

This is my spot: What are the characteristics of the trees excavated by the Black Woodpecker? A case study in two managed French forests

Camille Puverel, A. Abourachid, C. Böhmer, J. M. Leban, M. Svoboda, Yoan

Paillet

► To cite this version:

Camille Puverel, A. Abourachid, C. Böhmer, J. M. Leban, M. Svoboda, et al.. This is my spot: What are the characteristics of the trees excavated by the Black Woodpecker? A case study in two managed French forests. Forest Ecology and Management, 2019, 453, 9 p. 10.1016/j.foreco.2019.117621 . hal-02609898

HAL Id: hal-02609898 https://hal.inrae.fr/hal-02609898

Submitted on 20 Jul2022

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.



Distributed under a Creative Commons Attribution - NonCommercial 4.0 International License

Version of Record: https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0378112719316421 Manuscript_60649d4a3eb5be6a30187353dd41f11f

1 This is my spot: what are the characteristics of the trees excavated by the

2 Black Woodpecker? A case study in two managed French forests

- 3 Camille Puverel¹, Anick Abourachid², Christine Böhmer², Jean-Michel Leban^{3,4}, Miroslav
- 4 Svoboda⁵, Yoan Paillet^{1,2,6,*}
- 5 1 Irstea, UR EFNO, Domaine des Barres, 45290 Nogent-sur-Vernisson, France. CP:
- 6 camillepuverel@hotmail.fr
- 7 2 MECADEV, UMR 7179 MNHN/CNRS, CP50, 57 rue Cuvier, 75005 Paris, France. AA:
- 8 anick.abourachid@mnhn.fr; CB: boehmer@vertevo.de, ORCID: 0000-0003-1931-0888.
- 9 3 INRA, BEF UR 1138, 54280 Champenoux, France. JML: jean-michel.leban@inra.fr,
- 10 ORCID: 0000-0002-8998-6472
- 11 4 IGN, LIF, 54000 Nancy, France
- 12 5 Czech University of Life Sciences, Faculty of Forestry and Wood Sciences, Department of
- 13 Forest Ecology, Kamýcká 129, Praha 6 Suchdol, 16521, Czech Republic. MS:
- 14 svobodam@fld.czu.cz
- 15 6 Univ. Grenoble Alpes, Irstea, LESSEM, 38000 Grenoble, France
- 16 *Corresponding author: yoan.paillet@irstea.fr, ORCID: 0000-0001-7232-7844

17 Abstract

18 The Black Woodpecker (*Dryocopus martius* L.) is both an ecosystem engineer and an umbrella 19 species: it has the capacity to modify its environment through cavity excavation, which in turn favors a large range of species that depend on cavities but are unable to dig them themselves 20 (secondary cavity nesters). However, the factors driving cavity excavation by the Black 21 22 woodpecker at the tree scale remain poorly known. We analyzed the characteristics of trees bearing Black Woodpecker cavities to assess the bird's local habitat requirements and their 23 conservation potential as habitat trees. We compared the traits and characteristics of trees 24 bearing Black Woodpecker cavities (n=60) and control trees (n=56) in two managed lowland 25 broadleave-dominated forests in France. We hypothesized that: 26

27 (*i*) Cavity-trees would have lower wood density and display more conks of fungi than
 28 control-trees;

(*ii*) The local environment of cavity-trees would be less crowded than those of the control
trees. In particular, the first branch would be higher up, and their first neighboring tree would
be further away from cavity-trees compared to control-trees;

(iii) Cavity-trees would display a higher number of other woodpecker cavities and more
 saproxylic microhabitats than the control-trees.

We validated most of our hypotheses and showed that cavity trees differed significantly from their control counterparts. Black Woodpeckers excavate trees with softer wood and higher first branches in a less crowded environment, thus minimizing both the energy dedicated to cavity excavation and predation risk. Second, cavity-trees bear more microhabitats and play a complementary umbrella role than what was documented before. They also appear a good candidate for habitat-tree conservation.

In terms of biodiversity-friendly management measures, it would be beneficial to favor large
isolated standing trees devoid of low branches (notably beech), especially in stands dominated
by other tree species.

43 **Keywords:** habitat tree; tree cavities; Tree Related Microhabitats; conservation; forest

44 management

45 Introduction

Forest biodiversity conservation relies on biodiversity-friendly practices in daily forest 46 management. Forest managers can preserve favorable elements such as ageing islands, 47 habitat trees, and standing and lying deadwood (Kraus and Krumm, 2013). Those elements 48 49 may in turn favor the presence of ecosystem-structuring species, for which it appears necessary to understand and quantify the drivers in terms of conservation. Through cavity 50 excavation, woodpeckers are considered to be engineer species as they modify their 51 environment and provide new habitats for secondary cavity users (Jones et al., 1994; Remm 52 and Lõhmus, 2011). Primary excavators are therefore a target for the conservation of hole-53 54 nesting assemblages because they can directly impact the abundance and diversity of many 55 other species (Wesołowski, 2011). Woodpecker species vary in their selection of trees in which they excavate cavities ranging from live trees, decayed trees to dead trees (e.g. Martin, 2015). 56 The Black Woodpecker Dryocopus martius (Linnaeus, 1758) is the largest Eurasian 57 58 woodpecker species and the strongest excavator in Europe. It provides essential habitats for a multitude of large, secondary cavity users (Johnsson et al., 1993). With a home range 59 ranging from 200 ha to more than 1000 ha (Cuisin, 1986; Fernandez and Azkona, 1996; Bocca 60 et al., 2007; Olano et al., 2015), Black Woodpeckers require large patches of mature forest 61 (Garmendia et al., 2006), though they are able to adapt to different forest landscape contexts 62 (Rolstad et al., 2000; Angelstam et al., 2002; Saporetti et al., 2016). However, the drivers of 63 the Black Woodpecker's cavity excavation behavior are not fully understood yet, especially in 64 the context of managed temperate forests in Western Europe. Since Black Woodpeckers tend 65 to preferentially excavate living trees (Zahner et al., 2012; Zawadzka and Zawadzki, 2017), 66 they may alter tree vitality and trigger senescence. Damaged trees could hence be easier for 67 other, weaker woodpeckers to excavate (Wesołowski, 2011), and may bear more wood-68 decaying microhabitats - hereafter referred to as "saproxylic microhabitats" (Larrieu et al., 69 70 2018). As engineer species, the Black Woodpecker may have numerous roles: the bird provides holes for secondary cavity users and weakens healthy trees, which, in turn, triggers 71 the formation of other microhabitats. Additionally, since this bird plays a critical role in 72

determining community structure and in the conservation of a large number of co-occurring
species (Roberge and Angelstam, 2004), the Black Woodpecker is also an important umbrella
species (Garmendia *et al.*, 2006).

76 At the tree scale, Black Woodpecker cavity excavation could represent a trade-off between the energy applied during excavation and the final cavity quality (time, resistance, 77 78 microclimate, predation risk). Black Woodpeckers may target tree whose characteristics 79 reduce excavation time thus minimizing the energy required. In North America, primary cavity 80 excavators preferentially choose trees with softer wood at the cavity height (Schepps et al., 1999; Lorenz et al., 2015). In particular, reciprocal positive relationships between fungi and 81 primary cavity excavators have been documented (Jackson and Jackson, 2004) since wood 82 decaying fungi soften wood (Conner et al., 1976; Schwarze et al., 2008). Like other primary 83 excavators, Black Woodpeckers may select heart-rotted trees thus reducing the energy 84 needed for excavation (Conner et al., 1976; Zahner et al., 2012). Moreover, selecting an 85 appropriate nest site that minimizes offspring, and adult, predation is important for bird fitness 86 87 (Lima, 2009). Black Woodpeckers seem to preferentially excavate straight trunks free of 88 branches, reducing predation risks (Cuisin, 1967; Rolstad et al., 2000; Bocca et al., 2007; 89 Zahner et al., 2017). However, in western Europe, the studies documenting tree characteristics favorable for the Black Woodpecker have rarely been carried out in forests used for wood 90 production. Furthermore, existing quantitative studies concern either other biomes, e.g. North 91 92 America, Scandinavia (Andersson et al., 2018), or mature, primary forests (Wesołowski, 93 2011). Since forest managers already designate Black Woodpecker cavity-bearing trees as habitat trees (Bütler et al., 2013), our aim was to analyse specific characteristics of these trees 94 95 and indirectly assess their potential role for forest biodiversity (through the presence of tree 96 microhabitats, sensu Larrieu et al., 2018). We therefore examined the role of tree-level factors in Black Woodpecker cavity tree selection in two French managed forests. We compared the 97 characteristics of trees bearing at least one Black Woodpecker cavity (hereafter referred to as 98 "cavity-trees") and trees devoid of Black Woodpecker cavities (hereafter referred to as "control-99 trees"). We hypothesized that: 100

- 101 (i) Cavity-trees would have lower wood density and also display more conks than
 102 control-trees;
- 103 (ii) The local environment of cavity-trees would be less crowded than those of the 104 control trees. In particular, the first branch would be higher up, and the first 105 neighboring tree would be further away from cavity-trees than from control-106 trees;
- 107 (iii) Cavity-trees would display more cavities excavated by other woodpecker and
 108 more saproxylic microhabitat than the control-trees.
- 109

110 Materials and methods

111 Cavity-trees selection

We benefited from data for two managed broadleaf-dominated forest sites in France where Black Woodpecker cavities had been identified and mapped (Table 1, Figure 1). In the Auberive forest, forest managers (French National Service, ONF) located 223 (0.04/ha) Black Woodpecker cavity-trees during tree selection operations between 2003 and 2018. In the Loches forest, a naturalist (Michael Dubois) located 112 (0.03/ha) Black Woodpecker cavitytrees between 2010 and 2018. Cavity use (nesting, roosting or abandoned) was not considered as long as the cavity had clearly been excavated by a Black Woodpecker (Larrieu *et al.*, 2018).

119

120 Sampling design

In Auberive, we preselected the 64 most recent (>2015) out of the total 223 cavities because cavity-trees can break at the cavity location (Wesołowski, 2011) or heal (Colmant, 2003; Boutteaux Jean-Jacques; Dubois Michael, personal communications). In Loches, we kept all 112 cavities since the inventory date was not available and no preselection was possible. We then randomly selected the order in which the cavity-trees would be sampled. To reduce spatial autocorrelation, we rejected cavity-trees which were within 400 m of each other (Figure 1). In the field, we excluded dead trees and snags from our sample to avoid potentialconfounding effects between tree vitality, wood density or microhabitats.

We paired each cavity-tree with a control-tree, the closest equivalent tree devoid of Black Woodpecker cavities (mean distance = 18 m). We selected each control-tree for the characteristics it shared with its paired cavity-tree (species and Diameter at Breast Height, DBH \pm 10 cm). On four plots in Loches, we sampled an additional (unmapped) cavity-tree for the same control-tree, which gave us four triplets instead of pairs. As a result, we sampled 28 cavity-trees in Auberive, 32 in Loches, and 28 control-trees at each site. We performed the fieldwork in April 2018.

136

137 Local forest structure description

138 Each plot was centered around a cavity-tree. For each plot, we used a relascope (fixed 139 angle of 2%) to measure the basal area of small trees (DBH between 7.5 and 22.5 cm), medium trees (DBH: 22.5 - 47.5 cm) and large trees (DBH:>47.5 cm), as well as the total basal area 140 (the sum of the three). Within a radius of 20 meters around the cavity-tree, we measured the 141 DBH and height of any dead standing trees (trees, snags or stumps) with a minimum DBH of 142 143 30 cm. We also measured the length and median diameter of lying dead logs with a minimum median diameter of 30 cm. We used truncated cone volumes per ha to calculate standing and 144 lying deadwood volumes (Paillet et al., 2015). 145

146

147 Tree level measurements

On the cavity-trees, we recorded cavity height (m) and orientation (gr), and visually estimated cavity tilt (classified into four categories, Figure 2). For both cavity- and controltrees, we measured tree DBH, total tree height and the height of the first occurring branch, excluding epicormics shoots, as a proxy for the free-part of the trunk (hypsometer, Häglof's Vertex IV). We also measured the distance to the nearest neighboring tree (DBH > 7.5cm, threshold shared by forest inventories in Europe for tree recording, Gschwantner *et al.*, 2016)
as a proxy for vegetation clutter (Figure 2).

155 Using a manual auger, we sampled a wood core below the cavity of interest from the 156 trunk at breast height (1.30m); we sampled a similar core with the same orientation on the paired control-tree. If the cavity-tree bore several Black Woodpecker cavities, we arbitrarily 157 158 chose the highest one to orient the coring (Figure 2). Each core aimed for the pith, but if we missed it, the tree was not cored twice. For safety and practical reasons, we cored at breast 159 160 height and not at cavity height. It seems that Black Woodpeckers could detect and exploit vertical density variations of a give tree (Conner et al., 1976; Zahner et al., 2012), but our aim 161 was to test whether excavated trees were overall less dense than a comparable neighboring 162 tree. We also assumed that wood density in beech was relatively homogeneous along the 163 trunk as shown by Longuetaud et al. (2016). Furthermore, managers can benefit from this 164 appraoch with management-linked data such as wood cores for increment assessments and 165 thus derive wood density more easily than at cavity height. 166

167 Finally, we recorded tree-related microhabitat abundance (47 types, see Table 5 in 168 Larrieu et al., 2018) on both the cavity- and control-trees. Based on this abundance value, we 169 calculated the richness (number of types per tree) and abundance of saproxylic microhabitats 170 (32 types), grouped as follows: woodpecker cavities (excluding Black Woodpecker cavities), 171 woodpecker feeding holes, mould cavities, branch holes, insect galleries, water-filled holes, bark pockets and shelters, injuries (exposed sapwood and exposed heartwood), conks of 172 fungi, exudates, dead crown and broken limbs. We also separately calculated other 173 174 woodpecker species cavity abundance.

Although we recorded visible conks of fungi during the microhabitat inventories and heart rot on the wood core samples, there were not enough occurrences of these two traits to statistically test differences between cavity- and control-trees (Supplementary materials, Table S1).

179

180 Wood density measurements and tree age estimation

To determine wood density, the wood core samples were dried 24h at 103°C, then X-181 182 ray scanned (General Electric BrightSpeed Excel medical tomograph, one image every 0.625mm along the cores) at the INRA Nancy (Xyloscience Platform) laboratory. We derived 183 density profiles from these images with the ImageJ software and the CalDenQB plug-in 184 (Longuetaud et al., 2014; Leban et al., 2016; Jacquin et al., 2017; Leban et al., 2017). We 185 186 calculated the mean density for each sampled core and, to assess whether density varied 187 along each profile, also calculated the means of each 5-cm-long section (n=6) along the wood core samples from 0 cm (bark) to 30 cm (pith). 188

Finally, although age determination was not the primary aim of this study, the cores 189 allowed us to estimate tree age. We used a LintabTM sliding-stage measuring device 190 (Rinntech, Heidelberg) with a resolution of 0.01 mm to measure tree-ring widths. In the event 191 that the pith was missing from the core, we extrapolated the missing rings following Duncan's 192 (1989) method. We did not exclude cores for which a substantial part of the sample was 193 194 missing, but sensitivity analyses revealed that this did not significantly affect our results. 195 Finally, we used the COFECHA application (Holmes, 1983) to visually cross-date and verify the cores. 196

197

198 Statistical analyses

199 We processed all the analyses with the R software v. 3.4.3 (R Core Team, 2017).

We used generalized linear models (glm function) to compare the descriptive plot-level variables between the two sites. We chose the Gamma error distribution with an identity link since the variables had positive continuous values. We tested cavity orientation using the Rayleigh test of uniformity (circular package, Agostinelli and Lund, 2011). Tilt was not tested due to low variability (see below).

We used generalized linear mixed-effect models (glmer function; lme4 package v1.1-17; Bates *et al.*, 2014) to compare six response variables between cavity- and control-trees:

207 wood density (total and 5 cm lengths), first branch height, distance from the nearest neighboring tree, other woodpecker cavity abundance, and saproxylic microhabitat richness 208 209 and abundance. Since the first three variables had positive continuous values, we chose the 210 Gamma error distribution with an identity link. For the last three variables, we chose the Poisson error distribution with a log link since they are count variables. We added site 211 (Auberive versus Loches) as a fixed effect in interaction with tree type (cavity-trees versus 212 control-trees) to account for possible variations in the relationships with site. Finally, we added 213 214 a plot random effect on the intercept to account for the paired design. We first tested contrasts for all the parameters (type, site and interaction) based on model predictors for each response 215 variable (joint tests function; emmeans package v1.2.2; Russell, 2018). We then used 216 marginal post-hoc Tukey tests (emmeans function; emmeans package v1.2.2) to separately 217 compare estimated means between control- and cavity-trees by site. 218

219

220 **Results**

221 Local environment and cavity-tree descriptions

Auberive had a significantly higher mean elevation and steeper slopes than Loches. Mean basal area was significantly higher in Loches than in Auberive, which was mostly explained by a greater proportion of large trees (means = 14.1 and 8.6 m²/ha, respectively). Basal area of medium and small trees did not significantly differ between sites. Mean volume of deadwood near cavity-trees was not significantly different between sites (means = 20 and 24 m³/ha, respectively, Table 1).

All cavity-trees were beech (*Fagus sylvatica*) in Auberive; all but two (oak, *Quercus petraea*) were beech in Loches. Cavity-tree DBH was not significantly different between Loches and Auberive (mean = 51 and 55 cm, respectively). However, cavity-trees were significantly taller in Loches than in Auberive (means = 33 and 27 m, respectively). Cavities were located higher on the trees in Loches than in Auberive (means = 13 and 7 m, respectively) and were also higher relatively to total tree height (means = 0.36 and 0.27, respectively, Table 1). Cavity entrance orientation (Supplementary materials, Figure S1) was never significantly
different from a uniform distribution (Rayleigh test, overall: p=0.25; Auberive: p=0.88; Loches:
p=0.07). All cavity entrance holes were vertical, except for four in Auberive which were tilted
downwards (between 0 and -30°).

238

239 Comparison between cavity-trees and control-trees

Mean wood density was 5% lower in cavity-trees than in control-trees (Figure 3A) in Auberive (p < 0.001) but no significant difference was found in Loches (p = 0.45). When we removed the 12 trees with heart rot from the dataset, cavity-tree wood density remained only marginally lower than control-tree wood density (p = 0.07). Along wood core profiles, cavitytree wood density was significantly lower than in control-trees from 10 to 25 cm, but only in Auberive (Table 2, supplementary materials Figure S2).

Tree age estimates did not differ between sites or between cavity- and control-trees; only the interaction was significant (p=0.013) in the overall analysis. However, in Auberive, cavity trees were significantly older than control trees (+6%, resp. 150.2 +/- SE 6.3 years, 141.2 +/- 6.2 years, p=0.01) while this was not the case in Loches (resp. 143.4 +/- 6.2 years, 146.6 +/- 6.2, p=0.35).

Cavity-trees had a higher first branch compared to control-trees (Figure 3B): 55% higher in Auberive (p < 0.001) and 115% higher in Loches (p < 0.001). In Auberive, cavitytrees had a more distant nearest neighbor than did the control-trees (Figure 3C): 45% further away (p = 0.002), but there was no difference in Loches (p = 0.96).

Other woodpecker cavities were more numerous on cavity-trees compared to controltrees (Figure 3D): 4500% more in Auberive (p < 0.001) and 500% more in Loches (p = 0.001). Note that other woodpecker cavities were nearly absent on control-trees. Overall saproxylic microhabitat richness tended to be higher on cavity-trees than on control-trees (p < 0.1; Figure 3E): 35% higher in Auberive (p = 0.05), but no difference in Loches (p = 0.37). Saproxylic microhabitats were more abundant on cavity-trees compared to control-trees (Figure 3F): 60%

261 more in Auberive (p < 0.001) and 15% more in Loches (p = 0.04).

Except for first branch height, all other differences between cavity- and control-trees had higher magnitudes and significance in Auberive than in Loches.

264

265 **Discussion**

We validated most of our hypotheses and showed that cavity-trees differed significantly from their control counterparts. Below we discuss two possible underlying ecological drivers of these differences: energy required for excavation and limitation of predation risk. We then suggest forest management implications based on our results.

270

271 Black Woodpeckers minimize the energy they use for excavation

We partially validated our first hypothesis: Black Woodpeckers did excavate trees with 272 a lower mean wood density, which tended to bear more signs of decay linked to fungi (either 273 274 conks or heart rot) compared to control-trees. In Auberive, radial wood density variations 275 revealed that cavity-trees were around 3% less dense than the control-trees in the 10-to-25 cm depth range (distance from bark). While we found no significant differences in Loches, the 276 core profiles revealed a lower mean wood density in cavity-trees than in control-trees 277 278 (Supplementary Materials, Fig. S2). In addition, we showed that these observed differences were not related to tree age (Bouriaud et al., 2004). These results are in accordance with 279 studies showing that North American primary cavity excavators select trees with softer interior 280 wood at the cavity height (Lorenz et al., 2015). Primary cavity excavators probably face trade-281 offs when selecting cavity-trees: excavating softer trees may reduce excavation time and the 282 amount of energy needed, which could give a selective advantage. Head and body movements 283 are confined during interior cavity excavation and this might force the birds to select trees with 284 soft interior wood (Lorenz et al., 2015). On the other hand, lower wood density might increase 285 286 the risk of cavity-tree collapse during strong winds - decayed trees may more easily break than

healthy trees - leading primary cavity excavators to select trees with the maximum hardness 287 they are able to excavate, rather than the softer ones. Black Woodpeckers dig long-lasting 288 289 cavities (Wesołowski, 2011) and reuse them several years (Cuisin, 1986; Johnsson et al., 290 1993; Colmant, 2003). They may therefore select trees with a slightly lower wood density to 291 facilitate their excavation work, but which are also healthy enough to live for a long time. In terms of method, and contrary to Lorenz et al. (2015) who cored the trees at cavity height, we 292 293 cored at breast height (1.30 m), which may overestimate wood density. Coring near the cavity 294 may have allowed us to better detect signs of wood rot and revealed a stronger effect. Indeed, woodpeckers may be able to detect areas of lesser wood density along the trunk (Schepps et 295 al., 1999; Matsuoka, 2008; Zahner et al., 2012). Still, we evidenced softer interior wood at 1.30 296 297 m in cavity-trees free of wood rot. Since beech wood density is relatively homogeneous along 298 the trunk (Longuetaud et al., 2017), we assume that this comparison remains valid, but does not provide an absolute estimate of the wood density Black Woodpeckers are capable to dig. 299 Density measures along the trunk would allow to have such an estimate. 300

301 We did not observe that cavity-trees bear more conks of fungi than control-trees. This 302 result did not confirmed the link between fungi and woodpecker cavities documented by other 303 authors (Conner et al., 1976; Bull et al., 1992; Welsh and Capen, 1992; Jackson and Jackson, 304 2004; Zahner et al., 2012). However, as Conner et al. (1976) observed, cavity-trees do not 305 always have visible fungal fruiting bodies even when wood decay fungi are present; the low detectability of conks may also explain why we did not validate our initial hypothesis. As 306 specified by e.g. Jackson and Jackson (2004), a tree may have be rotten inside for a long time 307 308 before exhibiting actual conks on the outside. This was partially confirmed in our study by the trend towards a higher occurrence of heart-rot on cavity-trees. The use of DNA methods to 309 310 assess the actual presence of fungi seems more efficient - but also more labour-intensive than direct observation (Jusino et al., 2014; Jusino et al., 2016). 311

To sum up, cavity-tree wood density selection seems a woodpecker species-dependent compromise. Trade-offs occur between excavation ability, time investment, and overall cavitytree resistance and persistence (linked to cavity reuse by the species).

315

316 Black woodpeckers minimize nest predation risk

We validated our second hypothesis: we showed that the local environment of the cavity-trees was less crowded than that of the control-trees: cavity-trees were more isolated from other trees at the local scale and had higher first branches than the control-trees.

Our findings on distance to the closest neighbor refine studies which suggest Black 320 Woodpeckers prefer to dig cavities in relatively open areas (Rolstad et al., 2000; Saporetti et 321 al., 2016). This result seems to extend to the forest interior (a closed area at the stand scale), 322 323 where Black woodpeckers preferentially chose trees standing apart from others (in an open area at the tree scale). Cavity-trees were significantly further away from their first neighbor only 324 325 in Auberive, but the difference in response between the two sites could have several 326 explanations. Firstly, even-aged management in Loches is likely to have equalized distances 327 between trees. Secondly, we selected only recent cavities in Auberive but not in Loches, where 328 neighboring trees might have grown since cavity excavation. However, the basal area of small 329 trees was not significantly different between the two sites, which suggests that cavity trees 330 were simply further apart from other trees than in Loches than in Auberive.

331 In Auberive, cavities were on average 2-3 m below the first branch (means = 7 and 9.8 m, respectively). In Loches, cavities were 2 m higher than in Auberive, but still lower on the 332 trunk than the first branch (means = 13 and 15 m, respectively). These results confirm 333 numerous observations elsewhere (Cuisin, 1967; Nilsson, 1984; Johnsson, 1993a; Rolstad et 334 al., 2000; Colmant, 2003; Bocca et al., 2007; Pirovano and Zecca, 2014). To summarize, first 335 branch height and distance to the closest neighboring tree appear to be factors of cavity-tree 336 selection: a suitable Black Woodpecker cavity-tree has a trunk free of low branches and is 337 338 relatively isolated.

Indeed, as suggested by Cuisin (1967), isolated trees devoid of low branches could
facilitate aerial access to the cavity for adults and offspring flight when leaving the nest.
Moreover, the same tree characteristics could minimize predation risks. Using camera traps,

Zahner et al. (2017) showed that four predators visit inhabited Black Woodpeckers nest: the 342 Northern Goshawk (Accipiter gentilis), the Common Buzzard (Buteo buteo), the Great Spotted 343 344 Woodpecker (Dendrocopos major) and the Pine Marten (Martes martes). The Northern Goshawk has seldom been seen extirpating young Black Woodpeckers from their nest (Cuisin, 345 1967), but the size of the cavity entrance and cavity depth can help prevent large raptors from 346 347 reaching the offspring (Zahner et al., 2017). However, the Northern Goshawk, which prefers to hunt in large patches of later-successional-stage forests, has been reported to predate adult 348 349 Black Woodpeckers (Cuisin, 1967; Widen, 1989; Mikusiński, 1995; Rolstad et al., 2000). We assume that Black Woodpeckers are more likely to avoid Goshawk predation when the cavity-350 tree is more easily reachable, since it is potentially quicker to shelter when the cavity 351 environment is less crowded. The Pine Marten is the major Black Woodpecker nest predator 352 in Norway, Sweden and Germany (Nilsson et al., 1991; Rolstad et al., 2000; Zahner et al., 353 2017). It has been seen extirpating young Black Woodpeckers from the nest (Cuisin, 1967) 354 and is known to revisit cavities (Sonerud, 1985), thus increasing predation risk in old cavities 355 356 (Nilsson et al., 1991). The excavation of a new nest each year and the selection of higher 357 locations may reduce this risk (Nilsson, 1984; Johnsson et al., 1993; Zahner et al., 2017). Moreover, our results are consistent with those of several other authors, who found that Black 358 Woodpeckers generally seem to locate nests along "branch-free trunks" (Colmant, 2003; 359 360 Bocca et al., 2007), boles without branches for 10m (Rolstad et al., 2000; Zahner et al., 2012) or boles without branches below the cavity (Cuisin, 1967; Pirovano and Zecca, 2014). These 361 362 authors assume that branches on the trunk, or those of neighboring trees, may serve as a 363 ladder that help predators, notably the Pine Marten, reaching the nest. Black Woodpeckers could thus minimize offspring predation risk by selecting a safer tree, that is, one which is 364 365 relatively isolated with a branch-free trunk. Evidently, this explanation remains speculative and e.g. video surveillance of nests sites would be necessary to confirm it (see e.g. Zahner et al., 366 2017). 367

369

Black woodpeckers as umbrella species: the role of microhabitats

We validated our hypotheses linking Black Woodpecker cavities and other microhabitats; indeed, cavity-trees displayed significantly more other woodpecker cavities and saproxylic microhabitats than the control-trees. These results may have two opposing explanations.

Black Woodpeckers are capable of excavating apparently healthy trees, and when they 374 375 do so, they could themselves be contributing to the tree decay process (Kosiński and Kempa, 376 2007; Zahner et al., 2012; Zawadzka and Zawadzki, 2017), thus making the trees more microhabitat-ready. This is the case for fungi, as shown in many studies other than ours (see 377 the review of Jackson and Jackson, 2004). Black Woodpecker cavities would decrease trees 378 379 health, induce its slow decay, indirectly causing more holes, bark and wood injuries and deadwood. In comparison, other woodpeckers only excavate already decaying trees or target 380 dead branches borne by living trees: e.g. Pasinelli (2000); Kosiński and Kempa (2007) for the 381 middle spotted woodpecker; Wiktander et al. (2001) for the lesser spotted woodpecker. Black 382 383 Woodpeckers might be the first to degrade the trees, making them more suitable for weaker primary excavators. To sum up, Black Woodpeckers, through the tree decaying process they 384 provoke, could be considered as an umbrella species linked to the supply of cavities available 385 386 to many secondary cavity users (Zahner et al., 2017), increased microhabitat-dependent 387 biodiversity and other woodpecker excavation. These results suggest an additional umbrellaspecies role for Black Woodpeckers through the supposed facilitation of tree microhabitats 388 formation, especially since recent research has linked microhabitats (including woodpecker 389 cavities) with bat and bird biodiversity (Paillet et al., 2018). Black Woodpecker cavity-trees 390 391 have a higher potential regarding biodiversity than a comparable non-cavity trees, which 392 confirms their interest as habitat trees to be conserved in integrated forest management (Kraus and Krumm, 2013) 393

Conversely, Black Woodpeckers could select trees already bearing microhabitats for cavity excavation. This explanation is reversed in time and causality compared with the first one. In this case, fungal microhabitats would first appear on a senescent tree, and only then would Black Woodpeckers target that tree for excavation. We assume that this mechanism is less probable since many cavity-trees in our study did not show any apparent signs of senescence (but see Zahner *et al.*, 2012; Jusino *et al.*, 2016). However, to disentangle this chicken-and-egg issue and to better understand the succession between microhabitats and cavities ontogenesis, long-term monitoring in zones favored by the Black Woodpecker will be necessary (Wesołowski *et al.*, 2010; Cockle *et al.*, 2011).

403

404

Implications for forest management and Black woodpeckers' conservation

We showed that Black Woodpecker cavity-trees are isolated large-diameter beech 405 406 trees free of low branches; this suggests that Black Woodpeckers tend to select trees based on the energy required for cavity excavation and on predation risk. We confirmed our 407 408 hypothesis that Black Woodpeckers play a complementary umbrella role, by facilitating cavity excavation for other woodpecker species and saproxylic microhabitat formation. Therefore, 409 410 this also confirms that Black Woodpecker cavity-trees have high conservation interest as habitat trees (Office National des Forêts, 2010; Bütler et al., 2013). To secure an abundance 411 of biodiversity-friendly, tree-borne microhabitats, preserving trees with Black Woodpeckers 412 cavities while favoring trees suitable for Black Woodpecker excavation where such trees are 413 414 rare seems appropriate. However, determining the threshold density for optimal conservation remains beyond the scope of this study. Rolstad et al. (2000) propose preserving 1 tree /ha for 415 Black Woodpecker use while the French National Forest Service (Office National des Forêts, 416 2010) recommends preserving two living habitat trees/ha. Moreover, Black Woodpeckers 417 prefer to excavate new nests each year, probably to reduce offspring predation (Nilsson et al., 418 419 1991), so it seems important to maintain a constant pool of favorable trees. In addition, suitable 420 cavity-trees should be scattered throughout the forest for two reasons. First, Black 421 Woodpeckers have large home ranges, so clustered cavity-trees would be used by the same 422 individual or pair and exclude other individuals by mere competition. Second, clustered cavity-423 trees would be more sensitive to predation, which would reduce the efficiency of preserving 424 the habitat trees (Johnsson, 1993b).

Managers should keep in mind, however, that simply preserving a high quantity of 425 426 suitable cavity-trees scattered throughout the forest is likely to be insufficient to ensure the presence of Black Woodpeckers. Obviously, the birds have other requirements, most notably 427 patches of mature forest, presence of open areas and access to deadwood (Garmendia et al., 428 2006; Karimi et al., 2018). Similarly, biodiversity conservation should probably not focus on 429 only one but several umbrella species (Lambeck, 1997; Roberge and Angelstam, 2004). 430 431 Nonetheless, in French lowland forests, it would undoubtedly be interesting to favor scattered standing Beech trees with a minimum DBH of around 30 cm and a branch-free trunk, especially 432 in stands dominated by other, more commercially valuable, tree species such as oak. Since 433 Black Woodpecker cavities are relatively rare (e.g. 0.03-0.04/ha in our dataset, but see also 434 Kosiński et al., 2004), applying this biodiversity-friendly practice would be an interesting 435 production-protection compromise in managed forests. 436

437

438 Acknowledgements

We are indebted to Jean-Jacques Boutteaux (ONF Auberive) and Michael Dubois for sharing their data and for their advice. We thank Kristýna Svobodova, Martin Dušátko, Baptiste Kerfiden and Ondřej Vostarek for their work on wood cores. We also thank Fabien Laroche and the "cavity-group" in Nogent/Vernisson for valuable comments and discussions. Vicki Moore significantly improved the language of this paper. Two reviewers' comments helped improve the quality of this paper. This study was funded by the research project, Avineck: "Bird's neck, an arm for robots" (Grant number: ANR-16-CE33-0025).

446 **References**

- 447 Agostinelli, C., Lund, U., 2011. R package circular: Circular Statistics (version 0.4-3). In, CA Dep.
- Environ. Sci. Informatics Stat. Ca'Foscari Univ. Venice, Italy, UL Dep. Stat. Calif. Polytech. State Univ.
 San Luis Obispo, California, USA.
- 450 Andersson, J., Domingo Gómez, E., Michon, S., Roberge, J.M., 2018. Tree cavity densities and
- 451 characteristics in managed and unmanaged Swedish boreal forest. Scandinavian Journal of Forest 452 Research 33, 233-244.
- 453 Angelstam, P., Breuss, M., Mikusiński, G., Stenstrom, M., Stighall, K., Thorell, D., 2002. Effects of
- 454 forest structure on the presence of woodpeckers with different specialisation in a landscape history
- gradient in NE Poland. Avian Landscape Ecology: Pure and Applied Issues in the Large-Scale
 Ecology of Birds, 25-38.
- Bates, D., Mächler, M., Bolker, B., Walker, S., 2014. Fitting Linear Mixed-Effects Models using Ime4.
 67.
- 459 Bocca, M., Carisio, L., Rolando, A., 2007. Habitat use, home ranges and census techniques in the 460 Black Woodpecker *Dryocopus martius* in the Alps. Ardea 95, 17-29.
- Bouriaud, O., Bréda, N., Le Moguédec, G., Nepveu, G., 2004. Modelling variability of wood density in beech as affected by ring age, radial growth and climate. Trees 18, 264-276.
- 463 Bull, E.L., Holthausen, R.S., Henjum, M.G., 1992. Roost trees used by pileated woodpeckers in
- 464 northeastern Oregon. J Wildl Manag 56, 786-793.
- 465 Bütler, R., Lachat, T., Larrieu, L., Paillet, Y., 2013. Habitat trees: key elements for forest biodiversity.
- In: Kraus, D., Krumm, F. (Eds.), Integrative approaches as an opportunity for the conservation of forest
 biodiversity. European Forest Institute, pp. 84-91.
- 468 Cockle, K.L., Martin, K., Wesołowski, T., 2011. Woodpeckers, decay, and the future of cavity-nesting 469 vertebrate communities worldwide. Frontiers in Ecology and the Environment 9, 377-382.
- 470 Colmant, L., 2003. Population, Sites de nidification et arbres à loge du Pic noir *Dryocopus martius*
- 471 dans la région du parc naturel Viroin-Hermeton (Wallonie, Belgique). Alauda 71, 145-157.
- 472 Conner, R.N., Orson, K.M., Jr., Adkisson, C.S., 1976. Woodpecker dependence on trees infected by
 473 fungal heart rots. The Wilson Bulletin 88, 575-581.
- 474 Cuisin, M., 1967. Essai d'une monographie du Pic noir (*Dryocopus martius* (L.)). L'Oiseau et la Revue 475 française d'Ornithologie 37, 164-224.
- 476 Cuisin, M., 1986. Le Pic noir (*Dryocopus martius* L.) en forêt. Revue Forestière Française 38, 73-82.
- 477 Fernandez, C., Azkona, P., 1996. Influence of forest structure on the density and distribution of the
- 478 white-backed woodpecker *Dendrocopos leucotos* and black woodpecker *Dryocopus martius* in quinto 479 real (spanish western pyrenees). Bird Study 43, 305-313.
- 480 Garmendia, A., Cárcamo, S., Schwendtner, O., 2006. Forest management considerations for
- 481 conservation of Black Woodpecker Dryocopus martius and White-backed Woodpecker Dendrocopos
- 482 leucotos populations in Quinto Real (Spanish Western Pyrenees). Biodivers Conserv 15, 1399-1415.
- 483 Gschwantner, T., Lanz, A., Vidal, C., Bosela, M., Di Cosmo, L., Fridman, J., Gasparini, P., Kuliešis, A., 484 Tomter, S., Schadauer, K., 2016. Comparison of methods used in European National Forest
- 485 Inventories for the estimation of volume increment: towards harmonisation. Ann For Sci 73, 807-821.
- Holmes, R.L., 1983. Computer-Assisted Quality Control in Tree-Ring Dating and Measurement. Tree Ring Bulletin 43, 69-78.
- 488 Jackson, J.A., Jackson, B.J.S., 2004. Ecological Relationships Between Fungi and Woodpecker
- 489 Cavity Sites. The Condor 106, 37-37.
- Jacquin, P., Longuetaud, F., Leban, J.M., Mothe, F., 2017. X-ray microdensitometry of wood: A review
 of existing principles and devices. Dendrochronologia 42, 42-50.
- 492 Johnsson, K., 1993a. The Black Woodpecker *Dryocopus martius* as a keystone species in forest. In,
- 493 Institutionen foer Viltekologi. Sveriges Lantbruksuniversitet, Uppsala (Sweden).
- 494 Johnsson, K., 1993b. Colonial breeding and nest predation in the Jackdaw *Corvus monedula* using old 495 Black Woodpecker *Dryocopus martius* holes. Ibis 163, 313-331.
- 496 Johnsson, K., Nilsson, S.G., Tjernberg, M., 1993. Characteristics and utilization of old Black
- 497 Woodpecker *Dryocopus martius* holes by hole-nesting species. Ibis 135, 410-416.
- 498 Jones, C.G., Lawton, J.H., Shachak, M., 1994. Organisms as Ecosystem Engineers. Oikos 69, 373-499 386.
- Jusino, M.A., Lindner, D.L., Banik, M.T., Rose, K.R., Walters, J.R., 2016. Experimental evidence of a
- symbiosis between red-cockaded woodpeckers and fungi. Proceedings of the Royal Society B:Biological Sciences 283.
- Jusino, M.A., Lindner, D.L., Cianchetti, J.K., Grisé, A.T., Brazee, N.J., Walters, J.R., 2014. A minimally
- 504 invasive method for sampling nest and roost cavities for fungi: A novel approach to identify the fungi

- sos associated with cavity-nesting birds. Acta Ornithologica 49, 233-242.
- 506 Karimi, S., Moradi, H.V., Rezaei, H.R., Brambilla, M., Ghadimi, M., 2018. Fine-scale habitat use by
- 507 Black Woodpecker *Dryocopus martius* : a year-round study in the Hyrcanian forest, Iran. North-508 Western Journal of Zoology 14.
- 509 Kosiński, Z., Kempa, M., 2007. Density, distribution and nest-sites of woodpeckers picidae, in a
- 510 managed forest of western Poland. Pol J Ecol 55, 519-533.
- 511 Kosiński, Z., Kempa, M., Hybsz, R., 2004. Accuracy and efficiency of different techniques for
- 512 censusing territorial Middle Spotted Woodpeckers *Dendrocopos medius*. Acta Ornithologica 39, 29-34.
- 513 Kraus, D., Krumm, F., 2013. Integrative approaches as an opportunity for the conservation of forest
- 514 biodiversity. European Forest Institute, Freiburg, Germany.
- Lambeck, R.J., 1997. Focal species: A multi-species umbrella for nature conservation. Conserv Biol 11, 849-856.
- Larrieu, L., Paillet, Y., Winter, S., Bütler, R., Kraus, D., Krumm, F., Lachat, T., Michel, A.K., Regnery,
- 518 B., Vandekerkhove, K., 2018. Tree related microhabitats in temperate and Mediterranean European 519 forests: A hierarchical typology for inventory standardization. Ecol Indic 84, 194-207.
- Leban, J.M., Hervé, J.C., Bontemps, J.D., Longuetaud, F., Mothe, F., Jacquin, P., 2016. Measurement of the annual biomass increment of the French forests, XyloDensMap project. In.
- Leban, J.M., Hervé, J.C., Bontemps, J.D., Wurpillot, S., Dauffy, V., Morneau, F., Touzet, T., Jacquin,
- P., Longuetaud, F., Mothe, F., Kerfriden, B., Billard, A., Savagner, L., Trouy, M.C., Douzain, N., 2017.
 Le projet XyloDensMap. 2-3.
- Lima, S.L., 2009. Predators and the breeding bird: Behavioral and reproductive flexibility under the risk of predation. Biological Reviews 84, 485-513.
- 527 Longuetaud, F., Mothe, F., Fournier, M., Dlouha, J., Santenoise, P., Deleuze, C., 2016. Within-stem
- maps of wood density and water content for characterization of species: a case study on three
 hardwood and two softwood species. Ann For Sci 73, 601-614.
- Longuetaud, F., Mothe, F., Santenoise, P., Colin, F., Freyburger, C., Borianne, P., Deleuze, C., 2014.
- 531 Un scanner tomographique a rayons X pour l'analyse de la structure interne des arbres. RenDez-Vous 532 Techniques 44, 57-64.
- Longuetaud, F., Mothe, F., Santenoise, P., Diop, N., Dlouha, J., Fournier, M., Deleuze, C., 2017.
- 534 Patterns of within-stem variations in wood specific gravity and water content for five temperate tree 535 species. Ann For Sci 74.
- 536 Lorenz, T.J., Vierling, K.T., Johnson, T.R., Fischer, P.C., 2015. The role of wood hardness in limiting 537 nest site selection in avian cavity excavators. Ecol Appl 25, 1016-1033.
- 538 Martin, K., 2015. Nest webs and woodpecker ecological services: the role of woodpeckers in tree 539 cavity-using wildlife communities in North America. Denesia 36, 77-86.
- 540 Matsuoka, S., 2008. Wood hardness in nest trees of the Great Spotted Woodpecker *Dendrocopos* 541 *major*. Ornithol Sci 7, 59-66.
- 542 Mikusiński, G., 1995. Population trends in black woodpecker in relation to changes and characteristics 543 of European forests. Ecography 18, 363-369.
- Nilsson, S.G., 1984. The Evolution of Nest-Site Selection among Hole-Nesting Birds: The Importance
 of Nest Predation and Competition. Ornis Scandinavica 15, 167-167.
- Nilsson, S.G., Johnsson, K., Tjernberg, M., 1991. Is avoidance by black woodpeckers of old nest holes
 due to predators? Anim Behav 41, 439-441.
- 548 Office National des Forêts, 2010. Les arbres à conserver pour la biodiversité Comment les identifier 549 et les désigner ? In, pp. 8 p-8 p.
- 550 Olano, M., Aierbe, T., Beñaran, H., Hurtado, R., Ugarte, J., Urruzola, A., Vázquez, J., Ansorregi, F.,
- 551 Galdos, A., Garcianteparaluceta, A., Fernández-García, J.M., 2015. Black woodpecker *Dryocopus* 552 *martius (L., 1758)* distribution, abundance, habitat use and breeding performance in a recently
- 553 colonized region in SW Europe. Munibe, Cienc.nat. 63, 49-71.
- 554 Paillet, Y., Archaux, F., du Puy, S., Boulanger, V., Debaive, N., Fuhr, M., Gilg, O., Gosselin, F.,
- 555 Guilbert, E., 2018. The indicator side of tree microhabitats: a multi-taxon approach based on bats, 556 birds and saproxylic beetles. J Appl Ecol 55, 2147-2156.
- 557 Paillet, Y., Pernot, C., Boulanger, V., Debaive, N., Fuhr, M., Gilg, O., Gosselin, F., 2015. Quantifying
- 558 the recovery of old-growth attributes in forest reserves: A first reference for France. For Ecol Manag 559 346, 51-64.
- 560 Pasinelli, G., 2000. Oaks (*Quercus sp.*) and only oaks? Relations between habitat structure and home
- 561 range size of the middle spotted woodpecker (*Dendrocopos medius*). Biol Conserv 93, 227-235.
- 562 Pirovano, A.R., Zecca, G., 2014. Black woodpecker Dryocopus martius habitat selection in the italian
- alps: Implications for conservation in Natura 2000 network. Bird Conserv Int 24, 299-315.
- 564 R Core Team, 2017. R: A language and environment for statistical computing. In. R Foundation for

- 565 Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria.
- Remm, J., Lõhmus, A., 2011. Tree cavities in forests The broad distribution pattern of a keystone
- 567 structure for biodiversity. For Ecol Manag 262, 579-585.
- Roberge, J.M., Angelstam, P., 2004. Usefulness of the Umbrella Species Concept as a Conservation
 Tool. Conserv Biol 18, 76-85.
- Rolstad, J., Rolstad, E., Saeteren, O., 2000. Black Woodpecker nest sites: characteristics, selection
 and reproductive success. The Journal of Wildlife Management 64, 1053-1066.
- 572 Russell, L., 2018. emmeans: Estimated Marginal Means, aka Least-Squares Means. R package 573 version 1.2.2. In.
- 574 Saporetti, F., Colaone, S., Guenzani, W., Zarbo, T., 2016. Nest-site characteristics and breeding
- 575 biology of the Black Woodpecker in north-western Lombardy, Italy. Rivista Italiana di Ornitologia 86, 576 39-48.
- 577 Schepps, J., Lohr, S., Martin, T.E., Schepps, J., Lohr, S., Martin, T.E., 1999. Does Tree Hardness 578 Influence Nest-Tree Selection By Primary Cavity Nesters ? The Auk 116, 658-665.
- 579 Schwarze, F.W.M.R., Spycher, M., Fink, S., 2008. Superior wood for violins--wood decay fungi as a substitute for cold climate. The New phytologist 179, 1095-1104.
- 581 Sonerud, G.A., 1985. Nest hole shift in Tengmalm's owl Aegolius funereus as defence against nest
- 582 predation involving long-term memory in the predator. The Journal of Animal Ecology 54, 179-192.
- 583 Welsh, C.J.E., Capen, D.E., 1992. Availability of Nesting Sites as a Limit to Woodpecker Populations.
- 584 For Ecol Manag 48, 31-41.
- 585 Wesołowski, T., 2011. "Lifespan" of woodpecker-made holes in a primeval temperate forest: A thirty 586 year study. For Ecol Manag 262, 1846-1852.
- 587 Wesołowski, T., Mitrus, C., Czeszczewik, D., Rowiński, P., 2010. Breeding bird dynamics in a primeval 588 temperate forest over thirty-five years: Variation and stability in the changing world. Acta Ornithologica
- 589 45, 209-232.
- 590 Widen, P., 1989. The hunting habitats of Goshawks *Accipiter gentilis* in boreal forests of central 591 Sweden. Ibis 131, 205-213.
- 592 Wiktander, U., Olsson, O., Nilsson, S.G., 2001. Annual and seasonal reproductive trends in the Lesser 593 Spotted Woodpecker Dendrocopos minor. Ibis 143, 72-82.
- 594 Zahner, V., Bauer, R., Kaphegyi, T.A.M., 2017. Are Black Woodpecker (Dryocopus martius) tree
- 595 cavities in temperate Beech (Fagus sylvatica) forests an answer to depredation risk? Journal of
- 596 Ornithology 158, 1073-1079.
- Zahner, V., Sikora, L., Pasinelli, G., 2012. Heart rot as a key factor for cavity tree selection in the Black
 woodpecker. For Ecol Manag 271, 98-103.
- 599 Zawadzka, D., Zawadzki, G., 2017. Characteristics of the nesting trees of the Black Woodpecker in the 600 Augustów Forest. Sylwan 161, 1002-1009.

Table 1. Main characteristics of the sampling sites (ONF, 2006, 2012), surrounding environment description and cavity-tree characteristics (n=28 plots for each site): means, standard errors (s.e.) and ranges (minimum-maximum). Basal area: small trees (Diameter at Breast Height [DBH] between 7.5 - 22.5 cm), medium trees (DBH: 22.5 - 47.5 cm) and large trees (DBH: > 47.5 cm). Relative cavity height: cavity height divided by total tree height. We used generalized linear models (Gamma error distributed with identity link) to compare variables between sites.

Auberive Loches 47° 47' 42" N, 5° 4' 57" E 47° 9' 16" N, 1° 4' 23" E Location Area (ha) 5 584 3 952 Substrate Limestone Flint clay Uneven-aged Even-aged Management type Fagus sylvatica (56%) Quercus petraea (92%) Dominant tree Other broadleaves (15%) species Quercus sp. (13%) 223 Total number of 112 0.04 cav. /ha 0.03 cav. /ha cavity trees p value Mean ± s.e. Range Mean ± s.e. Range Local environment Altitude (m) 425 ± 5 [370-458] 116 ± 3 [88-139] < 0.001 *** Slope (°) 10 ± 2 0.001 ** 3 ± 1 [0-13] [0-26] Deadwood (m³/ha) 20 ± 9 [0.4-232] 24 ± 9 [0.3-162] 0.942 ns 2.9 ± 0.4 Small [0-6.5] 2.2 ± 0.3 0.171 ns [0-6.5] Basal Medium 7.6 ± 0.6 8.5 ± 0.9 [1-12] [2.5-24.5] 0.257 ns area 0.001 ** Large 8.6 ± 0.7 [1-15] 14.1 ± 1.2 [0-23.5] (m²/ha) < 0.001 *** Total 19.1 ± 0.5 [13.5-23.5] 24.7 ± 0.5 [18.5-30.5] Tree DBH (cm) 55 ± 2 [36-86] 51 ± 2 [31-64] 0.110 ns Height (m) 27 ± 1 [18-35] 33 ± 1 [26-43] < 0.001 *** < 0.001 *** Cavity height (m) 13 ± 0.6 7 ± 0.5 [3-15] [5-21] < 0.001 *** 0.27 ± 0.02 [0.12-0.46] 0.39 ± 0.02 [0.19-0.56] Relative cavity height

Table 2. Wood density comparisons (in percentage) between cavity- and control-trees based on estimates from generalized linear mixed models (Gamma error distribution). We compared means along wood core profiles every 5 cm from 0 (bark) to 30 (pith). Negative values indicate lower wood density for cavity-trees than control-trees. Stars show marginal Tukey test significance. Thresholds: (*) p < 0.1; * p < 0.05; ** p < 0.01; *** p < 0.001.

	Distanc	Distance from bark					
	0-5 cm	5-10 cm	10-15 cm	15-20 cm	20-25 cm	25-30 cm	
All trees (n=116)							
Auberive	- 1.86	- 1.94	- 3.25 (*)	- 3.59 (*)	- 6.13 *	+ 0.98	
Loches	- 0.25	+ 0.15	+ 0.22	- 1.46	- 2.24	- 2.32	
Trees without heart rot (n=1	04)						
Auberive	- 1.04	- 1.88	- 2.80	- 2.33	- 1.39	+ 3.47	
Loches	- 1.25	- 0.07	+ 0.23	- 0.57	- 2.34	- 2.32	

- Figure 1. Sampling design maps of Auberive (top) and Loches (bottom). Blue dots represent
- all recorded cavity-trees; red dots represent cavity-trees sampled in this study.



Figure 2. Tree-scale measurements comparing paired trees (green): cavity description (red) 622 623 and comparable variables (blue). We paired a control-tree, the closest equivalent tree (same species and Diameter at Breast Height [DBH] ± 10 cm), to each cavity-tree. The four classes 624 of cavity tilt are shown in the top left box. We inventoried tree-related microhabitat richness 625 and abundance following Larrieu et al.'s typology (2018). We sampled a wood core at breast 626 627 height (1.30 m) for wood density and age measurements. We chose the nearest neighbor 628 among all the surrounding trees with a DBH > 7.5cm.



Figure 3. Comparison of estimated means between cavity-trees (trees bearing at least one 631 Black Woodpecker cavity, in grey) and control trees (trees without cavities, in white) based on 632 633 generalized linear mixed models. A, B and C are Gamma error distributed models with identity links while D, E and F are Poisson error distributed models with log links (values were back-634 transformed). We added a random plot-level effect to the models to account for the paired 635 design. Error bars represent 95% confidence intervals and stars show marginal Tukey test 636 significance (thresholds: (*) p < 0.1; * p < 0.05; ** p < 0.01; *** p < 0.001). Associated tables 637 638 display the significance of each parameter in each model: Type (cavity- vs control-tree), Site (Auberive vs Loches) and Type:Site (the interaction between Type and Site). 639



641 Supplementary materials

- Table S1. Occurrences of fungi and heart rot on all surveyed trees for both sites (Auberive and
- Loches) for trees bearing at least one Black Woodpecker cavity (cavity-trees) and trees without
- 644 cavities (controls).

Tree type	Aut	perive	Loches		
	Cavity (n=28)	Control (n=28)	Cavity (n=32)	Control (n=28)	
Fungi	1	4	0	0	
Heart rot	7	2	2	1	

646

645

- 647
- Figure S1. Black Woodpeckers cavity entrance hole orientation (n = 56). Cavities in Auberive
- are in red, and those in Loches in blue.



Figure S2. Wood density profiles of trees bearing at least one Black Woodpecker cavity (cavitytrees, in dark grey) and trees without any Black Woodpecker cavities (control-trees, in light grey) in Auberive (left) and Loches (right). We used a generalized Additive Model (GAM) with distance as a smoother. Error margins represent 95% confidence intervals.



