AperTO - Archivio Istituzionale Open Access dell'Università di Torino

Acoustic divergence between bottlenose dolphin whistles from the Central-Eastern North Atlantic and Mediterranean Sea

This is the author's manuscript

Original Citation:

Availability:

This version is available <http://hdl.handle.net/2318/139280> since

Published version:

DOI:10.1007/s10211-013-0172-2

Terms of use:

Open Access

Anyone can freely access the full text of works made available as "Open Access". Works made available under a Creative Commons license can be used according to the terms and conditions of said license. Use of all other works requires consent of the right holder (author or publisher) if not exempted from copyright protection by the applicable law.

(Article begins on next page)

This is the author's final version of the contribution published as:

Papale Elena; Azzolin Marta; Cascão Irma; Gannier Alexandre; Lammers Marc; Martin Vidal; Oswald Julie; Perez-Gil Monica; Prieto Rui; Silva Monica; Giacomina Cristina. Acoustic divergence between bottlenose dolphin whistles from the Central-Eastern North Atlantic and Mediterranean Sea. ACTA ETHOLOGICA. None pp: 1-11.
DOI: 10.1007/s10211-013-0172-2

The publisher's version is available at:

<http://link.springer.com/content/pdf/10.1007/s10211-013-0172-2>

When citing, please refer to the published version.

Link to this full text:

<http://hdl.handle.net/2318/139280>

Dear Author

Here are the proofs of your article.

- You can submit your corrections **online**, via **e-mail** or by **fax**.
- For **online** submission please insert your corrections in the online correction form. Always indicate the line number to which the correction refers.
- You can also insert your corrections in the proof PDF and **email** the annotated PDF.
- For **fax** submission, please ensure that your corrections are clearly legible. Use a fine black pen and write the correction in the margin, not too close to the edge of the page.
- Remember to note the **journal title**, **article number**, and **your name** when sending your response via e-mail or fax.
- **Check** the metadata sheet to make sure that the header information, especially author names and the corresponding affiliations are correctly shown.
- **Check** the questions that may have arisen during copy editing and insert your answers/corrections.
- **Check** that the text is complete and that all figures, tables and their legends are included. Also check the accuracy of special characters, equations, and electronic supplementary material if applicable. If necessary refer to the *Edited manuscript*.
- The publication of inaccurate data such as dosages and units can have serious consequences. Please take particular care that all such details are correct.
- Please **do not** make changes that involve only matters of style. We have generally introduced forms that follow the journal's style.
- Substantial changes in content, e.g., new results, corrected values, title and authorship are not allowed without the approval of the responsible editor. In such a case, please contact the Editorial Office and return his/her consent together with the proof.
- If we do not receive your corrections **within 48 hours**, we will send you a reminder.
- Your article will be published **Online First** approximately one week after receipt of your corrected proofs. This is the **official first publication** citable with the DOI. **Further changes are, therefore, not possible.**
- The **printed version** will follow in a forthcoming issue.

Please note

After online publication, subscribers (personal/institutional) to this journal will have access to the complete article via the DOI using the URL:

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10211-013-0172-2>

If you would like to know when your article has been published online, take advantage of our free alert service. For registration and further information, go to:

<http://www.springerlink.com>.

Due to the electronic nature of the procedure, the manuscript and the original figures will only be returned to you on special request. When you return your corrections, please inform us, if you would like to have these documents returned.

Metadata of the article that will be visualized in OnlineFirst

1	Article Title	Acoustic divergence between bottlenose dolphin whistles from the Central–Eastern North Atlantic and Mediterranean Sea	
2	Article Sub- Title		
3	Article Copyright - Year	Springer-Verlag Berlin Heidelberg and ISPA 2013 (This will be the copyright line in the final PDF)	
4	Journal Name	acta ethologica	
5		Family Name	Papale
6		Particle	
7		Given Name	E.
8		Suffix	
9	Corresponding Author	Organization	University of Torino
10		Division	Life Science and Systems Biology Department
11		Address	Via Accademia Albertina 13, Torino 10123, Italy
12		e-mail	elena.papale@unito.it
13		Family Name	Azzolin
14		Particle	
15		Given Name	M.
16		Suffix	
17	Author	Organization	University of Torino
18		Division	Life Science and Systems Biology Department
19		Address	Via Accademia Albertina 13, Torino 10123, Italy
20		e-mail	
21		Family Name	Cascão
22		Particle	
23		Given Name	I.
24		Suffix	
25	Author	Organization	Universidade dos Açores
26		Division	Departamento de Oceanografia e Pescas, IMAR and LARSyS Associated Laboratory
27		Address	Horta 9901-862, Portugal
28		e-mail	
29	Author	Family Name	Gannier

30		Particle	
31		Given Name	A.
32		Suffix	
33		Organization	Groupe de Recherche sur les Cétacés (GREC)
34		Division	
35		Address	Antibes, France
36		e-mail	
37		Family Name	Lammers
38		Particle	
39		Given Name	M. O.
40		Suffix	
41		Organization	Ocean Wide Science Institute
42	Author	Division	
43		Address	PO Box 61692, Honolulu 96744, HI, USA
44		Organization	University of Hawaii
45		Division	Hawaii Institute of Marine Biology
46		Address	Kaneohe 96744, HI, USA
47		e-mail	
48		Family Name	Martin
49		Particle	
50		Given Name	V. M.
51		Suffix	
52	Author	Organization	Society for the Study of Cetaceans in the Canary Archipelago (SECAC)
53		Division	
54		Address	Edif. Antiguo Varadero 1ª planta Local 8 B, Urb. Puerto Calero, Yaiza 35571, Isla de Lanzarote, Spain
55		e-mail	
56		Family Name	Oswald
57		Particle	
58		Given Name	J.
59		Suffix	
60	Author	Organization	Bio-Waves, Inc.
61		Division	
62		Address	144 W. D Street, Suite #205, Encinitas 92024, CA, USA
63		e-mail	

64		Family Name	Perez-Gil
65		Particle	
66		Given Name	M.
67		Suffix	
68	Author	Organization	Society for the Study of Cetaceans in the Canary Archipelago (SECAC)
69		Division	
70		Address	Edif. Antiguo Varadero 1ª planta Local 8 B, Urb. Puerto Calero, Yaiza 35571, Isla de Lanzarote, Spain
71		e-mail	
72		Family Name	Prieto
73		Particle	
74		Given Name	R.
75		Suffix	
76	Author	Organization	Universidade dos Açores
77		Division	Departamento de Oceanografia e Pescas, IMAR and LARSyS Associated Laboratory
78		Address	Horta 9901-862, Portugal
79		e-mail	
80		Family Name	Silva
81		Particle	
82		Given Name	M. A.
83		Suffix	
84		Organization	Universidade dos Açores
85	Author	Division	Departamento de Oceanografia e Pescas, IMAR and LARSyS Associated Laboratory
86		Address	Horta 9901-862, Portugal
87		Organization	Woods Hole Oceanographic Institution
88		Division	Biology Department
89		Address	MS#33, Woods Hole 02543, MA, USA
90		e-mail	
91		Family Name	Giacoma
92		Particle	
93		Given Name	C.
94	Author	Suffix	
95		Organization	University of Torino
96		Division	Life Science and Systems Biology Department
97		Address	Via Accademia Albertina 13, Torino 10123, Italy

98		e-mail	
99		Received	9 May 2013
100	Schedule	Revised	10 May 2013
101		Accepted	31 October 2013
102	Abstract	To improve our understanding of the complex genetic and ecological structure of bottlenose dolphin (<i>Tursiops truncatus</i>) populations, we examined the acoustic features of communication signals from two geographically contiguous areas: the Central–Eastern North Atlantic and the Mediterranean Sea. Variations in the whistles were evaluated for four locations. Ten signal parameters were measured and used to statistically differentiate between the areas. Over 79 % of sightings were correctly classified by discriminant function analysis, confirming an acoustic differentiation between the two basins. The results of cluster analysis using the mean values of the parameters for each sighting showed that the three easternmost sightings from the Mediterranean and one sighting from the Canary archipelago formed a separate cluster from the rest of the Atlantic. The two sightings from the Alboran Sea in the west Mediterranean were grouped with the Atlantic recordings. There was more variability in whistles from the Atlantic Ocean consistent with data from genetic and photo-identification studies that document resident and non-resident animals in the area. The results suggest that the Alboran area may be inhabited by animals differentiated from the rest of the Mediterranean basin as a result of habitat features.	
103	Keywords separated by ' - '	Bottlenose dolphin - Intra-specific differences - Mediterranean - Atlantic - Whistles	
104	Foot note information		

Acoustic divergence between bottlenose dolphin whistles from the Central–Eastern North Atlantic and Mediterranean Sea

E. Papale · M. Azzolin · I. Cascão · A. Gannier ·
M. O. Lammers · V. M. Martin · J. Oswald ·
M. Perez-Gil · R. Prieto · M. A. Silva · C. Giacoma

Received: 9 May 2013 / Revised: 10 May 2013 / Accepted: 31 October 2013
© Springer-Verlag Berlin Heidelberg and ISPA 2013

Abstract To improve our understanding of the complex genetic and ecological structure of bottlenose dolphin (*Tursiops truncatus*) populations, we examined the acoustic features of communication signals from two geographically contiguous areas: the Central–Eastern North Atlantic and the Mediterranean Sea. Variations in the whistles were evaluated for four locations. Ten signal parameters were measured and

used to statistically differentiate between the areas. Over 79 % of sightings were correctly classified by discriminant function analysis, confirming an acoustic differentiation between the two basins. The results of cluster analysis using the mean values of the parameters for each sighting showed that the three easternmost sightings from the Mediterranean and one sighting from the Canary archipelago formed a separate cluster from the rest of the Atlantic. The two sightings from the Alboran Sea in the west Mediterranean were grouped with the Atlantic recordings. There was more variability in whistles from the Atlantic Ocean consistent with data from genetic and photo-identification studies that document resident and non-resident animals in the area. The results suggest that the Alboran area may be inhabited by animals differentiated from the rest of the Mediterranean basin as a result of habitat features.

Keywords Bottlenose dolphin · Intra-specific differences · Mediterranean · Atlantic · Whistles

Introduction

The bottlenose dolphin is widely distributed in temperate and tropical waters worldwide. Morphologic differences have, in the past, led to the subdivision of the genus into different species (Hershkovitz 1966). Currently, three species, *Tursiops truncatus*, *Tursiops aduncus* and *Tursiops australis* (Charlton-Robb et al. 2006, 2011), are recognized with the occurrence of local subspecies (e.g. *T. truncatus-ponticus* in the Black Sea; Viaud-Martinez et al. 2008) and nearshore and offshore ecotypes for a number of geographic locations (Ross 1977, 1984; Walker 1981; Duffield et al. 1983; Ross and Cockcroft 1990; Van Waerebeek et al. 1990; Mead and Potter 1995). Pelagic forms of *T. truncatus* have been reported to range primarily between the 200 and 2,000-m isobaths

E. Papale (✉) · M. Azzolin · C. Giacoma
Life Science and Systems Biology Department, University of Torino,
Via Accademia Albertina 13, Torino 10123, Italy
e-mail: elena.papale@unito.it

I. Cascão · R. Prieto · M. A. Silva
Departamento de Oceanografia e Pescas, IMAR and LARSyS
Associated Laboratory, Universidade dos Açores, Horta 9901-862,
Portugal

A. Gannier
Groupe de Recherche sur les Cétacés (GREC), Antibes, France

M. O. Lammers
Ocean Wide Science Institute, PO Box 61692, Honolulu, HI 96744,
USA

M. O. Lammers
Hawaii Institute of Marine Biology, University of Hawaii, Kaneohe,
HI 96744, USA

V. M. Martin · M. Perez-Gil
Society for the Study of Cetaceans in the Canary Archipelago
(SECAC), Edif. Antiguo Varadero 1ª planta Local 8 B, Urb. Puerto
Calero, Yaiza 35571, Isla de Lanzarote, Spain

J. Oswald
Bio-Waves, Inc., 144 W. D Street, Suite #205, Encinitas, CA 92024,
USA

M. A. Silva
Biology Department, Woods Hole Oceanographic Institution,
MS#33, Woods Hole, MA 02543, USA

(Wells et al. 1999). In the North-western Atlantic, this pelagic ecotype occurs mainly in waters beyond 34 km from shore and 34 m depth, while the coastal form occurs within 7.5 km from shore (Torres et al. 2003). In the Gulf of California, a distribution break was found around the 60-m isobath (Segura et al. 2006). In the Central–Eastern North Atlantic, no population structure was evident for either ecotype (Quérrouil et al. 2007). Resident populations of *T. truncatus* exist around the Canary Islands and the Azores archipelago (Silva et al. 2008). Nevertheless, in the latter, photo-identification data suggest that resident individuals mix and interact with non-resident individuals rarely observed in the area (Silva et al. 2008). In the Mediterranean Sea, bottlenose dolphins (*T. truncatus*) are thought to belong to the coastal ecotype (Notarbartolo di Sciara G and Demma 2004; Gannier 2005) despite being regularly observed in deep waters near the continental slope (Forcada et al. 2004) or beyond the continental shelf (Bearzi et al. 2004; Ben Naceur et al. 2004).

The bottlenose dolphin (*T. truncatus*) is a highly vocal species that shows great plasticity in its communication signals (May-Collado and Wartzok 2008). In this study, we refer to whistle as unpulsed, narrow-band signals, lasting between 0.1 and 4 s. The acoustic frequency of whistles is usually modulated, showing distinct contours of the fundamental frequencies (Caldwell et al. 1990). The whistles of bottlenose dolphins (*T. truncatus*) have been classified by Caldwell et al. (1990) into signature whistles, stereotypic and individual-specific signals that are stable over time and are used for group cohesion and variant whistles produced in a variety of social contexts. Furthermore, Caldwell and Caldwell (1972) and Reiss and McCowan (1993) reported that bottlenose dolphins are able to spontaneously copy sounds from the environment, and Tyack (1986) showed that they can also copy the whistles of conspecifics. Since acoustic transmission and ambient noise conditions can be locally different, animals may change the frequency and temporal structure of signals in response to the acoustic environment to ensure the transfer of information (May-Collado and Wartzok 2008). Local conditions of the acoustic environments experienced by a population can be reflected in differing traits of the acoustic structure of whistles and contribute to their geographic variation (May-Collado and Wartzok 2008). Furthermore, geographic variation can be related to morphological differences in the structure of the vocal apparatus and in overall body size. The call parameter most affected by body size is minimum frequency (May-Collado et al. 2007).

Intra-specific variations in the acoustic parameters of whistles have been successfully used to distinguish populations of many odontocete species, particularly bottlenose dolphins (Wang et al. 1995; Jones and Sayigh 2002; Morisaka et al. 2005; Azzolin 2008; Baron et al. 2008; May-Collado and Wartzok 2008; Hawkins 2010). Here, we evaluated differences in the acoustic characteristics of the signals produced

by bottlenose dolphins across the Central–Eastern North Atlantic and the Mediterranean Sea, and we tested population discriminability using whistles.

Methods

Study populations and data collection

Recordings of bottlenose dolphin (*T. truncatus*) whistles were collected from four geographic locations: the Mediterranean Sea, the Azores archipelago, the Canary archipelago and the Bay of Biscay (Fig. 1 and Table 1).

The Mediterranean Sea is a semi-enclosed basin, located between 30° and 46° North and 6° West and 36° East, composed of two main sub-basins (eastern and western). The Mediterranean connects with the Atlantic Ocean through the Strait of Gibraltar. Data were only collected from the western sub-basin: in the Tyrrhenian, the Gulf of Lion (France), the Gulf of Vera (Spain; Eastern Almeria) and in the Alboran Sea (to the west of the Almerian-Oran barrier). Water depths can reach 3.8 km in the centre of the Tyrrhenian Sea. The Centre de Recherche sur les Cétacés (GREC) provided the data from this location using either a mono towed hydrophone with *Benthos* AQ4 (in 1999) or a stereo towed hydrophone with the same elements (in 1998), with a linear flat response between 1 and 15 kHz±1 dB and between 15 and 30 kHz±3 dB (sensitivity of −156 dB re 1 V/μPa), a 29-dB pre-amplifier and 200 Hz high-pass filter. An external high-pass filter unit (Magrec Ltd.) set to 1 kHz was used on the hydrophone output to improve the quality of recordings.

The Azores archipelago is located between 36° and 40° North and 24° and 32° West and is composed of nine islands divided into three subgroups (western, central and eastern), extending about 600 km along a northwest–southeast axis. The islands are situated about 1,500 km from the Portuguese coast. The seabed around the islands is deep (around 1.50 km at 3 km off shore) with numerous scattered seamounts (Morato et al. 2008). The Department of Oceanography and Fisheries, Centre of IMAR of the University of the Azores (IMAR-DOP/UAç) and the International Fund for Animal Welfare–United Kingdom (IFAW) provided the recordings from the area using either an omnidirectional hydrophone (HTI-94-SSQ) with a linear flat response between 2 and 30 kHz±1 dB (sensitivity of −198 dB re 1 V/μPa) or a towed array with two hydrophones (*Benthos* AQ4).

The Canary Islands archipelago is located between 27° and 30° North and 13° and 19° West about 1,200 km from the Azores archipelago and 115 km west from the African coast. It is composed of seven main islands and extends 500 km. Water depth around the archipelago can reach more than 1 km at 1.8 km from the coast. The Society for the Study of Cetaceans in the Canary Archipelago (SECAC) obtained the recordings

Fig. 1 Location of recordings analyzed for the Atlantic Ocean and Mediterranean Sea. *Black dots* represent the approximate position of sightings. *Inserts* show details of locations where sightings were closer. Depth contour of 200 m is shown in grey

used in this study using a towed array with four elements: two hydrophones (*Benthos* AQ4) and two spherical ceramic hydrophone elements with a frequency response of ~2–150 kHz (Seiche UK Ltd.) with a sensitivity for the front element of –161 dB re 1 V/μPa and the rear element of –158 dB re 1 V/μPa.

The Bay of Biscay is situated between 43° and 50° North and 1° and 10° West and is characterized by variable sea depths, ranging from the shallow continental shelf (less than 0.10 km) to the abyssal plain (greater than 4 km) with submarine canyons, seamounts and a steep continental slope. The width of the continental shelf varies from 110 to 185 km in the northern part of the bay (up to 45° N) to 46 km in the southern part and is as narrow as 5.5 km at the latitude of the Capbreton trough. The IFAW provided data from this location with the same instruments used in the Azores area. We only used recordings for which the species was confirmed visually and when it was visually certain that no other odontocetes were present in the area.

Sound analysis

We analyzed recordings by creating spectrograms in CoolEdit 2000 (Syntrillium Software, USA; Blackmann-Harris window;

256–512 band resolution; 2048 FFT size). We sampled all data at 48 kHz except for a few Mediterranean recordings collected at 44.1 kHz for which none of the maximum frequencies was over Nyquist nor frequency parameters or harmonics of the signals presented overturned contours. Each extracted sound was classified by assigning a signal quality index from zero (weak or overlapped with other sounds) to three (good signal-to-noise ratio and definition of the contour). When the gap between consecutive whistles was larger than 200 ms, these were analyzed as individual whistles (Bazua-Duran and Au 2002).

Only whistles classified as two or three (with the highest intensity) were used in the analysis in order to avoid using sounds of groups outside the visual range. From each whistle contour, ten parameters were measured manually following the method adopted by Oswald et al. (2003, 2007), Azzolin (2008) and Papale et al. (2013). These included duration, beginning frequency, end frequency, minimum frequency, maximum frequency, number of inflection points (mathematic definition in sine function of a change from positive to negative or negative to positive slope), steps (a rapid discontinuous change in frequency), number of minima in the contour and number of maxima in the contour (relative maximal and minimal points in the whistle contour) (Fig. 2). We also

Table 1 Summary of data collected, locations, periods, instruments used, distance from the coast and depth where recordings have been collected

Area	Instruments	Research group	Sampling rate	Frequency response of the hydrophones	Sightings	Hours of recording	Total whistles	Selected whistles	Bathymetry range	Coast ranging
Azores archipelago	Omnidirectional hydrophone (HTI-94-SSQ) or towed array with two hydrophones Benthos AQ4	IMAR-DOP/UAç IFAW	48 kHz 48 kHz	1. ± 1 dB 1 Hz–15 kHz and ± 3 dB 15–30 kHz 2. ± 1 dB 2 Hz–30 kHz	20	5.32	866	352	Between 0.88 and 1.79 km	1.60–45 km
Bay of Biscay	Omnidirectional hydrophone (HTI-94-SSQ) or towed array with 2 hydrophones Benthos AQ4	IFAW	48 kHz	1. ± 1 dB 1 Hz–15 kHz and ± 3 dB 15–30 kHz 2. ± 1 dB 2 Hz–30 kHz	1	0.18	94	94	1 km	42 km
Canary archipelago	Towed array with four elements; two hydrophones Benthos AQ4 and two spherical ceramic hydrophone elements with a frequency response of ~2–150 kHz (Seiche UK Ltd.)	SECAC	192 kHz	± 1.5 dB 1 Hz–15 kHz ~2–150 kHz	3	2.25	186	94	Between 0.50 and 1.20 km	5–17 km
Mediterranean Sea (from Tyrrhenian to Alboran Sea)	Stereo towed hydrophone with Benthos AQ4 in 1998 and mono towed with AQ4 in 1999	GREC	44.1 kHz 48 kHz	± 2 dB 200 Hz–30 kHz	5	3.06	577	207	Between 0.20 and 1.20 km	6–71 km

Fig. 2 Sample spectrogram representing a bottlenose dolphin whistle. Parameters manually measured for each whistle are shown: signal duration, beginning frequency, end frequency, minimum frequency, maximum frequency, the number of inflection points, the number of steps and the number of relative minima and relative maxima in the contour. Frequency range was calculated as maximum frequency minus minimum frequency

calculated the frequency range (maximum frequency–minimum frequency). Since we could not know the emitter, we considered on the whole dataset a mean of four sounds per animal per sighting. Furthermore, to avoid overestimation of the most repeated whistle structure due to the occurrence of possible signature whistles (Caldwell et al. 1990; Sayigh et al. 1990, 1998; Janik et al. 1994; Tyack 1997; Janik and Slater 1998; Janik 2000; Fripp et al. 2005) or mimicry between individuals, the contribution to the entire data set from signals with contour similar to another one was not allowed to exceed 14 %. To prevent any type of statistical bias due to this percentage, we randomized ten times the new dataset and compared 80 % of the data contained in each randomized dataset. Since we obtained different results only for the frequency range, parameter strictly related to the maximum and minimum frequencies, we decided not to consider it in the analysis.

Data analysis

For each parameter, within- and between-basin coefficients of variation (CVs) were calculated as the ratio of the standard deviation to the mean (using all whistles for within-basin calculations and the mean value for each location for between-basin calculations) and expressed as a percentage

(Lehner 1998). In order to evaluate which parameters are more likely to contribute to differences between whistles from different locations (the Mediterranean, the Azores, the Canary Islands and the Bay of Biscay), we compared inter-area CVs and intra-area CVs. The statistical software package PASW Statistics 18.0 (SPSS Institute Inc., Chicago, IL, USA) was used to create descriptive statistics (mean and standard deviation). Since the data were not normally distributed, we used the Mann–Whitney non-parametric test to determine whether and which whistle parameters varied between areas. We performed a discriminant function analysis (DFA) using the mean values for each sighting to determine whether whistles recorded could be correctly classified to the sampling areas. In this case, all the assumptions of the DFA were met. The leave-one-out procedure (Lachenbruch and Mickey 1968) was then used for cross-validation. Unfortunately, the sample from the Bay of Biscay was only represented by a single sighting, so, in view of the possibility of bias due to the homogeneity of signals in a short period and a single group, the recording was not considered in univariate and discriminant function analyses. Finally, we performed a hierarchical cluster analysis (using the within groups average linkage method) with the mean values for each sighting to classify them into the four study locations: Azores, Bay of Biscay, Canaries and Mediterranean Sea. For all of the multivariate statistics, we

249 did not consider frequency range as a predictor variable due to
 250 its relationship with maximum and minimum frequency pa-
 251 rameters (Fig. 3).

252 Results

253 Study effort

254 For the Mediterranean Sea, we analyzed 3.06 h of recordings
 255 from which we extracted 577 whistles. For the statistical anal-
 256 ysis, we considered 207 good quality sounds that originated
 257 from five sightings. For the Canary archipelago, we analyzed
 258 2.25 h and extracted 186 whistles. We considered 94 sounds
 259 belonging to three sightings. For the Azores archipelago, 5.32 h
 260 from 20 sightings were investigated. We extracted 866 whistles
 261 and 352 of them were analyzed. In the Bay of Biscay, 0.18 h of
 262 recordings from one sighting were collected from which 94
 263 whistles were extracted and analyzed (Table 1).

264 Whistle variation between the Atlantic Ocean 265 and the Mediterranean Sea

266 Parameters related to signal frequency were significantly higher
 267 in the Atlantic Ocean than in the Mediterranean, especially the
 268 beginning (Mann–Whitney test $N=747$, $Z=-6.03$, $P<0.001$),
 269 minimum ($Z=-4.07$, $P<0.001$) and maximum ($Z=-3.95$, $P<$
 270 0.001) frequencies. Mean values of signal modulation param-
 271 eters, such as number of inflections and number of minima, were
 272 significantly lower in the Atlantic Ocean ($Z=5.20$, $P<0.001$;
 273 $Z=2.95$, $P<0.001$). The number of steps, maxima, end

frequency and signal duration did not show significant differ-
 274 ences between the basins ($Z=-0.68$, $P=0.49$; $Z=-0.63$, $P=$
 275 0.53 ; $Z=-1.59$, $P=0.11$; $Z=-1.49$, $P=0.13$; Table 2). The
 276 sightings could be correctly classified using DFA for 79.3 % of
 277 cross-validated cases (Table 3). The parameters that contributed
 278 to the classification were end frequency (coefficient=0.89) and
 279 number of inflection points (coefficient=0.68).

Whistle variation within and between areas

281
 282 We performed a hierarchical cluster analysis using the mean
 283 values for the parameters for each sighting. The cluster anal-
 284 ysis grouped three sightings from the Mediterranean Sea with
 285 one from the Canary archipelago. Three sightings from the
 286 Azores were also clustered separately from the other sightings
 287 from the region. The rest of the Atlantic sightings (2 from the
 288 Canaries, 17 from the Azores and 1 from the Bay of Biscay)
 289 were grouped together with the two sightings from the
 290 Alboran Sea (Fig. 4). The DFA performed using the mean
 291 values of the parameters for each sighting confirmed the
 292 results of the hierarchical cluster analysis. In this case, we
 293 excluded the Bay of Biscay because it contributed only one
 294 sighting. From the scatter plot of the analysis, it was possible
 295 to graphically identify one group encompassing the Azores,
 296 two sightings from the Alboran Sea (Mediterranean basin) and
 297 two from the Canaries and another group with the rest of the
 298 Mediterranean and Canarian sightings (Fig. 3).

299 Inter-area CVs of frequency parameters were generally
 300 lower, especially when compared with corresponding intra-
 301 area values (Table 2). Maximum frequency and range of
 302 frequency had the lowest inter-area CVs. The inter-area CVs
 303 for number of inflection points and steps ($CV=36.18$, 42.25)
 304 were nearly double those for other modulation parameters and
 305 had only slightly higher intra-area CVs.

306 In order to evaluate the differences found between the
 307 Alboran Sea sightings and the rest of the Mediterranean
 308 (Eastern Almeria), we compared the mean values of the param-
 309 eters. Signal duration in the Alboran Sea was significantly
 310 longer (Mann–Whitney test $N=207$, $Z=3.55$, $P<0.001$), while
 311 beginning, end and minimum and maximum frequencies were
 312 lower than in the rest of the Mediterranean ($Z=-3.64$, $P<$
 313 0.001 ; $Z=-7.52$, $P<0.001$; $Z=-6.22$, $P<0.001$; $Z=-4.98$, P
 314 <0.001 , respectively). In particular, the mean value of the end
 315 frequency parameter in the Alboran Sea was almost half the
 316 other Mediterranean sounds. Thus, this explains the differences
 317 among the parameter comparison for which there is no signif-
 318 icant difference in end frequency and the DFA, where end
 319 frequency is the most important parameter to discriminate
 320 between Atlantic and Mediterranean. The number of inflection
 321 points and number of maxima were double or higher ($Z=2.52$,
 322 $P=0.01$; $Z=5.29$, $P<0.001$; Table 4). The number of steps and
 323 the number of minima ($Z=-0.82$, $P=0.41$; $Z=1.73$, $P=0.08$)
 324 did not show any variation.

Fig. 3 Scatter plot of the discriminant function analysis performed using the mean values of each parameter for the sightings (Azores Islands, 20 sightings; Canary Islands, 3 sightings; Mediterranean Sea, 5 sightings)

t2.1 **Table 2** Means and intra- and inter-area CVs for each parameter in the areas. The CVs are expressed in percentage

t2.2		Mediterranean Sea			Canary archipelago			Azores archipelago			Bay of Biscay			Inter-area CV	Atlantic Ocean		
t2.3		N=207			N=94			N=352			N=94				N=540		
t2.4	Parameters	Mean	SD	CV	Mean	SD	CV	Mean	SD	CV	Mean	SD	CV		Mean	SD	CV
t2.5	Duration (s)	1.03	0.58	55.73	0.77	0.52	66.97	0.97	0.49	50.18	1.10	0.43	39.07	14.61	0.96	0.49	51.34
t2.6	Beginning frequency (Hz)	8315	3580	43.06	11125	4419	39.72	10094	4081	40.43	9406	3591	38.18	12.13	10153	4087	40.25
t2.7	End frequency (Hz)	9342	4512	48.29	11908	4625	38.83	8658	4088	47.22	11309	4560	40.32	15.05	9685	4491	46.37
t2.8	Minimum frequency (Hz)	6134	2080	33.91	7204	1827	25.35	6360	2001	31.47	7187	1614	22.45	8.27	6650	1947	29.28
t2.9	Maximum frequency (Hz)	14186	3674	25.90	16270	5005	30.76	15257	3900	25.56	16962	2423	14.28	7.73	15729	3963	25.19
t2.10	Range of frequency (Hz)	8052	3428	42.57	9066	5099	56.25	8897	3491	39.24	9775	2543	26.01	7.91	9079	3694	40.69
t2.11	Inflection points	2.93	2.42	82.69	1.18	1.77	150.04	2.12	2.55	120.18	2.90	2.40	82.52	36.18	2.09	2.45	117.22
t2.12	Steps	2.42	3.15	130.04	1.01	1.79	177.42	3.20	3.90	121.57	2.01	2.37	117.94	42.25	2.61	3.49	133.30
t2.13	Number of minima	1.17	0.94	79.70	0.81	1.12	138.46	1.13	1.25	110.14	0.89	1.14	127.61	17.89	1.04	1.21	117.33
t2.14	Number of maxima	1.16	0.99	84.72	0.90	1.04	114.75	1.20	1.13	93.51	1.22	1.09	89.02	13.19	1.16	1.11	95.97

325 Although the Atlantic sightings could be grouped together,
326 as evidenced by the DFA, the heterogeneity highlighted in the
327 cluster analysis within the Central–Eastern North Atlantic led
328 us to evaluate the variation of the parameters in particular
329 between the Canary archipelago and the Azores islands.
330 Significant differences were found in parameters related to
331 frequency (Mann–Whitney test: $N=446$, beginning frequency
332 $Z=-2.05$, $P<0.04$; end frequency $Z=-6.09$, $P<0.001$; min-
333 imum frequency $Z=-3.63$, $P<0.001$) and signal duration
334 ($Z=4.23$, $P<0.001$). Other parameters that also showed sig-
335 nificant variation between the locations were number of in-
336 flection points ($Z=3.64$, $P<0.001$), steps ($Z=6.37$, $P<$
337 0.001), minima ($Z=2.83$, $P<0.001$) and maxima ($Z=2.64$,
338 $P<0.001$). Maximum frequency did not show any differences
339 ($Z=-1.34$, $P=0.18$).

340 **Discussion**

341 Given the complexity of the genetic and ecological character-
342 istics of bottlenose dolphins (Hoelzel et al. 1998), two

scenarios can be put forward to interpret the variability ob-
served in the communication sounds of the species in the
Central–Eastern North Atlantic and the Mediterranean Sea:

- 1 No variation exists within the Central–Eastern North
Atlantic, but a difference exists between the Atlantic
Ocean and the Western Mediterranean Sea consistent with
the partial isolation proposed by genetic studies, which
have identified a single large population for each basin
(Natoli et al. 2005), although with some gene flow be-
tween the Atlantic Ocean and the Western Mediterranean.
- 2 Significant differences exist between the characteristics of
the signals of the locations of the same basin due to local
conditions of the acoustic and social environments of
resident individuals.

Unfortunately, data about the social (number of specimen
per group, site fidelity, associated behaviour to whistles),
ecological and physical environment (natural and anthropo-
genic noise, bathymetry, etc.) were not available for every site,
and we could not assess the effect of these factors, but based
on our acoustic results, we suggest that both scenarios coexist
in the study area.

t3.1 **Table 3** Assignment of the dis-
t3.2 criminant function analysis
performed between the Atlantic
Ocean and the Mediterranean Sea

	Area	Predicted group membership (%)		Total (%)	Overall classification
		Atlantic Ocean	Mediterranean Sea		
t3.4	Original	Atlantic Ocean	83.33	100	79.3 %
t3.5		Mediterranean Sea	20.00		
t3.6	Cross-validated	Atlantic Ocean	83.33	100	
t3.7		Mediterranean Sea	40.00		

Fig. 4 Dendrogram of the hierarchic cluster analysis performed using mean values of each parameter for the sightings

Table 4 Means and intra-area CVs for each parameter in the areas

Parameters	Alboran Sea			Eastern Almeria		
	N=177			N=30		
	Mean	SD	CV	Mean	SD	CV
Duration (s)	1.08	0.6	55.16	0.76	0.33	44.06
Beginning frequency (Hz)	7,953	3458	43.49	10,451	3,598	34.43
End frequency (Hz)	8,169	3,525	43.15	16,265	3,344	20.56
Minimum frequency (Hz)	5,720	1,823	31.88	8,577	1,826	21.29
Maximum frequency (Hz)	13,700	3,690	26.94	17,052	1,813	10.63
Range of frequency (Hz)	7,981	3,604	45.16	8,475	2,101	24.79
Inflection points	3.10	2.48	79.87	1.93	1.82	94.04
Steps	2.45	3.29	134.65	2.27	2.12	93.36
Number of minima	1.22	0.96	78.36	0.90	0.76	84.32
Number of maxima	1.31	0.98	74.76	0.33	0.55	164.00

Our results confirm the existence of a significant divergence between the Central–Eastern North Atlantic and the Mediterranean Sea. About 79 % of the sightings were correctly assigned to one of the two basins based on frequency and modulation parameters of the whistles. Furthermore, within the Atlantic Ocean, the sightings can be grouped together (both with DFA and cluster analysis) with the exception of one sighting from the Canary Islands that clusters with the Alboran Sea recordings. Our acoustic results suggest that bottlenose dolphins occurring in North Atlantic pelagic waters belong to a large oceanic population consistent with the results reported by genetic studies. Quérroul et al. (2007) showed that bottlenose dolphins inhabiting the waters around the Azores and the island of Madeira have high gene flow, lack population structure within and between areas and are more similar to the pelagic populations of the Western North Atlantic than to dolphins from the Eastern Atlantic or the Mediterranean. Unlike coastal populations, oceanic bottlenose dolphins maintain high levels of gene flow and genetic diversity (Natoli et al. 2004, Quérroul et al. 2007). Furthermore, in the Azores archipelago, Silva et al. (2008) reported the absence of habitat partitioning between resident and non-resident dolphins. In the Canary Islands, bottlenose dolphins do not seem to be island associated, but moved between several islands of the archipelago (Castrillón et al. 2011; Tobeña et al. 2013). This suggests a situation similar to the Azores Islands. Nevertheless, although sightings could be grouped together, large heterogeneity was found in the Central–Eastern North Atlantic, where differences in acoustic parameters may represent local adaptations to the acoustic and social environments.

Furthermore, the coefficients of variation showed a high variability within each location, especially for the Canary Islands and the Mediterranean Sea. In these locations, the acoustic sample came from just a few sightings; nevertheless, results from the DFA and the hierarchical cluster analysis confirmed the variability highlighted, suggesting differences in the samples of both locations and the need for a more detailed study investigating micro-geographic variation.

Within the Mediterranean, sounds recorded from the Alboran Sea were significantly different from the recordings made in the Gulf of Vera, the Provencal and the Tyrrhenian Sea. The Alboran Sea whistles exhibited significantly lower frequency parameters and higher signal duration and modulation. Our acoustic results therefore suggest the presence of two different groups in the Mediterranean basin. Furthermore, although the mean values of the parameters from this area varied from those of Atlantic Ocean, the frequency parameters from the Alboran Sea were more similar to those from the Azores Archipelago. These results suggest that the Alboran Sea may be an area that is ecologically distinct from the rest of the Mediterranean and is perhaps a zone of transition between the Mediterranean and the Atlantic Ocean. Castellote et al.

(2012) reported that fin whale (*Balaenoptera physalus*) calls detected in the Alboran basin and the Strait of Gibraltar were more similar to calls recorded in the Azores than to calls recorded elsewhere in the Western Mediterranean. These authors suggest that North Atlantic fin whales cross the Strait of Gibraltar and enter the Mediterranean Sea, but do not venture further than the Alboran Sea. Similarly, our recordings from the Alboran area are different to the rest of the Mediterranean, allowing us to assume that within their distribution range Mediterranean bottlenose dolphins have more than one evolutionary unit (considered as a distinct local population within a species that has different behavioural and phenological traits and thus harbours enough genetic uniqueness to warrant its own management and conservation). Furthermore, since the closest recording was collected in the Gulf of Vera (40 km east of the Alboran Sea), the possible limits to the distribution of Alboran animals may be at the Eastern end of the Alboran Sea, where an interchange zone could be present but not picked up by our sampling. The oceanographic features of the area, represented by the Almeria-Oran front, have already been suggested as a barrier to the movement of some species that leads to the creation of local populations of prey and their predators (Natoli et al. 2005). Bottlenose dolphins show genetic differentiation on either side of this front (Natoli et al. 2005), which is consistent with the acoustic results from our study.

In the Gibraltar area, the bottlenose dolphin population is considered strictly resident (Chico et al. 2011): in 2008, after 9 years of study, the re-sighting rate was found to be 90 %. A recent genetic study identifies individuals from the area as a pelagic population (Louis et al. 2013). Therefore, the Alboran basin may be inhabited by animals differentiated from the rest of the Mediterranean as a result of distinct habitat features, for example the presence of seamounts scattered through the whole area and currents coming from the Atlantic Ocean. The similarity between the oceanographic features of the Atlantic and the Almerian barrier suggests that an offshore population in the area could explain the acoustic relationship with the population inhabiting the Central–Eastern North Atlantic. This interpretation has important conservation implications since it suggests the presence of at least two different evolutionary units in the Mediterranean basin. Nevertheless, more data are needed to get new insights into the variability within the Mediterranean Sea especially where our relatively small sample size identified the possibility of a considerable acoustic difference.

The results reported here have value for the management of the species in the areas considered. Together with data from genetic studies, they provide a basis for defining bottlenose dolphin population ranges and give guidance to efforts aimed at defining conservation stocks. Despite common bottlenose dolphins' vocalizations being characterized by features under different selective forces and influenced by vocal production

470 learning, their variation can be considered a proxy for the
 471 differentiation of evolutionary units that show genetic
 472 variation.

473 **Acknowledgments** The authors are grateful to IFAW for its contribu-
 474 tion in the data collection. Without its support, this project could not have
 475 been accomplished. Data collection and processing in the Azores was
 476 funded by Fundação para a Ciência e a Tecnologia (FCT), Direcção
 477 Regional Para a Ciência, Tecnologia e Comunicações (DRCTC),
 478 FEDER, the Competitiveness Factors Operational (COMPETE), QREN
 479 European Social Fund and Proconvergência Açores Program through
 480 research projects PTDC/MAR/74071/2006 and M2.1.2/F/012/2011.
 481 The authors acknowledge funds provided by FCT to LARSyS
 482 Associated Laboratory and IMAR-University of the Azores/the
 483 Thematic Area E of the Strategic Project (OE and compete) and by the
 484 DRCTC–Government of the Azores pluriannual funding. MAS was
 485 supported by an FCT postdoctoral grant (SFRH/BPD/29841/2006), IC
 486 and RP were supported by FCT doctoral grants (respectively SFRH/BD/
 487 41192/2007 and SFRH/BD/32520/2006). RP received a research grant
 488 from the Azores Regional Fund for Science and Technology (M3.1.5/F/
 489 115/2012). Data collection by SECAC was funded by the EU LIFE
 490 programme—project LIFE INDEMARES (LIFE 07/NAT/E/000732)—
 491 and the Fundación Biodiversidad under the Spanish Ministry of
 492 Environment, Rural and Marine Affairs (project ZEC-TURSIOPS).

493 **Conflict of interest** None of the authors has any conflict of interest with
 494 the contents of the manuscript.
 495

496 **Ethical standards** The work has been carried out without putting at
 497 risk endangered populations, species or habitats in agreements with the
 498 “Guidelines for the Use of Animals in Research.”
 499

500 References

502 Azzolin M (2008) Acoustic identification of Mediterranean odontocetes
 503 as a prerequisite for their passive acoustic monitoring. Ph.D. Thesis,
 504 University of Torino, Italy
 505 Baron SC, Marinéz L, Garrison P, Keith KO (2008) Differences in
 506 acoustic signals from delphinids in the western North Atlantic and
 507 northern Gulf of Mexico. *Mar Mamm Sci* 24:42–56
 508 Bazua-Duran C, Au WWL (2002) The whistles of Hawaiian spinner
 509 dolphins. *J Acoust Soc Am* 112:3064–3072
 510 Bearzi G, Holcer D, di Notarbartolo Sciarra G (2004) The role of historical
 511 dolphin takes and habitat degradation in shaping the present status of
 512 northern Adriatic cetaceans. *Aquat Conserv Mar Freshw Ecosys* 14:
 513 363–379
 514 Ben Naceur L, Gannier A, Bradai MN, Drouot V, Bourreau S, Laran S,
 515 Khalfallah N, Mrabet R, Bdioui M (2004) Recensement du grand
 516 dauphin *Tursiops truncatus* dans les eaux tunisiennes. *Bulletin de*
 517 *l'Institut National des Sciences et Technologies de la Mer de*
 518 *Salammbô* 31:75–81
 519 Caldwell MC, Caldwell DK (1972) Vocal mimicry in the whistle mode by
 520 an Atlantic bottlenosed dolphin. *Cetology* 9:1–8
 521 Caldwell MC, Caldwell DK, Tyack PL (1990) Review of the signature-
 522 whistle hypothesis for the Atlantic bottlenose dolphin. In:
 523 Leatherwood S, Reeves RR (eds) *The bottlenose dolphin*.
 524 Academic, San Diego, pp 199–235
 525 Castellote M, Clark CW, Lammers MO (2012) Fin whale (*Balaenoptera*
 526 *physalus*) population identity in the western Mediterranean Sea.
 527 *Mar Mamm Sci* 28:325–344
 528 Castrillón J, Reyes M, Ruiz L, Pérez-Gil E, Brederlau B, Neves S, Pérez-
 529 Gil M, Tejedor M, Servidio A, Herrero R, Lucas T, Urquiola E,

Martín V (2011) Simultaneous survey of bottlenose dolphin
 (*Tursiops truncatus*) in five special areas of conservation in
 Canary Islands. 25th Conference of the European Cetacean
 Society, Cadiz, Spain
 Charlton-Robb K, Taylor AC, McKechnie SW (2006) A note on diver-
 gent mtDNA lineages of bottlenose dolphins from coastal waters of
 Southern Australia. *J Cet Res Manag* 8:173–179
 Charlton-Robb K, Gershwin LA, Thompson R, Austin J, Owen K,
 McKechnie SW (2011) A New Dolphin Species, the Burrunan
 Dolphin *Tursiops australis* sp. nov., Endemic to Southern
 Australian Coastal Waters. *PLoS One* 6:E24047
 Chico C, Jimenez-Torres C, Perez S, Verborgh P, Gauffier P, Esteban R,
 Gimenez J, Santos ME, De Stephanis R (2011) Survival rate, abun-
 dance and residency of bottlenose dolphin (*Tursiops truncatus*) in
 the strait of Gibraltar. 25th Conference of the European Cetacean
 Society, Cadiz, Spain
 Duffield DA, Ridgeway SH, Cornell LH (1983) Hematology distin-
 guishes coastal and offshore forms of dolphins (*Tursiops*). *Can J*
Zool 61:930–933
 Forcada J, Gazo M, Aguilar A, Gonzalvo J, Fernandez-Contreras M
 (2004) Bottlenose dolphin abundance in the NW Mediterranean:
 addressing heterogeneity in distribution. *Mar Ecol Prog Ser* 275:
 275–287
 Fripp D, Owen C, Quintana-Rizzo E, Shapiro A, Buckstaff K, Jankowski
 K, Wells R, Tyack PL (2005) Bottlenose dolphin (*Tursiops*
truncatus) calves appear to model their signature whistles on the
 signature whistles of community members. *Anim Cogn* 8:17–26
 Gannier A (2005) Summer distribution and relative abundance of
 delphinids in the Mediterranean sea. *Rev Ecol (Terre Vie)* 60:223–
 238
 Hawkins ER (2010) Geographic variations in the whistles of bottlenose
 dolphins (*Tursiops aduncus*) along the east and west coasts of
 Australia. *J Acoust Soc Am* 128:924–935
 Hershkovitz P (1966) A catalogue of living whales. *Bull US Nat Mus*
 246:1–259
 Hoelzel AR, Potter CW, Best PB (1998) Genetic differentiation between
 parapatric ‘nearshore’ and ‘offshore’ populations of the bottlenose
 dolphin. *Proc R Soc London B* 265:1177–1183
 Janik VM (2000) Whistle matching in wild bottlenose dolphin (*Tursiops*
truncatus). *Science* 289:1355–1357
 Janik VM, Slater PJB (1998) Context-specific use suggests that
 bottlenose dolphin signature whistles are cohesion calls. *Anim*
Behav 56:829–838
 Janik VM, Dehnhardt G, Todt D (1994) Signature whistle variations in a
 bottlenosed dolphin, *Tursiops truncatus*. *Behav Ecol Sociobiol* 35:
 243–248
 Jones GJ, Sayigh LS (2002) Geographical variation in rates of vocal
 production of free-ranging bottlenose dolphins. *Mar Mamm Sci*
 18:374–393
 Lachenbruch PA, Mickey MR (1968) Estimation of error rates in dis-
 criminant analysis. *Technometrics* 10:1–11
 Lehner PN (1998) *Handbook of ethological methods*, 2nd edn.
 Cambridge University, Cambridge, p 672
 Louis M, Guinet C, Lucas T, Viricel A, Peltier H, Alfonsi E, Berrow S,
 Brownlow A, Covelo P, Dabin W, Deaville R, Gally F, Gauffier P,
 Penrose R, Silva M, Simon-Bouhet B (2013) Population genetics of
 bottlenose dolphins in the North East Atlantic: a pelagic versus
 coastal segregation. 27th Conference of the European Cetacean
 Society, Setubal, Portugal
 May-Collado LJ, Wartzok D (2008) A comparison of bottlenose dolphin
 whistles in the Atlantic Ocean: factors promoting whistle variation. *J*
Mammal 89:1229–1240
 May-Collado LJ, Agnarsson I, Wartzok D (2007) Re-examining the
 relationship between body size and tonal signals frequency in
 whales: a comparative approach using a novel phylogeny. *Mar*
Mamm Sci 23:524–552

- 596 Mead JG, Potter CW (1995) Recognizing two populations of the bottlenose
597 dolphin (*Tursiops truncatus*) of the Atlantic coast of North America:
598 morphologic and ecologic considerations. IBI Rep 5:31–44
599 Morato T, Machete M, Kitchingman A, Tempera F, Lai S, Menezes G,
600 Pitcher TJ, Santos RS (2008) Abundance and distribution of sea-
601 mounts in the Azores. Mar Ecol Prog Ser 357:17–21
602 Morisaka T, Shinohara M, Nakahara F, Akamatsu T (2005) Geographic
603 variations in the whistles among three Indo-Pacific bottlenose dol-
604 phin *Tursiops aduncus* populations in Japan. Fish Sci 71:568–576
605 Natoli A, Peddemors VM, Hoelzel AR (2004) Population structure and
606 speciation in the genus *Tursiops* based on microsatellite and mito-
607 chondrial DNA analyses. J Evol Biol 17:363–375
608 Natoli A, Birkun A, Aguilar A, Lopez A, Hoelzel AR (2005) Habitat
609 structure and the dispersal of male and female bottlenose dolphins
610 (*Tursiops truncatus*) based on microsatellite and mitochondrial
611 DNA analyses. Proc R Soc London B 272:1217–1226
612 Notarbartolo di Sciarra G, Demma M (2004) Guida dei mammiferi marini
613 del Mediterraneo. In: Franco Muzzio (Ed) Scienze naturali Padova
614 Oswald JN, Barlow J, Norris TF (2003) Acoustic identification of nine
615 delphinid species in the eastern tropical pacific ocean. Mar Mamm Sci
616 19:20–37
617 Oswald JN, Rankin S, Barlow J, Lammers MO (2007) A tool for real-
618 time acoustic species identification of delphinid whistles. J Acoust
619 Soc Am 122:587–595
620 Quérouil S, Silva MA, Freitas L, Prieto R, Magalhaes S, Dinis A, Alves F,
621 Matos JA, Mendonca D, Hammond PS, Santos RS (2007) High
622 gene flow in oceanic bottlenose dolphins (*Tursiops truncatus*) of the
623 North Atlantic. Conserv Genet. doi:10.1007/s10592-007-9291-5
624 Reiss D, McCowan B (1993) Spontaneous vocal mimicry and production
625 by bottlenose dolphins (*Tursiops truncatus*): evidence for vocal
626 learning. J Comp Psychol 107:301–312
627 Ross GJB (1977) The taxonomy of bottlenose dolphins, *Tursiops species*,
628 in South African waters, with notes on their biology. Ann Cape
629 Provincial Mus 11:135–194
630 Ross GJB (1984) The smaller cetaceans of the southeast coast of southern
631 Africa. Ann Cape Provincial Mus 15:173–410
632 Ross GJB, Cockcroft VC (1990) Comments on Australian bottlenose
633 dolphins and the taxonomic status of *Tursiops aduncus* (Ehrenberg,
634 1832). In: Leatherwood S, Reeves RR (eds) The bottlenose dolphin.
635 Academic, New York, pp 101–128
636 Sayigh LS, Tyack PT, Wells RS, Scott MD (1990) Signature whistles of
637 free-ranging bottlenose dolphins *Tursiops truncatus*: stability and
638 mother–offspring comparisons. Behav Ecol Sociobiol 26:247–260
682
Sayigh LS, Tyack PL, Wells RS, Solows AR, Scott MD, Irvine 639
AB (1998) Individual recognition in wild bottlenose dol- 640
phins: a field test using playback experiments. Anim Behav 641
57:41–50 642
Segura I, Rocha-Olivares A, Flores-Ramirez S, Rojas-Bracho L (2006) 643
Conservation implications of the genetic and ecological distinction 644
of *Tursiops truncatus* ecotypes in the Gulf of California. Biol 645
Conserv 133:336–346 646
Silva MA, Prieto R, Magalhães S, Seabra MI, Santos RS, Hammond PS 647
(2008) Ranging patterns of bottlenose dolphins living in oceanic 648
waters: implications for population structure. Mar Biol 156:179–192 649
Sokal RR, Rohlf FJ (1995) Biometry: the principles and practice of 650
statistics in biological research, 3rd edn. Freeman W. H. and Co., 651
New York 652
Tobeña M, Escáñez A, Rodríguez Y, López C, Ritter F, Aguilar N (2013). 653Q8
Inter-island movements of common bottlenose dolphins (*Tursiops*
654 *truncatus* Montagu, 1821) among the Canary Islands: Online cata-
655 logues and implications for conservation and management. Afr J
656 Mar Sci (in press) 657
Torres LG, Rosel PE, D'Agrosa C, Read AJ (2003) Improving manage-
658 ment of overlapping bottlenose dolphin ecotypes through spatial
659 analysis and genetics. Mar Mamm Sci 19:502–514 660
Tyack PL (1986) Whistle repertoires of two bottlenosed dolphins,
661 *Tursiops truncatus*: mimicry of signature whistles? Behav Ecol
662 Sociobiol 18:251–257 663
Tyack PL (1997) Development and social functions of signature whistles
664 in bottlenose dolphins *Tursiops truncatus*. Bioacoustics 8:21–46
665
Van Waerebeek K, Reyes JC, Read AJ, McKinnon J (1990) Preliminary
666 observations of bottlenose dolphins from the Pacific coast of South
667 America. In: Leatherwood S, Reeves RR (eds) The bottlenose
668 dolphin. Academic, New York, pp 143–154 669
Viaud-Martinez KA, Brownell RL, Komnenou A, Bohonak AJ (2008)
670 Genetic isolation and morphological divergence of Black Sea
671 bottlenose dolphins. Biol Conserv 141:1600–1611 672
Walker WA (1981) Geographic variation in morphology and biology of
673 bottlenose dolphins (*Tursiops*) in the eastern North Pacific. NOAA/
674 NMFS Southwest Fisheries Science Centre Administrative Report
675 no. LJ-81-3c 676
Wang D, Wursig B, Evans WE (1995) Whistles of bottlenose dolphins:
677 comparisons among populations. Aquat Mamm 21:65–67 678
Wells RS, Rhinehart HL, Cunningham P, Whaley J, Baran M, Koberna C,
679 Costa DP (1999) Long distance offshore movements of bottlenose
680 dolphins. Mar Mamm Sci 15:1098–1114 681

AUTHOR QUERIES

AUTHOR PLEASE ANSWER ALL QUERIES.

- Q1. Please check if the affiliations are presented correctly.
- Q2. The citation “May-Collado et al. 2008” (original) has been changed to “May-Collado and Wartzok 2008”. Please check if appropriate.
- Q3. Please check Tables if presented correctly.
- Q4. “Papale et al. (2013)” is cited in text but not given in the reference list. Please provide details in the list or delete the citation from the text.
- Q5. Missing citation for Figure 3 was inserted here. Please check if appropriate. Otherwise, please provide citation for Figure 3. Note that the order of main citations of figures/tables in the text must be sequential.
- Q6. Table 5 has been changed to Table 4. Please check if correct.
- Q7. Sokal and Rohlf (1995) has been provided in the reference list but its citation in the text/body is missing. Please advise location of its citation. Otherwise, delete it from the reference list.
- Q8. Please provide updated bibliographic information for reference Tobeña et al.
- Q9. Figure 2 contains poor quality of text. Please provide replacement. Otherwise, please advise if okay to proceed with the figure/s as is.