**University of
Zurich^{UZH}**

**Zurich Open Repository and
Archive**

University of Zurich
University Library
Strickhofstrasse 39
CH-8057 Zurich
www.zora.uzh.ch

Year: 2014

Habitat requirements and dispersal ability of the Spanish Fritillary (*Euphydryas desfontainii*) in southern Portugal: evidence-based conservation suggestions for an endangered taxon

Pennekamp, Frank ; Garcia-Pereira, Patrícia ; Schmitt, Thomas

Abstract: A high level of plant and insect diversity, and more specifically high butterfly diversity characterizes the Mediterranean Basin. However, alarming negative trends have been reported for butterfly populations in that region emphasizing the urgent need to better understand the drivers of their population declines. Habitat specialists of grasslands are strongly affected, mainly by land use change and climate change. Thorough assessments of habitat requirements and dispersal abilities are crucial to establish appropriate conservation measures to counter these threats. Here, we investigate the ecological requirements and dispersal ability of *Euphydryas desfontainii*, one of Portugal's rarest butterflies, to develop targeted conservation strategies. The assessment of habitat requirements showed differences between occupied and unoccupied patches in terms of host plant abundance and area. Mark–release–recapture data were used to model demographic parameters: survival rates decreased linearly over the flight period and recruitment followed a parabolic curve with separate peaks for males and females. The movement data were fitted to an inverse power function and used to predict the probability of long-distance dispersal. The obtained probabilities were compared to related checkerspot butterflies and interpreted regarding the structural connectivity of the investigated habitat network. We suggest focusing on the preservation of remaining habitat patches, whilst monitoring and safeguarding that their vegetation structure does provide sufficiently diversified microclimates in order to best conserve *E. desfontainii* populations.

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10841-014-9655-3>

Posted at the Zurich Open Repository and Archive, University of Zurich

ZORA URL: <https://doi.org/10.5167/uzh-107018>

Journal Article

Accepted Version

Originally published at:

Pennekamp, Frank; Garcia-Pereira, Patrícia; Schmitt, Thomas (2014). Habitat requirements and dispersal ability of the Spanish Fritillary (*Euphydryas desfontainii*) in southern Portugal: evidence-based conservation suggestions for an endangered taxon. *Journal of Insect Conservation*, 18(3):497-508.

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10841-014-9655-3>

**Habitat requirements and dispersal ability of the Spanish
Fritillary (*Euphydryas desfontainii*) in southern Portugal:
evidence-based conservation suggestions for an
endangered taxon**

Frank Pennekamp^{1,3,*}, Patrícia Garcia-Perreira² & Thomas Schmitt³

¹ Earth and Life Institute, Université Catholique de Louvain, Louvain-la-Neuve, Belgium

² National Museum of Natural History and Science, Lisbon, Portugal

³ Trier University, Department of Biogeography, Trier, Germany

* corresponding author

Running head: Conservation strategies for *E. desfontainii*

Words: 5171 (+ 231 abstract)

Address corresponding author:

Frank Pennekamp

Earth and Life Institute

Biodiversity Research Centre (BDIV)

Université catholique de Louvain

Croix du Sud 4, box 4

B-1348 Louvain-la-Neuve

Belgium

email: Frank.Pennekamp@uclouvain.be

Abstract

A high level of plant and insect diversity, and more specifically high butterfly diversity characterizes the Mediterranean Basin. However, alarming negative trends have been reported for butterfly populations in that region emphasizing the urgent need to better understand the drivers of their population declines. Habitat specialists of grasslands are strongly affected, mainly by land use change and climate change. Thorough assessments of habitat requirements and dispersal abilities are crucial to establish appropriate conservation measures to counter these threats. Here, we investigate the ecological requirements and dispersal ability of *Euphydryas desfontainii*, one of Portugal's rarest butterflies, to develop targeted conservation strategies. The assessment of habitat requirements showed differences between occupied and unoccupied patches in terms of host plant abundance and area. Mark-release-recapture data was used to model demographic parameters: survival rates decreased linearly over the flight period and recruitment followed a parabolic curve with separate peaks for males and females. The movement data were fitted to an inverse power function and used to predict the probability of long-distance dispersal. The obtained probabilities were compared to related checkerspot butterflies and interpreted regarding the structural connectivity of the investigated habitat network. We suggest focusing on the preservation of remaining habitat patches, whilst monitoring and safeguarding that their vegetation structure does provide sufficiently diversified microclimates in order to best conserve *E. desfontainii* populations.

Keywords

Connectivity, conservation, dispersal kernel, habitat quality, mark-release-recapture, Mediterranean region, metapopulation, population ecology, *Euphydryas desfontainii*

48 **Introduction**

49 The Mediterranean Basin harbours an enormous biological diversity positioning it among the most
50 important global biodiversity hotspots (Myers, Mittermeier, Mittermeier, et al. 2000). High plant species
51 richness and endemism (Médail and Quézel 1999) in combination with its role as glacial refugium
52 (Hewitt 2011) have resulted in elevated numbers of insect species, in particular butterflies (Dennis and
53 Schmitt 2009). However, this diversity is at risk because habitat conversion largely exceeds habitat
54 protection in the Mediterranean region (Hoekstra, Boucher, Ricketts, et al. 2005). This development is
55 likely to lead to large-scale species extinctions if not counteracted by efficient conservation measures
56 (Hoekstra, Boucher, Ricketts, et al. 2005). Although long-term data on population trends are only
57 available for few Mediterranean countries (Stefanescu, Carnicer, and Peñuelas 2011), recent findings
58 from the butterfly monitoring program in Catalonia and Andorra show alarming trends for butterflies,
59 especially those inhabiting open habitat types such as shrub- and grasslands (Stefanescu, Torre,
60 Jubany, et al. 2011). Confirming the findings from other geographic areas, land use changes (i.e.
61 habitat loss, degradation and fragmentation) and climate change were identified as main drivers of
62 population declines (Stefanescu, Torre, Jubany, et al. 2011; Wilson and Maclean 2011). However, not
63 all species are equally affected by these drivers: habitat specialists were found to decline more
64 strongly than generalist species in temperate and Mediterranean regions (Warren, Hill, Thomas, et al.
65 2001; Stefanescu, Torre, Jubany, et al. 2011) due to restricted trophic niches and specific habitat
66 requirements and sometimes also lower dispersal power (Kotiaho, Kaitala, Komonen, et al. 2005;
67 Stefanescu, Carnicer, and Peñuelas 2011).

68 Metapopulation theory is essential for our understanding of the persistence of populations in spatially
69 structured landscapes (Hanski 1998). The viability of a metapopulation crucially depends on the
70 number and size, configuration and quality of habitat patches, which harbour the essential resources
71 for survival and reproduction (Hanski, Kuussaari, and Nieminen 1994). The subpopulations of a
72 metapopulation are interconnected by dispersal. This exchange of individuals between subpopulations
73 allows re-colonisation of vacant habitats (Bowler and Benton 2005) or re-enforcement of local
74 populations with low growth rates (i.e. rescue effect) (Brown and Kodric-Brown 1977). These
75 processes make dispersal a crucial determinant for the functioning of metapopulations. Hence, a
76 thorough understanding of dispersal is needed to efficiently establish conservation measures, such as

functional corridors and stepping stones, which aim to improve the functional connectivity of a given landscape (Haddad 1999; Dennis, Dapporto, Dover, et al. 2013).

The spatial configuration of patches (i.e. interpatch distance and matrix) defines the structural connectivity of a landscape (Baguette and Van Dyck 2007). However, to be informative, the dispersal abilities of a target organism must be considered to draw valid conclusions about the functional connectivity of a given landscape for a given organism (Stevens and Baguette 2008; Kadoya 2008; Öckinger, Schweiger, Crist, et al. 2010). In this context, the quantification of dispersal kernels is an often applied technique to assess the distance-dependent reduction of the dispersing fraction of individuals. This technique allows the estimation of the probability of long-distance movements (Baguette, Petit, and Queva 2000; Baguette 2003; Junker and Schmitt 2010; Stevens, Turlure, and Baguette 2010), which are important for the functioning of metapopulations (Trakhtenbrot, Nathan, Perry, et al. 2005). Especially for butterflies, such analyses are important predictors of dispersal power, in particular if one is interested in short-term responses to habitat fragmentation and recent climate change (Stevens, Turlure, and Baguette 2010). In addition to changes in number, size and connectivity of habitat patches, land use changes also affect habitat quality, which is equally important for metapopulation viability (Thomas, Bourn, Clarke, et al. 2001; Mortelliti, Amori, and Boitani 2010). For grassland specialists, habitat quality is often negatively impacted over time by abandonment of traditional land use (such as extensive grazing or mowing of low productivity grasslands) or conversion of such areas into urban or forested areas (Settele, Dover, Dolek, et al. 2009). Because of the ongoing farmland abandonment process, open habitats (such as semi-natural grasslands) belong to the most threatened habitat types throughout Europe (Habel, Dengler, Janišová, et al. 2013). Open habitats have suffered the most pronounced butterfly population declines in recent years (Van Swaay, Warren, and Loïs 2006; European Environment Agency 2013), emphasizing the urgent need to improve their conservation (Habel, Dengler, Janišová, et al. 2013).

Currently, it is intensively debated, whether conservation decisions should either favour (i) connectivity conservation or (ii) classic conservation measures (e.g. safeguarding the available (semi-)natural habitat, providing sufficient heterogeneity to buffer effects of climate change) (Hodgson, Thomas, Wintle, et al. 2009; Hodgson, Moilanen, Wintle, et al. 2011; Doerr, Barrett, and Doerr 2011). For the decision whether connectivity or classic conservation measures should be applied, a profound understanding of the requirements of all life stages and the dispersal abilities of a given organism is

essential. Classic strategies may be most useful if dispersal power is low or when barriers impede tracking of existing suitable environments. While such information is available for many of the endangered butterfly species in the UK or the Netherlands (Bink 1992; Asher, Warren, Fox, et al. 2001), detailed information is still lacking for most species in the Mediterranean Basin.

To establish conservation strategies thorough autecological studies are urgently needed. Comparisons of occupied and unoccupied habitats can, for instance, help to identify relationships between patch characteristics and butterfly occupancy (Heer, Pellet, Sierro, et al. 2013). Moreover, mark-release-recapture studies provide information on butterfly population dynamics (i.e. size, recruitment and survival) and also dispersal abilities (e.g. Schtickzelle, Le Boulenge, and Baguette 2002; Junker and Schmitt 2010; Zimmermann, Fric, Jiskra, et al. 2011). Such knowledge is essential for sound habitat management and the establishment of ecological networks (Thomas, Simcox, and Hovestadt 2010).

In this article, we investigate the autecology of the adult stage of *Euphydryas desfontainii* (Godart 1819), one of Portugal's rarest butterflies, where it is only found in very restricted areas of the Lower Alentejo and Algarve provinces (Maravalhas 2003). The species is considered as highly specialized (monophagous and high biotope specialisation in this particular region) and inhabits metapopulations with regular dispersal events (Stefanescu, Carnicer, and Peñuelas 2011), but so far we lack quantitative estimates of dispersal ability. We investigated the effects of landscape and habitat structure on habitat patch occupancy by *E. desfontainii*, its dispersal abilities and demographic parameters. Based on our results, we suggest management strategies for the conservation of the species' marginal populations in southern Portugal.

Material and Methods

Study species

Euphydryas desfontainii belongs to the butterfly family Nymphalidae; it has a scattered distribution on the Iberian Peninsula and occurs only locally in adjacent France (Eastern Pyrenees). The species is also found in Northern Africa with localised populations in the Atlas Mountains (Morocco and Algeria). The subspecies *Euphydryas desfontainii baetica* (Rambur 1858) inhabits the southern parts of Spain and Portugal (Tolman and Lewington 1998). In Portugal, the adult butterflies are on the wing from April to June in one discrete generation (Maravalhas 2003). The species is found from sea level up to 1800

m a.s.l. on hot rocky slopes (Tolman and Lewington 1998). Although the species can be classified as a typically Mediterranean faunal element, its habitats are characterized by some water availability. While populations in the most xeric regions are restricted to higher elevations with abundant precipitation (e.g. > 500 m a.s.l. in the Middle Atlas mountains (Tolman and Lewington 1998)), humid meadows in valley bottoms are used in the low elevation populations of southern Portugal and southwestern Spain (Novoa Pérez and García-Villanueva 1996; Pennekamp, Monteiro, and Schmitt 2013). The host plant is usually associated with soils characterised by fluctuating moisture content due to temporal inundations in winter and spring (Novoa Pérez and García-Villanueva 1996; Pennekamp, Monteiro, and Schmitt 2013). The larval ecology is key to a successful conservation strategy for butterflies (Thomas, Simcox, and Hovestadt 2010). In a previous study, we investigated the larval ecology of *E. desfontainii* in the study region among and within patches (Pennekamp, Monteiro, and Schmitt 2013). Females choose large individuals of the locally used host plant, *Dipsacus comosus*; eggs are laid in clutches, but only on second year individuals. The surroundings of the plants chosen for oviposition also matter, as plants in small stands, with lower sward and more sunshine hours are selected indicating that specific microclimatic conditions are preferred (Pennekamp, Monteiro, and Schmitt 2013).

Study area

The study was conducted in the Algarve and the adjacent Lower Alentejo province (southern Portugal). The study area comprises a mosaic of extensively used meadows, maquis shrublands (mainly *Cistus ladanifer*) and some *Eucalyptus globulus* plantations (Krohmer and Deil 1999). The hilly topology (up to 300 m a.s.l.) is marked by small and temporary river beds with *Rubus* hedges and meadows used for extensive cattle grazing. The high clay content of the soils favours the retention of water in the lower parts and creates a suitable environment for the larval host plant, *Dipsacus comosus*. The Mediterranean climate is characterised by mild wet winters and long dry summers, with normally little rain between mid-April and mid-October. The mean annual temperature for the region ranges from 15.5 to 17.5°C (Mabberley and Placito 1993).

For the analysis of the adult habitat structures, we studied a habitat network in the region between São Teotónio and Saboia in the Northwest and São Marcos da Serra in the East spanning about 200 square kilometres (Figure 1). For the capture-recapture study, we selected three sites close to Pereiras (central position at 37°25'N, 8°28'W), each of them having areas with host plants. The three sites were about 7, 1400 and 1700m apart and had surface areas of 200, 1400 and 16500m²

separated by a matrix of extensively used meadows (i.e. used as cow pastures in most cases) and *Eucalyptus* plantations.

Adult habitat structures

To determine the habitat characteristics associated with the presence of butterflies, a systematic search for imagos was conducted in all known patches with the larval host plants at the peak abundance of butterflies in mid-April. The time searched for butterflies depended on patch size (< 2000m²: 20min, > 2000m²: 40min); the search was stopped as soon as an *E. desfontainii* butterfly was detected. Habitat patches were defined by the presence of *D. comosus* plants. Further environmental variables considered important for the species' presence were collected for occupied and unoccupied patches between 17 March to 2 April 2008: area of the patch of host plants (minimum 10 individuals, a distance of more than 100m to the next plant was defined as a new patch), degree of shading (three categories), soil humidity (three categories), slope (measured in degrees and exposition), daily mean temperature, daily mean minimum and maximum temperatures (measured once per hour using data logger Tinytag Explorer [Gemini Data Loggers (UK) Ltd. 2004-2007]), number of host plants in the patch as well as cover of bare soil, herb and shrub layer in 5% steps, the presence of water bodies and whether the area was used for grazing or not. Based on the centroid position of each patch, a distance matrix between all patches was calculated and the minimum distance to the next patch and the next occupied patch was determined. Non-parametric tests Kruskal-Wallis tests were performed to compare occupied and unoccupied patches in terms of their characteristics for continuous and ordinal predictors, whereas the effect of grazing and the presence of water bodies on butterfly occupancy was tested with Fisher's Exact test. Additionally, non-metric multidimensional scaling was used to reveal multivariate relationships between patch features and butterfly occupancy and clustering tested using Analysis of Similarity (ANOSIM) implemented in the R package vegan (Oksanen, Blanchet, Kindt, et al. 2013). All statistical analyses were performed in the R – statistical computing environment (R Development Core Team 2012).

Mark-release-recapture study (MRR)

We performed a MRR study (18 sessions over 35 days) between 3 April and 8 May 2008 in three adjacent areas. Butterflies were captured by hand-netting between 9:30 am and 17:30 pm every day with suitable weather conditions (> 20°C, less than 50% cloud cover and weak to moderate wind). One person (FP) criss-crossed the study areas and captured all encountered *E. desfontainii* individuals.

First captured individuals were marked with a unique code by writing a number on both hind wings with a pen containing water- and light-resistant ink (Staedtler Lumocolor S). Prior to releasing the butterfly at the point of capture, the exact position was recorded with a GPS (Magellan Meridian Platinum, measuring accuracy about 3m). We also determined the sex of the individual and classified its wing wear on a scale from 1 to 4 (1 = fresh individual, 4 = heavily worn individual, cf. (Konvička and Kuras 1999)). We only obtained a sufficient number of recapture events for the largest of the three sites to estimate survival rates, catchability and population size. Analyses were done with the program MARK 6.0 (White & Burnham 1999) using the POPAN module (Schwarz and Arnason 1996): first, the survival rate (ϕ) and catchability (p) were determined by using the Cormack-Jolly-Seber method testing for effects of time (constant or varying between sessions) and sex. The best CJS model (survival and catchability) was then used as the basis in the POPAN module to model survival, catchability and the recruitment (p_{ent}), and we further tested for linear or quadratic trends on survival and recruitment as well as interactive or additive effects of time and sex. Finally, we checked whether the sampling effort (hours spent in the sampling area) improved catchability estimation compared to the time effect (i.e. marking day). From the set of models, we choose the model best representing the data set based on the Akaike information criterion corrected for small sample sizes (AIC_c), i.e. the model with the lowest AIC_c (Burnham & Anderson 2002; Johnson & Omland 2004), and we derived the daily population sizes and the super-population size from this model. We also recorded the use of nectar plants during the MRR study and provide a list of the species most frequently visited.

Mobility

We used the GPS data collected during the mark-release-recapture study (i.e. capture events from all sites) to infer the movement behaviour of *E. desfontainii*. We calculated the distance between a capture and subsequent recapture event and assessed the dispersal kernels obtained for males and females by calculating the inverse cumulative proportion of individuals in distance classes of 100m. The inverse power function was fitted to the dispersal kernels in order to predict rare long distance movements (Baguette, Petit, and Queva 2000; Baguette 2003; Fric and Konvicka 2007): Applying the IPF, the cumulative proportion I is log-transformed and equates as:

$$I_{IPF} = cD^{-n} \text{ respective } \ln I = \ln c - n (\ln D)$$

The parameter c is a scaling constant while n is a parameter describing the effect of distance on the dispersal probability. The estimation of the parameter n is done by log-transforming the inverse

cumulative proportion and regressing it against the log-transformed distance D. We evaluated potential sex differences on the intercept and the slope of the regressions by model comparisons based on the Akaike Information Criterion (AIC_c) (Burnham and Anderson 2002; Johnson and Omland 2004). Finally, the likelihoods for dispersal beyond distances measured in this study were extrapolated.

Results

Habitat requirements

The majority of patches was occupied (N=16), while only five unoccupied patches were encountered. Regarding their univariate characteristics (Table 1), occupied patches only differed significantly in having about four-fold higher abundances of host plants. There was a trend of patches also being larger, however this was only marginally significant. Fisher's exact test did not reveal an association of water body presence nor grazing with patch occupancy. A multivariate analysis using non-metric multidimensional scaling to display patches according to their similarity and a subsequent analysis of similarity detected no significant differentiation between occupied and unoccupied patches (Global R: 0.12, $p = 0.134$) [Supplementary material Figure S1].

Demography

During the MRR study, we marked 1191 individuals (706 males, 485 females) of which 464 individuals were recaptured at least once in a total of 1973 capture/recapture events. Males were recaptured considerably more often than females (46.1 vs. 28.4%) (Table 2). The maximum observed survival (i.e. time from first capture to last recapture) was 26 days for males and 23 days for females. The mean number of observed survival days was 5.7 (± 4.9 SD) for males and 5.4 (± 4.3 SD) for females.

The capture-recapture data were best represented by a single model explaining more variation than all other models tested (Table 3). The difference (ΔAIC_c) to the second best model amounted to 27.4 rendering the best model the only one with substantial empirical support (Burnham, Anderson, and Huyvaert 2011). According to the best model, the survival rate decreased over the flight season for both sexes following a linear trend declining from 0.88 for both sexes at the beginning to about 0.81 at the end. The catchability differed between sexes and varied with capture session. The effect of sex on catchability was additive with males always having higher capture rates (on average 0.38 for males vs. 0.29 for females). An alternative model where catchability was modelled by marking effort expressed as hours spent in the field instead of marking day decreased the fit of the best model ($\Delta AIC_c = 7.64$).

The proportional recruitment of individuals to the population was represented by a quadratic term and an interaction with sex translating into a parabolic curve. Consequently, the number of individuals entering the population increased with time and decreased towards the end of the flight season with an earlier peak for males than for females. The peaks of male (16-4-2008) and female abundance (30-4-2008) were separated by about 14 days (Figure 2). The super-population sizes, containing all individuals born into the population over the whole study period, were almost equal with 1041 ($\pm$ 36 SE) males and 1005 ($\pm$ 60 SE) females, which leads to a balanced sex ratio.

254 visits on flowering plants for nectar feeding were recorded. Most visits (48.4%) targeted plants with yellow flowers belonging to the Asteraceae, particularly *Coleostephus myconis*, *Andryala integrifolia*, *Crepis versicaria* and *Reichardia picroides*. However, visits to blue to violet flowers of *Scabiosa atropurpurea* (17.4%) and *Lavandula stoechas* (9.5%) were also registered.

Mobility

The movement behaviour was characterized by fractions of about 77% males and 64% females not moving more than 100m in their lifetime. The mean distances of the life time movement of 150 m ($\pm$ 202 m SD) for males and 190 m ($\pm$ 240 m SD) for females were not significantly different (Kruskal-Wallis-test: 1.80, $p > 0.17$). The maximum distance moved was 1207 m for females and 1425 m for males. Six events where individuals changed among two of the three sites were registered: five of these exchanges were between the two sites separated by about 700m, whereas only one exchange was found between the sites 1400m apart. No exchange between the 1700m distant sites was recorded.

Fitting the inverse cumulative proportion values of individuals moving certain distance classes to the inverse power function (IPF) yielded a reasonable fit ($R^2 = 0.96$ and 0.90 , for males and females, respectively; Table 4). An AIC_c model comparison suggested that most of the variation was explained by a model where sexes differed in their intercept, but not in the decay of the dispersing fraction with distance (Table 4). However, the second best model including an interaction between sex and log-distance had a ΔAIC_c of 2.16 and therefore still some empirical support (Table 5). Fitting the IPF function to each sex separately, the probability for a male to move beyond the distance of 500, 1000 and 2000 m was 0.063, 0.016 and 0.004, while for the females the estimated probabilities were 0.097, 0.027 and 0.008, respectively (Figure 3).

Discussion

Our study indicates that the habitat occupancy by adult stages of *E. desfontainii* was mainly influenced by host plant abundance and patch area. The imagos' dispersal power is moderate, largely coinciding or even exceeding what is expected for checkerspot butterflies and potentially leading to occasional long-distance movements (i.e. distances of several kilometres). Based on our findings, we discuss consequences for the conservation of the species in the face of habitat and climate change.

Habitat requirements

We found that host plant abundance and patch size, the former often seen as a measure of habitat quality, are of prime importance for *E. desfontainii*. These findings match what is known for several other checkerspot butterfly species such as *Euphydryas aurinia* (Wahlberg, Klemetti, Selonen, et al. 2002; Anthes, Fartmann, Hermann, et al. 2003). However, patches occupied by *E. desfontainii* did not differ in vegetation structure, although less herb and especially shrub cover characterized occupied patches. In previous studies, sward height was found to be important in the sister species *E. aurinia* due to its influence on microclimatic conditions (Fowles and Smith 2006; Betzholtz, Ehrig, Lindeborg, et al. 2007). Encroachment of shrubs, in general, is known to have negative impacts on species living in grasslands and relying on the occurrence of herb species that require certain disturbance regimes (Thomas, Simcox, and Hovestadt 2010). Habitats often are suffering from encroachment when traditional land use practices are stopped because they are no longer commercially viable (Bourn and Thomas 2002). In our study area, grazing by sheep and cattle is still practiced, but likely to vanish because people turn to more profitable jobs in the rapidly developing coastal region of the Algarve. Grazing did not influence occupancy status, although one would expect that grazing may have a positive effect on the ruderal host plant. However, our grazing evaluation was rather coarse (presence/absence), therefore a targeted study is needed to assess how grazing affects host plant abundance, vegetation structure and the resulting microclimatic conditions around host plants for successful larval development (Pennekamp, Monteiro, and Schmitt 2013), given that grazing can also negatively affect populations of rare specialist butterflies (Baguette, Clobert, and Schtickzelle 2011). In terms of structural connectivity, no differences were found between occupancy status meaning that the patches in the habitat network are probably still sufficiently connected. The connectivity within the system of *E. desfontainii* habitats is important for the re-colonisation dynamics as suggested by metapopulation theory (Hanski 1998). Patch isolation was found to influence occupancy in a metapopulation of *E. aurinia* in Sweden (Betzholtz, Ehrig, Lindeborg, et al. 2007), while a study in

Finland did not detect effects of isolation (Wahlberg, Klemetti, and Hanski 2002). Nevertheless, empty patches in the system may still be important as stepping stones facilitating movement through the matrix (Harrison, Murphy, and Ehrlich 1988). Overall, our findings here match the results of our previous study on the habitat requirements of *E. desfontainii* larval stages at the landscape level, where also the number of host plants mattered most (Pennekamp, Monteiro, and Schmitt 2013).

Demography

The overall demography of *E. desfontainii* showed the pattern of other checkerspot butterflies, with earlier emergence of males than females (i.e. protandry), a parabolic abundance curve and separate peaks between sexes as also exemplified by the well-studied species *Proclossiana eunomia* and *Euphydras aurinia* (Munguira, Martín, García-Barros, et al. 1997; Schtickzelle, Choutt, Goffart, et al. 2005; Junker and Schmitt 2010; Zimmermann, Blazkova, Cizek, et al. 2011). In general, protandry is commonly observed for a wide range of butterfly species, where freshly emerged females can then be mated immediately after hatching (Zimmermann, Blazkova, Cizek, et al. 2011) hereby optimising the reproductive success of early hatching males. However, males and females did not differ in their survival rates, which decreased linearly with the progression of the flight period. Schtickzelle *et al.* (2002) argue for a direct relation between decrease in survival and decreasing availability of nectar sources, which might have caused elevated mortality along the flight season of *P. eunomia*. In our study area, this explanation is less likely as *E. desfontainii* used different plant species as nectar sources, unlike *P. eunomia* which exclusively relies on a single nectar source, i.e. *Polygonum bistorta* (Schtickzelle, Le Boulenge, and Baguette 2002).

The estimation of population size showed that *E. desfontainii* can locally reach populations of several thousands of individuals, being at least temporarily the most abundant butterfly species in the study area. From a conservation point of view, large population sizes protect populations against the detrimental effects of demographic and genetic stochasticity and inbreeding, which usually operate in small populations (Caughley 1994; Habel and Schmitt 2012). On the other hand, population sizes of several thousands of individuals do not necessarily protect invertebrate populations from extinctions, e.g. given the enormous fluctuations known for checkerspot butterflies (two to five-fold among years, Ehrlich (1992)), mainly caused by varying degrees of parasitism and environmental (e.g. weather) conditions (Ehrlich 1992; Ehrlich and Hanski 2004). Indeed, several parasitic wasps and flies are known to attack *E. desfontainii* (Stefanescu, Planas, and Shaw 2009), and parasitised caterpillars were frequently observed in the field, suggesting that populations might be strongly impacted by

parasitism potentially leading to considerable fluctuations among years. Given that only a single year was studied, it is unknown whether the observed population size was well within or at an extreme of the normal population size range.

Dispersal

Checkerspot butterflies are generally considered as being rather sedentary compared to other butterflies (Wahlberg, Klemetti, Selonen, et al. 2002). *E. desfontainii* is no exception shown by the large fraction of individuals not moving more than 100 m from their first point of capture. However, we observed maximum distances of more than one kilometre for both sexes, thus being considerably higher than for populations of the sibling species *E. aurinia* in the same geographic region ((Junker and Schmitt 2010) observed maximum move distances: 349 and 283 m; mean distances: 53 and 39 m, for males and females, respectively). Munguira et al. (1997) reported equally low mean and maximum values for an *E. aurinia* population in Spain. However, studies on *E. aurinia* from other European countries found longer mean and maximum movements, for instance in Sweden, with maxima of 650m for females and 1670m for males (Betzholtz, Ehrig, Lindeborg, et al. 2007), while dispersal events of more than 10 km were reported from the Czech Republic (Zimmermann, Fric, Jiskra, et al. 2011).

While MRR studies, due to their often limited spatial scale can miss rare long-distance movements (Schneider, Dover, and Fry 2003), the fitting of certain phenomenological models (e.g. IPF [inverse power function], NEF [negative exponential function]) to butterfly dispersal kernels has been suggested for predicting their dispersal power (Hill, Thomas, and Lewis 1996; Baguette, Petit, and Queva 2000; Baguette 2003). These models were found to be more reliable than mere expert knowledge (Stevens *et al.* 2010) and provide conservation practitioners with the option to rank dispersal abilities of species, if dispersal data has been available. In general, IPF is preferred over NEF, even in case of a less good fit, due to its superiority in extrapolating rare long-distance events (Baguette, Petit, and Queva 2000; Baguette 2003) and its independence from marking effort (Fric and Konvicka 2007).

The dispersal kernel was best modelled with a lower intercept for females compared to males, which translates into lower overall mobility for the former, but a similar decay of dispersal distance for both sexes. However, the next best model including the interaction between sex and distance also had empirical support (ΔAIC_c 2.16). In terms of probability to move beyond the distance of one kilometre, the IPF predicts a lower likelihood for males (0.016) than for females (0.027). Based on these values,

E. desfontainii can be compared to species like *Boloria aquilonaris* with a probability of 0.021 for the same distance (Baguette 2003), or *Euphydryas aurinia* (males: 0.028; females: 0.029) and *Brenthis ino* (males: 0.024; females: 0.027) in the Czech Republic (Fric, Hula, Klimova, et al. 2010). Therefore, bridging distances between habitats of one kilometre or even more should not represent a problem for maintaining the metapopulation structure in *E. desfontainii*.

Conservation implications

Strategies to face the challenges of climate and habitat change to safeguard threatened invertebrates are heavily debated (Hodgson, Thomas, Wintle, et al. 2009; Hodgson, Moilanen, Wintle, et al. 2011; Doerr, Barrett, and Doerr 2011). While improving connectivity is frequently quoted as a recommendable measure in the context of climate change (Heller and Zavaleta 2009), Hodgson et al. (2011) argue that such a focus on simple connectivity may yield inferior results compared to the classic conservation strategies. They make the point that much more uncertainty is related with the concept of connectivity (e.g. in measuring dispersal, effects of population size etc.), while the positive effects of increasing habitat availability and improving habitat quality are well demonstrated. Interestingly, these authors suggest that focusing on habitat conservation is even more important under the assumption of shifting habitats due to climate change. While they aim at finding the best outcome for entire communities, the best strategy for a certain target species is additionally influenced by the availability of habitats in the surroundings and its dispersal power. Our results on *E. desfontainii* show dispersal abilities that should allow re-colonisations all over our studied habitat network (e.g. several kilometres). Therefore, safeguarding the species' survival in southern Portugal likely requires conserving the remaining habitat patches and guaranteeing their habitat suitability and especially their microclimatic heterogeneity to provide buffering against macroclimatic changes. In addition, flower-rich meadows with yellow-flowering plants of the family Asteraceae form part of the adult habitat to provide nectar to foraging *E. desfontainii* butterflies. These recommendations are in line with a recent review of conservation priorities in the UK, which highlights that preserving and improving existing habitats and guaranteeing their integration in a habitat network is essential for the preservation of species and communities (Lawton, Brotherton, Brown, et al. 2010).

In butterflies, habitat specialists are usually defined by their degree of host specialization (mono- vs. polyphagous) and their association with certain biotopes (Kotiaho, Kaitala, Komonen, et al. 2005; Stefanescu, Carnicer, and Peñuelas 2011). According to these criteria, we classify *E. desfontainii* as a habitat specialist given that the larval stages in the study area exclusively feed on a single host plant

and the species is only found in specific grassland habitat types in Southern Portugal. The degree of specialisation often interacts with the dispersal ability, which in the case of *E. desfontainii* can be considered as intermediate. In a comparison of Finnish butterflies, (2005) attributed the highest risk of extinction to habitat specialists with narrow larval and adult resources that in addition are characterized by low dispersal ability. Their conclusions suggest that the ecological characteristics of *E. desfontainii* potentially predispose the species to a high extinction risk, whereas the dispersal ability should be sufficient to maintain the connectivity of a metapopulation. Hence, habitat changes and losses are more likely to negatively affect population viability than is habitat fragmentation. In addition, negative effects are expected due to climate change: the predicted climatic changes might cause a loss of climatic suitability in about 95% of its current distribution in the future (Settele, Kudrna, Harpke, et al. 2008). Although these predictions are potentially too high because parts of the distribution in arid regions of the Maghreb were not included in the species' distribution models (Barbet-Massin, Thuiller, and Jiguet 2010), most of the rare habitats with high soil moisture are unlikely to persist when climate change proceeds. For these reasons, we advocate our previous recommendations to focus on the remaining habitats and especially to guarantee their suitability by providing the conditions for host plants growing in diversified microclimates.

Acknowledgements

The study was legally approved by the Instituto da Conservação da Natureza, Lisbon. F. Pennekamp was partly funded by a grant from the lifelong learning program of the EU Commission, sponsored by Leonardo Kontakt Rheinland-Pfalz. We thank TAGIS – Centro de Conservação das Borboletas de Portugal for logistical support of the field study, Viktoriia Radchuck for advice in the analysis of the MRR data and Thomas Merckx for providing valuable comments on an earlier draft of the article.

433 **References**

- 434 Anthes N, Fartmann T, Hermann G, Kaule G (2003) Combining larval habitat quality and
 435 metapopulation structure – the key for successful management of pre-alpine *Euphydryas*
 436 *aurinia* colonies. J Insect Conserv 7:175–185.
- 437 Asher J, Warren M, Fox R, Harding P, Jeffcoate G, Jeffcoate S (2001) The millennium atlas of
 438 butterflies in Britain and Ireland. Oxford University Press New York, New York, USA
- 439 Baguette M (2003) Long distance dispersal and landscape occupancy in a metapopulation of the
 440 cranberry fritillary butterfly. Ecography 26:153–160.
- 441 Baguette M, Clobert J, Schtickzelle N (2011) Metapopulation dynamics of the bog fritillary butterfly:
 442 experimental changes in habitat quality induced negative density-dependent dispersal.
 443 Ecography 34:170–176.
- 444 Baguette M, Van Dyck H (2007) Landscape connectivity and animal behavior: functional grain as a key
 445 determinant for dispersal. Landsc Ecol 22:1117–1129.
- 446 Baguette M, Petit S, Queva F (2000) Population Spatial Structure and Migration of Three Butterfly
 447 Species within the Same Habitat Network: Consequences for Conservation. J Appl Ecol
 448 37:100–108.
- 449 Barbet-Massin M, Thuiller W, Jiguet F (2010) How much do we overestimate future local extinction
 450 rates when restricting the range of occurrence data in climate suitability models? Ecography
 451 33:878–886.
- 452 Betzholtz PE, Ehrig A, Lindeborg M, Dinnetz P (2007) Food plant density, patch isolation and
 453 vegetation height determine occurrence in a Swedish metapopulation of the marsh fritillary
 454 *Euphydryas aurinia* (Rottemburg, 1775)(Lepidoptera, Nymphalidae). J Insect Conserv 11:343–
 455 350.
- 456 Bink FA (1992) Ecologische atlas van de dagvlinders van Noordwest-Europa. Schuyt, Haarlem
- 457 Bourn NAD, Thomas J (2002) The challenge of conserving grassland insects at the margins of their
 458 range in Europe. Biol Conserv 104:285–292.
- 459 Bowler DE, Benton TG (2005) Causes and consequences of animal dispersal strategies: relating
 460 individual behaviour to spatial dynamics. Biol Rev 80:205–225.
- 461 Brown JH, Kodric-Brown A (1977) Turnover rates in insular biogeography: effect of immigration on
 462 extinction. Ecology 58:445–449.
- 463 Burnham K, Anderson D, Huyvaert K (2011) AIC model selection and multimodel inference in
 464 behavioral ecology: some background, observations, and comparisons. Behav Ecol Sociobiol
 465 65:23–35–35.
- 466 Burnham KP, Anderson DR (2002) Model Selection and Multi-Model Inference: A Practical
 467 Information-Theoretic Approach. Springer, New York
- 468 Caughley G (1994) Directions in Conservation Biology. J Anim Ecol 63:215–244.

469 Dennis RLH, Dapporto L, Dover JW, Shreeve TG (2013) Corridors and barriers in biodiversity
 470 conservation: a novel resource-based habitat perspective for butterflies. *Biodivers Conserv*
 471 22:2709–2734.

472 Dennis RLH, Schmitt T (2009) Faunal structures, phylogeography and historical inference. In: Settele J,
 473 Shreeve T, Konvička M, Van Dyck H (eds) *Ecol. Butterflies Eur.* Cambridge University Press,
 474 Cambridge, pp 250–258

475 Doerr VAJ, Barrett T, Doerr ED (2011) Connectivity, dispersal behaviour and conservation under
 476 climate change: a response to Hodgson et al. *J Appl Ecol* 48:143–147.

477 Ehrlich PR (1992) Population Biology of Checkerspot Butterflies and the Preservation of Global
 478 Biodiversity. *Oikos* 63:6–12.

479 Ehrlich PR, Hanski I (2004) On the wings of checkerspots: A model system for population biology, First
 480 Printing. Oxford University Press, New York

481 European Environment Agency (2013) The European Grassland Butterfly Indicator: 1990–2011. 36.

482 Fowles AP, Smith RG (2006) Mapping the habitat quality of patch networks for the marsh fritillary
 483 *Euphydryas aurinia* (Rottemburg, 1775)(Lepidoptera, Nymphalidae) in Wales. *J Insect*
 484 *Conserv* 10:161–177.

485 Fric Z, Hula V, Klimova M, Zimmermann K, Konvicka M (2010) Dispersal of four fritillary butterflies
 486 within identical landscape. *Ecol Res* 25:543–552.

487 Fric Z, Konvicka M (2007) Dispersal kernels of butterflies: power-law functions are invariant to
 488 marking frequency. *Basic Appl Ecol* 8:377–386.

489 Habel JC, Dengler J, Janišová M, Török P, Wellstein C, Wiezik M (2013) European grassland
 490 ecosystems: threatened hotspots of biodiversity. *Biodivers Conserv* 22:2131–2138.

491 Habel JC, Schmitt T (2012) The burden of genetic diversity. *Biol Conserv* 147:270–274.

492 Haddad NM (1999) Corridor and distance effects on interpatch movements: a landscape experiment
 493 with butterflies. *Ecol Appl* 9:612–622.

494 Hanski I (1998) Metapopulation dynamics. *Nature* 396:41–49.

495 Hanski I, Kuussaari M, Nieminen M (1994) Metapopulation Structure and Migration in the Butterfly
 496 *Melitaea-Cinxia*. *Ecology* 75:747–762.

497 Harrison S, Murphy DD, Ehrlich PR (1988) Distribution of the Bay Checkerspot Butterfly, *Euphydryas*
 498 *editha bayensis*: Evidence for a Metapopulation Model. *Am Nat* 132:360–382.

499 Heer P, Pellet J, Sierro A, Arlettaz R (2013) Evidence-based assessment of butterfly habitat
 500 restoration to enhance management practices. *Biodivers Conserv* 22:239–252.

501 Heller NE, Zavaleta ES (2009) Biodiversity management in the face of climate change: a review of 22
 502 years of recommendations. *Biol Conserv* 142:14–32.

503 Hewitt GM (2011) Mediterranean Peninsulas: The Evolution of Hotspots. In: Zachos FE, Habel JC (eds)
 504 *Biodivers. Hotspots*. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, pp 123–147

- 505 Hill JK, Thomas CD, Lewis OT (1996) Effects of Habitat Patch Size and Isolation on Dispersal by
506 *Hesperia comma* Butterflies: Implications for Metapopulation Structure. *J Anim Ecol* 65:725–
507 735.
- 508 Hodgson JA, Moilanen A, Wintle BA, Thomas CD (2011) Habitat area, quality and connectivity:
509 striking the balance for efficient conservation. *J Appl Ecol* 48:148–152.
- 510 Hodgson JA, Thomas CD, Wintle BA, Moilanen A (2009) Climate change, connectivity and
511 conservation decision making: back to basics. *J Appl Ecol* 46:964–969.
- 512 Hoekstra JM, Boucher TM, Ricketts TH, Roberts C (2005) Confronting a biome crisis: global disparities
513 of habitat loss and protection. *Ecol Lett* 8:23–29.
- 514 Johnson JB, Omland KS (2004) Model selection in ecology and evolution. *Trends Ecol Evol* 19:101–
515 108.
- 516 Junker M, Schmitt T (2010) Demography, dispersal and movement pattern of *Euphydryas aurinia*
517 (Lepidoptera: Nymphalidae) at the Iberian Peninsula: an alarming example in an increasingly
518 fragmented landscape? *J Insect Conserv* 14:237–246.
- 519 Kadoya T (2008) Assessing functional connectivity using empirical data. *Popul Ecol* 51:5–15.
- 520 Konvička M, Kuras T (1999) Population Structure, Behaviour and Selection of Oviposition Sites of an
521 Endangered Butterfly, *Parnassius mnemosyne*, in Litovelské Pomoraví. Czech Republic. *J*
522 *Insect Conserv* 3:211–223.
- 523 Kotiaho JS, Kaitala V, Komonen A, Päivinen J (2005) Predicting the risk of extinction from shared
524 ecological characteristics. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* 102:1963–1967.
- 525 Krohmer J, Deil U (1999) Landnutzungswandel in der Sierra de Monchique (Südportugal) in
526 Abhängigkeit von natürlichen und anthropogenen Bedingungen. *Geoökodynamik* 20:169–
527 192.
- 528 Lawton JH, Brotherton PNM, Brown VK, Elphick C, Fitter AH, Forshaw J, Haddow RW, Hilborne S,
529 Leafé RN, Mace GM, Southgate MP, Sutherland WA, Tew TE, Varley J, Wynne GR (2010)
530 Making space for nature: a review of England's wildlife sites and ecological network. Report
531 to Defra
- 532 Mabblerley DJ, Placito PJ (1993) Algarve plants and landscapes: passing tradition and ecological
533 change. Oxford University Press, New York
- 534 Maravalhas E (2003) The butterflies of Portugal. Apollo Books, Stenstrup
- 535 Médail F, Quézel P (1999) Biodiversity hotspots in the Mediterranean Basin: setting global
536 conservation priorities. *Conserv Biol* 13:1510–1513.
- 537 Mortelliti A, Amori G, Boitani L (2010) The role of habitat quality in fragmented landscapes: a
538 conceptual overview and prospectus for future research. *Oecologia* 163:535–547.
- 539 Munguira ML, Martín J, García-Barros E, Viejo JL (1997) Use of space and resources in a
540 Mediterranean population of the butterfly *Euphydryas aurinia*. *Acta Oecologica* 18:597–612.
- 541 Myers N, Mittermeier RA, Mittermeier CG, Da Fonseca GA, Kent J (2000) Biodiversity hotspots for
542 conservation priorities. *Nature* 403:853–858.

543 Novoa Pérez J, García-Villanueva (1996) Biología y distribución geográfica de *Euphydryas desfontainii*
 544 (Godart, 1819) en el suroeste de la Península Ibérica (Lepidoptera: Nymphalidae). Shilap -
 545 Rev Lepidopterol 94:213–222.

546 Öckinger E, Schweiger O, Crist TO, Debinski DM, Krauss J, Kuussaari M, Petersen JD, Pöyry J, Settele J,
 547 Summerville KS, Bommarco R (2010) Life-history traits predict species responses to habitat
 548 area and isolation: a cross-continental synthesis. Ecol Lett 13:969–979.

549 Oksanen J, Blanchet FG, Kindt R, Legendre P, Minchin PR, O'Hara RB, Simpson GL, Solymos P, Stevens
 550 MHH, Wagner H (2013) vegan: Community Ecology Package.

551 Pennekamp F, Monteiro E, Schmitt T (2013) The larval ecology of the butterfly *Euphydryas*
 552 *desfontainii* (Lepidoptera: Nymphalidae) in SW-Portugal: food plant quantity and quality as
 553 main predictors of habitat quality. J Insect Conserv 17:195–206.

554 R Development Core Team (2012) R: A language and environment for statistical computing. R
 555 Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria

556 Schneider C, Dover J, Fry GLA (2003) Movement of two grassland butterflies in the same habitat
 557 network: the role of adult resources and size of the study area. Ecol Entomol 28:219–227.

558 Schtickzelle N, Le Boulenger E, Baguette M (2002) Metapopulation dynamics of the bog fritillary
 559 butterfly: demographic processes in a patchy population. Oikos 97:349–360.

560 Schtickzelle N, Chouet J, Goffart P, Fichet V, Baguette M (2005) Metapopulation dynamics and
 561 conservation of the marsh fritillary butterfly: Population viability analysis and management
 562 options for a critically endangered species in Western Europe. Biol Conserv 126:569–581.

563 Schwarz CJ, Arnason AN (1996) A general methodology for the analysis of capture-recapture
 564 experiments in open populations. Biometrics 860–873.

565 Settele J, Dover J, Dolek M, Konvička M (2009) Butterflies of European ecosystems: impact of land
 566 use and options for conservation management. In: Settele J, Shreeve TG, Konvička M, Van
 567 Dyck H (eds) Ecol. Butterflies Eur. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, pp 353–370

568 Settele J, Kudrna O, Harpke A, Kühn I, Van Swaay C, Verovnik R, Warren MS, Wiemers M, Hanspach J,
 569 Hickler T, others (2008) Climatic risk atlas of European butterflies. Pensoft Moscow

570 Stefanescu C, Carnicer J, Peñuelas J (2011) Determinants of species richness in generalist and
 571 specialist Mediterranean butterflies: the negative synergistic forces of climate and habitat
 572 change. Ecography 34:353–363.

573 Stefanescu C, Planas J, Shaw MR (2009) The parasitoid complex attacking coexisting Spanish
 574 populations of *Euphydryas aurinia* and *Euphydryas desfontainii* (Lepidoptera: Nymphalidae,
 575 Melitaeini). J Nat Hist 43:553–568.

576 Stefanescu C, Torre I, Jubany J, Páramo F (2011) Recent trends in butterfly populations from north-
 577 east Spain and Andorra in the light of habitat and climate change. J Insect Conserv 15:83–93.

578 Stevens VM, Baguette M (2008) Importance of habitat quality and landscape connectivity for the
 579 persistence of endangered Natterjack toads. Conserv Biol 22:1194–1204.

580 Stevens VM, Turlure C, Baguette M (2010) A meta-analysis of dispersal in butterflies. Biol Rev
 581 85:625–642.

582 Van Swaay C, Warren M, Loïs G (2006) Biotope Use and Trends of European Butterflies. *J Insect*
583 *Conserv* 10:189–209.

584 Thomas JA, Bourn NAD, Clarke RT, Stewart KE, Simcox DJ, Pearman GS, Curtis R, Goodger B (2001)
585 The quality and isolation of habitat patches both determine where butterflies persist in
586 fragmented landscapes. *Proc R Soc Lond B* 268:1791–1796.

587 Thomas JA, Simcox DJ, Hovestadt T (2010) Evidence based conservation of butterflies. *J Insect*
588 *Conserv* 15:241–258.

589 Tolman T, Lewington R (1998) *Die Tagfalter Europas und Nordwestafrikas*. Franckh-Kosmos Verlag,
590 Stuttgart

591 Trakhtenbrot A, Nathan R, Perry G, Richardson DM (2005) The importance of long-distance dispersal
592 in biodiversity conservation. *Divers Distrib* 11:173–181.

593 Wahlberg N, Klemetti T, Hanski I (2002) Dynamic populations in a dynamic landscape: the
594 metapopulation structure of the marsh fritillary butterfly. *Ecography* 25:224–232.

595 Wahlberg N, Klemetti T, Selonen V, Hanski I (2002) Metapopulation Structure and Movements in Five
596 Species of Checkerspot Butterflies. *Oecologia* 130:33–43.

597 Warren MS, Hill JK, Thomas JA, Asher J, Fox R, Huntley B, Roy DB, Telfer MG, Jeffcoate S, Harding P,
598 Jeffcoate G, Willis SG, Greatorex-Davies JN, Moss D, Thomas CD (2001) Rapid responses of
599 British butterflies to opposing forces of climate and habitat change. *Nature* 414:65–69.

600 Wilson RJ, Maclean IMD (2011) Recent evidence for the climate change threat to Lepidoptera and
601 other insects. *J Insect Conserv* 15:259–268.

602 Zimmermann K, Blazkova P, Cizek O, Fric Z, Hula V, Kepka P, Novotny D, Slamova I, Konvicka M (2011)
603 Demography of adults of the Marsh fritillary butterfly, *Euphydryas aurinia* (Lepidoptera:
604 Nymphalidae) in the Czech Republic: Patterns across sites and seasons. *Eur J Entomol*
605 108:243–254.

606 Zimmermann K, Fric Z, Jiskra P, Kopeckova M, Vlasanek P, Zapletal M, Konvicka M (2011) Mark-
607 recapture on large spatial scale reveals long distance dispersal in the Marsh Fritillary,
608 *Euphydryas aurinia*. *Ecol Entomol* 36:499–510.

609

Figure legends

Figure 1: Terrain map of the Algarve and Lower Alentejo regions between São Teotónio in the West and São Marcos da Serra in the East showing the study sites for the presence-absence analysis of *Euphydryas desfontainii* imagos.

Figure 2: Population sizes and standard error bars of *Euphydryas desfontainii* derived from the best supported model. Males (filled diamonds) appear before females (open quadrats), resulting in peak abundances shifted for about two weeks between sexes.

Figure 3: Fitting an inverse power function to the inverse cumulative proportion of individuals of *Euphydryas desfontainii*. Observed proportions moving to the distance D are given as symbols, fitted IPF as solid line for males (filled diamonds) and dashed line for females (open quadrats).

Table legends

Table 1: Comparison of patch characteristics (median and interquartile range) in relation to *Euphydryas desfontainii* butterfly occupancy. In occupied patches more host plants were found and there was a trend that occupied patches were larger. Statistically significant p-values shown in bold.

Table 2: Overview of the number of captures and recaptures of *Euphydryas desfontainii* butterflies and their average distances moved observed in a MRR study.

Table 3: AIC_c model selection for *Euphydryas desfontainii* showing the ten best supported models. The best model considers equal survival rates for both sexes decreasing with time, the catchability differing between sexes and capture day and the proportional recruitment differing between sexes and including a quadratic term.

Table 4: Parameters of the inverse power function separately estimated for both sexes of *Euphydryas desfontainii*.

Table 5: AIC_c model selection to determine whether the regression of the log-transformed inverse cumulative proportion differs between sexes of *Euphydryas desfontainii*.

Figure 1

646 **Figure 2**

647
648
649

Figure 3

654 **Table 1**
655

Variables	Unoccupied patches (n = 5)		Occupied patches (n = 16)		<i>H</i> -test	p
	median	interquartile range	median	interquartile range		
area (m ²)	328	329	1863	3386	3.79	0.052
inclination (°)	0	0	0	2.5	0.24	0.625
shading	3	0	3	1	1.00	0.317
humidity	1	0	1	1	2.47	0.116
mean temp (°C)	16.03	1.3725	16.905	1.275	1.96	0.161
max. temp (°C)	18.83	2.435	19.57	2.89	0.02	0.876
min. temp (°C)	13.255	0.66875	14.42	0.835	0.02	0.876
number HP	37.5	86.75	160.5	240.25	5.64	0.018
cover soil (%)	45	37.5	70	25	0.05	0.828
cover herb (%)	48.75	38.125	20	22.5	2.50	0.114
cover shrub (%)	0	3.75	0	5	2.74	0.098
distance to nearest patch (m)	767	2503	765	574	0.61	0.436
distance to nearest occupied patch (m)	975	2396	765	606	1.76	0.185

656
657

658 **Table 2**

Sex	Marked individuals	Capture events	Recaptured individuals	Recapture ratio (%)	Longest move (m)	Mean move length (m)
Males	706	1275	326	46.1	1425	150 (± 202)
Females	485	698	138	28.4	1207	190 (± 240)

659

660

661 **Table 3**

Model	AIC _c	Δ AIC _c	AIC _c weights	Model likelihood	parameters
{phi (tlin) p (g+t) pent (g*tlin+tlin²) N (.)}	4163.205	0	1	1	28
{phi (tlin) p (g+t) pent (g*t) N (.)}	4190.635	27.43	0	0	57
{phi (tlin) p (g+t) pent (g+tlin+tlin ²) N (.)}	4280.02	116.82	0	0	27
{phi (tlin) p (g+t) pent (g+t) N (.)}	4296.033	132.83	0	0	41
{phi (tlin) p (g+t) pent (g) N (.)}	4328.542	165.34	0	0	25
{phi (tlin) p (g+t) pent (tlin+tlin ²) N (.)}	4329.166	165.96	0	0	26
{phi (tlin) p (g+t) pent (g+tlin) N (.)}	4330.131	166.93	0	0	26
{phi (tlin) p (g+t) pent (g+tlin) N (.)}	4330.131	166.93	0	0	26
{phi (tlin) p (g+t) pent (t) N (.)}	4337.141	173.94	0	0	40
{phi (tlin) p (g+t) pent (tlin) N (.)}	4351.529	188.32	0	0	25

662

663

664 **Table 4**

Sex	Formula	Stability index (R ²)
Males	$I = 16706 * D^{-2.01}$ $\ln(I) = 9.72 - 2.01 \ln(D)$	0,96
Females	$I = 8464 * D^{-1.83}$ $\ln(I) = 9.04 - 1.83 \ln(D)$	0,90

665

666 **Table 5**

factors	no. of parameters	log-likelihood	AIC _c	Δ AIC _c
log(distance) sex	4	-13.32	36.38	0.0
log(distance) sex log(distance)*sex	5	-12.91	38.54	2.16
log(distance)	3	-17.59	42.18	5.80
intercept only	2	-51.69	107.8	71.47
sex	3	-50.92	108.8	72.46

667