

# Pioneering insights into the diving behavior of early-stage sea turtles revealed by novel marine miniaturized satellite tags

Received: 10 October 2025

Accepted: 30 March 2026

Published online: 09 April 2026

Cite this article as: Candela T., Gaspar P., Bailey H. *et al.* Pioneering insights into the diving behavior of early-stage sea turtles revealed by novel marine miniaturized satellite tags. *Sci Rep* (2026). <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-026-47239-6>

Tony Candela, Philippe Gaspar, Helen Bailey, Jeanette Wyneken, Emily Turla, Talitha Noble-Trull, Ronel Nel, Hirun Kanghae, Pinsak Suraswadi, Tipamat Upanoi, Junichi Okuyama, Isao Kawazu, Ken Maeda, Kaho Mizuochi, Nene Ogino, Frederic Vandeperre, Ana Mafalda Sousa, Andrea Herguedas, Mark Boer, Florence Dell'Amico, Antonieta Nunes, Joao Neves, Isabel Gaspar & George L. Shillinger

We are providing an unedited version of this manuscript to give early access to its findings. Before final publication, the manuscript will undergo further editing. Please note there may be errors present which affect the content, and all legal disclaimers apply.

If this paper is publishing under a Transparent Peer Review model then Peer Review reports will publish with the final article.

## Pioneering insights into the diving behavior of early-stage sea turtles revealed by novel marine miniaturized satellite tags

Tony Candela<sup>1,2,3\*</sup>, Philippe Gaspar<sup>2</sup>, Helen Bailey<sup>4</sup>, Jeanette Wyneken<sup>5</sup>, Emily Turla<sup>5</sup>, Talitha Noble-Trull<sup>6</sup>, Ronel Nel<sup>7</sup>, Hirun Kanghae<sup>8</sup>, Pinsak Suraswadi<sup>9</sup>, Tipamat Upanoi<sup>10</sup>, Junichi Okuyama<sup>11</sup>, Isao Kawazu<sup>12,13</sup>, Ken Maeda<sup>13</sup>, Kaho Mizuochi<sup>13</sup>, Nene Ogino<sup>13</sup>, Frederic Vandeperre<sup>14,15</sup>, Ana Mafalda Sousa<sup>14,15</sup>, Andrea Herguedas<sup>14,15</sup>, Mark De Boer<sup>16</sup>, Florence Dell'Amico<sup>3</sup>, Antonieta Nunes<sup>17</sup>, Joao Neves<sup>17</sup>, Isabel Gaspar<sup>17</sup>, and George L. Shillinger<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Upwell, Monterey, California, United States of America

<sup>2</sup>Mercator Ocean International, Toulouse, France

<sup>3</sup>Aquarium La Rochelle, Centre d'Etudes et de Soins pour les Tortues Marines, La Rochelle, France

<sup>4</sup>Blue Wave Consulting, LLC, Baltimore, Maryland, United State of America

<sup>5</sup>FAU Marine Science Laboratory, Department of Biological Sciences, Florida Atlantic University, Boca Raton, Florida, United States of America

<sup>6</sup>Two Oceans Aquarium Foundation, Cape Town, South Africa

<sup>7</sup>Nelson Mandela University, Port Elizabeth, South Africa

<sup>8</sup>Phuket Marine Biological Center, Department of Marine and Coastal Resources, Phuket, Thailand

<sup>9</sup>Department of Marine and Coastal Resources, Bangkok, Thailand

<sup>10</sup>Marine and Coastal Resources Research Center (Upper Andaman Sea), Phuket, Thailand

<sup>11</sup>Sea Turtle Ecology Lab, Yokohama, Kanagawa, Japan

<sup>12</sup>Okinawa Churashima Foundation, Okinawa, Japan

<sup>13</sup>Okinawa Churaumi Aquarium, Okinawa, Japan

<sup>14</sup>Institute of Marine Sciences, IICM Okeanos, University of the Azores, 9901-862 Horta, Portugal

<sup>15</sup>Institute of Marine Research, IMAR, 9900-138 Horta, Portugal

<sup>16</sup>Rotterdam Zoo, Rotterdam, The Netherlands

<sup>17</sup>Zoomarine Algarve, Mundo Aquatico SA, Guia, Albufeira, Portugal

\*Corresponding author

Email: [tcandela@mercator-ocean.fr](mailto:tcandela@mercator-ocean.fr) (Tony Candela)

**Keywords:** juvenile sea turtles, vertical behavior, diving activity, miniaturized satellite tags, foraging strategy, migration

## Abstract

Understanding how sea turtles interact with their environment during their early oceanic life stages – the time often termed “Lost Years” – is critical for informing conservation strategies. This study provides the most comprehensive analysis to date of vertical diving behavior in early life stages of two sea turtles species: leatherback (*Dermochelys coriacea*) and loggerhead (*Caretta caretta*) sea turtles. Using over 2,400 daily records from 71 individuals equipped with miniaturized satellite tags across multiple ocean basins, analyses revealed a clear ontogenetic progression. As a turtle’s size increases, they dive deeper and longer, with increasingly structured use of the water column. Some individuals also exhibited brief acclimatization phases after release, gradually adopting deeper and more consistent diving patterns. Environmental analyses highlight qualitative associations between vertical behavior in larger turtles and the structure of the water column, including thermal gradients and subsurface layers potentially associated with prey availability. These findings offer novel insights into the development, acclimatization, and ecological drivers of vertical movement in “Lost Years” sea turtles, helping to bridge knowledge gaps during this critical life stage.

## Introduction

To effectively manage and protect a species, knowledge of its spatial distribution through all its life stages is essential [1,2]. Key habitats and areas where threats are most likely to occur must be identified to inform the development of appropriate conservation strategies. Acquiring such knowledge for endangered or threatened highly migratory marine species such as sea turtles is a major challenge [3] since observations are especially difficult to obtain in the open ocean and even more so for very young individuals due to their small size. Survivorship of individuals during their juvenile life stages is particularly important for population-wide persistence [4,5]. However, their ecology remains enigmatic from the moment they crawl into the sea until they reappear, many years later, as large juveniles or adults in neritic foraging areas or in the direct vicinity of their nesting beaches. This obscure period of life is commonly referred to as the “Lost Years” [6].

Until recently, the very small body sizes and prolonged dispersal phases of juveniles posed many challenges for the development of satellite tracking studies [1,2,7]. Recent advances in tag miniaturization technologies have enabled researchers to undertake groundbreaking studies on the

movements and dispersal of early-stage sea turtles [7–12], significantly extending tracking durations of very early stage (neonate) turtles acquired through active tracking techniques with miniaturized acoustic tags [13,14]. Novel miniaturized satellite tags (some weighing less than 3 g) equipped with solar cells and pressure sensors have prolonged tracking durations and provided first-ever dive data for early-stage sea turtles for periods ranging from a few days to several months [12], and in some cases nearly a year or even longer. In addition to horizontal movement data, some miniaturized satellite tags now offer groundbreaking capabilities for collecting long-term, fine-scale observations on how young sea turtles move vertically during their initial dispersal stages. Understanding how these early-stage sea turtles interact with their environment in three dimensions provides an important ecological context to their migratory and survival strategies. Such knowledge of juvenile diving patterns provides a basis for conservation actions, for example by informing the adjustment of fishing gear deployment depth, and the design of marine protected areas that reflect the vertical habitat use of these species [15–19].


Our study harnesses an unprecedented dataset generated through deployments conducted since 2022 at different locations in the Atlantic, Indian and Pacific oceans. We compiled data from more than a hundred miniaturized satellite tags [12] equipped on early life stage juvenile loggerhead (*Caretta caretta*, Vulnerable [20]) and leatherback (*Dermochelys coriacea*, Vulnerable [21]) sea turtles, from post-hatchlings with straight carapace length (SCL) < 10 cm to small juveniles (SCL < 40 cm). Our study aims to provide critical insights into the early behavioral

development of these species, with a particular focus on their diving behavior. By improving understanding of behavioral mechanisms during the Lost Years, our work provides empirically grounded data that can help improve our capacity to predict juvenile sea turtle movements in the open ocean and identify potential overlaps with anthropogenic threats.

## Materials and methods

### Study animals

Our study involved a total of 105 young sea turtles, including both loggerheads and leatherbacks, released across 7 locations worldwide (Figure 1) between 2022 and 2024. The turtles were either captive-reared, wild-caught, or rehabilitated, and ranged from post-hatchlings with straight carapace length (SCL) < 10 cm to small juveniles (SCL < 40 cm).



**Figure 1: Release locations for leatherback and loggerhead sea turtles.**

Map with the release location of sea turtles deployed for this study. Leatherbacks (blue circles) were released from two locations: Eastern Florida (USA) and Western Thailand. Loggerheads (orange squares) were released from seven locations: Eastern Florida (USA), the Azores archipelago (Portugal), the Western France, Southern Portugal, Western and Eastern South Africa, and Southern Japan islands.

Our dataset included 58 loggerheads, 24 of which were captive-reared for approximately 3 months at Florida Atlantic University (Florida, USA) or

Churaumi Aquarium (Okinawa, Japan) post-emergence from *in situ* nests. The remaining 34 loggerheads were either rehabilitated (recovery after stranding or injury), or were wild-caught. The loggerhead SCL ranged from 9.14 to 28.00 cm. The captive-reared individuals released off Eastern Florida, USA (n = 13) and off Ie Island, Japan (n = 11) were the smallest (SCL from 9.14 to 16.20 cm). Rehabilitated sea turtles released off South Africa (n = 22, SCL from 11.90 to 16.20 cm) and in the Bay of Biscay along the Atlantic coast of France (n = 5, SCL from 16.40 to 20.40 cm) were slightly larger. Those released within the Azores (n = 6) included four small individuals (SCL from 11.20 to 14.40 cm), that were wild-caught using a dip net off the coast, and two large ones (26.00 and 28.00 cm), that were found stranded in the Netherlands and later transported to the Azores for release. The single turtle released off southern Portugal measured 26.60 cm.

The remaining 47 sea turtles in the dataset were all captive-reared leatherbacks. These included a subset of 36 turtles collected post-emergence from *in situ* nests in Boca Raton, Florida, USA, reared at Florida Atlantic University for about 2 or 3 months and then released in the Gulf Stream off the coast of Eastern Florida. Upon release, the turtles' SCL ranged from 7.42 to 12.10 cm. The remaining 11 leatherbacks were raised for just over a year (range: 375-377 days) at the Phuket Marine Biological Center [22] and released from Thailand's west coast into the Andaman Sea. The SCLs of these individuals ranged from 21.96 to 36.00 cm.

We compared observed size ranges with published growth curves for leatherbacks [23] and for loggerheads [24]. While leatherback sizes were

generally consistent with these growth trajectories, the smallest loggerheads appeared slightly above expected values, which may reflect differences between captive-reared and wild individuals growth patterns. Detailed information for all individuals included in the study is presented in supplementary material S1.

In the following sections, all the released individuals were classified according to their species, origin (i.e., wild-caught/rehabilitated, or captive-reared), and size class based on SCL at the time of release: small for SCL smaller than 15.00 cm, intermediate to SCL between 15.00 and 21.00 cm or large for SCL larger than 21.00 cm. These size classes were used to reflect different ontogenetic stages.

### **Platform Transmitter Terminals**

All the Platform Transmitter Terminals (PTT) used in this study were miniaturized satellite tags designed and manufactured by Lotek Wireless Inc. (Newmarket, Ontario, Canada). In order to conform tag size to body-size standard and mitigate the perturbations [1,25–27], all PTTs plus attachment materials weighed 5% or less of the turtle's body mass. All sea turtles included in this study were each equipped with one of two types of tags, based on tag availability, provided that the 5% criterion was satisfied. The smallest tag model was K4H 130B Dive (length x width x height: 26.0 x 14.7 x 7.7 mm, 3.1 g in air). The larger tag model was K4G 132A Sensor (47.7 x 30.0 x 21.9 mm, 12.1 g in air). All technical information (e.g., data transmission, power supply, sensors) of these PTTs and the attachment methods are available in Candela et al. (2024) [12].

In addition to the Argos locations, the PTTs were expected to provide daily summaries of the previous day's vertical (surface or dive depth) behavior with 3 distinct variables:

1. the fraction of the day (from 00:00 to 23:59 UTC) spent underwater (%TU) based on the saltwater switch, with the dry state associated with the time spent at the surface and the wet state associated with the time spent underwater;
2. the maximum depth reached during this 24-h period, hereafter referred to as the Maximum Daily Diving Depth (M3D);
3. the Time-at-Depth (TaD) distribution representing the distribution of underwater time (in %) within 7 depth layers. For loggerhead sea turtles, depth bins were 0-5, 5-10, 10-15, 15-20, 20-25, 25-30 and below 30 m. For leatherbacks, depth bins were 0-10, 10-20, 20-30, 30-40, 40-50, 50-60 and below 60m.

Because the variable accounting for time spent underwater (%TU) is directly derived from the saltwater switch as the fraction of time when the sensor is wet, it does not always clearly distinguish between turtles being truly submerged and those remaining at or near the surface. For instance, short periods of sensor wetness can occur at the surface due to splashing, rain, or water droplets. Conversely, the dry state can be slightly delayed when turtles emerge at the surface. To better isolate actual diving behavior, we defined a new variable, Diving Time (%DT), as the proportion of time spent below the first sampled vertical layer (i.e., below 5m for loggerheads and 10 m for leatherbacks). This metric, used alongside Maximum Daily Dive

Depth (M3D) and the Time-at-Depth (TaD) distribution, provided a more conservative assessment of the diving activity.

To characterize the mean behavior of a group of individuals, we used the mean  $\pm$  standard deviation (mean  $\pm$  SD) for continuous variables (e.g., M3D, tracking duration). However, for variables expressed as percentages (e.g., %DT and TaD distributions), this approach was not optimal. Instead, we used the mean with its 95% confidence interval (mean [CI95]), as recommended for proportion data [28]. This method retained information on the group's average behavior while providing a more appropriate and robust estimate of the precision of the mean.

## **Data processing**

In order to standardize the dataset, trajectories were resampled with the Move Persistence State-Space Model aniMotum [29] allowing for regularly time-spaced locations taking into account Argos location' error ellipses. The resampling interval was set to 12 h to get locations at 00:00 and 12:00 UTC every day.

Subsequently, oceanographic data from Copernicus Marine Service global ocean models [30–32] were interpolated at the resampled 12:00 UTC daily locations of the turtles using distance-weighted nearest neighbor interpolations. Daily 3D ocean current velocities and 3D sea water temperatures were retrieved from the Global Ocean Physics Analysis and Forecast product [30] which has a horizontal resolution of  $1/12^\circ$  and 50 vertical levels. Daily Significant Wave Heights (SWH) were retrieved and calculated from hourly data of the Global Ocean Waves Analysis and

Forecast product [31,33,34] with a horizontal resolution of  $1/12^\circ$ . Bathymetry data were retrieved from the General Bathymetric Chart of the Oceans (GEBCO) dataset [35] which has a horizontal resolution of 15 arc-seconds. Daily 3D concentrations of chlorophyll-a (chl-a) were retrieved from the Global Ocean Biogeochemistry Analysis and Forecast product [32] with a horizontal resolution of  $1/12^\circ$  and 50 vertical levels. It is used as a proxy for prey abundance.

We fit generalized additive mixed models (GAMMs) to test whether diving behavior varied in relation to time since release or size of the turtle. We fit models for each of the two turtle species with two response variables: the %DT (formatted as a proportion between 0 and 1) with a beta distribution and logit link function, and the M3D with a gamma distribution and log link function. The explanatory smoother variables were the time elapsed since the release (in days) and SCL (in cm) at the time of release. The smoothing functions of these continuous variables were limited to four degrees of freedom to limit overfitting the data. Individual IDs were included as a random effect to account for behavior specific to the individual. Statistical significance was assessed based on p-values, with effects considered significant at  $p\text{-value} < 0.05$ .

The software R version 4.2.2 [36] was used for trajectory resampling and for statistical (i.e., GAMMs) analyses and associated figures, using respectively the aniMotum [29] and mgcv [37] packages. All other processing works, including environmental variable interpolations, analyses, and figure production, were performed in Python version 3.14.1.

## **Ethic statements**


Work with leatherbacks and loggerheads from Florida, USA, complied with Florida FWC permit MTP-073, and FAU IACUC Protocol A22-30. Work involving loggerheads from South Africa has been conducted under the Ethics Approval TOA-RES 07\_25. Work with leatherbacks in Thailand was conducted by the Phuket Marine Biological Center and carried out in accordance with the Thailand Wildlife Conservation and Protection Act, in adherence with Constitutional Law of Thailand. For the loggerheads released in Japan, the entire experimental protocol - including hatchling collection on the beach, captive-rearing, transmitter attachment, and release - has been approved by both the Okinawa Fisheries Coordination Committee (6-k3) and the Okinawa Prefectural Government (6-35). The work with loggerheads in the Azores was conducted under the licenses LMAS-DRPM/2022/06, LMAS-DRPM/2023/15 issued by the Regional Directorate for Maritime Policies and approved by the board responsible for animal welfare of the University of the Azores (Órgão Responsável pelo Bem-Estar dos Animais; COM/ORBEA/2024/002). The two loggerheads that underwent rehabilitation in the Netherlands prior to their release in the Azores were rehabilitated under a license issued by the Omgevingsdienst Haaglanden and registered under Case Number 01004761. For the French turtles, this study meets the legal requirements of the country and the Rescue Center where the work was carried out and adhered to all institutional guidelines. The Prefectoral Order n°2004-1104 and its modifications n°2024 02286 approved the opening of the Centre d'Etudes et de Soins pour les Tortues Marines (CESTM) and delivered to Mrs. Florence Dell'Amico a certificate (n°2017 02173) to conduct care practices on non-

domestic animals. The French Ministerial Order (30/12/2020) acts as an exception to the strict protection of species, authorizing the manipulation of protected species when found bycaught, drifting at sea or stranded and for equipping with satellite tags the marine turtles. All wildlife rehabilitation procedures conducted in mainland Portugal were performed under Operational License n°2012 PT/03/CR, issued to the Porto d'Abrigo Rehabilitation Center at Zoomarine Portugal, in full compliance with the national regulations governing the rehabilitation of wild fauna.

## Results

### Tracking durations and filtering process

As of February 26<sup>th</sup>, 2025, tracking data were downloaded for all individuals involved in this study (Figure 2) and are presented here as mean  $\pm$  SD. The sea turtles' tracking duration averaged  $32.2 \pm 40.9$  days. Five tags deployed on loggerheads were still transmitting at this time, four of them for more than 100 days and one for more than 200 days. Tracking durations were significantly longer for loggerheads ( $50.8 \pm 46.1$  days) than for leatherbacks ( $9.3 \pm 12.9$  days). The reasons for this difference in tracking durations, likely reflecting the combination of demanding species-specific behaviors and the lack of robustness of the tag and its attachment, are discussed by Candela et al. (2024).



**Figure 2: Trajectories of released sea turtles.**

Maps representing all the trajectories of loggerhead (a) and leatherback (b) sea turtles released in this study. Trajectories are color-coded depending on the release site with Eastern Florida (blue), the Azores archipelago (orange), the Bay of Biscay (red), Southern Portugal (cyan), South Africa (green), Southern Japan islands (magenta) and Western Thailand (yellow).

Strict quality control of the dive data compelled us to discard the complete dive records of 34 individuals (see details in supplementary materials S2, S3). The final edited dataset includes dive records from 71 sea turtles (42 loggerheads and 29 leatherbacks) for a total of about 2,500 daily values of each analyzed variable (Table 1). Less than 10% of the daily values were from leatherbacks because they were fewer within our dataset and had shorter tracking durations than the loggerheads. In addition, tags deployed on leatherbacks exhibited a lower transmission ratio (46%) than those on

loggerhead sea turtles (76%), as previously noticed and discussed by Candela et al. (2024).

Species	Size interval [cm]	Origin	Number of turtles	Number of TaD distributions	Number of %TU	Number of M3D	Number of complete daily dive summaries
Loggerhead	Small (9.0 < SCL < 15.0)	Captive-reared	21	748	813	813	748
		Rehabilitated Wild-caught	13	832	848	846	830
		<i>Total</i>	<i>34</i>	<i>1,580</i>	<i>1,661</i>	<i>1,659</i>	<i>1,578</i>
	Intermediate (15.0 ≤ SCL < 21.0)	Captive-reared	1	72	74	74	72
		Rehabilitated Wild-caught	5	500	503	500	497
		<i>Total</i>	<i>6</i>	<i>572</i>	<i>577</i>	<i>574</i>	<i>569</i>
Large (26.0 ≤ SCL ≤ 28.0)	Rehabilitated Wild-caught	2	97	102	100	95	
Leatherback	Small (7.0 < SCL < 13.0)	Captive-reared	27	175	217	217	175
	Large (21.0 < SCL < 33.0)	Captive-reared	2	23	25	24	22
<b>Total</b>			<b>71</b>	<b>2,447</b>	<b>2,582</b>	<b>2,574</b>	<b>2,439</b>


**Table 1: Composition of the final dataset.**

Each individual is classified depending on species, origin (i.e., wild-caught/rehabilitated, or captive-reared), and size categories (SCL) at the time of release. For each category, the number of daily dive data is reported for the Time-at-Depth (TaD) distributions, the fractions of time spent underwater (%TU), the Maximum Daily Diving Depth (M3D) and the complete daily dive summaries (i.e., days for which all the aforementioned diagnoses were received).

## Vertical behavior characterization for loggerhead sea turtles

The smallest loggerheads (9.0 < SCL < 15.0 cm) exhibited strongly surface-oriented behavior with a mean %DT of only 0.3% (CI95: 0.2-0.4%) and over 80% of M3Ds within the top 5 m of the water column (mean M3D ± SD: 4.5 ± 9.1 m) (Figure 3a, Figure 3d). Observed use of the water column confirmed this trend with individuals spending less than 0.5% of the day at depths greater than 5 m (Figure 3a). Occasional deep dives were recorded,

with 1% of M3Ds exceeding 50 m and a maximum dive recorded down to 107 m (Figure 3d). This strongly surface-oriented behavior was similar in both captive-reared and rehabilitated individuals, although the latter showed slightly higher averages (mean %DT [CI95]: 0.6% [0.4-0.8%]; mean M3D  $\pm$  SD: 5.4  $\pm$  12.0 m) than the former (mean %DT [CI95]: 0.0% [0.0-0.1%]; mean M3D  $\pm$  SD: 3.6  $\pm$  4.3 m). However, this difference was driven by a single outlier (a rehabilitated loggerhead), which was released off South Africa where it dove longer and deeper than the other turtles, on average (mean %DT [CI95]: 10.3% [7.3-13.3%]; mean M3D  $\pm$  SD: 29.8  $\pm$  14.8 m). When excluding this individual outlier, average behavior converged (mean %DT [CI95]: 0.1% [0.0-0.2%]; mean M3D  $\pm$  SD: 4.3  $\pm$  10.6 m). Yet, the variability remained greater among rehabilitated turtles than among captively reared turtles, especially for M3D, highlighting inter-individual variability as a key differentiating factor.



**Figure 3: Vertical diving behavior of loggerhead sea turtles.**

On the left (a-c): mean Time-at-Depth distributions for small (a), intermediate (b) and large (c) loggerhead size classes. Each colored horizontal bar represents the mean fraction of time spent in the different vertical layers with the surface (orange) and 5-meter depth bins (shades of blue). The lowest (dark blue) horizontal bar corresponds to the time spent at all depths below 30 m. On each, the interquartile range is represented by grey horizontal bars, as well as the total range of daily values (dashed line).

On the right (d): Maximum Daily Diving Depth (M3D) distribution for each size class. The horizontal solid line represents the average M3D, the vertical grey bar shows the interquartile range, and the total range is represented by the vertical dashed line.


Intermediate-sized loggerheads ( $15.0 \leq \text{SCL} < 21.0$  cm), released either from Florida ( $n = 1$ ), France ( $n = 5$ ), or South Africa ( $n = 2$ ), also remained predominantly surface-oriented but showed a slight increase in dive depth and, in particular, a greater variability. Mean %DT increased to 3.1% (CI95: 2.3-3.8%) with daily values ranging from 0.0 to 65.0% (Figure 3b). Similarly, mean M3D rose from 4.5 m (SD: 9.1 m) to 14.2 m (SD: 14.0 m) with daily values ranging from 0.0 to 87.0 m and less than 30% of them occurring shallower than 5 m (Figure 3d). Time in the upper layers remained

dominant, but use of intermediate depths slightly increased to 0.9% (CI95: 0.7-1.2%) between 5-10 m and 1.5% (CI95: 1.1-1.9%) between 10-15 m (Figure 3b). Time spent below 15 m remained below 0.5%. Interestingly, 40% of M3Ds were deeper than 15m. This usage of the water column indicates that while deeper dives can occur, they were generally rare and brief.

The largest juvenile loggerheads ( $26.0 \leq \text{SCL} \leq 28.0$  cm) exhibited a distinct shift in vertical behavior relative to the two other size classes. They spent a greater proportion of each day (measured as mean %DT [CI95]) diving (26.5% [23.2-29.8%]) (Figure 3c), and diving more deeply: mean M3D increased to 78.6 m (SD: 31.8 m, range: 12.0-160.0 m). Over 80% of the M3D values were deeper than 50 m and 25% were deeper than 100 m (Figure 3d). These turtles used the entire sampled vertical range, with all sampled depths spanning more than 0.5% of the day. They remained near the surface most of the time (mean %DT [CI95]: 26.5% [23.2-29.8%]), yet also, uniquely, exhibited a strong bimodal use of the water column. Intermediate depths were largely bypassed, with an average of 0.6% (CI95: 0.2-1.0%) of the time spent between 5-10 m and 0.9% (CI95: 0.3-1.4%) between 10-15 m, while use of depths below 15 m increased, with an average of 1.9% (CI95: 1.3-2.5%) of the time spent between 15-20 m, 5.4% (CI95: 4.3-6.5%) between 20-25 m, 6.5% (CI95: 5.3-7.8%) between 25-30 m, and 11.2% (CI95: 9.0-13.4%) beyond 30 m (Figure 3c). Ninety-five percent of M3D values from the largest loggerheads exceeded 30 m, supporting their bimodal usage of the water column.

## **Vertical behavior characterization for leatherback sea turtles**

Small leatherbacks displayed a surface-oriented behavior with an average %DT of 4.5% (CI95: 3.6-5.4%) and never exceeded 25% in a single day (Figure 4a). However, they routinely dove beyond 10 m with 84% of days recording M3D deeper than 10 m and an average M3D of 25.4 m (SD: 15.7 m). The deepest recorded dive for this size class was 106 meters (Figure 4c). The use of the water column confirmed a surface habitat but also indicated that deeper dives were relatively frequent. The small juvenile leatherbacks spent on average 3.8% (CI95: 3.0-4.5%) of their time between 10-20 m, 0.7% (CI95: 0.4-1.0%) between 20-30 m and less than 0.5% in greater depths yet not exceeding 40 m in mean depth. The data support surface-oriented to relatively shallow depth habitat, punctuated by brief but frequent dives, mainly between 10 and 30 m (Figure 4a).



**Figure 4: Vertical diving behavior of juvenile leatherback sea turtles.**

On the left: mean Time-at-Depth distributions for small (a) and large (b) leatherback size classes. Each colored horizontal bar represents the mean fraction of time spent in the different vertical layers with the surface (orange) and 10-meter depth bins (shades of blue). The last (dark blue) horizontal bar corresponds to the time spent at all depths below 60 m. On each, the interquartile range is represented by grey horizontal bars, as well as the total range of daily values (dashed line).

On the right: Maximum Daily Diving Depth (M3D) distribution (c) for each size class. The horizontal solid line represents the average M3D, the vertical grey bar shows the interquartile range, and the total range is represented by the vertical dashed line.

Data from the largest leatherbacks showed a dramatically different profile from the small leatherbacks. The larger juveniles spent significantly more time diving, with a mean %DT rising from 4.5% (CI95: 3.6-5.4%) in small leatherbacks to 31.5% (CI95: 25.5-37.6%) in the large leatherbacks (Figure 4b). Large juveniles also had much deeper dives compared to the small leatherbacks with an M3D average of 94.5 m (SD: 33.6 m, range: 53.0-184.0 m) (Figure 4c). Large juvenile individuals still exhibited an important use of the near-surface layer of the water column (mean time spent in the first 10

meters of the water column [CI95]: 59.9% [53.3-66.5%]), but on average, they spent less time directly at the surface: at 8.1% (CI95: 6.1-10.1%). Instead, large juvenile leatherbacks spent more time at greater depths with an average of 8.7% (CI95: 7.0-10.3%) of the time spent between 10-20 m, 8.9% (CI95: 7.1-10.6%) between 20-30 m, 8.7% (CI95: 6.2-11.1%) between 30-40 m, 4.1% (CI95: 2.1-6.0%) between 40-50 m and 1.1% (CI95: 0.2-2.0%) between 50-60 m (Figure 4b). More than 95% of M3D values were deeper than 60 meters, but time use below 60 m was less than 0.5%, suggesting that deep dives were relatively short but recurrent.

### **Variation of the vertical behavior with size at the time of the release**

The GAMMs revealed a significant ( $p$ -values  $< 0.001$ ) relationship between body size (SCL) at the time of the release and vertical behavior for loggerheads and for leatherbacks (Table 2). In loggerheads, %DT and M3D remained low for the smallest individuals and increased with size, especially for turtles larger than 15 cm (Figure S4-1). In leatherbacks, similar results were found and, while %DT showed a pronounced increase for the larger individuals, M3D increased more continuously with size across the observed range, showing an almost linear relationship between the smallest and the largest turtles (Figure S4-1).

Species	Response variables	Estimated degrees of freedom for turtle size	Reference degrees of freedom for turtle size	Statistics	p-value
Loggerhead	%DT	2.821	2.887	434.101	$< 0.001$
	M3D	2.952	2.961	34.520	$< 0.001$
Leatherback	%DT	2.312	2.482	26.470	$< 0.001$


	M3D	1.281	1.486	56.740	< 0.001
--	-----	-------	-------	--------	------------

**Table 2: Statistical analysis of vertical behavior in relation to body size at the time of the release.**

Results from Generalized Additive Mixed Models (GAMMs) assessing the effect of the Straight Carapace Length (SCL) at the time of the release on the fraction of time spent diving (%DT) and the Maximum Daily Diving Depth (M3D), analyzed separately for each species. For %DT, smooth terms were characterized using chi-squared statistics, whereas for M3D, smooth terms were characterized using F-statistics.

## **Variation of the vertical behavior with time elapsed since the release**

Small and intermediate-sized loggerheads showed consistently minimal vertical activity with very little variation throughout the tracking period, as supported by averages presented above. In contrast, the two largest loggerheads (rehabilitated animals) displayed a progressive increase in their %DT and M3D over the first weeks at sea, followed by a gradual decline (Figure 5a, Figure 5d).



**Figure 5: Individual time series of diving time (%DT) and Maximum Daily Diving Depth (M3D).**

Panels (a-c) show individual time series of %DT for the two large rehabilitated loggerheads (a), small juvenile leatherbacks (b), and the single larger juvenile leatherbacks with multi-day data (c). Panels (d-f) show the corresponding M3D time series.

On each panel, the nominal behavior range is represented (in red) as the 95% confidence interval (CI95) for %DT and as the average plus or minus one standard deviation for M3D. Nominal behavior thresholds are represented by black dashed lines. Individual time series: colored dots represent different individuals.

For leatherbacks, during their first days at sea, most individuals exhibited low %DT and M3D (Figure 5b, Figure 5e). On Day 1, 95% of individuals had %DT values below the class average (4.5%), with low inter-individual variability (CI95: 0.1-0.2%). Over Days 2-4, both the variability and the proportion of individuals exceeding the average steadily increased, as did their M3D values. By Day 3, 94% of turtles had reached the nominal M3D

range, which remained stable for the following two weeks. Deeper dives beyond 60 m in small leatherbacks were mostly observed after this two-week period, though these were short or sporadic, and did not lead to increased %DT values. Interestingly, the only large leatherback with multi-day data did not exhibit an initial adjustment phase and instead exhibited nominal %DT and M3D values from the beginning (Figure 5c, Figure 5f). However, deeper dives beyond 100 m also emerged only after two weeks, and unlike the smaller turtles, these were accompanied by increased %DT, suggesting longer or more sustained activity.

The GAMMs similarly revealed contrasting relationships between time elapsed since release and vertical diving behavior in loggerhead and leatherback turtles (Table 3). While the %DT was not significantly related to time elapsed since the release for loggerheads (p-value: 0.571), a significant relationship was found between %DT and the time elapsed since the release for leatherbacks (p-value: 0.004). More precisely, leatherbacks exhibited very low values of %DT during approximately the first 4 days after their release, followed by a stabilization phase and a further increase after about 20 days at sea (Figure S5-1). The M3D was significantly related to the time elapsed since the release for both species when considering the full range of tracking durations (p-values: < 0.05). In that context, M3D from loggerheads remained relatively stable during the first 50 days at sea and then increased to a peak around 130 days, before a further decrease. Because this late increase, occurring nearly 2 months after the release, is unlikely to reflect post-release acclimation processes, the analysis was repeated using only the first 30 days of each loggerhead track. Within this

restricted period, no significant relationship between M3D and the time elapsed since release was detected for loggerheads (p-value: 0.402). In contrast, leatherback turtles showed a significant (p-value: 0.04) and approximately linear increase in M3D over the duration of their tracks (i.e. up to about 30 days).

Species	Response variables	Estimated degrees of freedom for time elapsed since release	Reference degrees of freedom for time elapsed since release	Statistics	p-value
Loggerhead	%DT	1.005	1.010	0.329	0.571
	M3D	2.971	2.999	38.730	< 0.001
	M3D (< 30 days)	1.000	1.001	0.704	0.402
Leatherback	%DT	2.498	2.816	13.410	0.004
	M3D	1.000	1.000	8.480	0.004

**Table 3: Statistical analysis of vertical behavior in relation to the time elapsed since the release.**

Results from Generalized Additive Mixed Models (GAMMs) assessing the effect of the time elapsed since the release on the fraction of time spent diving (%DT) and the Maximum Daily Diving Depth (M3D), analyzed separately for each species. For %DT, smooth terms were characterized using chi-squared statistics, whereas for M3D, smooth terms were characterized using F-statistics.


## Variation of the vertical behavior with environmental variables

In contrast with the small and intermediate-sized juvenile loggerheads, which exhibited very limited vertical activity without any associations with environmental drivers such as temperature, SWH, or chl-a concentration, interesting observations were made for the two largest individuals of this species within our tracking dataset. Small and intermediate-sized loggerheads consistently maintained a surface-oriented behavior regardless of ocean conditions, but the two largest individuals within our dataset displayed two distinct phases of vertical behavior, which may correspond to contrasting ocean conditions.

First, the two largest juvenile loggerhead turtles of this study were released in the Azores during late summer (on August 25<sup>th</sup>, 2024) during a very warm sea surface temperature (SST) episode for the area. During the first month of the tracking period, a warm surface mixed layer (SST between 21.2 and 26.1°C) was clearly observed. Its depth was stable (close to 30 m) with a sharp thermocline beneath it, suggesting minimal vertical mixing between the mixed layer and the underlying thermocline. A well-marked chl-a maximum was present within the thermocline, typically between 40 and 60 m (Figure 6). During this period, the two large loggerheads exhibited a clear bimodal use of the water column, being predominantly within the first 5 m of the water column (mean [CI95]: 63.4% [59.7-67.1%]) or below 20 m (mean [CI95]: 34.4% [30.8-38.0%]). These turtles also performed daily deep dives, reaching an average M3D of 95.0 m (SD: 28.0 m) (Figure 6). The water temperature at these depths was close to 16.5°C, the water temperature difference between the surface and the M3D being close to a 7.5°C differential.

The upper ocean started to cool down with the arrival of autumn and SST progressively decreased below 20°C. The temperature gradient between the upper mixed layer and the thermocline decreased markedly, facilitating turbulent vertical mixing and deepening of the mixed layer. This vertical mixing led to a more uniform distribution of chl-a in the water column as it brought the chl-a from the enriched thermocline waters into the mixed layer (Figure 6). Within the same timeframe, the vertical movements of the two large juvenile loggerheads changed to a predominantly surface-oriented behavior (Figure 6). They spent an average of 35.0% (CI95: 31.5-38.6%) of

their time at the surface and 50.3% (CI95: 47.3-53.3%) within the first 5 m of 50.3% (CI95: 47.3-53.3%). Lower depths were rarely but evenly used. On average, the two individuals spent only 1.2% (CI95: 0.4-2.1%) of their time between 5-10 m, 1.5% (CI95: 0.4-2.6%) between 10-15 m, 1.9% (CI95: 1.0-2.9%) between 15-20 m, 3.8% (CI95: 2.3-5.4%) between 20-25 m, 2.2% (CI95: 1.4-3.1%) between 25-30 m, and 4.1% (CI95: 2.8-5.4%) below 30 m. In addition to their surface-oriented behaviors, deep dives were also less frequent during that period and the average M3D decreased to 59.4 m (SD: 24.6 m). For comparison purposes, this seasonal shift in vertical behavior was not observed in small and intermediate-sized individuals. In both warm (SST  $\geq 24^{\circ}\text{C}$ ) and in colder (SST  $< 24^{\circ}\text{C}$ ) waters, these turtles remained almost exclusively at or near the surface with a mean fraction of time spent above 5 m of more than 95% for both the smallest and the intermediate-sized individuals.



**Figure 6: Significant wave height, Time-at-Depth (TaD) distributions and vertical profiles of sea water temperatures and chlorophyll-a concentrations along the**


**two largest juvenile loggerhead trajectories.**

Significant wave heights (first/top panels), Time at Depth (TaD) distributions (second panels), vertical distributions of sea water temperature (third panels) and vertical distributions of chlorophyll-a concentrations (fourth/bottom panels) along the trajectories of the two largest loggerhead sea turtles equipped with tags n°265785 (a) and n°265786 (b). On third and fourth panels, Maximum Daily Diving Depth (M3D) are represented as red dots.

Small leatherbacks were all released during either the summer or the fall season. They dispersed within the very warm waters of the Gulf Stream's environment and, consequently, they experienced an average SST of 28.9°C (SD: 1.8°C) along their trajectories. Despite these very warm surface conditions, they mostly remained near the surface, as reflected by their low average %DT of 4.5% (CI95: 3.6-5.4%). Only a small seasonal difference was observed in their vertical behaviors with a higher fraction of time spent diving during summer months (August-September) than during autumn months (October-November) (Figure 7). Indeed, the average %DT decreases from 7.3% (CI95: 5.9-8.6%) during summer months to 0.8% (CI95: 0.4-1.2%) during autumn months. These small juvenile leatherbacks jointly performed relatively deep dives on a daily basis as shown by their average M3D of 25.4 m (SD: 15.7m) but no clear seasonal variation was observed between summer and autumn months with a mean M3D of 27.7 m (SD: 14.1 m) and 22.1 m (SD: 17.2 m), respectively (Figure 7). Whatever the season, the surface waters were warm (average SST higher than 27.0°C for both seasons). Because of the deep thermocline (60-100 m) of the Gulf Stream, the temperatures encountered while diving were barely different from the surface with average temperature differences smaller than 1.0°C between the surface and these depths for both seasons (Figure 7). Despite no clear seasonal difference in the maximum depths reached by the turtles, one interesting observation is that while the water column was stratified

during summer months, with low surface chl-a concentration and a well-defined deep maximum roughly between 30 and 70 meters (Figure 7a); during the autumn season, the chl-a concentration was relatively uniform and high throughout the whole turtles' diving range (Figure 7b). In that context, while the deep dives performed during the autumn season remained within the mixed and nutrient-rich surface layer, the deep dives performed in summer generally terminated just above the deep chl-a maximum (Figure 7).


ARTICLE IN PRESS



**Figure 7: Significant wave height, Time at Depth distributions and vertical profiles of sea water temperatures and chlorophyll-a concentrations along the two longest small leatherback trajectories, released in the summer or in the autumn season.**

Significant wave heights (first/top panels), Time at Depth (TaD) distributions (second panels), vertical distributions of sea water temperature (third panels) and vertical distributions of chlorophyll-a concentrations (fourth/bottom panels) along the two longest trajectories of small leatherback sea turtles equipped with tags n°245114 (a), which was released during the summer season, and n°266103 (b), which was released during the autumn season. On third and fourth panels, Maximum Daily Diving Depth (M3D) are represented as red dots.

In contrast with the smallest leatherbacks, the vertical activity of the only large early-stage leatherback (SCL: 27.60 cm) revealed that this individual experienced much colder water temperatures than at the surface. This turtle was released during early April (on April 2<sup>nd</sup>, 2024), within the very warm waters of the Andaman Sea, and experienced an average SST of 31.8°C (SD: 0.4°C) (Figure 8). For the entire tracking period, the water column was thermally well stratified with a 20 to 30 m deep mixed layer with water temperatures over 30°C. While the turtle spent over 85% of its time above 10-20 m, M3Ds, generally in the range of 50 to 120 m were observed every day, and occasionally reached depths below 150 m. At these M3Ds, the mean water temperature encountered at M3Ds was close to 21°C and the average temperature difference between the surface and the M3D was 10.6°C, much larger than the temperature differences experienced by the small leatherbacks. These deep dives systematically reached or exceeded the lower bound of the deep chl-a maximum, which seems to seasonally plunge by mostly starting around 10-15 m during the first 18 days of the tracking period and around 20-25 m afterwards. In the same timeframes, the fraction of time spent in the upper 20 m of the water column decreases from 86.7% (CI95: 82.3-91.1%) during the first 18 days of the tracking period, to 62.9% (CI95: 53.4-72.3%) afterwards.



**Figure 8: Significant wave height, Time at Depth distributions and vertical profiles of sea water temperatures and chlorophyll-a concentrations along the selected large early-stage leatherback trajectory.**

Significant wave heights (first/top panel), Time at Depth (TaD) distributions (second panel), vertical distributions of sea water temperature (third panel) and vertical distributions of chlorophyll-a concentrations (fourth/bottom panel) along the trajectory of the large early-stage leatherback sea turtle equipped with tags n°261364. On third and fourth panels, Maximum Daily Diving Depth (M3D) are represented as red dots and blank spaces indicate absence of data where modeled bathymetry is shallower than 200 m.

## Discussion

### Ontogenetic shifts in vertical behavior

These findings demonstrate clear ontogenetic shifts in the extent and complexity of vertical habitat use and diving behavior for both juvenile loggerhead and leatherback sea turtles. Our results showed that as individuals age and grow (i.e., as SCL at the time of the release increase), their diving abilities appear to increase, with larger turtles spending more

time diving, reaching greater depths, and showing a greater proportion of sustained sub-surface activity. These ontogenetic changes in the vertical behavior of young sea turtles are consistent with the development of their physiological capacities, notably the increase in oxygen storage and buoyancy control [38-43]. Newly hatched sea turtles initially lack fine control over their specific buoyancy due to immature musculature and relatively small lung volume. Consequently, they are physiologically constrained to remaining at the surface [39]. However, as they grow, buoyancy control improves with the development of necessary physiological adaptations, such as lung capacity and musculature, which impact oxygen storage, aerobic diving capacity and ventilation efficiency. These physiological changes enable older juveniles to sustain longer and deeper dives with lower energetic costs [38,40,41,43-46]. Thus, the ontogenetic changes in dive behavior observed in this study could be explained by physiological changes that occur as the turtles develop and grow.

As size increased, the use of the water column became more extensive and structured. While the smaller individuals remained primarily in the upper part of the water column and exhibited surface-dominant behavior, larger individuals adopted a broader vertical strategy that involved consistent use of greater ocean depths. Large juvenile loggerheads routinely exploited depths beyond 30 m and showed bimodal use of the water column, concentrated near the surface and in greater depths with minimal use of intermediate depths. This bimodal vertical pattern, already observed in much larger oceanic juveniles (SCL: 35-65 cm) in the North Atlantic and

Pacific Ocean [47,48], suggests a targeted use of the water column, with intermediate layers likely serving as a transit zone between the surface, where individuals mostly breathe and rest, and a preferred deeper layer. As previously reported for larger juvenile and adult loggerhead sea turtles, preferences may be induced by higher prey density, thermoregulatory needs, or optimization of swimming conditions [47-52]. In leatherbacks, we observed similar ontogenetic shifts, with the larger individuals diving more frequently and to greater depths with much less time spent at the surface than the smallest individuals. As diving capacity increases with growth, leatherback sea turtles are able to use the water column more extensively and flexibly [53,54]. Consequently, the need to rest at the surface after each dive likely diminishes and while surfacing remains essential for breathing, the reduced surface residency in larger turtles may indicate a decreased reliance on surface recovery periods, enabling longer submersion periods. This phenomenon has been observed in other marine vertebrates [55], although the underlying physiological mechanisms likely differ. Leatherbacks should gain access to a wider range of depths as they grow, and therefore, to a wider range of foraging resources. Adult leatherback sea turtles are known to forage throughout the water column, exploiting gelatinous zooplankton that occur from surface waters to well below the epipelagic zone [56-61]. The increasing vertical range observed in larger juvenile leatherbacks in this study aligns with this ecological role, suggesting that as physiological constraints relax with growth, individuals begin to access a greater diversity of foraging opportunities throughout the water column.

## **Acclimation to a new environment**

After spending months in shallow and controlled environments during captive rearing or rehabilitation, some juvenile sea turtles may require a short post-release acclimation period. This transitional phase likely allows individuals to (re)discover their diving capacities, adjust to the open ocean, and recover from potential stress related to captivity, handling, or tagging [62].

Overall, the data suggests the existence of a short post-release acclimation period of about 4 days, especially for the smallest leatherback turtles. Once acclimated, individuals settled into a consistent diving routine for a week or two and, in some cases, began exploring greater ocean depths afterward. This pattern was not observed in the loggerheads of this dataset.

## **Environmental drivers of vertical behavior**

Environmental conditions such as sea state, temperature gradients, prey distribution and predation risk are known to influence the vertical behavior of marine megafauna, including sea turtles [63–71]. In particular, thermoregulatory and foraging strategies have been proposed as key drivers shaping diving patterns across life stages and species [50,61,72].

In our dataset, small and intermediate-sized juvenile loggerheads remained largely confined to or near the surface, with deep dives occurring only rarely and showing very limited variations across ocean conditions. This conforms to the generally surface-oriented behavior described in the literature for oceanic juvenile loggerheads [39,47,48,50], while still reflecting

physiological limits that restrict the extent of their vertical movements [39]. In contrast, noteworthy observations have been made with the other individuals, including the two largest loggerheads and the leatherbacks. However, given the limited number of individuals and the complexity of the multi-dimensional relationships between vertical behavior and the three-dimensional structure of the environment over time, the associations described below are presented as descriptive observations only. They cannot be interpreted as demonstrated environmental drivers but may help generate hypotheses for future studies.

The two largest loggerheads exhibited seasonally variable vertical behavior. During the first month following their release in summer, both turtles showed a bimodal use of the water column, within highly stratified waters. This vertical behavior enabled them to experience strong thermal gradients and to access waters much cooler than at the surface, close to their presumed preferred temperature around 18°C [73,74]. As surface waters cooled later in the season, the water column mixed and this vertical behavior shifted toward a mostly surface-oriented distribution. A similar seasonal signal was observed in small leatherbacks, spending a greater fraction of time diving during summer than during autumn. However, for these individuals, the deep dives did not expose them to large thermal gradients. The only large juvenile leatherback for which multiple days of dive data were received only experienced warm water conditions. Although it remained predominantly in the upper and very warm 30 m, this turtle frequently dived to about 100 m, experiencing strong thermal gradients and consistently reaching waters between 22 and 24°C, which could be close to

its preferred body temperature [75]. Such vertical patterns observed in warm surface waters and seasonal changes may evoke thermoregulatory processes. However, given the small sizes (SCL < 30 cm) and low body masses (< 5 kg) of these early-stage juvenile loggerheads and leatherbacks, their limited thermal inertia likely constrains the extent to which sustained thermoregulation through diving can be achieved [65-67]. Sea water temperature alone may not account for the observed vertical behavior.

In addition, observations involving vertical distribution of chl-a, used here as a proxy for prey availability, may point toward a potential link with foraging strategies. Deep chl-a maximums are known to concentrate biodiversity (predators and prey alike) much like a deep scattering layer [76]. Dives reaching or extending beyond this layer may thus reflect active targeting of these prey-rich habitats, perhaps after initial exploratory dives and subsequent strategies [61,69,76]. As autumn progresses and vertical mixing disrupts the stratification that likely supported these aggregations [77-79], chl-a and prey tend to become more evenly distributed throughout the water column and a more surface-oriented vertical behavior was observed.

Altogether, these observations indicate that the vertical behavior of early-stage juvenile sea turtles may reflect interactions with multiple aspects of their physical and biological environment. While thermal structure and prey distribution may both be relevant to the observed patterns, the present dataset does not allow their respective influences to be disentangled or quantified. Concurrent oceanographic measurements and prey sampling in

these habitats would help to elucidate the finer scale drivers of juvenile sea turtle vertical behavior.

This study provides the most extensive and detailed description to date of vertical behaviors in very early-stage juvenile loggerhead and leatherback sea turtles, revealing key ontogenetic and behavioral patterns that shape how these individuals interact with their three-dimensional environment. By improving our understanding of mechanisms during the Lost Years, this work offers a rare empirical foundation for anticipating juvenile movements in the open ocean and for assessing the conditions under which young turtles may encounter anthropogenic threats. These insights can support the development of more realistic three-dimensional representations of juvenile behavior in dispersal frameworks and can ultimately inform conservation strategies and guide the formulation of three-dimensional marine protected areas, reducing incidental mortality risks and optimizing conservation strategies for the most vulnerable stages of the sea turtle life cycle.

## **Author contribution statement**

T.C., P.G., and G.L.S. conceived the study. T.C., J.W., E.T., T.N.T., R.N., H.K., P.S., T.U., J.O., I.K., K.Ma., K.Mi., N.O., F.V., A.M.F., A.H., M.D.B., F.D.A., A.N., J.N., I.G., and G.L.S. conducted fieldwork including animal care, tag attachment and sea turtle release. G.L.S., P.G., and T.C. designed field tracking experiments in collaboration with local and regional teams from coauthor institutions. T.C. and G.L.S. acquired the sea turtle tracking data. T.C. processed sea turtle tracking data with input from coauthors regarding

turtle metadata and release information. H.B. ran statistical models and performed associated analyses. T.C. and P.G. performed the joint analysis of sea turtle tracking data and operational oceanography products. T.C. developed and ran all Python software tools needed for analysis and data visualization. T.C. wrote the initial draft of the manuscript with support from P.G., G.L.S., J.W., E.T., F.D.A., and H.B.. All authors contributed to the paper revision. All authors read and approved the final manuscript.

## **Additional information**

### **Competing Interest**

The authors declare no competing interests.

### **Data availability**

Restrictions apply to the availability of these data. Data were obtained from Upwell Turtles and are part of an ongoing collaborative research program involving multiple institutions. Due to ongoing analyses and planned publications, the full dataset is not publicly available at this stage. However, data are available upon reasonable request to the corresponding author and George L. Shillinger ([george@upwell.org](mailto:george@upwell.org)), with permission from Upwell Turtles.

### **Acknowledgment**

This study was financially and kindly supported by Upwell Turtles, Mercator Ocean International and the Copernicus Marine Service of the European

Union, and Aquarium La Rochelle. The authors would like to acknowledge the whole Upwell team and board of directors, in particular Dr. K. Reed for her invaluable operational support, K. Fisher for her administrative and programmatic support, and K. Sargent for her media and outreach support. The Florida-based team acknowledges the essential assistance of S. Antenoff, C. Bennice, E. Edds, E. Schulteis, and S. Trail for leatherback husbandry. We also would like to thank the South African Association for Marine Biological Research (SAAMBR) for logistical support, including facilities and transportation, and iSimangaliso Wetland Park Authority for permission to conduct turtle release activities within a protected marine reserve and World Heritage Site. The Aquarium La Rochelle team would like to acknowledge the volunteer correspondents of the East Atlantic Sea Turtle Network coordinated by the Aquarium La Rochelle who work in the field, participate in rescue operations and bring sea turtles to the CESTM for treatment and for data collection. The Azores team would like to acknowledge the invaluable help of its partners: whale watching companies, fishers, Flying Sharks and the regional stranding network RACA (Rede de Arrojamento de Cetáceos dos Açores). The authors also acknowledge M. Authier for his useful advice on the statistical analysis of the tracking data.

## **Funding**

T.C. was financially supported by Upwell Turtles, Mercator Ocean International and the Copernicus Marine Service of the European Union, and Aquarium La Rochelle. Work in the Azores was developed by the COSTA (COnsolidating Sea Turtle conservation in the Azores, [costaproject.org](http://costaproject.org))

project funded by the Marine Turtle Conservation Fund of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Agreement number F21AP02724), the Archie Carr Center for Sea Turtle Research through support from the Disney Conservation Fund, and the Regional Directorate for Fisheries (DRP), and the LIFE IP Azores Natura project (LIFE17IPE/PT/000010) funded by the European Commission. F.V. was supported by the Investigator Programme of the Fundação para a Ciência e Tecnologia (FCT CEECIND/03426/2020). IICM Okeanos acknowledges support from FCT – Foundation for Science and Technology, I.P., under the project UIDB/05634/2025 and UIDP/05634/2025 and through the Regional Government of the Azores through the project M1.1.A/FUNC.UI&D/003/2021-2024 and the project M1.1.A/REEQ.CIENTÍFICO UI&D/2021/010.

## References

1. Hazen, E. L. *et al.* Ontogeny in marine tagging and tracking science: technologies and data gaps. *Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser.* **457**, 221–240 (2012).
2. Shillinger, G. L. *et al.* Tagging through the stages: technical and ecological challenges in observing life histories through biologging. *Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser.* **457**, 165–170 (2012).
3. Block, B. A. Physiological ecology in the 21st century: advancements in biologging science. *Integr. Comp. Biol.* **45**, 305–320 (2005).
4. Spotila, J. R. *et al.* Worldwide population decline of *Dermochelys coriacea*: are leatherback turtles going extinct? *Chelonian Conserv. Biol.* **2**, 209–222 (1996).
5. Mazaris, A. D., Broder, B. & Matsinos, Y. G. An individual based model of a sea turtle population to analyze effects of age dependent mortality. *Ecol. Model.* **198**, 174–182 (2006).

6. Carr, A. *Handbook of Turtles: The Turtles of the United States, Canada, and Baja California*. (Cornell University Press, 1952).
7. Mansfield, K. L. *et al.* Satellite tag attachment methods for tracking neonate sea turtles. *Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser.* **457**, 181-192 (2012).
8. Mansfield, K. L., Wyneken, J., Porter, W. P. & Luo, J. First satellite tracks of neonate sea turtles redefine the 'lost years' oceanic niche. *Proc. R. Soc. B Biol. Sci.* **281**, 20133039 (2014).
9. Mansfield, K. L. *et al.* First satellite tracks of South Atlantic sea turtle 'lost years': seasonal variation in trans-equatorial movement. *Proc. R. Soc. B Biol. Sci.* **284**, 20171730 (2017).
10. Mansfield, K. L., Wyneken, J. & Luo, J. First Atlantic satellite tracks of 'lost years' green turtles support the importance of the Sargasso Sea as a sea turtle nursery. *Proc. R. Soc. B* **288**, 20210057 (2021).
11. Barbour, N. *et al.* Satellite Tracking of Head-Started Juvenile Green Turtles (*Chelonia mydas*) Reveals Release Effects and an Ontogenetic Shift. *Animals* **13**, 1218 (2023).
12. Candela, T. *et al.* Novel Microsatellite Tags Hold Promise for Illuminating the Lost Years in Four Sea Turtle Species. *Animals* **14**, 903 (2024).
13. Barbour, N. *et al.* Environmental and biological factors influencing dispersal of neonate leatherback turtles (*Dermochelys coriacea*) from an endangered Costa Rican nesting population. *Front. Mar. Sci.* **7**, 937 (2020).
14. Hoover, A. L., Shillinger, G. L., Williamson, S. A., Reina, R. D. & Bailey, H. Nearshore neonate dispersal of Atlantic leatherback turtles (*Dermochelys coriacea*) from a non-recovering subpopulation. *Sci. Rep.* **10**, 18748 (2020).
15. Wallace, B. P. *et al.* Impacts of fisheries bycatch on marine turtle populations worldwide: toward conservation and research priorities. *Ecosphere* **4**, 1-49 (2013).

16. Swimmer, Y. *et al.* Sea turtle bycatch mitigation in US longline fisheries. *Front. Mar. Sci.* **4**, 260 (2017).
17. Báez, J. C., García-Barcelona, S., Camiñas, J. A. & Macías, D. Fishery strategy affects the loggerhead sea turtle mortality trend due to the longline bycatch. *Fish. Res.* **212**, 21–28 (2019).
18. Barbour, N. *et al.* Incorporating multidimensional behavior into a risk management tool for a critically endangered and migratory species. *Conserv. Biol.* **37**, e14114 (2023).
19. Barbour, N. *et al.* Clustering and classification of vertical movement profiles for ecological inference of behavior. *Ecosphere* **14**, e4384 (2023).
20. Casale, P. & Tucker, A. D. *Caretta caretta*. The IUCN Red List of Threatened Species. <https://doi.org/http://dx.doi.org/10.2305/IUCN.UK.2017-2.RLTS.T3897A119333622.en> (2017)  
doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.2305/IUCN.UK.2017-2.RLTS.T3897A119333622.en>.
21. Wallace, B., Tiwari, M. & Girondot, M. *Dermochelys coriacea*. The IUCN Red List of Threatened Species.  
<https://doi.org/https://dx.doi.org/10.2305/IUCN.UK.2013-2.RLTS.T6494A43526147.en> (2013)  
doi:<https://dx.doi.org/10.2305/IUCN.UK.2013-2.RLTS.T6494A43526147.en>.
22. Kanghae, H. *et al.* First successful head-start program of leatherback sea turtles (*Dermochelys coriacea*) in Thailand and proposed dietary strategy. *Zoo Biol.* **43**, 110–122 (2023).
23. Jones, T. T., Hastings, M. D., Bostrom, B. L., Pauly, D. & Jones, D. R. Growth of captive leatherback turtles, *Dermochelys coriacea*, with inferences on growth in the wild: Implications for population decline and recovery. *J. Exp. Mar. Biol. Ecol.* **399**, 84–92 (2011).

24. Ramirez, M. D., Popovska, T. & Babcock, E. A. Global synthesis of sea turtle von Bertalanffy growth parameters through Bayesian hierarchical modeling. *Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser.* **657**, 191–207 (2021).
25. Murray, D. L. & Fuller, M. R. A critical review of the effects of marking on the biology of vertebrates. *Res. Tech. Anim. Ecol. Controv. Consequences* 15–64 (2000).
26. Kenward, R. A manual for wildlife radio tagging: behaviour and home ranges. *Man. Wildl. Radio Tagging* 201–232 (2001).
27. Vandenabeele, S. P., Shepard, E. L., Grogan, A. & Wilson, R. P. When three per cent may not be three per cent; device-equipped seabirds experience variable flight constraints. *Mar. Biol.* **159**, 1–14 (2012).
28. Altman, D., Machin, D., Bryant, T. & Gardner, M. *Statistics with Confidence: Confidence Intervals and Statistical Guidelines*. (John Wiley & Sons, 2013).
29. Jonsen, I. D. *et al.* aniMotum, an R package for animal movement data: Rapid quality control, behavioural estimation and simulation. *Methods Ecol. Evol.* **14**, 806–816 (2023).
30. E.U. Copernicus Marine Service Information (CMEMS). Global Ocean Physics Analysis and Forecast. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.48670/moi-00016>.
31. E.U. Copernicus Marine Service Information (CMEMS). Global Ocean Waves Analysis and Forecast. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.48670/moi-00017>.
32. E.U. Copernicus Marine Service Information (CMEMS). Global Ocean Biogeochemistry Analysis and Forecast. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.48670/moi-00015>.
33. Ardhuin, F. *et al.* Semi-Empirical Dissipation Source Functions for Wind-Wave Models: Part I, Definition, Calibration and Validation at Global Scales. *J Phys Ocean.* **40**, 1917–1941 (2010).


34. Janssen, P. *et al.* Final report of work package I in my wave project. *Cited On* 17 (2014).
35. Jakobsson, M. Global bathymetric data sets-general bathymetric chart of the oceans (GEBCO). *Boll. Geofis.* **195**, (2016).
36. R Core Team. R: A language and environment for statistical computing. R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria. *Httpwww R-Proj. Org* (2022).
37. Wood, S. N. Fast stable restricted maximum likelihood and marginal likelihood estimation of semiparametric generalized linear models. *J. R. Stat. Soc. Ser. B Stat. Methodol.* **73**, 3–36 (2011).
38. Deraniyagala, P. Some postnatal changes in the leathery turtle, *Dermochelys coriacea*. *Ceylon J Sci* **19**, 225–239 (1936).
39. Milsom, W. K. Development of buoyancy control in juvenile Atlantic loggerhead turtles, *Caretta c. caretta*. *Copeia* **1975**, 758–762 (1975).
40. Lutcavage, M. E., Bushnell, P. G. & Jones, D. R. Oxygen transport in the leatherback sea turtle *Dermochelys coriacea*. *Physiol. Zool.* **63**, 1012–1024 (1990).
41. Paladino, F., Spotila, J., O'Connor, M. & Gatten Jr, R. Respiratory Physiology of Adult Leatherback Turtles (*Dermochelys coriacea*) While Nesting on Land. *Chelonian Conserv. Biol.* **2**, 223–229 (1996).
42. Lutcavage, M. E. & Lutz, P. L. Diving physiology. in *The Biology of Sea Turtles, Volume 1* 277–296 (CRC press, 1997).
43. Hochscheid, S., Bentivegna, F. & Speakman, J. R. The dual function of the lung in chelonian sea turtles: buoyancy control and oxygen storage. *J. Exp. Mar. Biol. Ecol.* **297**, 123–140 (2003).
44. Lutcavage, M. E. & Lutz, P. L. Voluntary diving metabolism and ventilation in the loggerhead sea turtle. *J. Exp. Mar. Biol. Ecol.* **147**, 287–296 (1991).



45. Salmon, M., Jones, T. T. & Horch, K. W. Ontogeny of diving and feeding behavior in juvenile sea turtles: leatherback sea turtles (*Dermochelys coriacea* L) and green sea turtles (*Chelonia mydas* L) in the Florida Current. *J. Herpetol.* **38**, 36–43 (2004).
46. Robinson, N. & Paladino, F. Diving behavior and physiology of the leatherback turtle. *Leatherback Turt.* 21–31 (2015).
47. Howell, E. A. *et al.* Oceanographic influences on the dive behavior of juvenile loggerhead turtles (*Caretta caretta*) in the North Pacific Ocean. *Mar. Biol.* **157**, 1011–1026 (2010).
48. Chambault, P. *et al.* Swirling in the ocean: Immature loggerhead turtles seasonally target old anticyclonic eddies at the fringe of the North Atlantic gyre. *Prog. Oceanogr.* **175**, 345–358 (2019).
49. Polovina, J. J., Howell, E., Parker, D. M. & Balazs, G. H. Dive-depth distribution of loggerhead (*Caretta caretta*) and olive ridley (*Lepidochelys olivacea*) sea turtles in the central North Pacific: might deep longline sets catch fewer turtles? (2003).
50. Hochscheid, S. Why we mind sea turtles' underwater business: A review on the study of diving behavior. *J. Exp. Mar. Biol. Ecol.* **450**, 118–136 (2014).
51. Fujita, K. *et al.* Polymorphic foraging tactics in a marine reptile: insight from horizontal movement and dive behavior analyses. *Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser.* **707**, 115–129 (2023).
52. Stokes, K. L. *et al.* Optimization of swim depth across diverse taxa during horizontal travel. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.* **121**, e2413768121 (2024).
53. Davenport, J. *et al.* Ontogenetic changes in tracheal structure facilitate deep dives and cold water foraging in adult leatherback sea turtles. *J. Exp. Biol.* **212**, 3440–3447 (2009).


54. Davenport, J., Jones, T. T., Work, T. M. & Balazs, G. H. Unique characteristics of the trachea of the juvenile leatherback turtle facilitate feeding, diving and endothermy. *J. Exp. Mar. Biol. Ecol.* **450**, 40–46 (2014).
55. Kooyman, G. L. *Weddell Seal, Consummate Diver*. (1981).
56. Limpus, C. A benthic feeding record from neritic waters for the leathery turtle (*Dermochelys coriacea*). *Copeia* 552–553 (1984).
57. Eckert, S. A., Nellis, D. W., Eckert, K. L. & Kooyman, G. L. Diving patterns of two leatherback sea turtles (*Dermochelys coriacea*) during interesting intervals at Sandy Point, St. Croix, US Virgin Islands. *Herpetologica* 381–388 (1986).
58. Eckert, S. A., Eckert, K. L., Ponganis, P. & Kooyman, G. Diving and foraging behavior of leatherback sea turtles (*Dermochelys coriacea*). *Can. J. Zool.* **67**, 2834–2840 (1989).
59. Grant, G. & Ferrell, D. Leatherback turtle, *Dermochelys coriacea* (Reptilia: Dermochelidae): notes on the near-shore feeding behavior and association with cobia. *Brimleyana* 77–81 (1993).
60. Grant, G., Malpass, H. & Beasley, J. Correlation of Leatherback Turtle and Jellyfish Occurrence. *Herpetol. Rev.* **27**, 123–125 (1996).
61. Houghton, J. D., Doyle, T. K., Davenport, J., Wilson, R. P. & Hays, G. C. The role of infrequent and extraordinary deep dives in leatherback turtles (*Dermochelys coriacea*). *J. Exp. Biol.* **211**, 2566–2575 (2008).
62. Manning, J. C., Rosengarten, S., Hooper, C. & Fuentes, M. M. P. B. Post-release changes in the fine-scale diving behavior and activity of loggerhead sea turtles (*Caretta caretta*) from the Northeastern Gulf of Mexico. *Anim. Biotelemetry* **13**, 13 (2025).
63. Sakamoto, W. *et al.* Deep diving behavior of the loggerhead turtle near the frontal zone. *Nippon Suisan Gakkaishi* **56**, 1435–1443 (1990).

64. Hays, G. C. *et al.* The diving behaviour of green turtles at Ascension Island. *Anim. Behav.* **59**, 577–586 (2000).
65. Hochscheid, S., Bentivegna, F. & Hays, G. C. First records of dive durations for a hibernating sea turtle. *Biol. Lett.* **1**, 82–86 (2005).
66. Saba, V. S. *et al.* An Oceanographic Context for the Foraging Ecology of Eastern Pacific Leatherback Turtles: Consequences of ENSO. *Deep Sea Res. Part Oceanogr. Res. Pap.* **55**, 646–660 (2008).
67. Shillinger, G. L. *et al.* Persistent Leatherback Turtle Migrations Present Opportunities for Conservation. *PLoS Biol.* **6**, e171 (2008).
68. Shillinger, G. *et al.* 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 (2010).
69. Shillinger, G. L. *et al.* Vertical and horizontal habitat preferences of post-nesting leatherback turtles in the South Pacific Ocean. *Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser.* **422**, 275–289 (2011).
70. Heithaus, M. R. Predators, prey, and the ecological roles of sea turtles. in *The biology of sea turtles* vol. 3 249 (CRC Press, 2013).
71. Willis-Norton, E. *et al.* Climate change impacts on leatherback turtle pelagic habitat in the Southeast Pacific. *Deep Sea Res. Part II Top. Stud. Oceanogr.* **113**, 260–267 (2015).
72. Okuyama, J., Benson, S. R., Dutton, P. H. & Seminoff, J. A. Changes in dive patterns of leatherback turtles with sea surface temperature and potential foraging habitats. *Ecosphere* **12**, e03365 (2021).
73. Howell, E. A., Kobayashi, D. R., Parker, D. M., Balazs, G. H. & Polovina, J. J. 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 (2008).


74. Abecassis, M. *et al.* A model of loggerhead sea turtle (*Caretta caretta*) habitat and movement in the oceanic North Pacific. *PLoS One* **8**, e73274 (2013).
75. Gaspar, P. & Lalire, M. A model for simulating the active dispersal of juvenile sea turtles with a case study on western Pacific leatherback turtles. *PLoS One* **12**, e0181595 (2017).
76. Backus, R. H. & Clarke, G. L. *Interrelations between the Vertical Migration of Deep Scattering Layers, Bioluminescence, and Changes in Daylight in the Sea.* (1964).
77. Alvarez, I. *et al.* Influence of the Seasonal Thermocline on the Vertical Distribution of Larval Fish Assemblages Associated with Atlantic Bluefin Tuna Spawning Grounds. *Oceans* **2**, 64–83 (2021).
78. Chamberlin, D., Shaw, R. & Rich, A. The Seasons and the Thermoclines. *Our World Ocean: Understanding the Most Important Ecosystem on Earth - Essentials Edition*  
[https://geo.libretexts.org/Bookshelves/Oceanography/Our\\_World\\_Ocean%3A\\_Understanding\\_the\\_Most\\_Important\\_Ecosystem\\_on\\_Earth\\_Essentials\\_Edition%28Chamberlin\\_Shaw\\_and\\_Rich%29/03%3A\\_Voyage\\_III\\_Ocean\\_Physics/11%3A\\_A\\_The\\_Seasons\\_of\\_the\\_Sea/11.07%3A\\_The\\_Seasons\\_and\\_the\\_Thermoclines](https://geo.libretexts.org/Bookshelves/Oceanography/Our_World_Ocean%3A_Understanding_the_Most_Important_Ecosystem_on_Earth_Essentials_Edition%28Chamberlin_Shaw_and_Rich%29/03%3A_Voyage_III_Ocean_Physics/11%3A_A_The_Seasons_of_the_Sea/11.07%3A_The_Seasons_and_the_Thermoclines)  
(2023).
79. Romero, E., Tenorio-Fernandez, L., Portela, E., Montes-Aréchiga, J. & Sánchez-Velasco, L. Improving the thermocline calculation over the global ocean. *Ocean Sci* **19**, 887–901 (2023).




a. **LOGGERHEADS**b. **LEATHERBACKS**




a.




b.




c.




d.




a.




b.




c.




d.










## Small early-stage leatherback - PTT n°245114 - Summer release










ARTICLE IN PRESS














	Number of transmissions	Number of corrupted transmissions	Number of correct transmissions
T5	23,928	1,113	22,815
T6	24,607	759	23,848
Loggerhead	43,304	1,579	41,725
Leatherback	5,321	293	4,938
<b><i>Total</i></b>	<b><i>48,535</i></b>	<b><i>1,872</i></b>	<b><i>46,663</i></b>

**Table S3-1: Results of the Parity Bit Control.**

Species	Response variables	Estimated degrees of freedom for time elapsed since release	Reference degrees of freedom for time elapsed since release	Statistics	p-value
Loggerhead	%DT	1.005	1.010	0.329	0.571
	M3D	2.971	2.999	38.730	< 0.001
	M3D (< 30 days)	1.000	1.001	0.704	0.402
Leatherback	%DT	2.498	2.816	13.410	0.004
	M3D	1.000	1.000	8.480	0.004

**Table 3: Statistical analysis of vertical behavior in relation to the time elapsed since the release.**

Results from Generalized Additive Mixed Models (GAMMs) assessing the effect of the time elapsed since the release on the fraction of time spent diving (%DT) and the Maximum Daily Diving Depth (M3D), analyzed separately for each species. For %DT, smooth terms were characterized using chi-squared statistics, whereas for M3D, smooth terms were characterized using F-statistics.

Species	Response variables	Estimated degrees of freedom for turtle size	Reference degrees of freedom for turtle size	Statistics	p-value
Loggerhead	%DT	2.821	2.887	434.101	< 0.001
	M3D	2.952	2.961	34.520	< 0.001
Leatherback	%DT	2.312	2.482	26.470	< 0.001
	M3D	1.281	1.486	56.740	< 0.001

**Table 2: Statistical analysis of vertical behavior in relation to body size at the time of the release.**

Results from Generalized Additive Mixed Models (GAMMs) assessing the effect of the Straight Carapace Length (SCL) at the time of the release on the fraction of time spent diving (%DT) and the Maximum Daily Diving Depth (M3D), analyzed separately for each species. For %DT, smooth terms were characterized using chi-squared statistics, whereas for M3D, smooth terms were characterized using F-statistics.

Species	Size interval [cm]	Origin	Number of turtles	Number of TaD distributions	Number of %TU	Number of M3D	Number of complete daily dive summaries
Loggerhead	Small (9.0 < SCL < 15.0)	Captive-reared	21	748	813	813	748
		Rehabilitated Wild-caught	13	832	848	846	830
		<i>Total</i>	<i>34</i>	<i>1,580</i>	<i>1,661</i>	<i>1,659</i>	<i>1,578</i>
	Intermediate (15.0 ≤ SCL < 21.0)	Captive-reared	1	72	74	74	72
		Rehabilitated Wild-caught	5	500	503	500	497
		<i>Total</i>	<i>6</i>	<i>572</i>	<i>577</i>	<i>574</i>	<i>569</i>
Large (26.0 ≤ SCL ≤ 28.0)	Rehabilitated Wild-caught	2	97	102	100	95	
Leatherback	Small (7.0 < SCL < 13.0)	Captive-reared	27	175	217	217	175
	Large (21.0 < SCL < 33.0)	Captive-reared	2	23	25	24	22
<b><i>Total</i></b>			<b><i>71</i></b>	<b><i>2,447</i></b>	<b><i>2,582</i></b>	<b><i>2,574</i></b>	<b><i>2,439</i></b>

**Table 1: Composition of the final dataset.**

Each individual is classified depending on species, origin (i.e., wild-caught/rehabilitated, or captive-reared), and size categories (SCL) at the time of release. For each category, the number of daily dive data is reported for the Time-at-Depth (TaD) distributions, the fractions of time spent underwater (%TU), the Maximum Daily Diving Depth (M3D) and the complete daily dive summaries (i.e. days for which all the aforementioned diagnoses were received).

	Number of sequences of variables	Number of corrupted sequences	Number of undefined sequences	Number of correct sequences
T5	3,169	408	146	2,615
T6	3,158	361	170	2,627
Loggerhead	5,677	686	249	4,742
Leatherback	650	83	67	500
<b>Total</b>	<b>6,327</b>	<b>769</b>	<b>316</b>	<b>5,242</b>

**Table S3-3: Results of the Majority Rule Controls.**

ID	Species	Release SCL [cm]	Tag model	Release area	Release date	Origin	Tracking duration [day]
26364 5	<i>Caretta caretta</i>	14.40	K4H 130B Dive	Azores	2024 Jul. 17	Wild-caught	1
26364 6	<i>Caretta caretta</i>	13.50	K4H 130B Dive	Azores	2024 Jul. 17	Wild-caught	1
26364 7	<i>Caretta caretta</i>	13.40	K4H 130B Dive	Azores	2024 Jul. 17	Wild-caught	< 1
26364 8	<i>Caretta caretta</i>	11.20	K4H 130B Dive	Azores	2024 Jul. 17	Wild-caught	52
26578 5	<i>Caretta caretta</i>	28.00	K4G 132A Sensor	Azores	2024 Aug. 25	Rehabilitate d	50
26578 6	<i>Caretta caretta</i>	26.00	K4G 132A Sensor	Azores	2024 Aug. 25	Rehabilitate d	70
23630 2	<i>Dermochelys coriacea</i>	7.47	K4H 130B Dive	Florida	2022 Aug. 10	Captive- reared	10
23630 5	<i>Dermochelys coriacea</i>	8.90	K4H 130B Dive	Florida	2022 Aug. 10	Captive- reared	< 1
23631 0	<i>Dermochelys coriacea</i>	7.42	K4H 130B Dive	Florida	2022 Aug. 10	Captive- reared	8
23630 3	<i>Dermochelys coriacea</i>	9.47	K4H 130B Dive	Florida	2022 Sep. 22	Captive- reared	10
23630 6	<i>Caretta caretta</i>	9.44	K4H 130B Dive	Florida	2022 Sep. 22	Captive- reared	4
23630 8	<i>Caretta caretta</i>	10.08	K4H 130B Dive	Florida	2022 Sep. 22	Captive- reared	15
23630 9	<i>Caretta caretta</i>	9.14	K4H 130B Dive	Florida	2022 Sep. 22	Captive- reared	31
24511 0	<i>Dermochelys coriacea</i>	8.59	K4H 130B Dive	Florida	2023 Aug. 16	Captive- reared	7
24511 1	<i>Dermochelys coriacea</i>	8.91	K4H 130B Dive	Florida	2023 Aug. 16	Captive- reared	9
24511 2	<i>Dermochelys coriacea</i>	9.39	K4H 130B Dive	Florida	2023 Aug. 16	Captive- reared	10
24511 3	<i>Dermochelys coriacea</i>	8.95	K4H 130B Dive	Florida	2023 Aug. 16	Captive- reared	8
24511 4	<i>Dermochelys coriacea</i>	8.42	K4H 130B Dive	Florida	2023 Aug. 16	Captive- reared	22
24511 5	<i>Dermochelys coriacea</i>	9.11	K4H 130B Dive	Florida	2023 Aug. 16	Captive- reared	6
24511 6	<i>Dermochelys coriacea</i>	9.42	K4H 130B Dive	Florida	2023 Aug. 16	Captive- reared	9
24511 7	<i>Dermochelys coriacea</i>	8.43	K4H 130B Dive	Florida	2023 Aug. 16	Captive- reared	3

245118	<i>Dermochelys coriacea</i>	8.65	K4H 130B Dive	Florida	2023 Aug. 16	Captive-reared	3
245119	<i>Dermochelys coriacea</i>	8.22	K4H 130B Dive	Florida	2023 Aug. 16	Captive-reared	< 1
245120	<i>Dermochelys coriacea</i>	9.11	K4H 130B Dive	Florida	2023 Aug. 16	Captive-reared	1
245121	<i>Dermochelys coriacea</i>	9.36	K4H 130B Dive	Florida	2023 Aug. 16	Captive-reared	9
245122	<i>Dermochelys coriacea</i>	9.40	K4H 130B Dive	Florida	2023 Sep. 20	Captive-reared	< 1
245124	<i>Dermochelys coriacea</i>	9.34	K4H 130B Dive	Florida	2023 Sep. 20	Captive-reared	2
245125	<i>Dermochelys coriacea</i>	9.72	K4H 130B Dive	Florida	2023 Sep. 20	Captive-reared	< 1
245126	<i>Dermochelys coriacea</i>	8.94	K4H 130B Dive	Florida	2023 Sep. 20	Captive-reared	2
245127	<i>Dermochelys coriacea</i>	8.71	K4H 130B Dive	Florida	2023 Sep. 20	Captive-reared	8
245128	<i>Caretta caretta</i>	10.60	K4H 130B Dive	Florida	2023 Sep. 20	Captive-reared	13
245129	<i>Caretta caretta</i>	10.58	K4H 130B Dive	Florida	2023 Sep. 20	Captive-reared	4
245130	<i>Dermochelys coriacea</i>	9.45	K4H 130B Dive	Florida	2023 Sep. 20	Captive-reared	24
245131	<i>Dermochelys coriacea</i>	9.00	K4H 130B Dive	Florida	2023 Sep. 20	Captive-reared	3
245132	<i>Dermochelys coriacea</i>	9.23	K4H 130B Dive	Florida	2023 Sep. 20	Captive-reared	11
245133	<i>Dermochelys coriacea</i>	9.54	K4H 130B Dive	Florida	2023 Sep. 20	Captive-reared	7
266092	<i>Dermochelys coriacea</i>	9.13	K4H 130B Dive	Florida	2024 Oct. 24	Captive-reared	6
266093	<i>Dermochelys coriacea</i>	9.55	K4H 130B Dive	Florida	2024 Oct. 24	Captive-reared	17
266094	<i>Dermochelys coriacea</i>	9.13	K4H 130B Dive	Florida	2024 Oct. 24	Captive-reared	2
266097	<i>Dermochelys coriacea</i>	11.09	K4H 130B Dive	Florida	2024 Oct. 24	Captive-reared	10
266098	<i>Dermochelys coriacea</i>	9.60	K4H 130B Dive	Florida	2024 Oct. 24	Captive-reared	< 1
266099	<i>Dermochelys coriacea</i>	9.14	K4H 130B Dive	Florida	2024 Oct. 24	Captive-reared	< 1
266100	<i>Dermochelys coriacea</i>	10.80	K4H 130B Dive	Florida	2024 Oct. 24	Captive-reared	1

26610 1	<i>Dermochelys coriacea</i>	9.45	K4H 130B Dive	Florida	2024 Oct. 24	Captive-reared	< 1
26610 2	<i>Dermochelys coriacea</i>	9.00	K4H 130B Dive	Florida	2024 Oct. 24	Captive-reared	4
26610 3	<i>Dermochelys coriacea</i>	12.10	K4H 130B Dive	Florida	2024 Oct. 24	Captive-reared	21
26610 5	<i>Dermochelys coriacea</i>	9.05	K4H 130B Dive	Florida	2024 Oct. 24	Captive-reared	19
26409 0	<i>Caretta caretta</i>	12.31	K4H 130B Dive	Florida	2024 Nov. 26	Captive-reared	11
26409 1	<i>Caretta caretta</i>	12.54	K4H 130B Dive	Florida	2024 Nov. 26	Captive-reared	41
26409 2	<i>Caretta caretta</i>	12.52	K4H 130B Dive	Florida	2024 Nov. 26	Captive-reared	72
26409 3	<i>Caretta caretta</i>	13.24	K4H 130B Dive	Florida	2024 Nov. 26	Captive-reared	39
26409 4	<i>Caretta caretta</i>	12.79	K4H 130B Dive	Florida	2024 Nov. 26	Captive-reared	43
26409 5	<i>Caretta caretta</i>	12.54	K4H 130B Dive	Florida	2024 Nov. 26	Captive-reared	< 1
26409 8	<i>Caretta caretta</i>	12.10	K4H 130B Dive	Florida	2024 Nov. 26	Captive-reared	38
26409 9	<i>Caretta caretta</i>	16.20	K4H 130B Dive	Florida	2024 Nov. 26	Captive-reared	76
26365 0	<i>Caretta caretta</i>	20.40	K4G 132A Sensor	France	2024 Jul. 24	Rehabilitated	133
26365 1	<i>Caretta caretta</i>	18.20	K4G 132A Sensor	France	2024 Jul. 24	Rehabilitated	116
26365 2	<i>Caretta caretta</i>	16.90	K4G 132A Sensor	France	2024 Jul. 24	Rehabilitated	216*
26365 3	<i>Caretta caretta</i>	16.40	K4G 132A Sensor	France	2024 Jul. 24	Rehabilitated	72
26365 4	<i>Caretta caretta</i>	17.50	K4G 132A Sensor	France	2024 Jul. 24	Rehabilitated	36
26917 9	<i>Caretta caretta</i>	11.54	K4G 132A Sensor	Japan	2024 Nov. 14	Captive-reared	87
26918 0	<i>Caretta caretta</i>	10.90	K4G 132A Sensor	Japan	2024 Nov. 14	Captive-reared	42
26918 1	<i>Caretta caretta</i>	11.26	K4G 132A Sensor	Japan	2024 Nov. 14	Captive-reared	98
26918 2	<i>Caretta caretta</i>	11.40	K4G 132A Sensor	Japan	2024 Nov. 14	Captive-reared	19
26918 3	<i>Caretta caretta</i>	11.40	K4G 132A Sensor	Japan	2024 Nov. 14	Captive-reared	24

26918 4	Caretta caretta	11.16	K4G 132A Sensor	Japan	2024 Nov. 14	Captive- reared	92
26918 5	Caretta caretta	11.60	K4G 132A Sensor	Japan	2024 Nov. 14	Captive- reared	36
26918 6	Caretta caretta	11.10	K4G 132A Sensor	Japan	2024 Nov. 14	Captive- reared	33
26918 8	Caretta caretta	12.10	K4G 132A Sensor	Japan	2024 Nov. 14	Captive- reared	102*
26918 9	Caretta caretta	11.45	K4G 132A Sensor	Japan	2024 Nov. 14	Captive- reared	102*
26919 0	Caretta caretta	11.40	K4G 132A Sensor	Japan	2024 Nov. 14	Captive- reared	44
26464 8	Caretta caretta	26.60	K4G 132A Sensor	Portugal	2024 Jul.26	Rehabilitate d	146
25395 6	Caretta caretta	13.00	K4G 132A Sensor	South Africa	2024 Jan. 20	Rehabilitate d	88
25395 7	Caretta caretta	15.00	K4G 132A Sensor	South Africa	2024 Jan. 20	Rehabilitate d	29
25395 8	Caretta caretta	13.90	K4G 132A Sensor	South Africa	2024 Jan. 20	Rehabilitate d	2
25395 9	Caretta caretta	13.90	K4G 132A Sensor	South Africa	2024 Jan. 20	Rehabilitate d	< 1
25396 0	Caretta caretta	16.20	K4G 132A Sensor	South Africa	2024 Jan. 20	Rehabilitate d	< 1
25396 1	Caretta caretta	11.90	K4G 132A Sensor	South Africa	2024 Jan. 20	Rehabilitate d	< 1
25396 2	Caretta caretta	13.70	K4G 132A Sensor	South Africa	2024 Jan. 20	Rehabilitate d	4
25396 3	Caretta caretta	14.20	K4G 132A Sensor	South Africa	2024 Jan. 20	Rehabilitate d	27
25396 4	Caretta caretta	13.40	K4G 132A Sensor	South Africa	2024 Jan. 20	Rehabilitate d	< 1
25396 5	Caretta caretta	13.30	K4G 132A Sensor	South Africa	2024 Jan. 20	Rehabilitate d	11
26610 6	Caretta caretta	13.00	K4G 132A Sensor	South Africa	2024 Oct. 21	Rehabilitate d	88
26610 7	Caretta caretta	12.70	K4G 132A Sensor	South Africa	2024 Oct. 21	Rehabilitate d	97
26610 8	Caretta caretta	13.40	K4G 132A Sensor	South Africa	2024 Oct. 21	Rehabilitate d	60
26610 9	Caretta caretta	14.90	K4G 132A Sensor	South Africa	2024 Oct. 21	Rehabilitate d	127*
26611 0	Caretta caretta	12.70	K4G 132A Sensor	South Africa	2024 Oct. 21	Rehabilitate d	127*

26611 1	<i>Caretta caretta</i>	13.50	K4G 132A Sensor	South Africa	2024 Oct. 21	Rehabilitate d	32
26611 2	<i>Caretta caretta</i>	14.90	K4G 132A Sensor	South Africa	2024 Oct. 21	Rehabilitate d	73
26611 3	<i>Caretta caretta</i>	14.40	K4G 132A Sensor	South Africa	2024 Oct. 21	Rehabilitate d	104
26611 4	<i>Caretta caretta</i>	13.50	K4G 132A Sensor	South Africa	2024 Oct. 21	Rehabilitate d	35
26611 5	<i>Caretta caretta</i>	13.30	K4G 132A Sensor	South Africa	2024 Oct. 21	Rehabilitate d	43
26611 6	<i>Caretta caretta</i>	13.70	K4G 132A Sensor	South Africa	2024 Oct. 21	Rehabilitate d	37
26611 7	<i>Caretta caretta</i>	13.70	K4G 132A Sensor	South Africa	2024 Oct. 21	Rehabilitate d	< 1
25401 6	<i>Dermochelys coriacea</i>	21.96	K4G 132A Sensor	Thailand	2024 Apr. 02	Captive- reared	< 1
26135 9	<i>Dermochelys coriacea</i>	25.39	K4G 132A Sensor	Thailand	2024 Apr. 02	Captive- reared	64
26136 0	<i>Dermochelys coriacea</i>	32.50	K4G 132A Sensor	Thailand	2024 Apr. 02	Captive- reared	< 1
26136 3	<i>Dermochelys coriacea</i>	28.21	K4G 132A Sensor	Thailand	2024 Apr. 02	Captive- reared	1
26136 4	<i>Dermochelys coriacea</i>	27.60	K4G 132A Sensor	Thailand	2024 Apr. 02	Captive- reared	36
26136 5	<i>Dermochelys coriacea</i>	27.81	K4G 132A Sensor	Thailand	2024 Apr. 02	Captive- reared	1
26136 6	<i>Dermochelys coriacea</i>	36.00	K4G 132A Sensor	Thailand	2024 Apr. 02	Captive- reared	< 1
26136 7	<i>Dermochelys coriacea</i>	31.40	K4G 132A Sensor	Thailand	2024 Apr. 02	Captive- reared	< 1
26136 8	<i>Dermochelys coriacea</i>	26.27	K4G 132A Sensor	Thailand	2024 Apr. 02	Captive- reared	40
26136 9	<i>Dermochelys coriacea</i>	25.74	K4G 132A Sensor	Thailand	2024 Apr. 02	Captive- reared	39
26137 0	<i>Dermochelys coriacea</i>	26.43	K4G 132A Sensor	Thailand	2024 Apr. 02	Captive- reared	< 1

**Table S1-1: Detailed information for all individuals included in the study.**

Table summarizing detail for all individuals included in the study, including PTT ID, species, straight carapace length at the time of the release (in cm), tag model, release location and date, origin (i.e., captive-reared, rehabilitated, or wild-caught) and tracking duration (in days). Tracking durations with asterisk indicate PTT that were still transmitting at the time of the study.

	Number of transmissions	Number of sequences of variables	Number of transmissions per sequence
T5	22,815	3,169	7.20
T6	23,848	3,158	7.55
Loggerhead	41,725	5,677	7.35
Leatherback	4,938	650	7.60
<b><i>Total</i></b>	<b><i>46,663</i></b>	<b><i>6,327</i></b>	<b><i>7.38</i></b>

**Table S3-2: Number of transmissions to decode sequences of variables.**

ARTICLE IN PRESS