Estimating abundance, temporary emigration and the pattern of density dependence in a cyclic snowshoe hare population in Yukon, Canada

Journal:	<i>Canadian Journal of Zoology</i>
Manuscript ID	cjz-2021-0139.R2
Manuscript Type:	Article
Date Submitted by the Author:	03-Sep-2021
Complete List of Authors:	Oli, Madan; University of Florida, Department of Wildlife Ecology and Conservation Kenney, Alice; University of British Columbia, Department of Zoology Boonstra, Rudy; University of Toronto, Department of Biological Sciences Boutin, Stan; University of Alberta, Department of Biological Sciences Chaudhary, Vratika; University of Florida, Wildlife Ecology and Conservation Hines, James E.; US Geological Survey, Patuxant Wildlife Research Center Krebs, C.J.; Department of Zoology
Is your manuscript invited for consideration in a Special Issue?:	Not applicable (regular submission)
Keyword:	Boreal ecosystem, capture-mark-recapture analysis, <i>Lepus americanus</i> , Pollock's robust design, autocorrelation function, population cycles, Bayesian time series analysis

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

**Estimating abundance, temporary emigration and the pattern of density
dependence in a cyclic snowshoe hare population in Yukon, Canada**

Madan K. Oli, Alice J. Kenney, Rudy Boonstra, Stan Boutin, Vratika Chaudhary, James E.
Hines, and Charles J. Krebs*

*Department of Wildlife Ecology and Conservation, University of Florida, Gainesville,
Florida, USA (MKO, VC)*

Department of Zoology, University of British Columbia, Vancouver, Canada (CJK, AJK);

*Department of Biological Sciences, University of Toronto Scarborough (RB), Department
of Biological Sciences, University of Alberta, Edmonton, Canada (SB); U.S. Geological
Survey, Eastern Ecological Science Center, Laurel, Maryland, USA (JEH)*

*Corresponding author. Email: olim@ufl.edu

Abstract. Estimates of demographic parameters based on capture-mark-recapture (CMR) methods may be biased when some individuals in the population are temporarily unavailable for capture (temporary emigration). We estimated snowshoe hare abundance, apparent survival, and probability of temporary emigration in a population of snowshoe hares (*Lepus americanus* Erxleben 1777) in the Yukon using Pollock's robust design CMR model, and population density using spatially-explicit CMR models. Survival rates strongly varied among cyclic phases, seasons, and across five population cycles. We found strong evidence that temporary emigration was Markovian (i.e., non-random), suggesting that it varied among individuals that were temporary emigrant in the previous sampling period and those that were present in the sampled area. The probability of temporary emigration for individuals that were in the study area during the previous sampling occasion (γ'') varied among cycles. Probability that individuals that were temporarily absent from the sampled area would remain temporary emigrants (γ') showed strongly seasonal pattern, low in winter and high during summers. Snowshoe hare population density ranged from 0.017 (0.015–0.05) hares/ha to 4.43 (3.90–5.00) hares/ha and large-scale cyclical fluctuation. Autocorrelation functions and autoregressive analyses revealed that our study population exhibited statistically significant cyclic fluctuations, with a periodicity of 9-10 years.

Key words: Autoregressive analysis; boreal ecosystem; capture-mark-recapture analysis; capture probability; *Lepus americanus*; density dependence; Pollock's robust design; snowshoe hare cycles; survival; spatial capture recapture model; temporary emigration; wildlife's 10-year cycle,

INTRODUCTION

Studies of population dynamics often rely on individual-based data collected by following fates of individuals that are uniquely marked. When such data are available, capture-mark-recapture (CMR) methodologies offer a variety of tools to rigorously estimate many population parameters such as survival, recruitment, population growth rate, and abundance (Pollock et al. 1990; Lebreton et al. 1992; Williams et al. 2002; Lebreton et al. 2009). Because CMR methods are powerful, flexible, applicable in a variety of contexts and can adequately account for imperfect detection, they have become the method of choice for studying wildlife populations (Williams et al. 2002; Lebreton et al. 2009). An assumption inherent in most open CMR studies is that all emigration from the study site is permanent, and that temporary emigration does not occur. In reality, however, temporary emigration can occur in a variety of contexts (Kendall et al. 1997). For example, if the sampling area encompasses only a portion of animals' home ranges, some individuals may be temporarily unavailable for sampling if they are outside the study area at the time of sampling. Other situations when temporary emigration is possible include (but are not limited to) temporary absence of non-breeders on breeding grounds, and temporary unavailability of individuals that are underground or inactive due to torpor (Kendall et al. 1997; Kendall and Bjorkland 2001; Bailey et al. 2004; Penaloza et al. 2014). We note that temporary emigration in the CMR context refers to temporary unavailability of organisms to be sampled, and not permanent emigration (i.e., migration away from their home ranges) as is commonly used in dispersal or metapopulation literature.

Because temporary emigration can potentially introduce bias in the estimates of demographic parameters, it is desirable to account for temporary emigration when possible (Kendall et al. 1997; Kendall 1999; Bird et al. 2014). Pollock's robust design CMR modelling approach offers a flexible way to obtain unbiased estimates of demographic

parameters in the presence of temporary emigration (Kendall et al. 1997; Williams et al. 2002). Here, we apply a robust design CMR modelling framework to field data spanning 43 years (1977-2020) to estimate temporary emigration, apparent survival and abundance of a cyclic snowshoe hare (*Lepus americanus* Erxleben 1777) population in a boreal forest in southwestern Yukon, Canada. Snowshoe hares are the most important component of the food chain in many North American boreal forests, where snowshoe hare populations exhibit cyclic fluctuation in abundance with peak densities occurring every 9 – 11 years (Elton 1924; Krebs et al. 1995; Krebs et al. 2001; Krebs et al. 2018). Although several aspects of snowshoe hare population dynamics have been studied (e. g. Krebs et al. 1986; Hodges et al. 2001; Krebs et al. 2018; Oli et al. 2020; Peers et al. 2021), estimates of population size that take temporary emigration into consideration are currently not available for our study population. Thus, our goal was to provide unbiased estimates of temporary emigration and abundance, and to determine how they vary across season, cyclic phases and 5 population cycles.

Our study population exhibits the classic 10-year population cycles (Krebs et al. 1995; Krebs et al. 2001; Krebs et al. 2018). Theory suggests that density-dependent feedback mechanisms that permit populations to grow at faster rates when density is low (and at a slower rates when density is high) are necessary and often sufficient for regulation of biological populations (Royama 1992). The structure and strength of density-dependence determine the pattern of population fluctuations. Whereas direct (first-order) density-dependence leads to a stable equilibrium, delayed (second or higher order) density-dependence is thought to be a necessary condition for cyclic fluctuations in abundance (Royama 1992; Turchin 1999; Oli 2019). Although density dependence in snowshoe hare populations has been examined by several authors (Royama 1992; Stenseth et al. 1997; Turchin 2003), previous studies were based primarily on the analysis of fur return data. To

our knowledge, no study has examined density dependence in snowshoe hare populations using actual estimates of hare population size or density as opposed to indices of hare abundance. Thus, our second goal was to investigate the pattern and strength of density dependence in our study population using actual estimates of hare abundance.

METHODS

Study species, study area and field methods

Snowshoe hares are distributed across North American boreal forests (Hoffman and Smith 2005) where they are one of the most important herbivores in terms of biomass and impact across trophic levels (Boonstra et al. 2016). Their coat colour is white in winter but rusty brown during summer. Average lifespan is about one year, but they can live up to 4 years in the wild and up to 7 years in captivity (Keith and Windberg 1978; Boutin et al. 1986; Hodges et al. 2001; Krebs et al. 2018). At Kluane, predation is the most important cause of hare mortality, with $\geq 90\%$ of hare deaths occurring due to predation (Boutin et al. 1985; Hodges et al. 2001; Krebs et al. 2018). Hares breed from May to September; females typically produce up to 3 (and occasionally 4) litters per breeding season, with the first litters being born in May (Cary and Keith 1978; O'Donoghue and Krebs 1992; Boutin et al. 2002; Peers et al. 2021). Mean litter size varies between 3.2 – 6.9 leverets, depending on litter order and cyclic phase (Cary and Keith 1978; Hodges et al. 2001). Juveniles of both sexes disperse predominantly between 30 – 60 days of age; leverets typically disperse by September (Gillis and Krebs 1999; Hodges et al. 2001; Boutin et al. 2002). Dispersal rate is generally low (≤ 0.14), and plays a relatively minor role in snowshoe hare population dynamics (Boutin et al. 1985). Reproductive parameters typically show cyclic variation (Cary and Keith 1978; O'Donoghue and Krebs 1992; Hodges et al. 2001), but there is no evidence that dispersal varies depending on the phase of the population cycle (Boutin et al. 1985). During summer, hares consume forbs, grasses, leaves and some woody browse but

their winter diet in Kluane consists primarily of the twigs of dwarf birch (*Betula glandulosa* Michx.) and willow (*Salix glauca* L.) (Krebs et al. 2018).

Our field study was conducted near Kluane Lake in the southwestern Yukon, Canada. Vegetation in this region is boreal forest dominated by white spruce (*Picea glauca* (Moench) Voss), with small areas of balsam poplar (*Populus balsamifera* L.) and trembling aspen (*Populus tremuloides* Michx.). Climate is cold, with mean monthly temperature falling below -20° C during the winter months. The study area is typically under snow cover for about 8 months from October to May. A detailed description of the study area is given by Krebs et al. (2001).

We captured snowshoe hares using Tomahawk live traps (Tomahawk Live Trap Co., Tomahawk, WI) located on 10 x 10 or 20 x 20 grids with 30 m spacing between traps. For details of grid layout, see Krebs et al. (2001) pg. 59 and Appendix S1 Table S1 in Oli et al. (2020). Field methods are described in detail elsewhere (Hodges et al. 2006; Hodges et al. 2001; Krebs et al. 1986). Each hare received a Monel #3 eartag (National Band and Tag Co., Newport Kentucky) at first capture; identity of previously marked hares was recorded in subsequent captures. Live trapping began in Autumn 1977 and continued until Autumn 2020. We considered two 2.5-month primary sampling occasions each year, Autumn (hares captured during 1st September – 15th November) and Spring (1st March – 15th May). Our secondary samples consisted of each month within primary sampling occasions; thus, we had 3 secondary samples within each primary sample (Autumn: September, October and November; Spring: March, April and May). Additional details regarding the field study are presented elsewhere (Krebs et al. 2001; Krebs et al. 2018). All live trapping procedures were approved by the Yukon Territorial Government Scientists and Explorers Act Licenses and Wildlife Permits, the UBC Animal Care Committee, the University of Alberta Animal Use

and Care Committee, and the University of Toronto Animal Care Committee, and followed the guidelines of the American Society of Mammalogists (Sikes 2016).

Pollock's robust design capture-mark-recapture analysis

Traditionally, capture-mark-recapture (CMR) methods are divided into 2 broad categories: closed population models and open population models (Otis et al. 1978; Williams et al. 2002). Typically, closed population models provide estimates of capture probabilities and abundance, and assume that population size remains unchanged during the sampling period. Open population models, on the other hand, permit gains and losses during the sampling periods and provide estimates of survival, recruitment, abundance and other demographic parameters but they assume that any movement away from the sampled area is permanent. Pollock's robust design combines features of both closed and open population models (Pollock 1982; Lebreton et al. 1992; Pollock et al. 1993; Williams et al. 2002). Under this design, a distinction is made between primary and secondary sampling occasions. Within the secondary sampling occasions, the population is assumed to be closed (as in closed population CMR models), but primary sampling sessions are separated by longer time intervals (primary sampling sessions) during which populations can experience gains and losses (as in open population CMR models). Because the robust design modeling approach allows a flexible framework for estimating and modeling temporary emigration (Kendall et al. 1997; Kendall 1999; Williams et al. 2002), we used this modeling approach for our study.

The robust design approach to estimating temporary emigration envisions a superpopulation consisting of N_i^0 individuals that are associated with the sampling area (Kendall et al. 1997). Of these, N_i individuals are available for capture with capture probability p_i^* during the primary sampling occasion i . However, in the presence of

temporary emigration, some of these individuals would not be exposed to sampling because they would be temporarily absent from the study area. If the temporary emigration is completely random, then the expected number of individuals that are exposed to sampling during the primary sampling at primary sampling occasion i is $E(N_i) = (1-\gamma) N_i^0$, where γ is the probability that an individual temporarily emigrates prior to primary sampling occasion i . However, if temporary emigration is Markovian, then the probability that an individual is a temporary emigrant during primary sampling occasion i depends on whether or not it was a temporary emigrant during $i - 1$. Specifically, the probability of temporary emigration is γ' for $[N_i^0 - N_{i-1}]$ individuals that were temporary emigrants during $i - 1$; it is γ'' for the N_{i-1} individuals that were exposed to sampling during $i - 1$ (Kendall et al. 1997; Kendall 1999). In other words, this approach allows temporary emigration to be different for individuals that were in the study area during the previous sampling and those that were away; γ'' represents the probability of temporary emigration for individuals that were in the study area during the previous sampling occasion, whereas γ' represents the probability that individuals that were temporary emigrants during the previous sampling occasion will remain temporary emigrants in the current sampling occasion. We note that, under this study design, a hare would be considered a temporary emigrant if it were present in that portion of home range outside of the trapping area.

We used a robust design CMR approach to estimate and model temporary emigration and other demographic parameters. For each year of study, we had two sampling occasions (Autumn and Spring), and within each primary sampling occasion, we had 3 secondary sampling occasions. We considered 3 sets of models. In the first set, we assumed Markovian temporary emigration; in the second set, we assumed random temporary emigration; and in the third set, we assumed no temporary emigration. To facilitate parameter estimation, we constrained probability of first capture p in a secondary

period and subsequent secondary-period recaptures c within the same primary period to be the same, and allowed them to be affected by singular, additive and interactive (2-way only) effects of phase of the cycles (increase, peak, decline and low), season (Autumn or Spring), and cycle number (cycle that peaked in 1980 = cycle 1 and the recent cycle that peaked in 2017 = cycle 5; cycle number was treated as a discrete variable). Cyclic phases were defined following Keith (1990), based on previous estimates of finite rate of annual change (Spring to Spring) in snowshoe hare densities (Krebs et al. 2018).

We trapped snowshoe hares on seven control (unmanipulated) grids but not all grids were trapped simultaneously. Gribble's, Grid 1050 and Kloo Lake grids were not trapped after Spring 1985, and Chitty grid was trapped intermittently (Oli et al. 2020). To account for missing data, we fixed $p = c = 0$ for grids when they were not trapped. Preliminary analyses provided no evidence of sex-specific differences in model parameters (also see Hodges et al. 1999; Krebs et al. 1986), so sex effect was not included in the final analyses. Previous analyses have shown that apparent survival (ϕ) and capture probabilities (p) are strongly influenced by phase, season, and that they also vary across cycles. Thus, we allowed additive and interactive effects (only 2-way interactions) of these covariates on ϕ and p . Thus, in addition to constant parameter models, we allowed singular effect of phase, season and cycle number on γ' and γ'' ; our data were insufficient to support more complex models. In all analyses, we specified the time intervals between successive samples in months (average interval between Autumn to Spring sampling occasions was seven months, and between spring to Autumn sampling occasions was five months); thus, all estimated parameters are monthly rates or probabilities. There was no evidence that capture probability differed among secondary samples. Thus, the probability of at least one encounter during a primary sampling occasion is given by $1 - (1 - p_j)^3$, where p_j is the capture probability during a secondary sample, j .

We implemented the robust design CMR model using program MARK (White and Burnham 1999) Version 6.2 implemented in the RMark package (Laake 2013) for program R, Version 3.6.1 (R Core Team 2019). We used an information-theoretic approach for model selection with Akaike's information criterion corrected for small sample size (AIC_c) as a measure of model parsimony (Burnham and Anderson 2002; Williams et al. 2002). The effect of aforementioned covariates was determined by comparing AIC_c among models with and without covariates. Because the random and no temporary emigration models are special cases of the Markovian temporary emigration model, we could compare these models both within and among sets based on AIC_c values. Models with difference in AIC_c (ΔAIC_c) ≤ 2 were not considered to be substantially different in terms of the model likelihood. We expected that temporary emigration would be (i) higher during summer than winter because snow cover would reduce snowshoe hares' ability to move; (ii) higher during the peak and early decline phases, compared to late decline or low phases. High population sizes during late increase and peak density phases would mean a greater competition for resources, and a higher probability of temporary emigration; and (iii) higher during cycle 1 because of smaller effective sampling area during this cycle compared to later cycles. We also expected that apparent survival would be (i) higher during the increase and lower during the decline phase compared to other phases; (ii) higher during summer than winter because of harsh winter conditions and reduced food availability or accessibility during winter; and (iii) lower during cycle 1 compared to subsequent cycles because of higher temporary emigration during first cycle as described above. Finally, we expected capture probability to vary over time depending on environmental context, season, cyclic phases or across cycles but did not have specific expectations. For clarity, we refer to survival (or temporary emigration) from Spring to Autumn as summer survival (or temporary emigration), and survival (or temporary emigration) from Autumn to Spring as winter survival (or temporary emigration).

The size and number of trapping grids changed during the course of this study (Oli et al. 2020). Thus, we calculated the population density (along with 95% confidence intervals) by dividing estimated population size by the area of the sampled grids. Our intention was not necessarily to report unbiased estimates of population density but to provide a standardized estimate of abundance to permit comparison across the entire study period. Whereas the robust design CMR models provide unbiased estimates of abundance, density estimated as above may be biased because difficulties inherent in estimating effective trapping area (Efford 2004; Otis et al. 1978; Borchers and Efford 2008). Further complications may arise if the number and location of trapping grids change over time. Thus, we also estimated snowshoe hare population density using the spatially-explicit capture-recapture model (Efford 2004; Borchers and Efford 2008; Royle et al. 2014) using data from Silver and Sulphur (both control or unmanipulated) grids that were continuously trapped during each season and year of our study (Autumn 1977 to Spring 2020). We implemented the spatially-explicit capture-recapture model in program DENSITY (Efford 2014).

Analysis of density dependence

Density-dependence in population dynamics is typically studied within the framework of time-series analyses using autoregressive models. We considered an autoregressive process of order k , generally referred to as $AR(k)$ of the following form (Oli 2019; Royama 1992; Stenseth et al. 1997):

$$X_{t+1} = a_0 + (a_1 + 1)X_t + a_2X_{t-1} + a_3X_{t-2} + \cdots + a_kX_{t-k} + \varepsilon_t, \quad (1)$$

where X_t is log-transformed population size or density at time t , a_0 is the intercept term, a_i is the autoregressive coefficient of degree i , and ε_t is the independently and identically distributed process variance, assumed to be normally distributed with $\varepsilon_t \sim Normal(0, \sigma^2)$.

Ecologically, the parameters a_1 and a_2 (and higher-order coefficients) quantify the strength

of direct and delayed density-dependence, respectively. Populations experiencing direct density dependence converge to stable equilibria, whereas those experiencing delayed density-dependence exhibit a variety of dynamical behaviors, ranging from damped oscillations to cycles and chaos (Royama 1992). The periodicity of the second order autoregressive process is determined by values of parameters a_1 and a_2 (Royama 1992; Bjørnstad et al. 1995; Turchin 2003).

$\varepsilon_t \sim \text{Uniform}(0,1)$. The state process was then linked to the observation process as $Y_t = \text{Normal}(X_t, \eta_t^2)$, where Y_t is the log-transformed population density at time t and η_t^2 is its variance estimated as $\eta_t^2 = \text{var}(D_t)$, where D_t is the log-transformed variance of the density at time t estimated from the spatially-explicit capture-recapture model. We fitted the state space models to Spring to Spring, and Autumn to Autumn density estimates (time interval = 1 year). For each analysis, we ran 4 chains each with 60,00,000 iterations with 500,000 burn-ins and retained results for every 50 iterations to minimize autocorrelation in parameter estimates. Convergence of Markov chains was assessed using Gelman-Rubin statistics ($\hat{R}$); $\hat{R} \leq 1.1$ generally indicating convergence proper mixing of Markov chains. We report mean, median (50th percentile) and 95% credible intervals for each parameter monitored. We fitted state-space model in JAGS version 4.3 (Plummer 2003) in R computing environment (R Core Team 2021) with vague priors: $a_i \sim \text{Normal}(0, 10^{-7})$; $x_i \sim$

$Normal(Y_1, 10^{-7})$ for $i = \{1, 2\}$ for Spring to Spring, and Autumn to Autumn density data; $i = \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$ for analyses that included both Spring and Autumn density data; and $\varepsilon_i \sim Uniform(0,1)$. We fit $AR(k)$ models to the population density estimated obtained from the spatially-explicit capture-recapture models (SECR-based estimates). We did not fit $AR(k)$ models to naïve density estimates (i.e., population density estimated using the robust-design abundance estimates) because these estimates have correlation structure that is not appropriately accounted for in $AR(k)$ analyses.

We used autocorrelation function (ACF) to reveal the trend and periodic patterns of the time series of abundance (Box et al. 2008). The ACF is estimated by calculating the correlation between the pairs of log-transformed densities $X_{t-\tau}$ and X_t separated by time lag τ , $\tau = 1, 2, \dots$. The correlation coefficients were then plotted against τ to reveal the trend and periodicity in the time series of log-transformed snowshoe hare densities (Turchin 2003). The ACF analyses were conducted using the point estimates of snowshoe hare population densities obtained from the spatially-explicit capture-recapture analysis.

RESULTS

We live-trapped 5502 unique hares (2781 males and 2721 females) on control (unmanipulated) grids a total of 11,246 times during 1977 - 2020. More hares were encountered during Autumn (3140 females and 3178 males) than Spring (2314 females and 2614 males).

Robust design capture-mark-recapture models that assumed Markovian temporary emigration (Table 1A) were substantially better supported than those that assumed random (Table 1B) or no temporary emigration (Table 1C). The most parsimonious Markovian temporary emigration model (model 1, Table 1A) indicated that both ϕ and p were

influenced by an interactive effect of cycle number (treated as a categorical variable) and season, and an additive effect of phase; however, an equally well-supported model included an interactive effect of phase and cycle number, and an additive effect of season on both of these parameters.

Model-averaged estimates of ϕ were higher during summer than winter, and generally higher during the increase or peak phase than the decline phase. Generally, ϕ varied across cycles, but there was no apparent temporal trend (Fig. 1). Model-averaged estimates of p also varied across seasons (it was generally higher during Spring than Autumn), cycles (it was higher during cycle 1 compared to subsequent cycles) and phases (it was generally higher during the peak or late increase phase) (Fig. 2).

Virtually all well supported Markovian temporary emigration models (Table 1A) included an effect of cycle number on γ'' , indicating that this parameter strongly varied across cycles. Parameter estimates revealed that γ'' was non-zero only during cycle 1 ($\gamma'' = 0.336$; 95% CI: 0.252-0.432); it was practically zero for all other cycles. In contrast, most well supported models for γ' included an effect of season. Estimates of γ' revealed that the snowshoe hares that are temporarily outside of the sampled area are highly unlikely to return to the sampled area during summer ($\gamma' = 0.999$; 95% CI: 0-1; $1 - \gamma' \approx 0$); they were much more likely to return to the sampled area during winter ($\gamma' = 0.46$; 95% CI: 0.15-0.79; $1 - \gamma' \approx 0.54$). Model-averaging did not substantially alter these patterns.

Estimates of population size (i.e., abundance in all sampled grids) exhibited distinctly cyclic patterns, with higher population size during Autumn than during Spring; and increase and peak phases being generally characterized by high, and low phases being characterized by very low population sizes (Fig. 3A). Population density estimated from the spatially-explicit capture-recapture (SECR) model ranged from 0.017 (0.015 – 0.05) hares/ha in Spring 2002 to 4.43 (3.90 – 5.00) hares/ha in Autumn 1981. Although there

were sometimes substantial differences in hare density estimated from the two methods (SECR-based estimates were generally lower than those obtained from the robust-design CMR approach; (Otis et al. 1978)), the pattern of cyclic population fluctuations was almost identical (Fig. 3B – 3C). Based on SECR-based estimates of population densities, the amplitude of cycles (amplitude = highest population density/lowest density of the same cycle) was 38, 40, 164, 16, and 55 for cycle 1, cycle 2, cycle 4, and cycle 5, respectively. The amplitude of cycles based on naïve density estimates was 56, 29, 143, 18, and 38 for cycle 1, cycle 2, cycle 4, and cycle 5, respectively. We note, however, that cycle 5 was still in the decline when this study concluded.

The autocorrelation function (which reveals how correlation between population size at different points in time changes as their separation in time changes) using Spring, Autumn, and both Spring and Autumn population density data revealed distinctly cyclic population dynamics with periodicity of ~10 years (Fig. 4). Bayesian autoregressive models fitted to log-transformed population density converged with $\hat{R} \leq 1.001$ for all parameters. The first order autoregressive coefficient (β_1) was negative for both Autumn and Spring density data, suggesting evidence for direct density dependence (Table 2). Using Royama's (1992; Fig. 2.9) parameter plane scheme, we find that the term $(1 + \beta_1)$ was 0.16 for Autumn and -0.060 for Spring density data; β_2 (second order autoregressive coefficient) was -0.329 for Autumn and -0.308 for Spring density data. These autoregressive coefficients (Table 2) were broadly consistent with those expected for a cyclic population with a periodicity of ~10 years (Royama 1992).

DISCUSSION

Temporary emigration is commonplace in studies of animal populations and can arise when a portion of the population is unavailable for sampling for a variety of reasons (Kendall 1999; Kendall et al. 1997; Penaloza et al. 2014; Gowan et al. 2019). Failure to account for temporary emigration when it occurs can result in biased estimates of demographic parameters which can also lead to incorrect inferences or management decisions, especially when temporary emigration is non-random (Kendall et al. 1997; Kendall 1999; Williams et al. 2002). When temporary emigration is suspected (a likely scenario in most open populations), it is advisable to use models that allow estimation and modelling of parameters related to temporary emigration (Schaub et al. 2004).

The difference in AIC_c between the most parsimonious model that assumed Markovian emigration and the most parsimonious model that assumed random emigration was 87.4, and between one that assumed Markovian emigration and one that assumed no temporary emigration was 83.4 (Table 1). These results provide strong evidence that temporary emigration occurred in our study population, and that it was not random. We note, however, that estimated γ'' was non-zero only for cycle 1. Comparing model-averaged estimates of apparent survival based on models that assumed Markovian temporary emigration (Table 1A; Fig. 1) with those that ignored temporary emigration (Table 1C), we find that models that ignored temporary emigration under-estimated monthly apparent survival during cycle 1 by about 0.04 (or annual apparent survival by $1 - (1 - 0.4)^{12} = 0.39$); the influence of ignoring temporary emigration on apparent survival estimates for cycles 2-5 were less dramatic with an average difference in monthly survival of 0.008 (or annual apparent survival of $1 - (1 - 0.008)^{12} = 0.09$). These results are consistent with the expectation that failure to account for temporary emigration would introduce negative bias in estimates of apparent survival (Kendall et al. 1997; J. D. Nichols pers. comm.)

Nearly all well-supported Markovian temporary emigration models suggested that γ'' varied across cycles. Model-averaged estimates revealed that γ'' was generally high during cycle 1 ($\gamma'' \approx 0.34$), and close to zero during all other cycles. This pattern in γ'' was consistent with our expectations because the effective sampling area was the smallest during cycle 1 (~9 ha per trapping grid), compared to subsequent cycles (60 ha per trapping grid). The perimeter to area ratio increases as the size of the effective sampling area decreases, increasing the probability that snowshoe hares would have a portion of their home ranges outside the area that was sampled. As the size of the effective sampling area increases, the perimeter to area ratio decreases, reducing the likelihood that sampled hares would have a portion of their home range outside the sampled area, thereby reducing the probability of temporary emigration (Boutin 1984).

In contrast, γ' exhibited a strong seasonal pattern, evidenced by the fact that the most well supported Markovian temporary emigration models included an effect of season on γ' (Table 1A). During summer, model-averaged estimates of γ' were very high (~0.999), suggesting that snowshoe hares that were temporarily away from the sampled area were highly unlikely to return during the next primary sampling occasion, because an estimate of the probability of return is given by $1 - \gamma' = 1 - 0.999 \approx 0$. In contrast, estimated γ' during winter was 0.455, suggesting that about 54% of snowshoe hares that were temporarily away from the sampled area would return. Although it was not one of our predictions (because we did not know if the pattern of temporary emigration would be non-random), this result would make biological sense if hares move less in winter (but we do not have home range data for all these cycles), and if hares are less likely to wander off too far away from the sampled area in winter, which, if correct, would increase the probability of returning to the sampled area. As noted above, our inferences regarding γ'' and γ' apply primarily to cycle 1, because $\gamma'' \approx 0$ for cycles 2-5. Our expectation that temporary emigration would be

higher during the late increase or peak phase due to an increased competition for resources at high densities was not supported by our data.

Apparent survival probabilities were strongly phase- and season-specific, with generally higher survival during the increase and peak phase and the lowest survival during the decline phase. Hares survived substantially better during summer than winter; however, there was substantial variation across cycles in phase-specific and seasonal survival. The pattern of phase, season and cycle specific apparent survival and capture probabilities was consistent with those reported in earlier studies (Boutin and Krebs 1986; Hodges et al. 2001; Oli et al. 2020).

An important goal of this study was to estimate the size and density of our study population. Estimated population sizes of the sampled area and densities (which exhibited almost identical patterns) were generally precise and followed the expected phase- and season-specific patterns but also revealed variation across cycles. Autumn sampling occurred after the conclusion of the summer breeding season, whereas spring sampling occurred at the end of winter when hares do not reproduce; hence, Autumn densities were always higher than spring densities. As expected, peak phase within a cycle was characterized by higher densities compared to other phases. The amplitude of the snowshoe hare population cycles was remarkably variable, ranging from 18 for cycle 4 to 142 for cycle 3. Likewise, duration of low phase was highly variable (Fig. 3). We note, however, that estimates of population size, density and cyclic amplitudes of cycle 1 may not be directly comparable to those of the subsequent cycles. This is because size of the trapping grids (9 ha) was substantially smaller than those for subsequent cycles (60 ha), which could have affected our estimates of population size. However, grid size and other aspects of the sampling protocol remained unchanged for cycles 2-5 so the estimates of abundance and densities should be directly comparable for all cycles except cycle 1.

Although the robust design CMR (RD-CMR) model provides rigorous estimates of abundance and other demographic parameters, estimates of density obtained by dividing abundance estimates by the area of trapping grids should be viewed as naïve density estimates. This is because effective trapping area is difficult to objectively estimate (Williams et al. 2002; Efford 2004). In our study, the naïve estimates of hare population density were generally higher than those estimated by SECR method. These differences arise primarily due to the fact that SCR models use information on the location of capture and explicitly estimate population densities, whereas the naïve estimates do not. Another factor that may have contributed to the observed differences include the fact that, for SECR analyses, we used data from two grids (Sulphur and Silver) that were trapped throughout our study. On the other hand, RD-CMR analyses used data from all control (unmanipulated) grids because we were also interested to estimate and model other demographic parameters such as the probability of survival and temporary emigration; the size and the number of grids trapped varied over time. The result that SECR-based density estimates were generally lower than the naïve estimates suggests that the area of the trapping grids generally underestimates effective trapping area, leading an over-estimation of hare population density. Despite these differences, the estimates of hare density obtained from the two methods exhibit near-identical pattern of population fluctuations (Figs. 3B-3C) and autocorrelation functions (Fig. 4).

Population regulation – the study of why populations fluctuate the way they do – is frequently guided by the ‘density paradigm’ of population ecology (Krebs 2002a, 2002b), which posits that density-dependent feedback mechanisms that permit populations to grow at faster rates at low densities (and at slower rates when densities are high) are necessary and often sufficient for preventing unlimited population growth (Royama 1992; Turchin 1999, 2003). It has been suggested that population regulation necessarily implies density-

dependence, and that unregulated populations cannot persist (Royama 1992). The structure of density-dependence, possibly arising from direct or lagged effect of predation (Krebs et al. 1995), determines the pattern of population fluctuations; direct (or first-order) density-dependence typically leads to stable equilibrium with the population size ultimately converging to some equilibrium values (but see May (1974)), whereas delayed (or second-order) density-dependence can generate a variety of dynamical patterns, including cyclic and chaotic fluctuations, depending on the strength of direct and delayed density-dependence (Royama 1992; Turchin 2003). Ecologically, the first order autoregressive parameter quantifies the strength of direct density-dependence, whereas the second order autoregressive parameter quantifies the strength of delayed density-dependence (Oli 2019; Royama 1992). Population cycles, often considered to be the foundational problem in animal ecology (reviewed in Stenseth 1999; Lambin et al. 2002; Krebs et al. 2018; Myers 2018; Oli 2019), can be viewed as a special case of population regulation, where direct and delayed density-dependence interact to cause a variety of dynamical behaviors including cyclic fluctuations (Royama 1992; Oli 2019). Thus, we applied this analytical framework to understand structure and pattern of density dependence in our study population fluctuations in our study area.

Autocorrelation functions (Fig. 4) clearly revealed cyclic population dynamics with a periodicity of ~9 to 10-year density cycles, as indicated by the highest positive autocorrelation at 9-10 year lags. These results held regardless of whether Spring to Spring, or Autumn to Autumn data were used in the analyses. Autocorrelation functions (Fig. 4) revealed that highest positive autocorrelations occurred at lags of 9-10 years, suggesting a cyclic population fluctuation with a periodicity of 9-10 years. Likewise, autoregressive parameters (Table 2) also were broadly consistent with persistent or convergent population cycles with a periodicity of ~9-10 years, based on the parameter plane scheme proposed by

Royama (1992, Figs. 2.9 - 2.12). Our study is the first to report autocorrelation functions and autoregressive parameters for a snowshoe hare population using actual estimates of population density across 5 cycles and a Bayesian state-space model which appropriately accounts for both sampling and process variances (Viljugrein et al. 2005; Rotella et al. 2009; Ahrestani et al. 2014). Finally, we note that the mechanisms driving cyclic fluctuations in our study population remain to be completely ascertained. Field experiments suggest that predators, primarily through direct predation and possibly through maternally-inherited stress, are likely to be important drivers of snowshoe hare population cycles (Krebs et al. 1995; Boonstra et al. 1998; Sheriff et al. 2010; Krebs et al. 2018), although the possibility of 3-trophic (vegetation – snowshoe hares – predators) interactions cannot be conclusively ruled out at this time (Stenseth et al. 1997).

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Data used in this study were collected by a team of several university professors, postdoctoral researchers, graduate students, and technicians, led by Charles J. Krebs. We extend our gratitude to Tony Sinclair, the late Jamie Smith, Irene Wingate, Scott Gilbert, Jean Carey, Elizabeth Hofer, Mark O'Donoghue, Karen Hodges, Dennis Murray, Vilis Nams, Sabine Schweiger, Cathy and Frank Doyle, Michael Peers, Yasmine Majchrzak and Michael Sheriff. Funding for this study was provided by the Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada. We would like to thank the Champagne and Aishihik First Nations, and Kluane First Nation for granting us permission for our work within their traditional territories. We are grateful to James D. Nichols for his advice on data analysis, and for many helpful comments on the manuscript, and to Jeff Hostetler for his

506 help on Bayesian state-space modeling. Any use of trade, product, or firm names is for
507 descriptive purposes only and does not imply endorsement by the U.S. Government.

508

509

Draft

510

LITERATURE CITED

- 511 Ahrestani, F.S., Hebblewhite, M., and Post, E. 2014. The importance of observation versus
512 process error in analyses of global ungulate populations. *Scientific Reports* **3**:1-10.
- 513 Bailey, L.L., Kendall, W.L., Church, D.R., and Wilbur, H.M. 2004. Estimating survival and
514 breeding probability for pond-breeding amphibians: A modified robust design.
515 *Ecology* **85**: 2456-2466.
- 516 Bird, T., Lyon, J., Nicol, S., McCarthy, M., and Barker, R. 2014. Estimating population size
517 in the presence of temporary migration using a joint analysis of telemetry and capture-
518 recapture data. *Methods in Ecology and Evolution* **5**: 615-625.
- 519 Bjørnstad, O., Falck, W., and Stenseth, N.C. 1995. A geographic gradient in small rodent
520 density fluctuations: A statistical modelling approach. *Proceedings of the Royal*
521 *Society B-Biological Sciences* **262**: 127-133.
- 522 Boonstra, R., Hik, D., Singleton, G.R., and Tinnikov, A. 1998. The impact of predator
523 induced stress on the snowshoe hare cycle. *Ecological Monographs* **79**: 371-394.
- 524 Boonstra, R., Andreassen, H.P., Boutin, S., Husek, J., Ims, R.A., Krebs, C.J., Skarpe, C., and
525 Wabakken, P. 2016. Why do the boreal forest ecosystems of northwestern Europe
526 differ from those of western north America? *Bioscience* **66**: 722-734.
- 527 Borchers, D.L., and Efford, M.G. 2008. Spatially explicit maximum likelihood methods for
528 capture-recapture studies. *Biometrics* **64**: 377-385.
- 529 Boutin, S. 1984. Home range size and methods of estimating snowshoe hare densities. *Acta*
530 *Zoologica Fennica* **171**: 275-278.
- 531 Boutin, S., and Krebs, C.J. 1986. Estimating survival rates of snowshoe hares. *Journal of*
532 *Wildlife Management* **50**: 592-594.
- 533 Boutin, S., Krebs, C.J., Sinclair, A.R.E., and Smith, J.N.M. 1986. Proximate causes of losses
534 in a snowshoe hare population. *Canadian Journal of Zoology* **64**: 606-610.
- 535 Boutin, S., Gilbert, B.S., Krebs, C.J., Sinclair, A.R.E., and Smith, J.N.M. 1985. The role of
536 dispersal in the population dynamics of snowshoe hares. *Canadian Journal of Zoology*
537 **63**: 106-115.
- 538 Boutin, S., Krebs, C.J., Boonstra, R., Sinclair, A.R.E., and Hodges, K.E. 2002.
539 Understanding the snowshoe hare cycle through large-scale field experimentats. *In*
540 *Population cycles. Edited by A. Berryman. Oxford University Press, New York.* pp.
541 69-91.
- 542 Box, G.F.P., Jenkins, G.M., and Reinsel, G.C. 2008. Time series analysis: forecasting and
543 control. Wiley, Hoboken, New Jersey.
- 544 Burnham, K.P., and Anderson, D.R. 2002. Model selection and multimodel inference: a
545 practical information-theoretic approach. second ed. Springer Verlag, New York,
546 U.S.A.
- 547 Cary, J.R., and Keith, L.B. 1978. Reproductive change in the 10-year cycle of snowshoe
548 hares. *Canadian Journal of Zoology* **57**: 375-390.
- 549 Efford, M.G. 2004. Density estimation in live-trapping studies. *Oikos* **106**: 598-610.
- 550 Efford, M.G. 2014. DENSITY 5.0.3: Spatially explicit capture-recapture estimation of
551 animal population density. Department of Zoology, University of Otago., Dunedin,
552 New Zealand.
- 553 Elton, C.S. 1924. Periodic fluctuations in number of animals: their causes and effects. *British*
554 *Journal of Experimental Biology* **2**: 119-163.
- 555 Gillis, E.A., and Krebs, C.J. 1999. Natal dispersal of snowshoe hares during a cyclic
556 population increase. *Journal of Mammalogy* **80**: 933-939.

- Gowan, T.A., Ortega-Ortiz, J.G., Hostetler, J.A., Hamilton, P.K., Knowlton, A.R., Jackson, K.A., George, R.C., Taylor, C.R., and Naessig, P.J. 2019. Temporal and demographic variation in partial migration of the North Atlantic right whale. *Scientific Reports* **9**: 1-11.
- Hodges, K.E., Krebs, C.J., and Sinclair, A.R.E. 1999. Snowshoe hare demography during a cyclic population low. *Journal of Animal Ecology* **68**: 581-594.
- Hodges, K.E., Boonstra, R., and Krebs, C.J. 2006. Overwinter mass loss of snowshoe hares in the Yukon: starvation, stress, adaptation or artefact? *Journal of Animal Ecology* **75**: 1-13.
- Hodges, K.E., Krebs, C.J., Hik, D.S., Stefan, C.I., Gillis, E.A., and Doyle, C.E. 2001. Snowshoe hare demography. *In* *Ecosystem dynamics of the boreal forest: the Kluane project*. Edited by C.J. Krebs. Oxford University Press, New York. pp. 142-178.
- Hoffman, R.S., and Smith, A.T. 2005. Order Lagomorpha. *In* *Mammal species of the world: A taxonomic and geographic reference*. Edited by D.E. Wilson and D.M. Reeder. Johns Hopkins University Press, Baltimore. p. 195.
- Ims, R.A., Yoccoz, N., and Killengreen, S.T. 2011. Determinants of lemming outbreaks. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* **108**: 1970-1974.
- Keith, L.B. 1990. Dynamics of snowshoe hare populations. *Current Mammalogy* **2**: 119-195.
- Keith, L.B., and Windberg, L.A. 1978. Demographic analysis of snowshoe hare cycle. *Wildlife Monographs* **58**: 1-70.
- Kendall, W.L. 1999. Robustness of closed capture-recapture methods to violations of the closure assumption. *Ecology* **80**: 2517-2525.
- Kendall, W.L., and Bjorkland, R. 2001. Using open robust design models to estimate temporary emigration from capture-recapture data. *Biometrics* **57**: 1113-1122.
- Kendall, W.L., Nichols, J.D., and Hines, J.E. 1997. Estimating temporary emigration using capture-recapture data with Pollock's robust design. *Ecology* **78**: 563-578.
- Krebs, C.J. 2002a. Two complementary paradigms for analysing population dynamics. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society (London), Series B* **357**: 1211-1219.
- Krebs, C.J. 2002b. Beyond population regulation and limitation. *Wildlife Research* **29**: 1-10.
- Krebs, C.J., Boutin, S., and Boonstra, R. (eds). 2001. *Ecosystem dynamics of the boreal forest: The Kluane project*. Oxford University Press, Oxford, UK.
- Krebs, C.J., Boonstra, R., and Boutin, S. 2018. Using experimentation to understand the 10-year snowshoe hare cycle in the boreal forest of North America. *Journal of Animal Ecology* **87**: 87-100.
- Krebs, C.J., Gilbert, B.S., Boutin, S., Sinclair, A.R.E., and Smith, J.N.M. 1986. Population biology of snowshoe hares. I. Demography of food-supplemented populations in the southern Yukon, 1976-84. *Journal of Animal Ecology* **55**: 963-982.
- Krebs, C.J., Boutin, S., Boonstra, R., Sinclair, A.R.E., Smith, J.N.M., Dale, M.R.T., Martin, K., and Turkington, R. 1995. Impact of food and predation on the snowshoe hare cycle. *Science* **269**: 1112-1115.
- Laake, J.L. 2013. RMark: An R interface for analysis of capture-recapture data with MARK. Alaska Fish Scientific Center, NOAA, National Marine Fishery Service, Seattle.
- Lambin, X., Krebs, C.J., Moss, R., and Yoccoz, N. 2002. Population cycles: Inferences from experimental, modeling, and time series approaches. *In* *Population cycles: the case for trophic interactions*. Edited by A. Berryman. Oxford University Press, Oxford. pp. 155-176.
- Lebreton, J.D., Burnham, K.P., Clobert, J., and Anderson, D.R. 1992. Modeling Survival and Testing Biological Hypotheses Using Marked Animals - a Unified Approach with Case-Studies. *Ecological Monographs* **62**: 67-118.

- Lebreton, J.D., Nichols, J.D., Barker, R.J., Pradel, R., and Spendelov, J.A. 2009. Modeling individual animal histories with multistate capture-recapture models. *Advances in Ecological Research* **41**: 87-173.
- May, R.M. 1974. Biological populations with non-overlapping generations: stable points, stable cycles and chaos. *Science* **186**: 645-647.
- Myers, J.H. 2018. Population cycles: generalities, exceptions and remaining mysteries. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B-Biological Sciences* **285**: 10.1098/rspb.2017.2841.
- O'Donoghue, M., and Krebs, C.J. 1992. Effects of supplemental food on snowshoe hare reproduction and juvenile growth at a cyclic population peak. *Journal of Animal Ecology* **61**: 631-641.
- Oli, M.K. 2019. Population cycles in voles and lemmings: state of the science and future directions. *Mammal Review* **49**: 226-239.
- Oli, M.K., Krebs, C.J., Kenney, A.J., Boonstra, R., Boutin, S., and Hines, J.E. 2020. Demography of snowshoe hare population cycles. *Ecology* **101**: e02969.
- Otis, D.L., Burnham, K.P., White, G.C., and Anderson, D.R. 1978. Statistical inference from capture data on closed animal population. *Wildlife Monographs* **62**: 1-135.
- Peers, M.J.L., Reimer, J.R., Majchrzak, Y.N., Menzies, A.K., Studd, E.K., Boonstra, R., Kenney, A.J., Krebs, C.J., O'Donoghue, M., and Boutin, S. 2021. Contribution of late-litter juveniles to the population dynamics of snowshoe hares. *Oecologia* **195**: 949-957.
- Penaloza, C.L., Kendall, W.L., and Langtimm, C.A. 2014. Reducing bias in survival under nonrandom temporary emigration. *Ecological Applications* **24**: 1155-1166.
- Plummer, M. (ed). 2003. JAGS: A program for analysis of Bayesian graphical models using Gibbs sampling, Vienna, Austria.
- Pollock, K.H. 1982. A capture-recapture design robust to unequal probability of capture. *Journal of Wildlife Management* **46**: 757-760.
- Pollock, K.H., Kendall, W.L., and Nichols, J.D. 1993. The "robust" capture-recapture design allows components of the recruitment process to be estimated. *In The study of bird population dynamics using marked individuals Edited by J.-D. Lebreton and P.M. North*. Birkhauser Verlag, Berlin, pp. 245-252.
- Pollock, K.H., Nichols, J.D., Brownie, C., and Hines, J.E. 1990. Statistical inference for capture-recapture experiments. *Wildlife Monographs* **107**: 1-97.
- Rotella, J.J., Link, W.A., Nichols, J.D., Hadley, G.L., Garrott, R.A., and Proffitt, K.M. 2009. An evaluation of density-dependent and density-independent influences on population growth rates in Weddell seals. *Ecology* **90**: 975-984.
- Royama, T. 1992. Analytical population dynamics. Chapman and Hall, London, U. K.
- Royle, J.A., Chandler, R.B., Sollman, R., and Gardner, B. 2014. Spatial capture-recapture. Academic Press, Waltham.
- Schaub, M., Pradel, R., and Lebreton, J.D. 2004. Is the reintroduced white stork (*Ciconia ciconia*) population in Switzerland self-sustainable? *Biological Conservation* **119**: 105-114.
- Sheriff, M.J., Krebs, C.J., and Boonstra, R. 2010. The ghosts of predators past: population cycles and the role of maternal programming under fluctuating predation risk. *Ecology* **91**: 2983-2994.
- Sikes, R.S. 2016. Guidelines of the American Society of Mammalogists for the use of wild mammals in research and education. *Journal of Mammalogy* **97**: 663-688.
- Stenseth, N.C. 1999. Population cycles in voles and lemmings: density dependence and phase dependence in a stochastic world. *Oikos* **87**: 427-461.

- Stenseth, N.C., Falck, W., Bjornstad, O.N., and Krebs, C.J. 1997. Population regulation in snowshoe hare and Canadian lynx: Assymmetric food web configurations between hare and lynx. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* **94**: 5147-5152.
- Turchin, P. 1999. Population regulation: a synthetic view. *Oikos* **84**: 153-159.
- Turchin, P. 2003. Complex population dynamics. Princeton University Press.
- Viljugrein, H., Stenseth, N.C., Smith, G.W., and Steinbakk, G.H. 2005. Density Dependence in North American Ducks. *Ecology* **86**: 245-254.
- White, G.C., and Burnham, K.P. 1999. Program MARK: Survival rate estimation from both live and dead encounters. *Bird Studies* **46 (Suppl.)**: S120-S139.
- Williams, B.K., Nichols, J.D., and Conroy, M.J. 2002. Analysis and management of animal populations. Academic Press, San Diego.

Draft

668 Table 1. Model comparison statistics testing for the effect of various covariates on capture probability (p), apparent survival (ϕ) and temporary
669 emigration parameters (γ'' = probability of temporary emigration for snowshoe hares (*Lepus americanus* Erxleben 1777) that were exposed to
670 sampling during $i - 1$; γ' = probability that hares that were temporary emigrant during $i - 1$ will remain temporary emigration during sampling
671 occasion i). We considered 3 sets of models, assuming (A) Markovian temporary emigration; (B) Random temporary emigration (i.e., $\gamma'' = \gamma'$);
672 and (C) No temporary emigration (i.e., $\gamma'' = \gamma' = 0$). Covariates are: cyclic phase (phase; increase, peak, decline, low); season (Autumn or Spring
673 sampling occasions), and cycle number (cycle_no; cycle peaking in 1980-1981: cycle number 1; current cycle peaking in 2016-2017: cycle
674 number 5). For each model, we report the number of parameters (K), Akaike Information Criterion corrected for small sample size (AICc),
675 difference in AICc (Δ AICc), model weight and deviance.
676

Model no.	Model	K	AICc	Δ AICc	Weight	Deviance
A. Markovian temporary emigration						
1	$\phi(\text{cycle_no} * \text{season} + \text{phase})\gamma''(\text{cycle_no})\gamma'(\text{season})p(\text{cycle_no} * \text{season} + \text{phase})$	33	38960.172	0.000	0.586	47948.071
2	$\phi(\text{phase} * \text{cycle_no} + \text{season})\gamma''(\text{cycle_no})\gamma'(\text{season})p(\text{phase} * \text{cycle_no} + \text{season})$	48	38961.358	1.186	0.324	47919.006

3	$\phi(\text{cycle_no} * \text{season} + \text{phase})\gamma''(\text{cycle_no})\gamma'(\text{season})p(\text{phase} * \text{cycle_no} + \text{season})$	41	38965.106	4.934	0.050	47936.882
4	$\phi(\text{phase} * \text{cycle_no} + \text{season})\gamma''(\text{cycle_no})\gamma'(\text{season})p(\text{cycle_no} * \text{season} + \text{phase})$	40	38965.485	5.313	0.041	47939.278
5	$\phi(\text{phase} * \text{cycle_no} + \text{season})\gamma''(\text{cycle_no})\gamma'(\text{phase})p(\text{phase} * \text{cycle_no} + \text{season})$	50	38978.226	18.055	0.000	47931.834
6	$\phi(\text{cycle_no} * \text{season} + \text{phase})\gamma''(\text{season})\gamma'(\sim\text{cycle_no})p(\text{phase} * \text{cycle_no} + \text{season})$	41	38980.826	20.654	0.000	47952.602
7	$\phi(\text{cycle_no} * \text{season} + \text{phase})\gamma''(\text{season})\gamma'(\sim\text{cycle_no})p(\text{cycle_no} * \text{season} + \text{phase})$	33	38982.729	22.557	0.000	47970.628
8	$\phi(\text{phase} * \text{season} + \text{cycle_no})\gamma''(\text{cycle_no})\gamma'(\sim\text{season})p(\text{phase} * \text{cycle_no} + \text{season})$	40	38982.780	22.608	0.000	47956.573
9	$\phi(\text{phase} * \text{cycle_no} + \text{season})\gamma''(\text{cycle_no})\gamma'(\text{phase})p(\text{cycle_no} * \text{season} + \text{phase})$	42	38984.456	24.284	0.000	47954.215
10	$\phi(\text{phase} + \text{cycle_no} + \text{season})\gamma''(\text{cycle_no})\gamma'(\text{season})p(\text{phase} * \text{cycle_no} + \text{season})$	37	38985.319	25.148	0.000	47965.161

B. Random temporary emigration

1	$\phi(\text{cycle_no} * \text{season} + \text{phase})\gamma''(.)p(\text{phase} * \text{cycle_no} + \text{season})$	35	39045.560	0	0.685	47863.965
2	$\phi(\text{cycle_no} * \text{season} + \text{phase})\gamma''(\text{season})p(\text{phase} * \text{cycle_no} + \text{season})$	36	39047.571	2.015	0.254	48029.428
3	$\phi(\text{cycle_no} * \text{season} + \text{phase})\gamma''(\text{phase})p(\text{phase} * \text{cycle_no} + \text{season})$	38	39051.602	6.045	0.034	48029.428
4	$\phi(\text{cycle_no} * \text{season} + \text{phase})\gamma''(\text{cycle_no})p(\text{phase} * \text{cycle_no} + \text{season})$	39	39053.618	8.061	0.012	48029.428

5	$\phi(\text{cycle_no} * \text{season} + \text{phase})\gamma''(.)p(\text{cycle_no} * \text{season} + \text{phase})$	27	39057.297	11.741	0.002	48057.271
6	$\phi(\text{cycle_no} * \text{season} + \text{phase})\gamma''(\text{season})p(\text{cycle_no} * \text{season} + \text{phase})$	28	39059.309	13.752	0.001	48057.271
7	$\phi(\text{phase} * \text{cycle_no} + \text{season})\gamma''(.)p(\text{phase} * \text{cycle_no} + \text{season})$	42	39061.155	15.598	0.000	48030.914
8	$\phi(\text{phase} * \text{cycle_no} + \text{season})\gamma''(\text{season})p(\text{phase} * \text{cycle_no} + \text{season})$	43	39063.172	17.616	0.000	48030.914
9	$\phi(\text{cycle_no} * \text{season} + \text{phase})\gamma''(\text{phase})p(\text{cycle_no} * \text{season} + \text{phase})$	30	39063.333	17.776	0.000	48057.271
10	$\phi(\text{cycle_no} * \text{season} + \text{phase})\gamma''(\text{cycle_no})p(\text{cycle_no} * \text{season} + \text{phase})$	31	39065.345	19.789	0.000	48057.271

C. No temporary emigration

1	$\phi(\text{cycle_no} * \text{season} + \text{phase})p(\text{phase} * \text{cycle_no} + \text{season})$	34	39043.542	0.000	0.997	48029.428
2	$\phi(\text{cycle_no} * \text{season} + \text{phase})p(\text{cycle_no} * \text{season} + \text{phase})$	26	39055.286	11.744	0.003	48057.271
3	$\phi(\text{phase} * \text{cycle_no} + \text{season})p(\text{phase} * \text{cycle_no} + \text{season})$	41	39059.138	15.595	0.000	48030.914
4	$\phi(\text{phase} * \text{season} + \text{cycle_no})p(\text{phase} * \text{cycle_no} + \text{season})$	33	39068.814	25.271	0.000	48056.712
5	$\phi(\text{phase} + \text{cycle_no} + \text{season})p(\text{phase} * \text{cycle_no} + \text{season})$	30	39075.126	31.583	0.000	48069.063
6	$\phi(\text{cycle_no} * \text{season} + \text{phase})p(\text{phase} * \text{season} + \text{cycle_no})$	25	39077.159	33.616	0.000	48081.154
7	$\phi(\text{phase} * \text{cycle_no} + \text{season})p(\text{cycle_no} * \text{season} + \text{phase})$	33	39087.464	43.921	0.000	48075.363

8	$\phi(\text{phase} * \text{cycle_no})p(\text{phase} * \text{cycle_no} + \text{season})$	40	39088.565	45.022	0.000	48062.358
9	$\phi(\text{phase} * \text{cycle_no})p(\text{phase} * \text{cycle_no} + \text{season})$	40	39088.565	45.022	0.000	48062.358
10	$\phi(\text{phase} * \text{cycle_no} + \text{season})p(\text{phase} * \text{season} + \text{cycle_no})$	32	39093.677	50.135	0.000	48083.590

677

678

Draft

679

680 Table 2. Mean, median (50th percentile), standard error (SE), and 95% credible intervals
681 (95% CrI) for the estimates of autoregressive parameters (a_0 = intercept term; $a_k = k^{th}$ -order
682 autoregressive parameter) for snowshoe hares (*Lepus americanus* Erxleben 1777) in
683 Kluane, Canada. Results are presented for population density estimated using the spatially-
684 explicit capture-recapture model for Spring (A), and Autumn (B). Note that time interval
685 for Autumn to Autumn and Spring to Spring is one year, whereas that between seasons is
686 about 6 months.

Parameter	Mean	SE	95% CrI
A. Spring			
a_0	-0.724	0.648	-2.301, 0.267
a_1	-1.060	0.601	-2.213, 0.153
a_2	-0.308	0.370	-0.908, 0.485
B. Autumn			
a_0	-0.259	0.409	-1.248, 0.482
a_1	-0.840	0.738	-2.179, 0.484
a_2	-0.329	0.399	-0.966, 0.517

687

Draft

FIGURE LEGENDS

Figure 1. Model-averaged monthly estimates of apparent survival (ϕ , with 95% confidence intervals) for a snowshoe hare (*Lepus americanus* Erxleben 1777) population in Kluane, Yukon, Canada during Autumn 1977 – Spring 2020.

Figure 2. Model-averaged estimates of capture probability (p , with 95% confidence intervals) for a snowshoe hare (*Lepus americanus* Erxleben 1777) population in Kluane, Yukon, Canada during Autumn 1977 – Spring 2020. For these analyses, the probability of first time capture and subsequent recaptures were assumed to be the same. These estimates were obtained using the most parsimonious robust design capture-mark-recapture model that assumed Markovian temporary emigration (model 1, Table 1A). We note that these estimates of capture probability are expected to differ from those reported in previous analyses (Oli et al. 2020) because of non-zero temporary emigration (Kendall et al. 1997).

Figure 3. Model-averaged time-specific estimates of snowshoe hare (*Lepus americanus* Erxleben 1777) population size (A) and naïve estimates of population density (hares per ha.) obtained by dividing the population size estimates obtained from the robust design model of the trapping grid (B), population density (hares per ha.) estimated using the spatially-explicit capture-recapture (C) in Kluane, Yukon, Canada during Autumn 1977 – Spring 2020. Estimates in A and B were obtained using the most parsimonious robust design capture-mark-recapture model that assumed Markovian temporary emigration (model 1, Table 1A).

Figure 4. Autocorrelation functions (ACF) fitted to Spring to Spring (A), and Autumn to Autumn (B) density estimates for snowshoe hares (*Lepus americanus* Erxleben 1777) in

713 Kluane, Yukon, Canada during Autumn 1977 – Spring 2020. Analyses were performed
714 using the hare population density estimated using the spatially-explicit capture-recapture
715 model (SECR). Note that time intervals between Spring to Spring and Autumn to Autumn
716 samples were one year; thus, the time lag are in years in both panels.

717

Draft

718

Draft

Figure 1

740x529mm (72 x 72 DPI)

Figure 2
740x529mm (72 x 72 DPI)

Figure 3

1255x1095mm (72 x 72 DPI)

Figure 4

2207x2190mm (72 x 72 DPI)