1

2

Characterization of suitable breeding sites for Asiatic toads (*Bufo gargarizans* Cantor, 1842) (Anura, Bufonidae) using ecological modeling

6

7 SEUNG-MIN PARK, SEUNG-JU CHEON, CHOONG-HO HAM, SU-WAN PARK, HA-CHEOL SUNG

8

9

14

18

Characterization of suitable breeding sites for Asiatic toads (*Bufo gargarizans* Cantor, 1842) (Anura, Bufonidae) using ecological modeling

SEUNG-MIN PARK[1], SEUNG-JU CHEON[2], CHOONG-HO HAM[2], SU-WAN PARK[3], HA-CHEOL SUNG[1,*]

[1]*Department of Biological Sciences, Chonnam National University, 61186 Gwangju, Republic of Korea*

[2]*School of Biological Sciences and Biotechnology, Chonnam National University, 61186 Gwangju, Republic of Korea*

[3]*Gwangyang Greenkorea, 57756, Gwangyang, Republic of Korea*

[*]*Corresponding author. E-mail*: shcol2002@jnu.ac.kr

1   **Running title**: Breeding sites selection of *Bufo gargarizans*

2

3   **Abstract.** Efforts to protect amphibian habitats and breeding sites are increasing, with

4   ecological modeling playing a key role in predicting suitable habitats and informing

5   conservation strategies. The Asiatic toad (*Bufo gargarizans*) is widely distributed across South

6   Korea and is ideal for establishing comprehensive conservation measures. However, it is

7   increasingly vulnerable to human activities and climate change. In this study, we investigated

8   the breeding site characteristics of *B. gargarizans* using a generalized linear model (GLM).

9   Field surveys were conducted at 124 reservoirs across three study sites at similar longitudes but

10   different latitudes (Paju, Cheongju, and Gwangyang). To develop 30 candidate GLMs, using

11   model selection based on the Akaike Information Criterion (AIC), 17 variables were collected

12   from field measurements and geographic data. The results identified six factors influencing the

13   suitability of *B. gargarizans* breeding sites: water temperature, dissolved oxygen, the average

14   water depth 1 m from the shoreline, reservoir area, percentage of barren land within a 1km

15   buffer, and percentage of water within a 1km buffer. The model indicated that areas with a

16   shoreline depth of around 48 cm, low surrounding barren ratios (3%), and more than 3% water

17   bodies are suitable for *B. gargarizans* breeding. These findings provide valuable insights into

18   the conservation of *B. gargarizans* and can support the development of effective habitat

19   protection measures.

20

INTRODUCTION

Amphibians are sensitive to subtle habitat changes (Beebee, 1997; Alford and Richards, 1999; Stebbins and Cohen, 2021), and thus face significant threats to their survival, such as habitat fragmentation and alteration (Dixo et al., 2009; Decena et al., 2020). Most amphibians breed and develop in water, undergoing an aquatic larval stage before metamorphosing and moving onto land. Therefore, the quality and stability of their habitats are crucial for survival (Evans et al., 1996) and protecting key breeding habitats (wetlands and reservoirs) is essential for amphibian conservation.

The suitable selection of breeding sites by amphibians significantly impacts their survival and breeding success (Ra et al., 2010; Borzée et al., 2018). Previous studies have identified factors that differentiate breeding sites based on adult responses to different variables such as water-holding capacity (Lin et al., 2008), reproduction avoidance in response to predators (Murphy, 2003a; Jowers and Dowine, 2005), and negative relationships between conspecific density and breeding site preference (Resetarits and Wilbur, 1989; Crump, 1991; Spieler and Linsenmair, 1997; Murphy, 2003a). Additionally, for amphibians that breed primarily in permanent water sources, the disappearance of breeding sites due to drying can be a major cause of mortality for the hatched tadpoles (Smith, 1983; Newman, 1988), highlighting the importance of maintaining breeding sites for stable larval growth (Edgerly et al., 1998; Murphy, 2003b; Rudolf and Rödel, 2005).

Amphibians select breeding sites based on various environmental factors, including water temperature, dissolved oxygen, water depth, aquatic vegetation, and the presence of predators (Skelly et al., 1999; Semlitsch, 2000). The anuran family Bufonidae, commonly known as toads, tend to prefer larger bodies of water with stable environmental conditions, as seen in studies on the *Rhinella marina*, which selects breeding sites consisting of shallow pools and unvegetated

25   muddy banks (Semeniuk et al., 2007), and *Epidalea calamita* whose site preference is also

26   influenced by water temperature, chemistry, and the presence of competitor species (Banks and

27   Beebee, 1987). Understanding these factors provides valuable insights into amphibian breeding

28   and conservation efforts. Among the various research methods for identifying these key factors,

29   ecological modeling has been widely used to predict suitable breeding sites by analyzing

30   combinations of variables. Studies have applied habitat suitability models to assess amphibian

31   breeding habitats based on environmental predictors, such as land cover, climate, and

32   topography (Cunningham et al., 2007; Ra et al., 2010; Blank and Blaustein, 2012). These

33   models have proven effective in identifying relationships between species and their

34   environments and predicting species distributions, contributing to conservation planning

35   (Guisan and Zimmermann, 2000; Lunghi et al., 2015; Su et al., 2020).

36   This study focused on the Asiatic toad (*Bufo gargarizans* Cantor, 1842). *Bufo gargarizans*

37   is a species of the family Bufonidae that inhabits the inland areas of the Korean Peninsula and

38   parts of mainland East Asia and breeds in flat water (Lee et al., 2011). A recent taxonomic

39   review of this species was conducted by Matushkina et al. (2022), and based on molecular

40   analyses, proposed reclassifying populations from the Korean Peninsula, northeastern China,

41   and Russia Primorye region as *Bufo sachalinensis* (Othman et al., 2022). However, the

42   International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN) and South Korea's National Species

43   List has not adopted this classification; therefore, this study will use *Bufo gargarizans*.

44   According to the IUCN, the *B. gargarizans* classified as a "Least Concern (LC)" species (IUCN

45   2022). However, the population of *B. gargarizans* has been declining due to human activities

46   and climate change, highlighting the need for conservation efforts (Sung et al., 2007; Yang et

47   al., 2020). Identifying suitable habitats is essential to conserve the populations of *B. gargarizans*

48   (Yang et al., 2023). Additionally, since *B. gargarizans* is widely distributed across South Korea

49   (Lee et al., 2011), analyzing the key environmental factors of its breeding sites can contribute

50　to broader conservation strategies for amphibians. Therefore, this study aimed to characterize

51　the conditions of suitable breeding sites for *B. gargarizans* using Generalized Linear Models

52　(GLM) to identify critical variables and their influence on the selection of breeding sites.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Study area

55　Since *B. gargarizans* are known to breed in stable water bodies (Lee et al., 2011), only

56　reservoirs were selected as study sites where the water is stable. Data on *B. gargarizans*

57　breeding sites nationwide were collected through preliminary research and surveys (NIE 2018)

58　to determine the criteria for selecting reservoirs. Based on this data, regions located in the

59　northern, central, and southern parts of the country and situated at 127° longitude were selected

60　(Paju in the North, Cheongju in the Center, and Gwangyang in the South; Fig. 1). After selecting

61　the study sites, a preliminary survey was conducted in January and February to observe the

62　breeding activities and identify breeding and non-breeding sites.

63

Field survey

65　Considering the breeding period of *B. gargarizans* (Lee et al., 2011), a field survey was

66　conducted from March to May. The variables used for the model were referenced from previous

67　studies (Evans et al., 1996; Ra et al., 2010). In previous studies, the variables were categorized

68　into micro, biological, and non-biological categories. However, based on the toxicity of the

69　eggs and tadpoles from the family Bufonidae (Crossland and Alford, 1998; Lim et al., 2005)

70　and the fact that fish tend to avoid or do not prey on Bufonidae (Kruse and Stone, 1984;

71　Kiesecker et al., 1996), this study assumes there is no correlation between Bufonidae larvae and

72　the biological variables. Consequently, biological variables were not collected. Additionally,

73 data collection was conducted exclusively through field observations and did not involve

74 animal capture; therefore, no animal ethics approval was needed.

75   A total of 17 variables, consisting of 7 micro and 10 macro variables, were collected (Table

76 1). The micro variables consisted of 7 variables collected in the field: water temperature (Wt),

77 pH (P), dissolved oxygen (Do), the average depth of the water 1 m from the shoreline (Dp),

78 slope (Sl), elevation (El), and the average vegetation cover of the shoreline (Vc). The

79 measurement method involved selecting four points in the east, west, south, and north of each

80 reservoir based on true north and measuring the values at each point. First, water temperature,

81 pH, and dissolved oxygen were measured using a water quality meter (86031 AZ EB; AZ

82 Instrument Corp.; Taiwan) and by scooping water samples into a small box at each point. The

83 slope and elevation at points approximately 1 m above the ground were recorded using a GPS

84 receiver (GPSMAP 64s; Garmin; Switzerland). The average water depth was measured using a

85 plastic ruler 1 m from the shoreline. The average vegetation cover was assessed by placing a 2

86 m × 2 m grid around the measured water depth and taking photographs. The photographs were

87 then evaluated by two researchers, including the observer, to calculate the average cover. Values

88 recorded at each point were averaged and utilized as variables.

89   The macro variables consisted of 10 variables (Table 1) and were calculated using ArcMap

90 (ver. 10.7.1; ESRI; USA). The 10 macro variables consisted of reservoir area (Ar), distance to

91 a forest (Df), distance to the water (Dw), distance to a used area (Du), percentage of barren land

92 within a 1km buffer (Pb), percentage of agricultural land within a 1km buffer (Pa), percentage

93 of forest within a 1km buffer (Pf), percentage of wetland and water within a 1km buffer (Pw),

94 percentage of used area within a 1km buffer (Pu), and percentage of grass within a 1km buffer

95 (Pg). First, the coordinates of the reservoirs were collected using Google Earth (ver. Pro; Google;

96 USA). Then, using the Environmental Geographic Information Services, maps containing

97   reservoirs were identified, and the land cover maps were downloaded at a scale of 1:5,000

98   (EGIS, 2019). Considering the field survey period, maps from 2019 that utilized the primary

99   classification items were used. The classification consisted of 7 items, which were barren land,

100   such as sand or gravel; agricultural lands, such as rice paddies and agricultural fields; forests,

101   such as broadleaf and coniferous forests; used areas, including residential and industrial areas;

102   grasslands (grass with a low proportion of trees); wetlands (consistently saturated and where

103   water accumulates during the rainy season); and water, such as rivers and banks. However, in

104   this study, due to the low proportions of wetlands and water (lower than 1%), they were merged

105   into one variable: water. The reservoir shapes were extracted based on the coordinates, and the

106   reservoir areas were calculated using these shapes. Using the 'Find Nearest' function, the

107   distances between the reservoirs and the nearest forest, water, and used areas were calculated.

108   To determine the surrounding landscapes of the reservoirs, the 'Buffer' and 'Intersect' functions

109   were utilized to extract land use areas from each reservoir. The buffer range was set to 1 km,

110   considering the maximum distance between the breeding site and the microhabitats of *B.*

111   *gargarizans* within their home range (Park et al., 2021; 2024; 2025). Since the reservoir sizes

112   varied, the areas within the 1 km buffer were converted into ratios. Based on these area ratios,

113   the percentages of surrounding barren land, agricultural land, forest, water (including wetlands

114   and water), used areas, and grasslands were calculated.

115

116   *Statistical analysis*

117   All statistical analyses were conducted using SPSS (ver. 20.0; IBM; USA). All variables did

118   not exhibit normality in a Kolmogorov-Smirnov test ($p < 0.05$). Since no significant correlation

119   (Spearman correlation; $r > 0.8$, $p > 0.05$) was observed between the variables, and no variable

120   had a correlation coefficient above 0.8, all 17 variables were included in the analysis.

121   Modeling was conducted using a Generalized Linear Model (binomial logistic model), with

122   breeding site presence as the dependent variable (1 = breeding site, 0 = non-breeding site).

123   Model selection was based on the Akaike Information Criterion (AIC), a widely used method

124   for comparing and evaluating habitat suitability models (Burnham and Anderson, 2004; Hu,

125   2007). The AIC approach requires species presence-absence data along with habitat information

126   (MacKenzie and Bailey, 2004; Durso et al., 2011), allowing for the estimation of suitable

127   breeding habitats. Following Ra et al. (2010), an a priori model was developed by selecting

128   variables based on their ecological relevance and insights gained from field surveys. While

129   testing all possible variable combinations would provide a more exhaustive evaluation, this

130   approach was impractical due to computational constraints and the risk of model instability

131   (Johnson and Omland, 2004; Diniz-Filho et al., 2008). Instead, ecologically meaningful

132   combinations were prioritized based on previous research and field observations. To

133   systematically assess the influence of different variable types, the model selection was

134   structured into three groups: (1) 10 models using only microhabitat variables, (2) 10 models

135   using only macrohabitat variables, and (3) 9 models incorporating both. Additionally, a global

136   model including all variables was tested, resulting in 30 model combinations (Table 2). This

137   approach balanced model complexity and ecological interpretability while minimizing the risk

138   of overfitting.

139   Considering the small sample size, the corrected Akaike Information Criterion (AICc)

140   values were used in this study. Generally, the relative likelihood in an AIC model is proportional

141   to the probability of minimizing the information loss for each model (Burnham and Anderson,

142   2004). The relative likelihood was calculated using the formula: $\exp\left(\frac{(AICc_{min} - AICc_i)}{2}\right)$

143   The calculated values were then used to confirm the model's explanatory power as weights

144   (*wi*), ensuring the reliability of the selected suitable model. The selected suitable model

145   evaluated the impact on the breeding sites by assessing the significance of each variable.

146

147   **RESULTS**

148   The survey included 143 reservoirs: 21 in Gwangyang in 2017, 60 in Cheongju in 2018,

149   and 62 in Paju in 2019. Among these, breeding sites were identified in 13 reservoirs in

150   Gwangyang, 20 in Cheongju, and 23 in Paju, totaling 57 breeding sites. For the analysis,

151   modeling was conducted using 123 sites (46 breeding sites, 77 non-breeding sites); the

152   modeling excluded 20 sites in Paju (10 breeding sites, 10 non-breeding sites) that did not have

153   land cover maps.

154   Among the breeding site models, Model 25 exhibited the highest explanatory power (wi) of

155   0.6464, and included six variables (Table 3): water temperature (Wt), dissolved oxygen (Do),

156   the average water depth 1 m from the shoreline (Dp), reservoir area (Ar), the percentage of

157   barren land within a 1km buffer (Pb), and the percentage of water within a 1km buffer (Pw).

158   Among the variables included in this model, three were significant. The percentage of water

159   within a 1km buffer (Pw) had a positive correlation. In comparison, the average water depth 1

160   m from the shoreline (Dp) and the percentage of barren land within a 1km buffer (Pb) had

161   negative correlations (Table 4). The average water depth 1 m from the shoreline of breeding

162   sites was 47.9 ± 17.6 cm, and 57.0 ± 18.7 cm for non-breeding sites. The percentage of barren

163   land within a 1km buffer of breeding sites was $3.6 \pm 2.7\%$, and $4.7 \pm 3.6\%$ for non-breeding

164   sites. The percentage of water within a 1km buffer of breeding sites was $3.9 \pm 6.4\%$, and $2.4 \pm$

165   2.7% for non-breeding sites.

166

167   **DISCUSSION**

168   This study explored the suitable environmental conditions using a relatively simple model

169   for *B. gargarizans* breeding sites. Based on a GLM, the model provides valuable information

170   on the major environmental predictors affecting the selection of the breeding sites of *B.*

171   *gargarizans*. Among the variables showing significant differences, the average water depth 1

172   m from the shoreline (Dp) was considered an important factor. Since *B. gargarizans* are known

173   to breed at the shoreline of reservoirs (Lee et al., 2011), it is important to maintain suitable

174   shoreline depths (Jeong, 2017) and permanent waterbodies (Evans et al., 1996). Furthermore,

175   suitable water depths are necessary to ensure the stable occurrence of eggs and larvae (Edgerly

176   et al., 1998; Murphy, 2003b; Rudolf and Rödel, 2005) since lower water depths have lower

177   temperatures, which can negatively affect breeding. In this study, the average shoreline water

178   depth at non-breeding sites was relatively deep at 57 cm, nearly twice the 30 cm reported in a

179   previous study (Jeong, 2017). Therefore, a water depth of 30–48 cm is a suitable shoreline water

180   depth for *B. gargarizans* breeding sites.

181   The results of this study indicate that a percentage of barren land within a 1km buffer (Pb)

182   lower than 3% and a percentage of water within a 1km buffer (Pw) higher than 3% are suitable

183   for *B. gargarizans* breeding. *B. gargarizans* typically inhabit areas with vegetation cover or

184   grasslands (Yu and Guo, 2010; Su et al., 2020; Park et al., 2024; Park et al., 2025), and are

185   known to use reservoirs, ponds, rice paddies and rice paddy canals as breeding sites (Lee et al.,

186   2011). Bufonids have thicker skin than other frog families (Lee, 2003) and are more resistant

187   to drying out. However, they still prefer habitats with high humidity to retain moisture (Su et

188   al., 2020). Accordingly, the amount of barren land surrounding the breeding sites was relatively

189   low. Additionally, the percentage of water within a 1km buffer (Pw) of breeding sites was

190   relatively high compared with the non-breeding sites. In the post-breeding period, *B.*

191   *gargarizans* migrate from breeding sites (reservoirs) to the mountains (Park et al., 2021; 2024).

192   While anurans of the family Bufonidae are known for their drought tolerance (Lee, 2003),

193   maintaining access to water sources is crucial due to the high energy and moisture expenditure

194   required for movement and dispersal (Yu et al., 2009; Luo et al., 2014; 2015). Therefore,

195   additional water bodies near breeding sites likely play a vital role in the survival of

196   metamorphosed tadpoles as they disperse into the forests.

197   Among the six variables included in the best-suitable model, dissolved oxygen (Do) had a

198   p-value of 0.071, indicating marginal significance. However, it appeared in seven of the top ten

199   models and was statistically significant ($p < 0.05$) in four of them (models 29, 2, 21, and 5),

200   suggesting potential ecological relevance. The typical dissolved oxygen range in water is 7–10

201   ppm. In this study, dissolved oxygen levels were 9.4 ± 2.3 ppm in breeding sites and 8.5 ± 2.8

202   ppm for non-breeding sites, although the mean comparison between the two site types did not

203   reach statistical significance (T-test, t = 1.875, p = 0.063).Previous studies have shown that

204   toads prefer sites with higher dissolved oxygen levels (Noland and Ultsch, 1981; Semeniuk et

205   al., 2007). While dissolved oxygen was included in 7 of the top 10 models, no significant

206   differences were found between breeding and non-breeding sites. However, it remains an

207   important environmental factor influencing breeding site selection. Dissolved oxygen levels

208   can be affected by factors such as water flow, water depth, water temperature, and aquatic

209   vegetation, which could be explored further in future studies.

210   The results of this study provide meaningful implications for the conservation and

211   ecological management of *B. gargarizans* breeding habitats. Key factors such as shoreline water

212   depth, the percentage of barren land surrounding the breeding sites, and nearby water bodies

213   suggest practical strategies for breeding site restoration. For instance, altering artificial

214   reservoirs with overly steep or deep shorelines to include shallower zones with depths around

215   48 cm may enhance breeding habitat suitability. Furthermore, improving dissolved oxygen

216   concentrations could contribute to improving breeding site quality (Semeniuk et al., 2007). The

217   presence of nearby water bodies for post-breeding dispersal further highlights the necessity of

218   landscape-level conservation efforts. Preserving small wetlands and canals may facilitate

219   metamorphism juvenile movement and connect habitats (Yu et al., 2009; Luo et al., 2014).

220   Nevertheless, considering the overlapping breeding periods with other amphibian species

221   (*Hynobius* spp., *Rana dybowskii*, *R. huanrenensis*, and *R. coreana*; Lee et al., 2011), potential

222   ecological interactions and impacts should be carefully evaluated. Moreover, *B. gargarizans* in

223   South Korea primarily utilizes artificial reservoirs for breeding, but the effects on other

224   organisms, including amphibians, are unknown. Future research should investigate whether

225   these anthropogenic habitats confer ecological advantages compared with their natural breeding

226   sites, which may, in turn, influence long-term population dynamics.

227

REFERENCES

Alford, R.A., Richards, S.J. (1999): Global amphibian declines: a problem in applied ecology. Annu. Rev. Ecol. Syst. **30**: 133-165.

Banks, B., Beebee, T.J. (1987): Factors influencing breeding site choice by the pioneering amphibian *Bufo calamita*. Ecography. **10**: 14-21.

Beebee, T.J. (1997): Changes in dewpond numbers and amphibian diversity over 20 years on chalk downland in Sussex, England. Biol. Conserv. **81**: 215-219.

Blank, L., Blaustein, L. (2012): Using ecological niche modeling to predict the distributions of two endangered amphibian species in aquatic breeding sites. Hydrobiologia **693**: 157-167.

Borzée, A., Heo, K., Jang, Y. (2018): Relationship between agro-environmental variables and breeding Hylids in rice paddies. Sci. Rep. **8**: 8049.

Burnham, K.P., Anderson, D.R. (2004): Multimodel inference: understanding AIC and BIC in model selection. SMR **33**: 261-304.

Crossland, M.R., Alford, R.A. (1998): Evaluation of the toxicity of eggs, hatchlings and tadpoles of the introduced toad *Bufo marinus* (Anura: Bufonidae) to native Australian aquatic predators. Aust. J. Ecol. **23**: 129-137.

Crump, M.L. (1991): Choice of oviposition site and egg load assessment by a treefrog. Herpetol. **47**: 308-315.

Cunningham, J.M., Calhoun, A.J., Glanz, W.E. (2007): Pond-breeding amphibian species richness and habitat selection in a beaver-modified landscape. J. Wildl. Manag. **71**: 2517-2526.

22 Decena, S.C.P., Avorque, C.A., Decena, I.C.P., Asis, P.D., Pacle, B. (2020): Impact of habitat

23   alteration on amphibian diversity and species composition in a lowland tropical rainforest

24   in Northeastern Leyte, Philippines. Sci. Rep. **10**: 10547.

25 Diniz-Filho, J.A.F., Rangel, T.F.L., Bini, L.M. (2008). Model selection and information theory

26   in geographical ecology. Glob. Ecol. Biogeogr. **17**: 479-488.

27 Dixo, M., Metzger, J.P., Morgante, J.S., Zamudio, K.R. (2009): Habitat fragmentation reduces

28   genetic diversity and connectivity among toad populations in the Brazilian Atlantic Coastal

29   Forest. Biol. Conserv. **142**: 1560-1569.

30 Durso, A.M., Willson, J.D., Winne, C.T. (2011): Needles in haystacks: estimating detection

31   probability and occupancy of rare and cryptic snakes. Biol. Conserv. **144**: 1508-1515.

32 Edgerly, J.S., McFarland, M., Morgan, P., Livdahl, T. (1998): A seasonal shift in egg-laying

33   behaviour in response to cues of future competition in a treehole mosquito. J. Anim.

34   Ecol. **67**: 805-818.

35 Environmental Geographic Information Service (EGIS). (2019): Land cover map Subdivision.

36   Sejong, South Korea. URL: https://egis.me.go.kr/intro/land.do/ Accessed 20 September 2024.

37 Evans, M., Yáber, C., Hero, J.M. (1996): Factors influencing choice of breeding site by *Bufo*

38   *marinus* in its natural habitat. Copeia **1996**: 904-912.

39 Fleishman, E., Murphy, D.D., Sjogren-Gulve, P. (2002): Modeling species richness and habitat

40   suitability for taxa of conservation interest. Predicting species occurrences: issues of

41   accuracy and scale. Island Press, Washington, DC, 506-517.

42 Guisan, A., Zimmermann, N.E. (2000): Predictive habitat distribution models in ecology. Ecol.

43   Model. **135**: 147-186.

44 Hirzel, A.H., Hausser, J., Chessel, D., Perrin, N. (2002): Ecological-niche factor analysis: how
45   to compute habitat-suitability maps without absence data?. Ecol. **83**: 2027-2036.

46 Hu, S. (2007): Akaike information criterion. CRSC **93**: 1-20.

47 International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN). (2022): *Bufo gargarizans*. IUCN red
48   list   Threatened   Species.   Cambridge,   UK.   URL:
49   https://www.iucnredlist.org/species/78017839/197248539/ Accessed 20 September 2024.

50 Jeong, J.S. (2017): On the Population Density of *Bufo bufo gargarizans* in the Wetland of
51   nearby Seomjin River and Its Habitats. Master's Theses. Kong Ju National University,
52   Kong Ju.

53 Johnson, J.B., Omland, K.S. (2004). Model selection in ecology and evolution. TREE. **19**: 101-
54   108.

55 Jowers, M.J., Downie, J.R. (2005): Tadpole deposition behaviour in male stream frogs
56   *Mannophryne trinitatis* (Anura: Dendrobatidae). J. Nat. Hist. **39**: 3013-3027.

57 Kiesecker, J.M., Chivers, D.P., Blaustein, A.R. (1996): The use of chemical cues in predator
58   recognition by western toad tadpoles. Anim. Behav. **52**: 1237-1245.

59 Kruse, K.C., Stone, B.M. (1984): Largemouth bass (*Micropterus salmoides*) learn to avoid
60   feeding on toad (*Bufo*) tadpoles. Anim. Behav. **32**: 1035-1039.

61 Lee, J.H., Jang, H.J., Seo, J.H. (2011): Ecological guide book of herpetofauna in Korea. pp. 64-
62   66. Incheon, Republic of Korea. National Institute of Environmental Research.

63 Lee, S.H. (2003): A Comparative Histological Study on Some Salientia Inhabitated in Korea.
64   Honam University Academic papers **24**: 289–303.

65   Lim, M.A., Choi, W.K., Eo, S.H., Choi, H.Y., Lee, J.S., Yang, W.K., Woo, S.H., Park, Y.S.
66   (2005): Detection of Bufotoxins in Toad Venom and Toad Eggs. Kor. J. Forensic Sci. **6**:
67   125–130.

68   Lin, Y.S., Lehtinen, R.M., Kam, Y.C. (2008): Time-and context-dependent oviposition site
69   selection of a phytotelm-breeding frog in relation to habitat characteristics and conspecific
70   cues. Herpetol. **64**: 413-421.

71   Lunghi, E., Manenti, R., Ficetola, G.F. (2015): Seasonal variation in microhabitat of
72   salamanders: environmental variation or shift of habitat selection?. PeerJ **3**: e1122.

73   Luo, Z., Hu, M., Hong, M., Li, C., Gu, Q., Gu, Z., Liao, C., Zhao, M., Wu, H. (2015):
74   Outbreeding avoidance as probable driver of mate choice in the Asiatic toad. J. Zool. **295**:
75   223-231.

76   Luo, Z., Li, C., Wang, H., Zhao, M., Gu, Q., Gu, Z., Liao, C., Wu, H. (2014): Mutual mate
77   choice in the Asiatic toad, *Bufo gargarizans*, exerts stabilizing selection on body size. Chin.
78   Sci. Bull. **59**: 38-45.

79   MacKenzie, D.I., Bailey, L.L. (2004): Assessing the fit of site-occupancy models. JABES **9**:
80   300-318.

81   Matushkina, K.A., Makarov, O., Afrin, K., Kidov, A., Litvinchuk, S. (2022): Patterns of
82   reproduction, growth and development in Asiatic Toads,(*Bufo gargarizans* Cantor, 1842)
83   from Russia and China: an experimental comparison. Herpetol. Notes. **15**: 123-138.

84   Murphy, P.J. (2003a): Does reproductive site choice in a neotropical frog mirror variable risks
85   facing offspring?. Ecol. Monogr. **73**: 45-67.

86   Murphy, P.J. (2003b): Context-dependent reproductive site choice in a Neotropical frog. Behav.
87   Ecol. **14**: 626-633.

88 National Institute of Ecology (NIE) (2018): The 4th National Natural Environment Survey The

89   4th National Natural Environment Survey (2018) Amphibians and Reptiles. National

90   Institute of Ecology. Seocheon, Republic of Korea.

91 Newman, R.A. (1988): Adaptive plasticity in development of *Scaphiopus couchii* tadpoles in

92   desert ponds. Evol. **42**: 774-783.

93 Noland, R., Ultsch, G.R. (1981): The roles of temperature and dissolved oxygen in microhabitat

94   selection by the tadpoles of a frog (*Rana pipiens*) and a toad (*Bufo terrestris*). Copeia **1981**:

95   645-652.

96 Othman, S.N., Litvinchuk, S.N., Maslova, I., Dahn, H., Messenger, K.R., Andersen, D., Jowers,

97   M.J., Kojima, Y., Skorinov, D.V., Yasumiba, K., Chuang, M., Chen, Y., Bae, Y., Hoti, J.,

98   Jang, Y., Borzee, A. (2022): From Gondwana to the Yellow Sea, evolutionary

99   diversifications of true toads *Bufo* sp. in the Eastern Palearctic and a revisit of species

100   boundaries for Asian lineages. Elife. **11**: e70494.

101 Park, S.M., Kang, H.J., Ham, C.H., Lee, J.E., Park, S.W., Sung, H.C. (2021): A case study of

102   the movement and behavior of Asian toads (*Bufo gargarizans*) during post-breeding

103   season in the spring. Korean J. Herpetol. **12**: 9-15.

104 Park, S.M., Rahman, M.M., Ham, C.H., Park, S.W., Kang, H.J., Sung, H.C. (2025): Movement

105   patterns and habitat use within the home range of the Asiatic toad (*Bufo gargarizans*) prior

106   to hibernation. Herpetozoa. **38**: 77-85.

107 Park, S.M., Rahman, M.M., Park, H.R., Cheon, S.J., Kang, H.J., Park, S.W., Ham, C.H., Sung,

108   H.C. (2024): Resting Site Selection and Microhabitat Use of an Asiatic Toad (*Bufo

109   gargarizans*; Anura: Amphibia) in South Korea. Curr. Herpetol. **43**: 203-213.

110 Pearl, C.A., Adams, M.J., Leuthold, N., Bury, R.B. (2005): Amphibian occurrence and aquatic

111   invaders in a changing landscape: implications for wetland mitigation in the Willamette

112   Valley, Oregon, USA. Wetlands **25**: 76-88.

113 Ra, N.Y., Park, D., Cheong, S., Kim, N.S., Sung, H.C. (2010): Habitat associations of the

114   endangered gold-spotted pond frog (*Rana chosenica*). Zool. Sci. **27**: 396-401.

115 Resetarits Jr, W.J., Wilbur, H.M. (1989): Choice of oviposition site by *Hyla chrysoscelis*: role

116   of predators and competitors. Ecol. **70**: 220-228.

117 Rudolf, V.H., Rödel, M.O. (2005): Oviposition site selection in a complex and variable

118   environment: the role of habitat quality and conspecific cues. Oecologia **142**: 316-325.

119 Semeniuk, M., Lemckert, F., Shine, R. (2007): Breeding-site selection by cane toads (*Bufo*

120   *marinus*) and native frogs in northern New South Wales, Australia. Wildl. Res. **34**: 59-66.

121 Semlitsch, R.D. (2000): Principles for management of aquatic-breeding amphibians. J. Wildl

122   Manage. **64**: 615-631.

123 Skelly, D.K., Werner, E.E., Cortwright, S.A. (1999): Long-term distributional dynamics of a

124   Michigan amphibian assemblage. Ecology. **80**: 2326-2337.

125 Smith, D.C. (1983): Factors controlling tadpole populations of the chorus frog (*Pseudacris*

126   *triseriata*) on Isle Royale, Michigan. Ecol. **64**: 501-510.

127 Spieler, M., Linsenmair, K.E. (1997): Choice of optimal oviposition sites by *Hoplobatrachus*

128   *occipitalis* (Anura: Ranidae) in an unpredictable and patchy environment. Oecologia **109**:

129   184-199.

130 Stebbins, R.C., Cohen, N.W. (2021): A natural history of amphibians. Princeton University

131   Press, Princeton, New Jersey.

132   Su, J., Han, M., Zhu, X., Liao, C., Tu, S., Luo, Z. (2020): Habitat selection of the Asiatic toad

133   (*Bufo gargarizans*) during hibernation in the Badagongshan National Nature Reserve,

134   central China. Salamandra **56**: 16-26.

135   Sung, H.C., Park, O.H., Kim, S.K., Park, D.S., Park, S.R. (2007): Abundance and breeding

136   migration of the Asian Toad (*Bufo gargarizans*). J Ecol Environ **30**: 287-292.

137   Yang, L., Huang, L., Zhang, H., Lee, P., Zhang, N., Cai, R., Li, E., Pan, T., Wu, X. (2023):

138   Habitat suitability and distribution pattern response to global climate change in a

139   widespread species, the Asiatic Toad (*Bufo Gargarizans*). AHR **14**:138-146.

140   Yang, L., Zhang, H., Zhang, N., Cai, R., Yan, P., Li, E., Pan, T., Wu, X. (2020): Population and

141   habitat responses to the global climate change in a widespread species, the Asiatic Toad

142   (*Bufo gargarizans*). Authorea Preprints.

143   Yu, T.L., Gu, Y.S., Du, J., Lu, X. (2009): Seasonal variation and ontogenetic change in the diet

144   of a population of *Bufo gargarizans* from the farmland, Sichuan, China. Biharean Biol. **3**:

145   99-104.

146   Yu, T.L., Guo, Y.S. (2010): Overwintering habitat selection of Asiatic toad, *Bufo gargarizans*

147   in southwestern China. Biharean Biol. **4**: 15-18.

148

1 **Table 1.** Summary of the 17 recorded variables categorized into micro variables (1 to 7) and macro variables (8 to 17). All micro variables were

2 collected directly from the field, while the macro variables were calculated using the ArcMap.

No.	Variable (unit)	Acronym	Breeding site	Non-breeding site
	Micro			
1	Water temperature (°C)	Wt	20.9 ± 3.0 (13.6–29.9)	20.4 ± 3.8 (13.8–29.5)
2	pH	P	8.3 ± 1.1 (6.2–10.6)	8.1 ± 1.1 (5.9–10.1)
3	Dissolved Oxygen (ppm)	Do	9.4 ± 2.3 (4.1–15.6)	8.5 ± 2.8 (1.7–17.3)
4	Average water depth of 1 m from the shoreline (cm)	Dp	48.0 ± 17.6 (5–88.8)	57.0 ± 18.7 (13.25–133)
5	Slope (°)	Sl	26.2 ± 11.5 (6.0–90)	27.5 ± 13.2 (5.3–90)
6	Elevation (m)	El	101.4 ± 89.2 (5.0–383.8)	83.3 ± 60.9 (0.7–350)
7	Average vegetation cover of shoreline (%)	Vc	30.4 ± 30.5 (0–100)	28.3 ± 32.3 (0–100)
	Macro			
8	Distance to forest (m)	Df	18.8 ± 40.7 (0–228.2)	33.8 ± 51.4 (0–249.6)
9	Distance to water (m)	Dw	181.1 ± 250.9 (0–1,153.9)	192.4 ± 275.4 (0–1,339)
10	Distance to used area (m)	Du	17.5 ± 31.3 (0–147.8)	17.7 ± 39.1 (0–241.3)
11	Reservoir area (m^2)	Ar	5,325.7 ± 7,219.8 (144.8–35,897.5)	11,289.6 ± 40276.2 (104.6–276,599.7)
	Percentage within a 1km buffer			
12	Barren (%)	Pb	3.6 ± 2.7 (0.3–11.9)	4.7 ± 3.6 (0.5–22.7)
13	Agricultural land (%)	Pa	19.8 ± 11.5 (1.6–55)	22.4 ± 13.9 (1.0–58.7)
14	Forest (%)	Pf	50 ± 18.3 (6.6–84.5)	46.2 ± 20.5 (6.9–95.9)
15	Water and wetland (%)	Pw	3.9 ± 6.4 (0.1–28.7)	2.4 ± 2.7 (0.3–12.2)
16	Used area (%)	Pu	8.8 ± 7.4 (1.3–37.7)	9.5 ± 6.3 (0.3–29.6)
17	Grass (%)	Pg	13.9 ± 5.0 (3.5–27)	14.9 ± 6.0 (1.5–37.9)

3

4   **Table 2.** List of the 30 models. Models 1–10 consist of only micro variables, while models 11–

5   20 consist of only macro variables. Models 21–29 consist of combinations of micro and macro

6   variables, and Model 30 contains all 17 variables.

Model No.	Variable
Micro variable combination	
1	Do, Sl, El, Vc
2	Do, Dp, El, Vc
3	Wt, P, Dp
4	P, Dp, El, Vc
5	Wt, Do, Dp, Vc
6	Wt, Do, Sl, El, Vc
7	Wt, Sl, El, Vc
8	Dp, Sl, El, Vc
9	Wt, P, Do, Dp, El, Vc
10	Wt, P, Do, Dp, Sl, El, Vc
Macro variable combination	
11	Df, Pf, Pg
12	Dw, Ar, Pa, Pw
13	Du, Pb, Pu
14	Df, Ar, Pb, Pw, Pg
15	Df, Pb, Pa, Pg
16	Df, Dw, Du, Pf, Pu, Pg
17	Df, Dw, Ar, Pb, Pa, Pf, Pw, Pg
18	Ar, Pb, Pw, Pu
19	Du, Ar, Pb, Pa, Pu, Pg
20	Df, Dw, Du, Ar, Pb, Pa, Pf, Pw, Pu, Pg
All variable combination	
21	Do, Dp, Pb, Pa, Pg
22	Do, Dp, Pb, Pf, Pw
23	Dp, Sl, Df, Du, Ar, Pa, Pf, Pw
24	Wt, P, Sl, Pb
25	Wt, Do, Dp, Ar, Pb, Pw
26	El, Vc, Df, Pf, Pg
27	Do, Sl, El, Df, Pf
28	Dp, El, Vc, Df, Pa, Pf, Pg
29	Do, Dp, Df, Pg
Global	
30	Wt, P, Do, Dp, Sl, El, Vc, Df, Dw, Du, Ar, Pb, Pa, Pf, Pw, Pu, Pg

7

Table 3. Model selection results for breeding site suitability of *Bufo gargarizans*, including model number, variables used, number of parameters (k), AICc, ΔAICc, and model weights (*wi*). The models are ranked in order of their explanatory power, with lower AICc values indicating a better model fit.

Model No.	Variable list	k	AICc	ΔAICc	*wi*
25	Wt, Do, Dp, Ar, Pb, Pw	8	152.797	0	0.6464
22	Do, Dp, Pb, Pf, Pw	7	155.671	2.87	0.1536
29	Do, Dp, Df, Pg	6	158.423	5.63	0.0387
2	Do, Dp, EL, Vc	6	158.659	5.86	0.0345
4	P, Dp, El, Vc	6	158.726	5.93	0.0334
21	Do, Dp, Pb, Pa, Pg	7	159.344	6.55	0.0245
5	Wt, Do, Dp, Vc	6	159.437	6.64	0.0234
3	Wt, P, Dp	5	159.734	6.94	0.0201
18	Ar, Pb, Pw, Pu	6	160.164	7.37	0.0163
9	Wt, P, Do, Dp, El, Vc	8	161.313	8.52	0.0091

14   **Table 4.** The significance of the variables included in Model 25. The table presents the

15   estimated coefficients (B), standard errors (SE), Wald Chi-Square values, and significance

16   levels (Sig) from the binomial logistic regression analysis. The significant variables include

17   average water depth 1 m from the shoreline (Dp), the percentage of barren land within a 1 km

18   buffer (Pb), and the percentage of water within a 1 km buffer (Pw).

Variable	B	SE	Wald Chi-Square	Sig
intercept	1	1.6407	0.418	0.518
Wt	0.179	0.0617	1.620	0.203
Do	1.144	0.0795	3.263	0.071
Dp	**-0.035**	**0.0129**	**7.210**	**0.007**
Ar	-1.496	1.4142	1.080	0.299
Pb	**-0.203**	**0.0915**	**4.921**	**0.027**
Pw	**0.118**	**0.0525**	**5.091**	**0.024**

19

20

21 **Figure legends**

22 **Fig. 1.** Location of the study area. The study sites were selected from northern, central, and

23 southern regions, all located along the 127° longitude. Red dots indicate breeding sites, while

24 blue dots indicate non-breeding sites. **A:** Northern (Paju), **B:** Central (Cheongju), **C:** Southern

25 (Gwangyang).

Fig. 1.