1 **Region-specific magnetic fields structure sea turtle populations**

2 Sahmorie J.K. Cameron^{1,*}, Miguel Baltazar-Soares¹, Christophe Eizaguirre¹

3 ¹Queen Mary University of London, School of Biological and Chemical Sciences, Mile End
4 Road, E14NS, London, United Kingdom.

5 * Corresponding author: s.j.k.cameron@qmul.ac.uk

6 **Abstract**

7 Philopatry and long distance migrations are common in the animal kingdom, of which sea
8 turtles are flagship examples. Recent studies have suggested sea turtles use the Earth's
9 magnetic field to navigate across ocean basins to return to their natal area, yet the
10 mechanisms underlying this process remain unknown. If true though, the genetic structure at
11 nesting sites should positively correlate with differences in location-specific magnetic vectors
12 within nesting regions. Here, we confirm this working hypothesis but only in certain regions
13 of the world and for all sea turtle species nesting in those regions. Reversely, where no
14 correlations were found between genetic differentiation and geomagnetic vectors, this was
15 the case for all nesting sea turtle species. Our approach hence reveals parallel but not
16 universal use of geomagnetic cues in sea turtles. We describe magneto-sensing regions as
17 characterized by sharp clines of total and vertical field intensity vectors offering the
18 navigation cues that increase philopatric accuracy and promote genetic structuring among
19 sea turtle populations.

20 **Introduction**

21 Philopatry is a well-documented trait of many species, including insects, birds, mammals and
22 reptiles (Greenwood 1980; FitzSimmons *et al.* 1997). With this behavior, after long-distance
23 migration, individuals return to their natal area upon sexual maturity to mate, sometimes
24 decades after leaving at an early life stages. While philopatry can be a learned trait from
25 older individuals (e.g. sheep, moose (Jesmer *et al.* 2018), whales (Baker *et al.* 2013)), in
26 others, it is an evolved behaviour associated with long-distance navigation and imprinting,
27 such as butterflies, salmon, and sea turtles (Brower 1995; Dittman & Quinn 1996; Lohmann
28 *et al.* 1999). Sea turtles provide perhaps the best illustration of philopatry in the marine
29 environment since they return to their natal area after ~25-30 years and thousands of kms of
30 juvenile migration (Wyneken *et al.* 2013). Philopatry can be as accurate as 50 km (Hatase *et al.*
31 2002; Bowen & Karl 2007) and shapes population structure (Stiebens *et al.* 2013b). Yet,
32 its underlying mechanisms remain partly speculative.

33 Several studies have demonstrated that the Earth's magnetic field provides sufficient cues to
 34 guide animal migration (Wiltshko & Wiltshko 2005; Lohmann *et al.* 2008b). The Earth
 35 magnetism is driven by the motion of the molten iron in Earth's core and is defined by seven
 36 vectors (Campbell 2003). The shifting of liquid iron also means the magnetic field is in a
 37 constant state of flux over various time-scales. While it is acknowledged that imprinting
 38 occurs during the early stages of development or birth (Lohmann *et al.* 2008b), the
 39 underlying mechanisms of geomagnetic navigation remain unknown, particularly in sea
 40 turtles. Nevertheless, if, globally, geomagnetic imprinting determines philopatric behaviour
 41 (Brothers & Lohmann 2015), it should leave a signature of selection on the population
 42 genetic structure of sea turtles. This is because, within a region, if a location's (nesting site
 43 or natal area) geomagnetic profile differs extensively from neighbouring locations, the
 44 navigation accuracy of sea turtles should be high and genetic structure should increase, i.e.
 45 gene flow among populations should decrease.

46 By examining the possible determinants of genetic structure across the nesting aggregations
 47 (regions) of sea turtles, and across species with overlapping nesting distributions, we should
 48 be able to disentangle species-specific features of magneto-sensing from region-specific
 49 geomagnetic characteristics. This approach compensates for the lack of known underlying
 50 molecular mechanisms and the associated cline analysis of allele frequency change
 51 (Günther & Coop 2013). Positive correlations between geomagnetic field vectors and
 52 population genetic structure would confirm that sea turtles use vectors of the earth magnetic
 53 field for their philopatric migration. Finding no such pattern would challenge the imprinting
 54 hypothesis of early life stages as a potentially universal mechanism of navigation.

55 Here, we combine a thorough literature search with sampling and mitochondrial control
 56 region sequencing. We were able to obtain population structure data from five of the seven
 57 sea turtle species from 144 locations (nesting sites and natal areas) in nine regions globally,
 58 for ~ 17,470 sequences (Fig. 1). We obtained data from nesting regions where several
 59 species co-exist allowing us to disentangle species from region-specific effects and explore
 60 whether all species are equally responsive to geomagnetism. Specifically, we tested the
 61 correlation between genetic structure, estimated from Wright fixation indices, and
 62 geomagnetic vectors at natal areas. F_{ST} fixation indices from mitochondrial genes are widely
 63 used as markers of philopatric behaviours because of their maternal mode of inheritance
 64 (Bowen & Karl 2007).

65 **Methods**

66 Literature search and data collection

We took advantage of the well-characterized population genetic structure of sea turtle across the globe. Data were collected from published literature following a two-step process. Firstly, we used SWOT (The State of the World's Sea Turtles), IUCN (International Union for Conservation of Nature) and the grey literature to identify all the world nesting aggregations (Electronic supplementary material, Table S1). Secondly, we screened the primary and secondary literature for all studies with indices of population structure expressed as a pairwise Wright's fixation index (F_{ST} , γ_{ST} or ϕ_{ST}). To find this literature, we searched for "Sea turtle AND" either "Phylogeography", "Genetic structure", "Population structure" or "Mitochondrial DNA" together with the names of the nesting aggregations. We also performed individual searches for each of the seven sea turtle species substituting "Sea turtle" for: "Loggerhead", "Green turtle", "Hawksbill", "Leatherback", "Flatback", "Kemp's Ridley" and "Olive Ridley".

As our goal was to specifically compare genetic and geomagnetic information within sea turtle rookeries, obtaining exact nesting beach locations to derive accurate magnetic field information was important. Therefore, if the literature contained only one nesting site from a specific nesting region, this data point was removed (5 nesting sites removed). For literature that contained both nesting site and feeding ground genetic information, feeding ground data points were ignored. Data points in which genetic structure information was pooled from multiple geographic locations into a single general natal area were removed (18 nesting sites removed). When the exact nesting site sampled for a location could not be identified, data points were also removed (3 nesting sites removed). This resulted in the use of 144 locations (Electronic supplementary material, Table S2).

Nesting sites and areas among sea turtle species were grouped into what we define as "nesting regions" based on geographic location. We did not use regional management units (RMUs) due to the lack of consistency of RMUs among species, which would prevent direct comparison. It resulted into a dataset composed of 144 locations, from 9 different nesting regions worldwide for 5 of the 7 sea turtle species. Noteworthy, as gene flow across regions does not occur, data points between nesting regions did not enter the analyses to avoid biasing for high values of genetic structure indices.

Population structure in the largest North East Atlantic loggerhead turtle rookery

To complement the existing information, we also added data from the Cape Verde Archipelago, the 3rd largest aggregation of loggerhead turtles in the world. Field surveys took place in the Cape Verde archipelago in 2011, 2012 and 2013 during the nesting season from June to October. Nine different islands were sampled: Boavista, Fogo, Maio, Sal, Santa Luzia, Santiago, Santo Antão, São Nicolau and São Vicente. A 3mm piece of non-

keratinized tissue was removed from the right front flipper using a single-use disposable scalpel and samples were stored in ethanol (Stiebens *et al.* 2013a; Stiebens *et al.* 2013b). Turtles were tagged with metal tags and/or pit tags directly after egg deposition to track nesting behaviour and to avoid multiple sampling. In the laboratory, each sample was washed in distilled water for 20 seconds and cut into smaller pieces. DNA from tissues was extracted using the DNeasy® 96 Blood & Tissue Kit (QIAGEN, Hilden, Germany). Elution was conducted in twice 75 µl of AE Buffer. All other steps followed the manufacturer's protocol.

The control region of the mitochondrial DNA was amplified using the Primers LCM15382 (5'-GCTTAACCCTAAAGCATTGG-3') and H950 (5'-GTCTCGGATTAGGGGTTTG-3') (Abreu-Grobois *et al.* 2006) following (Stiebens *et al.* 2013a). PCR products were cleaned with ExoSAP-IT® following the manufacturer's protocol. Cycle sequencing reactions were performed with Big Dye® Terminator v3.1 Cycle Sequencing Kit (Applied Biosystems, Darmstadt, Germany). Sequences were obtained from the forward direction. In cases where a sufficiently long fragment could not be obtained, fragments were additionally sequenced from the reverse direction to build a longer contig. Sequencing was performed in an ABI 3730 Genetic Analyzer (Applied Biosystems, Darmstadt, Germany). Sequences were assembled in Codon Code Aligner v5.0 (CodonCode Corporation, Dedham, Massachusetts) and ambiguities were corrected by hand. All the amplified mitochondrial sequences were classified accordingly to the standardized nomenclature of the Archie Carr Centre for Sea turtle Research (<http://accstr.ufl.edu>). Wright's fixation index (F_{ST}) were computed with 10.000 permutations using Arlequin v3.5.1²⁸ (Electronic supplementary material, Table S3).

Defining the geomagnetic profiles

To evaluate whether the global nesting regions have significantly different geomagnetic profiles and to test for the stability of the difference in the last century, for each nesting site, we collected geomagnetic profiles at 3 time-points (the present day, standardized as 01/08/2015, 50 and 100 years prior to the present day). This confirmation step is important since it serves as a pre-requisite for the geomagnetic field to act as a reliable source of navigation cues everywhere and on an ecologically relevant timeframe. We used the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) Magnetic Field Calculator (<http://www.ngdc.noaa.gov/geomag-web/#igrfwmm>) and the International Geomagnetic Reference Field (IGRF) model, by entering the GPS coordinate of each natal area. The resulting geomagnetic field vectors included: declination and inclination in degrees (°), horizontal intensity in nano-teslas (nT) as well as the northern component (nT), eastern component (nT), vertical component (nT) and total field intensity (nT) at each natal area.

Estimating migration error rate

To estimate sea turtle navigational error (error rate), we focused on distances between isolines (bands of equal magnetic intensity) within a region. We first established the most northern and southern natal areas and their coordinates within each region. Next, we obtained geographic coordinates at each change of 1000nT (i.e. a change in 1 isoline) between these coordinates using the NOAA Magnetic Field Calculator (<https://www.ngdc.noaa.gov/geomag-web/#igrfgrid>) with the IGRF. Each region was given a standardized longitude comprised of the mean longitude of its most northern and southern locations. We then calculated the distance in kilometres between the geographic coordinates of each isoline using the NOAA Latitude/Longitude Distance Calculator. A region's navigational error rate is therefore given by the mean of the distances between its isolines.

Magnetic variation across regions

To quantify the selection acting on turtle philopatric accuracy, we also assessed how much error a turtle might accrue if it mistook adjacent vertical and total field intensity isolines. Vertical field intensity and total field intensity at each 1-degree change in latitude across regions were collected using the NOAA Magnetic Field Calculator with the IGRF. We defined each region by their most northern and most southern natal areas and longitude for a region was standardized as the mean of the longitudes of the natal areas within the region. This particular data collection was done in 2-year intervals across 24 years till the present day (01/08/1991 – 01/08/2015), based on the time it would take a turtle to sexually mature from hatching. Natal locations were categorized into northern or southern hemisphere based on their latitude.

Data analyses

Statistical analyses were performed in R Studio version 3.2.5 [(C) 2016 The R Foundation for Statistical Computing]. Three between-class analyses (BCA from the *ade4* package (Dray & Dufour 2007)) were performed (for the present day, 50 and 100 years prior to the present day) to establish whether geomagnetic field vectors differ among sea turtle nesting regions worldwide and whether these differences were stable across time.

To test for the possible correlation between geomagnetism and population structure (indices of population genetics differentiation at specific locations), the individual geomagnetic vectors were converted into distance matrices using the maximum distance (supremum norm) between any two points of a breeding region. We used the maximum distance as this accounts for potential land-barriers and Euclidean or ordinary-line distance would oversimplify distances among natal locations. As the geomagnetic field is intrinsically linked

to geographic location (confirmed here; Pearson's product-moment correlation, $t = 39.658$, $df = 1287$, $p < 0.001$), geomagnetism in our models was used as the residuals of the correlation between the magnetic field and geographic distance. Our global model included sea turtle fixation indices as the response variable with geomagnetic residuals, geographic distance between locations, sea turtle region and the two way interactions between the geomagnetic residuals and the other variables. This model was backward selected using the Akaike's Information Criterion (Burnham & Anderson 2004)(stepAIC). Further independent linear models were performed to explore both the relationship between sea turtle population genetic structure and the geomagnetic field as well as the relationship between the rate of error in "magneto-sensing" and "non-magneto sensing" regions in the northern and southern hemispheres.

Results and Discussion

Sea turtles require region-specific geomagnetic vectors that are stable over at least one generation if they are to use the earth's magnetic field to conduct their philopatric migration. Hence, we studied the geomagnetic signatures over the last century (present, 50 and 100 years before present) from all regions for the five sea turtle species for which we obtained genetic data. We confirmed that each region has had a specific geomagnetic signature at any time point over the last century (Randomization Test - Present: Obs = 0.049, $p = 0.001$; 50 years before present (BP): Obs = 0.827, $p = 0.001$; 100 years BP: Obs = 0.821, $p = 0.001$, Fig. 2). This result is a mandatory pre-requisite for the geomagnetic field to provide informative navigational cues across nesting regions and over time.

A principal component analysis, for the present day, shows that PC1 explains 89.4% of total variance, with PC2 explaining 6.42% (50-years before present (BP) PC1 = 90.23%, PC2 = 4.91%; 100-years BP PC1 = 89.55 %, PC2 = 5.9%). For PC1, 78.6% was explained by the vertical field component (Z) followed by total field intensity (F) with 21.3%. The pattern remained the same for both 50 (Z = 76.9%, F = 23.1% of PC1) and 100 years BP (Z = 77.2%, F = 22.8% of PC1). Thus, over the last century, this vector has been stable enough for turtles to differentiate between nesting regions. Previous studies showed that sea turtles from Florida can perceive magnetic total field intensity (Lohmann & Lohmann 1996; Lohmann *et al.* 2001; Lohmann *et al.* 2008b; Putman *et al.* 2011), an element of which is the vertical field component. Ultimately, this finding shows that geomagnetism is a basis acting as a navigational cue that underlies philopatric behaviours in sea turtle species at a time-scale relevant with both ecological (navigation) and evolutionary (population structure) processes.

As a second step, we investigated the correlation between geomagnetic vectors and indices of population structure for the five sea turtle species and 144 locations (Table S1). We found that within nesting regions, the stronger the geomagnetic difference between nesting groups is, the stronger the population structure ($F_{1, 694} = 52.845$, $p < 0.001$). We also found differences across species ($F_{4, 715} = 17.37$, $p < 0.001$) with generally higher genetic structure for the Hawksbill turtle (mean $\pm$ sd $F_{ST} = 0.451 \pm 0.283$) and lowest for the Olive Ridley ($F_{ST} = 0.009 \pm 0.044$). Strikingly, no interaction between species and geomagnetic vectors was detected ($F_{4, 694} = 0.997$, $p = 0.409$). Instead, an interaction between regions and geomagnetic vectors was a better predictor of the observed genetic structure ($F_{7, 694} = 11.620$, $p < 0.001$, Fig. 3a). Specifically, we found that the Northern/Western Caribbean, Northeast Pacific and Southwest Indian Ocean showed the expected positive correlation between genetic structure and geomagnetic field following the geomagnetic imprinting hypothesis (Northern/Western Caribbean: $F_{1, 256} = 12.75$, $p < 0.001$, Northeast Pacific: $F_{1, 21} = 6.318$, $p = 0.020$, Southwest Indian Ocean: $F_{1, 43} = 3.772$, $p = 0.059$). Crucially, this pattern was observed for all turtle species nesting within those regions, i.e. Green turtle, Hawksbill, Leatherback, Loggerhead and the Olive Ridley (Electronic supplementary material, Table S1). Thus, even though the absolute level of genetic differentiation may vary among sea turtle species, all turtles nesting in those three regions have retained parallel use of geomagnetic profile as a cue for their philopatric migration.

Conversely, in the six other nesting regions, we did not detect the expected relationship between population genetic structure and region-specific magnetic field. Here as well, this is true for all species nesting within those regions (All $F < 1.199$, all $p > 0.281$, Fig. 3b) and suggests that, in these regions, the magnetic field might not provide sufficient information to locate natal areas (i.e. area around their nesting site) with sufficiently high accuracy. Noteworthy, as expected, across the globe and across species, geographic distance was a good predictor of indices of population structure ($F_{1, 694} = 64.163$, $p < 0.001$). Overall, we demonstrate that geomagnetism-mediated philopatric behaviour is region-specific and not species-specific. This conclusion is reinforced by the parallel patterns observed across species within a region. But what are the characteristics of the earth magnetic field in some regions compared to others that would explain geomagnetic imprinting?

For each geomagnetic vector, the Earth is stratified by lines of constant magnetic values, known as isolines (Lohmann *et al.* 2008b)(Fig. 1). As coastlines are marked by isolines, sea turtles are thought to follow magnetism of equal value back to the area near their nesting sites (Lohmann *et al.* 2008b; Endres *et al.* 2016). Aggregated magnetic isolines across a geographic area highlight intense clines of the specific geomagnetic vector, whereas more

dispersed isolines over the same distance represent weaker gradients of the same vector. We tested whether the different groups of regions varied in the vertical and total field intensity vectors, which we show best characterize the specific rookeries. We also assessed whether there was any consistency in the variation across both hemispheres. We found magnetic-regions, i.e. those with correlations between population structure and the geomagnetic vectors, to differ significantly from non-magnetic regions for vertical field intensity in both the northern and the southern hemisphere (Northern Hemisphere: $F_{1, 1376} = 383.5$, $p < 0.001$, Southern Hemisphere: $F_{1, 713} = 219.5$, $p < 0.001$, Fig. 4a). Magnetic regions, therefore, are those that typically have increased vertical field intensity compared to non-magnetic regions, regardless of hemisphere. Magnetic and non-magnetic regions also differ in their total field intensity in the northern hemisphere ($F_{1, 1376} = 120.7$, $p < 0.001$), however no difference was found between regions in the southern hemisphere ($F_{1, 713} = 2.087$, $p = 0.149$, Fig. 4b).

To quantify the selection acting on turtle philopatric accuracy, we determined how far a turtle might stray if it mistakenly followed adjacent vertical and total field intensity isolines. We show that sea turtles from geomagnetic regions have significantly lower rates of philopatric error ($223\text{km} \pm 93\text{km}$) based on total field intensity compared to those in non-geomagnetic regions ($390\text{km} \pm 184\text{km}$, $F_{1, 217} = 8.366$, $p < 0.001$, Fig. 5). In contrast, no such difference was found between geomagnetic regions ($120\text{km} \pm 21\text{km}$) and non-geomagnetic regions ($124\text{km} \pm 46\text{km}$) for the error-rate if sea turtles were to use vertical field isolines alone ($F_{1, 227} = -0.889$, $p = 0.375$). This result is consistent with research based on hatchling geomagnetic orientation, which follow bi-coordinate geomagnetic map from which both longitudinal and latitudinal information can be derived (Lohmann *et al.* 2008b; Putman *et al.* 2011). As the vertical field only gives information towards the magnetic equator (i.e. equator = 0), it is unlikely sea turtles would use it alone. Instead, turtles likely derive information from the combined use of vertical and total field intensity.

While our findings are consistent with previous studies (Lohmann *et al.* 2008b; Endres *et al.* 2016; Brothers & Lohmann 2018), we demonstrate that geomagnetic imprinting is regional, not universal. This result concurs with secular variation of the Earth's magnetic field, which causes female sea turtles to change natal locations as magnetic signatures drift along coastlines (Brothers & Lohmann 2015). In general, our result demonstrates that slight inaccuracy in the detection of the geomagnetic field vector may lead turtles to fail to return to breeding sites (Lohmann *et al.* 2008b) creating extreme selection pressure to increase nesting site fidelity.

Overall, our study reveals the selective pressure exerted by the geomagnetic field on sea turtle population structure and how this contributes to sea turtle evolution. In geomagnetic-regions, isolines are close enough to one another to provide sufficiently accurate navigational information for turtles to reach their natal area and reproduce. This pattern of philopatry will ultimately restrict gene flow among populations within regions and among regions. In regions with distant isolines, navigation mistakes could result in the best case in increased gene flow among natal areas, or in the worst case in failure to reproduce at all. In these regions, philopatric journeys will likely require sea turtles to utilize multi-modal cues, e.g. olfaction and geomagnetism (Lohmann *et al.* 1999; Lohmann *et al.* 2008a; Endres *et al.* 2016). Previous genetic analyses also show that the accuracy of sea turtle philopatric journeys vary between different populations (Meylan *et al.* 1990; Bowen & Karl 2007; Lee *et al.* 2007) and our results could suggest these differences in accuracy may be determined by local cue. It would also explain why turtles with disrupted magneto-sensing capacity by the application of magnet on their head, despite longer journey, find their natal area (Luschi *et al.* 2007).

In our study, we cannot account for all the other parameters that also influence the distribution of sea turtles. For instance, modern and historical climates (Poloczanska *et al.* 2009; Pike 2013), ocean currents (Putman *et al.* 2010) or plate tectonics (Bowen *et al.* 1989) have all been implicated in the distribution of sea turtles. Our results suggest that rookery-specific environmental pressures will define which parameter is the most important. Interestingly, the framework we have detailed in this study should facilitate testing the different possible drivers of population genetics and ultimately determine their relative contribution in other species that have evolved philopatric behaviours.

In conclusion, while our results demonstrate that there is sufficient differentiation among the geomagnetic fields of sea turtle rookeries, location-specific use of given vectors suggests the parallel (across species) and local (to regions) adaptation of navigational cue recognition. Whilst our analyses focus specifically on sea turtles, its relevance extends to other taxa conducting long-distance migrations to and from their natal areas. Many other marine organisms e.g. elephant seals, European eels or salmon have been hypothesized to imprint on a natal geomagnetic field to complete their philopatric migrations (Matsumura *et al.* 2011; Putman *et al.* 2013; Putman *et al.* 2014; Baltazar-Soares & Eizaguirre 2017; Naisbett-Jones *et al.* 2017). Our results suggest that underlying mechanisms for geomagnetic navigation are locally adapted and future research into such mechanisms should focus on evolved region-specific and coupled systems rather than a universal molecular/physiological mechanism.

References

- 315 1.
- 316 Abreu-Grobois, F.A., Horrocks, J., Formia, A., Dutton, P., LeRoux, R., Vélez-Zuazo, X. *et al.* (2006).
317 New mtDNA Dloop primers which work for a variety of marine turtle species may increase
318 the resolution of mixed stock analyses. In: *Proceedings of the 26th annual symposium on sea*
319 *turtle biology. Island of Crete, Greece: ISTS*, p. 179.
- 320 2.
- 321 Baker, C.S., Steel, D., Calambokidis, J., Falcone, E., González-Peral, U., Barlow, J. *et al.* (2013). Strong
322 maternal fidelity and natal philopatry shape genetic structure in North Pacific humpback
323 whales. *Marine Ecology Progress Series*, 494, 291-306.
- 324 3.
- 325 Baltazar-Soares, M. & Eizaguirre, C. (2017). Animal Navigation: The Eel's Magnetic Guide to the Gulf
326 Stream. *Current Biology*, 27, R604-R606.
- 327 4.
- 328 Bowen, B.W. & Karl, S. (2007). Population genetics and phylogeography of sea turtles. *Molecular*
329 *Ecology*, 16, 4886-4907.
- 330 5.
- 331 Bowen, B.W., Meylan, A.B. & Avise, J.C. (1989). An odyssey of the green sea turtle: Ascension Island
332 revisited. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 86, 573-576.
- 333 6.
- 334 Brothers, J.R. & Lohmann, K.J. (2015). Evidence for geomagnetic imprinting and magnetic navigation
335 in the natal homing of sea turtles. *Current Biology*, 25, 392-396.
- 336 7.
- 337 Brothers, J.R. & Lohmann, K.J. (2018). Evidence that Magnetic Navigation and Geomagnetic
338 Imprinting Shape Spatial Genetic Variation in Sea Turtles. *Current Biology*, 28, 1325-
339 1329.e1322.
- 340 8.
- 341 Brower, L.P. (1995). Understanding and misunderstanding the migration of the monarch
342 butterfly(Nymphalidae) in North America: 1857-1995. *Journal of the Lepidopterists Society*,
343 49, 304-385.
- 344 9.
- 345 Burnham, K.P. & Anderson, D.R. (2004). Multimodel Inference. *Sociological Methods & Research*, 33,
346 261-304.
- 347 10.
- 348 Campbell, W.H. (2003). *Introduction to geomagnetic fields*. Cambridge University Press.
- 349 11.
- 350 Dittman, A. & Quinn, T. (1996). Homing in Pacific salmon: mechanisms and ecological basis. *Journal*
351 *of Experimental Biology*, 199, 83-91.
- 352 12.
- 353 Dray, S. & Dufour, A.-B. (2007). The ade4 package: implementing the duality diagram for ecologists.
354 *Journal of statistical software*, 22, 1-20.
- 355 13.
- 356 Endres, C.S., Putman, N.F., Ernst, D.A., Kurth, J.A., Lohmann, C.M. & Lohmann, K.J. (2016). Multi-
357 modal homing in sea turtles: modeling dual use of geomagnetic and chemical cues in island-
358 finding. *Frontiers in behavioral neuroscience*, 10.

- 359 14.
- 360 FitzSimmons, N.N., Limpus, C.J., Norman, J.A., Goldizen, A.R., Miller, J.D. & Moritz, C. (1997).
- 361 Philopatry of male marine turtles inferred from mitochondrial DNA markers. *Proceedings of*
- 362 *the National Academy of Sciences*, 94, 8912-8917.
- 363 15.
- 364 Greenwood, P.J. (1980). Mating systems, philopatry and dispersal in birds and mammals. *Animal*
- 365 *Behaviour*, 28, 1140-1162.
- 366 16.
- 367 Günther, T. & Coop, G. (2013). Robust identification of local adaptation from allele frequencies.
- 368 *Genetics*, 195, 205-220.
- 369 17.
- 370 Hatase, H., Takai, N., Matsuzawa, Y., Sakamoto, W., Omuta, K., Goto, K. *et al.* (2002). Size-related
- 371 differences in feeding habitat use of adult female loggerhead turtles *Caretta caretta* around
- 372 Japan determined by stable isotope analyses and satellite telemetry. *Marine Ecology*
- 373 *Progress Series*, 233, 273-281.
- 374 18.
- 375 Jesmer, B.R., Merkle, J.A., Goheen, J.R., Aikens, E.O., Beck, J.L., Courtemanch, A.B. *et al.* (2018). Is
- 376 ungulate migration culturally transmitted? Evidence of social learning from translocated
- 377 animals. *Science*, 361, 1023-1025.
- 378 19.
- 379 Lee, P.L., Luschi, P. & Hays, G.C. (2007). Detecting female precise natal philopatry in green turtles
- 380 using assignment methods. *Molecular Ecology*, 16, 61-74.
- 381 20.
- 382 Lohmann, K., Hester, J. & Lohmann, C. (1999). Long-distance navigation in sea turtles. *Ethology*
- 383 *Ecology & Evolution*, 11, 1-23.
- 384 21.
- 385 Lohmann, K. & Lohmann, C. (1996). Orientation and open-sea navigation in sea turtles. *Journal of*
- 386 *Experimental Biology*, 199, 73-81.
- 387 22.
- 388 Lohmann, K.J., Cain, S.D., Dodge, S.A. & Lohmann, C.M. (2001). Regional magnetic fields as
- 389 navigational markers for sea turtles. *Science*, 294, 364-366.
- 390 23.
- 391 Lohmann, K.J., Luschi, P. & Hays, G. (2008a). Goal navigation and island-finding in sea turtles. *Journal*
- 392 *of Experimental Marine Biology and Ecology*, 356, 83-95.
- 393 24.
- 394 Lohmann, K.J., Putman, N.F. & Lohmann, C.M.F. (2008b). Geomagnetic imprinting: A unifying
- 395 hypothesis of long-distance natal homing in salmon and sea turtles. *Proceedings of the*
- 396 *National Academy of Sciences*, 105, 19096-19101.
- 397 25.
- 398 Luschi, P., Benhamou, S., Girard, C., Ciccione, S., Roos, D., Sudre, J. *et al.* (2007). Marine turtles use
- 399 geomagnetic cues during open-sea homing. *Current Biology*, 17, 126-133.
- 400 26.

401 Matsumura, M., Watanabe, Y.Y., Robinson, P.W., Miller, P.J., Costa, D.P. & Miyazaki, N. (2011).
402 Underwater and surface behavior of homing juvenile northern elephant seals. *Journal of*
403 *Experimental Biology*, 214, 629-636.
404 27.

405 Meylan, A., Bowen, B. & Avise, J. (1990). A genetic test of the natal homing versus social facilitation
406 models for green turtle migration. *Science*, 248, 724-727.
407 28.

408 Naisbett-Jones, L.C., Putman, N.F., Stephenson, J.F., Ladak, S. & Young, K.A. (2017). A Magnetic Map
409 Leads Juvenile European Eels to the Gulf Stream. *Current Biology*, 27, 1236-1240.
410 29.

411 Pike, D.A. (2013). Climate influences the global distribution of sea turtle nesting. *Global Ecology and*
412 *Biogeography*, 22, 555-566.
413 30.

414 Poloczanska, E.S., Limpus, C.J. & Hays, G.C. (2009). Vulnerability of marine turtles to climate change.
415 *Advances in marine biology*, 56, 151-211.
416 31.

417 Putman, N.F., Bane, J.M. & Lohmann, K.J. (2010). Sea turtle nesting distributions and oceanographic
418 constraints on hatchling migration. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*,
419 277, 3631-3637.
420 32.

421 Putman, N.F., Endres, C.S., Lohmann, C.M. & Lohmann, K.J. (2011). Longitude perception and
422 bicoordinate magnetic maps in sea turtles. *Current Biology*, 21, 463-466.
423 33.

424 Putman, N.F., Jenkins, E.S., Michielsens, C.G. & Noakes, D.L. (2014). Geomagnetic imprinting predicts
425 spatio-temporal variation in homing migration of pink and sockeye salmon. *Journal of The*
426 *Royal Society Interface*, 11, 20140542.
427 34.

428 Putman, N.F., Lohmann, K.J., Putman, E.M., Quinn, T.P., Klimley, A.P. & Noakes, D.L. (2013). Evidence
429 for geomagnetic imprinting as a homing mechanism in Pacific salmon. *Current Biology*, 23,
430 312-316.
431 35.

432 Stiebens, V.A., Merino, S.E., Chain, F.J. & Eizaguirre, C. (2013a). Evolution of MHC class I genes in the
433 endangered loggerhead sea turtle (*Caretta caretta*) revealed by 454 amplicon sequencing.
434 *BMC evolutionary biology*, 13, 95.
435 36.

436 Stiebens, V.A., Merino, S.E., Roder, C., Chain, F.J., Lee, P.L. & Eizaguirre, C. (2013b). Living on the
437 edge: how philopatry maintains adaptive potential. *Proceedings of the Royal Society of*
438 *London B: Biological Sciences*, 280, 20130305.
439 37.

440 Wiltschko, W. & Wiltschko, R. (2005). Magnetic orientation and magnetoreception in birds and other
441 animals. *Journal of Comparative Physiology A*, 191, 675-693.
442 38.

443 Wyneken, J., Lohmann, K.J. & Musick, J.A. (2013). *The Biology of Sea Turtles*. Taylor & Francis.
444

445 Acknowledgements

446 We would like to thank the members of the Eizaguirre Lab for discussions and comments on
447 earlier versions of the manuscript. We also would like to thank G. Schofield for comments on
448 a previous version of this manuscript.

449

450 Author Contributions

451 CE and SJKC designed the study, CE and SJKC conducted sampling in Cape Verde. CE
452 and MBS conducted the molecular analyses. SJKC performed all the statistics of the meta-
453 analysis and drafted the manuscript. All authors edited the manuscript and contributed to its
454 final version.

455 Declaration of Interests

456 The authors declare no competing interests.

457

Figures

Fig. 1: World Magnetic Model (Epoch 2015.0) of total field intensity. Turtle species, locations split by nesting regions and field intensity isolines ($\Delta=1000\text{nT}$) are shown. Abbreviated nesting regions: EC = Eastern Caribbean, I-P = Indo-Pacific, MED = Mediterranean, NEP = Northeast Pacific, N/WC = Northern/Western Caribbean, NWP = Northwest Pacific, SEA = Southeast Atlantic, SWA = Southwest Atlantic, SWIO = Southwest Indian Ocean.

Fig. 2: Geomagnetic fields' representation. Principle component analysis including eigenvectors (D = Declination, I = Inclination, H = Horizontal Component, F = Total Field Intensity, X = North Component, Y = East Component, Z = Vertical Component) illustrating the geomagnetic vectors for each region from all sea turtle species. (a) The present day (01/08/2015), (b) 50 years and (c) 100 years prior to the present day.

Fig. 3a & b: Relationship between sea turtle population structure and the geomagnetic field. The geomagnetic field is expressed as residuals of the correlation between the geomagnetic field and geographic distance. (a) Shows the overall relationship for all regions and (b) these relationships for geomagnetic regions, that offer low rates of navigational error, and for non-geomagnetic (high rates of navigational error) regions.

Fig. 4a & b: Magnetic field vector intensity for geomagnetic and non-geomagnetic regions split by hemisphere. Means and standard deviation depicted. Data collected at each change of 1 degree of latitude, across each region from the most northern sea turtle natal areas to the most southern. Each data point (isoline) was sampled over 24 years from 01/08/1991 to 01/08/2015 at 2-year intervals, i.e. the average time a sea turtle would take to mature. (a) Shows vertical field intensity and (b) shows total field intensity.

Fig. 5: Estimated error rate in geomagnetic and non-geomagnetic regions. Means and confidence intervals are depicted. Values are obtained for "geomagnetic" and "non-geomagnetic" regions from the estimation of distance if turtles confused two adjacent isolines for magnetic total field intensity and vertical field intensity.

Loggerhead

Green

Hawksbill

Leatherback

Olive Ridley

Regions grouped based on their relationship between
sea turtle population structure and geomagnetic difference