1 **Factors affecting survival in Mediterranean populations of the**
2 **Eurasian eagle owl**

3

4 **Mario León-Ortega^{1*} · María del Mar Delgado² · José E. Martínez^{1,3} · Vincenzo**
5 **Penteriani^{2,4} · José F. Calvo¹**

6

7 ¹*Departamento de Ecología e Hidrología, Universidad de Murcia, Campus de*
8 *Espinardo, Spain*

9 ²*Research Unit of Biodiversity (UMIB, UO-CSIC-PA), Oviedo University - Campus*
10 *Mieres, 33600 Mieres, Spain*

11 ³*Bonelli's Eagle Study and Conservation Group. Apdo. 4009, E-30080, Murcia, Spain*

12 ⁴*Department of Conservation Biology, Estación Biológica de Doñana, C.S.I.C., c/*
13 *Americo Vespucio s/n, 41092 Sevilla, Spain*

14

15 * Corresponding author:

16 Email: mlortega@um.es

17 Telf: +34 626 99 94 45

18 **Abstract**

19 The survival rate is a key parameter for population management and the monitoring of
20 populations. Thus, an analysis of survival rate variations and the factors influencing the
21 same is essential for understanding population dynamics. Here, we study the factors
22 determining the survival and the causes of mortality of the Eurasian eagle owl (*Bubo*
23 *bubo*) in two Spanish Mediterranean populations (Murcia and Seville) where the species
24 has a high population density and breeding success; yet its survival rates and the factors
25 that affect them are unknown. Between 2003 and 2010, 63 breeding owls were captured
26 and radio-tracked. Three-monthly (quarterly) survival rates were estimated using
27 known-fate models in the program MARK. The mean overall annual survival rate was
28 0.776 (95% CI = 0.773-0.779). We observed survival differences between sexes, and
29 between the breeding and non-breeding periods, although no overwhelming support was
30 found for any particular model. We concluded that: (i) females have a lower survival
31 rate than males, probably due to their larger home ranges, which increase the risk of
32 mortality; (ii) the survival rates of both sexes were lower during the non-breeding
33 period; and (iii) the causes of mortality differed significantly between the two
34 populations, gunshot being the main cause in Seville and electrocution in Murcia.

35

36 **Keywords**

37 Home range · Human-induced mortality · Known-fate model · Sex-biased mortality.

38 **Introduction**

39 The study of demographic parameters in wildlife populations is essential for
40 understanding the trends and changes of wild populations (Moyes et al. 2006; Schaub et
41 al. 2010; Smith et al. 2010; Tenan et al. 2012). Within the different demographic
42 parameters, survival is considered the most important for population dynamics, since
43 this parameter is the greatest contributor to the population growth rate in *K*-selected
44 organisms (Sibly and Hone 2002; Grande et al. 2009; Margalida et al. 2014). The
45 survival rate is also a key parameter for population management and for monitoring
46 populations of conservation concern, especially in the case of long-lived species
47 (Wisdom et al. 2000; Hernández-Matías et al. 2011). Thus, understanding the patterns of
48 variation in survival is necessary for interpreting both life-history variations and the
49 mechanisms of population change and dynamics (Robinson et al. 2010; Smith et al.
50 2014).

51 To our knowledge, not a single work on owl survival in Mediterranean European
52 regions has been yet published, whereas in boreal and temperate regions of Europe and
53 North America this information is available for several species. These studies revealed
54 that owl survival: (i) shows temporal patterns of variation related to cyclic food
55 abundance and climatic factors (Seamans et al. 2002; Francis and Saurola 2004;
56 Lehtikoinen et al. 2011; Pavón-Jordán et al. 2013); (ii) is influenced by habitat structure
57 (Hakkarainen et al. 2008); (iii) decreases with the presence of human infrastructures
58 (Grilo et al. 2012; Thorup et al. 2013; Borda de Água et al. 2014); and (iv) is reduced by
59 the predation of young individuals (Sunde 2005). In addition to age, other individual-
60 related variables, such as sex or physical condition, are expected to be important factors
61 affecting survival. For example, age- and sex-biased mortality has been observed in
62 some wild bird populations (Tavecchia et al. 2001; Martín et al. 2007; Rymešová et al.
63 2012), and other studies have documented higher survival rates for individuals with

64 better body condition or health status (Dinsmore and Collazo 2003; Hylton et al. 2006).
65 Differences in survival rates between males and females are usually associated to
66 differences in behaviour and energetic investment during the reproduction period (Liker
67 and Székely 2005; Rymešová et al. 2012), but also to differences in habitat use or
68 foraging activities (Lambertucci et al. 2012).

69 For the Eurasian eagle owl *Bubo bubo* (Linnaeus, 1758), a socially monogamous
70 and long-lived species (> 15 years in the field and > 60 years in captivity; Penteriani et
71 al. 2010), which has a sedentary and territorial behaviour, a high adult survival is
72 probably attributable to the acquisition of a territory and increased foraging experience
73 (Newton 1989; Martin 1995). Although some studies on the causes of death of Eurasian
74 eagle owls showed high mortality by electrocution and direct persecution (Marchesi et
75 al. 2002; Sergio et al. 2004; Martínez et al. 2006), little information exists about
76 determining the factors that affect their survival, with only two studies showing that
77 survival rates increases with age (Olsson 1997; Schaub et al. 2010), although other
78 possible factors such as sex were not taken into account. The above studies used ring-
79 recoveries of birds that had been ringed in the nest (Olsson 1997) and data on dead owls
80 reported from bird rescue centres and museums of natural history (Schaub et al. 2010).
81 Hence, a possible bias in the estimation of adult survival could be possible.

82 Survival is frequently estimated using capture-mark-recapture techniques based
83 on recaptures and/or recoveries of birds ringed with metal or coloured rings, or a
84 combination of both (Lebreton et al. 1992), or by radio-tracking (Kenward 2001). These
85 methods have been widely used in population monitoring studies, which determine
86 general demographic parameters in wildlife, such as immigration, emigration, survival
87 and population size (Altwegg et al. 2003, Newton et al. 2016). In particular, the use of
88 radio telemetry represents an ideal method for survival studies, as it provides unbiased
89 results for relatively long periods of an individual's life (Smith et al. 2010; Thorup et al.

2013, Newton et al. 2016).

In this paper we aim to assess the factors determining survival and attempt to identify the causes of death in two Spanish populations of the Eurasian eagle owl, using radio-tracking methods and known-fate survival models. The two populations studied are located in areas characterized by the high availability of rabbits *Oryctolagus cuniculus* (the main prey of the Eurasian eagle owl; Penteriani et al. 2010) and different degrees of humanization (so that habitat management and land uses may be determining differences in the survival rates). The high density that this species reaches in our study areas allowed us to capture a high number of territorial individuals with relative ease by trapping (Campioni et al. 2013), and therefore, the populations studied provide an excellent opportunity to study survival in a long-lived species using radio-tracking techniques. Our objectives were: (1) to examine the effects of sex and age on the survival rates of Eurasian eagle owls, (2) to compare survival rates between the two populations, which are characterised by different human pressures and environmental characteristics, (3) to determine temporal patterns of survival and (4) to document the causes of mortality and analyse the factors influencing it.

Methods

Study areas

The study was carried out from January 2003 to December 2010 in two populations in southern Spain: (i) the Sierras of Columbares, Altaona and Escalona, a hilly area ranging from 40 to 646 m a.s.l. in the province of Murcia (south-eastern Spain 37°45' N, 0°57' W; hereafter Murcia), which includes a Special Protection Area (SPA) “Monte El Valle y Sierras de Altaona y Escalona” (ES0000269; León-Ortega et al. 2014); and (ii) the Sierra Norte of Seville (Sierra Morena massif, south-western Spain; 37°30' N, 06°03' W; hereafter Seville), a hilly area 60-200 m a.s.l. (Penteriani et al. 2005).

Both study areas share a Mediterranean climate and have high densities of rabbits and Eurasian eagle owl pairs (ca. 40 territories per 100 km² over the whole study area; Penteriani et al. 2010; León-Ortega et al. 2014). The landscape in Murcia is a mosaic of forest of Aleppo Pines *Pinus halepensis*, scrublands, irrigated and rainfed crops, hunting enclosures and urbanized areas. In contrast, the Seville landscape is dominated by sparse woodlands composed of Holm Oaks *Quercus ilex*, Gall Oaks *Quercus faginea*, Stone Pine *Pinus pinea*, Olive Trees *Olea europaea*, Mastic Tree *Pistacea lentiscus* and small plantations of *Eucalyptus sideroxylon*. In many areas, scrubland has replaced woodland. Most of the area is managed for game species (mainly partridges and rabbits).

Trapping and radio-tracking

Owls were trapped using two methods: (i) simulating a territorial intrusion with a combination of a taxidermy mount of an Eurasian eagle owl and a mist-net (Penteriani et al. 2007); (ii) using a bow-net placed in the nest when nestlings were 20-35 days old (i.e., when they were already able to thermoregulate; Campioni et al. 2013). Each trapped bird was fitted with a 30 g radio-transmitter (Biotrack Ltd, Wareham, Dorset, UK) attached as a back-pack harness made from Teflon ribbon, which contained a mercury posture sensor that allowed us to discriminate whether the owls were alive or dead. During eight years of continuous radio-tracking, we recorded no adverse effect of back-packs on birds or breeding performance. The backpacks were not removed after the study due to the difficulty of recapturing the same individual (Penteriani et al. 2011). To locate the owls, the surveys were made from four-wheel drive vehicles, using three-element hand-held Yagi antennas (Biotrack; Wareham, Dorset, UK; <http://www.biotrack.co.uk>) with either Stabo (XR-100) portable ICOM receivers (IC-R20) or SIKA radio tracking receivers. At least two attempts of re-sighting were made

during each three month interval throughout the study. When an owl was detected, we proceeded to determine its status (alive, dead); when the bird was not detected in several successive occasions, it was considered censored (i.e., end of monitoring).

Survival analysis

To estimate survival and determine factors affecting owl survival, we used the know-fate model with the logit-link function in the Program MARK ((Pollock et al. 1989, White and Burnham 1999). Know-fate modelling is an appropriate method for estimating survival parameters in radio-tracking studies, in which the status (dead or alive) of all tagged animals is known at each sampling occasion. Three-monthly (quarterly) survival rates were estimated for 32 quarterly intervals, using the 63 encounter histories obtained by relocating the radio-tracked individuals. The individual covariables included sex, age, population (Murcia, Seville) and two time-specific factors (year and period). To test which variables were most likely to influence owl survival, a set of candidate models was specified, including a number of additive and interaction models representing plausible biological hypotheses.

Birds were sexed by molecular procedures using DNA extracted from blood (Griffiths et al. 1998) or using discriminant functions based on body measurements that classified 98.4 % of the birds correctly (Delgado and Penteriani 2004). Eurasian eagle owls can begin to breed in the second calendar year and the bird age can be assessed by plumage characteristics until the fifth year (Martínez et al. 2002). Therefore we classified the individuals into two age-class groups: immature (owls from one to five years old) and adult (owls older than five years).

To examine inter- and intra-annual variations in survival we considered two time-specific group covariables: year and period. Inter-annual variations were studied using eight years (2003-2010), and the annual cycle was divided into breeding and non-

breeding periods, each related with different breeding stress, home range activity and food availability. The breeding season includes nine months (three quarterly intervals), from December to August, and the non-breeding season includes only three months (one quarterly interval), from September to November (Campioni et al. 2013).

Model selection was performed using Akaike's information criterion corrected for small sample size (AIC_c) and models differing by $\leq 2 \Delta AIC_c$ were considered as potential alternatives (Burnham and Anderson 2002). Akaike weights (w_i) were used to evaluate the strength of evidence among competing models. Because there is no goodness-of-fit for classical known-fate data, the variance inflation factor (i.e. the overdispersion term, $\hat{c}$) cannot be estimated adequately. Therefore, model robustness was investigated following the approach described in Smith et al. (2014), i.e., artificially inflating the overdispersion term from 1 to 3 (i.e. no dispersion to extreme dispersion) to simulate various levels of dispersion reflected in Quasi- AIC_c ($QAIC_c$).

Causes of mortality

The cause of mortality was determined through necropsy, although it could be identified visually in most cases. We classified the causes of mortality into the following classes:

(i) *Human-induced causes*. (1) Gunshot: pellets observed through radiography, or when the holes were clearly visible in the body or wings. (2) Electrocution: the carcass was found below power lines, usually with burns in both plumage and claws caused by electrocution. (3) Collision with fences: attributed to carcasses found close to fences and with broken bones or neck.

(ii) *Natural causes*. (1) Killing by other Eurasian eagle owls: the carcass was found partly eaten under roots, perches or in the nests of other territorial owls. (2) Disease: the carcass was found shortly after death and was complete, with no sign of injury through predation, starvation or human manipulation, but the

necropsy showed abnormalities in internal organs.

- (iii) *Unknown*: the carcass was found without any external evidence and a high degree of decomposition that did not permit us to determinate the cause of death.

In order to investigate the factors influencing variations in the causes of mortality, and given the low number of dead owls found, the cause of mortality was modelled as a nominal response variable with only four classes: gunshot, electrocution, disease and other. We then performed a multinomial regression analysis (Venables and Ripley 2002) and Type II likelihood-ratio tests (Fox and Weisberg 2011) to examine the significance of three potential explanatory variables: sex, population and period.

Multinomial regression is a simple extension of binary logistic regression that allows for more than two categories of the dependent variable, and is considered suitable for analysing multiway contingency tables. The analyses were performed using the “nnet” (Venables and Ripley 2002) and “car” (Fox and Weisberg 2011) packages in R version 3.1.1 (R Core Team 2014).

Results

Between 2003 and 2010 we captured, radio-tagged and tracked 63 breeding individuals (Table 1), of which 27 were females and 36 males. Most of them (51) were aged as immature (≤ 5 years old) and 12 were aged as adults.

Of the 24 candidate models selected to examine the influence of the variables considered on survival, the additive model including sex and period (breeding vs non-breeding season) was the most parsimonious (Table 2), although the model including only sex, and the model including the interaction term between sex and period, were suitable alternatives. The remaining models were $> 2.00 \Delta AIC_c$, which suggests no effect of age or population on survival rates or inter-annual variation. The best model showed a higher survival rate for males and a higher survival rate in the breeding season

(Fig. 1). These differences were not very large (less than 0.1), although they appear more important when expressed as annual rates: e.g. 0.852 (95% CI = 0.845- 0.859) for males vs. 0.648 (95% CI = 0.625- 0.670) for females. Nevertheless, the low Akaike weights of the two best alternative models indicate no overwhelming support for any particular model. Furthermore, when we set $\hat{c} = 2$, the constant (null) model was a plausible alternative model ($\Delta\text{QAIC}_c = 0.93$), and when $\hat{c} = 3$, the constant model was the best model, which points to no substantial variation in survival attributable to the factors analysed. The quarterly estimate of survival of the constant model was 0.939 (95% CI = 0.910-0.959), which yields a mean overall annual survival rate of 0.776 (95% CI = 0.773-0.779).

A total of 24 deaths (38.1%) were recorded during the study among the radio-tracked individuals. The main causes were human-induced (Table 3). Gunshot and electrocution represented 37.5% and 29.2% of the deaths, respectively. Death by disease also showed a high percentage (16.7%) of deaths. The multinomial analysis did not show any difference in the cause of mortality between sexes ($\chi^2 = 2.35$, $\text{df} = 3$, $P = 0.503$), or between breeding and non-breeding seasons ($\chi^2 = 0.99$, $\text{df} = 3$, $P = 0.804$). However, differences were observed among populations ($\chi^2 = 11.88$, $\text{df} = 3$, $P = 0.008$), with gunshot being the first cause for Seville and electrocution for Murcia.

Discussion

Our results obtained using known-fate analysis with radio-tracked breeders identified a sex-biased survival rate in favour of males, and differences between the breeding and non-breeding periods of the annual cycle. While sex-biased survival has commonly been reported in demographic studies (Donald 2007), there are few studies demonstrating survival differences between different phases of the biological cycle (e.g., Robinson et al. 2010; Leyrer et al. 2013; Varmer et al. 2014). However, the results

of our model selection procedure should be taken with caution given the low Akaike weights of the best models and that the constant model was among the higher-ranked models when considering overdispersion in the data.

This work provides evidence of different survival rates between genders, the annual survival rate being 1.31 times higher for males. Some studies have suggested that differences in male and female mortality are positively correlated with size dimorphism (Tavecchia et al. 2001) or asymmetric habitat use by the two sexes (Lambertucci et al. 2012). These differences in sex survival are sometimes associated with anthropogenic causes in large birds of prey (Ferrer and Hiraldo 1992), which affects the adult sex ratio of wild populations and causes males to outnumber females, even when the offspring sex ratio is 1:1 (as in the Eurasian eagle owl case; Mora et al. 2010). In fact, higher female mortality, rather than a skewed offspring sex ratio, is the main driver of male-skewed adult sex ratios in bird populations (Donald 2007; Székely et al. 2014), a circumstance which may influence multiple aspects of pair-bond and mating behaviour (Liker et al. 2014), and may have important consequences for the viability of populations of long-lived organisms that appear numerically stable (Grayson et al. 2014).

Given that we identified electrocution and shooting as the main causes of mortality in the populations studied, human-induced mortality might be expected to affect male owls less. However, no differences in the causes of mortality between sexes were observed, so the higher mortality of females is probably associated with differences in behaviour, habitat use or energetic investment during the reproduction period. More specifically, we hypothesize that the higher mortality of female Eurasian eagle owls is associated with differences in habitat use by the two sexes, with females foraging in larger home ranges (Campioni et al. 2013), which increase the interaction with human infrastructures such as power lines, fences, roads and hunting enclosures. In

addition, survival may be associated to the different home range behaviour (e.g., space
 use, movement patterns and rhythms of activity) of males and females during the
 different phases of the biological cycle (Campioni et al. 2013). Our results point to
 survival differences between the breeding and non-breeding periods, but, interestingly,
 the weight of evidence supporting the additive model $S_{sex+period}$ was 2.0 times greater
 than the model including the interaction term ($S_{sex*period}$), which indicates an indirect
 relationship between these factors (or independence). Moreover, we observed lower
 quarterly survival rates during the non-breeding period, whereas, given the reproductive
 effort and the degree of stress of individuals during the breeding season, the opposite
 pattern might be expected (Severinghaus and Rothery 2001; Thorup et al. 2013). During
 the breeding season, Eurasian eagle owl pairs spend most time in or near the nest, a
 behaviour characteristic that could reduce the exposure time in the most humanized
 areas of their home ranges, thereby minimizing the risk of being shot or electrocuted. In
 addition, with respect to food availability in these two periods, the marked intra-annual
 variations in the density of rabbits could affect survival rates at a particular time.
 Rabbits are less abundant in late summer and autumn (the nonbreeding season for the
 owls), due to a hunting pressure, the higher frequency of disease and limited food
 availability because of summer droughts (Beltrán 1991). Hence, the intra-annual density
 variations of prey could explain the intra-annual pattern of survival in the Eurasian
 eagle owl. In contrast, survival variation in most owl species in northern latitudes is
 year-dependent (Altwegg et al. 2003; Francis and Saurola 2004; Le Gouar et al. 2011;
 Pavón-Jordán et al. 2013) and associated to the cyclic food abundance of the main prey
 (Korpimäki 1992; Rutz and Bijlsma 2006; Karell et al. 2009; Lehikoinen et al. 2011).
 However, in Mediterranean ecosystems predator communities are mostly made up of
 generalists, and therefore predator-prey systems are more complex than those of
 northern latitudes (Fargallo et al. 2009; Moleón et al. 2012). Rabbit, a keystone species

in southern Europe (Delibes-Mateos et al. 2007), does not suffer regular cyclic oscillations, and, while this prey forms the bulk of the Eurasian eagle owl diet (Penteriani et al. 2002; Lourenço 2006), the species has a high capacity to switch to alternative prey if the basic prey does become scarce (Martínez and Calvo 2001). This could explain why we found no inter-annual variations in Eurasian Eagle Owl survival.

The survival of Eurasian eagle owls in Alpine and northern latitudes has previously been estimated from the recovery of owls marked as nestlings (Olsson 1997) and using a Bayesian integrated population model combining different data sets (Schaub et al. 2010). In contrast to our results (models including age were not well supported), these studies pointed to a variation in survival that depended on age-class (first, second and the subsequent years), and similar results have been found in other long-lived species (e.g., Daunt et al. 2007; Angelier et al. 2007; Grande et al. 2009; Hernández-Matías et al. 2011). However, it must be noted that, unlike the above mentioned studies, our study has been conducted on breeding individuals, which may explain the absence of an age effect on survival. In our study areas, a substantial proportion of first-time breeders were being recruited each year, resulting in a high number of immature breeders being captured. This circumstance denotes the existence of a high turn-over rate in territorial individuals, mainly females, and, although no evidence of lower survival in immature breeders was found, the differences in breeding success between immature and adult individuals might be worth investigating. However, assessing the effects of the cost of first reproduction requires a long-term data set with a large number of individuals (Tavecchia et al. 2001). It should be noted that the overall survival rate observed in our populations was intermediate between those reported in the studies of Olsson (1997) and Schaub et al. (2010).

Of note was the fact that our know-fate survival analyses showed no differences between the two populations studied (Murcia and Seville), but that the multinomial

analysis of the causes of mortality showed significant differences between them.

Previous studies have identified the source of variations in mortality in several owl species in Europe (Martínez et al. 2006; Thorup et al. 2013). In Spain, the main known cause of death in Eurasian eagle owl is interaction with power lines, followed by persecution and collisions with game fences and cars (Martínez et al. 2006). These authors found that some human-induced causes of mortality depended on the geographical region. The Seville population showed a higher frequency of deaths by shooting, whereas in Murcia the most common anthropogenic cause of death was electrocution. These differences appear to be directly related to range management and land uses in these separate study areas. The Murcia population inhabits more humanized landscapes than the Seville population. In Murcia the area dedicated to irrigated crops and urbanizations has grown continuously in the last 15 years, accompanied by an increase in other man-made structures, including roads, railways and new power generation facilities. This would explain the significant differences found in the causes of mortality between both populations. Our results demonstrate that human-induced mortality is a pending problem for Eurasian eagle owl conservation in Spain (Martínez et al. 2006), despite the considerable effort put into the creation of protected areas during the last 10 years, the identification of dangerous pylons and the application of appropriate insulation techniques on power lines (Moleón et al. 2007; López-López et al. 2011; Barrientos et al. 2012). Thus, the combination of public awareness and education programmes and an increase in mitigation measures implemented in power lines, should contribute positively to the conservation of the Eurasian eagle owl and may underpin survival and population growth, with positive side effects on other endangered birds of prey (López-López et al. 2011; Pérez-García et al. 2011).

350 **Acknowledgements**

351 We are very grateful to Eloy Pérez, José Alfonso Lacalle, Letizia Campioni, Chiara
352 Bettega, Rui Lourenço, and other collaborators for their help on the field work. We
353 thank Encarni Montoya, María Victoria Jiménez-Franco and Silvia Villaverde for their
354 unconditional support and comments. The Asociación de Naturalistas del Sureste
355 (ANSE) is also acknowledged for partial financial support in the Murcia area. The
356 Spanish Ministry of Economy and Competitiveness (CGL2012–33240; FEDER co-
357 financing) funded this study in the Seville area. The research adheres to the legal
358 requirements of the country where it has been carried out.

359

360

361 **References**

362 Altwegg R, Roulin A, Kestenholz M, Jenni L (2003) Variation and covariation in
363 survival, dispersal, and population size in barn owls (*Tyto alba*). J Anim Ecol 72:
364 391–399

365 Angelier F, Weimerskirch H, Dano S, Chastel O (2007) Age, experience and
366 reproductive performance in a long-lived bird: a hormonal perspective. Behav
367 Evol Sociobiol 61:611–621

368 Barrientos R, Ponce C, Palacín C, Martín CA, Martín B, Alonso JC (2012) Wire
369 marking results in a small but significant reduction in avian mortality at power
370 lines: a BACI designed study. PLoS ONE 7: e32569

371 Beltrán JF (1991) Temporal abundance pattern of the wild rabbit in Doñana, SW Spain.
372 Mammalia 55: 591–599

373 Borda de Água L, Grilo C, Pereira HM (2014) Modeling the impact of road mortality on
374 barn owl (*Tyto alba*) populations using age-structured models. Ecol Model 276:
375 29–37

376 Burnham KP, Anderson DR (2002) Model selection and multimodel inference. A
 377 practical information-theoretic approach. 2nd ed. Springer, New York
 378 Campioni L, Delgado MM, Lourenço R, Bastianelli G, Fernández N, Penteriani V
 379 (2013) Individual and spatio-temporal variations in the home range behaviour of
 380 a long-lived, territorial species. *Oecologia* 172: 371–385
 381 Daunt F, Wanless S, Harris MP, Money L, Monaghan P (2007) Older and wiser:
 382 improvements in breeding success are linked to better foraging performance in
 383 European shags. *Funct Ecol* 21: 561–567
 384 Delibes-Mateos M, Redpath SM, Angulo E, Ferreras P, Villafuerte R (2007) Rabbits as
 385 a keystone species in southern Europe. *Biol Conserv* 137: 149 –156.
 386 Delgado MM, Penteriani V (2004) Gender determination of Eurasian Eagle-Owls (*Bubo*
 387 *bubo*) by morphology. *J Raptor Res* 38: 375–377
 388 Dinsmore SJ, Collazo JA (2003) The influence of body condition on local apparent
 389 survival of spring migrant sanderlings in coastal North Carolina. *Condor* 105:
 390 465–473
 391 Donald PF (2007) Adult sex ratios in wild bird populations. *Ibis* 149: 671–692
 392 Fargallo JA, Martínez-Padilla J, Viñuela J, Blanco G, Torre I, Vergara P, De Neve L
 393 (2009) Kestrel-prey dynamic in a Mediterranean region: The effect of generalist
 394 predation and climatic factors. *PLoS ONE* 4: e4311.
 395 Ferrer M, Hiraldo F (1992) Man-induced sex-biased mortality in the Spanish imperial
 396 eagle. *Biol Conserv* 60: 57–60
 397 Fox J, Weisberg S (2011) An {R} Companion to Applied Regression, Second Edition.
 398 SAGE, Thousand Oaks CA
 399 Francis CM, Saurola P (2004) Estimating components of variance in demographic
 400 parameters of tawny owls, (*Strix aluco*) *Anim Biodivers Conserv* 27: 489–502
 401 Grande JM, Serrano D, Tavecchia G, Carrete M, Ceballos O, Díaz-Delgado R, Tella JL,

402 Donázar JA (2009) Survival in a long-lived territorial migrant: effects of life-
 403 history traits and ecological conditions in wintering and breeding areas. *Oikos*
 404 118: 580–590

405 Grayson KL, Mitchell NJ, Monks JM, Keall SN, Wilson JN, Nelson NJ (2014) Sex ratio
 406 bias and extinction risk in an isolated population of tuatara (*Sphenodon*
 407 *punctatus*). *PLoS ONE* 9: e94214

408 Griffiths R, Double MC, Orr K, Dawson RJG (1998) A DNA test to sex most birds. *Mol*
 409 *Ecol* 7: 1071–1075

410 Grilo C, Sousa J, Ascensão F, Matos H, Leitão I, Pinheiro P, Costa M, Bernardo J, Reto
 411 D, Lourenço R, Santos-Reis M, Revilla E (2012) Individual spatial responses
 412 towards roads: implications for mortality risk. *PLoS ONE* 7: e43811

413 Hakkarainen H, Korpimäki E, Laaksonen T, Nikula A, Suorsa P (2008) Survival of male
 414 tengmalm's owls increases with cover of old forest in their territory. *Oecologia*
 415 155: 479–486

416 Hernández-Matías A, Real J, Pradel R, Ravayrol A, Vincent-Martin N (2011) Effects of
 417 age, territoriality and breeding on survival of bonelli's eagle *Aquila fasciata*. *Ibis*
 418 153: 846–857

419 Hylton RA, Frederick PC, De La Fuente TE, Spalding MG (2006) Effects of nestling
 420 health on postfledging survival of woods storks. *Condor* 108: 97–106

421 Karell P, Ahola K, Karstinen T, Zolei A, Brommer JE (2009) Population dynamics in a
 422 cyclic environment: consequences of cyclic food abundance on tawny owl
 423 reproduction and survival. *J Anim Ecol* 78: 1050–1062

424 Kenward RE (2001) *A Manual for Wildlife Radio Tagging*. 2nd ed. Academic Press,
 425 London

426 Korpimäki E (1992) Fluctuating food abundance determines the lifetime reproductive
 427 success of male tengmalm's owls. *J Anim Ecol* 61: 103–111

- 428 Lambertucci SA, Carrete M, Donázar JA, Hiraldo F (2012) Large-scale age-dependent
429 skewed sex ratio in a sexually dimorphic avian scavenger. PLoS ONE 7: e46347
- 430 Le Gouar PJ, Schekkerman H, van der Jeugd HP, Boele A, van Harxen R, Fuchs P,
431 Stroeken P, Van Noordwijk A (2011) Long-term trends in survival of a declining
432 population: the case of the little owl (*Athene noctua*) in the Netherlands.
433 Oecologia 166: 369–379
- 434 Lebreton JD, Burnham KP, Clobert J, Anderson DR (1992) Modeling survival and
435 testing biological hypothesis using marked animals: a unified approach with case
436 studies. Ecol Monogr 62: 67–118
- 437 Lehikoinen A, Ranta E, Pietiäinen H, Byholm P, Saurola P, Valkama J, Huitu O,
438 Henttonen H, Korpimäki E (2011) The impact of climate and cyclic food
439 abundance on the timing of breeding and brood size in four boreal owl species.
440 Oecologia 165: 349–355
- 441 León-Ortega M, González-Wangüemert M, Martínez JE, Calvo JF (2014) Spatial
442 patterns of genetic diversity in Mediterranean eagle owl *Bubo bubo* populations.
443 Ardeola 61: 45–62
- 444 Leyrer J, Lok T, Brugge M, Spaans B, Sandercock BK, Piersma T (2013) Mortality
445 within the annual cycle: seasonal survival patterns in Afro-Siberian red knots
446 *Calidris canutus canutus*. J Ornithol 154: 933–943
- 447 Liker A, Székely T (2005) Mortality costs of sexual selection and parental care in
448 natural populations of birds. Evolution 59: 890–897
- 449 Liker A, Freckleton RP, Székely T (2014) Divorce and infidelity are associated with
450 skewed adult sex ratios in birds. Curr Biol 24: 880–884
- 451 López-López P, Ferrer M, Madero A, Casado E, McGrady M (2011) Solving man-
452 induced large-scale conservation problems: the Spanish imperial eagle and
453 power lines. PLoS ONE 6: e17196

- 454 Lourenço R (2006) The food habits of Eurasian eagle owls in Southern Portugal. J
455 Raptor Res 40: 297–300
- 456 Martin K (1995) Patterns and mechanisms for age-dependent reproduction and survival
457 in birds. Amer Zool 35: 340–348
- 458 Martín CA, Alonso JC, Alonso JA, Palacín C, Magaña M, Martín B (2007) Sex-biased
459 juvenile survival in a bird with extreme size dimorphism, the great bustard *Otis*
460 *tarda*. J Avian Biol 38: 335–346
- 461 Marchesi L, Sergio F, Pedrini P (2002) Costs and benefits of breeding in human-altered
462 landscapes for the eagle owl *Bubo bubo*. Ibis 144: E164–E177
- 463 Margalida A, Colomer MA, Oro D (2014) Man-induced activities modify demographic
464 parameters in a long-lived species: effects of poisoning and health policies.
465 Ecol Appl 24: 436–444
- 466 Martínez JA, Zuberogoitia I, Alonso R (2002) Rapaces Nocturnas. Guía para la
467 determinación de la edad y el sexo en las estrigiformes ibéricas. Monticola,
468 Madrid
- 469 Martínez JA, Martínez JE, Mañosa S, Zuberogoitia I, Calvo JF (2006) How to manage
470 human-induced mortality in the eagle owl *Bubo bubo*. Bird Conserv Int 16:
471 265–278.
- 472 Martínez JE, Calvo JF (2001) Diet and breeding success of Eurasian eagle-owl in
473 southeastern Spain: effect of rabbit haemorrhagic disease. J Raptor Res 35: 259–
474 262
- 475 Moleón M, Bautista J, Garrido JR, Martín-Jaramillo J, Ávila E, Madero A (2007) La
476 corrección de tendidos eléctricos en áreas de dispersión de Águila-azor
477 perdicera: efectos potenciales positivos sobre la comunidad de rapaces. Ardeola
478 54: 319–325
- 479 Moleón M, Sánchez-Zapata JA, Gil-Sánchez JM, Ballesteros-Duperón E, Barea-Azcón

480 JM, Virgós E (2012) Predator–prey relationships in a Mediterranean vertebrate
 481 system: bonelli's eagles, rabbits and partridges. *Oecologia* 168: 679–689
 482 Mora O, Delgado MM, Penteriani V (2010) Secondary sex ratio in Eurasian eagle-
 483 owls: Early-breeding females produce more daughters. *J Raptor Res* 44: 62–65
 484 Moyes K, Coulson T, Morgan BJT, Donald A, Morris SJ, Clutton-Brock TH (2006)
 485 Cumulative reproduction and survival costs in female red deer. *Oikos* 115: 241–
 486 252
 487 Newton I (ed) (1989) *Lifetime Reproduction in Birds*. Academic Press, London
 488 Newton I, McGrady MJ, Oli MK (2016) A review of survival estimates for raptors and
 489 owls. *Ibis* doi: 10.1111/ibi.12355
 490 Olsson V (1997) Breeding success, dispersal, and long-term changes in a population of
 491 eagle owls *Bubo bubo* in southeastern Sweden 1952-1996. *Ornis Svec* 7: 49–60
 492 Pavón-Jordán D, Karell P, Ahola K, Kolunen H, Pietiäinen H, Karstinen T, Brommer
 493 JE (2013) Environmental correlates of annual survival differ between two
 494 ecologically similar and congeneric owls. *Ibis* 155: 823–834
 495 Penteriani V, Gallardo M, Roche P (2002) Landscape structure and food supply affect
 496 Eurasian eagle owl (*Bubo bubo*) density and breeding performance: a case of
 497 intra-population heterogeneity. *J Zool* 257: 365–372
 498 Penteriani V, Delgado MM, Maggio C, Aradis A, Sergio F (2005) Development of
 499 chicks and pre-dispersal behaviour of young in the Eagle Owl *Bubo bubo*. *Ibis*
 500 147: 155–168
 501 Penteriani V, Delgado MM, Alonso-Álvarez C, Sergio F (2007) The importance of
 502 visual cues for nocturnal species: eagle owls signal by badge brightness. *Behav*
 503 *Ecol* 18: 143–147
 504 Penteriani V, Delgado MM, Pérez-García JM, Botella F, García S, Sánchez-Zapata JA,
 505 León-Ortega M, Martínez JE, Calvo JF, Ortego J, Penteriani G, Melletti M,

506 Krugersberg I, Talavera OM (2010) Sex allocation from an owl perspective:
 507 clutch order could determine brood sex to reduce sibling aggression in the eagle
 508 owl *Bubo bubo*. *Ornis Fenn* 87: 135–143

509 Penteriani V, Kuparinen A, Delgado MM, Lourenço R, Campioni L (2011) Individual
 510 status, foraging effort and need for conspicuousness shape behavioural
 511 responses of a predator to moon phases. *Anim Behav* 82: 413–420

512 Pérez-García JM, Botella F, Sánchez-Zapata JA, Moleón M (2011) Conserving outside
 513 protected areas: edge effects and avian electrocutions on the periphery of
 514 Special Protection Areas. *Bird Conserv Int.* 21: 296–302

515 Pollock KH, Winterstein SR, Bunck CM, Curtis PD (1989) Survival analysis in
 516 telemetry studies: the staggered entry design. *J Wildl Manag* 53: 7–15.

517 R Core Team (2014) R: A language and environment for statistical computing. R
 518 Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna. Available at: [http://www.R-](http://www.R-project.org/)
 519 [project.org/](http://www.R-project.org/)

520 Rymešová D, Šmilauer P, Šálek M (2012) Sex- and age-biased mortality in wild grey
 521 partridge *Perdix perdix* populations. *Ibis* 154: 815–824

522 Robinson RA, Kew JJ, Kew AJ (2010) Survival of suburban Blackbirds *Turdus merula*
 523 varies seasonally but not by sex. *J Avian Biol* 41: 83–87

524 Rutz C, Bijlsma RB (2006) Food limitation in a generalist predator. *Proc R Soc B* 273:
 525 2069–2076

526 Schaub M, Aebischer A, Gimenez O, Berger S, Arlettaz R (2010) Massive immigration
 527 balances high anthropogenic mortality in a stable eagle owl population: Lessons
 528 for conservation. *Biol Conserv* 143: 1911–1918

529 Seamans ME, Gutiérrez RJ, May CA (2002) Mexican spotted owl (*Strix occidentalis*)
 530 population dynamics: influence of climatic variation on survival and
 531 reproduction. *Auk* 119: 321–334

- 532 Sergio F, Marchesi L, Pedrini P, Ferrer M, Penteriani V (2004) Electrocutation alters the
533 distribution and density of a top predator, the eagle owl *Bubo bubo*. J Appl
534 Ecol. 41: 836–845
- 535 Sibly RM, Hone J (2002) Population growth rate and its determinants: an overview.
536 Philos. Trans R Soc Lond B Biol Sci 357: 1153–1170
- 537 Smith JB, Jenks JA, Grovenburg TW, Klaver RW (2014) Disease and predation:
538 sorting out causes of a bighorn sheep (*Ovis canadensis*) decline. PLoS ONE
539 92: e88271
- 540 Smith JG, Griffiths AD, Brook BW (2010) Survival estimation in a long-lived lizard:
541 radio-tracking of *Varanus mertensi*. Popul. Ecol. 52: 243–247
- 542 Sunde P (2005) Predators control post-fledging mortality in tawny owls (*Strix aluco*).
543 Oikos 110: 461–472
- 544 Severinghaus LL, Rothery P (2001) The survival rate of little owl (*Otus*
545 *elegans botelensis*). Ibis 143: 540–546
- 546 Székely T, Liker A, Freckleton RP, Fitchel C, Kappeler PM (2014) Sex-biased survival
547 predict adult sex ratio variation in wild birds. Proc R Soc B 281: 20140342
- 548 Tavecchia G, Pradel R, Boy V, Johnson AR, Cezilly F (2001) Sex- and age-related
549 variation in survival and cost of first reproduction in greater flamingos. Ecology
550 82: 165–174
- 551 Tenan S, Adrover J, Muñoz-Navarro A, Sergio F, Tavecchia G (2012) Demographic
552 consequences of poison-related mortality in a threatened bird of prey. PLoS
553 ONE 7: e49187
- 554 Thorup K, Pedersen D, Sunde P, Jacobsen LB, Rahbek C (2013) Seasonal survival
555 rates and causes of mortality of little owls in Denmark. J Ornithol. 154: 183–
556 190
- 557 Varmer DM, Hepp GR, Bielefeld RR (2014) Annual and seasonal survival of adult

558 female Mottled Ducks in southern Florida, USA. Condor 116: 134–143
559 Venables WN, Ripley BD (2002) Modern Applied Statistics with S. 4th ed. Springer,
560 New York
561 White GC, Burnham KP (1999) Program MARK: survival estimation from populations
562 of marked animals. Bird Study 46: 120–138
563 Wisdom MJ, Mills LS, Doak DF (2000) Life stage simulation analysis: estimating vital-
564 rate effects on population growth for conservation. Ecology 81: 628–641

565

566

567

568

569

570

571

572

573

574

575

576

577

578

579

580

581 **Tables**

582

583 **Table 1** Summary of the radio-tracking data of Eurasian eagle owls in Murcia and
584 Seville, 2003-2010.

585

586 **Table 2** Summary of known-fate survival model selection results for Eurasian eagle
587 owls in Murcia and Seville, 2003-2013 when the overdispersion term was 1.0.
588 Models are ranked according to Akaike's information criterion (AIC_c). Headers
589 for columns are: number of parameters (K), change in AIC_c relative to the
590 highest ranked model (ΔAIC_c), and Akaike weight (w_i).

591

592 **Table 3** Causes of death of Eurasian eagle-owls in the study areas, 2003-2010.

593

594

595

596

597

598

599

600

601

602

603

604

605

606

607 **Figure legends**

608 **Fig. 1.** Three-monthly (quarterly) survival probabilities of Eurasian eagle owls
609 estimated from the best approximating model in known-fate analyses, Table 2.
610 Vertical lines represent 95% confidence intervals.