Ergodicity breaking and lack of a typical waiting time in area-restricted search of avian predators
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Movement tracks of wild animals frequently fit models of anomalous rather than simple diffusion, mostly reported as ergodic superdiffusive motion combining area-restricted search within a local patch and larger-scale commuting between patches, as highlighted by the Lévy walk paradigm. Since Lévy walks are scale invariant, superdiffusive motion is also expected within patches, yet investigation of such local movements has been precluded by the lack of accurate high-resolution data at this scale. Here, using rich high-resolution movement datasets (>7×10^7 localizations) from 70 individuals and continuous-time random walk modeling, we found subdiffusive behavior and ergodicity breaking in the localized movement of three species of avian predators.
Movement of organisms is of key interest in many scientific fields, playing an essential role in a wide range of biological and ecological systems. The movement ecology paradigm aims to integrate theoretical and empirical frameworks for studying the causes and mechanisms underlying movement patterns, and their consequences, in all organisms (1). Within this framework, individual-based modeling of movement is imperative for understanding the dynamics of ecological systems at multiple spatial and temporal scales (2). With the increasing availability of high-quality tracking data, models can be refined to infer behaviors and to draw causal links between observed phenomena and their underlying mechanisms beyond phenomenological description of the observed patterns. This capacity, however, requires high spatiotemporal resolution of tracking data that is crucial for inferring behavior from movement data at sufficiently fine scales in which animals sense and respond to their dynamic environment (1, 3, 4).

Movement of animals varies across spatiotemporal scales due to resource patchiness, seasonality or other environment features such as competition, predator-prey dynamics and various other biotic interactions; all typically vary across scales (1, 3, 5–8). Inferring behavior from one scale to another can thus lead to nonrepresentative results (7, 8). In particular, real-life landscapes are typically heterogeneous, and animals routinely alternate between an extensive commuting mode of movement between resource-rich patches, and an intensive searching mode of area-restricted search (ARS) for prey within a local patch (5, 7, 9, 10). Such alternating behavior was claimed to increase foraging efficiency under specific conditions (11, 12). Elucidating the drivers of this common alternating behavior requires detailed information on animal movement both within and between patches at high spatial accuracy and temporal resolution, for multiple individuals and over a sufficiently long time, which are difficult to obtain with standard wildlife telemetry tools (7). Furthermore, established scaling laws in animal movement (see below) commonly engage averaging across conspecific individuals (13, 14), whereas intraspecific variation has only recently received significant attention (14–16). While many studies have dis-
tinguished an extensive commuting mode from an intensive searching (ARS) mode, movement within ARS has seldom been analyzed, overlooking a critical scale of foraging movement essential for elucidating the patterns and mechanisms underlying variation in movement behavior.

Animal movement has often been modelled by anomalous diffusion, and considered scale-free by incorporating the Lévy-walk formalism (17–19). Lévy walks – random walks (RWs) with jump lengths drawn from a fat-tailed distribution (20, 21) – have been hypothesized to reflect an optimal foraging strategy in landscapes with sparsely distributed resources (22, 23). Yet, this hypothesis remains debatable (5, 15, 24–26), since anomalous diffusion may also arise from alternative mechanisms (19). Here local movement within ARS are referred to as jumps, while movement between ARS is referred to as commuting. Furthermore, due to the scale-free nature of these power-law distributions, the Lévy-walk hypothesis implies that patterns are similar at different scales (21). This stands in contrast with the growing evidence for multiphasic movement (5–8), though analyses based on high-resolution tracking of wild animals across multiple scales are still too scarce to generalize whether animals mostly move in a scale-free or a scale-specific manner.

Besides a fat-tailed jump distribution, Lévy walks can also possess long waiting times (WTs) (27), reported for ambush (sit and wait) predators such as marine molluscs and fish (28); mobile free-ranging foragers such as seabirds (29, 30); insects (9) and cattle (31) in experimental arenas; and humans (32). The underlying reasons for long WTs span from long rests (33), pauses to more effectively search for hidden prey and to organize attacks, or due to intra- and inter-specific interactions such as mating, territorial guarding and predator avoidance (34, 35). Overall, animals exhibit a wide range of intermittent foraging behaviors, from ambush with very long stops and short or no moves, through saltation (stop and go) alternating between stops and moves of intermediate length, to cruising (widely ranging) with constant movement and a few stops (34, 35). It has been recently suggested that scale-free temporal dynamics are
the equivalent of the Lévy-walk scale-free spatial patterns for ambush predators (36). We propose a different conjecture, further elaborated below, that there exists a shift from nonergodic to ergodic and possibly from sub- to super-diffusive dynamics along this static-to-mobile foraging continuum.

Discerning between ergodic or nonergodic processes is a key challenge in studies of dynamical systems and stochastic processes in physics and mathematics (37). However, this issue has been widely overlooked in other scientific disciplines (38), including among ecologists. In ergodic systems, different samples (e.g. commuting paths) are equally representative of the whole, hence averaging informs on a typical behavior. Nonergodic systems, in contrast, encompass a discrepancy between long-time averaging over a sampled path (e.g. ARS) and an ensemble average of paths, entailing a lack of a typical behavior. Assessment of ergodicity is therefore of great importance in analysis of animal movement, dictating whether one can infer behavior by averaging across an ensemble of movement segments. Moreover, ergodicity breaking often entails ageing, indicating a tendency to decrease diffusivity over time (37). In an ecological context, ageing would infer that metrics involving averages over measurable quantities (e.g. velocity) can significantly vary depending on the time of measurement.

In this study, we use high-resolution data from a reverse-GPS wildlife tracking system (39) to characterize within-patch ARS movements of three species of avian predators: barn owls (Tyto alba, hereafter “owls”), black-winged kites (Elanus caeruleus, “kites”), and common kestrels (Falco tinnunculus, “kestrels”), all common residents in Israel. These species represent a rather restricted part of the static-to-mobile foraging continuum and have been classified, based on diet and foraging technique, into the same guild of “carnivore ground hawks” (40). Focusing on ARS, these three species combine multiple search tactics including short cruising flights, static hovering and perching while pursuing prey (41–44). However, since hovering and especially long perching have been frequently observed at this scale in all three species,
we hypothesized that local search (ARS) will be characterized as subdiffusive and nonergodic due to relatively long WTs. We combined track segmentation tools and models of anomalous diffusion to test this hypothesis, and to examine the notions of scale-specific movement, ergodicity breaking and ageing. Overall, we study whether foraging behaviors are inferable from models accounting for stochastic processes without explicitly incorporating complex interactions among individuals/species or differential responses to environmental heterogeneity in space and time.

**Theoretical model**

In physics, ergodicity breaking is defined as a disparity between the mean square displacement (MSD) and time-averaged square displacement (TASD), which can cause time-averaged measurable quantities to be irreproducible \((37, 45)\). The MSD is defined as the ensemble averaged square displacement of an individual’s position with respect to a reference position. In anomalous diffusion, the MSD satisfies \(\langle x^2(t) \rangle \sim t^\alpha\), where angular brackets denote ensemble averaging and \(t\) is the time of measurement. Here, the dynamics is superdiffusive for \(\alpha > 1\) and subdiffusive for \(\alpha < 1\), whereas \(\alpha \to 1\) is the Brownian limit \((20)\). The TASD is given by averaging over the square displacement performed in a time lag \(\Delta\)

\[
\overline{\delta^2(\Delta)} = \frac{1}{t-\Delta} \int_0^{t-\Delta} [x(t' + \Delta) - x(t')]^2 dt',
\]

(1)

where an overline denotes time averaging. For simple Brownian motion [e.g. Pearson’s RW \((46)\)] and \(\Delta \ll t\) one obtains \(\overline{\delta^2(\Delta)} \sim \Delta \sim \langle x^2(\Delta) \rangle\). Moreover, the TASD does not depend on the total measurement time \(t\). In contrast, if the TASD and MSD scale differently, the underlying process is, by definition, nonergodic; that is, the ensemble averaging is different from the time averaging \((20)\). Here, the process is said to display weak ergodicity breaking, to be distinguished from strong ergodicity breaking where phase space is separated into non-accessible domains.
Note that while not all subdiffusive processes display ergodicity breaking \((45)\), we show that our system is both subdiffusive and nonergodic. Importantly, in many realistic cases, the TASD is a more convenient experimental measure than the MSD as the former provides robust statistics in the limit \(\Delta \ll t\) and does not require a reference position or time, which is often arbitrary or unknown in ecological systems \((37)\).

To assess anomalous diffusion within ARS, we apply the continuous-time random walk (CTRW) formalism, frequently used in physical, biological, and ecological systems \((18, 32, 47, 48)\). Originally introduced by Montroll, Weiss, and Scher \((49)\), CTRW is a generalization of Pearson’s RW, defined in terms of the WT \(\tau\) between successive jumps, which is a random variable drawn from probability distribution function \(\psi(\tau)\). When the average WT \(\langle \tau \rangle\) diverges, the process displays subdiffusive dynamics and weak ergodicity breaking \((20, 37)\). We assume power-law distributed WTs:

\[
\psi(\tau) \sim \tau^{-(1+\alpha)}.
\] (2)

which, for \(0 < \alpha < 1\), give rise to a diverging mean and ergodicity breaking. In contrast, Pearson’s RW is a Poisson process with exponentially-distributed WTs, \(\psi(\tau) = \tau_0^{-1} \exp(-\tau/\tau_0)\), where \(\tau_0\) is the mean WT, resulting in ergodic dynamics. Notably, in CTRW the jump length can also be taken as a random variable; we have numerically verified that our main results are independent of the jump length choice (see SI).

To properly quantify the subdiffusive process at hand, we employ the so-called averaged TASD \((37)\):

\[
\left\langle \delta^2(\Delta) \right\rangle = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \delta^2(\Delta),
\] (3)

where TASD is averaged over an ensemble of \(N\) ARS segments; averaging is necessary here due to the irreproducible nature of the process (i.e. large diversity across trajectories). Further assuming that the movement is confined to a spatially bounded subregion (strictly speaking, due to an external confining potential), and using the fractional differential equation formalism and
(2) (see SI), one can show that (50):

\[
\langle \delta^2(\Delta) \rangle \sim (\Delta/t)^{1-\alpha},
\]

which is valid for long measurement times \( \Delta \ll t \). This stands in contrast to Pearson’s RW and most ergodic processes for which the TASD saturates \( \delta^2(\Delta) \sim \langle x^2(\Delta) \rangle \sim \Delta^0 \), upon reaching a length scale comparable to the system size.

Below, we show that the observed nonergodic and subdiffusive movement patterns in ARS indeed stem from power-law distributed WTs and infer the subdiffusion exponent \( \alpha \) via (4). Importantly, we show that during ARS the distribution of the TASD around the mean is relatively broad, characteristic of ergodicity breaking and ageing.

**Results**

We tracked 60 owls (18 adults and 42 fledglings), 21 kites (6 adults and 15 fledglings), and 15 kestrels (all adults) in two distinct locations in Israel: the Hula Valley and the Judean Plains. Individuals were tracked using ATLAS, an innovative reverse-GPS system that localizes extremely light-weight, low-cost tags (39). Each ATLAS tag transmits a distinct radio signal which is detected by a network of base-stations distributed in the study area. Tag localization is computed using nanosecond-scale differences in signal time-of-arrival to each station, allowing for real-time tracking and alleviating the need to retrieve tags or have power-consuming remote-download capabilities (51). The tracking frequency of individuals was between 0.125 and 1 Hz. We collected additional information for the adult birds: location of the nest, sex, breeding status, and brood size (when relevant). Only individuals who had \( > 15 \) high quality tracking days (see Methods) were included in the study: 14 adult and 30 fledgling owls, 6 adult and 10 fledgling kites, and 10 kestrels. To focus on local search-oriented behavior (ARS), we limited the analyses to movement data collected during the activity hours (nights for the noctur-
nal owl and days for the other two diurnal species) and excluded data collected in proximity to the nest for breeding birds.

Localization of all individual birds were segmented into ARS and commuting segments by detecting switching points in the data – distinct points in which the bird switches between the two behaviors (5). These were detected using the Penalized Contrast Method (52). For an example of a segmented trajectory, see Fig. 1(a). In the inset of Fig. 1(a) we show that an ARS also consists of several local clusters, located only tens of meters from one another, each with a different WT. Tracked by ATLAS, such high-resolution trajectories are attainable, per individual, for months at a time, at a mostly constant frequency. This remarkable availability of data allows us to reveal that commuting between ARS patches is qualitatively different from moving between the more local clusters within ARS [see highlighted clusters in the inset of Fig. 1(a)]. Importantly, in our study, resource patches that define ARS cannot be defined a-priori, as in general they do not correspond to well-defined, discrete spatial units (5). These are thus defined via the segmentation procedure and are robust with respect to changes in the segmentation parameters (see SI). We emphasize that movement data were segmented into two natural scales without a-priori assuming that movement patterns are either scale specific or scale free, but rather a-posteriori tested the scale-free prediction of the Lévy walk foraging hypothesis.

In Fig. 1(b), we compare the measured diffusivity of commuting and ARS segments by calculating the averaged TASD in both cases for an individual female owl. The commuting segments show an averaged TASD that resembles ballistic motion (\(\left\langle \frac{\delta^2(\Delta)}{\Delta} \right\rangle \sim \Delta^{1.8}\)). Indeed, the long commuting flights taken by the owl are strongly directed and relatively fast (8.5–9.5 m/s), and similar directional fast commuting also holds for kites and kestrels. The averaged TASD of ARS segments is qualitatively different and is clearly subdiffusive (\(\left\langle \frac{\delta^2(\Delta)}{\Delta} \right\rangle \sim \Delta^{0.35}\)), which confirms our scale-specific assumption (see additional evidence below). Moreover, the
inset of Fig. 1(b) shows a wide distribution of TASD around the average ARS, characteristic of ergodicity breaking, and a sharply peaked distribution for the commuting phase.

In Fig. 2 we use simulations to show the markedly different behavior between subdiffusive CTRW and simple RW, in the case of a confined movement within predefined domain walls. In Fig. 2(a-b) we show that for exponentially distributed WTs, the TASD saturates upon interacting with the boundaries and that there is no dependence on the measurement time. In contrast, in Fig. 2(c-d), we show that the averaged TASD does not saturate with \( \Delta \) and that the dependence on the time of measurement \( t \) agrees with (4).

For subdiffusive CTRW, since very long WTs can occur, time-averaged measurable quantities are generally irreproducible, such that realizations vary from one another even for very long times (37), see Fig. 2(c). This variability of the TASD is quantified in terms of the dimensionless parameter \( \xi = \frac{\overline{\delta^2(\Delta)}}{\langle \delta^2(\Delta) \rangle} \) – the TASD distribution normalized by its average. At long measurement times the distribution of \( \xi \) satisfies a Mittag-Leffler distribution (50, 53, 54):

\[
\phi(\xi) = \frac{\Gamma^{1/\alpha}(1 + \alpha)}{\alpha^{1+1/\alpha}} I_\alpha \left( \frac{\Gamma^{1/\alpha}(1 + \alpha)}{\xi^{1/\alpha}} \right),
\]

where \( I_\alpha \) is the one-sided Lévy stable distribution with the Laplace transform \( \mathcal{L}\{l_\alpha(t)\} = \exp(-u^\alpha) \) and \( \Gamma(\cdot) \) is the Gamma function. In the limit of Brownian diffusion, \( \alpha \to 1 \), \( \phi(\xi) \sim \delta(\xi - 1) \), i.e. a sharply peaked distribution around 1, but for general \( \alpha \) the distribution is wide and skewed; e.g., for \( \alpha = 0.5 \), \( \phi(\xi) \) tends to a half Gaussian with maximum at \( \xi = 0 \). Importantly, (5) also holds for subdiffusive CTRW in a bounded domain (50, 55) and accounts for the broad distribution of TASD in ARS, see Fig. 1(b).

Having segmented the data into commuting and ARS phases, we computed the average TASD, \( \langle \overline{\delta^2(\Delta)} \rangle \), for each bird in the following way: for each ARS, we computed the TASD and then averaged over all TASDs with similar total measurement times. Importantly, for all individuals, we aimed to average only TASDs within the same period, either within or after the
breeding season (see Methods). The TASD and averaged TASD are plotted in Fig. 3(a) as a function of $\Delta$ for an individual female owl, during the breeding season. For this female, for $\Delta \ll t$, the slope on a log-log plot approaches a value of $0.4 \pm 0.05$. The fit was performed on the range of $1 < \Delta < 30$ min to ensure the validity of the theory and that we were above the noise limit. We computed the slope for different measurement times, and the error reflects a 95% confidence interval in the slope variations for different measurement times. In Fig. 3(b), we plot the averaged TASD as a function of $t$ for different values of $\Delta$. Here we see an explicit dependence on the time of measurement, which is characteristic of ageing as longer measurement times infer smaller measured diffusivity ($37$). Thus, Fig. 3(a-b) strongly indicates that the process is subdiffusive. Moreover, the dependence $\langle \delta^2(\Delta) \rangle \sim \Delta^{0.4}$ indicates that for this individual, $\alpha \approx 0.6$. Notably, we do not extract the value of $\alpha$ from the dependence of the averaged TASD on $t$, as here, ageing effects can play a significant role, see Ref. (37).

We have measured the subdiffusivity for all individuals in the same manner and recorded the value of $\alpha$. The mean value of $\alpha$ for different subgroups within each species is given in Table 1. Notably, within each species, the values of $\alpha$ did not statistically differ between males and females, fledglings and adults, and during or after the breeding season (see Methods).

To evaluate the reproducibility of individual ARS, we calculated the distribution of $\xi$ for different $\Delta$ for each individual. Using (5), we compare in Fig. 3(c), between theoretical (for $\alpha = 0.6$) and experimental results for one female owl. Importantly, this broad distribution [see also Fig. 1(b)], which does not seem to depend on $\Delta$, as predicted by (5), is observed for all individuals and serves as further evidence of weak ergodicity breaking. The fact that the experimental TASD distribution is more sharply peaked than the theoretical prediction, can be explained by the presence of noise in our data, which skews the $\xi$ distribution and yields lower than expected values close to $\xi = 0$ (56). Additionally, in Fig. 3(d), we plot the autocorrelation function computed for owl ARS averaged over many ARSs, revealing that simulations based
Table 1: Mean $\alpha$ values for species subgroups, including the individuals number in each subgroup and a 95% confidence interval around the mean.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>species</th>
<th>subgroup</th>
<th>group size</th>
<th>$\langle \alpha \rangle$</th>
<th>±95%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>owls</td>
<td>breeding adults</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>post-breeding adults</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>fledglings</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kites</td>
<td>adults</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>fledglings</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kestrels</td>
<td>adults</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

on subdiffusive CTRW fit the data much better than those based on simple RW. This is also confirmed independently by a p-variation test (57) (see SI).

Direct evidence for long WTs is shown in Fig. 4, by plotting the distribution of WTs within a radius of 15 m (about the size of a local cluster within ARS) for all three study species. The WTs are calculated using a spatiotemporal criterion for the segmentation procedure with a threshold $R_{th}$; see the inset of Fig. 1. We chose the threshold to be above the noise limit of 5–10 m and much smaller than the typical size of an ARS patch; the results do not vary significantly when $R_{th}$ is between 10 and 25 m. We fitted the data to a power-law distribution (2) using the method of maximum likelihood (58) To test the quality of fit, we used a likelihood ratio test to compare between a power law and exponential fit for the distribution (58, 59). In all cases, a power law was a better fit. A similar test between a power law and a truncated power law showed that the latter was a better fit. In Fig. 4, we plot the distribution of all individuals within each species; similar results were separately obtained for each individual (see SI). For most individual birds, the results of this fit were within the error of the value of $\alpha$, independently found by fitting the averaged TASD to (4), see Table 1. Importantly, the distribution of stops within a 15 m radius anywhere within the foraging range (excluding their nest and its vicinity) shows a tendency of power-law dependence to break down at an average time of 40 min, as was corroborated by fitting a truncated power law to the data (Fig. 4(a-c)). Focusing on ARS,
the distribution of stop durations only within ARS reveals a clear phase transition at 30–60 min for all three species (Fig. 4(d-f)). For short times (< 40 min), the distribution is best fitted by a power-law with $\alpha = 1.15$, whereas for longer times (> 40 min), the data is best fitted by a power-law with $\alpha > 2$ for all species. These results are insensitive to our specific definition of ARS, see SI. Thus, within ARS, the birds abruptly shift from a subdiffusive to a diffusive regime as stops longer than 40 min become exceedingly unlikely. As the mean WT and variance of the jump length distribution are finite at such spatiotemporal scales (see SI) the process corresponds to regular Brownian motion (37). We thus suggest that the long stops within ARS, driven by the motivation to hunt from a perch, to rest, or by other reasons, are not only spatially but also temporally confined, such that beyond ~ 40 min the functional gain from a long stop is diminished, driving the bird to move to another location within or outside the local patch.

**Discussion**

Applying the CTRW framework to rich high-quality movement datasets encompassing $>10^7$ localizations from 70 individuals of three avian predator species, we revealed that local ARS is uniquely characterized as nonergodic, irreproducible and subdiffusive, whereas commuting is ergodic, reproducible and superdiffusive. That is, there is a typical commuting segment, but there is no typical ARS. These two distinct phases are separated via a phase transition in movement occurring at characteristic spatial and temporal scales. Specifically, ARS combines short and very long WTs yielding subdiffusive nonergodic motion, while the commuting mode is superdiffusive with long directional flights, and ergodic as implied by the TASD distribution around the mean. We therefore recommend that assessing whether movement patterns are ergodic or not should become a mandatory practice in movement ecology research, as averaging across an ensemble of movement segments in nonergodic systems is not a valid way to infer a typical behavior. Indeed, in previous studies the *average* WT during ARS has been used to
distinguish foraging tactics among species (60), while our study shows that the distribution of WTs during search is fat-tailed, with a cutoff around 40 min, indicating that ARS is composed of multiple foraging tactics. Moreover, while ARS is characterized by clear ageing, commuting birds maintain similar movement characteristics regardless of commuting duration. Putting this in simple words, there are many ways to hunt within a local patch but only a limited number of ways to commute between distant patches.

Our findings contradict the scale-free Lévy foraging hypothesis that local within-ARS movement and long-distance commuting between ARS stem from the same distribution. Instead, movements of all three avian predators differ markedly between the two scales, though fat-tailed distributions of WTs and steps have been observed at both scales. Overall, our analysis offers novel insights and a general formalism for resolving the long-standing conundrum of whether free-ranging animals move in a scale-specific or scale-free manner (5, 10).

We hypothesized that local ARS in the three study species would tend towards the static side of the static-to-mobile foraging continuum given their hunting behavior and despite their high mobility. Our findings support this hypothesis, as evident in the similar levels of subdiffusivity among species and individuals, indicating they operate within the same narrow zone of the continuum. Within species, $\alpha$ values were similar for both adults and fledglings and were higher for adult owls during breeding, but neither statistically different from the subsequent non-breeding season, nor between males and females. This tendency of breeding owls to minimize WTs within ARS is expected due to the urge to provision their nesting mate or nestlings, and the lack of a significant difference between the two periods can be attributed to the urge of adult owls to provision their young also a few months after they fledge. Interestingly, the only significant difference we found is among species: while anomalously long in all three species, WTs of kestrels and kites were similar and longer (lower $\alpha$) than those of owls, suggesting that nocturnally foraging owls tend to remain stationary for shorter periods compared to the
two diurnal raptors. Overall, assuming that the power-law distributed WTs encapsulate a wide spectrum of possible tactics, our framework offers a way to quantify fairly subtle variation along the static-to-mobile foraging continuum, based directly on movement patterns within ARS.

What is the origin of these slow, subdiffusive, dynamics within ARS? Although slow dynamics are counter-intuitive, they make sense if we recall that the predators primarily forage to find their target rather than to cover the most ground. We postulate that hunting efficiency can increase via highly variable, irreproducible foraging tactics compared to less variable, reproducible ones. Such variability may hold an evolutionary advantage through higher individual fitness of avian predators that combine different foraging behaviors \((11, 12)\). We also suggest that long WTs and ergodicity breaking are evolutionarily coupled to prey behavior. Barn owls, for example, are well known for their acute night vision and their high auditory sensitivity enabling high spatial resolution in sound localization of their prey even in complete darkness \((61, 62)\). Their prey, however, have evolved to avoid owl predation using various strategies such as minimizing exposure in risky times and habitats \((63)\) and adopting escape strategies during an active owl attack \((64, 65)\). Controlled experiments in a closed arena revealed that owls had higher success in catching stationary rather than moving prey, and they tended to postpone their attack until their prey became motionless \((65)\). Another experiment in the same settings revealed high variation in capture duration (from first attack to a successful capture) of spiny mice \((Acomys cahirinus)\) and Günther’s voles \((Microtus guentheri)\), ranging from 0.5 sec to 43 min \((64)\). The longest prey captures occurred while hunting voles, the preferred prey of owls in Israel \((66, 67)\) and in the Hula Valley in particular \((68)\). Thus, as it is hard to catch a highly apprehensive moving prey, adopting irreproducible (and thus unpredictable) movement tactics may prove beneficial for a predator. In other words, it is more efficient for a predator to adopt a wide spectrum of hunting tactics and behavioral modes among which it can alternate, rather than committing to a single tactic or behavior.
In summary, movement patterns of the three avian predators examined here are scale specific, with a unique scaling law for local scales that does not carry on to larger scales. Despite the urge to provision their offspring, our results provide evidence that free-ranging birds in the wild tend to remain stationary in their hunting sites for long periods, and to maintain nonergodic and unpredictable movement patterns, presumably due to co-evolutionary constraints imposed by the availability and behavior of their prey.

**Methods**

**Tracking method**

Sixty owls were tracked in the Hula Valley, Israel (33.10N, 35.61E) between May and December 2018. These include 18 adults tracked both during breeding and subsequent post breeding and 42 fledglings tracked for the first few months after fledging. For the adults, we used the hatching date to define the breeding season by assuming that the 90 days following hatching are within the season, as nestlings are still dependent on their parents (43). Twenty-one kites were tracked in the Hula Valley between July 2019 and September 2020. Six were adults that actively bred during the tracking period, and the other 15 were fledglings. As kites can have multiple broods in a year, we defined their breeding season by directly observing their nests. Lastly, fifteen kestrels were tracked in the Judean Plains, Israel (31.74N, 34.84E) between March and August 2019. Among these, 11 were actively nesting, and the breeding season was defined by direct observations.

All individuals were tracked using ATLAS (39, 51), which reports localization errors in the form of a $2 \times 2$ covariance matrix per localization. In this study we omit localizations with variance $> 50^2 \text{m}^2$, defined in terms of the trace over the covariance matrix. Furthermore, we filtered out days or nights in which many localizations are missing ($> 70\%$). Importantly, in accordance with the typical error reported by the system (10 m) (39), we assume 10 m to be the
noise limit in our measurements. Although for many ARS the noise is practically much smaller, this is treated as an upper limit for any significant results. In total, our analyses incorporated high-quality data for 4,710 nights and \( > 5 \times 10^7 \) localizations for 44 owls, 1,619 days and \( > 10^7 \) localizations for 16 kites, and 508 days and \( > 9 \times 10^6 \) localizations for 10 kestrels, mostly during their respective breeding seasons.

**Segmentation**

ATLAS tracks were first segmented to exclude stops in or around the (known) nests of breeding adults. The remaining tracks were considered foraging excursions and segmented by detecting distinct switching points separating ARS and commuting modes. We used the Penalized Contrast Method suggested by Barraquand and Benhamou (52), a non-parametric method in which the initial number of segments is unknown and estimated by minimizing a penalized contrast function. First passage time (FPT) was used as the focal metric (52, 69). Each point was assigned an FPT outside a radius of \( R_s \) and data was segmented such that points with similar FPT that were close in time were clustered together (70). Data are then split into commuting and ARS according to a threshold on the mean FPT chosen in accordance with the animal’s velocity, which during commuting is \( 7 – 10 \) m/s for all three species. In our segmentation we choose \( R_s = 100 \) m and a threshold of 50 s; yet our results are insensitive to small changes in these parameters: \( R_s \) was tested between \( 70 – 150 \) m and the threshold on the FPT between 40–120 s (see SI). Note that the choice of threshold reflects the time it takes the bird to cross the area defined by \( R_s \). For instance, taking \( R_s = 100 \) m, we define the threshold for a commuting flights such that crossing a diameter of 200 m takes \(< 50 \) s, as if the bird flies in a velocity of 4 m/s across in a straight line.
**Comparative analysis**

We used an unpaired t-test to compare the value of $\alpha$ between species. After verifying variance homogeneity (Levene test) and normal distribution (Shapiro-Wilk test) we performed for each two species an unpaired t-test for the means of two independent samples, with the null hypothesis being that the means are equal. P-values were corrected for multiple comparisons using Tukey’s honest significance test. Based on these tests, we found no difference between kestrels and kites ($p > 0.05$), but owls had significantly larger values of $\alpha$ than either kites ($p = 0.001$) or kestrels ($p = 0.001$). Comparing adults and fledglings yields no significant differences for owls and kites. Comparing breeding and post-breeding periods for owls (for kites and kestrels we did not have sufficient data outside the breeding season to make such a comparison), we found higher values of $\alpha$ during breeding for all 14 individual owls, but the null hypothesis of identical averages was not rejected ($p = 0.1$).
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Appendix

Here we provide technical details and additional results to support the derivations presented in the main text. In what follows, the notations and abbreviations are the same as in the main text and the equations and figures refer to those therein.

Mathematical background

In this section we give further details on continuous-time random walks (CTRWs) and ergodicity breaking, and provide a detailed derivation of Eq. (4) in the main text. We also discuss the universality of this result with respect to the confining potential form and jump-length distribution.

CTRWs are defined in terms of the waiting time (WT) \( \tau \) between successive jumps, which is a random variable drawn from a probability distribution \( \psi(\tau) \). Assuming

\[
\psi(\tau) \sim \tau^{-(1+\alpha)}, \tag{A1}
\]

the (one-dimensional) fractional Fokker-Planck equation governing the probability density \( W(x,t) \) of being at position \( x \) at time \( t \) is (20):

\[
\frac{\partial}{\partial t} W(x,t) = K_\alpha \, {}_0D_t^{1-\alpha} \left\{ - \frac{\partial}{\partial x} \left[ F(x) \right] \frac{F(x)}{k_B T} + \frac{\partial^2}{\partial x^2} \right\} W(x,t), \tag{A2}
\]

where \( V(x) = -\int^x F(x')dx' \) is the confining potential of the random walker, while for a free (unconfined) walker, \( F(x) = 0 \). Furthermore, \( K_\alpha \) is a generalized diffusion parameter, and the Riemann Liouville operator \( {}_0D_t^{1-\alpha} \equiv (\partial/\partial t){}_0D_t^{-\alpha} \) is defined for \( 0 < \alpha < 1 \) as (71):

\[
{}_0D_t^{1-\alpha} \phi(x,t) \equiv \frac{1}{\Gamma(\alpha)} \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \int_0^t dt' \frac{\phi(x,t')}{(t-t')^{1-\alpha}}. \tag{A3}
\]

In the limit of \( \alpha \to 1 \), Eq. (A2) reduces to the Fokker-Planck equation as the Riemann Liouville operator reduces to the unity operator. For an unconfined random walker the mean square
displacement (MSD) is given by (20)

$$\langle x^2 \rangle = 2K_\alpha \frac{t^\alpha}{\Gamma(a+1)},$$  \hspace{1cm} (A4)

while the averaged time-averaged square displacement (TASD), defined by Eq. (3) in the main text, satisfies (54):

$$\left\langle \delta^2(\Delta) \right\rangle \sim \frac{2K_\alpha}{\Gamma(1+\alpha)} \frac{\Delta}{t^{1-\alpha}}.$$  \hspace{1cm} (A5)

As the dependence of the averaged TASD on $\Delta$ is different from the dependence of the MSD on the measurement time $t$, the process is said to display weak ergodicity breaking, as the time average differs from the ensemble average. Moreover, since the averaged TASD depends on the total measurement time $t$, the process displays ageing (37).

For a bounded random walker, $F(x) \neq 0$, one obtains an a-priori surprising result for the averaged TASD. For Brownian motion and most ergodic processes the TASD saturates upon interacting with the confinement. Yet, for subdiffusive CTRW in a bounded domain governed by Eq. (A2), the averaged TASD does not saturate and satisfies (50):

$$\left\langle \delta^2(\Delta) \right\rangle \sim \left( \langle x^2 \rangle_B - \langle x \rangle_B^2 \right) \frac{2\sin(\pi\alpha)}{(1-\alpha)\alpha\pi} \left( \frac{\Delta}{t} \right)^{1-\alpha}.$$  \hspace{1cm} (A6)

Here $\langle x^n \rangle_B = Z^{-1} \int_\infty^\infty x^n \exp \left( -V(x)/k_B T \right)$ is the $n^{th}$ moment of the Boltzmann distribution, and $Z = \int_\infty^\infty \exp \left( -V(x)/k_B T \right)$ is its normalizing factor. Eq. (A6) is valid for $1 \ll \Delta \ll t$, i.e. long time lags that are much smaller than the total measurement time. This analysis indicates that, in contrast to the unbounded CTRW result [Eq. (A6)] in which $\left\langle \delta^2(\Delta) \right\rangle \sim \Delta/t^{1-\alpha}$, for bounded CTRW we have $\left\langle \delta^2(\Delta) \right\rangle \sim (\Delta/t)^{1-\alpha}$, see Eq. (4) in the main text. We stress that the result in Eq. (A6), which was verified both via simulations and in experiments (see Ref. (37) and references therein) is universal, and in the leading order, does not depend on the confining potential. Indeed, the potential only enters in the prefactor, and via the first two moments of the distribution (50). Importantly, in light of this analysis (which was also confirmed by our
simulations), knowledge of the exact form of the confining potential of individual birds is not crucial for any of our conclusions (see main text).

Notably, in CTRW the jump length $\delta r$ can be also taken as a random variable following distribution $\phi(\delta r)$. For instance, Pearson’s random walk (46) in discrete space is retrieved when $\psi(\tau) = \tau_0^{-1} \exp(-\tau/\tau_0)$ and $\phi(\delta r) = \delta_{\delta r,1}$, where $\tau_0$ is the mean WT and $\delta_{i,j}$ is the Kronecker delta. In our simulations [see Fig. (2) in the main text], the jump lengths are such that at each simulation step the random walker can perform a step to any point within the predefined domain walls with equal probability, but can not exit the walls. It was verified by additional simulations that our conclusions, and in particular the form given in Eq. (4) of the main text, do not depend on the jump-length distribution $\phi(\delta r)$.

**Waiting-time and jump-length distributions**

In this section we give additional results, supporting the discussion in the main text. Specifically, we plot the WT distribution for individual birds, and the jump-length distribution for each species.

In Fig. 4(a-c) of the main text we plotted the WT distribution within a radius of 15 m for each species. Here, in Fig. S1(a-c), we plot the WT distribution within the same radius for each individual. A power law was fitted to the distribution of each individual, and to test the quality of fit, we performed a likelihood ratio test to compare between a power-law and exponential fit for the distribution (58, 59). For all individuals, a power law was a better fit. A similar test between a power-law and a truncated power-law fits showed that the latter is a better fit.

In Fig. 4(d-f) of the main text we plotted the distribution of time spent within ARS to show that a qualitative phase transition occurs between ARS and larger spatial modes. Here, in Fig. S1(d-f), we give further validation of the phase transition by plotting the WT distribution within a larger radius of $R_{th} = 100$ m for each individual (note the units of hours). The WT's here were
calculated using a spatiotemporal segmentation procedure (72) and we verified that the results are not sensitive to small changes in $R_{th}$, between 70 – 200 m. The distributions in S1(d-f) strongly resemble the distribution of time spent within ARS, as the power-law fits (black and red dotted lines) are similar to those shown in Fig. 4(d-f) of the main text. At short times ($< 40$ min), the distribution is best fitted by a power law with $\alpha = 1.15$, indicating that searches performed at these timescales are strongly spatially bounded. At longer times ($> 40$ min), the data is best fitted by a power law with $\alpha > 2$ for all species, indicating that they are no longer in the subdiffusive regime. While at shorter times searches are spatially bounded, at longer times, the animal is driven to alternate between search grounds.

In Fig. S2 we further compare ARS to commuting flights by comparing the distribution of small-scale jump lengths performed within ARS [S2(a-c)], and large-scale jump lengths of commuting flights between ARS [S2(d-f)] for owls, kites and kestrels. Both the local jumps and the commuting flights are obtained directly from our segmentation procedure, and the distributions are fitted using the method of maximum likelihood. To evaluate the distributions for each flight mode we preformed a likelihood comparison test between a power-law and an exponential distribution for each group (a-f). We find that in (a-c) a power law is a better fit while in (d-f) an exponential distribution is a better fit. Notably, for all distributions in Fig. S2 it is plausible that other fat-tailed distributions will give a better fit; nonetheless, we view the qualitative difference between the distributions at small and large length scales as further evidence of a phase transition between the intensive ARS flight mode and the extensive commuting flight mode.

**Segmentation procedure**

In this section we provide evidence that our main results do not depend on the segmentation parameters and segmentation method.

In the Penalized Contrast Method we use $R_s = 100$ m and a threshold of $\tau_s = 50$ s to
classify commuting flights from ARS. In Fig. S3(a) we vary \( R_s \) between 70–150 m to show that the value of \( \alpha \) converges at around \( R_s = 100 \) m to a constant value. In Fig. S3(b) we vary \( \tau_s \) between 40–200 s to show that the value of \( \alpha \) does not depend on this parameter. Similar sensitivity analysis was performed for all individuals. Notably, due to the high frequency and resolution of the data the segments are clearly visible to the eye, see Fig. (1) of the main text, and are not sensitive to any specific segmentation procedure. To further show this, switching points were also detected using spatiotemporal criteria segmentation, such that localizations that are in proximity to one another, both in space and time were segmented together (72). Using this segmentation procedure did not significantly alter any of the results reported in our study.

**p-variation test**

In this section we employ the p-variation test (see below) to further validate our claim that the movement within ARS is a subdiffusive CTRW.

A p-variation test is performed in order to distinguish the CTRW from other types of subdiffusive behaviors such as fractal Brownian motion (37, 57, 73). Notably, this test was applied in Ref. (56) to evaluate the effect of noise in subdiffusive CTRW, and it was found in simulations that up to some noise level the p-variation test is valid. The test is defined in terms of the sum of increments of a trajectory \( x(t) \) on the time interval \([0, T]\):

\[
V_n^{(p)}(t) = \sum_{j=0}^{2^n-1} \left| x \left( \min \left\{ \frac{(j+1)T}{2^n}, n \right\} \right) - x \left( \min \left\{ \frac{jT}{2^n}, n \right\} \right) \right|^p.
\] (A7)

For subdiffusive CTRW \( V^{(p)}(t) = \lim_{n \to \infty} V_n^{(p)}(t) \) displays the following properties: for \( p = 2 \) it shows a monotonic, step-like increase in time, while for \( p = 2/\alpha \): \( V^{(2/\alpha)}(t) = 0 \) (57, 73). In Fig. S4 we show an example of this test on a randomly chosen ARS segment of a female barn owl, and the results fit both theoretical predictions. This indicates that the motion at hand is a subdiffusive CTRW. Notably, we have repeated the test on many randomly chosen trajectories
of various individuals, and all gave similar results.
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Figure 1: (a) Seventy-five minutes of tracking at a frequency of 0.5 Hz were segmented into 4 ARS and 3 commuting segments. These consisted of 2,280 localizations of a female owl (tag 4782) on the 4th of May 2018, starting from 7:50 pm local time. The arrows show the direction of motion. The 4 ARS segments are drawn in red and are 4, 2, 4 and 57 min long, while the 3 commuting segments are in blue, each approximately 1 min long. The inset shows one local search of size $200 \times 200$ m$^2$, 57 min long. This ARS consists of 5 local clusters with WTs of 14, 36, 2, 3, and 1 min, each represented by a different color and highlighted by a red circle. In moving between the local clusters, the animal performs local jumps ranging from 25 to 45 m. The non-stationary behavior of the animal (inset’s upper right corner) lasts for less than a minute. (b) The averaged TASD (3) of ARS segments (red triangles) and commuting segments (blue dots) of a female owl. The dashed and dash-dotted lines are power laws with $\Delta^{0.35}$ and $\Delta^{1.8}$ respectively, clearly separating between subdiffusive ARS and superdiffusive commuting mode. Inset shows the distribution of TASD around the average TASD (see (5)) for both cases, at a specific time lag $\Delta$ that is much smaller than each segment’s total time.
Figure 2: CTRW simulations. (a-b) Exponentially-distributed WTs (a simple RW with $\tau_0 = 10s$). (c-d) Power law WTs, \( (2) \), with $\alpha = 0.6$. In (a,c) each of the red lines are the TASD calculated for a single simulation versus the time difference $\Delta$, and the blue line is the average TASD, \( (3) \), over an ensemble of 200 simulations. In (b,d) we plot the averaged TASD versus the total time of the simulation. Simulations were done in a bounded domain of $100 \times 100 \text{m}^2$. 
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Figure 3: (a-b) TASD and averaged TASD of ARS of a female owl (tag 4789) during the breeding season of 2018. (a) TASD for single trajectories (red lines) versus $\Delta$, and the average of all lines ((3)) (blue solid line). The total measurement time is $t = 50$ min. The lower dashed line scales as $\Delta^{0.4}$. (b) The averaged TASD versus the total measurement time $t$ for specific values of $\Delta = 10, 40, 120$ s (bottom to top lines), yielding powers of $-0.26, -0.27$ and $-0.28$ respectively. (c) The distribution of $\xi$ of ARS for the same individual in the same time period (plotted using kernel estimation with a bandwidth of 0.1). Each of the + markers represents a distribution for a different $\Delta$ ($\Delta = 100, 200, 400, 700$ seconds). The total measurement time is 2000 seconds. The dashed line is the theoretical distribution ((5)) for $\alpha = 0.6$. Inset shows the same plot on a linear scale. (d) The autocorrelation function defined as $R_{XX}(\tau) = E[X(t)X(t+\tau)]$, versus the time difference $\tau$, such that $R_{XX}(\tau = 0) = 1$. Here $X$ is the location of the bird normalized by the mean location. The blue dots are $R_{XX}$ averaged over 100 owl ARS segments of length 2000s. The orange dashed and the green dash-dotted lines are averages over 1000 simulations of subdiffusive CTRW (with $\alpha = 0.6$) and simple RW, respectively.
Figure 4: (a-c) WT distributions (symbols) within a radius of 15 m, for 14 owls (a), 6 kites (b) and 10 kestrels (c), all adults. The solid line is a fit to a truncated power law, \( P(\tau) \sim \tau^{-\alpha}e^{-\tau/\tau_0} \), with \( \alpha = 0.68, 0.51, 0.55 \), and \( \tau_0 = 40, 35, 36 \) in (a), (b) and (c), respectively. These values of \( \alpha \) are the average fit values for the joint distribution of all birds within each species, and we have checked that for all birds, the power law truncates at \( \tau_0 = 20–80 \) min. The dashed lines are power laws, (2), with the same \( \alpha \) values. (d-f) Distributions of stop duration within ARS (symbols) for owls (d), kites (e) and kestrels (f), all adults. The dashed black and red lines are power laws, presenting a clear phase transition from \( \alpha = 1.15 \) for shorter \( \tau \) in all three species to \( \alpha = 2.97, 2.20 \) and 2.61 for longer \( \tau \), with typical transition times (when the two slopes intersect) of \( \tau = 45, 48 \) and 36 min in (d), (e) and (f), respectively.
Figure S1: WTs distributions within a radius of 15 m (a-c) and within a radius of 100 m (d-f), for 14 adult owls (a,d), 6 adult kites (b,e) and 12 adult kestrels (c,f). In each panel, different shapes and colors represent different individuals. In (a-c) the dashed black lines indicate a power law, $P(\tau) \sim \tau^{-\alpha} e^{-\tau/\tau_0}$, with $\alpha = 0.68, 0.51$ and 0.55 for (a), (b) and (c) respectively, and are plotted to guide the eye. The solid black line is the average fit for a truncated power law $P(\tau) \sim \tau^{-\alpha} e^{-\tau/\tau_0}$. For all birds the power law truncates between $\tau_0 = 20$ and $\tau_0 = 80$ min. The average fit values, for the joint distribution of all individuals within each species, were $\alpha = 0.68, 0.51, 0.55$ and $\tau_0 = 40, 35, 36$ min for the owls, kites, and kestrels respectively. In (d-f) the dashed black line indicates a power law with $\alpha = 1.15$ and the dashed red line indicates a power law with $\alpha = 2.97, 2.20$ and 2.61, for the owls, kites and kestrels respectively. At short times the birds are almost stationary (see main text) indicating motion within ARS (area restricted search), while at long times the WTs display a different movement phase.
Figure S2: (a-c) Distribution of local jump length within ARS for adult owls (a), adult kites (b) and adult kestrels (c). The dashed lines indicate a power law, $\phi(\delta r) \sim \delta r^\beta$, with $\beta = 2.17, 2.1$ and $1.96$ for (a), (b) and (c), respectively, and represent the best fit parameters. (d-f) Distribution of commuting flight distances between ARS for adult owls (d), adult kites (e) and adult kestrels (f). The dashed lines indicate an exponential distribution $\phi(\delta r) = e^{\delta r/\lambda}/\lambda$ with $\lambda = 437, 662$ and $374$ m for (d), (e) and (f), respectively.

Figure S3: (a) Value of $\alpha$ as a function of $R_s$, and (b) value of $\alpha$ as a function of $\tau_s$, for an individual owl. The error bars reflect a 95% confidence interval around the mean.
Figure S4: A p-variation test on a randomly chosen movement segment of a female owl. In (a) shown is the test for $p = 2$, and $V_n^{(p)}(t)$ displays a monotonic step-like increase. In (b) shown is the test for $p = 2/\alpha$ for $\alpha = 0.67$ (this was the value found for this female), and as expected $V_n^{(p)}(t)$ tends to zero as $n$ is increased. Note that $n$ can only be increased up to $2^n = N$, $N$ being the number of data points in the trajectory (73).