators in the Czech Republic (i.e. Bohuslav Urbánek, Vladimír Fiala, Čestmír Folk, Josef Křen, Ivana Kožená and Jitka Pellantová). We are also grateful to Carolyn Pimm for language improvements and Matyáš Adam for his help with the map. This study was supported by the project EHP-CZ02-OV-1-027-2015 entitled "The reduction of habitat fragmentation consequences in various types of landscape in the Czech Republic", the project TH 04030185 of Technology Agency of the Czech Republic entitled "Identification of important wintering sites of waterbirds, with a focus on the presence of conflict species and in the context of site protection, habitat characteristics and climate change" and the project No.20194209 of Internal Grant Agency of FES CULS entitled "Waterbirds as bioindicators of wetlands health: food specialisation determines the waterbird" response to climatic and environmental changes".

2
3
4
5
2
6
7
8
0
9
10
11
12
12
13
14
15
16
17
17
18
19
20
20 21
21
22
23
24
24
25
26
27
20
20
29
30
31
22
32
33
34
35
22
36
37
38
30
22
40
41
42
12
-+-5
44
45
46
17
4/
48
49
50
50
ЪI
52
53
54
54
55
56
57
Г О
¬×
28

573	References
574	Adam M., Musilová Z., Musil P., Zouhar J. & Romportl D. (2015). Long-Term Changes in
575	Habitat Selection of Wintering Waterbirds: High Importance of Cold Weather Refuge
576	Sites. Acta Ornithologica 50, 127–138.
577	https://doi.org/10.3161/00016454AO2015.50.2.001
578	Aharon-Rotman Y., Buchanan K.L., Clark N.J., Klaassen M. & Buttemer W.A. (2016). Why
579	fly the extra mile? Using stress biomarkers to assess wintering habitat quality in
580	migratory shorebirds. Oecologia 182, 385-395. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00442-016-
581	<u>3679-1</u>
582	Amano T., Székely T., Sandel B., Nagy S., Mundkur T., Langendoen T., et al. (2018).
583	Successful conservation of global waterbird populations depends on effective
584	governance. Nature 553, 199-202. https://doi.org/10.1038/nature25139
585	Angert A.L., Crozier L.G., Rissler L.J., Gilman S.E., Tewksbury J.J. & Chunco A.J. (20181).
586	Do species' traits predict recent shifts at expanding range edges? Ecology Letters 14,
587	677–689. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1461-0248.2011.01620.x
588	Arzel C., Nummi P., Arvola L., Pöysä H., Davranche A., Rask M., et al. (2020). Invertebrates
589	are declining in boreal aquatic habitat: The effect of brownification? Science of The
590	Total Environment 724, 138199. <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2020.138199</u>
591	Beekman, J., et al. (2019). Long-term population trends and shifts in distribution of Bewick's
592	Swans Cygnus columbianus bewickii wintering in northwest Europe. Wildfowl, Special
593	Issue 5, 73-102.
594	Bibby, C. J., Burgess, N. D. & Hill, D. A. (2007). Bird Census Techniques. Academic Press,
595	London.
596	BirdLife International & HBW (2017). Bird species distribution maps of the world. Version
597	7.0. Available at http://datazone.birdlife.org/species/requestdis .
	22

5		
6		
7		
8		
9		
10 11	598	Brogi A., Pernollet C.A., Gauthier-Clerc M. & Guillemain M. (2015). Waterfowl foraging in
12	599	winter-flooded ricefields: Any agronomic benefits for farmers? Ambio 44, 793-802.
13 14	600	https://doi.org/10.1007/s13280-015-0678-0
15	601	Brochet AL., Dessborn L., Legagneux P., Elmberg J., Gauthier-Clerc M., Fritz H., et al.
16 17	602	(2012). Is diet segregation between dabbling ducks due to food partitioning? A review
18 10	603	of seasonal patterns in the Western Palearctic. Journal of Zoology 286, 171-178.
20	604	https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1469-7998.2011.00870.x
21		
22	605	Cameron, A. C., & Miller, D. L. (2015). A practitioner's guide to cluster-robust
23	606	informan lowengl of human resources 50 (2) 217 272
24	000	interence. <i>Journal of numan resources</i> , 30 (2), 517–572.
25	607	Carlson R E (1977) A trophic state index for lakes Limnology and Oceanography 22: 361-
26	007	Carison, R. E. (1)//). It dopine sade index for larges. Enhancing and Oceanography 22, 501
27	608	369.
28		
29	609	Chatterjee A., Adhikari S., Pal S. & Mukhopadhyay S.K. (2020). Foraging guild structure and
3U 21	610	niche characteristics of waterbirds wintering in selected sub-Himalayan wetlands of
27		
32	611	India. Ecological Indicators 108, 105693.
37	612	https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolind.2019.105693
35	012	<u>https://doi.org/10.1010/j.cconnd.2019.105095</u>
36	613	Chen L-C Hill LK Ohlemüller R Roy D B & Thomas C D (2011) Rapid range shifts of
37	010	
38	614	species associated with high levels of climate warming. Science (New York, N.Y.) 333,
39	615	1024_1026 https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1206432
40	015	1024-1020. <u>https://doi.org/10.1120/setence.1200452</u>
41	616	Chytil, J., Hakrová, P., Hudec, K., Jandová, J. & Pellantová, J. (eds) (1999). Wetlands
42 43	617	of the Czech Republic – inventory of wetlands in the Czech Republic. Czech Ramsar
44 45	618	Committee, Mikulov, Czech Republic.Comte L., Buisson L., Daufresne M. &
46	619	Grenouillet G. (2013). Climate-induced changes in the distribution of freshwater fish:
47		
48	620	observed and predicted trends. Freshwater Biology 58, 625-639.
49	621	https://doi.org/10.1111/fwb.12081
50		<u> </u>
51		
h		
----	--	
2		
3		
1		
4		
5		
6		
7		
/		
8		
٥		
9		
10		
11		
10		
12		
13		
1/		
14		
15		
16		
17		
17		
18		
19		
20		
20		
21		
วา		
22		
23		
24		
27		
25		
26		
27		
27		
28		
29		
20		
30		
31		
27		
5Z		
33		
34		
54		
35		
36		
27		
37		
38		
30		
10		
40		
41		
12		
42		
43		
44		
45		
45		
46		
17		
4/		
48		
49		
50		
51		
50		
52		
53		
51		
54		
55		
56		
55		
5/		
58		
50		
22		
60		

622	Čížková H., Květ J., Comín F.A., Laiho R., Pokorný J. & Pithart D. (2013). Actual state of
623	European wetlands and their possible future in the context of global climate change.
624	Aquatic Sciences 75, 3-26. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00027-011-0233-4
625	Comte L., Buisson L., Daufresne M. & Grenouillet G. (2013). Climate-induced changes in the
626	distribution of freshwater fish: observed and predicted trends. Freshwater Biology 58,
627	625-639. https://doi.org/10.1111/fwb.12081
628	Dalby L., Fox A.D., Petersen I.K., Delany S. & Svenning JC. (2013). Temperature does not
629	dictate the wintering distributions of European dabbling duck species. Ibis 155, 80-
630	88. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1474-919X.2012.01257.x
631	Davidson N.C. (2014). How much wetland has the world lost? Long-term and recent trends in
632	global wetland area. Marine & freshwater research
633	Davis J.B., Guillemain M., Kaminski R.M., Arzel C., Eadie J.M. & Rees E.C. (2014). Habitat
634	and resource use by waterfowl in the northern hemisphere in autumn and winter.
635	Wildfowl 0 , 17–69
636	Dawson T.P., Jackson S.T., House J.I., Prentice I.C. & Mace G.M. (2011). Beyond
637	Predictions: Biodiversity Conservation in a Changing Climate. Science 332, 53-58.
638	https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1200303
639	Delany, S. (2005). Guidelines for national Coordinators of the International Waterbird census.
640	Wetlands International.
641	Delany, S. (2010). Guidance on Waterbird Monitoring Methodology: Field Protocol for
642	Waterbird Counting. Wetlands International.
643	Devictor V., Julliard R., Couvet D. & Jiguet F. (2008). Birds are tracking climate warming,
644	but not fast enough. Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences 275,
645	2743-2748. https://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2008.0878

646	Dirzo R., Young H.S., Galetti M., Ceballos G., Isaac N.J.B. & Collen B. (2014). Defaunation
647	in the Anthropocene. Science 345, 401-406. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1251817
648	Fernández G. & Lank D.B. (2008). Foraging behaviour of non-breeding Western Sandpipers
649	Calidris mauri as a function of sex, habitat and flocking. Ibis 150, 518-526.
650	https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1474-919X.2008.00812.x
651	Fouque C., Guilleman M. & Schricke V. (2009). Trends in the numbers of Coot Fulica atra
652	and wildfowl Anatidae wintering in France, and their relationship with hunting activity
653	at wetland sites. Wildfowl 0, 42–59
654	Fox A.D., Ebbinge B.S., Mitchell C., Heinicke T., Aarvak T., Colhoun K., et al. (2010).
655	Current estimates of goose population sizes in western Europe, a gap analysis and an
656	assessment of trends. Ornis Svecica 20, 115–127
657	Fox A.D., Kahlert J., Ettrup H., Nilsson L. & Hounisen J.P. (1995). Moulting Greylag Geese
658	Anser anser on the Danish island of Saltholm; numbers, phenology, status and origins.
659	Wildfowl 46, 16-30–30
660	Fox A.D., Madsen J., Boyd H., Kuijken E., Norriss D.W., Tombre I.M., et al. (2005). Effects
661	of agricultural change on abundance, fitness components and distribution of two
662	arctic-nesting goose populations. Global Change Biology 11, 881–893.
663	https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2486.2005.00941.x
664	Fried-Petersen H.B., Araya-Ajoy Y.G., Futter M.N. & Angeler D.G. (2020). Drivers of long-
665	term invertebrate community stability in changing Swedish lakes. Global Change
666	Biology 26, 1259–1270. https://doi.org/10.1111/gcb.14952
667	Gaget E., Galewski T., Jiguet F. & Le Viol I. (2018). Waterbird communities adjust to climate
668	warming according to conservation policy and species protection status. Biological
669	Conservation 227, 205–212. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biocon.2018.09.019
670	Gaget E., Le Viol I., Pavón-Jordán D., Cazalis V., Kerbiriou C., Jiguet F., et al. (2020).
671	Assessing the effectiveness of the Ramsar Convention in preserving wintering 25

2
4
5
6
7
/
ð
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
22
22
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
-7∠ ⊿2
-+
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
51
54
55
56
57
58
59

1

672 waterbirds in the Mediterranean. Biological Conservation 243, 108485. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biocon.2020.108485 673 Gaget E., Pavón-Jordán D., Johnston A., Lehikoinen A., Hochachka W.M., Sandercock B.K., 674 et al. (2021). Benefits of protected areas for nonbreeding waterbirds adjusting their 675 676 distributions under climate warming. Conservation Biology 35, 834-845. 677 https://doi.org/10.1111/cobi.13648 Gilissen, N., Haanstra, L., Delany, S., Boere, G., & Hagemeijer, W. (2002). Numbers 678 and distribution of wintering waterbirds in the Western Palearctic and Southwest Asia 679 680 in 1987, 1988 and 1999. Results from the International Waterbird Census. Wetlands International Global Series No. 11, Wetlands International, Wageningen, 681 682 The Netherlands. Gill, F. & Donsker, D. (eds). (2017). IOC World Bird List (v 7.1). 683 684 https://www.worldbirdnames.org Gozlan R.E., Karimov B.K., Zadereev E., Kuznetsova D. & Brucet S. (2019). Status, trends, 685 and future dynamics of freshwater ecosystems in Europe and Central Asia. Inland 686 Waters 9, 78-94. https://doi.org/10.1080/20442041.2018.1510271 687 Green A.J. & Elmberg J. (2014). Ecosystem services provided by waterbirds. Biological 688 Reviews 89, 105-122. https://doi.org/10.1111/brv.12045 689 690 Green A.J. (1998). Comparative feeding behaviour and niche organization in a Mediterranean Canadian 76, 500-507. 691 duck community. Journal of Zoology https://doi.org/10.1139/z97-221 692 693 Green A.J. (1998). Comparative feeding behaviour and niche organization in a Mediterranean

 694
 duck community.
 Canadian
 Journal
 of
 Zoology
 76,
 500–507.

 695
 https://doi.org/10.1139/z97-221

Green A.J., Fox A.D., Hughes B. & Hilton G.M. (1999). Time-activity budgets and	nd s
selection of White-headed Ducks Oxyura leucocephala at Burdur Lake, Turkey i	in la
winter. Bird Study 46, 62-73. https://doi.org/10.1080/00063659909461115	
Guillemain M., Elmberg J., Gauthier-Clerc M., Massez G., Hearn R., Champagnon J.,	, et
(2010). Wintering French Mallard and Teal Are Heavier and in Better Body Con-	nditi
than 30 Years Ago: Effects of a Changing Environment? Ambio 39, 170-80	
Guillemain M. & Hearn R. (2017). Ready for climate change? Geographic trends i	in t
protection status of critical sites for Western Palearctic ducks. Biodiversity	ty a
Conservation 26, 2347-2360. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10531-017-1359-z	
Guillemain M., Fritz H. & Duncan P. (2002). Foraging strategies of granivorous dat	bbli
ducks wintering in protected areas of the French Atlantic coast. Biodivers	sity
Conservation 11, 1721–	-173
http://dx.doi.org.ezproxy.is.cuni.cz/10.1023/A:1020322032114	
Guillemain M., Fritz H. & Guillon N. (2000). Foraging Behavior and Habitat Choi	oice
Wintering Northern Shoveler in a Major Wintering Quarter in France. Water	rbira
The International Journal of Waterbird Biology 23, 353	3–36
https://doi.org/10.2307/1522173	
Guillemain M., Champagnon J., Massez G., Pernollet C.A., George T., Momerency A.,	, et
(2015). Becoming more sedentary? Changes in recovery positions of Mallard	l Ar
platyrhynchos ringed in the Camargue, France, over the last 50 years. Wildfor	wl 6
51–63	
Gunnarsson G., Waldenström J. & Fransson T. (2012). Direct and indirect effects of v	win
harshness on the survival of Mallards Anas platyrhynchos in northwest Europe	e. Il
154, 307–317	
Haase P., Pilotto F., Li F., Sundermann A., Lorenz A.W., Tonkin J.D., et al. (2019). Mod	dera
warming over the past 25 years has already reorganized stream invertee	tebra
27	

1
2
3
4
5
5
0
/
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
27
20
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
30
10
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
57
52 52
55
54
55
56
57
58
59

722	communities. Science of The Total Environment 658, 1531–1538.
723	https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2018.12.234
724	Hair, J. F. Jr., Anderson, R. E., Tatham, R. L. & Black, W. C. (1995). Multivariate Data
725	Analysis (3rd edition). New York: Macmillan.
726	Holopainen S., Arzel C., Dessborn L., Elmberg J., Gunnarsson G., Nummi P., et al. (2015).
727	Habitat use in ducks breeding in boreal freshwater wetlands: a review. European
728	Journal of Wildlife Research 61, 339-363. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10344-015-0921-
729	2
730	Hrdinka, T. (2007). Typology and potential utilization of anthropogenic lakes in mining pits
731	in the Czech Republic. Limnological Review 7, 29–35.
732	Hurrell J.W. & Deser C. (2009). North Atlantic climate variability: The role of the North
733	Atlantic Oscillation. Journal of Marine Systems 78, 28–41.
734	https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jmarsys.2008.11.026
735	IPCC (2014). Climate Change 2014: Synthesis Report. Contribution of Working Groups I, II
736	and III to the Fifth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate
737	Change [Core Writing Team, R.K. Pachauri and L.A. Meyer (eds.)]. IPCC, Geneva,
738	Switzerland, 151 pp.
739	Jackson M.C., Loewen C.J.G., Vinebrooke R.D. & Chimimba C.T. (2016). Net effects of
740	multiple stressors in freshwater ecosystems: a meta-analysis. Global Change Biology
741	22, 180–189. <u>https://doi.org/10.1111/gcb.13028</u>
742	Jacobsen O.W. & Ugelvik M. (1994). Grazing and vigilance behaviour of breeding Eurasian
743	Wigeon Anas penelope in relation to distance from water. Wildfowl 45, 119-123
744	Janke A.K., Anteau M.J. & Stafford J.D. (2017). Long-Term Spatial Heterogeneity in
745	Mallard Distribution in the Prairie Pothole Region. Wildlife Society Bulletin
746	(2011-) 41 , 116–124

747	Jiguet F., Gadot AS., Julliard R., Newson S.E. & Couvet D. (2007). Climate envelope, life
748	history traits and the resilience of birds facing global change. Global Change Biology
749	13, 1672–1684. <u>https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2486.2007.01386.x</u>
750	Jørgensen P.S., Böhning-Gaese K., Thorup K., Tøttrup A.P., Chylarecki P., Jiguet F., et al.
751	(2016). Continent-scale global change attribution in European birds - combining
752	annual and decadal time scales. Global Change Biology 22, 530-543
753	https://doi.org/10.1111/gcb.13097
754	Kameníková M. & Rajchard J. (2013). Seasonal occurrence and abundance of waterbirds ir
755	sandpits and fishponds. EUROPEAN JOURNAL OF ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENCES
756	3, 48-63
757	Kear J. (2005). Ducks, Geese and Swans: General chapters, species accounts (Anhima to
758	Salvadorina). Oxford University Press.
759	Kingsford R.T., Basset A. & Jackson L. (2016). Wetlands: conservation's poor cousins
760	Aquatic Conservation: Marine and Freshwater Ecosystems 26, 892-916
761	https://doi.org/10.1002/aqc.2709
762	Kleyheeg E., van Dijk J.G.B., Tsopoglou-Gkina D., Woud T.Y., Boonstra D.K., Nolet B.A.
763	et al. (2017). Movement patterns of a keystone waterbird species are highly
764	predictable from landscape configuration. Movement Ecology 5, 2
765	https://doi.org/10.1186/s40462-016-0092-7
766	Kloskowski J., Green A.J., Polak M., Bustamante J. & Krogulec J. (2009). Complementary
767	use of natural and artificial wetlands by waterbirds wintering in Doñana, south-wes
768	Spain. Aquatic Conservation: Marine and Freshwater Ecosystems 19, 815-826
769	https://doi.org/10.1002/aqc.1027
770	Kranstauber, B., Smolla, M., & Safi, K. (2017). Similarity in spatial utilization distributions
771	measured by the earth mover's distance. Methods in Ecology and Evolution 8(2), 155-
772	160.
	29

1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
/	
8	
9	_
1	0
1	1
1	2
1	3
1.	4
1	5
1	6
1	7
1	8
1	a
ר ר	ر ۵
2	U 1
2	
2	2
2	3
2	4
2	5
2	б
2	7
2	8
2	9
3	0
2	1
ר כי	י ר
с. С	2
3	3
3	4
3	5
3	6
3	7
3	8
3	9
4	0
4	1
4	2
4	3
Δ.	4
1	5
1	ر د
4	7
4	/
4	ð
4	9
5	0
5	1
5	2
5	3
5	4
5	5
5	6
5	7
5	8
5	a
5	/

773	Lehikoinen A., Foppen R.P.B., Heldbjerg H., Lindström Å., van Manen W., Piirainen S., et
774	al. (2016). Large-scale climatic drivers of regional winter bird population trends.
775	Diversity and Distributions 22, 1163–1173. https://doi.org/10.1111/ddi.12480
776	Lehikoinen A., Jaatinen K., Vähätalo A.V., Clausen P., Crowe O., Deceuninck B., et al.
777	(2013). Rapid climate driven shifts in wintering distributions of three common
778	waterbird species. Global Change Biology 19, 2071-2081.
779	https://doi.org/10.1111/gcb.12200
780	Lewis B.S., Eichholz M.W., Yerkes T. & Coluccy J. (2019). Food Resources for Wintering
781	and Spring Staging American Black Ducks. Journal of Fish and Wildlife Management
782	10, 492-499. https://doi.org/10.3996/102018-JFWM-096
783	Lind L., Schuler M.S., Hintz W.D., Stoler A.B., Jones D.K., Mattes B.M., et al. (2018). Salty
784	fertile lakes: how salinization and eutrophication alter the structure of freshwater
785	communities. Ecosphere 9, e02383. https://doi.org/10.1002/ecs2.2383
786	Maclean I.M.D., Austin G.E., Rehfisch M.M., Blew J., Crowe O., Delany S., et al. (2008).
787	Climate change causes rapid changes in the distribution and site abundance of birds in
788	winter. Global Change Biology 14, 2489-2500. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-
789	<u>2486.2008.01666.x</u>
790	Musil, P., Cepák, J, Hudec, K. & Zárybnický, J. (2001). The Long-Term Trends in the
791	Breeding Waterfowl Populations in the Czech Republic. OMPO & Institute of Applied
792	Ecology, Kostelec nad Černými lesy.
793	Musil P., Darolová A., Jureček J., Musilová Z., Podhrazský M. & Slabeyová K. (2008). The
794	long-term trends in numbers of wintering geese in the Czech Republic and Slovakia
795	in 1991–2007. Tichodroma 20, 61–67
796	Musil P., Musilová Z., Fuchs R. & Poláková S. (2011). Long-term changes in numbers and
797	distribution of wintering waterbirds in the Czech Republic, 1966–2008. Bird Study 58,
798	450-460. https://doi.org/10.1080/00063657.2011.603289
	30

5		
6		
7		
8		
0		
10	799	Musil P (2006) Effect of Intensive Fish Production on Waterbird Breeding Population:
11	155	mash, 1. (2000). Effect of mensive risk frequencies on waterond Dieeding Fepalation.
12	800	Review of Current Knowledge. In: Boere G. C., Galbraith C. A. & Stroud D. A. (eds.),
13	801	Waterbirds around the world. TSO Scotland Ltd, Edinburgh, UK. pp 520-521.
14	002	Musilané 7, Musil D. Zaukan I. & Adam M. (2019a). Changes in bakitat suitability influence
16	802	Musilova Z., Musil P., Zounar J. & Adam M. (2018a). Changes in habitat suitability influence
17	803	non-breeding distribution of waterbirds in central Europe. Ibis 160, 582-596.
18 19	804	https://doi.org/10.1111/ibi.12559
20 21	805	Musilová Z., Musil P., Zouhar J. & Romportl D. (2015). Long-term trends, total numbers and
22	806	species richness of increasing waterbird populations at sites on the edge of their winter
23	807	range: cold-weather refuge sites are more important than protected sites. Journal of
24	808	Ornithelem: 1 10 https://doi.org/10.1007/s10336.015.1223.4
26	808	ormanology, 1=10. https://doi.org/10.100//310550-015-1225-4
27 28	809	Musilová Z., Musil P., Zouhar J., Adam M. & Bejček V. (2018b). Importance of Natura 2000
29	810	sites for wintering waterbirds: Low preference, species' distribution changes and
30 31	811	carrying capacity of Natura 2000 could fail to protect the species. Biological
32	812	Conservation 228, 79-88. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biocon.2018.10.004
33 34	813	Musilová Z., Musil P., Zouhar J., Bejček V., Šťastný K. & Hudec K. (2014). Numbers of
35	814	wintering waterbirds in the Czech Republic: long-term and spatial-scale approaches
30 37	815	to assess population size Bird Study 61 321-331
38	015	10 u_{33033} population 3120 . Dita 5100 01 , 521 551 .
39	816	https://doi.org/10.1080/00063657.2014.919573
40	817	Navedo I G Fernández G Valdivia N Drever M C & Masero I A (2017) Identifying
41 42	010	
43	818	management actions to increase foraging opportunities for shorebirds at semi-intensive
44	819	shrimp farms. Journal of Applied Ecology 54: 567–576.
45 46	820	Newton I. (1998). Population Limitation in Birds. Academic Press.
47		
48	821	Newton I. (2007). The Migration Ecology of Birds, 1 edition. Academic Press, Amsterdam.
49		
50	822	Newton I. (2013). Bird Populations, First Edition edition. William Collins.
51		
52		
53		

7		
8		
9		
10	823	Nilsson L. (2008). Changes in numbers and distribution of wintering waterfowl in Sweden
11	824	during forty years, 1967–2006. Ornis Svecica 18, 135–226
12	02.	
13	825	Nuijten R.J.M., Wood K.A., Haitjema T., Rees E.C. & Nolet B.A. (2020). Concurrent shifts
14		
15	826	in wintering distribution and phenology in migratory swans: Individual and
17	827	generational effects. Global Change Biology 26, 4263–4275.
18		
19	828	https://doi.org/10.1111/gcb.15151
20		
21	829	Nummi P. & Holopainen S. (2014). Whole-community facilitation by beaver: ecosystem
22	830	engineer increases waterbird diversity. Aquatic Conservation: Marine and Freshwater
23		
24	831	Ecosystems 24, 623-633. https://doi.org/10.1002/aqc.2437
25		
26	832	Nummi P., Väänänen VM., Holopainen S. & Pöysä H. (2016). Duck-fish competition in
27	833	boreal lakes - a review
28		
29	834	Oertli, B., Biggs, J., Céréghino, R., Grillas, P., Joly, P & Lachavanne, J. B. (2005).
30		
31	835	Conservation and monitoring of pond biodiversity: introduction. <i>Aquatic Conservation:</i>
32	836	Marine and Freshwater Ecosystems 15(6), 535–540
33		
34	837	Pannekoek, J. & Van Strien, A. J. (2005). TRIM 3 Manual (TRends and Indices for Monitoring
35		
36	838	Data). Statistics Netherlands, Voorburg, The Netherlands.
37	020	Provis M. C. different G. Narada LC. Carines Dadards A. Abad Cimer IN William A.
38	839	Parejo M., Gutierrez J.S., Navedo J.G., Soriano-Redondo A., Abad-Gomez J.M., Villegas A.,
39	840	et al. (2019). Day and night use of habitats by northern pintails during winter in a
40		
41	841	primary rice-growing region of Iberia. PLOS ONE 14, e0220400.
42	842	https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0220400
43		<u></u>
44	843	Pavón-Jordán D., Abdou W., Azafzaf H., Balaž M., Bino T., Borg J.J., et al. (2020). Positive
45 46		
40	844	impacts of important bird and biodiversity areas on wintering waterbirds under
47	845	changing temperatures throughout Europe and North Africa. Biological Conservation
40		
50	846	246, 108549. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biocon.2020.108549
51		
52	847	Pavón-Jordán D., Clausen P., Dagys M., Devos K., Encarnaçao V., Fox A.D., et al. (2019).
53	848	Habitat- and species-mediated short- and long-term distributional changes in
54		32
55		
56		

849	waterbird abundance linked to variation in European winter weather. Diversity and
850	Distributions 25, 225-239. https://doi.org/10.1111/ddi.12855
851	Pavón-Jordán D., Fox A.D., Clausen P., Dagys M., Deceuninck B., Devos K., et al. (2015).
852	Climate-driven changes in winter abundance of a migratory waterbird in relation to
853	EU protected areas. Diversity and Distributions 21, 571-582.
854	https://doi.org/10.1111/ddi.12300
855	Pechar L. (2000). Impacts of long-term changes in fishery management on the trophic level
856	water quality in Czech fish ponds. Fisheries Management and Ecology 7, 23-31.
857	https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1365-2400.2000.00193.x
858	Petrie M.J., Fleskes J.P., Wolder M.A., Isola C.R., Yarris G.S. & Skalos D.A. (2016). Potential
859	Effects of Drought on Carrying Capacity for Wintering Waterfowl in the Central
860	Valley of California. Journal of Fish and Wildlife Management 7, 408-422.
861	https://doi.org/10.3996/082015-JFWM-082
862	Pilotto F., Kühn I., Adrian R., Alber R., Alignier A., Andrews C., et al. (2020). Meta-analysis
863	of multidecadal biodiversity trends in Europe. Nature Communications 11, 3486.
864	https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-020-17171-y
865	Podhrázský M. Musil P. Musilová Z. Zouhar I. Adam M. Závora I. et al. (2017) Central
866	European Grevlag Geese Anser anser show a shortening of migration distance and
867	earlier spring arrival over 60 years. <i>Ibis</i> 159, 352–365.
868	https://doi.org/10.1111/ibi.12440
869	Pullin A.S. (2002). Conservation Biology. Cambridge University Press.
870	Radinger J., Essl F., Hölker F., Horký P., Slavík O. & Wolter C. (2017). The future distribution
871	of river fish: The complex interplay of climate and land use changes, species dispersal
872	and movement barriers. Global Change Biology 23, 4970-4986.
873	https://doi.org/10.1111/gcb.13760

8		
9		
10	874	Ridgill S.C. & Fox A.D. (1990). Cold Weather Movements of Waterfowl in Western Europe.
12	875	International Waterfowl and Wetlands Research Bureau.
13	876	Roverson P. A. (2001). Statistical methods for geography. London: Sage
14 15	070	Rogerson, T. A. (2001). Sutistical methods for geography. London. Suge.
16	877	Roy K., Vrba J., Kaushik S.J. & Mraz J. (2020). Feed-based common carp farming and
17	878	eutrophication: is there a reason for concern? Reviews in Aquaculture 12, 1736–1758.
18 19	879	https://doi.org/10.1111/raq.12407
20	000	Souter A. Karper Nieverselt F. & Jami J. (2010) Evidence of elimete change effects on
21	880	Sauter A., Komer-Wevergen F. & Jehn E. (2010). Evidence of chinate change effects on
23	881	within-winter movements of European Mallards Anas platyrhynchos. Ibis 152, 600-
24	882	609. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1474-919X.2010.01028.x
25 26	883	Seiche, E. K., Gerdeaux, D., Gwiazda, R., Lévai, F., Musil, P., Nemenonoks, O., Strod, T. &
27 28	884	Carss, D. N. (2012). Cormorant-fisheries conflicts in Carp ponds areas in Europe and
29	885	Israel - an INTERCAFE overview. COST Action 635 Final Report, COST ESF
30 31	886	Bussel. 112 pp.
32	887	Schummer M.L. Kaminski R.M. Raedeke A.H. & Graher D.A. (2010). Weather-Related
33 34	007	
35	888	Indices of Autumn-Winter Dabbling Duck Abundance in Middle North America. The
36 27	889	Journal of Wildlife Management 74, 94–101
38	890	Sinclair A.R.E., Fryxell J.M. & Caughley G. (2006). Wildlife Ecology, Conservation and
39 40	891	Management. Wiley.
41 42	892	Snow D.W. & Perrins C.M. (1998). The Birds of the Western Palearctic: Concise Edition
43	893	OUP. Oxford.
44 45	804	Soldaat I. L. Pannakoak I. Varwaii P. I.T. van Turnhout C. A. M. & van Strian A. I. (2017). A
46	094	Soluar E.E., Fannekock J., Verweij K.J.T., van Furmout C.A.W. & van Sulein A.J. (2017). A
47	895	Monte Carlo method to account for sampling error in multi-species indicators.
48 49	896	Ecological Indicators 81, 340–347. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolind.2017.05.033
50	897	Sutherland W.J., Pullin A.S., Dolman P.M. & Knight T.M. (2004). The need for evidence-
52	898	based conservation. TRENDS in Ecology and Evolution 19
53 54		24
54 55		34
56		
57		

58 59 60

	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
899	Sťastný, K., & Hudec, K. (eds) (2016). Fauna CR. Ptáci 1. Academia, Praha, 790 pp.
900	Švažas, S., Meissner, W., Serebryakov, V., Kozulin, A., Grishanov, G. (2001). Changes
901	of Wintering Sites of Waterfowl in Central and Eastern Europe. OMPO & Institute of
902	Ecology, Vilnius.
903	Tayleur C.M., Devictor V., Gauezere P., Jonzen N., Smith H.G. & Lindstrom A. (2016).
904	Regional variation in climate change winners and losers highlights the rapid loss of
905	cold-dwelling species. <i>Diversity and Distributions</i> 22, 468–480.
906	https://doi.org/10.1111/ddi.12412
907	Thomas C.D., Gillingham P.K., Bradbury R.B., Roy D.B., Anderson B.J., Baxter J.M., et al.
908	(2012). Protected areas facilitate species' range expansions. Proceedings of the
909	National Academy of Sciences 109, 14063–14068.
910	https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1210251109
911	Tourenq C., Bennetts R.E., Kowalski H., Vialet E., Lucchesi JL., Kayser Y., et al. (2001).
912	Are ricefields a good alternative to natural marshes for waterbird communities in the
913	Camargue, southern France? Biological Conservation 100, 335–343.
914	https://doi.org/10.1016/S0006-3207(01)00037-4
915	Tucker, G. M., & Evans, M. I. (1997). Habitats for birds in Europe. Aconservation strategy
916	for the wider environment. BirdLife International, Cambridge.
917	United Nations Environment Programme. Lakes and reservoirs – similarities, differences and
918	importance. 2017. Retrieved from:
919	http://www.unep.or.jp/ietc/Publications/Short_Series/LakeReservoirs-1/index.asp
920	van der Lee G.H. Vonk I.A. Verdonschot R.C.M. Kraak M.H.S. Verdonschot P.F.M. &
921	Huisman J. Eutrophication induces shifts in the trophic position of invertebrates in
922	aquatic food webs. <i>Ecology</i> , https://doi.org/10.1002/ecy.3275
522	aquante 1000 1000, 20010g

1
2
3
4
5
5
7
/
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
10
10
עו 20
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
20
20
50 21
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
11
יד ⊿ר∕
+∠ 42
45 44
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
55
50
5/
58
59

9	923	van Eerden, M. R. (1984). Waterfowl movements in relation to food stocks. In Coastal waders
9	924	and wildfowl in winter (ed. P.R. Evans, J.D. Goss-Custard and W.G.Hale), pp 84–100.
9	925	Cambridge Univ. Press.
9	926	Wagner D.L., Grames E.M., Forister M.L., Berenbaum M.R. & Stopak D. (2021). Insect
9	927	decline in the Anthropocene: Death by a thousand cuts. Proceedings of the National
9	928	Academy of Sciences 118. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.2023989118
9	929	Wetlands International (2006). Waterbird population estimates. Fourth Edition. Wetlands
9	930	International, Wageningen, The Netherlands.
9	931	Wetlands International (2018). Waterbird Population Estimates. Available
9	932	at: wpe.wetlands.org (accessed 10 March 2018).
9	933	Wood K.A., Stillman R.A., Wheeler D., Groves S., Hambly C., Speakman J.R., et al. (2013a).
9	934	Go with the flow: water velocity regulates herbivore foraging decisions in river
9	935	catchments. Oikos 122, 1720–1729. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1600-
9	936	<u>0706.2013.00592.x</u>
9	937	Wood K.A., Stillman R.A., Coombs T., Mcdonald C., Daunt F. & O'hare M.T. (2013b). The
9	938	role of season and social grouping on habitat use by Mute Swans (Cygnus olor) in a
9	939	lowland river catchment. Bird Study 60, 229–237.
9	940	https://doi.org/10.1080/00063657.2013.776003
9	941	
ļ	942	Data availability statement:
	943	The data that support the findings of this study are available from the corresponding author
	944	upon reasonable request.
	045	
2	945	
9	946	Additional Information:
9	947	The authors declare no competing interests.
		36





show the proportion of the given wetland type among all 1169 monitored sites.









968 (graphical abstract).



970 Table 1. List of investigated species and its species-specific variables (diet, species

971 temperature index and site <u>affinity-conservatism</u>)

Mute SwanCygnus olorherbivore 1.27 0.771 Tundra Been GooseAnser serrirostrisherbivore -2.51 0.139 White-fronted GooseAnser albifronsherbivore 2.53 0.462 Greylag GooseAnser anserherbivore 4.47 0.516 Eurasian WigeonMareca penelopeherbivore 16.53 0.468 GadwallMareca streperaherbivore 11.73 0.468 Eurasian TealAnas creccaomnivore 12.72 0.572 MallardAnas creccaomnivore -0.02 0.747 Northern PintailAnas acutaomnivore 10.45 0.816 Greater ScaupAythya ferinaomnivore 10.45 0.816 Greater ScaupAythya marilainvertivore 0.69 0.366 Common GoldeneyeBucephala clangulainvertivore -1.58 0.515 Common MerganserMergellus albelluspiscivore -1.58 0.643 Little GrebeTachybaptusinvertivore 3.70 0.486 Great CormorantPhalacrocoraxpiscivore 3.70 0.486 Great EgretArdea albapiscivore 3.25 0.612 Great EgretArdea albapiscivore 3.64 0.543 Great CormorantPhalacrocoraxpiscivore 3.64 0.689 Great Lorested GrebeFodiceps cristatuspiscivore 3.61 0.757 Common MoorhenGallinula chloropusomnivore <th>Species</th> <th></th> <th>Diet</th> <th>Species temperature index</th> <th>Site affinityconservatism</th>	Species		Diet	Species temperature index	Site affinityconservatism
Tundra Been GooseAnser serrirostrisherbivore-2.510.139White-fronted GooseAnser albifronsherbivore2.530.462Greylag GooseAnser anserherbivore4.470.516Eurasian WigeonMareca penelopeherbivore16.530.468GadwallMareca streperaherbivore11.730.468Eurasian TealAnas creccaomnivore12.720.572MallardAnas platyrhynchosomnivore16.90.412Common PochardAythya ferinaomnivore11.340.576Tufted DuckAythya farinainvertivore0.430.487Velvet ScoterMelanitta fuscainvertivore0.690.366Common GoldeneyeBucephala clangulainvertivore1.580.515Common MerganserMergus merganserpiscivore-1.580.643Little GrebeTachybatpusinvertivore3.540.689Great Crested GrebePodiceps cristatuspiscivore3.700.486Great EgretArdea albapiscivore3.250.612Great EgretArdea cinereapiscivore5.610.757Gommon MoorhenGallinula chloropusomnivore5.610.758Black-headed GullChroicoceph. carusomnivore5.680.691Mer GullChroicoceph. carusomnivore1.620.294	Mute Swan	Cygnus olor	herbivore	1.27	0.771
White-fronted GooseAnser anserherbivore2.530.462Greylag GooseAnser anserherbivore4.470.516Eurasian WigeonMareca penelopeherbivore16.530.468GadwallMareca streperaherbivore11.730.468Eurasian TealAnas creccaomnivore12.720.572MallardAnas platyrhynchosomnivore16.90.412Common PochardAythya ferinaomnivore11.340.576Tufted DuckAythya fuligulainvertivore0.430.487Velvet ScoterMelanitta fuscainvertivore0.690.366Common MochaneBucephala clangulainvertivore1.110.627SmewMergellus albelluspiscivore-1.580.515Common MerganserMergus merganserpiscivore3.540.689Great Crested GrebeTachybaptusinvertivore3.700.486Great CormorantPhalacrocoraxpiscivore3.250.612Great EgretArdea albapiscivore3.540.543GreyberonArdea cinereapiscivore5.610.757Common MoorhenGallinula chloropusomnivore5.610.758Black-headed GullChroicoceph. informationomnivore5.860.691Merguliinforceph. informationomnivore1.620.294	Tundra Been Goose	Anser serrirostris	herbivore	-2.51	0.139
Greylag GooseAnser anserherbivore4.470.516Eurasian WigeonMareca penelopeherbivore16.530.468GadwallMareca streperaherbivore11.730.468Eurasian TealAnas creccaomnivore12.720.572MallardAnas platyrhynchosomnivore-0.020.747Northern PintailAnas acutaomnivore16.90.412Common PochardAythya ferinaomnivore11.340.576Tufted DuckAythya fuligulainvertivore0.430.487Greater ScaupAythya marilainvertivore0.690.366Common GoldeneyeBucephala clangulainvertivore-1.110.627SmewMergellus albelluspiscivore-1.580.515Common MerganserMergus merganserpiscivore3.540.689Great Crested GrebePodiceps cristatuspiscivore3.250.612Great EgretArdea albapiscivore5.410.543Grey HeronArdea cinereapiscivore5.610.775Common MoorhenGallinula chloropusomnivore5.860.758Black-headed GullChroicoceph. Larus canusomnivore6.580.691Wew GullLarus canusomnivore1.620.294	White-fronted Goose	Anser albifrons	herbivore	2.53	0.462
Eurasian WigeonMareca penelopeherbivore16.530.468GadwallMareca streperaherbivore11.730.468Eurasian TealAnas creccaomnivore12.720.572MallardAnas platyrhynchosomnivore-0.020.747Northern PintailAnas acutaomnivore16.90.412Common PochardAythya ferinaomnivore11.340.576Tufted DuckAythya fuligulainvertivore10.450.816Greater ScaupAythya marilainvertivore0.690.366Common GoldeneyeBucephala clangulainvertivore-1.110.627SmewMergellus albelluspiscivore-1.580.515Common MerganserMergus merganserpiscivore3.700.486Great Crested GrebePhalacrocoraxpiscivore3.250.612Great EgretArdea albapiscivore5.410.543Grey HeronArdea cinereapiscivore5.610.775Common MoorhenGallinula chloropusomnivore5.860.758Black-headed GullChroicoceph. Larus canusomnivore6.580.691Wew GullLinkur Almaomnivore1.620.294	Greylag Goose	Anser anser	herbivore	4.47	0.516
GadwallMareca streperaherbivore11.730.468Eurasian TealAnas creccaomnivore12.720.572MallardAnas platyrhynchosomnivore-0.020.747Northern PintailAnas acutaomnivore16.90.412Common PochardAythya ferinaomnivore11.340.576Tufted DuckAythya fuligulainvertivore10.450.816Greater ScaupAythya marilainvertivore0.430.487Velvet ScoterMelanitta fuscainvertivore0.690.366Common GoldeneyeBucephala clangulainvertivore-1.110.627SmewMergellus albelluspiscivore-1.580.515Common MerganserMergus merganserpiscivore3.540.689Great Crested GrebeFodiceps cristatuspiscivore3.700.486Great CormorantPhalacrocoraxpiscivore3.250.612Great EgretArdea albapiscivore5.410.543Grey HeronArdea cinereapiscivore5.610.757Eurasian CootFulica atraomnivore5.860.758Black-headed GullChroicoceph. Larius canusomnivore6.580.691Mew GullLarius canusomnivore1.620.294	Eurasian Wigeon	Mareca penelope	herbivore	16.53	0.468
Eurasian TealAnas creccaomnivore12.720.572MallardAnas platyrhynchosomnivore-0.020.747Northern PintailAnas acutaomnivore16.90.412Common PochardAythya ferinaomnivore11.340.576Tufted DuckAythya fuligulainvertivore10.450.816Greater ScaupAythya marilainvertivore0.430.487Velvet ScoterMelanitta fuscainvertivore0.690.366Common MoldeneyeBucephala clangulainvertivore-1.110.627SmewMergulus albelluspiscivore-1.580.515Common MerganserMergus merganserpiscivore-0.500.643Little GrebeTachybaptusinvertivore3.540.689Great Crested GrebePodiceps cristatuspiscivore3.250.612Great EgretArdea cinereapiscivore5.410.543Grey HeronArdea cinereapiscivore5.610.757Common MoorhenGallinula chloropusomnivore5.860.758Black-headed GullChroicoceph.omnivore6.580.691Wew GullLitica atraomnivore1.620.294	Gadwall	Mareca strepera	herbivore	11.73	0.468
MallardAnas platyrhynchosomnivore-0.020.747Northern PintailAnas acutaomnivore16.90.412Common PochardAythya ferinaomnivore11.340.576Tufted DuckAythya fuligulainvertivore10.450.816Greater ScaupAythya marilainvertivore0.430.487Velvet ScoterMelanitta fuscainvertivore0.690.366Common GoldeneyeBucephala clangulainvertivore-1.110.627SmewMergellus albelluspiscivore-1.580.515Common MerganserMergus merganserpiscivore-0.500.643Little GrebeTachybaptusinvertivore3.540.689Great Crested GrebePhalacrocoraxpiscivore3.250.612Great EgretArdea cinereapiscivore5.410.543Grey HeronArdea cinereapiscivore5.610.757Common MoorhenGallinula chloropusomnivore5.610.758Black-headed GullChroicoceph.omnivore6.580.691Wew GullLitrus canusomnivore1.620.294	Eurasian Teal	Anas crecca	omnivore	12.72	0.572
Northern PintailAnas acutaomnivore16.90.412Common PochardAythya ferinaomnivore11.340.576Tufted DuckAythya fuligulainvertivore10.450.816Greater ScaupAythya marilainvertivore0.430.487Velvet ScoterMelanitta fuscainvertivore0.690.366Common GoldeneyeBucephala clangulainvertivore-1.110.627SmewMergellus albelluspiscivore-1.580.515Common MerganserMergus merganserpiscivore-0.500.643Little GrebeTachybaptusinvertivore3.540.689Great CormorantPhalacrocoraxpiscivore3.700.486Great EgretÄrdea albapiscivore5.410.543Grey HeronArdea cinereapiscivore5.610.775Eurasian CootFulica atraomnivore5.860.758Black-headed GullChroicoceph. Larus canusomnivore1.620.294	Mallard	Anas platyrhynchos	omnivore	-0.02	0.747
Common PochardAythya ferinaomnivore11.340.576Tufted DuckAythya fuligulainvertivore10.450.816Greater ScaupAythya marilainvertivore0.430.487Velvet ScoterMelanitta fuscainvertivore0.690.366Common GoldeneyeBucephala clangulainvertivore-1.110.627SmewMergellus albelluspiscivore-1.580.515Common MerganserMergus merganserpiscivore-0.500.643Little GrebeTachybaptusinvertivore3.540.689Great CormorantPhalacrocoraxpiscivore3.700.486Great EgretArdea albapiscivore5.410.543Grey HeronArdea cinereapiscivore5.610.775Eurasian CootFulica atraomnivore5.860.758Black-headed GullChroicoceph.omnivore6.580.691Wew GullLinualLinualsomnivore1.620.294	Northern Pintail	Anas acuta	omnivore	16.9	0.412
Tufted DuckAythya fuligulainvertivore10.450.816Greater ScaupAythya marilainvertivore0.430.487Velvet ScoterMelanitta fuscainvertivore0.690.366Common GoldeneyeBucephala clangulainvertivore-1.110.627SmewMergellus albelluspiscivore-1.580.515Common MerganserMergus merganserpiscivore-0.500.643Little GrebeTachybaptusinvertivore3.540.689Great Crested GrebePodiceps cristatuspiscivore3.700.486Great EgretArdea albapiscivore3.250.612Grey HeronArdea cinereapiscivore4.320.757Common MoorhenGallinula chloropusomnivore5.610.775Eurasian CootFulica atraomnivore5.860.691Mew GullLincurscianusomnivore1.620.294	Common Pochard	Aythya ferina	omnivore	11.34	0.576
Greater ScaupAythya marilainvertivore0.430.487Velvet ScoterMelanitta fuscainvertivore0.690.366Common GoldeneyeBucephala clangulainvertivore-1.110.627SmewMergellus albelluspiscivore-1.580.515Common MerganserMergus merganserpiscivore-0.500.643Little GrebeTachybaptusinvertivore3.540.689Great Crested GrebePodiceps cristatuspiscivore3.700.486Great CormorantPhalacrocoraxpiscivore3.250.612Great EgretArdea cinereapiscivore5.410.543Grey HeronArdea cinereapiscivore5.610.775Common MoorhenGallinula chloropusomnivore5.860.758Black-headed GullChroicoceph. Larus canusomnivore6.580.691Wer GullTarus canusomnivore1.620.294	Tufted Duck	Aythya fuligula	invertivore	10.45	0.816
Velvet ScoterMelanitta fuscainvertivore0.690.366Common GoldeneyeBucephala clangulainvertivore-1.110.627SmewMergellus albelluspiscivore-1.580.515Common MerganserMergus merganserpiscivore-0.500.643Little GrebeTachybaptusinvertivore3.540.689Great Crested GrebePodiceps cristatuspiscivore3.700.486Great CormorantPhalacrocoraxpiscivore3.250.612Great EgretArdea cinereapiscivore5.410.543Grey HeronArdea cinereapiscivore5.610.775Eurasian CootFulica atraomnivore5.860.758Black-headed GullChroicoceph. Larus canusomnivore1.620.294	Greater Scaup	Aythya marila	invertivore	0.43	0.487
Common GoldeneyeBucephala clangulainvertivore-1.110.627SmewMergellus albelluspiscivore-1.580.515Common MerganserMergus merganserpiscivore-0.500.643Little GrebeTachybaptusinvertivore3.540.689Great Crested GrebePodiceps cristatuspiscivore3.700.486Great CormorantPhalacrocoraxpiscivore3.250.612Great EgretArdea albapiscivore5.410.543Grey HeronArdea cinereapiscivore4.320.757Common MoorhenGallinula chloropusomnivore5.610.775Eurasian CootFulica atraomnivore5.860.691Wer GullLinus canusomnivore1.620.294	Velvet Scoter	Melanitta fusca	invertivore	0.69	0.366
SmewMergellus albelluspiscivore-1.580.515Common MerganserMergus merganserpiscivore-0.500.643Little GrebeTachybaptusinvertivore3.540.689Great Crested GrebePodiceps cristatuspiscivore3.700.486Great CormorantPhalacrocoraxpiscivore3.250.612Great EgretArdea albapiscivore5.410.543Grey HeronArdea cinereapiscivore4.320.757Common MoorhenGallinula chloropusomnivore5.610.775Eurasian CootFulica atraomnivore5.860.691Mew GullLichwidzeromnivore1.620.294	Common Goldeneye	Bucephala clangula	invertivore	-1.11	0.627
Common MerganserMergus merganserpiscivore-0.500.643Little GrebeTachybaptusinvertivore3.540.689Great Crested GrebePodiceps cristatuspiscivore3.700.486Great CormorantPhalacrocoraxpiscivore3.250.612Great EgretArdea albapiscivore5.410.543Grey HeronArdea cinereapiscivore4.320.757Common MoorhenGallinula chloropusomnivore5.610.775Eurasian CootFulica atraomnivore5.860.691Mew GullTarus canusomnivore1.620.294	Smew	Mergellus albellus	piscivore	-1.58	0.515
Little GrebeTachybaptus invertivoreinvertivore3.540.689Great Crested GrebePodiceps cristatuspiscivore3.700.486Great CormorantPhalacrocorax Ardea albapiscivore3.250.612Great EgretArdea cinereapiscivore5.410.543Grey HeronArdea cinereapiscivore4.320.757Common MoorhenGallinula chloropusomnivore5.610.775Eurasian CootFulica atraomnivore5.860.758Black-headed GullChroicoceph. Larus canusomnivore1.620.294	Common Merganser	Mergus merganser	piscivore	-0.50	0.643
Great Crested Grebe <i>Podiceps cristatus</i> <i>Podiceps cristatus</i> piscivore3.700.486Great Cormorant <i>Phalacrocorax</i> <i>Ardea alba</i> piscivore3.250.612Great Egret <i>Ardea alba</i> piscivore5.410.543Grey Heron <i>Ardea cinerea</i> piscivore4.320.757Common Moorhen <i>Gallinula chloropus</i> omnivore5.610.775Eurasian Coot <i>Fulica atra</i> omnivore5.860.758Black-headed Gull <i>Chroicoceph.</i> <i>Larus canus</i> omnivore1.620.294	Little Grebe	Tachybaptus	invertivore	3.54	0.689
Great CormorantPhalacrocoraxpiscivore3.250.612Great EgretArdea albapiscivore5.410.543Grey HeronArdea cinereapiscivore4.320.757Common MoorhenGallinula chloropusomnivore5.610.775Eurasian CootFulica atraomnivore5.860.758Black-headed GullChroicoceph.omnivore6.580.691Mew GullTarus canusomnivore1.620.294	Great Crested Grebe	Podiceps cristatus	piscivore	3.70	0.486
Great EgretArdea albapiscivore5.410.543Grey HeronArdea cinereapiscivore4.320.757Common MoorhenGallinula chloropusomnivore5.610.775Eurasian CootFulica atraomnivore5.860.758Black-headed GullChroicoceph.omnivore6.580.691Mew GullLarus canusomnivore1.620.294	Great Cormorant	Phalacrocorax	piscivore	3.25	0.612
Grey HeronArdea cinereapiscivore4.320.757Common MoorhenGallinula chloropusomnivore5.610.775Eurasian CootFulica atraomnivore5.860.758Black-headed GullChroicoceph.omnivore6.580.691Mew GullLarus canusomnivore1.620.294	Great Egret	Ardea alba	piscivore	5.41	0.543
Common MoorhenGallinula chloropusomnivore5.610.775Eurasian CootFulica atraomnivore5.860.758Black-headed GullChroicoceph.omnivore6.580.691Mew GullLarus canusomnivore1.620.294	Grey Heron	Ardea cinerea	piscivore	4.32	0.757
Eurasian CootFulica atraomnivore5.860.758Black-headed GullChroicoceph.omnivore6.580.691Mew GullLarus canusomnivore1.620.294	Common Moorhen	Gallinula chloropus	omnivore	5.61	0.775
Black-headed GullChroicoceph.omnivore6.580.691Mew Gull <i>Larus canus</i> omnivore1.620.294	Eurasian Coot	Fulica atra	omnivore	5.86	0.758
Mew Gull <i>Larus canus</i> omnivore 1.62 0.294	Black-headed Gull	Chroicoceph.	omnivore	6.58	0.691
	Mew Gull	Larus canus	omnivore	1.62	0.294

972 Notes: Species temperature index: the long-term average January temperature (1950–2000)
973 experienced by individuals of any given species across the species' entire wintering
974 distribution (Devictor *et al.*, 2008; Jiguet *et al.*, 2007). *Site affinity:* a measure of year-to-year
975 variation in geographical distribution of the species across the study region. The measure is
976 bounded between 0 and 1, with the actual range of values being 0.14–0.82 in our data set. See
977 species-specific variables in methods for details.

978	Table 2. Changes in <u>abundancesnumbers</u> of individual species in four wetland types (the overall area is also included)
-----	--

	Reservoirs (overall		Fishponds (overall		Industrial waters (overall		Running waters (overall		All wetlands (overall		Difference in wetl.types trends
Species	slope±SE)	trend	slope±SE)	trend	slope±SE)	trend	slope±SE)	trend	slope±SE)	Trend	(Wald test)
Mute Swan	$0.04{\pm}0.01$	MI**	-0.01 ± 0.00	S	0.03±0.01	MI*	-0.04 ± 0.00	MD**	-0.03 ± 0.00	MD**	200.65***
Tundra Been Goose	0.01 ± 62.66	U	0.09 ± 0.11	U	-0.06 ± 0.05	U	-0.04 ± 0.02	MD*	0.02 ± 0.02	S	0.00 ns.
White-fronted Goose	0.20 ± 4.75	U	0.24±0.51	U	0.23±0.05	SI**	0.08 ± 0.02	MI**	$0.16{\pm}0.02$	SI**	676.92***
Greylag Goose	0.16 ± 0.44	U	0.19±0.06	SI*	0.09±0.03	MI**	0.01 ± 0.01	S	0.13 ± 0.00	SI**	334.18***
Eurasian Wigeon	0.07 ± 0.07	U	0.14±0.09	U	0.16±0.03	SI**	0.02 ± 0.018	MI**	0.07 ± 0.01	SI**	170.32***
Gadwall	$0.20{\pm}0.11$	U	0.15 ± 0.04	SI*	0.28±0.21	U	0.13±0.02	SI**	$0.16{\pm}0.02$	SI**	320.61***
Eurasian Teal	$0.00{\pm}0.03$	U	0.01 ± 0.01	S	0.07±0.02	MI**	-0.01 ± 0.01	MD*	0.00 ± 0.00	S	2.24 ns.
Mallard	0.01 ± 0.01	S	0.01 ± 0.00	MI**	-0.04±0.01	MD**	-0.01±0.00	S	0.00 ± 0.00	S	2.23 ns.
Northern Pintail	0.06 ± 0.07	U	0.11±0.16	U	0.03±0.04	U	-0.01±0.02	S	$0.04{\pm}0.01$	MI*	19.85***
Common Pochard	0.03 ± 0.07	U	-0.08 ± 0.01	SD*	0.11±0.027	SI**	-0.14±0.02	SD**	-0.05 ± 0.00	MD**	284.35***
Tufted Duck	0.11±0.03	SI*	0.00 ± 0.01	S	0.10±0.02	SI**	-0.03 ± 0.00	MD**	0.01 ± 0.00	MI*	4.10*
Greater Scaup	0.17±0.13	U	0.01±0.09	U	0.13±0.08	U	-0.03±0.03	U	0.06 ± 0.02	MI**	33.99***
Velvet Scoter	0.11±0.09	U	-		0.07±0.05	U	-0.10±0.20	U	0.06 ± 0.02	MI**	31.97***
Common Goldeneye	0.09 ± 0.02	SI**	0.05 ± 0.02	MI**	0.11±0.02	SI**	-0.01±0.00	MD*	0.05±0.00	MI**	203.16***
Smew	0.05 ± 0.07	U	0.03 ± 0.07	U	0.13±0.04	MI**	0.00±0.01	S	0.03±0.01	MI**	18.18***
Common Merganser	0.03 ± 0.01	MI**	0.07 ± 0.01	SI*	0.07±0.01	MI**	0.02 ± 0.00	MI**	0.03±0.00	MI**	151.26***
Little Grebe	0.03 ± 0.02	U	-0.03 ± 0.02	MD*	0.01±0.02	S	0.01±0.00	MI**	0.01±0.00	MI**	40.12***
Great Crested Grebe	0.05 ± 0.01	MI**	0.08 ± 0.04	MI*	0.07±0.02	MI**	-0.03 ± 0.01	MD*	0.05±0.01	MI**	133.15***
Great Cormorant	$0.04{\pm}0.01$	MI**	0.08 ± 0.01	SI*	0.08±0.01	SI*	0.04 ± 0.00	MI**	0.05±0.00	MI**	296.69***
Great Egret	0.22±0.23	U	0.14±0.01	SI**	0.19±0.03	SI**	0.11±0.01	SI**	0.14±0.01	SI**	795.25***
Grey Heron	-0.02±0.01	MD**	0.03 ± 0.00	MI**	0.02±0.01	S	-0.01 ± 0.00	MD*	0.01±0.00	MI**	13.81***
Common Moorhen	0.02 ± 0.04	U	0.02 ± 0.01	MI*	0.05±0.02	MI*	-0.01±0.01	S	0.00 ± 0.00	S	7.22**
Eurasian Coot	0.07±0.01	SI*	0.01 ± 0.01	S	0.08±0.01	SI**	-0.07±0.00	SD**	-0.02 ± 0.00	MD**	129.51***
Black-headed Gull	0.07 ± 0.04	U	-0.01±0.01	S	-0.06±0.01	MD**	-0.02 ± 0.002	MD**	-0.01±0.00	MD**	19.73***

Freshwater Biology

1													
2													
3 ⊿													
4 5													
6		Mew Gull	0.06±0.07	U	0.01±0.02	U	0.02±0.01	S	0.02±0.01	S	0.04±0.01	MI**	85.90***
/ 8	070		- 0 01 م	< 0.001		C :	1CI (•	MT 1				1
9	979 980	Notes: (1) * $p < 0.05$, ** p SD – strong decrease. U –	o < 0.01, *** <i>p</i> < - uncertain.	< 0.001.	(11) Categories	s of tren	ids: SI – strong	; increase	, MI – moderat	te incre	ase, S – stable,	MD – mo	oderate decrease,
10		<i>b b b b b b b b b b</i>											
11													
12 13													
14													
15													
16													
17 10													
10 19													
20													
21													
22													
23 24													
24 25													
26													
27													
28													
29													
50 31													
32													
33													
34													
35													
30 37													
38							44						
39													
40													
41													
4∠ ⊿3													
44													
45													

981 Table 3. Results of a random-effects negative binomial regression explaining total

982 <u>abundancesnumbers</u>.

Diet	Reservoirs	Fishponds	Industrial	Running
TT - 1 '	0.202	0.905	0 (25	0.270
Herbivores	-0.202	0.895	-0.635	0.370
Omministra	(0.866)	(1.227)	(1.118)	(0.928)
Omnivores	rer.	reī.	reī.	rei.
Invertivores	-0.898	-1.996**	0.282	0.113
	(0.731)	(0.740)	(0.570)	(0.725)
Piscivores	-0.597	0.172	0.549	0.593
	(0.746)	(1.138)	(1.059)	(0.978)
Site affinityconservatism	0.206	0.627	0.360	1.290**
(standardized)				
	(0.423)	(0.521)	(0.511)	(0.444)
STI (standardized)	-0.914*	-0.248	-0.0483	-0.415
	(0.370)	(0.485)	(0.447)	(0.352)
Year (base $= 2020$)	0.0557*	0.0147	0.0232	-0.0226
	(0.0270)	(0.0218)	(0.0199)	(0.0150)
Diet #- <u>×</u> year				
Herbivores ≚# year	0.0220	0.0967*	0.0882^{**}	0.0456
	(0.0357)	(0.0377)	(0.0280)	(0.0298)
Invertivores ¥# year	0.0155	-0.0113	0.0847^{*}	0.000531
	(0.0327)	(0.0225)	(0.0393)	(0.0172)
Piscivorous <u>×</u> # year	-0.00951	0.0714*	0.0718**	0.0504^{*}
	(0.0374)	(0.0308)	(0.0244)	(0.0222)
Site <u>affinityconservatism ×</u> #	0.000514	-0.0204^{*}	-0.0238*	0.00214
year				
	(0.0171)	(0.0103)	(0.0114)	(0.0103)
STI ≚# year	-0.000489	0.0198*	0.0275**	0.00853
	(0.0124)	(0.00967)	(0.0103)	(0.00814)
Constant	6.448***	5.694***	5.765***	5.918***
	(0.624)	(0.888)	(0.921)	(0.725)
$log(\alpha)$	-0.0724	-0.0724	-0.0724	-0.0724
	(0.121)	(0.121)	(0.121)	(0.121)
var(species random effect)	4.088***	4.088***	4.088***	4.088***
	(1.041)	(1.041)	(1.041)	(1.041)
Observations	3267	3267	3267	3267
p(Different trends by diet)	0.63292	0.00002	0.00512	0.01802

983 Notes: (i) The model specification contains the interactions of *wetland type* with all other 984 covariates. To enhance readability, coefficients are presented in four columns, each related to 985 one wetland type; moreover, the coefficients have been transformed to show the covariate 986 effects *on the given wetland type*. (ii) Robust (Huber-White sandwich) standard errors in 987 parentheses. (iii) * p < 0.05, ** p < 0.01, *** p < 0.001.

 I