An introduction to predictive distribution modelling for conservation to encourage novel perspectives

M. P. MacPherson[1,2,3], K. R. Burgio[4,5], M. G. DeSaix[6], B. G. Freeman[7], J. Herbert[8,9], R. Herman[10], V. Jirinec[11,12], J. Shonfield[13], D. L. Slager[14], C. B. van Rees[15], J. E. Jankowski[7]

Author affiliations:
[1] Louisiana State University Museum of Natural Sciences, USA
[2] Université Laval, Canada
[3] Western Illinois University, USA
[4] New York City Audubon Society, USA
[5] University of Connecticut, USA
[6] Colorado State University, USA
[7] University of British Columbia, Canada
[8] Tulane University, USA
[9] Mass Audubon, USA
[10] Stony Brook University, USA
[11] Louisiana State University and LSU AgCenter, USA
[12] Integral Ecology Research Center, USA
[13] LGL Limited, Canada
[14] University of Washington, USA
[15] University of Georgia

Corresponding author:
MP MacPherson
maggie.macpherson@gmail.com

Handling Editor:
Luis M. Carrascal
Juan Carlos Senar

Abstract

An introduction to predictive distribution modelling for conservation to encourage novel perspectives. The rapid pace and potentially irreversible consequences of global change create an urgent need to predict the spatial responses of biota for conservation to better inform the prioritization and management of terrestrial habitats and prevent future extinctions. Here, we provide an accessible entry point to the field to guide near-future work building predictive species distribution models (SDMs) by synthesizing a technical framework for the proactive conservation of avian biodiversity. Our framework offers a useful approach to navigate the challenges surrounding the large spatio-temporal resolution of datasets and datasets that favor hypothesis testing at broad spatio-temporal scales and coarse resolutions, which can affect our ability to assess the validity of current predicted distributions. We explain how to improve the accuracy of predictive models by determining the extent to which: 1) dispersal limitation impacts the rate of range shifts, 2) taxa are rare at their range limits, and 3) land use and climate change interact. Finally, we offer approaches to filling knowledge gaps by creatively leveraging existing methods and data sources.

Key words: Species distribution model, Environmental niche model, Predictive distribution modeling, Climate change, Grinnellian niche, Eltonian niche

Resumen

Introducción a la elaboración de modelos predictivos de distribución para la conservación con el fin de fomentar nuevas perspectivas. El rápido avance del cambio global y sus consecuencias potencialmente irreversibles hacen que sea urgente predecir las respuestas espaciales de la biota para la conservación, con el fin de fundamentar mejor el establecimiento de un orden de prioridad entre los hábitats terrestres y su gestión y prevenir futuras extinciones. Aquí proporcionamos un punto de entrada accesible al campo para orientar la elaboración de modelos predictivos de distribución de especies (SDM) en el futuro próximo, sintetizando un marco técnico para la conservación proactiva de la biodiversidad aviar. Nuestro marco ofrece un enfoque útil para hacer frente a las dificultades relativas a la gran resolución espaciotemporal de los conjuntos de datos y a los conjuntos de datos que favorecen la comprobación de hipótesis a escalas espaciotemporales amplias y resoluciones bajas, lo que puede afectar a nuestra capacidad de evaluar la validez de las distribuciones predichas actuales. Explicamos cómo mejorar la precisión de los modelos predictivos determinando hasta qué punto 1) influye la limitación de la dispersión en el ritmo de los cambios de área de distribución, 2) son escasos los taxones en los límites de su área de distribución y 3) interaccionan el uso del suelo y el cambio climático. Por último, proponemos enfoques para subsanar la falta de conocimientos aprovechando de forma creativa los métodos y fuentes de datos existentes.

Palabras clave: Modelo de distribución de especies, Modelo de nicho ambiental, Elaboración de modelos predictivos de distribución, Cambio climático, Nicho grinnelliano, Nicho eltoniano

Introduction

Anthropogenic pressures on climate and land cover lead to altered ecosystems and species distributions (Parmesan and Yohe 2003). This creates an urgent need for understanding species spatial responses to global change and ensuring conservation of suitable habitat that supports population persistence and conserves biodiversity (Roberts et al 2019, De Frenne et al 2021). Species distribution models link species' occurrence with ecological explanatory variables and can be used to predict range dynamics for proactive conservation measures (Zurell et al 2016, van Rees et al 2022); however, the accuracy of current predictive species distribution models where there is a lot of occurrence data is still limited by the variation in temporal and spatial resolution of datasets used to build them (König et al 2021). This is because the capacity of species to change their geographic ranges is limited by both large-scale factors (i.e., range-wide drivers like temperature and rainfall that define macrohabitat) and small-scale factors (i.e., individual-specific biotic interactions and resource availability that affect microhabitat use). This issue is exacerbated for data-poor species, such as rare, cryptic and consequently, many tropical species. The limited availability of high-resolution datasets capable of capturing fine-scale dynamics thus decreases our predictive capacity for many such taxa.

A multitude of factors can ultimately influence how species, populations, and individuals respond to changing climate regimes driven by global change (reviewed in Peterson et al 2019). Individuals may lack flexibility in tracking relevant environmental cues to adjust the timing of life history events or to otherwise accommodate novel ecological circumstances. Alternatively, even when species are flexible in timing life history events, they may be unable to modulate behavior in response to environmental anomalies that affect recruitment. For example, advancing egg-laying dates to match earlier spring warming temperatures may have negative consequences for nestling survival when the chances of cold snaps are decoupled from warming trends (Shipley et al 2020, Sauser et al 2021). Predictions for how animal distributions could be altered (shifted, contracted or expanded) with climate change may be species-specific (Radosavljevic and Anderson 2014, Hallman and Robinson 2020), but research into how particular axes of climate change affect species with different life history strategies, foraging guilds or habitat affinities provides promising insights that may apply to a wider number of unstudied species (changing rainfall regimes, Brawn et al 2017; rearrangements of ecosystems, Huntley et al 2008; advances in spring phenology and breeding success, Sander et al 2020). Finally, the potential for range shifts is ultimately limited by whether potential habitat is available, accessible, and whether population density is high enough at the appropriate range edge to facilitate a shift (Block and Levine 2021, Stiels et al 2021).

A major gap in the current understanding of how organisms are likely to respond to global change remains in the effect of land use change and its interaction with climate change. Dispersal limitation is a critical component of distribution model theory, but is difficult to estimate in practice (Sousa et al 2021). Species with high site fidelity (Merkle et al 2022) or inflexible migratory routes (Stanley et al 2012) may not be able to adopt prospecting behaviors (searching for new sites; Cooper and Marra 2020) to accommodate dispersal to appropriate habitat following change. In the Northern Hemisphere, avian migration routes and resource tracking are well established (Faaborg et al 2010, Thorup et al 2017), but individuals still may not be able to correctly time migratory movements to keep up with the pace of climate change, as evidenced in declining populations that now experience mismatches in the timing of annual life history events and peaks in food availability (Møller et al 2008, Sander et al 2020). On the other hand, multiple Nearctic-Neotropical migrants have advanced their spring migration and breeding behavior in response to warming spring temperatures (Pecl et al 2017, Dunn and Møller 2019, Shipley et al 2020), offering support to the idea of 'evolutionary rescue', where existing variation within annual cycles may yield previously unknown adaptive potential (Helm et al 2019). Recent research on the interaction between land use and climate change points to the need to improve our understanding of interacting mechanisms underpinning risks to population persistence under climate and habitat stressors (Schulte to Bühne et al 2021).

Here, we provide an overview of predictive bird distribution modeling with the aim to inform future work focused on how dispersal limitation, biotic factors, and abiotic factors affect distributional shifts in birds and other taxa driven by global change. Birds are excellent indicators of environmental change, and they have the most widespread and in-depth databases on distributions (Morrison 1986, Riddell et al 2021), making them excellent focal taxa for predictive conservation modeling. Citizen science initiatives and long-term research programs have yielded an abundance of predictive distribution literature, and insights from avian literature should be generalizable to other taxa because birds display a wide variety of life history strategies (Şekercioğlu et al 2019).

We synthesize theory, methods, and data sources widely used to predict bird distributions under global change to highlight best practices and opportunities for innovation and refinement. Understanding where species occur and why some areas are occupied but not others is essential for developing effective conservation plans. Predictive distribution modeling is important to build upon our knowledge of distributions based on surveyed areas and to identify potential areas for protection or management. Modeling wide ranging, unevenly distributed, cryptic, or difficult to survey species all present problems for understanding factors driving occupancy. Here, we bring together the issues that often complicate predictive distribution modeling to offer a solutions-oriented approach to habitat conservation under global change.

Ecological and evolutionary theory as a backbone to approaching predictive SDMs

The first step in our synthesis is to illuminate the importance of a taxon's ecology and evolution in determining their spatial response to global change. Dramatic changes in climate over the remainder of this century are expected (fig. 1), with many species likely unable to survive in all of the areas they presently occupy (Sax et al 2013,

Fig. 1. Current climate and predicted change in climate of global terrestrial biomes. Climographs of (A) temperate and (B) tropical and subtropical global terrestrial biomes. Projected changes in temperature and precipitation regimes for (C) temperate and (D) tropical and subtropical global terrestrial biomes. While some areas are predicted to have increased or decreased precipitation in the future, no areas are expected to have lower or stable temperatures. Temperature increases are predicted to be higher in temperate biomes, while changes in precipitation are greater for tropical biomes. Climographs built from The World Wildlife Fund terrestrial ecoregions (https://www.worldwildlife.org/publications/terrestrial-ecoregions-of-the-world) and current climate (2021-2040) from CanESM5 middle of the road scenario (SSP3-7.0) accessed from Worldclim (https://www.worldclim.org/data/cmip6/cmip6climate.html). The projected change is modeled as the difference between current climate (2021-2040, described above) and future climate using the worst-case scenario (SSP4-6.0; 2081-2100) from CanESM5 global climate model data (Meinshausen et al 2020). Species' presence, and thus biodiversity, is highly influenced by biome type, which shifts from one form to another according to temperature and rainfall regimes (Whittaker 1975). Projected changes in temperature and precipitation may cause global terrestrial biomes to shift in space, but spatial gains and losses by different biomes over time may not occur in synchrony with habitat needs to maintain biodiversity (Dorazio et al 2015). R code for producing this figure can be found at: https://github.com/mmacphe/Global_Change_Biomes.

Fig. 1. Clima actual y cambio previsto en el clima de los biomas terrestres mundiales. Climogramas de los biomas terrestres mundiales (A) templados y (B) tropicales y subtropicales. Cambios previstos en la temperatura y los regímenes de precipitación en los biomas terrestres mundiales (C) templados y (D) tropicales y subtropicales. Si bien se prevé que en algunas zonas las precipitaciones aumentarán o disminuirán en el futuro, no se prevén zonas donde las temperaturas bajen o se mantengan estables. Según las previsiones, el aumento de la temperatura será mayor en biomas templados, mientras que los cambios en las precipitaciones serán más acusados en los biomas tropicales. Climogramas elaborados de acuerdo con las ecorregiones terrestres del Fondo Mundial en favor de la Naturaleza (https://www.worldwildlife.org/publications/terrestrial-ecoregions-of-the-world) y el clima actual (2021-2040) sobre la base de la hipótesis intermedia ('middle of the road', SSP3-7.0) del modelo canadiense elaborado para simular los cambios y la variabilidad del clima en el pasado, CanESM5, consultado en Worldclim (https://www.worldclim.org/data/cmip6/cmip6climate.html). Para elaborar el modelo del cambio previsto, se utiliza la diferencia entre el clima actual (2021-2040, descrito antes) y el clima futuro aplicando la hipótesis más desfavorable (SSP4-6.0; 2081-2100) del modelo de datos sobre el clima mundial CanESM5 (Meinshausen et al 2020). La presencia de especies y, por tanto, la biodiversidad, está fuertemente influida por el tipo de bioma, ya que cambia de uno a otro en función de la temperatura y el régimen pluviométrico (Whittaker 1975). Los cambios previstos en la temperatura y la precipitación pueden hacer que los biomas terrestres cambien en el espacio, si bien es posible que los avances y retrocesos de los biomas a lo largo del tiempo no se produzcan en sincronía con las necesidades del hábitat para mantener la biodiversidad (Dorazio et al 2015).

Ceballos et al 2015). Species typically respond to climate change in one of three ways: 1) by going extinct, 2) persisting via shifts in geographic range, or 3) adapting in place via evolutionary change. Evidence from the fossil record suggests all three responses are common (Smith et al 1995, Graham et al 1996). The capacity to adapt *in situ* in response to climate change has been relatively understudied (Parmesan and Matthews 2005, Jirinec et al 2021). A meta-analysis of observed phenological and morphological adaptations to climate change concluded that morphological trait adaptation, while variable among taxa, will not likely work on a sufficient scale to mitigate the worst effects of ongoing climate change, whereas phenological adaptation (e.g., timing of reproduction or migration) could mitigate such effects, albeit imperfectly (Radchuk et al 2019). Whether species with relatively shorter generation times should be better able to survive by evolving in place remains understudied. Advancing such research is hampered by the difficulty of conducting experiments on large numbers of species at sufficient time scales needed to develop a comprehensive framework (Holt et al 2005, Pierson et al 2015). Variability among taxa and the short time scales in which we have been making observations together indicate that selection pressure has yet to be strong enough to produce measurable changes, though it appears that species shift their phenology faster where the rate of climate change is higher (Poloczanska et al 2013). Precipitation, and to a lesser extent temperature, are the primary drivers of adaptive responses to climate change (Caruso et al 2017, Siepielski et al 2017, Jirinec et al 2021).

Relevant ecological covariates inform one of two main modeling categories to predict where a taxon could occur: 1) species distribution models (hereafter SDMs) that comprise presence records and abiotic data, and 2) ecological niche models (hereafter ENMs) that explicitly estimate the accessible environment (Soberón and Peterson 2005). These approaches are meant to have high spatial accuracy but are not intended to inform on cause-and-effect species-habitat relationships (Merow et al 2013). Whether using SDMs or ENMs, these models can be based on different niche perspectives, which present unique frameworks for estimating drivers of occupancy across a species' range. Here, we list simplified descriptions of three niche concepts to provide a basic introductory framework for understanding the domain of predictive distribution modeling as all are used in modern predictive modeling (see 'An Overview of Analytical Methods' section for more information). Models based on the Grinnellian niche concept focus on abiotic drivers of site occupancy (Elton 1927, Soberón 2007, Wisz et al 2013) and SDMs are mainly built under this framework (fig. 2, Saupe et al 2012). Coarse-scale variables describing ecosystem characteristics are often the most relevant for predicting shifting distributions across large spatial extents. In comparison, the Eltonian niche concept includes estimates of biotic interactions and resource-consumer dynamics that are only quantifiable at local scales (fig. 2, Elton, 1927, Soberón, 2007). Finally, the Hutchinsonian niche concept reflects the functional role of a species, which is often estimated using functional traits and habitat requirements based on functional traits (Rosado et al 2016), and projects the probability of site occupancy

beyond study areas, including estimates of dispersal probabilities in ENMs (fig. 2). Because a species' ability to move beyond their current realized niche depends on the relative importance of abiotic factors, biotic interactions, and dispersal probability, which can operate at different spatial scales (Jankowski et al 2013), knowledge of these categories is important for making sound inferences from whatever data and analytical approach are used.

While ENM tools can be used to predict spatially beyond the current range of a taxon, they are only able to predict the probability of site occupancy within the range of abiotic conditions measured within current range boundaries. Thus, assessing occurrence or abundance along abiotic gradients is important for predicting future range shifts under global change, as this relates directly to the response of species or populations to the environment. The gradual shifts in temperature and rainfall regimes can be expected to align with changes in species responses, reflecting the shifts in optimal ambient conditions and resulting in altered patterns of probability of occurrence or abundance. However, ENM tools are limited where climate change introduces novel conditions (e.g., Williams et al 2007), and more mechanistic (rather than correlative) analytical approaches may provide more accurate predictions.

Demographic information is also useful to incorporate for more accurate predictions because spatial ecology theory dictates that species respond to continuous environmental gradients through gradual changes in abundance, as individuals experience shifting conditions toward or away from environmental optima over space (Austin 2005, 2007). Populations may also show thresholds in abiotic tolerances or in response to biotic factors that change their response shape (e.g., creating asymmetric or skewed response functions; e.g., Oksanen and Minchin 2002). For example, the asymmetric abiotic stress limitation (AASL) hypothesis predicts a steeper decrease in a species' probability of occurrence toward the more stressful end of a species' distribution, which has been supported in several vascular plant species (Dvorský et al 2017). Other threshold-type effects can result in asymmetric responses shown across multiple species in communities (e.g., sharp ecotone boundaries, appearance of dominant predators or competitors; Jankowski et al 2013). Identifying response shapes is of practical interest to understand the impact of abiotic and biotic factors on occupancy. The evaluation of responses along abiotic gradients are becoming more common but often rely on high spatial resolution survey data (e.g., Maggini et al 2011, Urli et al 2014, Bani et al 2019, Burner et al 2019) that is difficult to amass. However, with more studies, comparisons across species would enable distinguishing commonalities and differences in responses to gradients and could point to key environmental variables driving patterns in community organization.

Whether populations would be able to respond (in time and space) to changing conditions also depends on heterogeneity within landscapes; this is the realm of landscape ecology land use change. Landscapes can vary naturally or due to anthropogenic alterations in ways that affect both the phenology of resources (time) or availability of habitat (space); such variability can be tracked if conditions change at a pace that populations could

Fig. 2. The 'BAM' diagram. The relationship between biotic (B), abiotic (A) and movement (M) (also thought of as 'access' and defined by dispersal ability) with respect to the authors of various niche theories (left). The location of realized, tolerance, and fundamental niche along the intersection of two hypothetical climate variables (right). Sax et al (2013) present an update to niche theory that considers three components of a species niche: 1) the 'realized niche': i.e., conditions within the native range, 2) the 'fundamental niche': conditions, in which a species could thrive if it were introduced there and 3) the 'tolerance niche': conditions, in which individuals could survive, but likely unable to maintain populations over the long-term. The fundamental niche is the set of appropriate abiotic conditions, and the realized niche is a smaller area where both abiotic and biotic environments are suitable. Theoretically not all of the realized niche could be accessible and so the potential range is yet smaller because it reflects only the area that is suitable and also accessible to the species. Occurrence is not expected outside of the colored areas. The occupied area is represented by G_0, and G_1 reflects appropriate conditions that have not or cannot be accessed by the species (as described by Saupe et al 2012).

Fig. 2. El diagrama BAM. La relación existente entre biótico (B), abiótico (A) y movimiento (M) (también considerado como 'acceso' y definido por la capacidad de dispersión) según los autores de las varias teorías del nicho (izquierda). La ubicación de los nichos realizado, de tolerancia y fundamental a lo largo de la intersección de dos variables climáticas hipotéticas (derecha). Sax et al (2013) presentan información actualizada sobre la teoría del nicho que considera tres componentes del nicho de las especies, a saber: 1) el nicho realizado: las condiciones imperantes en el área de distribución original, 2) el nicho fundamental: las condiciones en las que una especie podría prosperar si se hubiera introducido ahí y 3) el nicho de tolerancia: las condiciones en las que los individuos podrían sobrevivir, pero en las que las poblaciones tendrían pocas posibilidades de mantenerse a largo plazo. El nicho fundamental es el conjunto de condiciones abióticas apropiadas, mientras que el nicho realizado es la zona de menor extensión en la que los entornos abiótico y biótico son adecuados. En teoría, no todos los nichos realizados podrían ser accesibles y, por lo tanto, el área de distribución potencial es aún menor, ya que corresponde únicamente al área que es adecuada y también accesible para la especie. No se prevé presencia fuera de las zonas coloreadas. El área ocupada se representa con G_0, mientras que G_1 se refiere a las condiciones apropiadas a las que la especie no ha accedido o no puede acceder (según lo descrito por Saupe et al 2012).

respond to. Examples of this include species adapted to annually ephemeral or temporally patchy habitats such as wetlands and grasslands; species accustomed to such environments may have dispersal strategies that predispose them to better track climate (e.g., *Elaenia cristata*, Ritter et al 2021). In other cases, habitat and resources are spatially patchily distributed, and the ability of species to respond to changing conditions may be more taxon-specific for those that rely on spatiotemporal heterogeneity that is naturally patchy. Examples of this include habitat specialists in naturally patchy habitats such as Amazonian white sand habitats (e.g., rufous-crowned Elaenia *Elaenia ruficeps*, Ritter et al 2021).

Alternatively, animals may avoid the problem of range shifting altogether by buffering themselves from acutely unfavorable conditions using microclimate refugia. One example of this is through behavioral thermoregulation. Ambient temperature is almost never constant in terrestrial environments, it varies by time, and by habitat, often at very small scales (Scheffers et al 2014, 2017). Biologists have long understood that mobile animals exploit thermal heterogeneity to maintain optimal body temperature (Cowles and Bogert 1944, Porter et al 1973, Stevenson 1985, Angilletta Jr 2009, Angilletta et al 2009). For cold-adapted species in a warming world, this can be achieved by shifting activity times to cooler periods of

the year and day, and by moving to microhabitats with cooler microclimates. This capacity to compensate for unfavorable ambient temperature by behavioral thermoregulation, known as the 'Bogert Effect' (Huey et al 2003), can at least partly mitigate the harmful effects of climate warming (Huey et al 2012). However, behavioral thermoregulation is contingent on access to cooler areas and periods; animals already occurring in the most buffered environments have limited options for escape when conditions change. Furthermore, individuals could experience additional pressure from biotic interactions with species moving into their habitat to thermoregulate (Huey et al 2012).

Whether taxa will be able to respond to global change is ultimately a taxon-specific question driven by the constraints of dispersal limitation; one of three fundamental aspects of distribution theory (fig. 2). Understanding barriers to distributions caused by dispersal limitation has been of great interest, for example, in bird species unable to cross areas of unsuitable habitat, and has been studied both experimentally (e.g., Moore et al 2008, Naka et al 2022) and theoretically (Ribas et al 2018, e.g., 2012). Selection pressures driving morphology, such as migratory compared to sedentary life histories, may play a role in physically limiting dispersal distance (Claramunt et al 2012, Capurucho et al 2020, Sheard et al 2020, MacPherson et al 2022), even in birds. Life history strategies also dictate the demographic trends in dispersal; for example, in many species it is the inexperienced young that disperse into new areas away from the territories of their parents (e.g., Florida scrub jay *Aphelocoma coerulescens*, Suh et al 2020). Dispersal limitation is thus a complex and difficult-to-quantify aspect of predictive distribution modeling that is nevertheless fundamental for predicting the probability of range shifts with global change (reviewed in Zurell 2017). Coupling studies of distribution modeling with quantifiable measures of dispersal capacity is an important next step toward making more informed predictions of species responses to changing environments (Travis et al 2013, Urban et al 2013, Sousa et al 2021).

Ultimately, extinction risk (and conversely, population viability) centers on declining population and small population paradigms; population ecology. Population declines are driven by deterministic (demographic, abiotic, and biotic) factors that cause reduction to small numbers (e.g., the Allee effect), and also by stochastic factors, which dominate the extinction dynamics of small populations (Caughley 1994, Morris and Doak 2002, Smith et al 2021). The abiotic shifts in conditions due to climate change and the resulting shifts in species distributions play a role in both types of population dynamics. Shifting distributions can cause temporary or permanent reductions in habitat area (Thomas et al 2006, van Rees and Reed 2018), lowering carrying capacity and driving population declines at local or regional scales, or reducing connectivity and creating isolated subpopulations that are more susceptible to small-population dynamics (Anderson et al 2009). The degree to which changing distributions result in commonly observed conservation impacts depends on a diversity of species traits including habitat preferences and associations, phenotypic plasticity, and current range and population size (Jiguet et al 2007, Visser 2008). Notably, research based solely on changes in distributions tends to predict widespread extinctions due to the aforementioned mechanisms, but plasticity, dispersal, and adaptation appear to have been key for many species' resilience to past and current climate change (Moritz and Agudo 2013). For example, the Galapagos finches are a well-known example of phenotypic plasticity in bill morphology in response to environmental change (Weiner 1994, Grant and Weiner 2017, Grant and Grant 2020).

Conservation action that occurs at small spatial scales requires deep natural history knowledge for decision-making. In this section we described the domain of how ecological theory informs spatial responses to land use and climate change. When designing research projects that aim to predict future distributions under the umbrella of conservation ecology, we urge modelers to deeply consider the ecology of focal taxa by referring to this section again in the future, and the references cited within it. Fig. 3 summarizes essential broad considerations for predictive distribution modeling by the novice modeler.

A technical overview of occurrence data for predictive distribution modeling

Occurrence data through time is the foundation for applied predictive distribution modeling. Here, we present technical aspects of different sources of avian occurrence data to inform which questions can be answered with different data sets. To assess whether a change in distribution has occurred or will occur, researchers require historical records to establish a baseline for comparison, followed by surveys at one or more subsequent time points. Although birds are among the best studied class of animals, early baseline inventories are still rare, and often consist of field notes (Reznick et al 1994), which present challenges particularly in reconstructing past abundances (Shaffer et al 1998). The aim of general collecting for birds by museums is to document with vouchered specimens the complete taxonomic representation of a location, thus supplying presence and absence information. A caveat to this is that complete information is limited to small areas of intense investigation, thus limiting the widespread application of data gathered by museums in presence/absence modelling (e.g., Loiselle et al 2003). Although general collecting for birds is no longer the norm at some museums (Ferguson 2020, for reasons, please see Remsen 1995), museum records remain the best sources of historical occurrence data, though they primarily supply presence or presence/absence data only and not abundance data (Shaffer et al 1998).

A major challenge for predictive models is rarity or sparseness of point occurrence data. Even with many potential sources of occurrence data, knowledge of bird distributions still varies greatly by species, habitat, and geography. For example, rare, nocturnal, and/or secretive species and those in remote areas are difficult to detect and model accurately (MacKenzie et al 2005, Stralberg et al 2015). Rarity is a common characteristic of species in diverse tropical communities and remains a major challenge for constructing species distribution and environmental niche models for tropical species (e.g., Marini et al 2010).

In contrast to sparse information from the past, modern ornithologists benefit from technological advances that

---

Essential broad considerations for model-building

Common pitfalls of modelers:

- The timing of occurrence points does not match when explanatory variable data was collected.
- An artificial species limit is used (e.g., a political boundary) rather than the complete distribution which would reflect more accurately the range of each explanatory variable.
- Projecting beyond the area reachable by the taxon (e.g., predicting into a distant location unlikely to be reached, or across an ecological barrier).

Fig. 3. Essential broad considerations for predictive distribution modeling by novice modelers. Here we summarize this section by highlighting common pitfalls observed by the authors while acting as reviewers in the peer-review process.

Fig. 3. Consideraciones generales esenciales de la elaboración de modelos predictivos de la distribución por los principiantes. Aquí resumimos esta sección poniendo de relieve los errores que los autores observan frecuentemente en el proceso de examen por homólogos.

offer unprecedented information on bird occurrence including from devices that track individuals beyond specific field sites (satellite imagery, Borowicz et al 2018; sophisticated automated biodiversity data collection, Kitzes and Schricker 2019; for birds within appropriate size ranges, McKinnon and Love 2018; and online citizen science efforts, Sullivan et al 2009, 2014). They improve our understanding of avian ecology by identifying previously unknown species-habitat relationships (Jirinec et al 2016), migratory routes (Jahn et al 2016, 2021, Stanley et al 2012, 2015), foraging areas and behaviors (including accessing microhabitat refuges, Wolfson et al 2020), and wintering distributions (Renfrew et al 2013). These advances facilitate discovery of species responses to global change by revealing locations outside of direct observation. Aside from emerging technologies, simpler monitoring approaches implemented in the past at large scales have amassed rich long-term legacy datasets (e.g., breeding bird surveys, regional atlases, and the 5 million bird eggs housed at natural history museums, Marini et al 2020), and band recoveries across the globe continue to supply information on bird population trends and distributions.

Decisions about which type of occurrence data is best for predictive modeling hinges on the trade-off between addressing processes affecting the core distribution versus a more holistic understanding including unique responses at range boundaries, during different life history activities, or between different sex and age classes. Passive acoustic monitoring and long-term studies remain promising approaches for capturing relative abundance data to estimate population dynamics with respect to global change (Pérez-Granados et al 2019, Pérez-Granados and Schuchmann 2020, Sugai et al 2020). Trait databases are gaining momentum as sources of functional diversity to test hypotheses under the Hutchinsonian niche concept (Gallagher et al 2020, Leclerc et al 2020,

Matuoka et al 2020, Tobias et al 2022). Exploring how functional roles of species change across abiotic gradients can dramatically improve our understanding of abiotic tolerances to more accurately predict range dynamics. For example, bill size has been shown to be important for thermoregulation in birds (e.g., Danner and Greenberg 2015) and a study of functional trait structure along a tropical elevational gradient in Malaysian Borneo linked larger bills in low elevation communities with thermal tolerance (Boyce et al 2019). Current shortfalls in avian occurrence data (summarized by Lees et al 2020) require an integrated approach to predicting bird distributions with global change. Although most efforts to collect occurrence data are from small spatial areas (e.g., from individual field research sites) and coarse resolutions (table 1), this data contributes meaningfully to our understanding of species-habitat relationships that can be applied to predictive modelling.

Selecting appropriate explanatory variables

Predicting distributions relies on accurate assessments of life history requirements. In this section, we synthesize the spatial and temporal resolution of explanatory variables commonly used to match distributions with habitat and resource needs. Producing sound predictive models requires ecologically relevant, suitable proxies for resource or habitat needs (e.g., Burns et al 2020, Randin et al 2020). To scale up to entire distributions, there must be an underlying knowledge of a species' life history that effectively links the lives of individuals to the explanatory variable (or proxy variable) associated with site occupancy.

Predicting distributions influenced by changing food webs requires a breadth in knowledge of life history information to predict the probability of species' ranges shifting individually or with their entire biotic community. This task is complicated by the potentially differing

Table 1. Geospatial context of common occurrence data sources for birds and explanatory variables. Most occurrence data and explanatory variable data layers are of coarse spatial and temporal resolution, making them useful for testing hypotheses under the Grinnellian class of niche. Occurrence data sources with fine spatial and temporal resolution are not as common and require higher investment for acquiring location data (i.e., GPS tags) or physically tracking individual birds (i.e., radio-tracking) but could be important for testing hypotheses under the Eltonian class of niche.

Tabla 1. Contexto geoespacial de las fuentes habituales de datos sobre presencia de aves y variables explicativas. La mayoría de las capas de datos sobre presencia y datos de variables explicativas tienen baja resolución espacial y temporal, lo que las hace útiles para comprobar hipótesis relativas a la clase de nicho grinnelliano. Las fuentes de datos sobre presencia con una resolución espacial y temporal alta no son tan habituales y requieren una mayor inversión para adquirir datos sobre localización (por ejemplo, marcas satelitales) o seguir físicamente a las aves (por ejemplo, mediante seguimiento por radio), pero podrían ser importantes para comprobar las hipótesis relativas a la clase de nicho eltoniano.

Geospatial data qualities	Examples of occurrence data sources	Examples of explanatory variables
Large spatial area, coarse spatial and/or temporal resolution	Remote sensing assets (satellite imagery, aerial imagery etc.) Automated radiotelemetry Geolocators Citizen Science: eBird, European Bird Census Council, European Breeding Bird Atlas, South African Bird Atlas Project Stable hydrogen isotopes Genetic data Natural History collections	Long-term averages in stable climates (e.g., WorldClim) Land cover (e.g., MODIS, GlobCover, SPOT) Phenology and vegetation indices (e.g., MODIS, Landsat) Climate record (e.g., NCDC, ClimateNA, ClimateSA) Atmospheric weather reanalyses (e.g., ERA, European Centre for Medium-Range Weather Forecasts Re-Analysis; GPM, Global Precipitation Measurement; TRMM, Tropical Rainfall Measuring Mission; NCEP, National Centers for Environmental Prediction)
Small spatial area, coarse spatial and/or temporal resolution	Citizen science (e.g., Breeding Bird Surveys, Christmas Bird Counts) Natural history collections Field notes Point count surveys Passive acoustic monitoring Long-term datasets Bird banding data	
Large spatial area, fine spatial and/or temporal resolution	GPS tags	Digital elevation models (e.g., ASTER) Vegetation indices (e.g., SPOT)
Small spatial area, fine spatial and/or temporal resolution	VHF radio-tags	Personal weather data loggers Weather station data

needs for each life history stage or demographic, which is often the case for birds (e.g., habitat requirements may differ between fledglings and adults). While main considerations are the spatial and temporal resolutions of explanatory variables, biotic interactions can also play a critical role (see fig. 2) and may need to be considered on a taxon-specific basis.

Considering the spatial resolution of explanatory variables

Selecting the correct spatial resolution of explanatory variables to use with occurrence data is key to producing accurate assessments of species-habitat relationships. First, matching the spatial resolution of explanatory variables with our understanding of the scale at which individuals make occupancy decisions (e.g., whether they are micro- or macrohabitat based) is important for making proper predictions of where organisms could move in the future. Second, matching spatial resolution between explanatory variables and occurrence data prevents pseudoreplication. Specifically, occurrence data may be pseudoreplicated if many samples occur in the same pixel of explanatory data. Data spatial resolution also affects the possibility of model overfitting (i.e., when the importance of a narrow set of conditions is overestimated because occurrence data come from a limited portion of conditions actually experienced by the taxon).

Remotely sensed spatial products (e.g., NDVI and BIOCLIM variables) can be proxies for features of the environment being used by individuals at macrohabitat

scales that require occurrence data from a wider distribution. Remote sensing systems with finer spatial resolution, for example light detection and ranging (LiDAR), have been used to predict occupancy by light-demanding versus shade-tolerant plant species (Wüest et al 2020), and direct measurements of structural features of habitat (e.g., vertical distribution of forest canopy elements and foliage density) used to predict occupancy (e.g., Goetz et al 2010). Remotely sensed variables are thought to reflect a contingency of resources assuming the data product conveys mutual information on a shared spatiotemporal scale with the amount of food resources (Riotte-Lambert and Matthiopoulos 2020). There are some satisfying interpretations of the ecological relevance of these remotely sensed products (see Tøttrup et al 2012, drought; Renfrew et al 2013, NDVI; Bridge et al 2016, EVI), but the typical purpose of using these large scale variables is for spatial accuracy and not to infer causal relationships.

However, explanatory variables that reflect some ecological relevancy is important for building accurate predictions of how taxa may respond to global change. Some remotely sensed abiotic products do reflect a direct habitat resource or type. Habitat characteristics (i.e., land cover) are most often identified with remotely sensed data, which depending on the sensor, can have a variety of resolutions. Medium-high spatial resolutions (≤ 30m, e.g., Landsat, Sentinel) are useful to pair with more precise occurrence data (e.g., GPS tags, point counts; Shirley et al 2013), whereas low spatial resolution (e.g., MODIS) can be useful for occurrence data from geolocators or weather radar (Heim et al 2020). The temporal resolution of remotely sensed data is a limitation, especially when modeling the dynamic nature of migratory animals in seasonal environments (MacPherson et al 2018a, Roslin et al 2021).

Considering the temporal resolution of explanatory variables

The temporal predictability of resources is important for predicting future distributions because annual life history strategies are dependent upon correctly timing life cycle events with required resources. For example, it is widely held that birds breeding at high latitudes must correctly time the hatching of young with annual insect emergence to maximize fledging success, and early arrival to breeding grounds may enhance reproductive success (Smith and Moore 2005, Kokko et al 2006, Alerstam 2011, Nilsson et al 2013). Predictive distribution models are expected to be the most accurate when species-habitat correlations are assessed using occurrence and environmental data gathered from the same time-period. However, the temporal resolution of occurrence data is much finer than that of environmental data; this can create a mismatch that limits the questions that can be answered using current approaches. The habitat requirements for fulfilling life history needs may vary depending upon the life history event (i.e., mate acquisition, rearing young, molting, migrating) and the species life history strategy. Life history strategies vary in birds from those that have evolved to rely on consistent resource availability (e.g., in the case of dietary or habitat specialists that cannot live outside of narrow environmental conditions), to periodic resource abundance (e.g., seasonal, annual, inter-annual weather patterns that drive migratory or irruptive population movements), or irregular resource availability (e.g., in nomadic taxa), and it is important to match locality data in time to environmental data for accurate species-habitat assessment.

The temporal resolutions for widely used climate data varies, with trade-offs between temporal and spatial resolution in addition to the state of products limiting the types of distribution questions that they can inform (table 1). We expand on this using the examples of temperature and rainfall explanatory variables in appendix 1 because these are the two most widely used and generally important factors in species distribution modeling (Bradie and Leung 2017).

To build robust predictive models, it is necessary to match the spatial and temporal resolution of the occurrence data with that of the habitat characteristics. The temporal resolution of remotely sensed data is a limitation, especially when modeling the dynamic nature of migratory birds where dynamic seasonal habitat changes drive short-term habitat quality (e.g., seasonally flooded mudflat habitat for migrating shorebirds; Twedt 2013). Google Earth Engine (a javascript-based platform where one can write their own code to integrate many satellite products and independently calculate indices such as NDVI) is a flexible tool that can facilitate identifying the correct temporal resolution of land cover data to robustly test explanatory power of land cover variables. Examples of data sets in Google Earth Engine include vegetation indices (Landsat, ~2 weeks temporal resolution), products for creating land cover classifications (SPOT, ~1 month), and static land cover datasets (e.g., GlobCover, Cropland Data Layers, National Land Cover Database; table 1).

Considering biotic factors

Modeling future range shifts in response to global change rarely considers biotic factors. This omission is the main reason why an assumption of SDMs -that the species is at equilibrium with their environment- is rarely, if ever, met (Pearson and Dawson 2003). If this assumption were supported, the realized and fundamental niche would completely overlap as long as the species could access all available suitable niche space (fig. 2). Consideration of biotic factors has the potential to significantly enrich the field of predictive distribution modeling with more accurate forecasts, and here we synthesize leading research contributing to this end at both the intraspecific and interspecific level.

It is thought that biotic interactions vary along abiotic gradients such that they can either enhance or reduce predicted ranges (Louthan et al 2015). However, because capturing this information requires both high spatial and temporal accuracy across all abiotic scenarios within the realized niche, there are few examples to draw from. One promising approach to including biotic interactions in predictive spatial modeling is the development of causal models that estimate the influence of interspecific competition using co-occurrence data (e.g., Staniczenko et al 2017). The scope and strength of biotic factors may be correlated with abiotic pressures (Louthan et al 2015), and may differ depending upon which part of the range is being considered. For example, much work has been

Distribution: the area in geographic space over which a taxon is expected to occur.

Occupancy: the probability with which a taxon is expected to occur (or be detected) in a given area.

Rarity: a relative low probability of occurrence or restricted distribution.

Background points: typically, randomized locations used to characterize the values of environmental parameters within a study area where known occurrences have not occurred.

Pseudoabsence: background points that are used specifically in presence-only modeling to simulate absences or non-detections.

CORRELATIVE

MECHANISTIC

OCCURRENCE DATA

Presence-only occurrence data

Physiological tolerance data

ANALYSIS

Generalized linear model

Biophysical model

CONSERVATION APPLICATION

Identify places to look for a rare species (e.g., monitoring strategy)

Calculate estimates future population viability analyses

TIME

Background point   Potential habitat   Occurrence   Extirpation

Fig. 4. Analytical processes for species distribution models: left: important terms used in describing distribution model data; right: parallel workflows for example correlative versus mechanistic predictive modelling.

Fig. 4. *Procesos analíticos de los modelos de distribución de las especies: izquierda, términos importantes empleados para describir el modelo de datos sobre distribución; derecha: flujos de trabajo paralelos de la elaboración de modelos predictivos correlativos y mecánicos.*

done in the bird literature to improve our understanding of species-habitat relationships through the study of hybrid zones, which typically occupy only one part of a species range (e.g., Taylor et al 2014). Quantification of biotic factors, like the ones described here, requires targeted species-specific research to test hypotheses within the Eltonian and Hutchinsonian niche concepts. This research is mainly done within small spatial extents and without consideration of temporal or spatial resolution (e.g., co-occurrence records from different time periods or datasets with different spatial resolutions, Atauchi et al 2018, Palacio and Girini 2018, see also König et al 2021), but some research has been done at large spatial extents and coarse resolutions (e.g., acorn woodpecker *Melanerpes formicivorus* occurrence with Colombian oaks in the Northern Andes, Freeman and Mason 2015).

Intraspecific competition can drive density-dependent range shifts in migratory species such that interannual selection of locations are dependent on group size and food availability (Corre et al 2020). Dispersal limitation can contribute to inadequacies in recruitment to new or population sink sites, limiting population recovery or range shifts despite available habitat (Zurell et al 2016, Palma et al 2020). The ability to update behaviors when circumstances change (behavioral flexibility) may be key for driving range shifts or expansions under global change (Blaisdell et al 2021). Further, bird species capable of behavioral innovation (a.k.a. plasticity) often have lower

risk of extinction, as they are better able to adapt to changing ecosystems and habitat destruction (Reed et al 1999, Ducatez et al 2020). However, metapopulation dynamics can affect the introgression of adaptive traits such that maladaptive traits restrict range shifts under global change (e.g., Lavretsky et al 2020, Garcia-R and Matzke 2021). Each of these examples are implicitly expected to vary across abiotic gradients, highlighting the importance of assessing the probability of site occupancy beyond the core of a species distribution.

Perhaps more difficult is estimating the strength of interspecific biotic factors in shaping distributions because this requires a breadth of natural history knowledge beyond that of the species in question. However, interspecific biotic factors are thought to have strong influences on the probability of site occupancy. Predator distributions can be partially explained by their prey distributions (Léandri-Breton and Bêty 2020). Interspecific competition can also exclude species and is often assessed using co-occurrence data (Jankowski et al 2010, Freeman et al 2016, Elsen et al 2017). Commensalisms, where one organism benefits from the presence of another organism and the other unaffected, can also facilitate site occupancy (Aitken and Martin 2007). Including data on the presence of predators, competitors, and commensalisms in SDMs can be a useful addition to improving models (Jankowski et al 2013). Alternatively, the spatial overlap with other taxa may have little influence if the

focal species exhibits behavioral avoidance (e.g., via interference competition, Jaeger 1970, or predator-prey dynamics, Lukas et al 2021) or the spatio-temporal scope of data are not aligned.

The utility of SDMs to guide predictions of distributions under global change will certainly be limited by the spatio-temporal resolution of environmental variables. Even when researchers are mindful when selecting environmental data suited to answer questions about their occurrence data (i.e., using ecologically relevant environmental and climate data across biologically relevant space and timescales), a challenge remains in combining and contrasting the Grinnellian niche concept (e.g., climate variables) against other niche concepts that require finer temporal and spatial data (e.g., density of interacting species). This problem can further complicate predictive models if site occupancy is dependent on time-lags, as is the case in some migratory species (Bridge et al 2016), and is explored further in the following section.

An overview of analytical methods

Predictive models of species distributions can be divided into correlative versus mechanistic approaches (fig. 4). Correlative models elucidate relationships between species occurrence and spatially explicit explanatory variables and can be viewed as hypothesis-generating tools. Data to parameterize correlative models are readily available (e.g., correlating occurrence data with land-cover or weather data as described above), making them the dominant approach to predictive distribution modeling. Mechanistic models (a.k.a. causal models) are hypothesis-testing tools that incorporate physiological tolerance to predict where species will be capable of persisting within their physiological limits (Guisan and Zimmermann 2000); data to support these approaches is more limited. Here, we summarize popular SDM tools with important information to help novice modelers identify which tool might be appropriate given their data and question. Fundamentally, any projections of distributions with either approach (i.e., correlative or mechanistic) should be built from our best understanding of the underlying mechanisms driving species presence. We provide examples that students can refer to for accessing detailed methodologies.

Range estimates from correlative SDMs are valuable, helping us better understand species and their sensitivities to global change. MAXENT is one of the most popular SDM approaches, widely used for its ability to use presence-only datasets where true absence or non-detection data are typically hard to find (Elith and Leathwick 2007, Merow et al 2013). MAXENT has been useful for modeling distributions of rare or cryptic species due to its apparent high performance with small or incomplete datasets (Phillips et al 2006, Pearson et al 2007, Wisz et al 2008, Marini et al 2009, Aubry et al 2017). Boosted regression trees (BRTs) are one of many machine learning techniques well-suited to modeling complex ecological data because they can handle different types of predictor variables, fit complex nonlinear relationships, accommodate missing data and automatically handle interaction effects between predictors (Elith et al 2008, Graham et al 2008). BRTs have been used to predict bird distributions using occurrence data for land birds (Veloz et al 2015), waterfowl (Barker et al 2014),

shorebirds (Dalgarno et al 2017), seabirds (Oppel et al 2012), and owls (Domahidi et al 2019). Hierarchical Bayesian models can also integrate various occurrence data types (e.g., presence-absence, presence-only, count data) to create reliable spatio-temporal distribution models (Hefley and Hooten 2015). Using continuous spatial predictor variables such as land cover, the abundance and distribution of species can be predicted over a continuous latent surface (Chakraborty et al 2010), which has been useful with waterfowl aerial survey data (Herbert et al 2018, 2021). Generalized linear models (GLMs) and generalized additive models (GAMs) can be employed to understand distributions across multiple environmental conditions and also conceptualize patterns in distributions of abundances across environmental gradients (Augustin et al 1996, Smith and Edwards 2021). GAMs are used to model nonlinear relationships (e.g., Maggini et al 2011). One drawback to GAMs, however, is that evaluation of response shapes (e.g., optima, skewness) is done through visual inspection rather than statistically. Huisman-Olff-Fresco (HOF) models are used to predict occupancy along abiotic gradients and are particularly useful in evaluating alternative shapes of species responses to gradients, for example, if changes in abundance do not exhibit the widely assumed symmetric Gaussian functions, but instead show asymmetric, threshold-like changes in occupancy over space (Huisman et al 1993). HOF response curves can be used to highlight distinct distribution patterns such as species replacements, allowing inference of potential biotic interactions that are otherwise difficult to measure (Jansen and Oksanen 2013). Species climate response surfaces (CRSs) model the probability of occurrence using bioclimatic variables (Huntley et al 1995). Given that explanatory variables in correlative SDMs cannot be used to infer causation, the CRS approach can accommodate interactions between abiotic variables to predict distributions under future climate scenarios (Huntley et al 2006). The choice of predictive SDM technique and quality of SDM product are based predominantly on the type of occurrence data available and secondarily on spatiotemporal matching of explanatory variables.

Mechanistic approaches to SDMs predict areas where physico-chemical processes meet life history needs (Kearney 2006, Kearney and Porter 2009). For example, a biophysical model for the endangered night parrot *Pezoporus occidentalis* in Australia shows how air temperature increases of 3 °C would lead to lethal levels of dehydration (Kearney et al 2016). Bayesian networks (BNs) are another type of mechanistic model that go beyond species-habitat correlations by also considering processes that influence occupancy across space and time (i.e., site access and selection, Jones 2001). Originally employed to model human judgement (Pearl, 1985), BNs have only recently been adapted for predictive SDMs (Staniczenko et al 2017, MacPherson et al 2018b). Mechanistic models are informed by causal relationships based on empirical research or expert knowledge. The latter are referred to as belief networks (Drew and Collazo 2014, MacPherson et al 2018b). Occupancy models are another type of mechanistic approach that brings together site access and selection in a metapopulation framework (Dallas et al., 2019), and which explicitly accounts for issues concerning

species detection (e.g., Johnson et al 2021, Micheletti et al 2021, Valente et al 2024). Mechanistic models enable the identification of the most important variables driving distribution patterns through mapping the fundamental niche, which is helpful to inform conservation and management decisions when circumstances change.

Ensemble modeling strategies, in which the predictions of multiple approaches are combined or used simultaneously, are often suggested to better encompass the range of uncertainty in prediction (Araújo and New 2007). This method accounts for the fact that model choice is often the greatest source of quantifiable uncertainty in species distribution modeling and reduces sources of bias from the use of a single algorithm (Dormann et al 2008, Jarnevich et al 2017). Implementing ensembles of five or more of the algorithms and approaches described above has been greatly facilitated by software packages like BIOMOD (Thuiller et al 2009) and VisTrails SAHM (Morisette et al 2013), which bring methods together into a single analytical environment. Ensembles can be used to assess a range of potential projected outcomes, forming a 'bounding box' or 'consensus' across algorithm predictions (Araújo and New 2007). Analysis with model ensembles typically involves scaling and averaging model outputs and, often weighting these by some measurement of model performance such as 'area under the curve' (AUC) score.

The ongoing 'big data revolution' in many fields including ornithology (La Sorte et al 2018) has increased use of artificial intelligence for data handling and analysis (Xia et al 2020), especially in correlative distribution modeling. Machine learning algorithms like MAXENT (Merow et al 2013), random forests (Mi et al 2017), neural networks (e.g., Manel et al 1999), deep learning (Benkendorf and Hawkins 2020) and boosted regression trees (Elith et al 2006) are now commonly applied SDMs, and are valued for prediction and interpolation. They are excellent tools for insight into potential future shifts under global change (Elith 2017).

Conservation plans rely on SDMs for future species distributions, despite the small, but growing, body of literature on ways to incorporate climate change into conservation planning (Willis et al 2009, Hole et al 2011, Terribile et al 2012, Loyola et al 2013, Nakao et al 2013, Jones and Cheung 2015, Alexander et al 2017). The predictive power of SDMs for informing conservation decisions remains limited by a lack of tool capability to calculate confidence intervals around predictions (Marini et al 2010), a lack of validation to reduce uncertainties and the need for agreed-upon standards for guiding model building (Araújo et al 2005, 2019). Using correlative predictive models is likely to overestimate range shifts and extinction risk due to the violations of common assumptions in correlative distribution modeling. For example, SDMs tend to violate the assumption that the individual species is currently at equilibrium within its environment (Sax et al 2013, Early and Sax 2014) and do not take into account species interactions (Pearson and Dawson 2003). Despite these criticisms, SDMs remain the 'best' widely accessible approach currently in use for identifying potential future habitat-area (Tingley et al 2014).

Discussion

To invite novel perspectives into the field of predictive distribution modelling, we reviewed the theory underpinning how global change shapes range dynamics and outlined the technical details of data sources and analytic approaches needed for creating sound tests of ecological theory to improve predictive models. Predicting where species will live in an uncertain future is a central goal of modern ecology with several issues complicating the production of accurate forecasts. When beginning to build SDMs, developing a standard operating protocol for model reporting is essential for promoting replication and advancement of methods (Zurell et al 2020). This effort has recast the basic research question of what limits distribution of species - why a species lives 'here' but not 'there' - as an applied question. Species are already on the move in response to recent decades of global change (and, depending on the region, predicted trends of reduced or increased rainfall; fig. 2), supporting long-held theory that climate limits species' geographic ranges (Tingley et al 2009). However, the match between species' distributions and climatic conditions is often weak (Chapman 2010, Suggitt et al 2012); species vary considerably in their observed responses to recent climate change (Lehmann et al 2020, Mamantov et al 2021). These observations indicate that we are still in the early stages of ecological forecasting. To guide future research, we identified three core motivating questions that build from our technical introduction as the answers to these questions are particularly likely to generate important advancements in the field of predictive distribution modeling.

Is dispersal a rate-limiting step in range expansions?

The proximate driver of range shifts is dispersal; ranges expand when individuals move beyond the existing range limit. Dispersal constraints are thus one obvious explanation for cases where the rate of species' observed range shifts are failing to track with the rate of changing climate. Birds have incredible capacities for dispersal (e.g., Slager 2020), making it tempting to underestimate the possible role for dispersal constraints in avian range shifts, including unexplored factors such as site fidelity. However, even bird species often show extreme limitations in dispersal, suggesting that longer-distance range shifts (e.g., across latitudes) may be slow, particularly in heterogeneous landscapes, or when species show high specialization to their associated habitats. In the temperate zone, even some long-distance migrants may show strong site fidelity to breeding (and wintering) territories (Winger et al 2019), which suggests the possibility that rapid range shifts may be difficult to achieve. Lastly, dispersal may be possible but may introduce a new trade-off with other components of the annual life cycle, such as migration. For example, the ability of boreal breeding birds to take advantage of newly available forest habitat in the Arctic may be constrained by a trade-off with ever-increasing migration distances. We can improve our understanding of dispersal limitation by creatively pairing historical with contemporary datasets to identify patterns of dispersal limitation in places where global change has already altered species distributions.

Are species particularly rare at their range limits?

Ecological theory assumes that species are most abundant at the center or core of their range and become progressively rarer towards their range limits (the 'abundant-center hypothesis', Brown 1984). However, empirical patterns of abundance often fail to fit these expectations. Whether the abundant-center hypothesis generally holds or not is now a matter of debate (e.g., Dallas et al 2020), and the answer may have consequences for rates of species' range shifts. For example, low abundances at range edges could lead to slower rates of range shifts than if abundance distributions are more uniform across a core-to-limit transect through a species' geographic range. This could be due to simple numeric effects, range shifts are easier when there are more individuals at the range edge to start with, or to genetic effects. That is, low abundances (and hence lower genetic diversity) could reduce local rates of adaptation at range edges, with gene flow from the abundant range center swamping any effect of local adaptation at the range edge that would facilitate range expansion when conditions change (Haldane 1956, but see Kottler et al 2021). Pairing occurrence data with natural history knowledge of species expanding their ranges has the potential to improve our understanding of the mechanisms that promote expansion from original range boundaries (e.g., the tolerance niche of the asian openbill *Anastomus oscitans*, Lei and Liu 2021; and climate matching in the european bee-eater *Merops apiaster*, Stiels et al 2021). Additionally, assessing occupancy from the perspective of abiotic gradients rather than focal taxa would improve our ability to identify significant geographic barriers to range shifts with climate change.

How does land use change interact with climate change?

Like most of the range shift literature, we have focused in this review on predicting species' responses to changes in climate per se. But species are shifting (or failing to shift) their ranges in landscapes that are increasingly dominated by human activities (e.g., Fumy and Fartmann 2021). Studies that simultaneously incorporate both land use and climate change as drivers of distributional change are few in number but hold great promise for several reasons. First, land use change is an obvious driver of species' distributions; many species simply do not persist in landscapes with extreme levels of human control. Second, appropriate habitat for most species in human-dominated landscapes consists of habitat patches of varying sizes with varying levels of connectivity (e.g., Neilan et al 2019). This fact elevates the role of dispersal in determining whether patches (and scaled-up to a larger geographic scale, regions) are occupied by a given species. Third, habitat change directly affects local-scale climate. Fragmented forests, for example, average substantially warmer and drier than primary forests (Kapos 1989, Nunes et al 2022), and 'urban heat islands' alter local temperatures that are known to affect bird distributions (in migrants, Bonnet-Lebrun et al 2020; and residents, Latimer and Zuckerberg 2021). Hence, land use change can act as a multiplier of temperature effects on species. Here we emphasize the importance of high spatial and temporal resolution datasets for identifying mechanisms of global change that affect individual or-

ganisms or populations. Individual-based modelling that simulates multiple interacting ecological processes (e.g., demography, dispersal, and evolution) have the capacity to create more realistic predictive models (Urban et al 2016). In light of this, mechanistic (rather than correlative) models are likely to be better suited to identifying the interaction of land use and climate change when environmental conditions can be linked to the biological processes of individuals (or the loss of migration with increased urbanization, Bonnet-Lebrun et al 2020; e.g., thermoregulatory behaviors of individuals in unshaded desert areas, van de Ven et al 2019).

The consequences of climate change for species are potentially severe, with widespread predictions of extinctions (Thomas et al 2006), yet the application of predictive models to conservation and management are still limited (but see Casazza et al 2021). Some evidence suggests these dire predictions may be coming true. For example, warming temperatures have led to local extinctions in mountaintop communities in southeastern Peru as species shift their geographic ranges to track climate, a potential harbinger of the possible extinction of high elevation tropical species (Feeley et al 2012, Rehm and Feeley 2016, Freeman et al 2018). Yet species may be more resilient than models assume; for example, genetic data indicate that many species were able to persist through dramatic climate fluctuations in the Pleistocene (Song et al 2020, Wogan et al 2020, Bocalini et al 2021). Application of predictive distribution modes in conservation and management should become more widespread by including the development of tools for calculating confidence intervals (Marini et al 2010) and validating models (i.e., comparing past to present distributions with respect to global change) for correlative models, and increasing the use of mechanistic models.

Humans have already made Earth hotter than it has been since before the Pleistocene (~2 mya). This rapid change in Earth's climate has set species on the move and led to a plethora of scientific research aimed at predicting where species will live in the coming decades as warming continues. These predictions, though frequently made, are seldom tested (Tayleur et al 2015, Wilson et al 2018; but see Tingley et al 2009). Without this crucial step of model validation, it is impossible to assess the usefulness of predictive models. Here, we have presented theory and highlighted a range of data sources and analytical approaches that can be used to predict species' geographic responses to climate change. Ever-greater computational power, combined with increasingly large datasets of species occurrence and landscape covariates, permit the use of greater complexity in models (e.g., Lurgi et al 2015). However, more complex does not necessarily equate to better. The litmus test for any predictive model is how well it predicts reality. To this end, we advocate for an increasing focus on collecting empirical data that matches the spatio-temporal resolution of occurrence data with environmental variables, tests hypotheses beyond the Grinnellian niche concept, and directly evaluates model predictions (e.g., using mechanistic SDMs or resurveys). For example, the long-term predictions from models whose predictions are not met over the short-term are unlikely to be helpful (see Willis et al 2009). Determining species' resiliency will depend on accurate estimates of

the fundamental niche including which attributes make some species more vulnerable than others, which abiotic gradients are the most important to consider for the promotion of population persistence, and including biotic interactions in predictive, validated models. Our review aims to support the ongoing pursuit of more meaningful predictive distribution models under land use and climate change that will be of great near-term utility.

References

Aitken KEH, Martin K, 2007. The importance of excavators in hole-nesting communities: availability and use of natural tree holes in old mixed forests of western Canada. *Journal of Ornithology* 148, 425-434. DOI: 10.1007/s10336-007-0166-9

Alerstam T, 2011. Optimal bird migration revisited. *Journal of Ornithology* 152, 5-23. DOI: 10.1007/s10336-011-0694-1

Alexander JD, Stephens JL, Veloz S, Salas L, Rousseau JS, Ralph CJ, Sarr DA, 2017. Using regional bird density distribution models to evaluate protected area networks and inform conservation planning. *Ecosphere* 8, e01799. DOI: 10.1002/ecs2.1799

Anderson B j, Akçakaya H r, Araújo M b, Fordham D a, Martinez-Meyer E, Thuiller W, Brook B w, 2009. Dynamics of range margins for meta-populations under climate change. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences* 276, 1415-1420. DOI: 10.1098/rspb.2008.1681

Angilletta Jr MJ, 2009. *Thermal adaptation: a theoretical and empirical synthesis*. Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Angilletta MJ, Sears MW, Pringle RM, 2009. Spatial dynamics of nesting behavior: Lizards shift microhabitats to construct nests with beneficial thermal properties. *Ecology* 90, 2933-2939. DOI: 10.1890/08-2224.1

Araújo MB, Anderson RP, Márcia Barbosa A, Beale CM, Dormann CF, Early R, Garcia RA, Guisan A, Maiorano L, Naimi B, O'Hara RB, Zimmermann NE, Rahbek C, 2019. Standards for distribution models in biodiversity assessments. *Science Advances* 5, eaat4858. DOI: 10.1126/sciadv.aat4858

Araújo MB, New M, 2007. Ensemble forecasting of species distributions. *Trends in Ecology and Evolution* 22, 42-47. DOI: 10.1016/j.tree.2006.09.010

Araújo MB, Pearson RG, Thuiller W, Erhard M, 2005. Validation of species-climate impact models under climate change. *Global Change Biology* 11, 1504-1513. DOI: 10.1111/j.1365-2486.2005.01000.x

Atauchi PJ, Peterson AT, Flanagan J, 2018. Species distribution models for Peruvian plantcutter improve with consideration of biotic interactions. *Journal of Avian Biology* 49, jav-01617. DOI: 10.1111/jav.01617

Aubry KB, Raley CM, McKelvey KS, 2017. The importance of data quality for generating reliable distribution models for rare, elusive, and cryptic species. *Plos One* 12, e0179152. DOI: 10.1371/journal.pone.0179152

Augustin NH, Mugglestone MA, Buckland ST, 1996. An autologistic model for the spatial distribution of wildlife. *Journal of Applied Ecology* 33, 339-347. DOI: 10.2307/2404755

Austin MP, 2007. Species distribution models and ecological theory: A critical assessment and some possible new approaches. *Ecological Modelling* 200, 1-19. DOI: 10.1016/j.ecolmodel.2006.07.005

Austin MP, 2005. Vegetation and environment: discontinuous and continuous. *Vegetation ecology* 52-84.

Bani L, Luppi M, Rocchia E, Dondina O, Orioli V, 2019. Winners and losers: How the elevational range of breeding birds on Alps has varied over the past four decades due to climate and habitat changes. *Ecology and Evolution* 9, 1289-1305. DOI: 10.1002/ece3.4838

Barker NKS, Cumming SG, Darveau M, 2014. Models to predict the distribution and abundance of breeding ducks in Canada. *ACE* 9, art7. DOI: 10.5751/ACE-00699-090207

Benkendorf DJ, Hawkins CP, 2020. Effects of sample size and network depth on a deep learning approach to species distribution modeling. *Ecological Informatics* 60, 101137. DOI: 10.1016/j.ecoinf.2020.101137

Blaisdell A, Seitz B, Rowney C, Folsom M, MacPherson M, Deffner D, Logan C, 2021. Do the more flexible individuals rely more on causal cognition? Observation versus intervention in causal inference in great-tailed grackles. *Peer Community Journal* 1, e50. DOI: 10.24072/pcjournal.44

Block S, Levine JM, 2021. How Dispersal Evolution and Local Adaptation Affect the Range Dynamics of Species Lagging Behind Climate Change. *The American Naturalist* 197, E173-E187. DOI: 10.1086/714130

Bocalini F, Bolívar-Leguizamón SD, Silveira LF, Bravo GA, 2021. Comparative phylogeographic and demographic analyses reveal a congruent pattern of sister relationships between bird populations of the northern and south-central Atlantic Forest. *Molecular Phylogenetics and Evolution* 154, 106973. DOI: 10.1016/j.ympev.2020.106973

Bonnet-Lebrun A-S, Manica A, Rodrigues ASL., 2020. Effects of urbanization on bird migration. *Biological Conservation* 244, 108423. DOI: 10.1016/j.biocon.2020.108423

Borowicz A, McDowall P, Youngflesh C, Sayre-McCord T, Clucas G, Herman R, Forrest S, Rider M, Schwaller M, Hart T, Jenouvrier S, Polito MJ, Singh H, Lynch HJ, 2018. Multi-modal survey of Adélie penguin mega-colonies reveals the Danger Islands as a seabird hotspot. *Scientific Reports* 8, 3926. DOI: 10.1038/s41598-018-22313-w

Boyce AJ, Shakya S, Sheldon FH, Moyle RG, Martin TE, 2019. Biotic interactions are the dominant drivers of phylogenetic and functional structure in bird communities along a tropical elevational gradient. *The Auk* 136. DOI: 10.1093/auk/ukz054

Bradie J, Leung B, 2017. A quantitative synthesis of the importance of variables used in MaxEnt species distribution models. *Journal of Biogeography* 44, 1344-1361. DOI: 10.1111/jbi.12894

Brawn JD, Benson TJ, Stager M, Sly ND, Tarwater CE, 2017. Impacts of changing rainfall regime on the demography of tropical birds. *Nature Climate Change* 7, 133-136. DOI: 10.1038/nclimate3183

Bridge ES, Ross JD, Contina AJ, Kelly JF, 2016. Do molt-migrant songbirds optimize migration routes based on primary productivity? *Behavioral Ecology* 27, 784-792. DOI: 10.1093/beheco/arv199

Brown JH, 1984. On the Relationship between Abundance and Distribution of Species. *The American Naturalist* 124, 255-279. DOI: 10.1086/284267

Burner RC, Styring AR, Rahman MA, Sheldon FH, 2019. Occupancy patterns and upper range limits of lowland Bornean birds along an elevational gradient. *Journal of Biogeography* 46, 2583-2596. DOI: 10.1111/jbi.13691

Burns P, Clark M, Salas L, Hancock S, Leland D, Jantz P, Dubayah R, Goetz SJ, 2020. Incorporating canopy structure from simulated GEDI lidar into bird species distribution models. *Environmental Research Letters* 15, 095002. DOI: 10.1088/1748-9326/ab80ee

Busby JR, 1991. BIOCLIM - A bioclimate analysis and prediction system, in: *Nature Conservation: Cost Effective Biological Surveys and Data Analysis*: pp. 64-68. Margules, C.R., Austin, M.P. (Eds.), CSIRO, Melbourne, Australia.

Capurucho JMG, Ashley MV, Tsuru BR, Cooper JC, Bates JM, 2020. Dispersal ability correlates with range size in Amazonian habitat-restricted birds. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences* 287, 20201450. DOI: 10.1098/rspb.2020.1450

Caruso CM, Martin RA, Sletvold N, Morrissey MB, Wade MJ, Augustine KE, Carlson SM, MacColl ADC, Siepielski AM, Kingsolver JG, 2017. What Are the Environmental Determinants of Phenotypic Selection? A Meta-analysis of Experimental Studies. *The American Naturalist* 190, 363-376. DOI: 10.1086/692760

Casazza G, Abeli T, Bacchetta G, Dagnino D, Fenu G, Gargano D, Minuto L, Montagnani C, Orsenigo S, Peruzzi L, Varaldo L, Rossi G, 2021. Combining conservation status and species distribution models for planning assisted colonisation under climate change. *Journal of Ecology* 109, 2284-2295. DOI: 10.1111/1365-2745.13606

Caughley G, 1994. Directions in conservation biology. *Journal of Animal Ecology* 63, 215-244. DOI: 10.2307/5542

Ceballos G, Ehrlich PR, Barnosky AD, García A, Pringle RM, Palmer TM, 2015. Accelerated modern human-induced species losses: Entering the sixth mass extinction. *Science Advances* 1, e1400253. DOI: 10.1126/sciadv.1400253

Chakraborty A, Gelfand AE, Wilson AM, Latimer AM, John A Silande, J, 2010. Modeling large scale species abundance with latent spatial processes. *The Annals of Applied Statistics* 4, 1403-1429. DOI: 10.1214/10-AOAS335

Chapman DS, 2010. Weak climatic associations among British plant distributions. *Global Ecology and Biogeography* 19, 831-841. DOI: 10.1111/j.1466-8238.2010.00561.x

Claramunt S, Derryberry EP, Remsen JV, Brumfield RT, 2012. High dispersal ability inhibits speciation in a continental radiation of passerine birds. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences* 279, 1567-1574. DOI: 10.1098/rspb.2011.1922

Cooper NW, Marra PP, 2020. Hidden Long-Distance Movements by a Migratory Bird. *Current Biology* 30, 4056-4062.e3. DOI: 10.1016/j.cub.2020.07.056

Corre ML, Dussault C, Côté SD, 2020. Where to spend the winter? The role of intraspecific competition and climate in determining the selection of wintering areas by migratory caribou. *Oikos* 129, 512-525. DOI: 10.1111/oik.06668

Cowles RB, Bogert CM, 1944. A preliminary study of the thermal requirements of desert reptiles. *Bulletin of the American Museum of Natural History* 83, 261-296.

Dalgarno S, Mersey JE, Gedalof Z, Lemon M, 2017. Species-environment associations and predicted distribution of Black Oystercatcher breed-

ing pairs in Haida Gwaii, British Columbia, Canada. *ACE* 12, art9. DOI: 10.5751/ACE-01094-120209

Dallas TA, Saastamoinen M, Torsti S, Ovaskainen O, 2019. The relative importance of local and regional processes to metapopulation dynamics. *Journal of Animal Ecology* 89(3), 894-896. DOI: 10.1111/1365-2656.13141

Dallas TA, Santini L, Decker R, Hastings A, 2020. Weighing the Evidence for the Abundant-Center Hypothesis. *Biodiversity Informatics* 15, 81-91. DOI: 10.17161/bi.v15i3.11989

Danner RM, Greenberg R, 2015. A critical season approach to Allen's rule: Bill size declines with winter temperature in a cold temperate environment. *Journal of Biogeography* 42, 114-120. DOI: 10.1111/jbi.12389

De Frenne P, Lenoir J, Luoto M, Scheffers BR, Zellweger F, Aalto J, Ashcroft MB, Christiansen DM, Decocq G, De Pauw K, Govaert S, Greiser C, Gril E, Hampe A, Jucker T, Klinges DH, Koelemeijer IA, Lembrechts JJ, Marrec R, Meeussen C, Ogée J, Tyystjärvi V, Vangansbeke P, Hylander K, 2021. Forest microclimates and climate change: Importance, drivers and future research agenda. *Global Change Biology* 27, 2279-2297. DOI: 10.1111/gcb.15569

Domahidi Z, Shonfield J, Nielsen SE, Spence JR, Bayne EM, 2019. Spatial distribution of the Boreal Owl and Northern Saw-whet Owl in the boreal region of Alberta, Canada. *ACE* 14, art14. 10.5751/ACE-01445-140214

Dormann CF, Purschke O, Márquez JRG, Lautenbach S, Schröder B, 2008. Components of Uncertainty in Species Distribution Analysis: A Case Study of the Great Grey Shrike. *Ecology* 89, 3371-3386. DOI: 10.1890/07-1772.1

Drew A, Collazo J, 2014. *Bayesian networks as a framework to step-down and support Strategic Habitat Conservation of data-poor species: A case study with King Rail (*Rallus elegans*) in Eastern North Carolina and Southeastern Virginia*. US Fish and Wildlife Service, Raleigh, NC. DOI: 10.13140/2.1.4430.5920

Ducatez S, Sol D, Sayol F, Lefebvre, L, 2020. Behavioural plasticity is associated with reduced extinction risk in birds. *Nature Ecology and Evolution* 4, 788-793. DOI: 10.1038/s41559-020-1168-8

Dunn PO, Møller AP, 2019. *Effects of climate change on birds*. Oxford University Press, New York, NY.

Dvorský M, Macek M, Kopecký M, Wild J, Doležal J, 2017. Niche asymmetry of vascular plants increases with elevation. *Journal of Biogeography* 44, 1418-1425. DOI: 10.1111/jbi.13001

Early R, Sax DF, 2014. Climatic niche shifts between species' native and naturalized ranges raise concern for ecological forecasts during invasions and climate change. Global *Ecology and Biogeography* 23, 1356-1365. DOI: 10.1111/geb.12208

Elith J, 2017. Predicting Distributions of Invasive Species, In: *Invasive Species: Risk Assessment and Management*: pp. 93-129. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK.

Elith J, H. Graham C, P Anderson R, Dudík M, Ferrier S, Guisan A, J Hijmans R, Huettmann F, R Leathwick J, Lehmann A, Li J, G Lohmann L, A Loiselle B, Manion G, Moritz C, Nakamura M, Nakazawa Y, McC M Overton J, Townsend Peterson A, J Phillips S, Richardson K, Scachetti-Pereira R, E Schapire R, Soberón J, Williams S, S Wisz M, E Zimmermann N, 2006. Novel methods improve prediction of species' distributions from occurrence data. *Ecography* 29, 129-151. DOI: 10.1111/j.2006.0906-7590.04596.x

Elith J, Leathwick J, 2007. Predicting species distributions from museum and herbarium records using multiresponse models fitted with multivariate adaptive regression splines. *Diversity and Distributions* 13, 265-275. DOI: 10.1111/j.1472-4642.2007.00340.x

Elith J, Leathwick JR, Hastie T, 2008. A working guide to boosted regression trees. *Journal of Animal Ecology* 77, 802-813. DOI: 10.1111/j.1365-2656.2008.01390.x

Elsen PR, Tingley MW, Kalyanaraman R, Ramesh K, Wilcove DS, 2017. The role of competition, ecotones, and temperature in the elevational distribution of Himalayan birds. *Ecology* 98, 337-348. DOI: 10.1002/ecy.1669

Elton C, 1927. *Animal ecology*. Sidgwick & Jackson, London.

Faaborg J, Holmes RT, Anders AD, Bildstein KL, Dugger KM, Gauthreaux SA, Heglund P, Hobson KA, Jahn AE, Johnson DH, Latta SC, Levey DJ, Marra PP, Merkord CL, Nol E, Rothstein SI, Sherry TW, Sillett TS, Thompson FR, Warnock N, 2010. Recent advances in understanding migration systems of New World land birds. *Ecological Monographs* 80, 3-48. DOI: 10.1890/09-0395.1

Feeley K., Rehm EM, Machovina B, 2012. Perspective: The responses of tropical forest species to global climate change: acclimate, adapt, migrate, or go extinct? *Frontiers of Biogeography* 4. DOI: 10.21425/F5FBG12621

Ferguson AW, 2020. On the role of (and threat to) natural history museums in mammal conservation: an African small mammal perspective. *Fozo* 1 69, 20028.1. DOI: 10.25225/jvb.20028

Fick SE, Hijmans RJ, 2017. WorldClim 2: new 1-km spatial resolution climate surfaces for global land areas. *International Journal of Climatology* 37, 4302-4315. DOI: 10.1002/joc.5086

Freeman BG, Freeman AMC, Hochachka WM, 2016. Asymmetric interspecific aggression in New Guinean songbirds that replace one another along an elevational gradient. *Ibis* 158, 726-737. DOI: 10.1111/ibi.12384

Freeman BG, Mason NA, 2015. The geographic distribution of a tropical montane bird is limited by a tree: Acorn Woodpeckers (*Melanerpes formicivorus*) and Colombian oaks (*Quercus humboldtii*) in the Northern Andes. *Plos One* 10, e0128675. DOI: 10.1371/journal.pone.0128675

Freeman BG, Scholer MN, Ruiz-Gutierrez V, Fitzpatrick JW, 2018. Climate change causes upslope shifts and mountaintop extirpations in a tropical bird community. *PNAS* 115, 11982-11987. DOI: 10.1073/pnas.1804224115

Fumy F, Fartmann T, 2021. Climate and land-use change drive habitat loss in a mountain bird species. *Ibis* 163, 1189-1206. DOI: 10.1111/ibi.12954

Gallagher RV, Falster DS, Maitner BS, Salguero-Gómez R, Vandvik V, Pearse WD, Schneider FD, Kattge J, Poelen JH, Madin JS, Ankenbrand MJ, Penone C, Feng X, Adams VM, Alroy J, Andrew SC, Balk MA, Bland LM, Boyle BL, Bravo-Avila CH, Brennan I, Carthey AJR, Catullo R, Cavazos BR, Conde DA, Chown SL, Fadrique B, Gibb H, Halbritter AH, Hammock J, Hogan JA, Holewa H, Hope M, Iversen CM, Jochum M, Kearney M, Keller A, Mabee P, Manning P, McCormack L, Michaletz ST, Park DS, Perez TM, Pineda-Munoz S, Ray CA, Rossetto M, Sauquet H, Sparrow B, Spasojevic MJ, Telford RJ, Tobias JA, Violle C, Walls R, Weiss KCB, Westoby M, Wright IJ, Enquist BJ, 2020. Open Science principles for accelerating trait-based science across the Tree of Life. *Nature Ecology and Evolution* 4, 294-303. DOI: 10.1038/s41559-020-1109-6

Garcia-R JC, Matzke NJ, 2021. Trait-dependent dispersal in rails (Aves: Rallidae): Historical biogeography of a cosmopolitan bird clade. *Molecular Phylogenetics and Evolution* 159, 107106. DOI: 10.1016/j.ympev.2021.107106

Goetz SJ, Steinberg D, Betts MG, Holmes RT, Doran PJ, Dubayah R, Hofton M, 2010. Lidar remote sensing variables predict breeding habitat of a Neotropical migrant bird. *Ecology* 91, 1569-1576. DOI: 10.1890/09-1670.1

Graham CH, Elith J, Hijmans RJ, Guisan A, Peterson AT, Loiselle BA, 2008. The influence of spatial errors in species occurrence data used in distribution models. *Journal of Applied Ecology* 45, 239-247. DOI: 10.1111/j.1365-2664.2007.01408.x

Graham RW, Lundelius EL, Graham MA, Schroeder EK, Toomey RS, Anderson E, Barnosky AD, Burns JA, Churcher CS, Grayson DK, Guthrie RD, Harington CR, Jefferson GT, Martin LD, McDonald HG, Morlan RE, Semken HA, Webb SD, Werdelin L, Wilson MC, 1996. Spatial Response of Mammals to Late Quaternary Environmental Fluctuations. *Science* 272, 1601-1606. DOI: 10.1126/science.272.5268.1601

Grant PR, Grant BR, 2020. *How and Why Species Multiply*. Princeton University Press, NJ, USA.

Grant PR, Weiner J, 2017. *Ecology and Evolution of Darwin's Finches* (Princeton Science Library Edition). Princeton Science Library Edition.

Guisan A, Zimmermann NE, 2000. Predictive habitat distribution models in ecology. *Ecological Modelling* 135, 147-186. DOI: 10.1016/S0304-3800(00)00354-9

Haldane JS, 1956. The relation between density regulation and natural selection. Proceedings of the Royal Society of London. *Series B - Biological Sciences* 145, 306-308. DOI: 10.1098/rspb.1956.0039

Hallman TA, Robinson, W.D., 2020. Comparing multi- and single-scale species distribution and abundance models built with the boosted regression tree algorithm. *Landscape Ecology* 35, 1161-1174. DOI: 10.1007/s10980-020-01007-7

Harris, I., Jones, P.D., Osborn, T.J., Lister, D.H., 2014. Updated high-resolution grids of monthly climatic observations - the CRU TS3.10 Dataset. *International Journal of Climatology* 34, 623-642. 10.1002/joc.3711

Hefley TJ, Hooten MB, 2015. On the existence of maximum likelihood estimates for presence-only data. *Methods in Ecology and Evolution* 6, 648-655. DOI: 10.1111/2041-210X.12340

Heim W, Heim RJ, Beermann I, Burkovskiy OA, Gerasimov Y, Ktitorov P, Ozaki K, Panov I, Sander MM, Sjöberg S, Smirenski SM, Thomas A, Tøttrup AP, Tiunov IM, Willemoes M, Hölzel N, Thorup K, Kamp J, 2020. Using geolocator tracking data and ringing archives to validate citizen-science based seasonal predictions of bird distribution in a data-poor region. *Global Ecology and Conservation* 24, e01215. DOI: 10.1016/j.gecco.2020.e01215

Helm B, Van Doren BM, Hoffmann D, Hoffmann U, 2019. Evolutionary response to climate change in migratory Pied Flycatchers. *Current Biology* 29, 3714-3719.e4. DOI: 10.1016/j.cub.2019.08.072

Herbert JA, Chakraborty A, Naylor LW, Beatty WS, Krementz DG, 2018.

Effects of landscape structure and temporal habitat dynamics on wintering mallard abundance. *Landscape Ecology* 33, 1319-1334. DOI: 10.1007/s10980-018-0671-7

Herbert JA, Chakraborty A, Naylor LW, Krementz DG, 2021. Habitat associations of wintering dabbling ducks in the Arkansas Mississippi Alluvial Valley: implications for waterfowl management beyond the mallard. *Wildlife Biology* 2021. DOI: 10.2981/wlb.00792

Hole DG, Huntley B, Arinaitwe J, Butchart SHM, Collingham YC, Fishpool LDC, Pain DJ, Willis SG, 2011. Toward a Management Framework for Networks of Protected Areas in the Face of Climate Change. *Conservation Biology* 25, 305-315. DOI: 10.1111/j.1523-1739.2010.01633.x

Holt RD, Keitt TH, Lewis MA, Maurer BA, Taper ML, 2005. Theoretical models of species' borders: single species approaches. *Oikos* 108, 18-27. DOI: 10.1111/j.0030-1299.2005.13147.x

Huey RB, Hertz PE, Sinervo B, 2003. Behavioral drive versus behavioral inertia in evolution: A null model approach. *The American Naturalist* 161, 357-366. DOI: 10.1086/346135

Huey RB, Kearney MR, Krockenberger A, Holtum JAM, Jess M, Williams SE, 2012. Predicting organismal vulnerability to climate warming: roles of behaviour, physiology and adaptation. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences* 367, 1665-1679. DOI: 10.1098/rstb.2012.0005

Huisman J, Olff H, Fresco Lfm, 1993. A hierarchical set of models for species response analysis. *Journal of Vegetation Science* 4, 37-46. DOI: 10.2307/3235732

Huntley B, Berry PM, Cramer W, McDonald AP, 1995. Special Paper: Modelling Present and Potential Future Ranges of Some European Higher Plants Using Climate Response Surfaces. *Journal of Biogeography* 22, 967-1001. DOI: 10.2307/2845830

Huntley B, Collingham YC, Green RE, Hilton GM, Rahbek C, Willis SG, 2006. Potential impacts of climatic change upon geographical distributions of birds. *Ibis* 148, 8-28. DOI: 10.1111/j.1474-919X.2006.00523.x

Huntley B, Collingham YC, Willis SG, Green RE., 2008. Potential Impacts of Climatic Change on European Breeding Birds. *Plos One* 3, e1439. DOI: 10.1371/journal.pone.0001439

Jaeger RG, 1970. Potential Extinction Through Competition Between Two Species of Terrestrial Salamanders. *Evolution* 24, 632-642. DOI: 10.2307/2406842

Jahn AE, Buechley E, Bugoni L, Cereghetti J, Repenning M, Marra PP, Ryder TB, 2021. Variable Seasonal Movement Dynamics Among Individual Snail Kites (*Rostrhamus sociabilis*) In South America. *Journal of Raptor Research* 55(2), 151-168. DOI: 10.3356/JRR-20-77

Jahn AE, Seavy N, Bejarano V, Guzmán MB, Provinciato ICC, Pizo M, MacPherson M, 2016. Intra-tropical migration and wintering areas of Fork-tailed Flycatchers (*Tyrannus savana*) breeding in São Paulo, Brazil. *Revista Brasileira de Ornitologia* 24, 116–121. DOI: 10.1007/BF03544339

Jankowski JE, Londoño GA, Robinson SK, Chappell MA, 2013. Exploring the role of physiology and biotic interactions in determining elevational ranges of tropical animals. *Ecography* 001-012.

Jankowski JE, Robinson SK, Levey DJ, 2010. Squeezed at the top: Interspecific aggression may constrain elevational ranges in tropical birds. *Ecology* 91, 1877-1884. DOI: 10.1890/09-2063.1

Jansen F, Oksanen J, 2013. How to model species responses along ecological gradients - Huisman-Olff-Fresco models revisited. *Journal of Vegetation Science* 24, 1108-1117. DOI: 10.1111/jvs.12050

Jarnevich CS, Talbert M, Morisette J, Aldridge C, Brown CS, Kumar S, Manier D, Talbert C, Holcombe T, 2017. Minimizing effects of methodological decisions on interpretation and prediction in species distribution studies: An example with background selection. *Ecological Modelling* 363, 48-56. DOI: 10.1016/j.ecolmodel.2017.08.017

Jiguet F Gadot, A-S, Julliard R, Newson SE, Couvet D, 2007. Climate envelope, life history traits and the resilience of birds facing global change. *Global Change Biology* 13, 1672-1684. DOI: 10.1111/j.1365-2486.2007.01386.x

Jirinec V, Burner RC, Amaral BR, Bierregaard Jr RO, Fernandez-Arellano G, Hernandez-Palma A, Johnson EI, Lovejoy TE, Powell LL, Rutt CL, Wolfe JD, Stouffer PC, 2021. Morphological consequences of climate change for resident birds in intact Amazonian rainforest. *Science Advances* 7, eabk1743. DOI: 10.1126/sciadv.abk1743

Jirinec V, Isdell RE, Leu M, 2016. Prey availability and habitat structure explain breeding space use of a migratory songbird. *Condor* 118, 309-328. DOI: 10.1650/CONDOR-15-140.1

Johnston A, Hochachka WM, Strimas-Mackey ME, Gutierrez VR, Robinson OJ, Miller ET, Kelling ST, Fink D, 2021. Analytical guidelines to increase the value of community science: An example using eBird data to estimate species distributions. *Diversity and Distributions* 21(7), 1265-1277. DOI: 10.1111/ddi.13271

Jones J, 2001. Habitat selection studies in avian ecology: a critical review. *The Auk* 118, 557-562. DOI: 10.1093/auk/118.2.557

Jones MC, Cheung WWL, 2015. Multi-model ensemble projections of climate change effects on global marine biodiversity. *ICES Journal of Marine Science* 72, 741-752. DOI: 10.1093/icesjms/fsu172

Kapos V, 1989. Effects of isolation on the water status of forest patches in the Brazilian Amazon. *Journal of Tropical Ecology* 5, 173-185. DOI: 10.1017/S0266467400003448

Kearney M, 2006. Habitat, environment and niche: what are we modelling? *Oikos* 115, 186-191. DOI: 10.1111/j.2006.0030-1299.14908.x

Kearney M, Porter W, 2009. Mechanistic niche modelling: combining physiological and spatial data to predict species' ranges. *Ecology Letters* 12, 334-350. DOI: 10.1111/j.1461-0248.2008.01277.x

Kearney MR, Porter WP, Murphy SA, 2016. An estimate of the water budget for the endangered night parrot of Australia under recent and future climates. *Climate Change Responses* 3, 14. DOI: 10.1186/s40665-016-0027-y

Kitzes J, Schricker L, 2019. The necessity, promise and challenge of automated biodiversity surveys. *Environmental Conservation* 46, 247-250. DOI: 10.1017/S0376892919000146

Kokko H, Gunnarsson TG, Morrell LJ, Gill JA, 2006. Why do female migratory birds arrive later than males? *Journal of Animal Ecology* 75, 1293-1303. DOI: 10.1111/j.1365-2656.2006.01151.x

König C, Wüest RO, Graham CH, Karger DN, Sattler T, Zimmermann NE, Zurell D, 2021. Scale dependency of joint species distribution models challenges interpretation of biotic interactions. *Journal of Biogeography* 1-11. DOI: 10.1111/jbi.14106

Kottler EJ, Dickman EE, Sexton JP, Emery NC, Franks SJ, 2021. Draining the Swamping Hypothesis: Little Evidence that Gene Flow Reduces Fitness at Range Edges. *Trends in Ecology and Evolution* 36, 533-544. DOI: 10.1016/j.tree.2021.02.004

La Sorte FA, Lepczyk CA, Burnett JL, Hurlbert AH, Tingley MW, Zuckerberg B, 2018. Opportunities and challenges for big data ornithology. *The Condor* 120, 414-426. DOI: 10.1650/CONDOR-17-206.1

Latimer CE, Zuckerberg B, 2021. Habitat loss and thermal tolerances influence the sensitivity of resident bird populations to winter weather at regional scales. *Journal of Animal Ecology* 90, 317-329. DOI: 10.1111/1365-2656.13332

Lavretsky P, McInerney NR, Mohl JE, Brown JI, James HF, McCracken KG, Fleischer RC, 2020. Assessing changes in genomic divergence following a century of human-mediated secondary contact among wild and captive-bred ducks. *Molecular Ecology* 29, 578-595. DOI: 10.1111/mec.15343

Léandri-Breton D-J, Bêty J, 2020. Vulnerability to predation may affect species distribution: plovers with broader arctic breeding range nest in safer habitat. *Scientific Reports* 10, 5032. DOI: 10.1038/s41598-020-61956-6

Leclerc C, Villéger S, Marino C, Bellard C, 2020. Global changes threaten functional and taxonomic diversity of insular species worldwide. *Diversity and Distributions* 26, 402-414. DOI: 10.1111/ddi.13024

Lees AC, Rosenberg KV, Ruiz-gutierrez V, Marsden S, Schulenberg TS, Rodewald AD, 2020. A roadmap to identifying and filling shortfalls in Neotropical ornithology. *The Auk* 137, 1-17. DOI: 10.1093/auk/ukaa048

Lehmann P, Ammunét T, Barton M, Battisti A, Eigenbrode SD, Jepsen JU, Kalinkat G, Neuvonen S, Niemelä P, Terblanche JS, Økland B, Björkman C, 2020. Complex responses of global insect pests to climate warming. *Frontiers in Ecology and the Environment* 18, 141-150. DOI: 10.1002/fee.2160

Lei Y, Liu Q, 2021. Tolerance niche expansion and potential distribution prediction during Asian openbill bird range expansion. *Ecology and Evolution* 1-13. DOI: 10.1002/ece3.7456

Loiselle BA, Howell CA, Graham CH, Goerck JM, Brooks T, Smith KG, Williams PH, 2003. Avoiding Pitfalls of Using Species Distribution Models in Conservation Planning. *Conservation Biology* 17, 1591-1600. DOI: 10.1111/j.1523-1739.2003.00233.x

Louthan AM, Doak DF, Angert AL, 2015. Where and when do species interactions set range limits? *Trends in Ecology and Evolution* 30, 780-792. DOI: 10.1016/j.tree.2015.09.011

Loyola RD, Lemes P, Nabout JC, Trindade-Filho J, Sagnori MD, Dobrovolski R, Diniz-Filho JAF, 2013. A straightforward conceptual approach for evaluating spatial conservation priorities under climate change. *Biodiversity and Conservation* 22, 483-495. DOI: 10.1007/s10531-012-0424-x

Lukas J, Auer F, Goldhammer T, Krause J, Romanczuk P, Klamser P, Arias-Rodriguez L, Bierbach D, 2021. Diurnal Changes in Hypoxia Shape Predator-Prey Interaction in a Bird-Fish System. *Frontiers in Ecology and Evolution* 9, 619193. DOI: 10.14279/depositonce-11735

Lurgi M, Brook BW, Saltré F, Fordham DA, 2015. Modelling range dynamics under global change: which framework and why? *Methods in Ecology and Evolution* 6, 247-256. DOI: 10.1111/2041-210X.12315

MacKenzie DI, Nichols JD, Sutton N, Kawanishi K, Bailey L., 2005. Improving inferences in population studies of rare species that are detected imperfectly. *Ecology* 86, 1101-1113. DOI: 10.1890/04-1060

MacPherson MP, Jahn AE, Mason NA, 2022. Morphology of migration: associations between wing shape, bill morphology and migration in kingbirds (*Tyrannus*). *Biological Journal of the Linnean Society* 135, 71-83. DOI: 10.1093/biolinnean/blab123

MacPherson MP, Jahn AE, Murphy MT, Kim DH, Cueto VR, Tuero DT, Hill ED, 2018a. Follow the rain? Environmental drivers of Tyrannus migration across the New World. *The Auk* 135, 881-894. DOI: 10.1642/AUK-17-209.1

MacPherson MP, Webb EB, Raedeke A, Mengel D, Nelson F, 2018b. A review of Bayesian belief network models as decision-support tools for wetland conservation: Are water birds potential umbrella taxa? *Biological Conservation* 226, 215-223. DOI: 10.1016/j.biocon.2018.08.001

Maggini R, Lehmann A, Kéry M, Schmid H, Beniston M, Jenni L, Zbinden N, 2011. Are Swiss birds tracking climate change?: Detecting elevational shifts using response curve shapes. *Ecological Modelling* 222, 21-32. DOI: 10.1016/j.ecolmodel.2010.09.010

Mamantov MA, Gibson-Reinemer DK, Linck EB, Sheldon K., 2021. Climate-driven range shifts of montane species vary with elevation. *Global Ecology and Biogeography* 30, 784-794. DOI: 10.1111/geb.13246

Manel S, Dias JM, Buckton ST, Ormerod SJ, 1999. Alternative methods for predicting species distribution: an illustration with Himalayan river birds. *Journal of Applied Ecology* 36, 734-747. DOI: 10.1046/j.1365-2664.1999.00440.x

Marini Miguel Â, Barbet-Massin M, Lopes LE, Jiguet F, 2010. Predicting the occurrence of rare Brazilian birds with species distribution models. *Journal of Ornithology* 151, 857-866. DOI: 10.1007/s10336-010-0523-y

Marini MÂ, Barbet-Massin M, Lopes LE, Jiguet F, 2009. Predicted climate-driven bird distribution changes and forecasted conservation conflicts in a Neotropical savanna. *Conservation Biology* 23, 1558-1567. DOI: 10.1111/j.1523-1739.2009.01258.x

Marini MÂ, Barbet-Massin M, Martinez J, Prestes NP, Jiguet F, 2010. Applying ecological niche modelling to plan conservation actions for the Red-spectacled Amazon (*Amazona pretrei*). *Biological Conservation* 143, 102-112. DOI: 10.1016/j.biocon.2009.09.009

Marini MÂ, Hall L, Bates J, Steinheimer FD, McGowan R, Silveira LF, Lijtmaer DA, Tubaro PL, Córdoba-Córdoba S, Gamauf A, Greeney HF, Schweizer M, Kamminga P, Cibois A, Vallotton L, Russell D, Robinson SK, Sweet PR, Frahnert S, Corado R, Heming NM, 2020. The five million bird eggs in the world's museum collections are an invaluable and underused resource. *The Auk* 137, ukaa036. DOI: 10.1093/auk/ukaa036

Matuoka MA, Benchimol M, Almeida-Rocha JM de, Morante-Filho JC, 2020. Effects of anthropogenic disturbances on bird functional diversity: A global meta-analysis. *Ecological Indicators* 116, 106471. DOI: 10.1016/j.ecolind.2020.106471

McKinnon EA, Love OP, 2018. Ten years tracking the migrations of small landbirds: Lessons learned in the golden age of bio-logging. *The Auk* 135, 834-856. DOI: 10.1642/AUK-17-202.1

Merkle JA, Abrahms B, Armstrong JB, Sawyer H, Costa DP, Chalfoun AD, 2022. Site fidelity as a maladaptive behavior in the Anthropocene. *Frontiers in Ecology and the Environment* 20, 187-194. DOI: 10.1002/fee.2456

Merow C, Smith MJ, Silander JA Jr, 2013. A practical guide to MaxEnt for modeling species' distributions: what it does, and why inputs and settings matter. *Ecography* 36, 1058-1069. DOI: 10.1111/j.1600-0587.2013.07872.x

Mi C, Huettmann F, Guo Y, Han X, Wen L, 2017. Why choose Random Forest to predict rare species distribution with few samples in large undersampled areas? Three Asian crane species models provide supporting evidence. *PeerJ* 5, e2849. DOI: 10.7717/peerj.2849

Micheletti T, Stewart FE, Cumming SG, Haché S, Stralberg D, Tremblay JA, Barros C, Eddy IMS, Chubaty AM, Leblond M, Pankratz RF, Mahon CL, Van Wilgenburg SL, Bayne EM, Schmiegelow F, McIntyre EJB, 2021. Assessing Pathways of Climate Change Effects in SpaDES: An Application to Boreal Landbirds of Northwest Territories Canada. *Frontiers in Ecology and Evolution* 9, Article 679673. DOI: 10.3389/fevo.2021.679673

Møller AP, Rubolini D, Lehikoinen E, 2008. Populations of migratory bird species that did not show a phenological response to climate change are declining. *PNAS* 105, 16195-16200. DOI: 10.1073/pnas.0803825105

Moore RP, Robinson WD, Lovette IJ, Robinson TR, 2008. Experimental evidence for extreme dispersal limitation in tropical forest birds. *Ecology Letters* 11, 960-968. DOI: 10.1111/j.1461-0248.2008.01196.x

Morisette JT, Jarnevich CS, Holcombe TR, Talbert CB, Ignizio D, Talbert MK, Silva C, Koop D, Swanson A, Young NE, 2013. VisTrails SAHM: visualization and workflow management for species habitat modeling. *Ecography* 36, 129-135. DOI: 10.1111/j.1600-0587.2012.07815.x

Moritz C, Agudo R, 2013. The future of species under climate change: resilience or decline? *Science* 341, 504-508. DOI: 10.1126/science.1237190

Morris WF, Doak DF, 2002. *Quantitative conservation biology: theory and practice of population viability analysis*. Sinauer Associates, Sunderland, MA, USA.

Morrison ML, 1986. Bird populations as indicators of environmental change, In: *Current Ornithology: Volume 3, Current Ornithology*. Johnston, R.F. (Ed.), Springer US, Boston, MA, pp. 429-451. DOI: 10.1007/978-1-4615-6784-4_10

Naka LN, Costa BM da S, Lima GR, Claramunt S, 2022. Riverine Barriers as Obstacles to Dispersal in Amazonian Birds. *Frontiers in Ecology and Evolution* 10.

Nakao K, Higa M, Tsuyama I, Matsui T, Horikawa M, Tanaka N, 2013. Spatial conservation planning under climate change: Using species distribution modeling to assess priority for adaptive management of Fagus crenata in Japan. *Journal for Nature Conservation* 21, 406-413. DOI: 10.1016/j.jnc.2013.06.003

Neilan WL, Barton PS, McAlpine CA, Wood JT, Lindenmayer DB, 2019. Contrasting effects of mosaic structure on alpha and beta diversity of bird assemblages in a human-modified landscape. *Ecography* 42, 173-186. DOI: 10.1111/ecog.02981

Nilsson C, Klaassen RHG, Alerstam T, 2013. Differences in speed and duration of bird migration between spring and autumn. *The American Naturalist* 181, 837-845. DOI: 10.1086/670335

Nunes MH, Campana Camargo JL, Vincent G, Calders K, Oliveira RS, Huete A, Mendes de Moura Y, Nelson B, Smith MN, Stark SC, Maeda EE, 2022. Forest fragmentation impacts the seasonality of Amazonian evergreen canopies. *Nature Communications* 13. DOI: 10.1038/s41467-022-28490-7

Oksanen J, Minchin P., 2002. Continuum theory revisited: what shape are species responses along ecological gradients? *Ecological Modelling* 157, 119-129. DOI: 10.1016/S0304-3800(02)00190-4

Oppel S, Meirinho A, Ramírez I, Gardner B, O'Connell AF, Miller PI, Louzao M, 2012. Comparison of five modelling techniques to predict the spatial distribution and abundance of seabirds. *Biological Conservation* 156, 94-104. DOI: 10.1016/j.biocon.2011.11.013

Palacio FX, Girini JM, 2018. Biotic interactions in species distribution models enhance model performance and shed light on natural history of rare birds: a case study using the straight-billed reedhaunter Limnoctites rectirostris. *Journal of Avian Biology* 49, e01743. DOI: 10.1111/jav.01743

Palma AC, Goosem M, Fensham RJ, Goosem S, Preece ND, Stevenson PR, Laurance SGW, 2020. Dispersal and recruitment limitations in secondary forests. *Journal of Vegetation Science* e12975. DOI: 10.1111/jvs.12975

Parmesan C, Matthews J, 2005. *Ecological Impacts of Climate Change*. The National Academies Press. Washington, DC, USA. DOI: 10.17226/12491

Parmesan C, Yohe G, 2003. A globally coherent fingerprint of climate change impacts across natural systems. *Nature* 421, 37-42. DOI: 10.1038/nature01286

Pearl J, 1985. Bayesian networks: A model of self-activated memory for evidential reasoning. In: *Proceedings of the 7th Conference of the Cognitive Science Society*: pp. 15-17. University of California, Irvine, CA.

Pearson RG, Dawson TP, 2003. Predicting the impacts of climate change on the distribution of species: are bioclimate envelope models useful? *Global Ecology and Biogeography* 12, 361-371. DOI: 10.1046/j.1466-822X.2003.00042.x

Pearson RG, Raxworthy CJ, Nakamura M, Peterson AT, 2007. Predicting species distributions from small numbers of occurrence records: a test case using cryptic geckos in Madagascar. *Journal of Biogeography* 34, 102-117. DOI: 10.1111/j.1365-2699.2006.01594.x

Pecl GT, Araújo MB, Bell JD, Blanchard J, Bonebrake TC, Chen I-C, Clark TD, Colwell RK, Danielsen F, Evengård B, Falconi L, Ferrier S, Frusher S, Garcia RA, Griffis RB, Hobday AJ, Janion-Scheepers C, Jarzyna MA, Jennings S, Lenoir J, Linnetved HI, Martin VY, McCormack PC, McDonald J, Mitchell NJ, Mustonen T, Pandolfi JM, Pettorelli N, Popova E, Robinson SA, Scheffers BR, Shaw JD, Sorte CJB., Strugnell JM, Sunday JM, Tuanmu M-N, Vergés A, Villanueva C, Wernberg T, Wapstra E, Williams SE, 2017. Biodiversity redistribution under climate change: Impacts on ecosystems and human well-being. *Science* 355. DOI: 10.1126/science.aai9214

Pérez-Granados C, Bota G, Giralt D, Barrero A, Gómez-Catasús J, Rosa DB-DL, Traba J, 2019. Vocal activity rate index: a useful method to infer terrestrial bird abundance with acoustic monitoring. *Ibis* 161, 901-907. DOI: 10.1111/ibi.12728

Pérez-Granados C, Schuchmann K-L, 2020. Monitoring the annual vocal

activity of two enigmatic nocturnal Neotropical birds: the Common Potoo (Nyctibius griseus) and the Great Potoo (Nyctibius grandis). *Journal of Ornithology* 161, 1129-1141. DOI: 10.1007/s10336-020-01795-4

Peterson ML, Doak DF, Morris WF, 2019. Incorporating local adaptation into forecasts of species' distribution and abundance under climate change. *Global Change Biology* 25, 775-793. DOI: 10.1111/gcb.14562

Phillips SJ, Anderson RP, Schapire RE, 2006. Maximum entropy modeling of species geographic distributions. *Ecological Modelling* 190, 231-259. DOI: 10.1016/j.ecolmodel.2005.03.026

Pierson JC, Beissinger SR, Bragg JG, Coates DJ, Oostermeijer JGB., Sunnucks P, Schumaker NH, Trotter MV, Young AG, 2015. Incorporating evolutionary processes into population viability models. *Conservation Biology* 29, 755-764. DOI: 10.1111/cobi.12431

Poloczanska ES, Brown CJ, Sydeman WJ, Kiessling W, Schoeman DS, Moore PJ, Brander K, Bruno JF, Buckley LB, Burrows MT, Duarte CM, Halpern BS, Holding J, Kappel CV, O'Connor MI, Pandolfi JM, Parmesan C, Schwing F, Thompson SA, Richardson AJ, 2013. Global imprint of climate change on marine life. *Nature Climate Change* 3, 919-925. DOI: 10.1038/nclimate1958

Porter WP, Mitchell JW, Beckman WA, DeWitt CB, 1973. Behavioral implications of mechanistic ecology. *Oecologia* 13, 1-54. DOI: 10.1007/BF00379617

Radchuk V, Reed T, Teplitsky C, van de Pol M, Charmantier A, Hassall C, Adamík P, Adriaensen F, Ahola MP, Arcese P, Miguel Avilés J, Balbontin J, Berg KS, Borras A, Burthe S, Clobert J, Dehnhard N, de Lope F, Dhondt AA, Dingemanse NJ, Doi H, Eeva T, Fickel J, Filella I, Fossøy F, Goodenough AE, Hall SJG, Hansson B, Harris M, Hasselquist D, Hickler T, Joshi J, Kharouba H, Martínez JG, Mihoub J-B, Mills JA, Molina-Morales M, Moksnes A, Ozgul A, Parejo D, Pilard P, Poisbleau M, Rousset F, Rödel M-O, Scott D, Senar JC, Stefanescu C, Stokke BG, Kusano T, Tarka M, Tarwater CE, Thonicke K, Thorley J, Wilting A, Tryjanowski P, Merilä J, Sheldon BC, Pape Møller A, Matthysen E, Janzen F, Dobson FS, Visser ME, Beissinger SR, Courtiol A, Kramer-Schadt S, 2019. Adaptive responses of animals to climate change are most likely insufficient. *Nature Communications* 10, 3109. DOI: 10.1038/s41467-019-10924-4

Radosavljevic A, Anderson RP, 2014. Making better Maxent models of species distributions: complexity, overfitting and evaluation. *Journal of Biogeography* 41, 629-643. DOI: 10.1111/jbi.12227

Randin CF, Ashcroft MB, Bolliger J, Cavender-Bares J, Coops NC, Dullinger S, Dirnböck T, Eckert S, Ellis E, Fernández N, Giuliani G, Guisan A, Jetz W, Joost S, Karger D, Lembrechts J, Lenoir J, Luoto M, Morin X, Price B, Rocchini D, Schaepman M, Schmid B, Verburg P, Wilson A, Woodcock P, Yoccoz N, Payne D, 2020. Monitoring biodiversity in the Anthropocene using remote sensing in species distribution models. *Remote Sensing of Environment* 239, 111626. DOI: 10.1016/j.rse.2019.111626

Reed JM, Boulinier T, Danchin E, Oring LW, 1999. Informed Dispersal, in: *Current Ornithology, Current Ornithology*: pp. 189-259. Nolan, V., Ketterson, E.D., Thompson, C.F. (Eds.), Springer US, Boston, MA. DOI: 10.1007/978-1-4757-4901-4_5

Rehm E, Feeley KJ, 2016. Many species risk mountain top extinction long before they reach the top. *Frontiers of Biogeography* 8. DOI: 10.21425/F5FBG27788

Remsen JV, 1995. The importance of continued collecting of bird specimens to ornithology and bird conservation. *Bird Conservation International* 5, 146-180. DOI: 10.1017/S095927090000099X

Renfrew RB, Kim D, Perlut N, Smith J, Fox J, Marra PP, 2013. Phenological matching across hemispheres in a long-distance migratory bird. *Diversity and Distributions* 19, 1008-1019. DOI: 10.1111/ddi.12080

Reznick D, Baxter RJ, Endler J, 1994. Long-term studies of tropical stream fish communities: The use of field notes and museum collections to reconstruct communities of the past. *American Zoologist* 34, 452-462. DOI: 10.1093/icb/34.3.452

Ribas CC, Aleixo A, Gubili C, d'Horta FM, Brumfield RT, Cracraft J, 2018. Biogeography and diversification of Rhegmatorhina (Aves: Thamnophilidae): Implications for the evolution of Amazonian landscapes during the Quaternary. *Journal of Biogeography* 45, 917-928. DOI: 10.1111/jbi.13169

Ribas CC, Aleixo A, Nogueira ACR, Miyaki CY, Cracraft J, 2012. A palaeobiogeographic model for biotic diversification within Amazonia over the past three million years. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences* 279, 681-689. DOI: 10.1098/rspb.2011.1120

Riddell EA, Iknayan KJ, Hargrove L, Tremor S, Patton JL, Ramirez R, Wolf BO, Beissinger SR, 2021. Exposure to climate change drives stability or collapse of desert mammal and bird communities. *Science* 371, 633-636. DOI: 10.1126/science.abd4605

Riotte-Lambert L, Matthiopoulos J, 2020. Environmental Predictability as a Cause and Consequence of Animal Movement. *Trends in Ecology and Evolution* 35, 163-174. DOI: 10.1016/j.tree.2019.09.009

Ritter CD, Coelho LA, Capurucho JM, Borges SH, Cornelius C, Ribas CC, 2021. Sister species, different histories: comparative phylogeography of two bird species associated with Amazonian open vegetation. *Biological Journal of the Linnean Society* 132, 161-173. DOI: 10.1093/biolinnean/blaa167

Roberts CP, Allen CR, Angeler DG, Twidwell D, 2019. Shifting avian spatial regimes in a changing climate. *Nature Climate Change* 9, 562-566. DOI: 10.1038/s41558-019-0517-6

Rosado BHP, Figueiredo MSL, Mattos EA de, Grelle CEV, 2016. Eltonian shortfall due to the Grinnellian view: functional ecology between the mismatch of niche concepts. *Ecography* 39, 1034-1041. DOI: 10.1111/ecog.01678

Roslin T, Antão L, Hällfors M, Meyke E, Lo C, Tikhonov G, Delgado M del M, Gurarie E, Abadonova M, Abduraimov O, Adrianova O, Akimova T, Akkiev M, Ananin A, Andreeva E, Andriychuk N, Antipin M, Arzamascev K, Babina S, Babushkin M, Bakin O, Barabancova A, Basilskaja I, Belova N, Belyaeva N, Bespalova T, Bisikalova E, Bobretsov A, Bobrov V, Bobrovskyi V, Bochkareva E, Bogdanov G, Bolshakov V, Bondarchuk S, Bukharova E, Butunina A, Buyvolov Y, Buyvolova A, Bykov Y, Chakhireva E, Chashchina O, Cherenkova N, Chistjakov S, Chuhontseva S, Davydov EA, Demchenko V, Diadicheva E, Dobrolyubov A, Dostoyevskaya L, Drovnina S, Drozdova Z, Dubanaev A, Dubrovsky Y, Elsukov S, Epova L, ErmakovaO., Ermakova OS, Ershkova E, Esengeldenova A, Evstigneev O, Fedchenko I, Fedotova V, Filatova T, Gashev S, Gavrilov A, Gaydysh I, Golovcov D, Goncharova N, Gorbunova E, Gordeeva T, Grishchenko V, Gromyko L, Hohryakov V, Hritankova A, Ignatenko E, Igosheva S, Ivanova U, Ivanova N, Kalinkin Y, Kaygorodova E, Kazansky F, Kiseleva D, Knorre A, Kolpashikov L, Korobov E, Korolyova H, Korotkikh N, Kosenkov G, Kossenko S, Kotlugalyamova E, Kozlovsky E, Kozsheechkin V, Kozurak A, Kozyr I, Krasnopevtseva A, Kruglikov S, Kuberskaya O, Kudryavtsev A, Kulebyakina E, Kulsha Y, Kupriyanova M, Kurbanbagamaev M, Kutenkov A, Kutenkova N, Kuyantseva N, Kuznetsov A, Larin E, Lebedev P, Litvinov K, Luzhkova N, Mahmudov A, Makovkina L, Mamontov V, Mayorova S, Megalinskaja I, Meydus A, Minin A, Mitrofanov O, Motruk M, Myslenkov A, Nasonova N, Nemtseva N, Nesterova I, Nezdoliy T, Niroda T, Novikova D, Panicheva D, Pavlov A, Pavlova K, Podolski S, Polikarpova N, Polyanskaya T, Pospelov I, Pospelova E, Prokhorov I, Prokosheva I, Puchnina L, Putrashyk I, Raiskaya, J, Rozhkov Y, Rozhkova O, Rudenko M, Rybnikova I, Rykova S, Sahnevich M, Samoylov A, Sanko V, Sapelnikova I, Sazonov S, Selyunina Z, Shalaeva K, Shashkov M, Shcherbakov A, Shevchyk V, Shubin S, Shujskaja E, Sibgatullin R, Sikkila N, Sitnikova E, Sivkov A, Skok N, Skorokhodova S, Smirnova E, Sokolova G, Sopin V, Spasovski Y, Stepanov S, Stratiy V, Strekalovskaya V, Sukhov A, Suleymanova G, Sultangareeva L, Teleganova V, Teplov V, Teplova V, Tertitsa T, Timoshkin V, Tirski D, Tolmachev A, Tomilin A, Tselishcheva L, Turgunov M, Tyukh Y, Van P, Van V, Vasin A, Vasina A, Vekliuk A, Vetchinnikova L, Vinogradov V, Volodchenkov N, Voloshina I, Xoliqov T, Yablonovska-Grishchenko E, Yakovlev V, Yakovleva M, Yantser O, Yarema Y, Zahvatov A, Zakharov V, Zelenetskiy N, Zheltukhin A, Zubina T, Kurhinen J, Ovaskainen O, 2021. Phenological shifts of abiotic events, producers and consumers across a continent. *Nature Climate Change* 11, 241-248. DOI: 10.1038/s41558-020-00967-7

Sander M, Chamberlain D, Mermillon C, Alba R, Jähnig S, Rosselli D, Lisovski S, 2020. Reduced breeding success suggests trophic mismatch despite timely arrival in an alpine songbird.

Saupe EE, Barve V, Myers CE, Soberón J, Barve N, Hensz CM, Peterson AT, Owens HL, Lira-Noriega A, 2012. Variation in niche and distribution model performance: The need for a priori assessment of key causal factors. *Ecological Modelling* 237-238, 11-22. DOI: 10.1016/j.ecolmodel.2012.04.001

Sauser C, Delord K, Barbraud C, 2021. Sea ice and local weather affect reproductive phenology of a polar seabird with breeding consequences. *Ornithological Applications* 123, duab032. DOI: 10.1093/ornithapp/duab032

Sax DF, Early R, Bellemare J, 2013. Niche syndromes, species extinction risks, and management under climate change. *Trends in Ecology and Evolution* 28, 517-523. DOI: 10.1016/j.tree.2013.05.010

Scheffers BR, Edwards DP, Diesmos A, Williams SE, Evans TA, 2014. Microhabitats reduce animal's exposure to climate extremes. *Global Change Biology* 20, 495-503. DOI: 10.1111/gcb.12439

Scheffers BR, Edwards DP, Macdonald SL, Senior RA, Andriamahohatra LR, Roslan N, Rogers AM, Haugaasen T, Wright P, Williams SE, 2017. Extreme thermal heterogeneity in structurally complex tropical rain forests. *Biotropica* 49, 35-44. DOI: 10.1111/btp.12355

Schulte to Bühne H, Tobias JA, Durant SM, Pettorelli N, 2021. Improving Predictions of Climate Change-Land Use Change Interactions. *Trends in Ecology and Evolution* 36, 29-38. DOI: 10.1016/j.tree.2020.08.019

Şekercioğlu C, Wenny DG, Whelan CJ, 2019. *Why birds matter: avian*

ecological function and ecosystem services. Şekercioğlu C, Wenny DG, Whelan CJ (Eds.), University of Chicago Press, IL, USA.

Shaffer HB, Fisher RN, Davidson C, 1998. The role of natural history collections in documenting species declines. *Trends in Ecology and Evolution* 13, 27-30. DOI: 10.1016/S0169-5347(97)01177-4

Sheard C, Neate-Clegg MHC, Alioravainen N, Jones SEI, Vincent C, MacGregor HEA, Bregman TP, Claramunt S, Tobias JA, 2020. Ecological drivers of global gradients in avian dispersal inferred from wing morphology. *Nature Communications* 11, 2463. DOI: 10.1038/s41467-020-16313-6

Shipley JR, Twining CW, Taff CC, Vitousek MN, Flack A, Winkler DW, 2020. Birds advancing lay dates with warming springs face greater risk of chick mortality. *PNAS* 117, 25590-25594. DOI: 10.1073/pnas.2009864117

Shirley SM, Yang Z, Hutchinson RA, Alexander JD, McGarigal K, Betts MG, 2013. Species distribution modelling for the people: unclassified landsat TM imagery predicts bird occurrence at fine resolutions. *Diversity and Distributions* 19, 855-866. DOI: 10.1111/ddi.12093

Siepielski AM, Morrissey MB, Buoro M, Carlson SM, Caruso CM, Clegg SM, Coulson T, DiBattista J, Gotanda KM, Francis CD, Hereford J, Kingsolver JG, Augustine KE, Kruuk LEB, Martin RA, Sheldon BC, Sletvold N, Svensson EI, Wade MJ, MacColl ADC, 2017. Precipitation drives global variation in natural selection. *Science* 355, 959-962. DOI: 10.1126/science.aag2773

Slager DL, 2020. Seasonal and directional dispersal behavior in an ongoing dove invasion. *Journal of Avian Biology* 51. DOI: 10.1111/jav.02332

Smith AC, Edwards BPM, 2021. North American Breeding Bird Survey status and trend estimates to inform a wide range of conservation needs, using a flexible Bayesian hierarchical generalized additive model. *Ornithological Applications* 123. DOI: 10.1093/ornithapp/duaa065

Smith BT, Gehara M, Harvey MG, 2021. The demography of extinction in eastern North American birds. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences* 288, 20201945. DOI: 10.1098/rspb.2020.1945

Smith FA, Betancourt JL, Brown JH, 1995. Evolution of Body Size in the Woodrat over the Past 25,000 Years of Climate Change. *Science* 270, 2012-2014. DOI: 10.1126/science.270.5244.2012

Smith RJ, Moore FR, 2005. Arrival timing and seasonal reproductive performance in a long-distance migratory landbird. *Behavioral Ecology and Sociobiology* 57, 231-239. DOI: 10.1007/s00265-004-0855-9

Soberón J, 2007. Grinnellian and Eltonian niches and geographic distributions of species. *Ecology Letters* 10, 1115-1123. DOI: 10.1111/j.1461-0248.2007.01107.x

Soberón J, Peterson AT, 2005. Interpretation of models of fundamental ecological niches and species' distributional areas. *Biodiversity Informatics* 2, 1-10. DOI: 10.17161/bi.v2i0.4

Song G, Zhang R, Machado-Stredel F, Alström P, Johansson US Irestedt, M, Mays HL, McKay BD, Nishiumi I, Cheng Y, Qu Y, Ericson PGP, Fjeldså J, Peterson AT, LeiF., 2020. Great journey of Great Tits (*Parus major group*): Origin, diversification and historical demographics of a broadly distributed bird lineage. *Journal of Biogeography* 47, 1585-1598. DOI: 10.1111/jbi.13863

Sousa NO de M, Lopes LE, Costa LM, Motta-Junior JC, Freitas GHS de, Dornas T, Vasconcelos MF de, Nogueira W, Tolentino VC de M, De-Carvalho CB, Barbosa MO, Ubaid FK, Nunes AP, Malacco GB, Marini MÂ, 2021. Adopting habitat-use to infer movement potential and sensitivity to human disturbance of birds in a Neotropical Savannah. *Biological Conservation* 254, 108921. DOI: 10.1016/j.biocon.2020.108921

Staniczenko PPA, Sivasubramaniam P, Suttle KB, Pearson RG, 2017. Linking macroecology and community ecology: refining predictions of species distributions using biotic interaction networks. *Ecology Letters* 20, 693-707. DOI: 10.1111/ele.12770

Stanley CQ, MacPherson M, Fraser KC, McKinnon EA, Stutchbury BJM, 2012. Repeat tracking of individual songbirds reveals consistent migration timing but flexibility in route. *Plos One* 7, e40688. DOI: 10.1371/journal.pone.0040688

Stanley CQ, McKinnon EA, Fraser KC, Macpherson MP, Casbourn G, Friesen L, Marra PP, Studds C, Ryder TB, Diggs NE, Stutchbury BJM, 2015. Connectivity of wood thrush breeding, wintering, and migration sites based on range-wide tracking. *Conservation Biology* 29, 164-174. DOI: 10.1111/cobi.12352

Stevenson RD, 1985. The relative importance of behavioral and physiological adjustments controlling body temperature in terrestrial ectotherms. *The American Naturalist* 126, 362-386. DOI: 10.1086/284423

Stiels D, Bastian H-V, Bastian A, Schidelko K, Engler JO, 2021. An iconic messenger of climate change? Predicting the range dynamics of the European Bee-eater (*Merops apiaster*). *Journal of Ornithology* 162, 631-644. DOI: 10.1007/s10336-021-01867-z

Stralberg D, Matsuoka SM, Hamann A, Bayne EM, Sólymos P, Schmiegelow FKA, Wang X, Cumming SG, Song SJ, 2015. Projecting boreal bird responses to climate change: the signal exceeds the noise. *Ecological Applications* 25, 52-69. DOI: 10.1890/13-2289.1

Sugai LSM, Desjonquères C, Silva TSF, Llusia D, 2020. A roadmap for survey designs in terrestrial acoustic monitoring. *Remote Sensing in Ecology and Conservation* 6, 220-235. DOI: 10.1002/rse2.131

Suggitt AJ, Stefanescu C, Páramo F, Oliver T, Anderson BJ, Hill JK, Roy DB, Brereton T, Thomas CD, 2012. Habitat associations of species show consistent but weak responses to climate. *Biology Letters* 8, 590-593. DOI: 10.1098/rsbl.2012.0112

Suh YH, Pesendorfer MB, Tringali A, Bowman R, Fitzpatrick JW, 2020. Investigating social and environmental predictors of natal dispersal in a cooperative breeding bird. *Behavioral Ecology* 31, 692-701. DOI: 10.1093/beheco/araa007

Sullivan BL, Aycrigg JL, Barry JH, Bonney RE, Bruns N, Cooper CB, Damoulas T, Dhondt AA, Dietterich T, Farnsworth A, Fink D, Fitzpatrick JW, Fredericks T, Gerbracht J, Gomes C, Hochachka WM, Iliff MJ, Lagoze C, La Sorte FA, Merrifield M, Morris W, Phillips TB, Reynolds M, Rodewald AD, Rosenberg KV, Trautmann NM, Wiggins A, Winkler DW, Wong W-K, Wood CL, Yu J, Kelling S, 2014. The eBird enterprise: An integrated approach to development and application of citizen science. *Biological Conservation* 169, 31-40. DOI: 10.1016/j.biocon.2013.11.003

Sullivan BL, Wood CL, Iliff MJ, Bonney RE, Fink D, Kelling S, 2009. eBird: A citizen-based bird observation network in the biological sciences. *Biological Conservation* 142, 2282-2292. DOI: 10.1016/j.biocon.2009.05.006

Tayleur C, Caplat P, Massimino D, Johnston A, Jonzén N, Smith HG, Lindström Å, 2015. Swedish birds are tracking temperature but not rainfall: evidence from a decade of abundance changes. *Global Ecology and Biogeography* 24, 859-872. DOI: 10.1111/geb.12308

Taylor SA, White TA, Hochachka WM, Ferretti V, Curry RL, Lovette I, 2014. Climate-Mediated Movement of an Avian Hybrid Zone. *Current Biology* 24, 671-676. DOI: 10.1016/j.cub.2014.01.069

Terribile LC, Lima-Ribeiro MS, Araújo MB, Bizão N, Collevatti RG, Dobrovolski R, Franco AA, Guilhaumon F, de Souza Lima J, Murakami DM, Nabout JC, de Oliveira G, de Oliveira LK, Rabelo SG, Rangel TF, Simon LM, Soares TN, de Campos Telles MP, Diniz-Filho JAF, 2012. Areas of climate stability of species ranges in the Brazilian Cerrado: disentangling uncertainties through time. *Natureza & Conservação* 10, 152-159. DOI: 10.4322/natcon.2012.025

Thomas CD, Franco AMA, Hill JK, 2006. Range retractions and extinction in the face of climate warming. *Trends in Ecology and Evolution* 21, 415-416. DOI: 10.1016/j.tree.2006.05.012

Thorup K, Tøttrup AP, Willemoes M, Klaassen RHG, Strandberg R, Vega ML, Dasari HP, Araújo MB, Wikelski M, Rahbek C, 2017. Resource tracking within and across continents in long-distance bird migrants. *Science Advances* 3, e1601360. DOI: 10.1126/sciadv.1601360

Thuiller W, Lafourcade B, Engler R, Araújo MB, 2009. BIOMOD - a platform for ensemble forecasting of species distributions. *Ecography* 32, 369-373. DOI: 10.1111/j.1600-0587.2008.05742.x

Tingley MW, Darling E, Wilcove DS, 2014. Fine- and coarse-filter conservation strategies in a time of climate change. *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences* 1322, 92-109. DOI: 10.1111/nyas.12484

Tingley MW, Monahan WB, Beissinger SR, Moritz C, 2009. Birds track their Grinnellian niche through a century of climate change. *PNAS* 106, 19637-19643. DOI: 10.1073/pnas.0901562106

Tobias JA, Sheard C, Pigot AL, Devenish AJM, Yang J, Sayol F, Neate-Clegg MHC, Alioravainen N, Weeks TL, Barber RA, Walkden PA, MacGregor HEA, Jones SEI, Vincent C, Phillips AG, Marples NM, Montaño-Centellas FA, Leandro-Silva V, Claramunt S, Darski B, Freeman BG, Bregman TP, Cooney CR, Hughes EC, Capp EJR, Varley ZK, Friedman NR, Korntheuer H, Corrales-Vargas A, Trisos CH, Weeks BC, Hanz DM, Töpfer T, Bravo GA, Remeš V, Nowak L, Carneiro LS, Moncada R AJ Matysioková B, Baldassarre DT, Martínez-Salinas A, Wolfe JD, Chapman PM, Daly BG, Sorensen MC, Neu A, Ford MA, Mayhew RJ, Fabio Silveira L, Kelly DJ, Annorbah NND, Pollock HS, Grabowska-Zhang AM, McEntee JP, Carlos T, Gonzalez J, Meneses CG, Muñoz MC, Powell LL, Jamie GA, Matthews TJ, Johnson O, Brito GRR, Zyskowski K, Crates R, Harvey MG, Jurado Zevallos M, Hosner PA, Bradfer-Lawrence T, Maley JM, Stiles FG, Lima HS, Provost KL, Chibesa M, Mashao M, Howard JT, Mlamba E, Chua MAH, Li B, Gómez MI, García NC, Päckert M, Fuchs J, Ali JR, Derryberry EP, Carlson ML, Urriza RC, Brzeski KE, Prawiradilaga DM, Rayner MJ, Miller ET, Bowie RCK, Lafontaine R-M, Scofield RP, Lou Y, Somarathna L, Lepage D, Illif M, Neuschulz EL, Templin M, Dehling DM, Cooper JC, Pauwels OSG, Analuddin K, Fjeldså J, Seddon N, Sweet PR, DeClerck FAJ, Naka LN, Brawn JD, Aleixo A, Böhning-Gaese K, Rahbek C, Fritz SA, Thomas GH, Schleuning M, 2022. AVONET: morphological, ecological and geographical data for all birds. *Ecology Letters* 25, 581-597. DOI: 10.1111/ele.13898

Tøttrup AP, Klaassen RHG, Kristensen MW, Strandberg R, Vardanis Y, Lindström Å, Rahbek C, Alerstam T, Thorup K, 2012. Drought in Africa caused delayed arrival of European songbirds. *Science* 338, 1307-1307. DOI: 10.1126/science.1227548

Travis JMJ, Delgado M, Bocedi G, Baguette M, Bartoń K, Bonte D, Boulangeat I, Hodgson JA, Kubisch A, Penteriani V, Saastamoinen M, Stevens VM, Bullock JM, 2013. Dispersal and species' responses to climate change. *Oikos* 122, 1532-1540. DOI: 10.1111/j.1600-0706.2013.00399.x

Twedt DJ, 2013. Foraging Habitat for Shorebirds in Southeastern Missouri and its Predicted Future Availability. *Wetlands* 33, 667-678. DOI: 10.1007/s13157-013-0422-0

Urban MC, Zarnetske PL, Skelly DK, 2013. Moving forward: dispersal and species interactions determine biotic responses to climate change. *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences* 1297, 44-60. DOI: 10.1111/nyas.12184

Urban MC, Bocedi G, Hendry AP, Mihoub J-B, Pe-er G, Singer A, Bridle JR, Crozier LG, De Meester L, Godsoe W, Gonzlez A, Hellmann JJ, Holt RD, Huth A, Johst K, Krug CB, Leadley PW, Palmer SCF, Pantel JH, Schmitz A, Zollner PA, Travis JMJ, 2016. Improving the forecast for biodiversity under climate change. *Science* 353(6304), aad8466. DOI: 10.1126/science.aad8466

Urli M, Delzon S, Eyermann A, Couallier V, García-Valdés R, Zavala MA, Porté AJ, 2014. Inferring shifts in tree species distribution using asymmetric distribution curves: a case study in the Iberian mountains. *Journal of Vegetation Science* 25, 147-159. DOI: 10.1111/jvs.12079

Valente JJ, Jirinec V, Leu M, 2024. Thinking beyond the closure assumption: Designing surveys for estimating biological truth with occupancy models. *Methods in Ecology and Evolution* 15(12), 2289-2300. DOI: 10.1111/2041-210x.14439

van de Ven TMFN, McKechnie AE, Cunningham SJ, 2019. The costs of keeping cool: behavioural trade-offs between foraging and thermoregulation are associated with significant mass losses in an arid-zone bird. *Oecologia* 191, 205-215. DOI: 10.1007/s00442-019-04486-x

van Rees CB, Hand BK, Carter S, Bargeron C, Cline T, Daniel W, Ferrante J, Gaddis K, Hunter M, Jarnevich C, McGeoch M, Morisette J, Neilson M, Rozance M, Sepulveda A, Wallace R, Whited D, Wilcox T, Kimball J, Luikart G, 2022. A Framework to Integrate Innovations in Invasion Biology for Proactive Management. *Biological Reviews* 97(4), 1712-1735

van Rees CB, Reed JM, 2018. Predicted effects of landscape change, sea level rise, and habitat management on the extirpation risk of the Hawaiian common gallinule (*Gallinula galeata sandvicensis*) on the island of Oʻahu. *PeerJ* 6, e4990. DOI: 10.7717/peerj.4990

Veloz S, Salas L, Altman B, Alexander J, Jongsomjit D, Elliott N, Ballard G, 2015. Improving effectiveness of systematic conservation planning with density data. *Conservation Biology* 29, 1217-1227. DOI: 10.1111/cobi.12499

Visser ME, 2008. Keeping up with a warming world; assessing the rate of adaptation to climate change. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences* 275, 649-659. DOI: 10.1098/rspb.2007.0997

Weiner J, 1994. *The Beak of the Finch: A Story of Evolution in Our Time.* Alfred A. Knopf, New York, USA.

Williams JW, Jackson ST, Kutzbach JE, 2007. Projected distributions of novel and disappearing climates by 2100 AD. *PNAS* 104, 5738-5742. DOI: 10.1073/pnas.0606292104

Willis SG, Thomas CD, Hill JK, Collingham YC, Telfer MG, Fox R, Huntley B, 2009. Dynamic distribution modelling: predicting the present from the past. *Ecography* 32, 5-12. DOI: 10.1111/j.1600-0587.2008.05711.x

Wilson S, Smith AC, Naujokaitis-Lewis I, 2018. Opposing responses to drought shape spatial population dynamics of declining grassland birds. *Diversity and Distributions* 24, 1687-1698. DOI: 10.1111/ddi.12811

Winger BM, Auteri GG, Pegan TM, Weeks BC, 2019. A long winter for the Red Queen: rethinking the evolution of seasonal migration. *Biological Reviews* 94, 737-752. DOI: 10.1111/brv.12476

Wisz, M.S., Hijmans, R.J., Li, J., Peterson, A.T., Graham, C.H., Guisan, A., 2008. Effects of sample size on the performance of species distribution models. *Diversity and Distributions* 14, 763-773. 10.1111/j.1472-4642.2008.00482.x

Wisz MS, Pottier J, Kissling WD, Pellissier L, Lenoir J, Damgaard CF, Dormann CF, Forchhammer MC, Grytnes J-A, Guisan A, Heikkinen RK, Høye TT, Kühn I, Luoto M, Maiorano L, Nilsson M-C, Normand S, Öckinger E, Schmidt NM, Termansen M, Timmermann A, Wardle DA, Aastrup P, Svenning J-C, 2013. The role of biotic interactions in shaping distributions and realised assemblages of species: implications for species distribution modelling. *Biological Reviews* 88, 15-30. DOI: 10.1111/j.1469-185X.2012.00235.x

Wogan GOU, Voelker G, Oatley G, Bowie RCK, 2020. Biome stability predicts population structure of a southern African aridland bird species. *Ecology and Evolution* 10, 4066-4081. DOI: 10.1002/ece3.6175

Wolfson DW, Fieberg JR, Andersen DE, 2020. Juvenile Sandhill Cranes exhibit wider ranging and more exploratory movements than adults during the breeding season. *Ibis* 162, 556-562. DOI: 10.1111/ibi.12786

Wüest RO, Bergamini A, Bollmann K, Baltensweiler A, 2020. LiDAR data as a proxy for light availability improve distribution modelling of woody species. *Forest Ecology and Management* 456, 117644. DOI: 10.1016/j.foreco.2019.117644

Xia J, Wang J, Niu S, 2020. Research challenges and opportunities for using big data in global change biology. *Global Change Biology* 26, 6040-6061. DOI: 10.1111/gcb.15317

Zurell D, 2017. Integrating demography, dispersal and interspecific interactions into bird distribution models. *Journal of Avian Biology* 48, 1505-1516. DOI: 10.1111/jav.01225

Zurell D, Thuiller W, Pagel J, Cabral JS, Münkemüller T, Gravel D, Dullinger S, Normand S, Schiffers KH, Moore KA, Zimmermann NE, 2016. Benchmarking novel approaches for modelling species range dynamics. *Global Change Biology* 22, 2651-2664. DOI: 10.1111/gcb.13251

Zurell D, Franklin J, König C, Bouchet PJ, Dormann CF, Elith J, Fandos G, FengX., Guillera-Arroita G, Guisan A, Lahoz-Monfort JJ, Leitão PJ, Park DS, Peterson AP, Rapacciuolo G, Schmatz DR, Schröder B, Serra-Diaz JM, Thuiller W, Yates KL, Zimmermann NE, Merow C, 2020. A standard protocol for reporting species distribution models. *Ecography* 43(9), 1261-1277. DOI: 10.1111/ecog.04960

Complete affiliations

Maggie P. MacPherson, Louisiana State University Museum of Natural Sciences, Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge, LA, USA. Département des sciences du bois et de la forêt, Université Laval, Québec City, Québec, Canada. Department of Biological Sciences, Western Illinois University, Macomb, IL, USA.
Kevin R. Burgio, New York City Audubon Society, New York, NY, USA. Department of Ecology and Evolutionary Ecology, University of Connecticut, Storrs, CT, USA.
Matthew G. DeSaix, Department of Biology, Colorado State University, Fort Collins, CO, USA.
Ben G. Freeman, University of British Columbia, Vancouver, BC, Canada.
Jill E. Jankowski, Biodiversity Research Centre and Department of Zoology, University of British Columbia, Vancouver, BC, Canada.
John Herbert, Ecology and Evolutionary Biology, Tulane University, New Orleans, LA, USA. Mass Audubon, Lincoln, MA, USA.
Rachael Herman, Department of Ecology and Evolution, Stony Brook University, NY, USA.
Vitek Jirinec, School of Renewable Natural Resources, Louisiana State University and LSU AgCenter, Baton Rouge, LA, USA. Integral Ecology Research Center, 239 Railroad Ave., Blue Lake, CA, USA.
Julia Shonfield, LGL Limited, Cambridge, ON, Canada.
David L. Slager, Department of Biology, University of Washington, Seattle, WA, USA.
Charles B. van Rees, River Basin Center & Odum School of Ecology, University of Georgia, Athens, GA, USA.

Appendix 1

Predicting future distributions from current relationships with explanatory variables is often done using freely available future climate projections (e.g., various 'business as usual', 'middle of the road', and 'worst case scenario' models downloaded from https://www.worldclim.org), whereas hindcasting distributions is often done using paleo-climate models downloaded from the Intercomparison Project Phase II at https://www.pmip2.lsce.ipsl.fr. Here, we elaborate on the challenge of matching occurrence data with temperature and rainfall explanatory variable data sources because these are the two most widely used and generally important environmental factors in species distribution modeling (Bradie and Leung 2017). The finest spatial and temporal resolution of environmental data is typically from weather station data from the nearest station to the research site (e.g., from https://www.wunderground.com/history) or by collecting weather data alongside occurrence data using data loggers available from various manufacturers (e.g., Meter, Truebner). The ERA5-Land dataset provides fine scale (hourly) temperature and precipitation data, but at a 9 km spatial resolution from January 1950 to present (https://cds.climate.copernicus.eu/cdsapp#!/dataset/reanalysis-era5-land?tab=overview). National Centers for Environmental Prediction (NCEP) provides global temperature and precipitation data (four-times daily) data at a 0.25 x 0.25 degree grid resolution from 1948-present (https://psl.noaa.gov/data/gridded/data.ncep.reanalysis.surface.html). WorldClim is a commonly used source of environmental data, and the current version (2.1) provides global monthly values of min and max temperature, and precipitation averaged from 1970-2000 (Fick and Hijmans 2017). Historical monthly min and max temperature, and total precipitation data used for hindcasting are averaged by decade from 1960-2018 (Harris et al 2014, Fick and Hijmans 2017). BioClim data are 19 quarterly estimates derived from WorldClim monthly temperature and rainfall values that are thought to be more biologically meaningful than raw temperature or rainfall data (Busby 1991). Despite being powerful tools for assessing macroclimate associations, caution should be used when using the most accessible climate products to inform conservation decisions by assessing the probability of future range locations with empirical validations that climate products (e.g., Bioclim variable 1, annual mean temperature, Bioclim variable 5, max temperature of the warmest month) are ecologically relevant to site occupancy.