FLSEVIER



Progress in Oceanography



journal homepage: www.elsevier.com/locate/pocean

Seabird assemblages are linked to the major western boundary current off eastern Australia

Nicholas W. Daudt ^{a,*}, Eric J. Woehler ^b, Matthew R. Schofield ^c, Robert O. Smith ^a, Leandro Bugoni ^d, William J. Rayment ^a

^a Department of Marine Science, University of Otago, Dunedin Aotearoa, New Zealand

^b Australasian Seabird Group, BirdLife Australia, Hobart, Australia

^c Department of Mathematics and Statistics, University of Otago, Dunedin, Aotearoa, New Zealand

^d Institute of Biological Sciences, Universidade Federal do Rio Grande—FURG, Rio Grande, RS, Brazil

ARTICLE INFO

Dataset link: https://doi.org/10.17605/OSF.IO /N582D

Keywords: Biogeography Community ecology Distribution East Australian Current Mixture models Region of Common Profiles

ABSTRACT

Identifying species assemblages helps understand the relationship between organisms and their environment. Assemblages can be used to predict biological changes caused by environmental perturbations, and are thus essential surrogates to monitor biodiversity. In this study, to identify and describe seabird assemblages, we used 15 at-sea ship-based survey data sets collected over 37° of latitude off eastern Australia, from 2016 to 2021. We fitted seasonal Region of Common Profile (RCP) mixture models, for two types of data (presence-absence and abundance). RCP groups are defined as regions where the probability of encountering a particular species profile is constant within regions, but different amongst them. These groups also vary according to covariates, which in our case included oceanographic, climatic, and physiographic parameters. Results were based on 142,646 seabirds recorded from 80 species, including albatrosses, petrels, prions, shearwaters, boobies, and terns, among other taxa. All models suggested two macro-scale assemblages ('northern' and 'southern'), except for the autumn presence-absence model that identified three groups. The model results consistently show a biogeographic transition at \sim 34° S, near the latitude at which the East Australian Current (EAC) separates from the Australian continental slope. Sea surface temperatures or sea surface salinities were selected in all final models, further indicating a close relationship between seabird assemblages and water masses. Results from both data types, presence-absence and abundance, resulted in similar spatial and species profile patterns. RCP models clearly identified two seabird assemblages off the east coast of Australia, suggesting the persistence of these groups at seasonal and macro spatial scales. Given the ongoing poleward intensification that the EAC is experiencing, which is projected to continue over the next century, and its importance in influencing the distributions of seabirds, the methods applied in our study could be replicated to assess possible changes in seabird assemblages and how they are affected by changing environmental conditions.

1. Introduction

Bioregionalization is the discipline that identifies, delimits, characterises, and names biogeographical regions (Morrone, 2018; Vilhena and Antonelli, 2015). Although there is often no agreement on the naming systems among proposed regionalisation schema (but see Ebach et al., 2008), the hierarchical nature of bioregions is well recognised (Kreft and Jetz, 2010; Vilhena and Antonelli, 2015). Thus, bioregions are usually described within geographically larger classifications, such as 'provinces' or 'realms' (Costello et al., 2017; Spalding et al., 2007). The delimitation of bioregions is made through identifying sets of species that are endemic or have high levels of co-occurrence, and are distinct enough from other regions. In this sense, bioregions are interpreted as natural representations of common historical and/or ecological processes shaped by physical and biological forces (Kreft and Jetz, 2010). In particular, the identification of bioregions allows representation of the distribution of multiple species at a given time and space, and relating these regions to environmental characteristics. By doing so, bioregions can be interpreted as species assemblages (Hill et al., 2017; Lyons et al., 2017). Given these features, bioregions can be used as surrogates for biodiversity monitoring in data-poor regions and in regional conservation planning (Ferrier, 2002; Spalding et al., 2007), playing a fundamental role in conservation biogeography (Whittaker et al., 2005).

* Corresponding author. *E-mail address:* nicholaswdaudt@gmail.com (N.W. Daudt).

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pocean.2024.103215

Received 1 November 2023; Received in revised form 30 January 2024; Accepted 2 February 2024 Available online 4 March 2024

0079-6611/© 2024 The Author(s). Published by Elsevier Ltd. This is an open access article under the CC BY license (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).

Seabird assemblages have been widely described and related to environmental characteristics (Hyrenbach et al., 2007; Ribic et al., 1997; Woehler et al., 2003). Considering the hierarchical nature of oceanographic processes and their resulting features (Haury et al., 1978), it is not surprising that the distribution of highly mobile seabirds are linked differently across temporal and spatial scales (Haury et al., 1978; Hunt and Schneider, 1987). In the marine environment, largescale oceanographic features (e.g. boundary currents and water masses) act similarly to terrestrial biomes (based on vegetation), and influence seabird assemblage structure-i.e. the occurrence of species and their relative numerical composition (Commins et al., 2014; Hyrenbach et al., 2007; Ribic et al., 1997). In contrast, local abundance is related to meso- (10-100 km) and sub-mesoscale (1-10 km) processes that aggregate prey and therefore predators, such as fronts and eddies (Scales et al., 2014b; Weimerskirch, 2007). Such processes, although relatively ephemeral, are primarily driven by physical and atmospheric forces, and are thus somewhat predictable in space and time, providing consistent feeding areas for marine predators when they occur (Davoren, 2013; Hazen et al., 2013). Sea surface temperatures are a key driver of seabird distributions, at individual- and assemblagelevels, operating over a range of spatial and temporal scales from macro (e.g. water masses) to fine (e.g. fronts) (Dunlop et al., 1988; Gall et al., 2022; Quillfeldt et al., 2015; Ribic et al., 1997; Serratosa et al., 2020). Despite extensive surveys (e.g. Ballance et al., 1997) and tracking studies (e.g. Carneiro et al., 2020), many oceanic regions still lack information on the distributions and abundances of seabird species, and how they assemble in space and time.

One area in need of better understanding of seabird distributions is Australia, considered a global seabird hotspot (Karpouzi et al., 2007; Ramírez et al., 2017). Given the region's importance for seabird diversity, there are surprisingly few studies on seabird distributions at sea (Bernard et al., 2021; Mott and Clarke, 2018). Off northwest Australia, at-sea surveys, multivariate analyses (Dunlop et al., 1988) and ensemble species distribution models of species assemblages (Lavers et al., 2014) showed that habitat use by tropical seabird species was related to sea surface temperatures and salinity. Dunlop et al. (1988) suggested that salinity was the main variable influencing species' distributions in oceanic waters while temperature was the key factor for species on the continental shelf. In contrast, there are few studies at large spatial and temporal scales off eastern Australia. Reid and Hindell (2000) and Evans et al. (2021) analysed seabird assemblages and their relationships with oceanographic and prev data at mesoscale off southeast Tasmania. The remaining studies are mostly descriptive accounts locally (Blaber and Milton, 1994; Norman, 1992), or focused on a single species (Priddel et al., 2014).

The East Australian Current (EAC) is the major western boundary current in the South Pacific Ocean, and the dominant boundary current off eastern Australia (Ganachaud et al., 2014). The EAC has been extensively studied, although the links between the EAC's oceanography and marine predators are not well known. The dynamic features associated with the EAC, such as mesoscale eddies and upwelling, are likely to influence marine biota (Scales et al., 2014b; Suthers et al., 2011). While most of the biological studies in this system were focused on plankton entrapment within the cores of eddies (Firme et al., 2023; Garcia et al., 2022; Hassler et al., 2011), there is a growing body of work focusing on fisheries (Brieva et al., 2015; Hobday, 2010; Young et al., 2011). These studies emphasised how the probability of occurrence of a given taxon, and the structure of species assemblages, were driven by the EAC. However, the relationships between oceanography and marine megafauna within the EAC are poorly known (Suthers et al., 2011). Some progress has been made using shark and ray movement data (Jaine et al., 2014; Niella et al., 2022, 2020), and satellite tracking has also demonstrated that increased sea surface temperatures in the EAC decreases little penguin Eudyptula minor foraging success (Carroll et al., 2016), but information at the assemblage-level for seabirds in the EAC is absent.

Marine species range shifts are more likely to occur faster than terrestrial species due to their higher sensitivity to warming (Lenoir et al., 2020; Pinsky et al., 2019). As a result, climate change is rearranging the structure of species assemblages around the globe (Antão et al., 2020; Dornelas et al., 2014; Poloczanska et al., 2013). Top predators, for instance, may change their core habitats (Hazen et al., 2013; Reisinger et al., 2022), with unprecedented population consequences (Woehler and Hobday, 2024). For seabirds, Péron et al. (2010) and Sojitra et al. (2022) showed that sea surface temperature anomalies affected the occurrence and abundances of albatross and petrel species with latitude, thus affecting assemblage structure. In eastern Australia, changing EAC conditions have affected a range of marine species. For example, changes in zooplankton assemblage structure and fish distribution patterns have been recorded and attributed to warming water temperatures, and shifts in shark distributions are expected (Johnson et al., 2011; Niella et al., 2022). A severe marine heatwave driven by a poleward strengthening of the EAC, showed drastic environmental impacts including disease outbreaks in aquaculture farms and wildlife mortalities (Oliver et al., 2017). Given that the EAC is strengthening and extending farther southward and getting warmer (Cai et al., 2005; Phillips et al., 2022), biological changes are expected to occur (Hobday, 2010: Poloczanska et al., 2007).

In light of eastern Australia's importance for seabirds, and the recent attention on how predicted climate change will influence the EAC's marine biota (Poloczanska et al., 2007), an assessment of the contemporary spatial distributions of seabirds within the EAC at large temporal and spatial scales is timely. Seabirds can serve as sentinels for tracking ecological changes in the EAC in many ways (e.g. Sydeman et al., 2012). Surprisingly though, particularly in the Australasian region, seabird distribution is under-represented in climate change studies, despite being highlighted as a priority topic (Grémillet and Boulinier, 2009; Sydeman et al., 2012).

In this study, we aim to identify assemblages of seabird species within the EAC and adjacent areas, and relate these assemblages to environmental conditions, by using at-sea survey data and a state-of-theart modelling technique. We use the Region of Common Profiles-RCP (Foster et al., 2013), a mixture model capable of describing bioregions (Hill et al., 2020; Woolley et al., 2020). RCP is a model-based approach, and has a range of advantages over traditional algorithmbased statistics (Hill et al., 2020; Warton et al., 2015). Eastern Australia supports a high diversity of seabirds and offers wide environmental gradients over a near 40° latitudinal range, from the tropics to the cool temperate. We hypothesised to find different seabird assemblages relating to different environmental conditions within the EAC. In addition, presence-absence and abundance data were used to test if the different numerical resolutions would result in the identification of similar assemblages. This study provides a replicable framework on which future studies can assess how future changes in the EAC may influence the distribution of seabird assemblages.

2. Methods

2.1. Study area

The EAC originates from the South Equatorial Current (SEC), a tropical nutrient-poor current. When the SEC's North Caledonian Jet meets the Queensland Plateau ($\sim 18^{\circ}$ S), it splits into a north-flowing branch towards the Gulf of Papua and a south-flowing branch, which marks the start of the EAC (Ganachaud et al., 2014; Kessler and Cravatte, 2013). The South Caledonian Jet completes the EAC system at $\sim 22^{\circ}$ S after encountering the shelf break in the southern portion of the Great Barrier Reef (Fig. 1a; Ganachaud et al., 2014; Kessler and Cravatte, 2013). The EAC interacts with the bathymetry of the seafloor, giving rise to oceanographic features and processes, such as smaller currents, upwellings, and persistent dynamic eddies (Oke et al., 2019b; Oke and Middleton, 2000; Ridgway and Dunn, 2003). The EAC flows



Fig. 1. Study area showing the main ocean currents (a), and seabird records made by season on top of the 1° latitude \times 1° longitude grid cells (b). In (a), the East Australian Current (EAC) system is highlighted with its acronyms in bold and drawn in blue. The South Equatorial Current (SEC) and its branches, the North Caledonian Jet (NCJ) and South Caledonian Jet (SCJ), are drawn in red. The EAC 'eastern extension' is an eddy field (blue shaded area) often called the 'Tasman Front', from which the East Auckland Current originates (EAUC, in green).

Source: Figure (a) is adapted after Oke et al. (2019b).

polewards and is primarily associated with the shelf break, but at \sim 32° S it detaches from the shelf and spawns an area of eddy generation that dissipates throughout the western Tasman Sea (Mata et al., 2006; Oke et al., 2019b), the 'EAC eastern extension', often termed the 'Tasman Front' (Oke et al., 2019a). Although most EAC energy is converted into eddies, the EAC still runs southwards following the shelf break towards Tasmania (the 'EAC southern extension'; Fig. 1a), carrying eddy-like features as a transient current (Oke et al., 2019b).

2.2. Seabird and environmental data sources

Seabird data were gathered aboard RV Investigator and RV Falkor on 15 vovages, between 2016/17-2020/21, spanning over $\sim 37^{\circ}$ of latitude (Fig. 1b: Supplementary Table 1). Two observers continuously recorded seabirds within a 300 m forward quadrant (eye height 25 m a.s.l.) from sunrise to sunset hours while the ship was underway, following a strip-transect protocol. The species, the numbers of birds, and their behaviours (i.e. flying, feeding, sitting on the water) were logged in real time into a ship-based web server. Seabird surveys were halted when sea conditions exceeded 6 m wave height and 40 kn of wind or visibility was under 500 m. Environmental parameters for atmospheric and oceanographic conditions were logged continuously by automatedship based sensors, with seabird observations supplementing relevant environmental conditions such as visibility or associations with marine mammals. Individual records received a date/time/geographic coordinate label (multi-species records have the same label but are logged as separate entries for each species). Birds following the vessels were excluded from analyses. Seabird observation protocols followed Raymond et al. (2010), in use around Australia since 1980.

To investigate and predict species' distributions and relationships with environmental variables, a considered choice of broad-scale climatic and oceanographic covariates is important (Barbet-Massin and Jetz, 2014). We used three physiographic variables and seven oceanographic variables, from which a further three climatic layers were calculated (Table 1). These variables are the most frequently used in seabird–environment relationship studies (Tremblay et al., 2009), capturing processes at a range of spatial and temporal scales from macro-scale water-mass properties to prey availability in meso- to submesoscale oceanographic features (Haury et al., 1978; Scales et al., 2014b; Weimerskirch, 2007).

2.3. Data treatment

Data wrangling, modelling and visualisation were done in R 4.2.0 (R Core Team, 2022); the full list of packages can be found in the Supplementary Material. Code and the modelling dataset (see Section 2.3.2) are available in Daudt et al. (2023).

2.3.1. Environmental layers

The spatial and temporal persistence of oceanographic features such as eddy kinetic energy ('eke') and thermal fronts (sea surface temperature gradient: 'sst_grad') may influence the movements and distributions of seabirds by offering a higher likelihood of finding food (Scales et al., 2014a; Weimerskirch, 2007). Thus, 'eke' and 'sst_grad' environmental layers were calculated before extracting environmental data for each seabird record. For both 'eke' and 'sst_grad', we used their original cell spatial resolution (Table 1) and calculations were done layer-by-layer to match seabird data on the finest spatial scale possible. Eddy kinetic energy was calculated as $0.5(u'^2 + v'^2)$, where $u' = u - \bar{u}$ and $v' = v - \bar{v}$ are the surface zonal (latitudinal) and meridian (longitudinal) geostrophic currents, respectively, using a rolling mean of 90 days as \bar{u} and \bar{v} (Sun et al., 2022). The spatial 'sst grad' for each cell was calculated by averaging the maximum value for each neighbouring cell (average neighbourhood maximum), from north-to-south (NS) and west-to-east (WE); then, the magnitude of the gradient was defined as $NS^2 + WE^2$ (Burrows et al., 2011). In addition, we calculated climatic seasonal average layers for 'eke' and 'sst grad' based on the 11-year data for 2011-2021 as a proxy for persistent oceanographic features, and the 'eke' standard deviation over the same period (named with the prefix 'clim_' in Table 1). Seabed slope was calculated using 'raster::terrain()' (Hijmans, 2022a), and distance from the coast was calculated through 'sf::st_distance()' (Pebesma, 2018) using Australia and Tasmania as the mainland (i.e. ignoring smaller islands). Then, for each seabird record, the most proximate value for each environmental layer (original or calculated) was extracted using built-in functions from 'raster' 3.5-21, 'terra' 1.6-7, and 'sf' 1.0-8 packages (Hijmans, 2022a,b; Pebesma, 2018).

2.3.2. Data

Seabirds are highly mobile animals, and many species migrate and/or disperse during their non-breeding periods (Schreiber and Burger, 2002). Therefore, seasonal differences in species composition were expected (e.g. Reid et al., 2023), and in the probabilities of occurrence and in total numbers. Thus, we built separate modelling datasets for each season. Seasons were defined as summer (Dec-Feb), autumn (Mar-May), winter (Jun-Aug), and spring (Sep-Nov). We aggregated seabird data by 1° latitude \times 1° longitude grid cells (c. 110 \times 110 km) and season (Fig. 1b), by summing seabirds from the same species (flying, feeding, and sitting on the water). To test if the presence-absence and abundance (raw counts) data would result in similar assemblage patterns, we built two species matrices, where the presence-absence matrix transformed values >1 to 1. To avoid numerical instabilities in the models prompted by unusual or rare species, we kept only species occurring in at least six grids within each season (summer = 12 species; autumn = 21; winter = 20; spring = 33). The associated environmental data of each seabird record were averaged within the same grid cells and seasons, and environmental data were standardised before modelling.

2.4. Statistical modelling

We used the mixture model Region of Common Profiles (RCP) to identify and describe seabird species assemblages. RCP is a one-stage bioregionalization approach, as it identifies bioregions by specifying a statistical model that simultaneously relates response (multi-species data) and predictor (environmental data) (Hill et al., 2020; Woolley et al., 2020). Given a set of environmental variables, the model can

Table 1

Environmental data used in the Region of Common Profile models applied to seabird data off eastern Australia, their spatial/temporal resolutions, units, and sources.

Variable	Abbreviation	Units	Spatial resolution	Temporal resolution	Source
Sea Surface Temperature	sst	° Celsius	0.25° ×0.25°	daily	Huang et al. (2021) ^a
Sea Surface Temperature gradient	sst_grad	∆° Celsius	0.25° ×0.25°	daily	Derived from Huang et al. (2021) ^a
Sea Surface Salinity	SSS	PSU	0.083° ×0.083°	daily	E.U. Copernicus Marine Service Information ^{b,c}
Mixed Layer Depth	mld	m	0.083° ×0.083°	daily	E.U. Copernicus Marine Service Information ^{b,c}
8-day average Chlorophyll-a	chl8	mg/m ³	0.036° ×0.036°	8-days composite	Hu et al. (2012) ^d
Log10 8-day average Chlorophyll-a	log10_chl8	<i>log</i> ₁₀ (chl8)	0.036° ×0.036°	8-days composite	Derived from Hu et al. (2012) ^d
Eddy Kinetic Energy	eke	m/s	0.2° ×0.2°	daily	IMOS/AODN ^e
Climatic mean EKE	clim_eke_mean	mean(m/s)/season/11 years	0.2° ×0.2°	seasonal climatology	Derived from IMOS/AODN ^e
Climatic standard deviation EKE	clim_eke_sd	sd(m/s)/season/11 years	0.2° ×0.2°	seasonal climatology	Derived from IMOS/AODN ^e
Climatic mean SSTgrad	clim_sst_grad	mean(Δ° Celsius)/season/11 years	0.25° ×0.25°	seasonal climatology	Derived from Huang et al. (2021) ^a
Bathymetry	bat	m	0.004° ×0.004°	NA	GEBCO ^f
Slope	slope	degrees (°)	0.004° ×0.004°	NA	Derived from GEBCO ^f
Distance from coast	dist_coast	km	NA	NA	Calculated in R (see main text)

^a NOAA OISST: (https://psl.noaa.gov/data/gridded/data.noaa.oisst.v2.highres.html);

^b 2011–2019: GLOBAL_MULTIYEAR_PHY_001_030 (https://doi.org/10.48670/moi-00021);

^c 2020–2021: GLOBAL ANALYSIS_FORECAST_PHY_001_024 (https://doi.org/10.48670/moi-00016);

^d ERDDAP/NOAA (https://coastwatch.pfeg.noaa.gov/erddap/griddap/erdMH1chla8day.html);

^e IMOS/AODN (https://portal.aodn.org.au/search), 'OceanCurrent - Gridded sea level anomaly - Delayed mode' data set;

f GEBCO (https://www.gebco.net/data_and_products/gridded_bathymetry_data/; doi:10.5285/a29c5465-b138-234d-e053-6c86abc040b9)

predict assemblage probabilities for sites where no biotic (observational) data exist. As a model-based approach, RCPs can be compared by information criteria, present uncertainty around the results, and check for model assumptions through assessing residuals (Hill et al., 2020; Warton et al., 2015).

The model is specified in terms of assemblages and site-specific probabilities. There are *K* assemblages (i.e. RCPs), K = (1, ..., k), that are common across the study area. The outcome variable is a vector $y_i = (y_{i1}, ..., y_{iS})$, that gives the count or presence–absence of each of the *S* species at site *i*. Depending on whether we model the counts or presence–absence data, the assemblages are defined in terms of the expected frequency or relative frequency of the species, respectively. An output of the model is the estimated probability that site *i* has each of the *K* possible assemblages. RCPs are a multivariate adaptation of a mixture-of-experts model; as such, the mixing proportions (assemblage structure) vary according to covariates (predictors) (Foster et al., 2013). RCPs can be directly interpreted as assemblages; the assemblage structure is given by the species profiles (i.e. the proportion of each species within the assemblage given by their probability of occurrence or predicted abundance).

Before fitting models, covariates were checked for collinearity within each seasonal dataset. If a pairwise collinearity of |x| > 0.7 was found we removed one of the variables (Dormann et al., 2013), favouring direct measures over the 'climatic' layers we calculated (e.g. if 'sst_grad' and 'clim_sst_grad' were correlated, we chose 'sst_grad'). Thus, 'full models' differed between seasons as the retained covariates varied, although most covariates were common for all seasons.

Due to seabird migration and dispersion, seasons could act as 'sampling artefacts' (Foster et al., 2017), thus biasing results (Ponti and Sannolo, 2023). In light of the difference among seasons in the numbers of species that met our occurrence threshold (see Section 2.3.2), we decided to use RCP models by season and data type (presence-absence and abundance). RCP models were used to relate the response variables (i.e. presence-absence or abundance of each seabird species in each grid cell) to the independent predictor covariates (i.e. averaged values of environmental variables in each cell). Presence–absence data were modelled based on a Bernoulli model, whereas abundance data were based on a negative binomial model. RCPs were fitted using the 'ecomix' 1.0.0 package (Woolley et al., 2022), with the following work-flow: (i) find the best number of groups (K) that describes the data, (ii) re-fit the model by fixing K and selecting the optimal combination of covariates, (iii) check residuals, (iv) bootstrap the best model to estimate uncertainty of parameter estimates, and (v) produce results.

To identify the best number of RCP groups (K) that described the data, we used full models (all covariates) with 100 random start numbers (see Foster et al., 2013) between k = (2, ..., 7) groups, and chose the number of RCPs that minimised the Bayesian Information Criterion (BIC). Then, we fixed K at the optimal number and fitted models for every possible linear, additive combination of covariates. We chose the best model as the one with the lowest BIC. Visual inspection of randomised quantile residual plots modified for mixture models was used to verify model assumptions (Dunstan et al., 2013). To obtain estimates of uncertainty for model parameters (confidence intervals), we used the default settings of 'ecomix::regional_mix.bootstrap()', which applies a Bayesian bootstrap 1000 times. A custom code was written to generate partial plots for exploring the influence of covariates on RCP membership.

We built a seasonal 11-year (2011–2021) average layer for predicting model results for each environmental covariate. These variables were then averaged within 1° latitude × 1° longitude grid cells, by season, between 9–47° S and 141–161° E. Note that 'clim_eke_mean' and 'clim_sst_grad' were processed beforehand as they may characterise persistent oceanographic features (described above) and thus represent the same value as 'eke' and 'sst_grad'. Data for prediction were standardised using the same mean and standard deviation from the modelling dataset.

Finally, we ran rarefaction curves based on the presence–absence matrix and the assigned RCP group for each sample (grid cell) to assess if the amount of information in the RCP model was representative. Rarefaction curves were fit using the 'iNEXT' 3.0.0 package (Chao et al.,



Fig. 2. Species richness (a) and the total number of seabirds counted (b) off eastern Australia during Australasian Seabird Group's ship-based surveys between 2016–2021, by grid/season, after data aggregation (see Methods). Dots represent the grid centroids.

2014; Hsieh et al., 2016), and results are presented based on alpha diversity (i.e. species richness).

3. Results

3.1. Summary of species richness and numbers

A total of 10,261 seabird records was obtained during the 15 voyages, comprising 142,646 individuals from 80 species, belonging to 11 families and five orders. The five most abundant species made up 83% of total birds counted (43.0% short-tailed shearwater Ardenna tenuirostris, 17.2% fairy prion Pachyptila turtur, 14.3% wedge-tailed shearwater Ardenna pacifica, 5.2% sooty tern Onychoprion fuscatus, 3.2% shy albatross Thalassarche cauta). The five most frequently encountered species were A. pacifica (frequency of occurrence = 35.3%), T. cauta (33.2%), brown booby Sula leucogaster (25.4%), red-footed booby S. sula (25.4%) and black-browed albatross T. melanophris (25%) (Supplementary Fig. 1). An increase in species richness towards the south of the study region was clear in all but the winter season (Fig. 2). Noticeably higher counts were made around Tasmania, possibly due to the 'colony effect' and/or the presence of Southern Ocean species (Fig. 2). However, in summer, one cell in the Coral Sea had counts of the same order of magnitude as off Tasmania.

3.2. RCP models

In this section, we will present only the main results for the spring season when delving into specifics about each model and its results. The results of spring models summarise the key findings of our analysis, but we encourage the reader to look at the Supplementary Material for other seasons.

For all models, two RCPs was the optimal number of seabird groups, except for the presence-absence-autumn model, which indicated three RCPs as the best fit (Supplementary Figs. 2, 3). The best fitting models generally had one or two covariates selected, although the abundanceautumn model had five covariates (Table 2). The best models showed a good fit with no apparent deviations from the assumptions (Supplementary Figs. 4, 5). All the best models selected sea surface temperature ('sst') or salinity ('sss'), as essential for characterising water masses. The thresholds for defining RCP membership were 18-21 °C for 'sst' and 35.1 PSU for 'sss' (Fig. 3, Supplementary Figs. 6, 7), similar to the characteristics used to define the EAC. Furthermore, most of the best models selected bathymetry ('bat'), suggesting a gradient between 'coastal' and 'oceanic' taxa (Supplementary Figs. 6, 7). Of particular note, proxies for persistent oceanographic features that may aggregate food resources (the 'climatic' variables) for seabirds were selected only in the autumn and spring abundance models.

Grid point-predictions are the assignment of the RCP with the highest probability value for a given cell. When predicting RCP onto space, patterns of point-predictions suggest a biogeographic transition

Table 2

Bernoulli a bat + slope + eke + sst + sss + mld + sst_grad 332.69 Jummer a bat + slope + eke + sst + sss + mld + sst_grad 319.34 Autumn a bat + slope + eke + chl + sst + sss + mld + sst_grad + clim_sst_grad 1184.29 b bat + slope + eke + chl + sst + sss + mld + sst_grad + clim_sst_grad 1184.29 Winter a bat + slope + eke + sst + sss + mld + sst_grad + clim_sst_grad 1089.43 Spring a bat + slope + dist_coast + eke + chl + sst + sss + mld + sst_grad + clim_sst_grad + clim_sst_grad + clim_eke_mean 2345.6
Summer a bat + slope + eke + sst + sss + mld + sst_grad 332.69 319.34
a bat + slope + eke + sst + sss + mld + sst_grad 332.69 b bat + slope + eke + sst + sss + mld + sst_grad 319.34 Autumn a bat + slope + eke + chl + sst + sss + mld + sst_grad + clim_sst_grad 1184.29 b bat + slope + eke + chl + sst + sss + mld + sst_grad + clim_sst_grad 1184.29 Winter a bat + slope + eke + sst + sss + mld + sst_grad + clim_sst_grad 1089.43 b sst 1062.98 1062.98 Spring a bat + slope + dist_coast + eke + chl + sst + sss + mld + sst_grad + clim_sst_grad + clim_s
b bat + sss 319.34 Autumn a bat + slope + eke + chl + sst + sss + mld + sst_grad + clim_sst_grad 1184.29 b bat + slope + eke + chl + sst + sss + mld + sst_grad + clim_sst_grad 1184.29 Winter a bat + slope + eke + sst + sss + mld + sst_grad + clim_sst_grad 1089.43 b sst 1062.98 1062.98 Spring a bat + slope + dist_coast + eke + chl + sst + sss + mld + sst_grad + clim_sst_grad + clim_sst_grad + clim_eke_mean 2345.6
Autumn a bat + slope + eke + chl + sst + sss + mld + sst_grad + clim_sst_grad 1184.29 b bat + sst 1147.94 Winter a bat + slope + eke + sst + sss + mld + sst_grad + clim_sst_grad 1089.43 b sst 1062.98 Spring a bat + slope + dist_coast + eke + chl + sst + sss + mld + sst_grad + clim_sst_grad + clim_sst_grad + clim_sst_grad + clim_eke_mean 2345.6
a bat + slope + eke + chl + sst + sss + mld + sst_grad + clim_sst_grad 1184.29 b bat + sst 1147.94 Winter a bat + slope + eke + sst + sss + mld + sst_grad + clim_sst_grad 1089.43 b sst 1062.98 Spring a bat + slope + dist_coast + eke + chl + sst + sss + mld + sst_grad + clim_sst_grad
b bat + sst 1147.94 Winter a bat + slope + eke + sst + sss + mld + sst_grad + clim_sst_grad 1089.43 b sst 1062.98 Spring a bat + slope + dist_coast + eke + chl + sst + sss + mld + sst_grad + clim_sst_grad + cli
Winter a bat + slope + eke + sst + sss + mld + sst_grad + clim_sst_grad 1089.43 b sst 1062.98 Spring a bat + slope + dist_coast + eke + chl + sst + sss + mld + sst_grad + clim_sst_grad + clim_ss
a bat + slope + eke + sst + sss + mld + sst_grad + clim_sst_grad 1089.43 b sst 1062.98 Spring a bat + slope + dist_coast + eke + chl + sst + sss + mld + sst_grad + clim_sst_grad
b sst 1062.98 Spring a bat + slope + dist_coast + eke + chl + sst + sss + mld + sst_grad + clim_sst_grad + clim_eke_mean 2345.6
Spring a bat + slope + dist_coast + eke + chl + sst + sss + mld + sst_grad + clim_sst_grad + clim_eke_mean 2345.6
a bat + slope + dist_coast + eke + chl + sst + sss + mld + sst_grad + clim_sst_grad + clim_eke_mean 2345.6
b bat + sst 2306.7
Negative Binomial
Summer
a bat + slope + eke + sst + sss + mld + sst_grad 1518.96
b bat + sss 1505.13
 Autumn
a bat + slope + eke + chl + sst + sss + mld + sst_grad + clim_sst_grad -Inf (n.f.)
b bat + chl + sst + mld + clim_sst_grad 3082.14
Winter
a bat + slope + eke + sst + sss + mld + sst_grad + clim_sst_grad 3262.45
b sst 3234.21
a $bat + slope + dist_coast + eke + chl + sst + sss + mld + sst_grad + clim_sst_grad + clim_eke_mean$ 5854.32
b sst + clim_eke_mean 5824.38

Full (a) and best (b) Region of Common Profile models applied to seabird data off eastern Australia, for both data types used (presence-absence, based on Bernoulli models; abundance, based on negative binomial models). Refer to Table 1 for the environmental data acronyms.

in seabird species around ~34° S, with both presence–absence and abundance models pointing to similar results (Fig. 4). These patterns are further reinforced when looking at the mean probability along with the lower and upper confidence intervals of predictions (Fig. 5, Supplementary Figs. 8, 9), showing that around ~34° S, the 'northern' RCP tended to have higher probabilities in coastal regions, whereas the 'southern' RCP spread northward offshore. The autumn presence–absence model (three RCPs) had a similar broad-scale pattern, although the southern RCP is farther south, and a strong 'Tasmania/Bass Strait' assemblage appears (Fig. 4, Supplementary Figs. 8, 9).

The broad pattern of two large-scale assemblages is reflected in their species compositions. Although there are overlaps among the seabird groups, both presence–absence and abundance models captured typical tropical species in the northern RCP (e.g. boobies *Sula* spp., lesser frigatebird *Fregata ariel*) and typical Southern Ocean species in the southern RCP (e.g. small albatrosses *Thalassarche* spp., fairy prion *P. turtur*) (Fig. 6, Supplementary Figs. 10, 11). The autumn presence– absence model, which had three RCPs, also showed the characteristic taxa representing the 'northern' and 'southern' RCPs. However, the intermediate 'Tasmania/Bass Strait' assemblage showed a mixture of both groups with shy albatross and Australasian gannet *Morus serrator* prominent with high probabilities of occurrence.

4. Discussion

This study showed that seabird assemblages off eastern Australia were correlated with oceanographic conditions, and that the East Australian Current appeared to be key in structuring seabird distributions at meso- to macro scales (*sensu* Hunt and Schneider, 1987). Our results are based on a multivariate statistical model (Hill et al., 2020), which brings advantages over classical methods for describing species assemblages. RCP models allow estimating uncertainty around the point

probability of a sample (grid cell) belonging to an assemblage, thus representing the fuzziness between bioregion boundaries. These transition zones between bioregions are essential for monitoring biological changes due to environmental changes (Morrone, 2024). As such, the boundary between the two consistently identified bioregions in this study may be a crucial region to monitor in future, given noticeable anomalies in the EAC at this same region (Phillips et al., 2022). Our results draw an important baseline for seabird assemblages in a world hotspot for seabirds.

4.1. Seabird bioregions off eastern Australia

The relationships between seabird assemblages and water masses has been well established (Elphick and Hunt, 1993; Gall et al., 2022; Pocklington, 1979; Ribic et al., 1997). Thus, it is not surprising that two seabird assemblages were identified off eastern Australia. However, the spatial consistency of these patterns throughout seasons is surprising and remarkable (but see Section 4.3). Resident species seem to characterise these assemblages. Shy albatross (Hedd et al., 2001; Mason et al., 2018) and fairy prions (Fromant et al., 2022) in the southern assemblage, and boobies (Bunce, 2015; Miller et al., 2018) and wedgetailed shearwaters (McDuie et al., 2015; Weimerskirch et al., 2020) in the northern assemblage, were always profiled with higher probabilities of occurrence and predicted abundances compared to other species in the same groups. Given that changes in assemblages over time are typically driven by a few species (Gotelli et al., 2022), and that those species are likely residents (Souza and Santos, 2023), the relationships between these resident seabirds and the EAC system over the broad latitudinal range detailed here should be closely monitored. Elsewhere, coastal seabirds such as little penguin are signalling the adverse effects that climate change might have in changing seabird behaviours and decreasing foraging success (Carroll et al., 2016; Woehler and



Fig. 3. Partial plots for the retained covariates in the best spring (a) presence-absence and (b) abundance models. The plot shows the fitted probability of belonging to a Region of Common Profiles (RCP) against the environmental value. All other predictors are held at their mean values. Results for other seasons and models can be found in the Supplementary Figs. 6, 7. Refer to Table 1 for the environmental data acronyms.

Hobday, 2024), which ultimately influence their breeding success and population dynamics (Johnson and Colombelli-Négrel, 2021). Thus, the species profiles and the spatial predictions of assemblages from RCP models could be used as tools for monitoring future seabird responses to the fast-changing EAC.

The seasonal models also captured the influence of migratory species, particularly in the southern assemblage. The summer and autumn models reflected the high abundance of short-tailed shearwater before they depart on their trans-equatorial migration (Carey et al., 2014); the presence of the Australasian gannet was picked up by the autumn and winter models (Ismar et al., 2011); and the white-headed petrel Pterodroma lessonii movements during chick-rearing and pre-laying exodus (Taylor et al., 2021) were detected in autumn and spring models, respectively. Given the geographic location of the southern assemblage, however, we believe sub-Antarctic taxa were not well represented in our models due to their low number of occurrences and relative paucity of survey effort to date (Supplementary Fig. 1; hence they were removed before modelling). Additional surveys may reveal the seasonal northward pulse of these taxa into the southern assemblage (e.g. albatrosses Diomedea spp. and Phoebetria spp.), given that more effort translates as higher likelihood of recording these species. In turn, including these taxa in the models could result in a more stable 'three assemblage pattern' (as revealed by the autumn presence-absence model) in all but the summer season, when the majority of Antarctic species are breeding (Marchant and Higgins, 1990).

Our analyses clearly revealed a 'northern' and a 'southern' assemblage of seabirds off eastern Australia within the EAC. There is a noticeable link with the EAC dynamics: the boundaries of RCPs occurred at $\sim 34^{\circ}$ S, near the average separation latitude ($\sim 32^{\circ}$ S; 25– 38° S) of the EAC and its eastward extension into the Tasman Sea (Oke et al., 2019b). However, the 'northern/southern' assemblage pattern identified herein does not agree with previously-proposed large-scale regionalisations, such as the pelagic Longhurst Provinces (Longhurst, 2007), the Marine Ecoregions of the World [MEOW; Spalding et al. (2007)], or the Large Marine Ecosystems [LME; Sherman (1994)]. The MEOW schema was based on coastal and shelf biota and was meant to represent habitats to the 200 m isobath, which clearly does not encompass the entirety of seabird habitats. The LME schema is characterised by physiographical, hydrological and productivity data but has a strong focus on practical management of areas and thus there is a political component embedded within it, which does not align with seabird distributions. Longhurst (2007) designated only one biogeochemical province for eastern Australia based on productivity patterns, which may work well at larger (macro) scales, but appears to be oversimplified for the EAC.

The results do agree with the marine biogeographic units proposed by Costello et al. (2017), who identified a boundary at ~34° S between their 'Coral Sea' and 'South Australia' realms. Their approach used 65,000 taxa, from benthic/pelagic and coastal/offshore habitats, thus integrating more complexity of the biogeographic boundaries in the marine environment. Other biological data also suggest 'northern/southern' assemblages off eastern Australia, including tuna and billfish [also highly mobile top predators; Reygondeau et al. (2012)], mesopelagic fauna [which includes seabird prey; Sutton et al. (2017)] and deep-sea invertebrates and fish (O'Hara et al., 2020a,b). All these studies focused mainly on describing biological assemblages, as opposed to classifying environments. It is worth noting that the Longhurst Provinces approach was updated to include SST, SSS and bathymetry (the same variables retained by our best RCP models) and a temporal component to the classification (Reygondeau et al., 2013). The updated provinces are more similar to the seabird assemblages described here, although still not a perfect match, which could be partially explained



Fig. 4. Spatialized point predictions (hard-classes) for seabird assemblages (Region of Common Profile; RCP), by season, based on presence–absence (a) and abundance (b) models, off eastern Australia. Each grid was assigned to the RCP group with highest membership probability.

because the seabird assemblage in the EAC region includes several longdistance migratory species. Australia's bioregionalization has a long story of disagreements (Ebach, 2012), however, the inherent link that RCPs develop between environment and biological data can be a strong tool to support marine bioregionalization.

4.2. Fitting RCP models to highly mobile animals

To the best of our knowledge, this is the first study applying RCPs to highly mobile animals such as seabirds. RCP models have been previously applied to plants (Lyons et al., 2017), and relatively sedentary animals, such as macrobenthic organisms (Pantiukhin et al., 2021) and demersal fish (Hill et al., 2017). Oceanic seabirds can have daily movements of hundreds of kilometres (e.g. McDuie et al., 2015), during which they traverse a variety of habitats and environmental gradients.

As such, capturing the distribution of highly mobile species, and their relationships with environmental parameters is not a trivial task, and much harder than for sessile organisms. Among marine megafauna, seabirds are relatively easy to detect visually, enabling suitable sample sizes to be gathered over large areas (Ballance, 2007). Thus, seabirds can be used as models to study the distribution of highly mobile animals in relation to environmental characteristics in the marine environment.

While remote tracking studies are advancing our understanding on how individual seabirds use their environment at fine scales (Tremblay et al., 2009; Trevail et al., 2023), they fail to perceive how species assemblages interact with the environment and each other. Therefore, using at-sea counts of seabirds is a well established method to capture these relationships (Ainley et al., 2012; Hyrenbach et al., 2007; Woehler et al., 2003). Further, the spatial scales on which assemblages relate to their environment is variable and species-specific (Hunt and Schneider, 1987; Ribic et al., 1997; Scales et al., 2017). Understanding



Fig. 5. Predicted probability membership of each seabird assemblage (Region of Common Profiles; RCP) and grid, off eastern Australia, from spring presence–absence (a) and abundance (b) models. The central column, 'mean', corresponds to the point prediction and Bayesian boot-strapped, lower and upper confidence intervals (CI), on its sides. Note that, in case of two RCPs, RCP2 probability equals (1 - RCP1 probability). Results for other seasons and models can be found in the Supplementary Figs. 8, 9.



Fig. 6. Species profiles of seabird assemblages (Region of Common Profile; RCP) off eastern Australia in spring. Values are the average and 95% confidence intervals of probability of occurrence (a) and predicted mean abundance (b) for each species, based on 1000 Bayesian bootstraps. Values in (b) were log10-transformed to accommodate the high variation between species. Results for other seasons and models can be found in the Supplementary Figs. 10, 11. Note the species on the *Y*-axis are ordered alphabetically, from bottom up.

the biology of the studied group is thus essential to set the appropriate scales of analyses. Our choice of 1° latitude \times 1° longitude was mainly determined by data availability reflecting survey effort, and the trade-off between the number of species per grid/season (see also Section 4.3). Nonetheless, the chosen spatial scale is similar to other seabird distribution analyses conducted elsewhere (Harris et al., 2007; Santora and Veit, 2013; Sojitra et al., 2022). Therefore, for describing seabird assemblages at a macro-scale, the chosen resolution seems to have been a good fit, accords with studies elsewhere, and the resultant models described patterns of seabird species' composition consistent with our current understanding of species' ecologies and life history strategies.

RCP models based on presence–absence and abundance data are able to complement each other. Previous studies using RCPs have opted to use only one type of response data. Lyons et al. (2017), Hill et al. (2017), and Pantiukhin et al. (2021) all used presence–absence data, whereas Lee et al. (2019) and Receveur et al. (2020) used abundance (count) data. The added information contained in abundance data make them inherently more powerful than binary presence–absence data. However, the use of different data inputs in multivariate biodiversity assessments and assemblage descriptions has shown contrasting patterns at different spatial scales. At larger spatial and temporal scales, presence–absence data describe similar patterns to abundance data (Anderson et al., 2005), as we found. In contrast, at smaller scales, abundance data may highlight local conditions and therefore reveal hidden patterns at coarse to fine scales (Anderson et al., 2005; Marchant, 1990; Melo, 2005; Waters, 2008). If combined with ecological knowledge of a particular group, the information contained in both

presence-absence and abundance data could be leveraged to better interpret the resulting patterns.

For example, seabirds will likely occur in specific water masses or currents (Commins et al., 2014; Gall et al., 2022; Hunt and Schneider, 1987; Ribic et al., 1997), whereas their abundance is related to coarse- to fine-scale processes that enhance prey availability (De Pascalis et al., 2021; Hunt and Schneider, 1987; Weimerskirch, 2007). Although we have not approached the data in a multi-scale analysis, our results partially support this. Presence-absence models retained static variables and oceanographic variables that define water masses (i.e. SST and salinity). In addition to those, the autumn and spring abundance models also retained variables associated with persistent oceanographic features (e.g. climatic variables related to eddies and fronts), as well as mixed layer depth and chlorophyll in the autumn model. Eddies, fronts, high chlorophyll and shallower mixed layer depths are all related to increased seabird foraging success (De Pascalis et al., 2021; Scales et al., 2014b; Weimerskirch, 2007), and therefore likely to influence seabird numbers. Thus, future studies assessing bioregions of highly mobile animals could describe the compositions of assemblages using smaller resolution grid cells and presence-absence models. Then, abundance models using higher resolution grid cells could improve our understanding of how these animals relate to their environment and possibly reveal multi-species aggregation areas (therefore 'new bioregions') likely nested within the bioregions described at large scales. Such a hierarchical approach would require substantial concurrent observational and environmental data sets, which, to our knowledge, do not exist for our study area.

4.3. Limitations

Although the results suggest consistent patterns, there are a number of caveats to our analyses. Seabird data were gathered during multi-disciplinary cruises, whose sampling designs were not specifically planned to account for spatial ecology of seabirds. As a result, there are spatial discontinuities in the data, which might have limited the ability of our models to detect the relationships between the seabird assemblages and the full spectrum of environmental predictors. Even though Australia is a hotspot for seabirds (Karpouzi et al., 2007; Ramírez et al., 2017), there is a paucity of information on seabird distributions in the region (Bernard et al., 2021; Mott and Clarke, 2018). Dedicated seabird surveys would help to advance seabird research in this region, and improve our understanding of the patterns described here. By increasing the amount of data, future studies could set the grid cells at higher resolution, and potentially reveal assemblages at finer spatial and temporal scales. In addition, ideally, we would have had more information within each grid cell by season (our sampling units). Nonetheless, rarefaction curves show that the sample coverage (see Chao and Jost, 2012) was high at the RCP level, although there is room for detecting more species in most of them (Supplementary Fig. 12).

These limitations are illustrated in the results for the summer and autumn seasons. Considering the strong support for a southern and a northern assemblage, we note that both summer and autumn lack samples in representative southern and northern (summer) and northern (autumn) areas. Albeit the sample coverage values were overall high, compared to winter and spring, summer and autumn had lower values (in particular, for the southern assemblage 'RCP1' in summer and for the northern assemblage 'RCP3' in autumn; Supplementary Fig. 12). Further, based on point predictions, higher probabilities of the southern assemblage in the northern area in summer (both presence-absence and abundance models) and of the northern assemblage in the southern area in autumn (abundance model), were assigned to a few grids (Fig. 4). The latter reinforces the possible weakness of these models to detect stronger relationships between the identified assemblages and the predictors. We also acknowledge the sharp spatial change in probabilities between assemblages in summer models (i.e. without

a proper 'transition zone'), which may be related to the previous point. However, both summer and autumn models detected higher probabilities of expected taxa in their species profiles, suggesting that the make-up of the assemblage was well distinguished by the models. In addition, these models also seem to have captured the appropriate number of assemblages, agreeing with other models/seasons. Despite their limitations, we believe these models agree with the big picture of our results, therefore being a valid resource as a baseline.

5. Conclusions

We applied a robust, replicable method to assess seabird assemblages off eastern Australia within the EAC for the first time. The models point towards a consistent pattern of a 'northern' and a 'southern' seabird assemblage, where the spatial division is attributable to the eastward separation of the EAC from the coast, and that SST seems to be the key variable discriminating these groups. The mechanistic links between SST and seabird assemblages deserve more studies but may be due to the distribution of seabird prey, which at the biogeographic level seems to correlate with our findings (Sutton et al., 2017). The EAC has penetrated poleward over the past half-century (Hill et al., 2008; Li et al., 2022), a trend which is anticipated to continue into the future (Yang et al., 2016), and extreme weather events such as marine heatwaves to happen more often (Oliver et al., 2018). As such, seabirds will have to respond to these changes (Woehler and Hobday, 2024). Southern Ocean albatrosses off southeast Australia, for instance, have shown 'early stages of a southward range shift' due to environmental variability (Sojitra et al., 2022). Resident species such as little penguins and wedge-tailed shearwater change their behaviour and have decreased foraging success when SST is higher (Carroll et al., 2016; Peck et al., 2004). Given that eastern Australia is a biodiversity and numerical hotspot for seabirds, it is imperative to establish a monitoring program allowing the assemblages and species profiles presented here to be used as the baseline for understanding possible effects of a warming ocean on seabird distribution. In particular, the transition zone between assemblages might be pushed southwards along with the expected trend of the EAC. The transition zone between assemblages (Morrone, 2024), associated with the eastern extension of the EAC, may be fundamental to effectively monitoring the strengthening of the EAC and the subsequent impact on marine biota.

CRediT authorship contribution statement

Nicholas W. Daudt: Conceptualization, Data curation, Formal analysis, Methodology, Software, Visualization, Writing – original draft. Eric J. Woehler: Conceptualization, Data curation, Investigation, Methodology, Resources, Supervision, Writing – review & editing. Matthew R. Schofield: Conceptualization, Software, Supervision, Writing – review & editing. Robert O. Smith: Supervision, Writing – review & editing. Leandro Bugoni: Supervision, Writing – review & editing. William J. Rayment: Conceptualization, Supervision, Writing – review & editing.

Declaration of competing interest

The authors declare that they have no known competing financial interests or personal relationships that could have appeared to influence the work reported in this paper.

Data availability

The data that support the findings of this study are openly available in Daudt et al. (2023), from Open Science Framework (OSF) at https:// doi.org/10.17605/OSF.IO/N582D. The seabird raw data are currently being used for other projects and thus cannot be publicly available—if you are interested in it, please contact Eric J. Woehler. The environmental data used in this study are freely available in their source: (i) GEBCO Compilation Group provided detailed bathymetric data; (ii) Eddy kinetic energy was derived from data sourced from Australia's Integrated Marine Observing System (IMOS), enabled by the National Collaborative Research Infrastructure Strategy (NCRIS); (iii) Sea surface salinity and mixed layer depth were sourced from E.U. Copernicus Marine Service Information; (iv) Sea surface temperature was sourced from NOAA OI SST V2 High Resolution Dataset provided by the NOAA PSL, Boulder, Colorado, USA; and (v) Chlorophyll-*a* was sourced from ERDDAP/NOAA, which uses NASA's Aqua-MODIS satellite data. See detailed information regarding environmental layers in the main text (Table 1).

Acknowledgements

We thank all observers who assisted in data collection, the crews of RV *Investigator* and RV *Falkor*, and the Australasian Seabird Group (BirdLife Australia) for logistical support. The authors would like to thank Dr. Skipton N.C. Woolley, {ecomix} developer, who kindly helped NWD build preliminary models and gave advice in several stages of model construction. NWD thanks the Department of Marine Science (University of Otago), New Zealand for supporting a PhD writing retreat, during which most of this manuscript was drafted. Thanks also to two anonymous reviewers whose comments helped improve our manuscript. NWD is supported by a Doctoral scholarship from the University of Otago, New Zealand; LB is a research fellow from CNPq, Brazil (310145/2022-8).

Funding

Parks Australia provided funding support to participants for selected voyages.

Appendix A. Supplementary data

Supplementary material related to this article can be found online at https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pocean.2024.103215.

References

- Ainley, D., Ribic, C., Woehler, E., 2012. Adding the ocean to the study of seabirds: a brief history of at-sea seabird research. Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser. 451, 231–243. http://dx.doi.org/10.3354/meps09524.
- Anderson, M.J., Connell, S.D., Gillanders, B.M., Diebel, C.E., Blom, W.M., Saunders, J.E., Landers, T.J., 2005. Relationships between taxonomic resolution and spatial scales of multivariate variation. J. Anim. Ecol. 74, 636–646. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/ j.1365-2656.2005.00959.x.
- Antão, L.H., Bates, A.E., Blowes, S.A., Waldock, C., Supp, S.R., Magurran, A.E., Dornelas, M., Schipper, A.M., 2020. Temperature-related biodiversity change across temperate marine and terrestrial systems. Nat. Ecol. Evol. 4, 927–933. http://dx. doi.org/10.1038/s41559-020-1185-7.
- Ballance, L.T., 2007. Understanding seabirds at sea: why and how? Mar. Ornithol. 35, 127–135.
- Ballance, L.T., Pitman, R.L., Reilly, S.B., 1997. Seabird community structure along a productivity gradient: importance of competition and energetic constraint. Ecology 78, 1502–1518. http://dx.doi.org/10.1890/0012-9658(1997)078%5B1502: SCSAAP%5D2.0.CO;2.
- Barbet-Massin, M., Jetz, W., 2014. A 40-year, continent-wide, multispecies assessment of relevant climate predictors for species distribution modelling. Divers. Distrib. 20, 1285–1295. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/ddi.12229.
- Bernard, A., Rodrigues, A.S.L., Cazalis, V., Grémillet, D., 2021. Toward a global strategy for seabird tracking. Conserv. Lett. 14, e12804. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/conl. 12804.
- Blaber, S., Milton, D., 1994. Distribution of seabirds at sea in the Gulf of Carpentaria, Australia. Mar. Freshw. Res. 45, 445–454.
- Brieva, D., Ribbe, J., Lemckert, C., 2015. Is the east Australian current causing a marine ecological hot-spot and an important fisheries near Fraser Island, Australia? Estuar. Coast. Shelf Sci. 153, 121–134. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.ecss.2014.12.012.
- Bunce, A., 2015. Foraging behaviour of a declining population of brown boobies (*Sula leucogaster*) breeding in the Swain Reefs, Great Barrier Reef. Emu Austral Ornithol. 115, 368–372. http://dx.doi.org/10.1071/MU14037.

- Burrows, M.T., Schoeman, D.S., Buckley, L.B., Moore, P., Poloczanska, E.S., Brander, K.M., Brown, C., Bruno, J.F., Duarte, C.M., Halpern, B.S., Holding, J., Kappel, C.V., Kiessling, W., O'Connor, M.I., Pandolfi, J.M., Parmesan, C., Schwing, F.B., Sydeman, W.J., Richardson, A.J., 2011. The pace of shifting climate in marine and terrestrial ecosystems. Science 334, 652–655. http://dx.doi.org/10. 1126/science.1210288.
- Cai, W., Shi, G., Cowan, T., Bi, D., Ribbe, J., 2005. The response of the Southern Annular Mode, the East Australian Current, and the southern mid-latitude ocean circulation to global warming. Geophys. Res. Lett. 32, L23706. http://dx.doi.org/ 10.1029/2005GL024701.
- Carey, M.J., Phillips, R.A., Silk, J.R.D., Shaffer, S.A., 2014. Trans-equatorial migration of short-tailed shearwaters revealed by geolocators. Emu - Austral Ornithol. 114, 352–359. http://dx.doi.org/10.1071/MU13115.
- Carneiro, A.P.B., Pearmain, E.J., Oppel, S., Clay, T.A., Phillips, R.A., Bonnet-Lebrun, A.-S., Wanless, R.M., Abraham, E., Richard, Y., Rice, J., Handley, J., Davies, T.E., Dilley, B.J., Ryan, P.G., Small, C., Arata, J., Arnould, J.P.Y., Bell, E., Bugoni, L., Campioni, L., Catry, P., Cleeland, J., Deppe, L., Elliott, G., Freeman, A., González-Solís, J., Granadeiro, J.P., Grémillet, D., Landers, T.J., Makhado, A., Nel, D., Nicholls, D.G., Rexer-Huber, K., Robertson, C.J.R., Sagar, P.M., Scofield, P., Stahl, J.-C., Stanworth, A., Stevens, K.L., Trathan, P.N., Thompson, D.R., Torres, L., Walker, K., Waugh, S.M., Weimerskirch, H., Dias, M.P., 2020. A framework for mapping the distribution of seabirds by integrating tracking, demography and phenology. J. Appl. Ecol. 57, 514–525. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/1365-2664. 13568.
- Carroll, G., Everett, J.D., Harcourt, R., Slip, D., Jonsen, I., 2016. High sea surface temperatures driven by a strengthening current reduce foraging success by penguins. Sci. Rep. 6, 22236. http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/srep22236.
- Chao, A., Chiu, C.-H., Jost, L., 2014. Unifying species diversity, phylogenetic diversity, functional diversity, and related similarity and differentiation measures through Hill numbers. Annu. Rev. Ecol. Evol. Syst. 45, 297–324. http://dx.doi.org/10.1146/ annurev-ecolsys-120213-091540.
- Chao, A., Jost, L., 2012. Coverage-based rarefaction and extrapolation: standardizing samples by completeness rather than size. Ecology 93, 2533–2547. http://dx.doi. org/10.1890/11-1952.1.
- Commins, M.L., Ansorge, I., Ryan, P.G., 2014. Multi-scale factors influencing seabird assemblages in the African sector of the Southern Ocean. Antarctic Sci. 26, 38–48. http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S0954102013000138.
- Costello, M.J., Tsai, P., Wong, P.S., Cheung, A.K.L., Basher, Z., Chaudhary, C., 2017. Marine biogeographic realms and species endemicity. Nat. Commun. 8, 1057. http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/s41467-017-01121-2.
- Daudt, N.W., Woehler, E.J., Schofield, M.R., Smith, R.O., Bugoni, L., Rayment, W.J., 2023. Data and code: Seabird assemblages off Eastern Australia. http://dx.doi.org/ 10.17605/OSF.IO/N582D.
- Davoren, G.K., 2013. Distribution of marine predator hotspots explained by persistent areas of prey. Mar. Biol. 160, 3043–3058. http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s00227-013-2294-5.
- De Pascalis, F., Pala, D., Pisu, D., Morinay, J., Benvenuti, A., Spano, C., Ruiu, A., Serra, L., Rubolini, D., Cecere, J., 2021. Searching on the edge: dynamic oceanographic features increase foraging opportunities in a small pelagic seabird. Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser. 668, 121–132. http://dx.doi.org/10.3354/meps13726.
- Dormann, C.F., Elith, J., Bacher, S., Buchmann, C., Carl, G., Carré, G., Marquéz, J.R.G., Gruber, B., Lafourcade, B., Leitão, P.J., Münkemüller, T., McClean, C., Osborne, P.E., Reineking, B., Schröder, B., Skidmore, A.K., Zurell, D., Lautenbach, S., 2013. Collinearity: a review of methods to deal with it and a simulation study evaluating their performance. Ecography 36, 27–46. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j. 1600-0587.2012.07348.x.
- Dornelas, M., Gotelli, N.J., McGill, B., Shimadzu, H., Moyes, F., Sievers, C., Magurran, A.E., 2014. Assemblage time series reveal biodiversity change but not systematic loss. Science 344, 296–299. http://dx.doi.org/10.1126/science.1248484.
- Dunlop, J., Wooller, R., Cheshire, N., 1988. Distribution and abundance of marine birds in the Eastern Indian Ocean. Mar. Freshw. Res. 39, 661–669. http://dx.doi.org/10. 1071/MF9880661.
- Dunstan, P.K., Foster, S.D., Hui, F.K.C., Warton, D.I., 2013. Finite mixture of regression modeling for high-dimensional count and biomass data in ecology. J. Agric. Biol. Environ. Stat. 18, 357–375. http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s13253-013-0146-x.
- Ebach, M.C., 2012. A history of bioregionalisation in Australia. Zootaxa 3392, 1–34. http://dx.doi.org/10.11646/ZOOTAXA.3392.1.1.
- Ebach, M.C., Morrone, J.J., Parenti, L.R., Viloria, Á.L., 2008. International code of area nomenclature. J. Biogeogr. 35, 1153–1157. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2699.2008.01920.x.
- Elphick, C.S., Hunt, G.L., 1993. Variations in the distributions of marine birds with water mass in the northern Bering Sea. Condor 95, 33–44. http://dx.doi.org/10. 2307/1369384.
- Evans, R., Lea, M.-A., Hindell, M.A., 2021. Predicting the distribution of foraging seabirds during a period of heightened environmental variability. Ecol. Appl. 31, e02343. http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/eap.2343.
- Ferrier, S., 2002. Mapping spatial pattern in biodiversity for regional conservation planning: where to from here? Syst. Biol. 51, 331–363. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/ 10635150252899806.

- Firme, G.F., Hughes, D.J., Laiolo, L., Roughan, M., Suthers, I.M., Doblin, M.A., 2023. Contrasting phytoplankton composition and primary productivity in multiple mesoscale eddies along the East Australian coast. Deep-Sea Res. I 193, 103952. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.dsr.2022.103952.
- Foster, S.D., Givens, G.H., Dornan, G.J., Dunstan, P.K., Darnell, R., 2013. Modelling biological regions from multi-species and environmental data. Environmetrics 24, 489–499. http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/env.2245.
- Foster, S.D., Hill, N.A., Lyons, M., 2017. Ecological grouping of survey sites when sampling artefacts are present. J. R. Stat. Soc. Ser. C. Appl. Stat. 66, 1031–1047. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/rssc.12211.
- Fromant, A., Eizenberg, Y.H., Poupart, T., Bustamante, P., Arnould, J.P.Y., 2022. Yearround at-sea movements of fairy prions from southeastern Australia. R. Soc. Open Sci. 9, 220134. http://dx.doi.org/10.1098/rsos.220134.
- Gall, A.E., Prichard, A.K., Kuletz, K.J., Danielson, S.L., 2022. Long: Influence of water masses on the summer structure of the seabird community in the northeastern Chukchi sea. PLoS One 17, e0266182. http://dx.doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone. 0266182.
- Ganachaud, A., Cravatte, S., Melet, A., Schiller, A., Holbrook, N.J., Sloyan, B.M., Widlansky, M.J., Bowen, M., Verron, J., Wiles, P., Ridgway, K., Sutton, P., Sprintall, J., Steinberg, C., Brassington, G., Cai, W., Davis, R., Gasparin, F., Gourdeau, L., Hasegawa, T., Kessler, W., Maes, C., Takahashi, K., Richards, K.J., Send, U., 2014. The Southwest Pacific Ocean circulation and climate experiment (SPICE). J. Geophys. Res.: Oceans 119, 7660–7686. http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/2013JC009678.
- Garcia, V., Schilling, H., Cruz, D., Hawes, S., Everett, J., Roughan, M., Miskiewicz, A., Pakhomov, E., Jeffs, A., Suthers, I., 2022. Entrainment and development of larval fish assemblages in two contrasting cold core eddies of the east Australian current system. Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser. 685, 1–18. http://dx.doi.org/10.3354/meps13982.
- Gotelli, N.J., Moyes, F., Antão, L.H., Blowes, S.A., Dornelas, M., McGill, B.J., Penny, A., Schipper, A.M., Shimadzu, H., Supp, S.R., Waldock, C.A., Magurran, A.E., 2022. Long-term changes in temperate marine fish assemblages are driven by a small subset of species. Global Change Biol. 28, 46–53. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/gcb. 15947.
- Grémillet, D., Boulinier, T., 2009. Spatial ecology and conservation of seabirds facing global climate change: a review. Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser. 391, 121–137. http://dx.doi. org/10.3354/meps08212.
- Harris, J., Haward, M., Jabour, J., Woehler, E.J., 2007. A new approach to selecting Marine Protected Areas (MPAs) in the Southern Ocean. Antarct. Sci. 19, 189–194. http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S0954102007000260.
- Hassler, C.S., Djajadikarta, J.R., Doblin, M.A., Everett, J.D., Thompson, P.A., 2011. Characterisation of water masses and phytoplankton nutrient limitation in the East Australian Current separation zone during spring 2008. Deep-Sea Res. II 58, 664–677. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.dsr2.2010.06.008.
- Haury, L., McGowan, J., Wiebe, P., 1978. Patterns and processes in the time-space scales of plankton distributions. In: Steele, J. (Ed.), Spatial Pattern in Plankton Communities. Springer, Springer, US, pp. 277–327.
- Hazen, E.L., Jorgensen, S., Rykaczewski, R.R., Bograd, S.J., Foley, D.G., Jonsen, I.D., Shaffer, S.A., Dunne, J.P., Costa, D.P., Crowder, L.B., Block, B.A., 2013. Predicted habitat shifts of Pacific top predators in a changing climate. Nat. Clim. Change 3, 234–238. http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/nclimate1686.
- Hazen, E.L., Suryan, R.M., Santora, J.A., Bograd, S.J., Watanuki, Y., Wilson, R.P., 2013. Scales and mechanisms of marine hotspot formation. Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser. 487, 177–183. http://dx.doi.org/10.3354/meps10477.
- Hedd, A., Gales, R., Brothers, N., 2001. Foraging strategies of shy albatross *Thalassarche cauta* breeding at Albatross Island, Tasmania, Australia. Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser. 224, 267–282. http://dx.doi.org/10.3354/meps224267.
- Hijmans, R.J., 2022a. raster: Geographic data analysis and modeling. R package version 3.5-21. https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=raster.
- Hijmans, R.J., 2022b. terra: Spatial data analysis. R package version 1.6-7. https: //CRAN.R-project.org/package=terra.
- Hill, N.A., Foster, S.D., Duhamel, G., Welsford, D., Koubbi, P., Johnson, C.R., 2017. Model-based mapping of assemblages for ecology and conservation management: a case study of demersal fish on the Kerguelen Plateau. Divers. Distrib. 23, 1216–1230. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/ddi.12613.
- Hill, K.L., Rintoul, S.R., Coleman, R., Ridgway, K.R., 2008. Wind forced low frequency variability of the East Australia Current. Geophys. Res. Lett. 35, L08602. http: //dx.doi.org/10.1029/2007GL032912.
- Hill, N.A., Woolley, S.N.C., Foster, S., Dunstan, P.K., McKinlay, J., Ovaskainen, O., Johnson, C., 2020. Determining marine bioregions: a comparison of quantitative approaches. Methods Ecol. Evol. 11, 1258–1272. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/2041-210X.13447.
- Hobday, A.J., 2010. Ensemble analysis of the future distribution of large pelagic fishes off Australia. Prog. Oceanogr. 86, 291–301. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.pocean. 2010.04.023.
- Hsieh, T.C., Ma, K.H., Chao, A., 2016. iNEXT: an R package for rarefaction and extrapolation of species diversity (hill numbers). Methods Ecol. Evol. 7, 1451–1456. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/2041-210X.12613.
- Hu, C., Lee, Z., Franz, B., 2012. Chlorophyll a algorithms for oligotrophic oceans: a novel approach based on three-band reflectance difference. J. Geophys. Res.: Oceans 117, C01011. http://dx.doi.org/10.1029/2011JC007395.

- Huang, B., Liu, C., Banzon, V., Freeman, E., Graham, G., Hankins, B., Smith, T., Zhang, H.-M., 2021. Improvements of the daily optimum interpolation sea surface temperature (DOISST) version 2.1. J. Clim. 34, 2923–2939. http://dx.doi.org/10. 1175/JCLI-D-20-0166.1.
- Hunt, G.L., Schneider, D.C., 1987. Scale-dependent processes in the physical and biological environment of marine birds. In: Croxall, J.P. (Ed.), Seabirds: Feeding Ecology and Roles in Marine Ecosystem. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK, pp. 7–41.
- Hyrenbach, K.D., Veit, R.R., Weimerskirch, H., Metzl, N., Hunt, G.L., 2007. Community structure across a large-scale ocean productivity gradient: marine bird assemblages of the Southern Indian Ocean. Deep-Sea Res. I 54, 1129–1145. http://dx.doi.org/ 10.1016/j.dsr.2007.05.002.
- Ismar, S.M.H., Phillips, R.A., Rayner, M.J., Hauber, M.E., 2011. Geolocation tracking of the annual migration of adult Australasian gannets (*Morus serrator*) breeding in New Zealand. Wilson J. Ornithol. 123, 121–125. http://dx.doi.org/10.1676/10-072.1.
- Jaine, F., Rohner, C., Weeks, S., Couturier, L., Bennett, M., Townsend, K., Richardson, A., 2014. Movements and habitat use of reef manta rays off eastern Australia: offshore excursions, deep diving and eddy affinity revealed by satellite telemetry. Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser. 510, 73–86. http://dx.doi.org/10.3354/meps10910.
- Johnson, C.R., Banks, S.C., Barrett, N.S., Cazassus, F., Dunstan, P.K., Edgar, G.J., Frusher, S.D., Gardner, C., Haddon, M., Helidoniotis, F., Hill, K.L., Holbrook, N.J., Hosie, G.W., Last, P.R., Ling, S.D., Melbourne-Thomas, J., Miller, K., Pecl, G.T., Richardson, A.J., Ridgway, K.R., Rintoul, S.R., Ritz, D.A., Ross, D.J., Sanderson, J.C., Shepherd, S.A., Slotwinski, A., Swadling, K.M., Taw, N., 2011. Climate change cascades: shifts in oceanography, species' ranges and subtidal marine community dynamics in eastern Tasmania. J. Exp. Mar. Biol. Ecol. 400, 17–32. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jembe.2011.02.032.
- Johnson, B., Colombelli-Négrel, D., 2021. Breeding success in southern Australian little penguins is negatively correlated with high wind speeds and sea surface temperatures. Ornithol. Appl. 123, duaa062. http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/ornithapp/ duaa062.
- Karpouzi, V., Watson, R., Pauly, D., 2007. Modelling and mapping resource overlap between seabirds and fisheries on a global scale: a preliminary assessment. Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser. 343, 87–99. http://dx.doi.org/10.3354/meps06860.
- Kessler, W.S., Cravatte, S., 2013. Mean circulation of the Coral Sea. J. Geophys. Res.: Oceans 118, 6385–6410. http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/2013JC009117.
- Kreft, H., Jetz, W., 2010. A framework for delineating biogeographical regions based on species distributions. J. Biogeogr. 37, 2029–2053. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j. 1365-2699.2010.02375.x.
- Lavers, J.L., Miller, M.G.R., Carter, M.J., Swann, G., Clarke, R.H., 2014. Predicting the spatial distribution of a seabird community to identify priority conservation areas in the Timor Sea. Conserv. Biol. 28, 1699–1709. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/cobi. 12324.
- Lee, M.R., Powell, J.R., Oberle, B., Cornwell, W.K., Lyons, M., Rigg, J.L., Zanne, A.E., 2019. Good neighbors aplenty: fungal endophytes rarely exhibit competitive exclusion patterns across a span of woody habitats. Ecology 100, e02790. http: //dx.doi.org/10.1002/ecy.2790.
- Lenoir, J., Bertrand, R., Comte, L., Bourgeaud, L., Hattab, T., Murienne, J., Grenouillet, G., 2020. Species better track climate warming in the oceans than on land. Nat. Ecol. Evol. 4, 1044–1059. http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/s41559-020-1198-2.
- Li, J., Roughan, M., Kerry, C., 2022. Drivers of ocean warming in the western boundary currents of the Southern Hemisphere. Nat. Clim. Change 12, 901–909. http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/s41558-022-01473-8.
- Longhurst, A.R., 2007. Ecological Geography of the Sea, second ed. Academic Press, Amsterdam, Boston, MA.
- Lyons, M.B., Foster, S.D., Keith, D.A., 2017. Simultaneous vegetation classification and mapping at large spatial scales. J. Biogeogr. 44, 2891–2902. http://dx.doi.org/10. 1111/jbi.13088.
- Marchant, R., 1990. Robustness of classification and ordination techniques applied to macroinvertebrate communities from the La Trobe River, Victoria. Mar. Freshw. Res. 41, 493–504. http://dx.doi.org/10.1071/MF9900493.
- Marchant, S., Higgins, P.J., 1990. Handbook of Australian, New Zealand & Antarctic birds: Ratites to ducks. vol. 1, Oxford University Press.
- Mason, C., Alderman, R., McGowan, J., Possingham, H.P., Hobday, A.J., Sumner, M., Shaw, J., 2018. Telemetry reveals existing marine protected areas are worse than random for protecting the foraging habitat of threatened shy albatross (*Thalassarche cauta*). Divers. Distrib. 24, 1744–1755. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/ddi.12830.
- Mata, M.M., Wijffels, S.E., Church, J.A., Tomczak, M., 2006. Eddy shedding and energy conversions in the East Australian Current. J. Geophys. Res.: Oceans 111 (C09034), http://dx.doi.org/10.1029/2006JC003592.
- McDuie, F., Weeks, S.J., Miller, M.G.R., Congdon, B.C., 2015. Breeding tropical shearwaters use distant foraging sites when self-provisioning. Mar. Ornithol. 43, 123–129.
- Melo, A.S., 2005. Effects of taxonomic and numeric resolution on the ability to detect ecological patterns at a local scale using stream macroinvertebrates. Archiv Hydrobiologie 164, 309–323. http://dx.doi.org/10.1127/0003-9136/2005/0164-0309.
- Miller, M.G.R., Silva, F.R.O., Machovsky-Capuska, G.E., Congdon, B.C., 2018. Sexual segregation in tropical seabirds: drivers of sex-specific foraging in the brown booby *Sula leucogaster*. J. Ornithol. 159, 425–437. http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10336-017-1512-1.

- Morrone, J.J., 2018. The spectre of biogeographical regionalization. J. Biogeogr. 45, 282–288. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/jbi.13135.
- Morrone, J.J., 2024. Why biogeographical transition zones matter. J. Biogeogr. http: //dx.doi.org/10.1111/jbi.14632.
- Mott, R., Clarke, R.H., 2018. Systematic review of geographic biases in the collection of at-sea distribution data for seabirds. Emu - Austral Ornithol. 118, 235–246. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/01584197.2017.1416957.
- Niella, Y., Butcher, P., Holmes, B., Barnett, A., Harcourt, R., 2022. Forecasting intraspecific changes in distribution of a wide-ranging marine predator under climate change. Oecologia 198, 111–124. http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s00442-021-05075-7.
- Niella, Y., Smoothey, A., Peddemors, V., Harcourt, R., 2020. Predicting changes in distribution of a large coastal shark in the face of the strengthening East Australian Current. Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser. 642, 163–177. http://dx.doi.org/10.3354/ meps13322.
- Norman, F., 1992. Distribution and abundance of seabirds off Phillip Island and within Port Phillip Bay, Victoria, 1986–1988. Emu - Austral Ornithol. 91, 377–394.
- O'Hara, T.D., Williams, A., Althaus, F., Ross, A.S., Bax, N.J., 2020a. Regional-scale patterns of deep seafloor biodiversity for conservation assessment. Divers. Distrib. 26, 479–494. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/ddi.13034.
- O'Hara, T.D., Williams, A., Woolley, S.N.C., Nau, A.W., Bax, N.J., 2020b. Deepsea temperate-tropical faunal transition across uniform environmental gradients. Deep-Sea Res. I 161, 103283. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.dsr.2020.103283.
- Oke, P.R., Middleton, J.H., 2000. Topographically induced upwelling off eastern Australia. J. Phys. Oceanogr. 30, 512–531. http://dx.doi.org/10.1175/1520-0485(2000)030%3C0512:TIUOEA%3E2.0.CO;2.
- Oke, P.R., Pilo, G.S., Ridgway, K., Kiss, A., Rykova, T., 2019a. A search for the Tasman Front. J. Mar. Syst. 199, 103217. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jmarsys. 2019.103217.
- Oke, P.R., Roughan, M., Cetina-Heredia, P., Pilo, G.S., Ridgway, K.R., Rykova, T., Archer, M.R., Coleman, R.C., Kerry, C.G., Rocha, C., Schaeffer, A., Vitarelli, E., 2019b. Revisiting the circulation of the East Australian Current: its path, separation, and eddy field. Prog. Oceanogr. 176, 102139. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.pocean. 2019.102139.
- Oliver, E.C.J., Benthuysen, J.A., Bindoff, N.L., Hobday, A.J., Holbrook, N.J., Mundy, C.N., Perkins-Kirkpatrick, S.E., 2017. The unprecedented 2015/16 Tasman Sea marine heatwave. Nat. Commun. 8, 16101. http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/ ncomms16101.
- Oliver, E.C.J., Lago, V., Hobday, A.J., Holbrook, N.J., Ling, S.D., Mundy, C.N., 2018. Marine heatwaves off eastern Tasmania: trends, interannual variability, and predictability. Prog. Oceanogr. 161, 116–130. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.pocean. 2018.02.007.
- Pantiukhin, D., Piepenburg, D., Hansen, M.L.S., Kraan, C., 2021. Data-driven bioregionalization: a seascape-scale study of macrobenthic communities in the Eurasian Arctic. J. Biogeogr. 48, 2877–2890. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/jbi.14247.
- Pebesma, E., 2018. Simple features for R: standardized support for spatial vector data. R J. 10, 439–446. http://dx.doi.org/10.32614/RJ-2018-009.
- Peck, D., Smithers, B., Krockenberger, A., Congdon, B., 2004. Sea surface temperature constrains wedge-tailed shearwater foraging success within breeding seasons. Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser. 281, 259–266. http://dx.doi.org/10.3354/meps281259.
- Péron, C., Authier, M., Barbraud, C., Delord, K., Besson, D., Weimerskirch, H., 2010. Interdecadal changes in at-sea distribution and abundance of subantarctic seabirds along a latitudinal gradient in the Southern Indian Ocean. Global Change Biol. 16, 1895–1909. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2486.2010.02169.x.
- Phillips, L.R., Malan, N., Roughan, M., Harcourt, R., Jonsen, I., Cox, M., Brierley, A.S., Slip, D., Wilkins, A., Carroll, G., 2022. Coastal seascape variability in the intensifying East Australian Current southern extension. Front. Mar. Sci. 9, 925123. http://dx.doi.org/10.3389/fmars.2022.925123.
- Pinsky, M.L., Eikeset, A.M., McCauley, D.J., Payne, J.L., Sunday, J.M., 2019. Greater vulnerability to warming of marine versus terrestrial ectotherms. Nature 569, 108–111. http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/s41586-019-1132-4.
- Pocklington, R., 1979. An oceanographic interpretation of seabird distributions in the Indian Ocean. Mar. Biol. 51, 9–21. http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/BF00389026.
- Poloczanska, E.S., Babcock, R.C., Butler, A., Hobday, A.J., Hoegh-Guldberg, O., Kunz, T.J., Matear, R., Milton, D., Okey, T.A., Richardson, A.J., 2007. Climate change and Australian marine life. In: Gibson, R.N., Atkinson, R.J.A., Gordon, J.D.M. (Eds.), Oceanography and Marine Biology: An Annual Review. CRC Press, Taylor & Francis Group, Boca Raton, FL, pp. 407–478.
- Poloczanska, E.S., Brown, C.J., Sydeman, W.J., Kiessling, W., Schoeman, D.S., Moore, P.J., Brander, K., Bruno, J.F., Buckley, L.B., Burrows, M.T., Duarte, C.M., Halpern, B.S., Holding, J., Kappel, C.V., O'Connor, M.I., Pandolfi, J.M., Parmesan, C., Schwing, F., Thompson, S.A., Richardson, A.J., 2013. Global imprint of climate change on marine life. Nat. Clim. Change 3, 919–925. http://dx.doi.org/ 10.1038/nclimate1958.
- Ponti, R., Sannolo, M., 2023. The importance of including phenology when modelling species ecological niche. Ecography 2023, e06143. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/ecog. 06143.

- Priddel, D., Carlile, N., Portelli, D., Kim, Y., O'Neill, L., Bretagnolle, V., Ballance, L.T., Phillips, R.A., Pitman, R.L., Raynei, M.J., 2014. Pelagic distribution of Gould's petrel (*Pterodroma leucoptera*): linking shipboard and onshore observations with remote-tracking data. Emu - Austral Ornithol. 114, 360–370. http://dx.doi.org/10. 1071/MU14021.
- Quillfeldt, P., Cherel, Y., Delord, K., Weimerkirch, H., 2015. Cool, cold or colder? Spatial segregation of prions and blue petrels is explained by differences in preferred sea surface temperatures. Biol. Lett. 11, 20141090. http://dx.doi.org/ 10.1098/rsbl.2014.1090.
- R Core Team, 2022. R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing. R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria.
- Ramírez, F., Afán, I., Davis, L.S., Chiaradia, A., 2017. Climate impacts on global hot spots of marine biodiversity. Sci. Adv. 3, e1601198. http://dx.doi.org/10.1126/ sciadv.1601198.
- Raymond, B., Shaffer, S.A., Sokolov, S., Woehler, E.J., Costa, D.P., Einoder, L., Hindell, M., Hosie, G., Pinkerton, M., Sagar, P.M., Scott, D., Smith, A., Thompson, D.R., Vertigan, C., Weimerskirch, H., 2010. Shearwater foraging in the Southern Ocean: the roles of prey availability and winds. PLoS One 5, e10960. http://dx.doi.org/ 10.1371/journal.pone.0010960.
- Receveur, A., Vourey, E., Lebourges-Dhaussy, A., Menkes, C., Ménard, F., Allain, V., 2020. Biogeography of micronekton assemblages in the Natural Park of the Coral Sea. Front. Mar. Sci. 7, 449. http://dx.doi.org/10.3389/fmars.2020.00449.
- Reid, K., Baker, G.B., Woehler, E.J., 2023. An ecological risk assessment for the impacts of offshore wind farms on birds in Australia. Austral Ecol. 48, 418–439. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/aec.13278.
- Reid, T.A., Hindell, M.A., 2000. Coarse-scale relationships between seabirds and zooplankton off south-eastern Tasmania. Mar. Freshw. Res. 51, 789–798. http: //dx.doi.org/10.1071/MF98160.
- Reisinger, R.R., Corney, S., Raymond, B., Lombard, A.T., Bester, M.N., Crawford, R.J.M., Davies, D., de Bruyn, P.J.N., Dilley, B.J., Kirkman, S.P., Makhado, A.B., Ryan, P.G., Schoombie, S., Stevens, K.L., Tosh, C.A., Wege, M., Whitehead, T.O., Sumner, M.D., Wotherspoon, S., Friedlaender, A.S., Cotté, C., Hindell, M.A., Ropert-Coudert, Y., Pistorius, P.A., 2022. Habitat model forecasts suggest potential redistribution of marine predators in the southern Indian Ocean. Divers. Distrib. 28, 142–159. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/ddi.13447.
- Reygondeau, G., Longhurst, A., Martinez, E., Beaugrand, G., Antoine, D., Maury, O., 2013. Dynamic biogeochemical provinces in the global ocean. Glob. Biogeochem. Cycles 27, 1046–1058. http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/gbc.20089.
- Reygondeau, G., Maury, O., Beaugrand, G., Fromentin, J.M., Fonteneau, A., Cury, P., 2012. Biogeography of tuna and billfish communities. J. Biogeogr. 39, 114–129. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2699.2011.02582.x.
- Ribic, C., Ainley, D., Spear, L., 1997. Scale-related seabird-environmental relationships in Pacific equatorial waters, with reference to El Niño-Southern Oscillation events. Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser. 156, 183–203. http://dx.doi.org/10.3354/meps156183.
- Ridgway, K.R., Dunn, J.R., 2003. Mesoscale structure of the mean East Australian Current System and its relationship with topography. Prog. Oceanogr. 56, 189–222. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0079-6611(03)00004-1.
- Santora, J., Veit, R., 2013. Spatio-temporal persistence of top predator hotspots near the Antarctic Peninsula. Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser. 487, 287–304. http://dx.doi.org/10. 3354/meps10350.
- Scales, K.L., Hazen, E.L., Jacox, M.G., Edwards, C.A., Boustany, A.M., Oliver, M.J., Bograd, S.J., 2017. Scale of inference: on the sensitivity of habitat models for wide-ranging marine predators to the resolution of environmental data. Ecography 40, 210–220. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/ecog.02272.
- Scales, K.L., Miller, P.I., Embling, C.B., Ingram, S.N., Pirotta, E., Votier, S.C., 2014a. Mesoscale fronts as foraging habitats: composite front mapping reveals oceanographic drivers of habitat use for a pelagic seabird. J. R. Soc. Interface 11, 20140679. http://dx.doi.org/10.1098/rsif.2014.0679.
- Scales, K.L., Miller, P.I., Hawkes, L.A., Ingram, S.N., Sims, D.W., Votier, S.C., 2014b. On the front line: frontal zones as priority at-sea conservation areas for mobile marine vertebrates. J. Appl. Ecol. 51, 1575–1583. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/1365-2664.12330.
- Schreiber, E.A., Burger, J. (Eds.), 2002. Biology of Marine Birds, CRC Marine Biology Series. CRC Press, Boca Raton, FL.
- Serratosa, J., Hyrenbach, K.D., Miranda-Urbina, D., Portflitt-Toro, M., Luna, N., Luna-Jorquera, G., 2020. Environmental drivers of seabird at-sea distribution in the eastern south Pacific Ocean: assemblage composition across a longitudinal productivity gradient. Front. Mar. Sci. 6, 838. http://dx.doi.org/10.3389/fmars.2019. 00838.
- Sherman, K., 1994. Sustainability, biomass yields, and health of coastal ecosystems: an ecological perspective. Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser. 112, 277–301. http://dx.doi.org/10. 3354/meps112277.
- Sojitra, M., Woehler, E.J., Lea, M.-A., Wotherspoon, S., 2022. Multi-decadal changes in the at-sea distribution and abundance of black-browed and light-mantled sooty albatrosses in the Southwest Pacific Ocean. ICES J. Mar. Sci. 79, fsac197. http: //dx.doi.org/10.1093/icesjms/fsac197.
- Souza, J.S., Santos, L.N., 2023. Resident species, not immigrants, drive reorganization of estuarine fish assemblages in response to warming. Ecology 104, e3987. http: //dx.doi.org/10.1002/ecy.3987.

- Spalding, M.D., Fox, H.E., Allen, G.R., Davidson, N., Ferdaña, Z.A., Finlayson, M., Halpern, B.S., Jorge, M.A., Lombana, A., Lourie, S.A., Martin, K.D., McManus, E., Molnar, J., Recchia, C.A., Robertson, J., 2007. Marine ecoregions of the world: a bioregionalization of coastal and shelf areas. BioScience 57, 573–583. http://www.science.com/action/actionalization/actionalization/actionalization/actionalization/action/actionalization/action/actionalization/action/actionalization/ac
- //dx.doi.org/10.1641/B570707. Sun, C., Zhang, A., Jin, B., Wang, X., Zhang, X., Zhang, L., 2022. Seasonal variability of eddy kinetic energy in the North Indian Ocean. Front. Mar. Sci. 9, 1032699. http://dx.doi.org/10.3389/fmars.2022.1032699.
- Suthers, I.M., Young, J.W., Baird, M.E., Roughan, M., Everett, J.D., Brassington, G.B., Byrne, M., Condie, S.A., Hartog, J.R., Hassler, C.S., Hobday, A.J., Holbrook, N.J., Malcolm, H.A., Oke, P.R., Thompson, P.A., Ridgway, K., 2011. The strengthening East Australian Current, its eddies and biological effects — an introduction and overview. Deep-Sea Res. II 58, 538–546. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.dsr2.2010.09. 029.
- Sutton, T.T., Clark, M.R., Dunn, D.C., Halpin, P.N., Rogers, A.D., Guinotte, J., Bograd, S.J., Angel, M.V., Perez, J.A.A., Wishner, K., Haedrich, R.L., Lindsay, D.J., Drazen, J.C., Vereshchaka, A., Piatkowski, U., Morato, T., Błachowiak-Samołyk, K., Robison, B.H., Gjerde, K.M., Pierrot-Bults, A., Bernal, P., Reygondeau, G., Heino, M., 2017. A global biogeographic classification of the mesopelagic zone. Deep-Sea Res. I 126, 85–102. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.dsr.2017.05.006.
- Sydeman, W., Thompson, S., Kitaysky, A., 2012. Seabirds and climate change: roadmap for the future. Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser. 454, 107–117. http://dx.doi.org/10.3354/ meps09806.
- Taylor, G., Elliott, G., Walker, K., Bose, S., 2021. Year-round distribution, breeding cycle, and activity of white-headed petrels (*Pterodroma lessonii*) nesting on Adams Island, Auckland Islands. Notornis 67, 369–386.
- Tremblay, Y., Bertrand, S., Henry, R., Kappes, M., Costa, D., Shaffer, S., 2009. Analytical approaches to investigating seabird–environment interactions: a review. Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser. 391, 153–163. http://dx.doi.org/10.3354/meps08146.
- Trevail, A.M., Nicoll, M.A.C., Freeman, R., Corre, M.Le., Schwarz, J., Jaeger, A., Bretagnolle, V., Calabrese, L., Feare, C., Lebarbenchon, C., Norris, K., Orlowski, S., Pinet, P., Plot, V., Rocamora, G., Shah, N., Votier, S.C., 2023. Tracking seabird migration in the tropical Indian Ocean reveals basin-scale conservation need. Curr. Biol. 33, 5247–5256. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.cub.2023.10.060.
- Vilhena, D.A., Antonelli, A., 2015. A network approach for identifying and delimiting biogeographical regions. Nat. Commun. 6, 6848. http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/ ncomms7848.

- Warton, D.I., Foster, S.D., De'ath, G., Stoklosa, J., Dunstan, P.K., 2015. Model-based thinking for community ecology. Plant Ecol. 216, 669–682. http://dx.doi.org/10. 1007/s11258-014-0366-3.
- Waters, J.M., 2008. Marine biogeographical disjunction in temperate Australia: historical landbridge, contemporary currents, or both? Divers. Distrib. 14, 692–700. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1472-4642.2008.00481.x.
- Weimerskirch, H., 2007. Are seabirds foraging for unpredictable resources? Deep-Sea Res. II 54, 211–223. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.dsr2.2006.11.013.
- Weimerskirch, H., Grissac, S.De., Ravache, A., Prudor, A., Corbeau, A., Congdon, B., McDuie, F., Bourgeois, K., Dromzée, S., Butscher, J., Menkes, C., Allain, V., Vidal, E., Jaeger, A., Borsa, P., 2020. At-sea movements of wedge-tailed shearwaters during and outside the breeding season from four colonies in New Caledonia. Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser. 633, 225–238. http://dx.doi.org/10.3354/meps13171.
- Whittaker, R.J., Araújo, M.B., Jepson, P., Ladle, R.J., Watson, J.E.M., Willis, K.J., 2005. Conservation biogeography: assessment and prospect. Divers. Distrib. 11, 3–23. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1366-9516.2005.00143.x.
- Woehler, E., Hobday, A., 2024. Impacts of marine heatwaves may be mediated by seabird life history strategies. Mar. Ecol. Progress Ser. HEAT http://dx.doi.org/10. 3354/meps14333.
- Woehler, E., Raymond, B., Watts, D., 2003. Decadal-scale seabird assemblages in Prydz Bay, East Antarctica. Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser. 251, 299–310. http://dx.doi.org/10. 3354/meps251299.
- Woolley, S.N.C., Foster, S.D., Bax, N.J., Currie, J.C., Dunn, D.C., Hansen, C., Hill, N.A., O'Hara, T.D., Ovaskainen, O., Sayre, R., Vanhatalo, J.P., Dunstan, P.K., 2020. Bioregions in marine environments: combining biological and environmental data for management and scientific understanding. BioScience 70, 48–59. http://dx.doi. org/10.1093/biosci/biz133.
- Woolley, S.N.C., Foster, S., Dunstan, P., 2022. ecomix: Fitting finite mixture models to ecological data. https://github.com/skiptoniam/ecomix.
- Yang, H., Lohmann, G., Wei, W., Dima, M., Ionita, M., Liu, J., 2016. Intensification and poleward shift of subtropical western boundary currents in a warming climate. J. Geophys. Res.: Oceans 121, 4928–4945. http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/2015JC011513.
- Young, J.W., Hobday, A.J., Campbell, R.A., Kloser, R.J., Bonham, P.I., Clementson, L.A., Lansdell, M.J., 2011. The biological oceanography of the east Australian current and surrounding waters in relation to tuna and billfish catches off eastern Australia. Deep-Sea Res. II 58, 720–733. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.dsr2.2010.10.005.