This is a post-print (unformatted) copy of the accepted article. The published version can be found at http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/ecog.02850/full

The definitive version is available at www.blackwell-synergy.com.

TITLE: Modelling species responses to extreme weather provides new insights into constraints on range and likely climate change impacts for Australian mammals.

Authors: Alejandra Morán-Ordóñez [1,2], Natalie J. Briscoe[1], Brendan A. Wintle[1]

[1] School of BioSciences, The University of Melbourne, VIC 3010, Australia

[2] CTFC Centre Tecnològic Forestal de Catalunya, Ctra. Antiga St. Llorenç km 2, 25280 Solsona, Spain.

Email addresses: alejandra.moran@ctfc.es; nbriscoe@unimelb.edu.au; b.wintle@unimelb.edu.au

Current details corresponding author: Alejandra Morán-Ordóñez, CTFC Centre Tecnològic Forestal de Catalunya, Ctra. Antiga St. Llorenç km 2, 25280 Solsona, Spain. Telephone: 973481752 - Ext. 330, email: alejandra.moran@ctfc.es; ORCID: 0000-0002-5815-6089

Keywords: AUC; geographic range; MaxEnt; physiological thresholds; scenarios; correlative models; daily weather data; ecological forecasting

Type of paper: Original research

ABSTRACT

Conservation of species under climate change relies on accurate predictions of species ranges under current and future climate conditions. To date, modelling studies have focused primarily on how changes in long-term averaged climate conditions are likely to influence species distributions with much less attention paid to the potential effect of extreme events such as droughts and heatwaves which are expected to increase in frequency over coming decades. In this study we explore the benefits of tailoring predictor variables to the specific physiological constraints of species, or groups of species. We show how utilizing spatial predictors of extreme temperature and water availability (heat-waves and droughts), derived from high-temporal resolution, long-term weather records, provides categorically different predictions about the future (2070) distribution of suitable environments for 188 mammal species across different biomes (from arid zones to tropical environments) covering the whole of continental Australia. Models based on long-term averages-only and extreme conditions-only showed similarly high predictive performance tested by hold-out cross-validation on current data, and yet some predicted dramatically different future geographic ranges for the same species under 2070 climate scenarios. Our results highlight the importance of accounting for extreme conditions/events by identifying areas in the landscape where species may cope with average conditions, but cannot persist under extreme conditions known or predicted to occur there. Our approach provides an important step toward identifying the location of climate change refuges and danger zones that goes beyond the current standard of extrapolating long-term climate averages.

INTRODUCTION

There is strong evidence that climate change is already influencing natural systems (Parmesan 2006), and an increasing number of species are projected to be at risk of extinction unless effective mitigation and conservation actions can be implemented (Thomas et al. 2004). Accurate predictions of species responses to projected changes in climate could greatly enhance the effectiveness of conservation actions (Guisan et al. 2013). This need, along with advances in species distribution modelling techniques (SDMs), has led to a proliferation of studies examining changes in species distributions linked to recent climate change (Chen et al. 2011, VanDerWal et al. 2012a), as well as predictions of future distributions of taxa across broad geographic scales (Peterson et al. 2002, Thuiller et al. 2005).

To date, modelling studies have focused primarily on how changes in mean temperatures and rainfall are likely to influence species distributions (Porfirio et al. 2014), with less attention paid to the effect of extreme events such as droughts, cyclons and heatwaves, on species persistence. The frequency and severity of extreme weather events such as heatwaves are predicted to increase (IPCC 2014). These extreme conditions can play an important role in regulating population dynamics and thus constrain species distributions (Harrison 2000, Frederiksen et al. 2008, Wernberg et al. 2013), either directly, via thermal stress, or indirectly, by influencing food or habitat availability or disturbance processes such as fire (Andersen et al. 2012, Bateman et al. 2012, Cadenhead et al. 2016)**.** For example, population declines, range contractions and local extinctions of birds and mammals have been reported or predicted in relation to thermal stresses caused by very hot temperatures coupled with drought conditions (Welbergen et al. 2008, McKechnie and Wolf 2010, Krockenberger et al. 2012). In contrast, extreme heavy rainfall events that drive lush vegetation growth are associated with booms of rodent populations in arid and semi-arid zones of Australia and America (Parmesan et al. 2000, Holmgren et al. 2006, Letnic and Dickman 2006, Greenville et al. 2012) .

Mechanistic and process-based niche models represent valuable tools that can be used to predict population trends and geographic distributions of species in relation to these direct and indirect impacts of climatic conditions by explicitly accounting for demographic processes and/or physiological tolerances of the target species, as well as daily or yearly variation in weather (Anderson et al. 2009, Kearney and Porter 2009, Briscoe et al. 2016). However process-based models are typically data-hungry, and for most species in most ecosystems in most areas of the world there exists insufficient data, knowledge, expertise and computational resources to fit mechanistic models to a large enough portion of the biota such that they could be widely used for comprehensive conservation planning or ecological impact assessment of climate change (Kearney et al. 2010, Dormann et al. 2012, Peterson et al. 2016). Despite their many shortcomings (Dormann 2007, Jackson et al. 2009, Jarnevich et al. 2015), correlative species distribution models will, for the foreseeable future, remain the most widely used tools to forecast the effects of climate change on biodiversity (Thomas et al. 2004, Thuiller 2007, Franklin 2010, Dormann et al. 2012).

Correlative SDMs relate species' occurrence data to spatial variation in environmental conditions (Franklin 2010). These can be used as a good approximation to process-based models to forecast species distributions under climate change, if the environmental predictors selected for fitting the models are known to directly influence population persistence of the target species (Kearney et al. 2010). While the use of ecologically and biologically meaningful variables in correlative SDMs is widely advocated in the SDM literature (Guisan and Zimmermann 2000, Araújo and Guisan 2006, Elith and Leathwick 2009, Jarnevich et al. 2015), most of the studies forecasting future distribution ranges still rely primarily on the use of long-term average climatic variables (e.g. bioclim variables; Milanovich et al. 2010, Franklin et al. 2013). Recently, biogeographic studies have started to implement predictors accounting for variability and stochasticity of weather for making inferences about current species distribution ranges/patterns (Zimmermann et al. 2009, Reside et al. 2010, Bateman et al. 2012, Seabrook et al. 2014, Briscoe et al. 2016). Studies that have explored the influence of extreme weather conditions on future species distributions (e.g. Porfirio et al. 2014, Briscoe et al. 2016) have focused on few species or a small geographic extent, limiting generalization to other species or environments.

Australian mammals present an interesting case study of a group of species that tend to be physiologically constrained by environmental extremes (Kearney et al. 2010, Briscoe et al. 2016). Periodic weather extremes have been identified as constraining the ranges of some Australian mammals (Bateman et al. 2012, Briscoe et al. 2016). Extreme heat can be particularly challenging for large terrestrial endotherms that must minimise heat gained from their environment, while also losing heat produced by their own metabolism (Bartholomew 1966). Across Australia high temperatures are often accompanied by low water availability or high humidity, which can further exacerbate this problem by restricting the use of evaporative cooling – the primary method of heat loss in most mammal species (Adolph 1947, Maloney and Dawson 1998). Because Australia's mammal fauna exist across a wide range of biogeographical regions (from arid zones to tropical environments), there is likely to be some benefit in studying the group as a whole and seeking generalizations about which types of extremes constrain their range. Here we provide the first comprehensive account of how weather extremes constrain the ranges of this diverse group of mammals using a unique spatial dataset compiled for the purpose. We explore the degree to which SDM predictions concur under current and future climate and provide recommendations for modellers seeking robust predictions about species future ranges under changing environmental conditions.

METHODS

Mammals occurrence data

We accessed presence-only records for all terrestrial mammals from the Atlas of Living Australia (ALA; http://spatial.ala.org.au/). Due to incomplete coverage of all Australian states, we also sought data from individual states agencies (see acknowledgments). We filtered and reduced this data set (569,292 records) by: (i) removing gross positional errors on a basis of contemporary knowledge on current and historical species distribution ranges (Van Dyck and Strahan 2008, Churchill 2009, Menkhorst and Knight 2010); (ii) retaining only spatially-valid records collected from 1980 to 2013 with maximum point location error of less than 1 km and (iii) removing duplicated records: we kept only one observation per species per grid cell (1 km resolution). We modelled only those species with at least 30 records (n = 197 species) in order to minimize the possible negative influence of small samples sizes (Hernandez et al. 2006, Wisz et al. 2008). See Appendix S1 for full list of species and information on data availability for each of them.

Model predictors

Interpolated daily and monthly climate data at 0.05° spatial resolution (~ 5-km) were obtained from the Australian Water Availability Project for the period 1977 – 2012 (Raupach et al. 2009, 2012). Temperature data were corrected with an adiabatic lapse rate of 0.00645 °C m^{-1} (Moore 1956, Sturman and Tapper 1996) from the original 0.05° values to a resolution of 0.01° (~1 km) based on a digital elevation model (DEM) resampled from its original 0.0025° to 0.01° resolution (GEODATA 9-second DEM v.3, Geoscience Australia). The spatial resolution of the weather data therefore matched the (approximate) worst case on the spatial point accuracy of the mammals' occurrence data. We used the monthly climate data to create a set of long-term averaged climatic variables representing mean annual trends (e.g.

annual rainfall) and seasonality (e.g. annual range in temperature) using the R package “climates” (version 0.1.1-3) (VanDerWal et al. 2012b). These climate predictors are widely used in species distribution models studies conducted at regional to global scales (Franklin 2010).

From the daily weather data we calculated seven weather variables accounting for extreme conditions that are likely to influence mammal distributions. These included indices describing the magnitude of temperature extremes (5^{th} and 95^{th} percentile temperatures for minimum and maximum daily temperatures, respectively), maximum length of dry spells (maximum run of sequential dry days; rainfall < 1mm), and rainfall intensity (mean rainfall on days where rainfall >1mm). The effects of hot temperatures on mammals are likely to be dependent on water availability and humidity, which influence the use and effectiveness of evaporative cooling (Adolph 1947, Maloney and Dawson 1998, Krockenberger et al. 2012). Therefore we also calculated mean vapour pressure during hot weather, the maximum length of heatwaves, as well as the sum of temperatures during the longest run of sequential dry days (rainfall <1mm) (see Table 1). All weather and climatic predictors were mapped at 1km grid cell resolution. Models were only based on a subset of the above mentioned variables with maximum Pearson’s pairwise correlation of 0.7 (Tabachnick and Fidell 1996, Dormann et al. 2013) (see Table 1 for a description of the retained variables and Appendix S2 for a full list of the variables considered for the analyses and correlation matrices). These correlations were calculated across all mammals’ occurrence records of the filtered data set (background points), and assessed for each of the predictor sets individually and jointly.

Some remote areas in Central and Western Australia had sparse rainfall data (see Appendix S3) and therefore, interpolation of data in these areas might be insufficient to meaningfully define rainfall patterns in these areas, affecting the calculation of many of the climatic and weather extremes variables explained above. We ran preliminary analyses to identify the boundaries of these sparsely-gauged parts of the continent and to assess the effects of their inclusion into modelling outputs. Areas with sparse station data were masked out of further analysis in order to minimize the effect of these interpolation errors in our subsequent analyses (Appendix S3).

In addition to weather variables, a remotely sensed average vegetation height variable was included in all predictors sets (AVG, EXT and COMP) to capture some of the variation relating to underlying habitat type and site productivity (Simard et al. 2011) (Table 1). We chose not to include coarse categorical variables relating to vegetation composition (land cover classes (e.g. National Vegetation Information System of Australia; ESCAVI 2003) due to constraints on the number of observation data points for several species and concerns about over-fitting with categorical variables using numerous degrees of freedom. Note that the vegetation height variable is assumed constant in future predictions due to the lack of information about future distribution of vegetation type and structure, growth, and disturbance.

Modelling framework

We modelled the distribution of mammal species using MaxEnt (version 3.3.3k; Phillips et al. 2006, Phillips and Dudík 2008), a machine learning method designed for dealing with presence-only data (Elith et al. 2006, 2011) while taking into account the distribution of environmental predictors in the background area of analysis. For each species we fitted three sets of Maxent models using the average vegetation height predictor plus: (1) the long-term mean climatic variables only (AVG model); (2) the extreme weather variables only (EXT model) and (3) all extreme weather variables plus the long-term averaged annual precipitation (COMP) (see Table 1 for the detailed list of predictors included in each of these predictors sets). This allowed us to test for differences in model predictive performance and spatial predictions of habitat suitability based on long-term mean climatic variables versus extreme weather variables, as well as the effect of using both predictor types in the same model (although, because all temperature related variables were strongly correlated, the only long-term mean climatic variable that could be included in the COMP model was annual precipitation).

Exploratory analyses showed that species records were biased towards areas of high accessibility (e.g. roads and urban areas). Biased survey data can lead to environmentally and geographic biased predictions that might reflect the sampling effort rather than the species' true distributions across the study area (Phillips et al. 2009, Kramer-Schadt et al. 2013, Syfert et al. 2013, Lahoz-Monfort et al. 2014). In order to reduce the possible effect of geographical bias in presence data on SDM predictive performance, we provided background points to MaxEnt in such a way as to copy the geographic and environmental bias of the occurrence records (sensu Phillips *et al.*, 2009; Syfert *et al.*, 2013) by using as background all available records for mammals (76,980 records after removing duplicate records per grid cell). This approach, known as the "target-group background" approach (Phillips et al. 2009), has been shown to perform well in dealing with spatial sampling bias (Syfert et al. 2013, Fithian et al. 2015). The same background points were used in all three sets of models.

In addition to controlling the selection of background points, we also controlled the complexity of the response shapes by allowing only linear, quadratic and product features in the models. These are similar to linear, quadratic and interaction terms in regression models. Models with these restricted feature types will be smoother than those fitted with MaxEnt's default settings, less prone to fitting idiosyncrasies of the data, and potentially better at predicting to new times and places (Merow et al. 2014). Default values were used for all other MaxEnt settings except that adding sample points to the background was not required as that was already achieved by our use of the 'target background' approach. Predictive performance was assessed in terms of discrimination ability measured using the area under the receiver-operator characteristic curve (AUC; Hanley and McNeil 1982) adapted for use with presence - background samples (Phillips et al. 2006). This metric is suited to presence-background data, since calibration cannot be assessed and applying thresholds to predictions loses information (Guillera-Arroita et al. 2015, Morán-Ordóñez et al. 2016). We calculated AUC using the ten-fold cross-validation provided in Maxent. Final reported models were also run using 100 % of the data available for each species. We refer to the later as '*alldata*' models and they were only used to compare future predictions based on the different data sets (AVG, EXT and COMP).

Integration of model results across all species

We used boxplots to analyse the differences in predictive performance (cross-validated AUC) of the three sets of models across all species (n = 197). To examine spatial differences in predictions, we calculated the differences in the relative environmental suitability values predicted across the landscape between the three model data sets: $alldata_{\mathrm{EXT}} - alldata_{\mathrm{AVG}}$, $alldata_{\mathrm{COMP}} - alldata_{\mathrm{EXT}}$ and $alldata_{\mathrm{COMP}} - alldata_{\mathrm{AVG}}$. For these analyses, we omitted species for which models performed poorly based on at least one of the three model data sets (cross-validated AUC < 0.7; Swets 1988) as these can not reliably characterise the current distribution of the species (n = 188). These comparisons were based on the models fitted with all of the available observation data (i.e. not the cross-validation subsets). This allowed us to identify the areas across the continent where one predictor set predicted higher or lower relative environmental suitability for a given species in comparison with the other model data sets. The difference maps for each species were aggregated across species; providing the mode of the differences across the 188 species for each pair of predictor variable data types (e.g. EXT vs AVG) at each grid cell. This addresses the question of whether the relative suitability of the cell is predicted to decrease or increase at each grid cell for most of the species when fitting the models using EXT predictors compared with AVG predictors. The output of these joint analyses is a binary map showing the areas where the use of one predictor set (e.g. EXT) increases or reduces relative environmental suitability predictions compared with other predictor variable types (e.g. AVG). To explore which variables could be driving the differences in predictions between the two model sets we analysed the distribution of the values of the original predictors in those areas (Table 1).

Future scenarios

To illustrate how the use of different climate variables (EXT, AVG) could influence forecasts of species' responses to climate change, we also predicted mammal distributions for the year 2070. Acknowledging the potential importance of GCM variability in analysing the impacts of climate change on biodiversity (Diniz-Filho et al. 2009, Synes and Osborne 2011, Harris et al. 2014) we compared forecasts of species' responses under two general circulation models (GCM), the ACCESS 1.3(CSIRO: Bi et al. 2013) and the CanESM2 -Canadian Earth System Model (Chylek et al. 2011) and the emissions scenario RCP8.5 (Riahi et al. 2011). We modelled future climates under RCP 8.5, a high emissions business as usual scenario, because observed emission trends appear to be tracking these projections (Peters et al. 2013).

Relative to other possible futures, the ACCESS 1.3 scenario modelled here represents a relatively hot and dry climate future for Australia, with CanESM2 predicting more variable changes in rainfall across the continent. Downscaled projected monthly changes in temperature, humidity, and rainfall for 2070 were obtained as the differences from the base period (1990-2009) using SimClim (1 km resolution; Yin et al. 2013) and assuming greenhouse gas concentrations for RCP8.5 and a moderate response to increased CO_2 concentrations (Riahi et al. 2011). We then used the offset (or change factor) method to construct future daily weather data by combining the change signal from these GCM outputs with observed weather datasets (CSIRO and Bureau of Meteorology 2015), an approach previously used in impact assessments (Cullen et al. 2009, Bell et al. 2012). At each site we splined predicted monthly changes in temperature and humidity to predict daily changes over an annual cycle, with these then added to daily weather data for 1990-2009. To generate rainfall predictions we applied the monthly predicted changes in total precipitation to observed monthly rainfall values (1990-2009), with the constraint that monthly rainfall could not fall below 0. We then multiplied rainfall from all of the days with rainfall greater than 0 by a set proportion, such that the new monthly total rainfall matched predictions. Changes in the temporal pattern of 'rainy days' were therefore driven by changes in rainfall that resulted in days that were previously classified as 'rainy days' being classified as 'dry days' (i.e. if rainfall fells below 1mm) and vice versa. While climate change may also alter rainfall patterns, for example by increasing the frequency of heavy rainfall events followed by longer dry spells, spatial and temporal predictions of how changes in variance are likely to influence patterns of daily weather and extremes across all of Australia were not available at the time of our study. Future climate average and extreme weather variables were then calculated from these derived daily future weather data.

Long-term averaged and short-term extreme weather variables were used to generate predictions of mammal distributions for 2070 using the three sets of MaxEnt models fitted under the current climate (AVG model, EXT model and COMP). We compared the spatial predictions of AVG, EXT and COMP model projections for the current and 2070 climates and measured the correlations between their spatial outputs, and the extent of predicted temporal change in suitable ranges (calculated as the sum of cell values of the logistic MaxEnt output across Australia). We used the limiting factors tool of MaxEnt (Elith et al. 2010) to explore which variables limit the predicted geographic distribution of mammals the most both currently and under the 2070 climatic/weather scenarios. This tool identifies the variable *X* that could increase environmental suitability the most at a given grid cell when its actual value is changed by its mean value across the training data. We also used the MESS map tool of MaxEnt (Multivariate Environmental Similarity Surface; Elith et al. 2010) to assess the proportion of novel environmental space in each model prediction, under both current and future scenarios (i.e. the level of environmental extrapolation). We calculated the percentage of grid cells across Australia with values outside the environmental ranges captured by the target-group background data used to fit the models. All statistical analyses were performed in R (R Core Team 2013).

We also explored whether the differences in spatial predictions of AVG, EXT and COMP model projections for current and 2070 climates were related to species traits. We collated available trait data for the mammal species modelled (body mass, activity cycle and geographic breath) and plotted the relationship between these traits and the aspects of model prediction evaluated here (correlations between spatial output predictions and differences in predicted ranges). In addition, we assessed whether differences in range projections varied between species occupying different primary climatic zone/s.

RESULTS

There was a relatively high correlation between predictions, and high congruence in predictive discrimination between modelling approaches based on average, extreme and composite climate variables. However, the relatively high correlation between predictions broke down when predicting to future climates due to the divergence in spatial patterns of average and extreme climate predictors.

Current distributions

The predictive discrimination of models tested using cross-validation did not differ markedly between the three sets of climatic/weather scenarios (AVG, EXT and COMP), with moderate to high predictive performance across most species (AUC ≥ 0.7; Fig. 1). Only 9 out of 197 mammal species showed poor predictive performance across at least one scenario (AUC < 0.7; Appendix S1). These nine species had low predictive performance across all three variable sets, and were not considered for subsequent analyses.

For many species predictions of environmental suitability differed spatially between models that utilized different predictor variables. Models fit using averaged short-term extreme weather predictors (EXT) predicted higher environmental suitability compared to models fit using long-term averaged climatic predictors (AVG) for most species across Tasmania, the SE and SW parts of continental Australia, as well as some small areas in the NE coast of Australia (Fig. 2a, b). Areas where higher environmental suitability was predicted by the extremes models for the largest number of species (areas with darker colours in Fig. 2a), are characterized by either their low average annual mean temperature (< 10 ºC; Fig 2c), very low - < 5^{th} percentile - minimum temperatures (< -5 ºC; Fig 2g), high rainfall (> 2000 mm; 2f), high vegetation height (> 40 m) and/or for being areas where the contrast between the diurnal temperature range differs markedly from the annual temperature (isothermality values < 0.4; Fig. 2d). The areas where lower environmental suitability was predicted for the largest number of species when using extreme weather predictors instead of long-term average climatic predictors (areas with lighter colours in Fig 2a and grey areas in Fig 2b) were characterized by one or more of the following conditions: high average annual mean temperatures (≥ 25 º C; Fig 2c); high 5^{th} percentile minimum temperatures (≥ 10 º C, tropical and subtropical regions; Fig 2g); areas where there is either very high humidity or very low humidity during hot weather (tropical and arid zones, respectively; Fig. 2h); areas that experience very high temperatures over long dry spells (areas in the Central and NW of Australia; Fig. 2i, j); and areas with low seasonality (Fig 2e) where the diurnal temperature range does not differ much from the annual temperature range (mainly the tropical regions of the North of Australia; Fig 2d).

Models fit on short-term extreme weather conditions *plus* annual rainfall (COMP) showed very similar spatial patterns to models fit on extreme weather conditions only (EXT). Therefore, the comparison between COMP and AVG models yields near identical results to the comparison between EXT and AVG models (Appendix 4, Fig. S4.1). However, COMP models predicted a decrease in environmental suitability compared to EXT models for most species in areas with high annual rainfall (mainly the Western Coast of Tasmania and the NE coastal areas of continental Australia) and an increase in environmental suitability in the NW of Australia (Appendix S4, Fig. S4.2).

Current vs future distribution predictions

We found that the relationship between averages and extreme weather variable models were very similar under both GCM scenarios (Appendix S5). Thus, for simplicity, and because we are interested in exploring the variation in predictions due to the variables set selection rather than the variation associated to different GCM scenarios, we focus here on the results from simulations using one scenario only (ACCESS 1.3).

In general, Pearson's correlations between environmental suitability maps of AVG, EXT and COMP models were lower under the *2070* hot and dry climate scenario than under *current* climate/weather, suggesting a divergence in predictions of environmental suitability under future climate change (Fig. 3a, Fig. 4). These results were consistent even when assessed only within the extent of the biogeographical regions where the species is known to occur currently (Appendix S6). For most of the species the decrease in correlations between *current* and *2070* climate scenarios was less than |0.2| across all predictor sets (Fig 3b). However, for 13 of the 188 species modelled, Pearson's correlations between environmental suitability maps dropped from r >0.6 (highly correlated) to r < 0.36 (weakly correlated) under the 2070 climate scenario when comparing EXT vs AVG models, and for 19 species when comparing COMP vs AVG models (Fig. 3a, b).

Across the 13 species that showed large declines in correlations between current future scenarios, future divergences were most commonly due to the fact that the EXT and COMP models predicted large changes in distribution relative to the AVG model predictions (Appendix S7). For example, environmental suitability predictions for the Paucident Planigale (*Planigale gilensy*) were similar between AVG, EXT and COMP models under current climate (all models identified the central parts of the continent as the most suitable for this species) (Fig. 4). In contrast, whereas the AVG model predicted that areas predicted to be suitable for the Planigale under the current climate would remain suitable under the 2070 climatic scenario, EXT and COMP models predicted dramatic shifts in the distribution range of the species in slightly different directions (from central Australia towards the South and South-East coast; Fig. 4). For this species, the shifts in the suitable conditions predicted by EXT and COMP models seem to be driven by the increase in the length of heatwaves (*av.m0v.hot*) predicted under the 2070 scenario (Fig. 4). In some other cases, the change in predictions' correlations over future scenarios arises because one of the predictor-set models predicted limited or zero environmental suitability for a species under 2070 scenario whereas other models predicted the maintenance of the suitable environmental range over time or even an increase in environmental suitability (see further examples in Appendix S7).

In general terms, under the *current* climate scenario the extent of suitability predicted by EXT and COMP models tended to be smaller than those predicted by AVG models, although this difference was not evident when we included only biogeographical regions where the species is known to occur currently (Fig. 5, Fig. S6 d, f). Under the *current* climate COMP models predicted slightly more restricted suitable distribution ranges than EXT models (Fig 5). Under the *future* climate scenario, differences in the extent of predicted suitable range showed a high variability across species and predictors sets.

The amount of extrapolation to novel environments (as measured by MESS maps) was larger in EXT and COMP models than in AVG models under both current and - especially- future climate scenarios. Under the current climate, novel climatic conditions were found in 0.08, 0.11 and 0.12% of the total study area for AVG, EXT and COMP predictions, respectively. These percentages increased to 20.6, 57.8 and 59.9 %, respectively under the future climatic scenario. The areas of non-analogue climate under the future scenario are located mainly in the Central and Northern parts of the continent (Appendix S8).

We found no clear evidence for an effect of species traits on the magnitude of divergence of predictions between AVG, EXT and COMP models (Appendix S9). The reduction in suitable range predicted by EXT models compared to AVG model under future climate scenario was marginally larger for species that occupy - totally or partially- desert areas or areas of hot and dry summers and mild winters (Fig. S9.1) than for species characteristic of other climate zones.

DISCUSSION

Conservation of species under climate change relies on accurate predictions of both the extent and suitability of species ranges under current and future climate conditions. We showed that species distribution models based on long-term averaged means and extreme conditions generally have similarly good predictive performance, and yet predicted geographic ranges for the same species often differ (both in extent and spatial distribution). Differences in the spatial predictions of these models increase under future climate scenarios (Fig. 4, Appendix

S7). These differences are likely to have significant implications for conservation, such as leading to different spatial priorities for conservation actions, and in extreme instances, influencing extinction risk status assessment under IUCN red list or other prioritization approaches. Our results highlight the importance of accounting for extreme conditions/events alongside traditionally used long-term averaged climatic predictor when modelling species distributions on the basis of their climatic niche. Failure to consider the potential role of extreme conditions when modelling species distributions could lead to unreliable predictions of species responses to change in climate.

Across species, EXT and COMP models tended to predict more restrictive suitable ranges than AVG models suggesting that extreme weather conditions might limit species distributions in areas theoretically suitable in terms of long-term mean climatic conditions. In other words, models based on long-term averages might be over predicting the amount of environmental suitable area for a species, at least in some areas (Zimmermann et al. 2009, Reside et al. 2010, Bateman et al. 2012, 2016, Briscoe et al. 2016). Divergences between model predictions showed strong patterns in geographic and environmental space (Appendix S7), providing general insight into key processes that may be missed by failing to consider a broad suite of climate variables. Based on annual mean temperature values (AVG models) many species that occur in temperate areas along the East coast of Australia were predicted to also find suitable environmental conditions in the arid central parts of the continent and/or in the subtropical or tropical northern areas under the current climate scenario. Although these areas may not differ substantially in mean climate, they are likely to present quite different challenges to mammal species. For example, mammals that rely heavily on evaporative cooling may struggle to regulate their body temperature when faced with high temperatures coupled with high humidity – conditions that frequently occur in subtropical and tropical areas (Adolph 1947, West 2003, Briscoe et al. 2016). Similarly, the arid zones of central and northern Australia are challenging for species that do not have physiological or behavioural adaptations (e.g. heterothermy, use of burrows, nocturnality) to cope with long heatwaves or extended dry spells captured in the EXT model thorough the variables *av.sum.temp* and *av.m0v.hot* (Fuller et al. 2014). While we found no strong patterns between the divergence of predictions between different models and a number key species' traits, we did find that range predictions in the future tended to diverge more for species that occupied environments characterised by these conditions (e.g. desert and areas with hot summers/mild winters).

Models based on extreme conditions only (EXT) predicted higher suitability for species than AVG models in areas of very high annual rainfall (mainly areas corresponding to the distribution of rainforest in Australia) and areas characterized by low minimum (temperatures below 5^{th} percentile) and average annual mean temperatures. This might be due to the fact the variables included in the EXT model focused on capturing extreme conditions that are likely to prove physiologically challenging for mammals. These variables may fail to capture processes responsible of the distribution of vegetation communities and their productivity over space and time (which in turn determine patterns of species distributions and richness), such as the cumulative effect of rainfall over time in combination with annual mean temperatures (Huston and Wolverton 2009). These factors were better captured in the AVG model (annual mean temperature is known to be a good proxy for net primary productivity; Gaston 2000, Huston and Wolverton 2009) and therefore in their absence, EXT models might have overestimated the suitability of some areas for many species. For example, mountain areas in the South Eastern Great Dividing Range will have similar values of T5 (extreme minimum temperatures) than neighbouring temperate or semi-arid inland areas, yet their annual mean temperature and total rainfall – and therefore the vegetation communities and species they support – differ substantially (e.g. dense forest in the Great Dividing Range vs open dry woodlands). Ideally, both extreme conditions and long-term averages should be considered together as potential predictors for species distribution models (e.g. COMP models in this study), since each individual extreme and average climatic variable might help to capture different aspects of the ecology and distribution of the species over different spatial scales. This is supported by the fact that in our study, COMP models tended to perform slightly better than either EXT or AVG models (although we note that they did also have one extra predictor variable, which may have had a minor influence on results). However, there are potential drawbacks of integrating all these variables in the same model: many of the extreme weather conditions are strongly correlated to long-term averages under the current conditions (Appendix S2), and the inclusion of correlated variables might hamper the capacity of using these models for inference (James et al. 2013). Model averaging or ensemble modelling approaches may prove useful as a way of capturing multiple processes in inference and prediction (Wintle et al. 2003, Thuiller et al. 2009) while avoiding parameter instability during model fitting.

Correlations between extreme variables and average conditions are expected to change over space and time: recent studies have demonstrated that extremes of temperature and precipitation are changing at a faster rate than annual trends (Alexander et al. 2007). This might help explain why spatial predictions –and therefore correlations - between different models diverged more under the future climatic scenario tested here than under the current climate. Divergence in EXT, COMP and AVG future model predictions is also associated with the fact that more than 50 % of the extreme conditions predicted for 2070 showed non-analogue conditions under current climate (i.e. there is a large uncertainty of predictions in more than 50 % of Australia). The extrapolation of predictions to non-analogue environmental conditions in MaxEnt is controlled by a feature called “clamping”: it constrains predictions to remain within the range of values of the training data (in the case of this study, the target-group background data set used to characterize the range of available environmental conditions under current climate) (Elith et al. 2011). Therefore, the prediction of environmental suitability in areas of non-analogue climate is constant. In our simulations, non-analogue conditions for EXT models were largely driven by longer runs of hot days (*av.m0v.hot*) than observed under the current climate. In many instances, the relative environmental suitability for species' was close to zero at the maximum values of *av.m0v.hot* under the current climate, supporting the use of the 'clamping' feature. These predictions do not explicitly take into account the physiological thresholds of the species (which in most cases is unknown as it requires detailed studies/lab experiments not available for most of the species; Krockenberger et al. 2012) nor the resilience and plasticity of the species to adapt to changes in environmental conditions (Elith and Leathwick 2009, Catullo et al. 2015). For example, model predictions for the species *Rhinonicteris aurantia* , the Orange leaf-nose bat using EXT and COMP predictors sets showed that there would not be any climatic suitable conditions for the species in a hot and drier Australia in 2070 (Appendix S7). However this species roosts in cave environments that are strongly buffered against daily, seasonal and long-term variations in external climatic conditions (i.e. environments with relatively constant temperature and humidity). Therefore, the 2070 predictions of EXT and COMP models might not correspond to the real conditions that the species will experience in a hot and drier climate future.

Our finding that models with apparently similar predictive performance when evaluated against current observation data can diverge so much when projected to future climates has significant implications for the way predictive uncertainty should be represented and results used in conservation decision making. The use of extreme weather variables known to directly impact species or groups of species (mammals in this case) when making predictions of future species ranges, permits identification of areas in the landscape where species will be more or less at threat by extreme weather. This helps identify future climatic refugia where species could be buffered against extreme events, providing greater chances of adapting to long-term changes in average climatic conditions (Reside et al. 2014). However, very few studies that analyse the long-term prospects for species under climate change account for the potential effect of extreme weather conditions. This may be partly due to the fact that, relative to data on future mean climate, projections of extremes (e.g. length of heatwaves or dry days) are much less commonly available (Garcia et al. 2014). The uncertainty arising from having to choose between models - e.g. model types or model predictors - is almost never represented as prediction uncertainty or formally considered when assessing conservation options (sensu Moilanen and Wintle 2006). Our results highlight the importance of incorporating uncertainty about predictor choice when representing SDM prediction uncertainty and interpreting the results of climate change impact studies. For several species in this study that appeared to be modelled quite well based on current data (high AUCs, high deviance reduction), the predicted 2070 distributions ranged from total loss of suitable range through to a substantial increase in range, depending on which climate or weather variables were included in the model. There remain significant challenges in interpreting and acting on such results that will require both further validation data (species presence-absence data – which is more robust than presence-only data for evaluating predictions, but rarely available at large spatial scales for most taxa) and sophisticated decision support approaches to explicitly factor in predictive uncertainty. It is well understood that choosing a single-best model for inference and prediction about the future of a species is a risky strategy (Wintle et al. 2003, Thuiller et al. 2009). We advocate for thoughtful application of multi-model inference and treatment of model-choice uncertainty when predicting the future distribution of a species and planning for the conservation of species in a rapidly changing world.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Data custodians: Department of Land Resource Management of Northern Territory; Department of Environment and Primary Industries of Victoria; New South Wales office of Environment and Heritage; Department of Environment and Land Conservation of Western Australia, and the Department of Environment and Heritage protection of Queensland. This work was supported by the ARC Centre of Excellence for Environmental Decisions (CEED) and the National Environment Research Program Decisions Hub (NERP ED). BW is supported by ARC Future Fellowship. AMO was also supported by the FORESTCAST (CGL2014-59742-C2-2-R) and ERA-NET FORESTERRA INFORMED (29183) projects and the CERCA Programme (Generalitat de Catalunya). NJB was also supported by the National Environment Science Program Threatened Species Recovery Hub.

REFERENCES

Adolph, E. F. 1947. Tolerance to heat and dehydration in several species of mammals. - Am. J. Physiol. Content 151: 564–575.

Alexander, L. V et al. 2007. Trends in Australia’s climate means and extremes: a global context. - Aust. Meteorol. Mag. 56: 1–18.

Andersen, A. N. et al. 2012. Savanna burning for biodiversity: Fire management for faunal conservation in Australian tropical savannas. - Austral Ecol. 37: 658–667.

Anderson, B. J. et al. 2009. Dynamics of range margins for metapopulations under climate change. - Proc. R. Soc. B Biol. Sci. 276: 1415–1420.

Araújo, M. B. and Guisan, A. 2006. Five (or so) challenges for species distribution modelling. - J. Biogeogr. 33: 1677–1688.

Bartholomew, G. A. 1966. Interaction of physiology and behavior under natural conditions. - In: Bowman, R. I. (ed), The Galapagos. University of California Press, pp. 39–45.

Bateman, B. L. et al. 2012. Nice weather for bettongs: using weather events, not climate means, in species distribution models. - Ecography 35: 306–314.

Bateman, B. L. et al. 2016. Potential breeding distributions of U.S. birds predicted with both short-term variability and long-term average climate data. - Ecol. Appl. 26: 2718–2729.

Bell, M. J. et al. 2012. The effect of future climate scenarios on the balance between productivity and greenhouse gas emissions from sheep grazing systems. - Livest. Sci. 147: 126–138.

Bi, D. et al. 2013. The ACCESS coupled model : description , control climate and evaluation. - Aust. Meteorol. Oceanogr. J. 63: 41–64.

Briscoe, N. J. et al. 2016. Unpacking the mechanisms captured by a correlative SDM to improve predictions of climate refugia. - Glob. Chang. Biol. 22: 2425–2439.

Cadenhead, N. C. R. et al. 2016. Climate and Fire Scenario Uncertainty Dominate the Evaluation of Options for Conserving the Great Desert Skink. - Conserv. Lett. 9: 181–190.

Catullo, R. a. et al. 2015. Extending spatial modelling of climate change responses beyond the realized niche: estimating, and accommodating, physiological limits and adaptive evolution. - Glob. Ecol. Biogeogr. 24: 1192–1202.

Chen, I. et al. 2011. Rapid range shifts of species of climate warming. - Science 333: 1024–1026.

Churchill, S. 2009. Australian bats. - Allen & Unwin .

Chylek, P. et al. 2011. Observed and model simulated 20th century Arctic temperature variability: Canadian Earth System Model CanESM2. - Atmos. Chem. Phys. Discuss. 11: 22893–22907.

CSIRO and Bureau of Meteorology 2015. Climate Change in Australia Information for Australia’s Natural Resource Management Regions: Technical Report.

Cullen, B. R. et al. 2009. Climate change effects on pasture systems in south-eastern Australia. - Crop Pasture Sci. 60: 933–942.

Diniz-Filho, J. A. F. et al. 2009. Partitioning and mapping uncertainties in ensembles of forecasts of species turnover under climate change. - Ecography 32: 897–906.

Dormann, C. F. 2007. Promising the future? Global change projections of species distributions. - Basic Appl. Ecol. 8: 387–397.

Dormann, C. F. et al. 2012. Correlation and process in species distribution models: Bridging a dichotomy. - J. Biogeogr. 39: 2119–2131.

Dormann, C. F. et al. 2013. Collinearity: a review of methods to deal with it and a simulation study evaluating their performance. - Ecography 36: 027–046.

Elith, J. and Leathwick, J. R. 2009. Species Distribution Models: Ecological Explanation and Prediction Across Space and Time. - Annu. Rev. Ecol. Evol. Syst. 40: 677–697.

Elith, J. et al. 2006. Novel methods improve prediction of species’ distributions from occurrence data. - Ecography 29: 129–151.

Elith, J. et al. 2010. The art of modelling range-shifting species. - Methods Ecol. Evol. 1: 330–342.

Elith, J. et al. 2011. A statistical explanation of MaxEnt for ecologists. - Divers. Distrib. 17: 43–57.

ESCAVI, Executive Steering Committee for Australian Vegetation Information 2003. Australian Vegetation Attribute Manual: National Vegetation Information System. Version 6.0. Department of the Environment and Heritage, Canberra, Australia. URL: https://www.environment.gov.au/node/18927.

Fithian, W. et al. 2015. Bias correction in species distribution models: pooling survey and collection data for multiple species. - Methods Ecol. Evol. 6: 424–438.

Franklin, J. 2010. Mapping species distributions: spatial inference and prediction. - Cambridge University Press.

Franklin, J. et al. 2013. Modeling plant species distributions under future climates: How fine scale do climate projections need to be? - Glob. Chang. Biol. 19: 473–483.

Frederiksen, M. et al. 2008. The demographic impact of extreme events: stochastic weather drives survival and population dynamics in a long-lived seabird. - J. Anim. Ecol. 77: 1020–1029.

Fuller, A. et al. 2014. Adaptation to heat and water shortage in large, arid-zone mammals. - Physiology 29: 159–167.

Garcia, R. a et al. 2014. Multiple dimensions of climate change and their implications for biodiversity. - Science 344: 1247579.

Gaston, K. J. 2000. Global patterns in biodiversity. - Nature 405: 220–227.

Greenville, A. C. et al. 2012. Extreme climatic events drive mammal irruptions: Regression analysis of 100-year trends in desert rainfall and temperature. - Ecol. Evol. 2: 2645–2658.

Guillera-Arroita, G. et al. 2015. Is my species distribution model fit for purpose? Matching data and models to applications. - Glob. Ecol. Biogeogr. 24: 276–292.

Guisan, A. and Zimmermann, N. E. 2000. Predictive habitat distribution models in ecology. - Ecol. Modell. 135: 147–186.

Guisan, A. et al. 2013. Predicting species distributions for conservation decisions. - Ecol.

Lett. 16: 1424–1435.

Hanley, J. A. and McNeil, B. J. 1982. The meaning and use of the area under a receiver operating characteristic (ROC) curve. - Radiology 143: 29–36.

Harris, R. M. B. et al. 2014. Climate projections for ecologists. - Wiley Interdiscip. Rev. Clim. Chang. 5: 621–637.

Harrison, R. D. 2000. Repercussions of El Niño: drought causes extinction and the breakdown of mutualism in Borneo. - Proc. R. Soc. B Biol. Sci. 267: 911–915.

Hernandez, P. A. et al. 2006. The effect of sample size and species characteristics on performance of different species distribution modeling methods. - Ecography 29: 773–785.

Holmgren, M. et al. 2006. Extreme climatic events shape arid and semiarid ecosystems. - Front. Ecol. Environ. 4: 87–95.

Huston, M. a. and Wolverton, S. 2009. The global distribution of net primary production: resolving the paradox. - Ecol. Monogr. 79: 343–377.

IPCC 2014. Synthesis Report. Contribution of Working Groups I, II and II to the Fifth assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change.

Jackson, S. T. et al. 2009. Ecology and the ratchet of events: climate variability, niche dimensions, and species distributions. - Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A. 106: 19685–19692.

James, G. et al. 2013. An Introduction to Statistical Learning with Applications in R. - Springer.

Jarnevich, C. S. et al. 2015. Caveats for correlative species distribution modeling. - Ecol. Inform. 29: 6–15.

Kearney, M. and Porter, W. 2009. Mechanistic niche modelling: Combining physiological and spatial data to predict species' ranges. - Ecol. Lett. 12: 334–350.

Kearney, M. R. et al. 2010. Correlative and mechanistic models of species distribution provide congruent forecasts under climate change. - Conserv. Lett. 3: 203–213.

Kramer-Schadt, S. et al. 2013. The importance of correcting for sampling bias in MaxEnt species distribution models. - Divers. Distrib. 19: 1366–1379.

Krockenberger, A. K. et al. 2012. The limit to the distribution of a rainforest marsupial folivore is consistent with the thermal intolerance hypothesis. - Oecologia 168: 889–899.

Lahoz-Monfort, J. J. et al. 2014. Imperfect detection impacts the performance of species distribution models. - Glob. Ecol. Biogeogr. 23: 504–515.

Letnic, M. and Dickman, C. R. 2006. Boom means bust: Interactions between the El Niño/Southern Oscillation (ENSO), rainfall and the processes threatening mammal species in arid Australia. - Biodivers. Conserv. 15: 3847–3880.

Maloney, S. K. and Dawson, T. J. 1998. Changes in pattern of heat loss at high ambient temperature caused by water deprivation in a large flightless bird, the emu. - Phys. Zool. 71: 712–719.

McKechnie, A. E. and Wolf, B. O. 2010. Climate change increases the likelihood of catastrophic avian mortality events during extreme heat waves. - Biol. Lett. 6: 253–256.

Menkhorst, P. and Knight, F. 2010. A field guide to the mammals of Australia. - Oxford University Press.

Merow, C. et al. 2014. What do we gain from simplicity versus complexity in species distribution models? - Ecography (Cop.). 37: 1267–1281.

Milanovich, J. R. et al. 2010. Projected loss of a salamander diversity hotspot as a consequence of projected global climate change. - PLoS One 5: e12189.

Moilanen, A. and Wintle, B. A. 2006. Uncertainty analysis favours selection of spatially aggregated reserve networks. - Biol. Conserv. 129: 427–434.

Moore, J. G. 1956. The tropospheric temperature lapse rateitle. - Arch. für Meteorol. Geophys. und Bioklimatologie, Ser. A 9: 468–470.

Morán-Ordóñez, A. et al. 2016. Evaluating 318 continental-scale species distribution models over a 60-year prediction horizon: what factors influence the reliability of predictions? - Glob. Ecol. Biogeogr (*early online*). DOI: 10.1111/geb.12545.

Parmesan, C. 2006. Ecological and evolutionary responses to recent climate change. - Annu.

Rev. Ecol. Evol. Syst. 37: 637–669.

Parmesan, C. et al. 2000. Impacts of Extreme Weather and Climate on Terrestrial Biota*. - Bull. Am. Meteorol. Soc. 81: 443–450.

Peters, G. P. et al. 2013. The challenge to keep global warming below 2 °C. - Nat. Clim. Chang. 3: 4–6.

Peterson, a. T. et al. 2002. Future projections for Mexican faunas under global climate change scenarios. - Nature 416: 626–629.

Peterson, A. T. et al. 2016. Mechanistic and correlative models of ecological niches. - Eur. J. Ecol. 1: 28–38.

Phillips, S. J. and Dudík, M. 2008. Modeling of species distributions with Maxent: new extensions and a comprehensive evaluation. - Ecography (Cop.). 31: 161–175.

Phillips, S. J. et al. 2006. Maximum entropy modeling of species geographic distributions. - Ecol. Modell. 190: 231–259.

Phillips, S. J. et al. 2009. Sample selection bias and presence-only distribution models: implications for background and pseudo-absence data. - Ecol. Appl. 19: 181–197.

Porfirio, L. L. et al. 2014. Improving the use of species distribution models in conservation planning and management under climate change. - PLoS One 9: e113749.

R Core Team 2013. R: A language and environment for statistical computing. in press.

Raupach, M. R. et al. 2009. Australian Water Availability Project (AWAP): CSIRO Marine and Atmospheric Research Component: Final Report for Phase 3. CAWCR Technical Report. (CSIRO, Ed.). No 13. 66 pp.

Raupach, M. R. et al. 2012. Australian Water Availability Project. CSIRO Marine and Atmospheric Research, Canberra, Australia. <http://www.csiro.au/awap>.

Reside, A. E. et al. 2010. Weather, Not Climate, Defines Distributions of Vagile Bird Species. - PLoS One 5: e13569.

Reside, A. E. et al. 2014. Characteristics of climate change refugia for Australian biodiversity. - Austral Ecol. 39: 887–897.

Riahi, K. et al. 2011. RCP 8.5-A scenario of comparatively high greenhouse gas emissions. - Clim. Change 109: 33–57.

Seabrook, L. et al. 2014. Determining range edges: Habitat quality, climate or climate extremes? - Divers. Distrib. 20: 95–106.

Simard, M. et al. 2011. Mapping forest canopy height globally with spaceborne lidar. - J. Geophys. Res. 116: G04.

Sturman, A. P. and Tapper, N. 1996. The weather and climate of Australia and New Zealand. - Oxford Univerity Press.

Swets, J. A. 1988. Measuring the Accuracy of Diagnostic Systems. - Science 240: 1285–1293.

Syfert, M. M. et al. 2013. The effects of sampling bias and model complexity on the predictive performance of MaxEnt species distribution models. - PLoS One 8: e55158.

Synes, N. W. and Osborne, P. E. 2011. Choice of predictor variables as a source of uncertainty in continental-scale species distribution modelling under climate change. - Glob. Ecol. Biogeogr. 20: 904–914.

Tabachnick, B. G. and Fidell, L. S. 1996. Using multivariate statistics. - HarperCollins College Publishers.

Thomas, C. D. et al. 2004. Extinction risk from climate change. - Nature 427: 145–148.

Thuiller, W. 2007. Biodiversity: climate change and the ecologist. - Nature 448: 550–552.

Thuiller, W. et al. 2005. Climate change threats to plant diversity in Europe. - Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A. 102: 8245–8250.

Thuiller, W. et al. 2009. BIOMOD - a plataform for ensemble forecasting of species distributions. - Ecography 32: 369–373.

Van Dyck, S. and Strahan, R. 2008. The Mammals of Australia. - Reed New Holland.

VanDerWal, J. et al. 2012a. Focus on poleward shifts in species' distribution underestimates the fingerprint of climate change. - Nat. Clim. Chang. 3: 239–243.

VanDerWal, J. et al. 2012b. climates: Methods for working with weather & climate. in press.

Welbergen, J. a et al. 2008. Climate change and the effects of temperature extremes on Australian flying-foxes. - Proc. R. Soc. B Biol. Sci. 275: 419–425.

Wernberg, T. et al. 2013. An extreme climatic event alters marine ecosystem structure in a global biodiversity hotspot. - Nat. Clim. Chang. 3: 78–82.

West, J. W. 2003. Effects of heat-stress on production in dairy cattle. - J. Dairy Sci. 86: 2131–2144.

Wintle, B. A. et al. 2003. The Use of Bayesian Model Averaging to Better Represent Uncertainty in Ecological Models. - Conserv. Biol. 17: 1579–1590.

Wisz, M. S. et al. 2008. Effects of sample size on the performance of species distribution models. - Divers. Distrib. 14: 763–773.

Yin, C. et al. 2013. SimCLIM 2013 Data Manual.

Zimmermann, N. E. et al. 2009. Climatic extremes improve predictions of spatial patterns of tree species. - Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. 106: 19723–19728.

Table 1.

Environmental predictors retained for modelling. A check mark denotes the predictors included in each of the predictors sets used to fit the species distribution models: the long-term mean climatic variables only (AVG model; five predictors); the extreme weather variables only (EXT model; five predictors) and all extreme weather variables plus the long-term averaged annual precipitation (COMP; six predictors)

Variable name	Description	Resolution	AVG	EXT	COMP
Climate: averages					
Bio1	Annual Mean Temperature	0.05°	✓		
Bio3	Isothermality: mean diurnal range /annual temperature range	0.05°	✓		
Bio4	Temperature Seasonality (standard deviation)	0.05°	✓		
Bio12	Total annual Precipitation	0.05°	✓		✓
Weather: extremes					
T5	5th percentile of minimum temperature (across all years)	0.05°		✓	✓
av.vpr.hot	Average vapour pressure on days when maximum temperature exceeds T90 (maximum temperature > 90th percentile)	0.05°		✓	✓
av.sum.temp	Sum of maximum temperatures during maximum run of dry days (rainfall < 1mm), (average across years)	0.05°		✓	✓
av.m0v.hot	Maximum run of hot, dry days (maximum temp >T90, rainfall <1mm) (average across years)	0.05°		✓	✓
Vegetation structure					
veg.hgt	Forest canopy height (Simard *et al.*, 2011)	1 km	✓	✓	✓

Figure captions

Figure 1. Notched boxplots for AUC values (area under the curve statistic) for all cross-validated mammals' models (n= 197 species), detailed for climate/weather predictor-set: AVG (models using long-term averaged climatic conditions), EXT (averaged short-term extreme weather conditions) and COMP (averaged short-term extreme weather conditions plus long-term average annual rainfall). In each boxplot, the boxes delimit interquartile ranges (25th and 75th percentiles), the whiskers delimit ~2 standard deviations. The notches are centred around the AUC median values (horizontal bolded line) and the outliers are represented as open circles. The lack of overlap between the notch - narrowing around the median - of two boxes offers evidence of a statistically significant difference between the medians. Note that the Y-axis is truncated to the range of observed AUC values (0.6 - 1).

Figure 2. a) Spatial variation in the number of species for which models fit using short-term extreme weather conditions (EXT) predicted higher habitat suitability than models fit using long-term averaged climatic conditions (AVG); **b)** Difference between spatial predictions of EXT and AVG models. Areas of the continent where EXT models predict higher environmental suitability than AVG models for most of the species are shown in orange, with regions where EXT models predict lower environmental suitability than AVG models for most species shown in grey; **c - k)** Density plots for the predictors used to fit EXT and/or AVG models (see Table 1 for a full description of these predictors). These plots (c –k) show the range of values of each predictor in each one of the two zones defined in Figure 2b, and the frequency at which those values occur across the landscape: the orange curve shows the distribution of the predictors' values in the areas where EXT models predict higher environmental suitability compared to AVG models for most of the species; the grey curve shows the distribution of predictors' values in the areas where EXT models predict lower environmental suitability compared to AVG models for most of the species. Arrows point to

areas of the environmental space where the values of predictors contribute to explain the differences in spatial predictions of EXT and AVG models.

Figure 3. **a)** Pearson's correlations between the environmental suitability maps of models fit on the three predictor-sets (AVG, EXT and COMP), under current climatic/weather conditions (current scenario– x-axis) and under a hot and dry climate future scenario for 2070 (2070 scenario – y-axis); points aligned to the dashed black line indicate species for which the correlation between environmental suitability maps was constant over current and 2070 climatic scenarios; **b)** Range of changes in Pearson's correlations of environmental suitability maps between 2070 and current climates (X-axis) for each pair of predictor sets (EXT vs AVG, COMP vs AVG and COMP vs EXT). The Y-axis indicates the frequency (number of species) at which those changes in correlation were observed across the data (n=188 mammal species). Composite (COMP) and extreme-only model predictions for 2070 are, on average, more highly correlated than composite and long-term-average predictions, reflecting that extremes variables are contributing more to composite models than the long-term-average variables.

Figure 4. Environmental suitability maps for the Paucident Planigale (*Planigale gilesi*) as predicted by each climate predictor set (AVG, EXT and COMP). Predictive performance values (cross-validated AUC value, mean±sd) are indicated for the current predictions of each model. The figure shows the contrast between the predictions of each predictor-set under current and future (2070) climatic scenarios (maps on first and second columns, respectively). The limiting factors maps (third column) show the variable that it is limiting the most an increase in environmental suitability at each grill cell and across the study area under the 2070 scenario and for each climate predictor-set individually (AVG, EXT and COMP). Refer to Table 1 for meaning of the variables' abbreviations.

Figure 5. Differences in the predicted environmental suitability range between the three predictor-sets (AVG, EXT and COMP) for current climate scenarios (current scenario– x-axis) for a hot and dry climate 2070 future scenario (2070 scenario– y- axis). Environmental suitability range was calculated as the sum of grid values of the logistic MaxEnt output across Australia. When comparing EXT vs AVG, positive values in any of the axis indicate that the total range predicted by EXT models is larger than the range predicted by the AVG models, and negative values indicate the opposite. Similarly for the COMP vs AVG and the COMP vs EXT comparisons. The intersection between the two dashed black lines represents a species for which there was no difference in predicted suitable range between models under either current or 2070 (future) scenarios.

Figure 1



Figure 2



a
n species
20 60 100 140
b
EXT higher habt. suit. than AVG
EXT lower habt. suit. than AVG
North
0 5001000 km
Normalized frequency (density)
c
Bio1
Mild regions of SW and SE of mainland Australia & Tasmania
Hot regions (Central and North Aust.)
Avg. annual mean temperature (°C)
d
Bio3
Arid regions (Central Aust.) & alpine & subalpine areas
Tropical regions N Australia
Isothermality (%)
e
Bio4
Tropics & coastal areas
Arid regions
Temperature seasonality (sd)
f
Bio12
NE coastal Australia & W Tasmania (rainforest areas)
Avg. annual rainfall (mm)
g
T5
Mountain regions SE Australia & Tasmania
Tropical and subtropical regions
5th percentile min. temperature (°C)
h
av.vpr.hot
Dry conditions when very hot (arid zones)
High humidity when high temperatures (tropics)
Avg. vapour pressure during hot weather
i
av.sum.temp
Long dry spells (Central & NW Australia)
Sum of temperatures during max. dry run (°C)
j
av.m0v.hot
Long run of hot days during dry periods (Central & NW Aust)
Maximum run of hot, dry days
k
veg.hgt
Vegetation heigth (m)

Figure 3


a)
EXT vs AVG
COMP vs AVG
COMP vs EXT
Correlation between predictions 2070 / FUTURE scenario
Correlation between predictions CURRENT scenario
1
0.8
0.6
0.4
0.2
0
-0.2
0
0.2
0.4
0.6
0.8
1
b)
EXT vs AVG
COMP vs AVG
COMP vs EXT
Frequency (n species)
140
120
100
80
60
40
20
0
-0.8
-0.6
-0.4
-0.2
0
0.2
Change in correlation between FUTURE and CURRENT scenarios

Figure 4


AVG
2070 limiting factors
AUC = 0.963 ± 0.010
Bio1
Bio4
Bio12
veg.hgt
Bio3
Predicted habitat suitability
Low
0.2
0.4
0.6
0.8
1
High
EXT
AUC = 0.963 ± 0.010
T5
av.vpr.hot
av.m0v.hot
veg.hgt
av.sum.temp
COMP
AUC = 0.972 ± 0.007
T5
av.vpr.hot
av.m0v.hot
Bio12
av.sum.temp
veg.hgt
Current
2070 climate scenario

Figure 5


1e+05
-1e+06
-3e+06
Difference predicted range
2070/ FUTURE scenario
-5e+05
0
5e+05
Difference predicted range
CURRENT scenario
EXT vs AVG
COMP vs AVG
COMP vs EXT

Appendix 1. List of taxa.

List of mammal species detailing their scientific and common names, the number of records used to fit the models (n samples), and the cross-validated values of predictive performance for the current climatic scenario (AUC mean± SD) of models using long-term averaged climatic conditions (AVG), averaged short-term extreme weather conditions (EXT) and averaged short-term extreme weather conditions plus long-term average annual rainfall (COMP).

Scientific Name	Common Name	n samples	$AVG_{AUC±SD}$	$EXT_{AUC±SD}$	$COMP_{AUC±SD}$
Acrobates pygmaeus	Feathertail Glider	1068	0.734 ± 0.019	0.728 ± 0.019	0.731 ± 0.019
Aepyprymnus rufescens	Rufous Bettong	1022	0.869 ± 0.013	0.890 ± 0.011	0.896 ± 0.011
Antechinomys laniger	Kultarr	237	0.964 ± 0.008	0.965 ± 0.008	0.964 ± 0.008
Antechinus agilis	Agile Antechinus	1464	0.888 ± 0.007	0.880 ± 0.008	0.892 ± 0.007
Antechinus bellus	Fawn Antechinus	83	0.997 ± 0.001	0.996 ± 0.001	0.996 ± 0.000
Antechinus flavipes	Yellow-Footed Antechinus	1722	0.775 ± 0.015	0.783 ± 0.014	0.795 ± 0.013
Antechinus minimus	Swamp Antechinus	84	0.972 ± 0.010	0.976 ± 0.007	0.978 ± 0.006
Antechinus stuartii	Brown Antechinus	2693	0.825 ± 0.008	0.836 ± 0.008	0.843 ± 0.008
Antechinus subtropicus	Subtropical Antechinus	114	0.913 ± 0.031	0.922 ± 0.023	0.934 ± 0.020
Antechinus swainsonii	Dusky Antechinus	771	0.862 ± 0.015	0.855 ± 0.015	0.864 ± 0.015
Bettongia gaimardi	Eastern Bettong	125	0.980 ± 0.004	0.967 ± 0.006	0.983 ± 0.004
Bettongia lesueur	Burrowing Bettong	88	0.934 ± 0.028	0.962 ± 0.018	0.961 ± 0.018
Bettongia penicillata	Brush-Tailed Bettong	220	0.911 ± 0.032	0.977 ± 0.006	0.977 ± 0.007
Bettongia tropica	Northern Bettong	49	0.994 ± 0.002	0.997 ± 0.001	0.998 ± 0.000
Burramys parvus	Mountain Pygmy-Possum	68	0.993 ± 0.004	0.992 ± 0.005	0.992 ± 0.005
Cercartetus concinnus	Southwestern Pygmy Possum	430	0.935 ± 0.012	0.961 ± 0.004	0.961 ± 0.005
Cercartetus lepidus	Tasmanian Pygmy Possum	73	0.954 ± 0.014	0.956 ± 0.015	0.959 ± 0.016
Cercartetus nanus	Eastern Pygmy Possum	446	0.802 ± 0.028	0.828 ± 0.026	0.827 ± 0.026
Chaerephon jobensis	Northern Freetail Bat	228	0.960 ± 0.007	0.963 ± 0.007	0.961 ± 0.008
Chalinolobus dwyeri	Large-Eared Pied Bat	479	0.860 ± 0.022	0.839 ± 0.021	0.838 ± 0.023
Chalinolobus gouldii	Gould's Wattled Bat	4977	0.684 ± 0.010	0.647 ± 0.012	0.649 ± 0.012
Chalinolobus morio	Chocolate Wattled Bat	4296	0.717 ± 0.009	0.677 ± 0.011	0.68 ± 0.010
Chalinolobus nigrogriseus	Hoary Wattled Bat	321	0.883 ± 0.020	0.897 ± 0.016	0.897 ± 0.017
Chalinolobus picatus	Little Pied Bat	469	0.925 ± 0.011	0.938 ± 0.007	0.939 ± 0.007
Dactylopsila trivirgata	Stripped Possun	43	0.991 ± 0.003	0.991 ± 0.003	0.992 ± 0.002
Dasycercus blythi	Brush-Tailed Mulgara	111	0.975 ± 0.006	0.977 ± 0.006	0.977 ± 0.006
Dasycercus cristicauda	Crest-Tailed Mulgara	252	0.982 ± 0.004	0.976 ± 0.006	0.980 ± 0.006
Dasykaluta rosamondae	Little Red Kaluta	306	0.986 ± 0.001	0.987 ± 0.001	0.987 ± 0.001
Dasyuroides byrnei	Brush-Tailed Marsupial Rat	124	0.994 ± 0.001	0.996 ± 0.000	0.996 ± 0.000
Dasyurus geoffroii	Western Quoll	594	0.905 ± 0.016	0.965 ± 0.008	0.976 ± 0.006
Dasyurus hallucatus	Northern Quoll	521	0.961 ± 0.007	0.961 ± 0.009	0.964 ± 0.009
Dasyurus maculatus	Spotted-Tail Quoll	2479	0.796 ± 0.011	0.819 ± 0.010	0.828 ± 0.010
Dasyurus viverrinus	Eastern Quoll	610	0.978 ± 0.002	0.969 ± 0.004	0.978 ± 0.002
Dendrolagus lumholtzi	Lumholtz's Tree-Kangaroo	48	0.997 ± 0.000	0.994 ± 0.001	0.995 ± 0.002
Falsistrellus mackenziei	Western Falsistrelle	74	0.953 ± 0.024	0.981 ± 0.009	0.990 ± 0.005
Falsistrellus tasmaniensis	Eastern Falsistrelle	1029	0.793 ± 0.017	0.789 ± 0.016	0.79 ± 0.016
Gymnobelideus leadbeateri	Leadbeater's Possum	99	0.988 ± 0.007	0.984 ± 0.009	0.985 ± 0.009
Hemibelideus lemuroides	Lemur-Like Ringtail Possum	31	0.995 ± 0.003	0.988 ± 0.008	0.992 ± 0.005
Hipposideros ater	Dusky Leaf-Nosed Bat	32	0.959 ± 0.017	0.953 ± 0.028	0.954 ± 0.027
Hydromys chrysogaster	Rakali/ Water Rat	804	0.665 ± 0.027	0.685 ± 0.026	0.684 ± 0.026

Scientific Name	Common Name	n samples	$AVG_{AUC±SD}$	$EXT_{AUC±SD}$	$COMP_{AUC±SD}$
Isoodon macrourus	Northern Brown Bandicoot	1463	0.875 ± 0.009	0.869 ± 0.009	0.879 ± 0.009
Isoodon obesulus	Southern Brown Bandicoot	926	0.856 ± 0.016	0.908 ± 0.013	0.921 ± 0.013
Kerivoula papuensis	Golden-Tipped Bat	467	0.897 ± 0.016	0.892 ± 0.015	0.896 ± 0.015
Lagorchestes conspicillatus	Spectacled Hare-Wallaby	127	0.971 ± 0.007	0.968 ± 0.009	0.971 ± 0.008
Lasiorhinus latifrons	Southern Hairy-Nosed Wombat	169	0.985 ± 0.004	0.983 ± 0.005	0.986 ± 0.003
Leggadina forresti	Forrest's Mouse	245	0.969 ± 0.008	0.973 ± 0.005	0.973 ± 0.005
Leggadina lakedownensis	Lakeland Downs Mouse	194	0.975 ± 0.005	0.978 ± 0.005	0.977 ± 0.005
Macroderma gigas	Ghost Bat	148	0.959 ± 0.009	0.962 ± 0.010	0.962 ± 0.012
Macropus agilis	Agile Wallaby	839	0.980 ± 0.001	0.982 ± 0.001	0.982 ± 0.001
Macropus antilopinus	Antilopine Kangaroo	161	0.981 ± 0.002	0.985 ± 0.002	0.985 ± 0.002
Macropus bernardus	Black Wallaroo	31	0.992 ± 0.003	0.985 ± 0.008	0.986 ± 0.008
Macropus dorsalis	Black-Striped Wallaby	270	0.915 ± 0.024	0.930 ± 0.015	0.932 ± 0.016
Macropus eugenii	Tammar Wallaby	93	0.952 ± 0.020	0.986 ± 0.004	0.987 ± 0.003
Macropus fuliginosus	Western Grey Kangaroo	2507	0.926 ± 0.005	0.941 ± 0.003	0.946 ± 0.003
Macropus giganteus	Eastern Grey Kangaroo	6903	0.729 ± 0.008	0.733 ± 0.008	0.742 ± 0.008
Macropus irma	Western Brush Wallaby	552	0.936 ± 0.011	0.975 ± 0.003	0.978 ± 0.003
Macropus parma	Parma Wallaby	329	0.939 ± 0.012	0.933 ± 0.012	0.945 ± 0.011
Macropus parryi	Whiptail Wallaby	467	0.878 ± 0.018	0.902 ± 0.014	0.907 ± 0.014
Macropus robustus	Common Wallaroo	3732	0.805 ± 0.009	0.793 ± 0.011	0.798 ± 0.011
Macropus rufogriseus	Red-Necked Wallaby	4022	0.711 ± 0.010	0.744 ± 0.009	0.756 ± 0.009
Macropus rufus	Red Kangaroo	2266	0.923 ± 0.003	0.927 ± 0.004	0.931 ± 0.003
Macrotis lagotis	Greater Bilby	194	0.940 ± 0.013	0.958 ± 0.009	0.964 ± 0.008
Mastacomys fuscus	Broad-Toothed Mouse	168	0.977 ± 0.010	0.972 ± 0.011	0.976 ± 0.011
Melomys burtoni	Grassland Melomys	544	0.971 ± 0.005	0.971 ± 0.005	0.973 ± 0.005
Melomys capensis	Cape York Melomys	33	0.998 ± 0.000	0.998 ± 0.000	0.998 ± 0.000
Melomys cervinipes	Fawn-Footed Melomys	819	0.89 ± 0.013	0.896 ± 0.012	0.910 ± 0.010
Mesembriomys gouldii	Black-Footed Tree-Rat	119	0.992 ± 0.002	0.992 ± 0.002	0.992 ± 0.002
Miniopterus australis	Little Bentwing Bat	1632	0.879 ± 0.007	0.877 ± 0.007	0.882 ± 0.007
Miniopterus schreibersii	Common Bentwing Bat	2041	0.726 ± 0.014	0.734 ± 0.014	0.737 ± 0.014
Mormopterus beccarii	Beccari's Freetail Bat	197	0.908 ± 0.028	0.920 ± 0.020	0.918 ± 0.021
Mormopterus norfolkensis	East-Coast Freetail Bat	765	0.877 ± 0.015	0.893 ± 0.013	0.892 ± 0.013
Myotis macropus	Large-Footed Myotis	810	0.775 ± 0.022	0.788 ± 0.022	0.795 ± 0.022
Myrmecobius fasciatus	Numbat	256	0.924 ± 0.022	0.984 ± 0.004	0.986 ± 0.003
Ningaui ridei	Wongai Ningaui	193	0.958 ± 0.008	0.965 ± 0.005	0.968 ± 0.005
Ningaui timealeyi	Pilbara Ningaui	493	0.987 ± 0.001	0.987 ± 0.001	0.987 ± 0.001
Ningaui yvonneae	Southern Ningaui	239	0.977 ± 0.004	0.978 ± 0.003	0.979 ± 0.003
Notomys alexis	Spinifex Hopping Mouse	461	0.958 ± 0.005	0.957 ± 0.005	0.959 ± 0.005
Notomys cervinus	Fawn Hopping Mouse	53	0.994 ± 0.002	0.995 ± 0.001	0.997 ± 0.000
Notomys fuscus	Dusky Hopping Mouse	160	0.995 ± 0.001	0.986 ± 0.004	0.992 ± 0.002
Notomys mitchellii	Mitchell's Hopping Mouse	207	0.975 ± 0.007	0.981 ± 0.004	0.983 ± 0.004
Nyctimene robinsoni	Eastern Tube-Nosed Bat	95	0.955 ± 0.015	0.955 ± 0.016	0.962 ± 0.014
Nyctophilus bifax	Eastern Long-Eared Bat	221	0.938 ± 0.016	0.938 ± 0.014	0.939 ± 0.016
Nyctophilus corbeni	South-Eastern Long-Eared Bat	227	0.954 ± 0.010	0.948 ± 0.012	0.949 ± 0.011
Nyctophilus geoffroyi	Lesser Long-Eared Bat	3671	0.682 ± 0.012	0.657 ± 0.013	0.682 ± 0.013
Nyctophilus gouldi	Gould's Long-Eared Bat	2978	0.752 ± 0.010	0.747 ± 0.010	0.747 ± 0.010
Onychogalea unguifera	Northern Nail-Tail Wallaby	107	0.987 ± 0.003	0.988 ± 0.003	0.989 ± 0.003
Ornithorhynchus anatinus	Platypus	1593	0.731 ± 0.018	0.733 ± 0.016	0.744 ± 0.016
Perameles gunnii	Eastern Barred Bandicoot	498	0.982 ± 0.002	0.972 ± 0.003	0.982 ± 0.002

Scientific Name	Common Name	n samples	$AVG_{AUC \pm SD}$	$EXT_{AUC \pm SD}$	$COMP_{AUC \pm SD}$
Perameles nasuta	Long-Nosed Bandicoot	2670	0.810 ± 0.009	0.815 ± 0.008	0.817 ± 0.008
Petauroides volans	Greater Glider	5782	0.806 ± 0.007	0.815 ± 0.007	0.815 ± 0.007
Petaurus australis	Yellow-Bellied Glider	5673	0.815 ± 0.006	0.818 ± 0.006	0.822 ± 0.006
Petaurus breviceps	Sugar Glider	7399	0.734 ± 0.007	0.735 ± 0.007	0.743 ± 0.007
Petaurus norfolcensis	Squirrel Glider	1581	0.815 ± 0.013	0.807 ± 0.013	0.812 ± 0.013
Petrogale assimilis	Allied Rock-Wallaby	62	0.988 ± 0.005	0.993 ± 0.002	0.995 ± 0.001
Petrogale brachyotis	Short-Eared Rock-Wallaby	76	0.987 ± 0.002	0.990 ± 0.002	0.990 ± 0.002
Petrogale herberti	Herbert's Rock-Wallaby	86	0.956 ± 0.014	0.975 ± 0.009	0.976 ± 0.009
Petrogale inornata	Unadorned Rock-Wallaby	47	0.952 ± 0.022	0.991 ± 0.003	0.992 ± 0.002
Petrogale lateralis	Black-Flanked Rock-Wallaby	237	0.947 ± 0.02	0.965 ± 0.012	0.969 ± 0.011
Petrogale penicillata	Brush-Tailed Rock-Wallaby	573	0.892 ± 0.015	0.880 ± 0.016	0.882 ± 0.016
Petrogale persephone	Proserpine Rock-Wallaby	38	0.997 ± 0.001	0.998 ± 0.000	0.998 ± 0.000
Petrogale rothschildi	Rothschild's Rock-Wallaby	38	0.988 ± 0.003	0.989 ± 0.002	0.989 ± 0.002
Petrogale xanthopus	Yellow-Footed Rock-Wallaby	660	0.962 ± 0.007	0.981 ± 0.003	0.981 ± 0.003
Petropseudes dahli	Rock-Haunting Ringtail Possum	37	0.986 ± 0.003	0.985 ± 0.005	0.986 ± 0.004
Phascogale calura	Red-Tailed Phascogale	138	0.979 ± 0.008	0.993 ± 0.002	0.994 ± 0.002
Phascogale tapoatafa	Brush-Tailed Phascogale	1127	0.782 ± 0.018	0.754 ± 0.018	0.797 ± 0.017
Phascolarctos cinereus	Koala	10406	0.756 ± 0.006	0.773 ± 0.006	0.774 ± 0.006
Planigale gilesi	Paucident Planigale	125	0.963 ± 0.010	0.963 ± 0.010	0.972 ± 0.007
Planigale ingrami	Long-Tailed Planigale	316	0.972 ± 0.004	0.974 ± 0.004	0.976 ± 0.004
Planigale maculata	Common Planigale	409	0.899 ± 0.016	0.9 ± 0.016	0.903 ± 0.015
Planigale tenuirostris	Narrow-Nosed Planigale	175	0.933 ± 0.011	0.941 ± 0.014	0.941 ± 0.014
Potorous longipes	Long-Footed Potoroo	86	0.963 ± 0.016	0.965 ± 0.014	0.971 ± 0.015
Potorous tridactylus	Long-Nosed Potoroo	471	0.865 ± 0.018	0.844 ± 0.019	0.842 ± 0.019
Pseudantechinus bilarni	Sandstone False Antechinus	35	0.989 ± 0.003	0.991 ± 0.003	0.991 ± 0.003
Pseudantechinus macdonnellensis	Fat-Tailed False Antechinus	47	0.966 ± 0.012	0.976 ± 0.010	0.984 ± 0.006
Pseudantechinus woolleyae	Woolley's False Antechinus	84	0.962 ± 0.009	0.962 ± 0.011	0.962 ± 0.011
Pseudocheirus occidentalis	Western Ringtail Possum	349	0.979 ± 0.006	0.986 ± 0.003	0.987 ± 0.004
Pseudocheirus peregrinus	Common Ringtail Possum	5754	0.743 ± 0.008	0.694 ± 0.008	0.699 ± 0.008
Pseudochirops archeri	Green Ringtail Possum	34	0.995 ± 0.001	0.995 ± 0.002	0.995 ± 0.001
Pseudomys albocinereus	Ash-Grey Mouse	36	0.935 ± 0.027	0.980 ± 0.005	0.981 ± 0.005
Pseudomys apodemoides	Silky Mouse	97	0.989 ± 0.004	0.983 ± 0.008	0.986 ± 0.006
Pseudomys australis	Plains Rat	67	0.965 ± 0.011	0.962 ± 0.014	0.970 ± 0.010
Pseudomys bolami	Bolam's Mouse	200	0.974 ± 0.006	0.969 ± 0.006	0.975 ± 0.005
Pseudomys calabyi	Kakadu Pebble-Mound Mouse	36	0.996 ± 0.001	0.995 ± 0.001	0.996 ± 0.001
Pseudomys chapmani	Western Pebble-Mound Mouse	333	0.987 ± 0.001	0.988 ± 0.001	0.988 ± 0.001
Pseudomys delicatulus	Little Native Mouse	345	0.951 ± 0.009	0.955 ± 0.008	0.956 ± 0.008
Pseudomys desertor	Desert Mouse	478	0.963 ± 0.004	0.964 ± 0.004	0.964 ± 0.004
Pseudomys fumeus	Smoky Mouse	52	0.939 ± 0.017	0.910 ± 0.026	0.927 ± 0.022
Pseudomys gracilicaudatus	Eastern Chestnut Mouse	116	0.808 ± 0.034	0.844 ± 0.031	0.848 ± 0.029
Pseudomys hermannsburgensis	Sandy Inland Mouse	1542	0.954 ± 0.002	0.955 ± 0.002	0.955 ± 0.002
Pseudomys johnsoni	Central Pebble-Mound Mouse	42	0.995 ± 0.002	0.992 ± 0.002	0.994 ± 0.001
Pseudomys nanus	Western Chestnut Mouse	311	0.988 ± 0.002	0.987 ± 0.001	0.988 ± 0.001
Pseudomys novaehollandiae	New Holland Mouse	207	0.815 ± 0.035	0.866 ± 0.030	0.868 ± 0.031
Pseudomys occidentalis	Western Mouse	47	0.984 ± 0.007	0.992 ± 0.004	0.993 ± 0.003
Pseudomys oralis	Hastings River Mouse	185	0.940 ± 0.019	0.940 ± 0.019	0.951 ± 0.016
Pseudomys patrius	Eastern Pebble Mound Mouse	70	0.940 ± 0.029	0.960 ± 0.017	0.965 ± 0.015
Pseudomys pilligaensis	Pilliga Mouse	55	0.992 ± 0.002	0.992 ± 0.002	0.993 ± 0.002

Scientific Name	Common Name	n samples	$AVG_{AUC±SD}$	$EXT_{AUC±SD}$	$COMP_{AUC±SD}$
Pseudomys shortridgei	Heath Mouse	91	0.952 ± 0.020	0.975 ± 0.012	0.975 ± 0.012
Pteropus alecto	Black Flying-Fox	470	0.932 ± 0.011	0.936 ± 0.010	0.938 ± 0.010
Pteropus conspicillatus	Pteropus Conspicillatus	45	0.990 ± 0.004	0.979 ± 0.015	0.977 ± 0.017
Pteropus poliocephalus	Grey-Headed Flying-Fox	2453	0.876 ± 0.007	0.874 ± 0.007	0.875 ± 0.007
Pteropus scapulatus	Pteropus Scapulatus	639	0.824 ± 0.020	0.841 ± 0.018	0.841 ± 0.018
Rattus colletti	Dusky Rat	107	0.995 ± 0.000	0.996 ± 0.000	0.996 ± 0.000
Rattus fuscipes	Bush Rat	5282	0.791 ± 0.007	0.779 ± 0.007	0.785 ± 0.007
Rattus leucopus	Cape York Rat	35	0.995 ± 0.002	0.995 ± 0.002	0.995 ± 0.002
Rattus lutreolus	Australian Swamp Rat	1505	0.808 ± 0.013	0.807 ± 0.013	0.809 ± 0.013
Rattus sordidus	Dusky Field Rat	60	0.964 ± 0.018	0.972 ± 0.013	0.971 ± 0.014
Rattus tunneyi	Pale Field Rat	474	0.926 ± 0.016	0.918 ± 0.016	0.925 ± 0.015
Rattus villosissimus	Long-Haired Rat	310	0.972 ± 0.009	0.97 ± 0.008	0.970 ± 0.007
Rhinolophus megaphyllus	Eastern Horseshoe Bat	1529	0.802 ± 0.014	0.800 ± 0.013	0.803 ± 0.013
Rhinonicteris aurantia	Orange Leaf-Nosed Bat	112	0.980 ± 0.004	0.982 ± 0.004	0.983 ± 0.004
Saccolaimus flaviventris	Yellow-Bellied Sheath-Tailed Bat	842	0.820 ± 0.02	0.819 ± 0.019	0.822 ± 0.019
Sarcophilus harrisii	Tasmanian Devil	2728	0.974 ± 0.001	0.972 ± 0.001	0.974 ± 0.001
Scoteanax rueppellii	Greater Broad-Nosed Bat	839	0.796 ± 0.018	0.811 ± 0.017	0.811 ± 0.017
Scotorepens balstoni	Inland Broad-Nosed Bat	872	0.894 ± 0.011	0.894 ± 0.012	0.899 ± 0.010
Scotorepens greyii	Little Broad-Nosed Bat	1014	0.886 ± 0.011	0.884 ± 0.011	0.889 ± 0.011
Scotorepens orion	Eastern Broad-Nosed Bat	1098	0.779 ± 0.015	0.792 ± 0.014	0.790 ± 0.014
Setonix brachyurus	Quokka	207	0.953 ± 0.018	0.980 ± 0.008	0.989 ± 0.004
Sminthopsis crassicaudata	Fat-Tailed Dunnart	1052	0.933 ± 0.006	0.924 ± 0.007	0.935 ± 0.006
Sminthopsis dolichura	Little Long-Tailed Dunnart	322	0.953 ± 0.007	0.975 ± 0.005	0.975 ± 0.005
Sminthopsis gilberti	Gilbert's Dunnart	64	0.926 ± 0.030	0.979 ± 0.009	0.985 ± 0.006
Sminthopsis granulipes	White-Tailed Dunnart	32	0.970 ± 0.009	0.987 ± 0.006	0.984 ± 0.007
Sminthopsis griseoventer	Grey-Bellied Dunnart	70	0.939 ± 0.025	0.976 ± 0.008	0.979 ± 0.007
Sminthopsis hirtipes	Hairy-Footed Dunnart	63	0.954 ± 0.014	0.962 ± 0.013	0.963 ± 0.013
Sminthopsis leucopus	White-Footed Dunnart	77	0.899 ± 0.031	0.883 ± 0.039	0.900 ± 0.036
Sminthopsis longicaudata	Long-Tailed Dunnart	45	0.968 ± 0.008	0.962 ± 0.013	0.963 ± 0.013
Sminthopsis macroura	Stripe-Faced Dunnart	1374	0.942 ± 0.004	0.936 ± 0.004	0.937 ± 0.004
Sminthopsis murina	Slender-Tailed Dunnart	837	0.750 ± 0.024	0.754 ± 0.024	0.776 ± 0.023
Sminthopsis ooldea	Ooldea Dunnart	209	0.971 ± 0.006	0.977 ± 0.004	0.98 ± 0.003
Sminthopsis psammophila	Sandhill Dunnart	50	0.985 ± 0.005	0.991 ± 0.004	0.992 ± 0.003
Sminthopsis virginiae	Red-Cheeked Dunnart	118	0.993 ± 0.001	0.992 ± 0.002	0.994 ± 0.001
Sminthopsis youngsoni	Lesser Hairy-Footed Dunnart	172	0.976 ± 0.005	0.975 ± 0.005	0.976 ± 0.005
Syconycteris australis	Syconycteris Australis	109	0.957 ± 0.016	0.957 ± 0.014	0.962 ± 0.014
Tachyglossus aculeatus	Short-Beaked Echidna	5126	0.624 ± 0.011	0.616 ± 0.011	0.621 ± 0.011
Tadarida australis	White-Stripped Freetailed Bat	4498	0.701 ± 0.010	0.632 ± 0.011	0.635 ± 0.012
Taphozous georgianus	Common Sheath-Tailed Bat	229	0.977 ± 0.004	0.980 ± 0.003	0.981 ± 0.003
Taphozous hilli	Hill's Sheath-Tailed Bat	33	0.948 ± 0.016	0.949 ± 0.017	0.954 ± 0.021
Taphozous troughtoni	Troughton's Sheath-Tailed Bat	75	0.946 ± 0.019	0.972 ± 0.007	0.970 ± 0.008
Tarsipes rostratus	Honey Possum	104	0.952 ± 0.017	0.984 ± 0.006	0.985 ± 0.005
Thylogale billardierii	Tasmanian Pademelon	575	0.972 ± 0.002	0.969 ± 0.003	0.976 ± 0.002
Thylogale stigmatica	Red-Legged Pademelon	225	0.916 ± 0.019	0.913 ± 0.020	0.929 ± 0.017
Thylogale thetis	Red-Necked Pademelon	575	0.906 ± 0.013	0.903 ± 0.012	0.915 ± 0.011
Trichosurus caninus	Short-Eared Possum	1057	0.839 ± 0.012	0.840 ± 0.012	0.850 ± 0.012
Trichosurus cunninghami	Mountain Brushtail Possum	579	0.951 ± 0.009	0.959 ± 0.007	0.961 ± 0.007
Trichosurus vulpecula	Common Brushtail Possum	9104	0.652 ± 0.007	0.636 ± 0.007	0.664 ± 0.007

Scientific Name	Common Name	n samples	$AVG_{AUC \pm SD}$	$EXT_{AUC \pm SD}$	$COMP_{AUC \pm SD}$
Uromys caudimaculatus	Giant White-Tailed Rat	112	0.994 ± 0.002	0.994 ± 0.001	0.995 ± 0.001
Vespadelus baverstocki	Inland Forest Bat	235	0.936 ± 0.013	0.941 ± 0.010	0.946 ± 0.010
Vespadelus caurinus	Northern Cave Bat	34	0.987 ± 0.003	0.987 ± 0.002	0.987 ± 0.002
Vespadelus darlingtoni	Large Forest Bat	2571	0.791 ± 0.011	0.764 ± 0.011	0.766 ± 0.011
Vespadelus finlaysoni	Inland Cave Bat	276	0.964 ± 0.008	0.970 ± 0.006	0.972 ± 0.006
Vespadelus pumilus	Eastern Forest Bat	1595	0.881 ± 0.009	0.873 ± 0.009	0.884 ± 0.008
Vespadelus regulus	Southern Forest Bat	2220	0.760 ± 0.013	0.737 ± 0.014	0.738 ± 0.014
Vespadelus troughtoni	Eastern Cave Bat	303	0.821 ± 0.029	0.872 ± 0.020	0.871 ± 0.020
Vespadelus vulturnus	Little Forest Bat	5180	0.730 ± 0.008	0.717 ± 0.008	0.733 ± 0.008
Vombatus ursinus	Common Wombat	5540	0.804 ± 0.007	0.782 ± 0.006	0.804 ± 0.006
Wallabia bicolor	Swamp Wallaby	8490	0.711 ± 0.007	0.688 ± 0.007	0.694 ± 0.007
Xeromys myoides	False Water Rat	62	0.992 ± 0.002	0.994 ± 0.002	0.997 ± 0.001
Zyzomys argurus	Common Rock Rat	514	0.969 ± 0.004	0.971 ± 0.004	0.972 ± 0.004

Appendix 2. List of predictors and table of Pearson's correlations (correlations > 0.7 are shaded in grey).

Variable name	Description
Long-term average climatic predictors (AVG)	
Bio1	Annual Mean Temperature
Bio2	Mean Diurnal Range
Bio3	Isothermality: mean diurnal range /annual temperature range
Bio4	Temperature Seasonality (standard deviation)
Bio5	Max Temperature of Warmest Period
Bio6	Min Temperature of Coldest Period
Bio7	Temperature Annual Range
Bio8	Mean Temperature of Wettest Quarter
Bio9	Mean Temperature of Driest Quarter
Bio10	Mean Temperature of Warmest Quarter
Bio11	Mean Temperature of Coldest Quarter
Bio12	Annual Precipitation
Bio13	Precipitation of Wettest Period
Bio14	Precipitation of Wettest Period
Bio15	Precipitation Seasonality (coefficient of variation)
Bio16	Precipitation of Wettest Quarter
Bio 17	Precipitation of Driest Quarter
Bio18	Precipitation of Warmest Quarter
Bio19	Precipitation of Coldest Quarter
Extreme climatic and weather conditions (EXT)	
T5	5th percentile of minimum temperature (across all years)
T95	95th percentile of maximum temperature (across all years)
av.vpr.hot	Average vapour pressure on days when maximum temperature exceeds T90
av.m0v.dry	Average maximum run of dry days
av.rr.int	Rainfall intensity (mean rainfall on days where rainfall >1mm)
av.sum.temp	Average sum of temperatures during maximum run of dry days
av.m0v.hot	Average maximum run of hot (maximum temp >T90) days that it doesn't rain
Vegetation structure	
veg.hgt	Forest canopy height (Simard et al. 2011)

References Appendix 2

Simard M, Pinto N, Fisher JB, Baccini A (2011) Mapping forest canopy height globally with spaceborne lidar. *Journal of Geophysical Research*, **116**, G04.

Pearson's correlations under current and 2070 climatic scenarios (retained variables only). Correlations were estimated on background points.

***Current* scenario**

	Long-term average climatic predictors				Extreme climate and weather predictors				
	bio1	bio3	bio4	bio12	T5	av.vpr.hot	av.sum.temp	av.m0v.hot	veg.hgt
bio1	1	0.38	0.10	-0.20	0.80	0.48	0.80	0.44	-0.48
bio3		1	-0.56	0.17	0.50	0.53	0.21	-0.19	-0.07
bio4			1	-0.66	-0.43	-0.53	0.33	0.58	-0.26
bio12				1	0.13	0.54	-0.45	-0.45	0.51
T5					1	0.58	0.54	0.13	-0.33
av.vpr.hot						1	0.01	-0.27	0.09
av.sum.temp							1	0.69	-0.53
av.m0v.hot								1	-0.48
veg.hgt									1

***2070* hot and dry scenario**

	Long-term average climatic predictors				Extreme climate and weather predictors				
	bio1	bio3	bio4	bio12	T5	av.vpr.hot	av.sum.temp	av.m0v.hot	veg.hgt
bio1	1	0.26	0.18	-0.15	0.80	0.58	0.80	0.78	-0.46
bio3		1	-0.61	0.09	0.49	0.38	0.23	0.30	-0.10
bio4			1	-0.56	-0.39	-0.36	0.30	0.12	-0.26
bio12				1	0.12	0.51	-0.41	-0.10	0.51
T5					1	0.64	0.57	0.63	-0.31
av.vpr.hot						1	0.14	0.45	0.05
av.sum.temp							1	0.79	-0.52
av.m0v.hot								1	-0.41
veg.hgt									1

Appendix 3. Spatial distribution of meteorological stations across Australia.

Meteorological stations with daily and monthly rainfall observations across Australia (green squares in the map). The dashed polygon indicate the area that was masked out of the analyses due to sparse daily weather data. Source: Bureau of Meteorology, Australian Government (http://www.bom.gov.au/climate/averages/).

Appendix 4. Comparison between spatial outputs of different predictor sets

COMP vs. AVG



Figure A4.1 Difference between spatial predictions of models fit using short-term extreme weather conditions plus annual rainfall (COMP) and models fit using long-term averaged climatic conditions only (AVG). See caption of Figure 2 in the main text for a full explanation of plots' meaning.

COMP vs. EXT



Figure A4.2 Difference between spatial predictions of models fit using short-term extreme weather conditions plus annual rainfall (COMP) and models fit using long-term averaged climatic conditions only (EXT). See caption of Figure 2 in the main text for a full explanation of plots' meaning.

Appendix 5 Comparison of results under the CanESM2 -Canadian Earth System Model – and the ACCESS 1.3 emissions scenarios



Fig. A5.1. Pearson's correlations between the habitat suitability maps of models fit using the three predictor-sets (AVG, EXT and COMP), under current climatic/weather conditions (*current* scenario– x-axis) and under **a) ACCESS 1.3**. future scenario for 2070 (same figure as Figure 3a in main text) and **b) CanESM2 -**Canadian Earth System Model- future scenario for 2070; points aligned to the dashed black line indicate species for which the correlation between its habitat suitability maps was constant over *current* and *2070* climatic scenarios.



Fig. A5.2. Differences in the predicted habitat suitability range between the three predictor-sets (AVG, EXT and COMP) in the current climate scenarios (*current* scenario– x-axis) and in **a) ACCESS 1.3**. future scenario for 2070 (*y*- axis) (same figure than Figure 5in main text) and **b) CanESM2** -Canadian Earth System Model- future scenario for 2070 (y- axis). Habitat suitability range was calculated as the sum of grid values of the logistic Maxent output across Australia. When comparing EXT vs AVG, positive values in any of the axis indicate that the total range predicted by EXT models is larger than the range predicted by the AVG models, and negative values indicate the opposite. Similarly for the COMP vs AVG and the COMP vs EXT comparisons. The intersection between the two dashed black lines represents a species for which there was no difference in predicted suitable range between models under either *current* or *2070* (future) scenarios.

Appendix 6. Change in correlations and range predictions between model outputs overtime.

Figure A6 compares results of model predictions when these were assessed at three different spatial extents: (1) Australia wide (panels a, b); (2) the biogeographic regions where each species occurred – based on training presence data- (Biogeographic regions; panels c, d) and (3) the biogeographic regions where each species occurred and their directly neighbouring biogeographic regions (Biogeographic regions extended, panels e, f). We used the Interim Biogeographic Regionalisation of Australia spatial layer (IBRA v 7), to identify the biogeographic regions where there were occurrence records of each species as their extent and geographic distribution (http://www.environment.gov.au/land/nrs/science/ibra).

Panels a, c, e show Pearson's correlations between the habitat suitability maps of models fit using the three predictor-sets (AVG, EXT and COMP), under current climatic/weather conditions (current scenario– x-axis) and under a hot and dry climate future scenario for 2070 (2070 scenario – y-axis); points aligned to the dashed black line indicate species for which the correlation between its habitat suitability maps was constant over current and 2070 climatic scenarios.

Panels b, d, f show the differences in the predicted habitat suitability range between the three predictor-sets (AVG, EXT and COMP) for current climate scenarios (*current* scenario– x-axis) for a hot and dry climate 2070 future scenario (*2070* scenario– y- axis). Habitat suitability range was calculated as the sum of grid values of the logistic Maxent output across Australia. When comparing EXT vs AVG, positive values in any of the axis indicate that the total range predicted by EXT models is larger than the range predicted by the AVG models, and negative values indicate the opposite. Similarly for COMP vs AVG and COMP vs EXT comparisons. The intersection between the two dashed black lines represents a species for which there was no difference in predicted suitable range between models under either *current* or *2070* (future) scenarios.


Australia wide
a)
EXT vs AVG
COMP vs AVG
COMP vs EXT
Correlations. 2070 / FUTURE scenario
Correlations. CURRENT scenario
b)
2070/ FUTURE scenario
Difference in range. CUI
1e+05
-1e+06
-3e+06
-5e+05
0
5e+05
Biogeographic regions
c)
d)
Biogeographic regions extended
e)
f)
0
0.2
0.4
0.6
0.8
1
-0.2

Figure A6

Appendix 7. Habitat suitability and limiting factors' maps.

Habitat suitability maps for the 13 species which showed the largest change in Pearson's correlations between current and future scenarios when comparing AVG and EXT models. Habitat suitability maps are detailed for each climate predictor set (rows: AVG, EXT and COMP). Predictive performance values (cross-validated AUC value, mean±sd) are indicated for the current predictions of each model. The figure shows the contrast between the predictions of each data set under current and future (2070) climatic scenarios (maps on first and second columns, respectively). The limiting factors maps (third column) show the variable that it is limiting the most an increase in habitat suitability at each grill cell and across the study area under the 2070 scenario and for each climate predictor-set individually (AVG, EXT and COMP). Refer to Table 1 for meaning of the variables' abbreviations.

Greater bilby (*Macrotis lagotis*)



Northern nail-tail wallaby (*Onychogalea unguifera*)



Kultarr (*Antechinomis laniger*)



Lumholtz's tree-kangaroo (*Dendrolagus lumholtzi*)



Numbat (*Myrmecobius fasciatus*)



Herbert's rock-wallaby (*Petrogale herberti*)



Black-Flanked Rock-Wallaby (*Petrogale lateralis*)



Red-Tailed Phascogale (*Phascogale calura*)



Central Pebble-Mound Mouse (*Pseudomys johnsoni*)



Orange Leaf-Nose Bat (*Rhinonicteris aurantia*)



Gilbert's Dunnart (*Sminthopsis gilberti*)



Hairy-Footed Dunnart (*Sminthopsis hirtipes*)



Appendix 8. Multivariate Environmental Similarity Surfaces (MESS maps).

The multivariate environmental similarity surfaces indicate where extrapolation beyond the environmental values of the training data occurs. Warmer colours indicate extrapolation is occurring (darker reds being the most extreme) and therefore, predictions in these areas should be interpreted with extreme care. White and blue colours indicate areas where values of environmental conditions (climatic conditions in this case) are within the range of values of the training data set.

	Current climate	**Future hot and dry climate (2070 ACCESS 1.3 scenario)**

AVG




EXT




COMP




Appendix 9. Variation in predictions as a function of species traits



Figure A9.1. Differences in predicted area between AVG and EXT model sets depending on the primary climate zone where species occur. Two climatic classifications schemes are considered: **a)** vegetation (Köppen) and **b)** temperature/humidity, both sourced from the Australian Bureau of Meteorology. The Köppen classification divides Australia in six major climatic zones: Ecuatorial, Tropical, SubTropical, Desert, Grassland and Temperate areas. The second climatic classification identifies six climatic zones based on different temperature and humidity combinations: hot-humid summer, warm-humid summer, hot-dry summer and mild winter, hot-dry summer and cold winter, warm summer and cold winter, and mild/warm summer and cold winter. We assumed a species occurs within a given climate zone only if 20% or more of its presence records fall within one of the climate zones identified by each classification scheme (i.e. each species can be counted in more than one climate zone). The number of species that fulfil this condition within each of the climate zones is indicated at the bottom of the plot. Differences are shown for current predictions (CUR, light grey boxes) and the future 2070 RCP 8.5 ACCESS 1.3 emissions scenario (FUT, dark grey boxes).

Figure A9.2. Pearson's correlations between the environmental suitability maps of models fit on the three predictor-sets (Y-axis) across species traits values (X-axis), under current climatic/weather conditions (solid circles) and under a hot and dry climate future scenario for 2070 (2070 scenario – 'crosses'). Each pair of predictor sets is represented with a different colour (EXT vs AVG – black- , COMP vs AVG – blue- and COMP vs EXT - orange). Body mass and activity cycle data were sourced from the mammals database PanTHERIA (Jones et al. 2009). We used the Interim Biogeographic Regionalisation of Australia spatial layer (IBRA v 7), to identify the biogeographic sub-regions where there were occurrence records of each species (http://www.environment.gov.au/land/nrs/science/ibra). We used the number of bio-geographic sub-regions in which a species occur as a proxy of geographic breath of the species. The number of species with available data for each trait is indicated in italics at the right bottom corner of each plot.



Figure A9.3. Range of changes in Pearson's correlations of environmental suitability maps between 2070 and current climates (Y-axis) across species traits values (X-axis). Each pair of predictor sets is represented with a different colour (EXT vs AVG – black- , COMP vs AVG – blue- and COMP vs EXT - orange). Body mass and activity cycle data were sourced from the mammals database PanTHERIA (Jones et al. 2009). We used the Interim Biogeographic Regionalisation of Australia spatial layer (IBRA v 7), to identify the biogeographic sub-regions where there were occurrence records of each species (http://www.environment.gov.au/land/nrs/science/ibra). We used the number of bio-geographic sub-regions in which a species occur as a proxy of geographic breath of the species. The number of species with available data for each trait is indicated in italics at the right top corner of each plot.

References Appendix 9

Jones, K. E. et al. (2009). PanTHERIA: a species-level database of life history, ecology, and geography of extant and recently extinct mammals. *Ecology*, 90: 2648-2648.


Change in correlations between FUTUR
Body mass
n=171
0.2
0
-0.2
-0.4
-0.6
-0.8
1
2
4
6
8
10
log(body mass)
Activity cycle
n=94
0.2
0
-0.2
-0.4
-0.6
-0.8
1
Noct-only
Crepuscular
Diurna
Geographic breadth
n=188
0.2
0
-0.2
-0.4
-0.6
-0.8
-1
0
50
100
150
200
Number of biogeographic su
EXT vs AVG
COMP vs AVG
COMP vs EXT