



HAL
open science

Variation among species and populations in bill shape and size in three planktivorous petrels

Maria Laranjeiro, Marc Farré, Richard Phillips, Petra Quillfeldt, Francesco Bonadonna, Charlene Gémard, Maximiliano Daigre, Cristián Suazo, Christophe Barbraud, Joan Navarro

► To cite this version:

Maria Laranjeiro, Marc Farré, Richard Phillips, Petra Quillfeldt, Francesco Bonadonna, et al.. Variation among species and populations in bill shape and size in three planktivorous petrels. *Marine Biology*, 2022, 169 (2), pp.24. 10.1007/s00227-021-04014-7 . hal-03652996

HAL Id: hal-03652996

<https://hal.science/hal-03652996>

Submitted on 8 Aug 2022

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

1 **Variation among species and populations in bill shape and size in three**
2 **planktivorous petrels**

3

4 Maria I. Laranjeiro^{1,2,*}, Marc Farré^{1,3}, Richard A. Phillips⁴, Petra Quillfeldt⁵, Francesco
5 Bonadonna⁶, Charlene Gémard⁶, Maximiliano Daigre⁷, Cristian G. Suazo⁵ & Joan
6 Navarro¹

7

8 ¹Institut de Ciències del Mar (ICM-CSIC), Passeig Marítim de la Barceloneta 37-49,
9 08003 Barcelona, Spain.

10 ²University of Coimbra, MARE – Marine and Environmental Sciences Centre,
11 Department of Life Sciences, Calçada Martim de Freitas, 3000-456 Coimbra, Portugal.

12 ³Instituto Español de Oceanografía, Centre Oceanogràfic de les Balears, Moll de
13 Ponent, s/n, 07015, Palma, Spain.

14 ⁴British Antarctic Survey, Natural Environment Research Council, High Cross,
15 Cambridge, United Kingdom.

16 ⁵Department of Animal Ecology and Systematics, Justus Liebig University Giessen,
17 Heinrich-Buff-Ring 26, 35392 Giessen, Germany.

18 ⁶CEFE, Univ Montpellier, CNRS, EPHE, IRD, Montpellier, France.

19 ⁷Facultad de Ciencias de la Vida, Universidad Andrés Bello, Santiago, Chile.

20

21 *Corresponding author: Maria Inês Laranjeiro

22 E-mail address: mariaines.santos@outlook.pt

23 ORCID: 0000-0001-9884-4743

24 **Abstract**

25 Morphological variation in biological structures may be driven by genetic and
26 environmental factors, such as inter and intraspecific competition for resources. In
27 seabirds, although the bill is also involved in vocalization, olfaction, sexual selection
28 and defence, the main drivers of high morphological plasticity in bill size and shape
29 appear to relate primarily to diet and thus to niche differentiation. Here, we combined
30 geometric morphometrics and comparisons of linear measurements as a precise tool for
31 measuring shape variation in anatomical features, to investigate the differences among
32 species and populations (island groups) in bill shape of three abundant planktivorous
33 petrels (Antarctic prion *Pachyptila desolata*, blue petrel *Halobaena caerulea* and thin-
34 billed prion *Pachyptila belcheri*). Fieldwork was carried out in South Georgia (54°0'S,
35 38°3'W), Falkland Islands (51°42'S, 57°51'W), Diego Ramírez Islands (56°31'S,
36 68°44'W) and Kerguelen Islands (49°20'S, 69°20'E), across 2010-2021. As expected,
37 the bills of Antarctic prions were more robust and shorter, appropriate for filtering large
38 amounts of small prey. Blue petrels and thin-billed prions had narrower and longer bills,
39 effective for catching and tearing large single prey. Also, Antarctic prions and blue
40 petrels from Kerguelen had longer and narrower bills than conspecifics from other
41 colonies, which could potentially be explained by geographic variation in diet. In
42 conclusion, prey availability and diversity appear to be important factors influencing
43 variation in bill morphology. This study highlights the utility of geometric
44 morphometrics for investigating bill shape variation in seabirds. Nevertheless, further
45 studies are needed to better understand selective pressures leading to morphological
46 displacement of biological structures.

47

48 **Introduction**

49 Morphological variation is known to be shaped by abiotic and biotic conditions, and
50 their interaction. For instance, genes provide the potential for a particular phenotype,
51 but environmental factors determine how this potential is expressed through selective
52 pressures (Grant and Grant 1989; Aldrich and James 1991). In seabirds, selective
53 pressures can be related to environmental conditions, predation, disease, and
54 interspecific and intraspecific competition for resources such as food or nest sites
55 (Buckley and Buckley 1980; Warham 1996). Suitable breeding sites are limited in
56 number and hence multiple species of seabirds often breed in sympatry (Warham 1996;
57 Brooke 2004). As seabirds are often very abundant, and foraging ranges subject to the
58 central-place constraint during breeding (i.e., the need to return to incubate eggs or feed
59 chicks), interspecific and intraspecific competition around colonies is particularly
60 intense (Lewis et al. 2001; Phillips et al. 2005; Wakefield et al. 2014). Seabirds have
61 therefore evolved diverse ecological strategies which allow coexistence, including
62 segregation of foraging areas, behaviour or diet (Quillfeldt et al. 2013; Navarro et al.
63 2013; Corman et al. 2016), as well as allochrony to reduce overlap in the periods of
64 higher demand for prey, including chick-rearing and moulting (Cherel et al. 2016; Jones
65 et al. 2020). Selective pressures differ between regions and thus morphological variation
66 might reflect adaption to local conditions in different populations (i.e., breeding at
67 different island groups) of the same species (Mayr and Diamond 2001; Bull et al. 2004;
68 Bull 2006).

69 Common examples of variation among birds in specific morphological traits include
70 the shape and size of feeding structures such as the bill. This is widely established, for
71 example, in different species of Darwin's finches (Coerebinae), in which bill
72 morphology is associated with interspecific variability in foraging strategies (Boag and

73 Grant 1981; Kleindorfer et al. 2006; Foster et al. 2008). Similar patterns occur in
74 boobies (*Sula* spp.) in the Pacific, and little penguins (*Eudyptula minor*) in south
75 Australia, in which wing and bill size differ between colonies in relation to prey
76 selection and competition with sympatric species, and with variation in environmental
77 conditions, respectively (Colombelli-Négrel 2016; Van Oordt et al. 2018). In seabirds,
78 the bill is of great ecological and biological importance since it provides essential
79 functions related to food intake, vocalization, sexual selection or defensive and
80 territorial behaviour (Warham 1996; Nebel 2005; Gémard et al. 2019). Given its
81 versatile role, the bill is subject to strong selective forces and it shows wide
82 morphological plasticity and divergence (Schluter 2000; Van Oordt et al. 2018). Many
83 studies have pointed out the association between bill shape and size, and diet and niche
84 differentiation (Nebel et al. 2005; Bull 2006; Trallero et al. 2019), presumably driven by
85 interspecific competition and natural selection (Grémillet et al. 2004; Navarro et al.
86 2013; Corman et al. 2016).

87 In spite of sometimes wide geographic separation between colonies, breeding
88 populations of seabirds often show limited genetic structure (Moum and Árnason 2001;
89 Wojczulanis-Jakubas et al. 2014). This applies to Antarctic prions (*Pachyptila desolata*)
90 and blue petrels (*Halobaena caerulea*) breeding at South Georgia and Kerguelen
91 Islands, even though the island groups are far apart and the populations exploit different
92 trophic niches (Quillfeldt et al. 2017). Therefore, morphological variation among
93 individuals and populations in the bill might be related to environmental factors such as
94 relative availability of different prey (Croxall and Prince 1980). Based on previous
95 studies, the diet of Antarctic prions at South Georgia is composed mainly of small
96 copepods and Antarctic krill *Euphausia superba*, followed by the amphipod *Themisto*
97 *gaudichaudii*, small fish and cephalopods (Prince 1980; Croxall et al. 1997; Reid et al.

1997). At Kerguelen, although crustaceans are also important, Antarctic prion prey
mainly on *T. gaudichaudii*, and only rarely on Antarctic krill and copepods (Cherel et
al. 2002b). Blue petrels at South Georgia feed mostly on crustaceans and small
myctophids, whereas conspecifics from Kerguelen also catch larger fish such as
Paradiplospinus gracilis and consume substantial numbers of cephalopods (Prince
1980; Cherel et al. 2002a). The targeting of distinct prey could therefore drive
morphological differences between these colonies. Cherel et al. (2002b) suggested that
while other crustaceans can be caught individually, large numbers of small copepods
might be ingested at once by Antarctic prions through filter feeding. Moreover, Prince
(1980) suggested that long and narrow bills in blue petrels could be indicative of surface
dipping, and tearing of large single prey. Accordingly, the bill, as the anatomical
structure most directly related to diet, might be the key to detecting phenotypical
variation within these genetically similar populations.

Geometric morphometric analyses represents a precise tool for measuring shape
variation in anatomical features (Adams et al. 2013), providing insights into
relationships between morphological structures and ecological strategies (Adams 1999;
Zelditch et al. 2004; Farré et al. 2016b), including in seabirds (Foster et al. 2008;
Navarro et al. 2009; Berns and Adams 2010; Trallero et al. 2019). With this approach, it
is possible to accurately compare biological form in statistical terms, while accounting
for the non-shape variation (size, orientation, deformation etc.) (Adams et al. 2004;
Zelditch et al. 2004). In a previous study (Trallero et al. 2019), we quantified
differences among species and sexes in bill morphology of Antarctic prions, blue
petrels, and two species of diving petrels (*Pelecanoides* spp.) all breeding at South
Georgia, South Atlantic. Here, we extend this by investigating the differences in bill
shape among populations of three abundant planktivorous petrels (Antarctic prion, blue

123 petrel and thin-billed prion *Pachyptila belcheri*) which have circumpolar distributions in
124 the Southern Ocean. Although diet proportions are similar in terms of prey classes, the
125 three species differs in terms of the main crustacean species consumed (Prince 1980;
126 Cherel et al. 2002a,b) which might explain the striking spatial and ecological
127 segregation among species and populations (Quillfeldt et al. 2013, 2015; Navarro et al.
128 2013, 2015). Hence, our initial hypothesis was that these differences in foraging
129 ecology would be reflected in bill-character displacement. While species differences
130 have been described with traditional methods, geometric morphometric analyses can
131 reveal subtler contrasts and offers a precise tool to analyse less obvious differences, as
132 may be found between populations.

133

134 **Material and Methods**

135 *Study species*

136 The work focused on three monogamous, small-bodied procellariiform species:
137 Antarctic prion, blue petrel and thin-billed prion. All can feed 100s or 1000s of km from
138 the colony and spend most of their time at sea (Quillfeldt et al. 2013, 2014). They breed
139 in burrows or rock crevices in dense colonies and show the typical procellariiform
140 pattern of single-egg clutch and slow chick development (Warham 1996; Brooke 2004).
141 Both the Antarctic prion and blue petrel feed mainly on crustaceans, and small fish
142 (myctophids) (Table 1), but the particular prey species vary, presumably related to
143 relative availability in the environment (Ainley et al. 1992). Similarly, thin-billed prions
144 prey mostly on crustaceans (amphipods and krill), myctophid fish and squid (Table 1).

145

146 *Study sites*

147 Fieldwork was conducted in breeding colonies at four sub-Antarctic island groups
148 >1000 km apart (Fig. 1): Bird Island, South Georgia (54°0'S, 38°3'W), New Island,
149 Falkland Islands (Malvinas) (51°42'S, 57°51'W), Gonzalo Island, Diego Ramírez
150 Islands (56°31'S, 68°44'W) and Île Verte, Kerguelen Islands (49°20'S, 69°20'E).
151 Antarctic krill are particularly abundant around and to the south of South Georgia
152 (Atkinson et al. 2001). Prey availability for seabirds is high in the waters surrounding
153 the Falkland Islands, which are characterised by low temperatures, strong winds and
154 turbulent waters (Armstrong and Forbes 1997). At Diego Ramírez, temperatures are low
155 and there are strong westerly winds and high annual rainfall (Schlatter & Riveros,
156 1997). The Kerguelen Islands are also in a region characterized by low temperatures and
157 high winds, with strong upwellings (Zhou et al. 2014). Estimated breeding populations
158 in each island group are as follows: Antarctic prion, South Georgia (22 million pairs);
159 blue petrel, South Georgia (70 000 pairs); Antarctic prion, Kerguelen (2-3 million
160 pairs); blue petrel, Kerguelen (100-200,000 pairs); thin-billed prion, New Island,
161 Falkland Islands (Malvinas) (2 million pairs); blue petrel, Diego Ramírez (1.35 million
162 pairs) (Prince and Croxall 1983; Weimerskirch et al. 1989; Schlatter and Riveros 1997;
163 Catry et al. 2003; Barbraud and Delord 2006; Lawton et al. 2006).

164

165 *Sampling and morphological data acquisition*

166 During the breeding period, a total of 60 Antarctic prions and 29 blue petrels were
167 sampled at Bird Island (November 2010 – February 2011); 54 Antarctic prions and 37
168 blue petrels at Île Verte (December 2018 – January 2019), 29 blue petrels at Gonzalo
169 Island (November 2020 – January 2021) and 27 thin-billed prions at New Island
170 (February 2019). For each individual, digital pictures were taken of the right profile and
171 dorsal view of the bill using a compact digital camera in a consistent orientation: the bill

172 was supported using a wooden board with a ruler underneath for scale, and the camera
173 lens was always perpendicular to the bill surface. Any pictures that were not
174 standardized in this way were excluded from morphological analyses. In addition, three
175 biometric measurements were taken in the field: maximum bill depth, bill depth at nares
176 and culmen length as shown in Trallero et al. (2019). All measurements were made
177 using digital callipers (± 0.1 mm) (Fig. 2).

178

179 *Bill shape analysis*

180 Characterization and assessment of variability in bill shape were performed using
181 geometric morphometric methods (Rohlf and Marcus 1993; Zelditch et al. 2004). A
182 total of 10 landmarks (fixed homologous points) in dorsal pictures (Tokita et al. 2017;
183 Trallero et al. 2019) and 11 landmarks and 3 semilandmarks (mobile non-homologous
184 points) in profile pictures (Navarro et al. 2009; Militão et al. 2014; Trallero et al. 2019)
185 were used to define the overall shape of bill and nares (Fig. 2, Table 2). Landmarks and
186 semilandmarks coordinates were digitized and transformed into geometric data using
187 the tpsDig2 v.2.31 (Rohlf 2017), creating a metric map for each individual. A
188 Generalized Procrustes Analysis (GPA) was then applied, using tpsRelw v.1.70 (Rohlf
189 2019). GPA compares all the landmark configurations removing distortions not related
190 to shape, translating all configurations to a common centroid position, scaling them to
191 the unit centroid size and rotating them to minimise the distances between
192 corresponding landmarks (Adams et al. 2004; Zelditch et al. 2004). Next, a consensus
193 configuration was obtained by averaging the spatial coordinates of all landmarks using a
194 thin-plate spline procedure. The comparison of each configuration with this consensus
195 form allows the shape deformation variables (relative warps, RWs) to be extracted for
196 each individual. Each RW represents a specific set of morphological characteristics, and

197 their comparison allows the potential variation in shape of analysed objects to be
198 visualised (Rohlf and Marcus 1993; Zelditch et al. 2004). Thus, the values of RWs were
199 plotted spatially (generating a morphospace) to compare individuals according to
200 morphological features and axis orientation. Only the first two RWs were used to create
201 morphospaces as they represented a sufficiently high percentage of total morphological
202 variance (Table 3), for the profile (60.27%) and dorsal (72.07%) perspectives,
203 respectively (Farré et al. 2016a; Trallero et al. 2019). The morphospaces were built
204 using PAST v.3.26 (Paleontological Statistics software package, Hammer et al. 2001).

205

206 *Statistical analysis*

207 Bill size (maximum bill depth, bill depth at nares and culmen length) and shape
208 (using the RW1 and RW2 values of the profile and dorsal views) were compared among
209 species and populations using Kruskal-Wallis and Mann-Whitney U tests, with species
210 and island group as fixed factors. Sex was not included as a factor because it was
211 unknown for the samples from some sites. Moreover, the study species are considered
212 to be sexually monomorphic (Warham 1990), the differences between sexes in bill size
213 and shape of Antarctic prions and blue petrels are very slight (Trallero et al. 2019), there
214 are no significant sex differences in foraging strategies (Quillfeldt et al. 2008; Phillips et
215 al. 2011; Cherel et al. 2014), and we had no reason to expect biased sex ratios during
216 sampling. Data were tested for normality (Shapiro-Wilk test) and homogeneity of
217 variances (Levene's test). These analyses were performed using R 3.5.0 (R Core Team
218 2018).

219

220 **Results**

221 *Interspecific differences in bill morphology*

222 There were significant differences in bill size (all measurements) and shape of both
223 profile and dorsal views among the three species (Tables 4 and 5). This included clear
224 interspecific differences in profile shape (Fig. 3). Species segregated along the
225 horizontal axis (RW1, representing 39.12% of the total morphological variability)
226 separating individuals by shape of nares, length of *culminicorn* and size of *maxillary*
227 *unguis* (Fig. 3): specimens with more triangular nares, longer *culminicorn* and smaller
228 *maxillary* and *mandibular unguis* showed positive values (Antarctic prions); specimens
229 with more rectangular nares, shorter *culminicorn* and proportionally bigger *maxillary*
230 and *mandibular unguis* (blue petrels) showed negative values; and thin-billed prions
231 showed intermediate (near to zero) values. The vertical axis (RW2, 21.15% of the total
232 morphological variation) differentiated individuals by bill depth, and shape of *maxillary*
233 *unguis* (Fig. 3): most of the blue petrels and Antarctic prions had deeper bill and sharper
234 *maxillary unguis*, with higher values and located towards the positive extreme, and
235 those with less deep bills and more rounded *maxillary unguis* showed lower values in
236 the negative extreme (thin-billed prions).

237 Differences in bill shape among species were also observed in the dorsal perspective
238 (Fig. 4), although less so than in the profile view. The horizontal axis (RW1) explained
239 a high proportion of the total morphological variability (45.52%), grouping individuals
240 by width and length of bill, length of nares and length of *maxillary unguis* (Fig. 4): birds
241 with wider and shorter bills, shorter nares and shorter *maxillary unguis* tended to the
242 positive extreme (Antarctic prions), and those with narrower and longer bills, longer
243 nares and longer *maxillary unguis* to the negative extreme (blue petrels and thin-billed
244 prions). The vertical axis (RW2, 26.55% of the total morphological variability)
245 differentiated specimens by width of bill basis, shape of *culminicorn* and size of
246 *maxillary unguis* (Fig. 4): birds with wider bill basis, longer and narrower *culminicorn*

247 and smaller *maxillary unguis* were positioned towards the positive extreme (most
248 Antarctic prions) and those with narrower bill basis, shorter and wider *culminicorn* and
249 bigger *maxillary unguis* had more negative RW2 values (mostly blue petrels). Thin-
250 billed prions showed intermediate (near to zero) values.

251 *Differences in bill morphology between populations*

252 There were significant differences in bill size and in both profile and dorsal-view bill
253 shape between populations of Antarctic prions and blue petrels at different island
254 groups (Tables 4 and 5). Antarctic prions and blue petrels from South Georgia had a
255 bigger maximum bill depth than those breeding at Kerguelen (Tables 4 and 5), and blue
256 petrels from Diego Ramírez had bigger maximum bill depth than those from South
257 Georgia and Kerguelen (Tables 4 and 5). Antarctic prions from South Georgia had
258 longer culmens than at Kerguelen, and blue petrels at Diego Ramírez had shorter
259 culmens than at South Georgia and Kerguelen (Tables 4 and 5). In profile view, there
260 were differences among populations of the sympatric species (blue petrel and Antarctic
261 prion) (Fig. 3). Between-population morphological variation was significant in both
262 axes (Tables 4 and 5). Antarctic prions from Kerguelen had more rectangular nares,
263 shorter *culminicorn* and a bigger *maxillary* and *mandibular unguis* than at South
264 Georgia (lower RW1 values, Fig. 3). Blue petrels from Kerguelen (higher RW1 values)
265 had slightly more triangular nares, longer *culminicorn* and smaller *maxillary* and
266 *mandibular unguis* than at South Georgia and Diego Ramírez (Fig. 3). Also, both
267 Antarctic prions and blue petrels from South Georgia had deeper bills and sharper
268 *maxillary unguis* (higher RW2 values) than birds from other conspecific populations
269 (Fig. 3).

270 Dorsal shape variability between populations was more apparent for Antarctic prions
271 than blue petrels. Most birds from South Georgia and Diego Ramírez (blue petrel only)

272 had wider and shorter bills, as well as shorter nares and *maxillary unguis*, than
273 conspecifics at Kerguelen (higher RW1 values, Fig. 4). Most Antarctic prions and blue
274 petrels from Kerguelen had wider bills at the base, longer and narrower *culminicorn* and
275 smaller *maxillary unguis* (higher RW2 values, Fig. 4) than conspecifics at Diego
276 Ramírez (blue petrels) and South Georgia.

277 **Discussion**

278 Using geometric morphometrics, we found significant differences among species
279 and populations (island groups) in bill morphology of three planktivorous petrels.
280 Specifically, Antarctic prions have more robust and shorter bills with shorter nares,
281 while both blue petrels and thin-billed prions have slenderer and elongated bills, with
282 longer nares. The Antarctic prions from Kerguelen have longer and narrower bills, and
283 longer nares, than conspecifics from South Georgia. Overall, blue petrels from South
284 Georgia and Diego Ramírez Islands had wider and shorter bills, with shorter nares, than
285 conspecifics from Kerguelen Islands.

286 As the main function of the bill in seabirds is for foraging, niche differentiation
287 could presumably be the main driver of the interspecific and between-population
288 segregation in bill shape found in the present study. Antarctic prions have smaller but
289 more robust bills than blue petrels and thin-billed prions. Antarctic prions feed mainly
290 on crustaceans, including small copepods (see diet review in Table 1) and use a
291 hydroplaning, surface-filtration technique to capture very large numbers of these
292 abundant but small prey (Croxall and Prince 1980; Harper 1987; Warham 1990). These
293 strategies consist of sitting on the water, or swimming with the head below the surface
294 and filtering seawater through the palatal lamellae (a specialized adaptation for filter-
295 feeding on small copepods) that line the interior edge of the upper mandible (Prince
296 1980; Warham 1990). We hypothesise that a wide and deep bill is particularly adapted

297 to this feeding strategy because it allows filtering of a greater volume of water, thus
298 maximizing the number of small copepods that can be ingested at one time. Blue petrels
299 and thin-billed prions, on the other hand, have narrower and longer bills that lack palatal
300 lamellae. Although they also feed mostly on crustaceans, copepods are rare or absent,
301 and they consume a higher percentage of small fish and squid; this applies particularly
302 to thin-billed prions during incubation (Quillfeldt et al. 2010), compared with Antarctic
303 prions (Table 1). The foraging strategy of blue petrels mainly involves dipping while in
304 flight and selection of single, large prey items (Croxall and Prince 1980; Prince 1980).
305 Their long and narrow bills are more well adapted for quick movements and catching,
306 and may thus allow them to seize and tear quicker, more slippery and larger prey (fish
307 or squid) that cannot be ingested whole (Harper 1987; Warham 1990).

308 The morphological segregation of bill morphology observed between populations
309 from Kerguelen and South Georgia might be also related to prey selection. At South
310 Georgia, Antarctic prions consume on large numbers of small copepods, along with
311 Antarctic krill (Table 1), and the short but deeper bills are potentially better adapted for
312 filter-feeding (Croxall and Prince 1980; Prince 1980; Warham 1990; Cherel et al.
313 2002b). In contrast, the diet of Antarctic prions at Kerguelen is mainly composed of
314 hyperiid amphipods, primarily *T. gaudichaudii*, which are larger than copepods and are
315 caught mostly in pelagic waters (Table 1). This would explain why the bills of Antarctic
316 prions at Kerguelen are longer and narrower, thus more adapted for the capture of single
317 prey items. Blue petrels from South Georgia feed mainly on Antarctic krill and small
318 myctophids (length range: \approx 35-55 mm, Cherel et al. 2002a; Table 1). At Kerguelen,
319 besides crustaceans and myctophids, the diet of blue petrels also includes a high
320 percentage of larger prey such as squid, and fish *P. gracilis* (mean length: \approx 283 mm,
321 Cherel et al. 2002a) (Table 1). Hence, the long and narrow bills of blue petrels at this

322 site are also consistent with the requirement to seize and tear larger individual prey
323 items. Although there are no published studies of the diet of blue petrels at Diego
324 Ramírez, stomachs of adults contained lots of crustaceans (Euphausiids and
325 Amphipods), followed by remains of small fish and cephalopod beaks (Suazo, unpubl.
326 data). Therefore, we predict according to the similarity in bill morphology that their diet
327 is more similar to conspecifics from South Georgia, rather than Kerguelen.

328 In conclusion, our results reveal key interspecific and geographic differences in bill
329 shape and size of four small petrels, which seem likely to reflect variation in prey
330 selection and foraging style. Our study also highlights the usefulness of geometric
331 morphometric methods for investigating the bill morphology of seabirds. Further studies
332 linking bill shape and foraging strategies are needed to better identify the main
333 ecological drivers that lead to morphological displacement of biological structures in
334 seabirds.

335

336 **Compliance with Ethical Standards**

337 Conflicts of interest/Competing interests: The authors declare that they have no conflicts of
338 interest.

339 Ethics approval: Work on South Georgia was approved by the Animal Welfare and Ethical
340 Review Body (AWERB) of the British Antarctic Survey and was carried out under permit from
341 the Government of South Georgia and the Sandwich Islands. Work on New Island was
342 approved by the Falkland Islands Government (Environmental Office). Kerguelen data were
343 supported by the French Polar Institute Paul Emile Victor. Work on Diego Ramírez Islands was
344 supported by Armada de Chile (Chilean Navy, 3rd Naval Zone).

345 **Acknowledgments**

346 We are grateful to Julia Slezacek, Ruth Brown and Jaume Forcada for their help during the
347 fieldwork.

348 **Declarations**

349 **Funding**

350 M.I.L. was funded with an Erasmus+ internship of the European Union. MF was supported by
351 the project CLIFISH (CTM2015-66400-C3-3-R, MINECO/FEDER) co-funded by the
352 Ministerio de Economía y Competitividad of the Spanish government and by the European
353 Regional Development Fund (ERDF). JN was supported by the Spanish National Program
354 Ramón y Cajal (RYC-2015-17809). JN was funded with the Collaborative Gearing Scheme of
355 the NERC Antarctic Funding Initiative. PQ was supported by the Deutsche
356 Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG) in the framework of the priority programme SPP1154
357 “Antarctic Research with comparative investigations in Arctic ice areas”. Kerguelen data were
358 supported by the French Polar Institute Paul Emile Victor (IPEV, program no. 354 to FB). Work
359 on Diego Ramírez Islands was supported by Armada de Chile (Chilean Navy, 3rd Naval Zone).

360 **Availability of data and material:** Not applicable

361 **Code availability:** Not applicable

362 **Consent to participate:** Not applicable

363 **Consent for publication:** Not applicable

364

365 **References**

- 366 Adams DC (1999) Methods for shape analysis of landmark data from articulated structures.
367 Evol Ecol Res 1:959–970.
- 368 Adams DC, Rohlf FJ, Slice DE (2004) Geometric morphometrics: Ten years of progress
369 following the ‘revolution.’ Ital J Zool 71:5–16. doi: 10.1080/11250000409356545
- 370 Adams DC, Rohlf FJ, Slice DE (2013) A field comes of age: Geometric morphometrics in the
371 21st century. Hystrix 24:7–14. doi: 10.4404/hystrix-24.1-6283
- 372 Ainley DG, Ribic CA, Fraser WR (1992) Does prey preference affect habitat choice in Antarctic
373 seabirds? Mar Ecol Prog Ser 90:207–221. doi: 10.3354/meps090207
- 374 Aldrich J, James F (1991) Ecogeographic Variation In The American Robin (*Turdus*
375 *Migratorius*). Auk Ornithol Adv 108:230–249. doi: 10.1093/auk/108.2.230
- 376 Armstrong P, Forbes V (1997) The Falkland Islands and their Adjacent Maritime Area.
377 Maritime Briefing
- 378 Atkinson A, Whitehouse MJ, Priddle J, Cripps GC, Ward P, Brandon MA (2001) South
379 Georgia, Antarctica: A productive, cold water, pelagic ecosystem. Mar Ecol Prog Ser
380 216:279–308. doi: 10.3354/meps216279
- 381 Barbraud C, Delord K (2006) Population census of blue petrels *Halobaena caerulea* at Mayes
382 Island, Iles Kerguelen. Antarct Sci 18:199–204. doi: 10.1017/S095410200600023X
- 383 Berns CM, Adams DC (2010) Bill Shape and Sexual Shape Dimorphism between two Species
384 of Temperate Hummingbirds: Black-Chinned Hummingbird (*Archilochus alexandri*) and
385 Ruby-Throated Hummingbird (*A. colubris*). Auk 127:626–635. doi:
386 10.1525/auk.2010.09213
- 387 Boag PT, Grant PR (1981) Intense natural selection in a population of Darwin’s finches
388 (geospizinae) in the Galápagos. Science (80-) 214:82–85. doi:
389 10.1126/science.214.4516.82
- 390 Brooke M (2004) Albatrosses and petrels across the world. Oxford University Press
- 391 Buckley FG, Buckley PA (1980) Habitat Selection and Marine Birds. In: Behavior of Marine

392 Animals. Plenum Press, New York, pp 69–112

393 Bull LS (2006) Geographical variation in the morphology of the Wedge-tailed Shearwater
394 (*Puffinus pacificus*). Emu 106:233–243. doi: 10.1071/MU05050

395 Bull LS, Haywood J, Pledger S (2004) Components of phenotypic variation in the
396 morphometrics of shearwater (*Puffinus*) species. Ibis (Lond 1859) 146:38–45. doi:
397 10.1111/j.1474-919X.2004.00209.x

398 Catry P, Campos A, Segurado P, Silva M, Strange I (2003) Population census and nesting
399 habitat selection of thin-billed prion *Pachyptila belcheri* on New Island, Falkland Islands.
400 Polar Biol 26:202–207. doi: 10.1007/s00300-002-0465-9

401 Cherel Y, Bocher P, Trouvé C, Weimerskirch H (2002a) Diet and feeding ecology of blue
402 petrels *Halobaena caerulea* at Iles Kerguelen, Southern Indian Ocean. Mar Ecol Prog Ser
403 228:283–299. doi: 10.3354/meps228283

404 Cherel Y, Bocher P, De Broyer C, Hobson KA (2002b) Food and feeding ecology of the
405 sympatric thin-billed *Pachyptila belcheri* and Antarctic *P. desolata* prions at Iles
406 Kerguelen, Southern Indian Ocean. Mar Ecol Prog Ser 228:263–281. doi:
407 10.3354/meps228263

408 Cherel Y, Connan M, Jaeger A, Richard P (2014) Seabird year-round and historical feeding
409 ecology: Blood and feather $\delta^{13}\text{C}$ and ^{15}N values document foraging plasticity of small
410 sympatric petrels. Mar Ecol Prog Ser 505:267–280. doi: 10.3354/meps10795

411 Cherel Y, Quillfeldt P, Delord K, Weimerskirch H (2016) Combination of At-Sea Activity,
412 Geolocation and Feather Stable Isotopes Documents Where and When Seabirds Molt.
413 Front Ecol Evol. doi: 10.3389/fevo.2016.00003

414 Colombelli-Négrel D (2016) Both natural selection and isolation by distance explain phenotypic
415 divergence in bill size and body mass between South Australian little penguin colonies.
416 Ecol Evol 6:7965–7975. doi: 10.1002/ece3.2516

417 Corman AM, Mendel B, Voigt CC, Garthe S (2016) Varying foraging patterns in response to
418 competition? A multicolony approach in a generalist seabird. Ecol Evol 6:974–986. doi:
419 10.1002/ece3.1884

420 Croxall JP, Prince PA (1980) Food, feeding ecology and ecological segregation of seabirds at
421 South Georgia. *Environment* 103–131.

422 Croxall JP, Prince PA, Reid K (1997) Dietary segregation of krill-eating South Georgia
423 seabirds. *J Zool* 242:531–556. doi: 10.1111/j.1469-7998.1997.tb03854.x

424 Farré M, Tuset VM, Cartes JE, Massutí E, Lombarte A (2016a) Depth-related trends in
425 morphological and functional diversity of demersal fish assemblages in the western
426 Mediterranean Sea. *Prog Oceanogr* 147:22–37. doi: 10.1016/j.pocean.2016.07.006

427 Farré M, Tuset VM, Maynou F, Recasens L, Lombarte A (2016b) Selection of landmarks and
428 semilandmarks in fishes for geometric morphometric analyses: a comparative study based
429 on analytical methods. *Sci Mar* 80:175–186. doi: 10.3989/scimar.04280.15a

430 Foster DJ, Podos J, Hendry AP (2008) A geometric morphometric appraisal of beak shape in
431 Darwin’s finches. *J Evol Biol* 21:263–275. doi: 10.1111/j.1420-9101.2007.01449.x

432 Gémard C, Aubin T, Bonadonna F (2019) Males’ calls carry information about individual
433 identity and morphological characteristics of the caller in burrowing petrels. *J Avian Biol.*
434 doi: 10.1111/jav.02270

435 Grant BR, Grant PR (1989) *Evolutionary Dynamics of a Natural Population: The Large Cactus*
436 *Finch of the Galápagos*, The Univer. Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data,
437 Chicago

438 Grémillet D, Omo GD, Ryan PG, Peters G, Ropert-coudert Y, Weeks SJ (2004) GPS tracking of
439 Cape gannets and intra-specific competition: a case study based on GPS tracking of Cape
440 gannets from neighbouring colonies. *Mar Ecol Prog Ser* 268:265–279.

441 Hammer Ø, Harper DAT, Ryan PD (2001) Past: Paleontological statistics software package for
442 education and data analysis. *Palaeontol Electron* 4:1–9.

443 Harper PC (1987) Feeding behaviour and other notes on 20 species of Procellariiformes at sea.
444 *Notornis* 34:169–192.

445 Jones CW, Phillips RA, Grecian WJ, Ryan PG (2020) Ecological segregation of two
446 superabundant, morphologically similar, sister seabird taxa breeding in sympatry. *Mar*
447 *Biol* 167:45. doi: 10.1007/s00227-020-3645-7

448 Kleindorfer S, Chapman TW, Winkler H, Sulloway FJ (2006) Adaptive divergence in
449 contiguous populations of Darwin's Small Ground Finch (*Geospiza fuliginosa*). *Evol Ecol*
450 *Res* 8:357–372.

451 Lawton K, Robertson G, Kirkwood R, Valencia J, Schlatter R, Smith D (2006) An estimate of
452 population sizes of burrowing seabirds at the Diego Ramirez archipelago, Chile, using
453 distance sampling and burrow-scoping. *Polar Biol* 29:229–238. doi: 10.1007/s00300-005-
454 0043-z

455 Lewis S, Sherratt TN, Hamer KC, Wanless S (2001) Evidence of intra-specific competition for
456 food in a pelagic seabird. *Nature* 412:816–819. doi: 10.1038/35090566

457 Mayr E, Diamond J (2001) *The Birds of Northern Melanesia: Speciation, Evology and*
458 *Biogeography*. Oxford University Press U.K.

459 Militão T, Gómez-Díaz E, Kaliontzopoulou A, González-Solís J (2014) Comparing multiple
460 criteria for species identification in two recently diverged seabirds. *PLoS One* 9:1–27. doi:
461 10.1371/journal.pone.0115650

462 Moum T, Árnason E (2001) Genetic diversity and population history of two related seabird
463 species based on mitochondrial DNA control region sequences. *Mol Ecol* 10:2463–2478.
464 doi: 10.1046/j.0962-1083.2001.01375.x

465 Navarro J, Kaliontzopoulou A, González-Solís J (2009) Sexual dimorphism in bill morphology
466 and feeding ecology in Cory's shearwater (*Calonectris diomedea*). *Zoology* 112:128–138.
467 doi: 10.1016/j.zool.2008.05.001

468 Navarro J, Votier SC, Aguzzi J, Chiesa JJ, Forero MG, Phillips RA (2013) Ecological
469 Segregation in Space, Time and Trophic Niche of Sympatric Planktivorous Petrels. *PLoS*
470 *One* 8:e62897. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0062897

471 Navarro J, Cardador L, Brown R, Phillips RA (2015) Spatial distribution and ecological niches
472 of non-breeding planktivorous petrels. *Sci Rep* 5:12164. doi: 10.1038/srep12164

473 Nebel S (2005) Latitudinal clines in bill length and sex ratio in a migratory shorebird: A case of
474 resource partitioning? *Acta Oecologica* 28:33–38. doi: 10.1016/j.actao.2005.02.002

475 Nebel S, Jackson DL, Elnor RW (2005) Functional association of bill morphology and foraging

476 behaviour in calidrid sandpipers. *Anim Biol* 55:235–243. doi: 10.1163/1570756054472818

477 Phillips RA, Silk JRD, Croxall JP (2005) Foraging and provisioning strategies of the light-

478 mantled sooty albatross at South Georgia: Competition and co-existence with sympatric

479 pelagic predators. *Mar Ecol Prog Ser* 285:259–270. doi: 10.3354/meps285259

480 Phillips RA, McGill RAR, Dawson DA, Bearhop S (2011) Sexual segregation in distribution,

481 diet and trophic level of seabirds: Insights from stable isotope analysis. *Mar Biol*

482 158:2199–2208. doi: 10.1007/s00227-011-1725-4

483 Prince PA (1980) The food and feeding ecology of Blue petrel (*Halobaena caerulea*) and Dove

484 prion (*Pachyptila desolata*). *J Zool* 190:59–76. doi: 10.1111/j.1469-7998.1980.tb01423.x

485 Prince PA, Croxall JP (1983) Birds of South Georgia: new records and re-evaluations of status.

486 *Br Antarct Surv Bull* 59:15–27.

487 Quillfeldt P, McGill RAR, Masello JF, Weiss F, Strange IJ, Brickle P, Furness RW (2008)

488 Stable isotope analysis reveals sexual and environmental variability and individual

489 consistency in foraging of thin-billed prions. *Mar Ecol Prog Ser* 373:137–148. doi:

490 10.3354/meps07751

491 Quillfeldt P, Michalik A, Veit-Köhler G, Strange IJ, Masello JF (2010) Inter-annual changes in

492 diet and foraging trip lengths in a small pelagic seabird, the thin-billed prion *Pachyptila*

493 *belcheri*. *Mar Biol* 157:2043–2050. doi: 10.1007/s00227-010-1472-y

494 Quillfeldt P, Masello JF, Navarro J, Phillips RA (2013) Year-round distribution suggests spatial

495 segregation of two small petrel species in the South Atlantic. *J Biogeogr* 40:430–441. doi:

496 10.1111/jbi.12008

497 Quillfeldt P, Phillips RA, Marx M, Masello JF (2014) Colony attendance and at-sea distribution

498 of thin-billed prions during the early breeding season. *J Avian Biol* 45:315–324. doi:

499 10.1111/jav.00307

500 Quillfeldt P, Cherel Y, Delord K, Weimerkirch H (2015) Cool, cold or colder? Spatial

501 segregation of prions and blue petrels is explained by differences in preferred sea surface

502 temperatures. *Biol Lett* 11:20141090. doi: 10.1098/rsbl.2014.1090

503 Quillfeldt P, Moodley Y, Weimerskirch H, Cherel Y, Delord K, Phillips RA, Navarro J,

504 Calderón L, Masello JF (2017) Does genetic structure reflect differences in non-breeding
505 movements? A case study in small, highly mobile seabirds. BMC Evol Biol 17:160. doi:
506 10.1186/s12862-017-1008-x

507 R Core Team (2018) R: A language and environment for statistical computing. R Foundation
508 for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria. URL: <https://www.r-project.org/>.

509 Reid K, Croxall JP, Edwards TM (1997) Interannual variation in the diet of the antarctic prion
510 *Pachyptila desolata* at South Georgia. Emu 97:126–132. doi: 10.1071/MU97016

511 Rohlf FJ (2017) tpsDig2 2.31 relative warps software.

512 Rohlf FJ (2019) tpsRelw 1.70 Relative Warps.

513 Rohlf JF, Marcus LF (1993) A revolution morphometrics. Trends Ecol Evol 8:129–132. doi:
514 10.1016/0169-5347(93)90024-J

515 Schlatter RP, Riveros GM (1997) Natural history of the Diego Ramirez Archipelago, Chile. Sep
516 Client Ina 47:87–112.

517 Schluter (2000) Ecological Character Displacement in Adaptive Radiation. Am Nat 156:S4–
518 S16. doi: 10.2307/3079223

519 Tokita M, Yano W, James HF, Abzhanov A (2017) Cranial shape evolution in adaptive
520 radiations of birds: Comparative morphometrics of Darwin’s finches and Hawaiian
521 honeycreepers. Philos Trans R Soc B Biol Sci. doi: 10.1098/rstb.2015.0481

522 Trallero L, Farré M, Phillips RA, Navarro J (2019) Geometric morphometrics reveal
523 interspecific and sexual differences in bill morphology in four sympatric planktivorous
524 petrels. J Zool 307:167–177. doi: 10.1111/jzo.12631

525 Van Oordt F, Torres-Mura JC, Hertel F (2018) Ecomorphology and foraging behaviour of
526 Pacific boobies. Ibis (Lond 1859) 160:313–326. doi: 10.1111/ibi.12545

527 Wakefield ED, Phillips RA, Matthiopoulos J (2014) Habitat-mediated population limitation in a
528 colonial central-place forager: The sky is not the limit for the black-browed albatross. Proc
529 R Soc B Biol Sci. doi: 10.1098/rspb.2013.2883

530 Warham J (1990) The petrels: their ecology and breeding systems. A & C Black, London


531 Warham J (1996) The Behaviour, Population Biology and Physiology of the Petrels. London

532 Weimerskirch H, Zotier R, Jouventin P (1989) The avifauna of the kerguelen islands. *Emu*
533 89:15–29. doi: 10.1071/MU9890015

534 Wojczulanis-Jakubas K, Kilikowska A, Harding AMA, Jakubas D, Karnovsky NJ, Steen H,
535 Strøm H, Welcker J, Gavriilo M, Lifjeld JT, Johnsen A (2014) Weak population genetic
536 differentiation in the most numerous Arctic seabird, the little auk. *Polar Biol* 37:621–630.
537 doi: 10.1007/s00300-014-1462-5


538 Zelditch ML, Swidersky DL, Sheeds HD, Fink WL (2004) *Geometric morphometrics for*
539 *biologists: a primer*. London: Elsevier Academic Press

540 Zhou M, Zhu Y, D'Ovidio F, Park Y-H, Durand I, Kestenare E, Sanial V, Van-Beek
541 P, Queguiner B, Carlotti F, Blain S (2014) Surface currents and upwelling in Kerguelen
542 Plateau regions. *Biogeosciences Discuss* 11:6845–6876. doi: 10.5194/bgd-11-6845-2014
543




545 **Fig. 1** Location of the different breeding colonies of Antarctic prions, thin-billed prions and
 546 blue petrels sampled in this study

547




548
 549
 550
 551
 552
 553
 554
 555
 556 **Fig. 2** (a) Bill morphology and measurements: 1 = *superior unguicorn-maxillary unguis*, 2 =
 557 *inferior unguicorn-mandibular unguis*, 3 = *ramicorn*, 4 = *latericorn*, 5 = *nares*, 6 = *culminicorn*
 558 and 7 = *tomia-cutting edges*. Landmarks (red dots) and semilandmarks (green dots) used to

559 describe the shape of (b) the profile, and (c) the dorsal view of the bill. All pictures are of a blue
 560 petrel



561 **Fig. 3** (a) Morphospace of the shape of the right profile of the bills of Antarctic prions (AP)
 562 from South Georgia and Kerguelen Islands, blue petrels (BP) from South Georgia, Kerguelen
 563 and Diego Ramírez Islands, and thin-billed prions (TBP) from Falkland Islands. (b)
 564 Descriptions of the meaning of the relative warps (RW1 and RW2), corresponding to the
 565 horizontal and vertical axes of profile morphospace (red/orange and blue/green indicate higher
 566 and lower shape variation, respectively)



568 **Fig. 4** (a) Morphospace of the shape of the dorsal view of the bills of Antarctic prions (AP)
 569 from South Georgia and Kerguelen Islands, blue petrels (BP) from South Georgia, Kerguelen
 570 and Diego Ramírez Islands, and thin-billed prions (TBP) from Falkland Islands. (b)
 571 Descriptions of the meaning of the relative warps (RW1 and RW2), corresponding to the
 572 horizontal and vertical axes of dorsal morphospace (red/orange and blue/green indicate higher
 573 and lower shape variation, respectively)

574 **Tables**575 **Table 1.** Review of the diet of Antarctic prions and blue petrels breeding in South Georgia and the Kerguelen Islands, and thin-billed prions breeding in the Falkland Islands.

576 There are no published studies of the diet of blue petrels at the Diego Ramírez Islands.

Species	Colony	Type of prey	Average frequency of occurrence (%)	Prey preferences	References
Antarctic prion	South Georgia	Cephalopod	11.1	<i>Euphausia superba</i> , Amphipoda (<i>Themisto gaudichaudii</i>), Copepoda	Prince (1980); Croxall <i>et al.</i> (1997); Reid, Croxall & Edwards (1997)
		Fish	28.2		
		Crustacean	96.8		
	Kerguelen Islands	Cephalopod	15.4	<i>Oegopsida sp.</i>	Cherel <i>et al.</i> (2002a)
		Fish	31.7	Myctophidae	
		Crustacean	100	Amphipoda (<i>T. gaudichaudii</i>)	
Blue petrel	South Georgia	Cephalopod	6.4	<i>E. superba</i>	Prince (1980)
		Fish	83.3		
		Crustacean	97.4		
	Kerguelen Islands	Cephalopod	14.3	<i>Oegopsida sp.</i>	Cherel <i>et al.</i> (2002b)
		Fish	81.0	Myctophidae, <i>Paradiplospinus gracilis</i>	
		Crustacean	100	Amphipoda (<i>T. gaudichaudii</i>), <i>Thysanoessa sp.</i>	
Thin-billed prion	Falkland Islands	Cephalopod	55.9	Squid (<i>Gonatus antarcticus</i>)	Quillfeldt <i>et al.</i> (2010)
		Fish	12.5		
		Crustacean	68.6	Euphausiids, Amphipoda (<i>T. gaudichaudii</i>)	

577

578 **Table 2.** Description of the landmarks and semilandmarks used to define the shape of the profile and
 579 dorsal views of the bills of Antarctic prions, thin-billed prions and blue petrels (following Trallero *et al.*,

Profile		Dorsal	
Landmark	Description	Landmark	Description
1	Upper jaw, most distal tip of maxilla (<i>maxillary unguis</i>)	1	Upper jaw, most distal tip of maxilla (<i>maxillary unguis</i>)
2	Lower jaw, most distal tip of the mandibular zone (<i>mandibular unguis</i>)	2	Articulation between the upper and lower <i>ramicorn</i> (right side)
3	Anterior tip of the inferior <i>ramicorn</i> at the conjuncture with the inferior <i>unguicorn</i>	3	The most distal tip of the <i>latericorn</i> (right side)
4	Posterior tip of the lower <i>ramicorn</i>	4	Lower and posterior border of the nare, at the junction with the posterior point of the <i>latericorn</i> joint (right

580 2019).

5	Posterior tip of the <i>latericorn</i>	5	Upper and posterior border of the nare
6	Lower and posterior border of the nares, at the junction with the posterior point of the <i>latericorn</i> joint	6	Point of maximum curvature at the rostral end of the right nare
7	Upper and posterior border of the nares	7	Point of maximum curvature at the rostral end of the left nare
8	Point of maximum curvature of the superior and anterior border of the nare	8	Lower and posterior border of the nare, at the junction with the posterior point of the <i>latericorn</i> joint (left side)
9	Lower and anterior border, in the joint with the <i>latericorn</i>	9	The most distal tip of the <i>latericorn</i> (left side)
10	Articulation between the upper anterior border of the <i>culminicorn</i> and the posterior superior border of the maxillary zone	10	Articulation between the upper and lower <i>ramicorn</i> (left side)
14	Articulation between the upper and lower <i>ramicorn</i>		
Semilandmark			
11, 12, 13	Curvature of the maxillary nail, between landmarks 1 and 10		

581

Table 3. Percentage explained for the first five relative warps (RW) in both dorsal and profile perspectives.

	RW1	RW2	RW3	RW4	RW5
Dorsal					
Percentage (%)	45.52	26.55	9.24	6.75	2.96
Cumulative percentage (%)	45.52	72.07	81.31	88.07	91.02
Profile					
Percentage (%)	39.12	21.15	10.73	6.46	4.11
Cumulative percentage (%)	39.12	60.27	71.00	77.46	81.57

582

583

584 **Table 4.** Comparison of bill size and shape variation measurements between Antarctic prions, thin-billed prions and blue petrels breeding at different island groups. Values
585 are mean \pm standard deviation (sample size). Values with the same subscript indicate no significant difference between species (letters) or colonies (numbers) based on Mann-
586 Whitney tests.

	Antarctic prion		Blue petrel			Thin-billed prion
	Kerguelen Islands	South Georgia	Kerguelen Islands	South Georgia	Diego Ramírez Islands	Falkland Islands
Maximum bill depth	8.44 \pm 0.39 (20) _{A1}	12.42 \pm 1.04 (53) _{A2}	9.45 \pm 0.40 (14) _{B3}	10.12 \pm 0.64 (27) _{B4}	10.93 \pm 0.46 (29) _{B5}	7.41 \pm 0.35 (17) _{C6}
Bill depth at nares		9.13 \pm 0.90 (53) _{A1}		7.51 \pm 0.47 (28) _{B2}	7.39 \pm 0.47 (29) _{B2}	
Culmen length	26.91 \pm 1.01 (20) _{A1}	28.19 \pm 1.16 (53) _{A2}	26.08 \pm 1.06 (14) _{B3}	26.32 \pm 1.10 (28) _{B1,3}	25.21 \pm 0.99 (29) _{B4}	25.10 \pm 0.97 (17) _{C4}
Dorsal						
RW1	-0.01 \pm 0.02 (54) _{A1}	0.08 \pm 0.02 (55) _{A2}	-0.06 \pm 0.03 (37) _{B3}	-0.02 \pm 0.03 (29) _{B4}	-0.01 \pm 0.02 (29) _{B1,4}	-0.03 \pm 0.02 (23) _{B4}
RW2	0.04 \pm 0.02 (54) _{A1}	0.01 \pm 0.02 (55) _{A2}	-0.01 \pm 0.03 (37) _{B3}	-0.03 \pm 0.02 (29) _{B4}	-0.06 \pm 0.02 (29) _{B5}	0.003 \pm 0.016 (23) _{C2,3}
Profile						
RW1	0.04 \pm 0.01 (54) _{A1}	0.05 \pm 0.02 (60) _{A2}	-0.04 \pm 0.01 (35) _{B3}	-0.06 \pm 0.02 (29) _{B4}	-0.06 \pm 0.02 (29) _{B4}	-0.01 \pm 0.01 (27) _{C5}
RW2	-0.02 \pm 0.02 (54) _{A1}	0.03 \pm 0.02 (60) _{A2}	0.01 \pm 0.02 (35) _{B3}	0.04 \pm 0.02 (29) _{B4}	-0.001 \pm 0.024 (29) _{B3}	-0.06 \pm 0.02 (27) _{C5}

587

Table 5. Summary of the Kruskal-Wallis tests examining variation in bill size and morphology (dorsal and profile) between Antarctic prions, thin-billed prions and blue petrels breeding at different island groups.

	Species		Colony		Species*colony	
	H	<i>p</i>	H	<i>p</i>	H	<i>p</i>
Maximum bill depth	58.2	<0.001	103.8	<0.001	138.0	<0.001
Bill depth at nares	70.2	<0.001	26.2	<0.001	96.4	<0.001
Culmen length	79.4	<0.001	68.0	<0.001	96.4	<0.001
Dorsal-RW1	93.8	<0.001	70.7	<0.001	160.2	<0.001
Dorsal-RW2	101.0	<0.001	92.2	<0.001	152.4	<0.001
Profile-RW1	189.3	<0.001	56.2	<0.001	195.9	<0.001
Profile-RW2	70.7	<0.001	139.4	<0.001	157.3	<0.001