Combined influence of food availability and agricultural intensification on a declining aerial insectivore

Daniel R. Garrett[1,2], Fanie Pelletier[1], Dany Garant[1], and Marc Bélisle[1]

Authors Affiliations

[1]Département de biologie, Université de Sherbrooke, 2500 Boulevard de l'Université, Sherbrooke, Québec J1K2R1 Canada

[2]daniel.garrett@usherbrooke.ca

Abstract

Aerial insectivores show worldwide population declines coinciding with shifts in agricultural practices. Increasing reliance on certain agricultural practices, is thought to have led to an overall reduction in insect abundance that negatively effects aerial insectivore fitness. The relationship between prey availability and the fitness of insectivores may thus vary with the extent of agricultural production. It is therefore imperative to quantify the strength and direction of these associations. Here we used data from an 11-year study monitoring the breeding of Tree swallows (*Tachycineta bicolor*) and the availability of Diptera (their main prey) across a gradient of agricultural intensification in southern Québec, Canada. More specifically, we evaluated the landscape characteristics affecting prey availability, and how this relationship influences the fledging success, the duration of the nestling period, the fledgling body mass and wing length as these variables are known to influence the population dynamics of this species. Diptera availability was greatest within predominately forested landscapes, yet within principally agricultural landscapes, it was greatest within ones dominated by intensive row crops (corn, soybean and wheat), and, counter to our predictions, lowest within those dominated by forage and pasture fields. Of the measured fitness proxies, only fledging success was positively related to prey availability. The impact of prey availability varied across the agricultural gradient as fledging success improved with increasing prey levels within forage landscapes yet declined in more agro-intensive landscapes. Finally, once conditioning on prey availability, fledging success was lowest, nestling periods were the longest, and wing length of fledglings were shortest within more agro-intensive landscapes. Our results highlight the interacting roles that aerial insect availability and agricultural intensification have on the fitness of aerial insectivores, and by extension how food availability may interact with other aspects of breeding habitats to influence the population dynamics of predators.

Introduction

Food availability is a key determinant of population size and dynamics (Hailman and Lack 1955, McCamey and Slobodkin 1963, Newton 1998). The amount of food resources an individual can acquire from a given foraging effort affects the amount of energy it can potentially allocate to both its survival and reproduction, thereby affecting vital rates (Martin 1987, Newton 1998, 2002, Stephens et al. 2008). Food reduction or supplementation experiments are often used to quantify the impact of limiting food availability on reproductive output (Martin 1987, Seward et al. 2014, Ruffino et al. 2014, Seress et al. 2020). For example, *Bacillus thuringiensis* (Bt) insecticides are used to reduce insect abundance and both experimental and observational studies typically report reduced fitness of insectivorous predators following its application (Rodenhouse and Holmes 1992, Nagy and Smith 1997, Marshall et al. 2002, Poulin et al. 2010). Other studies, conducted under unaltered levels of food availability have reported no link with fitness outcomes of consumers (Dawson and Bortolotti 2000, Imlay et al. 2017, McClenaghan et al. 2019). Such contrasting results can be explained by food being overly abundant and thus other environmental (e.g. extreme temperature or elevated precipitation) or endogenous factors (e.g. parental condition, care and past experience), having greater influence than food availability in limiting reproductive output and subsequent population growth (Martin 1987, Newton 1998, White 2008, Winkler et al. 2013, Quinney 2019). Studies of naturally occurring predator-prey interactions are frequently within single landscapes, ones already suitable for elevated fitness, or occurred without reference to human dominated landscapes (Martin 1987, Fazey et al. 2005, Robb et al. 2008, Martin et al. 2012). Habitat induced variability in prey from such studies may thus not be great enough to influence the fitness of predators.

Human-driven landscape modifications are known to affect both the magnitude and direction of a broad spectrum of ecological processes occurring over a multitude of spatio-temporal scales and therefore studies disregarding such impacts may overlook confounding or interacting factors of foraging within anthropogenic landscapes (Rolstad 1991, Miller and Adams 1995, Fischer and Lindenmayer 2007, Davis 2007). For instance, populations of pest insects may be higher in landscapes with an abundance of large scale monocultures (Andow 1983, 1991). Yet in these same landscapes, the availability of other crucial resources may be limited, possibly influencing either the lifetime or annual fitness of animals continuing to perceive them as suitable breeding or foraging habitats (Gates and Gysel 1978, Robertson 2012, Hale et al. 2015, Letten et al. 2017). The historical removal of forests and replacement of grasslands and wetlands with agricultural lands, including the simplification of agricultural landscapes and a shift from mixed crop farming to livestock or intensive row-cropping, a process known as agricultural intensification, is one of the most prominent driver of human-induced landscape change (Lambin et al. 2001, Fischer and Lindenmayer 2007).

Despite agricultural intensification being linked to the decline of many vertebrates (Ceballos 2002, Rosenberg et al. 2019, Wagner 2020), the relationship between observed prey availability to the fitness of predators has rarely been investigated with respect to agricultural cover. As an example, several species of grassland and farmland birds displayed important declines since the 1970s (Jobin et al. 1996, Vickery et al. 2004, Boatman et al. 2004, Stanton et al. 2018, Rosenberg et al. 2019). In particular, steep declines are observed in many aerial insectivores, a guild of birds foraging near exclusively on aerial insects (Nebel et al. 2010, Smith et al. 2015, Michel et al. 2016, NABCI 2019). Due to spatio-temporal correlations between declines and agricultural intensification, a common hypothesis is that, declines are mediated through this process influencing the abundance

and species composition of these bird's food resources (McCracken 2008, Stanton et al. 2018, Twining et al. 2018, Spiller and Dettmers 2019). Multiple lines of evidence exist linking changes in specific insect communities, abundance, behavior or phenology to agricultural intensification (Benton et al. 2002, Thomas 2004, Pisa et al. 2015, Stanton et al. 2018, Montgomery et al. 2020, Wagner 2020). Yet, the link between agricultural intensification and aerial insectivore declines, through a reduction in the availability of food resources, has so far yielded inconsistent results (Evans et al. 2007, Nocera et al. 2012, Imlay et al. 2017, Stanton et al. 2017, McClenaghan et al. 2019).

Within agricultural landscapes, practices such as large-scale, simplified arable row-cropping, increased reliance on agro-chemical inputs (i.e. pesticides and fertilizers) as well as the removal of both natural and marginal habitats are suspected to be the primary drivers of changes of insect populations (Tscharntke et al. 2005, Grüebler et al. 2008, Attwood et al. 2008, Montgomery et al. 2020). Furthermore, within heavily cultivated landscapes, the same mechanisms reducing insect abundance, may also impact insectivorous birds, either irrespective of, or in conjunction with, levels of prey. For example, due to the near reliance on pesticides, insectivorous birds breeding within landscapes dominated by agro-intensive monocultures (e.g. corn or soybean) may not only be exposed to decreased prey availability, but also to elevated toxicological loads of food items (Morrissey et al. 2015, Haroune et al. 2015, Giroux 2019, Montiel-León et al. 2019). Breeding within agro-intensive landscapes may thus have the potential to impact fitness not only through a trophic pathway, via variation in prey availability, but also through indirect pathways linked to agricultural intensification (Stanton et al. 2018). It is therefore imperative to understand the role of prey availability on aerial insectivore fitness under a range of agricultural contexts. The lack of strong evidence of trophic links is possibly due to the logistical constraints to evaluate these

relationships experimentally. Therefore, longitudinal studies incorporating congruent measurements of the fitness of aerial insectivores and the seasonal availability of their prey across a range of agricultural contexts are needed.

Here, we present results of an 11-year study monitoring both the reproductive attempts of Tree swallows (*Tachycineta bicolor*) and the availability of their aerial insect prey throughout a nest box network located along a gradient of agricultural intensification in southern Québec, Canada. Tree swallows breed over much of North America and demonstrate population declines similar to those of most other aerial insectivores, especially in the north eastern portion of their breeding range (Shutler et al. 2012, Smith et al. 2015, Michel et al. 2016, Stanton et al. 2018). Our principal objectives were to assess evidence with respect to three hypotheses. The first was that a gradient of agricultural intensification influences the availability of aerial insectivore prey, and we predicted that landscapes with increasing levels of arable row crops would result in a reduction in prey availability (Benton et al. 2002, Thomas 2004, Pisa et al. 2015, Stanton et al. 2018, Montgomery et al. 2020, Wagner 2020). The second hypothesis was that, as aerial insectivores, breeding Tree swallows are food limited (McCracken 2008, Stanton et al. 2018, Twining et al. 2018, Spiller and Dettmers 2019). Therefore, periods of increased prey availability should result in greater fitness. Our third hypothesis was that Tree swallow fitness is influenced by agricultural landcover through more than just a trophic pathway. We therefore predicted that, upon conditioning on prey availability, breeding attempts within landscapes occupied by increasing row crops should result in decreased fitness.

Population growth of short lived species is thought to be driven by adult and juvenile return rates and to a lesser extent fecundity (Saether and Bakke 2000). Within Tree swallow populations, adult survival appear to be relatively stable throughout their distribution (Weegman et al. 2017, Clark et

al. 2018). Furthermore, recent evidence demonstrates that, due to their high elasticity, population viability of this species could largely be determined by fledgling survival and recruitment rates (Jones et al. 2017, Weegman et al. 2017, Cox et al. 2018). Although food limitation can be influential throughout the life cycle (Hostetler et al. 2015, Knight et al. 2019), given the above, we focus primarily on the nestling period as factors influencing fledgling number and post fledging survival are suggested to be significantly impactful to population growth. We therefore assess the influence of prey availability on the fledging success, the duration of the nestling period and the morphological traits of fledglings (hitherto referred collectively as fitness proxies). Evidence suggests food availability and agricultural landscapes can be influential to both nestling growth and condition, and yet has only recently received more attention as a possible driver of aerial insectivore declines (Smith and Bruun 1998, Granbom and Smith 2006, Pigeon et al. 2013, Almasi et al. 2015, Kusack et al. 2020, Houle et al. 2020). Therefore we assess the possibility that links between agricultural intensification and declining populations of aerial insectivores are not only through a reduction in the number of fledglings, but also through reduced offspring condition, as this may carry over and affect future recruitment and productivity (Stutchbury et al. 2011, Naef-Daenzer and Grüebler 2016, Saino et al. 2018, Evans et al. 2020, Jones and Ward 2020).

Methods

Study area and nest box system

Between 2006 and 2016, we monitored breeding attempts of Tree swallows within 400 nest boxes dispersed throughout a gradient of agricultural intensification in southern Quebec, Canada. Ten nest boxes were spaced approximately 50 m apart along the field margins of 40 different farms, located in various agricultural landscape contexts (Figure 1; see Ghilain and Bélisle 2008 for details). The gradient of agricultural intensification was characterized by an east-west shift of

agricultural production. While the eastern portion of the system was composed primarily of pastures and forage crops (e.g. hay, alfalfa and clover) interspersed with large expanses of forest cover, the west was dominated by large-scale monocultures (principally corn, soybean and wheat) and was denuded of forest cover (Bélanger and Grenier 2002, Jobin et al. 2005, Ruiz and Domon 2009). This increased use of monocultures has resulted in a near reliance on fertilizers, pesticides, mechanization and drainage of surface waters and wetlands (Jobin et al. 1996, 2003). Furthermore, between 2011 to 2019, approximately 100% of the corn and 60% of the soybean were sown as neonicotinoid-coated seeds in our study area (MDDELCC 2015). Subsequently, within the water bodies of the western part of our study area, neonicotinoids, as well as many other pesticides, are frequently detected at levels threatening to aquatic life if chronically exposed (Giroux 2019, Montiel-León et al. 2019).

Nest box monitoring and nestling condition

Each year, nest boxes were monitored prior to the arrival of Tree swallows and then every two days throughout the breeding season (Supplemental S3). This detailed monitoring allowed us to accurately estimate the dates of laying, incubation, hatching, and fledging, as well as record the number of eggs, nestlings and fledglings of each breeding event. We caught and banded adult females during incubation and adult males during food provisioning. We were 99% and 80% successful, respectively, at capturing targeted adults. Once caught, adults received an aluminum US Geological Survey (USGS) band containing a unique identification code. At 12 days of age, nestlings also received a USGS band. To prevent premature fledging, following 16 days of age, the number of nestlings remaining within nest boxes were only counted, thus the exact date each nestling fledged is unknown.

Insect samples and prey availability

Throughout the duration of this study, two insect traps were placed on each of the 40 farms (N=80). Traps were spaced at least 250 meters apart along the central portion of each nest box transect. The content of traps was collected every two days throughout each breeding season. Insect traps were a combined window/water-pan flight trap. Traps were made by bisecting two plexiglass sheets (11.5 cm x 30 cm), and then fixing them on top of a yellow bucket 15 cm deep and 21 cm in diameter (Rioux Paquette et al. 2013, Bellavance et al. 2018). Traps were then attached to a stake one meter above the ground and filled with approximately one liter of a saltwater and soap solution. The content of each trap was collected by straining out the insects into a tube filled with 70% ethanol. Samples were then stored in closed boxes at room temperature until processing.

Our interest being in prey availability during the nestling rearing period, we focused the processing of insect samples collected between 1 June and 15 July, covering over 96% of breeding attempts (Supplemental S3). In our system, about 70% of the insects found within food boluses provided to nestlings are Diptera (Bellavance et al. 2018), and is pattern shared with other Tree swallows study systems (McCarty and Winkler 1999, Johnson and Lombardo 2000, Mengelkoch et al. 2004, Twining et al. 2018). We thus used the biomass of Diptera within each sample as a proxy of prey availability (using the number of Diptera resulted in qualitatively similar results; analyses not shown). Once extracted, the number of individual Diptera was recorded and the sample was placed in an oven at 60ºC for over 24 hours, ensuring no further change in biomass occurred. Once dried, samples were weighed without delay ($\pm$ 0.0001 g). The dried biomass of Diptera (hereinafter referred to as Diptera biomass) from these samples thus represents an estimate of prey availability on a specific farm and year over the two days prior to the sample collection.

Fitness proxies

We focused on four fitness proxies; the proportion of a brood that fledged (fledging success), the duration of the nestling period, and the body mass and wing length of fledglings. Field methods did not allow us to define the fledging dates of specific nestlings. Consequently, the duration of the nestling phase was represented by the number of days between the maximum hatching date and mean Julian date between the first and last disappeared nestlings. At 16 days of age, we measured nestling mass ($\pm$ 0.01 g) and wing lengths ($\pm$ 1 mm) using a wing ruler. Mean fledging age was 19.69 $\pm$ 1.77 (SD) and the mean number of days between the first and last disappeared nestling was 1.58 $\pm$ 1.08 (SD). We therefore assumed morphological measures at 16 days of age were representative of fledgling morphology (Zach and Mayoh 1982, McCarty 2001).

Landscape composition

Landscape composition (i.e. the relative coverage of habitats composing a given landscape) was derived separately for each farm at the end of each breeding season and required the characterization of habitats and cultures within 500 m of each nest box. This 500 m spatial scale represents the area within which nestling-rearing female Tree swallows spend ~80% of their time (Garrett et al. in prep, McCarty and Winkler 1999a) and is the largest extent for which exhaustive annual characterization of landscapes has been performed in our system since 2006 (Porlier et al. 2009). Parcels representing different habitats and agricultural fields within each 500-m buffer were delineated using orthophotos (scale 1:40 000) in QGIS (QGIS 2020), then characterized *in situ*. This included characterizing which cultures, if any, were in agricultural fields. Habitats and cultures were then reclassified into one of five higher order categories, representing the habitats Tree swallows are hypothesized to use as indicators of nest-site selection, and the principal habitats composing landscapes throughout this system (Rendell and Robertson 1989, 1990, Winkler et al.

2020). These higher order categories are forested, corn and soybean, forage fields (including hay fields, other grasses, alfalfa, clover, pastures and old fields), and cereals (other than corn and soybean). We then calculated the mean percent cover of higher order habitats across the 10 nest boxes on each farm and for every year independently.

To obtain an integrative measure of the percent cover of all higher order habitats, defined as the landscape context, we used a robust principal components analysis (PCA) for compositional data (Filzmoser et al. 2009) to assign "site scores" to each of the farms during each year. Site scores were defined by the values along the first two components of the resulting compositional PCA of each farm during each year as fitted using the robCompositions package in R (Templ et al. 2011). This method takes into consideration the principle that values of compositional data are inherently related to one another given they must sum to one and resulted in the calculation of 440 different landscape contexts observed throughout the duration of the study (i.e. 40 farms x 11 years). Site scores were then assigned to each breeding attempt and insect sample and used in all subsequent analyses as they allow for comparative measurements of landscape contexts.

The first component (Comp.1) of the PCA explained 80.34% of the variance in landcover and correlated positively with corn and soybean and negatively with both forage fields and forest cover. The second component (Comp.2) explained 14.69% of the variance in landcover and correlated negatively with forage fields and positively with forest cover (Figure 2). Landscapes expressed by maximizing Comp.1 and minimizing Comp.2 represent ones for which there is a mixture of corn, soybean, and cereals and denuded of forest cover, and are thus referred to as mixed-row crop landscapes. Landscapes expressed by minimizing Comp.1 and with negative Comp.2 values represent ones for which there is an abundance of forage and pasture fields with average forest cover and are thus referred to as forage landscapes.

Finally, GPS data highlighted that breeding females can take daily trips at great distances from their nest boxes in order to forage over large open-water bodies (Garrett et al. unpublished data). These landscape features are however rare within our study area. Because these long-distance trips may be important to the subsequent reproductive output of breeding individuals, we performed a post-hoc model comparison determining the spatial extent to which the percent cover of open water was influential in predicting fledging success. Each model had an identical set of covariates and random effect structure (model: Base + Food * Land in Table S1), varying only by the percent cover of open water calculated at increasing spatial extents between 500 m to 10 km, at 500-m increments. This modeling endeavor resulted in only one local minimum second-order Akaike information criterion (AICc) (Burnham and Anderson 2002), occurring at a spatial extent of 3 km from each nest box. We thus included the percent cover of open water within 3 km around each breeding attempt as another landscape variable. Open water data was derived from the annual crop inventory produced by Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada (AAFC; AAFC 2018).

Weather variables

Due to the ectothermic nature of insects, measurements of prey availability can be strongly influenced by weather conditions during each sampling event (Mellanby 1939, Taylor 1963). Furthermore, Tree swallow breeding success may also be influenced by weather conditions independently of its effects on prey availability through, for example, the induction of hypothermic conditions of nestlings (Newton 2007, Ardia et al. 2010). We wanted to control for these effects by including parameters indicative of temperature and precipitation during insect sampling and during the pertinent time windows of each breeding attempt. We therefore collected hourly temperature with iButtons (model DS1922L; Embedded Data Systems, Lawrenceburg, Kentucky, USA) attached to the underside of a single nest box on each farm. Temperatures were recorded

throughout the entirety of each breeding season and started prior to the arrival of Tree swallows onto the system. From these data, we derived daily summaries of the minimum, mean, and maximum daily temperatures. We measured total farm-specific precipitation every two days throughout the breeding season using a single pluviometer placed on each farm and recorded measurements to the nearest 0.5 ml during each farm visit.

Statistical analyses

Seasonal influence of weather and landscape composition on prey availability

We assessed the influence of covariates on prey availability using linear mixed-effects models (LMM). We assessed a series of models representing alternative hypotheses in order to evaluate if agricultural landcover is related to prey availability either additively or through interactions with seasonality and/or weather. We calculated the mean temperature values between the day of and day preceding the collection of insect samples, to ensure that weather covariates were representative of the estimate of prey availability. We treated precipitation the same way, as the bi-daily recordings already represented the accumulated precipitation during each insect sampling period. Because the conditional distribution of Diptera biomass was right-skewed, all values of biomass were log-transformed prior to analyses. Fixed effects within competing models included the site scores (Comp.1 and Comp.2), Julian date, and weather variables associated with the collection of each sample. We treated the effect of Julian date as a second-degree polynomial, expecting insect abundance to reach a peak about the middle of the breeding season (Rioux Paquette et al. 2013, Bellavance et al. 2018). Ad-hoc model comparison using full models (model: Base + Rain * Land + Time * Land; Table S1) highlighted that the most predictive temperature of Diptera biomass was the mean maximum temperature over the two-day period (AICc $w = 0.94$). We therefore treated temperature as the mean maximum during this period. Because we did not

expect Diptera biomass to respond linearly with temperature, as it typically rises at an increasing rate with temperature before plateauing and subsequently declining, indicative of a third degree polynomial, we treated the effect of temperature as such (Mellanby 1939, Taylor 1963, Winkler et al. 2013). Finally, preliminary exploration highlighted that the phenology of Diptera biomass varied markedly among both years and farms. We hence performed further ad-hoc model comparisons of two full models, differing only in the presence of a variable slope of Julian date, treated as a second-degree polynomial, across years and farms through random effects. AICc weights greatly favored this variable slope model (AICc w >0.99). All implementation of polynomial terms was with the poly() function in R.

Evaluating the strength of evidence for the hypothesis that prey availability is related to landscape context took an information theoretic and multimodel approach (Burnham and Anderson 2002). Alternative hypotheses were thus evaluated using the second order Akaike information criterion (AICc) and the associated Akaike weight of competing models. We hypothesized that the weather dependent nature of insects may result in the influence of the landscape context on prey availability being either masked by or vary with the timing of sampling and weather conditions around sampling time (i.e. in the two days prior to insect collection). We accordingly defined a set of six candidate models including a null model exempt of all fixed effects (Table S1). Two models treated fixed effects as strictly additive, including one where prey availability varied only with sampling time and weather (Base), and one with the landscape context, while controlling for both sampling time and weather (Base + Land). We also considered models where the effect of landscape context on prey availability varied either with the sampling time (Base + Time*Land), the amount of precipitation (Base + Rain*Land) or both the sampling time as well as the amount of precipitation (Base + Rain*Land + Time*Land).

Influence of prey availability and agricultural landcover on fitness proxies

We reduced analyses of fitness proxies to first breeding attempts (90% of all attempts and ranging between 80% and 95% across years), as reproductive success can vary greatly between first and second attempts, and as second attempts occur nearly exclusively following the failure of a nest during laying or incubation. Fledging success was modeled as the number of fledglings over brood size (i.e. number of successes over trials) via generalized linear mixed effects models (GLMMs) with a binomial distribution and logit link function (Douma and Weedon 2019). The duration of the nestling period as well as nestling body mass and wing length were modeled using LMMs. We included year, farm and nest box identification as random factors for fledging success and duration of the nestling period. Since multiple observations of nestling body mass and wing length for each brood were observed and brood identification within nest box identification led to convergence failures, we nested brood identification within farm identification, along with year, as random factors. No trends within (simulated) residuals were observed once accounting for the hierarchical nature of the data for all fitness proxies (Hartig 2020).

Model covariate summaries can be found in Table 1 and were averaged across a 12-day window post-hatching for fledging success and a 16-day window post-hatching for the duration of the nestling period, nestling body mass and wing length. Twelve days of age represents the period when Tree swallow nestlings become homeothermic, reach peak body mass, and during which most nestling mortality occurs, thus representing the period where food availability is presumably most crucial (McCarty 1995, Lamoureux 2010, Houle et al. 2020). Estimates of prey availability during each breeding attempt was represented by predictions from generalized additive models (GAMs) in which raw values of logged prey availability (i.e. Diptera biomass) were regressed against the Julian date of sample collection for each farm and year separately. We modeled Diptera

availability in order to capture the general phenology throughout each season and avoid biases caused by more punctual or local disturbances or phenomena such as the capture of an insect swarm. GAMs were fitted as a tensor product smoother using the mgcv package in R (Wood 2017) with an identical degree of smoothness (k=10) (Wood 2017, Pedersen et al. 2019). From these predictions, we calculated an estimate of the mean availability of prey during the respective temporal window of each fitness proxy for each breeding attempt.

In order to evaluate our hypothesis regarding trophic links between agricultural landscapes and fitness proxies, we compared a set of five models, each representing biologically relevant alternative hypotheses predicting the outcome of each fitness proxy and took an information theoretic and multimodel approach (Table S1). Besides a null model only containing random effects, we started with a model including only confounding factors (Base). Confounding factors remained identical across all fitness proxies, and were included to control for their known effects, varying only in the temporal window in which values of weather were summarized. Weather factors were the mean maximum temperature (Winkler et al. 2013) and mean precipitation (Cox et al. 2019, 2020). We also included the morphological age of the breeding (second year (SY) vs. after second year (ASY); Hussell 1983), hatching date, percent cover of open water within 3 km of the breeding attempt and brood size. In the case of nestling body mass and wing length, we replaced brood size by the summation of the daily brood size during the 16-day period (Brood days), as this accounts for intra-brood competition in the event of nestling mortality (Martin 1987). All model terms within Base were included in all subsequent models of the candidate set. We included three models hypothesizing the effect of prey availability and landscape context were influential in a strictly additive capacity, including a model with only prey availability (Base + Food), a model with only site scores (Base + Land), and a model with both prey availability and

site scores (Base + Food + Land). The final model is one hypothesizing that the effect of prey availability varied with landscape context and thus included an interaction between prey availability and both sites score values (Base + Food*Land).

In all analyses of both Diptera availability and fitness proxies, unless a top performing model could be determined (ΔAICc > 4.00), the effects of key individual variables, including interactions, were estimated via multi-model inference whereby model predictions were calculated by model-averaging with shrinkage and shown with their 95% unconditional confidence intervals (Burnham and Anderson 2002). All quantitative covariates were z-transformed, r-squares were calculated following Nakagawa and Schielzeth (2013), and all analyses were performed in R version 3.6.2 (R Core Team 2019) using the glmmTMB (Magnusson et al. 2020) and AICcmodavg (Mazerolle 2020) packages. Model validation was performed following Zuur et al. (2009) and using the DHARMa package (Hartig 2020).

Results

Seasonal influence of weather and an agricultural gradient on prey availability

We collected and processed 15,916 insect samples, resulting in information on 8,614 farm visits over 11 years. Overall mean Diptera availability ($\pm$ SD) was 0.030 $\pm$ 0.044 g. While it did not vary greatly between years (range of means: 0.019 g - 0.037 g), the variance within each year was high (range of SD: 0.023 g - 0.059 g; Supplemental S2). Diptera availability peaked near Julian day 178 (June 24; Supplemental S4), decreased following increasing precipitation and rapidly increased with mean maximum temperature, peaking at 23.2°C (Supplemental S4). While the interaction between site score values indicated Diptera availability was highest within predominantly forested landscapes (range percent forest cover: 0.0% to 69.1%) and to a lesser extent within mixed-row crop landscapes, it was lowest within areas dominated by either forage fields or corn and soybean

fields (Figure 3f). Compared to forage landscapes, predicted Diptera availability was 11.8% higher in corn and soybean landscapes, 39.8% within mixed-row crop landscapes and 71.7% higher in forested landscapes. Furthermore, the interaction between site scores and precipitation highlighted that, during periods of heavy precipitation (daily accumulation 15 ml; 10% of observations when daily precipitation is greater than 2 ml), Diptera availability can be 17.7% lower within corn and soybean landscapes compared to forage landscapes (Supplemental S5). Finally, the interaction between site scores and Julian date highlighted that, at the start and end of the food provisioning period (Julian date 152 and 196 respectively), Diptera availability within corn and soybean landscapes was 16.9% and 39.5% lower than within forage landscapes (Supplemental S6). During the middle of the food-provisioning period (Julian date 174), predicted Diptera availability was 10.7% higher within corn and soybean landscapes versus forage landscapes.

Fledging success

In total, we monitored the breeding activity of 1,897 breeding attempts producing at least one nestling across the 40 farms and 11 breeding seasons. Overall mean fledging success ($\pm$ SD) was 0.74 $\pm$ 0.38 and ranged between 0.63 and 0.88 among years, with the exception of the 2016 breeding season, where mean fledging success was 0.49 due to a period of prolonged cold temperatures in June resulting in many brood failures (Supplemental S2). Model selection determined a single most predictive and parsimonious model (AICc w = 0.92, R2m = 0.047; Supplemental S1). As expected, this model showed fledging success increased with prey availability (Table 2, Figure 3b). An increase of 19.9% in fledging success was predicted between broods experiencing the minimum and maximum observed levels of prey availability. A residual effect of land cover indicated that, under average prey availability, fledging success was greatest within landscapes minimizing site score values, and thus lowest within more agro-intensive

landscapes (Figure 3g). Compared to forage landscapes, fledging success was 10.4% lower in corn and soybean landscapes and 12.4% lower within mixed-row crop landscapes. Interaction terms between site scores and prey availability indicated under low prey conditions (half of the mean), fledging success within corn and soybean landscapes or mixed-row crop landscapes was 9.7% and 9.3% lower than in forage landscapes, respectively. Furthermore, under typically high levels of prey availability (twice the mean), fledging success within these same two agro-intensive landscapes was 11.6% and 18.9% lower than in forage landscapes, respectively (Supplemental S7). Hatching date, younger aged females (SY), brood size, and mean precipitation were all negatively related to fledging success (Table 2). Both the mean maximum daily temperature and percent cover of open water were positively related to fledging success (Table 2).

Nestling duration

We measured the duration of the nestling period for 1,556 broods from which at least one nestling fledged. Mean nestling duration (± SD) was 19.7 ± 1.8 days and ranged between 18.9 days and 21.1 days across years (Supplemental S2). While we found no effect of prey availability on nestling duration, the latter was 6.7% longer between maximum and minimum Comp.1 scores and decreased slightly along Comp.2 (Figure 3h). Nestling duration was thus longest within landscapes dominated by row crops and shortest within those occupied by a mixture of forage fields and tree cover. We found that nestling duration increased with both the younger age of the female (SY) and brood size but decreased with higher mean maximum daily temperature. However, we found no strong relationship with hatching day, mean precipitation, or percent cover of open water (Table 2).

Nestling body mass

We weighed 6,001 nestlings from 1,400 broods at 16 days of age that survived to fledging. Mean body mass (± SD) was 21.2 ± 2.0 g, ranging between 20.4 g and 21.5 g across years (Supplemental S2). We found no strong indication that nestling body mass increased with prey availability (Figure 3d). Upon conditioning on prey availability, we observed no residual effect of landscape context on body mass (Figure 3i). We nevertheless found nestling body mass decreased with high levels of precipitation, throughout the breeding season and with increasing number of brood days. However, nestling body mass was not related to the percent cover of open water or age of breeding females (Table 2).

Nestling wing length

We measured the wing length of 6,054 nestlings from 1,413 broods at 16 days of age that survived to fledging. Mean wing length (± SD) was 45.8 ± 7.0 mm, ranging between 38.7 mm and 49.2 mm across years (Supplemental S2). We found wing length was unrelated to prey availability (Figure 3e). However, we observed a residual effect of landscape context on wing length whereby wing length was up to 9.7% longer within forage landscapes compared to corn and soybean landscapes (Figure 3j). We further found wing length increased with increasing mean maximum daily temperatures and was shorter for nestlings of young (SY) mothers and with increasing brood days. However, no relationship was observed between wing length and either precipitation, percent cover of open water, or hatching date (Table 2).

Discussion

Peak prey availability for Tree swallows occurred in landscapes dominated by forest cover and a mixture of agricultural habitats, suggesting greater landscape heterogeneity results in greater prey availability for this species throughout southern Québec's gradient of agricultural intensification.

We also observed that prey availability is an important determinant of Tree swallow reproductive success in this geographical context. Indeed, greater prey availability was associated with higher fledging success but was not related to the time taken by nestlings to fledge or their body mass and wing length upon fledging. Interestingly, we found landscape context was associated to fledging success, nestling duration and nestling wing length only after controlling for the effect of prey availability. This residual effect of landcover suggests other factors related to the agricultural landscape context affect breeding Tree swallows.

Seasonal influence of weather and agricultural landcover on prey availability

We found prey availability was on average lowest within forage landscapes, and to a lesser extent corn and soybean landscapes, and highest within mixed-row crop landscapes (Figure 3f). These results run counter to those found in the literature and our own predictions suggesting insect abundance being greater within less agro-intensive habitats (Wickramasinghe et al. 2004, Evans et al. 2007, Grüebler et al. 2008). However, these studies used proxies of insect abundance lumping together taxonomically diverse groups of insects. Here, we focused only on Diptera as it is the primary taxa within the diet of Tree swallows nesting in our study system (Bellavance et al. 2018). An increase in Diptera availability within more agro-intense landscapes may be expected, at least in some years, due to the susceptibility of arable crops to pest outbreaks (Étilé 2014, Gutiérrez Illán et al. 2020). For example, *Delia,* a genus of Diptera, encompasses several pest species (Savage et al. 2016). This group can present sporadic and field-wide infestations, leading to their elevated representation within arable crop habitats and resulting in an increased Diptera biomass (Savage et al. 2016, Sappington et al. 2018). Furthermore, several previous studies used different time windows, while our focus was on the availability of Diptera during the food provisioning period of nestlings (Wickramasinghe et al. 2004, Grüebler et al. 2008). Previous studies in our

study system indeed highlighted that during the tail ends of each breeding season, Diptera availability was lower within agricultural landscapes containing more row crops (Rioux Paquette et al. 2013, Bellavance et al. 2018). We showed similar spatio-temporal trends, in that during the tail ends of the food-provisioning period, Diptera availability was higher within landscapes dominated by forage crops versus corn or soybean crops, and yet highest within landscapes dominated by a mixture of crop types. Tree swallows, similar to many other passerine species, display seasonal declines in reproductive success thought to be related to changes in the availability or adequacy of resources (Winkler and Allen 1996, Nooker et al. 2005, Bourret et al. 2015). Therefore, the landscape driven difference in the phenology of food resources reported here may suggest that the severity of seasonal declines in reproductive success of this Tree swallow population could be landscape dependent.

Effects of prey availability on fitness

As predicted, fledging success, and to a lesser extent nestling body mass, were positively related to prey availability. These findings support previous studies documenting similar trends stemming from artificial changes in local food availability (Boutin 1990, Granbom and Smith 2006, Robb et al. 2008, Ruffino et al. 2014). For instance, multiple lines of evidence suggest declines in fitness proxies and changes in foraging behaviors of avian species following the decrease of prey availability through the application of various agro-chemical agents (Martin et al. 1998, 2000, Brickle et al. 2000, Hart et al. 2006, Poulin et al. 2010). Our results also agree with previous evidence from other swallow populations observing unaltered fluctuations in prey availability being positively related to fledging success and nestling condition (Quinney et al. 1986, Mccarty and Winkler 2008, Winkler et al. 2013, Teglhøj 2017, Twining et al. 2018). Yet, our results run counter to recent studies from other swallow populations where measurable variation in aerial

insect prey was suggested to have no impact on seasonal reproductive success and morphological condition of offspring (Dunn et al. 2011, Imlay et al. 2017, McClenaghan et al. 2019). A frequent claim of these studies is that prey availability was overly abundant during periods of observation, and thus other resources limited fitness, highlighting the importance of conducting food availability studies across a broad enough range of habitat qualities to reduce the availability of resources below such critical threshold (Fazey et al. 2005). We found evidence that, within agricultural systems, the growth of Tree swallow populations could be food limited. However, to address the role of prey availability on the population dynamics of this species more fully, the availability of food resources will also need to be understood in reference to both clutch size and egg condition, as these factors partly determine brood size and fledgling number (Meijer et al. 1989, Ardia et al. 2006). Indeed, food resources may limit clutch size through a reduction in resource allocation (Wilson et al. 2017) and impact incubation capacity and hatching by regulating the duration and time between foraging bouts (McCarty 1995, Monaghan and Nager 1997, Thomson et al. 2007).

We found no indication that wing length was related to the availability of prey, perhaps suggesting that prey availability during this study was adequate for allocating resources towards the growth of flight feathers. We also found that the duration of the nestling period was unrelated to prey availability, a result running counter to that of other swallow studies (Teglhøj 2017). One plausible explanation is that the supply of food resources was sufficient to meet the basal metabolic demand for the rate of nestling growth given the observed brood sizes (Leonard 2000, Stodola et al. 2010). The duration of the nestling period is likely a function of nestling's growth rate, and they thus should remain within nests until reaching a sufficient condition (Nilsson and Svensson 1993, Seki and Takano 1998, Rossmanith et al. 2007). Recognizing this, the lack of a relationship between

the duration of the nestling period and prey availability leads us to suggest that, in our system, the duration of the nestling period may be driven by something other than the accumulation of food resources.

An important finding of our study is that relationships between fitness proxies and agricultural landcover was observed even after considering prey availability. Fledging success was lower, nestling period durations were longer and nestling wing lengths were indeed shorter within areas dominated by large-scale row-crop monocultures, principally corn and soybean. Among the several hypotheses explaining such results, we discuss three non-mutually exclusive alternatives whereby differences in landscape context could lead to variation in the contamination of food by pesticides, in the nutritive value of food, and in the rate at which food is provisioned. During the years covered by this study, areas intensively-managed for the growing of corn and soybean harbored elevated levels of pesticides in their surface waters, notably several herbicides (e.g. glyphosate, atrazine, S-metolachlor, imazethapyr) and neonicotinoid insecticides (e.g. clothianidin, thiacloprid, thiametoxam (Giroux 2019, Montiel-León et al. 2019)). Many of those pesticides were also found, even simultaneously, in the insects fed to nestlings by Tree swallows in our system (Haroune et al. 2015) and may hence have caused lethal and sublethal toxicological effects on nestlings. For instance, many pesticides, such as the neonicotinoids, can alter the genetics as well as the neurological, endocrine and immunological systems of non-target animals, including vertebrates, via skin contact, breathing or food/water consumption (Grue et al. 1997, Mayne et al. 2005, Mineau and Palmer 2013, Lopez-Antia et al. 2015, Gibbons et al. 2015). Such disruptions can induce, among many observed effects, anorexia and reduced mass gain, and even result in lower nestling survival, delayed fledging and lower fledging mass, irrespective of the amount of food provided (Grue et al. 1997, Eng et al. 2017, 2019, Addy-Orduna et al. 2019).

Pesticide exposure of Tree swallow broods within areas dominated by corn and soybean may thus have been severe enough to result in nestling mortality or retarded nestling growth. Moreover, this may explain the lack of relationship between prey availability and the duration of the nestling period we observed, inasmuch as some pesticides lessen parental care in birds (Grue et al. 1997, Custer 2011, Mineau and Palmer 2013, Gibbons et al. 2015).

Residual effects of agricultural landcover on fitness

Variation in landscape contexts may also have resulted in Tree swallows feeding on diets differing not in prey species composition, but also in nutritive value. Indeed, the diet of Tree swallows varies across the agricultural intensification gradient covered by our study area (Bellavance et al. 2018; see also (Nocera et al. 2012, Michelson et al. 2018)). In the period during which Tree swallows provide food to nestlings, they eat more Diptera and less Ephemeroptera in landscapes dominated by row crops than in landscapes mostly devoted to forage crops and pastures (Bellavance et al. 2018). This difference may lead to a more nutritive diet in less intensively cultivated landscapes as Ephemeroptera typically contain high levels of highly unsaturated omega-3 fatty acids (HUFA), which have been found to improve the mass gain, immunocompetence, and fledging success of Tree swallow nestlings (Twining et al. 2016, 2018). Insects with an aquatic larval stage similar to Ephemeroptera can however also be loaded with various contaminants, including pesticides, that may impair the breeding behavior and success of swallows as well as their survival (Custer 2011). The costs and benefits of feeding on aquatic insects rich in HUFA within an agricultural context will thus require further attention before we can determine its real impact on Tree swallow fitness components and demography.

Landscapes dominated by row crop monocultures express landscape simplification in which large swaths of areas are occupied by only a handful of habitats (Benton et al. 2003). This phenomenon

may make finding and exploiting suitable food resources more difficult for animals relying upon "residual" marginal habitats as landscape simplification lowers the functional connectivity of agricultural landscapes (Hinsley 2000, Bélisle 2005, Rainho and Palmeirim 2011). If the amount and quality of suitable foraging habitats are reduced and disconnected, we may expect a negative impact of such landscape simplification on nestling growth if parents cannot compensate by increasing foraging effort. There is currently insufficient evidence to evaluate if differing compositions of agricultural landscapes consistently impact foraging adults negatively, yet the evidence available does suggest this is the case (Poulin et al. 2010, Staggenborg et al. 2017), albeit weakly in Tree swallows (Stanton et al. 2016). In our study system, we observed that the biomass of food boluses delivered to nestlings does not vary with landscape context, yet their delivery rate is lowest within landscapes dominated by row crops (Garrett et al in prep). Assuming parents are maximizing provisioning rate of food items to their offspring, given the availability of prey, this may provide evidence that adults are having to spend more time foraging within these types of landscapes (Charnov 1976, Pyke et al. 1977, Orians and Pearson 1979). If sustained, this increased foraging effort could come at a cost to parents and lead to carry-over effects eventually impacting their future fitness (Saino et al. 1999, 2018, Harrison et al. 2011, Stanton et al. 2017).

Conclusion

Taken together, our results provide evidence that food availability during the nestling period has a positive effect on fitness components of Tree swallows breeding in farmlands. Yet, more importantly, upon conditioning on food resources, a residual effect of agricultural landcover persisted. The interactive effect of prey availability and agricultural intensification on fitness proxies likely means that, for breeding attempts within less agro-intensive areas, increased prey availability has a positive influence. Yet, similar increases in prey availability within more

intensively cultivated landscapes potentially result in an increased toxicological load of food to nestlings. Future work should expand on the relationship between nestling condition, fledging success, and post-fledgling survival in landscapes harboring elevated levels of agricultural habitats. More specifically, it is unknown how the availability of food resources early in the breeding season is influenced by agricultural land cover and if this relationship impacts settlement patterns and clutch size (Rendell and Robertson 1990, Orians and Wittenberger 1991, Grüebler et al. 2010, Robillard et al. 2013). However, it is certain that these are important features of the seasonal reproductive success and the population dynamics of aerial insectivores. Furthermore, nestlings reared under reduced prey availability conditions may be unfit for post-fledging survival or pre-migration fueling (Saino et al. 2012, Jones et al. 2017). For example, the body condition of nestling Barn swallows (*Hirundo rustica*) is positively correlated to post fledging survival and fledglings in better condition initiated migration sooner (Evans et al. 2020). The poor body condition expressed by fledglings within more agro-intensive areas may thus result in elevated post-fledging mortality, a field readily understudied (Cox et al. 2014) yet a key part in the annual cycle of this species and another missing link in the understanding of the aerial insectivore declines.

Literature cited

Addy-Orduna, L. M., J. C. Brodeur, and R. Mateo. 2019. Oral acute toxicity of imidacloprid, thiamethoxam and clothianidin in eared doves: A contribution for the risk assessment of neonicotinoids in birds. Science of The Total Environment 650:1216–1223.

Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada (AAFC). 2018. Annual Crop Inventory. https://open.canada.ca/data/en/dataset/.

Almasi, B., P. Béziers, A. Roulin, and L. Jenni. 2015. Agricultural land use and human presence around breeding sites increase stress-hormone levels and decrease body mass in barn owl nestlings. Oecologia 179:89–101.

Andow, D. 1983. The extent of monoculture and its effects on insect pest populations with particular reference to wheat and cotton. Agriculture, Ecosystems & Environment 9:25–35.

Andow, D. 1991. Vegetational Diversity And Arthropod Population Response. Annual Review of Entomology 36:561–586.

Ardia, D. R., J. H. Pérez, and E. D. Clotfelter. 2010. Experimental cooling during incubation leads to reduced innate immunity and body condition in nestling tree swallows. Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences 277:1881–1888.

Ardia, D. R., M. F. Wasson, and D. W. Winkler. 2006. Individual quality and food availability determine yolk and egg mass and egg composition in tree swallows Tachycineta bicolor. Journal of Avian Biology 37:252–259.

Attwood, S. J., M. Maron, A. P. N. House, and C. Zammit. 2008. Do arthropod assemblages display globally consistent responses to intensified agricultural land use and management? Global Ecology and Biogeography 17:585–599.

Bélanger, L., and M. Grenier. 2002. Agriculture intensification and forest fragmentation in the St. Lawrence valley, Québec, Canada. Landscape Ecology 17:495–507.

Bélisle, M. 2005. Measuring landscape connectivity: the challenge of behavioral landscape ecology. Ecology 86:1988–1995.

Bellavance, V., M. Bélisle, J. Savage, F. Pelletier, and D. Garant. 2018. Influence of agricultural intensification on prey availability and nestling diet in Tree Swallows (Tachycineta bicolor). Canadian Journal of Zoology 96:1053–1065.

Benton, T. G., D. M. Bryant, L. Cole, and H. Q. P. Crick. 2002. Linking agricultural practice to insect and bird populations: a historical study over three decades. Journal of Applied Ecology 39:673–687.

Benton, T. G., J. A. Vickery, and J. D. Wilson. 2003. Farmland biodiversity: is habitat heterogeneity the key? Trends in Ecology & Evolution 18:182–188.

Boatman, N. D., N. W. Brickle, J. D. Hart, T. P. Milsom, A. J. Morris, A. W. A. Murray, K. A. Murray, and P. A. Robertson. 2004. Evidence for the indirect effects of pesticides on farmland birds. Ibis 146:131–143.

Bourret, A., M. Bélisle, F. Pelletier, and D. Garant. 2015. Multidimensional environmental influences on timing of breeding in a tree swallow population facing climate change. Evolutionary Applications 8:933–944.

Boutin, S. 1990. Food supplementation experiments with terrestrial vertebrates: patterns, problems, and the future. Canadian Journal of Zoology 68:203–220.

Brickle, N. W., D. G. C. Harper, N. J. Aebischer, and S. H. Cockayne. 2000. Effects of agricultural

intensification on the breeding success of corn buntings Miliaria calandra. Journal of Applied Ecology 37:742–755.

Burnham, K. P., and D. R. Anderson. 2002. Model Selection and Multimodel Inference. second. Springer, New York, New York, USA.

Ceballos, G. 2002. Mammal Population Losses and the Extinction Crisis. Science 296:904–907.

Charnov, E. L. 1976. Optimal foraging, the marginal value theorem. Theoretical Population Biology 9:129–136.

Clark, R. G., D. W. Winkler, R. D. Dawson, D. Shutler, D. J. T. Hussell, M. P. Lombardo, P. A. Thorpe, P. O. Dunn, and L. A. Whittingham. 2018. Geographic variation and environmental correlates of apparent survival rates in adult tree swallows Tachycineta bicolor. Journal of Avian Biology 49:jav-012514.

Cox, A. R., R. J. Robertson, B. C. Fedy, W. B. Rendell, and F. Bonier. 2018. Demographic drivers of local population decline in Tree Swallows (Tachycineta bicolor) in Ontario, Canada. The Condor 120:842–851.

Cox, A. R., R. J. Robertson, Á. Z. Lendvai, K. Everitt, and F. Bonier. 2019. Rainy springs linked to poor nestling growth in a declining avian aerial insectivore (Tachycineta bicolor). Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences 286:20190018.

Cox, A. R., R. J. Robertson, W. B. Rendell, and F. Bonier. 2020. Population decline in tree swallows (Tachycineta bicolor) linked to climate change and inclement weather on the breeding ground. Oecologia 192:713–722.

Cox, W. A., F. R. Thompson, A. S. Cox, and J. Faaborg. 2014. Post-fledging survival in passerine

birds and the value of post-fledging studies to conservation. The Journal of Wildlife Management 78:183–193.

Custer, C. 2011. Swallows as a Sentinel Species for Contaminant Exposure and Effect Studies. Pages 267–300 *in* J. E. Elliott, C. A. Bishop, and C. A. Morrissey, editors. Wildlife Ecotoxicology: Forensic Approaches. Springer New York, New York, NY.

Davis, R. 2007. Habitat Fragmentation and Landscape Change: An Ecological and Conservation Synthesis. Austral Ecology 32:477–478.

Dawson, R. D., and G. R. Bortolotti. 2000. Reproductive Success of American Kestrels: The Role of Prey Abundance and Weather. The Condor 102:814–822.

Douma, J. C., and J. T. Weedon. 2019. Analysing continuous proportions in ecology and evolution: A practical introduction to beta and Dirichlet regression. Methods in Ecology and Evolution 10:1412–1430.

Dunn, P. O., D. W. Winkler, L. a. Whittingham, S. J. Hannon, and R. J. Robertson. 2011. A test of the mismatch hypothesis: How is timing of reproduction related to food abundance in an aerial insectivore? Ecology 92:450–461.

Eng, M. L., B. J. M. Stutchbury, and C. A. Morrissey. 2017. Imidacloprid and chlorpyrifos insecticides impair migratory ability in a seed-eating songbird. Scientific Reports 7:15176.

Eng, M. L., B. J. M. Stutchbury, and C. A. Morrissey. 2019. A neonicotinoid insecticide reduces fueling and delays migration in songbirds. Science 365:1177–1180.

Étilé, E. 2014. Agricultural Practices that Promote Crop Pest Suppression by Natural Predators. Page Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada.

Evans, D. R., K. A. Hobson, J. W. Kusack, M. D. Cadman, C. M. Falconer, and G. W. Mitchell. 2020. Individual condition, but not fledging phenology, carries over to affect post-fledging survival in a Neotropical migratory songbird. Ibis 162:331–344.

Evans, K. L., J. D. Wilson, and R. B. Bradbury. 2007. Effects of crop type and aerial invertebrate abundance on foraging barn swallows Hirundo rustica. Agriculture, Ecosystems & Environment 122:267–273.

Fazey, I., J. Fischer, and D. B. Lindenmayer. 2005. What do conservation biologists publish? Biological Conservation 124:63–73.

Filzmoser, P., K. Hron, and C. Reimann. 2009. Principal component analysis for compositional data with outliers. Environmetrics 20:621–632.

Fischer, J., and D. B. Lindenmayer. 2007. Landscape modification and habitat fragmentation: a synthesis. Global Ecology and Biogeography 16:265–280.

Gates, J. E., and L. W. Gysel. 1978. Avian Nest Dispersion and Fledging Success in Field-Forest Ecotones. Ecology 59:871–883.

Gibbons, D., C. A. Morrissey, and P. Mineau. 2015. A review of the direct and indirect effects of neonicotinoids and fipronil on vertebrate wildlife. Environmental Science and Pollution Research 22:103–118.

Giroux, I. 2019. Présence de pesticides dans l'eau au Québec : Portrait et tendances dans les zones de maïs et de soya – 2015 à 2017, Québec, ministère de l'Environnement et de la Lutte contre les changements climatiques, Direction générale du suivi de l'état de l'environ.

Granbom, M., and H. G. Smith. 2006. Food Limitation During Breeding in a Heterogeneous

Landscape. The Auk 123:97–107.

Grue, C. E., P. L. Gibert, and M. E. Seeley. 1997. Neurophysiological and Behavioral Changes in Non-Target Wildlife Exposed to Organophosphate and Carbamate Pesticides: Thermoregulation, Food Consumption, and Reproduction. American Zoologist 37:369–388.

Grüebler, M. U., F. Korner-Nievergelt, and J. Von Hirschheydt. 2010. The reproductive benefits of livestock farming in barn swallows Hirundo rustica: quality of nest site or foraging habitat? Journal of Applied Ecology 47:1340–1347.

Grüebler, M. U., M. Morand, and B. Naef-Daenzer. 2008. A predictive model of the density of airborne insects in agricultural environments. Agriculture, Ecosystems & Environment 123:75–80.

Gutiérrez Illán, J., E. H. Bloom, C. H. Wohleb, E. J. Wenninger, S. I. Rondon, A. S. Jensen, W. E. Snyder, and D. W. Crowder. 2020. Landscape structure and climate drive population dynamics of an insect vector within intensely managed agroecosystems. Ecological Applications 30:1–13.

Hailman, J. P., and D. Lack. 1955. The Natural Regulation of Animal Numbers. AIBS Bulletin 5:12–12.

Hale, R., R. Coleman, V. Pettigrove, and S. E. Swearer. 2015. Identifying, preventing and mitigating ecological traps to improve the management of urban aquatic ecosystems. Journal of Applied Ecology 52:928–939.

Haroune, L., R. Cassoulet, M.-P. Lafontaine, M. Bélisle, D. Garant, F. Pelletier, H. Cabana, and J.-P. Bellenger. 2015. Liquid chromatography-tandem mass spectrometry determination for multiclass pesticides from insect samples by microwave-assisted solvent extraction followed

by a salt-out effect and micro-dispersion purification. Analytica Chimica Acta 891:160–170.

Harrison, X. A., J. D. Blount, R. Inger, D. R. Norris, and S. Bearhop. 2011. Carry-over effects as drivers of fitness differences in animals. Journal of Animal Ecology 80:4–18.

Hart, J. D., T. P. Milsom, G. Fisher, V. Wilkins, S. J. Moreby, A. W. A. Murray, and P. A. Robertson. 2006. The relationship between yellowhammer breeding performance, arthropod abundance and insecticide applications on arable farmland. Journal of Applied Ecology 43:81–91.

Hartig, F. 2020. DHARMa: Residual Diagnostics for Hierarchical Regression Models.

Hinsley, S. A. 2000. The costs of multiple patch use by birds. Landscape Ecology 15:765–775.

Hostetler, J. A., T. S. Sillett, and P. P. Marra. 2015. Full-annual-cycle population models for migratory birds. The Auk 132:433–449.

Houle, C., F. Pelletier, M. Bélisle, and D. Garant. 2020. Impacts of environmental heterogeneity on natural selection in a wild bird population. Evolution 74:1142–1154.

Hussell, D. J. T. 1983. Age and Plumage Color in Female Tree Swallows. Journal of Field Ornithology 54:312–318.

Imlay, T. L., H. A. R. Mann, and M. L. Leonard. 2017. No effect of insect abundance on nestling survival or mass for three aerial insectivores. Avian Conservation and Ecology 12:art19.

Jobin, B., J. Beaulieu, M. Grenier, L. Bélanger, C. Maisonneuve, D. Bordage, and B. Filion. 2003. Landscape changes and ecological studies in agricultural regions, Québec, Canada. Landscape Ecology 18:575–590.

Jobin, B., J.-L. DesGranges, and C. Boutin. 1996. Population trends in selected species of farmland

birds in relation to recent developments in agriculture in the St. Lawrence Valley. Agriculture, Ecosystems & Environment 57:103–116.

Jobin, B., M. Grenier, and P. Laporte. 2005. Using satellite imagery to assess breeding habitat availability of the endangered loggerhead shrike in Québec. Biodiversity and Conservation 14:81–95.

Johnson, M. E., and M. P. Lombardo. 2000. Nestling Tree Swallow (Tachycineta bicolor) Diets in an Upland Old Field in Western Michigan. The American Midland Naturalist 144:216–219.

Jones, T. M., and M. P. Ward. 2020. Pre- to post-fledging carryover effects and the adaptive significance of variation in wing development for juvenile songbirds. Journal of Animal Ecology 89:2235–2245.

Jones, T. M., M. P. Ward, T. J. Benson, and J. D. Brawn. 2017. Variation in nestling body condition and wing development predict cause-specific mortality in fledgling dickcissels. Journal of Avian Biology 48:439–447.

Knight, S. M., E. A. Gow, D. W. Bradley, R. G. Clark, M. Bélisle, L. L. Berzins, T. Blake, E. S. Bridge, L. Burke, R. D. Dawson, P. O. Dunn, D. Garant, G. L. Holroyd, D. J. T. Hussell, O. Lansdorp, A. J. Laughlin, M. L. Leonard, F. Pelletier, D. Shutler, L. Siefferman, C. M. Taylor, H. E. Trefry, C. M. Vleck, D. Vleck, L. A. Whittingham, D. W. Winkler, and D. R. Norris. 2019. Nonbreeding season movements of a migratory songbird are related to declines in resource availability. The Auk 136:1–13.

Kusack, J. W., G. W. Mitchell, D. R. Evans, M. D. Cadman, and K. A. Hobson. 2020. Effects of agricultural intensification on nestling condition and number of young fledged of barn swallows (Hirundo rustica). Science of The Total Environment 709:136195.

Lambin, E. F., B. L. Turner, H. J. Geist, S. B. Agbola, A. Angelsen, J. W. Bruce, O. T. Coomes, R. Dirzo, G. Fischer, C. Folke, P. S. George, K. Homewood, J. Imbernon, R. Leemans, X. Li, E. F. Moran, M. Mortimore, P. S. Ramakrishnan, J. F. Richards, H. Skånes, W. Steffen, G. D. Stone, U. Svedin, T. A. Veldkamp, C. Vogel, and J. Xu. 2001. The causes of land-use and land-cover change: moving beyond the myths. Global Environmental Change 11:261–269.

Lamoureux, S. 2010. Impact de l 'intensification agricole sur l'effort parental, la croissance et la survie des oisillons chez l'hirondelle bicolore (Tachycineta bicolor). Université de Sherbrooke.

Leonard, M. L. 2000. The Role of Development, Parental Behavior, and Nestmate Competition in Fledging of Nestling Tree Swallows. The Auk 117:996–1002.

Letten, A. D., P.-J. Ke, and T. Fukami. 2017. Linking modern coexistence theory and contemporary niche theory. Ecological Monographs 87:161–177.

Lopez-Antia, A., M. E. Ortiz-Santaliestra, F. Mougeot, and R. Mateo. 2015. Imidacloprid-treated seed ingestion has lethal effect on adult partridges and reduces both breeding investment and offspring immunity. Environmental Research 136:97–107.

Magnusson, A., H. J. Skaug, A. Nielsen, C. W. Berg, K. Kristensen, M. Maechler, K. J. van Benthem, B. M. Bolker, N. Sadat, D. Lüdecke, R. Lenth, J. O'Brien, and M. E. Brooks. 2020. Package ' glmmTMB .'

Marshall, M. R., R. J. Cooper, J. A. DeCecco, J. Strazanac, and L. Butler. 2002. Effects of Experimentally Reduced Prey Abundance on the Breeding Ecology of the Red-Eyed Vireo. Ecological Applications 12:261.

Martin, L. J., B. Blossey, and E. Ellis. 2012. Mapping where ecologists work: biases in the global

distribution of terrestrial ecological observations. Frontiers in Ecology and the Environment 10:195–201.

Martin, P. A., D. L. Johnson, D. J. Forsyth, and B. D. Hill. 1998. Indirect effects of the pyrethroid insecticide deltamethrin on reproductive success of chestnut-collared longspurs. Ecotoxicology 7:89–97.

Martin, P. A., D. L. Johnson, D. J. Forsyth, and B. D. Hill. 2000. Effects of two grasshopper control insecticides on food resources and reproductive success of two species of grassland songbirds. Environmental Toxicology and Chemistry 19:2987–2996.

Martin, T. E. 1987. Food as a Limit on Breeding Birds: A Life-History Perspective. Annual Review of Ecology and Systematics 18:453–487.

Mayne, G. J., C. A. Bishop, P. A. Martin, H. J. Boermans, and B. Hunter. 2005. Thyroid Function in Nestling Tree Swallows and Eastern Bluebirds Exposed to Non-Persistent Pesticides and p, p-DDE in Apple Orchards of Southern Ontario, Canada. Ecotoxicology 14:381–396.

Mazerolle, M. J. 2020. AICcmodavg: model selection and multimodel inference based on (Q)AIC(c).

McCamey, F., and L. B. Slobodkin. 1963. Growth and Regulation of Animal Populations. Bird-Banding 34:52.

McCarty, J. P. 1995. Effects of short-term changes in environmental conditions on the foraging ecology and reproductive success of tree swallows, Tachycineta bicolor. Cornell Univeristy.

McCarty, J. P. 2001. Variation in Growth of Nestling Tree Swallows Across Multiple Temporal and Spatial Scales. The Auk 118:176–190.

Mccarty, J. P., and D. W. Winkler. 2008. Relative importance off environmental variables in determining the growth off nestling Tree Swallows Tachycineta bicolor. Ibis 141:286–296.

McCarty, J. P., and D. W. Winkler. 1999. Foraging Ecology and Diet Selectivity of Tree Swallows Feeding Nestlings. The Condor 101:246–254.

McClenaghan, B., K. C. R. Kerr, and E. Nol. 2019. Does prey availability affect the reproductive performance of Barn Swallows (Hirundo rustica) breeding in Ontario, Canada? Canadian Journal of Zoology 97:979–987.

McCracken, J. D. 2008. Are Aerial Insectivores Being "Bugged Out"? Birdwatch Canada 42:4–7.

MDDELCC. 2015. Ministère du Développement durable, de l'Environnement et de la Lutte contre les changements climatiques. Stratégie québécoise sur les pesticides 2015-2018. http://www.mddelcc.gouv.qc.ca/.

Meijer, T., D. Masman, and S. Daan. 1989. Energetics of Reproduction in Female Kestrels. The Auk 106:549–559.

Mellanby, K. 1939. Low temperature and insect activity. Proceedings of the Royal Society of London. Series B - Biological Sciences 127:473–487.

Mengelkoch, J. M., G. J. Niemi, and R. R. Regal. 2004. Diet of the nestling tree swallow. The Condor 106:423–429.

Michel, N. L., A. C. Smith, R. G. Clark, C. A. Morrissey, and K. A. Hobson. 2016. Differences in spatial synchrony and interspecific concordance inform guild-level population trends for aerial insectivorous birds. Ecography 39:774–786.

Michelson, C. I., R. G. Clark, and C. A. Morrissey. 2018. Agricultural land cover does not affect

the diet of Tree Swallows in wetland-dominated habitats. The Condor 120:751–764.

Miller, E. J., and L. W. Adams. 1995. Urban Wildlife Habitats: A Landscape Perspective. The Journal of Wildlife Management 59:194.

Mineau, P., and C. Palmer. 2013. The impact of the nation's most widely used insecticides on birds. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Monaghan, P., and R. G. Nager. 1997. Why don't birds lay more eggs? Trends in Ecology & Evolution 12:270–274.

Montgomery, G. A., R. R. Dunn, R. Fox, E. Jongejans, S. R. Leather, M. E. Saunders, C. R. Shortall, M. W. Tingley, and D. L. Wagner. 2020. Is the insect apocalypse upon us? How to find out. Biological Conservation 241:108327.

Montiel-León, J. M., G. Munoz, S. Vo Duy, D. T. Do, M. Vaudreuil, K. Goeury, F. Guillemette, M. Amyot, and S. Sauvé. 2019. Widespread occurrence and spatial distribution of glyphosate, atrazine, and neonicotinoids pesticides in the St. Lawrence and tributary rivers. Environmental Pollution 250:29–39.

Morrissey, C. A., P. Mineau, J. H. Devries, F. Sanchez-Bayo, M. Liess, M. C. Cavallaro, and K. Liber. 2015. Neonicotinoid contamination of global surface waters and associated risk to aquatic invertebrates: A review. Environment International 74:291–303.

NABCI. 2019. NABCI [Canada, North American Bird Conservation Initiative]. Page North American Bird Conservation Initiative Canada. 2019. The State of Canada's Birds, 2019. Environment and Climate Change Canada, Ottawa, Canada.

Naef-Daenzer, B., and M. U. Grüebler. 2016. Post-fledging survival of altricial birds: ecological

determinants and adaptation. Journal of Field Ornithology 87:227–250.

Nagy, L. R., and K. G. Smith. 1997. Effects of Insecticide-Induced Reduction in Lepidopteran Larvae on Reproductive Success of Hooded Warblers. The Auk 114:619–627.

Nakagawa, S., and H. Schielzeth. 2013. A general and simple method for obtaining R 2 from generalized linear mixed-effects models. Methods in Ecology and Evolution 4:133–142.

Nebel, S., A. Mills, J. D. McCracken, and P. D. Taylor. 2010. Declines of Aerial Insectivores in North America Follow a Geographic Gradient. Avian Conservation and Ecology 5:art1.

Newton, I. 1998. Population Limitations in Birds. Academic Press, New York, New York, USA.

Newton, I. 2002. The Role of Food in Limiting Bird Numbers. Ardea 38–90:11–30.

Newton, I. 2007. Weather-related mass-mortality events in migrants. Ibis 149:453–467.

Nilsson, J.-Å., and M. Svensson. 1993. Fledging in altricial birds: parental manipulation or sibling competition? Animal Behaviour 46:379–386.

Nocera, J. J., J. M. Blais, D. V. Beresford, L. K. Finity, C. Grooms, L. E. Kimpe, K. Kyser, N. Michelutti, M. W. Reudink, and J. P. Smol. 2012. Historical pesticide applications coincided with an altered diet of aerially foraging insectivorous chimney swifts. Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences 279:3114–3120.

Nooker, J. K., P. O. Dunn, and L. A. Whittingham. 2005. Effects of food abundance, weather, and female condition on reproduction in tree swallows (Tachycineta bicolor). Auk 122:1225–1238.

Orians, G. H., and E. Pearson. 1979. On the theory of central place foraging. Analysis of Ecological Systems:154–1177.

Orians, G. H., and J. F. Wittenberger. 1991. Spatial and Temporal Scales in Habitat Selection. The American Naturalist 137:S29–S49.

Pedersen, E. J., D. L. Miller, G. L. Simpson, and N. Ross. 2019. Hierarchical generalized additive models in ecology: an introduction with mgcv. PeerJ 7:e6876.

Pigeon, G., R. Baeta, M. Bélisle, D. Garant, and F. Pelletier. 2013. Effects of agricultural intensification and temperature on immune response to phytohemagglutinin in Tree Swallows (Tachycineta bicolor). Canadian Journal of Zoology 91:56–63.

Pisa, L. W., V. Amaral-Rogers, L. P. Belzunces, J. M. Bonmatin, C. A. Downs, D. Goulson, D. P. Kreutzweiser, C. Krupke, M. Liess, M. McField, C. A. Morrissey, D. A. Noome, J. Settele, N. Simon-Delso, J. D. Stark, J. P. Van der Sluijs, H. Van Dyck, and M. Wiemers. 2015. Effects of neonicotinoids and fipronil on non-target invertebrates. Environmental Science and Pollution Research 22:68–102.

Porlier, M., M. Bélisle, and D. Garant. 2009. Non-random distribution of individual genetic diversity along an environmental gradient. Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences 364:1543–1554.

Poulin, B., G. Lefebvre, and L. Paz. 2010. Red flag for green spray: adverse trophic effects of Bti on breeding birds. Journal of Applied Ecology 47:884–889.

Pyke, G. H., H. R. Pulliam, and E. L. Charnov. 1977. Optimal Foraging: A Selective Review of Theory and Tests. The Quarterly Review of Biology 52:137–154.

QGIS. 2020. QGIS Geographic Information System. QGIS Association. http://www.qgis.org.

Quinney, T. E. 2019. Wilson Ornithological Society. Pages 976–976 The Grants Register 2019.

Palgrave Macmillan UK, London.

Quinney, T. E., D. J. T. Hussell, and C. D. Ankney. 1986. Sources of Variation in Growth of Tree Swallows. The Auk 103:389–400.

R Core Team. 2019. R: A language and environment for statistical computing.

Rainho, A., and J. M. Palmeirim. 2011. The Importance of Distance to Resources in the Spatial Modelling of Bat Foraging Habitat. PLoS ONE 6:e19227.

Rendell, W. B., and R. J. Robertson. 1989. Nest-Site Characteristics, Reproductive Success and Cavity Availability for Tree Swallows Breeding in Natural Cavities. The Condor 91:875.

Rendell, W. B., and R. J. Robertson. 1990. Influence of Forest Edge on Nest-Site Selection by Tree Swallows. Wilson Journal of Ornithology 102:634–644.

Rioux Paquette, S., D. Garant, F. Pelletier, and M. Bélisle. 2013. Seasonal patterns in Tree Swallow prey (Diptera) abundance are affected by agricultural intensification. Ecological Applications 23:122–133.

Robb, G. N., R. A. McDonald, D. E. Chamberlain, and S. Bearhop. 2008. Food for thought: supplementary feeding as a driver of ecological change in avian populations. Frontiers in Ecology and the Environment 6:476–484.

Robertson, B. a. 2012. Investigating Targets of Avian Habitat Management to Eliminate an Ecological Trap. Avian Conservation and Ecology 7:art2.

Robillard, A., D. Garant, and M. Bélisle. 2013. The Swallow and the Sparrow: how agricultural intensification affects abundance, nest site selection and competitive interactions. Landscape Ecology 28:201–215.

Rodenhouse, N. L., and R. T. Holmes. 1992. Results of Experimental and Natural Food Reductions for Breeding Black-Throated Blue Warblers. Ecology 73:357–372.

Rolstad, J. 1991. Consequences of forest fragmentation for the dynamics of bird populations: conceptual issues and the evidence. Pages 149–163 Metapopulation Dynamics: Empirical and Theoretical Investigations. Elsevier.

Rosenberg, K. V., A. M. Dokter, P. J. Blancher, J. R. Sauer, A. C. Smith, P. A. Smith, J. C. Stanton, A. Panjabi, L. Helft, M. Parr, and P. P. Marra. 2019. Decline of the North American avifauna. Science 366:120–124.

Rossmanith, E., K. Höntsch, N. Blaum, and F. Jeltsch. 2007. Reproductive success and nestling diet in the Lesser Spotted Woodpecker (Picoides minor): the early bird gets the caterpillar. Journal of Ornithology 148:323–332.

Ruffino, L., P. Salo, E. Koivisto, P. B. Banks, and E. Korpimäki. 2014. Reproductive responses of birds to experimental food supplementation: a meta-analysis. Frontiers in Zoology 11:80.

Ruiz, J., and G. Domon. 2009. Analysis of landscape pattern change trajectories within areas of intensive agricultural use: case study in a watershed of southern Québec, Canada. Landscape Ecology 24:419–432.

Saether, B.-E., and O. Bakke. 2000. Avian Life History Variation and Contribution of Demographic Traits to the Population Growth Rate. Ecology 81:642.

Saino, N., R. Ambrosini, D. Rubolini, M. Romano, M. Caprioli, A. Romano, and M. Parolini. 2018. Carry-over effects of brood size on morphology, reproduction, and lifespan in barn swallows. Behavioral Ecology and Sociobiology 72:30.

Saino, N., S. Calza, P. Ninni, and A. P. Møller. 1999. Barn swallows trade survival against offspring condition and immunocompetence. Journal of Animal Ecology 68:999–1009.

Saino, N., M. Romano, R. Ambrosini, D. Rubolini, G. Boncoraglio, M. Caprioli, and A. Romano. 2012. Longevity and lifetime reproductive success of barn swallow offspring are predicted by their hatching date and phenotypic quality. Journal of Animal Ecology 81:1004–1012.

Sappington, T. W., L. S. Hesler, K. C. Allen, R. G. Luttrell, and S. K. Papiernik. 2018. Prevalence of Sporadic Insect Pests of Seedling Corn and Factors Affecting Risk of Infestation. Journal of Integrated Pest Management 9.

Savage, J., A. Fortier, F. Fournier, and V. Bellavance. 2016. Identification of Delia pest species (Diptera: Anthomyiidae) in cultivated crucifers and other vegetable crops in Canada. Canadian Journal of Arthropod Identification 29:1–40.

Seki, S., and H. Takano. 1998. Caterpillar abundance in the territory affects the breeding performance of great tit Parus major minor. Oecologia 114:514–521.

Seress, G., K. Sándor, K. L. Evans, and A. Liker. 2020. Food availability limits avian reproduction in the city: An experimental study on great tits Parus major. Journal of Animal Ecology 89:1570–1580.

Seward, A. M., C. M. Beale, L. Gilbert, T. H. Jones, and R. J. Thomas. 2014. The Impact of Increased Food Availability on Reproduction in a Long-Distance Migratory Songbird: Implications for Environmental Change? PLoS ONE 9:e111180.

Shutler, D., D. J. T. Hussell, D. R. Norris, D. W. Winkler, R. J. Robertson, F. Bonier, W. B. Rendell, M. Bélisle, R. G. Clark, R. D. Dawson, N. T. Wheelwright, M. P. Lombardo, P. A. Thorpe, M. a. Truan, R. Walsh, M. L. Leonard, A. G. Horn, C. M. Vleck, D. Vleck, A. P.

Rose, L. a. Whittingham, P. O. Dunn, K. a. Hobson, and M. T. Stanback. 2012. Spatiotemporal Patterns in Nest Box Occupancy by Tree Swallows Across North America. Avian Conservation and Ecology 7:art3.

Smith, A. C., M.-A. R. Hudson, C. M. Downes, and C. M. Francis. 2015. Change Points in the Population Trends of Aerial-Insectivorous Birds in North America: Synchronized in Time across Species and Regions. PLOS ONE 10:e0130768.

Smith, H. G., and M. Bruun. 1998. The effect of egg size and habitat on starling nestling growth and survival. Oecologia 115:59–63.

Spiller, K. J., and R. Dettmers. 2019. Evidence for multiple drivers of aerial insectivore declines in North America. The Condor 121:1–13.

Staggenborg, J., H. M. Schaefer, C. Stange, B. Naef-Daenzer, and M. U. Grüebler. 2017. Time and travelling costs during chick-rearing in relation to habitat quality in Little Owls Athene noctua. Ibis 159:519–531.

Stanton, R., R. G. Clark, and C. A. Morrissey. 2017. Intensive agriculture and insect prey availability influence oxidative status and return rates of an aerial insectivore. Ecosphere 8:e01746.

Stanton, R., C. A. Morrissey, and R. G. Clark. 2016. Tree Swallow (Tachycineta bicolor) foraging responses to agricultural land use and abundance of insect prey. Canadian Journal of Zoology 94:637–642.

Stanton, R., C. A. Morrissey, and R. G. Clark. 2018. Analysis of trends and agricultural drivers of farmland bird declines in North America: A review. Agriculture, Ecosystems & Environment 254:244–254.

bioRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.02.02.427782; this version posted February 2, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted bioRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under aCC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license.

Stephens, D. W., J. S. Brown, and R. C. Ydenberg. 2008. Foraging: behavior and ecology. University of Chicago Press.

Stodola, K. W., D. A. Buehler, D. H. Kim, K. E. Franzreb, and E. T. Linder. 2010. Biotic and Abiotic Factors Governing Nestling-period Length in the Ovenbird (Seiurus aurocapilla). The Auk 127:204–211.

Stutchbury, B. J. M., E. A. Gow, T. Done, M. MacPherson, J. W. Fox, and V. Afanasyev. 2011. Effects of post-breeding moult and energetic condition on timing of songbird migration into the tropics. Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences 278:131–137.

Taylor, L. R. 1963. Analysis of the Effect of Temperature on Insects in Flight. The Journal of Animal Ecology 32:99.

Teglhøj, P. G. 2017. A comparative study of insect abundance and reproductive success of barn swallows Hirundo rustica in two urban habitats. Journal of Avian Biology 48:846–853.

Templ, M., K. Hron, and P. Filzmoser. 2011. robCompositions: An R-package for Robust Statistical Analysis of Compositional Data. Pages 341–355 Compositional Data Analysis. John Wiley & Sons, Ltd, Chichester, UK.

Thomas, J. A. 2004. Comparative Losses of British Butterflies, Birds, and Plants and the Global Extinction Crisis. Science 303:1879–1881.

Thomson, D. L., P. Monaghan, and R. W. Furness. 2007. The demands of incubation and avian clutch size. Biological Reviews 73:293–304.

Tscharntke, T., A. M. Klein, A. Kruess, I. Steffan-Dewenter, and C. Thies. 2005. Landscape perspectives on agricultural intensification and biodiversity - ecosystem service management.

Ecology Letters 8:857–874.

Twining, C. W., J. T. Brenna, P. Lawrence, J. R. Shipley, T. N. Tollefson, and D. W. Winkler. 2016. Omega-3 long-chain polyunsaturated fatty acids support aerial insectivore performance more than food quantity. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences 113:10920–10925.

Twining, C. W., J. R. Shipley, and D. W. Winkler. 2018. Aquatic insects rich in omega-3 fatty acids drive breeding success in a widespread bird. Ecology Letters 21:1812–1820.

Vickery, J. A., R. B. Bradbury, I. G. Henderson, M. A. Eaton, and P. V. Grice. 2004. The role of agri-environment schemes and farm management practices in reversing the decline of farmland birds in England. Biological Conservation 119:19–39.

Wagner, D. L. 2020. Insect Declines in the Anthropocene. Annual Review of Entomology 65:457–480.

Weegman, M. D., T. W. Arnold, R. D. Dawson, D. W. Winkler, and R. G. Clark. 2017. Integrated population models reveal local weather conditions are the key drivers of population dynamics in an aerial insectivore. Oecologia 185:119–130.

White, T. C. R. 2008. The role of food, weather and climate in limiting the abundance of animals. Biological Reviews 83:227–248.

Wickramasinghe, L. P., S. Harris, G. Jones, and N. Vaughan Jennings. 2004. Abundance and Species Richness of Nocturnal Insects on Organic and Conventional Farms: Effects of Agricultural Intensification on Bat Foraging. Conservation Biology 18:1283–1292.

Wilson, K. M., M. Kem, and N. T. Burley. 2017. Diet history effects on Zebra Finch incubation

performance: Nest attendance, temperature regulation, and clutch success. The Auk 134:295–307.

Winkler, D. W., and P. E. Allen. 1996. The Seasonal Decline in Tree Swallow Clutch Size: Physiological Constraint or Strategic Adjustment? Ecology 77:922–932.

Winkler, D. W., K. K. Hallinger, D. R. Ardia, R. J. Robertson, B. J. M. Stutchbury, and R. R. Cohen. 2020. Tree Swallow (Tachycineta bicolor). Page *in* A. F. Poole, editor. Birds of the World. Cornell Lab of Ornithology.

Winkler, D. W., M. K. Luo, and E. Rakhimberdiev. 2013. Temperature effects on food supply and chick mortality in tree swallows (Tachycineta bicolor). Oecologia 173:129–138.

Wood, S. N. 2017. Generalized additive models: an introduction with R. CRC press.

Zach, R., and K. R. Mayoh. 1982. Weight and feather growth of nestling tree swallows. Canadian Journal of Zoology 60:1080–1090.

Zuur, A. F., E. N. Ieno, N. Walker, A. A. Saveliev, and G. M. Smith. 2009. Mixed effects models and extensions in ecology with R. Page Smart Society. Springer New York, New York, NY.

Tables and figures

Table 1: Mean (±SD) of covariates used to model response variables. Covariates for prey availability were averaged over two days prior to the collection of each insect sample, whereas those for fitness proxies were averaged over either a 12-day (fledging success) or 16-day (nestling period duration and nestling body mass and wing length) window post hatching (presented are values for fledging success). Dashes imply the covariates were not used in the modeling of the response variable. Model groups identify which covariates were present within models found in Supplemental S1.

Covariate	Acronym	Unit	Prey availability	Fitness proxy	Model group
Julian day	JJ	day	172.2 ± (12.21)	-	Time
Maximum temperature	MAX	°C	25.61 ± (3.75)	25.36 ± (2.31)	Base
Precipitation	RN	ml	7.16 ± (11.13)	7.44 ± (4.92)	Base
Site score component 1	Comp.1	-	0.42 ± (1.77)	0.20 ± (1.80)	Land
Site score component 2	Comp.2	-	-0.24 ± (0.91)	-0.18 ± (0.91)	Land
Open water	WT	%	-	0.01 ± (0.01)	Base
Prey availability (Diptera dry biomass)	FDM	g	-	0.02 ± (0.01)	Food
Hatching day	HD	day	-	159.9 ± (5.76)	Base
Brood size	NN	nestlings	-	4.83 ± (1.27)	Base
Brood days	BD	summation of daily brood size	-	51.67 ± (10.58)	Base

Table 2. Standardized coefficient estimates, and their 95% confidence intervals of the top model for each response variable. See Table 1 for definitions of covariates and Supplemental S1 for outcome of model selection. Coefficients in bold indicate confidence intervals not overlapping zero. Numbers next to acronym refer to the order of the polynomial term

| Covariate	Biomass	Fledging success	Duration	Mass	Wing
FDM	-	**0.13** **(0.05, 0.20)**	-	0.08 (-0.02, 0.18)	-
Comp.1	-0.04 (-0.10, 0.01)	-0.02 (-0.10, 0.07)	**0.17** **(0.08, 0.26)**	-	**-53.55** **(-83.65, -23.45)**
Comp.2	0.05 (-0.03, 0.12)	**-0.15** **(-0.30, -0.01)**	0.06 (-0.11, 0.22)	-	-9.75 (-63.22, 43.72)
Comp.1:Comp.2	**-0.05** **(-0.08, -0.02)**	**0.07** **(0.00, 0.14)**	0.03 (-0.05, 0.12)	-	-8.70 (-36.54, 19.15)
Comp.1:FDM	-	**-0.05** **(-0.09, -0.01)**	-	-	-
Comp.2:FDM	-	**0.10** **(0.03, 0.18)**	-	-	-
WT	-	**0.24** **(0.09, 0.39)**	-0.09 (-0.24, 0.07)	0.07 (-0.09, 0.22)	40.10 (-10.83, 91.03)
HD	-	**-0.28** **(-0.36, -0.20)**	-0.05 (-0.15, 0.06)	**-0.25** **(-0.35, -0.15)**	6.51 (-24.75, 37.77)
MAX	-	**0.30** **(0.21, 0.38)**	**-0.33** **(-0.45, -0.21)**	0.04 (-0.09, 0.16)	**150.13** **(111.06, 189.21)**
RN	**-0.10** **(-0.12, -0.08)**	**-0.11** **(-0.20, -0.03)**	0.03 (-0.08, 0.15)	**-0.12** **(-0.24, -0.01)**	13.53 (-24.35, 51.42)
AGSY	-	**-0.25** **(-0.44, -0.06)**	**0.36** **(0.09, 0.63)**	0.00 (-0.27, 0.27)	**-143.03** **(-225.72, -60.35)**
NN	-	**-0.18** **(-0.25, -0.11)**	**0.26** **(0.18, 0.34)**	-	-
BD	-	-	-	**-0.22** **(-0.30, -0.15)**	**-46.72** **(-69.97, -23.48)**
JJ1	10.62 (-7.68, 28.91)	-	-	-	-
JJ2	**-12.26** **(-23.47, -1.05)**	-	-	-	-
JJ1:Comp.1	**-1.87** **(-3.31, -0.43)**	-	-	-	-
JJ2:Comp.1	**-3.34** **(-5.71, -0.97)**	-	-	-	-
MAX1	**-6.18** **(-9.28, -3.09)**	-	-	-	-
MAX2	**-12.30** **(-15.03, -9.56)**	-	-	-	-
MAX3	1.41 (-1.22, 4.03)	-	-	-	-
RN:Comp.1	**-0.02** **(-0.03, -0.01)**	-	-	-	-

Figure 1: Map of the 40 different farms across a gradient of agricultural intensification within southern Québec, Canada. Each point represents the location of a farm. Underlying raster represents the agricultural gradient derived from the Annual crop inventory of 2013 (AAFC 2018), for which each pixel represents either one of the five higher order categories or open water. The Star within inset map represents the centroid of this study system. Projected coordinate reference system of map is the Universal Transverse Mercator (UTM) zone 18 north. Subsequently graticules are the number of kilometers from some origin.

Figure 2: Robust compositional principal components analysis (PCA) of landscape habitat composition surrounding each of the 40 farms between 2006 and 2016. Arrows indicate the eigenvalue and loadings of each higher order habitat. Points within the background represent the site scores assigned to each farm and year combination and used to define landscape context (N=440 farms*years)

Figure 3: Predictions for the main covariates of interest. All predictions are unconditional predictions that have been model averaged, with shrinkage, according to Supplemental S1. Each row are predictions for the same response variable. Each plot within the first column, except for panel a, is one fitness proxy plotted against the full range of observed prey availability. Panel a is

the predicted Diptera biomass against the range of Julian dates. All error bars are unconditional (or conditional when appropriate) 95% confidence intervals. Each plot within the second column is a prediction surface of each response variable against the first two components of the robust PCA describing landscape context. The prediction surface has been reduced to the convex hull of site scores observed within this study. The range of colors represent the minimum (deep blue) and maximum (yellow) predicted values of each response variable given site score values. Individual plots are; the predicted prey availability against Julian date of collection (a), the predicted fledging success (b), duration of the nestling period (c), body mass (d) and wing length (e) of nestlings at 16 days of age against the full range of prey availability. The predicted Diptera availability (f), fledging success (g), duration of the nestling period (h), body mass (i) and wing length (j) of nestlings at 16 days of age against the first two components of the compositional PCA. Predictions and their covariates have been back transformed to either the response or unstandardized scale, respectively. All covariates not explicitly presented in figures were fixed to their mean values prior to predictions.