Satellite Tracking in Sea Turtles: How do we Find Our Way to the Conservation Dividends?

Victoria F. Jeffers[1]* and Brendan J. Godley[1]

[1]Marine Turtle Research Group, Centre for Ecology and Conservation, School of Biosciences, University of Exeter, Cornwall Campus, Penryn TR10 9EZ, UK

* victoria@blueventures.org, 07963051037

Abstract

As species of conservation concern, sea turtles have historically been difficult to study because of their elusive nature and extensive ranges, but improvements in telemetry have facilitated insights into life histories and behaviours which can potentially inform conservation policies. To date, there have been few assessments of the impact of satellite tracking data on species conservation, and it is difficult to clearly gauge whether the dividends justify the costs. Through an extensive review of the literature (**369 papers, 1982-2014**) and a questionnaire-based survey of **171 sea turtle tracking researchers**, we evaluate the conservation dividends gained thus far from tracking and highlight conservation successes. We discuss who is tracking and where, where biases in effort exist, and evaluate the impact of tracking data on conservation. Conservation issues are increasingly being considered. Where research recommends policy change, the quality of advice varies and the level of uptake is still uncertain, with few clearly described examples of tracking-data actually influencing policy. The means to increase the conservation impact are discussed, including: disseminating findings more widely; communicating and collaborating with colleagues and stakeholders for more effective data sharing; community liaison, and endeavouring to close the gaps between researchers and conservation practitioners.

Keywords: review**,** telemetry, impact, questionnaires, marine vertebrates, collaboration, communication

Introduction

Marine megavertebrates have historically been difficult to study due to their extensive ranges and many such species, including sea turtles, face numerous threats (e.g. bycatch: Lewison et al., 2014) and consequently are of profound conservation concern. Despite debate over their conservation status (Godfrey & Godley 2008; Seminoff & Shanker 2008), sea turtles ('turtles' hereafter) are considered important as potential ecosystem engineers, keystone, or flagship species, instrumental in raising awareness about wider marine ecosystems and their conservation (Coleman & Williams 2002; Eckert & Hemphill 2005; Moran & Bjorndal 2006; Butler et al., 2012). Their management and protection is therefore important and depends on an accurate understanding of both their distribution and how they interact with their environment, including anthropogenic stressors.

Tracking of marine turtles by satellite has evolved significantly since the first published study, in which researchers tethered turtles to floating buoys (Stoneburner 1982). Subsequent developments in tracking have enabled researchers to gain valuable insights into turtle ecology and behaviour, particularly via satellite tracking (including Argos-linked GPS units) (Rees et al., 2010; Marcovaldi et al., 2010; Arendt et al., 2011; Bailey et al., 2012; Casale et al., 2012; Gaos et al., 2012b; Witt et al., 2010). Tracking units are now typically quite small and ranging from *ca.*30-490g, with the most commonly used tags approximately 130g in air (pers comm Kevin Lay, Wildlife Computers). Reduced size has enabled this method to overcome some of the barriers to tracking multiple life stages of these migratory species such as wide ranging dispersal and occupation of remote areas. This has great potential to inform conservation science. It is now possible to track multiple species in near real-time over great distances (Frydman & Gales, 2007; Block et al., 2011).

Consequently, satellite tracking data can help provide the information necessary to inform management policies and mitigate against anthropogenic threats (Hart et al., 2012; Maxwell et al., 2013). It has been suggested, however, that researchers sometimes focus on the results rather than the implications (Hammerschlag et al., 2011) and data might not be used to their full potential. To date, there are few assessments of the conservation impact of satellite tracking (e.g. Godley et al., 2008) and no studies assess the overall impacts on policy. Without evaluation it is difficult to measure the tangible benefits of tracking, or determine if the expenditure and potential animal welfare issues are justified (McMahon et al., 2011; Jones et al., 2013; Hammerschlag et al., 2014).

Using data from an extensive literature review and a questionnaire-based survey of researchers tracking turtles, we sought to investigate: *To what extent are data from satellite tracked turtles ('tracking data' hereafter) influencing relevant conservation policies and practices to protect turtles and/or their habitats?* Answering this is imperative to discern the benefits to conservation and help counter any criticisms that workers are guilty of a *'tagging reflex'* (when tags are applied without clear objectives or strong experimental design; Mrosovsky 1983).

Methods

Reviewing the literature

We searched Web of Science and Google Scholar using the terms 'marine turtle' or 'sea turtle', plus either 'telemetry' or 'satellite tracking'. All Web of Science results and the first 200 results from each Google Scholar search were included for all papers published until end 2014 (final searches carried out 24 Sept 2015). The archive of the *Marine Turtle Newsletter* (vol 1-139) was also searched using the term 'satellite' to check for any further relevant papers. We removed duplicates, false positives and non-peer reviewed 'grey' literature based on title and abstract, or main text if relevance was unclear from the abstract (without duplicates n=350). Papers reviewed described work that either directly tracked turtles, or used third-party satellite tracking data. Review papers using turtle tracking case studies, methodologies directly related to satellite tracking turtles, or comments related to tracking (e.g. Chaloupka et al., 2004a) were included as they may inform future tracking practice (e.g. Sperling & Guinea 2004; Pilcher 2013). These were cross-checked with citations in a similar review (Godley et al., 2008) and those cited by recent papers.

As a further check, peer-review and contribution of new or missing papers was invited at three stages when the original list of literature was sent to: all sea turtle researchers at the University of Exeter; members of the www.seaturtle.org satellite tracking e-mail list; and all authors contacted as part of the questionnaire. This process resulted in 19, mostly new, papers coming to our attention leading to an overall sample size of 369 papers.

Literature analysis

We conducted a systematic review as outlined in previous studies (Khan 2003; Pullin & Stewart 2006). We examined papers using a list of criteria including: main theme: species/ life-stage/sex of animals tracked; tracking location; sample size; inclusion/discussion of conservation issues; the nature of any recommendations and recognition of animal welfare concerns. To enable comparison with respondents' reasons for tracking, papers were assigned (by VJ) to a category using title and abstract, based on their main theme (1. biological or ecological; 2. conservation and management; 3. Other. See table 1 for categories). Papers were rated on a four point scale according to the extent that conservation/management issues were mentioned in the discussion sections using the following criteria: a) conservation/management issues formed the majority of the discussion, or the paper focussed on a particular issue or threat; b) some conservation/management issues were discussed in the context of the tracking results, or tracking results were applied to a conservation issue; c) conservation/management applications mentioned in passing, but no further explanation given; d) no mention of conservation/management.

Expert opinion

We designed a mixed method (see Lobe & Vehovar 2008) questionnaire (see supplementary material) using an online survey tool (www.surveymonkey.com) to obtain researchers' views on how tracking data contribute to policy and overall turtle conservation. The 12 questions combined a mix of question types and were designed to take a maximum 13 minutes (the ideal length to obtain a good response rate; Fan & Yan 2010). We sent a pilot version to several individuals for feedback, including a researcher with extensive experience in qualitative analysis and others who were experienced in turtle tracking.

Email addresses for first and last authors of the papers reviewed, plus anyone else with correspondence details were gathered from the published papers or, where possible, the internet (total 270 individuals). We sent personalised emails to obtain the best response rates (Sánchez-Fernández et al., 2012) and a reminder a week later. Around 60 remained unreachable due to expired email addresses. Additionally, we sent the questionnaire to the www.seaturtle.org tracking mailing list, comprising of 258 individuals involved in satellite tracking projects, including other taxa; the email was tailored to target those tracking turtles. Inevitably there was considerable overlap between these two groups, so as a conservative estimate, 300 people were contacted. Surveys were completed between 4 and 17 June 2014.

Data analysis

We conducted statistical analyses using the R statistical package (v. 3.0.2; http://www.r-project.org/). All percentages in the text were rounded to the nearest whole number. We used three different methods to analyse qualitative responses: 1.Qualitative responses justifying quantitative answers were selected to support statements based on quantitative data ; 2. others were coded and analysed quantitatively; 3. Despite some criticism of thematic content analysis, (see Jackson & Trochim 2002 for a summary) we chose this method to analyse open-ended responses as a word-only based coding method would undermine the meaning of the comments, and a concept mapping approach was not feasible for this study (Jackson & Trochim 2002).

Results

In total 369 papers were reviewed in full. Approximately 57% of people responded to the questionnaire, (n=171, 90% fully completed. These are hereafter referred to as 'respondents'). Total responses for each question varied and where relevant, the number of responses is stated. The questionnaire reached a broad range of individuals; the largest group (n=79) were from academic institutions, but a large number worked for government (n=46), or non-government (n=45) organisations. Additionally, 21 respondents selected two employment sectors, usually including an academic institution and a second institution (government: n= 10; non-government: n= 4; consultancy: n=3; other: n= 1).

Who's tracking what and where?

Satellite tracking turtles is increasing, both in terms of the number of papers published and the number of nations hosting the work (fig. 1, a & b). The majority of individuals use data that they have collected themselves (55%), 10% use only data collected by third-parties and 35% use a combination of their own and others' data.

Both the published data and the questionnaire responses (fig. 2) show biases. As previously found (Godley et al., 2008), there was a bias towards tracking females, albeit slightly reduced (70% to 67%), with a small increase in males (7% to 10%) and juvenile numbers (both sexes) around the same (23%) The loggerhead (*Caretta caretta*) and green turtle (*Chelonia mydas*) were most commonly tracked but relatively few data exist for the flatback turtle (*Natator depressus*) and Kemp's ridley (*Lepidochelys kempii*) which are range restricted (fig. 2a) (See supplementary table 1 for a breakdown by species). Tracking was most common in the Atlantic and Pacific oceans (fig. 2b). The USA was the highest ranked nation both by the number of individuals involved (42%) and number of turtle tracks (20%) (fig. 2c). Geographical irregularities exist, with tracking hotspots such as the Caribbean (contributing 12% of study locations) and data deficient areas e.g. S.E. Asia (Indonesia, Malaysia, Thailand), which hosts all species except the Kemp's ridley (Shanker & Pilcher 2003), yet contributed relatively few (total 4% e.g. Papi et al., 1995; Kittiwattanawong et al., 2002; Yasuda et al., 2006; Klain et al., 2007).

To what extent are conservation issues considered?

There have been significant improvements in our understanding of basic turtle biology and ecology, evident from the rise in the number of papers and tracking locations (fig.1 a & b) and 65% of the 165 people who listed motives for tracking, cited reasons of a biological/ecological nature. These subjects were also the main focus for 65% of the papers reviewed (table 1). Comparatively, all conservation/management related sub-categories comprised of only 19% of main themes of papers, and 26% of survey respondents cited these as a major motivation (45 people listed reasons of this nature and all (45 of 77 academics who answered the question) were affiliated with an academic institution.

The extent to which conservation is discussed in the literature varies greatly. In total, 39% of papers make no reference to conservation issues. Many of these were published in the early days of tracking, but 31% of the 298 papers published in the last ten years, do not mention conservation, and only 15% (of 298) focus on conservation concerns as a major part of the paper. Those that refer to conservation issues do so with varying levels of rigour and commitment and range from papers predominantly focusing on turtle conservation issues (12% of all papers) such as threats (Troëng et al., 2007; Witt et al., 2011; Maxwell et al., 2013; Roe et al., 2014), or practices such as head-starting (Shaver & Rubio 2008), to those with a mere sentence appended to the discussion, without further explanation (25% of total papers).

In total, 133 papers (36%) make conservation related recommendations (table 2). These include expansion of national park boundaries (Schofield et al., 2007, 2009; Shillinger et al., 2010), fishing fleet reductions (Scott et al., 2012a) and zoning to protect turtles (Witt et al., 2008). The level of detail of these comments varies from vague statements about the necessity to protect coastlines and beaches, to more specific statements which could easily inform policies such as expanding existing ecotourism zones by 4km to improve turtle-watching regulations (Schofield et al., 2007). The level of consideration given to conservation issues in the literature is increasing, with a significant relationship evident between the proportion of papers that discuss these concerns and the year of publication (fig. 1c).

To what extent are recommendations being 'translated' into actions

Respondents were asked how often they make recommendations for policy, based on tracking data, and the consequent impact and outcomes. In total, 61% (of 154 respondents who answered this question) made recommendations for policy changes (always: 10%; sometimes: 26%; and quite often: 25%). Those who said they make recommendations 'always' (n=15) breakdown as: 33% academics, 20% consultants, 20% government, 13% NGO workers and 13% academic plus another category. Additionally, 38% (of 128 who answered) said they knew of examples where their recommendations had been implemented (n=49, breakdown by organisation: 32% government, 24% academic, 24% NGO, 16% academic plus another category and 2% consultant). Moreover, 30% (of 128) said they knew of plans for future implementation (n=38, breakdown by organisation: 32% NGO, 29% academic, 26% government, 11% academic plus another category and 3% consultant). However, there were only a few definitive examples of tracking data being translated from paper to policy (table 3).

A total 84% (of 152) respondents thought that tracking data had an impact on turtle conservation more than 'not very often' (very often: 13%; quite often: 28%; sometimes: 43%. n=128, breakdown by organisation: 33% academic, 26% government, 23% NGO, 7% academic/government, 4% consultant, 3% academic/NGO, 2% NGO/government.2% academic/consultant , <1% government/consultant.)

Respondents also rated the following outputs of their research based on a five-point scale ('very high impact' to 'no impact'): academic publications; educational activities; public relations activities; government collaboration; and news coverage. There was no significant difference in the overall perceived impact among the different outputs (Median score: 3 or "modest impact"; Kruskal-Wallis, H_4=2.34, p=0.67).

Ethical Concerns

Several respondents mentioned the potential negative impacts of tagging (10% of the 71 that provided further general comments) and some thought that addressing these concerns could improve the conservation dividends (table 4). One respondent said: *"Tracking devices … impact [turtles] negatively and may even make them more vulnerable, so it's important that tags are not attached randomly …."lower impact" alternative methods should be employed where available …".*

Only 18% (n=66) of papers make any reference to ethical or welfare implications associated with tagging and it was a main theme for less than 2% of papers (table1). Some do acknowledge the potential impact, and many ensure that tags are attached carefully to avoid drag (Godley et al., 2002; Byrne et al., 2009; Sperling et al., 2010; Snoddy & Southwood Williard 2010) whilst others are dedicated solely to these issues (Watson & Granger 1998; Sherrill-Mix & James 2008; McMahon et al., 2011; Jones et al., 2013). Investigations into tagging methods, such as harness alternatives for leatherbacks (Eckert & Eckert 1986; Lutcavage et al., 2001; Sperling & Guinea 2004; Troëng et al., 2006; Fossette et al., 2007) have often resulted in improved methodologies in future studies (Witt et al., 2008; Dodge et al., 2014).

There is a paucity of data on how tagging impacts mortality rates, depredation, or risk of entaglement. A total of 37 papers (10%) mentioned suspected or confirmed turtle deaths (deaths: n=49, total turtle tracks in these papers: n=746). Many were presumed fisheries interactions not necessarily associated with satellite tagging. Determining the extent of anthropogenic threats was cited as a reason for tracking (ranked 6 out of 12, table 1) and several papers examine fisheries threats by combining tracking and fisheries data (Peckham et al., 2007; Howell et al., 2008; McClellan & Read 2009; McClellan et al., 2009; da Silva et al., 2011; Scott et al., 2012a; Hart et al., 2013; Pikesley et al., 2013; Fossette et al., 2014; Roe et al., 2014). Papers focusing on mortality tend to consider post-release mortalities (survival rates after fisheries interactions; Swimmer et al., 2002, 2006, 2013; Chaloupka et al., 2004b; Sasso & Epperly 2007; Snoddy & Southwood Williard 2010; Mangel et al., 2011; Àlvarez de Quevedo et al., 2013), or if tracking data can be used to estimate mortality rates (Hays et al., 2003, 2004a; Chaloupka et al., 2004a, 2004b; Bradshaw 2005).

How can the benefits for conservation be increased?

Improving communications, collaborations and the dissemination of results were the main suggestions to increase tracking impact. The number one suggestion was greater collaboration with stakeholders and policy makers (table 4). This was echoed in suggestions for improved research design, such as targeting studies to collect specific management data, directly tailored to the needs of policy makers and practitioners, who should be consulted at conception and throughout the study.

Discussion

Evaluating tracking

Evaluating the success of conservation interventions lags behind that of other fields (Ferraro & Pattanayak 2006) but there is a strong case for evaluating the impact and effectiveness of environmental policies (Ferraro & Pattanayak 2006; Ferraro 2009) and this should also apply to tracking data and any consequent management actions. Meaningful evaluation of the impact of satellite tracking is thus far absent from the literature, but a few papers do evaluate the effectiveness of existing restrictions and policies (Witt et al., 2008; Shillinger et al., 2010; Scott et al., 2012b; Schofield et al., 2013b; Whittock et al., 2014). Data from satellite tracking can play a key role in providing empirical evidence to practitioners and policy makers to evaluate existing spatio-temporal restrictions; proving especially valuable when the policy or restriction is contested (McClellan et al., 2009) or not originally based on evidence from tracking (Hardy et al., 2014).

Scientific Publications: the best tool for dissemination?

Despite a rise in papers focusing on conservation management issues, only 36% of papers make conservation or management recommendations, compared to 61% of respondents claiming they do. This suggests these best intentions may not match the reality, there has been a recent change in focus, or these are made outside of publications. Although papers are increasingly discussing relevant conservation issues, they are often included at the end of the discussion, almost as an afterthought, suggesting conservation may not be a key consideration when deploying satellite tags. Many papers made vague statements, leaving the reader to make their own assumptions about how the data could be applied to conservation; a notion supported by one respondent: "*I review many papers that state 'this information may be applied to conservation' but rarely state how".*

There are examples of recommendations being 'translated' into management plans, but respondents generally knew of only a few 'successes' and tended to mention the same examples (Howell et al., 2008; Schofield et al., 2009), or none at all. Additionally, only a few papers referenced examples where tracking data resulted in change (Peckham et al., 2007; Shaver & Rubio 2008; Shillinger et al., 2008; Hazen et al., 2012; Crossin et al., 2014) and the largest group of respondents thought that tracking data had an impact only 'sometimes'. This may indicate that it is rare for recommendations to be implemented, they are not well publicised in the literature or there is a general lack of communication. If individuals working within this field are unaware of the impacts of tracking data, it seems unlikely that many other stakeholders will be.

Perhaps scientific publications are not the most effective way to disseminate useful tracking data. Due to accessibility issues, research may not reach those most likely to implement recommendations. Despite this, one respondent argued: *"Peer-reviewed publications are extremely important. This is one means by which [Protected Area] authorities are able to place pressure on governments to update legislation based on sound scientific information, rather than unsubstantiated requests*." Open Access articles could grant access to a wider set of stakeholders without the funding or institutional affiliations necessary to obtain this information, but the associated costs may deter some researchers.

Alternatively, publicising results in multiple, more accessible outlets could help raise public awareness and disseminate tracking data more effectively. For example, many national policies cite technical reports or conference proceedings alongside peer-reviewed journal articles (e.g. NMFS and USWS 2008). One respondent, affiliated with an NGO said "…*We make our results freely available after each season of* *monitoring in the form of a technical report…I have not published results in any academic publications, mostly due to a lack of staff and time as this is a low priority*."

Collaboration and communication

The impact of research may be improved if information is presented to decision-makers in an accessible and objective way. As one respondent commented, "*Academic publications are important and provide the science and expertise … that enable [us] to approach decision makers and have a chance to influence them, but they don't read the publications themselves, so the impact is modest, because you still need to "translate* …". Combining a pro-active, multi-disciplinary approach with evidence from scientific publications may be the best way to influence policy-makers and facilitate 'translation' to ensure relevant parties are informed. As another respondent said, "*We find that we get better uptake of our research by Government when we produce small 1-2 page summaries of our work, or a 5 slide powerpoint and then present it to relevant people (outside of the collaboration group)*". It is vital that researchers attempt to communicate with stakeholders as previous studies indicate a dichotomy exists between researchers and practitioners. With no effective information flow between the two, perhaps due to the previously discussed accessibility issues, policies may end up based on myths and political agenda rather than having biodiversity science at their heart (Pullin & Knight 2003; Sutherland et al., 2004; Pullin et al., 2004; Cook et al., 2010). Although most of these studies are now more than 10 years old, this remains relevant to researchers, with one commenting: "*There is a huge gap between those who compile academic publications and those involved in the direct management of [Protected Areas]".*

Collaborating with resource managers and conservation agencies, to identify areas of data paucity, better still co-developing research questions, would improve study design and ensure that tracking data are applied to relevant problems. For example, targeting data poor species, to enable inclusion in legislation, or to be considered in EIAs to inform legislation may be necessary (Whittock et al., 2014). As one respondent said "*It is important for researchers to collaborate with PA managers to determine what needs to be researched and what actions are actually feasible*". Studies indicate there is often a mismatch between the priorities of conservation managers and the research questions being asked by scientists (Pullin & Knight, 2003), and so addressing this gap could increase the potential management applications. Previous studies have compiled global research priorities for general conservation (Sutherland et al., 2009), for turtles specifically (Hamann et al., 2010), and, in an attempt to bridge the gaps, some included practitioners and policy-makers in the process (Sutherland et al., 2011). Directly involving key stakeholders, or allowing stakeholder groups to drive the research themselves should be the next step for turtle conservation, to help improve the benefits realised from tracking data.

Some national species/habitat protection policies are peer reviewed, compiled by experts, and do cite scientific papers, many of which are included in this review (e.g. NMFS and USWS 2008) (see table 3). Additionally, individuals working for multiple sectors may help improve relations and communications between researchers and policy makers; key to ensuring that research outcomes inform policy decisions (Gibbons et al., 2008). Collaborations with NGOs could prove productive, but researchers must be cautious of sequestering knowledge without providing incentives for the communities from the ecosystems that they track in. For instance, one respondent commented on collaborating with local NGOs: "… *the benefits of the collaboration are not always equivalent and I have seen examples where the overseas institution has obtained multiple publications … and often [for] more theoretical than applied purposes, while the local NGO has little more than a map and hopefully some public awareness enhancement that may lead to some conservation success locally, and an acknowledgement (if they are lucky!). I think there is need for more formal data-use and data-sharing agreements*." Ideally NGOs would be involved in writing the publications too.

Is bigger better? Working together, sample sizes and data sharing

In 2008, Godley et al., postulated that scientific breakthroughs would arise from greater sample sizes, suggesting data sharing and inter-disciplinary synergy held the key to success. Eight years on, larger sample sizes and further improvements to data sharing are still recognised as necessary to help improve the conservation benefits from tracking (table 4), but has this interdisciplinary nature of the research landscape changed? There is still a sense that sharing data and both positive and negative research experiences would help refine future research (Habib et al., 2014). Sample size was cited as a means to increase the benefits to conservation: "*It is important to extend beyond single species, and identify important areas for conservation based on multiple species/taxa – this is likely to generate more interest by government …So, researchers should be encouraged to make their tracking data available, and collaborations should be encouraged*."

Facilitated in some cases by clearing houses such as STAT (Coyne & Godley 2005), many papers already use large sample sizes (see legend of fig.1d for studies with n>70), combine datasets (e.g. Kobayashi et al., 2008; Scott et al., 2014b) or use data from multiple taxa (Block et al., 2011; Maxwell et al., 2013; Gredzens et al., 2014; Pendoley et al., 2014). Papers are increasingly combining satellite tracking data with oceanographic data layers (Polovina et al., 2004; Hawkes et al., 2006; James et al., 2006; Seminoff et al., 2008; Howell et al., 2010; Hays et al., 2014a; Fujioka et al., 2014) and data layers mapping potential pressures from fisheries have also been employed in an attempt to identify patterns and areas of latent threat to inform relevant management solutions (Howell et al., 2008; da Silva et al., 2011; Scott et al., 2012a; Fossette et al., 2014; Roe et al., 2014).

However, some review papers drew conclusions based only on journal published data and did not analyse relevant tracks widely available on sites like www.seaturtle.org, yet acknowledged them and recommended that they be journal published (Luschi & Casale 2014). Also important studies are sometimes conducted by organisations who do not share their data: "*Too many times a resources company does the work but never releases the results due to 'commercial confidentiality'.* There should be a way of ensuring these data are shared, either as a clause in the tracking license or a stipulation of the funding agreement or "*There should be a time frame in which data should be published/made available (after initial collection); so that important datasets are not lost/never make it into the literature*." This kind of stipulation, although potentially difficult to enforce in the private sector, would encourage data sharing, raise awareness about the need to share and encourage groups to publish sooner. It should be considered as best practice to be recommended by consultants.

Encouragingly, there are examples of emerging partnerships which have had an impact on local management strategies and bycatch mitigation (Peckham et al., 2007; McClellan et al., 2009). Other collaborations include multi-sector partnerships (Marcovaldi et al., 1999; Richardson et al., 2010) and 'embedded experiences', where scientists spend an intensive period integrated in communities or other disciplinary sectors (Jenkins et al., 2012). These should be encouraged to develop a deeper understanding of the relevant community conservation management issues and the data required to address these.

International cooperation

International cooperation was another common theme, both in the literature and questionnaire responses. (table 2 and 4). Tracking data have clarified the migratory nature of turtles and highlighted that effective protection measures need to be based on international agreements, with relevant nations committing to enforce legislation (Blumenthal et al., 2006; Shillinger et al., 2008). The literature makes many recommendations, including co-developing management solutions with neighbouring countries (Gredzens et al., 2014) and making additional efforts to control international fishing activities (Georges et al., 2007). One respondent emphasised this by saying: "*New fishing management agreements among multiple nations are needed. The turtles don't recognise international boundaries.*"

In some cases, the discrepancy between the number of respondents and number of papers per country could indicate a non-response bias, whereby respondents have very different demographic characteristics to non-respondents (Fleming & Bowden 2009). However, it seems more plausible that there is a bias in the origin of the researchers, with those in wealthier nations conducting tracking overseas, especially given the costs of tracking devices (Godley et al., 2008). When tracking location was compared with author nationality it indicated that researchers are tracking in locations other than the country they reside in, although many are collaborating with researchers in-country.

Falling on deaf ears?

To maximise the impact of research findings, researchers and policy-makers would ideally enjoy a synergistic relationship and operate in the 'domain of best practice', where strong scientific findings directly affect well-defined policy, providing solutions to real-life conservation issues (Rudd 2011). This is already occurring in some places as evident from their national species recovery plans (table 3). Sometimes, recommendations are successfully communicated to decision-makers but are not implemented, or execution is difficult and slow, as is the case in Zakynthos, Greece. Many tracking studies focus on turtle use of the Bay of Laganas, home to the largest known Mediterranean rookery (e.g. Schofield et al., 2010a, 2013a, 2013b; Zbinden et al., 2007, 2011), and recommendations are made in support of the new ecotourism zone (Schofield et al., 2009). Nevertheless, compliance to the proposed new zone remains voluntary as part of a national park directive, and is still pending endorsement by the government (G. Schofield pers. comm). Sometimes policy alone is insufficient to prevent infractions and only a lawsuit will effect change. The Karen Beasley Sea Turtle Rescue and Rehabilitation Centre filed a lawsuit against the North Carolina Division of Marine Fisheries (NCDMF) and the North Carolina Marine Fisheries Commission (NCMFC), for the illegal take of turtles in a state-regulated inshore gillnet fishery. Eventually new regulations were formed, based on satellite tracking data, restricting gillnets to overnight sets to alleviate conflict (NOAA 2013) (See table 3).

Community

Community engagement, a theme emerging in both the literature (table 2) and respondent recommendations (table 4), can play an important role in turtle conservation and should be considered when tracking turtles. Grassroots initiatives, encouraging local awareness and engagement, can often be more sustainable and can lead to community marine reserves and reduced turtle take (Peckham et al., 2007; Garnier et al., 2012). Forging relationships and working collaboratively with communities to form management strategies can enhance the quality of environmental decisions (Reed 2008) and may prove key in achieving sustainability, especially where local communities hold the traditional management rights (Kennett et al., 2004). As one respondent said: "*Communities often resent being overlooked by researchers/government. Before tagging turtles there should be effort made to explain the project and its reasons to stakeholders and then an effort to keep them involved … in many cases [this will] change the way people view turtles and makes the public feel involved in research and welcome/understand new protection measures suggested by researchers.*"

Turtles provide a flagship opportunity to introduce communities to conservation (Blumenthal et al., 2006), form the basis for community outreach exercises (Richardson et al., 2010) or provide other benefits such as hiring ex-turtle hunters or fisherman to protect turtles (Marcovaldi et al., 1999). Being involved in such initiatives can make locals think differently about the management and protection of turtles when they realise how far turtles travel (e.g Richardson et al., 2010). Engaging communities in local conservation issues may also result in bottom-up pressure on governments, or inspire groups to seek legislation for community reserves (Peckham et al., 2007). Sometimes tracking projects propagate other community-based actions, such as beach surveys (Whiting et al., 2006), or eliminating hazards on nesting-beaches (Cheng 2007). These indirect conservation dividends from satellite tracking, highlight the necessity for, and benefits of, collaboration at all stages of the tracking process.

Technology

Improving technology and reducing costs to facilitate larger sample sizes and more accurate data collection was suggested by respondents, as a way to increase the benefits to conservation. Recent developments, such as Argos-linked FastLoc GPS devices, although more expensive, have overcome some of the limitations caused by turtles surfacing infrequently (Hoenner et al., 2012). These improvements, alongside new filtering techniques (Shimada et al., 2012), have enhanced the quality and accuracy of location data, allowing movements and behaviours to be discerned at a much finer scale (Bradshaw et al., 2007; Hazel 2009). Consequently recommendations for spatial designations are based on more realistic predictions (Schofield et al., 2007, 2010b;) and other estimates have been updated such as the average number of clutches per female (Weber et al., 2013). Given fiscal constraints, ARGOS-only transmitters may, however, be adequate for some research questions (Witt et al., 2010). Tags are, however, still too large to track hatchlings, with the youngest tracked aged 3.5 months (Mansfield et al., 2014). Developing smaller tags to track these turtles could have significant conservation implications, as knowledge of their early movements are, as yet, largely unknown and based on genetics, oceanographic modelling (e.g. Godley et al., 2010) and real time tracking using other tracking mechanisms such as sonic tagging (e.g. Scott et al., 2014a); see also Hazen et al,. 2012 for a review.

Welfare considerations

Although the extent to which tagging impacts turtles is debated, some studies show that tagging may cause various behavioural changes including early migration or increased interactions with fisheries, including a reduction in the effectiveness of bycatch mitigation devices (Sherrill-Mix & James 2008; Seney et al., 2010). A cost-benefit analysis would be useful in justifying the potential negative impacts, a concern highlighted by respondents: "*Is the potential increased risk to turtles (entanglement, easier to spot by hunters, etc.) worth the potential benefit if the data do not lead to further conservation measures?*". Failure to consider these factors could result in a modern satellite "tagging reflex" (Mrosovsky 1983) and leave researchers struggling to apply data to conservation issues post-collection. Further studies should compare the survival of turtles with and without tags.

Conclusions

The potential dividends to conservation from satellite tracking turtles are abundant, as highlighted by many of the accomplishments discussed here. Species and habitat management considerations are increasingly integrated in tracking methodologies, and discussed in the literature, with an impact on both national policies and community-level activities. However, it is still fundamentally difficult to quantify the current impact that these data have had on turtle conservation and in particular, it is difficult to attribute dividends to one data source or output type. Although researchers should remain cautious of being overly-prescriptive or forceful, many of the recommendations made to date are vague. More explicit, better-communicated recommendations may help bridge the current gaps between policy makers and researchers and produce more tangible benefits for conservation. Researchers should be looking to those who are influencing policy at the local level to see what information they require to inform their work.

Perhaps it is premature to determine the full extent of conservation dividends from satellite tracking turtles. Change can be slow, often impeded by government bureaucracy, and the literature has only recently started focusing on conservation in the last ten years. Further evaluation is necessary to gain a clearer understanding of the impacts of tracking data, especially as we have only considered journal-published data. To gain a more holistic understanding of the current impact and dividends, further research would include more evidence from policy-makers and should evaluate the impact of other dissemination methods, such as technical reports, and assess the proportion of data and 'success' stories that are published there. Additionally, whilst we have focused on satellite tracked turtles, these discussions may apply to more general areas of conservation, or tracking other marine megavertebrates, such as sharks. There are no-doubt lessons to be learnt from researchers in those fields too and by integrating datasets from multiple species (Hammerschlag et al., 2015). If researchers continue to align their aims with key conservation concerns, and collaborations are strengthened, then the direct benefits to conservation from satellite tracking turtles will become more tangible.

Acknowledgements

We are most grateful to: Michael Coyne for assistance with Seaturtle.org; Anna Nuno for her questionnaire assistance; everyone who kindly shared their views in the questionnaire; especially Annette Broderick, Alan Rees and Matthew Godfrey who tested the questionnaire and those scientists who allowed their comments to be used. The manuscript was improved as a result of the feedback of three reviewers and the Editor.

Literature cited

Àlvarez de Quevedo, I., San Félix, M., Cardona, L., 2013. Mortality rates in by-caught loggerhead turtle (*Caretta caretta*) in the Mediterranean Sea and implications for the Atlantic populations. Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser. 489, 225–234. doi:10.3354/meps10411

Arendt, M.D., Segars, A.L., Byrd, J.I., Boynton, J., Schwenter, J.A., Whitaker, J.D., Parker, L., 2011. Migration, distribution, and diving behavior of adult male loggerhead sea turtles (*Caretta caretta*) following dispersal from a major breeding aggregation in the Western North Atlantic. Mar. Biol. 159, 113–125. doi:10.1007/s00227-011-1826-0

Bailey, H., Fossette, S., Bograd, S.J., Shillinger, G.L., Swithenbank, A.M., Georges, J.-Y., Gaspar, P., Strömberg, K.H.P., Paladino, F. V, Spotila, J.R., Block, B.A., Hays, G.C., 2012. Movement patterns for a critically endangered species, the leatherback turtle (*Dermochelys coriacea*), linked to foraging success and population status. PLoS One 7, e36401. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0036401

Block, B., Jonsen, I., Jorgensen, S., Winship, A., Shaffer, S., Bograd, S., Hazen, E., Foley, D., Breed, G., Harrison, A., Ganong, J., Swithenbank, A., Castleton, M., Dewar, H., Mate, B., Shillinger, G., Schaefer, K., Benson, S., Weise, M., Henry, R., Costa, D., 2011. Tracking apex marine predator movements in a dynamic ocean. Nature 475, 86–90. doi:10.1038/nature10082

Blumenthal, J.M., Solomon, J.L., Bell, C.D., Austin, T.J., Ebanks-Petrie, G., Coyne, M.S., Broderick, A.C., Godley, B.J., 2006. Satellite tracking highlights the need for international cooperation in marine turtle management. Endanger. Species Res. 7, 1–11.

Bradshaw, C.J.A., 2005. Survival of the fittest technology — problems estimating marine turtle mortality. Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser. 287, 261–262.

Bradshaw, C.J.A., Sims, D.W., Hays, G.C., 2007. Measurement error causes scale-dependent threshold erosion of biological signals in animal movement data. Ecol. Soc. Am. 17, 628–638.

Butler, J.R.A., Tawake, A., Skewes, T., Tawake, L., Mcgrath, V., 2012. Integrating traditional ecological knowledge and fisheries management in the Torres Strait , Australia: the catalytic role of turtles and dugong as cultural keystone species. Ecol. Soc. 17.

Byrne, R., Fish, J., Doyle, T.K., Houghton, J.D.R., 2009. Tracking leatherback turtles (*Dermochelys coriacea*) during consecutive inter-nesting intervals: Further support for direct transmitter attachment. J. Exp. Mar. Bio. Ecol. 377, 68–75. doi:10.1016/j.jembe.2009.06.013

Casale, P., Affronte, M., Scaravelli, D., Lazar, B., Vallini, C., Luschi, P., 2012. Foraging grounds, movement patterns and habitat connectivity of juvenile loggerhead turtles (*Caretta caretta*) tracked from the Adriatic Sea. Mar. Biol. 159, 1527–1535. doi:10.1007/s00227-012-1937-2

Chaloupka, M., Parker, D., Balazs, G., 2004a. Tracking turtles to their death - reply to Hays et al. Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser. 283, 301–302. doi:10.3354/meps283301

Chaloupka, M., Parker, D., Balazs, G., 2004b. Modelling post-release mortality of loggerhead sea turtles exposed to the Hawaii-based pelagic longline fishery. Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser. 280, 285–293. doi:10.3354/meps280285

Cheng, I.J., 2007. Nesting ecology and postnesting migration of sea turtles on Taipin Tao, Nansha Archipelago, South China Sea. Chelonian Conserv. Biol. 6, 277–282.

Coleman, F.C., Williams, S.L., 2002. Overexploiting marine ecosystem engineers : potential consequences for biodiversity. Trends Ecol. Evol. 17, 40–44.

Cook, C.N., Hockings, M., Carter, R. (Bill), 2010. Conservation in the dark? The information used to support management decisions. Front. Ecol. Environ. 8, 181–186. doi:10.1890/090020

Coyne, M.S., Godley, B.J., 2005. Satellite tracking and analysis tool (STAT): an integrated system for archiving, analyzing and mapping animal tracking data. Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser. 301, 1–7.

Crossin, G., Cooke, S., Goldbogen, J., Phillips, R., 2014. Tracking fitness in marine vertebrates: current knowledge and opportunities for future research. Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser. 496, 1–17. doi:10.3354/meps10691

Da Silva, A., Dos Santos, E., Oliveira, F., Weber, M., Batista, J., Serafini, T., De Castilhos, J., 2011. Satellite-tracking reveals multiple foraging strategies and threats for olive ridley turtles in Brazil. Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser. 443, 237–247. doi:10.3354/meps09427

Dodge, K.L., Galuardi, B., Miller, T.J., Lutcavage, M.E., 2014. Leatherback turtle movements, dive behavior, and habitat characteristics in ecoregions of the northwest Atlantic Ocean. PLoS One 9, e91726. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0091726

Eckert, K.L., Hemphill, A.H., 2005. Sea Turtles as Flagships for Protection of the Wider Caribbean Region. MAST 3, 119–143.

Eckert, S.A., Eckert, K., 1986. Harnessing leatherbacks. Mar. Turt. Newsl. 1–3.

Fan, W., Yan, Z., 2010. Factors affecting response rates of the web survey: A systematic review. Comput. Human Behav. 26, 132–139. doi:10.1016/j.chb.2009.10.015

Ferraro, P.J., 2009. Counterfactual thinking and impact evaluation in environmental policy, in: Birnbaum, M., Mickwitz, P. (Eds.), Environmental Program and Policy Evaluation New Directions for Evaluation. Wiley, pp. 75–84. doi:10.1002/ev

Ferraro, P.J., Pattanayak, S.K., 2006. Money for nothing? A call for empirical evaluation of biodiversity conservation investments. PLoS Biol. 4, e105. doi:10.1371/journal.pbio.0040105

Fleming, C.M., Bowden, M., 2009. Web-based surveys as an alternative to traditional mail methods. J. Environ. Manage. 90, 284–92. doi:10.1016/j.jenvman.2007.09.011

Fossette, S., Corbel, H., Gaspar, P., Maho, Y.L., Georges, J.-Y., 2007. An alternative technique for the long-term satellite tracking of leatherback turtles. Endanger. Species Res. 3. doi:10.3354/esr00039

Fossette, S., Witt, M.J., Miller, P., Nalovic, A., Albareda, D., Almeida, A.P., Broderick, A.C., Chacon-Chaverri, D., Coyne, M.S., Domingo, A., Eckert, S., Evans, D., Fallabrino, A., Ferraroli, S., Giffoni, B., Hays, G.C., Hughes, G., Kelle, L., Leslie, A., Luschi, P., Turny, A., Verhage, S., Godley, B.J., 2014. Pan-Atlantic analysis of the overlap of a highly migratory species, the leatherback turtle, with pelagic longline fisheries. Proc. R. Soc. B Biol. Sci. 281. doi:10.1098/rspb.2013.3065

Frydman, S.Ã., Gales, N., 2007. HeardMap : Tracking marine vertebrate populations in near real time. Deep Sea Res. Part II Top. Stud. Oceanogr. 54, 384–391. doi:10.1016/j.dsr2.2006.11.015

Fujioka, E., Kot, C.Y., Wallace, B.P., Best, B.D., Moxley, J., Cleary, J., Donnelly, B., Halpin, P.N., 2014. Data integration for conservation: leveraging multiple data types to advance ecological assessments and habitat modeling for marine megavertebrates using OBIS–SEAMAP. Ecol. Inform. 20, 13–26. doi:10.1016/j.ecoinf.2014.01.003

Gaos, A.R., Lewison, R.R., Wallace, B.P., Yañez, I.L., Liles, M.J., Baquero, A., Seminoff, J.A., 2012. Dive behaviour of adult hawksbills (*Eretmochelys imbricata*, Linnaeus 1766) in the eastern Pacific Ocean highlights shallow depth use by the species. J. Exp. Mar. Bio. Ecol. 432-433, 171–178. doi:10.1016/j.jembe.2012.07.006

Garnier, J., Hill, N., Guissamulo, A., Silva, I., Witt, M., Godley, B., 2012. Status and community-based conservation of marine turtles in the northern Querimbas Islands (Mozambique). Oryx 46, 359–367. doi:10.1017/S0030605311001566

Georges, J., Billes, A., Ferraroli, S., Fossette, S., Fretey, J., Grémillet, D., Maho, Y. Le, Myers, A.E., Tanaka, H., Hays, G.C., 2007. Meta-analysis of movements in Atlantic leatherback turtles during nesting season:conservation implications. Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser. 338, 225–232.

Gibbons, P., Zammit, C., Youngentob, K., Possingham, H.P., Lindenmayer, D.B., Bekessy, S., Burgman, M., Colyvan, M., Considine, M., Felton, A., Hobbs, R.J., Hurley, K., McAlpine, C., McCarthy, M. a., Moore, J., Robinson, D., Salt, D., Wintle, B., 2008. Some practical suggestions for improving engagement between researchers and policy-makers in natural resource management. Ecol. Manag. Restor. 9, 182–186. doi:10.1111/j.1442-8903.2008.00416.x

Godfrey, M., Godley, B., 2008. Seeing past the red: flawed IUCN global listings for sea turtles. Endanger. Species Res. 6, 155–159. doi:10.3354/esr00071

Godley, B.J., Barbosa, C., Bruford, M., Broderick, A.C., Catry, P., Coyne, M.S., Formia, A., Hays, G.C., Witt, M.J., 2010. Unravelling migratory connectivity in marine turtles using multiple methods. J. Appl. Ecol. 47, 769–778. doi:10.1111/j.1365-2664.2010.01817.x

Godley, B.J., Blumenthal, J, M., Broderick, A.C., Coyne, M.S., Godfrey, M., Hawkes, L., Witt, M., 2008. Satellite tracking of sea turtles: where have we been and where do we go next? Endanger. Species Res. 4, 3–22. doi:10.3354/esr00060

Godley, B.J., Richardson, S., Broderick, A.C., Coyne, M.S., Glen, F., Hays, G.C., 2002. Long-term satellite telemetry of the movements and habitat utilisation by green turtles in the Mediterranean. Ecography (Cop.). 25, 352–362.

Gredzens, C., Marsh, H., Fuentes, M.M.P.B., Limpus, C.J., Shimada, T., Hamann, M., 2014. Satellite tracking of sympatric marine megafauna can inform the biological basis for species co-management. PLoS One 9, e98944. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0098944

Habib, B., Shrotriya, S., Sivakumar, K., Sinha, P., Mathur, V., 2014. Three decades of wildlife radio telemetry in India: a review. Anim. Biotelemetry 2, 4. doi:10.1186/2050-3385-2-4

Hamann, M., Godfrey, M., Seminoff, J., Arthur, K., Barata, P.C., Bjorndal, K., Bolten, A., Broderick, A., Campbell, L., Carreras, C., Casale, P., Chaloupka, M., Chan, S.K., Coyne, M., Crowder, L., Diez, C., Dutton, P., Epperly, S., FitzSimmons, N., Formia, A., Girondot, M., Hays, G., Cheng, I., Kaska, Y., Lewison, R., Mortimer, J., Nichols, W., Reina, R., Shanker, K., Spotila, J., Tomás, J., Wallace, B., Work, T., Zbinden, J., Godley, B., 2010. Global research priorities for sea turtles: informing management and conservation in the 21st century. Endanger. Species Res. 11, 245–269. doi:10.3354/esr00279

Hammerschlag, N., Broderick, A.C., Coker, J.W., Coyne, M.S., Dodd, M., Frick, M.G., Godfrey, M.H., Godley, B.J., Griffin, D.B., Hartog, K., Murphy, S.R., Murphy, T.M., Nelson, E., Williams, K.L., Witt, M.J., Hawkes, L.A., 2015. Evaluating the landscape of fear between apex predatory sharks and mobile sea turtles across a large dynamic seascape. Ecol. Soc. Am. 96, 2117–2126.

Hammerschlag, N., Cooke, S.J., Gallagher, A.J., Godley, B.J., 2014. Considering the fate of electronic tags: interactions with stakeholders and user responsibility when encountering tagged aquatic animals. Methods Ecol. Evol. 1147–1153. doi:10.1111/2041-210X.12248

Hammerschlag, N., Gallagher, a. J., Lazarre, D.M., 2011. A review of shark satellite tagging studies. J. Exp. Mar. Bio. Ecol. 398, 1–8. doi:10.1016/j.jembe.2010.12.012

Hardy, R.F., Tucker, A.D., Foley, A.M., Schroeder, B.A., Giove, R.J., Meylan, A.B., 2014. Spatiotemporal occurrence of loggerhead turtles (*Caretta caretta*) on the West Florida Shelf and apparent overlap with a commercial fishery. Can. J. Aquat. Sci. 1933, 1924–1933.

Hart, K.M., Lamont, M.M., Fujisaki, I., Tucker, A.D., Carthy, R.R., 2012. Common coastal foraging areas for loggerheads in the Gulf of Mexico: opportunities for marine conservation. Biol. Conserv. 145, 185–194. doi:10.1016/j.biocon.2011.10.030

Hart, K.M., Lamont, M.M., Sartain, A.R., Fujisaki, I., Stephens, B.S., 2013. Movements and habitat-use of loggerhead sea turtles in the northern Gulf of Mexico during the reproductive period. PLoS One 8, e66921. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0066921

Hawkes, L.A., Broderick, A.C., Coyne, M.S., Godfrey, M.H., Lopez-Jurado, L.-F., Lopez-Suarez, P., Merino, S.E., Varo-Cruz, N., Godley, B.J., 2006. Phenotypically linked dichotomy in sea turtle foraging requires multiple conservation approaches. Curr. Biol. 16, 990–5. doi:10.1016/j.cub.2006.03.063

Hays, G., Broderick, A., Godley, B., Luschi, P., Nichols, W., 2003. Satellite telemetry suggests high levels of fishing-induced mortality in marine turtles. Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser. 262, 305–309. doi:10.3354/meps262305

Hays, G.C., Broderick, A.C., Godley, B.J., Luschi, P., Nichols, W.J., 2004. Tracking turtles to their death. Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser. 283, 299–300.

Hays, G.C., Christensen, A., Fossette, S., Schofield, G., Talbot, J., Mariani, P., 2014. Route optimisation and solving Zermelo's navigation problem during long distance migration in cross flows. Ecol. Lett. 17, 137–43. doi:10.1111/ele.12219

Hazel, J., 2009. Evaluation of fast-acquisition GPS in stationary tests and fine-scale tracking of green turtles. J. Exp. Mar. Bio. Ecol. 374, 58–68. doi:10.1016/j.jembe.2009.04.009

Hazen, E., Maxwell, S., Bailey, H., Bograd, S., Hamann, M., Gaspar, P., Godley, B., Shillinger, G., 2012. Ontogeny in marine tagging and tracking science: technologies and data gaps. Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser. 457, 221–240. doi:10.3354/meps09857

Hoenner, X., Whiting, S.D., Hindell, M.A., McMahon, C.R., 2012. Enhancing the use of Argos satellite data for home range and long distance migration studies of marine animals. PLoS One 7, e40713. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0040713

Howell, E., Kobayashi, D., Parker, D., Balazs, G., Polovina, A.J., 2008. TurtleWatch: a tool to aid in the bycatch reduction of loggerhead turtles *Caretta caretta* in the Hawaii-based pelagic longline fishery. Endanger. Species Res. 5, 267–278. doi:10.3354/esr00096

Howell, E.A., Dutton, P.H., Polovina, J.J., Bailey, H., Parker, D.M., Balazs, G.H., 2010. Oceanographic influences on the dive behavior of juvenile loggerhead turtles (*Caretta caretta*) in the North Pacific Ocean. Mar. Biol. 157, 1011–1026. doi:10.1007/s00227-009-1381-0

Jackson, K.M., Trochim, W.M.K., 2002. Concept mapping as an alternative approach for the analysis of open-ended survey responses. Organ. Res. Methods 5, 307–336. doi:10.1177/109442802237114

James, M.C., Davenport, J., Hays, G.C., 2006. Expanded thermal niche for a diving vertebrate: a leatherback turtle diving into near-freezing water. J. Exp. Mar. Bio. Ecol. 335, 221–226. doi:10.1016/j.jembe.2006.03.013

Jenkins, L.D., Maxwell, S.M., Fisher, E., 2012. Increasing conservation impact and policy relevance of research through embedded experiences. Conserv. Biol. 26, 740–2. doi:10.1111/j.1523-1739.2012.01878.x

Jones, T., Houtan, K.S. Van, Bostrom, B.L., Ostafichuk, P., Mikkelsen, J., Tezcan, E., Carey, M., Imlach, B., Seminoff, J.A., 2013. Calculating the ecological impacts of animal-borne instruments on aquatic organisms. Methods Ecol. Evol. 4, 1178–1186. doi:10.1111/2041-210X.12109

Kennett, R., Munungurritj, N., Yunupingu, D., 2004. Migration patterns of marine turtles in the Gulf of Carpentaria, northern Australia: implications for Aboriginal management. Wildl. Res. 31, 241. doi:10.1071/WR03002

Khan, K.S., Kunz, R., Kleijnen, J., Antes, G., 2003. Five steps to conducting a systematic review. J. R. Soc. Med. 96, 118–121.

Kittiwattanawong, K., Chantrapornsyl, S., Sakamoto, W., Arai, N., 2002. Tracking of green turtles *Chelonia mydas* in the Andaman Sea using platform transmitter terminals. Phuket Mar. Biol. Cent. Res. Bull. 64, 81–87.

Klain, S., Eberdong, J., Kitalong, A., Yalap, Y., Matthews, E., Eledui, A., Morris, M., Andrew, W., Albis, D., Kemesong, P., 2007. Linking Micronesia and Southeast Asia: Palau sea turtle satellite tracking and flipper tag returns. Mar. Turt. Newsl. 9–11.

Kobayashi, D.R., Polovina, J.J., Parker, D.M., Kamezaki, N., 2008. Pelagic habitat characterization of loggerhead sea turtles, *Caretta caretta*, in the North Pacific Ocean (1997 – 2006): insights from satellite tag tracking and remotely sensed data. J. Exp. Mar. Bio. Ecol. 356, 96–114. doi:10.1016/j.jembe.2007.12.019

Lewison, R.L., Crowder, L.B., Wallace, B.P., Moore, J.E., Cox, T., Zydelis, R., McDonald, S., DiMatteo, A., Dunn, D.C., Kot, C.Y., Bjorkland, R., Kelez, S., Soykan, C., Stewart, K.R., Sims, M., Boustany, A., Read, A.J., Halpin, P., Nichols, W.J., Safina, C., 2014. Global patterns of marine mammal, seabird, and sea turtle bycatch reveal taxa-specific and cumulative megafauna hotspots. Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A. 111, 5271–6. doi:10.1073/pnas.1318960111

Lobe, B., Vehovar, V., 2008. Towards a flexible online mixed method design with a feedback loop. Qual. Quant. 43, 585–597. doi:10.1007/s11135-007-9146-7

Luschi, P., Casale, P., 2014. Movement patterns of marine turtles in the Mediterranean Sea: a review. Ital. J. Zool. 81, 478–495. doi:10.1080/11250003.2014.963714

Lutcavage, M., Rhodin, A., Sadove, S., Conroy, C., 2001. Direct carapacial attachment of satellite tags using orthopedic bioabsorbable mini-anchor screws on leatherback turtles in Culebra, Puerto Rico. Mar. Turt. Newsl. 9–12.

Mangel, J., Alfaro-Shigueto, J., Witt, M., Dutton, P., Seminoff, J., Godley, B., 2011. Post-capture movements of loggerhead turtles in the southeastern Pacific Ocean assessed by satellite tracking. Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser. 433, 261–272. doi:10.3354/meps09152

Mansfield, K.L., Wyneken, J., Porter, W.P., Luo, J., 2014. First satellite tracks of neonate sea turtles redefine the 'lost years' oceanic niche. Proc. R. Soc. B Biol. Sci. 281.

Marcovaldi, Ã., Guagni, G., Maria, A., 1999. Marine turtles of Brazil: the history and structure of Projeto TAMAR-IBAMA 91.

Marcovaldi, M., Lopez, G., Soares, L., Lima, E.H.S., Thomé, J.C., Almeida, A., 2010. Satellite-tracking of female loggerhead turtles highlights fidelity behavior in northeastern Brazil. Endanger. Species Res. 12, 263–272. doi:10.3354/esr00308

Maxwell, S.M., Hazen, E.L., Bograd, S.J., Halpern, B.S., Breed, G.A., Nickel, B., Teutschel, N.M., Crowder, L.B., Benson, S., Dutton, P.H., Bailey, H., Kappes, M.A., Kuhn, C.E., Weise, M.J., Mate, B., Shaffer, S.A., Hassrick, J.L., Henry, R.W., Irvine, L., Mcdonald, B.I., Robinson, P.W., Block, B.A., Costa, D.P., 2013. Cumulative human impacts on marine predators. Nat. Commun. 4, 1–9. doi:10.1038/ncommsS3688

McClellan, C., Read, A., 2009. Confronting the gauntlet: understanding incidental capture of green turtles through fine-scale movement studies. Endanger. Species Res. 10, 165–179. doi:10.3354/esr00199

McClellan, C.M., Read, A.J., Price, B.A., Cluse, W.M., Godfrey, M.H., 2009. Using telemetry to mitigate the bycatch of long-lived marine vertebrates. Ecol. Appl. 19, 1660–71.

McMahon, C., Collier, N., Northfield, J., Glen, F., 2011. Taking the time to assess the effects of remote sensing and tracking devices on animals. Anim. Welf. 20, 515–521.

Moran, K.L., Bjorndal, K.A., 2006. Simulated green turtle grazing affects nutrient composition of the seagrass Thalassia testudinum. Mar. Biol. 150, 1083–1092. doi:10.1007/s00227-006-0427-9

Mrosovsky, N., 1983. Conserving sea turtles. British Herpetological Society.

NMFS and USWS, 2008. Recovery plan for the northwest Atlantic population of the loggerhead sea turtle (*Caretta caretta*), Second Revision. National Marine Fisheries Service, Silver Spring, MD.

NOAA (National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration), 2013. NOAA's National marine fisheries service endangered species act (ESA) - Section 7 consultation.

Papi, F., Liew, H., Luschi, P., Chan, E., 1995. Long-range migratory travel of a green turtle tracked by satellite: evidence for navigational ability in the open sea. Mar. Biol. 122, 171–175.

Peckham, S.H., Maldonado Diaz, D., Walli, A., Ruiz, G., Crowder, L.B., Nichols, W.J., 2007. Small-scale fisheries bycatch jeopardizes endangered Pacific loggerhead turtles. PLoS One 2, e1041. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0001041

Pendoley, K.L., Schofield, G., Whittock, P.A., Ierodiaconou, D., Hays, G.C., 2014. Protected species use of a coastal marine migratory corridor connecting marine protected areas. Mar. Biol. doi:10.1007/s00227-014-2433-7

Pikesley, S.K., Maxwell, S.M., Pendoley, K., Costa, D.P., Coyne, M.S., Formia, A., Godley, B.J., Klein, W., Makanga-Bahouna, J., Maruca, S., Ngouessono, S., Parnell, R.J., Pemo-Makaya, E., Witt, M.J., 2013. On the front line: integrated habitat mapping for olive ridley sea turtles in the southeast Atlantic. Divers. Distrib. 19, 1518–1530. doi:10.1111/ddi.12118

Pilcher, N.J., 2013. A portable restraining box for sea turtles. Mar. Turt. Newsl. 136, 3–4.

Polovina, J.J., Balazs, G.H., Howell, E.A., Parker, D.M., Seki, M.P., Dutton, P.H., 2004. Forage and migration habitat of loggerhead (*Caretta caretta*) and olive ridley (*Lepidochelys olivacea*) sea turtles in the central North Pacific Ocean. Fish. Oceanogr. 13, 36–51. doi:10.1046/j.1365-2419.2003.00270.x

Pullin, A.S., Knight, T.M., 2003. Nature conservation support for decision making in conservation practice: an evidence-based approach 90, 83–90.

Pullin, A.S., Knight, T.M., Stone, D.A., Charman, K., 2004. Do conservation managers use scientific evidence to support their decision-making? Biol. Conserv. 119, 245–252. doi:10.1016/j.biocon.2003.11.007

Pullin, A.S., Stewart, G.B., 2006. Guidelines for systematic review in conservation and environmental management. Conserv. Biol. 20, 1647–56. doi:10.1111/j.1523-1739.2006.00485.x

Reed, M.S., 2008. Stakeholder participation for environmental management: A literature review. Biol.

Conserv. 141, 2417–2431. doi:10.1016/j.biocon.2008.07.014

Rees, A.F., Saady, S. Al, Broderick, A.C., Coyne, M.S., Papathanasopoulou, N., Godley, B.J., 2010. Behavioural polymorphism in one of the world's largest populations of loggerhead sea turtles *Caretta caretta*. Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser. 418, 201–212. doi:10.3354/meps08767

Richardson, P.B., Calosso, M.C., Claydon, J., Clerveaux, W., Godley, J., Phillips, Q., Ranger, S., Sanghera, A., Stringell, T.B., 2010. Suzie the green turtle: 6, 000 kilometres for one clutch of eggs? Mar. Turt. Newsl. 127, 26–27.

Roe, J.H., Morreale, S.J., Paladino, F. V, Shillinger, G.L., Benson, S.R., Eckert, S., Bailey, H., Tomillo, P.S., Bograd, S.J., Eguchi, T., Dutton, P.H., Seminoff, J.A., Block, B.A., Spotila, J.R., 2014. Predicting bycatch hotspots for endangered leatherback turtles on longlines in the Pacific Ocean. Proc. R. Soc. B Biol. Sci. 281.

Rudd, M.A., 2011. How research-prioritization exercises affect conservation policy. Conserv. Biol. 25, 860–6. doi:10.1111/j.1523-1739.2011.01712.x

Sánchez-Fernández, J., Muñoz-Leiva, F., Montoro-Ríos, F.J., 2012. Improving retention rate and response quality in web-based surveys. Comput. Human Behav. 28, 507–514. doi:10.1016/j.chb.2011.10.023

Sasso, C.R., Epperly, S.P., 2007. Survival of pelagic juvenile loggerhead turtles in the open ocean. J. Wildl. Manage. 71, 1830–1835. doi:10.2193/2006-448

Schofield, G., Bishop, C.M., MacLean, G., Brown, P., Baker, M., Katselidis, K.A., Dimopoulos, P., Pantis, J.D., Hays, G.C., 2007. Novel GPS tracking of sea turtles as a tool for conservation management. J. Exp. Mar. Bio. Ecol. 347, 58–68. doi:10.1016/j.jembe.2007.03.009

Schofield, G., Dimadi, A., Fossette, S., Katselidis, K.A., Koutsoubas, D., Lilley, M.K.S., Luckman, A., Pantis, J.D., Karagouni, A.D., Hays, G.C., 2013a. Satellite tracking large numbers of individuals to infer population level dispersal and core areas for the protection of an endangered species. Divers. Distrib. 19, 834–844. doi:10.1111/ddi.12077

Schofield, G., Hobson, V.J., Fossette, S., Lilley, M.K.S., Katselidis, K.A., Hays, G.C., 2010a. Fidelity to foraging sites, consistency of migration routes and habitat modulation of home range by sea turtles. Divers. Distrib. 16, 840–853. doi:10.1111/j.1472-4642.2010.00694.x

Schofield, G., Hobson, V.J., Lilley, M.K.S., Katselidis, K.A., Bishop, C.M., Brown, P., Hays, G.C., 2010b. Inter-annual variability in the home range of breeding turtles: Implications for current and future conservation management. Biol. Conserv. 143, 722–730. doi:10.1016/j.biocon.2009.12.011

Schofield, G., Lilley, M.K., Bishop, C., Brown, P., Katselidis, K., Dimopoulos, P., Pantis, J., Hays, G., 2009.

Conservation hotspots: implications of intense spatial area use by breeding male and female loggerheads at the Mediterranean's largest rookery. Endanger. Species Res. 10, 191–202. doi:10.3354/esr00137

Schofield, G., Scott, R., Dimadi, A., Fossette, S., Katselidis, K.A., Koutsoubas, D., Lilley, M.K.S., Pantis, J.D., Karagouni, A.D., Hays, G.C., 2013b. Evidence-based marine protected area planning for a highly mobile endangered marine vertebrate. Biol. Conserv. 161, 101–109. doi:10.1016/j.biocon.2013.03.004

Scott, J.A., Dodd, M.G., Castleberry, S.B., 2012. Assessment of management scenarios to reduce loggerhead turtle interactions with shrimp trawlers in Georgia. Mar. Coast. Fish. Manag. Ecosyst. Sci. 5, 281–290. doi:10.1080/19425120.2013.829143

Scott, R., Biastoch, A., Roder, C., Stiebens, V.A., Eizaguirre, C., 2014a. Nano-tags for neonates and ocean-mediated swimming behaviours linked to rapid dispersal of hatchling sea turtles. Proc. R. Soc. B Biol. Sci. 281. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2014.1209

Scott, R., Hodgson, D.J., Witt, M.J., Coyne, M.S., Adnyana, W., Blumenthal, J.M., Broderick, A.C., Canbolat, A.F., Catry, P., Ciccione, S., Delcroix, E., Hitipeuw, C., Luschi, P., Pet-Soede, L., Pendoley, K., Richardson, P.B., Rees, A.F., Godley, B.J., 2012. Global analysis of satellite tracking data shows that adult green turtles are significantly aggregated in Marine Protected Areas. Glob. Ecol. Biogeogr. 21, 1053–1061. doi:10.1111/j.1466-8238.2011.00757.x

Scott, R., Marsh, R., Hays, G., 2014b. Ontogeny of long distance migration. Ecology 140425082009005. doi:10.1890/13-2164.1

Seminoff, J., Shanker, K., 2008. Marine turtles and IUCN red listing. J. Exp. Mar. Bio. Ecol. 356, 52–68.

Seminoff, J., Zárate, P., Coyne, M., Foley, D., Parker, D., Lyon, B., Dutton, P., 2008. Post-nesting migrations of Galápagos green turtles *Chelonia mydas* in relation to oceanographic conditions: integrating satellite telemetry with remotely sensed ocean data. Endanger. Species Res. 4, 57–72. doi:10.3354/esr00066

Seney, E.E., Higgins, B.M., Landry, A.M., 2010. Satellite transmitter attachment techniques for small juvenile sea turtles. J. Exp. Mar. Bio. Ecol. 384, 61–67. doi:10.1016/j.jembe.2010.01.002

Shanker, K., Pilcher, N.J., 2003. Marine turtle conservation in south and southeast Asia: hopeless cause or cause for hope? Mar. Turt. Newsl. 100, 43–51.

Shaver, D., Rubio, C., 2008. Post-nesting movement of wild and head-started Kemp's ridley sea turtles Lepidochelys kempii in the Gulf of Mexico. Endanger. Species Res. 4, 43–55. doi:10.3354/esr00061

Sherrill-Mix, S., James, M., 2008. Evaluating potential tagging effects on leatherback sea turtles. Endanger.

Species Res. 4, 187–193. doi:10.3354/esr00070

Shillinger, G., Swithenbank, A., Bograd, S., Bailey, H., Castelton, M., Wallace, B., Spotila, J., Paladino, F., Piedra, R., Block, B., 2010. Identification of high-use internesting habitats for eastern Pacific leatherback turtles: role of the environment and implications for conservation. Endanger. Species Res. 10, 215–232. doi:10.3354/esr00251

Shillinger, G.L., Palacios, D.M., Bailey, H., Bograd, S.J., Swithenbank, A.M., Gaspar, P., Wallace, B.P., Spotila, J.R., Paladino, F. V, Piedra, R., Eckert, S.A., Block, B.A., 2008. Persistent leatherback turtle migrations present opportunities for conservation. PLoS Biol. 6, e171. doi:10.1371/journal.pbio.0060171

Shimada, T., Jones, R., Limpus, C., Hamann, M., 2012. Improving data retention and home range estimates by data-driven screening. Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser. 457, 171–180. doi:10.3354/meps09747

Snoddy, J., Southwood Williard, A., 2010. Movements and post-release mortality of juvenile sea turtles released from gillnets in the lower Cape Fear River, North Carolina, USA. Endanger. Species Res. 12, 235–247. doi:10.3354/esr00305

Sperling, J.B., Grigg, G.C., Limpus, C.J., 2010. Diving behaviour in two distinct populations of gravid Flatback turtles *Natator depressus*. Aust. Zool. 35, 291–306. doi:10.7882/AZ.2010.018

Sperling, J.B., Guinea, M., 2004. A harness for attachment of satellite transmitters on flatback turtles. Mar. Turt. Newsl. 11–13.

Stoneburner, D.L., 1982. Satellite telemetry of loggerhead sea turtle movement in the Georgia Bight. Copeia 400–408.

Sutherland, W.J., Adams, W.M., Aronson, R.B., Aveling, R., Blackburn, T.M., Broad, S., Ceballos, G., Côté, I.M., Cowling, R.M., Da Fonseca, G.A.B., Dinerstein, E., Ferraro, P.J., Fleishman, E., Gascon, C., Hunter, M., Hutton, J., Kareiva, P., Kuria, A., Macdonald, D.W., Mackinnon, K., Madgwick, F.J., Mascia, M.B., McNeely, J., Milner-Gulland, E.J., Moon, S., Morley, C.G., Nelson, S., Osborn, D., Pai, M., Parsons, E.C.M., Peck, L.S., Possingham, H., Prior, S. V, Pullin, A.S., Rands, M.R.W., Ranganathan, J., Redford, K.H., Rodriguez, J.P., Seymour, F., Sobel, J., Sodhi, N.S., Stott, A., Vance-Borland, K., Watkinson, A.R., 2009. One hundred questions of importance to the conservation of global biological diversity. Conserv. Biol. 23, 557–67. doi:10.1111/j.1523-1739.2009.01212.x

Sutherland, W.J., Fleishman, E., Mascia, M.B., Pretty, J., Rudd, M.A., 2011. Methods for collaboratively identifying research priorities and emerging issues in science and policy. Methods Ecol. Evol. 2, 238–247. doi:10.1111/j.2041-210X.2010.00083.x

Sutherland, W.J., Pullin, A.S., Dolman, P.M., Knight, T.M., 2004. The need for evidence-based conservation. Trends Ecol. Evol. 19, 305–8. doi:10.1016/j.tree.2004.03.018

Swimmer, Y., Arauz, R., Mccracken, M., Naughton, L.M., Ballestero, J., Musyl, M., Bigelow, K., Brill, R., 2006. Diving behavior and delayed mortality of olive ridley sea turtles *Lepidochelys olivacea* after their release from longline fishing gear. Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser. 323, 253–261.

Swimmer, Y., Brill, R., Musyl, M., 2002. Use of pop-up satellite archival tags to quantify mortality of marine turtles incidentally captured in longline fishing gear. Mar. Turt. Newsl. 97, 3–7.

Swimmer, Y., Empey Campora, C., Mcnaughton, L., Musyl, M., Parga, M., 2013. Post-release mortality estimates of loggerhead sea turtles (*Caretta caretta*) caught in pelagic longline fisheries based on satellite data and hooking location. Aquat. Conserv. Mar. Freshw. Ecosyst. doi:10.1002/aqc.2396

Troëng, S., Harrison, E., Evans, D., Haro, A., Vargas, E., 2007. Leatherback turtle nesting trends and threats at Tortuguero, Costa Rica. Chelonian Conserv. Biol. 6, 117–122.

Troëng, S., Solano, R., Diaz-Merry, A., Ordonez, J., Taylor, J., Evans, D.R., Godfrey, D., Bagley, D., Ehrhart, L., Eckert, S., 2006. Report on long-term transmitter harness retention by a leatherback turtle. Mar. Turt. Newsl. 6–7.

Watson, K., Granger, R., 1998. Hydrodynamic effect of a satellite transmitter on a juvenile green turtle (*Chelonia mydas*). J. Exp. Biol. 201 (Pt 17, 2497–505.

Weber, N., Weber, S.B., Godley, B.J., Ellick, J., Witt, M., Broderick, A.C., 2013. Telemetry as a tool for improving estimates of marine turtle abundance. Biol. Conserv. 167, 90–96. doi:10.1016/j.biocon.2013.07.030

Whiting, S.D., Hartley, S., Lalara, S., White, D., Bara, T., Maminyamunja, C., Wurramarrba, L., 2006. Hawksbill turtle tracking as part of initial sea turtle research and conservation at Groote Eylandt, Northern Australia. Mar. Turt. Newsl. 14–15.

Whittock, P., Pendoley, K., Hamann, M., 2014. Inter-nesting distribution of flatback turtles *Natator depressus* and industrial development in Western Australia. Endanger. Species Res. 26, 25–38. doi:10.3354/esr00628

Witt, M., Åkesson, S., Broderick, A., Coyne, M., Ellick, J., Formia, A., Hays, G., Luschi, P., Stroud, S., Godley, B.J., 2010. Assessing accuracy and utility of satellite-tracking data using Argos-linked Fastloc-GPS. Anim. Behav. 80, 571–581. doi:10.1016/j.anbehav.2010.05.022

Witt, M.J., Bonguno, E., Broderick, A.C., Coyne, M.S., Formia, A., Gibudi, A., Mounguengui Mounguengui, G.A., Moussounda, C., NSafou, M., Nougessono, S., Parnell, R.J., Sounguet, G.-P., Verhage, S., Godley, B.J., 2011. Tracking leatherback turtles from the world's largest rookery:

assessing threats across the South Atlantic. Proc. R. Soc. B Biol. Sci. 278, 2338–47. doi:10.1098/rspb.2010.2467

Witt, M.J., Broderick, A.C., Coyne, M.S., Formia, A., Ngouessono, S., Parnell, R.J., Sounguet, G.-P., Godley, B.J., 2008. Satellite tracking highlights difficulties in the design of effective protected areas for Critically Endangered leatherback turtles *Dermochelys coriacea* during the inter-nesting period. Oryx 42, 296–300. doi:10.1017/S0030605308006947

Yasuda, T., Tanaka, H., Kittiwattanawong, K., Mitamura, H., Klom-in, W., Arai, N., 2006. Do female green turtles (*Chelonia mydas*) exhibit reproductive seasonality in a year-round nesting rookery? J. Zool. 269, 451–457. doi:10.1111/j.1469-7998.2006.00134.x

Zbinden, J. a., Aebischer, A., Margaritoulis, D., Arlettaz, R., 2007. Important areas at sea for adult loggerhead sea turtles in the Mediterranean Sea: satellite tracking corroborates findings from potentially biased sources. Mar. Biol. 153, 899–906. doi:10.1007/s00227-007-0862-2

Zbinden, J., Bearhop, S., Bradshaw, P., Gill, B., Margaritoulis, D., Newton, J., Godley, B., 2011. Migratory dichotomy and associated phenotypic variation in marine turtles revealed by satellite tracking and stable isotope analysis. Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser. 421, 291–302. doi:10.3354/meps08871

Table 1. **Main reasons for tracking compared with mains themes from the literature**. Data from questionnaire responses (reasons: n=508, people: n=165) and the literature reviewed (n=369). Respondents were asked to list their reasons for satellite tracking turtles. If respondents cited multiple reasons within one sub-category (e.g. movements and migrations), only one suggestion was accounted for so the column 'No. of respondents' refers to the number of people who cited each reason. As respondents could list up to 5 reasons the 'Subtotals' represent the total number of reasons given (excluding those duplicated responses) and adds up to more than 100% of the total respondents. Papers were assigned to a category according to their main theme. Conservation and management issues do not feature highly in either the motivation for tracking or the main aim of the papers. Percentages are calculated on the total values and then given a rank accordingly.

Reasons for tracking and main themes	No. of respondents	%	Rank	No. of papers	%	Rank
Biology and Ecology						
Movements and migrations	108	21.2	**1**	139	37.7	**1**
Habitat identification	99	19.4	**2**	50	13.6	**3**
Behaviour	59	11.6	**5**	30	8.1	**4**
Other	62	12.2	**3**	22	5.9	**7**
Subtotal	**328**	**64.6**			**65.3**	
Conservation and Management						
Opportunities for conservation or management s e.g. MPAs	61	12	**4**	27	7.3	**5**
Anthropogenic threats	51	10	**6**	24	6.5	**6**
Post-release mortality/rehabilitation success	11	2.1	**9**	10	2.7	**8**
Effects of tagging	3	0.5	**12**	5	1.4	**10**
Head-starting	4	0.7	**11**	3	0.8	**11**
Subtotal	**130**	**25.5**		**69**	**18.6**	
Other						
Methods	6	1.1	**10**	51	13.8	**2**
Miscellaneous other	20	3.9	**8**	8	2.2	**9**
Education and awareness	24	4.7	**7**	0	0	NA
Subtotal	**50**	**9.8**		**59**	**16**	

Table 2. Recommendations made in the literature. Recommendations from papers were coded according to the criteria listed. Papers often made recommendations of more than one type, if multiple recommendations were made under the same heading only one was counted (e.g. if two recommendations relating to spatial restrictions were made only one was counted). Number of recommendations: n=196; papers: n=133. The level of explicitness of these recommendations varied.

Type of recommendation	No. of papers making recommendations	%	Rank	Example papers
Mitigation				
Spatial	55	28	1	Craig et al., 2004; McMahon & Hays 2006; Broderick et al., 2007; Schofield et al., 2009, 2013b, 2007; Girard et al., 2009; Maxwell et al., 2011; Almeida et al., 2011; Gaos et al., 2012a; Walcott & Horrocks 2014; Hart et al., 2014; Hays et al., 2014c
Other fisheries	31	16	3	Shaver & Rubio 2008; Shillinger et al., 2008; Scott et al., 2012a; Cardona et al., 2012; Roe et al., 2014
Temporal	14	7	5	Polovina et al., 2000; Morreale & Standora 2005; Howell et al., 2008; Witt et al., 2008; Maxwell et al., 2013
Collaborative efforts				
Regional and international	49	25	2	Song et al., 2002; Wang et al., 2002; Hays et al., 2004b; Blumenthal et al., 2006; Shillinger et al., 2010, 2008; Fossette et al., 2010a; Rees et al., 2010; Hawkes et al., 2011; Stewart et al., 2013; Shaver et al., 2013a, 2013b; Richardson et al., 2013b; Varo-Cruz et al., 2013; Foley et al., 2013
Community involvement	12	6	6	Kennett et al., 2004; Hitipeuw et al., 2007; Peckham et al., 2007; Shillinger et al., 2010; Swimmer et al., 2013
Multi-sector	8	4	7	Coyne & Godley 2007; Seney & Landry 2008; Hamann et al., 2010; Barceló et al., 2013; Dalleau et al., 2014; Roe et al., 2014
Other				
Policy changes	16	8	4	Plotkin & Spotila 2002; Cheng 2007; Schofield et al., 2007; Gaos et al., 2012a; Moncada et al., 2012; Hawkes et al., 2012; Fossette et al., 2014; Whittock et al., 2014
Other conservation practices	11	6	6	Hitipeuw et al., 2007; Pabón-aldana et al., 2012; Pajuelo et al., 2012; Richardson et al., 2013; Rees et al., 2013
Total	196			

Table 3. **Examples of tracking data resulting in policy changes**. Combines examples from the questionnaires and the literature. Data from the questionnaire was drawn from answers to 'How often do you think satellite tracking results in changes for turtle conservation' and to give example, and 'To your knowledge have any of your recommendations been implemented?' Abbreviations: CC =Loggerhead (*Caretta caretta*); CM = Green (*Chelonia mydas*); DC = Leatherback (*Dermochelys coriacea*); LO = Olive ridley (*Lepidochelys olivacea*); LK = Kemp's ridley (*Lepidochelys kempii*).

Type of policy	Nature of success	Location	Species	Related papers/those that have informed the policy	Source of impact
Temporal	Used to set a longer closed season for shrimp trawling in near-shore waters of south Texas.	USA Texas	LK	Shaver & Rubio 2008	Pers. comm. A. Landry; Shaver & Rubio, 2008
	Regulations restricting gillnets to overnight sets (when turtles are resting and not moving around much) have been implemented in the NOAA NMFS Incidental Take Permit (#16230) for this region.	USA N. Carolina	CM, CC, LK	Keinath & Musick 1993; Hays et al., 2001, 2004c; Ferraroli et al., 2004; James et al., 2005a; Eckert et al., 2006; Eckert 2006; McMahon & Hays 2006; Benson et al., 2007, 2011; Troëng et al., 2007; Shillinger et al., 2008; Schofield et al., 2009a	NOAA 2013
Spatial	Proactive approaches to inform fishers about areas of high loggerhead turtle bycatch risk based on fisheries effort, bycatch and satellite telemetry data: TurtleWatch product.	USA Hawaii	CC	Howell et al., 2008	Howell et al., 2008
	Tracking data helped to strengthen the marine park zoning on Zakynthos, Greece. Compliance to the proposed new zone (ecotourism zone) is currently voluntary as part of a national park directive, pending endorsement by the government.	Zakynthos Greece	CC	Schofield et al., 2009, 2013b	Pers. comm. G. Schofield.
	Informed and catalysed an agreement between 4 countries to create and protect a corridor.	Pacific Ocean	DC	Morreale et al., 1996; Shillinger et al., 2008	Pers. comm. M. P. Santidrian-tomillo
	USA Naval undersea warfare training range was relocated after advice that it was located too close to wintering loggerhead sea turtles off the coast of North Carolina.	USA N. Carolina	CC	Hawkes et al., 2007	Pers. comm. L. Hawkes
	Used to identify important marine habitats, which then supports protected area designations	USA	DC	Keinath & Musick 1993; Ferraroli et al., 2004; Hays et al., 2004b; James et al., 2005a; Eckert et al., 2006; Benson et al., 2007, 2011	NOAA, 2012

	Tracking of loggerhead turtles and an awareness campaign inspired fishermen to voluntarily reduce their bycatch. Consequently, fishers declared the core high use area a ''Fishers' Turtle Reserve'' in 2006 and with the support of local, state, and federal governments, a coalition of fishers, managers, scientists, and citizens is now seeking federal legislation to establish and co-manage the reserve.	Mexico	CC	Peckham et al., 2007	Peckham et al., 2007
National policy	Used in NMFS U.S Endangered Species Act Recovery Plans. The Loggerhead Recovery Plan.	USA	CC	Hatase et al., 2002; Plotkin & Spotila 2002; Dodd & Byles 2003; Morreale & Standora 2005; Hawkes et al., 2006, 2007; McClellan & Read 2007	NMFS and USWS 2008
	Tracking has highlighted that leatherbacks are at home in temperate waters This has filtered into EU legislation, such as the Habitats Directive and subsequent reporting e.g. conservation assessments are now made for leatherbacks in Irish waters.	Europe	DC	Ferraroli et al., 2004; Hays et al., 2004b, 2004a; James et al., 2005a; McMahon & Hays 2006	Pers. comm. T. Doyle JNCC 2012
	Published research used in Australia's Species Report Cards which provide accessible and up-to-date information for Commonwealth marine regions	Australia	Data are used for CM and LO	McMahon et al., 2007	Department of Sustainability Environment Water Population and Communities 1999
	Species recovery policies for Canada (Atlantic and Pacific)	Canada	DC	Atlantic: Keinath & Musick 1993; Morreale et al., 1996; Eckert & Sarti. 1997; James et al., 2005c, 2005a. Pacific: Morreale et al., 1996	Fisheries and Oceans -Canada 2006

Table 4. **How to increase the conservation dividends from tracking data, suggestions from questionnaire respondents**. Respondents were asked 'How do you think the benefits to conservation from satellite tracking could be increased?' and 135 people responded in a free text comments box. Percentages are based on the total number of suggestions, which adds up to more than 100% of the number of respondents because many people made suggestions under more than one theme. Only one suggestion per category was counted for each respondent. 'Other' included suggestions such as more financial support, reducing the number of trackers deployed and giving to those with conservation aims, quality control agreements as part of funding agreements and using satellite tracking to evaluate new and revised policies as a sort of feedback loop.

Suggestions	No of people making suggestions	% of responses	Rank
Collaboration, communication and dissemination			
More effective communications and collaborations with government and stakeholders	43	18.4	1
Data sharing and collaboration amongst researchers	33	14.1	2
Dissemination of results/education and awareness	32	13.7	3
Incorporate results directly into marine conservation planning	17	7.3	5
Publish more	10	4.3	8
Present data in a useful way for policy-makers	8	3.4	9
International conservation efforts	5	2.1	11
Community involvement/communication	5	2.1	11
Subtotal	153	65.4	
Methods			
Specific conservation focused research/ improved study design	20	8.5	4
Further studies	17	7.3	5
Larger study samples	14	6.0	6
Better or cheaper technology	10	4.3	8
Combine datasets from multiple sources e.g. stable isotopes	7	3.0	10
Reduce tagging impact	2	0.9	12
Subtotal	70	30	
Other	11	4.7	7
Total suggestions	234		



Fig. 1. Patterns in satellite tracking turtles (1982-2014)

a) Total number of satellite tracking papers published per year. Number of published papers is generally increasing.

b) Cumulative number of nations where tracking has been undertaken (by year data were published). Overseas territories of plenipotentiary states are not counted separately.

c) Proportion of papers mentioning conservation. There was a significant relationship between year of publication and whether conservation was discussed in papers (Spearman's R_s=0.86, p = <0.001,).

d) Sample sizes of papers reviewed and the year it was published with 3 year smoothing spline based on actual values). Axis was fixed at 70 to better display data. 12 papers had a sample size larger than 70 as follows: Howell et al., 2008 (105); Kobayashi et al., 2008 (186); Benson et al., 2011 (126); Bailey et al., 2012b(135); Abecassis et al., 2013 (224); Schofield et al., 2013a (75); Schofield et al., 2013b (77); Ceriani et al., 2014 (80)., Fossette et al., 2014 (106);Hardy et al., 2014(81); Hays et al., 2014b, (82); Luschi & Casale 2014, (195); Pendoley et al., 2014 (100); Roe et al., 2014 (135); Scott et al., 2014b (400); Tucker et al., 2014(88)



Fig. 2. Breakdown of turtle species being tracked, where and by whom (1982-2014). Shaded bars represent data from papers and unshaded from questionnaires, for all graphs.

a) Breakdown of turtle species tracked. Respondents were able to select more than one species (number of responses: n=433) and papers may have tracked more than one species or no specific species. Species abbreviated by scientific name, listed here in brackets in the order they appear: Loggerhead (*Caretta caretta*); Green (*Chelonia mydas*); Leatherback (*Dermochelys coriacea*), Hawksbill. (*Eretmochelys imbricate*); Olive ridley (*Lepidochelys olivacea*); Kemp's ridley (*Lepidochelys kempii*), Flatback (*Natator depressus*).

b) Ocean region where tracking is occurring. Abbreviations refer to: Atlantic Ocean, Pacific Ocean, Mediterranean Sea and Indian Oceans. Some papers had multiple locations (paper locations: n=379, unspecified: n=51) and respondents could select more than one location (no. of responses: n=268).

c) Location of tracking launch points from papers (shaded) and questionnaire respondents (unshaded). Countries (n=72 when overseas territories (OTs) are counted together) were ranked according to the combined total of respondents and papers, with the top 10 listed here. Respondents could only select one location (n=171), papers sometimes had multiple locations, those that did not specify the exact location were not included (no. of locations specified in papers: n= 379; unspecified: n=55). As the number of respondents and papers varied for each country and the combined total was used to rank countries, Australia is ranked as overall second but is not ranked second by number of papers. The rank order was different when countries were ranked using data from either papers or questionnaire response as listed here: Top ten countries by launch locations from papers: USA (20%); UKOTs (6%); Costa Rica (5%); Greece (5%); French OTs (5%); Australia (4%); Canada (4%); Mexico (3%); Grenada (3%); Italy (2%). Top ten countries ranked by respondent location: USA (42%); UK (11%); Australia (7%); Italy (4%); Brazil (4%); Spain and France joint 6th (3%); Mexico (2%); UKOTs, Greece, Canada and Peru joint 8th (2%)

All percentages rounded to the nearest whole number.

.

Supplemental Methods– Online questionnaire

1. **What type of organisation(s) do you currently work for? (Tick all that apply)**
   Academic/ NGO/Government/Consultancy/Other (please specify)........

2. **How are you involved in satellite tracking?**
   I am/was part of a group that tracks turtles /I used/used data gathered by others./Both

3. **Which Ocean basin(s) have you satellite tracked turtles in, or used data from? (Tick all that apply)**
   Atlantic/Pacific/Indian/Mediterranean

4. **Which country do you live in? (Drop-down list)**

5. **Which turtle species have you tracked or used satellite tracking data for? (Tick all that apply)**
   Flatback (*Natator depressus)/*Green (*Chelonia mydas)/*Hawksbill (*Eretmochelys imbricate)/* Kemp's ridley (*Lepidochelys kempii)/* leatherback (*Dermochelys coriacea)/* loggerhead (*Caretta caretta)/* olive ridley (*Lepidochelys olivacea)*

6. **What are your reasons for satellite tracking turtles or using data ? Please list your top reasons (up to five).**

7. **How often do you think that satellite tracking results in changes for conservation?**
   Never/Not very often/sometimes (neither quite often nor very often)/quite often/very often/ not sure

8. **How do you think the benefits to conservation from satellite tracking could be increased?**

9. **What impact do the following outputs from your work, satellite tracking turtles, have on turtle conservation?**
   Please give examples to support your decision and describe 'other' where applicable.

	No impact	**Low impact**	**Modest impact**	**High impact**	**Very high impact**	**Not sure**
Academic publications						
Please provide examples to support your decision						
Educational activities						
Please provide examples to support your decision						
Public awareness/PR ventures						
Please provide examples to support your decision						
Government collaboration						

Please provide examples to support your decision	
News coverage	
Please provide examples to support your decision	
Other (please specify)................	
Please provide examples to support your decision (if applicable)	

10. **How often do you make recommendations for changes to policy or conservation best practice based on results of satellite tracking turtles?**
    Never (skips to Q17)/ Not very often/Sometimes /Quite often/Always/Not sure

11. **Research recommendations**

To your knowledge have any of your recommendations been implemented? Yes/No/Not sure
Please provide further details

Are you aware of plans to implement any recommendations you have made? Yes/No/not sure
Please provide further details

12. **Do you have any other comments about satellite tracking in turtles that you think need to be considered when assessing the benefits to conservation?**

Thank you for taking the time to answer my questionnaire. I may wish to contact some respondents for further details and short telephone interview follow-ups. If you are willing to be contacted further, please provide your email address (this will not affect anonymity when reporting responses).

Supplementary table 1. Breakdown of papers according to turtle species tracked or species data used. Papers that include more than one turtle species have been included in each relevant section. Review papers include those which do not specify species and 'Other' refers to any other papers such as comment style papers or method papers.

Species/Type of paper	Relevant papers
Loggerhead (*Caretta caretta*)	Abecassis et al., 2013; Àlvarez de Quevedo et al., 2013; Arendt et al., 2011a, 2011b, 2011c; Barceló et al., 2013; Bentivegna 2002; Bentivegna et al., 2007; Blumenthal et al., 2006; Broderick et al., 2007; Cardona et al., 2005, 2009, 2012; Casale et al., 2012b, 2012a, 2012c; Cejudo et al., 2006; Ceriani et al., 2012; Chaloupka et al., 2004a; Crossin et al., 2014; Dalleau et al., 2014; Dodd & Byles 2003; Eckert et al., 2008; Etnoyer et al., 2006; Foley et al., 2013, 2014; Fujioka & Halpin 2014; Fujioka et al., 2014; Fuller et al., 2008; Girard et al., 2009; Godley et al., 2003a; Griffin et al., 2013; Hammerschlag et al., 2015; Hardy et al., 2014; Hart et al., 2010, 2012a, 2013a, 2014a, 2014b; Hatase & Sakamoto 2004; Hatase et al., 2002a, 2002b, 2007; Hawkes et al., 2006, 2007, 2011; Hays et al., 2003a, 1991, 2010b, 2010a, 2014b, 2014a; Hochscheid et al., 2005, 2007a, 2010; Howell et al., 2008, 2010; Kobayashi et al., 2008, 2011, 2014; Limpus & Limpus 2001; Luschi & Casale 2014; Luschi et al., 2003b, 2006, 2013; Mangel et al., 2011; Mansfield et al., 2012, 2009, 2014; Marcovaldi et al., 2010; Margaritoulis & Rees 2011; McClellan & Read 2007; McClellan et al., 2009; Mencacci et al., 2009, 2011; Mestre et al., 2014; Morreale & Standora 2005; Nichols et al., 2000; Olson et al., 2012; Pajuelo et al., 2012b, 2012a; Papi et al., 1997; Parker et al., 2014a; Peckham et al., 2011, 2007; Pikesley et al., 2014; Plotkin & Spotila 2002; Polovina et al., 2006, 2000, 2001, 2003, 2004; Ragland et al., 2011; Rees et al., 2010, 2012c; Renaud & Carpenter 1994; Revelles et al., 2007a, 2007b; Sakamoto et al., 1997; Sasso & Epperly 2007; Sasso et al., 2011; Schofield et al., 2007, 2009a, 2009b, 2010b, 2010a, 2013b, 2013a; Scott et al., 2012a, 2012b; Seney et al., 2010a, 2010b; Shimada et al., 2012; Stoneburner 1982; Swimmer et al., 2013; Timko & Kolz 1982; Tucker 2009, 2010; Tucker et al., 2014; Varo-Cruz et al., 2013; Wingfield et al., 2011; Zbinden et al., 2011, 2007a, 2007b
Green (*Chelonia mydas*)	Akesson et al., 2001, 2003; Anon 1993, 1994; Attum et al., 2014; Benhamou et al., 2011; Blanco et al., 2012, 2013; Blumenthal et al., 2006; Bradshaw et al., 2007b; Broderick et al., 2007; Brooks et al., 2009; Chan et al., 2003; Cheng 2007, 2000; Cheng & Wang 2009; Craig et al., 2004; Crossin et al., 2014; Dujon et al., 2014; Etnoyer et al., 2006; Fujioka & Halpin 2014; Fuller et al., 2008; Garnier et al., 2012; Gillespie 2001; Girard et al., 2006; Godley et al., 2003b, 2002, 2010; González Carman et al., 2012, 2014; Gredzens et al., 2014; Habib et al., 2014; Hart & Fujisaki 2010; Hart et al., 2013b; Hatase et al., 2006; Hays et al., 2001a, 2003a, 1999, 2001d, 2001c, 2001b, 2002, 2003b, 2014c; Hazel 2009; Jones et al., 2013; Kennett et al., 2004; Kittiwattanawong et al., 2002; Klain et al., 2007; Liew et al., 1995, 2000; Luschi & Casale 2014; Luschi et al., 1996, 1998, 2001, 2007; McClellan & Read 2009; McClellan et al., 2009; Mendez et al., 2013; Mestre et al., 2014; Meylan et al., 2011; Ng et al., 2014; Papi et al., 1995, 2000; Parker et al., 2014a; Pelletier et al., 2003; Read et al., 2014; Rees et al., 2008, 2012b, 2013; Richardson et al., 2010, 2013a; Scott et al., 2012b; Seminoff & Zarate 2008; Seminoff et al., 2008; Shaver et al., 2013a; Snoddy & Southwood Williard 2010; Song et al., 2002; Spring & Pike 1998; Swimmer et al., 2006; Troëng et al., 2005; Türkecan & Yerli 2011; Van De Merwe et al., 2009; Wang et al., 2002, 2014; Watson & Granger 1998; Weber et al., 2013; Whiting et al., 2008; Wright et al., 2012; Yasuda & Arai 2005; Yasuda et al., 2006; Yeh et al., 2014

Leatherback (*Dermochelys coriacea*)	Almeida et al., 2011; Bailey et al., 2008, 2012a, 2012b; Benson et al., 2007a, 2007b, 2011; Bradshaw et al., 2007a; Byrne et al., 2009; Ceriani et al., 2014; Dodge et al., 2014; Doyle et al., 2008; Duron-Defrenne 1987; Eckert & Eckert 1986; Eckert & Sarti 1997; Eckert 2006; Eckert et al., 2006; Ferraroli et al., 2004; Flemming et al., 2006, 2010; Fossette et al., 2007a, 2007b, 2008, 2010a, 2010b, 2014; Fujioka & Halpin 2014; Fujioka et al., 2014; Galli et al., 2012; Gaspar et al., 2006; Georges et al., 2007; Gillespie 2001; Hamel et al., 2008; Hays et al., 2003a, 2004c, 2004b, 2006, 2007; Hitipeuw et al., 2007; Houghton et al., 2008; Hughes et al., 1998; James et al., 2005c, 2005a, 2005b, 2006b, 2006a; Jones et al., 2013; Jonsen et al., 2006, 2007; Keinath & Musick 1993; Lambardi et al., 2008; López-Mendilaharsu et al., 2009; Luschi et al., 2003c, 2006; Lutcavage et al., 2001; Maxwell et al., 2013; McMahon & Hays 2006; McMahon et al., 2005; Morreale et al., 1996; Myers et al., 2006; Richardson et al., 2013b; Roe et al., 2014; Royer & Lutcavage 2008; Sale & Luschi 2009; Sale et al., 2006; Seminoff & Dutton 2007; Seminoff et al., 2012; Sherrill-Mix & James 2008; Sherrill-Mix et al., 2007; Shillinger et al., 2010, 2011, 2008; Troëng et al., 2006, 2007; Witt et al., 2008, 2010, 2011
Hawksbill (*Eretmochelys imbricate*)	Cuevas et al., 2008; Fujioka & Halpin 2014; Gaos et al., 2012a, 2012b, 2012c; Hart et al., 2012b; Hawkes et al., 2012; Hoenner et al., 2012; Horrocks et al., 2001; Jones et al., 2013; Klain et al., 2007; Marcovaldi et al., 2012; Moncada et al., 2012; Pabón-aldana et al., 2012; Parker et al., 2009, 2014b; Pilcher et al., 2014; Troeng et al., 2005; Van Dam et al., 2008; Walcott & Horrocks 2014; Walcott et al., 2012; Weber et al., 2014; Whiting & Koch 2006; Whiting et al., 2006; Yasuda & Arai 2005
Kemp's Ridley (*Lepidochelys kempii*)	Epperly et al., 2013; Gitschlag 1996; Lyn et al., 2012; McClellan et al., 2009; Morreale et al., 2007; Morreale & Standora 2005; Renaud & Williams 2005; Renaud 1995; Renaud et al., 1993, 1996; Schmid & Witzell 2006; Seney & Landry 2008, 2011; Shaver & Rubio 2008; Shaver et al., 2005, 2013b; Snoddy & Southwood Williard 2010; Stewart et al., 2013
Olive ridley (*Lepidochelys olivacea*)	Beavers & Cassano 1996; da Silva et al., 2011; Eguchi et al., 2007; Etnoyer et al., 2006; Habib et al., 2014; Hamel et al., 2008; Hays et al., 2004a, 2007; Jones et al., 2013; Maxwell et al., 2011; McMahon et al., 2007; Morreale et al., 2007; Pikesley et al., 2013; Plot et al., 2012; Plotkin 2010, 1998; Plotkin et al., 1996, 1995; Polovina et al., 2003, 2004; Rees et al., 2012a; Sasamal & Panigraphy 2006; Swimmer et al., 2002, 2006, 2009; Whiting et al., 2007
Flatback (*Natator depressus*)	Pendoley et al., 2014; Sperling & Guinea 2004; Sperling et al., 2010; Whittock et al., 2014
Review papers	Block et al., 2011; Block 2005; Boarman et al., 1998; Bradshaw 2005; Cooke 2008; Costa et al., 2012; Godley & Wilson 2008; Godley et al., 2008; Halpin et al., 2006; Hamann et al., 2010; Hammerschlag et al., 2014; Hart & Hyrenbach 2009; Hays & Scott 2013; Hays 2008, 2014; Hays et al., 2004a; Hazen et al., 2012; Hochscheid 2014; Hochscheid et al., 2007b; Kot et al., 2010; Lohmann 2007; Lohmann et al., 1999, 2008; Luschi et al., 2003a; McMahon et al., 2011; Musyl et al., 2011; Papi & Luschi 1996; Robel et al., 2011; Scott et al., 2014b; Shillinger et al., 2012; Wallace et al., 2010
Other	Chaloupka et al., 2004b; Cognetti 1996; Coyne & Godley 2005, 2007; Parga 2012; Pilcher 2013; Williams 2007

Full list of papers reviewed (in supplementary table 1)

Abecassis, M., Senina, I., Lehodey, P., Gaspar, P., Parker, D., Balazs, G., Polovina, J., 2013. A model of loggerhead Sea Turtle (*Caretta caretta*) habitat and movement in the oceanic North Pacific. PLoS One 8. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0073274

Akesson, S., Broderick, A.C., Glen, F., Godley, B.J., Luschi, P., Papi, F., Hays, G.C., 2003. Navigation by green turtles: which strategy do displaced adults use to find Ascension Island? Oikos 103, 363–372.

Akesson, S., Luschi, P., Broderick, A.C., Glen, F., Godley, B.J., Papi, F., Hays, G.C., 2001. Oceanic long-distance navigation: do experienced migrants use the earth's magnetic field? J. Navig. 54, 419–427. doi:10.1017/S0373463301001473

Almeida, A., Eckert, S., Bruno, S., Scalfoni, J., Giffoni, B., López-Mendilaharsu, M., Thomé, J., 2011. Satellite-tracked movements of female *Dermochelys coriacea* from southeastern Brazil. Endanger. Species Res. 15, 77–86. doi:10.3354/esr00359

Àlvarez de Quevedo, I., San Félix, M., Cardona, L., 2013. Mortality rates in by-caught loggerhead turtle (*Caretta caretta*) in the Mediterranean Sea and implications for the Atlantic populations. Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser. 489, 225–234. doi:10.3354/meps10411

Anon, 1994. Long-distance migration of green sea turtles from Pulau Redang tracked by satellites. Mar. Turt. Newsl. 66, 5–7.

Anon, 1993. Satellites used to study the oceanic migrations of Hawaii's green sea turtles. Mar. Turt. Newsl. 61, 7–9.

Arendt, M.D., Segars, A.L., Byrd, J.I., Boynton, J., Schwenter, J. a., Whitaker, J.D., Parker, L., 2011a. Migration, distribution, and diving behavior of adult male loggerhead sea turtles (*Caretta caretta*) following dispersal from a major breeding aggregation in the Western North Atlantic. Mar. Biol. 159, 113–125. doi:10.1007/s00227-011-1826-0

Arendt, M.D., Segars, A.L., Byrd, J.I., Boynton, J., Whitaker, J.D., Parker, L., Owens, D.W., Blanvillain, G., Quattro, J.M., Roberts, M.A., 2011b. Seasonal distribution patterns of juvenile loggerhead sea turtles (*Caretta caretta*) following capture from a shipping channel in the Northwest Atlantic Ocean. Mar. Biol. 159, 127–139. doi:10.1007/s00227-011-1829-x

Arendt, M.D., Segars, A.L., Byrd, J.I., Boynton, J., Whitaker, J.D., Parker, L., Owens, D.W., Blanvillain, G., Quattro, J.M., Roberts, M.A., 2011c. Distributional patterns of adult male loggerhead sea turtles (*Caretta caretta*) in the vicinity of Cape Canaveral, Florida, USA during and after a major annual breeding aggregation. Mar. Biol. 159, 101–112. doi:10.1007/s00227-011-1793-5

Attum, O., Kramer, A., Mahmoud, T., Fouda, M., 2014. Post-nesting migrations patterns of green turtles (*Chelonia mydas*) from the Egyptian Red Sea. Zool. Middle East 60, 299–305. doi:10.1080/09397140.2014.962833

Bailey, H., Benson, S.R., Shillinger, G.L., Bograd, S.J., Dutton, P.H., Eckert, S.A., Morreale, S.J., Paladino, F. V, Eguchi, T., Foley, D.G., Block, B.A., Piedra, R., Hitipeuw, C., Tapilatu, R.F., Spotila, J.R., 2012a. Identification of distinct movement patterns in Pacific leatherback turtle populations influenced by ocean conditions. Ecol. Appl. 22, 735–47.

Bailey, H., Fossette, S., Bograd, S.J., Shillinger, G.L., Swithenbank, A.M., Georges, J.-Y., Gaspar, P., Strömberg, K.H.P., Paladino, F. V, Spotila, J.R., Block, B.A., Hays, G.C., 2012b. Movement patterns for a critically endangered species, the leatherback turtle (*Dermochelys coriacea*), linked to foraging success and population status. PLoS One 7, e36401. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0036401

Bailey, H., Shillinger, G., Palacios, D., Bograd, S., Spotila, J., Paladino, F., Block, B., 2008. Identifying and comparing phases of movement by leatherback turtles using state-space models. J. Exp. Mar. Bio. Ecol. 356, 128–135. doi:10.1016/j.jembe.2007.12.020

Barceló, C., Domingo, A., Miller, P., Ortega, L., Giffoni, B., Sales, G., McNaughton, L., Marcovaldi, M., Heppell, S., Swimmer, Y., 2013. High-use areas, seasonal movements and dive patterns of juvenile loggerhead sea turtles in the Southwestern Atlantic Ocean. Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser. 479, 235–250. doi:10.3354/meps10222

Beavers, S.C., Cassano, E.R., 1996. Movements and dive behavior of a male sea turtle (*Lepidochelys olivacea*) in the eastern tropical Pacific. J. Herpetol. 30, 97–104.

Benhamou, S., Sudre, J., Bourjea, J., Ciccione, S., De Santis, A., Luschi, P., 2011. The role of geomagnetic cues in green turtle open sea navigation. PLoS One 6, e26672. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0026672

Benson, S.R., Dutton, P.H., Hitipeuw, C., Samber, B.P., Bakarbessy, J., Parker, D., 2007a. Post-nesting migrations of leatherback turtles (*Dermochelys coriacea*) from Jamursba-Medi , Bird's Head Peninsula , Indonesia. Chelonian Conserv. Biol. 6, 150–158.

Benson, S.R., Eguchi, T., Foley, D.G., Forney, K.A., Bailey, H., Hitipeuw, C., Samber, B.P., Tapilatu, R.F., Rei, V., Ramohia, P., Pita, J., Dutton, P.H., 2011. Large-scale movements and high-use areas of western Pacific leatherback turtles, *Dermochelys coriacea*. Ecosphere 2, art84. doi:10.1890/ES11-00053.1

Benson, S.R., Kisokau, K.M., Ambio, L., Rei, V., Dutton, P.H., Parker, D., 2007b. Beach use, internesting movement, and migration of leatherback turtles, *Dermochelys coriacea*, Nesting on the north coast of Papua New Guinea. Chelonian Conserv. Biol. 6, 7–14.

Bentivegna, F., 2002. Intra-Mediterranean migrations of loggerhead sea turtles (*Caretta caretta*) monitored by satellite telemetry. Mar. Biol. 141, 795–800. doi:10.1007/s00227-002-0856-z

Bentivegna, F., Valentino, F., Falco, P., Zambianchi, E., Hochscheid, S., 2007. The relationship between loggerhead turtle (*Caretta caretta*) movement patterns and Mediterranean currents. Mar. Biol. 151, 1605–1614. doi:10.1007/s00227-006-0600-1

Blanco, G., Morreale, S., Bailey, H., Seminoff, J., Paladino, F., Spotila, J., 2012. Post-nesting movements and feeding grounds of a resident East Pacific green turtle *Chelonia mydas* population from Costa Rica. Endanger. Species Res. 18, 233–245. doi:10.3354/esr00451

Blanco, G.S., Morreale, S.J., Seminoff, J.A., Paladino, F. V, Piedra, R., Spotila, J.R., 2013. Movements and diving behavior of internesting green turtles along Pacific Costa Rica. Integr. Zool. 8, 293–306. doi:10.1111/j.1749-4877.2012.00298.x

Block, B., Jonsen, I., Jorgensen, S., Winship, A., Shaffer, S., Bograd, S., Hazen, E., Foley, D., Breed, G., Harrison, A., Ganong, J., Swithenbank, A., Castleton, M., Dewar, H., Mate, B., Shillinger, G., Schaefer, K., Benson, S., Weise, M., Henry, R., Costa, D., 2011. Tracking apex marine predator movements in a dynamic ocean. Nature 475, 86–90. doi:10.1038/nature10082

Block, B.A., 2005. Physiological ecology in the 21st century: advancements in biologging science. Integr. Comp. Biol. 45, 305–20. doi:10.1093/icb/45.2.305

Blumenthal, J.M., Solomon, J.L., Bell, C.D., Austin, T.J., Ebanks-Petrie, G., Coyne, M.S., Broderick, A.C., Godley, B.J., 2006. Satellite tracking highlights the need for international cooperation in marine turtle management. Endanger. Species Res. 7, 1–11.

Boarman, W., Goodlet, T., Goodlet, G., Hamilton, P., 1998. Review of radio transmitter attachment techniques for turtle research and recommendations for improvement. Herpetol. Rev. 29, 26–33.

Bradshaw, C.J.A., 2005. Survival of the fittest technology - problems estimating marine turtle mortality. Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser. 287, 261–262.

Bradshaw, C.J.A., McMahon, C.R., Hays, G.C., 2007a. Behavioral inference of diving metabolic rate in free-ranging leatherback turtles. Physiol. Biochem. Zool. 80, 209–19. doi:10.1086/511142

Bradshaw, C.J.A., Sims, D.W., Hays, G.C., 2007b. Measurement error causes scale-dependent threshold erosion of biological signals in animal movement data. Ecol. Soc. Am. 17, 628–638.

Broderick, A.C., Coyne, M.S., Fuller, W.J., Glen, F., Godley, B.J., 2007. Fidelity and over-wintering of sea turtles. Proc. R. Soc. B Biol. Sci. 274, 1533–8. doi:10.1098/rspb.2007.0211

Brooks, L., Harvey, J., Nichols, W., 2009. Tidal movements of East Pacific green turtle *Chelonia mydas* at a foraging area in Baja California Sur, México. Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser. 386, 263–274. doi:10.3354/meps08061

Byrne, R., Fish, J., Doyle, T.K., Houghton, J.D.R., 2009. Tracking leatherback turtles (*Dermochelys coriacea*) during consecutive inter-nesting intervals: Further support for direct transmitter attachment. J. Exp. Mar. Bio. Ecol. 377, 68–75. doi:10.1016/j.jembe.2009.06.013

Cardona, L., Fernández, G., Revelles, M., Aguilar, A., 2012. Readaptation to the wild of rehabilitated loggerhead sea turtles (*Caretta caretta*) assessed by satellite telemetry. Aquat. Conserv. Mar. Freshw. Ecosyst. 22, 104–112. doi:10.1002/aqc.1242

Cardona, L., Revelles, M., Carreras, C., San Félix, M., Gazo, M., Aguilar, A., 2005. Western Mediterranean immature loggerhead turtles: habitat use in spring and summer assessed through satellite tracking and aerial surveys. Mar. Biol. 147, 583–591. doi:10.1007/s00227-005-1578-9

Cardona, L., Revelles, M., Parga, M.L., Tomás, J., Aguilar, A., Alegre, F., Raga, A., Ferrer, X., 2009. Habitat use by loggerhead sea turtles *Caretta caretta* off the coast of eastern Spain results in a high vulnerability to neritic fishing gear. Mar. Biol. 156, 2621–2630. doi:10.1007/s00227-009-1288-9

Casale, P., Affronte, M., Scaravelli, D., Lazar, B., Vallini, C., Luschi, P., 2012a. Foraging grounds, movement patterns and habitat connectivity of juvenile loggerhead turtles (*Caretta caretta*) tracked from the Adriatic Sea. Mar. Biol. 159, 1527–1535. doi:10.1007/s00227-012-1937-2

Casale, P., Broderick, A.C., Freggi, D., Mencacci, R., Fuller, W.J., Godley, B.J., Luschi, P., 2012b. Long-term residence of juvenile loggerhead turtles to foraging grounds: a potential conservation hotspot in the Mediterranean. Aquat. Conserv. Mar. Freshw. Ecosyst. 22, 144–154. doi:10.1002/aqc.2222

Casale, P., Freggi, D., Cinà, A., Rocco, M., 2013. Spatio-temporal distribution and migration of adult male loggerhead sea turtles (*Caretta caretta*) in the Mediterranean Sea: further evidence of the importance of neritic habitats off North Africa. Mar. Biol. 160, 703–718. doi:10.1007/s00227-012-2125-0

Cejudo, D., Varo-Cruz, N., Liria, A., Castilla, J.J., Bellido, J.J., Lopez-Jurado, L.F., 2006. Transatlantic migration of juvenile loggerhead turtles (*Caretta caretta*) from the Strait of Gibraltar. Mar. Turt. Newsl. 9–11.

Ceriani, S., Roth, J., Sasso, C., McLellan, C., James, M.C., Haas, H., Smolowitz, R., Evans, D., Addison, D.S., Bagley, D., Ehrhart, L.M., Weishampel, J.F., 2014. Modeling and mapping isotopic patterns in the Northwest Atlantic derived from loggerhead sea turtles. Ecosphere 5, 1–24.

Ceriani, S.A., Roth, J.D., Evans, D.R., Weishampel, J.F., Ehrhart, L.M., 2012. Inferring foraging areas of nesting loggerhead turtles using satellite telemetry and stable isotopes. PLoS One 7, e45335. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0045335

Chaloupka, M., Parker, D., Balazs, G., 2004a. Modelling post-release mortality of loggerhead sea turtles exposed to the Hawaii-based pelagic longline fishery. Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser. 280, 285–293. doi:10.3354/meps280285

Chaloupka, M., Parker, D., Balazs, G., 2004b. Tracking turtles to their death - reply to Hays et al., Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser. 283, 301–302. doi:10.3354/meps283301

Chan, S., Chan, J., Lo, L., Balazs, G.H., 2003. Satellite tracking of the post-nesting migration of a green turtle (*Chelonia mydas*) from Hong Kong. Mar. Turt. Newsl. 2–4.

Cheng, I.-J., 2000. Post-nesting migrations of green turtles (*Chelonia mydas*) at Wan-An Island, Penghu Archipelago, Taiwan. Mar. Biol. 137, 747–754. doi:10.1007/s002270000375

Cheng, I., Wang, Y., 2009. Influence of surface currents on post-nesting migration of green turtles nesting on Wan-An Island, Penghu Archipelago, Taiwan. J. Mar. Sci. Technol. 17, 306–311.

Cheng, I.J., 2007. Nesting ecology and postnesting migration of sea turtles on Taipin Tao, Nansha Archipelago, South China Sea. Chelonian Conserv. Biol. 6, 277–282.

Cognetti, G., 1996. Satellite tracking methods for turtle protection. Mar. Pollut. Bull. 32, 452–453.

Cooke, S.J., 2008. Biotelemetry and biologging in endangered species research and animal conservation: relevance to regional, national, and IUCN Red List threat assessments. Endanger. Species Res. 4, 165–185. doi:10.3354/esr00063

Costa, D.P., Breed, G.A., Robinson, P.W., 2012. New Insights into pelagic migrations: implications for ecology and conservation. Annu. Rev. Ecol. Evol. Syst. 43, 73–96. doi:10.1146/annurev-ecolsys-102710-145045

Coyne, M.S., Godley, B.J., 2007. Clearing house for satellite tracking data. Mar. Turt. Newsl. 117, 47.

Coyne, M.S., Godley, B.J., 2005. Satellite tracking and analysis tool (STAT): an integrated system for archiving, analyzing and mapping animal tracking data. Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser. 301, 1–7.

Craig, P., Parker, D., Brainard, R., Rice, M., Balazs, G., 2004. Migrations of green turtles in the central South Pacific. Biol. Conserv. 116, 433–438. doi:10.1016/S0006-3207(03)00217-9

Crossin, G., Cooke, S., Goldbogen, J., Phillips, R., 2014. Tracking fitness in marine vertebrates: current knowledge and opportunities for future research. Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser. 496, 1–17. doi:10.3354/meps10691

Cuevas, E., Abreu-Grobois, F., Guzmán-Hernández, V., Liceaga-Correa, M., Van Dam, R., 2008. Post-nesting migratory movements of hawksbill turtles *Eretmochelys imbricata* in waters adjacent to the Yucatan Peninsula, Mexico. Endanger. Species Res. 10, 123–133. doi:10.3354/esr00128

Da Silva, A., Dos Santos, E., Oliveira, F., Weber, M., Batista, J., Serafini, T., de Castilhos, J., 2011. Satellite-tracking reveals multiple foraging strategies and threats for olive ridley turtles in Brazil. Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser. 443, 237–247. doi:10.3354/meps09427

Dalleau, M., Benhamou, S., Sudre, J., Ciccione, S., Bourjea, J., 2014. The spatial ecology of juvenile loggerhead turtles (*Caretta caretta*) in the Indian Ocean sheds light on the "lost years" mystery. Mar. Biol. 161, 1835–1849. doi:10.1007/s00227-014-2465-z

Dodd, C.K., Byles, R., 2003. Post-nesting movements and behavior of loggerhead sea turtles (*Caretta caretta*) departing from east-central Florida nesting beaches. Chelonian Conserv. Biol. 4, 1–7.

Dodge, K.L., Galuardi, B., Miller, T.J., Lutcavage, M.E., 2014. Leatherback turtle movements, dive behavior, and habitat characteristics in ecoregions of the northwest Atlantic Ocean. PLoS One 9, e91726. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0091726

Doyle, T., Houghton, J., O'Súilleabháin, P., Hobson, V., Marnell, F., Davenport, J., Hays, G., 2008. Leatherback turtles satellite-tagged in European waters. Endanger. Species Res. 4, 23–31. doi:10.3354/esr00076

Dujon, A.M., Lindstrom, R.T., Hays, G.C., 2014. The accuracy of Fastloc-GPS locations and implications for animal tracking. Methods Ecol. Evol. 5, 1162–1169. doi:10.1111/2041-210X.12286

Duron-Defrenne, M., 1987. First satellite-based tracking in the Atlantic Ocean of a leatherback turtle (*Dermochelys coracea*). Life Sci. 15–18.

Eckert, S., Bagley, D., Kubis, S., Ehrhart, L., Johnson, C., Stewart, K., DeFreese, D., 2006. Internesting and postnesting movements and foraging habitats of leatherback sea turtles (*Dermochelys coriacea*) nesting in Florida. Chelonian Conserv. Biol. 5, 239–248. doi:10.2744/1071-8443

Eckert, S., Moore, J.E., Dunn, D.C., Van Buiten, R.S., Eckert, K., Halpin, P., 2008. Modeling loggerhead turtle movement in the Mediterranean: importance of body size and oceanography. Ecol. Appl. 18, 290–308.

Eckert, S.A., 2006. High-use oceanic areas for Atlantic leatherback sea turtles (*Dermochelys coriacea*) as identified using satellite telemetered location and dive information. Mar. Biol. 149, 1257–1267. doi:10.1007/s00227-006-0262-z

Eckert, S.A., Eckert, K., 1986. Harnessing leatherbacks. Mar. Turt. Newsl. 1–3.

Eckert, S.A., Sarti., L.M., 1997. Distant fisheries implicated in the loss of the world's largest leatherback nesting population. Mar. Turt. Newsl. 2–7.

Eguchi, T., Gerrodette, T., Pitman, R., Seminoff, J., Dutton, P., 2007. At-sea density and abundance estimates of the olive ridley turtle *Lepidochelys olivacea* in the eastern tropical Pacific. Endanger. Species Res. 3, 191–203.

Epperly, S., Nunes, A., Zwartepoorte, H., Byrd, L., Stokes, L., Bragança, M., Tucker, A., Christopher, R., 2013. Repatriation of a Kemp's Ridley from the Eastern North Atlantic to the Gulf of Mexico. Mar. Turt. Newsl. 136, 1–2.

Etnoyer, P., Canny, D., Mate, B.R., Morgan, L.E., Ortega-Ortiz, J.G., Nichols, W.J., 2006. Sea-surface temperature gradients across blue whale and sea turtle foraging trajectories off the Baja California Peninsula, Mexico. Deep Sea Res. Part II Top. Stud. Oceanogr. 53, 340–358. doi:10.1016/j.dsr2.2006.01.010

Ferraroli, S., Georges, J., Gaspar, P., Maho, Y. Le, 2004. Where sea turtles meet fisheries. Nature 429, 521–522.

Flemming, J.E., Field, C.A., James, M.C., Jonsen, I.D., Myers, R.A., 2006. How well can animals navigate? Estimating the circle of confusion from tracking data. Environmetrics 17, 351–362. doi:10.1002/env.774

Flemming, J.M., Jonsen, I.D., Myers, R.A., Field, C.A., 2010. Hierarchical state-space estimation of leatherback turtle navigation ability. PLoS One 5, e14245. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0014245

Foley, A.M., Schroeder, B., Hardy, R., MacPherson, S., Nicholas, M., Coyne, M.S., 2013. Postnesting migratory behavior of loggerhead sea turtles *Caretta caretta* from three Florida rookeries. Endanger. Species Res. 21, 129–142. doi:10.3354/esr00512

Foley, A.M., Schroeder, B.A., Hardy, R., MacPherson, S.L., Nicholas, M., 2014. Long-term behavior at foraging sites of adult female loggerhead sea turtles (*Caretta caretta*) from three Florida rookeries. Mar. Biol. 161, 1251–1262. doi:10.1007/s00227-014-2415-9

Fossette, S., Corbel, H., Gaspar, P., Maho, Y.L., Georges, J.-Y., 2007a. An alternative technique for the long-term satellite tracking of leatherback turtles. Endanger. Species Res. 3. doi:10.3354/esr00039

Fossette, S., Ferraroli, S., Tanaka, H., Ropert-Coudert, Y., Arai, N., Sato, K., Naito, Y., Maho, Y. Le, Georges, J.-Y., 2007b. Dispersal and dive patterns in gravid leatherback turtles during the nesting season in French Guiana. Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser. 338, 233–247.

Fossette, S., Girard, C., Lopez-Mendilaharsu, M., Miller, P., Domingo, A., Evans, D., Kelle, L., Plot, V., Prosdocimi, L., Verhage, S., Gaspar, P., Georges, J.-Y., 2010a. Atlantic leatherback migratory paths and temporary residence areas. PLoS One 5, e13908. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0013908

Fossette, S., Hobson, V.J., Girard, C., Calmettes, B., Gaspar, P., Georges, J.-Y., Hays, G.C., 2010b. Spatio-temporal foraging patterns of a giant zooplanktivore, the leatherback turtle. J. Mar. Syst. 81, 225–234. doi:10.1016/j.jmarsys.2009.12.002

Fossette, S., Kelle, L., Girondot, M., Goverse, E., Hilterman, M.L., Verhage, B., de Thoisy, B., Georges, J.-Y., 2008. The world's largest leatherback rookeries: A review of conservation-oriented research in French Guiana/Suriname and Gabon. J. Exp. Mar. Bio. Ecol. 356, 69–82. doi:10.1016/j.jembe.2007.12.024

Fossette, S., Witt, M.J., Miller, P., Nalovic, A., Albareda, D., Almeida, A.P., Broderick, A.C., Chacon-Chaverri, D., Coyne, M.S., Domingo, A., Eckert, S., Evans, D., Fallabrino, A., Ferraroli, S., Giffoni, B., Hays, G.C., Hughes, G., Kelle, L., Leslie, A., Luschi, P., Turny, A., Verhage, S., Godley, B.J., 2014. Pan-Atlantic analysis of the overlap of a highly migratory species, the leatherback turtle, with pelagic longline fisheries. Proc. R. Soc. B Biol. Sci. 281. doi:10.1098/rspb.2013.3065

Fujioka, E., Halpin, P.N., 2014. Spatio-temporal assessments of biodiversity in the high seas. Endanger. Species Res. 24, 181–190. doi:10.3354/esr00591

Fujioka, E., Kot, C.Y., Wallace, B.P., Best, B.D., Moxley, J., Cleary, J., Donnelly, B., Halpin, P.N., 2014. Data integration for conservation: leveraging multiple data types to advance ecological assessments and habitat modeling for marine megavertebrates using OBIS–SEAMAP. Ecol. Inform. 20, 13–26. doi:10.1016/j.ecoinf.2014.01.003

Fuller, W.J., Broderick, A., Phillips, R.A., Silk, J.R.D., Godley, B., 2008. Utility of geolocating light loggers for indicating at-sea movements in sea turtles. Endanger. Species Res. 4, 139–146. doi:10.3354/esr00048

Galli, S., Gaspar, P., Fossette, S., Calmettes, B., Hays, G.C., Lutjeharms, J.R.E., Luschi, P., 2012. Orientation of migrating leatherback turtles in relation to ocean currents. Anim. Behav. 84, 1491–1500. doi:10.1016/j.anbehav.2012.09.022

Gaos, A.R., Lewison, R.L., Wallace, B.P., Yañez, I.L., Liles, M.J., Nichols, W.J., Baquero, A., Hasbún, C.R., Vasquez, M., Urteaga, J., Seminoff, J.A., 2012a. Spatial ecology of critically endangered hawksbill turtles *Eretmochelys imbricata*: implications for management and conservation. Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser. 450, 181–194. doi:10.3354/meps09591

Gaos, A.R., Lewison, R.L., Yañez, I.L., Wallace, B.P., Liles, M.J., Nichols, W.J., Baquero, A., Hasbún, C.R., Vasquez, M., Urteaga, J., Seminoff, J.A., 2012b. Shifting the life-history paradigm: discovery of novel habitat use by hawksbill turtles. Biol. Lett. 8, 54–6. doi:10.1098/rsbl.2011.0603

Gaos, A.R., Lewison, R.R., Wallace, B.P., Yañez, I.L., Liles, M.J., Baquero, A., Seminoff, J.A., 2012. Dive behaviour of adult hawksbills (*Eretmochelys imbricata*, Linnaeus 1766) in the eastern Pacific Ocean highlights shallow depth use by the species. J. Exp. Mar. Bio. Ecol. 432-433, 171–178. doi:10.1016/j.jembe.2012.07.006

Garnier, J., Hill, N., Guissamulo, A., Silva, I., Witt, M., Godley, B., 2012. Status and community-based conservation of marine turtles in the northern Querimbas Islands (Mozambique). Oryx 46, 359–367. doi:10.1017/S0030605311001566

Gaspar, P., Georges, J.-Y., Fossette, S., Lenoble, A., Ferraroli, S., Le Maho, Y., 2006. Marine animal behaviour: neglecting ocean currents can lead us up the wrong track. Proc. R. Soc. B Biol. Sci. 273, 2697–702. doi:10.1098/rspb.2006.3623

Georges, J., Billes, A., Ferraroli, S., Fossette, S., Fretey, J., Grémillet, D., Maho, Y. Le, Myers, A.E., Tanaka, H., Hays, G.C., 2007. Meta-analysis of movements in Atlantic leatherback turtles during nesting season: conservation implications. Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser. 338, 225–232.

Gillespie, T.W., 2001. Remote sensing of animals. Prog. Phys. Geogrpahy 25, 355–362.

Girard, C., Sudre, J., Benhamou, S., Roos, D., Luschi, P., 2006. Homing in green turtles *Chelonia mydas*: oceanic currents act as a constraint rather than as an information source. Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser. 322, 281–289. doi:10.3354/meps322281

Girard, C., Tucker, A.D., Calmettes, B., 2009. Post-nesting migrations of loggerhead sea turtles in the Gulf of Mexico: dispersal in highly dynamic conditions. Mar. Biol. 156, 1827–1839. doi:10.1007/s00227-009-1216-z

Gitschlag, G.R., 1996. Migration and diving behavior of Kemp's ridley (Garman) sea turtles along the U.S. southeastern Atlantic coast. J. Exp. Mar. Bio. Ecol. 205, 115–135. doi:10.1016/S0022-0981(96)02602-0

Godley, B.J., Barbosa, C., Bruford, M., Broderick, A.C., Catry, P., Coyne, M.S., Formia, A., Hays, G.C., Witt, M.J., 2010. Unravelling migratory connectivity in marine turtles using multiple methods. J. Appl. Ecol. 47, 769–778. doi:10.1111/j.1365-2664.2010.01817.x

Godley, B.J., Blumenthal, J, M., Broderick, A.C., Coyne, M.S., Godfrey, M., Hawkes, L., Witt, M., 2008. Satellite tracking of sea turtles: where have we been and where do we go next? Endanger. Species Res. 4, 3–22. doi:10.3354/esr00060

Godley, B.J., Broderick, a. C., Glen, F., Hays, G.C., 2003. Post-nesting movements and submergence patterns of loggerhead marine turtles in the Mediterranean assessed by satellite tracking. J. Exp. Mar. Bio. Ecol. 287, 119–134. doi:10.1016/S0022-0981(02)00547-6

Godley, B.J., Lima, E.H.S., Åkesson, S., Broderick, A.C., Glen, F., Godfrey, M.H., Luschi, P., Hays, G.C., 2003. Movement patterns of green turtles in Brazilian coastal waters described by satellite tracking and flipper tagging. Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser. 253, 279–288. doi:10.3354/meps253279

Godley, B.J., Richardson, S., Broderick, A.C., Coyne, M.S., Glen, F., Hays, G.C., 2002. Long-term satellite telemetry of the movements and habitat utilisation by green turtles in the Mediterranean. Ecography (Cop.). 25, 352–362.

Godley, B.J., Wilson, R.P., 2008. Tracking vertebrates for conservation: introduction. Endanger. Species Res. 4, 1–2. doi:10.3354/esr00081

González Carman, V., Acha, E.M., Maxwell, S.M., Albareda, D., Campagna, C., Mianzan, H., 2014. Young green turtles, *Chelonia mydas*, exposed to plastic in a frontal area of the SW Atlantic. Mar. Pollut. Bull. 78, 56–62. doi:10.1016/j.marpolbul.2013.11.012

González Carman, V., Falabella, V., Maxwell, S., Albareda, D., Campagna, C., Mianzan, H., 2012. Revisiting the ontogenetic shift paradigm: The case of juvenile green turtles in the SW Atlantic. J. Exp. Mar. Bio. Ecol. 429, 64–72. doi:10.1016/j.jembe.2012.06.007

Gredzens, C., Marsh, H., Fuentes, M.M.P.B., Limpus, C.J., Shimada, T., Hamann, M., 2014. Satellite tracking of sympatric marine megafauna can inform the biological basis for species co-management. PLoS One 9, e98944. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0098944

Griffin, D.B., Murphy, S.R., Frick, M.G., Broderick, A.C., Coker, J.W., Coyne, M.S., Dodd, M.G., Godfrey, M.H., Godley, B.J., Hawkes, L.A., Murphy, T.M., Williams, K.L., Witt, M.J., 2013. Foraging habitats and migration corridors utilized by a recovering subpopulation of adult female loggerhead sea turtles: implications for conservation. Mar. Biol. 160, 3071–3086. doi:10.1007/s00227-013-2296-3

Habib, B., Shrotriya, S., Sivakumar, K., Sinha, P., Mathur, V., 2014. Three decades of wildlife radio telemetry in India: a review. Anim. Biotelemetry 2, 4. doi:10.1186/2050-3385-2-4

Halpin, P.N., Read, A.J., Best, B.D., Hyrenbach, K.D., Fujioka, E., Coyne, M.S., Crowder, L.B., Freeman, S.A., Spoerri, C., 2006. OBIS-SEAMAP: developing a biogeographic research data commons for the ecological studies of marine mammals, seabirds, and sea turtles. Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser. 316, 239–246.

Hamann, M., Godfrey, M., Seminoff, J., Arthur, K., Barata, P.C., Bjorndal, K., Bolten, A., Broderick, A., Campbell, L., Carreras, C., Casale, P., Chaloupka, M., Chan, S.K., Coyne, M., Crowder, L., Diez, C., Dutton, P., Epperly, S., FitzSimmons, N., Formia, A., Girondot, M., Hays, G., Cheng, I., Kaska, Y., Lewison, R., Mortimer, J., Nichols, W., Reina, R., Shanker, K., Spotila, J., Tomás, J., Wallace, B., Work, T., Zbinden, J., Godley, B., 2010. Global research priorities for sea turtles: informing management and conservation in the 21st century. Endanger. Species Res. 11, 245–269. doi:10.3354/esr00279

Hamel, M.A., McMahon, C.R., Bradshaw, C.J., 2008. Flexible inter-nesting behaviour of generalist olive ridley turtles in Australia. J. Exp. Mar. Bio. Ecol. 359, 47–54. doi:10.1016/j.jembe.2008.02.019

Hammerschlag, N., Broderick, A.C., Coker, J.W., Coyne, M.S., Dodd, M., Frick, M.G., Godfrey, M.H., Godley, B.J., Griffin, D.B., Hartog, K., Murphy, S.R., Murphy, T.M., Nelson, E., Williams, K.L., Witt, M.J., Hawkes, L.A., 2015. Evaluating the landscape of fear between apex predatory sharks and mobile sea turtles across a large dynamic seascape. Ecol. Soc. Am. 96, 2117–2126.

Hammerschlag, N., Cooke, S.J., Gallagher, A.J., Godley, B.J., 2014. Considering the fate of electronic tags: interactions with stakeholders and user responsibility when encountering tagged aquatic animals. Methods Ecol. Evol. 1147–1153. doi:10.1111/2041-210X.12248

Hardy, R.F., Tucker, A.D., Foley, A.M., Schroeder, B.A., Giove, R.J., Meylan, A.B., 2014. Spatiotemporal occurrence of loggerhead turtles (*Caretta caretta*) on the West Florida Shelf and apparent overlap with a commercial fishery. Can. J. Aquat. Sci. 1933, 1924–1933.

Hart, K., Fujisaki, I., 2010. Satellite tracking reveals habitat use by juvenile green sea turtles *Chelonia mydas* in the Everglades, Florida, USA. Endanger. Species Res. 11, 221–232. doi:10.3354/esr00284

Hart, K., Zawada, D., Fujisaki, I., Lidz, B., 2010. Inter-nesting habitat-use patterns of loggerhead sea turtles: enhancing satellite tracking with benthic mapping. Aquat. Biol. 11, 77–90. doi:10.3354/ab00296

Hart, K.M., Hyrenbach, K., 2009. Satellite telemetry of marine megavertebrates: the coming of age of an experimental science. Endanger. Species Res. 10, 9–20. doi:10.3354/esr00238

Hart, K.M., Lamont, M.M., Fujisaki, I., Tucker, A.D., Carthy, R.R., 2012. Common coastal foraging areas for loggerheads in the Gulf of Mexico: Opportunities for marine conservation. Biol. Conserv. 145, 185–194. doi:10.1016/j.biocon.2011.10.030

Hart, K.M., Lamont, M.M., Sartain, A.R., Fujisaki, I., 2014a. Migration, foraging, and residency patterns for northern gulf loggerheads: implications of local threats and international movements. PLoS One 9. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0103453

Hart, K.M., Lamont, M.M., Sartain, A.R., Fujisaki, I., Stephens, B.S., 2013. Movements and habitat-use of loggerhead sea turtles in the northern Gulf of Mexico during the reproductive period. PLoS One 8, e66921. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0066921

Hart, K.M., Sartain, A., Fujisaki, I., Pratt, J., Morley, D., Feeley, M., 2012. Home range, habitat use, and migrations of hawksbill turtles tracked from Dry Tortugas National Park, Florida, USA. Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser. 457, 193–207. doi:10.3354/meps09744

Hart, K.M., Zawada, D.G., Fujisaki, I., Lidz, B.H., 2013. Habitat use of breeding green turtles *Chelonia mydas* tagged in Dry Tortugas National Park: making use of local and regional MPAs. Biol. Conserv. 161, 142–154. doi:10.1016/j.biocon.2013.03.019

Hart, K.M., Zawada, D.G., Sartain, A.R., Fujisaki, I., 2014b. Breeding loggerhead marine turtles *Caretta caretta* in Dry Tortugas National Park, USA, show high fidelity to diverse habitats near nesting beaches. Oryx 1–6. doi:10.1017/S0030605314000854

Hatase, H., Matsuzawa, Y., Sakamoto, W., Baba, N., Miyawaki, I., 2002. Pelagic habitat use of an adult Japanese male loggerhead turtle *Caretta caretta* examined by the Argos satellite system. Fish. Sci. 68, 945–947.

Hatase, H., Omuta, K., Tsukamoto, K., 2007. Bottom or midwater: alternative foraging behaviours in adult female loggerhead sea turtles. J. Zool. 273, 46–55. doi:10.1111/j.1469-7998.2007.00298.x

Hatase, H., Sakamoto, W., 2004. Forage-diving behaviour of adult Japanese female loggerhead turtles (*Caretta caretta*) inferred from Argos location data. J. Mar. Biol. Assoc. UK 84, 855–856. doi:10.1017/S0025315404010070h

Hatase, H., Sato, K., Yamaguchi, M., Takahashi, K., Tsukamoto, K., 2006. Individual variation in feeding habitat use by adult female green sea turtles (*Chelonia mydas*): are they obligately neritic herbivores? Oecologia 149, 52–64. doi:10.1007/s00442-006-0431-2

Hatase, H., Takai, N., Matsuzawa, Y., Sakamoto, W., Omuta, K., Goto, K., Arai, N., Fujiwara, T., 2002. Size-related differences in feeding habitat use of adult female loggerhead turtles *Caretta caretta* around Japan determined by stable isotope analyses and satellite telemetry. Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser. 233, 273–281.

Hawkes, L., Tomás, J., Revuelta, O., León, Y., Blumenthal, J., Broderick, A., Fish, M., Raga, J., Witt, M., Godley, B., 2012. Migratory patterns in hawksbill turtles described by satellite tracking. Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser. 461, 223–232. doi:10.3354/meps09778

Hawkes, L.A., Broderick, A.C., Coyne, M.S., Godfrey, M.H., Godley, B.J., 2007. Only some like it hot - quantifying the environmental niche of the loggerhead sea turtle. Divers. Distrib. 13, 447–457. doi:10.1111/j.1472-4642.2007.00354.x

Hawkes, L.A., Broderick, A.C., Coyne, M.S., Godfrey, M.H., Lopez-Jurado, L.-F., Lopez-Suarez, P., Merino, S.E., Varo-Cruz, N., Godley, B.J., 2006. Phenotypically linked dichotomy in sea turtle foraging requires multiple conservation approaches. Curr. Biol. 16, 990–5. doi:10.1016/j.cub.2006.03.063

Hawkes, L.A., Witt, M.J., Broderick, A.C., Coker, J.W., Coyne, M.S., Dodd, M., Frick, M.G., Godfrey, M.H., Griffin, D.B., Murphy, S.R., Murphy, T.M., Williams, K.L., Godley, B.J., 2011. Home on the range: spatial ecology of loggerhead turtles in Atlantic waters of the USA. Divers. Distrib. 17, 624–640. doi:10.1111/j.1472-4642.2011.00768.x

Hays, G., Broderick, A.C., Glen, F., Godley, B.J., Nichols, W.J., 2001. The movements and submergence behaviour of male green turtles at Ascension Island. Mar. Biol. 139, 395–400. doi:10.1007/s002270100580

Hays, G., Broderick, A., Godley, B., Luschi, P., Nichols, W., 2003. Satellite telemetry suggests high levels of fishing-induced mortality in marine turtles. Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser. 262, 305–309. doi:10.3354/meps262305

Hays, G.C., 2014. Tracking animals to their death. J. Anim. Ecol. 83, 5–6. doi:10.1111/1365-2656.12164

Hays, G.C., 2008. Sea turtles: A review of some key recent discoveries and remaining questions. J. Exp. Mar. Bio. Ecol. 356, 1–7. doi:10.1016/j.jembe.2007.12.016

Hays, G.C., Akesson, S., Broderick, A.C., Glen, F., Godley, B.J., Luschi, P., Martin, C., Metcalfe, J.D., Papi, F., 2001. The diving behaviour of green turtles undertaking oceanic migration to and from Ascension Island: dive durations, dive profiles and depth distribution. J. Exp. Biol. 204, 4093–8.

Hays, G.C., Akesson, S., Broderick, A.C., Glen, F., Godley, B.J., Papi, F., Luschi, P., 2003. Island-finding ability of marine turtles. Proc. R. Soc. B Biol. Sci. 270 Suppl, S5–7. doi:10.1098/rsbl.2003.0022

Hays, G.C., Åkesson, S., Godley, B.J., Luschi, P., Santidrian, P., 2001. The implications of location accuracy for the interpretation of satellite-tracking data. Anim. Behav. 61, 1035–1040. doi:10.1006/anbe.2001.1685

Hays, G.C., Bradshaw, C.J.A., James, M.C., Lovell, P., Sims, D.W., 2007. Why do Argos satellite tags deployed on marine animals stop transmitting? J. Exp. Mar. Bio. Ecol. 349, 52–60. doi:10.1016/j.jembe.2007.04.016

Hays, G.C., Broderick, A.C., Godley, B.J., Lovell, P., Martin, C., Mcconnell, B.J., Richardson, S., 2002. Biphasal long-distance migration in green turtles. Anim. Behav. 64, 895–898. doi:10.1006/anbe.2002.1975

Hays, G.C., Broderick, A.C., Godley, B.J., Luschi, P., Nichols, W.J., 2004a. Tracking turtles to their death. Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser. 283, 299–300.

Hays, G.C., Christensen, A., Fossette, S., Schofield, G., Talbot, J., Mariani, P., 2014. Route optimisation and solving Zermelo's navigation problem during long distance migration in cross flows. Ecol. Lett. 17, 137–43. doi:10.1111/ele.12219

Hays, G.C., Dray, M., Quaife, T., Smyth, T.J., Mironnet, N.C., Luschi, P., Papi, F., Barnsley, M.J., 2001. Movements of migrating green turtles in relation to AVHRR derived sea surface temperature. Int. J. Remote Sens. 22, 1403–1411. doi:10.1080/01431160118422

Hays, G.C., Fossette, S., Katselidis, K., Mariani, P., Schofield, G., 2010a. Ontogenetic development of migration: Lagrangian drift trajectories suggest a new paradigm for sea turtles. J. R. Soc. Interface 7, 1319–27. doi:10.1098/rsif.2010.0009

Hays, G.C., Fossette, S., Katselidis, K.A., Schofield, G., Gravenor, M.B., 2010b. Breeding Periodicity for male sea turtles, operational sex ratios, and implications in the face of climate change. Conserv. Biol. 24, 1636–1643. doi:10.1111/j.1523-1739.2010.01531.x

Hays, G.C., Hobson, V.J., Metcalfe, J.D., Righton, D., Sims, D.W., 2006. Flexible foraging movements of leatherback turtles across the North Atlantic Ocean. Ecology 87, 2647–56.

Hays, G.C., Houghton, J.D., Isaacs, C., King, R.S., Lloyd, C., Lovell, P., 2004b. First records of oceanic dive profiles for leatherback turtles, *Dermochelys coriacea*, indicate behavioural plasticity associated with long-distance migration. Anim. Behav. 67, 733–743. doi:10.1016/j.anbehav.2003.08.011

Hays, G.C., Houghton, J.D., Myers, A.E., 2004. Pan-Atlantic leatherback turtle movements. Nature 429, 2004.

Hays, G.C., Luschi, P., Papi, F., Seppia, C., Marsh, R., 1999. Changes in behaviour during the inter-nesting period and post-nesting migration for Ascension Island green turtles. Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser. 189, 263–273.

Hays, G.C., Mazaris, A.D., Schofield, G., 2014a. Different male vs. female breeding periodicity helps mitigate offspring sex ratio skews in sea turtles. Front. Mar. Sci. 1, 1–9. doi:10.3389/fmars.2014.00043

Hays, G.C., Mortimer, J.A., Ierodiaconou, D., Esteban, N., 2014b. Use of long-distance migration patterns of an endangered species to inform conservation planning for the world's largest marine protected area. Conserv. Biol. 00, 1–9. doi:10.1111/cobi.12325

Hays, G.C., Scott, R., 2013. Global patterns for upper ceilings on migration distance in sea turtles and comparisons with fish, birds and mammals. Funct. Ecol. 27, 748–756. doi:10.1111/1365-2435.12073

Hays, G.C., Webb, P., Hayes, J., Priede, I., French, J., 1991. Satellite tracking of a loggerhead turtle (*Caretta caretta*) in the Mediterranean. J. Mar. Biol. Assoc. UK 71, 743–746.

Hazel, J., 2009. Evaluation of fast-acquisition GPS in stationary tests and fine-scale tracking of green turtles. J. Exp. Mar. Bio. Ecol. 374, 58–68. doi:10.1016/j.jembe.2009.04.009

Hazen, E., Maxwell, S., Bailey, H., Bograd, S., Hamann, M., Gaspar, P., Godley, B., Shillinger, G., 2012. Ontogeny in marine tagging and tracking science: technologies and data gaps. Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser. 457, 221–240. doi:10.3354/meps09857

Hitipeuw, C., Dutton, P.H., Benson, S., Thebu, J., 2007. Population Status and internesting movement of leatherback turtles, *Dermochelys coriacea*, nesting on the northwest coast of Papua, Indonesia. Chelonian Conserv. Biol. 6, 28–36.

Hochscheid, S., 2014. Why we mind sea turtles' underwater business: a review on the study of diving behavior. J. Exp. Mar. Bio. Ecol. 450, 118–136. doi:10.1016/j.jembe.2013.10.016

Hochscheid, S., Bentivegna, F., Bradai, M., Hays, G., 2007. Overwintering behaviour in sea turtles: dormancy is optional. Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser. 340, 287–298. doi:10.3354/meps340287

Hochscheid, S., Bentivegna, F., Hamza, A., Hays, G., 2010. When surfacers do not dive: multiple significance of extended surface times in marine turtles. J. Exp. Biol. 213, 1328–37. doi:10.1242/jeb.037184

Hochscheid, S., Bentivegna, F., Hays, G.C., 2005. First records of dive durations for a hibernating sea turtle. Biol. Lett. 1, 82–6. doi:10.1098/rsbl.2004.0250

Hochscheid, S., Mcmahon, C.R., Bradshaw, C.J.A., Maffucci, F., Bentivegna, F., Hays, G.C., 2007. Allometric scaling of lung volume and its consequences for marine turtle diving performance. Comp. Biochem. Physiol. Part A 148, 360–367. doi:10.1016/j.cbpa.2007.05.010

Hoenner, X., Whiting, S.D., Hindell, M.A., McMahon, C.R., 2012. Enhancing the use of Argos satellite data for home range and long distance migration studies of marine animals. PLoS One 7, e40713. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0040713

Horrocks, J., Vermeer, L., Krueger, B., Coyne, M., Schroeder, B.A., Balazs, G.H., 2001. Migration routes and destination characteristics of post-nesting hawksbill turtles satellite-tracked from Barbados, West Indies. Chelonian Conserv. Biol. 4, 107–114.

Houghton, J.D.R., Doyle, T.K., Davenport, J., Wilson, R.P., Hays, G.C., 2008. The role of infrequent and extraordinary deep dives in leatherback turtles (*Dermochelys coriacea*). J. Exp. Biol. 211, 2566–75. doi:10.1242/jeb.020065

Howell, E., Kobayashi, D., Parker, D., Balazs, G., Polovina, A.J., 2008. TurtleWatch: a tool to aid in the bycatch reduction of loggerhead turtles *Caretta caretta* in the Hawaii-based pelagic longline fishery. Endanger. Species Res. 5, 267–278. doi:10.3354/esr00096

Howell, E.A., Dutton, P.H., Polovina, J.J., Bailey, H., Parker, D.M., Balazs, G.H., 2010. Oceanographic influences on the dive behavior of juvenile loggerhead turtles (*Caretta caretta*) in the North Pacific Ocean. Mar. Biol. 157, 1011–1026. doi:10.1007/s00227-009-1381-0

Hughes, G.R., Luschi, P., Mencacci, R., Papi, F., 1998. The 7000-km oceanic journey of a leatherback turtle tracked by satellite. J. Exp. Mar. Bio. Ecol. 229, 209–217.

James, M.C., Andrea Ottensmeyer, C., Myers, R.A., 2005a. Identification of high-use habitat and threats to leatherback sea turtles in northern waters: new directions for conservation. Ecol. Lett. 8, 195–201. doi:10.1111/j.1461-0248.2004.00710.x

James, M.C., Davenport, J., Hays, G.C., 2006. Expanded thermal niche for a diving vertebrate: A leatherback turtle diving into near-freezing water. J. Exp. Mar. Bio. Ecol. 335, 221–226. doi:10.1016/j.jembe.2006.03.013

James, M.C., Eckert, S.A., Myers, R.A., 2005b. Migratory and reproductive movements of male leatherback turtles (*Dermochelys coriacea*). Mar. Biol. 147, 845–853. doi:10.1007/s00227-005-1581-1

James, M.C., Myers, R.A., Ottensmeyer, C.A., 2005. Behaviour of leatherback sea turtles , *Dermochelys coriacea*, during the migratory cycle. Proc. R. Soc. B Biol. Sci. 272, 1547–1555. doi:10.1098/rspb.2005.3110

James, M.C., Ottensmeyer, C.A., Eckert, S.A., Myers, R.A., 2006. Changes in diel diving patterns accompany shifts between northern foraging and southward migration in leatherback turtles. Can. J. Zool. 84, 754–765. doi:10.1139/Z06-046

Jones, T., Houtan, K.S. Van, Bostrom, B.L., Ostafichuk, P., Mikkelsen, J., Tezcan, E., Carey, M., Imlach, B., Seminoff, J.A., 2013. Calculating the ecological impacts of animal-borne instruments on aquatic organisms. Methods Ecol. Evol. 4, 1178–1186. doi:10.1111/2041-210X.12109

Jonsen, I.D., Myers, R.A., James, M.C., 2007. Identifying leatherback turtle foraging behaviour from satellite telemetry using a switching state-space model. Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser. 337, 255–264.

Jonsen, I.D., Myers, R.A., James, M.C., 2006. Robust hierarchical state-space models reveal diel variation in travel rates of migrating leatherback turtles. J. Anim. Ecol. 75, 1046–57. doi:10.1111/j.1365-2656.2006.01129.x

Keinath, J., Musick, J., 1993. Movements and diving behavior of a leatherback turtle, *Dermochelys coriacea*. Copeia 1010–1017.

Kennett, R., Munungurritj, N., Yunupingu, D., 2004. Migration patterns of marine turtles in the Gulf of Carpentaria, northern Australia: implications for Aboriginal management. Wildl. Res. 31, 241. doi:10.1071/WR03002

Kittiwattanawong, K., Chantrapornsyl, S., Sakamoto, W., Arai, N., 2002. Tracking of Green Turtles *Chelonia mydas* in the Andaman Sea using platform transmitter terminals. Phuket Mar. Biol. Cent. Res. Bull. 64, 81–87.

Klain, S., Eberdong, J., Kitalong, A., Yalap, Y., Matthews, E., Eledui, A., Morris, M., Andrew, W., Albis, D., Kemesong, P., 2007. Linking Micronesia and Southeast Asia: Palau sea turtle satellite tracking and flipper tag returns. Mar. Turt. Newsl. 9–11.

Kobayashi, D.R., Cheng, I.-J., Parker, D.M., Polovina, J.J., Kamezaki, N., Balazs, G.H., 2011. Loggerhead turtle (*Caretta caretta*) movement off the coast of Taiwan: characterization of a hotspot in the East China Sea and investigation of mesoscale eddies. ICES J. Mar. Sci. 68, 707–718. doi:10.1093/icesjms/fsq185

Kobayashi, D.R., Farman, R., Polovina, J.J., Parker, D.M., Rice, M., Balazs, G.H., 2014. “Going with the flow” or not: evidence of positive rheotaxis in oceanic juvenile loggerhead turtles (*Caretta caretta*) in the South Pacific Ocean using satellite tags and ocean circulation data. PLoS One 9. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0103701

Kobayashi, D.R., Polovina, J.J., Parker, D.M., Kamezaki, N., 2008. Pelagic habitat characterization of loggerhead sea turtles, *Caretta caretta*, in the North Pacific Ocean (1997-2006): insights from satellite tag tracking and remotely sensed data. J. Exp. Mar. Bio. Ecol. 356, 96–114. doi:10.1016/j.jembe.2007.12.019

Kot, C.Y., Fujioka, E., Hazen, L.J., Best, B.D., Read, A.J., Halpin, P.N., 2010. Spatio-temporal gap analysis of OBIS-SEAMAP project data: assessment and way forward. PLoS One 5, e12990. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0012990

Lambardi, P., Lutjeharms, J.R., Mencacci, R., Hays, G., Luschi, P., 2008. Influence of ocean currents on Influence of ocean currents on long-distance movement of leatherback sea turtles in the Southwest Indian Ocean. Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser. 353, 289–301. doi:10.3354/meps07118

Liew, H.-C., Bali, J., Chan, E.-H., Braken, Q., 2000. Satellite tracking of green turtles from the Sarawak Turtle Islands, Malaysia. Mar. Turt. Newsl. 20.

Liew, H.-C., Chan, E.-H., Luschi, P., Papi, F., 1995. Satellite tracking data in Malaysian green turtle migration. Rend. Fis. Acc. Linceri 9, 239–246.

Limpus, C., Limpus, D., 2001. The loggerhead turtle, *Caretta caretta*, in Queensland: breeding migrations and fidelity to a warm temperate feeding area. Chelonian Conserv. Biol. 4, 142–153.

Lohmann, K., Hester, J., Lohmann, C.M., 1999. Long-distance navigation in sea turtles. Ethol. Ecol. Evol. 11, 1–23.

Lohmann, K.J., 2007. Sea turtles: navigating with magnetism. Curr. Biol. 17, R102–4. doi:10.1016/j.cub.2007.01.023

Lohmann, K.J., Luschi, P., Hays, G.C., 2008. Goal navigation and island-finding in sea turtles. J. Exp. Mar. Bio. Ecol. 356, 83–95. doi:10.1016/j.jembe.2007.12.017

López-Mendilaharsu, M., Rocha, C.F.D., Miller, P., Domingo, A., Prosdocimi, L., 2009. Insights on leatherback turtle movements and high use areas in the Southwest Atlantic Ocean. J. Exp. Mar. Bio. Ecol. 378, 31–39. doi:10.1016/j.jembe.2009.07.010

Luschi, P., Åkesson, S., Broderick, A., Glen, F., Godley, B., Papi, F., Hays, G., 2001. Testing the navigational abilities of ocean migrants: displacement experiments on green sea turtles (*Chelonia mydas*). Behav. Ecol. Sociobiol. 50, 528–534. doi:10.1007/s002650100396

Luschi, P., Benhamou, S., Girard, C., Ciccione, S., Roos, D., Sudre, J., Benvenuti, S., 2007. Marine turtles use geomagnetic cues during open-sea homing. Curr. Biol. 17, 126–33. doi:10.1016/j.cub.2006.11.062

Luschi, P., Casale, P., 2014. Movement patterns of marine turtles in the Mediterranean Sea: a review. Ital. J. Zool. 81, 478–495. doi:10.1080/11250003.2014.963714

Luschi, P., Hays, G., Papi, F., 2003. A review of long-distance movements by marine turtles , and the possible role of ocean currents. Oikos 103, 293–302.

Luschi, P., Hays, G.C., Del Seppia, C., Marsh, R., Papi, F., 1998. The navigational feats of green sea turtles migrating from Ascension Island investigated by satellite telemetry. Proc. R. Soc. B Biol. Sci. 265, 2279–84. doi:10.1098/rspb.1998.0571

Luschi, P., Hughes, G.R., Mencacci, R., De Bernardi, E., Sale, A., Broker, R., Bouwer, M., Papi, F., 2003. Satellite tracking of migrating loggerhead sea turtles (*Caretta caretta*) displaced in the open sea. Mar. Biol. 143, 793–801. doi:10.1007/s00227-003-1117-5

Luschi, P., Lutjeharms, J.R., Lambardi, P., Mencacci, R., Hughes, G., Hays, G., 2006. A review of migratory behaviour of sea turtles off southeastern Africa. S. Afr. J. Sci. 102, 51–58.

Luschi, P., Mencacci, R., Vallini, C., Ligas, A., Lambardi, P., Benvenuti, S., 2013. Long-term tracking of adult loggerhead turtles (*Caretta caretta*) in the Mediterranean Sea. J. Herpetol. 47, 227–231. doi:10.1670/11-173

Luschi, P., Papi, F., Liew, H., Chan, E., 1996. Long-distance migration and homing after displacement in green turtle (*Chelonia mydas*): a satellite tracking study. J. Comp. Physiol. A 178, 447–452.

Luschi, P., Sale, A., Mencacci, R., Hughes, G., Lutjeharms, J.R., Papi, F., 2003. Current transport of leatherback sea turtles (*Dermochelys coriacea*) in the ocean. Proc. R. Soc. B Biol. Sci. 270, S129–32. doi:10.1098/rsbl.2003.0036

Lutcavage, M., Rhodin, A., Sadove, S., Conroy, C., 2001. Direct carapacial attachment of satellite tags using orthopedic bioabsorbable mini-anchor screws on leatherback turtles in Culebra, Puerto Rico. Mar. Turt. Newsl. 9–12.

Lyn, H., Coleman, A., Broadway, M., Klaus, J., Finerty, S., Shannon, D., Solangi, M., 2012. Displacement and site fidelity of rehabilitated immature Kemp's Ridley sea turtles (*Lepidochelys kempii*). Mar. Turt. Newsl. 135, 10–13.

Mangel, J., Alfaro-Shigueto, J., Witt, M., Dutton, P., Seminoff, J., Godley, B., 2011. Post-capture movements of loggerhead turtles in the southeastern Pacific Ocean assessed by satellite tracking. Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser. 433, 261–272. doi:10.3354/meps09152

Mansfield, K., Wyneken, J., Rittschof, D., Walsh, M., Lim, C., Richards, P., 2012. Satellite tag attachment methods for tracking neonate sea turtles. Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser. 457, 181–192. doi:10.3354/meps09485

Mansfield, K.L., Saba, V.S., Keinath, J.A., Musick, J.A., 2009. Satellite tracking reveals a dichotomy in migration strategies among juvenile loggerhead turtles in the Northwest Atlantic. Mar. Biol. 156, 2555–2570. doi:10.1007/s00227-009-1279-x

Mansfield, K.L., Wyneken, J., Porter, W.P., Luo, J., 2014. First satellite tracks of neonate sea turtles redefine the 'lost years' oceanic niche. Proc. R. Soc. B Biol. Sci. 281.

Marcovaldi, M., Lopez, G., Soares, L., Lima, E.H.S., Thomé, J.C., Almeida, A., 2010. Satellite-tracking of female loggerhead turtles highlights fidelity behavior in northeastern Brazil. Endanger. Species Res. 12, 263–272. doi:10.3354/esr00308

Marcovaldi, M., Lopez, G., Soares, L., López-Mendilaharsu, M., 2012. Satellite tracking of hawksbill turtles *Eretmochelys imbricata* nesting in northern Bahia, Brazil: turtle movements and foraging destinations. Endanger. Species Res. 17, 123–132. doi:10.3354/esr00421

Margaritoulis, D., Rees, A.F., 2011. Loggerhead turtles nesting at Rethymno, Greece, prefer the Aegean Sea as their main foraging area. Mar. Turt. Newsl. 131, 12–14.

Maxwell, S.M., Breed, G.A., Nickel, B.A., Makanga-Bahouna, J., Pemo-Makaya, E., Parnell, R.J., Formia, A., Ngouessono, S., Godley, B.J., Costa, D.P., Witt, M.J., Coyne, M.S., 2011. Using satellite tracking to optimize protection of long-lived marine species: olive ridley sea turtle conservation in Central Africa. PLoS One 6, e19905. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0019905

Maxwell, S.M., Hazen, E.L., Bograd, S.J., Halpern, B.S., Breed, G.A., Nickel, B., Teutschel, N.M., Crowder, L.B., Benson, S., Dutton, P.H., Bailey, H., Kappes, M.A., Kuhn, C.E., Weise, M.J., Mate, B., Shaffer, S.A., Hassrick, J.L., Henry, R.W., Irvine, L., Mcdonald, B.I., Robinson, P.W., Block, B.A., Costa, D.P., 2013. Cumulative human impacts on marine predators. Nat. Commun. 4, 1–9. doi:10.1038/ncommsS3688

McClellan, C., Read, A., 2009. Confronting the gauntlet: understanding incidental capture of green turtles through fine-scale movement studies. Endanger. Species Res. 10, 165–179. doi:10.3354/esr00199

McClellan, C., Read, A., 2007. Complexity and variation in loggerhead sea turtle life history. Biol. Lett. 3, 592–594. doi:10.1098/rsbl.2007.0355

McClellan, C.M., Read, A.J., Price, B. a, Cluse, W.M., Godfrey, M.H., 2009. Using telemetry to mitigate the bycatch of long-lived marine vertebrates. Ecol. Appl. 19, 1660–71.

McMahon, C., Bradshaw, C.J., Hays, G., 2007. Satellite tracking reveals unusual diving characteristics for a marine reptile, the olive ridley turtle *Lepidochelys olivacea*. Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser. 329, 239–252. doi:10.3354/meps329239

McMahon, C., Collier, N., Northfield, J., Glen, F., 2011. Taking the time to assess the effects of remote sensing and tracking devices on animals. Anim. Welf. 20, 515–521.

McMahon, C.R., Autret, E., Houghton, J.D.R., Lovell, P., Myers, A.E., Hays, G.C., 2005. Animal-borne sensors successfully capture the real-time thermal properties of ocean basins. Limnol. Oceanogr. 3, 392–398.

McMahon, C.R., Hays, G.C., 2006. Thermal niche, large-scale movements and implications of climate change for a critically endangered marine vertebrate. Glob. Chang. Biol. 12, 1330–1338. doi:10.1111/j.1365-2486.2006.01174.x

Mencacci, R., Bernardi, E., Sale, A., Lutjeharms, J.R.E., Luschi, P., 2009. Influence of oceanic factors on long-distance movements of loggerhead sea turtles displaced in the southwest Indian Ocean. Mar. Biol. 157, 339–349. doi:10.1007/s00227-009-1321-z

Mencacci, R., Ligas, A., Meschini, P., Luschi, P., 2011. Movements of three loggerhead sea turtles in Tuscany waters. Atti della Soc. toscana di Sci. Nat. Resid. Pisa, Ser. B 118, 117–120. doi:10.2424/ASTSN.M.2011.31

Mendez, D., Cuevas, E., Navarro, J., Blanca, I., Gonzalez-Garza, B., Guzman-Hernandez, V., 2013. Satellite tracking of green turtle females *Chelonia mydas* and the evaluation of their home ranges in the north coast of the Yucatan Peninsula, Mexico. Rev. Biol. Mar. Oceanogr. 48, 497–509.

Mestre, F., Bragança, M.P., Nunes, A., dos Santos, M.E., 2014. Satellite tracking of sea turtles released after prolonged captivity periods. Mar. Biol. Res. 10, 996–1006. doi:10.1080/17451000.2013.872801

Meylan, P.A., Meylan, A., Gray, J., 2011. The Ecology and Migrations of Sea Turtles: Tests of the Developmental Habitat Hypothesis. Bull. Am. Museum Nat. Hist.

Moncada, F.G., Hawkes, L.A., Fish, M.R., Godley, B.J., Manolis, S.C., Medina, Y., Nodarse, G., Webb, G.J.W., 2012. Patterns of dispersal of hawksbill turtles from the Cuban shelf inform scale of conservation and management. Biol. Conserv. 148, 191–199. doi:10.1016/j.biocon.2012.01.011

Morreale, S., Plotkin, P., Shaver, D.J., Kalb, H., 2007. Migration and movements of ridley turtles., in: Pamela, P. (Ed.), Biology and Conservation of Ridley Sea Turtles,. Smithsonian Institution Press., pp. 213–230.

Morreale, S., Standora, E., 2005. Western North Atlantic waters: crucial developmental habitat for Kemp's ridley and loggerhead sea turtles. Chelonian Conserv. Biol. 4, 872–882.

Morreale, S.J., Standora, E., Spotila, J.R., Paladino, F. V, 1996. Migration corridor for sea turtles. Nature 384, 319–320.

Musyl, M., Domeier, M., Nasby-Lucas, N., Brill, R., McNaughton, L., Swimmer, J., Lutcavage, M., Wilson, S., Galuardi, B., Liddle, J., 2011. Performance of pop-up satellite archival tags. Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser. 433, 1–28. doi:10.3354/meps09202

Myers, A.E., Lovell, P., Hays, G.C., 2006. Tools for studying animal behaviour: validation of dive profiles relayed via the Argos satellite system. Anim. Behav. 71, 989–993. doi:10.1016/j.anbehav.2005.06.016

Ng, C.K., Dutton, P.H., Chan, S.K., Cheung, K., Qiu, J., Sun, Y., 2014. Characterization and conservation concerns of green turtles (*Chelonia mydas*) nesting in Hong Kong, China. Pacific Sci. 68, 231–243. doi:10.2984/68.2.5

Nichols, W.J., Resendiz, A., Seminoff, J.A., Resendiz, B., 2000. Transpacific migration of a loggerhead turtle monitored by satellite telemetry. Bull. Mar. Sci. 67, 937–947.

Olson, E.L., Salomon, A.K., Wirsing, A.J., Heithaus, M.R., 2012. Large-scale movement patterns of male loggerhead sea turtles (*Caretta caretta*) in Shark Bay, Australia. Mar. Freshw. Res. 63, 1108. doi:10.1071/MF12030

Pabón-Aldana, K., Noriega-Hoyos, C., Jaúregui, G., 2012. First satellite track of a head-started juvenile hawksbill in the Colombian Caribbean. Mar. Turt. Newsl. 4–7.

Pajuelo, M., Bjorndal, K., Reich, K.J., Vander Zanden, H., Hawkes, L., Bolten, A., 2012a. Assignment of nesting loggerhead turtles to their foraging areas in the Northwest Atlantic using stable isotopes. Ecosphere 3, 1–18.

Pajuelo, M., Bjorndal, K.A., Reich, K.J., Arendt, M.D., Bolten, A.B., 2012b. Distribution of foraging habitats of male loggerhead turtles (*Caretta caretta*) as revealed by stable isotopes and satellite telemetry. Mar. Biol. 159, 1255–1267. doi:10.1007/s00227-012-1906-9

Papi, F., Liew, H., Luschi, P., Chan, E., 1995. Long-range migratory travel of a green turtle tracked by satellite: evidence for navigational ability in the open sea. Mar. Biol. 122, 171–175.

Papi, F., Luschi, P., 1996. Pinpointing "Isla Meta": the case of sea turtles and albatrosses. J. Exp. Biol. 199, 65–71.

Papi, F., Luschi, P., Akesson, S., Capogrossi, S., Hays, G., 2000. Open-sea migration of magnetically disturbed sea turtles. J. Exp. Biol. 203, 3435–43.

Papi, F., Luschi, P., Crosio, E., Hughes, G.R., 1997. Satellite tracking experiments on the navigational ability and migratory behaviour of the loggerhead turtle *Caretta caretta*. Mar. Biol. 129, 215–220. doi:10.1007/s002270050162

Parga, M.L., 2012. Hooks and sea turtles: a veterinarian's perspective. Bull. Mar. Sci. 88, 731–741. doi:10.5343/bms.2011.1063

Parker, D.M., Balazs, G.H., King, C.S., Katahira, L., 2009. Short-range movements of hawksbill turtles (*Eretmochelys imbricata*) from nesting to foraging areas within the Hawaiian Islands. Pacific Sci. 63, 371–382.

Parker, D.M., Balazs, G.H., Rice, M.R., Tomkeiwicz, S.M., 2014. Variability in reception duration of dual satellite tags on sea turtles tracked in the Pacific Ocean. Micronesia 03, 1–8.

Parker, D.M., King, C., Rice, M., Balazs, G., 2014. First use of a GPS satellite tag to track a post-nesting hawksbill (*Eretmochelys imbricata*) in the Hawaiian Islands with an indication of possible mortality. Mar. Turt. Newsl. 142, 10–13.

Peckham, H., Maldonado Diaz, D., Tremblay, Y., Ochoa, R., Polovina, J., Balazs, G., Dutton, P., Nichols, W., 2011. Demographic implications of alternative foraging strategies in juvenile loggerhead turtles *Caretta caretta* of the North Pacific Ocean. Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser. 425, 269–280. doi:10.3354/meps08995

Peckham, S.H., Maldonado Diaz, D., Walli, A., Ruiz, G., Crowder, L.B., Nichols, W.J., 2007. Small-scale fisheries bycatch jeopardizes endangered Pacific loggerhead turtles. PLoS One 2, e1041. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0001041

Pelletier, D., Roos, D., Ciccione, S., 2003. Oceanic survival and movements of wild and captive-reared immature green turtles (*Chelonia mydas*) in the Indian Ocean. Aquat. Living Resour. 16, 35–41.

Pendoley, K.L., Schofield, G., Whittock, P.A., Ierodiaconou, D., Hays, G.C., 2014. Protected species use of a coastal marine migratory corridor connecting marine protected areas. Mar. Biol. doi:10.1007/s00227-014-2433-7

Pikesley, S.K., Broderick, A.C., Cejudo, D., Coyne, M.S., Godfrey, M.H., Godley, B.J., Lopez, P., López-Jurado, L.F., Elsy Merino, S., Varo-Cruz, N., Witt, M.J., Hawkes, L.A., 2014. Modelling the niche for a marine vertebrate: a case study incorporating behavioural plasticity, proximate threats and climate change. Ecography (Cop.). n/a–n/a. doi:10.1111/ecog.01245

Pikesley, S.K., Maxwell, S.M., Pendoley, K., Costa, D.P., Coyne, M.S., Formia, A., Godley, B.J., Klein, W., Makanga-Bahouna, J., Maruca, S., Ngouessono, S., Parnell, R.J., Pemo-Makaya, E., Witt, M.J., 2013. On the front line: integrated habitat mapping for olive ridley sea turtles in the southeast Atlantic. Divers. Distrib. 19, 1518–1530. doi:10.1111/ddi.12118

Pilcher, N.J., 2013. A portable restraining box for sea turtles. Mar. Turt. Newsl. 136, 3–4.

Pilcher, N.J., Antonopoulou, M., Perry, L., Abdel-Moati, M.A., Al Abdessalaam, T.Z., Albeldawi, M., Al Ansi, M., Al-Mohannadi, S.F., Al Zahlawi, N., Baldwin, R., Chikhi, A., Das, H.S., Hamza, S., Kerr, O.J., Al Kiyumi, A., Mobaraki, A., Suwaidi, H.S.A., Suweidi, A.S.A., Sawaf, M., Tourenq, C., Williams, J., Willson, A., 2014. Identification of important sea turtle areas (ITAs) for hawksbill turtles in the Arabian region. J. Exp. Mar. Bio. Ecol. 460, 89–99. doi:10.1016/j.jembe.2014.06.009

Plot, V., de Thoisy, B., Blanc, S., Kelle, L., Lavergne, A., Roger-Bérubet, H., Tremblay, Y., Fossette, S., Georges, J.-Y., 2012. Reproductive synchrony in a recovering bottlenecked sea turtle population. J. Anim. Ecol. 81, 341–51. doi:10.1111/j.1365-2656.2011.01915.x

Plotkin, P., Owens, D.W., Byles, R., Patterson, R., 1996. Departure of Male Olive Ridley Turtles (*Lepidochelys olivacea*) from a nearshore breeding ground. Herpetologica 25, 1–7.

Plotkin, P., 2010. Nomadic behaviour of the highly migratory olive ridley sea turtle *Lepidochelys olivacea* in the eastern tropical Pacific Ocean. Endanger. Species Res. 13, 33–40. doi:10.3354/esr00314

Plotkin, P., 1998. Interaction between behavior of marine organisms and the performance of satellite transmitters: a marine turtle case study. Mar. Technol. Soc. J. 31, 5–10.

Plotkin, P.T., Byles, R.A., Rostal, D.C., Owens, D.W., 1995. Independent versus socially facilitated oceanic migrations of the olive ridley, *Lepidochelys olivacea*. Mar. Biol. 122, 137–143. doi:10.1007/BF00349287

Plotkin, P.T., Spotila, J.R., 2002. Post-nesting migrations of loggerhead turtles *Caretta caretta* from Georgia, USA: conservation implications for a genetically distinct subpopulation. Oryx 36, 396–399. doi:10.1017/S0030605302000753

Polovina, J., Uchida, I., Balazs, G., Howell, E.A., Parker, D., Dutton, P., 2006. The Kuroshio Extension Bifurcation Region: A pelagic hotspot for juvenile loggerhead sea turtles. Deep Sea Res. Part II Top. Stud. Oceanogr. 53, 326–339. doi:10.1016/j.dsr2.2006.01.006

Polovina, J.J., Balazs, G.H., Howell, E.A., Parker, D.M., Seki, M.P., Dutton, P.H., 2004. Forage and migration habitat of loggerhead (*Caretta caretta*) and olive ridley (*Lepidochelys olivacea*) sea turtles in the central North Pacific Ocean. Fish. Oceanogr. 13, 36–51. doi:10.1046/j.1365-2419.2003.00270.x

Polovina, J.J., Howell, E., Kobayashi, D.R., Seki, M.P., 2001. The transition zone chlorophyll front, a dynamic global feature defining migration and forage habitat for marine resources. Prog. Oceanogr. 49, 469–483. doi:10.1016/S0079-6611(01)00036-2

Polovina, J.J., Howell, E., Parker, D.M., Balazs, G.H., 2003. Dive-depth distribution of loggerhead (*Carretta carretta*) and olive ridley (Lepidochelys olivacea) sea turtles in the central North Pacific: might deep longline sets catch fewer turtles? Fish. Bull. 101, 189–193.

Polovina, J.J., Kobayashi, D.R., Parker, D.M., Seki, M.P., Balazs, G.H., 2000. Turtles on the edge: movement of loggerhead turtles (*Caretta caretta*) along oceanic fronts, spanning longline fishing grounds in the central North Pacific, 1997-1998. Fish. Oceanogr. 9, 71–82.

Ragland, J.M., Arendt, M.D., Kucklick, J.R., Keller, J.M., 2011. Persistent organic pollutants in blood plasma of satellite-tracked adult male loggerhead sea turtles (*Caretta caretta*). Environ. Toxicol. Chem. 30, 1549–56. doi:10.1002/etc.540

Read, T.C., Wantiez, L., Werry, J.M., Farman, R., Petro, G., Limpus, C.J., 2014. Migrations of green turtles (*Chelonia mydas*) between nesting and foraging grounds across the Coral Sea. PLoS One 9, 1–10. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0100083

Rees, A.F., Al-Kiyumi, A., Broderick, A.C., Papathanasopoulou, N., Godley, B.J., 2012a. Conservation related insights into the behaviour of the olive ridley sea turtle *Lepidochelys olivacea* nesting in Oman. Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser. 450, 195–205. doi:10.3354/meps09527

Rees, A.F., Al-Kiyumi, A., Broderick, A.C., Papathansopoulou, N., Godley, B.J., 2012b. Each to their own: inter-specific differences in migrations of Masirah Island turtles. Chelonian Conserv. Biol. 11, 243–248.

Rees, A.F., Hafez, A. Al, Lloyd, J.R., Papathansopoulou, N., Godley, B.J., 2013. Green turtles, *Chelonia mydas*, in Kuwait: nesting and movements. Chelonian Conserv. Biol. 12, 157–163. doi:10.2744/CCB-1030.1

Rees, A.F., Jony, M., Margaritoulis, D., 2008. Satellite tracking of a Green Turtle, *Chelonia mydas*, from Syria further highlights importance of North Africa for Mediterranean turtles. Zool. Middle East 45, 49–54.

Rees, A.F., Margaritoulis, D., Newman, R., Riggall, T.E., Tsaros, P., Zbinden, J.A., Godley, B.J., 2012. Ecology of loggerhead marine turtles *Caretta caretta* in a neritic foraging habitat: movements, sex ratios and growth rates. Mar. Biol. 160, 519–529. doi:10.1007/s00227-012-2107-2

Rees, A.F., Saady, S. A., Broderick, A.C., Coyne, M.S., Papathanasopoulou, N., Godley, B.J., 2010. Behavioural polymorphism in one of the world's largest populations of loggerhead sea turtles *Caretta caretta*. Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser. 418, 201–212. doi:10.3354/meps08767

Renaud, M., Carpenter, J.A., Williams, J., Landry, A., 1996. Kemp's ridley sea turtle (*Lepidochelys kempii*) tracked by satellite telemetry from Louisiana to nesting beach at Rancho Nuevo, Tamaulipas, Mexico. Chelonian Conserv. Biol. 2, 108–109.

Renaud, M., Gitschlag, G., Hale, J., 1993. Retention of imitation satellite transmitters fiberglassed to the carapace of sea turtles. Herpetol. Rev. 24, 94–99.

Renaud, M.L., 1995. Movements and submergence patterns of Kemp's Ridley turtles (*Lepidochelys kempii*). J. Herpetol. 29, 370–374.

Renaud, M.L., Carpenter, J.A., 1994. Movements and submergence patterns of loggerhead turtles (*Carreta caretta*) in the gulf of Mexico determined through satellite telemetry. Bull. Mar. Sci. 55, 1–15.

Renaud, M.L., Williams, J., 2005. Kemp's Ridley sea turtle movements and migrations. Chelonian Conserv. Biol. 4, 808–816.

Revelles, M., Cardona, L., Aguilar, A., San Félix, M., Fernández, G., 2007a. Habitat use by immature loggerhead sea turtles in the Algerian Basin (western Mediterranean): swimming behaviour, seasonality and dispersal pattern. Mar. Biol. 151, 1501–1515. doi:10.1007/s00227-006-0602-z

Revelles, M., Isern-Fontanet, J., Cardona, L., San Félix, M., Carreras, C., Aguilar, A., 2007b. Mesoscale eddies, surface circulation and the scale of habitat selection by immature loggerhead sea turtles. J. Exp. Mar. Bio. Ecol. 347, 41–57. doi:10.1016/j.jembe.2007.03.013

Richardson, P.B., Broderick, A.C., Coyne, M.S., Ekanayake, L., Kapurusinghe, T., Premakumara, C., Ranger, S., Saman, M.M., Witt, M.J., Godley, B.J., 2013. Satellite telemetry reveals behavioural plasticity in a green turtle population nesting in Sri Lanka. Mar. Biol. 160, 1415–1426. doi:10.1007/s00227-013-2194-8

Richardson, P.B., Broderick, A.C., Coyne, M.S., Gore, S., Gumbs, J.C., Pickering, A., Ranger, S., Witt, M.J., Godley, B.J., 2013. Leatherback turtle conservation in the Caribbean UK overseas territories: act local, think global? Mar. Policy 38, 483–490. doi:10.1016/j.marpol.2012.08.003

Richardson, P.B., Calosso, M.C., Claydon, J., Clerveaux, W., Godley, J., Phillips, Q., Ranger, S., Sanghera, A., Stringell, T.B., 2010. Suzie the green turtle: 6, 000 kilometres for one clutch of eggs? Mar. Turt. Newsl. 127, 26–27.

Robel, A.A., Susan Lozier, M., Gary, S.F., Shillinger, G.L., Bailey, H., Bograd, S.J., 2011. Projecting uncertainty onto marine megafauna trajectories. Deep Sea Res. Part I Oceanogr. Res. Pap. 58, 915–921. doi:10.1016/j.dsr.2011.06.009

Roe, J.H., Morreale, S.J., Paladino, F. V, Shillinger, G.L., Benson, S.R., Eckert, S., Bailey, H., Tomillo, P.S., Bograd, S.J., Eguchi, T., Dutton, P.H., Seminoff, J.A., Block, B.A., Spotila, J.R., 2014. Predicting bycatch hotspots for endangered leatherback turtles on longlines in the Pacific Ocean. Proc. R. Soc. B Biol. Sci. 281.

Royer, F., Lutcavage, M., 2008. Filtering and interpreting location errors in satellite telemetry of marine animals. J. Exp. Mar. Bio. Ecol. 359, 1–10. doi:10.1016/j.jembe.2008.01.026

Sakamoto, W., Bando, T., Arai, N., Baba, N., 1997. Migration paths of the adult female and male loggerhead turtles *Caretta caretta* determined through satellite telemetry. Fish. Sci. 63, 547–552.

Sale, A., Luschi, P., 2009. Navigational challenges in the oceanic migrations of leatherback sea turtles. Proc. R. Soc. B Biol. Sci. 276, 3737–45. doi:10.1098/rspb.2009.0965

Sale, A., Luschi, P., Mencacci, R., Lambardi, P., Hughes, G.R., Hays, G.C., Benvenuti, S., Papi, F., 2006. Long-term monitoring of leatherback turtle diving behaviour during oceanic movements. J. Exp. Mar. Bio. Ecol. 328, 197–210. doi:10.1016/j.jembe.2005.07.006

Sasamal, S.K., Panigraphy, R.C., 2006. Influence of eddies on the migratory routes of the sea turtles in the Bay of Bengal. Int. J. Remote Sens. 27, 3115–3122. doi:10.1080/01431160500382915

Sasso, C.R., Epperly, S.P., 2007. Survival of pelagic juvenile loggerhead turtles in the open ocean. J. Wildl. Manage. 71, 1830–1835. doi:10.2193/2006-448

Sasso, C.R., Epperly, S.P., Johnson, C., 2011. Annual survival of loggerhead sea turtles (*Caretta caretta*) nesting in peninsular Florida: A cause for concern. Herpetol. Conserv. Biol. 6, 443–448.

Schmid, J., Witzell, W., 2006. Seasonal migrations of immature Kemp's Ridley turtles (*Lepidochelys kempii* Garman) along the West Coast of Florida. Gulf Mex. Sci. 28–40.

Schofield, G., Bishop, C.M., Katselidis, K.A., Dimopoulos, P., Pantis, J.D., Hays, G.C., 2009. Microhabitat selection by sea turtles in a dynamic thermal marine environment. J. Anim. Ecol. 78, 14–21. doi:10.1111/j.1365-2656.2007.0

Schofield, G., Bishop, C.M., MacLean, G., Brown, P., Baker, M., Katselidis, K.A., Dimopoulos, P., Pantis, J.D., Hays, G.C., 2007. Novel GPS tracking of sea turtles as a tool for conservation management. J. Exp. Mar. Bio. Ecol. 347, 58–68. doi:10.1016/j.jembe.2007.03.009

Schofield, G., Dimadi, A., Fossette, S., Katselidis, K.A., Koutsoubas, D., Lilley, M.K.S., Luckman, A., Pantis, J.D., Karagouni, A.D., Hays, G.C., 2013a. Satellite tracking large numbers of individuals to infer population level dispersal and core areas for the protection of an endangered species. Divers. Distrib. 19, 834–844. doi:10.1111/ddi.12077

Schofield, G., Hobson, V.J., Fossette, S., Lilley, M.K.S., Katselidis, K.A., Hays, G.C., 2010a. Fidelity to foraging sites, consistency of migration routes and habitat modulation of home range by sea turtles. Divers. Distrib. 16, 840–853. doi:10.1111/j.1472-4642.2010.00694.x

Schofield, G., Hobson, V.J., Lilley, M.K.S., Katselidis, K.A., Bishop, C.M., Brown, P., Hays, G.C., 2010b. Inter-annual variability in the home range of breeding turtles: Implications for current and future conservation management. Biol. Conserv. 143, 722–730. doi:10.1016/j.biocon.2009.12.011

Schofield, G., Lilley, M.K., Bishop, C., Brown, P., Katselidis, K., Dimopoulos, P., Pantis, J., Hays, G., 2009. Conservation hotspots: implications of intense spatial area use by breeding male and female loggerheads at the Mediterranean's largest rookery. Endanger. Species Res. 10, 191–202. doi:10.3354/esr00137

Schofield, G., Scott, R., Dimadi, A., Fossette, S., Katselidis, K.A., Koutsoubas, D., Lilley, M.K.S., Pantis, J.D., Karagouni, A.D., Hays, G.C., 2013b. Evidence-based marine protected area planning for a highly mobile endangered marine vertebrate. Biol. Conserv. 161, 101–109. doi:10.1016/j.biocon.2013.03.004

Scott, J.A., Dodd, M.G., Castleberry, S.B., 2012. Assessment of management scenarios to reduce loggerhead turtle interactions with shrimp trawlers in Georgia. Mar. Coast. Fish. Manag. Ecosyst. Sci. 5, 281–290. doi:10.1080/19425120.2013.829143

Scott, R., Hodgson, D.J., Witt, M.J., Coyne, M.S., Adnyana, W., Blumenthal, J.M., Broderick, A.C., Canbolat, A.F., Catry, P., Ciccione, S., Delcroix, E., Hitipeuw, C., Luschi, P., Pet-Soede, L., Pendoley, K., Richardson, P.B., Rees, A.F., Godley, B.J., 2012. Global analysis of satellite tracking data shows that adult green turtles are significantly aggregated in Marine Protected Areas. Glob. Ecol. Biogeogr. 21, 1053–1061. doi:10.1111/j.1466-8238.2011.00757.x

Scott, R., Marsh, R., Hays, G., 2014. Ontogeny of long distance migration. Ecology 140425082009005. doi:10.1890/13-2164.1

Seminoff, J. A., Zarate, P., 2008. Satellite-tracked migrations by Galápagos green turtles and the need for multinational conservation efforts. Curr. Conserv. 2, 11–12.

Seminoff, J., Zárate, P., Coyne, M., Foley, D., Parker, D., Lyon, B., Dutton, P., 2008. Post-nesting migrations of Galápagos green turtles *Chelonia mydas* in relation to oceanographic conditions: integrating satellite telemetry with remotely sensed ocean data. Endanger. Species Res. 4, 57–72. doi:10.3354/esr00066

Seminoff, J.A., Benson, S.R., Arthur, K.E., Eguchi, T., Dutton, P.H., Tapilatu, R.F., Popp, B.N., 2012. Stable isotope tracking of endangered sea turtles: validation with satellite telemetry and δ15N analysis of amino acids. PLoS One 7, e37403. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0037403

Seminoff, J.A., Dutton, P.H., 2007. Leatherback turtles (*Dermochelys coriacea*) in the Gulf of California: distribution, demography, and human interactions. Chelonian Conserv. Biol. 6, 137–141. doi:10.2744/1071-8443(2007)6[137:LTDCIT]2.0.CO;2

Seney, E.E., Landry, A., 2011. Movement patterns of immature and adult female Kemp's ridley sea turtles in the northwestern Gulf of Mexico. Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser. 440, 241–254. doi:10.3354/meps09380

Seney, E.E., Landry, A., 2008. Movements of Kemp's ridley sea turtles nesting on the upper Texas coast: implications for management. Endanger. Species Res. 4, 73–84. doi:10.3354/esr00077

Seney, E.E., Higgins, B.M., Landry, A.M., 2010. Interactions between platform terminal transmitters and turtle excluder devices. Mar. Fish. Rev. 72, 44–47.

Seney, E.E., Higgins, B.M., Landry, A.M., 2010. Satellite transmitter attachment techniques for small juvenile sea turtles. J. Exp. Mar. Bio. Ecol. 384, 61–67. doi:10.1016/j.jembe.2010.01.002

Shaver, D., Rubio, C., 2008. Post-nesting movement of wild and head-started Kemp's ridley sea turtles *Lepidochelys kempii* in the Gulf of Mexico. Endanger. Species Res. 4, 43–55. doi:10.3354/esr00061

Shaver, D., Schroeder, B., Byles, R., Burchfield, P., Pena, J., Marquez, R., Martinez, H., 2005. Movements and home ranges of adult male Kemp's ridley sea turtles (*Lepidochelys kempii*) in the Gulf of Mexico investigated by satellite telemetry. Chelonian Conserv. Biol. 4, 817–827.

Shaver, D.J., Hart, K.M., Fujisaki, I., Rubio, C., Sartain, A.R., 2013. Movement mysteries unveiled: spatial ecology of juvenile green sea turtles, in: Reptiles in Research: Investigations of Ecology, Physiology, Behavior from Desert to Sea. pp. 463–484.

Shaver, D.J., Hart, K.M., Fujisaki, I., Rubio, C., Sartain, A.R., Peña, J., Burchfield, P.M., Gamez, D.G., Ortiz, J., 2013. Foraging area fidelity for Kemp's ridleys in the Gulf of Mexico. Ecol. Evol. 3, 2002–12. doi:10.1002/ece3.594

Sherrill-Mix, S., James, M., 2008. Evaluating potential tagging effects on leatherback sea turtles. Endanger. Species Res. 4, 187–193. doi:10.3354/esr00070

Sherrill-Mix, S.A., James, M.C., Myers, R.A., 2007. Migration cues and timing in leatherback sea turtles. Behav. Ecol. 19, 231–236. doi:10.1093/beheco/arm104

Shillinger, G., Bailey, H., Bograd, S., Hazen, E., Hamann, M., Gaspar, P., Godley, B., Wilson, R., Spotila, J., 2012. Tagging through the stages: technical and ecological challenges in observing life histories through biologging. Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser. 457, 165–170. doi:10.3354/meps09816

Shillinger, G., Swithenbank, A., Bailey, H., Bograd, S., Castelton, M., Wallace, B., Spotila, J., Paladino, F., Piedra, R., Block, B., 2011. Vertical and horizontal habitat preferences of post-nesting leatherback turtles in the South Pacific Ocean. Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser. 422, 275–289. doi:10.3354/meps08884

Shillinger, G., Swithenbank, A., Bograd, S., Bailey, H., Castelton, M., Wallace, B., Spotila, J., Paladino, F., Piedra, R., Block, B., 2010. Identification of high-use internesting habitats for eastern Pacific leatherback turtles: role of the environment and implications for conservation. Endanger. Species Res. 10, 215–232. doi:10.3354/esr00251

Shillinger, G.L., Palacios, D.M., Bailey, H., Bograd, S.J., Swithenbank, A.M., Gaspar, P., Wallace, B.P., Spotila, J.R., Paladino, F. V, Piedra, R., Eckert, S.A., Block, B.A., 2008. Persistent leatherback turtle migrations present opportunities for conservation. PLoS Biol. 6, e171. doi:10.1371/journal.pbio.0060171

Shimada, T., Jones, R., Limpus, C., Hamann, M., 2012. Improving data retention and home range estimates by data-driven screening. Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser. 457, 171–180. doi:10.3354/meps09747

Snoddy, J., Southwood Williard, A., 2010. Movements and post-release mortality of juvenile sea turtles released from gillnets in the lower Cape Fear River, North Carolina, USA. Endanger. Species Res. 12, 235–247. doi:10.3354/esr00305

Song, X., Wang, H., Wang, W., Gu, H., Chan, S., Jiang, H., 2002. Satellite tracking of post-nesting movements of green turtles *Chelonia mydas* from the Gangkou sea turtle National Nature Reserve, China, 2001. Mar. Turt. Newsl. 8–9.

Sperling, J.B., Grigg, G.C., Limpus, C.J., 2010. Diving behaviour in two distinct populations of gravid Flatback turtles *Natator depressus*. Aust. Zool. 35, 291–306. doi:10.7882/AZ.2010.018

Sperling, J.B., Guinea, M., 2004. A harness for attachment of satellite transmitters on flatback turtles. Mar. Turt. Newsl. 11–13.

Spring, C., Pike, D., 1998. Tag recovery supports satellite tracking of a green turtle. Mar. Turt. Newsl. 8.

Stewart, K.R., James, M.C., Roden, S., Dutton, P.H., 2013. Assignment tests, telemetry and tag-recapture data converge to identify natal origins of leatherback turtles foraging in Atlantic Canadian waters. J. Anim. Ecol. doi:10.1111/1365-2656.12056

Stoneburner, D.L., 1982. Satellite telemetry of loggerhead sea turtle movement in the Georgia Bight. Copeia 400–408.

Swimmer, Y., Arauz, R., Mccracken, M., Naughton, L.M., Ballestero, J., Musyl, M., Bigelow, K., Brill, R., 2006. Diving behavior and delayed mortality of olive ridley sea turtles *Lepidochelys olivacea* after their release from longline fishing gear. Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser. 323, 253–261.

Swimmer, Y., Brill, R., Musyl, M., 2002. Use of pop-up satellite archival tags to quantify mortality of marine turtles incidentally captured in longline fishing gear. Mar. Turt. Newsl. 97, 3–7.

Swimmer, Y., Empey Campora, C., Mcnaughton, L., Musyl, M., Parga, M., 2013. Post-release mortality estimates of loggerhead sea turtles (*Caretta caretta*) caught in pelagic longline fisheries based on satellite data and hooking location. Aquat. Conserv. Mar. Freshw. Ecosyst. doi:10.1002/aqc.2396

Swimmer, Y., McNaughton, L., Foley, D., Moxey, L., Nielsen, a, 2009. Movements of olive ridley sea turtles *Lepidochelys olivacea* and associated oceanographic features as determined by improved light-based geolocation. Endanger. Species Res. 10, 245–254. doi:10.3354/esr00164

Timko, R., Kolz, A., 1982. Satellite sea turtle tracking. Mar. Fish. Rev. 44, 20–24.

Troeng, S., Dutton, P.H., Evans, D., 2005. Migration of hawksbill turtles *Eretmochelys imbricata* from Tortuguero, Costa Rica. Ecography (Cop.). 28, 394–402.

Troëng, S., Evans, D.R., Harrison, E., Lagueux, C.J., 2005. Migration of green turtles *Chelonia mydas* from Tortuguero, Costa Rica. Mar. Biol. 148, 435–447. doi:10.1007/s00227-005-0076-4

Troëng, S., Harrison, E., Evans, D., Haro, A., Vargas, E., 2007. Leatherback turtle nesting trends and threats at Tortuguero, Costa Rica. Chelonian Conserv. Biol. 6, 117–122.

Troëng, S., Solano, R., Diaz-Merry, A., Ordonez, J., Taylor, J., Evans, D.R., Godfrey, D., Bagley, D., Ehrhart, L., Eckert, S., 2006. Report on long-term transmitter harness retention by a leatherback turtle. Mar. Turt. Newsl. 6–7.

Tucker, A., MacDonald, B., Seminoff, J., 2014. Foraging site fidelity and stable isotope values of loggerhead turtles tracked in the Gulf of Mexico and northwest Caribbean. Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser. 502, 267–279. doi:10.3354/meps10655

Tucker, A.D., 2010. Nest site fidelity and clutch frequency of loggerhead turtles are better elucidated by satellite telemetry than by nocturnal tagging efforts: implications for stock estimation. J. Exp. Mar. Bio. Ecol. 383, 48–55. doi:10.1016/j.jembe.2009.11.009

Tucker, A.D., 2009. Eight nests recorded for a loggerhead turtle within one season. Mar. Turt. Newsl. 16–17.

Türkecan, O., Yerli, S.V, 2011. Satellite tracking of adult green sea turtles from Turkey: A long distance diary. Mar. Turt. Newsl. 38–41.

Van Dam, R., Diez, C., Balazs, G., Colón Colón, L., McMillan, W., Schroeder, B., 2008. Sex-specific migration patterns of hawksbill turtles breeding at Mona Island, Puerto Rico. Endanger. Species Res. 4, 85–94. doi:10.3354/esr00044

Van De Merwe, J.P., Ibrahim, K., Lee, S.Y., Whittier, J.M., 2009. Habitat use by green turtles (*Chelonia mydas*) nesting in Peninsular Malaysia: local and regional conservation implications. Wildl. Res. 36, 637–645.

Varo-Cruz, N., Hawkes, L.A., Cejudo, D., López, P., Coyne, M.S., Godley, B.J., López-Jurado, L.F., 2013. Satellite tracking derived insights into migration and foraging strategies of male loggerhead turtles in the eastern Atlantic. J. Exp. Mar. Bio. Ecol. 443, 134–140. doi:10.1016/j.jembe.2013.02.046

Walcott, J., Eckert, S., Horrocks, J.A., 2012. Tracking hawksbill sea turtles (Eretmochelys imbricata) during inter-nesting intervals around Barbados. Mar. Biol. 159, 927–938. doi:10.1007/s00227-011-1870-9

Walcott, J., Horrocks, J.A., 2014. Design of a protected area for inter-nesting hawksbills in Barbados: an evidence-based approach. Bull. Mar. Sci. 90, 969–987.

Wallace, B.P., DiMatteo, A.D., Hurley, B.J., Finkbeiner, E.M., Bolten, A.B., Chaloupka, M.Y., Hutchinson, B.J., Abreu-Grobois, F.A., Amorocho, D., Bjorndal, K. a, Bourjea, J., Bowen, B.W., Dueñas, R.B., Casale, P., Choudhury, B.C., Costa, A., Dutton, P.H., Fallabrino, A., Girard, A., Girondot, M., Godfrey, M.H., Hamann, M., López-Mendilaharsu, M., Marcovaldi, M.A., Mortimer, J. A, Musick, J. a, Nel, R., Pilcher, N.J., Seminoff, J. A, Troëng, S., Witherington, B., Mast, R.B., 2010. Regional management units for marine turtles: a novel framework for prioritizing conservation and research across multiple scales. PLoS One 5, e15465. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0015465

Wang, H., Wang, D., Wang, W., Song, X., Chan, K., Gu, H., 2002. An experimental biotelemetric study based on satellite tracking during post-nesting migrations of green turtles. High Technol. Lett. 8, 16–21.

Wang, Y-H., Cheng, I.-J., Centurioni, L., 2014. Riding on the fast lane: how sea turtles behave in post-nesting migration. Biogeosciences Discuss. 11, 11481–11508. doi:10.5194/bgd-11-11481-2014

Watson, K., Granger, R., 1998. Hydrodynamic effect of a satellite transmitter on a juvenile green turtle (*Chelonia mydas*). J. Exp. Biol. 201 (Pt 17, 2497–505.

Weber, N., Weber, S.B., Godley, B.J., Ellick, J., Witt, M., Broderick, A.C., 2013. Telemetry as a tool for improving estimates of marine turtle abundance. Biol. Conserv. 167, 90–96. doi:10.1016/j.biocon.2013.07.030

Weber, S.B., Weber, N., Godley, B.J., Pelembe, T., Stroud, S., Williams, N., Broderick, A.C., 2014. Ascension Island as a mid-Atlantic developmental habitat for juvenile hawksbill turtles. J. Mar. Biol. Assoc. United Kingdom 1–8. doi:10.1017/S0025315414001258

Whiting, S., Long, J., Coyne, M., 2007. Migration routes and foraging behaviour of olive ridley turtles Lepidochelys olivacea in northern Australia. Endanger. Species Res. 3, 1–9.

Whiting, S.D., Hartley, S., Lalara, S., White, D., Bara, T., Maminyamunja, C., Wurramarrba, L., 2006. Hawksbill turtle tracking as part of initial sea turtle research and conservation at Groote Eylandt, Northern Australia. Mar. Turt. Newsl. 14–15.

Whiting, S.D., Koch, A.U., 2006. Oceanic movement of a benthic foraging juvenile hawksbill turtle from The Cocos (Keeling) Islands. Mar. Turt. Newsl. 112, 15–16.

Whiting, S.D., Murray, W., Macrae, I., Thorn, R., Chongkin, M., Koch, A.U., 2008. Non-migratory breeding by isolated green sea turtles (*Chelonia mydas*) in the Indian Ocean: biological and conservation implications. Naturwissenschaften 95, 355–60. doi:10.1007/s00114-007-0327-y

Whittock, P., Pendoley, K., Hamann, M., 2014. Inter-nesting distribution of flatback turtles *Natator depressus* and industrial development in Western Australia. Endanger. Species Res. 26, 25–38. doi:10.3354/esr00628

Williams, N., 2007. Route masters. Curr. Biol. 17, R343–4.

Wingfield, D., Peckham, S.H., Foley, D.G., Palacios, D.M., Lavaniegos, B.E., Durazo, R., Nichols, W.J., Croll, D.A., Bograd, S.J., 2011. The making of a productivity hotspot in the coastal ocean. PLoS One 6, e27874. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0027874

Witt, M., Åkesson, S., Broderick, A., Coyne, M., Ellick, J., Formia, A., Hays, G., Luschi, P., Stroud, S., Godley, B.J., 2010. Assessing accuracy and utility of satellite-tracking data using Argos-linked Fastloc-GPS. Anim. Behav. 80, 571–581. doi:10.1016/j.anbehav.2010.05.022

Witt, M.J., Bonguno, E., Broderick, A.C., Coyne, M.S., Formia, A., Gibudi, A., Mounguengui Mounguengui, G.A., Moussounda, C., NSafou, M., Nougessono, S., Parnell, R.J., Sounguet, G.-P., Verhage, S., Godley, B.J., 2011. Tracking leatherback turtles from the world's largest rookery: assessing threats across the South Atlantic. Proc. R. Soc. B Biol. Sci. 278, 2338–47. doi:10.1098/rspb.2010.2467

Witt, M.J., Broderick, A.C., Coyne, M.S., Formia, A., Ngouessono, S., Parnell, R.J., Sounguet, G.-P., Godley, B.J., 2008. Satellite tracking highlights difficulties in the design of effective protected areas for Critically Endangered leatherback turtles *Dermochelys coriacea* during the inter-nesting period. Oryx 42, 296–300. doi:10.1017/S0030605308006947

Wright, L.I., Stokes, K.L., Fuller, W.J., Godley, B.J., McGowan, A., Snape, R., Tregenza, T., Broderick, A.C., 2012. Turtle mating patterns buffer against disruptive effects of climate change. Proc. R. Soc. B Biol. Sci. 279, 2122–7. doi:10.1098/rspb.2011.2285

Yasuda, T., Arai, N., 2005. Fine-scale tracking of marine turtles using GPS-Argos PTTs. Zoolog. Sci. 22, 547–53.

Yasuda, T., Tanaka, H., Kittiwattanawong, K., Mitamura, H., Klom-in, W., Arai, N., 2006. Do female green turtles (*Chelonia mydas*) exhibit reproductive seasonality in a year-round nesting rookery? J. Zool. 269, 451–457. doi:10.1111/j.1469-7998.2006.00134.x

Yeh, F., Balazs, G.H., Parker, D.M., Ng, C.K., Shi, H., 2014. Novel use of satellite tracking as a forensic tool to determine foraging ground of a rescued green turtle (*Chelonia mydas*). Mar. Turt. Newsl. 142, 1–3.

Zbinden, J.A., Aebischer, A., Margaritoulis, D., Arlettaz, R., 2007. Important areas at sea for adult loggerhead sea turtles in the Mediterranean Sea: satellite tracking corroborates findings from potentially biased sources. Mar. Biol. 153, 899–906. doi:10.1007/s00227-007-0862-2

Zbinden, J., Bearhop, S., Bradshaw, P., Gill, B., Margaritoulis, D., Newton, J., Godley, B., 2011. Migratory dichotomy and associated phenotypic variation in marine turtles revealed by satellite tracking and stable isotope analysis. Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser. 421, 291–302. doi:10.3354/meps08871

Zbinden, J.A., Aebischer, A., Margaritoulis, D., Arlettaz, R., 2007. Insights into the management of sea turtle internesting area through satellite telemetry. Biol. Conserv. 137, 157–162. doi:10.1016/j.biocon.2007.01.022