1	Modelling	the	responses	of	partially-migratory	metapopulations	to	changing	seasonal
2	migration r	ates:	from theory	y to	data.				

- 3 Ana Payo-Payo¹, Paul Acker^{1,3}, Greta Bocedi¹, Justin M. J. Travis¹; Sarah J. Burthe², Michael
- 4 P. Harris², Sarah Wanless², Mark Newell², Francis Daunt² and Jane M. Reid^{1,3}.
- 5 ¹School of Biological Sciences, University of Aberdeen, Zoology Building, Tillydrone
- 6 Avenue, Aberdeen AB24 2TZ, UK. ²UK Centre for Ecology & Hydrology, Bush Estate,
- 7 Penicuik, Midlothian EH26 0QB, UK. ³Centre for Biodiversity Dynamics, NTNU, Trondheim,

8 Norway.

9 **Correspondence**:

- 10 Ana Payo-Payo
- 11 Email: ana.payo-payo@abdn.ac.uk
- 12
- 13
- 14
- 15
- 16
- 17
- 18
- 19
- 20
- 20
- 21

22 Abstract

Among-individual and within-individual variation in expression of seasonal migration
 versus residence is widespread in nature and could substantially affect the dynamics of
 partially-migratory metapopulations inhabiting seasonally- and spatially-structured
 environments. However, such variation has rarely been explicitly incorporated into
 metapopulation dynamic models for partially migratory systems. We therefore lack
 general frameworks that can identify how variable seasonal movements, and associated
 season- and location-specific vital rates, can control system persistence.

2. We constructed a novel conceptual framework that captures full-annual-cycle dynamics 30 and key dimensions of metapopulation structure for partially-migratory species 31 inhabiting seasonal environments. We conceptualize among-individual variation in 32 seasonal migration as two variable vital rates: seasonal movement probability and 33 associated movement survival probability. We conceptualize three levels of within-34 35 individual variation (i.e. plasticity), representing seasonal or annual variation in seasonal migration or lifelong fixed strategies. We formulate these concepts as a general matrix 36 model, which is customizable for diverse life-histories and seasonal landscapes. 37

3. To illustrate how variable seasonal migration can affect metapopulation growth rate, 38 demographic structure and vital rate elasticities, we parameterize our general models for 39 40 hypothetical short- and longer-lived species. Analyses illustrate that elasticities of seasonal movement probability and associated survival probability can sometimes equal 41 or exceed those of vital rates typically understood to substantially influence 42 metapopulation dynamics (i.e. seasonal survival probability or fecundity), that 43 elasticities can vary non-linearly, and that metapopulation outcomes depend on the level 44 of within-individual plasticity. 45

46 4. We illustrate how our general framework can be applied to evaluate the consequences of variable and changing seasonal movement probability by parameterizing our models 47 for a real partially-migratory metapopulation of European shags (Gulosus aristotelis) 48 49 assuming lifelong fixed strategies. Given observed conditions, metapopulation growth rate was most elastic to breeding season adult survival of the resident fraction in the 50 51 dominant population. However, given doubled seasonal movement probability, 52 variation in survival during movement would become the primary driver of metapopulation dynamics. 53

54 5. Our general conceptual and matrix model frameworks, and illustrative analyses, thereby 55 highlight complex ways in which structured variation in seasonal migration can 56 influence dynamics of partially-migratory metapopulations, and pave the way for 57 diverse future theoretical and empirical advances.

58 KEYWORDS Demographic structure, elasticity, full-annual-cycle matrix model,
59 metapopulation, partial migration, persistence, seasonal movement, seasonality.

60

61

62

63

64

65

66

68

69 1 | INTRODUCTION

Identifying which life-history traits, and resulting population-wide vital rates, show environmentally-induced variation and substantially affect population growth rate (λ) can facilitate prediction of population responses to environmental change and inform population management (Caswell, 2001; Heppell et al., 2000; Saether & Bakke, 2000). As effects of environmental variation on λ can depend on population demographic structure (Coulson et al., 2001; Hansen et al., 2019), efforts to explain and predict λ should aim to capture multiple dimensions of structure that can apply in wild populations (Tuljapurkar & Caswell, 1997).

To date, most theoretical and empirical studies have incorporated structure by 77 78 considering variation in vital rates among ages or stages across locations and/or years (Gaillard 79 & Yoccoz, 2003; Koons et al., 2016; Revilla & Wiegand, 2008). However, many populations also experience seasonal (i.e. within-year) environmental variation, which often exceeds the 80 81 magnitude of among-year environmental variation (Gauthier et al., 2001; Paniw et al., 2019; Sendor & Simon, 2003). Such seasonal environmental variation can drive seasonal movements 82 among locations that could both cause additional demographic structure, and interact with that 83 structure to shape λ . 84

85 Specifically, individuals can respond to seasonal environmental variation by reversibly 86 moving between discrete breeding and non-breeding locations across seasons (hereafter "seasonal migration"), alongside permanent or semi-permanent movements between discrete 87 breeding locations (hereafter "dispersal"). Even though seasonal migration and dispersal are 88 different processes with distinct implications, the words are often used interchangeably, 89 generating widespread confusion (e.g., Inchausti & Weimerskirch, 2002). Considerable work 90 91 has focused on understanding how variation in dispersal affects metapopulation structure and persistence, including in seasonal landscapes (Akçakaya, 2000; Bocedi et al., 2014; Hokit et 92

al., 2001; Lecomte et al., 2020; Shima et al., 2010; Travis et al., 2012). However, 93 metapopulation dynamic consequences of variation in seasonal migration remain scarcely 94 examined (Castro et al., 2006; Hanski et al., 2000; Lee & Bolger, 2017). Indeed the need to 95 build and analyze 'full-annual-cycle' metapopulation models for mobile populations has been 96 repeatedly emphasized, but still not fully enacted (Hostetler et al., 2015; Sample et al., 2018; 97 Small-Lorenz et al., 2013). Such models could identify key locations in spatio-seasonally 98 99 heterogeneous landscapes, and season-specific vital rates including migration rates, that constrain λ . 100

101 Explicitly considering metapopulation consequences of changing seasonal migration is relevant because expression of migration (versus residence) commonly varies among 102 individuals and years within populations, generating variable 'partial migration' (Chapman et 103 104 al., 2011; Grist et al., 2017; White et al., 2007). Given multiple breeding locations, "partiallymigratory metapopulations" can then arise (Reid et al., 2018). Here, different sets of individuals 105 from single the same breeding populations can experience different non-breeding season 106 environmental conditions and associated vital rates. Meanwhile, seasonally-sympatric 107 individuals from different breeding populations can experience similar seasonal conditions. 108 Moreover, migrants might experience additional movement mortality on top of mortality 109 110 attributable to conditions at their destinations (Mora Alvarez et al., 2019). Seasonal movement probability is therefore a key variable vital rate that can affect λ both by exposing individuals 111 to movement-induced mortality risk, and by creating substantial within-population structure in 112 other key vital rates through both direct and carry-over environmental effects. 113

Further structure could then result from the temporal scale of within-individual variation in seasonal migration versus residence, and associated plasticity(i.e. the potential of a single genotype or individual to express differing phenotypes, ((Dingemanse et al., 2010; Scheiner, 1993). Here, individuals could make independent decisions to move or not after each

breeding and non-breeding season (hereafter 'seasonally plastic' movement, Fig. 1). This 118 generates three possible annual outcomes: residence, seasonal migration and dispersal. 119 Alternatively, individuals could make such decisions annually after each breeding season, with 120 all moving individuals returning after the non-breeding season (hereafter 'annually plastic' 121 migration, Fig. 1). Both seasonally and annually plastic movements generate partial migration 122 at the population level with within-individual variation in movement between years. Such 123 124 outcomes have been observed in diverse species including North Atlantic right whales (Eubalaena glacialis) and red-spotted newts (Notophthalmus viridescens) (Gowan et 125 126 al., 2019; Grayson et al., 2011). Finally, individuals could develop fixed migrant or resident strategies at or soon after birth, with little or no subsequent within-individual plasticity. 127 Surviving individuals then consistently enact seasonal migration or residence each year 128 129 throughout their lifetime (hereafter 'lifelong fixed' migration, Fig. 1). Indeed, high individual migratory repeatability occurs in diverse species including European shag (Gulosus 130 aristotelis), elk (Cervus elaphus) and white perch (Morone americana) (Eggeman et al., 2016; 131 Grist et al., 2014; Kerr et al., 2009). Then, if residents and migrants experience different 132 survival probabilities, the proportion of each cohort that is seasonally migrant will change 133 across years due to within-generation phenotypic selection. Resulting deviations from the 134 seasonal movement probability manifested at birth could further alter metapopulation structure 135 and responses to spatially-structured environmental perturbations. 136

Sources of demographic structure



FIGURE 1 Conceptual framework highlighting considered sources of demographic structure in partially migratory metapopulations: (a) among individual variation, (b) within individual variation, (c) environmental variation illustrated for a landscape with two patches (black and white) and two seasons (dark and light grey) and (d) life history variation illustrated for short and longer lived species. Possible seasonal movements (a) result in three within year strategies: residents (R), seasonal migrants (M) and dispersers (D). Possible among year strategies (b) result in three distinct models, with seasonally plastic movement (M_{season}), annually plastic

seasonal migration (M_{year}) or lifelong fixed seasonal migration (M_{life}). Arrows represent
different potential individual paths among years.

148

Considering within-individual variation occuring across the three levels of seasons, 149 years and lifetimes provides a useful conceptual framework to evaluate the consequences of 150 151 structured variation in seasonal migration for the dynamics of partially-migratory metapopulations inhabiting seasonally- and spatially-structured environments (Fig. 1).Such 152 capabilities are valuable because numerous species are partially migratory and rely on multiple 153 seasonally-occupied locations, which could make them particularly vulnerable to 154 environmental change (Both et al., 2006; Chapman et al., 2011). Yet, we still lack general 155 theory and models that identify fundamental demographic and (meta-)population properties of 156 such systems and predict potential responses to changes in seasonality, as is expected under 157 climate change (IPCC, 2022; Reid et al., 2018). 158

One approach to understanding impacts of changing migration is to utilize well-159 established principles of matrix population models to project λ (e.g. Caswell, 2001). This 160 approach could identify parameter spaces where partially-migratory metapopulations are 161 expected to grow, remain stable or decrease given differing probabilities of seasonal migration 162 and associated vital rates. 'Elasticities' can then be computed to predict relative impacts of 163 perturbations (e.g. Caswell, 2001). Moreover, such models can facilitate generalization along 164 165 the 'fast-slow' life-history continuum (i.e. short-lived vs longer-lived, Fig. 1, Sæther & Bakke, 2000), project demographic structure, and identify links between vital rate variation and life-166 167 history evolution (Benton & Grant, 1999; Caswell, 2001; van Tienderen, 1995). Seasonal matrix models have previously been formulated, for instance considering seasonal demography 168 in European ticks (Ixodes ricinus, Dobson et al., 2011) and Caribbean Red-tailed Hawks (Buteo 169 170 jamaicensis jamaicensis, Gallardo et al., 2019). However, general models that jointly and explicitly consider variation in seasonal migration probability, plasticity and associatedsurvival have not previously been formulated or analyzed.

173 Accordingly, we construct a general full-annual-cycle matrix model framework that considers seasonal and spatial variation in vital rates in partially-migratory metapopulations. 174 Our framework is novel in conceptualizing multiple levels of among-individual and within-175 individual variation in seasonal migration, as could arise given any life-history paces and 176 177 spatio-seasonal landscape. Specifically, we conceptualize seasonal migration as the outcome of two vital rates: seasonal movement probability and seasonal movement survival probability. 178 179 We formulate within-individual variation by allowing seasonal or annual plasticity, or lifelong fixed strategiesWe evaluate how variation in migration, and associated survival, can affect 180 persistence, demographic structure and associated. To illustrate how our framework can 181 quantify properties of such systems, we parameterize and analyze models firstfor hypothetical 182 short-lived and longer-lived partially-migratory species, and second using empirical data from 183 a partially-migratory metapopulation of European shags. We thereby demonstrate how vital 184 rates that constrain λ for partially-migratory metapopulations can be identified both 185 theoretically and empirically, and highlight parameters that now need to be widely estimated 186 187 in natural systems.

188

189 2 | GENERAL FRAMEWORK FOR PARTIALLY MIGRATORY 190 METAPOPULATIONS

191 2.1 | Seasonal matrix modelling approach and demographic formulation

We construct a general stage-structured full-annual-cycle matrix model with explicit seasonal and spatial variation in vital rates (Figs. 1 and 2). The model considers females within a sexually reproducing population, and an annual projection interval based on a pre-breeding census. Each year comprises two consecutive seasons (*b*): a breeding season (hereafter, b = 1) and a non-

breeding season (hereafter, b = 2). The landscape consists of two patches (hereafter k = 1 and 196 k = 2) with one population breeding in each patch. This is the simplest structure that allows 197 spatial and seasonal variation in vital rates following the concept of a partially-migratory 198 metapopulation (Reid et al., 2018). The annual projection matrix characterizes a full-annual-199 cycle comprising reproduction, breeding season survival, post-breeding seasonal movement 200 (and associated survival) or residence, non-breeding season survival, and post non-breeding 201 seasonal movement (and associated survival) or residence. Specifically, we model 202 metapopulation dynamics from time t to t+1 as $N_{t+1} = AN_t$, where N_t and N_{t+1} are vectors of 203 metapopulation size in each age or stage at time t and t+1 respectively, and A is the full-annual-204 cycle metapopulation projection matrix. A is the product of non-breeding (B_2) and breeding 205 (B_1) season metapopulation projection matrices (i.e. $A=B_2B_1$), thereby conceptually allowing 206 207 movement between patches and demographic strata between seasons (Caswell 2001). Each seasonal matrix (B_b) has sub-matrices B_{bdo} , where d refers to the destination (to) patch and o 208 209 refers to the original (from) patch. For example, B_{b12} is the projection matrix for the population that was in patch 2 at the beginning of season b and moved to patch 1, while B_{b22} is the 210 projection matrix for the population that was in patch 2 and remained there. Overall, B_b is 211 defined as: $B_b = \begin{pmatrix} B_{b11} & B_{b12} \\ B_{b21} & B_{b22} \end{pmatrix}$. 212

As the full life-cycles and *A* and *B_b* matrices are cumbersome, they are presented in Appendix
S2. However, illustrative sub-matrices of *B_b* for the general movement model are shown in Fig
2. Within each *B_b* sub-matrix we define life-histories by setting parameters for age-, season-
and location-dependent survival (*s_{abk}*), age at first reproduction (*a_r*) and location-dependent
fecundity (*f_k*, daughters produced per female from age of first reproduction, assuming a 1:1
sex ratio). To allow age-specific survival, we define seasonal adult survival as a baseline and
define seasonal newborn survival as a proportion (i.e., *s_{01k}* =
$$\alpha_a s_{a1k}$$
).





FIGURE 2 Annual life cycles and $M_{season} B_b$ sub-matrices for hypothetical (a) short-lived and (b) longer-lived species for a landscape with two patches (k=1 and k=2) and two seasons (b=1 and b=2). Life-histories are defined by setting parameters for age-, season- and locationdependent survival (s_{abk}), for age-, season- and location-dependent seasonal movement (m_{abk}) and seasonal movement survival (w_{abk}), age at first reproduction (a_r) and locationdependent fecundity (f_k) . Short-lived and longer lived species consider age at first reproduction (a_r) equal 1 and 3 respectively. Age classes are noted as a_n. For further illustration see Appendix S1.

229 2.2 | Conceptualizing environmental variation

We capture demographic structure resulting from varying spatial and seasonal environmental 230 quality by implementing spatio- seasonal variation in survival and fecundity. To achieve this, 231 we define baseline parameters in patch 1 (k = 1) during the breeding season (b = 1), then define 232 233 other parameters as proportions. For example, we set patch 1 breeding season adult survival 234 probability to s_{a11} . Non-breeding season survival probability in patch 1 is a proportion α_s of s_{a11} (i.e. $s_{a2k} = \alpha_s s_{a1k}$), while breeding season survival probability in patch 2 is a proportion 235 α_g of that in patch 1 (i.e. $s_{a12} = \alpha_g s_{a11}$). To create a biologically relevant seasonal landscape 236 in which a population breeding in patch 1 can escape deteriorating conditions by seasonal 237 movement, we set non-breeding season survival probability in patch 1 to be α_R of that in patch 238 2 (i.e. $s_{a21} = \alpha_R s_{ak2}$). Spatial differences in fecundity follow the same pattern as differences 239 in survival. Therefore, fecundity in patch 2 is α_g of that in patch 1 (i.e. $f_2 = \alpha_s f_1$). However, 240 our general model framework allows for any desired parameterisation. 241

242

243

244 2.3 | Conceptualizing among-individual variation in seasonal migration

We capture structure resulting from among-individual variation in seasonal migration (Figs.1 and 2) by formulating seasonal movement as the product of two variable vital rates: seasonal movement probability (m_{abk}) and seasonal movement survival probability (w_{abk}) . Specifically, a proportion m_{abk} of each age stage class a at the end of season b moves from their current patch (k = 1 or k = 2) towards the other patch. The proportion m_{abk} of the population that moves has probability w_{abk} of surviving the movement. This general formulation allows any desired form of symmetry or asymmetry in seasonal movement
probability and seasonal movement survival probability across ages, seasons and patches.
Appropriate parameterizations can generate diverse forms of movement, including seasonal
migration, temporary and permanent dispersal, or skipping breeding (e.g. Alderman et al.,
2010; Shaw & Levin, 2011, Appendix S1).

256

257 2.4 | Conceptualizing within-individual variation in seasonal migration

We capture structure resulting from within-individual variation in seasonal migration by 258 259 defining a general model, which we constrain to consider seasonal or, annual plasticity, or lifelong fixed strategies (Fig. 1, Appendix S1). First, we consider a general 'seasonal movement 260 model' (hereafter M_{season}, Fig. 1) where movement between patches after each season occurs 261 with probability m_{abk} that is independent of previous seasonal movement or residency (i.e. 262 seasonal plasticity). Hence, at the start of each annual projection cycle, patch 1 contains a 263 264 mixture of individuals that are susceptible to be year-round residents, migrants and dispersers in proportions that depend on the values of m_{a11} and m_{a21} . 265

266 Second, we constrain M_{season} by forcing the surviving population fraction that had moved between patches after the breeding season to return to their original patch after the non-267 breeding season and preventing any new movement at this time (hereafter Myear, Fig.1). This 268 269 generates seasonal migration sensu stricto with no dispersal due to seasonal movement. This is achieved by specifying $m_{a21} = 0$ in B_2 for fractions of the patch 1 population that were 270 already in patch 1 in season 1, and $m_{a21} = 1$ for fractions of the patch 1 population that were 271 previously in patch 2 in season 1 (with identical constraints on m_{a22} for patch 2). These 272 transitions occur repeatedly across successive years. At the start of each annual projection 273 cycle, both patches can contain resident and migrant fractions, where the population 274 proportions that will undertake seasonal migration equal m_{a11} and m_{a12} for patches 1 and 2 275

276 respectively. M_{year} does not allow dispersal due to seasonal movement, but allows random
277 switching between year-round residence and seasonal migration between years (i.e. annual
278 plasticity).

Third, we further constrain M_{vear} by forcing population fractions to retain the migrant 279 or resident strategy acquired at birth (i.e. no plasticity, hereafter Mlife, Fig.1). At the start of 280 each annual cycle, each patch can contain individuals that are lifelong residents and migrants. 281 282 To achieve this, we explicitly define discrete resident and migrant stages for each patch population, with no between-stage transitions allowed. Consequently, M_{life} has twice as many 283 284 stages as M_{vear} and M_{season}. During the breeding season, migrant and resident offspring are produced in proportions m_{01k} and $1 - m_{01k}$ by both residents and migrants. For each patch k 285 we set $m_{a1k} = 0$ for residents, and $m_{a1k} = 1$ for migrants (highlighted in Appendix S2) for 286 juvenile or older. This generates seasonal migration *sensu stricto* with no dispersal due to 287 seasonal movement. Full details of implementation of models Mseason, Myear and Mlife are in 288 Appendix S2. 289

290

291 **2.5 | Model analyses**

All three models can be parameterized and analyzed to quantify how metapopulation 292 persistence ($\lambda \ge 1$), underlying demographic structure, and asymptotic elasticity (e_{θ}) of λ to 293 each vital rate (θ) vary across the potential range of values of seasonal movement probability 294 (m_{abk}) and seasonal movement survival probability (w_{abk}) considering any given level of 295 296 plasticity and life-history. λ is the dominant eigenvalue of the annual projection matrix A. Characterizing demographic structure helps illuminate the mechanisms underlying variation in 297 298 λ , by showing the population proportion that moves and is consequently susceptible to movement costs. Specifically, metapopulation mobile fraction (Ω) is the proportion of 299 individuals that start each annual projection cycle that is susceptible to moving at any given 300

301 time during the focal year. Ω can be further decomposed into migrant (*u*) and disperser (δ) fractions which respectively correspond to individuals susceptible for seasonal migration and 302 303 for dispersal. These individuals experience a cost of movement twice or once a year, respectively. If we assume equal movement probabilities (m) among patches, ages and seasons, 304 then for $M_{\text{season}} u = m^2$ and $\delta = 2(1 - m)m$, and for $M_{\text{vear}} u = m$ and $\delta = 0$. For M_{life} , which 305 explicitly includes separate resident and migrant stages, *w* is the sum of the elements of the 306 307 right eigenvector of M_{life} matrix that corresponds with the migrant stages and $\delta = 0$. For M_{season} and M_{life} , Ω will deviate from the specified value of m. This deviation results from the presence 308 309 of both dispersers and seasonal migrants in M_{season}, and from phenotypic selection arising from any survival differences between residents and migrants in M_{life}. Values of asymptotic elasticity 310 e_{θ} , which quantify the proportional change in λ given a proportional change in a vital rate θ , 311 312 can be calculated as scaled partial derivatives using the chain rule (Caswell 2001), facilitating comparison across vital rates and life-histories. In Myear and Mlife, the two breeding populations 313 are reproductively isolated as there is no dispersal. The size of the population with the lower λ 314 is consequently asymptotically negligible. Accordingly, the metapopulation λ , Ω and 315 e_{θ} correspond to those of the population with the higher λ . However, dispersal among patches 316 can be explicitly implemented to connect populations (see the empirical case study and 317 318 Appendix S6).

319

320 3 | THEORETICAL EXAMPLES: PROPERTIES OF PARTIALLY MIGRATORY 321 METAPOPULATIONS

322 **3.1** | Illustrative parameterizations

323 Our general model allows formulation of any life-history representing any partially-migratory 324 taxa by implementing an appropriate age or stage structure, and allows parameterizations for 325 any desired two-patch landscape (Appendices C and F). However, to illustrate how our 326 framework can quantify key properties of partially-migratory metapopulations and highlight 327 roles of migratory plasticity, here we focus on two illustrative parameterizations representing 328 seasonal landscapes supporting stereotypical relatively short-lived and longer-lived species.

We define a landscape where a population breeding in a high-quality patch (k = 1, i.e. higher breeding season vital rates) can escape locally deteriorating conditions during the nonbreeding season by moving to another patch (k = 2, Fig. 2). Meanwhile, a population breeding in patch 2 can remain resident or move to patch 1, which is of lower non-breeding season quality.

334



335



We then parameterize models M_{season}, M_{year} and M_{life}for a hypothetical short-lived species with relatively low annual survival and high reproductive rate, and a hypothetical longer-lived species with higher annual survival and lower reproductive rate (Figs. 2&3). For current illustrative purposes, parameters were set to broadly resemble a partially-migratory

passerine bird and a European shag. The latter was chosen to facilitate subsequent 345 parameterization with available empirical data, thereby facilitating direct transition from theory 346 347 to data (see Empirical case study). pWe define baseline conditions by setting breeding season adult survival in patch 1 as $s_{111} = 0.73$ and $s_{111} = 0.99$, and age at first reproduction of $a_r =$ 348 1 and $a_r = 3$, for the short- and longer-lived species respectively. To ensure a parameter space 349 where populations persist, we set fecundity to give $\lambda = 1.3$ for a population resident in patch 350 1, giving $f_1 = 4.5$ and $f_2 = 2$ for the short-lived and longer-lived species, respectively. 351 Environmental differences between patches and seasons were implemented as proportions of 352 baseline vital rates (Fig. 3, Appendix S3). 353

354

355 To understand how variation in seasonal migration and associated survival costs affect metapopulation dynamics we consider discrete values along the full parameter space that is 356 possible for any species (i.e. m and $w \in [0, 0.1, 0.2, ..., 1)$). This captures the conceptual point 357 that species with any relatively fast or slow baseline life-history can potentially occupy any 358 359 position on the continuum of year-round residence to full seasonal migration, which can potentially be perturbed. Our general model readily allows m_{abk} and w_{abk} to vary among 360 seasons, patches and/or ages. However, to maintain a tractable number of dimensions of 361 variation for current illustrative analyses, we set m_{abk} constant across these dimensions and 362 allowed w_{abk} to vary among ages. Movement survival probability of young from the current 363 breeding season (w_{0bk} , hereafter "newborn") is defined as a proportion of adult movement 364 survival probability (w_{arbk} , where a_r is age at first reproduction; Appendix S3). For simplicity, 365 presented results refer to *m* and *w*, with no subscripts. 366

We quantify metapopulation growth rate (λ) , mobile fraction (Ω) and vital rate elasticities (e_{θ}) for each model and hypothetical species across the full possible ranges of m and w (ϵ [0,1]). Mobile fraction (Ω) is a composite of the fraction susceptible to migrate (UI)

and the fraction susceptible to disperse (δ), and δ is necessarily 0 for M_{year} and M_{life}. We present these results as heat maps across axes of m and w structured by level of plasticity, lifehistory and θ , thereby summarizing up to six dimensions (further explained in Appendix S4). We ran all analyses in R 3.5.2 (R-Core Team, 2013). General code that is customizable for any desired life-history is in Appendix S8.

375

376 **3.2** | Results from illustrative parameterizations: Growth rate (λ), mobile fraction (Ω) and 377 elasticity of λ to vital rates (e_{θ}).

As expected, λ is high when movement survival probability (w) is high irrespective of seasonal 378 movement probability (*m*, Figs. 4ai–iii vs 4bi–iii). Decreasing w decreases λ unless m is small 379 (Figs 4ai-iii vs 4bi-iii). These patterns of variation in λ are qualitatively consistent across the 380 two illustrative life-histories (Figs 4ai-iii vs 4bi-iii) and levels of seasonal movement plasticity 381 (Fig. 4 columns). However, the parameter space that allows metapopulation persistence ($\lambda >$ 382 383 1) differs between life-histories. In general, persistence occurs in a wider range of m - wparameter space for the longer-lived species (Figs 4aiii vs 4biii). Further, within each life-384 history, metapopulation persistence occurs in a more restricted part of the m - w parameter 385 space when seasonal movement is seasonally plastic (M_{season}) or annually plastic (M_{vear}), than 386 when it is fixed (M_{life}, Figs 4a&b i & ii vs iii). 387



388

FIGURE 4 Projected asymptotic metapopulation growth rate (λ), mobile fraction (Ω), migrant fraction (III) and disperser fraction (δ) for (a) short-lived and (b) longer-lived species. Columns depict the level of movement plasticity: seasonal (M_{season}), annual (M_{year}) and lifelong fixed (M_{life}). Each square depicts values across the full possible range of values of the seasonal movement probability ($m\epsilon[0-1]$) and the seasonal movement survival probability ($w\epsilon[0-1]$). The white contour line represents $\lambda = 1$. The heat map representation is further explained in Appendix S4.

396

Differences between λ given seasonal and annual plasticity result from differing underlying metapopulation mobile fractions and resulting survival costs experienced. Given seasonal plasticity, the population fractions susceptible to migrate (UI) and disperse (δ) at the beginning of each year are m^2 and 2(1 - m)m respectively. Given annual plasticity, these fractions are m and 0 respectively. As migrants experience the direct cost of movement twice a year while dispersers experience it once, seasonal plasticity results in a slightly lower annual survival probability (Figs 4a&b iv vs v). Finally, differences between M_{year} and M_{life}, for which

disperser fraction is 0, arise because in M_{life} within-generation phenotypic selection can 404 decrease Ω and thereby reduce exposure to lower survival probability (Figs 4a&b v vs vi). In 405 our illustrative parameterization, migrants are the less fit strategy. For instance, for migrants 406 originating in patch 1, the direct cost of moving after the breeding season exceeds the benefit 407 of moving to a patch with higher non-breeding season survival probability (Fig. 3). 408 Consequently, in M_{life}, migrants experience the cost of migration twice a year and are selected 409 410 out, leaving an increasing proportion of residents (the fitter strategy, Fig. 4, panel b ix). This is particularly evident for the longer-lived species, where the mobile fraction Ω can decrease well 411 412 below the specified seasonal movement probability m, and hence 'rescue' λ by exposing fewer individuals to seasonal movement mortality (1 - w). This is less evident for the short-lived 413 414 species, because a high proportion of the metapopulation alive at any time is newborn and life expectancy is much shorter, which limits the impact of within-generation selection on Ω and 415 416 hence λ .

As expected, elasticities of λ to fecundity (f_k) and newborn survival (s_{0bk}) are positive 417 and higher for the short-lived species, while elasticities of λ to adult seasonal survival (s_{1bk}) 418 419 are higher for the longer-lived species (Fig. 5). Meanwhile, elasticities of λ to the seasonal 420 movement vital rates m and w show substantial variation across the full m - w parameter space (Fig. 5). The elasticity of λ to w is always positive, but the elasticity of λ to m is widely 421 negative. This occurs because increasing w can only increase λ , while increasing m can 422 increase or decrease λ depending on the overall costs versus benefits of increasing the 423 proportion of the metapopulation that moves. When m is moderately high, the seasonal 424 movement parameters can have elasticities comparable to, or even higher than, the fecundity 425 426 and survival rates that are typically considered to drive metapopulation dynamics (Fig. 5). Additionally, when m is very high and w is very low, elasticities to seasonal movement 427

428 parameters become several orders of magnitude higher than the other parameters' elasticities, 429 especially when $\lambda < 1$ (Fig. 5).





432 **FIGURE 5** Elasticity (e_{θ}) of metapopulation growth rate (λ) to vital rates (θ) for the shortlived and longer-lived species (top and bottom blocks) and three levels of plasticity: seasonal 433 434 (M_{season}), annual (M_{year}) and lifelong fixed (M_{life}). Parameter notation: f_k , fecundity in patch k; s_{abk} , seasonal survival at age a during season b in patch k; w_{abk} and m_{abk} , seasonal movement 435 436 survival probabilities and seasonal movement probabilities at age a during season b in patch k; a = 0, newborns and a = 1, adults. Each square depicts values of e_{θ} across the full possible 437 438 range of values of seasonal movement probability $(m\epsilon[0-1])$ and seasonal movement survival probability ($w \in [0-1)$), as explained in Appendix S4. The deep red represents e_{θ} < 439 440 -2 and white panels correspond to parameters absent in M_{year} and M_{life} . Dashed lines separate newborn from adult vital rates. 441

442

Given our illustrative parameterizations, λ is generally slightly more elastic to breeding season vital rates (b = 1) than to non-breeding season vital rates (b = 2, Fig. 5). Also, λ is slightly more elastic to vital rates in the high-quality breeding patch (k = 1) than in the patch

with worse breeding season vital rates (k = 2, Fig. 5). These differences are more evident for 446 the parameters to which λ is more elastic for each life-history; namely fecundity (f_k) and 447 newborn survival (s_{0bk}) for the short-lived species, and adult survival (s_{abk}) for the longer-448 lived species (Fig. 5). Most of these overarching patterns are less pronounced given seasonal 449 450 plasticity (M_{season}) in movement than given annual (M_{vear}) or no plasticity (M_{life}, Fig. 5). This is because the intrinsic emergence of dispersal in M_{season} reduces the effect of seasonal and 451 spatial differences in vital rates on λ and allows individuals to contribute to λ in a different 452 patch from their origin (Fig.5). Beyond these summary patterns, our illustrative 453 parameterizations also demonstrate that elasticities can vary in complex, non-linear ways along 454 the full axes of variation in m and w, depending on the level of plasticity (examples in Appendix 455 456 S5).

457

458 4 | FROM THEORY TO APPLICATION: AN EMPIRICAL CASE STUDY

459 4.1 | Empirical parameterization

Applying our conceptual framework to real systems requires estimating seasonal vital rates, 460 including movement probabilities, in partially migratory systems. This is challenging (Marra 461 et al., 2015; Sample et al., 2018), but will become increasingly feasible as individual tracking 462 technologies, large-scale monitoring programs and associated statistical tools reach maturity 463 (Eggeman et al., 2016; Grist et al., 2017; Reid et al., 2018). For instance, combinations of 464 breeding and non-breeding season monitoring data can allow estimation of season and location 465 specific vital rates (Acker, Daunt, et al., 2021; Grayson et al., 2011), carry-over effects 466 (Gillanders et al., 2015; Grist et al., 2017), and forms of within-individual repeatability (or 467 plasticity) in non-breeding location (Grist et al., 2014, Eggeman et al. 2016). Given such 468 estimates, our models allow quantitative evaluation of the impact of changing seasonal 469 migration probability, and associated survival probability, on metapopulation dynamics. 470

As a proof of concept, we consider a partially migratory metapopulation of European 471 shags for which seasonal vital rates have recently been estimated. We consider shags breeding 472 across two colonies in north-east Scotland: Isle of May (hereafter "IoM") and Bullers of 473 Buchan (hereafter "BoB", Fig. 6). From 2009, shags hatched or breeding at IoM and BoB have 474 been individually marked with alphanumeric metal rings and field-readable color rings (Acker, 475 Daunt, et al., 2021; Grist et al., 2014, 2017; Reid et al., 2020). From 2009, extensive year-round 476 477 resightings have been undertaken to identify individuals' breeding and non-breeding season locations (Acker, Daunt, et al., 2021). These resightings reveal that shags breeding at both 478 479 colonies can remain resident there through the non-breeding season or migrate elsewhere, and that seasonal vital rates can differ between residents and seasonal migrants (Acker, Daunt, et 480 al., 2021; Grist et al., 2017; Reid et al., 2020). Moreover, shags show high within-individual 481 repeatability in non-breeding location across years (~0.8, Grist et al. 2014). We therefore 482 considered metapopulation dynamics by directly parameterizing model M_{life}, as set up for our 483 theoretical example for the longer-lived species. 484

485



FIGURE 6 Summary of vital rates estimated for a European shag (*Gulosus aristotelis*)
partially-migratory metapopulation in Scotland to illustrate a landscape with seasonal and

spatial variation in survival and fecundity. (a) Location of Isle of May (IoM) and Bullers of Buchan (BoB) colonies. (b) Spatio-temporal vital rates: f_k , fecundity; s_{2bk} , seasonal adult survival probabilities (i.e. $y \ge 2$) during each season (b = 1, breeding, solid fill and b = 2, non-breeding, dotted fill) at IoM (k = 1; dark fill) and BoB (k = 2; light fill) for resident (R) and migrant (M) population fractions; w and w^2 , seasonal and annual movement survival probabilities; m, seasonal movement/migration probability and d, dispersal probability. (c) Realized annual survival probabilities for residents and migrants breeding at IoM and BoB.

496

497 As shags typically first breed aged three years (Aebischer et al., 1995), we formulate M_{life} considering three stages (Fig.3): yearlings (a = 1, 1-2years), sub-adults (a = 2, 2-3years) 498 and breeding adults ($a = 3, \ge 3$ years). We take previously estimated values of local breeding 499 success for residents and migrants (f_k) and seasonal survival probabilities (s_{abk}) (Acker, 500 Burthe, et al., 2021; Acker, Daunt, et al., 2021; Grist et al., 2017; Reid et al., 2020). As seasonal 501 movement survival probabilities (w_{abk}) have not previously been explicitly estimated, we 502 derive an estimate from the maximum observed difference in annual survival between residents 503 and migrants (Appendix S7) and assume that w is season- and site-independent but age-504 dependent (w_a) . We use proportional age-specific survival rates estimated by Frederiksen et 505 506 al. (2008, Appendix S7). We take seasonal movement probability m_k as the realized migratory fraction estimated following (Acker, Daunt, et al., 2021) averaged across years and assume that 507 m is age independent ($m_1 = 0.441$, $m_2 = 0.306$). As the IoM and BoB breeding populations 508 are connected through occasional dispersal (Barlow et al. 2013), we extend M_{life} to allow age-509 independent dispersal probability $\delta = 0.1$, assuming that demography and dispersal occur 510 sequentially within the annual projection interval (Appendix S6). All resulting parameter 511 values are shown in Fig. 6 (further details in Appendix S7). 512

We calculate metapopulation growth rate (λ) , mobile fraction (Ω) and associated elasticities of λ to vital rates (e_{θ}) at the asymptotic equilibrium. Our assumption that m_k equals the realized (observed) mobile fraction will likely underestimate the true value of m_k , because some individuals will die before achieving movement. Further, previous studies suggested that movement probability can increase with increased environmental stochasticity (Kokko & Lundberg, 2001). Therefore, we explore potential metapopulation consequences of higher m_k by doubling the initial values (i.e. $2m_k$).

520

521 **4.2** | Results from empirical case study: Growth rate (λ), mobile fraction (Ω) and 522 elasticity of λ to vital rates (e_{θ}).

Estimated λ s were 1.11 and 1.05 given m_k and $2m_k$ respectively. Both scenarios therefore allow metapopulation growth and persistence. Migrants are the less fit strategy and are selected out, leaving increasing proportions of residents. Accordingly, in both scenarios, Ω is lower than the imposed value of m_k . Specifically, Ω is only 0.14 at IoM and 0.09 at BoB given m_k , and 0.37 at IoM and 0.26 at BoB given $2m_k$.

The elasticities of λ to adult seasonal survival probability (s_{2bk}) and adult movement 528 survival probability (w_2) are higher than those to fecundity (f_k) and newborn and sub-adult 529 local survival probability (s_{0bk}, s_{1bk}) and movement survival probability $(w_0, w_1, \text{Fig. 7})$. 530 While elasticities to fecundity (f) and survival rates are of course positive, elasticities to 531 seasonal migration (m_k) and dispersal (δ) probabilities are negative (Fig. 7). The elasticity to 532 m_k is comparable to that of seasonal survival (s_{abk}) given the observed m_k values, but 533 approximately doubles given $2m_k$. For both m_k and $2m_k$ the elasticity to dispersal is negative 534 and negligible compared to the elasticities of other vital rates ($e_{\delta} = -0.002$). 535



537

FIGURE 7 Elasticity of metapopulation growth rate (λ) to vital rates (θ) for estimated value 538 of seasonal movement probability (a) m, (b) 2m, and (c) their comparison. Parameter notation: 539 f_k , fecundity in patch k; s_{abk} , age a, season b and patch k survival; w_a , age a movement 540 survival; m_k , seasonal migration probability from patch k and δ dispersal probability; a = 0, 541 newborns; a = 1, sub-adults; a = 2, adults. Parameters from Isle of May (IoM) and Bullers of 542 Buchan (BoB) or both are separated by dashed lines and noted in grey, black and white 543 respectively. In c dashed lines between the two scenarios are used as reference in the change 544 of value but they do not denote trends as these are often non-linear (see Appendix S6). 545

Elasticities also differ between the two focal populations breeding on IoM and BoB, 547 and between residents and seasonal migrants. Elasticities of λ to breeding season vital rates are 548 549 greater at IoM, while elasticities of non-breeding season vital rates are greater at BoB. The pattern of differences in elasticities of λ to breeding and non-breeding season vital rates is 550 consistent given m_k and doubled m_k , but the magnitude is greater for doubled m_k (Fig. 7). With 551 m_k , λ is more elastic to changes in f_k and s_{abk} than in w_a , m_k and δ (Fig. 7a). Moreover, λ is 552 most elastic to the vital rates of the population fraction breeding at IoM (i.e. f_1 and $s_{ab1}s_{ab1}$ Fig. 553 7a). Likewise, λ is most elastic to vital rates of the resident fraction of the population (Fig. 7a). 554 However, with doubled m_k , λ is most elastic to $m_2 w_2$ (Fig. 7b). Overall, elasticities of λ to w_a 555 approximately doubled. Still, λ is more elastic to changes in vital rates of the resident fraction 556 than the migrant fraction (Fig. 7c). However, the overall relative contribution of the resident 557 558 fraction decreases. With doubled m_k , the effect of seasonality becomes more obvious with notable increase in the differences between the elasticities of λ to the breeding and non-559 breeding season vital rates. 560

561

562 5 | DISCUSSION

Increasingly important aims in fundamental and applied ecology are to identify which seasonal 563 vital rates, life-history stages and locations regulate the size and persistence of partially-564 migratory metapopulations, and thereby forecast likely impacts of deteriorating seasonally-565 occupied habitats (Reid et al., 2018; Small-Lorenz et al., 2013). In such systems, individuals 566 567 can potentially respond to seasonal environmental variation by migrating between discrete locations. Yet, while the metapopulation dynamic consequences of variable dispersal rates have 568 been widely studied (Akçakaya, 2000; Hokit et al., 2001; Lecomte et al., 2020; Travis et al., 569 2012), effects of structured variation in seasonal migration on dynamics of partially-migratory 570 metapopulations remain largely unexplored. We provide a general conceptual framework that 571

explicitly incorporates seasonal movement probability (*m*), and movement survival probability
(*w*), as population-level vital rates, and conceptualizes several forms of within-individual
variation (i.e., 'plasticity') in seasonal movement. Our example theoretical and empirical
example parameterizations illustrate how movement vital rates and plasticity can interact to
shape the dynamics and persistence of partially-migratory metapopulations across different
life-histories.

578

579 5.1 | Implications of variation in seasonal migration for metapopulation dynamics

Our illustrative theoretical parameterizations provide proof of concept of how our framework 580 can identify regions of movement parameter space where partially-migratory metapopulations 581 582 can persist $(\lambda > 1)$, and identify what values of m are sustainable for any given values of w. The point that when m is high, persistence is only possible when w is also high (Fig. 4), is 583 584 qualitatively intuitive. However, our analyses quantitatively evaluate such relationships, and show how they can vary with life-history. For example, our hypothetical longer-lived species 585 persisted in a wider range of the explored movement parameter space. Additionally, our 586 parameterizations show how such outcomes can depend on the level of individual plasticity. 587 Persistence occurred across wider movement parameter space when seasonal migration or 588 589 residence are lifelong fixed strategies than given seasonal or annual plasticity, especially in the longer-lived species. With fixed strategies, the less fit phenotype (migrants in our examples) is 590 591 selected out, causing the mobile fraction Ω to be lower than m. Effects of such withingeneration selection are smaller in the short-lived species, leaving a higher proportion of the 592 metapopulation susceptible to movement costs. 593

594 Our results highlight the potentially key contributions of variable seasonal migration 595 rates to metapopulation dynamics. Specifically, elasticities highlight that perturbations in m596 and associated w can have comparable (or even larger) effects on λ than perturbations in the

vital rates that are typically taken to have the greatest impacts (i.e. fecundity for short-lived 597 species; adult survival for longer-lived species). As vital rates are location- and season-specific, 598 599 our framework can identify critical locations and seasons that could underlie system dynamics (Erickson et al., 2018; Sample et al., 2020). Such understanding could aid effective 600 conservation or management of vulnerable seasonally-mobile species (Møller et al., 2008; 601 White et al., 2018), including eradication of pest or invasive species (Stuart et al., 2006). 602 603 However, as elasticities of λ to vital rates varied non-linearly with seasonal movement rates, and interacted with plasticity levels (Appendix S5), simple overarching generalizations cannot 604 605 be readily drawn. To make progress towards identifying general principles of constraints on partially-migratory metapopulations, we now need empirical estimates of key vital rates 606 comprising stage-, season- and location-specific seasonal movement probability and associated 607 survival and plasticity, alongside seasonal survival and reproduction (see also Norris & Taylor, 608 2006; Reid et al., 2018; Runge & Marra, 2005; Small-Lorenz et al., 2013). 609

610 Accordingly, our empirical case study illustrates how year-round demographic 611 monitoring can allow initial parameterization of required models. We characterized the relevant m - w parameter space, and other vital rates, for a shag metapopulation where 612 individuals are consistently resident or migrant across years (Fig. 6). By parameterizing the 613 model M_{life} , we show that λ would be most elastic to perturbations of adult survival probability 614 for the resident fraction of the metapopulation breeding at the Isle of May colony. However, 615 under a hypothetical scenario with higher m, adult survival during seasonal movement would 616 become the vital rate to which λ is most elastic. Thus, our framework can be used to consider 617 618 the relative value of managing the breeding colony versus the larger-scale coastal environment. As technologies develop, the required estimates of key seasonal movement vital rates such as 619 620 m and w will soon become available for diverse seasonally-mobile species (Eggeman et al., 2016; Grayson et al., 2011; Grist et al., 2017). Future ambitions should be to systematically 621

include such estimates within comparative demography databases (e.g., Salguero-Gómez et al. 2016). This would also facilitate further exploration of how matrix dimensions can affect calculated elasticities of λ to vital rates, and hence affect demographic inferences (Reid et al., 2004; Salguero-Gómez & Plotkin, 2010). Meanwhile our current analyses illustrate how, when explicit vital rate estimates are not yet available, reasonable assumptions can allow exploration of biologically plausible or postulated scenarios.

628

629 **5.2** | Extensions and open questions

630 Our conceptual framework is implemented as a flexible and customizable matrix model, enabling future implementation of multiple scenarios and extensions. It allows formulating 631 particular baseline life-history structures (i.e. modifying age or stage structure) and specifying 632 specific vital rates associated with any postulated seasonal and spatial landscape. It allows 633 including variation in m and w among age, locations and seasons, such as widely occurs in 634 nature (Chapman et al., 2011; Lundberg, 1988; Mysterud et al., 2011). This could allow for 635 instance evaluating whether further imbalance in patch quality may result more substantial 636 differences in resident and moving fractions. Further, it allows consideration of 'carry-over 637 effects', wherein conditions experienced in one season affect vital rates expressed subsequently 638 (e.g. persistent effects of seasonal location on body condition or territory maintenance, Grist et 639 al., 2017; Kokko, 2011; Norris & Taylor, 2006). Carry-over effects can be implemented within 640 M_{life} by allowing vital rates to differ between resident and seasonally mobile subpopulations 641 that are seasonally sympatric. This would also be readily achievable for M_{season} and M_{year}, by 642 explicitly modelling two stages for previous migrants and previous residents. The magnitude 643 of the carry-over effects could be defined as a parameter itself that could vary among age, 644 locations or seasons. The elasticity of λ to the magnitude of carry-over effects could then be 645 evaluated. 646

Systems where resident versus migrant strategies are acquired at a given life stage (e.g. 647 fish, Chapman et al., 2012) could be implemented by applying appropriate constraints on stage 648 structure. For instance, specific combinations of pre-migratory and post-migratory stages could 649 be formulated, with *m* defined as the transition rate. Systems where movements occur more 650 than twice per year could be considered by defining additional seasonal matrices (e.g. 651 representing stop-over locations, Bauer et al., 2008). More patches could be included; 652 653 incorporating greater spatial complexity has illuminated the causes and consequences of dispersal (Bocedi et al., 2014), and might be similarly influential for systems involving 654 655 seasonal migration.

In practice, expanding our current framework to more than three patches would be 656 cumbersome, due to the need to explicitly formulate all possible seasonal and spatial transitions 657 through non-symmetric matrices. However, our current analyses highlight that, in the absence 658 of environmental stochasticity and when populations are not connected through dispersal, key 659 660 aspects of system dynamics and specifically λ could be captured by solely considering the dominant population. But, considering the full system will still be necessary if density- or 661 frequency-dependence in vital rates occurs in seasonally shared locations. Moreover, variation 662 663 in seasonal migration and/or environmental stochasticity can modify which is the dominant population at any given time. 664

Indeed, our current models could be extended to explicitly consider densitydependence, environmental and demographic stochasticity and resulting transient dynamics, as previously done for matrix models that do not consider variable seasonal migration (Caswell, 2007; Haridas & Tuljapurkar, 2007). Yet, such extensions would yield additional interesting challenges, due to the implied demographic, spatial and seasonal structure. Environmental stochasticity and extreme climatic events might differentially affect vital rates of seasonally mobile versus resident subpopulations rather than have system-wide effects (Acker, Daunt, et al., 2021). Further, environmental changes could potentially directly affect movement
probabilities and associated survival probabilities; indeed it has been previously suggested that
increasing environmental stochasticity can increase movement propensity (Kokko &
Lundberg, 2001).

Seasonal movement probabilities could also be density-dependent (Grayson et al., 676 2011; Mysterud et al., 2011), and will certainly alter local seasonal densities and thereby affect 677 678 other density-dependent vital rates. Indeed, intrinsic relationships between the frequency of seasonal migration and local density have been suggested to cause frequency-dependent 679 680 selection on seasonal migration, and thereby maintain partial migration (Kokko & Lundberg, 2001; Runge & Marra, 2005). However, such tight relationships between migration probability 681 and density only arise when migratory subpopulations move to otherwise unoccupied patches. 682 Much more complicated relationships could potentially arise in partially-migratory 683 metapopulations inhabiting weakly seasonal landscapes where different locations can hold 684 residents alongside incoming and outgoing migrants, as envisaged by our current models (Reid 685 et al., 2018). Such effects may ultimately be best considered by placing our concepts within a 686 spatially-explicit individual-based model framework, which could track local density and 687 effects of differing spatio-temporal regimes of environmental perturbations. Individual-based 688 models would also facilitate eco-evolutionary extensions to examine evolutionary dynamics of 689 690 partial migration and associated plasticity or canalization. This approach will ultimately 691 facilitate integration of holistic understanding of metapopulation dynamic consequences of variation in seasonal migration into forecasting and management tools (e.g. Bocedi et al., 692 2014). 693

694

695 ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

APP, PA, JMR, FD, SJB and JMJT were supported by UK Natural Environment Research
Council (NE/R000859/1; NE/R016429/1 through the UK-SCaPE Programme delivering
National Capability; NE/M005186/1). GB was supported by a Royal Society University
Research Fellowship. JMR was additionally supported by NTNU and the Norwegian Research
Council (grant 223257). We thank Steve Palmer and Marco Thiel for helpful discussions.

701

702 AUTHORS' CONTRIBUTIONS

APP conceived the ideas, undertook the analyses and drafted the manuscript, assisted by JMR and PA. JR and PA provided empirical estimates. FD, SW, SB, MN, MPH, and JMR collected the data. All authors contributed to conceptual, technical and manuscript development and gave final approval for publication.

707

708 DATA AVAILABILITY STATEMENT

709 There are no primary data associated with this manuscript.

710

711 **REFERENCES**

/12 Acker, P., Burtne, S., Newell, M., Grist, H., Gunn, C., Harris, M., Payo-Payo, A., S	swann,	К.,
--	--------	-----

713 Wanless, S., Daunt, F., & Reid, J. (2021). Episodes of opposing survival and reproductive

selection cause strong fluctuating selection on seasonal migration versus residence.

715 *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, 288(20210404), 1–10.

Acker, P., Daunt, F., Wanless, S., Burthe, S. J., Newell, M. A., Harris, M. P., Grist, H., Sturgeon, J.,

- 717 Swann, R. L., Gunn, C., Payo-Payo, A., & Reid, J. M. (2021). Strong survival selection on
- seasonal migration versus residence induced by extreme climatic events. *Journal of Animal*
- 719 *Ecology*, 90(4), 796–808. https://doi.org/10.1111/1365-2656.13410

- Aebischer, N. J., Potts, G. R., & Coulson, J. C. (1995). Site and mate fidelity of Shags Phalacrocorax
 aristotelis at two British colonies. *Ibis*, *137*(1), 19–28. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1474919X.1995.tb03215.x
- Akçakaya, H. R. (2000). Viability analyses with habitat-based metapopulation models. *Population Ecology*, 42(1), 45–53. https://doi.org/10.1007/s101440050043
- Alderman, R., Gales, R., Hobday, A., & Candy, S. (2010). Post-fledging survival and dispersal of shy
 albatross from three breeding colonies in Tasmania. *Marine Ecology Progress Series*, 405,

727 271–285. https://doi.org/10.3354/meps08590

- 728 Barlow, E. J., Daunt, F., Wanless, S., & Reid, J. M. (2013). Estimating dispersal distributions at
- multiple scales: Within-colony and among-colony dispersal rates, distances and directions in
- European Shags Phalacrocorax aristotelis. *Ibis*, 155(4), 762–778.
- 731 https://doi.org/10.1111/ibi.12060
- Bauer, S., Dinther, M. V., Høgda, K.-A., Klaassen, M., & Madsen, J. (2008). The consequences of
 climate-driven stop-over sites changes on migration schedules and fitness of Arctic geese.

734 *Journal of Animal Ecology*, 77(4), 654–660. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-

- 735 2656.2008.01381.x
- 736 Benton, T. G., & Grant, A. (1999). Elasticity analysis as an important tool in evolutionary and
- population ecology. *Trends in Ecology & Evolution*, *14*(12), 467–471.
- 738 https://doi.org/10.1016/S0169-5347(99)01724-3
- 739 Bocedi, G., Palmer, S. C. F., Pe'er, G., Heikkinen, R. K., Matsinos, Y. G., Watts, K., & Travis, J. M.
- 740 J. (2014). RangeShifter: A platform for modelling spatial eco-evolutionary dynamics and
- species' responses to environmental changes. *Methods in Ecology and Evolution*, 5(4), 388–
- 742 396. https://doi.org/10.1111/2041-210X.12162
- 743 Both, C., Bouwhuis, S., Lessells, C. M., & Visser, M. E. (2006). Climate change and population
- declines in a long-distance migratory bird. *Nature*, *441*(7089), 81–83.
- 745 https://doi.org/10.1038/nature04539

- 746 Castro, M. L. de, Silva, J. A. L., & Justo, D. A. R. (2006). Stability in an age-structured
- 747 metapopulation model. *Journal of Mathematical Biology*, 52(2), 183–208.
 748 https://doi.org/10.1007/s00285-005-0352-4
- 749 Caswell. (2001). Matrix population models: Construction, analysis and interpretation. Sinauer.
- 750 Caswell, H. (2007). Sensitivity analysis of transient population dynamics. *Ecology Letters*, 10, 1–15.
- 751 Chapman, B. B., Brönmark, C., Nilsson, J.-Å., & Hansson, L.-A. (2011). The ecology and evolution
- of partial migration. *Oikos*, *120*(12), 1764–1775. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.16000706.2011.20131.x
- 754 Chapman, B. B., Hulthén, K., Brodersen, J., Nilsson, P. A., Skov, C., Hansson, L.-A., & Brönmark, C.
- 755 (2012). Partial migration in fishes: Causes and consequences. *Journal of Fish Biology*, *81*(2),
 756 456–478. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1095-8649.2012.03342.x
- Coulson, T., Catchpole, E. A., Albon, S. D., Morgan, B. J. T., Pemberton, J. M., Clutton-Brock, T. H.,
 Crawley, M. J., & Grenfell, B. T. (2001). Age, sex, density, winter weather, and population
 crashes in Soay Sheep. *Science*, *292*(5521), 1528–1531.
- 760 https://doi.org/10.1126/science.292.5521.1528
- 761 Dingemanse, N. J., Kazem, A. J. N., Réale, D., & Wright, J. (2010). Behavioural reaction norms:
- Animal personality meets individual plasticity. *Trends in Ecology & Evolution*, 25(2), 81–89.
 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tree.2009.07.013
- Dobson, A. D. M., Finnie, T. J. R., & Randolph, S. E. (2011). A modified matrix model to describe
 the seasonal population ecology of the European tick Ixodes ricinus. *Journal of Applied Ecology*, 48, 1017–1028.
- 767 Eggeman, S. L., Hebblewhite, M., Bohm, H., Whittington, J., & Merrill, E. H. (2016). Behavioural
- flexibility in migratory behaviour in a long-lived large herbivore. *The Journal of Animal Ecology*, 85(3), 785–797. https://doi.org/10.1111/1365-2656.12495
- 770 Erickson, R. A., Diffendorfer, J. E., Norris, D. R., Bieri, J. A., Earl, J. E., Federico, P., Fryxell, J. M.,
- 771 Long, K. R., Mattsson, B. J., Sample, C., Wiederholt, R., & Thogmartin, W. E. (2018).
- 772 Defining and classifying migratory habitats as sources and sinks: The migratory pathway

- approach. *Journal of Applied Ecology*, 55(1), 108–117. https://doi.org/10.1111/13652664.12952
- Frederiksen, M., Daunt, F., Harris, M. P., & Wanless, S. (2008). The demographic impact of extreme
 events: Stochastic weather drives survival and population dynamics in a long-lived seabird. *Journal of Animal Ecology*, 77(5), 1020–1029. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-
- 778 2656.2008.01422.x
- Gaillard, J.-M., & Yoccoz, N. G. (2003). Temporal variation in survival of mammals: A case of
 environmental canalization? *Ecology*, 84(12), 3294–3306. https://doi.org/10.1890/02-0409
- 781 Gallardo, J. C., Vilella, F. J., & Colvin, M. E. (2019). A seasonal population matrix model of the
- 782 Caribbean Red-tailed Hawk Buteo jamaicensis jamaicensis in eastern Puerto Rico. *Ibis*,
 783 *161*(2), 459–466. https://doi.org/10.1111/ibi.12703
- Gauthier, G., Pradel, R., Menu, S., & Lebreton, J.-D. (2001). Seasonal Survival of Greater Snow
- 785Geese and Effect of Hunting Under Dependence in Sighting Probability. Ecology, 82(11),

786 3105–3119. https://doi.org/10.1890/0012-9658(2001)082[3105:SSOGSG]2.0.CO;2

- Gillanders, B. M., Izzo, C., Doubleday, Z. A., & Ye, Q. (2015). Partial migration: Growth varies
- between resident and migratory fish. *Biology Letters*, *11*(3), 20140850–20140850.
- 789 https://doi.org/10.1098/rsbl.2014.0850
- Gowan, T. A., Ortega-Ortiz, J. G., Hostetler, J. A., Hamilton, P. K., Knowlton, A. R., Jackson, K. A.,
- 791 George, R. C., Taylor, C. R., & Naessig, P. J. (2019). Temporal and demographic variation in
- partial migration of the North Atlantic right whale. *Scientific Reports*, *9*(1), 353.
- 793 https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-018-36723-3
- Grayson, K. L., Bailey, L. L., & Wilbur, H. M. (2011). Life history benefits of residency in a partially
 migrating pond-breeding amphibian. *Ecology*, 92(6), 1236–1246. https://doi.org/10.1890/110133.1
- 797 Grist, H., Daunt, F., Wanless, S., Burthe, S. J., Newell, M. A., Harris, M. P., & Reid, J. M. (2017).
- 798 Reproductive performance of resident and migrant males, females and pairs in a partially
- migratory bird. *The Journal of Animal Ecology*, 86(5), 1010–1021.
- 800 https://doi.org/10.1111/1365-2656.12691

Grist, H., Daunt, F., Wanless, S., Nelson, E. J., Harris, M. P., Newell, M., Burthe, S., & Reid, J. M.
(2014). Site Fidelity and Individual Variation in Winter Location in Partially Migratory

European Shags. *PLOS ONE*, 9(6), e98562. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0098562

- Hansen, B. B., Gamelon, M., Albon, S. D., Lee, A. M., Stien, A., Irvine, R. J., Sæther, B.-E., Loe, L.
- 805 E., Ropstad, E., Veiberg, V., & Grøtan, V. (2019). More frequent extreme climate events
- stabilize reindeer population dynamics. *Nature Communications*, *10*(1), 1616.
- 807 https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-019-09332-5
- Hanski, I., Alho, J., & Moilanen, A. (2000). Estimating the Parameters of Survival and Migration of
 Individuals in Metapopulations. *Ecology*, *81*(1), 239–251. https://doi.org/10.1890/00129658(2000)081[0239:ETPOSA]2.0.CO;2
- Haridas, C. V., & Tuljapurkar, S. (2007). Time, transients and elasticity. *Ecology Letters*, 10(12),
 1143–1153. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1461-0248.2007.01108.x
- Heppell, S., Caswell, H., & Crowder, L. (2000). Life Histories and Elasticity Patterns: Perturbation
 Analysis for Species with Minimal Demographic Data. *Ecology*, *81*(3), 654–665. JSTOR.
 https://doi.org/10.2307/177367
- Hokit, D. G., Stith, B. M., & Branch, L. C. (2001). Comparison of Two Types of Metapopulation
 Models in Real and Artificial Landscapes. *Conservation Biology*, *15*(4), 1102–1113.
- Hostetler, J. A., Sillett, T. S., & Marra, P. P. (2015). Full-annual-cycle population models for
 migratory birds. *The Auk*, *132*(2), 433–449. https://doi.org/10.1642/AUK-14-211.1
- 820 Inchausti, P., & Weimerskirch, H. (2002). Dispersal and metapopulation dynamics of an oceanic
- seabird, the wandering albatross, and its consequences for its response to long-line fisheries.
- 822 *Journal of Animal Ecology*, 71(5), 765–770. https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1365-
- 823 2656.2002.00638.x
- 824 IPCC. (2022). In Climate Change 2022: Impacts, Adaptation, and Vulnerability. Contribution of
- 825 Working Group II to the Sixth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate
- 826 Change [H.-O. Pörtner, D.C. Roberts, M. Tignor, E.S. Poloczanska, K. Mintenbeck, A.
- 827 Alegría, M. Craig, S. Langsdorf, S. Löschke, V. Möller, A. Okem, B. Rama (eds.)]. Cambridge
- 828 University Press. In Press.

- Kerr, L. A., Secor, D. H., & Piccoli, P. M. (2009). Partial Migration of Fishes as Exemplified by the
 Estuarine-Dependent White Perch. *Fisheries*, *34*(3), 114–123. https://doi.org/10.1577/15488446-34.3.114
- 832 Kokko, H. (2011). Directions in modelling partial migration: How adaptation can cause a population
- decline and why the rules of territory acquisition matter. *Oikos*, *120*(12), 1826–1837.
- 834 https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1600-0706.2011.19438.x
- Kokko, H., & Lundberg, P. (2001). Dispersal, migration, and offspring retention in saturated habitats. *The American Naturalist*, *157*(2), 188–202. https://doi.org/10.1086/318632
- 837 Koons, D. N., Iles, D. T., Schaub, M., & Caswell, H. (2016). A life-history perspective on the
- 838 demographic drivers of structured population dynamics in changing environments. *Ecology*839 *Letters*, 19(9), 1023–1031. https://doi.org/10.1111/ele.12628
- 840 Lecomte, J.-B., Le Pape, O., Baillif, H., Nevoux, M., Vermard, Y., Savina, M., Veron, M., Lehuta, S.,
- 841 Hunter, E., & Rivot, E. (2020). State-space modeling of multidecadal mark–recapture data
- 842 reveals low adult dispersal in a nursery-dependent fish metapopulation. *Canadian Journal of*
- 843 *Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences*, 77(2), 342–354. https://doi.org/10.1139/cjfas-2019-0037
- Lee, D. E., & Bolger, D. T. (2017). Movements and source–sink dynamics of a Masai giraffe
- 845 metapopulation. *Population Ecology*, *59*(2), 157–168. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10144-017846 0580-7
- Lundberg, P. (1988). The evolution of partial migration in Birds. *Trends in Ecology & Evolution*,
 3(7), 172–175. https://doi.org/10.1016/0169-5347(88)90035-3
- Marra, P. P., Cohen, E. B., Loss, S. R., Rutter, J. E., & Tonra, C. M. (2015). A call for full annual
 cycle research in animal ecology. *Biology Letters*, *11*(8), 20150552.
- 851 https://doi.org/10.1098/rsbl.2015.0552
- 852 Møller, A. P., Rubolini, D., & Lehikoinen, E. (2008). Populations of migratory bird species that did
- 853 not show a phenological response to climate change are declining. *Proceedings of the*
- 854 *National Academy of Sciences*, *105*(42), 16195–16200.
- 855 https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.0803825105

- Mora Alvarez, B. X., Carrera-Treviño, R., & Hobson, K. A. (2019). Mortality of Monarch Butterflies
 (Danaus plexippus) at Two Highway Crossing "Hotspots" During Autumn Migration in
 Northeast Mexico. *Frontiers in Ecology and Evolution*, 7.
- 859 https://doi.org/10.3389/fevo.2019.00273
- Mysterud, A., Loe, L. E., Zimmermann, B., Bischof, R., Veiberg, V., & Meisingset, E. (2011). Partial
 migration in expanding red deer populations at northern latitudes a role for density
- 862 dependence? *Oikos*, *120*(12), 1817–1825. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1600-0706.2011.19439.x
- Norris, D. R., & Taylor, C. M. (2006). Predicting the consequences of carry-over effects for migratory
 populations. *Biology Letters*, 2(1), 148–151. https://doi.org/10.1098/rsbl.2005.0397
- Paniw, M., Maag, N., Cozzi, G., Clutton-Brock, T. H., & Ozgul, A. (2019). Life history responses of
 meerkats to seasonal changes in extreme environments. *Science*, *363*(6427), 631–635.
- R Core Team. (2013). *R: A language and environment for statistical computing*. R Foundation for
 Statistical Computing. http://www.R-project.org/.
- Reid, J. M., Bignal, E. M., Bignal, S., McCracken, D. I., & Monaghan, P. (2004). Identifying the
- 870 demographic determinants of population growth rate: A case study of red-billed choughs
- 871 Pyrrhocorax pyrrhocorax. *Journal of Animal Ecology*, 73(4), 777–788.
- 872 https://doi.org/10.1111/j.0021-8790.2004.00854.x
- 873 Reid, J. M., Souter, M., Fenn, S. R., Acker, P., Payo-Payo, A., Burthe, S. J., Wanless, S., & Daunt, F.
- 874 (2020). Among-individual and within-individual variation in seasonal migration covaries with
- subsequent reproductive success in a partially migratory bird. *Proceedings of the Royal*
- 876 *Society B: Biological Sciences*, 287(1931), 20200928. https://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2020.0928
- 877 Reid, J. M., Travis, J. M. J., Daunt, F., Burthe, S. J., Wanless, S., & Dytham, C. (2018). Population
- and evolutionary dynamics in spatially structured seasonally varying environments.
- 879 *Biological Reviews*, 3(0), 1578–1603. https://doi.org/10.1111/brv.12409
- 880 Revilla, E., & Wiegand, T. (2008). Individual movement behavior, matrix heterogeneity, and the
- 881 dynamics of spatially structured populations. *Proceedings of the National Academy of*
- 882 Sciences, 105(49), 19120–19125. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.0801725105

- Runge, M. C., & Marra, P. P. (2005). Modeling seasonal interactions in the population dynamics of
 migratory birds. In *Birds of Two Worlds: The Ecology and Evolution of Migration*(R.Greenbergand P. P.Marra, pp. 375–389). The John HopkinsUniversity Press.
- 886 Saether, B.-E., & Bakke, O. (2000). Avian Life History Variation and Contribution of Demographic
- 887 Traits to the Population Growth Rate. *Ecology*, *81*(3), 642–653.
- 888 https://doi.org/10.2307/177366
- 889 Salguero-Gómez, R., & Plotkin, J. B. (2010). Matrix dimensions bias demographic inferences:
 890 Implications for comparative plant demography. *The American Naturalist*, *176*(6), 710–722.
- 891 https://doi.org/10.1086/657044
- 892 Sample, C., Bieri, J. A., Allen, B., Dementieva, Y., Carson, A., Higgins, C., Piatt, S., Qiu, S.,
- 893 Stafford, S., Mattsson, B. J., Semmens, D. J., Diffendorfer, J. E., & Thogmartin, W. E.

894 (2020). Quantifying the Contribution of Habitats and Pathways to a Spatially Structured

- Population Facing Environmental Change. *The American Naturalist*, *196*(2), 157–168.
 https://doi.org/10.1086/709009
- 897 Sample, C., Fryxell, J. M., Bieri, J. A., Federico, P., Earl, J. E., Wiederholt, R., Mattsson, B. J.,
- 898 Flockhart, D. T. T., Nicol, S., Diffendorfer, J. E., Thogmartin, W. E., Erickson, R. A., &
- 899 Norris, D. R. (2018). A general modeling framework for describing spatially structured
- 900 population dynamics. *Ecology and Evolution*, 8(1), 493–508.
- 901 https://doi.org/10.1002/ece3.3685
- Scheiner, S. M. (1993). Genetics and Evolution of Phenotypic Plasticity. *Annual Review of Ecology and Systematics*, 24(1), 35–68. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.es.24.110193.000343
- 904 Sendor, T., & Simon, M. (2003). Population dynamics of the pipistrelle bat: Effects of sex, age and
- 905 winter weather on seasonal survival. *Journal of Animal Ecology*, 72(2), 308–320.
- 906 https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1365-2656.2003.00702.x
- 907 Shaw, A. K., & Levin, S. A. (2011). To breed or not to breed: A model of partial migration. Oikos,
- 908 *120*(12), 1871–1879. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1600-0706.2011.19443.x

- Shima, J. S., Noonburg, E. G., & Phillips, N. E. (2010). Life history and matrix heterogeneity interact
 to shape metapopulation connectivity in spatially structured environments. *Ecology*, *91*(4),
 1215–1224. https://doi.org/10.1890/08-2058.1
- 912 Small-Lorenz, S. L., Culp, L. A., Ryder, T. B., Will, T. C., & Marra, P. P. (2013). A blind spot in
- 913 climate change vulnerability assessments. *Nature Climate Change*, *3*, 91–93.
- 914 https://doi.org/10.1038/nclimate1810
- Stuart, I. G., Williams, A., McKenzie, J., & Holt, T. (2006). Managing a Migratory Pest Species: A
 Selective Trap for Common Carp. *North American Journal of Fisheries Management*, 26(4),
 888–893. https://doi.org/10.1577/M05-205.1
- 918 Travis, J. M. J., Mustin, K., Bartoń, K. A., Benton, T. G., Clobert, J., Delgado, M. M., Dytham, C.,
- 919 Hovestadt, T., Palmer, S. C. F., Dyck, H. V., & Bonte, D. (2012). Modelling dispersal: An
- 920 eco-evolutionary framework incorporating emigration, movement, settlement behaviour and
- 921 the multiple costs involved. *Methods in Ecology and Evolution*, *3*(4), 628–641.
- 922 https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2041-210X.2012.00193.x
- 923 Tujlapurkar, S., & Caswell, H. (1997). *Structured-population models in marine, terrestrial, and*924 *freshwater systems* (Vol. 18). Chapman & Hall.
- van Tienderen, P. H. van. (1995). Life Cycle Trade-Offs in Matrix Population Models. *Ecology*,
- 926 76(8), 2482–2489. https://doi.org/10.2307/2265822
- 927 White, Davis, Barnowe-Meyer, Crabtree, & Garrott. (2007). Partial migration and philopatry of
 928 Yellowstone pronghorn. *Biological Conservation*, *135*(4), 502–510.
- 929 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biocon.2006.10.041
- 930 White, Gregovich, & Levi. (2018). Projecting the future of an alpine ungulate under climate change
- 931 scenarios. *Global Change Biology*, 24(3), 1136–1149. https://doi.org/10.1111/gcb.13919
- 932 APPENDICES
- 933 APPENDIX S1 Possible sequences of movement states for a two-year trajectory under the

934 different temporal scales of plasticity considered

APPENDIX S2 | Seasonal (B_b) and annual (A) metapopulation Leslie matrices.

- **APPENDIX S3** | Defining the seasonal and spatial environmental landscape.
- **APPENDIX S4** | Multidimensional representation of results.
- **APPENDIX S5** | Elasticities of metapopulation lambda to vital rates in detail.
- **APPENDIX S6** | Empirical case study: dispersal matrix formulation.
- **APPENDIX S7** | Empirical case study: vital rate estimation.
- **APPENDIX S8** | Code.