

AperTO - Archivio Istituzionale Open Access dell'Università di Torino

Variations in Niche Breadth and Position of Alpine Birds along Elevation Gradients in the European Alps

This is a pre print version of the following article:

Original Citation:

Availability:

This version is available <http://hdl.handle.net/2318/1822743> since 2021-12-05T12:32:04Z

Published version:

DOI:10.13157/arla.69.1.2022.ra3

Terms of use:

Open Access

Anyone can freely access the full text of works made available as "Open Access". Works made available under a Creative Commons license can be used according to the terms and conditions of said license. Use of all other works requires consent of the right holder (author or publisher) if not exempted from copyright protection by the applicable law.

(Article begins on next page)



UNIVERSITÀ DEGLI STUDI DI TORINO

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13

This is an author version of the contribution published on:

Questa è la versione dell'autore dell'opera:

[Ardeola, 2021, 10.13157/arla.69.1.2022.ra3]

The definitive version is available at:

La versione definitiva è disponibile alla URL:

<https://bioone.org/journals/ardeola/volume-69/issue-1/arla.69.1.2022.ra3/Variations-in-Niche-Breadth-and-Position-of-Alpine-Birds-along/10.13157/arla.69.1.2022.ra3.short>

14 **Variations in niche breadth and niche position of alpine birds along elevation gradients in the**
15 **European Alps**

16

17 Camille Mermillon^{1,2}, Susanne Jähnig¹, Martha Maria Sander¹, Riccardo Alba¹, Domenico Rosselli³,

18 Dan Chamberlain¹

19 ¹Department of Life Sciences and Systems Biology, University of Turin, Via Accademia Albertina 13,

20 10123 Turin, Italy

21 ²Centre d'Etudes Biologiques de Chizé, CNRS UMR 7372, La Rochelle Université, 79360 Villiers-en-

22 Bois, France

23 ³Ente di Gestione delle Aree Protette delle Alpi Cozie, Via Fransuà Fontan 1, 10050 Salbertrand, Italy

24

25 Contact author

26 Dan Chamberlain : dan.chamberlain99@googlemail.com

27

28 ORCID ID

29 Camille Mermillon 0000-0002-9155-9525

30 Martha Maria Sander 0000-0002-9036-0450

31 Dan Chamberlain 0000-0002-5381-2024

32

33 4530 words

34 Research paper

35

36 ABSTRACT

37 Mountains support high levels of biodiversity, but they are also particularly vulnerable to climate
38 change. Whilst studies on mountain biodiversity at the species level are common, studies that consider
39 whole assemblages are scarce. We assessed how an alpine bird assemblage varied in terms of
40 ecological habitat niche by surveying bird communities and habitat at point counts placed along
41 elevation gradients in the Western Italian Alps. Niche breadth as measured by habitat use increased
42 along the gradient, suggesting that being more generalist is an advantage in terms of survival at higher
43 elevation. Niche position also increased with elevation, which means that species occurring at higher
44 elevations use habitats that are atypical with respect to the average species in the community. Both
45 niche breadth and position were negatively associated with habitat diversity, but these relationships
46 were mainly driven by the species occurring at the very highest elevations (>2500 m), suggesting that
47 true alpine specialist show a different pattern from the other species of the assemblage. Our results
48 therefore generally supported the idea that having a wider niche breadth is useful in harsh
49 environments, such as mountains, enabling the exploitation of a wider range of resources. The broader
50 niche of many high elevation species may therefore indicate some degree of resilience to
51 environmental change, as long as key habitat types are maintained.

52

53 Keywords

54 Alpine specialists, Birds, Elevation gradient, Niche breadth, Niche position.

55

56 INTRODUCTION

57 Climate change and land use changes are regarded as the major threats to biodiversity in the world
58 (Travis, 2003; Stephens et al., 2016). The interaction between these two threats can intensify the
59 impacts on biodiversity. Species are thus constrained to adjust their spatial distribution according to
60 their ecological niches in order to have the resources they need to survive (Bani et al., 2019). It
61 therefore follows that species with a broader niche ('generalists') will be better placed to adapt to

62 environmental changes (McKinney & Lockwood, 1999). Indeed, there are many examples of generalists
63 increasing their range in response to environmental changes, often accompanied by decreases in
64 narrow-niche specialists (e.g. Warren et al., 2001; Clavel et al., 2011). Studying niche breadth and niche
65 position is thus likely to give an insight into those species that may be more vulnerable to
66 environmental change in the future.

67 Birds are definitely a well-studied group regarding the impacts of environmental changes.
68 Nevertheless, compared to other habitats, bird distribution and population dynamics are less well
69 known in mountains (Chamberlain et al., 2012), mainly because of logistical constraints of working in
70 this type of environment (Chamberlain et al., 2012). Mountains are subject to several pressures such
71 as climate change (Gobiet et al., 2014), land-use change (Laiolo et al., 2004) and human disturbance
72 (Caprio et al., 2011; Brambilla et al., 2016). Mountain species are considered particularly vulnerable to
73 climate change, since opportunities to shift their distributions towards the mountain tops in response
74 to environmental changes are constrained by mountain orography (i.e. they effectively run out of
75 space on the 'escalator to extinction'; (Freeman et al., 2018), and dispersal to alternative suitable sites
76 may be limited by low connectivity with other mountain ranges (Lehikoinen et al., 2018).

77 Many species have already shown shifts in their distributions in response to environmental
78 changes, notably towards high latitudes and elevations (Maggini et al., 2011; Reif & Flousek, 2012; Bani
79 et al., 2019). These effects could have considerable consequences for mountain biodiversity
80 (Chamberlain et al., 2013, 2016), and it has been shown that birds of high elevation are already
81 declining in Europe (Lehikoinen et al., 2018). Given that habitat preference is one of the key ecological
82 traits of any bird species (Reif et al., 2010), analysing how niche breadth and niche position can affect
83 the distribution of species along environmental gradients is useful to understand and predict their
84 future responses to environmental change. It may help to identify which species (i.e. with narrower
85 niches, or that use less typical resources) may be negatively impacted by, and which species will be
86 resilient to, future environmental change, if our environmental gradient is considered as a space-for

87 time substitution (Hodkinson, 2005; Blois et al., 2013). In the absence of long-term monitoring data,
88 this approach can be useful to understand changes in the community.

89 Niche breadth and niche position are two complementary measures of specialisation. Niche
90 position assesses how typical the resource use of a particular species is relative to all other species and
91 the resources available. Thus, species with a high niche position use less typical resources, i.e. these
92 species are specialised compared to the community studied (Mac Nally, 1989). Niche breadth
93 measures the range of environmental conditions or habitat used by a species (Shugart & Patten, 1972).
94 As species that have a wide niche breadth show more tolerance to environmental conditions (Evans et
95 al., 2011), they should be better adapted to higher elevations than species with a narrow niche breadth
96 as conditions become harsher and less predictable (Körner, 2003). Furthermore, if species of high
97 elevation are considered more generalist because of the environmental conditions, they should have
98 a low niche position compared to other species. Furthermore, if niche trends only reflect habitat along
99 the elevation gradient (i.e. habitat availability corresponds to habitat use), we also expect some
100 relationship between habitat diversity and niche breadth.

101 Traditionally, the monitoring of biodiversity, including birds, has focused on the distribution or
102 the abundance of single species. However, studying a whole community through assemblages such as
103 habitat selection can be useful to assess ecosystem health (Siriwardena et al., 2019). We are unaware
104 of any studies that have considered potential drivers of bird species distributions (including habitat
105 and climate) along elevation gradients from a community perspective in the Alps. Here, we take an
106 assemblage approach to consider how habitat niche varies along elevation gradients in the Western
107 European Alps at relatively high elevation (1700-3100 m) using multi-species and multi-variate
108 analyses. We define habitat niche (henceforth 'niche') as the environmental conditions present within
109 a 100m radius (i.e. the point count area) in which a given species was detected, which include measures
110 of habitat, topography and climate. We assume therefore that a given species is using the habitat
111 resources as expressed by our niche measures at any point where it was recorded. This study focuses

112 on assessing the relationship (1) between niche (position and breadth) and elevation; (2) between
113 niche (position and breadth) and habitat diversity.

114

115 **METHODS**

116 *Study sites*

117 A database of the presence of bird species from several sites in the Western Alps was compiled from
118 two different bird surveys, carried out between 2010 and 2012 for the first, and in 2017 for the second.

119 In the majority of cases, points were only surveyed in a single year (92%). Sites were located in the far
120 north of Italy close to the French border (Appendix 1, Fig. S1). At a lower elevation, the European larch
121 *Larix decidua* is the dominant species in the study area. The natural treeline is around 2200-2300 m,
122 although in many areas, this limit is lower owing to pastoral activities. Juniper *Juniperus communis* and
123 rhododendron *Rhododendron ferrugineum* are the main shrub species in the area. Above the treeline,
124 alpine meadows and grasslands are found. Higher in elevation (>2700 m), rocks and scree are dominant
125 (Chamberlain et al., 2016; Jähnig et al., 2018).

126

127 *Point counts*

128 Full methods are given in Chamberlain et al. (2013), so only a summary is provided here. Point counts
129 were carried out from mid-May to mid-July along elevation gradients on transects that were a
130 minimum distance of 300 m apart. On a single transect, each point was separated from another by at
131 least 200 m to make sure two successive points did not overlap. All the points were above 1700 m
132 (minimum = 1717 m) and reached a maximum of 3056 m. The mean range in elevation for each
133 transect was 601 m \pm 339 m (mean \pm SD; n=39). At each point, for 10 minutes, all birds heard or seen
134 were recorded by the observer within a 100 m radius (estimated with the aid of a laser range finder),
135 and signs of potential breeding (e.g. singing, carrying nesting material or food for young, territorial
136 disputes) were noted. Transects were visited one to three times. The maximum count over all visits

137 was used in the analyses for each species for the relatively small proportion of points that had more
138 than one visit.

139 Both studies (i.e. from 2010-2012 and 2017) adopted the same point count method, except that
140 the early survey included a 5-minute settling period before the point count period started, which was
141 absent in the later surveys. However, previous work (Chamberlain & Rolando 2014) and additional
142 analyses (Appendix 2) has demonstrated that inclusion of the settling period makes very little
143 difference to estimations of species occurrence. Observer effects were minimised since all observers
144 were experienced in identifying Alpine birds by sight and song, and the two surveys (i.e. from 2010-
145 2012 and 2017) were not independent and done in a consistent manner (one observer took part in
146 both and led training days for all observers to standardize the recording methods).

147 Two data sets were created, one with all the species observed and another one with only the
148 species showing evidence of potential breeding. In total, 39 transects were studied for 309 point
149 counts. During the first bird survey (2010-2012), 271 points were carried out in 34 transects. In 2017,
150 a total of 194 points were carried out on 35 transects in a restricted area (Natural Park of Val Troncea).
151 In order to avoid hyper-sampling from a single geographical location, only five transects comprising 38
152 points were selected, at random, from this latter data set. On average, there were 8 ± 4 (mean \pm SD)
153 points per transect over the whole sample.

154 In order to carry out the multivariate analyses (CCA), points where no species were observed
155 ($n=17$ and $n=35$ respectively for complete and breeding data) and where habitat descriptions were
156 missing ($n=15$) were removed from both datasets, since this type of analysis cannot include zeros or
157 missing values. For the breeding data, 38 transects and 259 points were used, while for the complete
158 data, 38 transects and 277 points were used.

159

160 *Environmental data*

161 At each point count location, habitat was described within a 100 m radius (all variables are summarised
162 in Appendix 1). The percentage cover of each type of habitat was estimated by eye, including canopy

163 (vegetation above head height), shrubs (ligneous vegetation under head height), grassland (without
164 canopy), rock (unvegetated areas and screes), and snow (surface that was still covered by snow during
165 the survey). Such estimates have proven to match closely with those from remote-sensed land cover
166 datasets (Chamberlain et al., 2013). The presence or absence of water, footpaths and dung was
167 recorded. The number of mature trees (approximately greater than 20 cm in diameter at breast height)
168 was recorded within a 50-m radius (in forested areas, it was not possible to count trees at a greater
169 distance). The elevation of each point (in meters) was recorded with a GPS in the field. Topographic
170 data (slope and aspect) were extracted from a Digital Terrain Model of Northern Italy. Slope was
171 measured in degrees. Both northing and easting were considered and were expressed as an index
172 equal to $-\cos(x)$ where x is the aspect (north or east) in radians. A value of 1 indicates facing directly
173 south (or east) and a value of -1 indicates facing directly north (or west).

174 Climate data were obtained from Chelsa (Climatologies at High resolution for the Earth's Land
175 Surface Areas) Climate (Karger et al., 2017). Data comprised monthly precipitation and temperature
176 climatology for the period 1979-2013 and had a resolution of 30 arc sec. The mean monthly
177 precipitation for the breeding season (May-July) was used. For temperatures, three variables were
178 extracted: the minimum, maximum and mean monthly temperature for the breeding season.

179

180 *Data analysis*

181 All analyses were carried out in R 4.0.0 (R Core Team 2020). Preliminary analyses showed that including
182 rare species (that occurred in less than 1% of the points) often resulted in convergence problems,
183 hence these species were removed from the dataset in subsequent analyses (n=9 for complete data,
184 n=5 for breeding data).

185 Following Reif et al. (2010) and Evans et al. (2011), habitat niche position and niche breadth were
186 calculated using Canonical Correspondence Analysis (CCA) with environmental data (habitat and
187 climate). CCA was performed using the *cca* command in the *vegan* package (Oksanen et al., 2013). CCA
188 is a weighted ordination method, thus rare species have a low weight and do not have a great influence

189 in the rotation ordination. Elevation was not included as we were interested in explaining which
190 environmental variables were the key drivers of assemblage change that may explain elevational
191 trends. Using both habitat and climate variables to define the habitat niche of each species was
192 justified by the fact that usually, models combining habitat and climate performed best to study
193 species distribution along elevational gradients (Acharya et al., 2011; Chamberlain et al., 2016). The
194 CCA allowed the niche breadth and the niche position of each species along the first four axes of the
195 CCA (those explaining the largest proportion of variability in bird community structure) to be defined.
196 Niche position was considered as “the distance of the centroid of a species from that of the whole
197 assemblage (=mean of the coordinates of the species’ centroids)”. Niche breadth was calculated as the
198 standard deviation of each species’ distribution of tolerance across each axis identified by the CCA,
199 providing estimates of niche breadth. The root mean-squared standard deviations across the first four
200 axes provided an overall estimate of niche breadth. To reduce the skew in their distribution and hence
201 approximate normal distributions, niche position and niche breadth were log-transformed prior to
202 analyses.

203 Habitat diversity was estimated at each point count with the percentage cover of each type of
204 habitat, calculating the Shannon diversity index with the function *diversity* from the *vegan* package.
205 Habitat diversity was estimated in elevation bands of 100 m (e.g. 1800-1899m) by calculating the mean
206 Shannon index of all point counts located in each band.

207 Niche breadth and habitat niche position were modelled separately in relation to elevation,
208 considering both linear and quadratic effects. The niche breadth and position of each species
209 (extracted from the CCA – see above) were related to the median elevation (centred and scaled) across
210 all points at which each species was recorded. In the same way, the relationship between niche
211 breadth of each species and the standard deviation of elevation (centred and scaled) was analysed in
212 order to see if species with a greater elevational range also have a wider niche breadth. Then, niche
213 breadth and niche position were analysed in relation to habitat diversity along the elevation gradient.
214 In order to account for the non-independence of species due to a shared ancestry, we used a

215 Phylogenetic Generalised Least Squared (PGLS) approach for the analysis of niche breadth and niche
216 position. Closely related species are expected to have more similar traits because of their shared
217 evolutionary history, and hence to produce more similar residuals from least squares regression. PGLS
218 provides estimates of this covariance and includes it in a statistical model (Symonds & Blomberg,
219 2014). The PGLS approach was carried out in R using the *caper* package (Orme, 2018) and the
220 phylogeny of Jetz et al. (2012).

221 Outliers were defined visually with a qq-plot (Mundry, 2014) and if outliers were detected, models
222 were run again without these points. Both linear and quadratic models were fitted, and their
223 performance was assessed using Akaike's Information Criterion (AIC). The model with the lowest AIC
224 was presented in the Results, unless the difference in AIC (Δ AIC) was less than 2, in which case they
225 were considered as equivalent (Burnham & Anderson, 2010).

226

227 **RESULTS**

228 In total, 47 species were recorded, but only 34 of them showed signs of breeding (Table 1). There were
229 38 species recorded on at least 1% of the points (i.e. at least 3 records), of which 29 species showed
230 evidence of potential breeding. Models were run for both datasets (complete and breeding records),
231 but since the results were similar, only results for the complete dataset are presented here (see
232 Appendix 3 for the main results with the breeding dataset).

233

234 *Species-habitat associations*

235 The first four axes of the CCA accounted for 76.5% of the variation in the data and represented the
236 following gradients: (1) an elevation gradient from closed habitats (forest and shrubland) with light
237 precipitation and relatively warm temperatures to open habitats (grasslands and rocks) with low
238 temperatures and heavy precipitation (explaining 44.9% of the variation in the data); (2) from grassy
239 and south exposed slope to rocky areas (14,9%); (3) from shrubby habitats to all other habitats (10,7%);

240 (4) from steep slopes with heavy precipitation to less steep areas with dung proving the presence of
241 cattle (6.1%; see Appendix 4 for figures and Appendix 5 for the habitat scores on each axis).

242

243 *Niche position and niche breadth along the elevation gradient*

244 Niche position varied non-linearly with elevation (Fig. 1A; Appendix 6, Table S5), while niche breadth
245 showed no association with elevation. However, after removal of one detected outlier (Snowfinch
246 *Montifringilla nivalis*), there was a positive association between niche breadth and elevation (Fig. 1B;
247 Table S5). Niche breadth was positively associated with the standard deviation of elevation in both
248 linear and quadratic models (Fig. 2A) which performed equally ($\Delta AIC_c < 2$; Table S5). Although
249 Snowfinch was again identified as an influential outlier in the linear regression, its removal did not
250 affect the outcome of the model (Table S5). Niche position varied non-linearly with the standard
251 deviation of elevation (Fig. 2B, Table S5).

252

253 *Habitat niche position and niche breadth along the habitat diversity gradient*

254 Habitat niche position was negatively and linearly related to habitat diversity as measured by the
255 Shannon index (Table S5). However, this relationship seemed to be mainly driven by three species
256 (Alpine Accentor *Prunella collaris*, Snowfinch and Alpine Chough *Pyrrhocorax graculus*; Appendix 7, Fig.
257 S3A). When these species were removed, habitat niche position was still negatively linked with habitat
258 diversity, but the relationship was less strong (Table S5). Habitat niche breadth did not show any
259 association with habitat diversity. However, an outlier was detected (Snowfinch), and removing this
260 species resulted in a negative relationship between niche breadth and habitat diversity (Table S5). As
261 previously, this trend was driven by few species (Alpine Accentor and Alpine Chough; Fig. S3B). When
262 they were removed, there was no longer an evidence of a relationship between niche breadth and
263 habitat diversity.

264

265 **DISCUSSION**

266 *Habitat niche position and niche breadth along the elevation gradient*

267 Habitat niche position increased with increasing elevation, suggesting that species occurring at higher
268 elevations are associated with atypical habitats compared to the rest of the community, characterised
269 by high precipitation, low temperatures, rock and grass. This result represents the turnover of species
270 along the elevation gradient from forest species such as Chaffinch *Fringilla coelebs* and Tree Pipit
271 *Anthus trivialis* to open habitat species such as Northern Wheatear *Oenanthe oenanthe* and finally high
272 elevation species including Alpine Chough, Snowfinch and Alpine Accentor. García-Navas et al. (2020)
273 showed that the alpine bird community (>2000 m) constituted a group distinct from lower elevation
274 species (from 500 m to 2000 m) in terms of functional richness. However, they defined the treeline as
275 the division between these two groups, whereas we found a continuum from forest species to open
276 grassland species (from 1700 m to 2500 m), and then a more marked division for high elevation species
277 (>2500 m).

278 Habitat niche breadth increased with increasing elevation, which supported our hypothesis that
279 it is an advantage to be more generalist in a harsh environment, i.e. to be able to exploit a wider range
280 of resources. Blondel & Farré (1988) found that specialisation of birds was more important in the early
281 stages of ecological succession in open and semi-open forest than in mature forest. At first glance, the
282 elevational gradient is similar to this ecological succession, with high elevation open habitat analogous
283 to early stages and forests analogous to later stages at lower elevation. Thus, habitat niche breadth
284 should have decreased with elevation. However, specialisation is only possible when environmental
285 conditions are stable, and with increasing elevation the variability of some (particularly climatic)
286 conditions increases. The elevation niche breadth hypothesis based on ecological succession as
287 analogous to the habitat-elevation gradient is thus not supported. As for insects (Rasman et al., 2014),
288 a wider niche breadth is an advantage for birds at higher elevations. Furthermore, a narrower niche
289 breadth at lower elevation could be explained by interspecific competition. Indeed, more species are
290 living at low elevation and thus compete for the available resources. Due to competition between
291 species, they have to reduce their niche (Fuller, 2012b).

292 For higher elevation species, the results indicate both a wide niche breadth and a use of less
293 typical habitats (i.e. a high niche position). These two results may at first sight seem contradictory, but
294 they arise because high elevation species use a range of habitats, but these habitats are not used by
295 the other species. Thus our high elevation species use a broad range of habitats, but these habitats are
296 atypical compared to the average species in the community.

297 Niche breadth and niche position increased with increasing standard deviation of elevation,
298 indicating as expected that species occupying a wider elevation range use a greater range of habitats
299 that are more typical of the community as a whole. Quintero & Jetz (2018) showed that there is globally
300 a mid-elevation peak in bird richness along elevation gradients which is mainly driven by wide-ranging
301 species. We did not observe this peak since our elevation gradient was not complete and already
302 started at relatively high elevation (c. 1700 m). When a species has a greater elevational range, it is
303 more likely that it will occupy a wider range of habitats since the elevational gradient is characterised
304 by a succession of habitats from forests to rocky and snowy areas.

305

306 *Habitat niche position and niche breadth along the habitat diversity gradient*

307 Habitat niche position was negatively associated with habitat diversity, but this trend was mainly
308 driven by three species of high elevation (Alpine Accentor, Alpine Chough and Snowfinch). At lower
309 elevations, more species are present because of a greater availability of resources while at higher
310 elevations, the number of species is very scarce. These species of high elevation differ a lot from the
311 whole assemblage of species in terms of habitat use and they usually occupy habitats with a low
312 diversity. Habitat niche breadth only showed an association with habitat diversity when species of high
313 elevation were included in the model. If habitat availability had matched perfectly with habitat use,
314 then we would have seen a positive relationship between habitat niche breadth and habitat diversity.
315 Instead the results imply that other factors also drive species distribution along this habitat diversity
316 gradient. Where habitat diversity is greater, more resources are available and it is likely that more
317 species can use them, but interspecific competition likely also increases with habitat diversity resulting

318 in species exploiting a narrower range of resources (i.e. having a narrower niche breadth; (Fuller,
319 2012b). Species of high elevation are less numerous (lower species richness) and thus the competition
320 between them is lower, allowing them to exploit a wider range of resources (although Snowfinch was
321 the exception to this pattern). Finally, there was little evidence for a gradient from low diversity habitat
322 with 'generalist' species (broad niche breadth) to high diversity habitat 'specialist' species (narrow
323 niche breadth); rather, there was an indication of a threshold that separated species of high elevation
324 from the others. These species correspond to alpine specialists as defined by Thompson et al. (2012).
325 Alpine specialists are confined to the alpine zone (i.e. the major part of the population breeds in this
326 zone), while alpine generalists breed in mountains, but they can also breed at lower elevation in
327 different habitats. This result suggests that mountain generalists and mountain specialists may not
328 show the same pattern regarding the link between habitat niche and habitat diversity.

329

330 *Wider implications*

331 The species with smaller habitat niches at lower elevations tended to be forest species. Although this
332 may reflect a greater specialisation, these species are thought to be less threatened by climate change
333 as upslope shifts in treelines are unlikely to result in a net loss of suitable habitats (or indeed suitable
334 climates) in these species (Chamberlain et al., 2013). Species with a wider habitat niche breadth may
335 adapt better to environmental change than species with a narrower habitat niche breadth (e.g. Evans
336 et al., 2011), since they can exploit a larger range of resources. Indeed, there is evidence that generalist
337 bird species are adapting to climate change better than specialist species (Davey et al., 2012; Pearce-
338 Higgins et al., 2015; Bowler et al., 2019). Given that we found that habitat niche breadth increased
339 with elevation, species at higher elevation should be fairly resilient to environmental change. This
340 therefore suggests that high elevation species will have some capacity to adapt to environmental
341 changes, including some currently relatively widespread grassland species likely to be negative
342 affected by future climate change, e.g. Water Pipit *Anthus spinoletta*, Wheatear (Chamberlain et al.,
343 2013), and Ring Ouzel *Turdus torquatus* (Beale et al., 2006). However, the greatest impact of climate

344 change for such species is likely to be the loss of suitable habitat caused by forest encroachment
345 (García-Navas et al. 2020), hence such species may have some resilience, but only within habitat of
346 suitable structure. Furthermore, according to our results, these habitats are atypical and hence only
347 associated with higher elevation that are under threat from upslope shifts in vegetation zones.
348 Strategies to minimise gross changes in habitat (e.g. maintaining open grasslands) may therefore be
349 beneficial to these species, despite increases in temperature. In addition, some species occurring at
350 the highest elevations did not seem to follow the general pattern. For example, among the three
351 species occurring above 2500 m, Snowfinch, a scarce species, had a notably low habitat niche breadth,
352 suggesting that this true high alpine specialist may indeed be particularly threatened (as per Scridel et
353 al., 2018). Nevertheless, the two other species, Alpine Accentor and Alpine Chough, had particularly
354 wide habitat niche breadths suggesting that they could adapt more easily to future environmental
355 changes. Alpine Chough is indeed known to be adaptable and able to exploit anthropogenic habitats
356 even at high elevation (Vallino et al., 2019).

357 Our results could be slightly biased by some factors. First, we were not able to account for
358 detectability of species. Thus, we cannot know whether a species is rare because it has a low
359 probability of detection or because it is indeed very scarce. That is particularly true for Snowfinch which
360 was rarely contacted during the surveys and seemed to be specialised on high elevation habitats.
361 Second, and similarly, some species known to be present in the area were detected only rarely, or not
362 at all. For example, species such as Tengmalm's Owl *Aegolius funereus*, Black Grouse *Lyrurus tetrix* or
363 Rock Ptarmigan *Lagopus muta* have a lower detectability and are probably not suited to the point
364 count method used. It would be interesting to get more data for these species in order to assess their
365 influence on our analyses. Third, median elevation at which species occurred could be more accurately
366 assessed if the abundance of each species had been estimated. Indeed, bird distributions do not show
367 symmetric patterns along elevation gradients (Chamberlain et al., 2016), thus weighting presence of a
368 species by the abundance would give a more precise median elevation for the species.

369 Finally, given that in theory, a species can vary remarkably in its occupancy rate of identical
 370 patches in different landscape contexts (Fuller, 2012a), more studies are needed in other regions of
 371 the Alps in order to corroborate our results and assess the transferability of our models. As
 372 Chamberlain et al. (2016) showed, species distribution is mainly driven by habitat and climate (and
 373 thus elevation), but much variation was still unexplained by their models, suggesting that other factors
 374 affected bird occurrence. Studying which factors (diet for example) can modulate bird occurrence
 375 along the elevation gradient could be the subject of further ecological studies on alpine birds.
 376 Furthermore, since niche space is multidimensional, it would also be useful to study the relationship
 377 between niche and elevation by using a broader niche definition including other factors such as diet or
 378 foraging substrate.

379
 380 We thank the Ente di Gestione delle Aree Protette delle Alpi Cozie for providing accommodation during
 381 field work. We are also grateful to the Savoie Mont-Blanc University that allowed C.M. to stay at the
 382 University of Turin for her Master's thesis.


383

384 REFERENCES

- 385 Acharya, B.K., Sanders, N.J., Vijayan, L. & Chettri, B. (2011). Elevational Gradients in Bird Diversity in
 386 the Eastern Himalaya: An Evaluation of Distribution Patterns and Their Underlying Mechanisms.
 387 *PLoS ONE*, 6: e29097.
- 388 Bani, L., Luppi, M., Rocchia, E., Dondina, O. & Orioli, V. (2019). Winners and losers: How the elevational
 389 range of breeding birds on Alps has varied over the past four decades due to climate and habitat
 390 changes. *Ecology and Evolution*, 9: 1289–1305.
- 391 Beale, C.M., Burfield, I.J., Sim, I.M.W., Rebecca, G.W., Pearce-Higgins, J.W. & Grant, M.C. (2006).
 392 Climate change may account for the decline in British ring ouzels *Turdus torquatus*. *Journal of*
 393 *Animal Ecology*, 75: 826–835.
- 394 Blois, J.L., Williams, J.W., Fitzpatrick, M.C., Jackson, S.T. & Ferrier, S. (2013). Space can substitute for
 395 time in predicting climate-change effects on biodiversity. *Proceedings of the National Academy of*
 396 *Sciences*, 110: 9374–9379.
- 397 Blondel, J. & Farré, H. (1988). The convergent trajectories of bird communities along ecological
 398 successions in European forests. *Oecologia*, 75: 83–93.
- 399 Bowler, D.E., Heldbjerg, H., Fox, A.D., Jong, M. & Böhning-Gaese, K. (2019). Long-term declines of
 400 European insectivorous bird populations and potential causes. *Conservation Biology*, 33: 1120–
 401 1130.
- 402 Brambilla, M., Pedrini, P., Rolando, A. & Chamberlain, D.E. (2016). Climate change will increase the
 403 potential conflict between skiing and high-elevation bird species in the Alps. *Journal of*
 404 *Biogeography*, 43: 2299–2309.

- 405 Burnham, K.P. & Anderson, D.R. (2010). *Model selection and multimodel inference: a practical*
 406 *information-theoretic approach*, 2. ed. Springer, New York, NY.
- 407 Caprio, E., Chamberlain, D.E., Isaia, M. & Rolando, A. (2011). Landscape changes caused by high altitude
 408 ski-pistes affect bird species richness and distribution in the Alps. *Biological Conservation*, 144:
 409 2958–2967.
- 410 Chamberlain, D., Arlettaz, R., Caprio, E., Maggini, R., Pedrini, P., Rolando, A. & Zbinden, N. (2012). The
 411 altitudinal frontier in avian climate impact research: *The altitudinal frontier in climate research. Ibis*,
 412 154: 205–209.
- 413 Chamberlain, D., Brambilla, M., Caprio, E., Pedrini, P. & Rolando, A. (2016). Alpine bird distributions
 414 along elevation gradients: the consistency of climate and habitat effects across geographic regions.
 415 *Oecologia*, 181: 1139–1150.
- 416 Chamberlain, D. & Rolando, A. (2014). The effects of a settling-down period on estimates of bird
 417 species richness and occurrence from point counts in the Alps. *Bird Study*, 61: 121–124.
- 418 Chamberlain, D.E., Negro, M., Caprio, E. & Rolando, A. (2013). Assessing the sensitivity of alpine birds
 419 to potential future changes in habitat and climate to inform management strategies. *Biological*
 420 *Conservation*, 167: 127–135.
- 421 Clavel, J., Julliard, R. & Devictor, V. (2011). Worldwide decline of specialist species: toward a global
 422 functional homogenization? *Frontiers in Ecology and the Environment*, 9: 222–228.
- 423 Davey, C.M., Chamberlain, D.E., Newson, S.E., Noble, D.G. & Johnston, A. (2012). Rise of the generalists:
 424 evidence for climate driven homogenization in avian communities: Avian diversity, homogenization
 425 and warming climate. *Global Ecology and Biogeography*, 21: 568–578.
- 426 Evans, K.L., Chamberlain, D.E., Hatchwell, B.J., Gregory, R.D. & Gaston, K.J. (2011). What makes an
 427 urban bird? *Global Change Biology*, 17: 32–44.
- 428 Freeman, B.G., Scholer, M.N., Ruiz-Gutierrez, V. & Fitzpatrick, J.W. (2018). Climate change causes
 429 upslope shifts and mountaintop extirpations in a tropical bird community. *Proceedings of the*
 430 *National Academy of Sciences*, 115: 11982–11987.
- 431 Fuller, R. (2012a). *Habitat quality and habitat occupancy by birds in variable environments. Birds and*
 432 *habitat: Relationships in changing landscapes* Ecological reviews. (ed. by R. Fuller), pp. 37–62.
 433 Cambridge University Press, New York.
- 434 Fuller, R. (2012b). *The bird and its habitat: an overview of concepts. Birds and habitat: relationships in*
 435 *changing landscapes* Ecological reviews. (ed. by R. Fuller), pp. 3–36. Cambridge University Press,
 436 New York.
- 437 García-Navas, V., Sattler, T., Schmid, H. & Ozgul, A. (2020). Temporal homogenization of functional and
 438 beta diversity in bird communities of the Swiss Alps. *Diversity and Distributions*, 26: 900–911.
- 439 Gobiet, A., Kotlarski, S., Beniston, M., Heinrich, G., Rajczak, J. & Stoffel, M. (2014). 21st century climate
 440 change in the European Alps—A review. *Science of The Total Environment*, 493: 1138–1151.
- 441 Hodkinson, I.D. (2005). Terrestrial insects along elevation gradients: species and community responses
 442 to altitude. *Biological Reviews*, 80: 489.
- 443 Jähnig, S., Alba, R., Vallino, C., Rosselli, D., Pittarello, M., Rolando, A. & Chamberlain, D. (2018). The
 444 contribution of broadscale and finescale habitat structure to the distribution and diversity of birds
 445 in an Alpine forest-shrub ecotone. *Journal of Ornithology*, 159: 747–759.
- 446 Jetz, W., Thomas, G.H., Joy, J.B., Hartmann, K. & Mooers, A.O. (2012). The global diversity of birds in
 447 space and time. *Nature*, 491: 444–448.
- 448 Karger, D.N., Conrad, O., Böhner, J., Kawohl, T., Kreft, H., Soria-Auza, R.W., Zimmermann, N.E., Linder,
 449 H.P. & Kessler, M. (2017). Climatologies at high resolution for the earth's land surface areas.
 450 *Scientific Data*, 4: .
- 451 Körner, C. (2003). *Alpine plant life: functional plant ecology of high mountain ecosystems*, 2nd ed.
 452 Springer, Berlin ; New York.
- 453 Laiolo, P., Dondero, F., Ciliento, E. & Rolando, A. (2004). Consequences of pastoral abandonment for
 454 the structure and diversity of the alpine avifauna. *Journal of Applied Ecology*, 41: 294–304.
- 455 Lehtikoinen, A., Brotons, L., Calladine, J., ..., Trautmann, S. (2018). Declining population trends of
 456 European mountain birds. *Global Change Biology*, 25: 577–588.

- 457 Mac Nally, R.C. (1989). The Relationship between Habitat Breadth, Habitat Position, and Abundance in
458 Forest and Woodland Birds along a Continental Gradient. *Oikos*, 54: 44.
- 459 Maggini, R., Lehmann, A., Kéry, M., Schmid, H., Beniston, M., Jenni, L. & Zbinden, N. (2011). Are Swiss
460 birds tracking climate change? *Ecological Modelling*, 222: 21–32.
- 461 McKinney, M.L. & Lockwood, J.L. (1999). Biotic homogenization: a few winners replacing many losers
462 in the next mass extinction. *Trends in Ecology & Evolution*, 14: 450–453.
- 463 Mundry, R. (2014). *Statistical Issues and Assumptions of Phylogenetic Generalized Least Squares. Modern Phylogenetic Comparative Methods and Their Application in Evolutionary Biology* (ed. by
464 L.Z. Garamszegi), pp. 131–153. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, Berlin, Heidelberg.
- 465 Oksanen, J., Blanchet, F.G., Kindt, R., Legendre, P., Minchin, P., O’Hara, R., Simpson, G., Solymos, P.,
466 Stevens, M. & Wagner, H. (2013). *Vegan: Community Ecology Package*. R Package Version. 2.0-10.
467 *CRAN*: .
- 468 Orme, D. (2018). The Caper Package: Comparative Analysis of Phylogenetics and Evolution in R. R
469 package version 1.0.1. 5: 1–36.
- 470 Pearce-Higgins, J.W., Eglinton, S.M., Martay, B. & Chamberlain, D.E. (2015). Drivers of climate change
471 impacts on bird communities. *Journal of Animal Ecology*, 84: 943–954.
- 472 Quintero, I. & Jetz, W. (2018). Global elevational diversity and diversification of birds. *Nature*, 555:
473 246–250.
- 474 Rasmann, S., Pellissier, L., Defosse, E., Jactel, H. & Kunstler, G. (2014). Climate-driven change in plant-
475 insect interactions along elevation gradients. *Functional Ecology*, 28: 46–54.
- 476 Reif, J. & Flousek, J. (2012). The role of species’ ecological traits in climatically driven altitudinal range
477 shifts of central European birds. *Oikos*, 121: 1053–1060.
- 478 Reif, J., Jiguet, F. & Štátný, K. (2010). Habitat specialization of birds in the Czech Republic: comparison
479 of objective measures with expert opinion. *Bird Study*, 57: 197–212.
- 480 Scridel, D., Brambilla, M., Martin, K., ..., Chamberlain, D. (2018). A review and meta-analysis of the
481 effects of climate change on Holarctic mountain and upland bird populations. *Ibis*, 160: 489–515.
- 482 Shugart, H. & Patten, B. (1972). *Systems analysis and simulation in ecology II*, Academic Press. New
483 York, EUA.
- 484 Siriwardena, G.M., Henderson, I.G., Noble, D.G. & Fuller, R.J. (2019). How can assemblage structure
485 indices improve monitoring of change in bird communities using ongoing survey data? *Ecological*
486 *Indicators*, 104: 669–685.
- 487 Stephens, P.A., Mason, L.R., Green, R.E., ..., Willis, S.G. (2016). Consistent response of bird populations
488 to climate change on two continents. *Science*, 352: 84–87.
- 489 Symonds, M.R.E. & Blomberg, S.P. (2014). *A Primer on Phylogenetic Generalised Least Squares. Modern*
490 *Phylogenetic Comparative Methods and Their Application in Evolutionary Biology* (ed. by L.Z.
491 Garamszegi), pp. 105–130. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, Berlin, Heidelberg.
- 492 Thompson, D.B.A., Kålås, J.A. & Byrkjedal, I. (2012). *Arctic-alpine mountain birds in northern Europe:*
493 *contrasts between specialists and generalists. Birds and habitat: Relationships in changing*
494 *landscapes* Ecological reviews. (ed. by R.J. Fuller), pp. 237–252. Cambridge University Press, New
495 York.
- 496 Travis, J.M.J. (2003). Climate change and habitat destruction: a deadly anthropogenic cocktail.
497 *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London. Series B: Biological Sciences*, 270: 467–473.
- 498 Vallino, C., Caprio, E., Genco, F., Chamberlain, D., Palestini, C., Roggero, A., Bocca, M. & Rolando, A.
499 (2019). Behavioural responses to human disturbance in an alpine bird. *Journal of Ornithology*, 160:
500 763–772.
- 501 Warren, M.S., Hill, J.K., Thomas, J.A., Asher, J., Fox, R., Huntley, B., Roy, D.B., Willis, S.G., Greatorex-
502 Davies, J.N., Jeffcoate, S., Telfer, M.G., Harding, P., Jeffcoate, G., Moss, D. & Thomas, C. (2001).
503 Rapid responses of British butterflies to opposing forces of climate and habitat change. *Nature*, 414:
504 65–69.
- 505
- 506



507 **Fig. 1** Niche position (A) and niche breadth (B) in relation to the median elevation of each
 508 species' range. The dashed lines are fitted from the models given in Table S2. For niche
 509 breadth, the influential outlier is represented by a bold black star with code in bold
 510 (Snowfinch). See Table 1 for species codes.

511

512

513
514
515
516
517
518
519




Fig. 2 Standard deviation of elevation in relation to habitat niche breadth (A) and niche position (B). Influential outlier is represented by a bold black star with code in bold (Snowfinch). The orange line represents the prediction of the linear model (with all the species; Table S2). The green line represents the prediction of the quadratic model (with all the species; Table S2). See Table 1 for species codes.

520 **Table 1** Number of records for each species contacted during the surveys (Count, given as all
 521 records/breeding records). Species with less than 3 records were removed from the data sets for
 522 analyses.

Code	Species	Count	Code	Species	Count
AA	Alpine Accentor	<i>Prunella collaris</i> 21/10	LI	Linnet	<i>Linaria cannabina</i> 10/4
AC	Alpine Chough	<i>Pyrrhacorax graculus</i> 6/0	LW	Lesser Whitethroat	<i>Sylvia curruca</i> 38/32
B	Blackbird	<i>Turdus merula</i> 1/1	M	Mistle Thrush	<i>Turdus viscivorus</i> 45/23
BF	Bullfinch	<i>Pyrrhula pyrrhula</i> 1/0	MN	Snowfinch	<i>Montifringilla nivalis</i> 3/0
BK	Black Grouse	<i>Lyrurus tetrrix</i> 1/0	NC	Nutcracker	<i>Nucifraga caryocatactes</i> 9/0
BT	Blue Tit	<i>Cyanistes caeruleus</i> 1/0	PM	Rock Ptarmigan	<i>Lagopus muta</i> 1/0
BX	Black Redstart	<i>Phoenicurus ochruros</i> 72/54	Q	Common Quail	<i>Coturnix coturnix</i> 1/1
C	Carrion Crow	<i>Corvus corone</i> 4/0	R	Robin	<i>Erithacus rubecula</i> 29/29
CC	Chiffchaff	<i>Phylloscopus collybita</i> 44/43	RO	Rock Thrush	<i>Monticola saxatilis</i> 3/0
CF	Citril Finch	<i>Carduelis citronella</i> 2/1	RP	Rock Partridge	<i>Alectoris graeca</i> 4/0
CG	Red-billed Chough	<i>Pyrrhacorax pyrrhacorax</i> 1/0	RU	Rock Bunting	<i>Emberiza cia</i> 37/17
CH	Chaffinch	<i>Fringilla coelebs</i> 184/172	RZ	Ring Ouzel	<i>Turdus torquatus</i> 32/10
CI	Crested Tit	<i>Lophophanes cristatus</i> 11/4	S	Skylark	<i>Alauda arvensis</i> 63/56
CK	Cuckoo	<i>Cuculus canorus</i> 19/16	SK	Siskin	<i>Spinus spinus</i> 1/1
CR	Red Crossbill	<i>Loxia curvirostra</i> 30/0	ST	Song Thrush	<i>Turdus philomelos</i> 10/9
CT	Coal Tit	<i>Periparus ater</i> 66/58	TC	Treecreeper	<i>Certhia familiaris</i> 29/13
D	Dunnock	<i>Prunella modularis</i> 48/47	TP	Tree Pipit	<i>Anthus trivialis</i> 80/79
FF	Fieldfare	<i>Turdus pilaris</i> 4/2	W	Northern Wheatear	<i>Oenanthe oenanthe</i> 83/59
GC	Goldcrest	<i>Regulus regulus</i> 6/6	WC	Whinchat	<i>Saxicola rubetra</i> 10/7
GO	Goldfinch	<i>Carduelis carduelis</i> 4/3	WI	Water Pipit	<i>Anthus spinoletta</i> 99/81
GS	Great Spotted Woodpecker	<i>Dendrocopos major</i> 20/4	WR	Wren	<i>Troglodytes troglodytes</i> 69/69
GW	Garden Warbler	<i>Sylvia borin</i> 7/7	WT	Willow Tit	<i>Poecile montanus</i> 91/50
IW	Bonelli's Warbler	<i>Phylloscopus bonelli</i> 35/35	Y	Yellowhammer	<i>Emberiza citrinella</i> 13/9
J	Eurasian Jay	<i>Garrulus glandarius</i> 4/0			