

**Which temporal resolution to consider when
investigating the impact of climatic data on population
dynamics? The case of the lesser horseshoe bat
(*Rhinolophus hipposideros*)**

Pierre-Loup Jan, Olivier Farcy, Josselin Boireau, Erwan Le Texier, Alice Baudoin, Pascaline Le Gouar, Sebastien J. Puechmaille, Eric J. Petit

► **To cite this version:**

Pierre-Loup Jan, Olivier Farcy, Josselin Boireau, Erwan Le Texier, Alice Baudoin, et al.. Which temporal resolution to consider when investigating the impact of climatic data on population dynamics? The case of the lesser horseshoe bat (*Rhinolophus hipposideros*). *Oecologia*, Springer Verlag, 2017, 184 (4), pp.749-761. <10.1007/s00442-017-3901-9>. <hal-01580367>

HAL Id: hal-01580367

<https://hal-univ-rennes1.archives-ouvertes.fr/hal-01580367>

Submitted on 4 Oct 2017

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 **Which temporal resolution to consider when investigating the impact of**
2 **climatic data on population dynamics? The case of the lesser horseshoe bat**
3 **(*Rhinolophus hipposideros*).**

4 **Authors :** Pierre-Loup Jan^{1*}, Olivier Farcy², Josselin Boireau³, Erwan Le Texier⁴, Alice
5 Baudoin⁴, Pascaline Le Gouar⁴, Sébastien J. Puechmaille⁵, Eric J. Petit¹

6 ¹ *UMR 985 ESE, Ecology and Ecosystem Health, INRA, Agrocampus Ouest,, F-35042 Rennes*
7 *cedex, France*

8 ² *Bretagne Vivante, 29221 Brest cedex 2, France*

9 ³ *Groupe Mammologique Breton, 29450 Sizun, France*

10 ⁴ *UMR 6553 ECOBIO, CNRS, Université Rennes 1, Station Biologique de Paimpont, F-35380*
11 *Paimpont, France*

12 ⁵ *Zoological Institute and Museum, Greifswald University, 17489 Greifswald, Germany*

13 * Corresponding author. Mail : pierreloup.jan@gmail.com, Phone : (+33)2 23 48 70 38

14

15

16

17

18

19 ***Application for Oecologia Highlighted Student Paper:***

20 *Determining the temporal resolution of climatic variables when identifying their impact on*
21 *wild population abundance is a rising concern. Our work proposes a way free of most*
22 *assumptions for doing it.*

Author Contributions: OF and JB provided count data. ELT and AB developed methodology.

PLJ, PLG, SJP and EJP analyzed the data. PLJ, PLG, SJP and EJP wrote the manuscript.

23 **Abstract**

24 Climatic variables are often considered when studying environmental impacts on population
25 dynamics of terrestrial species. However, the temporal resolution considered varies depending
26 on studies, even among studies of the same taxa. Most studies interested in climatic impacts
27 on populations tend to average climatic data across timeframes covering life cycle periods of
28 the organism in question or longer, even though most climatic databases provide at least a
29 monthly resolution. We explored the impact of climatic variables on lesser horseshoe bat
30 (*Rhinolophus hipposideros*) demography based on count data collected at 94 maternity
31 colonies from 2000 to 2014 in Brittany, France. Meteorological data were considered using
32 different time resolutions (month, life cycle period and year) to investigate their adequacy.
33 Model averaging was used to detect significant predictors for each temporal resolution. Our
34 results show that the finest temporal resolution, e.g. month, was more informative than
35 coarser ones. Precipitation predictors were particularly decisive, with a negative impact on
36 colony sizes when rainfall occurred in October, and a positive impact for June precipitations.
37 Fecundity was influenced by April weather. This highlights the strong impact of climatic
38 conditions during crucial but short time periods on the population dynamics of bats. We
39 demonstrate the importance of choosing an appropriate time resolution and suggest that
40 analogous studies should consider fine-scale temporal resolution (e.g. month) to better grasp
41 the relationship between population dynamics and climatic conditions.

42 **Key Words**

43 *Rhinolophus hipposideros*, temporal resolution, model averaging, climatic variables,
44 population demography.

45

46

47

48 **Introduction**

49 Weather and climatic conditions have a great influence on the population dynamics of
50 most species (Kingsolver 1989; Saether et al. 2004; Forrester and Wittmer 2013). Climatic
51 factors directly impact organisms, especially in cases of extreme climatic events (Şekercioğlu
52 et al. 2012; Leigh et al. 2015). They also affect species' dynamics by altering their
53 environment (Peterman and Semlitsch 2014; Akesson 2016; Hasan and Ansari 2016; Ceglar
54 et al. 2016). Because of their great impact on species at the bottom of the food chain, weather
55 conditions are also known to have a drastic impact on food availability (White 2008). For
56 these reasons, the abundance and distributions of species are expected to be altered in the
57 current context of global climate change (Thomas et al. 2004).

58 In this context, understanding the impact of climatic factors on population dynamics
59 and demography appears to be fundamental to interpret or predict long term population trends
60 (McLean et al. 2016; Urban et al. 2016). This topic has been studied for many species,
61 generally using long-term observed abundance or other population dynamics metrics based on
62 count or capture data at one particular moment in the life cycle of the species. These data are
63 then modelled as a function of weather, considering mainly temperature and rainfall, but
64 sometimes including other variables (Bruggeman et al. 2015; Kerbiriou et al. 2015; Bleho et
65 al. 2015; Kanno et al. 2016; Dugger et al. 2016). Obviously, variables included in the model
66 directly depend on the considered species biology, but more surprisingly, the temporal
67 resolution considered is also highly variable. The latter citations correspond to recent studies
68 that deal with various taxa, and all of them have used climatic databases offering a monthly (if
69 not daily) resolution. Monthly resolution involves a great number of climatic variables. In a
70 few cases, the number of variables were reduced by pre-selecting months based on
71 preliminary analysis (Parent et al. 2016) or on expert knowledge (Kerbiriou et al. 2015). Most
72 studies have aggregated climatic data to correspond to climatic seasons (varying from two to

73 six month periods) that are consistent with the life cycle of the species of interest (Bruggeman
74 et al. 2015; Bleho et al. 2015; Ciuti et al. 2015; Kanno et al. 2016; Dugger et al. 2016;
75 Masciocchi et al. 2016; Townsend et al. 2016). Occasionally, studies even considered these
76 data by averaging them over a year (Nouvellet et al. 2013). Another option is to mix different
77 time resolutions in the same models, such as in BIOCLIM derived models, which include 19
78 variables that are aggregated on a yearly, seasonal or monthly (extreme month) basis and are
79 now commonly used to predict species distributions (Barbet-Massin and Jetz 2014; Del Toro
80 et al. 2015; Beltramino et al. 2015; Ray et al. 2016). The absence of clearly defined criteria to
81 select the temporal resolution is problematic (van de Pol et al. 2016), particularly for
82 population dynamic processes, because the temporal resolution considered when studying
83 these processes can greatly affect the outcome of statistical or predictive models (Radchuk et
84 al. 2014).

85 Bat populations are particularly sensitive to climatic variations, and are recognized as
86 valuable indicators of climate change (Jones et al. 2009). For example, in temperate regions,
87 cold temperature will greatly reduce their food availability, e.g. the abundance and activity
88 level of insect prey (Hoying and Kunz 1998; Ciechanowski et al. 2007). Inclement weather,
89 including heavy rain, will also increase the energetic cost for flying and maintaining
90 euthermy, and will reduce the efficiency of echolocation (Reiter 2004a; Burles et al. 2009).
91 Furthermore, numerous studies have demonstrated the impact of climatic conditions on the
92 activity, survival, and reproductive success of bats (Adams and Hayes 2008; Burles et al.
93 2009; Schorcht et al. 2009; Frick et al. 2010; Adams 2010; Amorim et al. 2012; Lučan et al.
94 2013; Amorim et al. 2015). Climate change during the last decades has already caused a shift
95 in the distributional range of some bats (Uhrin et al. 2016; Wu 2016), a process that will
96 probably be exacerbated during the next decades (Rebelo et al. 2010).

97 Studies of bat population dynamics usually take into account weather as one of the
98 fundamental explanatory variables. Those studies are mainly based on counts or captures
99 made at one particular moment in the life cycle, such as during parturition or the hibernation
100 period (Grindal et al. 1992; Zahn 1999; Hoyle et al. 2001; López-Roig and Serra-Cobo 2014;
101 Kerbiriou et al. 2015). Climatic factors usually include rainfall and temperature, which can be
102 the daily mean (Zahn 1999; Schorcht et al. 2009; Kerbiriou et al. 2015) or minimum
103 temperature (Grindal et al. 1992; Hoyle et al. 2001; López-Roig and Serra-Cobo 2014). Some
104 other variables, such as drought severity, winter severity or winter duration, can also be
105 included, using different proxies (Schorcht et al. 2009; López-Roig and Serra-Cobo 2014;
106 Amorim et al. 2015; Kerbiriou et al. 2015). Once again, the time resolution of these variables
107 differs between studies, and climatic factors can be considered for specific months (Grindal et
108 al. 1992; Zahn 1999; Kerbiriou et al. 2015), averaged over seasons consistent with the species
109 biology (Schorcht et al. 2009; Frick et al. 2010; Adams 2010; López-Roig and Serra-Cobo
110 2014), or averaged over even longer periods (Hoyle et al. 2001; Amorim et al. 2015).

111 The lesser horseshoe bat (*Rhinolophus hipposideros*) is a small insectivorous bat of
112 recognized conservation concern (Bontadina et al. 2000). This bat forages exclusively in
113 woodlands, preferentially in dense areas (Bontadina et al. 2002; Reiter 2004b), and is already
114 considered as a good indicator of biodiversity loss (Haysom et al. 2013). After the last
115 glaciation, this species expanded its range from southern Europe to northern parts of Europe
116 (Dool et al. 2013), into environments with colder and less stable climate (Bontadina et al.
117 2000). In spring, females leave the underground sites used as hibernacula and gather in
118 maternity roosts, which are generally in warmer places, like attics, and the parturition and
119 rearing of offspring takes place during June and July. Mating then occurs principally between
120 the end of September and the beginning of the hibernation period (Gaisler 1966). The life
121 cycle and activity of *R. hipposideros* are particularly affected by weather conditions. This bat

122 prefers higher temperature for its maternity roost than other attic dwelling species
123 (Kayikcioglu and Zahn 2004). However, if available, they will switch to colder satellite roosts
124 if temperatures become too high during summer. These observations suggest direct effects of
125 weather on the thermoregulation and energy budget (Kayikcioglu and Zahn 2004;
126 Seckerdieck et al. 2005). Inclement weather (i.e. cool and wet) before parturition generally
127 delays birth and decreases the average size at birth and growth rate of the juveniles. These
128 effects are explained by energetic costs, implying more torpor and a slowed metabolism for
129 pregnant females, as well as by decreased food availability (Reiter 2004a). However, the
130 global effect of weather conditions on the overall population dynamics of *R. hipposideros*,
131 crucial information for understanding population trends, is not documented (Bontadina et al.
132 2000).

133 As climatic impact can greatly differ depending on the level of response considered
134 (McLean et al. 2016), we investigated two proxies of the dynamics of *R. hipposideros*
135 colonies: colony size, which is the result of the dynamics of colonies, and fecundity, one
136 parameter that drives these dynamics. In order to understand the impact of climatic conditions
137 on these parameters, we used count data from 94 colonies (Brittany, France) collected by
138 local associations during fifteen years. These count data offer reliable estimates of colony size
139 as confirmed by independent non-invasive Capture-Mark Recapture methods (Puechmaile
140 and Petit 2007). Brittany populations are at the species range margin, and thus not at their
141 optimal climatic conditions, a situation where population dynamics are likely to be strongly
142 influenced by the weather (Thomas et al. 1994; Geber 2008; Bateman et al. 2011).
143 Furthermore, this region is under a temperate climate greatly influenced by oceanic
144 conditions, and the weather can be very variable during and between years (Lamy and
145 Dubreuil 2010). Our study had two objectives: 1) investigating the temporal resolution at
146 which climatic variables should be considered when assessing the population dynamics of a

147 bat species at a regional scale and 2) improving our understanding of the climate impact on a
148 species of great conservation concern. Because most climatic databases facilitate access to
149 data with at least a monthly resolution, we considered a monthly resolution, a several months
150 resolution (corresponding to life cycle periods that are suitable for *R. hipposideros*), a yearly
151 resolution, and also mixed temporal resolutions that correspond to commonly used BIOCLIM
152 variables to explain variability in colony size and fecundity in *R. hipposideros*. We
153 hypothesized that finer temporal resolution would better grasp weather effects.

154 **Material and Methods**

155 **Monitoring of colonies**

156 From 2000 to 2014, a total of 94 *R. hipposideros* maternity colonies were monitored in
157 Brittany (Fig. 1). Not every colony was known in 2000, and, in some cases, monitoring was
158 not possible due to unforeseen circumstances (blocked access to the bats or the person in
159 charge of counting the bats). Thus, the number of monitored years per colony ranged from 3
160 to 14 (7.73 on average). This monitoring consisted of one or two counts during late June or
161 early July, that is, during the period when newborns are easily distinguished from adults in
162 Brittany. When multiple counts were carried out in a given year, only the largest one was
163 considered. Adults and juveniles were counted separately: for each year, the census size of the
164 colony was estimated by the number of adults, and the fecundity by the number of juveniles
165 divided by the number of adults.

166 Colony size distribution is expected to correspond to a Poisson or a negative binomial
167 distribution (O'Hara and Kotze 2010). Some colonies disappeared over the years, probably
168 for reasons unrelated to the climatic variables considered: thus, we also considered zero-
169 inflated Poisson and zero-inflated negative binomial distributions (Zuur et al. 2009). We
170 tested which of these four distributions corresponded to our demographic data by using the

171 maximum likelihood method implemented in the R package *fitdistrplus* (Delignette-Muller
172 and Dutang 2014). Fecundity was considered to follow a normal distribution. Generalized
173 linear (count data) and linear (fecundity) mixed models together with Wald chi-square tests
174 were used to test whether bat counts and fecundity varied between years. Colonies were
175 considered as a random factor in the models, so as to not consider the impact of roost quality
176 and environment. We then removed the random effects to plot the deviance residuals against
177 the theoretical quantiles (QQ-plots) to check the assumptions of our models and detect
178 possible outliers in the colonies. These tests, as well as the analyses described below, were
179 carried out in R version 3.2.2 (R Development Core Team 2015).

180 **Climatic data**

181 Minimum temperature, mean temperature, and precipitation were recorded monthly at
182 16 meteorological stations in Brittany (Météo-France data, <https://publitheque.meteo.fr>) since
183 the beginning of the monitoring. Temperature directly influences the bats energy budget and
184 their cost for homeothermy, but the most significant impact of temperature may also come
185 from a decrease under particular thresholds: temperature low enough can induce torpor in bats
186 or inhibit the flight of insects, needed for most bats foraging. Thus, both mean and minimum
187 temperature have been considered in studies interested in the effect of climatic variables on
188 bats (Reiter 2004a; Burles et al. 2009; López-Roig and Serra-Cobo 2014; Kerbiriou et al.
189 2015), and we decided to consider both of them here. Temperature and especially
190 precipitation exhibited a great variability during the counting period (Fig. S1). We performed
191 an ordinary kriging to obtain these climatic data for each colony by using the package
192 "gstats", function "krige" (Pebesma 2004). Brittany's weather is spatially and temporally
193 variable. We therefore performed a local kriging by taking into account only the three closest
194 stations. Climatic information for each counting was then treated in three different ways.
195 Firstly, each month of the previous life cycle (from August to July) was considered. These

196 data are thereafter named "monthly data". Secondly, we averaged the climatic information
197 over longer periods corresponding to the mating period (September-November), hibernation
198 (December-February), the spring transition (March-May) and parturition (June-July) periods.
199 From now on, this temporal resolution is called "life cycle data". Thirdly, we averaged
200 climatic data over the previous year, and refer to this temporal resolution as the "yearly data".
201 Finally, we considered 17 of the 19 bioclimatic variables (Table 3) by computing our dataset
202 the same way as ANUCLIM (Xu and Hutchinson 2013) with the help of the R package
203 climates (Van der Wal et al. 2014) and refer to these as BIOCLIM data. The variable bio7
204 correspond to bio5 minus bio6, and caused linear combinations in our dataset: we thus
205 excluded bio7, which is less informative than the two other variables, to avoid rank-deficiency
206 in our models. The variables bio 2 and bio3 caused multiple correlations when in the same

207 model ($bio3 = \frac{bio2}{bio5 - bio6}$), and we discarded the less informative one, bio3.

208 Explanatory variables were centred and scaled prior to model fitting.

209 **Model averaging**

210 Model averaging was performed to estimate the effect of climatic variables on colony
211 size and fecundity. We created models explaining the variation in colony size (GLMM) and
212 fecundity (LMM) depending on the climatic variables, by considering the different temporal
213 resolutions. For monthly and life cycle data, models were computed separately for average
214 temperatures, minimum temperatures, and precipitation. Two bioclimatic models were built
215 considering separately temperature (BIOCLIM 1-11) and precipitation variables (BIOCLIM
216 12-19) to ease comparison with other models. Colonies were considered as a random factor in
217 the models, and there were no temporal autocorrelations in those models (as explored using
218 models residuals via the "acf" R function). Correlations between fixed effects were checked.
219 Only bio4 and bio11 as well as bio13 and bio15 were highly correlated ($r > 0.8$).

220 Full models were then used as bases in the glmulti R package to obtain every possible
221 combination of explanatory variables (without interaction) and order them by AIC (Calcagno
222 et al. 2010). Models including highly correlated variables ($r > 0.8$) were discarded, and the
223 package glmulti was then used to perform model averaging by calculating the Akaike weight
224 of each model within $2\Delta\text{AIC}$ of the best model (Burnham and Anderson 2002). The model-
225 averaged regression coefficients of the predictors and their 95% confidence intervals (CI)
226 were then calculated based on the cumulative weights of the models including the variable
227 (Calcagno et al. 2010). Explanatory variables were then considered as having a meaningful
228 positive or negative impact on the response variable if their 95% confidence interval did not
229 include zero (Lankinen et al. 2016). The significance of yearly models, containing only one
230 fixed effect (mean temperature, minimum temperature, or precipitation) and one random
231 effect (colonies) were tested with Wald chi-square tests.

232 Model averaging with all temperature and precipitation monthly variables considered
233 together would require very high computing power and memory (more than 16 million
234 models to be evaluated and compared), especially for the colony size data and its more
235 elaborate distributions. Thus, we created the mixed models that incorporated only significant
236 predictors from previous model averaging (with either the minimum or average temperature,
237 depending of the AIC) and computed their AIC and R^2 (marginal and conditional - Nakagawa
238 and Schielzeth 2013) to determine which kind of predictor and which temporal resolution best
239 explained variations in colony size and fecundity of *R. hipposideros* colonies in Brittany. AIC
240 was chosen over other criteria such as BIC because it is more appropriate for an exploratory
241 analysis investigating which predictors could give the best description of a very complex
242 system, whereas BIC is more performant in confirmatory analysis or hypothesis testing (Aho
243 et al. 2014).

244 **Results**

245 **Variation of colony size and fecundity over the years**

246 Colony size data had a better fit with the zero-inflated negative binomial distribution
247 (AIC : 6323.29), followed by the negative binomial, the zero-inflated Poisson and the Poisson
248 distribution (with AIC of 6326.31, 21167.65 and 22596.92, respectively). Thus, we performed
249 GLMMs with the zero-inflated negative binomial distribution. Both colony size and fecundity
250 varied over the years (Wald chi-square test; $p = 0.002$ and $p < 0.001$ respectively).

251 **Impact of climate**

252 Significant predictors were found for most monthly and life cycle models for both
253 colony size (Table 1) and fecundity (Table 2). Annual climatic factors were never significant
254 (Wald chi-square test; $p > 0.15$ in all cases).

255 Comparisons of predictor categories and time resolutions showed that the models with
256 the lowest AIC were those including monthly significant predictors for both colony size and
257 fecundity. Precipitation model was the best for colony size, whereas the minimum
258 temperature model had a lower AIC for fecundity

259 Colony size was positively influenced by precipitation in June and negatively
260 impacted by October precipitation. Fecundity was positively impacted by the rain of October
261 and negatively by precipitation during April. Monthly minimum temperature models had
262 higher AIC than the corresponding monthly averaged temperature models for colony size, but
263 lower in the case of fecundity. Nonetheless, they showed similar results regarding significant
264 explanatory variables. Colony size was positively impacted by the temperature in May and
265 November. Fecundity was positively influenced by the temperature during the months of
266 April and July.

267 The AIC of the life cycle models were always larger than the corresponding monthly
268 models ($> 7 \Delta AIC$). Model averaging on life cycle data was not able to give any significant
269 predictor when considering the impact of average or minimum temperature on colony size.
270 Only precipitation during parturition time was found to be significant for colony size at the
271 life cycle temporal scale. When looking at fecundity, the minimum temperature during spring
272 transition and precipitation during mating period were significant. Yearly models were the
273 models with the highest AIC (Table 1 and 2), and did not outperform the null model in most
274 cases (AIC : 5755.42 and -37.15 for the null model of respectively the colony size and the
275 fecundity dataset.)

276 There was no significant BIOCLIM predictor for colony size, but four variables were
277 significant for fecundity (Table 3). Two factors positively affected fecundity: minimum
278 temperature of the coldest month and precipitation of the wettest quarter. Annual precipitation
279 and precipitation seasonality negatively impacted fecundity. The AIC of models built with
280 these significant predictors were higher than those of monthly and life-cycle models.

281 Models with significant temperature (minimum for fecundity and average for colony
282 size) and precipitation predictors were computed for each temporal resolution, as well as a
283 model containing every bioclimatic predictor which was significant for both colony size and
284 fecundity. Once again, the models with the lowest AIC were the monthly models, and the
285 models with the highest AIC were yearly models, whilst those with life cycle and bioclimatic
286 models were intermediate. Marginal R^2 (Nakagawa and Schielzeth 2013) showed that the
287 fixed effect of monthly models explained 0.9% and 5.3% of variability for colony size and
288 fecundity, respectively, and ranking of marginal R^2 was congruent with the AIC ranking
289 (Table 4).

290 **Discussion**

291 Colony size and fecundity varied between years and between colonies. Exploring
292 whether these variations could be explained by climatic factors, we showed that fine temporal
293 resolution climatic models have superior explanatory power compared to temporally coarse
294 ones. These models reveal that climatic variables impact *R. hipposideros* population dynamics
295 at critical periods, with more precipitation having significant and opposite impacts depending
296 on the time of year, and increased temperatures having a positive impact.

297 **Temporal resolution of weather impact**

298 Life cycle data correspond to meteorological data averaged over specific periods built
299 upon the biology and life cycle of species. These averages are commonly used in studies
300 interested in exploring climatic impacts on species demographic dynamics. For *R.*
301 *hipposideros*, the periods were chosen according to bibliography and expert knowledge.
302 Using AIC selection, we showed that abiotic factors calculated with monthly resolution better
303 predicted the *R. hipposideros* colony size and fecundity in Brittany compared to the factors
304 calculated with coarser resolution. These results can be explained by the great climate
305 variability observed between months, especially for precipitation (Fig. S1). Our results also
306 suggest that the same variable can have either positive or negative effects depending on the
307 period of the year. This implies that in regions like Brittany, population dynamic processes
308 are mainly dependent on critical periods which are shorter than life cycle periods. Those
309 critical periods are supposedly highly dependent on the interaction between the species
310 biology and the local climate.

311 One could argue that comparisons of models using AIC tend to favour complex
312 models (Link and Barker 2006). We however did not observe this when computing AIC for
313 full models that included all variables (both non-significant and significant predictors, data
314 not shown). The use of model averaging instead of other approaches such as stepwise AIC

315 also allowed us to only consider significant predictors and limits bias towards over-complex
316 models (Lukacs et al. 2010). Besides providing estimates and confidence intervals, model
317 averaging also measures the importance of each variable, based on the AIC of the models
318 where they were included, the so called "sum of weight". The sum of weight of each
319 significant predictor in our study was superior to 0.95 (data not shown), further supporting the
320 importance of these variables in explaining variations in colony size and fecundity in the
321 lesser horseshoe bat (Giam and Olden 2016).

322 Considering all the models which are at 2 Δ AIC from the best model is a common
323 practice in model averaging, but it has been argued that even models below this threshold
324 should be included in the analysis, and that being too stringent could exclude significant
325 variables (Burnham et al. 2011). In the case of our results, monthly data gave still better
326 predictors than life cycle data when we extended the threshold until 7 Δ AIC. However, it
327 caused the disappearance of some significant variables instead of the appearance of new ones
328 (see supplementary materials, Tables S1 and S2). Multicollinearity in the averaged models
329 was suspected, but excluding all the models with Variance Inflation Factors higher than 2 did
330 not change the results (data not shown). The disappearance of significant variables can be due
331 to the fact that we considered every month or period of the year without any a priori, and thus
332 probably included some non-relevant variables. Increasing the threshold to 7 Δ AIC led to the
333 inclusion of poor models , which are known to impact the results and increase confidence
334 intervals around effect sizes (Burnham and Anderson 2002). Indeed, models including
335 significant predictors obtained with 2 Δ AIC had lower AIC than models including significant
336 predictors obtained with 7 Δ AIC (compare Tables 1 to S1 and 2 to S2). Thus, we only
337 considered the 2 Δ AIC results in the following discussion.

338 Depending on climate variability, averaging weather variables over long periods could
339 result in the concealment or misidentification of essential impacts on population dynamics.

340 Comparisons between climate variables averaged yearly or over shorter periods already
341 showed that short-term climatic conditions are better at characterising population dynamics
342 (Gedir et al. 2015). This was also shown in mechanistic models, which in contrast with our
343 correlative approach directly model the relationship between individual traits and the
344 environment. Those models generally use finer temporal scale resolution than correlative
345 models, and it has been shown that reducing the environmental data to a daily resolution
346 permitted a better understanding of environmental impact (Kearney et al. 2012). Our results
347 suggest that even periods of several-months which are consistent with the life cycle of the
348 species, and which are commonly used in explanatory correlative studies, could be too long to
349 really grasp the effect of climate on species. Likewise, the now widely used BIOCLIM
350 variables (Barbet-Massin and Jetz 2014; Del Toro et al. 2015; Beltramino et al. 2015; Ray et
351 al. 2016) were far less predictive than monthly variables, and did not result in better models
352 than our life cycle variables. Interestingly though, BIOCLIM variables included variables that
353 were not present in the other models, such as precipitation seasonality that appeared to
354 significantly explain fecundity.

355 Studies interested in the impact of climate on demographic parameters would therefore
356 greatly benefit from considering explanatory variables with fine temporal resolution (e.g.
357 monthly). One could argue that considering a short temporal resolution implies multiplying
358 the number of variables used in those models. One solution could be to only consider a few
359 months based on the species biology (Kerbiriou et al. 2015), but the best way might be to
360 select the most relevant predictors by statistical means before performing other analyses
361 (Parent et al. 2016; van de Pol et al. 2016). To this end, model averaging is an ideal tool for
362 selecting significant predictors. A recently released R package, *climwin*, is also a well-
363 designed tool to address the question of temporal resolution. Though it allows a great
364 flexibility to easily detect the best time window based on AIC comparisons, it is not well-

365 optimized for detecting multiple effect of the same variable (van de Pol et al. 2016). Our
366 example demonstrates that situations may include multiple effects of the same variable, and
367 we advocate the use of alternative and complementary tools to understand how species
368 respond to environmental variation, which is one of the main challenges when the aim is to
369 predict the future of biodiversity (Urban et al. 2016).

370 Indeed, temporal resolution is also an important feature when predicting the impact of
371 future climate change on species distribution, a topic which has received increasing interest in
372 the scientific community. If global or regional climate change are generally considered on a
373 yearly (or coarser temporal) basis when it comes to prediction (Turner et al. 1989), coarse
374 temporal resolution will fail to grasp the heterogeneity of responses and could substantially
375 alter the outcome of population viability predictions under temperature change scenarios
376 (Radchuk et al. 2014). Reducing the temporal resolution for species distribution models is
377 particularly important when dealing with microclimate (Kearney and Porter 2009). The future
378 species distribution of European bats, including *R. hipposideros*, has been predicted in a
379 recent study based on climate variables averaged over 30 years (Rebelo et al. 2010). This
380 pooling is understandable given the number of species, and the prediction time span (2050
381 and 2090), but the impact of temporal resolution on these models has not been, to our
382 knowledge, deeply investigated. Despite the fact that the processes considered in this study
383 are not directly related to range distribution, it would be interesting to test different temporal
384 resolutions when conducting distribution modelling for species that experience highly
385 variable climatic conditions like *R. hipposideros*.

386 **Impact of weather on *R. hipposideros***

387 *R. hipposideros* colony size and fecundity significantly varied between years. Variances
388 explained by the fixed effect of our models were low, especially for the colony size models,

389 but the variance explained by the fecundity model was within the range of variance usually
390 explained by most ecology models (Møller and Jennions 2002). In a study on a pipistrelle bat
391 population, Kerbiriou et al. (2015) have shown that the variance of meaningful environmental
392 variables (including climatic variables) could be drastically reduced (to 1%) because of
393 intrinsic demographic trends. Additionally, although *R. hipposideros* is a rather sedentary
394 species (Dool et al. 2016), we do not consider emigration or immigration which could
395 influence the colony size besides the effect of climate . Thermal isolation of the
396 roosts/hibernacula could also modify the impact of the ambient temperature during summer or
397 winter. Even though we cannot predict which part of the environmental variance those
398 variables explain (Sæther et al. 2000), our results nevertheless pinpoint mechanisms by which
399 climatic factors play a role in the inter-annual variation of colony size and fecundity of *R.*
400 *hipposideros*.

401 Precipitation was the climatic factor that best explained the variation in colony size.
402 Rainfall directly impacts bats by increasing the energetic cost of flight and homeothermy and
403 by making echolocation less efficient, but also indirectly by acting on insect abundance and
404 hence on food availability (Grindal et al. 1992; Frick et al. 2010; Voigt et al. 2011). If a
405 greater effect of the precipitation on bats compared to temperature has been observed in
406 warmer climates (Hoyle et al. 2001; Frick et al. 2012), this was unexpected for European
407 insectivorous bats (Rebelo et al. 2010). This could be explained by the greater variability of
408 precipitation in Brittany (Fig. S1) that would have increased the support for this variable in
409 our models (Frick et al. 2010).

410 An interesting result is that depending on the month and the demographic variable considered,
411 precipitation had a positive or a negative impact. If the ambiguous impact of rain on bats,
412 depending on region and time, has already been reported (Frick et al. 2010; Lučan et al.
413 2013), this study is to our knowledge, the first where precipitation is shown to have

414 significant and opposite impacts on the same bat population depending on the time of the
415 year. The impact of precipitation on the colony size was negative in October but positive in
416 June. Precipitation impact on bat population dynamics differs depending on the timing of
417 precipitation (Frick et al. 2010), either negatively by increasing the energy cost for foraging
418 (Voigt et al. 2011) and decreasing the efficiency of echolocation (Griffin 1971), or positively
419 by increasing insect abundance in dryer periods (Williams 1951). Opposite effects of the same
420 factor, caused by spatial or temporal variability, has already been observed in a wide range of
421 species (Spiller and Schoener 2008; Satterthwaite et al. 2012; Metz and Tielboerger 2016),
422 but these results highlight the necessity to have the finest temporal resolution possible to
423 enhance our understanding of the impact of climatic factors. Thus, it seems that precipitation
424 impact can be highly variable in Brittany, with an overall negative effect except during
425 summer, which is the driest period. The positive impact of rain during October on fecundity is
426 more surprising given that it has the opposite effect on colony size. Opposite climate or
427 environmental effects on survival and fecundity have already been observed in other species
428 such as emperor penguins (Barbraud and Weimerskirch 2001), Eurasian oystercatchers (Van
429 de Pol et al. 2010) or goshawks (Herfindal et al. 2015). Those results signal a complex pattern
430 of co-variation that would need further investigation and a better understanding of the
431 underlying mechanisms.

432 Low temperatures can influence bat survival by directly increasing energetic cost for
433 homeothermy, but also by reducing insect activity and so food availability (Reiter 2004a;
434 Burles et al. 2009). The colony size in *R. hipposideros* was positively impacted by higher
435 temperatures during the period when individuals return to their maternity roosts and
436 hibernacula (May and November, respectively). We can thus hypothesize that the temperature
437 of these months would strongly impact the bats' energy budget for parturition and
438 hibernation.

439 Because the flight of most insects is inhibited under some threshold temperature
440 (Taylor 1963), it is more impacted by minimum than average temperatures . A stronger
441 influence of the minimum temperature than of average temperature on fecundity of *R.*
442 *hipposideros* suggests that this process depends on food availability at some critical periods.
443 April seems to be the key month regarding fecundity. Inclement weather, e.g. cold and rainy,
444 during the early foetal stage, is known to cause abortion or resorption of embryos in bats
445 (Grindal et al. 1992; Lučan et al. 2013) which could explain the observed negative impact of
446 precipitation and the positive impact of minimum temperature in April on fecundity. The
447 impact of temperature during July, the lactating period in Brittany, is also not surprising,
448 because a cold month is expected to reduce the survival rate of juveniles, diminishing
449 reproductive success (Reiter 2004a; Burles et al. 2009).

450 Results based on BIOCLIM variables gave a consistent pattern, with notably a positive
451 impact of the higher minimum temperature and a negative impact of precipitation except for
452 the wettest quarter (which would correspond approximately to autumn in Brittany). Even if
453 the AIC of BIOCLIM models were higher than monthly models, there are two significant
454 variables that could not be detected by our other models, which are temperature and
455 precipitation seasonality, with a positive and negative impact respectively. Adding those
456 variables to monthly models did not change the significant predictors (data not shown), but
457 the impact of climate seasonality on bat fecundity deserves further investigation.

458 **Conclusion**

459 Considering the temporal resolution of weather variables allowed the detection of
460 climate impact on a bat population of high conservation priority at a very fine resolution.
461 Relaxing the assumption that the impact of weather variables is invariant during life cycle
462 periods was here important to uncover the effects of climate on colony sizes and fecundity in

463 the lesser horseshoe bat. Because most climate databases offer at least a monthly resolution,
464 we suggest that analogous studies should consider fine temporal resolution for testing the
465 impact of continuous abiotic variables such as those linked to weather. Although our approach
466 was correlative, it enabled the identification of potential mechanisms by which climatic
467 factors affect population dynamics. Obtaining this knowledge is a necessary step towards
468 better forecasts of biodiversity responses under climate change.

469

470 **References**

471 Adams RA (2010) Bat reproduction declines when conditions mimic climate change
472 projections for western North America. *Ecology* 91:2437–2445.

473 Adams RA, Hayes MA (2008) Water availability and successful lactation by bats as related to
474 climate change in arid regions of western North America. *J Anim Ecol* 77:1115–1121. doi:
475 10.1111/j.1365-2656.2008.01447.x

476 Aho K, Derryberry D, Peterson T (2014) Model selection for ecologists: the worldviews of
477 AIC and BIC. *Ecology* 95:631–636.

478 Akesson S (2016) Flying with the winds: differential migration strategies in relation to winds
479 in moth and songbirds. *J Anim Ecol* 85:1–4. doi: 10.1111/1365-2656.12450

480 Amorim F, Rebelo H, Rodrigues L (2012) Factors influencing bat activity and mortality at a
481 wind farm in the mediterranean Region. *Acta Chiropterol* 14:439–457. doi:
482 10.3161/150811012X661756

483 Amorim F, Mata VA, Beja P, Rebelo H (2015) Effects of a drought episode on the
484 reproductive success of European free-tailed bats (*Tadarida teniotis*). *Mamm Biol* 80:228–
485 236. doi: 10.1016/j.mambio.2015.01.005

486 Barbet-Massin M, Jetz W (2014) A 40-year, continent-wide, multispecies assessment of
487 relevant climate predictors for species distribution modelling. *Divers Distrib* 20:1285–1295.
488 doi: 10.1111/ddi.12229

489 Barbraud C, Weimerskirch H (2001) Emperor penguins and climate change. *Nature* 411:183–
490 186. doi: 10.1038/35075554

491 Bateman BL, Abell-Davis SE, Johnson CN (2011) Climate-driven variation in food
492 availability between the core and range edge of the endangered northern bettong (*Bettongia*
493 *tropica*). Aust J Zool 59:177–185. doi: 10.1071/ZO11079

494 Beltramino AA, Vogler RE, Gutiérrez Gregoric DE, Rumi A (2015) Impact of climate change
495 on the distribution of a giant land snail from South America: predicting future trends for
496 setting conservation priorities on native malacofauna. Clim Change 131:621–633. doi:
497 10.1007/s10584-015-1405-3

498 Bleho BI, Koper N, Borkowsky CL, Hamel CD (2015) Effects of weather and land
499 management on the western prairie fringed-orchid (*Platanthera praeclara*) at the northern
500 limit of its range in Manitoba, Canada. Am Midl Nat 174:191–203. doi: 10.1674/0003-0031-
501 174.2.191

502 Bontadina F, Arlettaz R, Fankhauser T, et al (2000) The lesser horseshoe bat *Rhinolophus*
503 *hipposideros* in Switzerland: present status and research recommendations. Le Rhinolophe
504 14:69–83.

505 Bontadina F, Schofield H, Naef-Daenzer B (2002) Radio-tracking reveals that lesser
506 horseshoe bats (*Rhinolophus hipposideros*) forage in woodland. J Zool 258:281–290. doi:
507 10.1017/S0952836902001401

508 Bruggeman JE, Swem T, Andersen DE, et al (2015) Dynamics of a recovering arctic bird
509 population: the importance of climate, density dependence, and site quality. Ecol Appl
510 25:1932–1943.

511 Burles DW, Brigham RM, Ring RA, Reimchen TE (2009) Influence of weather on two
512 insectivorous bats in a temperate Pacific Northwest rainforest. Can J Zool 87:132–138.

513 Burnham KP, Anderson DR (2002) Model selection and multimodel inference: a practical
514 information-theoretic approach. Springer

515 Burnham KP, Anderson DR, Huyvaert KP (2011) AIC model selection and multimodel
516 inference in behavioral ecology: some background, observations, and comparisons. *Behav*
517 *Ecol Sociobiol* 65:23–35. doi: 10.1007/s00265-010-1029-6

518 Calcagno V, de Mazancourt C, et al (2010) glmulti: an R package for easy automated model
519 selection with (generalized) linear models. *J Stat Softw* 34:1–29.

520 Ceglar A, Toreti A, Lecerf R, et al (2016) Impact of meteorological drivers on regional inter-
521 annual crop yield variability in France. *Agric For Meteorol* 216:58–67. doi:
522 10.1016/j.agrformet.2015.10.004

523 Ciechanowski M, Zajac T, Bilas A, Dunajski R (2007) Spatiotemporal variation in activity of
524 bat species differing in hunting tactics: effects of weather, moonlight, food abundance, and
525 structural clutter. *Can J Zool* 85:1249–1263.

526 Ciuti S, Jensen WF, Nielsen SE, Boyce MS (2015) Predicting mule deer recruitment from
527 climate oscillations for harvest management on the northern Great Plains: Predicting deer
528 recruitment from climate indices. *J Wildl Manag* 79:1226–1238. doi: 10.1002/jwmg.956

529 Del Toro I, Silva RR, Ellison AM (2015) Predicted impacts of climatic change on ant
530 functional diversity and distributions in eastern North American forests. *Divers Distrib*
531 21:781–791. doi: 10.1111/ddi.12331

532 Delignette-Muller ML, Dutang C (2014) fitdistrplus: An R Package for fitting distributions. *J*
533 *Stat Softw* 64:1–34.

534 Dool SE, Puechmaille SJ, Dietz C, et al (2013) Phylogeography and postglacial recolonization
535 of Europe by *Rhinolophus hipposideros*: evidence from multiple genetic markers. *Mol Ecol*
536 22:4055–4070. doi: 10.1111/mec.12373

537 Dool SE, Puechmaille SJ, Kelleher C, et al (2016) The effects of human-mediated habitat
538 fragmentation on a sedentary woodland-associated species (*Rhinolophus hipposideros*) at its
539 range margin. *Acta Chiropterol* 18:377–393.

540 Dugger KM, Forsman ED, Franklin AB, et al (2016) The effects of habitat, climate, and
541 Barred Owls on long-term demography of Northern Spotted Owls. *The Condor* 118:57–116.
542 doi: 10.1650/CONDOR-15-24.1

543 Forrester TD, Wittmer HU (2013) A review of the population dynamics of mule deer and
544 black-tailed deer *Odocoileus hemionus* in North America. *Mammal Rev* 43:292–308. doi:
545 10.1111/mam.12002

546 Frick WF, Reynolds DS, Kunz TH (2010) Influence of climate and reproductive timing on
547 demography of little brown myotis *Myotis lucifugus*. *J Anim Ecol* 79:128–136. doi:
548 10.1111/j.1365-2656.2009.01615.x

549 Frick WF, Stepanian PM, Kelly JF, et al (2012) Climate and weather impact timing of
550 emergence of bats. *PLoS ONE* 7:e42737. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0042737

551 Gaisler J (1966) Reproduction in the lesser horseshoe bat (*Rhinolophus hipposideros*
552 *hipposideros* Bechstein, 1800). *Bijdr Tot Dierkd* 36:45–62.

553 Geber MA (2008) To the edge: studies of species' range limits. *New Phytol* 178:228–230.

554 Gedir JV, Cain JW, Harris G, Turnbull TT (2015) Effects of climate change on long-term
555 population growth of pronghorn in an arid environment. *Ecosphere* 6:1-20. doi:
556 10.1890/ES15-00266.1

557 Giam X, Olden JD (2016) Quantifying variable importance in a multimodel inference
558 framework. *Methods Ecol Evol* 7:388–397. doi: 10.1111/2041-210X.12492

559 Griffin DR (1971) The importance of atmospheric attenuation for the echolocation of bats
560 (Chiroptera). *Anim Behav* 19:55–61.

561 Grindal SD, Collard TS, Brigham RM, Barclay RM (1992) The influence of precipitation on
562 reproduction by *Myotis* bats in British Columbia. *Am Midl Nat* 128:339–344.

563 Hasan F, Ansari MS (2016) Temperature-dependent development and demography of
564 *Zygogramma bicolorata* (Coleoptera: Chrysomelidae) on *Parthenium hysterophorus*. *Ann*
565 *Appl Biol* 168:81–92. doi: 10.1111/aab.12244

566 Haysom K, Dekker J, Russ J, et al (2013) European bat population trends - a prototype
567 biodiversity indicator. European Environment Agency

568 Herfindal I, van de Pol M, Nielsen JT, et al (2015) Climatic conditions cause complex
569 patterns of covariation between demographic traits in a long-lived raptor. *J Anim Ecol*
570 84:702–711. doi: 10.1111/1365-2656.12318

571 Hoying KM, Kunz TH (1998) Variation in size at birth and post-natal growth in the
572 insectivorous bat *Pipistrellus subflavus* (Chiroptera: Vespertilionidae). *J Zool* 245:15–27.

573 Hoyle SD, Pople AR, Toop GJ (2001) Mark–recapture may reveal more about ecology than
574 about population trends: demography of a threatened ghost bat (*Macroderma gigas*)
575 population. *Austral Ecol* 26:80–92.

576 Jones G, Jacobs DS, Kunz TH, et al (2009) Carpe noctem: the importance of bats as
577 bioindicators. *Endanger Species Res* 8:93–115.

578 Kanno Y, Pregler KC, Hitt NP, et al (2016) Seasonal temperature and precipitation regulate
579 brook trout young-of-the-year abundance and population dynamics. *Freshw Biol* 61:88–99.
580 doi: 10.1111/fwb.12682

581 Kayikcioglu A, Zahn A (2004) High temperatures and the use of satellite roosts in
582 *Rhinolophus hipposideros*. *Mamm Biol* 69:337–341. doi: 10.1078/1616-5047-00152

583 Kearney M, Porter W (2009) Mechanistic niche modelling: combining physiological and
584 spatial data to predict species' ranges. *Ecol Lett* 12:334–350.

585 Kearney MR, Matzelle A, Helmuth B (2012) Biomechanics meets the ecological niche: the
586 importance of temporal data resolution. *J Exp Biol* 215:1422–1424. doi: 10.1242/jeb.072249

587 Kerbiriou C, Julien JF, Monsarrat S, et al (2015) Information on population trends and
588 biological constraints from bat counts in roost cavities: a 22-year case study of a pipistrelle
589 bats (*Pipistrellus pipistrellus Schreber*) hibernaculum. *Wildl Res* 42:35. doi:
590 10.1071/WR14197

591 Kingsolver JG (1989) Weather and the population dynamics of insects: integrating
592 physiological and population ecology. *Physiol Zool* 62:314–334.

593 Lamy C, Dubreuil V (2010) Impact des sécheresses en bretagne sur le bilan hydrique:
594 modélisation à partir du climat d'années passées - 23ème Colloque de l'Association
595 Internationale de Climatologie, pp 325–330

596 Leigh C, Bush A, Harrison ET, et al (2015) Ecological effects of extreme climatic events on
597 riverine ecosystems: insights from Australia. *Freshw Biol* 60:2620–2638. doi:
598 10.1111/fwb.12515

599 Link WA, Barker RJ (2006) Model weights and the foundations of multimodel inference.
600 *Ecology* 87:2626–2635.

601 López-Roig M, Serra-Cobo J (2014) Impact of human disturbance, density, and
602 environmental conditions on the survival probabilities of pipistrelle bat (*Pipistrellus*
603 *pipistrellus*). *Popul Ecol* 56:471–480. doi: 10.1007/s10144-014-0437-2

604 Lučan RK, Weiser M, Hanák V (2013) Contrasting effects of climate change on the timing of
605 reproduction and reproductive success of a temperate insectivorous bat: Climate change and
606 reproduction of a temperate bat. *J Zool* 290:151–159. doi: 10.1111/jzo.12021

607 Lukacs PM, Burnham KP, Anderson DR (2010) Model selection bias and Freedman’s
608 paradox. *Ann Inst Stat Math* 62:117–125. doi: 10.1007/s10463-009-0234-4

609 Masciocchi M, Pereira AJ, Corley JC (2016) Local dynamics of worker activity of the
610 invasive *Vespula germanica* and *V. vulgaris* (Hymenoptera: Vespidae) wasps in Argentina:
611 Activity fluctuations of *Vespula* spp. in Argentina. *Ecol Entomol* 41:105–111. doi:
612 10.1111/een.12277

613 McLean N, Lawson CR, Leech DI, van de Pol M (2016) Predicting when climate-driven
614 phenotypic change affects population dynamics. *Ecol Lett.* 19:595-608. doi:
615 10.1111/ele.12599

616 Metz J, Tielboerger K (2016) Spatial and temporal aridity gradients provide poor proxies for
617 plant-plant interactions under climate change: a large-scale experiment. *Funct Ecol* 30:20–29.
618 doi: 10.1111/1365-2435.12599

619 Møller AP, Jennions MD (2002) How much variance can be explained by ecologists and
620 evolutionary biologists? *Oecologia* 132:492–500.

621 Nakagawa S, Schielzeth H (2013) A general and simple method for obtaining R^2 from
622 generalized linear mixed-effects models. *Methods Ecol Evol* 4:133–142. doi: 10.1111/j.2041-
623 210x.2012.00261.x

624 Nouvellet P, Newman C, Buesching CD, Macdonald DW (2013) A Multi-metric approach to
625 investigate the effects of weather conditions on the demographic of a terrestrial mammal, the
626 european badger (*Meles meles*). *PLoS ONE* 8:e68116. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0068116

627 O’Hara RB, Kotze DJ (2010) Do not log-transform count data. *Methods Ecol Evol* 1:118–
628 122. doi: 10.1111/j.2041-210X.2010.00021.x

629 Parent CJ, Hernández F, Brennan LA, et al (2016) Northern bobwhite abundance in relation to
630 precipitation and landscape structure: Mapping Northern bobwhite. *J Wildl Manag* 80:7–18.
631 doi: 10.1002/jwmg.992

632 Pebesma EJ (2004) Multivariable geostatistics in S: the gstat package. *Comput Geosci*
633 30:683–691.

634 Peterman WE, Semlitsch RD (2014) Spatial variation in water loss predicts terrestrial
635 salamander distribution and population dynamics. *Oecologia* 176:357–369. doi:
636 10.1007/s00442-014-3041-4

637 Pretzlaff I, Kerth G, Dausmann KH (2010) Communally breeding bats use physiological and
638 behavioural adjustments to optimise daily energy expenditure. *Naturwissenschaften* 97:353–
639 363. doi: 10.1007/s00114-010-0647-1

640 Puechmaille SJ, Petit EJ (2007) Empirical evaluation of non-invasive capture-mark-recapture
641 estimation of population size based on a single sampling session: Non-invasive capture-mark-
642 recapture. *J Appl Ecol* 44:843–852. doi: 10.1111/j.1365-2664.2007.01321.x

643 Radchuk V, Johst K, Groeneveld J, et al (2014) Appropriate resolution in time and model
644 structure for population viability analysis: Insights from a butterfly metapopulation. *Biol*
645 *Conserv* 169:345–354. doi: 10.1016/j.biocon.2013.12.004

646 Ray D, Behera MD, Jacob J (2016) Predicting the distribution of rubber trees (*Hevea*
647 *brasiliensis*) through ecological niche modelling with climate, soil, topography and
648 socioeconomic factors. *Ecol Res* 31:75–91. doi: 10.1007/s11284-015-1318-7

649 Rebelo H, Tarroso P, Jones G (2010) Predicted impact of climate change on European bats in
650 relation to their biogeographic patterns. *Glob Change Biol* 16:561–576.

651 Reiter G (2004a) Postnatal growth and reproductive biology of *Rhinolophus hipposideros*
652 (Chiroptera: Rhinolophidae). *J Zool* 262:231–241. doi: 10.1017/S0952836903004588

653 Reiter G (2004b) The importance of woodland for *Rhinolophus hipposideros* (Chiroptera,
654 Rhinolophidae) in Austria. *Mamm Mamm* 68:403–410.

655 Saether BE, Sutherland WJ, Engen S (2004) Climate influences on avian population
656 dynamics. In: Moller AP, Fielder W, Berthold P (eds) *Birds and climate change*. Elsevier
657 Science Ltd, London, pp 185–209

658 Sæther B-E, Tufto J, Engen S, et al (2000) Population dynamical consequences of climate
659 change for a small temperate songbird. *Science* 287:854–856. doi:
660 10.1126/science.287.5454.854

661 Satterthwaite WH, Kitaysky AS, Mangel M (2012) Linking climate variability, productivity
662 and stress to demography in a long-lived seabird. *Mar Ecol Prog Ser* 454:221–235. doi:
663 10.3354/meps09539

664 Schorcht W, Bontadina F, Schaub M (2009) Variation of adult survival drives population
665 dynamics in a migrating forest bat. *J Anim Ecol* 78:1182–1190. doi: 10.1111/j.1365-
666 2656.2009.01577.x

667 Seckerdieck A, Walther B, Halle S (2005) Alternative use of two different roost types by a
668 maternity colony of the lesser horseshoe bat (*Rhinolophus hipposideros*). *Mamm Biol*
669 70:201–209. doi: 10.1016/j.mambio.2004.10.002

670 Şekercioğlu ÇH, Primack RB, Wormworth J (2012) The effects of climate change on tropical
671 birds. *Biol Conserv* 148:1–18. doi: 10.1016/j.biocon.2011.10.019

672 Spiller DA, Schoener TW (2008) Climatic control of trophic interaction strength: the effect of
673 lizards on spiders. *Oecologia* 154:763–771. doi: 10.1007/s00442-007-0867-z

674 Taylor LR (1963) Analysis of the effect of temperature on insects in flight. *J Anim Ecol*
675 32:99–117. doi: 10.2307/2520

676 Thomas CD, Cameron A, Green RE, et al (2004) Extinction risk from climate change. *Nature*
677 427:145–148.

678 Thomas JA, Moss D, Pollard E (1994) Increased fluctuations of butterfly populations towards
679 the northern edges of species' ranges. *Ecography* 17:215–220. doi: 10.1111/j.1600-
680 0587.1994.tb00096.x

681 Townsend AK, Cooch EG, Sillett TS, et al (2016) The interacting effects of food, spring
682 temperature, and global climate cycles on population dynamics of a migratory songbird. *Glob*
683 *Change Biol* 22:544–555. doi: 10.1111/gcb.13053

684 Turner MG, Dale VH, Gardner RH (1989) Predicting across scales: theory development and
685 testing. *Landsc Ecol* 3:245–252.

686 Uhrin M, Hüttmeir U, Kipson M, et al (2016) Status of Savi's pipistrelle *Hypsugo savii*
687 (Chiroptera) and range expansion in Central and south-eastern Europe: a review. *Mammal*
688 *Rev* 46:1–16. doi: 10.1111/mam.12050

689 Urban MC, Bocedi G, Hendry AP, et al (2016) Improving the forecast for biodiversity under
690 climate change. *Science* 353:1113. doi: 10.1126/science.aad8466

691 Van de Pol M, Bailey LD, McLean N, et al (2016) Identifying the best climatic predictors in
692 ecology and evolution. *Methods Ecol Evol*. doi: 10.1111/2041-210X.12590

693 Van de Pol M, Vindenes Y, Sæther B-E, et al (2010) Effects of climate change and variability
694 on population dynamics in a long-lived shorebird. *Ecology* 91:1192–1204.

695 Van der Wal J, Beaumont L, Zimmerman N, Lorch P (2014) *Climates: methods for working*
696 *with weather & climate*. R package version 0.1-1.6.

697 Voigt CC, Schneeberger K, Voigt-Heucke SL, Lewanzik D (2011) Rain increases the energy
698 cost of bat flight. *Biol Lett* 7:793–795. doi: 10.1098/rsbl.2011.0313

699 White TCR (2008) The role of food, weather and climate in limiting the abundance of
700 animals. *Biol Rev* 83:227–248. doi: 10.1111/j.1469-185X.2008.00041.x

701 Williams CB (1951) Changes in insect populations in the field in relation to preceding
702 weather conditions. *Proc R Soc Lond B Biol Sci* 138:130–156. doi: 10.1098/rspb.1951.0011

703 Wu J (2016) Detection and attribution of the effects of climate change on bat distributions
704 over the last 50 years. *Clim Change* 134:681–696. doi: 10.1007/s10584-015-1543-7

705 Xu T, Hutchinson MF (2013) New developments and applications in the ANUCLIM spatial
706 climatic and bioclimatic modelling package. *Environ Model Softw* 40:267–279. doi:
707 10.1016/j.envsoft.2012.10.003

708 Zahn A (1999) Reproductive success, colony size and roost temperature in attic-dwelling bat
709 *Myotis myotis*. *J Zool* 247:275–280.

710 Zuur AF, Ieno EN, Walker NJ, et al (2009) Zero-truncated and zero-inflated models for count
711 data. In: *Mixed effects models and extensions in ecology with R*. Springer New York, pp
712 261–293

713 **Data Accessibility:**

714 Data used in this study were deposited at DRYAD entry XXXXXXXX

715 **Table 1:** Colony size as a function of average temperature, minimum temperature and precipitation at different temporal resolutions. Monthly
716 models consider each month from August to July preceding bat counts. Life cycle models consider mating, hibernation, spring transition and
717 parturition period (August month was excluded). Yearly models only consider the climatic variable averaged over the year. NS : non-significant
718 predictor after model averaging (monthly and life cycle models) or non-significant Wald chi-square test (yearly models); + : positive significant
719 predictor; - : negative significant predictor. Model averaging was based on AIC (see text). Last rows display the AIC of the models only
720 containing the significant predictors as fixed effects, and finally their corresponding rank.

		Monthly models			Life cycle models			Yearly models		
		Aver. Temp.	Min. Temp.	Precip.	Aver. Temp.	Min. Temp.	Precip.	Aver. Temp.	Min. Temp.	Precip.
Mating	August	NS	NS	NS						
	September	NS	NS	NS						
	October	NS	NS	-	NS	NS	NS			
	November	+	+	NS						
Hibernation	December	NS	NS	NS						
	January	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS
	February	NS	NS	NS						
Spring Transition	March	NS	NS	NS						
	April	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS			
	May	+	+	NS						
Parturition	June	NS	NS	+	NS	NS	+			
	July	NS	NS	NS						
AIC - Significant predictor		5748.96	5749.26	5743.98	NA	NA	5751.2	5757.36	5757.42	5757.36
(Rank)		(2)	(3)	(1)			(3)	(5)	(6)	(5)

722 **Table 2:** Fecundity as a function of average temperature, minimum temperature and precipitation at different temporal resolutions. Legend and
 723 format are identical to those of Table 1.

724

725

726

	Monthly models			Life cycle models			Yearly models		
	Aver. Temp.	Min. Temp.	Precip.	Aver. Temp.	Min. Temp.	Precip.	Aver. Temp.	Min. Temp.	Precip.
Mating	August	NS	NS	NS					
	September	NS	NS	NS					
	October	NS	NS	+	NS	NS	+		
	November	NS	NS	NS					
Hibernation	December	NS	NS	NS					
	January	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS
	February	NS	NS	NS					
Spring Transition	March	NS	NS	NS					
	April	+	+	-	NS	+	NS		
	May	NS	NS	NS					
Parturition	June	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS		
	July	+	+	NS					
AIC - Significant predictor	-55.24	-61.35	-57.55	NA	-42.24	-47.25	-35.60	-38.34	-35.79
(Rank)	(3)	(1)	(2)		(5)	(4)	(8)	(6)	(7)

727

728

729 **Table 3:** Impact of temperature and precipitation BIOCLIM variables on *Rhinolophus hipposideros* fecundity. Model averaging was performed
730 on two models separating temperature and precipitation variables. BIOCLIM variables 3 and 7 were excluded from our analysis (see text). NS:
731 non-significant predictor after model averaging; +: positive significant predictor; -: negative significant predictor. Last columns display the AIC
732 of the models only containing the significant predictors as fixed effects.

	Variable Description	Number (BIOCLIM)	Significance	Significant predictors
Temperature	Annual mean temperature	1	NS	
	Mean diurnal range	2	NS	
	Isothermality (2/7)	3		
	Temperature seasonality	4	NS	
	Maximum temperature of warmest month	5	NS	
	Minimum temperature of coldest month	6	+	-37.78
	Temperature annual range (5-6)	7		
	Mean temperature of wettest quarter	8	NS	
	Mean temperature of driest quarter	9	NS	
	Mean temperature of the warmest quarter	10	NS	
	Mean temperature of coldest quarter	11	NS	
Precipitation	Annual precipitation	12	-	
	Precipitation of wettest month	13	NS	
	Precipitation of driest month	14	NS	
	Precipitation seasonality	15	-	
	Precipitation of wettest quarter	16	+	-43.30
	Precipitation of driest quarter	17	NS	
	Precipitation of the warmest quarter	18	NS	
	Precipitation of the coldest quarter	19	NS	

733 **Table 4:** AIC and ranks of models that included both minimum temperature and precipitation significant predictors for the different temporal
 734 resolutions of explanatory variables.


	Fixed effects	AIC (Rank)	Marginal R ²	Conditional R ²
Census size	Month Minimum temperature : November & May Precipitation : October & June	5746.74 (1)	0.009	0.669
	Life cycle Precipitation : Parturition	5751.2 (2)	0.003	0.658
	Year Minimum temperature : Year Precipitation : Year	5759.3 (3)	<0.001	0.654
	BIOCLIM NA	NA	NA	NA
Fecundity	Month Minimum temperature : April & July Precipitation : October & April	-65.14 (1)	0.053	0.177
	Life cycle Minimum temperature : Spring Transition Precipitation : Mating	-51.79 (2)	0.027	0.154
	Year Minimum temperature : Year Precipitation : Year	-36.48 (4)	0.006	0.123
	BIOCLIM Temperature : 6 Precipitation : 12,15 & 16	-43.72 (3)	0.021	0.148

735 **Figure legends**

736 **Figure 1:** Map of the 94 colonies monitored in Brittany, France.

737

738 **Figure 1**



739