1	Original Article
2	
3	Running header: Global patterns and drivers of avian phylogenetic diversity
4	
5	Global patterns in the divergence between phylogenetic diversity and species richness in
6	terrestrial birds
7	
8	Alke Voskamp ^{1*} , David J Baker ^{1,2} , Philip A Stephens ¹ , Paul J Valdes ³ , Stephen G Willis ^{1*}
9	
10	¹ Conservation Ecology Group, Department of Biosciences, Durham University, South Road, Durham
11	DH1 3LE, UK
12	² School of Biosciences, Monash University, VIC, 3800, AU
13	³ Bristol Research Initiative for the Dynamic Global Environment, School of Geographical Sciences,
14	University of Bristol, University Road, Bristol BS8 1SS, UK
15	
16	
17	*Corresponding author, E-mail: <u>alke.voskamp@durham.ac.uk</u>
18	<u>s.g.willis@durham.ac.uk</u>
19	
20	Word count: 8365 (Including main text and references)
21	Amount pages for figures: 2

22 Abstract

Aim: The conservation value of sites is often based on species richness (SR). However, metrics of phylogenetic diversity (PD) reflect a community's evolutionary potential and reveal the potential for additional conservation value above that based purely on SR. Although PD is typically correlated with SR, localized differences in this relationship have been found in different taxa. Here, we explore geographic variation in global avian PD. We identify where PD is higher or lower than expected (from SR) and explore correlates of those differences, to find communities with high irreplaceability, in terms of the uniqueness of evolutionary histories.

30 Location: Global terrestrial

Methods: Using comprehensive avian phylogenies and global distribution data for all extant birds, we calculated SR and Faith's PD, a widely applied measure of community PD, across the terrestrial world. We modelled the relationship between avian PD for terrestrial birds and its potential environmental correlates. Analyses were conducted at a global scale and also for individual biogeographic realms. Potential explanatory variables of PD included SR, long-term climate stability, climatic diversity (using altitudinal range as a proxy), habitat diversity and proximity to neighbouring realms.

Results: We identified areas of high and low relative PD (rPD; PD relative to that expected given SR).
Areas of high rPD were associated with deserts and islands, whilst areas of low rPD were associated
with historical glaciation. Our results suggest that rPD is correlated with different environmental
variables in different parts of the world.

Main conclusion: There is geographic variation in avian rPD, much of which can be explained by putative drivers. However, the importance of these drivers shows pronounced regional variation. Moreover, the variation in avian rPD differs substantially from patterns found for mammals and amphibians. We suggest that PD adds additional insights about the irreplaceability of communities to conventional metrics of biodiversity based on SR, and could be usefully included in assessments of site valuation and prioritisation. 48 Keywords: birds, phylogenetic diversity, conservation, Faith's PD, global species richness,
49 biodiversity measures

50 Introduction

51 Rapid losses of biodiversity have occurred across the globe over recent decades, driven primarily by 52 human modification of the environment and increasing demand for natural resources (Vitousek et 53 al., 1997; Butchart et al., 2010; Cardinale et al., 2012). Estimates of the current rate of species 54 extinctions are 1000 to 10,000 times higher than background levels, and this is consistent with 55 previous mass extinction events (Leaky & Lewin, 1992; Mace et al., 2000; Barnosky et al., 2011). The 56 loss of biodiversity is likely to have profound effects on ecosystem functioning (Loreau et al., 2001), 57 reducing the intrinsic resilience of these systems to environmental change (Peterson et al., 1998; Chapin III et al., 2000), and affecting ecosystem processes and the provision of ecosystem services 58 59 (Tilman et al., 2006; Worm et al., 2006). Consequently, preventing the loss of biodiversity is a global 60 priority (Rands et al., 2010).

61 Conservation efforts in situ usually focus on the preservation of species and, consequently, 62 species richness (SR) is frequently used as the metric of biodiversity for assessing spatial conservation priorities (Gaston, 1996; Gotelli & Colwell, 2001; Fuller et al., 2010). SR, however, is 63 driven largely by common and widespread species, and thus, conservation prioritisations based on 64 65 this metric will often fail to capture the features of biodiversity that require the greatest 66 conservation focus (Brooks et al., 2006). To address this concern, metrics have been developed that 67 quantify various aspects of species' irreplaceability; such metrics include the number of endemic 68 species or the taxonomic uniqueness of species in a community (Brooks et al. 2006). These metrics 69 aim to better account for the conservation value of individual species based on rarity or their unique 70 evolutionary history (May, 1990; Vane-Wright et al., 1991). While irreplaceability metrics have 71 theoretical appeal, it has often proven difficult to quantify these metrics, in large part due to 72 limitations with data, including incomplete species inventories and lack of robust phylogenies. 73 However, for many of the major taxonomic groups (e.g. birds, mammals), distribution and

phylogenetic data have become more widely available, leading to irreplaceability metrics being
estimated and used more readily in conservation prioritisations (Heard & Mooers, 2000; Purvis *et al.*,
2000; Isaac *et al.*, 2007).

77 Phylogenetic diversity (PD) is a measure of the evolutionary relationship between species 78 (Hardy & Senterre, 2007) and provides a metric of biodiversity that accounts for evolutionary 79 distances between co-occurring species (Crozier, 1997). Thus, PD can be used to quantify the 80 taxonomic uniqueness of species in a community and to assess irreplaceability in terms of 81 evolutionary history, functional diversity (Flynn et al., 2011) and evolutionary potential (Faith, 1992; 82 Forest et al., 2007). Such irreplaceability metrics might add value over SR metrics when considered 83 in conservation strategies (Isaac et al., 2007; Isaac et al., 2012). Under the assumption that closely 84 related species have a similar evolutionary potential, but more distantly related species differ more 85 in their potential, a community with high PD has a higher chance of containing a subset of species 86 with greater evolutionary potential (Winter et al., 2012). Therefore, a community with high PD might 87 be considered to have a greater potential to be robust to future environmental changes (Faith, 88 1992).

89 Patterns of SR and PD tend to be highly correlated across broad spatial scales and earlier 90 studies suggest that SR is, in general, an adequate surrogate for PD (Rodrigues et al., 2005). Yet 91 localised differences between SR and PD, as well as related measures such as phylogenetic 92 endemism and functional diversity, have been found across a range of taxa (Davies et al., 2008; 93 Davies & Buckley, 2011; Fritz & Rahbek, 2012). A global study of amphibians found mismatches 94 between SR and PD, with lower PD than expected (given SR) on remote islands and archipelagos, as 95 well as in regions that have been long isolated, such as Madagascar and Australia (Fritz & Rahbek, 96 2012). For mammals, lower than expected PD has been identified for some mountain ranges and 97 remote islands, whereas higher than expected PD was found in Sub-Saharan Africa and parts of the 98 Indian sub-continent (Davies & Buckley, 2011).

99 Observed localized differences between SR and PD could occur for various reasons. Unlike 100 SR patterns, which have been a central topic throughout the history of ecology (Wallace, 1878; 101 Stevens, 1989; Palmer, 1994), exploring patterns of PD has become possible only very recently, due 102 to the availability of comprehensive phylogenies (Cavender-Bares et al., 2009; Roquet et al., 2013). 103 Consequently, the drivers of these PD patterns remain largely unknown. Important historical 104 processes (Losos & Glor, 2003), as well as macro-ecological changes such as mass migrations (e.g. 105 Great American Biotic Interchange; Webb 2006) and extinctions, can leave a signature in PD (Mooers 106 & Heard, 1997). Additionally, environmental factors that could affect PD (Appendix S1a) include 107 areas of long-term climate stability and areas with a steep altitudinal gradient, both of which could lead to areas acting as climate refugia (Keppel et al., 2012). Ecological transition zones, harbouring 108 109 communities with great genetic diversity (Petit et al., 2003) could also have higher PD, due to the 110 occurrence of species adapted to different ecological zones within one community. Habitat diversity, 111 which is known to affect SR (Rahbek & Graves, 2001) and to drive diversification (Emerson & Kolm, 112 2005), could also affect PD. Identifying regions where PD is higher or lower than would be expected 113 given SR (PD relative to the SR within the area, hereafter termed relative PD, or rPD), and exploring 114 environmental correlates of rPD, can help identify communities with high irreplaceability, when 115 assessed in terms of the uniqueness of evolutionary histories.

116 Here, for the first time, we: (1) map geographic variation in avian rPD and identify those 117 areas characterised by particularly high or low values; and (2) explore potential environmental 118 correlates of PD, in addition to SR, that might indicate where the macroecological processes of 119 dispersal and diversification differ from the global average (Fritz & Rahbek, 2012). We develop 120 models of PD on a global scale, as well as for individual biological realms. We hypothesise that high 121 rPD should be favoured by relatively stable climates, but that habitat diversity will principally affect 122 SR. High rPD might also arise from opportunities for community interchange (for example at 123 boundaries between realms), or by relative isolation (promoting the persistence of ancient lineages). 124 Conversely, we expect lower rPD on more recently formed land-masses. We expect the drivers of PD

to differ between individual biological realms, since many broad-scale, macroecological processes
 differ between these geographic areas. We discuss the implications of our findings for conservation
 prioritisation, highlighting differences between biodiversity metrics and between major taxonomic
 groups.

129

130 Materials and Methods

131 Species distribution data

132 We estimated the extant species present in each grid cell across the global terrestrial land mass 133 using global breeding range maps for 9227 bird species (BirdLife International & NatureServe, 2012). 134 Taxonomic differences between the species' range data and the avian phylogeny used (see below), 135 meant that 420 of the 9227 species were excluded, e.g. species might be recognized as one species 136 in the phylogeny but split into two separate species in the BirdLife taxonomy. Owing to our 137 terrestrial focus, a further 346 seabird species were also excluded. Range data were transferred onto 138 an equal area grid in Behrman projection with a cell size of 1° latitude by 1° longitude at 30°N and 139 30°S latitude (Orme et al., 2005; Fritz & Rahbek, 2012; Huang et al., 2012). An equal area grid 140 enables spatially unbiased comparisons among grid cells. A species was considered to occur in a cell 141 only if the species' range polygon and grid cell overlap was \geq 10%, a threshold that prevents species 142 being represented in cells in which their occurrence is very limited. For 1287 species with ranges so 143 restricted that they never occur in at least 10% of any cell, their occurrences were derived from the 144 intersection of their range polygons with cells, without applying a 10% threshold. The gridded 145 species' range data were then used to determine species lists for each grid cell across the globe.

146 Global phylogenetic diversity

To derive PD, we used the first full phylogeny of extant birds (Jetz *et al.*, 2012). These phylogenetic data are provided as 10,000 possible tree topologies in Newick tree format (Olsen, 1990). The phylogenetic data are available based on two taxonomic backbones: those of Hackett *et al.* (2008) and Ericson (Ericson *et al.*, 2006). Here we used the phylogeny based on the Hackett backbone,
which is the more recent higher-level avian topology available (Hackett *et al.*, 2008).

152 Several indices are available to measure PD but the most frequently used is Faith's PD 153 (Cadotte et al., 2010). Faith's PD (hereafter just PD) summarises how much of the branching pattern 154 of a phylogenetic tree is represented in a community, by adding the branch lengths for all members 155 of the community (Faith, 1992). As such, it provides a summary measure of the phylogenetic 156 diversity of a community (Faith, 1992; Barker, 2002). For each terrestrial grid cell globally, we 157 calculated SR and PD. To aid the comparison of PD between cells, the root of the phylogenetic tree 158 was excluded and the tree was pruned, using the 'APE' package in R (Paradis et al., 2004), to the 159 most recent common ancestor of the species within each cell (Faith, 1992). We calculated PD for all 160 terrestrial cells containing at least two species. Grid cells that contain only one species cannot 161 provide a minimum spanning path between two species, resulting in the exclusion of some cells in 162 the Saharan desert and around the poles (Faith, 1992; Barker, 2002). In total, we collected data on 163 avian PD from 17,363 terrestrial grid cells.

164 A pilot study (See Figure S1 in Supporting Information) showed that 200 randomly chosen 165 potential trees of the avian phylogeny (Jetz et al., 2012) were adequate to reduce the coefficient of 166 variation (from the trees available in this phylogeny) of estimated PD, for individual cells, to below 167 0.005 for 90% of the test cells. Consequently, we estimated PD for all cells using a random selection 168 of 200 of the possible phylogenetic trees. Previous studies have used different methods to 169 investigate the relationship between PD and SR, including analysing the residuals of the modelled 170 relationship (Davies & Buckley, 2011; Fritz & Rahbek, 2012), or using a null model based on 171 randomized species assemblages, which are then compared to the empirical data; the latter having 172 been used only for studies on a smaller scale (Kluge & Kessler, 2011). Here, we used two approaches. 173 Firstly, we followed the methods of Fritz and Rahbek (2012) and modelled the relationship between PD and SR using local regression with nonparametric smoothing techniques (Forest et al., 2007), 174 175 utilising functions from the 'CAIC' package in R (Orme et al., 2009). This allows us to compare our

results to previous studies on global patterns of PD that have used a similar approach but for other
taxa (Davies & Buckley, 2011; Fritz & Rahbek, 2012). To highlight areas with unusually high or low
rPD, we selected the cells with the top and bottom 5% of the residuals from the local regression
between PD and SR (Fritz & Rahbek, 2012).

180

181 Secondly, because when using a local regression with nonparametric smoothing techniques, the residuals can be affected by the surrounding cells, i.e. the rPD value for a grid cell is always relative 182 183 to the surrounding values within the window of the local regression, which could mask important 184 general relationships, we used an alternative method (Appendix S1c) to check the robustness of the 185 observed patterns in rPD. We ordered the cells of the world by their SR values and divided them into 186 five equal-sized groups. We fitted a generalized (Michaelis-Menten) saturating curve to the PD and 187 SR data from a random data sample (n = 1000) drawn from each the five groups and then predicted 188 to the four left-out groups each time. The process was repeated 50 times, taking new random 189 samples each time. From these predictions we calculated the mean residual value from the fitted 190 generalized saturating curves for each grid cell. Unlike in the locally-weighted regression, the 191 resultant residual is relative to the whole dataset and not just to grid cells with similar SR values. 192 Although the patterns of the residuals from this alternative approach (See Figure S2 in Supporting 193 Information) are less pronounced than those of the locally-weighted regressions (See Figure S3 in 194 Supporting Information) and the transitions between areas of low and high residual are more 195 gradual, the overall pattern remains very similar. Consequently, and for simplicity, we display only 196 results from the locally weighted regression analysis in the main manuscript.

197 Environmental correlates of rPD

We assessed environmental characteristics that might be associated with geographic variation in rPD. Specifically, we modelled the relationship between PD and SR, including additional covariates to help explain divergence. These additional covariates were: the distance to the nearest neighbouring realm, altitudinal range (considered as a proxy for within-cell climatic diversity), climate stability since the Last Glacial Maximum (LGM, present to 20,000 years ago), climate stability since the last interglacial period (LIG, present to 125,000 years ago), and habitat diversity (Appendix S1a). The derivations of these covariates are described below.

We calculated the distance of each grid cell to the nearest neighbouring realm based on an updated version of Wallace's zoogeographic regions of the world (Holt *et al.*, 2013). To calculate the altitudinal range within each cell we used the 30 arc second (approx. 1 x 1 km) GMTED 2010 global elevation data (U.S. Geological Survey, 2012a). Habitat diversity was measured as the number of habitats covering a minimum of 1% of a cell's area, using the USGS vegetation cover data, which comprises 24 different habitat types (U.S. Geological Survey, 2012).

Measures of temporal climate stability for two time periods (since the LGM, and since the LIG) were based on modelled palaeo-climatic data (the production of which is detailed in Appendix S1a). The palaeo-climate data were derived from a series of general circulation model (GCM) climate simulations, performed using the HadCM3 version of the Hadley Centre Unified Model (Gordon *et al.*, 2000; Pope *et al.*, 2000). Details of the model's configuration are given by Singarayer & Valdes (2010), and the resultant climate data were made available by the Bristol Research Initiative for the Global Environment (BRIDGE, http://www.bridge.bris.ac.uk/).

218 We extracted, as potential explanatory palaeoclimatic variables: (1) the stability of past 219 precipitation, (2) the stability of past temperature, and (3) a bivariate metric based on variation in 220 both of those variables. From these we calculated eight potential palaeoclimate environmental 221 covariates, including stability of: mean temperature, mean precipitation, mean bivariate climate and 222 maximum bivariate climate, for time since both LGM and LIG. We used the potential for maximum 223 values to explain PD because extreme events may drive extinctions (Crowley & North, 1988; 224 Parmesan, 2006). Following Dormann et al., (2013), we avoided combinations of highly correlated 225 climate variables (Pearsons' correlation, r > 0.70). Specifically, we used a preliminary model selection 226 approach to select the climate stability variable with the most explanatory power (Appendix S1d), 227 such that no model contained more than one metric of climate stability. Following preliminary data

exploration, we included quadratic terms for SR, altitudinal range and climate stability variables, and
linear effects for the remaining variables in our models to estimate global PD.

230 To identify global drivers of PD, we fitted general linear models of global PD including all 231 valid combinations of environmental covariates and polynomial terms. The PD values were highly 232 spatially auto-correlated (Moran's I = 0.99), which can affect inference. To minimise the potential 233 impacts of spatial autocorrelation on inference, we designed a blocking method in which models of 234 global PD were built and tested using spatially disaggregated data (See Figure S4 in Supporting 235 Information). This approach substantially reduced the spatial autocorrelation (mean Moran's I across 236 random data subsets = 0.18; Table 1). Using this blocking method we fitted models to 1000 random 237 subsets of the data. In each case, we selected among all competing models using the 'MuMIn' 238 package in R (Barton', 2014). Inevitably, this resampling approach resulted in subtly different 239 variable selection for each random subset of data. To identify those parameters with robust and 240 repeatable influences on PD, we recorded the frequency with which individual environmental 241 covariates were selected in the top models across the 1000 subsets. We report the parameter values 242 for those covariates that were included in at least 95% of the top models (See Figure S5 in 243 Supporting Information). Parameters defined as robust by this method were used to predict PD for 244 all terrestrial cells globally.

245 To test whether environmental covariates relate to PD in different ways, or to differing 246 degrees, in individual biological realms, we produced models similar to the global models described 247 above but fitted instead to data from the individual realms. We considered only those realms with > 248 500 grid cells, to permit a blocking approach during model fitting. Eight realms satisfied this selection 249 criterion: the Afrotropical, Neotropical, Nearctic, Australian, Saharo-Arabian, Sino-Japanese, Oriental 250 and Palaearctic realms. Each of these realms was split into eight blocks, using the same method as 251 for the global model. Following the same approach as described above for the global data, we 252 identified the best model for each biological realm.

253 For each of the identified best models for the global scale and the individual biological 254 realms, we calculated McFadden's r² (McFadden, 1974; Beaujean, 2012) as a measure of the extent 255 to which the model with the lowest Akaike information criterion (AIC) value was an improvement 256 over an alternative model containing only SR. Finally, we compared the predictions of PD from the 257 global model with the predictions of the models based on the individual realms to assess whether 258 the improvement in predictions of PD based on combining predictions from models fitted to the 259 individual realms justifies the increase in complexity over the model fitted to the global data. To do 260 this, we compared the AIC (based on the least squares case, Burnham & Anderson, 2002, p.46) of 261 the global model to that of an amalgamation of the separate realm predictions, for the realms where 262 we could produce estimates using both methods.

263

264 Results

265 Global patterns of SR, PD and rPD

266 As expected, the correlation between SR (Fig. 1a) and PD (Fig. 1b) is very high for terrestrial bird species across the globe (Fig. 2a; $r^2 = 0.973$). Nonetheless, the residuals of the LOESS regression have 267 268 a marked spatial pattern (Fig. 1c, 1d), with clusters of positive and negative residuals that indicate 269 divergence between SR and PD (Fig. 2b). Areas with the most negative rPD (i.e. where PD is lower 270 than expected given SR) include areas of high relief, such as the Himalayas and Andes, and also areas 271 of glacial coverage during the LGM, such as the northern Nearctic and Palaearctic. Extensive areas of 272 high rPD occur on isolated tropical islands including Madagascar and Sri Lanka, and in dryland areas 273 fringing the subtropics. The latter regions include the Sahelian edge of the Afrotropical realm, parts 274 of eastern Africa and central southern Africa, as well as northern Australia and the border between 275 India and Pakistan.

276 Potential drivers of avian PD

The best global model of avian PD included the variables SR, mean climate stability since the LIG and altitudinal range, and explained 98% ($r^2 = 0.982$, Table 1, Table 2) of the variation in PD. This model explained one third of the remaining variation in PD when compared to the global model including only SR ($r^2 = 0.973$, Table 1).

At a realm level, the climate variables included in the best model of PD differed among realms (Table 2). Nonetheless, for all realms, besides the Australian and the Neotropical realm, the best PD models included one of the LIG climate variables. Other variables (apart from SR and climatic variables) included in the best realm models of PD were the distance to the nearest neighbouring realm and altitudinal range, though combinations of variables in the best individual realm models differed. For the Oriental and Saharo-Arabian realms, no additional drivers of PD could be identified in addition to SR.

Overall, the amalgamated realm level models described PD better than the global level model (realm model AIC: 81420, global model AIC: 86716). The residuals of the realm level models (Fig. 3b) have a considerably less pronounced pattern than the residuals of the global level model suggesting that these models are able to explain considerably more of the divergence between PD and SR than the global model (Fig. 3a).

293

294 Discussion

295 Global patterns of avian rPD

Our analyses show that macro-evolutionary processes have left a strong pattern in the phylogenetic diversity of current avian assemblages. We have shown that there is clear spatial patterning in areas where PD diverges from SR, and this suggests that biological and geological processes play a major role in rPD. The spatial pattern observed here for birds differs markedly to those that have been observed previously for other taxa (Davies *et al.*, 2008; Davies & Buckley, 2011; Fritz & Rahbek, 2012), indicating that these processes may operate differently across taxonomic groups. Areas of low avian rPD occurred at high latitudes and in areas of high relief associated with the Andes and Himalayan mountain ranges. Areas with particularly high rPD were distributed more widely and include islands and isolated regions, such as Australia and Madagascar, as well as ecological transition zones, such as the Sahel and parts of Central America.

We discuss our results in the context of the correlates of rPD identified in this study; the relationship between avian, mammalian and amphibian rPD; the importance of refining our understanding of rPD; and the potential implications for conservation.

309 Potential drivers of avian PD

310 As suggested by earlier studies (Rodrigues et al., 2005; Davies & Buckley, 2011; Fritz & Rahbek, 311 2012), SR showed a high correlation with PD; however, additional variables explained much of the 312 remaining variation (rPD). As expected, the importance of the additional environmental variables 313 differed between the individual realms and, consequently, the individual realm models predicted 314 realm-level PD better than a single global model. Areas of very high or low rPD reveal information 315 about the underlying structures of the communities, and indicate if these are taxonomically 316 clustered or over dispersed (Rodrigues et al., 2005; Forest et al., 2007). Unusually high rPD, i.e. a 317 taxonomically over-dispersed assemblage in an area, especially when associated with low SR, can be 318 the result of the existence of old lineages, harbouring unique evolutionary information. These 319 lineages can result from a speciation process with little radiation, or from the extinction of other 320 species in the same clades (Rodrigues et al., 2005). These old lineages occur more frequently in the 321 Neotropical and Afrotropical regions, which harbour large numbers of basal taxa (Wiens & 322 Donoghue, 2004; Hawkins et al., 2006; Hawkins et al., 2007). By contrast, unusually low rPD (i.e., a 323 taxonomically clustered assemblage) is more likely to occur in areas with more recent speciation 324 events (Davies & Buckley, 2011).

The environmental predictors tested here were expected, *a priori*, to be important based on macroecological and biogeographic theory. For example, contact zones between realms could positively affect the rPD, because dispersal events from different species pools in neighbouring biogeographic realms into areas in the contact zone are likely to occur. We found that a large proportion of the cells with a high rPD are located within contact regions between biomes, such as in
Sahelian Africa. Consequently, the distance to the nearest neighbouring realm was an important
driver of the rPD pattern in the Afrotropical realm.

332 Another likely predictor of low rPD that we considered *a priori* was climate stability. It was 333 selected because areas with unstable climates are likely to experience frequent local extinction 334 events, reducing the number of old lineages. The largest clusters of low rPD occur in the two large northern-temperate realms, as well as in some mountain areas at lower latitudes, such as occur in 335 336 the Andes and the Himalayas. In the Nearctic and Palaearctic, the climatic stability since the LIG is 337 the most important explanatory variable of rPD. Low rPD in areas of climatic instability since the LIG 338 might reflect the impact of past glacial events, and result in a phylogenetically depauperate fauna considering the SR in the area. 339

340 Altitudinal range was considered a potential driver of both high and low rPD, depending on 341 the age of the mountain range and the local climate stability. High rPD is likely to occur where 342 movement up or down the altitudinal gradient could act as a local buffer against climatic variation, 343 enabling persistence of lineages. Low rPD is likely to be found where mountain ranges are relatively 344 young and provide a centre for relatively recent speciation events. Previous studies have identified 345 mountain ranges as centres for speciation during the Pleistocene period (circa 2.5Ma to 12Ka) 346 (Fjeldså, 2012; Päckert et al., 2012), although there is evidence that some of the younger mountain 347 ranges are approaching ecological saturation and species radiations are slowing down (Price et al., 348 2014). We found greater support for altitudinal range being associated with low rPD, with areas of 349 low rPD in the relatively young Andes and Himalayan mountain ranges. The importance of altitudinal 350 range in explaining rPD in the Neotropical realm model, which contains the Andes, similarly suggests 351 that these mountain ranges may act as centres for recent speciation, resulting in low rPD despite 352 high endemism. Hence, the variables that best explained rPD in this study tend to fit with contemporary evolutionary and geological understanding of how species have evolved and 353 354 persisted.

The only potential driver of avian PD that was not selected as important in any model was contemporary habitat diversity. This might reflect that habitat diversity mainly drives patterns of SR (Lack, 1969; Bazzaz, 1975). It might also arise because of the use of contemporary habitat diversity data, which does not reflect long-term changes in habitat diversity that might have influenced the current PD pattern.

360 Several of the larger biological realms span multiple ecosystems, such that variables explaining rPD may not operate similarly across the entire area. As we only report variables that are 361 362 selected in most models, this could result in some important variables that operate in only part of a 363 realm being overlooked. For example, in the Oriental realm, only SR was consistently selected, 364 although long term temperature stability was selected in 76% of models explaining PD. We found that adding this variable significantly improved PD prediction for the Indian subcontinent but not for 365 366 the rest of the Oriental realm. This suggests that, for some realms, variables influencing PD may be 367 operating over a finer scale than the realm and conducting analyses over smaller sub-regions could 368 highlight locally influential variables that are overlooked by our realm-level analysis.

369 Mismatch of avian rPD with that of other taxa

370 The rPD patterns found for birds are very different from those previously identified for amphibians 371 (Fritz & Rahbek, 2012) and mammals (Davies & Buckley, 2011; Safi et al., 2011; Rosauer & Jetz, 372 2015). Strikingly, the patterns of highest and lowest rPD for birds are, to a large extent, the inverse 373 of those found for amphibians. In particular, for birds, areas of low rPD are often located in 374 extensive mainland areas and in mountainous areas such as the Himalayas and the Andes; for amphibians these are areas of high rPD. For amphibians, islands and isolated areas such as Australia, 375 376 Madagascar, New Guinea and the Caribbean have been identified as having low rPD (Fritz & Rahbek, 377 2012), whereas for birds these tend to be regions of high rPD. Similarly, areas of high rPD for 378 amphibians in the Indo-Chinese realm are identified as regions of lower than expected PD for birds. 379 For birds and mammals, there are also areas where the two taxa show contrasting patterns of rPD. 380 This occurs in islands and isolated areas such as Australia and the Caribbean, as well as Central

America, with avian rPD being higher than mammal rPD. Areas such as the Sahel, parts of Eastern
 and Southern Africa, and parts of the Indian subcontinent show a high rPD for both taxa.

383 Relatively few areas of the world have similarly high rPD for birds, mammals and 384 amphibians. Those that do include parts of South America which lie to the east of the Andes, the 385 Cameroon Highlands and parts of the Eastern Arc mountain range in Africa. Amphibians and birds 386 also both have high rPD in SE Brazil and parts of Indochina. However, outside of Amazonia, the most 387 remarkable thing about rPD patterns of these taxa is their lack of congruence. This may, in part, be a 388 result of the mobility of birds relative to mammals and amphibians, which could facilitate relatively 389 rapid recolonization of newly exposed mountain and arctic sites following glaciation events, and 390 increased colonisation of isolated island sites (Weir & Schluter, 2004). It could explain the different 391 observed patterns among taxa on islands and newly exposed sites, which often show very low rPD 392 for amphibians and mammal but not for birds.

393 Improving our understanding of rPD

394 Here, we try to explain rPD through consideration of contemporary niche diversity (current habitat 395 and climate diversity) and longer term climate stability. However, there are other potentially 396 important determinants of PD that we were unable to consider, including short duration extreme 397 events (climatic or tectonic), longer term habitat occurrence and persistence, and 398 isolation/connectivity due to landmass movements. One of our putative niche measures, elevation 399 range (considered a proxy for contemporary climate diversity), may have operated more as a 400 tectonic proxy in our models, by highlighting the youngest land on mainland landmasses, such as the 401 Himalayas and Andes. Assessing directly the role of these longer-term landmass and habitat changes 402 and the impacts of extreme events was not possible in the current study. Future studies of PD would 403 undoubtedly benefit from the inclusion of such measures, should data become available.

The phylogeny of Jetz *et al.* (2012) is the best full avian phylogeny currently available. Nevertheless, it has been the focus of academic discussion as a result of the methods used to construct the phylogenetic tree (Ricklefs & Pagel, 2012). Sources of uncertainty include the use of a previously defined backbone, the estimation of branch length by inference from time-dated trees (Venditti *et al.*, 2010), as well as local differences in the level to which populations are resolved (see Appendix
S1g for a more detailed discussion of the potential sources of uncertainty).

Amendments to the avian taxonomy are ongoing, and suggested alterations to the phylogeny of living birds further our understanding of avian phylogenetic history (Appendix S1h). Recent amendments demonstrate the rapid advances in this field (Jarvis *et al.* 2014, Prum *et al.* 2015, Rocha *et al.* 2015). Repeating our analyses with alternative full avian phylogenies, when available, will determine how robust the patterns identified here are to updates in taxonomy.

415 Our study gives a first indication of the variables that drive avian rPD patterns on a large 416 scale in different ecoregions of the world, and identifies areas where macro-ecological processes are 417 likely to have affected the underlying structures of species in a community, resulting in a mismatch 418 between SR and PD. Future work could focus on understanding the causes of pattern in rPD at a 419 finer scale. Exploring beta diversity (Whittaker, 1960) across areas with a steep rPD gradient could 420 aid our understanding of how changing species compositions affect rPD, and enable deeper insights 421 into the drivers at a local scale. For example, high rPD might be primarily driven by the occurrence of 422 a small number of old lineages in an area.

423 Studies considering PD for conservation purposes have become more frequent (Rodrigues & 424 Gaston, 2002; Winter et al., 2012; Brooks et al., 2015). These have advocated, for example, 425 conservation that prioritises the protection of unique lineages (Isaac et al., 2007). Nonetheless, 426 phylogenetic information remains under-used (Rodrigues et al., 2011). One difficulty is that 427 biodiversity measures based on phylogenetic information [e.g. PD (Faith, 1992), phylogenetic 428 endemism (Rosauer et al., 2009), and evolutionary distinctiveness (Isaac et al., 2007)] have been 429 found to be inconsistent in their spatial congruence (Daru et al., 2014). A future research priority 430 should be to improve our understanding of the global pattern of rPD among taxa and its relationship 431 with other biodiversity measures, and with current protected area networks, to make phylogenetic 432 information more applicable for conservation practice.

433 Implications for conservation

434 Our findings have implications for biodiversity conservation. Aside from the role of rPD in aiding our 435 understanding of historical patterns of evolution, extinction and colonisation, rPD could prove a 436 useful metric to highlight areas of high irreplaceability and added value, in conservation terms. Our 437 study confirms that, across much of the world, SR provides a good proxy for avian PD and, hence, 438 provides a good surrogate for biodiversity (where biodiversity is richness at all diversity scales, 439 including phylogenetic diversity). However, we also identify areas of high (or low) rPD where this 440 relationship is weaker. The areas of high rPD are of particular interest for conservation planning 441 since they indicate a likely high evolutionary potential of a community, in comparison to 442 communities with a similar SR in combination with an average or low rPD value. Interestingly, for 443 birds, we find that many areas prioritised because of endemic species actually have low rPD. 444 Typically, these areas are associated with recent species radiations as seen in, for example, the 445 Andes which have a comparably low rPD. This region harbours many endemic, but closely related, 446 hummingbirds (McGuire et al., 2014). Consequently, such areas might be considered of lower 447 conservation priority than regions with similar SR but higher rPD.

448 Importantly, the lack of overlap between the rPD of birds, amphibians and mammals, 449 compels caution in generalising PD results among taxa. This result is consistent with a recent study 450 by Zupan et al., (2014) which suggests strong divergence between the patterns of PD in vertebrate 451 taxa across Europe. As with SR, it seems that there is no 'silver bullet' indicator taxon that can be 452 used to infer PD across taxa. That habitat diversity was seldom identified as a useful predictor of PD 453 suggests that this, too, would be a poor metric of current PD. Using ecosystem-based metrics (such 454 as habitat/ecosystem richness) as a basis for protecting areas for biodiversity conservation (Brooks 455 et al., 2006) may conserve ecosystem function, and to some extent SR, but would perform rather 456 poorly in representing rPD, as habitat diversity was not included in our global or regional models of 457 PD. Current best-practice to identify terrestrial biodiversity hotspots (such as Conservation 458 International's hotspots or BirdLife International's EBAs) consider endemism but do not yet account

459 for phylogenetic uniqueness. The next challenge for conservation biologists is to combine supertree 460 PD data across a number of key taxa to identify hotspots of biodiversity that represent areas of true 461 phylogenetic diversity and uniqueness, in addition to species diversity, endemism and 462 distinctiveness.

463

464 Acknowledgements

We would like to thank BirdLife International for providing us with the species distribution data and
Stuart H.M. Butchart at Birdlife International for commenting on the manuscript. We also thank Judy
R.M. Allen for assisting in the extraction and interpretation of the palaeoclimatic data. We thank
Peter Linder, Fumin Lei, and two anonymous referees for their thoughtful suggestions that improved
this manuscript.

470 References

- Barker, G.M. (2002) Phylogenetic diversity: a quantitative framework for measurement of priority
 and achievement in biodiversity conservation. *Biological Journal of the Linnean Society*, **76**,
 165-194.
- Barnosky, A.D., Matzke, N., Tomiya, S., Wogan, G.O.U., Swartz, B., Quental, T.B., Marshall, C.,
 McGuire, J.L., Lindsey, E.L., Maguire, K.C., Mersey, B. & Ferrer, E.A. (2011) Has the earth's
 sixth mass extinction already arrived? *Nature*, 471, 51-57.
- 477 Barton', K. (2014) *MuMIn: Multi-model inference*. Available at: <u>http://CRAN.R-</u>
 478 project.org/package=MuMIn (accessed 01.10.2014)
- Bazzaz, F.A. (1975) Plant species diversity in old-field successional ecosystems in southern Illinois. *Ecology*, 56, 485-488.
- Beaujean, A.A. (2012) BaylorEdPsych: R package for Baylor University educational psychology
 quantitative courses. R package version 0.5., R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna,
 Austria. Available at: <u>http://CRAN.R-project.org/package=BaylorEdPsych</u>.
- BirdLife International & NatureServe (2012) *Bird species distribution maps of the world*, BirdLife
 International, Cambridge, UK & NatureServe, Arlington, USA.
- 486 Brooks, T.M., Cuttelod, A., Faith, D.P., Garcia-Moreno, J., Langhammer, P. & Pérez-Espona, S. (2015)
- Why and how might genetic and phylogenetic diversity be reflected in the identification of
 key biodiversity areas? *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, **370**, 1471-2970.
- Brooks, T.M., Mittermeier, R.A., da Fonseca, G.A.B., Gerlach, J., Hoffmann, M., Lamoreux, J.F.,
 Mittermeier, C.G., Pilgrim, J.D. & Rodrigues, A.S.L. (2006) Global biodiversity conservation
 priorities. *Science*, **313**, 58-61.
- Burnham, K.P. & Anderson, D.R. (2002) Model selection and multimodel inference: a practical
 information-theoretic approach. Springer, New York.

- Butchart, S.H.M., Walpole, M., Collen, B. et al. (2010) Global biodiversity: Indicators of recent
 declines. *Science*, **328**, 1164-1168.
- Cadotte, M.W., Jonathan Davies, T., Regetz, J., Kembel, S.W., Cleland, E. & Oakley, T.H. (2010)
 Phylogenetic diversity metrics for ecological communities: integrating species richness,
 abundance and evolutionary history. *Ecology Letters*, **13**, 96-105.
- 500 Cardinale, B.J., Duffy, J.E., Gonzalez, A., Hooper, D.U., Perrings, C., Venail, P., Narwani, A., Mace,
 501 G.M., Tilman, D., Wardle, D.A., Kinzig, A.P., Daily, G.C., Loreau, M., Grace, J.B., Larigauderie,
- A., Srivastava, D.S. & Naeem, S. (2012) Biodiversity loss and its impact on humanity. *Nature*,
 486, 59-67.
- Cavender-Bares, J., Kozak, K.H., Fine, P.V.A. & Kembel, S.W. (2009) The merging of community
 ecology and phylogenetic biology. *Ecology Letters*, **12**, 693-715.
- Chapin III, F.S., Zavaleta, E.S., Eviner, V.T., Naylor, R.L., Vitousek, P.M., Reynolds, H.L., Hooper, D.U.,
 Lavorel, S., Sala, O.E., Hobbie, S.E., Mack, M.C. & Diaz, S. (2000) Consequences of changing
 biodiversity. *Nature*, 405, 234-242.
- 509 Crowley, T.J. & North, G.R. (1988) Abrupt climate change and extinction events in earth history.
 510 Science, 240, 996-1002.
- 511 Crozier, R.H. (1997) Preserving the information content of species: genetic diversity, phylogeny, and
 512 conservation worth. *Annual Review of Ecology and Systematics*, **28**, 243-268.
- 513 Daru, B.H., van der Bank, M. & Davies, T.J. (2014) Spatial incongruence among hotspots and 514 complementary areas of tree diversity in southern Africa. *Diversity and Distributions*, 1 - 12.
- Davies, T.J. & Buckley, L.B. (2011) Phylogenetic diversity as a window into the evolutionary and
 biogeographic histories of present-day richness gradients for mammals. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, **366**, 2414-2425.
- Davies, T.J., Fritz, S.A., Grenyer, R., Orme, C.D.L., Bielby, J., Bininda-Emonds, O.R.P., Cardillo, M.,
 Jones, K.E., Gittleman, J.L., Mace, G.M. & Purvis, A. (2008) Phylogenetic trees and the future

520

521

of mammalian biodiversity. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, **105**, 11556-11563.

Dormann, C.F., Elith, J., Bacher, S., Buchmann, C., Carl, G., Carré, G., Marquéz, J.R.G., Gruber, B., Lafourcade, B., Leitão, P.J., Münkemüller, T., McClean, C., Osborne, P.E., Reineking, B., Schröder, B., Skidmore, A.K., Zurell, D. & Lautenbach, S. (2013) Collinearity: a review of methods to deal with it and a simulation study evaluating their performance. *Ecography*, 36, 27-46.

- 527 Emerson, B.C. & Kolm, N. (2005) Species diversity can drive speciation. *Nature*, **434**, 1015-1017.
- Ericson, P.G.P., Anderson, C.L., Britton, T., Elzanowski, A., Johansson, U.S., Källersjö, M., Ohlson, J.I.,
 Parsons, T.J., Zuccon, D. & Mayr, G. (2006) Diversification of Neoaves: integration of
 molecular sequence data and fossils. *Biology Letters*, 2, 543-547.
- Faith, D.P. (1992) Conservation evaluation and phylogenetic diversity. *Biological Conservation*, **61**, 110.
- 533 Fjeldså, J. (2012) Diversification of the neotropical avifauna: disentangling the geographical patterns 534 of persisting ancient taxa and phylogenetic expansions. *Ornitologia Neotropical* **23**, 13-27.
- 535 Flynn, D.F.B., Mirotchnick, N., Jain, M., Palmer, M.I. & Naeem, S. (2011) Functional and phylogenetic
- 536 diversity as predictors of biodiversity–ecosystem-function relationships. *Ecology*, **92**, 1573537 1581.
- Forest, F., Grenyer, R., Rouget, M., Davies, T.J., Cowling, R.M., Faith, D.P., Balmford, A., Manning,
 J.C., Proches, S., van der Bank, M., Reeves, G., Hedderson, T.A.J. & Savolainen, V. (2007)
 Preserving the evolutionary potential of floras in biodiversity hotspots. *Nature*, 445, 757760.
- Fritz, S.A. & Rahbek, C. (2012) Global patterns of amphibian phylogenetic diversity. *Journal of Biogeography*, **39**, 1373-1382.

- Fuller, R.A., McDonald-Madden, E., Wilson, K.A., Carwardine, J., Grantham, H.S., Watson, J.E.M.,
 Klein, C.J., Green, D.C. & Possingham, H.P. (2010) Replacing underperforming protected
 areas achieves better conservation outcomes. *Nature*, 466, 365-367.
- Gaston, K.J. (1996) Species richness: measure and measurement. *Biodiversity: a Biology of Numbers and Difference* (ed. by K.J. Gaston), pp. 77 113. Blackwell Science, Oxford.
- Gordon, C., Cooper, C., Senior, C.A., Banks, H., Gregory, J.M., Johns, T.C., Mitchell, J.F.B. & Wood,
 R.A. (2000) The simulation of SST, sea ice extents and ocean heat transports in a version of
 the Hadley Centre coupled model without flux adjustments. *Climate Dynamics*, 16, 147-168.
- 552 Gotelli, N.J. & Colwell, R.K. (2001) Quantifying biodiversity: procedures and pitfalls in the 553 measurement and comparison of species richness. *Ecology Letters*, **4**, 379-391.
- Hackett, S.J., Kimball, R.T., Reddy, S., Bowie, R.C.K., Braun, E.L., Braun, M.J., Chojnowski, J.L., Cox,
 W.A., Han, K.-L., Harshman, J., Huddleston, C.J., Marks, B.D., Miglia, K.J., Moore, W.S.,
 Sheldon, F.H., Steadman, D.W., Witt, C.C. & Yuri, T. (2008) A phylogenomic study of birds
 reveals their evolutionary history. *Science*, **320**, 1763-1768.
- Hardy, O.J. & Senterre, B. (2007) Characterizing the phylogenetic structure of communities by an
 additive partitioning of phylogenetic diversity. *Journal of Ecology*, **95**, 493-506.
- Hawkins, B.A., Diniz-Filho, J.A.F., Jaramillo, C.A. & Soeller, S.A. (2006) Special paper: post-eocene
 climate change, niche conservatism, and the latitudinal diversity gradient of new world
 birds. *Journal of Biogeography*, **33**, 770-780.
- Hawkins, B.A., Diniz-Filho, J.A.F., Jaramillo , C.A. & Soeller, S.A. (2007) Climate, niche conservatism,
 and the global bird diversity gradient. *The American Naturalist*, **170**, 16-27.
- 565 Heard, S.B. & Mooers, A.O. (2000) Phylogenetically patterned speciation rates and extinction risks
- 566 change the loss of evolutionary history during extinctions. *Proceedings of the Royal Society*567 *of London. Series B: Biological Sciences*, **267**, 613-620.
- Holt, B.G., Lessard, J.-P., Borregaard, M.K., Fritz, S.A., Araújo, M.B., Dimitrov, D., Fabre, P.-H.,
 Graham, C.H., Graves, G.R., Jønsson, K.A., Nogués-Bravo, D., Wang, Z., Whittaker, R.J.,

- 570 Fjeldså, J. & Rahbek, C. (2013) An update of Wallace's zoogeographic regions of the world.
 571 Science, 339, 74-78.
- Huang, S., Davies, T.J. & Gittleman, J.L. (2012) How global extinctions impact regional biodiversity in
 mammals. *Biology Letters*, 8, 222-225.
- Isaac, N.J.B., Redding, D.W., Meredith, H.M. & Safi, K. (2012) Phylogenetically-informed priorities for
 amphibian conservation. *PLoS ONE*, **7**, e43912.
- Isaac, N.J.B., Turvey, S.T., Collen, B., Waterman, C. & Baillie, J.E.M. (2007) Mammals on the EDGE:
 conservation priorities based on threat and phylogeny. *PLoS ONE*, 2, e296.
- Jarvis, E.D., Mirarab, S., Aberer, A.J. et al. (2014) Whole-genome analyses resolve early branches in
 the tree of life of modern birds. *Science*, **346**, 1320-1331.
- Jetz, W., Thomas, G.H., Joy, J.B., Hartmann, K. & Mooers, A.O. (2012) The global diversity of birds in
 space and time. *Nature*, **491**, 444-448.
- 582 Keppel, G., Van Niel, K.P., Wardell-Johnson, G.W., Yates, C.J., Byrne, M., Mucina, L., Schut, A.G.T.,
- 583 Hopper, S.D. & Franklin, S.E. (2012) Refugia: identifying and understanding safe havens for

biodiversity under climate change. *Global Ecology and Biogeography*, **21**, 393-404.

- 585 Kluge, J. & Kessler, M. (2011) Phylogenetic diversity, trait diversity and niches: species assembly of 586 ferns along a tropical elevational gradient. *Journal of Biogeography*, **38**, 394-405.
- Lack, D. (1969) The number of bird species on islands. *Bird Study*, 193-209.
- Leaky, R. & Lewin, R. (1992) *The sixth extinction: patterns of life and the future of humankind*.
 doubleday, New York.
- Loreau, M., Naeem, S., Inchausti, P., Bengtsson, J., Grime, J.P., Hector, A., Hooper, D.U., Huston,
 M.A., Raffaelli, D., Schmid, B., Tilman, D. & Wardle, D.A. (2001) Biodiversity and ecosystem
- 592 functioning: current knowledge and future challenges. *Science*, **294**, 804-808.
- Losos, J.B. & Glor, R.E. (2003) Phylogenetic comparative methods and the geography of speciation.

594 Trends in Ecology & Evolution, **18**, 220-227.

- Mace, G.M., Balmford, A., Boitani, L., Cowlishaw, G., Dobson, A.P., Faith, D.P., Gaston, K.J.,
 Humphries, C.J., Vane-Wright, R.I., Williams, P.H., Lawton, J.H., Margules, C.R., May, R.M.,
 Nicholls, A.O., Possingham, H.P., Rahbek, C. & van Jaarsveld, A.S. (2000) It's time to work
 together and stop duplicating conservation efforts. *Nature*, **405**, 393-393.
- 599 May, R.M. (1990) Taxonomy as destiny. *Nature*, **347**, 129-130.
- McFadden, D. (1974) Conditional logit analysis of qualitative choice behaviour. *Frontiers in econometrics* (ed. by P. Zarembka), pp. 105 142. Academic Press, New York.
- McGuire, Jimmy A., Witt, Christopher C., Remsen Jr, J.V., Corl, A., Rabosky, Daniel L., Altshuler,
 Douglas L. & Dudley, R. (2014) Molecular phylogenetics and the diversification of
 hummingbirds. *Current Biology*, 24, 910-916.
- Mooers, A.O. & Heard, S.B. (1997) *Infering evolutionary process from phylogenetic treeshape*.
 University of Chicago Press, Chicago, IL.
- Olsen, G. (1990) *Gary Olsen's interpretation of the "Newick's 8:45" tree format standard*. Available
 at: <u>http://evolution.genetics.washington.edu/phylip/newick_doc.html(accessed 01.10.2014)</u>
- 609 Orme, C.D.L., Freckleton, R.P. & Thomas, G.H. (2009) *CAIC: comparative analyses using independent*
- 610 *contrasts. R package version 1.0.4.*, R Foundation for Statistical Computing ,Vienna, Austria.
- 611 Available at: <u>http://r-forge.r-project.org/projects/caic</u>
- Orme, C.D.L., Davies, R.G., Burgess, M., Eigenbrod, F., Pickup, N., Olson, V.A., Webster, A.J., Ding, T.-
- S., Rasmussen, P.C., Ridgely, R.S., Stattersfield, A.J., Bennett, P.M., Blackburn, T.M., Gaston,
 K.J. & Owens, I.P.F. (2005) Global hotspots of species richness are not congruent with
 endemism or threat. *Nature*, 436, 1016-1019.
- Päckert, M., Martens, J., Sun, Y.-H., Severinghaus, L.L., Nazarenko, A.A., Ting, J., Töpfer, T. & Tietze,
- D.T. (2012) Horizontal and elevational phylogeographic patterns of Himalayan and South
 East Asian forest passerines (Aves: Passeriformes). *Journal of Biogeography*, **39**, 556-573.
- Palmer, M. (1994) Variation in species richness: towards a unification of hypotheses. *Folia Geobotanica et Phytotaxonomica*, 29, 511-530.

- Paradis, E., Claude, J. & Strimmer, K. (2004) APE: analyses of phylogenetics and evolution in R
 language. *Bioinformatics*, 289 290.
- Parmesan, C. (2006) Ecological and evolutionary responses to recent climate change. *Annual Review of Ecology, Evolution, and Systematics*, **37**, 637-669.
- Peterson, G., Allen, C.R. & Holling, C.S. (1998) Ecological resilience, biodiversity, and scale. *Ecosystems*, 1, 6-18.
- 627 Petit, R.J., Aguinagalde, I., de Beaulieu, J.-L., Bittkau, C., Brewer, S., Cheddadi, R., Ennos, R., Fineschi,
- S., Grivet, D., Lascoux, M., Mohanty, A., Müller-Starck, G., Demesure-Musch, B., Palmé, A.,
 Martín, J.P., Rendell, S. & Vendramin, G.G. (2003) Glacial refugia: hotspots but not melting
 pots of genetic diversity. *Science*, **300**, 1563-1565.
- Pope, V.D., Gallani, M.L., Rowntree, P.R. & Stratton, R.A. (2000) The impact of new physical
 parametrizations in the Hadley Centre climate model: HadAM3. *Climate Dynamics*, 16, 123146.
- Price, T.D., Hooper, D.M., Buchanan, C.D., Johansson, U.S., Tietze, D.T., Alstrom, P., Olsson, U.,
 Ghosh-Harihar, M., Ishtiaq, F., Gupta, S.K., Martens, J., Harr, B., Singh, P. & Mohan, D. (2014)
- 636 Niche filling slows the diversification of Himalayan songbirds. *Nature*, **509**, 222-225.
- 637 Prum, R.O., Berv, J.S., Dornburg, A., Field, D.J., Townsend, J.P., Lemmon, E.M. & Lemmon, A.R. (2015)
- A comprehensive phylogeny of birds (Aves) using targeted next-generation DNA sequencing. *Nature*, **526**, 569-573.
- Purvis, A., Agapow, P.-M., Gittleman, J.L. & Mace, G.M. (2000) Nonrandom extinction and the loss of
 Evolutionary History. *Science*, 288, 328-330.
- Rahbek, C. & Graves, G.R. (2001) Multiscale assessment of patterns of avian species richness.
 Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, **98**, 4534-4539.
- Rands, M.R.W., Adams, W.M., Bennun, L., Butchart, S.H.M., Clements, A., Coomes, D., Entwistle, A.,
 Hodge, I., Kapos, V., Scharlemann, J.P.W., Sutherland, W.J. & Vira, B. (2010) Biodiversity
 conservation: challenges beyond 2010. *Science*, **329**, 1298-1303.

647 Ricklefs, R.E. & Pagel, M. (2012) Evolutionary biology: birds of a feather. *Nature*, **491**, 336-337.

- Rocha, T.C., Sequeira, F., Aleixo, A., Rêgo, P.S., Sampaio, I., Schneider, H. & Vallinoto, M. (2015)
 Molecular phylogeny and diversification of a widespread Neotropical rainforest bird group:
 the Buff-throated Woodcreeper complex, Xiphorhynchus guttatus/susurrans (Aves:
 Dendrocolaptidae). *Molecular Phylogenetics and Evolution*, **85**, 131-140.
- Rodrigues, A.S.L. & Gaston, K.J. (2002) Maximising phylogenetic diversity in the selection of networks
 of conservation areas. *Biological Conservation*, **105**, 103-111.
- Rodrigues, A.S.L., Brooks, T.M. & Gaston, K.J. (2005) Integrating phylogenetic diversity in the
 selection of priority areas for conservation: does it make a difference? *Phylogeny and Conservation* (ed. by A. Purvis, J.L. Gittleman and T.M. Brooks), pp. 101 116. Cambridge
 University Press, Cambridge.
- Rodrigues, A.S.L., Grenyer, R., Baillie, J.E.M., Bininda-Emonds, O.R.P., Gittlemann, J.L., Hoffmann, M.,
 Safi, K., Schipper, J., Stuart, S.N. & Brooks, T. (2011) Complete, accurate, mammalian
 phylogenies aid conservation planning, but not much. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, **366**, 2652-2660.
- Roquet, C., Thuiller, W. & Lavergne, S. (2013) Building megaphylogenies for macroecology: taking up
 the challenge. *Ecography*, **36**, 013-026.
- Rosauer, D.A.N., Laffan, S.W., Crisp, M.D., Donnellan, S.C. & Cook, L.G. (2009) Phylogenetic
 endemism: a new approach for identifying geographical concentrations of evolutionary
 history. *Molecular Ecology*, 18, 4061-4072.
- Rosauer, D.F. & Jetz, W. (2015) Phylogenetic endemism in terrestrial mammals. *Global Ecology and Biogeography*, 24, 168-179.
- Safi, K., Cianciaruso, M.V., Loyola, R.D., Brito, D., Armour-Marshall, K. & Diniz-Filho, J.A.F. (2011)
 Understanding global patterns of mammalian functional and phylogenetic diversity.
 Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences, **366**, 2536-2544.

- 672 Singarayer, J.S. & Valdes, P.J. (2010) High-latitude climate sensitivity to ice-sheet forcing over the last
- 673 120kyr. *Quaternary Science Reviews*, **29**, 43-55.
- Stevens, G.C. (1989) The latitudinal gradient in geographical range: how so many species coexist in
 the tropics. *The American Naturalist*, **133**, 240-256.
- Tilman, D., Reich, P.B. & Knops, J.M.H. (2006) Biodiversity and ecosystem stability in a decade-long
 grassland experiment. *Nature*, 441, 629-632.
- 678 U.S. Geological Survey (2012a) *Global 30 arc-second elevation (GTOPO30)* Available at:
 679 <u>http://lpdaac.usgs.gov</u> (accessed 01.05.2014)
- 680 U.S. Geological Survey (2012b) Global land cover (GlobCover), Land Processes Distributed Active
- Archive Center (LP DAAC), located at USGS/EROS, Sioux Falls, SD. Available at:
 http://lpdaac.usgs.gov.
- Vane-Wright, R.I., Humphries, C.J. & Williams, P.H. (1991) What to protect?—systematics and the
 agony of choice. *Biological Conservation*, 55, 235-254.
- Venditti, C., Meade, A. & Pagel, M. (2010) Phylogenies reveal new interpretation of speciation and
 the Red Queen. *Nature*, 463, 349-352.
- Vitousek, P.M., Mooney, H.A., Lubchenco, J. & Melillo, J.M. (1997) Human domination of earth's
 ecosystems. *Science*, 277, 494-499.
- 689 Wallace, A.R. (1878) *Tropical nature: and other essays*. Macmillan and Company.
- Webb, S.D. (2006) The great american biotic interchange: patterns and processes. *Annals of the Missouri Botanical Garden*, 93, 245-257.
- Weir, J.T. & Schluter, D. (2004) Ice sheets promote speciation in boreal birds. *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London B: Biological Sciences*, **271**, 1881-1887.
- Whittaker, R.H. (1960) Vegetation of the Siskiyou Mountains, Oregon and California. *Ecological Monographs*, **30**, 279 338.
- Wiens, J.J. & Donoghue, M.J. (2004) Historical biogeography, ecology and species richness. *Trends in Ecology & Evolution*, **19**, 639-644.

- Winter, M., Devictor, V. & Schweiger, O. (2012) Phylogenetic diversity and nature conservation:
 where are we? *Trends in ecology & evolution*, 28, 199-204.
- Worm, B., Barbier, E.B., Beaumont, N., Duffy, J.E., Folke, C., Halpern, B.S., Jackson, J.B.C., Lotze, H.K.,
 Micheli, F., Palumbi, S.R., Sala, E., Selkoe, K.A., Stachowicz, J.J. & Watson, R. (2006) Impacts
 of biodiversity loss on ocean ecosystem services. *Science*, **314**, 787-790.
- Zupan, L., Cabeza, M., Maiorano, L., Roquet, C., Devictor, V., Lavergne, S., Mouillot, D., Mouquet, N.,
- Renaud, J. & Thuiller, W. (2014) Spatial mismatch of phylogenetic diversity across three
- vertebrate groups and protected areas in Europe. *Diversity and Distributions*, **20**, 674-685.

707 SUPPORTING INFORMATION

- Additional Supporting Information may be found in the online version of this article:
- 709 Appendix S1 Supplementary methods and supplementary figures
- 710 Biosketch
- 711 All PJV members the authors except are of Conservation Ecology Group 712 (www.conservationecology.org) at Durham, which applies ecological approaches to issues of interest 713 to conservation biology. AV is a PhD student in the group working on global species distributions and 714 their underlying ecological and evolutionary processes. AV is supervised by SGW and PAS. AV and 715 DJB performed the analyses and, with SGW and PAS, wrote the manuscript. PJV is a climatologist, 716 working on contemporary and palaeo climatology.
- 717
- 718 Editor: Fumin Lei

719 Figure legends

Figure 1: Global maps (Behrman projection) showing (a) global avian species richness, (b) global avian phylogenetic diversity (calculated using Faith's (1992) phylogenetic diversity), (c) residuals of the local regression (LOESS) between avian species richness (SR) and phylogenetic diversity (PD) and (d) global areas containing the highest or lowest 5% of the residuals, with cells that do not fall in the top or bottom 5% masked in grey. In the latter two graphs, red indicates unusually high PD given the SR, and blue unusually low PD given the SR.

726

Figure 2: (a) The global relationship between avian species richness (SR) and phylogenetic diversity
(PD); the red line was fitted to the data using local regression with nonparametric smoothing
techniques; (b) residuals of the local regression plotted against avian species richness, coloured by
realm.

731

Figure 3: (a) The residuals of the global model to predict phylogenetic diversity (PD) and (b) the residuals of stitched models per realm. Realms with less than 500 cells and realms where no drivers for the PD pattern other than species richness (SR) could be identified were excluded from the individual realm analysis and are masked grey.















(b)



740

741 Figure 3

742 Table legends

Table 1: Mean autocorrelation values (Moran's I) for the model fitting data after subsampling and r²
 values for the species richness (SR) only model and the full model (SR plus the additional explanatory

variables) for the global scale model and the individual realm models (same as Table 2).

746

Table 2: Variables used to model phylogenetic diversity (PD) on a global scale and in the individual realms. Standardized coefficients are given for all variables that have been used in a model.
Variables which have been consistently selected for the best model (variables that were in the best model after model selection 95% of the time) are marked with an asterisk. Variables which have not been used in any of the models were excluded from the table (habitat diversity, mean short-term climate stability).

Table 1

755		Moran's I	r2 SR only model	r2 full model
756	Global	0.136	0.973	0.982
757	Afrotropical	0.118	0.980	0.989
758	Australian	0.156	0.913	0.988
759	Nearctic	0.154	0.900	0.955
760	Neotropical	0.140	0.937	0.946
761	Palaearctic	0.135	0.965	0.971
762	Sino Japanese	0.230	0.971	0.983

764 Table 2

765	Variable	Global Afro		Afrotropi	Afrotropical		Australian Neo		Neotropical		Nearctic		Palaearctic		Sino Japanese	
766	Term used	Quadratio	: Linear	Quadratic Linear		Quadratic Linear		Quadratic Linear		Quadratic Linear		Quadratic Linear		Quadratic Linear		
767	Distance to neighbouring realm	-	-0.014	-	-0.052*	-	-0.045*	-	0.022	-	0.081	-	-0.058	-	0.008*	
768	Altitudinal range	0.006*	-0.041*	0.001	-0.018	0.007	-0.021	-0.003*	-0.038*	0.083*	-0.116*	0.028	-0.058	-0.012*	-0.098*	
769	Mean long term climate stability	0.036*	-0.073*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
770	Max long term climate stability	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.080*	-0.270*	-	-	-	-	
771	Long term precipitation stability	-	-	0.010	-0.023	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-0.026*	0.090*	
772	Short term precipitation stability	-	-	-	-	0.024	0.016	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
773	Long term temperature stability	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.068*	-0.071*	-	-	
774	Short term temperature stability	-	-	-	-	-	-	-0.014	-0.011	-	-	-	-	-	-	
775	Species richness	0.144*	0.965*	-0.182*	1.005*	-0.083*	0.987*	-0.132*	0.973*	-0.054*	0.937*	-0.067*	0.985*	-0.140*	1.014*	