**Movement behaviour of large female yellow European eel (*Anguilla anguilla* L.) in a freshwater polder area**

**Pieterjan Verhelst1,2,3,4** | **Jan Reubens1,3** | **Ine Pauwels2** | **David Buysse2** |

**Bart Aelterman2** | **Stijn Van Hoey2** | **Peter Goethals4** | **Tom Moens1** |

**Johan Coeck2** | **Ans Mouton2,4**

1Marine Biology Research Group, Ghent University, Ghent, Belgium

**Abstract**

Due to a recruitment decline of more than 90% in 30 years, the European eel (*Anguilla anguilla* L.) has been classified by IUCN as critically endangered. Although the species has been studied intensively to obtain knowledge to improve management, studies about the resident yellow stage are relatively scarce. In this study, 52 large female yel- low eels were tagged with acoustic transmitters in a Belgian polder system and tracked by a network of 23 automatic listening stations. We studied both circadian and sea- sonal movement patterns and the effect of environmental variables on these patterns. Large female yellow eels were most active at night in late summer and early autumn. A generalised linear mixed model showed that their movement is only slightly influ- enced by environmental variables. Moreover, as yellow eels show high site fidelity (i.e., the majority was detected only in the habitat type of their catch-release location), they do not encounter many human-induced connectivity problems in polder systems, which makes these systems highly suitable as eel growth habitat. These results can contribute to an effective eel management regarding habitat protection and restoration.

**KEYWORDS**

acoustic telemetry, circadian, European eel, movement, movement range, seasonal

2Research Institute for Nature and Forest (INBO), Brussels, Belgium

3Flanders Marine Institute, Ostend, Belgium

4Laboratory of Environmental Toxicology and Aquatic Ecology, Ghent University, Ghent, Belgium

**Correspondence**

Pieterjan Verhelst, Biology Department, Marine Biology Research Group, Ghent University, Ghent, Belgium.

Email: [pieterjan.verhelst@ugent.be](mailto:pieterjan.verhelst@ugent.be)

**Funding information**

Flemish Agency for Innovation & Entrepreneurship (VLAIO); Agency Nature and Forest (ANB); Flemish Government

# | INTRODUCTION


The European eel (*Anguilla anguilla* L.) is a facultative catadromous fish which grows in coastal and freshwater habitats (i.e., the yellow eel stage) of Europe and northern Africa (Tesch, 2003). During the last 30 years, glass eel recruitment has declined by ≥90%, rendering European eel “critically endangered” on the IUCN Red List (Jacoby & Gollock, 2014). This decline is attributed to various causes, such as fisheries, habitat deterioration, pollution, migration barriers, climate change and the introduction of parasites (Buysse, Mouton, Stevens, Van den Neucker, & Coeck, 2014; Dekker, 2016; Feunteun, 2002;

Køie, 1991; Miller & Tsukamoto, 2016; Winter, Jansen, & Bruijs, 2006). To restore the European eel population, the European Commission has issued the European Eel Regulation (Council Regulation (EC) No 1100/2007), urging member states to improve eel survival. To meet this goal, countries are implementing measures such as fisheries restrictions, restocking and remediation of migration barriers.

Due to the endangered status of the eel population, it is crucial that eel growth habitats obtain proper protection. Among suitable eel growth habitats, polders are anthropogenic water bodies where water levels are controlled by, for example, embankments, weirs and pumping stations to prevent flooding. Polders are characterised by a network of canals, connected ponds and ditches, resulting in a high habitat diversity and thus many potential growth areas (Lasne, Acou, Vila-Gispert, & Laffaille, 2008). This could lead to higher growth rates,

|

**FIGURE 1** Study area with the location of the migration barriers and the network of waterways in the Belgian



part of the polder area: (1) the tidal sluice,

(2) the pumping station in the Isabella Canal (Boekhoute) and (3) the weir at Sint-Laureins. The blue dots represent automatic listening stations, and the symbols are the different catch locations: ponds (star), Leopold Canal (triangle) and polder ditches (pentagon)

and larger eels have a higher survival rate (Boulenger et al., 2016). In addition, these areas are located close to the sea and may therefore, in the absence of migration barriers, be easily colonised by glass eels (Laffaille, Baisez, Rigaud, & Feunteun, 2004). Little is known about the importance of polders for eels, especially for yellow eels, which is the sedentary growing stage (Laffaille, Acou, & Guillouet, 2005). However, due to climate change-driven sea-level rise, the polder area will tend to increase worldwide during the upcoming decades, turning these systems into potentially important eel habitat and interesting study areas.

Research on eel behaviour may provide insight into the importance of polder areas for yellow eel, especially because behaviour research has hitherto mainly focused on upstream migration during the glass and yellow eel stages and downstream migration during the silver eel stage (e.g., White & Knights, 1997; Davidsen et al., 2011; Mouton, Stevens, Van den Neucker, Buysse, & Coeck, 2011; Buysse, Mouton, Baeyens, & Coeck, 2015; Nzau Matondo & Ovidio, 2016). While it has been reported that yellow eels may move seasonally (Jellyman & Sykes, 2003), are primarily nocturnal and that their activity increases with water temperature (Baras, Jeandrain, Serouge, & Philippart, 1998), substantial knowledge gaps still exist about the habitat utili- sation and movement of yellow eels. It is, for instance, unknown to what extent eels move in a polder area, what is their movement range and whether they use different habitats within that range. It is also unknown what environmental variables trigger movement.

In this study, we investigated the behaviour of large female European eels in a polder area in Flanders, Belgium, by acoustic telemetry. Fish were tagged with an acoustic transmitter, which emits a signal with a unique ID code that can be detected by an acous- tic listening station (ALS). Both yellow- and silver-staged eels were tagged in this study. However, the classification of eels in yellow and silver stages is rather arbitrary (Durif, Dufour, & Elie, 2005), espe- cially because silver eels can postpone their migration and turn into a semiyellow stage (Svedäng & Wickstrom, 1997). This study was based

on resident (i.e., nonmigratory) behaviour, and as such, all tagged eels were female yellow eels, based on morphometric criteria (Durif et al., 2005; Laffaille et al., 2005). The main aims of this study were to investigate different aspects of yellow eel behaviour in a polder system. Specifically, we investigated (i) when yellow eels were most active in terms of circadian inter-ALS movements and seasonal swim distance patterns, including effects of temperature, (ii) the size of the movement range and (iii) what environmental variables determined movement. In addition, we checked for (iv) an effect of habitat type (i.e., canal, polder ditch and pond) on (ii) and (iii). A better understand- ing of yellow eel behaviour will contribute to effective polder man- agement including habitat restoration and protection. Such measures may lead to a higher survival to the silver eel stage and hence to a higher seaward escapement rate.

1. | **METHODS**

# | Study area

The study was performed in a polder area in Flanders, Belgium, which is part of the Scheldt River Basin. The drainage area of the polder is *ca.* 200 km², and drainage is through the Leopold Canal (LC). During high precipitation, water is pumped from the LC into the Braakman pond via a pumping station in the Isabella Canal (Boekhoute); it flows into the Scheldt Estuary via a tidal sluice (Figure 1). This is undoubtedly also the main migration route of silver eel from the polder to the estu- ary. The LC is an unnavigable waterway extending from the Belgian coast to Boekhoute. It is *ca.* 46 km long, 10–20 m wide and one to four metres deep. It is a stagnant water system, but during dewatering, the system can have a slow-flowing current (on average 1.21 m³/s during this study period). Connectivity from the polder area to marine areas is blocked by the weir in Sint-Laureins (except in cases of exception- ally high precipitation, when the system can be dewatered towards Zeebrugge by lowering a weir in the LC at Sint-Laureins) and the

**TABLE 1** Depth, width and current characteristics of the different habitat types

**Types Depth (m) Width (m) Current**

Canal 1–4 10–20 Slow

Small polder ditch 0.2–1 0.5–5 Slow

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Pond | 0.5–10 | 15–150 | Stagnant |
| Large polder ditch | 0.5–2 | 5–10 | Slow |

pumping station in Boekhoute (Figure 1). The LC connects different habitats in the polder such as ponds and small and large polder ditches with variable width (0.5–150 m) and depth (0.2–10 m) (Table 1).

# | Tagging procedure

From July to August 2012, a total of 526 eels were caught with double fyke nets in the LC, ponds and large polder ditches (electrofishing in the small polder ditches did not yield any eels). At each location, four double fyke nets were placed and emptied for four consecutive days. Several morphometric features were measured in order to determine the sex and eel maturation stage according to Durif et al. (2005): total length (TL, to the nearest mm), body weight (W, to the nearest g), the vertical and horizontal eye diameter (EDv and EDh respectively, to the nearest 0.1 mm) and the length of the pectoral fin (FL, to the nearest 0.1 mm). Fifty-two eels were considered large enough to tag, with a minimum TL of 495 mm and minimum weight of 246 g (Table S1). According to the size classes of Laffaille et al. (2003), the selected eels were considered large and female, as males are smaller than the minimum size handled in this study (<450 mm (Durif et al., 2005)) (Table 2). Five life stages can be found in female European eel: a sexu- ally undifferentiated growing phase (I), a female differentiated grow- ing phase (FII), a premigratory phase (FIII) and two migratory phases (FIV and FV) (Durif et al., 2005). FIV-staged eels are considered to be on the onset of migration, while FV-staged eels are regarded as migrating eels. Here, yellow eel (FII, *n* = 11), premigrant eel (FIII, *n* = 28) and two classified migrant eel stages (FIV, *n* = 4, and FV, *n* = 9 respectively) were tagged.

Eels were tagged with V13-1L-coded acoustic transmitters (13 × 36 mm, weight in air 11 g, weight in water 6 g, random delay between 80 and 160 s, guaranteed life time 1,116 days, frequency 69 Hz) from VEMCO Ltd (Canada, [http://www.vemco.com](http://www.vemco.com/)). After anaesthetising the eels with 0.3 ml/L clove oil, tags were implanted

according to Baras and Jeandrain (1998). After recovery in a quaran- tine reservoir, eels were released at their catch location.

# | Acoustic network

An acoustic network of 23 ALSs (VR2W, VEMCO Ltd) was deployed in the polder system in the LC, Isabella Canal, ponds and large polder ditches. The ALSs register the tag IDs with date and time of the detec- tions. They were moored at strategic locations (Figure 1) to maximise the probability of detection and to minimise detection gaps: an ALS was deployed at each entry of a pond or polder ditch into the LC. They were on average 1,912 m (range 114–5,264 m) apart. The ALSs were moored at the bank by means of weights and a small buoy, so the ALS was deployed on the bottom with the hydrophone directed upwards in the water column. Data from ALSs were downloaded two to three times a year. As environmental conditions do not change drastically in the polder area, only a short-term range test (i.e., <1 day) was performed. An ALS was moored in the different habitats in the polder and a range test tag [i.e., a tag with a very short fixed delay of *ca*. 10 s]) was positioned at several ranges (0–500 m, with 50-m intervals) from the ALS. Tests revealed detection ranges of 300 m.

# | Data processing

To determine residency times (time between arrival and departure at an ALS), searches were performed with the VUE software (Vemco Users Environment, VEMCO Ltd, Canada). This allows us to reduce the data by accumulating the number of detections during a fixed period of time. We applied an absence threshold of 1 hr (i.e., the maximum time between detections within a single residency period) and a detection threshold of one detection (i.e., the minimum number of detections required for a residency period). The residency search resulted in inter- vals with arrival and departure times per eel at each ALS. The numbers of detections between each arrival and departure per ALS were cal- culated. The residence time between arrival and departure, and the swim distance, swim time and swim speed between each consecutive interval were calculated in R (R Development Core Team, 2015).

Of the 52 tagged eels, 18 showed yellow eel (i.e., resident) behaviour followed by silver eel behaviour (i.e., migration: direc- tional movements towards seawards exit from the polder system). As this study focused on yellow eel movement behaviour only, data on behaviour typical of silver eels were removed. To determine a clear

**TABLE 2** Number of tagged female eels per stage with the different morphometrics: total length (TL), body weight (BW), horizontal and vertical eye diameters (EDh and EDv respectively) and pectoral fin length (FL)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Stages** | **Number** | **TL (mm)** | **BW (g)** | **EDh (mm)** | **EDv (mm)** | **FL (mm)** |

FII 11 607 ± 32.2 392 ± 107.9 6.29 ± 0.462 5.96 ± 0.577 26.54 ± 1.782

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| FIII | 28 | 662 ± 68.6 | 556 ± 189.6 | 7.59 ± 0.77 | 7.27 ± 0.75 | 31.96 ± 4.472 |

FIV 4 773 ± 81.4 1,066 ± 251.4 9.74 ± 1.138 8.71 ± 1.173 36.07 ± 1.497

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| FV | 9 | 630 ± 56.4 | 486 ± 123.0 | 9.16 ± 0.983 | 8.21 ± 1.200 | 33.58 ± 2.890 |

Means ± *SD* are indicated. The FII stage is a female differentiated growing phase, FIII is a premigratory phase, and FIV and FV are considered two migratory phases (Durif et al., 2005).

distinction between yellow and silver eel behaviour, a trajectory analysis was applied for each individual eel. We used the method of Lavielle from the adehabitatLT package in R to divide an ani- mal’s trajectory into a yellow and a silver eel phase (Calenge, 2006) (Fig. S1). This method does not require discretisation in time and is based on residence time (Lavielle, 1999, 2005). The 52 eels were detected as yellow eels between 4th July 2012 and 7th September 2015 (39 months), resulting in a data set of 1,627,846 detections; the average tracking period per eel was 470 days (range 28–1,135).

# | Data analysis

In this study, four research questions were addressed, each with its own data analysis. We investigated (i) when yellow eels were most active in terms of circadian inter-ALS movements and seasonal swim distance patterns, including effects of temperature, (ii) the size of the movement range, (iii) what environmental variables determined movement and (iv) effects of habitat type (i.e., canal, polder ditch and pond) on (ii) and (iii). For each analysis, assumptions were checked and data exploration was conducted following Zuur, Ieno, and Elphick (2010).

# | Circadian and seasonal activity

Circadian activity was defined as the total number of inter-ALS move- ments made by eels, as they moved between one ALS to an adjacent one per circadian phase. Consequently, four different circadian phases were determined and linked to each record in the data set: dawn (start of civil twilight to sunrise, i.e., when the geometric centre of the sun is 6° below the horizon in the morning (or evening for dusk)), day (sun- rise to sunset), dusk (sunset to end of civil twilight) and night (end of civil twilight to start of civil twilight). Time stamps of sunset, sun- rise and twilight were obtained from the Astronomical Applications Department of the U.S. Naval Observatory [(http://aa.usno.navy.mil/](http://aa.usno.navy.mil/index.php) [index.php;](http://aa.usno.navy.mil/index.php) coordinates: 51°16′N 3°43′E).

Seasonal activity was analysed by summing the swim distances per eel for each month. Only data records of eels that swam to another ALS were taken into account. A one-way ANOVA with Welch correc- tion was performed, as the variances were not homogenous. Following a significant ANOVA result, a Games–Howell post hoc test for multiple pairwise comparisons was applied (Games & Howell, 1976). The effect of water temperature on mean swim distance was analysed by means of a one-way ANOVA.

# | Movement range

Polder areas are geographically complex systems, where it is hard to apply classical methods of movement range estimation such as minimum convex polygons and kernel utilisation distribution (Benhamou & Cornélis, 2010; Heupel, Simpfendorfer, & Hueter, 2004; Meyer & Holland, 2005). Moreover, the detection range of the ALSs deployed in the study area was larger than the width of the waterways. As such, the movement range was considered as

the distance swum by an eel between the two most distant ALSs during the tracking period (Walker, Godard, & Davison, 2014). Although some eels were only detected at one ALS but regularly swam out of its range, they were assigned a minimum movement range equal to the detection range of one ALS. Based on range tests, this was *ca*. 300 m in the study area (INBO, unpublished data). Linear regression was used to test for relationships between movement range and eel catch-release location habitat type (canal, polder ditch and pond):

Movement range = α+ β1catch- release location habitat type+ ε

A censoring problem emerged from the fact that the smallest dis- tance measurable by the ALSs was *ca.* 300 m: the true value of the range distance was unknown, and so was the error between range distance and the regression line relating range distance to the catch location. Therefore, the summed squared errors cannot be minimised and ordinary least-squares methods cannot work. Therefore, censored linear regression was applied, which uses maximum-likelihood estima- tion (Greene, 2008). Assumptions of normality and homogeneity of variances were met after log transformation.

# | Environmental variables determining

**eel movement**

## **Environmental data**

Five continuous environmental variables were linked to the depar- ture times in the data set. These were precipitation (mm), pump- ing discharge (m³/s), water temperature (°C), day length (min) and atmospheric pressure (hPa). Precipitation, water temperature and atmospheric pressure data were measured daily and obtained from the Flemish Environment Agency [(www.waterinfo.be).](http://www.waterinfo.be/) Water tem- perature and atmospheric pressure were measured near the pumping station (coordinates: 51°16′15.8″N 3°42′43.6″E), while precipitation was an average value over a large part of the study area (Fig. S2). There were two gaps of a couple of months in the water temperature data. To fill these gaps, data from a nearby canal were used (Ede canal; 51°12′15.4″N 3°26′22.3″E). Both canals have a similar morphology and discharge regime and showed a high correlation (0.98) in tem- perature regime. A linear regression was then applied to obtain the relationship between the two data sets and fill in the gaps of the water temperature data of the studied polder area with the modified values of the nearby canal:

Water temperature LC = 1.161941 × water temperature Ede canal

− 0.780858

From 1st July 2012 till 15th August 2014, pumping discharge data were obtained daily from the Flemish Environment Agency by recordings at the pumping station. The variable “day length” was obtained from the Astronomical Applications Department of the U.S. Naval Observatory (h[ttp://aa.usno.navy.mil/index.php;](http://aa.usno.navy.mil/index.php) coordinates: 51°16′N 3°43′E). Additionally, one categorical explanatory variable was included, namely catch-release location habitat type.

## **Model development**

To determine the variables that significantly contributed to yellow eel movement, a generalised linear mixed model (GLMM) was applied (Mouton, Alcaraz-Hernandez, De Baets, Goethals, & Martinez-Capel, 2011; Verhelst et al., 2015; Zuur, Ieno, Walker, Saveliev, & Smith, 2009). We arbitrarily chose three movement thresholds by means of a cross-validation, and as such, three different models were con- structed: an eel was considered to have moved when its swim distance was larger than 500, 1,000 or 1,500 m. For each model, the response variable “movement” was binomial: swim distances ≤a threshold value were considered as no movement, whereas higher values were con- sidered movement. In order to give an equal weight to movement and nonmovement behaviour, bootstrapping was applied to obtain the same number of records with and without movement (Mouton, De Baets, & Goethals, 2010). After the data were checked for outliers and homogeneity, a collinearity analysis was conducted (Zuur et al., 2010). As correlations were ≤|0.70|, all six variables were included for analysis (Dormann et al., 2013) (Table S2).

Finally, for each of the three movement thresholds, a binomial GLMM with logit link was applied to assess the effects of the explan- atory variables on eel movement. In addition, the significance of three random effects in the models was tested: year, month and tag ID, the latter being a proxy for individual variation. For each full model (i.e., the model with all explanatory variables), all possible combinations with the random effects were applied, including the single random effects. The model with the lowest Akaike Information Criterion (AIC) was selected to apply a stepwise backward model selection, again based on AIC: for the 500-m threshold model, the model with the random effect “month” was selected for stepwise backward selection; for the 1,000-m and 1,500-m models, the models with both month and year as random effects were selected.

The kappa statistic (κ) was calculated to evaluate the final model; κ ranges between −1 and 1 (Goethals, Dedecker, Gabriels, Lek, & De Pauw, 2007; Mouton et al., 2010). We used the “lme4” package (Bates, Maechler, Bolker, & Walker, 2015) of the R environment (R Development Core Team 2015) to create the GLMMs and the “blmeco” package to check the models for overdispersion: if the scale parameter is between 0.75 and 1.4, overdispersion is considered absent. In addi- tion, Random Forests (RF) was applied, which is a widely used machine learning technique (Breiman, 2001; Mouton, Alcaraz-Hernandez, et al., 2011). The method was applied by means of cross-validation for the variables selected by the GLMM: we checked whether the variables selected by the GLMM also proved important by RF. The results of this analysis can be found in Appendix S1.

1. | **RESULTS**

# | Circadian activity patterns

Eels were most active at night with almost two times more inter-ALS movements than during daytime (Table 3). Moreover, 87% of the 52 tagged eels were detected at night, while only 62% were detected during daylight. The lowest activity was observed during dawn and

**TABLE 3** Number of inter-ALS movements per circadian phase

Dawn 49 21

**Circadian phase**

**Number of inter-ALS**

**movements Number of eels**

Day 377 32

Dusk 24 9

Night 744 45

The number of eels contributing to the number of inter-ALS movements is also given.

dusk with only 40% and 17% of the eels detected during those periods respectively.

# | Seasonal activity patterns


Activity patterns differed significantly between months (Welch ANOVA, *F* = 18.434, *df* = 11, *p* = 2.2e-16): the mean swim distance in summer (June–August) and autumn (September–November) was almost threefold that in winter (December–February), with the high- est activity in August (Figure 2a; Table S3). Activity in spring (March–s May) was intermediate between winter and summer, with activity ris- ing from early spring towards summer.

Although no significant relation between water temperature and monthly swim distance was found (one-way ANOVA, *F* = 0.016, *df* = 846, *p* > .05), some trends were observed. When the mean water temperature rose above 10°C in April, a higher eel activity was observed compared to that in January and February (Figure 2b). Activity was almost twice as high compared to March, but this was not statistically significant. Mean water temperature dropped below 10°C in November, accompanied by a significantly lower activity. Water temperature was highest during late summer, when activity peaked. However, activity was highest in August despite a lower water tem- perature than in July.


# | Movement range differences according to

**habitat type**

In this study, the movement range was considered as the distance swum by an eel between the two furthest spaced ALSs during the tracking period, following the definition of Walker et al. (2014). Seven of the 52 eels were detected at only one ALS. For the latter 45 eels, the aver- age movement range size ± *SD* was 3,917.34 m ± 4,116.64 m. No sig- nificant difference was found between eels tagged and released in dif- ferent habitat types (censored regression, log-likelihood = −79.82251, *df* = 4, *p* > .05) (Figure 3). Furthermore, of the 52 tagged eels, 14 (27%) were detected in another habitat than their catch habitat (Table 4). Notably, the eight eels caught and released in polder ditches were later found in the canal. Moreover, after release, only two returned to a polder ditch. Of the 19 eels tagged and released in ponds, three were exclusively detected in the LC, while two moved between the LC and the pond of capture. Only one eel tagged and released in the LC was detected in a pond.



**FIGURE 2** (a) Boxplot of the swim distances of all eels per month. Outliers are presented as dots above the boxplots. The number of eels taken into account is given above the different boxplots. (b) monthly water temperature (mean shown as blue dots, range by vertical lines)



**FIGURE 3** Boxplots of movement range distances (m) in the three different catch location types: ponds, canals and polder ditches. The numbers of eels caught, tagged and released at each location type are given above the different boxplots. Outliers are presented as dots above the boxplots

# | Environmental variables determining

**eel movement**

For the model with the 500-m threshold, 45 (87%) of 52 eels were con- sidered to have moved (801 movement records); the seven remaining eels were highly resident and stayed in the vicinity of a single ALS. The final model obtained from the backward selection only contained the variable precipitation, which had a negative relationship with eel move- ment (GLMM, estimated coefficient = −0.032 ± 0.014, *z* value = −2.224, *p* = .026; Table 5). When a movement threshold of 1,000 m was applied, 38 (73%) eels had moved (660 movement records). A nonsignificant

**TABLE 4** Number of eels detected in one or more habitat types

**Detection location type**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Catch location type** | **Canal** | **Pond** | **Polder ditch** |
| Canal | 24 | 0 | 1 |
| Pond | 5 | 14 | 0 |
| Polder ditch | 8 | 0 | 0 |

The catch location type gives the habitat type where the eels were caught, tagged and released. The columns “canal,” “pond” and “polder ditch” give the number of eels that were detected in those habitats.

negative relation with precipitation was present in the final model (GLMM, estimated coefficient = −0.034 ± 0.018, *z* value = −1.914, *p* = .056). The final model obtained for a movement threshold of 1,500 m (33 (63%) eels had moved, resulting in 397 movement records) showed a negative relationship with precipitation (GLMM, estimated coeffi- cient = −0.055 ± 0.024, *z* value = −2.297, *p* = .022) and water tempera- ture (GLMM, estimated coefficient = −0.033 ± 0.016, *z* value = −2.088, *p* = .037). The impact of precipitation on eel movement was about 1.5 times that of temperature. For the results of the backward selections and Random Forests, see Table S4 and Appendix S1 respectively.

1. | **DISCUSSION**

# | Circadian activity

Eels are known to be nocturnal fish which hide in crevices or bury themselves in the bottom substrate during daytime (Baras et al., 1998;

McGovern & McCarthy, 1992). Our long-term (39-month) tracking study confirmed nocturnal activity: the number of inter-ALS move- ments was almost twice as high during the night than during daytime. Also, the majority of the eels (87%) moved at night, agreeing with findings in other tracking studies (LaBar, Hernando Casal, & Delgado, 1987; Riley, Walker, Bendall, & Ives, 2011). The daytime activity found in the present study possibly occurred mostly during overcast weather, as found by LaBar et al. (1987) and McGovern and McCarthy (1992), or during periods of increased turbidity (Baras et al., 1998). The lowest activity was found during dusk and dawn, with approxi- mately twice the number of eels and inter-ALS movements detected during dawn compared to dusk. However, it is possible that the eels started moving during dusk or dawn, but were only detected at night due to the short duration of the twilight periods (<1 hr). Although pro- nounced activity during twilight was not observed in this study, it has been found for European eel (Baras et al., 1998; Riley et al., 2011), New Zealand longfinned eel (Jellyman & Sykes, 2003) and American

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| eel (Bohun & Winn, 1966). |  | **Estimate** | ***SE*** | ***Z* value** | ***p* Value** |
| There are two plausible explanations for this nocturnal behaviour: | Intercept | −.24035 | .27146 | −.885 | .376 |
| foraging and predator avoidance. Eels may feed primarily at night, as | Precipitation | −.03436 | .01796 | −1.914 | .056 |

**TABLE 5** Output of the three different movement threshold models (500, 1,000 and 1,500 m) after stepwise backward selection

**Binomial GLMM (500 m)**

*N* = 1,602

AIC: 2,165

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Random effect: month (var = 0.32; *SD* = 0.57) | | | | |
|  | **Estimate** | ***SE*** | ***Z* value** | ***p* Value** |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| κ: .1671235 |  | | | |
| Intercept | −.20828 | .18446 | −1.129 | .259 |
| Precipitation | −.03197 | .01437 | −2.224 | .026 |

**Binomial GLMM (1,000 m)**

*N* = 1,320

AIC: 1,768

κ: .2318182

Random effect: month (var = 0.51; *SD* = 0.71)

year (var = 0.08; *SD* = 0.28)

their stomachs are fullest just before morning (de Nie, 1987). Eels also have a very broad diet spectrum, from invertebrates (e.g., mussels, insects, crustaceans) to fish. Many invertebrates avoid fish predation by drifting or emerging at night (Douglas, Forrester, & Cooper, 1994; Learner, Pickering, & Wiles, 1990; Morgan & Waddell, 1961). Some— particularly larger—eels are piscivorous (Tesch, 2003) and may benefit from low light conditions when stalking prey (Barry et al., 2016; Pitcher

& Turner, 1986), also supporting the hypothesis that foraging at night may be more favourable. As our study only considered large eels, pisciv- ory may have been an important strategy. Furthermore, energetic ben- efits could arise from a circadian rhythm, because periods of reduced activity may enable eels to meet the costs of feeding (Owen, 2001).

Predator avoidance is also often related to circadian behaviour (Ibbotson, Beaumont, Pinder, Welton, & Ladle, 2006). Likely eel pred- ators in our polder area include the grey heron (*Ardea cinerea* L.) and northern pike (*Esox lucius* L.), both of which are primarily active during daytime, although northern pike also feeds during twilight (Feunteun

& Marion, 1994; Jepsen, Beck, Skov, & Koed, 2001). In conclusion, nocturnal activity may result from both foraging behaviour and pred- ator avoidance.

# | Seasonal activity

A trend of increasing eel activity from winter over spring to a peak at the end of summer and in autumn was found. As eels are ecto- thermic, a lower activity during winter was expected and is consist- ent with studies which found little to no activity when tempera- ture dropped below 10°C (e.g., Riley et al., 2011; White & Knights, 1997). In contrast, in a mild-climate stream in Spain, eels remained active throughout the year (Costa-Dias & Lobón-Cerviá, 2008). In our study, eel activity was indeed lowest from November till March when water temperature was below 10°C. Activity rose until sum- mer together with the water temperature. Highest activities were

**Binomial GLMM (1,500 m)**

*N* = 794

AIC: 1,049

κ: .2619647

Random effect: month (var = 1.17; *SD* = 1.08)

year (var = 0.31; *SD* = 0.56)

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Estimate** | ***SE*** | ***Z* value** | ***p* Value** |
| Intercept | .09894 | .48638 | .203 | .839 |
| Precipitation | −.05475 | .02383 | −2.297 | .022 |
| Water temperature | −.03288 | .01574 | −2.088 | .037 |

For each model, the number of records taken into account (*N*) is given, as well as the Akaike Information Criterion (AIC), κ and the selected random effect with the variance and standard deviation. For the intercept and the selected variables, the estimate, standard error (*SE*), *Z* value and *p* value are given.

found when water temperature rose above 16°C, consistent with Riley et al. (2011) and Baras et al. (1998). The latter authors stated that large yellow eels may be more active during higher water tem- peratures to meet increasing energetic expenditures. Nonetheless, eels were most active at the end of summer, although water temper- ature was lower (mean water temperature was 19.3°C in August and 16.7°C in September) than during mid-summer (mean water tem- perature was 20.2°C in July). This may be explained by the increas- ing night lengths (Béguer-Pon et al., 2015). As light negatively influ- ences eel activity, longer nights may favour more activity as long as water temperature is above a certain threshold (Bohun & Winn, 1966). Another plausible explanation could be that the eels were more active at the end of the summer as they were seeking over- wintering thermal refuge areas (Hammond & Welsh, 2009). Finally, although a distinction between yellow and silver eel behaviour was made based on the trajectory analysis of Lavielle (Lavielle, 1999,

2005), we cannot exclude that the increased activity at the end of summer was the result of eels showing movements associated with the onset of silver eel emigration.

# | Movement range

In this study, the maximum linear range between ALSs was used as a measure of movement range, as movement ranges could not be estimated in terms of area utilised (Walker et al., 2014). It should be noted that not the whole study area was covered by ALSs. Hence, reported movement ranges may be underestimated as eels could swim outside the *ca*. 300-m range of an ALS without being detected by an adjacent ALS. However, 15 eels (29%) were restricted to a movement range of <1 km, while six (12%) moved over distances in excess of 10 km. This corroborates the high interindividual vari- ation in European eels. A range distance of maximum 285 m was found by Baras et al. (1998), while this was up to 4,150 m in a study conducted in an estuary in England (Walker et al., 2014). Baras et al. (1998) attributed the small movement range to the high complex- ity and numerous hiding places for eels in the studied river, leading to less foraging-related movement. The movement ranges found in our study were larger than the abovementioned studies. This could be attributed to the large size of our eels, as larger eels may have a larger movement range (Barry et al., 2016). However, one of the six eels with a movement range >10 km was at the growing FII stage and two were at the premigratory FIII stage. The remaining three com- prised one FIV- and two FV (migratory)-staged eels. Moreover, two eels with a movement range <1 km were FV. The large movement range of these FII- and FIII-staged eels may be attributed to silvering processes, while the small movement range of the FV-staged eels could be the result of turning back into a semiyellow stage (Svedäng

& Wickstrom, 1997). It clearly remains difficult to define a sharp bor- der between yellow- and silver-staged eels during long-term tracking studies.

In our study, eels were captured, tagged and released in three different habitat types. The majority of eels caught in the canal and ponds were only detected in the habitat where they were caught and released (96% and 74% respectively), demonstrating a high site fidelity.

All eels caught in large polder ditches moved to another habi- tat type, while none of the eels from the ponds and only one from the canal moved into a polder ditch. The lower preference for pol- der ditches may be explained by the fact that these habitats were the smallest and shallowest of the system. Laffaille et al. (2003, 2004) and Lasne and Laffaille (2008) found that eels larger than 360 mm do not prefer shallow ditches with much plant cover, similar to the pol- der ditches in this study. As such, the results presented here illustrate that larger eels may more commonly reside in deeper habitats. This would also explain why fewer eels were caught and tagged in polder ditches (canal: *n* = 25, ponds: *n* = 19, polder ditches: *n* = 8). Moreover, electrofishing in the smallest polder ditches during the tagging period (July–August 2012) did not yield any eels. This is also why no ALSs were placed in those systems.

These results may have important implications for water manage- ment in polders. If water management aims to create eel growth hab- itat in polder systems or apply habitat restoration, sufficiently deep waterways should be aimed to provide habitat for large yellow eels. In addition, shallower waters with plentiful instream vegetation (e.g., reed beds) will favour the production of smaller yellow eels (Laffaille et al., 2003, 2004; Lasne & Laffaille, 2008).

# | Movement behaviour

In general, the relationships between eel movement and environmen- tal factors based on GLMM were too weak to draw strong conclu- sions. We can therefore not exclude that yellow eels move largely randomly through the study area and are not influenced greatly by the environmental factors taken into account in this study. This may be confirmed by the fact that eels are opportunistic feeders (Van Liefferinge et al., 2012), and their movement may largely depend on their feeding behaviour.

1. | **CONCLUSION**

This study describes the behaviour of large female yellow eel based on a substantial number of tagged individuals (*n* = 52), some of which have been tracked for up to 3 years (28–1,135 days). We provide evidence that European eels in freshwater polder systems are most active during the night in late summer and early autumn. We found that large female yellow eels have a high site fidelity and are not strongly affected by environmental factors (temperature, precipita- tion, day length, atmospheric pressure, pumping discharge). This may be attributed to the productivity of the polder system, which makes such systems highly suitable as eel growth habitats (Lasne & Laffaille, 2008; Lasne et al., 2008). In view of their high site fidelity, large female yellow eels may not encounter many human-induced con- nectivity problems in polder systems. In addition, our study indicates that large eels prefer deeper habitats in polder systems. If measures concerning eel habitat restoration in polders are considered, areas of sufficient depth need to be maintained for large eels. A higher yellow eel survival could in turn result in a higher silver eel escapement, and as such could help meet the 40% escapement obligation imposed by the European Eel Regulation.

### ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

P. Verhelst holds a doctoral grant from the Flemish Agency for Innovation & Entrepreneurship (VLAIO). R. Baeyens, E. Gelaude, N. De Maerteleire, K. Robberechts, Y. Jacobs and S. Pieters assisted with the data collection. The authors want to thank S. Gobeyn for advice considering the GLMM development. This research was financed by the Agency Nature and Forest (ANB) and the Fisheries Fund of the Flemish Government. Furthermore, this work was supported by data and infrastructure provided by the INBO and VLIZ as part of the Flemish contribution to the LifeWatch

ESFRI observatory. This manuscript has benefitted from a statis- tical consult with the Ghent University FIRE service (Fostering Innovative Research based on Evidence). Furthermore, we thank M. Lauwers for providing environmental data collected by the Flemish Environment Agency. Finally, we thank two anonymous reviewers for their helpful comments.

### REFERENCES

Baras, E., & Jeandrain, D. (1998). Evaluation of surgery procedures for tagging eel *Anguilla anguilla* (L.) with biotelemetry transmitters. *Hydrobiologia*, *371/372*, 107–111.

Baras, E., Jeandrain, D., Serouge, B., & Philippart, J. C. (1998). Seasonal vari- ations in time and space utilization by radio-tagged yellow eels *Anguilla anguilla* (L.) in a small stream. *Hydrobiologia*, *371/372*, 187–198.

Barry, J., Newton, M., Dodd, J. A., Hooker, O. E., Boylan, P., Lucas, M. C.,

& Adams, C. E. (2016). Foraging specialisms influence space use and movement patterns of the European eel *Anguilla anguilla*. *Hydrobiologia*, *766*, 333–348.

Bates, D., Maechler, M., Bolker, B., & Walker, S. (2015). Fitting linear mixed- effects models using lme4. *Journal of Statistical Software*, *67*, 1–48.

Béguer-Pon, M., Castonguay, M., Benchetrit, J., Hatin, D., Legault, M.,

Verreault, G., … Dodson, J. J. (2015). Large-scale, seasonal habitat use and movements of yellow American eels in the St. Lawrence River re- vealed by acoustic telemetry. *Ecology of Freshwater Fish*, *24*, 99–111.

Benhamou, S., & Cornélis, D. (2010). Incorporating movement behaviour

and barriers to improve kernel home range space use estimates. *Journal of Wildlife Management*, *74*, 1353–1360.

Bohun, S., & Winn, H. E. (1966). Locomotor activity of the American eel (*Anguilla rostrata*). *Chesapeake Science*, *7*, 137–147.

Boulenger, C., Acou, A., Gimenez, O., Charrier, F., Tremblay, J., & Feunteun,

E. (2016). Factors determining survival of European eels in two unex- ploited sub-populations. *Freshwater Biology*, *61*, 947–962.

Breiman, L. (2001). Random forests. *Machine Learning*, *45*, 5–32.

Buysse, D., Mouton, A. M., Baeyens, R., & Coeck, J. (2015). Evaluation of downstream migration mitigation actions for eel at an Archimedes screw pump pumping station. *Fisheries Management and Ecology*, *22*, 286–294. Buysse, D., Mouton, A. M., Stevens, M., Van den Neucker, T., & Coeck, J. (2014). Mortality of European eel after downstream migration through two types of pumping stations. *Fisheries Management and Ecology*, *21*,

13–21.

Calenge, C. (2006). The package adehabitat for the R software: A tool for the analysis of space and habitat use by animals. *Ecological Modelling*, *197*, 516–519.

Costa-Dias, S., & Lobón-Cerviá, J. (2008). Diel feeding activity and intensity in the European eel *Anguilla anguilla* (L.) during an annual cycle in a Cantabrian stream. *Knowledge and Management of Aquatic Ecosystems*, *390–391*, 1–9.

Davidsen, J. G., Finstad, B., Økland, F., Thorstad, E. B., Mo, T. A., & Rikardsen,

A. H. (2011). Early marine migration of European silver eel *Anguilla an- guilla* in northern Norway. *Journal of Fish Biology*, *78*, 1390–1404.

de Nie, H. W. (1987). Food, feeding periodicity and consumption of the eel *Anguilla anguilla* (L.) in the shallow eutrophic Tjeukemeer (The Netherlands). *Archiv für Hydrobiologie*, *109*, 421–443.

Dekker, W. (2016). Management of the eel is slipping through our hands! Distribute control and orchestrate national protection. *ICES Journal of Marine Science*, *73*, 2442–2452. <https://doi.org/10.1093/icesjms/fsw094> Dormann, C. F., Elith, J., Bacher, S., Buchmann, C., Carl, G., Carré, G., … Lautenbach, S. (2013). Collinearity: A review of methods to deal with

it and a simulation study evaluating their performance. *Ecography*, *36*, 27–46.

Douglas, P. L., Forrester, G. E., & Cooper, S. D. (1994). Effects of trout on the diel periodicity of drifting baetid mayflies. *Oecologia*, *98*, 48–56.

Durif, C. M. F., Dufour, S., & Elie, P. (2005). The silvering process of *Anguilla anguilla*: A new classification from the yellow resident to the silver mi- grating stage. *Journal of Fish Biology*, *66*, 1025–1043.

Feunteun, E. (2002). Management and restoration of European eel popu- lation (*Anguilla anguilla*): An impossible bargain. *Ecological Engineering*, *18*, 575–591.

Feunteun, E., & Marion, L. (1994). Assessment of Grey Heron preda- tion on fish communities: The case of the largest European colony. *Hydrobiologia*, *279/280*, 327–344.

Games, P. A., & Howell, J. F. (1976). Pairwise multiple comparison proce-

dures with unequal N’s and/or variances: A Monte Carlo study. *Journal of Educational Statistics*, *1*, 113–125.

Goethals, P. L. M., Dedecker, A. P., Gabriels, W., Lek, S., & De Pauw, N. (2007). Applications of artificial neural networks predicting macroin- vertebrates in freshwaters. *Aquatic Ecology*, *41*, 491–508.

Greene, W. H. (2008). *Econometric analysis* (6th ed.) New Jersey: Prentice

Hall.

Hammond, S. D., & Welsh, S. T. (2009). Seasonal movements of large yel- low American eels downstream of a hydroelectric dam, Shenandoah River, West Virginia. *American Fisheries Society Symposium*, *58*, 309–323.

Heupel, M. R., Simpfendorfer, C. A., & Hueter, R. E. (2004). Estimation of shark home ranges using passive monitoring techniques. *Environmental Biology of Fishes*, *71*, 135–142.

Ibbotson, A. T., Beaumont, W. R. C., Pinder, A., Welton, S., & Ladle, M. (2006). Diel migration patterns of Atlantic salmon smolts with par- ticular reference to the absence of crepuscular migration. *Ecology of Freshwater Fish*, *15*, 544–551.

Jacoby, D., & Gollock, M. (2014). *Anguilla anguilla*. *The IUCN red list of threat- ened species*. Version 2014.2. Retrieved from [www.iucnredlist.org](http://www.iucnredlist.org/) (last accessed 24 July 2014).

Jellyman, D. J., & Sykes, J. R. E. (2003). Diel and seasonal movements of radio-tagged freshwater eels, *Anguilla* spp., in two New Zealand streams. *Environmental Biology of Fishes*, *66*, 143–154.

Jepsen, N., Beck, S., Skov, C., & Koed, A. (2001). Behaviour of pike (*Esox lucius* L.) > 50 cm in a turbid reservoir and in a clearwater lake. *Ecology of Freshwater Fish*, *10*, 26–34.

Køie, M. (1991). Swimbladder nematodes (*Anguillicola* spp.) and gill mono- geneans (*Pseudodactylogyrus* spp.) parasitic on the European eel (*Anguilla anguilla*). *Journal du Conseil: ICES Journal of Marine Science*, *47*, 391–398.

LaBar, G. W., Hernando Casal, J. A., & Delgado, C. F. (1987). Local movements and population size of European eels, *Anguilla anguilla*, in a small lake in southwestern Spain. *Environmental Biology of Fishes*, *19*, 111–117.

Laffaille, P., Acou, A., & Guillouet, J. (2005). The yellow European eel (*Anguilla anguilla* L.) may adopt a sedentary lifestyle in inland freshwa- ters. *Ecology of Freshwater Fish*, *14*, 191–196.

Laffaille, P., Baisez, A., Rigaud, C., & Feunteun, E. (2004). Habitat prefer- ences of different European Eel size classes in a reclaimed Marsh: A contribution to species and ecosystem conservation. *Wetlands*, *24*, 642–651.

Laffaille, P., Feunteun, E., Baisez, A., Robinet, T., Acou, A., Legault, A., & Lek,

S. (2003). Spatial organisation of European eel (*Anguilla anguilla* L.) in a small catchment. *Ecology of Freshwater Fish*, *12*, 254–264.

Lasne, E., Acou, A., Vila-Gispert, A., & Laffaille, P. (2008). European eel dis- tribution and body condition in a river floodplain: Effect of longitudinal and lateral connectivity. *Ecology of Freshwater Fish*, *17*, 567–576.

Lasne, E., & Laffaille, P. (2008). Analysis of distribution patterns of yellow

European eels in the Loire catchment using logistic models based on presence–absence of different size-classes. *Ecology of Freshwater Fish*, *17*, 30–37.

Lavielle, M. (1999). Detection of multiple changes in a sequence of depen- dent variables. *Stochastic Processes and Their Applications*, *83*, 79–102. Lavielle, M. (2005). Using penalized contrasts for the change-point prob-

lem. *Signal Processing*, *85*, 1501–1510.

Learner, M., Pickering, J., & Wiles, R. (1990). Diel emergence patterns of chironomids. *Internationale Revue der Gesamten Hydrobiologie und Hydrographie*, *75*, 569–581.

Matondo, B. N., & Ovidio, M. (2016). Dynamics of upstream movements of the European eel Anguilla anguilla in an inland area of the River Meuse over the last 20 years. *Environmental Biology of Fishes*, *99*, 223–235.

McGovern, P., & McCarthy, T. K. (1992). Local movements of freshwater

eels (*Anguilla anguilla* L.) in western Ireland. In I. G. Priede & S. M. Swift (Eds.), *Wildlife telemetry: Remote sensing and monitoring of animals* (pp. 319–327). Chichester, UK: Ellis Horwood.

Meyer, C. G., & Holland, K. N. (2005). Movement patterns, home range size and habitat utilization of the bluespine unicornfish, *Naso unicornis* (Acanthuridae) in a Hawaiian marine reserve. *Environmental Biology of Fishes*, *73*, 201–210.

Miller, M. J., & Tsukamoto, K. (2016). The ecology of oceanic dispersal and survival of anguillid leptocephali. *Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences*. <https://doi.org/10.1139/cjfas-2016-0281>

Morgan, N. C., & Waddell, A. B. (1961). Diurnal variation in the emergence of some aquatic insects. *Transactions of the Royal Entomological Society of London*, *113*, 123–137.

Mouton, A. M., Alcaraz-Hernandez, J. D., De Baets, B., Goethals, P. L. M.,

& Martinez-Capel, F. (2011). Data-driven fuzzy habitat suitability mod- els for brown trout in Spanish Mediterranean rivers. *Environmental Modelling and Software*, *26*, 615–622.

Mouton, A. M., De Baets, B., & Goethals, P. L. M. (2010). Ecological rele- vance of performance criteria for species distribution models. *Ecological Modelling*, *221*, 1995–2002.

Mouton, A. M., Stevens, M., Van den Neucker, T., Buysse, D., & Coeck, J. (2011). Adjusted barrier management to improve glass eel migration at an estuarine barrier. *Marine Ecology Progress Series*, *439*, 213–222.

Owen, S. F. (2001). Meeting energy budgets by modulation of behaviour

and physiology in the eel (*Anguilla anguilla* L.). *Comparative Biochemistry and Physiology Part A: Molecular & Integrative Physiology*, *128*, 631–644.

Pitcher, T. J., & Turner, J. R. (1986). Danger at dawn: Experimental support for the twilight hypothesis in shoaling minnows. *Journal of Fish Biology*, *29*, 59–70.

R Development Core Team (2015). *R: A language and environment for statis- tical computing* (version version 3.2.2). Vienna, Austria. Retrieved from [http://www.Rproject.org](http://www.Rproject.org/)

Riley, W. D., Walker, A. M., Bendall, B., & Ives, M. J. (2011). Movements of the European eel (*Anguilla anguilla*) in a chalk stream. *Ecology of Freshwater Fish*, *20*, 628–635.

Svedäng, H., & Wickstrom, H. (1997). Low fat contents in female silver eels: Indications of insufficient energetic stores for migration and gonadal development. *Journal of Fish Biology*, *50*, 475–486.

Tesch, F.-W. (2003). *The eel* (pp. 1–408). Oxford: Blackwell Science.

Van Liefferinge, C., Dillen, A., Ide, C., Herrel, A., Belpaire, C., Mouton, A.,

… Meire, P. (2012). The role of a freshwater tidal area with controlled reduced tide as feeding habitat for European eel (*Anguilla anguilla*, L.). *Journal of Applied Ichthyology*, *28*, 572–581.

Verhelst, P., Boets, P., Van Thuyne, G., Verreycken, H., Goethals, P. L. M.,

& Mouton, A. M. (2015). The distribution of an invasive fish species is highly affected by the presence of native fish species: Evidence based on species distribution modelling. *Biological Invasions*, *18*, 427–444.

Walker, A. M., Godard, M. J., & Davison, P. (2014). The home range and

behaviour of yellow-stage European eel *Anguilla anguilla* in an estuarine environment. *Aquatic Conservation: Marine and Freshwater Ecosystems*, *24*, 155–165.

White, E. M., & Knights, B. (1997). An analysis of environmental factors affecting upstream migration of the European eel, *Anguilla anguilla* L., in the Rivers Severn and Avon. *Journal of Fish Biology*, *50*, 1104–1116.

Winter, H. V., Jansen, H. M., & Bruijs, M. C. M. (2006). Assessing the im- pact of hydropower and fisheries on downstream migration silver eel, *Anguilla anguilla*, by telemetry in the River Meuse. *Ecology of Freshwater Fish*, *15*, 221–228.

Zuur, A. F., Ieno, E. N., & Elphick, C. S. (2010). A protocol for data explo- ration to avoid common statistical problems. *Methods in Ecology and Evolution*, *1*, 3–14.

Zuur, A. F., Ieno, E. N., Walker, N. J., Saveliev, A. A., & Smith, G. (2009). *Mixed effects models and extensions in ecology with R*. (575 pp). New York, NY: Springer.