Version of Record: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0022098119300152> Manuscript_ce039933315fd322c1f6848391fdae2a

21 * corresponding author: Leena Riekkola. lrie003@aucklanduni.ac.nz. +64(0)212922551.

22 **ABSTRACT**

23 Satellite telemetry and animal movement models advance our ability to remotely monitor the 24 behavior of wide-ranging species. Understanding how different behaviors (e.g. foraging) are 25 shaped by dynamic environmental features is fundamental to understanding ecological 26 interactions and the impact of variability. In this study we deployed satellite-linked tags on 27 humpback whales (*Megaptera novaeangliae*) and used state-space models to estimate locations 28 and to infer underlying behavioral states. We then modelled the association between whale 29 behavior (e.g. foraging or transiting) and environmental variables using linear mixed-effect 30 models. We identified the importance of two recently discovered Southern Ocean feeding areas 31 for Oceania humpback whales as well as the key environmental drivers affecting whale behavior. 32 We detected behavioral differences between whales utilizing the two adjacent feeding regions 33 (\approx 2,000 km apart), which were likely caused by animals trying to efficiently locate prey in relation 34 to the dynamic environmental characteristics of each habitat. We observed a seasonal pattern 35 in foraging behavior, with the peak occurring in the middle of summer. Whales also foraged 36 more intensively with increasing proximity to areas from which the ice edge had recently 37 retreated, suggesting heightened productivity in these areas. The relationship between the 38 animals and the physical features of the seascape, as well as the behavioral plasticity observed, 39 could have implications for the future recovery of these whales in a changing Southern Ocean.

40

41 **Key words:**

42 Foraging behavior; Habitat use; Migration; Telemetry; Whales

44

45 Many animal behaviors, such as movement and habitat use, are driven by responses to internal 46 cues as well as the external conditions experienced by the animal (Nathan et al. 2008). 47 Understanding how the physical environment shapes the behavior and distribution of animals 48 as they try to satisfy their resource requirements is a fundamental topic in behavioral ecology 49 (e.g. Ballance et al. 2006; Aarts et al. 2008; Davies et al., 2012). A wide range of animals from 50 moths to caribou (*Rangifer tarandus*) migrate between critical habitats following pulses in 51 resource availability and abundance (Jiang et al. 2011; Le Corre et al. 2017). In many terrestrial 52 and aquatic taxa the decision to depart for a new habitat is often controlled by variables such as 53 photoperiod, temperature, snow fall and severe weather at the initial location, at which point 54 the animals cannot predict the habitat conditions at the end destination (Jonsson and Ruud-55 Hansen 1985; Vøllestad et al. 1986; Cotton 2003; Balbontín et al. 2009; Jiang et al. 2011; Rivrud 56 et al. 2016). Memory of long-term average conditions may also play a role in directing migrants 57 to their destination (Bracis and Mueller 2017; Abrahms et al. 2019). Upon arrival at a new 58 location resources, such as prey, are often patchily distributed throughout space and time, at 59 which point animals initiate search strategies to locate and secure prey (Benhamou 1992; Boyd 60 1996; Sims et al. 2008; Humphries et al. 2010; Carroll et al. 2017). In marine systems specifically, 61 biological productivity can be highly variable due to the heterogeneity of the many physical 62 processes in the environment (Haury et al. 1978). This results in some habitats being more 63 productive than others, which in turn influences prey availability and predator behavior. To 64 forage efficiently predators must move through their dynamic environment in search of prey 65 while maximizing time spent foraging in the most productive areas (Stephens and Krebs 1986; 66 Fauchald and Tveraa 2006). In patchy environments individuals may even adjust aspects of their 67 foraging behavior depending on the external environmental conditions (Weimerskirch 2007; 68 Sebastiano et al., 2012; Kirchner et al. 2018).

69 Obtaining direct observations of movement and behavior in wide-ranging predators can be 70 challenging, and more indirect techniques, such as animal-borne transmitters and data loggers, 71 are often required to detect and identify behavior. Advancements in satellite telemetry and 72 tagging technology have improved the ability to remotely collect animal movement data at high 73 spatial and temporal resolutions (Hussey et al. 2015; Gurarie et al. 2016; Chimienti et al. 2017). 74 Different movement models can be applied to these remotely collected data to identify 75 underlying behavioral states such as foraging (Morales et al. 2004; Jonsen et al. 2005, 2006; 76 Michelot et al. 2017). Various statistical models can then be used to link animal locations and 77 behavior with ecological variables. Such models are useful tools for explaining spatial 78 distribution patterns of highly mobile animals, for identifying critical habitats, and they have 79 many applications including addressing management and conservation questions (Mandel et al. 80 2008; Gregr et al. 2013; Guisan et al. 2013).

81 In the Southern Hemisphere, humpback whales (*Megaptera novaeangliae*) migrate thousands 82 of kilometers annually from the tropics to the Southern Ocean to feed on their main prey, the 83 Antarctic krill (*Euphausia superba*; Kawamura 1994; Murase et al. 2002). The endogenous and 84 exogenous cues used by the whales to navigate to the feeding grounds and to search for prey 85 remains unresolved (Horton et al. 2011, 2017; Torres, 2017). Directly observing the foraging 86 behavior and characterizing the foraging habitat of large marine predators, such as humpback 87 whales, in the Southern Ocean is notoriously difficult due to the logistical challenges associated 88 with accessing this remote and vast area (Griffiths 2010). Therefore, our knowledge of the fine-89 scale behavior and patterns of habitat use by humpback whales in this region remains limited, 90 compared to for example the more accessible Antarctic Peninsula (e.g. Friedlaender et al. 2013, 91 2016).

92 During the commercial whaling era, Southern Hemisphere humpback whale stocks were highly 93 overexploited and hunted to near extinction (Ivashchenko and Clapham 2014; Clapham and 94 Baker 2017). Since being granted protection from whaling, humpback populations have shown 95 variable recovery. The Oceania humpback whales, comprising whales from multiple breeding

96 ground subpopulations from the Pacific Islands (spanning New Caledonia to French Polynesia) 97 are estimated to be <50% of pre-exploitation numbers and recovering more slowly than the 98 neighboring east Australian population (Childerhouse et al. 2008; Constantine et al. 2012; 99 International Whaling Commission 2015). To date there has been little information available on 100 the Oceania humpback whales within the Southern Ocean feeding grounds, and we only recently 101 revealed their migration paths and location of the feeding grounds (Riekkola et al. 2018). As a 102 consequence, we do not know whether the feeding behavior and patterns of habitat use by 103 these humpback whales could be linked to the different population recovery rates (International 104 Whaling Commission 2015).

105 Here we applied a movement model to satellite tagging data of humpback whales on their 106 Southern Ocean feeding grounds to infer underlying behavioral states: transiting and area 107 restricted search (ARS), a behavior indicative of foraging (Weinstein et al. 2017; Andrews-Goff 108 et al. 2018). We expected that aspects of whale foraging behavior would change throughout the 109 feeding season. For example, we hypothesized that there would be an increase in foraging effort 110 as prey becomes more abundant with the onset of spring and summer. We then used a statistical 111 model to investigate the relationship between the inferred behavioral states (specifically the 112 occurrence of ARS-foraging) and different environmental variables. We expected the whales' 113 behavior to be affected by different environmental factors, and that behavioral differences 114 would exist between animals utilizing different regions of the Southern Ocean. By linking whale 115 movement data and behavioral changes to the conditions of their foraging habitat, this study 116 ultimately contributes to a better understanding of the behavior of wide-ranging predators.

117

118 **MATERIALS AND METHODS**

119 **Satellite tag deployment**

120 Wildlife Computers (Redmond, WA, USA) SPOT 5 Platform Transmitting Terminals (PTTs) were 121 attached to 25 adult humpback whales during the peak of their southern migration past the 122 Kermadec Islands, New Zealand, between September and October 2015 (Figure 1). The tags 123 were deployed using a modified version of the Air Rocket Transmitter System (Heide-Jørgensen 124 et al. 2001) at a pressure of 10-12 bars. Observed locations were calculated by the Argos System 125 using the Doppler Effect on transmission frequency when multiple messages from a tag were 126 received by a satellite. An estimated error and a location class (in descending order of accuracy: 127 3, 2, 1, 0, A, B, Z) were assigned to each location (see Argos user's manual 2016). Location classes 128 A and B have no accuracy estimation and Z is an invalid location. The tags were duty cycled to 129 transmit for 21 hours each day to maximize the time with overhead Argos satellites. The 130 maximum number of transmissions per day was set to 600 at a repetition rate of 45s. 131 Reproductive status (mother with a calf, or adult) of the tagged whales was inferred in the field 132 based on the presence of a calf closely associated with the satellite tagged animal (Clapham et 133 al. 1999). Molecular sex identification was conducted using tissue samples collected at the time 134 of tagging (Riekkola et al. 2018).

135

136 **Data processing and hierarchical state-space model**

137 Raw Argos locations were speed filtered using the R package *argosfilter* (Freitas et al. 2008) at 138 a conservative maximum speed of 36km/h to remove only highly erroneous and unrealistic 139 locations. We used a hierarchical version of a Bayesian state-space model (SSM; Jonsen et al. 140 2005, 2006) to estimate locations (via an observational model) and behavioral states (via a 141 movement model). We used a 6-h time-step in the model to provide detailed whale movement 142 data. Obtaining whale data on an even finer scale was not necessary given the low resolution of 143 some of the environmental covariates (see section 'Explanatory variables for statistical model' 144 and Table 1). The SSM was fitted in R (version 3.5.1, R Core Team 2018) using the software JAGS 145 (Plummer 2013) and the R packages *rjags* (Plummer 2016) and *bsam* (Jonsen et al. 2015). Where 146 a gap of >1 day existed in the satellite data transmission, the individual track was split and ran 147 as segments to avoid interpolating over long periods of time with no data. Two Markov chain 148 Monte Carlo (MCMC) chains were run in parallel, each for a total of 200,000 simulations. The 149 first 100,000 samples were discarded as a 'burn-in', and the remaining samples were thinned, 150 retaining every 100th sample to reduce autocorrelation. The final 2,000 samples were used to 151 compute the posterior distribution of the model parameter estimates: the mean turning angles, 152 and movement persistence (i.e. the autocorrelation in speed and direction). The behavioral 153 mode estimate (*b*), ranging between 1 and 2, was inferred from the means of the MCMC 154 samples. A behavioral mode close to 1 (*b*<1.25) indicates transiting behavior, which is persistent 155 and highly directional movement with low turning angles (near 0°). Animals are expected to be 156 in transiting mode during migration or when traveling between favorable locations (e.g. prey 157 patches). A behavioral mode close to 2 (*b*>1.75) indicates area-restricted search (ARS) behavior, 158 a more variable movement with large turning angles (near 180°) and increased rate of turning. 159 ARS is generally considered to be indicative of foraging, resting or breeding behavior (e.g. 160 Weinstein et al. 2017; Andrews-Goff et al. 2018). Locations with a mean *b* estimate between 161 1.25 and 1.75 were treated as 'uncertain'.

162

163 **Explanatory variables for statistical model**

164 We used both static and dynamic variables estimated at each state-space modelled location 165 as explanatory variables to identify those that had most effect on the whales' behavioral mode 166 (specifically the occurrence of ARS-foraging). We selected environmental variables which, based 167 on prior knowledge, are likely to be biologically relevant (e.g. Friedlaender et al. 2011; Bombosch 168 et al. 2014; Trudelle et al. 2016; Andrews-Goff et al. 2018; Table 1), and that were available for 169 the entire spatial extent of location data.

170 Daily sea ice concentration data were obtained from the National Snow and Ice Data Center 171 (NSIDC, https://nsidc.org/data). Distance to the ice edge was calculated from the daily ice 172 concentration as the minimum distance between whale locations and the 15% sea ice 173 concentration contour (e.g. Gloersen et al. 1992; Stammerjohn and Smith 1997). One month 174 and two-month lags were calculated as the distance of each SSM-estimated whale location to 175 where the ice edge was one month and two months prior. It takes approximately one to two

176 months after ice melt for productivity to peak in the marginal ice zone (Lehodey et al. 1998; 177 Arrigo et al. 2008; Dalpadado et al. 2014). Altimeter derived daily sea surface heights (SSH) and 178 daily sea surface current velocity data were obtained using E.U. Copernicus Marine Service 179 Information (http://marine.copernicus.eu). SSH and sea surface current velocity gradients can 180 be used to trace the locations of the Antarctic Circumpolar Current fronts, and therefore by 181 using these variables we could account for possible interactions with the fronts (e.g. Sokolov 182 and Rintoul 2009). Sea surface current velocity was log transformed prior to analysis. Data on 183 sea ice, SSH, and sea surface current velocity were obtained through the Australian Antarctic 184 Data Centre and extracted using the R package *raadtools* (Sumner 2016).

185 Bathymetry was obtained from the International Bathymetric Chart of the Southern Ocean 186 (IBCSO) digital bathymetric model of the circum-Antarctic waters (Arndt et al. 2013). IBCSO is a 187 regional mapping project of the General Bathymetric Chart of the Oceans (GEBCO) and the 188 digital bathymetric model is publicly available (www.ibcso.org). Slope was derived from the 189 IBCSO digital bathymetric model using the '*slope*' tool in ArcGIS (version 10.5, Esri, Redlands, CA, 190 USA) and was log transformed prior to analysis.

191 Month for each point was obtained from the SSM estimated locations. We chose to include 192 month as a continuous variable in the model. Therefore, November, the first month for which 193 there were data within the feeding grounds, was labelled '0' (followed by December = 1 through 194 to June = 7) in order to set November as the baseline and to maintain chronological order.

195 Prior analysis of the satellite tags had revealed that the whales diverged to two broad feeding 196 regions (Riekkola et al. 2018). To make comparisons between these feeding areas, each location 197 was assigned a 'region' based on whether it occurred west (Ross Sea) or east (Amundsen and 198 Bellingshausen Seas) of the 130°W meridian (Figure 1). Studies have identified regional trends 199 in the Antarctic sea ice variability, with increasing sea ice extent occurring in the Ross Sea region, 200 and contrasting decrease in sea ice extent occurring in the Amundsen and Bellingshausen Seas 201 region (e.g. Zwally et al. 2002; Turner et al. 2009). Future ocean and sea-ice changes are also 202 projected to affect the growth rates of krill (the whales' main prey), with modelled high potential

203 growth rates in Ross Sea, and low or negative potential growth rates in the Amundsen and 204 Bellingshausen Seas (Murphy et al., 2017).

205

206 **Environmental drivers of behavior**

207 To assess the influence of the explanatory variables on the SSM estimated behavioral modes, 208 we fitted a series of linear mixed-effect models (LMMs) by maximum likelihood (ML) using the 209 R software package *nlme* (Pinheiro et al. 2018). Similar to previous studies, we adjusted the 210 behavioral mode (*b*) to range between 0 and 1 (by subtracting 1 from each value), after which 211 the variable (continuous) was logit transformed (O'Toole et al. 2015, Cerchio et al. 2016). We 212 dealt with sample proportions equal to exactly zero or one by adding the smallest non-zero 213 proportion (ε) to the numerator and denominator of the logit function (i.e. log(y+ε /1-y+ε)) as 214 per Warton and Hui (2011). Individual whales (i.e. unique tag numbers/PTTs) were fitted as a 215 random effect to account for individual variation, and a first order AR(1) autocorrelation 216 structure for each individual whale was assumed. We first built LMMs with the full data set using 217 region as a factorial variable, and then split the data to build region specific models.

218 The remotely sensed variables SSH and sea surface current speed included missing values 219 (n=31 and n=35 respectively, representing 0.9% of the data), most likely due to sea ice coverage. 220 To maintain the same number of observations between models, the rows including missing 221 values were removed from the data set prior to model fitting. The variables sea surface current 222 velocity and slope were log transformed prior to analysis. A quadratic term was included for 223 month and the different 'distance to ice edge' candidate variables following examination of the 224 relationships visually. All continuous variables were tested for pairwise correlation (Electronic 225 Supplementary Material, Figure ESM 1). SSH and log transformed sea surface current velocity 226 had a Spearman correlation of 0.66. All other variables showed a Spearman correlation of ≤0.5. 227 As the different 'distance to ice edge' candidate variables represent the same environmental 228 process, we included each of these terms sequentially during the model building (Table 2). 229 Several model combinations of the different main effects and various interaction terms were

230 run (Table 2). For model selection we explored both backward selection following Zuur et al. 231 (2009; starting with a full model with all explanatory variables included, dropping individual 232 variables one by one until all remaining variables are significant) and automated model selection 233 (function *dredge* in R package *MuMIn*; Bartoń 2018) to check for all possible variable 234 combinations. We used the Akaike Information Criterion (AIC) to select the most parsimonious 235 (lowest AIC value) model as the criterion penalizes for the use of more variables (Burnham and 236 Anderson 2002; Burnham et al. 2011). The best model based on AIC was then run using 237 restricted maximum likelihood (REML) to obtain the final parameter estimates (as per Zuur et 238 al. 2009). The normality of residuals was checked graphically.

- 239
- 240 **RESULTS**

241 **Whale movement and behavior**

242 Out of 25 tags deployed, 18 transmitted sufficient data for the SSM analysis (Table 3). This 243 included 5 females without calves, 6 females with calves, 5 males and 2 individuals of unknown 244 sex (PTT102211 had no tissue sample; molecular sex identification for PTT112722 was 245 unsuccessful). Ten tags had data gaps of >1 day (range: 2-76 d), excluding those tags that did not 246 begin transmission straight after deployment. The average number of location fixes per day 247 received from a tag was 22 (range: 10-42).

248 The tags of 14 individual humpback whales transmitted data within the feeding grounds south 249 of 60°S, covering a temporal period from November 2015 to June 2016 and a spatial range from 250 175°E to 80°W. The number of active tags transmitting data varied between months (range: 1- 251 14; Table 4). The SSM distinguished well between the two behavioral states (Electronic 252 Supplementary Material, Table ESM 2) and classified 6.3% of locations as ARS-foraging, and 253 79.3% of locations as transiting behavior, with the remaining 14.4% classified as uncertain 254 (Figure 1). The average behavioral mode (i.e. likelihood of ARS-foraging behavior) increased as 255 the feeding season progressed, peaking in March (February-March for whales on the Ross Sea 256 side only; Figure 2a). Overall, the whales on the Ross Sea side were consistently farther away

257 from the continental shelf break (Figure 1) and from the ice edge than the whales in the 258 Amundsen and Bellingshausen Seas region (Figure 2b). In general, the whales' distance from the 259 ice edge increased between December and January (December-February for Ross Sea whales) 260 and decreased between January and April (February-May for Ross Sea whales; Figure 2b).

261

262 **Environmental drivers of behavior**

263 Out of the highly correlated variables SSH was identified as being a more important predictor 264 than log transformed sea surface current speed and was therefore kept in the model. 265 Examination of the different 'distance to ice edge' scenarios resulted in 2-month lag being 266 identified as the most relevant, and out of several trials with different interaction terms 267 interaction between month (representing time) and region was found to be most significant 268 (Table 2). The most parsimonious model identified month, 2-month lag in the distance to the ice 269 edge, SSH and the interaction between region and month as important predictors of the 270 behavioral state of humpback whales within their Southern Ocean feeding grounds (Table 2, 271 Table 5). Non-linear relationships indicated that the whales were more likely to exhibit ARS-272 foraging behavior during the middle of the summer feeding season, and near where the marginal 273 ice-edge had been two months prior. Humpback whales were also more likely to exhibit ARS-274 foraging behavior at lower SSH values, and there was a significant interaction between region 275 and month (Table 5, Figure 3). The model provided some indication of possible differences 276 between regions. The variable 'region' was marginally significant (F-test p=0.06), although the 277 coefficient estimate was not significantly different from zero (t-test p=0.36). Dredge automated 278 model selection identified region to be a significant variable in 70% of 1664 model variations.

279

280 **DISCUSSION**

281 Humpback whales foraging in the Southern Ocean changed their ranging behavior and habitat 282 use patterns throughout the summer feeding season suggesting that behavioral plasticity is 283 important for this large predator. The changes were related to the environmental features of 284 the different habitats, in particular to an important lag effect in the ice edge dynamics, and 285 consequently the whales ended up utilizing these areas very differently. Similar to other long-286 distance migrants that move between critical habitats for different life functions (Both and 287 Visser 2001; Le Corre et al. 2017), these whales time their arrival at their feeding grounds to 288 exploit the habitat optimally without knowing the precise habitat conditions when beginning 289 their migration ~7,000km north. The large-scale sensitivity to environmental cues enabling 290 prediction of conditions in another geographic location is key to the success of migratory 291 animals, e.g. barn swallow (*Hirundo rustica L*., Balbontín et al. 2009), caribou (Le Corre et al. 292 2017).

293

294 **Characterizing whale movement and behavior on the Southern Ocean feeding grounds**

295 The SSM results revealed two important resource sites for Oceania humpback whale foraging; 296 one within the Amundsen and Bellingshausen Seas and one north of the Ross Sea, ~2,000 km 297 west (Figure 1). The majority of ARS-foraging locations for the whales within the Amundsen and 298 Bellingshausen Seas occurred near the continental shelf break (within ~200km) where high 299 densities of krill are expected to be found due to life history related movement (e.g. Pauly et al. 300 2000; Nicol 2006; Davis et al. 2017), as well as near the ice edge (~210km on average) where ice 301 melt stimulates primary production which in turn supports elevated concentrations of higher 302 trophic level organisms (e.g. Brierley et al. 2002; Nicol 2006; Meyer et al. 2017). In contrast, the 303 main aggregation of ARS-foraging locations north of the Ross Sea did not occur near the shelf 304 break (>500km away; Figure 1) nor the ice edge (~370km on average; Figure 2b). However, the 305 ARS-foraging locations of the Ross Sea whales occurred in a reported hotspot, with increased 306 chlorophyll *a* as an indicator of primary production (Schine et al. 2015). The observed differences 307 between the foraging regions suggest that humpback whales utilize different environmental 308 cues, with some cues being of greater importance for whales in one area than the other.

309 Although we were not able to confirm ARS behavior identified by our SSM as foraging, both 310 previous studies and the general knowledge about humpback whale behavior south of 60°S 311 suggest that ARS behavior identified by the SSM is largely foraging (Chittleborough 1965; 312 Weinstein et al. 2017; Andrews-Goff et al. 2018). With this assumption in mind, the high overall 313 amount of transiting behavior south of 60°S might serve as an indicator of prey distribution, 314 whereby whales may have to move quite long distances between prey patches. For instance, 315 the Amundsen and Bellingshausen Seas reportedly have generally low chlorophyll *a* 316 concentration with only isolated pockets of high productivity (e.g. Constable et al. 2003; 317 Stambler 2003). This could result in smaller prey aggregations that are highly spread out, 318 increasing the whales' need to transit between foraging patches.

319 Humpback whales in the northern hemisphere have been shown to exhibit strong maternally 320 inherited feeding ground fidelity (Palsbøll et al. 1995; Stevick et al., 2006; Baker et al., 2013). In 321 contrast, humpback whales from discrete Oceania breeding grounds do not show such clear 322 patterns of feeding ground fidelity (Rosenbaum et al. 2017). Additionally, as satellite tagged 323 Oceania mothers with calves migrated to the Ross Sea and given that whales still also migrate 324 to the Amundsen and Bellingshausen Seas (Riekkola et al. 2018), these whales may not have 325 maternally inherited feeding grounds. Knowing the approximate location of profitable foraging 326 areas and consistently returning to them may increase foraging success and individual fitness, 327 which could be highly advantageous for the slowly recovering Oceania population. Memory of 328 long-term average conditions may be more important for cetaceans than previously thought 329 (Abrahms et al. 2019), and some marine species in the Southern Ocean have been found to 330 consistently return to foraging areas that may have arisen as a consequence of predictable 331 oceanographic conditions (Weimerskirch 2007; McIntyre et al. 2017; Sztukowski et al. 2018). 332 Data on the Oceania whales across multiple years could help identify persistent patterns in the 333 whales' behavior to determine the role of memory, and assess the stability of the two feeding 334 areas over time, especially given the predicted future changes in ice dynamics due to climate 335 change (de la Mare 1998; Turner et al. 2009). Changes in global oceanographic events are 336 becoming more common, for example they are likely to have disrupted the long-term feeding 337 ground fidelity in humpback whales in southern Alaska (Neilson & Gabriele 2019).

338

339 **Environmental effects on whale movement and behavior on the Southern Ocean**

340 **feeding grounds**

341 Because large baleen whales have very high energetic demands (Lockyer 1981), we expect that 342 humpback whale behavior on the feeding grounds is largely driven by the distribution and 343 availability of krill; especially given they effectively undertake all foraging during the ~five 344 months they spend in the Southern Ocean. Previous studies have linked the behavior and 345 distribution of humpback whales to krill abundance and distribution (e.g. Friedlaender et al. 346 2006, 2011, 2013; Curtice et al. 2015). However, as obtaining reliable data on krill abundance 347 and distribution for the large temporal and spatial extent covered by our satellite telemetry data 348 is all but impossible, we examined how the behavior of these whales was affected by more easily 349 recorded, remotely sensed environmental parameters. In the absence of easily obtained prey 350 field data understanding how marine top predators, such as whales, pinnipeds and seabirds, 351 respond to more easily recorded variables (which act as proxies for prey availability) is often the 352 only approach available (Raymond et al. 2015; Reisinger et al. 2018).

353 The best LMM indicated that the inferred behavioral states of humpback whales within the 354 Southern Ocean feeding grounds were most affected by timing within the feeding season 355 (month), where the marginal ice edge was two months prior, SSH, and to some extent the region 356 (Table 5, Figure 3). All these variables are thought to be linked to krill availability and distribution 357 associated with local and regional scale oceanographic features. By targeting and favoring areas 358 with environmental conditions that are associated with increased prey availability, large marine 359 predators, such as humpback whales, can improve their foraging opportunities (Heerah et al. 360 2016). In the absence of prior knowledge regarding potential prey locations, whales might use 361 environmental cues to place themselves in likely profitable foraging areas.

362 As the feeding season progressed the likelihood of adopting ARS-foraging behavior increased, 363 peaking in February-March (Figure 2a). This was expected as the whales would be finding 364 sufficient prey to feed on after several months of fasting, and as productivity should increase 365 following the spring/summer ice melt (Lehodey et al. 1998; Arrigo et al. 2008; Dalpadado et al. 366 2014). After the peak, the likelihood of ARS-foraging behavior decreased likely in response to 367 productivity declining in late summer-autumn months, however data for the last two months 368 came from only one whale (Table 4).

369 The results indicated that foraging behavior was more likely to occur near where the ice edge 370 was two months prior. As the sea ice melts, the ice-free waters promote phytoplankton blooms 371 which in turn trigger grazers such as krill to aggregate at the sea ice edge (Nicol 2006; Arrigo et 372 al. 2008). This link between humpback whales and the ice indicates that the whales do not 373 actively track the ice edge itself, but instead the productivity that occurs following ice melt (i.e. 374 after a time lag). Organisms do not always respond immediately to changes in the physical or 375 biotic environment. Animal population trends respond to fluctuations in the environment after 376 appropriate time lags (e.g. Baker et al. 2007; Walker et al. 2013), however distribution and 377 foraging behavior can also show lagged responses to environmental conditions (Pinaud and 378 Weimerskirch 2005). Our findings therefore support the importance of including time-lagged 379 variables when modelling the relationships between animals and their environment, which is 380 applicable to both aquatic and terrestrial species across a broad array of ecosystems.

381 The humpback whales were also more likely to exhibit ARS-foraging behavior at lower SSH 382 values. Lower (more negative) SSH values are linked to meso-scale eddies, which stimulate 383 productivity near the surface through vertical mixing of deep nutrient rich waters, and trap 384 aggregations of buoyant and weekly swimming plankton and fish (Olson and Backus 1985; Nel 385 et al. 2001; Hyrenbach et al. 2006). However, whether the whales can detect changes in SSH and 386 relate them to krill presence is unknown. As noted above, areas with lower SSH are generally 387 linked to productivity and prey, and SSH is therefore functioning as a proxy for prey in our model. 388 There was some evidence that the behavioral mode of the whales was affected by the feeding 389 region they were in, and the interaction between region and month suggests that the whales 390 behave differently in the different regions during different points of the season (Figure 2a).

391 Animals are expected to strive to maximize foraging success while minimizing the associated 392 effort and costs (MacArthur and Pianka 1966; Schoener 1971). Predators foraging in complex 393 and patchy environments should therefore adjust their movements and foraging behavior 394 according to prey availability (and density) to maximize foraging efficiency. They might for 395 instance employ distinct foraging strategies in different habitats (Arthur et al. 2016). We expect 396 that the observed regional foraging behaviors by the humpback whales are the result of region-397 specific decisions made in response to the dynamic characteristics of the environment in each 398 habitat, suggesting that there is behavioral plasticity in this population. Many ecological studies 399 have treated conspecific individuals as ecological equivalents, but the existence of intraspecific 400 plasticity in foraging behavior (in the form of dietary differences, variation in habitat use or 401 foraging strategies for example) is widespread among taxonomic groups and can be ecologically 402 important (Bolnick et al. 2003; Ceia and Ramos 2015; McHuron et al. 2018). The predicted 403 climate change induced spatial variability in factors that influence krill populations, such as sea 404 ice characteristics and seasonal dynamics, are likely to result in region-specific responses in the 405 whales' main prey (e.g. Constable et al. 2014), which might necessitate region-specific foraging 406 strategies in the future.

407 In order to respond dynamically to sensory cues from the dynamic environment whales likely 408 use multimodal sensory systems (Carroll et al. 2017; Torres 2017). Additionally, species-habitat 409 relationships are often scale dependent, and different environmental parameters may have a 410 stronger influence on animals at different scales (Redfern et al. 2006; Ballance et al. 2006). For 411 example, during long distance migration to the feeding grounds (thousands of kilometers) 412 humpback whales, as well as other cetaceans, use large-scale oceanographic patterns and 413 features to navigate (Horton et al. 2017; Torres 2017). Once near or within the feeding grounds 414 the whales are expected to change their movement to a smaller-scale prey search pattern, and 415 will likely utilize different, finer-scale environmental cues (Ballance et al. 2006; Doniol-Valcroze 416 et al. 2007; Torres 2017; Kirchner et al. 2018). It is therefore important to use temporal and 417 spatial scales that are appropriate for the main objectives of the analysis and relevant for the

418 ecology of the target species (e.g. Ballance et al. 2006; Redfern et al. 2006; Fernandez et al. 419 2017). Unfortunately, the temporal and spatial scale used is often determined by the availability 420 of the environmental data. We were not immune to this problem, yet we aimed to use 421 resolutions closest to our modelled data to best capture the whales' behavior patterns. Using 422 different movement/behavioral modelling techniques (e.g. McClintock et al. 2015; McClintock 423 and Michelot 2018) it can be possible to further improve the accuracy of the animal locations. 424 In our case, due to the low resolution of many of the environmental covariates (raster data), 425 improving the whale location estimates would have likely resulted in us sampling from the same 426 environmental raster cell. In studies covering a smaller study area and having higher quality 427 environmental data increasing the accuracy of the animal locations would be more paramount. 428 Despite some caveats, using the available remotely sensed data and spatial modelling 429 techniques enabled us to uncover the behavioral patterns of these whales spread over 4,000km 430 across the Southern Ocean largely devoid of distinct land mass features, apart from the Antarctic 431 continent. The whales' ability to detect and use environmental cues to locate patchily 432 distributed prey in this vast ocean environment is remarkable and identifying the key variables 433 for these animals will help us better understand their behavior and how they might respond to 434 changes in their environment.

435 In many animal taxa (including insects, birds and mammals) the decision to begin migrating 436 from one critical habitat to another often occurs in response to environmental conditions, social 437 cues or sexual hierarchy, and is highly affected by individual variation (Chittleborough 1965; 438 Gunnarsson et al. 2006; Balbontín et al. 2009; Jiang et al. 2011; Rivrud et al. 2016; Berdahl et al. 439 2017). Climate change has a variety of effects on the critical habitats of different animals, for 440 example by altering the distribution and seasonal availability of food as well as the size of 441 suitable breeding areas (Fitter and Fitter 2002; Walther et al. 2002; Derville et al. 2019). If the 442 timing of migration relies on endogenous cues that are not affected by climate change 443 (compared to e.g. weather cues), the migration of such species will not advance even though 444 they need to arrive earlier on their breeding or feeding grounds (Both and Visser 2001). It is yet 445 unclear whether climate change will influence whale arrival at the Southern Ocean feeding 446 grounds earlier, and whether this would have a positive or a negative effect on their fitness. 447 Waiting for krill to become available could incur an energetic cost due to the wait time, yet the 448 whales might adapt and prey switch which has, to forage more on already available prey; this 449 has been documented in different humpback whale populations (e.g. Weinrich et al. 1992; 450 Fleming et al. 2015).

451

452 **CONCLUSIONS**

453 Here we used spatial modelling techniques to identify underlying behavioral states from 454 movement data for a wide-ranging marine predator inhabiting a remote area, and related those 455 behaviors with environmental conditions. We identified two important Southern Ocean feeding 456 areas for humpback whales and observed differences in behavior, likely related to decisions 457 made about the local environmental variation between the two adjacent habitats. Behavioral 458 plasticity is critical to survive in environments that are unpredictable and changing (Stien et al. 459 2010; Wong and Candolin 2015; Courbin et al. 2017). This could therefore be of advantage to 460 whales in a changing Southern Ocean, especially as the two feeding areas are experiencing 461 different responses to climate change; sea ice increase in the Ross Sea, sea ice retreat in the 462 Amundsen and Bellingshausen Seas (e.g. Zwally et al. 2002; Turner et al. 2009) and regional 463 differences in food web structure (e.g. Murphy et al. 2012; Constable et al. 2014). Environmental 464 changes may therefore elicit different behavioral and demographic responses for populations 465 inhabiting different, yet adjacent, regions of the Southern Ocean. Having whales of the same 466 population being subject to different environmental conditions provides an opportunity to study 467 changes in their distribution and behavior within and between circum-Antarctic regions, which 468 in turn can be used as indicators of change in the ecosystem (e.g. prey distribution) for all marine 469 predators (Raymond et al. 2015). The phenomena of range shifts and behavioral adaptations in 470 response to environmental change are better understood in the northern hemisphere where 471 such events are more apparent (Both and Visser 2001; Post et al. 2009).

472

473 **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

- 474 This work was supported by the Ministry for Primary Industries BRAG; Pew Charitable Trusts;
- 475 Southern Ocean Research Partnership International Whaling Commission; Australian
- 476 Antarctic Division; University of Auckland; Institut de Recherche pour le Développement;
- 477 Conservation International; Blue Planet Marine; Opération Cétacés; National Marine Mammal
- 478 Laboratory NOAA; the Australasian Society for the Study of Animal Behaviour, and Scientific
- 479 Committee on Antarctic Research (SCAR) Fellowship to L.R. We thank the crew of RV
- 480 Braveheart; the Raoulies Department of Conservation; Kevin Chang University of Auckland;
- 481 Charlotte Boyd National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration; Mike Double, Ben
- 482 Raymond and Sophie Bestley Australian Antarctic Division, and Ben Weinstein University of
- 483 Florida. Kia ora Ngāti Kurī and Te Aupōuri for allowing us to work with their taonga. Research
- 484 was conducted under University of Auckland Animal Ethics AEC001587 and Department of

485 Conservation Permit #44388-MAR.

538 Bolnick DI, Svanbäck R, Fordyce JA, Yang LH, Davis JM, Hulsey CD, Forister ML (2003) The 539 ecology of individuals: incidence and implications of individual specialization. Am Nat 161:1-28 540 541 Bombosch A, Zitterbart DP, Van Opzeeland I, Frickenhaus S, Burkhardt E, Wisz MS, Boebel O 542 (2014) Predictive habitat modelling of humpback (*Megaptera novaeangliae*) and Antarctic 543 minke (*Balaenoptera bonaerensis*) whales in the Southern Ocean as a planning tool for seismic 544 surveys. Deep Sea Res I 91:101-114 545 546 Both C, Visser ME (2001) Adjustment to climate change is constrained by arrival date in a long-547 distance migrant bird. Nature 411(6835):296 548 549 Boyd IL (1996) Temporal scales of foraging in a marine predator. Ecology 77:426-34 550 551 Bracis C, Mueller T. (2017) Memory, not just perception, plays an important role in terrestrial 552 mammalian migration. Proc Biol Sci 284(1855):20170449. 553 554 Brierley AS, Fernandes PG, Brandon MA, Armstrong F, Millard NW, McPhail SD, Stevenson P, 555 Pebody M, Perrett J, Squires M, Bone DG (2002) Antarctic krill under sea ice: elevated 556 abundance in a narrow band just south of ice edge. Science 295: 1890-1892 557 558 Burnham KP, Anderson DR (2002) Model selection and multimodel inference: a practical 559 information-theoretic approach, 2nd edn. Springer, New York 560 561 Burnham KP, Anderson DR, Huyvaert KP (2011) AIC model selection and multimodel inference 562 in behavioral ecology: some background, observations, and comparisons. Behav Ecol Sociobiol 563 65:23-35 564 565 Carroll G, Cox M, Harcourt R, Pitcher BJ, Slip D, Jonsen I. (2017) Hierarchical influences of prey 566 distribution on patterns of prey capture by a marine predator. Funct Ecol 31(9):1750-1760. 567 568 Ceia FR, Ramos JA (2015) Individual specialization in the foraging and feeding strategies of 569 seabirds: a review. Mar Biol 162:1923-1938 570 571 Cerchio S, Trudelle L, Zerbini AN, Charrassin JB, Geyer Y, Mayer FX, Andrianarivelo N, Jung JL, 572 Adam O, Rosenbaum HC (2016) Satellite telemetry of humpback whales off Madagascar 573 reveals insights on breeding behavior and long-range movements within the southwest Indian 574 Ocean. Mar Ecol Prog Ser 562:193-209 575 576 Childerhouse S, Jackson J, Baker CS, Gales N, Clapham PJ, Brownell Jr RL (2008) *Megaptera* 577 *novaeangliae* (Oceania subpopulation). IUCN Red List of Threatened Species. Version 2009.2 578 (http://www.iucnredlist.org/) 579 580 Chimienti M, Cornulier T, Owen E, Bolton M, Davies IM, Travis JM, Scott BE (2017) Taking 581 movement data to new depths: Inferring prey availability and patch profitability from seabird 582 foraging behavior. Ecol Evol 23:10252-10265 583 584 Chittleborough RG (1965) Dynamics of two populations of the humpback whale, *Megaptera* 585 *novaeangliae* (Borowski). Mar Freshwater Res 16:33-128 586 587 Clapham PJ, Baker CS (2017) Whaling, modern. In: Perrin WF, Würsig B, Thewissen JGM (eds) 588 Encyclopedia of marine mammals. 3rd edn. Academic Press, New York, pp 1239–1242 589

643 Fitter AH, Fitter RS (2002) Rapid changes in flowering time in British plants. Science 644 296(5573):1689-1691 645 646 Fleming AH, Clark CT, Calambokidis J, Barlow J (2015) Humpback whale diets respond to 647 variance in ocean climate and ecosystem conditions in the California Current. Glob Change Biol 648 22(3):1214-1224 649 650 Freitas C, Lydersen C, Fedak MA, Kovacs KM (2008) A simple new algorithm to filter marine 651 mammal Argos locations. Mar Mammal Sci 24(2):315-325 652 653 Friedlaender AS, Halpin PN, Qian SS, Lawson GL, Wiebe PH, Thiele D, Read AJ (2006) Whale 654 distribution in relation to prey abundance and oceanographic processes in shelf waters of the 655 Western Antarctic Peninsula. Mar Ecol Prog Ser 317:297-310 656 657 Friedlaender AS, Johnston DW, Fraser WR, Burns J, Costa DP (2011) Ecological niche modeling 658 of sympatric krill predators around Marguerite Bay, Western Antarctic Peninsula. Deep Sea Res 659 II 58:1729-1740 660 661 Friedlaender AS, Johnston DW, Tyson RB, Kaltenberg A, Goldbogen JA, Stimpert AK, Curtice C, 662 Hazen EL, Halpin PN, Read AJ, Nowacek DP (2016) Multiple-stage decisions in a marine central-663 place forager. Roy Soc Open Sci 3(5):160043 664 665 Friedlaender AS, Tyson RB, Stimpert AK, Read AJ, Nowacek DP (2013) Extreme diel variation in 666 the feeding behavior of humpback whales along the western Antarctic Peninsula during 667 autumn. Mar Ecol Prog Ser 494:281-289 668 669 Gloersen P, Campbell WJ, Cavalieri DJ, Comiso JC, Parkinson CL, Zwally HJ (1992) Arctic and 670 Antarctic sea ice, 1978–1987: Satellite passive microwave observations and analysis, 671 Washington, DC, USA, NASA, 290pp 672 673 Gregr EJ, Baumgartner MF, Laidre KL, Palacios DM (2013) Marine mammal habitat models 674 come of age: the emergence of ecological and management relevance. Endanger Species Res 675 22:205-212 676 677 Griffiths HJ (2010) Antarctic marine biodiversity–what do we know about the distribution of 678 life in the Southern Ocean? PloS One 5(8):e11683 679 680 Guisan A, Tingley R, Baumgartner JB, Naujokaitis-Lewis I, Sutcliffe PR, Tulloch AI, Regan TJ, 681 Brotons L, McDonald-Madden E, Mantyka-Pringle C, Martin TG (2013) Predicting species 682 distributions for conservation decisions. Ecol Lett 16:1424-1435 683 684 Gunnarsson TG, Gill JA, Atkinson PW, Gelinaud G, Potts PM, Croger RE, Gudmundsson GA, 685 Appleton GF, Sutherland WJ (2006) Population-scale drivers of individual arrival times in 686 migratory birds. J Anim Ecol 75(5):1119-1127 687 688 Gurarie E, Bracis C, Delgado M, Meckley TD, Kojola I, Wagner CM (2016) What is the animal 689 doing? Tools for exploring behavioural structure in animal movements. J Anim Ecol 85:69-84 690 691 Haury LR, McGowan JA, Wiebe PH (1978) Patterns and processes in the time-space scales of 692 plankton distributions. In: Steele JH (ed) Spatial Pattern in Plankton Communities. NATO 693 Conference Series (IV Marine Sciences), vol 3. Springer, Boston (MA) 694

695 Heerah K, Hindell M, Andrew-Goff V, Field I, McMahon CR, Charrassin JB (2016) Contrasting 696 behavior between two populations of an ice-obligate predator in East Antarctica. Ecol Evol 697 7:606-618 698 699 Heide-Jørgensen MP, Kleivane L, ØIen N, Laidre KL, Jensen MV (2001) A new technique for 700 deploying satellite transmitters on baleen whales: tracking a blue whale (*Balaenoptera* 701 *musculus*) in the North Atlantic. Mar Mammal Sci 17:949-954 702 703 Horton TW, Hauser N, Zerbini AN, Francis MP, Domeier ML, Andriolo A, Costa DP, Robinson 704 PW, Duffy CA, Nasby-Lucas N, Holdaway RN, Clapham, PJ (2017) Route fidelity during marine 705 megafauna migration. Front Mar Sci 4:422. 706 707 Horton TW, Holdaway RN, Zerbini AN, Hauser N, Garrigue C, Andriolo A, Clapham PJ (2011) 708 Straight as an arrow: humpback whales swim constant course tracks during long-distance 709 migration. Biol lett rsbl20110279 710 711 Humphries NE, Queiroz N, Dyer JR, Pade NG, Musyl MK, Schaefer KM, Fuller DW, 712 Brunnschweiler JM, Doyle TK, Houghton JD, Hays GC (2010) Environmental context explains 713 Lévy and Brownian movement patterns of marine predators. Nature 465(7301):1066 714 715 Hussey NE, Kessel ST, Aarestrup K, Cooke SJ, Cowley PD, Fisk AT, Harcourt RG, Holland KN, 716 Iverson SJ, Kocik JF, Flemming JE (2015) Aquatic animal telemetry: a panoramic window into 717 the underwater world. Science 348(6240):1255642 718 719 Hyrenbach KD, Veit RR, Weimerskirch H, Hunt Jr GL (2006) Seabird associations with mesoscale 720 eddies: the subtropical Indian Ocean. Mar Ecol Prog Ser 324:271-279 721 722 International Whaling Commission (2015) Report of the sub-committee on other Southern 723 Hemisphere whale stocks Annex H. International Whaling Commission IWC/66/Rep01, San 724 Diego, USA 22 May–3 June 2015, pp. 38 725 726 Ivashchenko YV, Clapham PJ (2014) Too much is never enough: the cautionary tale of Soviet 727 illegal whaling. Mar Fish Rev 76:1-22 728 729 Jiang X, Luo L, Zhang L, Sappington TW, Hu Y (2011) Regulation of migration in *Mythimna* 730 *separata* (Walker) in China: a review integrating environmental, physiological, hormonal, 731 genetic, and molecular factors. Environ Entomol 40(3):516-533 732 733 Jonsen ID, Flemming JM, Myers RA (2005) Robust state–space modeling of animal movement 734 data. Ecology 86:2874-2880 735 736 Jonsen, I., Luque, S., Winsip, A., Pedersen, M.W (2015) bsam: Bayesian state-space models for 737 animal movement. R package version 0.43.1. http://www.r-project.org 738 739 Jonsen ID, Myers RA, James MC (2006) Robust hierarchical state–space models reveal diel 740 variation in travel rates of migrating leatherback turtles. J Anim Ecol 75:1046-1057 741 742 Jonsson B, Ruud-Hansen J (1985) Water temperature as the primary influence on timing of 743 seaward migrations of Atlantic salmon (*Salmo salar*) smolts. Can J Fish Aquat Sci 42(3):593-595 744 745 Kawamura AA (1994) A review of baleen whale feeding in the Southern Ocean. Report of the 746 International Whaling Commission, 44:261-271 747

748 Kirchner T, Wiley DN, Hazen EL, Parks SE, Torres LG, Friedlaender AS. (2018) Hierarchical 749 foraging movement of humpback whales relative to the structure of their prey. Mar Ecol Prog 750 Ser 607:237-250. 751 752 Le Corre M, Dussault C, Côté SD (2017) Weather conditions and variation in timing of spring 753 and fall migrations of migratory caribou. J Mammal 98(1):260-271 754 755 Lehodey P, Andre JM, Bertignac M, Hampton J, Stoens A, Menkès C, Mémery L, Grima N (1998) 756 Predicting skipjack tuna forage distributions in the equatorial Pacific using a coupled dynamical 757 bio-geochemical model. Fish Oceanogr 7(3-4):317-325 758 759 Lockyer C (1981) Growth and energy budgets of large baleen whales from the Southern 760 Hemisphere. *Mammals in the seas*. 3, FAO Fisheries Series, No. 5:379-487 761 762 MacArthur RH, Pianka ER (1966) On optimal use of a patchy environment. Am Nat 763 100(916):603-609 764 765 Mandel JT, Bildstein KL, Bohrer G, Winkler DW (2008) Movement ecology of migration in 766 turkey vultures. Proc Natl Acad Sci 105:19102-19107 767 768 McClintock BT, Michelot T (2018) momentuHMM: R package for generalized hidden Markov 769 models of animal movement. Methods Ecol Evol 9(6):1518-1530 770 771 McClintock BT, London JM, Cameron MF, Boveng PL (2015) Modelling animal movement using 772 the Argos satellite telemetry location error ellipse. Methods Ecol Evol 6(3):266-277 773 774 McHuron EA, Peterson SH, Hückstädt LA, Melin SR, Harris JD, Costa DP (2018) The energetic 775 consequences of behavioral variation in a marine carnivore. Ecol Evol 8:4340-4351 776 777 McIntyre T, Bester MN, Bornemann H, Tosh CA, de Bruyn PN (2017) Slow to change? Individual 778 fidelity to three-dimensional foraging habitats in southern elephant seals, *Mirounga leonina*. 779 Anim Behav 127:91-99 780 781 Meyer B, Freier U, Grimm V, Groeneveld J, Hunt BP, Kerwath S, King R, Klaas C, Pakhomov E, 782 Meiners KM, Melbourne-Thomas J (2017) The winter pack-ice zone provides a sheltered but 783 food-poor habitat for larval Antarctic krill. Nature Ecol Evol 1(12):1853-1861 784 785 Michelot T, Langrock R, Bestley S, Jonsen ID, Photopoulou T, Patterson TA (2017) Estimation 786 and simulation of foraging trips in land-based marine predators. Ecology 98:1932-1944 787 788 Morales JM, Haydon DT, Frair J, Holsinger KE, Fryxell JM (2004) Extracting more out of 789 relocation data: building movement models as mixtures of random walks. Ecology 85:2436- 790 2445 791 792 Murase H, Matsuoka K, Ichii T, Nishiwaki S (2002) Relationship between the distribution of 793 euphausiids and baleen whales in the Antarctic (35 E–145 W). Polar Biol 25:135-145 794 795 Murphy EJ, Cavanagh RD, Hofmann EE, Hill SL, Constable AJ, Costa DP, Pinkerton MH, Johnston 796 NM, Trathan PN, Klinck JM, Wolf-Gladrow DA (2012) Developing integrated models of 797 Southern Ocean food webs: including ecological complexity, accounting for uncertainty and 798 the importance of scale. Prog Oceanogr 102:74-92 799

25

905 Stevick PT, Allen J, Clapham PJ, Katona SK, Larsen F, Lien J, Mattila DK, Palsbøll PJ, Sears R, 906 Sigurjonsson J, Smith TD (2006) Population spatial structuring on the feeding grounds in North 907 Atlantic humpback whales (*Megaptera novaeangliae*). J Zool 270:244-255 908 909 Stien A, Loe LE, Mysterud A, Severinsen T, Kohler J, Langvatn R (2010) Icing events trigger 910 range displacement in a high-arctic ungulate. Ecology 91(3):915-920 911 912 Sumner MD (2016) raadtools: Tools for synoptic environmental spatial data. Retrieved from 913 https://github.com/ AustralianAntarcticDivision/raadtools 914 915 Sztukowski LA, Cotton PA, Weimerskirch H, Thompson DR, Torres LG, Sagar PM, Knights AM, 916 Fayet AL, Votier SC (2018) Sex differences in individual foraging site fidelity of Campbell 917 albatross. MarEcol Prog Ser 601:227-238 918 919 Torres LG (2017) A sense of scale: Foraging cetaceans' use of scale-dependent multimodal 920 sensory systems. Mar Mammal Sci 33:1170-1193 921 922 Trudelle L, Cerchio S, Zerbini AN, Geyer Y, Mayer FX, Jung JL, Hervé MR, Pous S, Sallée JB, 923 Rosenbaum HC, Adam O (2016) Influence of environmental parameters on movements and 924 habitat utilization of humpback whales (*Megaptera novaeangliae*) in the Madagascar breeding 925 ground. Roy Soc Open Sci 3:160616 926 927 Turner J, Comiso JC, Marshall GJ, Lachlan-Cope TA, Bracegirdle T, Maksym T, Meredith MP, 928 Wang Z, Orr A (2009) Non-annular atmospheric circulation change induced by stratospheric 929 ozone depletion and its role in the recent increase of Antarctic sea ice extent. Geophys Res 930 Lett 36(8): L08502 931 932 Vøllestad LA, Jonsson B, Hvidsten NA, Næsje TF, Haraldstad Ø, Ruud-Hansen J (1986) 933 Environmental factors regulating the seaward migration of European silver eels (*Anguilla* 934 *anguilla*). Can J Fish Aquat Sci 43(10):1909-1916 935 936 Walker J, Rotella JJ, Stephens SE, Lindberg MS, Ringelman JK, Hunter C, Smith AJ (2013) Time-937 lagged variation in pond density and primary productivity affects duck nest survival in the 938 Prairie Pothole Region. Ecological Applications 23(5):1061-1074 939 940 Walther GR, Post E, Convey P, Menzel A, Parmesan C, Beebee TJ, Fromentin JM, Hoegh-941 Guldberg O, Bairlein F (2002) Ecological responses to recent climate change. Nature 942 416(6879):389 943 944 Warton DI, Hui FK (2011) The arcsine is asinine: the analysis of proportions in ecology. Ecology 945 92(1):3-10. 946 947 Weimerskirch H (2007) Are seabirds foraging for unpredictable resources? Deep Sea Res II 948 54(3-4):211-223 949 950 Weinrich MT, Schilling MR, Belt CR (1992) Evidence for acquisition of a novel feeding 951 behaviour: lobtail feeding in humpback whales, *Megaptera novaeangliae*. Anim Behav. 952 44(6):1059-72 953 954 Weinstein BG, Double M, Gales N, Johnston DW, Friedlaender AS (2017) Identifying overlap 955 between humpback whale foraging grounds and the Antarctic krill fishery. Biol Conserv 956 210:184-191 957

- 958 Wong B, Candolin U (2015) Behavioral responses to changing environments. Behav Ecol 959 26(3):665-673
- 960
- 961 Zuur AF, Ieno EN, Walker NJ, Saveliev AA, Smith GM (2009) Mixed effects models and
- 962 extensions in ecology with R. Springer, New York, USA
- 963
- 964 Zwally HJ, Comiso JC, Parkinson CL, Cavalieri DJ, Gloersen P (2002) Variability of Antarctic sea
- 965 ice 1979–1998. J Geophys Res: Oceans. 107(C5):9-1

Tables and table legends

Table 1. The unit of measure, source and resolution of the environmental predictor variables used to construct the species distribution models

Resolution

Table 2. Model selection results of the best linear mixed-effect models to explain the effects of different variables on humpback whale behavioral mode (*b*).

All models include the individual whale (unique tag number, PTT) fitted as a random effect. For each candidate model we report the Akaike's Information Criterion (AIC) and the change in AIC (∆AIC) compared to the best model of each scenario. K = number of parameters. The best overall model is bolded.

Table 3. Summary of satellite tag deployments and tracking data for 18 humpback whales used in the state-space model.

All tags were deployed at Raoul Island (Kermadec Islands, New Zealand). PTT = unique tag number. Only whales whose tags transmitted data south of 60°S were used in the linear mixed-effect model.

F = female, M = male, U = unknown sex, and * denotes animals that had a calf. All dates are in UTC. Transmitting days = number of days when one or more locations were received.

Data gaps = any gaps in data transmission >1 day in length, data gap length is in days, multiple data gaps for the same animal are separated with a comma.

Percent of locations belonging to each of the seven Argos service provider assigned location classes. Location classes in a descending order of accuracy: 3, 2, 1, 0, A, B and Z. See Argos user's manual 2016

Table 4. Number of unique tags transmitting in any given month, and the number of state-space modelled data points (in brackets) within the feeding grounds (south of 60°S).

In total, the tags of 14 individual whales transmitted data within the feeding grounds. A&B seas = Amundsen and Bellingshausen Seas.

* PTT131182 travels through both regions during the month of November

† PTT102218, PTT131175 and PTT131187 travel through both regions during the month of December

‡ PTT131175 travels through both regions during the month of January

§ PTT102218 travels through both regions during the month of May

Table 5. Results of the best Linear Mixed Effect model, with logit transformed behavioral state (*b*) as a response variable and individual whales as a random effect. Higher b-values indicate an increasing likelihood of whales exhibiting ARS-foraging behavior.

Estimates are in log-odds scale. During model selection all models were fitted using maximum likelihood for comparing models with different fixed effects. The best model was then fitted with restricted maximum likelihood to obtain final parameter estimates. Variables with a significant parameter estimate (<0.05) are in bold.

Figure legends

Figure 1: Migration pathways for 18 Oceania humpback whales satellite-tagged at the Kermadec Islands, New Zealand. Left column: State-space model estimated behavioral states: red dot = area restricted search (ARS; inferred foraging); black dot = inferred transit; grey dot = uncertain behavioral mode. Bottom left: Tracks of 14 whales whose tags transmitted on their Southern Ocean feeding grounds with circles denoting the approximate locations of the two key foraging grounds. The background color scale indicates the bathymetric depth (derived from the International Bathymetric Chart of the Southern Ocean (IBCSO) digital bathymetric model of the circum-Antarctic waters). Right column: Satellite tracks color coded by month.

Figure 2. a) Average behavioral mode (*b*) by month. Values closer to 1 indicate transiting behavior and values closer to 2 indicate ARS-foraging behavior, and b) distance to ice edge (km; all locations) by month. Black dashed = all whales, green = Ross Sea, blue = Amundsen & Bellingshausen Seas.

Figure 3. The relationship between significant explanatory variables a) month, b) distance to the ice edge (2-month lag) and c) SSH (sea surface height) and the logit transformed behavioral mode (*b*). Green = Ross Sea, Blue = Amundsen and Bellingshausen Seas. Higher predicted *b*(logit) values indicate an increasing likelihood of whales exhibiting ARS-foraging behavior. A negative value for 'distance to ice edge' indicates that the whale has moved past the point where the ice edge was two months prior. Simplified univariate regression lines from the mixed-effect model analysis (without random effects and autocorrelation structure) were added to b) and c) to highlight the overall trend in the data for the sample population.

Figure 1.

disttoice_2mth_lag distoice_1mth_lag Region_numerical current_log bathymetry slope_log disttoice iceConc month **HSS** $\overline{1}$ month 0.8 Region_numerical 0.6 -0.23 disttoice 0.4 iceConc -0.22 0.2 **SSH** -0.47 0.5 $\mathbf 0$ bathymetry 0.14 -0.36 -0.4 -0.2 disttoice_1mth_lag -0.37 -0.49 0.45 0.27 -0.4 disttoice_2mth_lag 0.2 0.41 -0.6 current_log 0.17 -0.26 -0.37 -0.48 0.66 -0.8 slope_log -0.45 -0.27 0.42 \mathbf{H}

Electronic Supplementary Material, Figure ESM 1. Spearman correlation matrix of the 10 covariates used in the statistical model.

Electronic Supplementary Material, Table ESM 2. Posterior sample means and 95% confidence intervals for movement parameters (transit, and arearestricted search; ARS) estimated using a hierarchical state-space model. γ = autocorrelation in speed and direction, θ = turning angles (radians).

