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**Abstract**

**Predation is a leading cause of breeding failure as well as adult mortality in majority of bird species, prompting the evolution of various anti-predator behaviours. Among these, cryptic breeding birds often rely on strategies such as nest concealment and reduced activity to avoid detection. However, in some of them were observed also more active responses, such as defecation, when flushed from their nests. In this study, we investigate this behaviour in incubating female Eurasian woodcocks *(Scolopax rusticola)* using a large dataset of nest photographs sourced from various open-source internet platforms. Our analysis reveals that signs of defecation are obvious in 54% of nests photos. Moreover in 67% nests are visible freshly moulted feathers around the nest, indicating possible application of fright moulting — a behaviour not previously documented in this context. We give both these behaviours into the common context and suggests that may primarily serve to aid the female's escape rather than to protect the nest, though their effectiveness as anti-predator strategies remain uncertain. The presence of faeces and feathers may, in fact, increase the risk of nest predation by making the nest more conspicuous to predators. Our findings thus also emphasize the importance of minimising nest disturbance during research to preserve the integrity of nest environment. We show that open-source platforms can provide valuable data for studies of breeding behaviour in wild birds.**

1. **Introduction**

**Given that predation is the leading cause of breeding failure for most bird species (Ricklefs, 1969), various species have evolved a range of adaptations and mechanisms to mitigate the risk of predation (Caro, 2005). These adaptations can be broadly categorized into two strategies. On one hand, they include active nest defense (Larsen et al., 1996), which may be enhanced by forming colonies** (Götmark & Andersson, 1984; Šálek & Šmilauer, 2002)**. On the other hand, so-called “cryptic breeders” rely on nest concealment (Sládeček et al., 2015), minimized movement around the nest (Martin et al., 2000), and finely tuned crypsis of both eggs** (Colwell et al., 2011; Šálek & Cepáková, 2006) **and parents (Ekanayake et al., 2015).**

**One behaviour that has been proposed to have an anti-predator function is defecation at the moment of perceived predator approach. This behaviour is commonly observed and well documented in colonial birds that actively defend their nests, such as fieldfares *(Turdus pilaris)* (Haas, 1985) and various terns and gulls (Fuchs, 1977), which attempt to hit approaching predators with falling faeces. In colonial breeders, this behaviour can indeed lead to a reduction in nest predation rates** (Andersson, 1978; Haas, 1985). In extreme cases, it has even been observed that a predator lost the ability to fly due to the intensity of faecal contamination (Bezzel, 1975). However, defecation has also been documented in several cryptic breeders, who **frequently smear their eggs with faeces when flushed from the nest. Defecation by flushed incubating females is a regular and common occurrence in several duck species, most often in eiders *(Somateria mollissima)*** (King & Shutler, 2010; Swennen, 1968) **and has also been anecdotally reported in two shorebird species, namely snipes** (Müller & Königstedt, 1990)**. Nonetheless, although suggested by several authors** (McDougall & Milne, 1968; Müller & Königstedt, 1990)**, the anti-predatory function and effectiveness of this behaviour remains unclear and controversial.**

**The controversy surrounding the suggested nest-protective function of this behaviour can be attributed to several factors. Firstly, testing the effectiveness of smearing eggs with faeces to deter predators gives contradictory results. While some studies have found a protective effect of faeces against certain predator species** (McDougall & Milne, 1968; Swennen, 1968)**, other studies reported higher predation rates at faeces-contaminated nests, likely because predators can use the faeces as an olfactory cue to locate the nest** (Clark & Wobeser, 1997; Olson & Rohwer, 1998)**.** This means that by defecating, the flushed female breaks the olfactory crypsis of the nest**. The importance of olfactory crypsis is perhaps best documented by the fact that the incubating sex of many bird species changes the composition of their preen waxes during incubation, replacing more volatile monoesters with less volatile but more costly diesters (Reneerkens et al., 2005, 2007). In addition, we can speculate that faeces spread over the clutch and nest surroundings may also reduce visual crypsis of the nest, as bird predators have been shown to use UV reflective spots in urine as visual cues for prey detection (Viitala et al., 1995). Finally, although it may not be essential if it would protect the nest from predation, it should be mentioned that egg contamination** of **eggshells with faeces can introduce pathogenic bacteria, posing a risk to the embryo (Cox et al., 2000).**

**Due to these controversies, an alternative explanation regarding the adaptive function of defecation have been proposed, suggesting that defecation may protect the escaping female rather than the clutch** (King & Shutler, 2010)**. This is supported by the fact that defecation during flushing is common in various bird species outside the context of incubation (Tillmann, 2009). First hypothesis of how defecation may help the bird escape was that it might lighten the escaping female, which may cause acceleration of her starting speed (Simmons, 1955). However, as discussed by King et al. (2010), the impact of defecation on the starting speed and manoeuvrability of duck-size birds is likely negligible, given the minimal weight of the faeces compared to the weight of escaping female.**

**Another hypothesis proposes that defecation may serve to divert a predator’s attention away from the flushed female** (King & Shutler, 2010; Tillmann, 2009)**. A similar idea in a different context was presented by** Lindstrom and Nilsson(1988)**, who described several observations in which a bird escaping from a predator shed a small "cloud" of body feathers even though the predator hadn't yet touched it. Such behaviour is referred to as "fright moulting"** (Lindstrom & Nilsson, 1988) **but is usually described as autotomic feather loss when the bird is captured by a predator (or handled by humans), similar to the autotomy of the lizard's tail (Awasthy, 2010; Dathe, 1955). Observation of the feather cloud shedding without direct contact with a predator, however, the authors liken it more to an octopus releasing a cloud of ink** (Lindstrom & Nilsson, 1988)**. Within this context is noteworthy, that dropping faeces and shedding feathers could work in very similar ways.**

**When analysing a large dataset of Eurasian woodcock (*Scolopax rusticola*) nest photos from various open sources, we noticed that many showed fresh faecal contamination of eggs or nest surroundings, which has not been described before in this species. A large proportion of nests also showed the presence of freshly lost feathers, often in significant numbers. It is important to note that woodcocks are highly cryptic breeders, continuing incubation until the approaching human is in close proximity (~ 1-2 metres). It is thus almost impossible to find the nest without flushing the female.** As a result, vast majority of photographs capture the nest shortly after the incubating female has been flushed by the photographer. This makes it possible to use photos from internet sources to describe the condition of nests left by escaping females.

**In this study we describe and quantify the occurrence of signs of female defecation in and around the nest captured in nest photographs. We also quantify the presence of feathers in the photographs. We suggest that frequently observed feathers around the nest may be a consequence of the fright moulting of the flushed female, which has also not been previously described. We hypothesise that if both phenomena have a similar function, their occurrence in the photo should be correlated. We discuss in detail the possible function and adaptive value of these phenomena.**

1. **Methods**
   1. *Data searching and filtering*

To assess the behaviour of flushed breeding woodcocks, we combined several sources of photos. First, we conducted an extensive search of the various open sources on the Internet, including literature searches, searches of faunistic databases operating in countries throughout the breeding range of the Eurasian woodcock, and also searches of Google images, a number of social media and networks (see Table A1 for the list of all sources and the number of nests obtained). Second, we supplemented this dataset with nests that that we found in the past, our colleagues or friends who provided us with photos of nests they found (n=7). Finally, we included the only picture, which we obtained based on a public call published in the hunting magazine “Svět myslivosti” (n=1).

In all faunistic databases (see Table A2 for the list of databases and number of nests obtained), we filtered and manually checked all photos of Eurasian woodcock nests with eggs or incubating females taken in any year between 1 March and 31 August, which (with a certain margin) covers the presumed breeding season of the woodcock. Photographs of nests published in the literature were searched through the google scholar database (see Table A3 for the list of literature sources used).

We searched Google images and social media/networks in most of the national languages used throughout the breeding range of the Eurasian woodcock (see table A4 for the list of languages), and the scientific name *Scolopax rusticola*. In all languages we used queries that can be translated into English as "woodcock's nest", and “woodcock eggs” (see Table A4 for the list the queries used). If we found more than one photo for a single nest (from any source), we recorded all of them. Within YouTube, we extracted photos from each video by cropping them with the print screen function. In this case, we tried to cut out photos showing both the whole (surrounding habitat) and a detail of the nest.

Once we found a photo of the nest, we tried to find as much traceable information as possible. In particular, the location where the photo was taken (at the highest possible level of geographical detail), the date when the photo was taken, the author of the photo, and possibly other details about the circumstances surrounding the discovery of the nest. For this we tried to use any information from the website/social media post in question, or information from other posts/discussions etc.

Google image searches were stopped at the end of 2023, social media and databases were checked until 30 June 2024. The individual image sources were divided among three authors (MS, KB, LN) who searched them independently. The first author then merged and cleaned all the datasets obtained in this way. Every possible effort was made especially to ensure the exclusion of duplicate images of the same nest, nests of another species and photographs of artificially arranged museum exhibits.

* 1. *Photo evaluation and data analysis*

All obtained photographs were carefully inspected by one of the authors (MS), who recorded the following information. First of all, we distinguished whether there were signs of faeces in the photograph. Specifically, a distinction was made as to whether fresh faeces had stained the eggs or the nest surroundings (Figure 2). In some cases, although fresh faeces were not visible in the photograph, white dry specks of faeces were visible on the eggs, apparently resulting from faecal contamination in the more distant past (Figure 2). In such cases this was also noted.

We also recorded whether any feathers were present in the visible area around the nest, and if so, whether these were only small (down or contour) feathers or whether at least one flight feather (wing/tail feathers) was also present (Figure 2). We specifically recorded instances where five or more feathers were clearly identifiable in the photo as we assume that such a situation is extremely unlikely without an immediate shedding of feathers during the escape.

If, for some reason, we judged that the quality of the photo did not allow both observed characteristics to be assessed (e.g. the nest was photographed from too far away, or the photo quality was too low), both characteristics were assessed as NA. Note however, that the pictures used differ significantly in terms of shot type, including variations in distance, angle, and the positioning of the nest within the frame. For example, the number of feathers recorded in a photograph is likely to be much lower than the actual number of feathers in the nest surroundings. In addition, we cannot rule out the possibility that some of the images may have been altered by the photographer, for example by removing faeces from the eggs to improve the aesthetic quality of the picture. As both these problems certainly affect the presented data, we mention and discus them in the discussion.

All the work with the data, including picture inspection, data curation, statistics calculation and visualization were carried out in R version 4.2.1 (R-Core-Team, 2022). For all the commented proportions we report the estimate, and its 95% confidence interval provided by the ‘binom.test’ function (R-Core-Team, 2022). To test the independence of both observed phenomena we used the Pearson’s Chi-squared test with Yates continuity correction.

1. **Results**

A total of 658 photos of 501 nests were obtained. Of these, for 399 nests we obtained at least one image that allowed us to assess whether the nest or its immediate surroundings were contaminated with faeces and whether there were any feathers.

In total, fresh faeces indicating female defecation shortly before the picture was taken were observed in 215 nests (i.e., 53.9%; 95%CI: 49% - 59%). Of this number, however, only in 35.8% of the cases (n=77; 95%CI: 29% - 43%; Figure 1a) was at least one of the eggs contaminated. In the remaining cases, only the immediate vicinity of the nest was contaminated. The amount of visible faeces, as well as the extent to which the eggs or surroundings were affected, was highly variable. In addition, we detected a further 28 cases (7%; 95%CI: 5% - 10%; Figure 1a) where white marks on the eggshell detected that faecal contamination of the eggs had occurred earlier, probably during previous disturbance of the female.

In 267 nests (67%; 95%CI: 62% - 72%) or their immediate surroundings we observed at least one feather. In the vast majority of such cases (256; 96%; 95%CI: 93% - 98%; Figure 1b) these were small body feathers, and in 107 cases (40%; 95%CI: 34% - 46%; Figure 1b), there were five or more visible feathers within the photo. In 11 cases (4%; 95%CI: 2% - 7%; Figure 1b), also large flight feathers were observable.

Taken together, only in 63 nests (16%; 95%CI: 12% - 20%; Figure 1c) had neither faeces or feathers observed. On the contrary, in 174 nests both faeces and feathers were found (44%; 95%CI: 39% - 49%; Figure 1c). The occurrence of both phenomena was correlated (Chi = 5.63, df=1, p-value =0.018).
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***Figure 1.*** *Proportions of faeces occurrence and location (a), feathers, their type and abundance (b), and the representation of each combination of both phenomena found in the entire dataset evaluated (n=399 nests).*
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***Figure 2.*** *Examples of analysed photos; a) nest with eggs contaminated with faeces (photo credit: Miroslav E. Šálek), b) nest with only the surroundings contaminated with faeces (source: eBird; photo credit: Stephen Carter), c) nest with several small feathers visible (photo credit: Karel Pithart), and d) female woodcock incubating nest with clearly visible faeces traces (and one feather) around the nest, a probable consequence of an escape during a previous disturbance (source: Instagram; photo credit: Aniuta Gorchakova).*

1. **Discussion**

In this study, we utilized extensive photographic material obtained from various open-source internet sources to explore two phenomena frequently associated with the departure of female Eurasian woodcocks flushed from their nests. Specifically, we observed signs of defecation shortly before the photo was taken in 54% of nests, and feathers around the nest visible in 67% of nests, suggesting possible fright moulting during nest departure.

* 1. *Methodological Limitations*

While the occurrence of fright moulting in this context has not been previously documented, the frequency of defecation can be compared with similar behaviours observed in several duck species, who defecate (and smear the eggs) almost any time they are flushed, as quantified by Swennen (1968). However, it is important to acknowledge the limitations of using photo material from internet sources, despite it being the most feasible approach for studying such phenomena in a species as elusive as the Eurasian woodcock. Our estimates of the frequency of defecation, as well as the presence and quantity of feathers around the nest, are almost surely underestimated for several reasons. First, faeces and feathers may be dispersed over a larger area than captured in the photographs, which often focus only on a nest and its closest vicinity. Second, the circumstances in which the photographs were taken are not always clear. Some images may have been taken without the female being flushed. Third, in some cases it appears that the nest and eggs may have been 'cleaned' by the photographer before the photo was taken, in order to improve the aesthetic quality of the photo. This would also reduce the chance of identification for both phenomena studied. However, it is important to say that despite these limitations our dataset is likely the largest ever compiled for this species, because finding Eurasian woodcock nests is extremely challenging, and collecting representative data on woodcock breeding biology through direct fieldwork is nearly impossible, making our findings particularly valuable.

Nonetheless, lower probability of defecation when woodcocks are flushed compared to ducks could also have a biological explanation. Unlike ducks, who often incubate the nest almost continuously (Bolduc & Guillemette, 2003), woodcock regularly interrupt incubation during the light part of the day (Trejbalová et al., 2023), when almost all photos were taken. Some females therefore could defecate shortly before the photo was taken and therefore may not need or be able to do so again in a short period.

Another issue that needs to be addressed is the uncertainty surrounding the origin of the feathers found around the nest. We cannot definitively conclude that they are the result of fright moulting, as some may have come from regular partial moulting, which can overlap with the early breeding season (Hudec & Šťastný, 2005). However, feathers were frequently observed throughout the breeding season, and many photographs clearly showed a relatively large number of feathers scattered around the nest shortly before the images were taken. Additionally, partial moulting into breeding plumage should not involve flight feathers, yet these were observed in 4% of nests. Moreover, our extensive experience with several shorebird species that escape from the nest from a safe distance, such as the Northern Lapwing *(Vanellus vanellus)* and Little Ringed Plover *(Charadrius dubius)*, provides a contrasting perspective. Although these species also undergo regular moulting during part of the breeding season (Hudec & Šťastný, 2005), the presence of even single feathers in their nests is extremely rare (own unpublished results).

* 1. *Antipredatory function of defecation and fright moulting*

Our study confirms that defecation, often accompanied by the shedding of feathers, is a common behaviour in woodcocks when flushed from the nest. However, the question remains what adaptive function this behaviour performs in relation to the risk of predation. At least we propose that frequent defecation by female Eurasian woodcocks is unlikely to be an effective adaptation to protect the nest from predation from several reasons.

First, a significant proportion of dropped faeces is deposited next to the nest, meaning the eggs themselves are not directly affected and are unlikely to be protected. Second, in ducks, the protective effect of faeces, if any, is specifically linked to the type of faeces produced by birds during incubation. The predator deterrent effect disappeared when the faeces of non-breeding birds were used in experiments (Swennen, 1968). This is a consequence of the fact, that almost continuously incubating ducks fast during the incubation (Bolduc & Guillemette, 2003). This causes them to produce very specific faeces, with modified bacterial composition and more alkaline pH (McDougall & Milne, 1968), which are probably specifically unpalatable to many predators (Swennen, 1968). Although we did not measure the specific characteristics of the faeces produced by incubating Eurasian woodcock, we assume that it will not differ from the faeces of non-incubating birds, as the incubation rhythm of Eurasian woodcock allows females to avoid fasting (Trejbalová et al., 2023). The protective potential of their faeces for eggs is thus rather improbable.

Third, the presence of faeces and conspicuous urine spots around the nest likely makes the nest more noticeable to a wide range of potential predators. This increased noticeability could result from reduced olfactory crypsis (Reneerkens et al., 2005), attracting mammalian predators (Clark & Wobeser, 1997; Olson & Rohwer, 1998), or using UV-reflective urine spots as visual cues to locate prey, by avian predators (Viitala et al., 1995). The latter is particularly relevant during incubation breaks when the nest remains uncovered each day for about three hours during daylight (Trejbalová et al., 2023). It is worth noting that feathers scattered outside the nest could pose a similar problem in terms of crypsis.

Fourth, woodcocks regularly abandon the nest completely after being flushed, especially during the first third of the incubation period. The probability of nest desertion after being flushed is about 12% (Hoodless & Coulson, 1998). This behaviour suggests that the primary focus of the escaping female may be on preserving her own life, rather than protecting the eggs.

Given the above reasoning, we consider it likely, that if defecation by woodcock female flushed from the nest has some specific adaptive function, it helps the female safely escape predation, most probably by diverting the predator's attention (King & Shutler, 2010). This hypothesis places defecation and fright moulting, the two phenomena studied in this paper in a common context: in order to distract the predator, the flushed female may need to leave behind either faeces or a small cloud of feathers, or even both. This is also consistent with the fact, that defecation when flushed has also been observed in many birds outside of the incubation context (Reviewed in: Tillmann, 2009).

An alternative, albeit not completely exclusive explanation for frequent defecation and feather shedding is that these behaviours may be a side effects of the physiological processes accompanying the activation of the sympathetic nervous system during an acute stress response, which is necessary to minimize reaction time when the bird is threatened by a predator (Jerem & Romero, 2023; Romero & Wingfield, 2016). Frequent defecation often accompanies the stress induced by handling (Boissy, 1995; Romero & Wingfield, 2016), or predator model presentation (Clarke et al., 2012). Easy shedding of feathers during fright moult may be related to the reduction in surface temperature (reviewed in: Jerem & Romero, 2023), that occurs as a result of constriction of the visceral vasculature, which is necessary to increase perfusion pressure and redirect blood flow to where it is most needed, the skeletal muscles (Vianna & Carrive, 2005). Notably, feather loss is a regular response of male Eurasian woodcock caught in mist-nets (own observations). Nonetheless, even if the observed behaviour does not evolve primarily as a response to predator threatening and is primarily connected to such physiological processes, the possible diversion of attacking predator may be a very welcome side effect in this case, even if the effectiveness of the behaviour would be low.

The key question for the proposed hypothesis is whether a female's escape from the nest is perceived as an immediate life-threatening situation sufficient to trigger the "fight-or-flight" response, a commonly used synonymous with sympathetic nervous system activation (Romero & Wingfield, 2016). This has been disputed by Tillman (2009) in his study of flushed coveys of grey partridges (*Perdix perdix*). Although we did not test this in female woodcocks, we consider it as highly probable, as they typically rely on crypsis and remain on the nest until the intruder is very close, often within a metre. Importantly, this behaviour is very similar to what is observed in other species where defecation upon being flushed from the nest has been documented (Müller & Königstedt, 1990; Swennen, 1968). The urgency and stress of such an escape are likely significant, especially given the proximity of potential predators capable of directly attacking the sitting female.

* 1. *Conclusions and future Directions*

Our study provides new insights into the behaviour of cryptic breeding birds when flushed from their nests. In particular, we highlight the occurrence of fright moulting, a phenomenon not previously documented in this context, in addition to the already known defecation. Our results suggest several directions for future research. To begin with, while our findings focus on Eurasian woodcock, and defecation has been observed in several other species, the prevalence and distribution of these two phenomena across avian taxa remains largely unexplored. We hypothesise that both phenomena will be most (or exclusively) present in species that rely on crypsis and escape before a predator (or human) approach from the immediate vicinity. We suggest that open-source internet platforms offer an excellent opportunity for data mining in future studies, both for single species analyses and for comparative studies across species.

In addition, the physiological mechanisms underlying these behaviours, including their potential link to sympathetic nervous system activation, require further investigation.

Finally, our findings may also have conservation implications. Since the dispersal of faeces or feathers around the nest is unlikely to provide egg protection and may instead increase the risk of subsequent predation, we recommend minimising the number of nest visits during research, especially in species exhibiting defecation and feather shedding at the moment of flushing from the nest. If possible, nest visits should be timed to coincide with the period when the female is away from the nest during an incubation break. Given that disturbance of woodcock nests is often accidental and unintentional, it may be worth considering at least a basic cleaning of the nest and surrounding area if it is contaminated with faeces and/or there are many feathers after our visit.
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**Appendix**

**Table A1**| List of sources used to search for nest images (except of faunistic databases) and corresponding number of nests found.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Social media and networks** | **Number of nest images** |
| Facebook | 32 |
| Flickr | 22 |
| Google Images | 109 |
| Instagram | 50 |
| Twitter | 30 |
| Youtube | 6 |
| **Published literature** | 17 |
| **Team** | 7 |

**Table A2**| List of faunistic databases used to search for nest images, their geographical coverage and number of nests found.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Database** | **Link** | **Coverage** | **Number of nests** | |
| Avif | https://avif.birds.cz/ | Czech Republic | 7 |
| Artportalen | https://artportalen.se/ | Sweden | 24 |
| Artsobservasjoner | https://www.artsobservasjoner.no/ | Norway | 19 |
| BirdPhoto | http://www.birdphoto.cz/ | Czech Republic | 3 |
| Birding Slovakia | https://birding.sk/ | Slovakia | 1 |
| Dabasdati | https://dabasdati.lv/ | Latvia | 41 |
| eBird | https://ebird.org/ | worldwide | 5 |
| Elurikkus | https://elurikkus.ee/ | Estonia | 9 |
| iNaturalist | https://www.inaturalist.org/ | worldwide | 71 |
| NDOP | https://portal23.nature.cz/ | Czech Republic | 3 |
| Ornitho | https://www.ornitho.at/ | Austria | 2 |
| Ornitho | https://www.ornitho.cat/ | Catalonia | 1 |
| Ornitho | https://www.ornitho.de/ | Germany | 12 |
| Ornitho | https://www.ornitho.ch/ | Switzerland | 7 |
| Ornitho | https://www.ornitho.it/ | Italy | 3 |
| Ornitho | https://www.ornitho.pl/ | Poland | 6 |
| Russian Bird Conservation Union | https://rbcu.ru/ | Russia | 1 |
| [Ukrainian Biodiversity Information Network](https://ukrbin.com/) | https://ukrbin.com/ | Ukraine | 2 |
| waarnemingen | https://waarnemingen.be/ | Belgium | 4 |
| waarnemingen | https://waarneming.nl/ | Netherlands | 6 |

**Table A3**| List ofliterature sources containing photo material used in this publication.
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**Table A4**| All search languages and queries that can be translated into English as "woodcock's nest" and "woodcock’s eggs". The scientific name *Scolopax rusticola* was also included in the search. For use in Facebook and Instagram, the queries were used also in the form of hashtags, e.g. #woodcockegg, #woodcocknest.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Language list** | **Query** |
| Belarusian | Гняздо вальдшнепа |
| Яйка вальдшнепа |
| Bulgarian | Гнездо Горска бекасина |
| яйца Горска бекасина |
| Croatian | Gnijezdo šljuke |
| Jaje šljuke |
| Czech | Hnízdo sluky lesní |
| Vejce sluky lesní |
| Danish | Skovsneppe rede |
| Skovsneppe æg |
| Dutch | Houtsnipnest |
| Houtsnipei |
| English | Woodcock nest |
| Woodcock eggs |
| Estonian | Metskurvitsa pesa |
| Metskurvitsa muna |
| Finnish | Lehtokurpan pesä |
| Lehtokurpan muna |
| French | Nid de bécasse des bois |
| Œuf de bécasse des bois |
| German | Waldschnepfennest |
| Waldschnepfeneier |
| Hungarian | Erdei szalonka fészke |
| Erdei szalonka tojása |
| Italian | Nido di beccaccia |
| Uovo di beccaccia |
| Japanese | ウッドコックの巣 |
| ウッドコックの卵 |
| Latvian | Sloka Ligzdo |
| Sloka olas |
| Lithuanian | eurazinė slanka lizdas |
| eurazinė slanka kiaušinis |
| Norwegian | Rugdenes rede |
| Rugdeegg |
| Polish | Gniazdo słonki |
| Jajo słonki |
| Portuguese | Ninho de Galinholas |
| Ovo de Scolopax rusticola |
| Romanian | cuib Sitar de pădure |
| ouă Sitar de pădure |
| Russian | Гнездо вальдшнепа |
| Яйца вальдшнепа |
| Serbian | Гнездо шљуке |
| Јаје шљуке |
| Slovenian | Gnezdo lesne šljuke |
| Jajce lesne šljuke |
| Slovakia | hniezdo sluka hôrna |
| Vajcia sluka hôrna |
| Spanish | Nido de becada |
| Huevo de becada |
| Swedish | Morkullans bo |
| Morkullans ägg |
| Ukrainian | гніздо вальдшнепа |
|  | Яйця вальдшнепа |