### **RESEARCH PAPER**



**ABSTRACT**

### **Aim**

 To test whether tropical habitat groups across the world can be differentiated by using taxon-free mammalian community structures and to discuss the implications of this analysis for palaeoecological community studies.

### **Materials and Methods**

 We used mammalian community data for 169 localities, which were assigned *a priori* to hierarchical Olson (1983) vegetation categories. Species over 500 g were classified into dietary, locomotion, and body mass groups and the resulting group structures were analysed using community structure analyses (NPMANOVA, CAP, SIMPER).

### **Results**

 The test results show that the mammalian community structures are significantly different between all of Olson's categories. These differences are highest at Olson's major and minor ecosystem levels, and require the least number of variable categories. At the vegetation level, the number of variable categories required to distinguish between them becomes higher. Of the dietary groups, the number of frugivore-granivores, frugivore- omnivores, grazers and mixed feeders contribute most to these differences, while the number of arboreal, arboreal-terrestrial and subterranean-terrestrial species are the key locomotor groups. Body mass was not a good discriminator.

### **Main conclusions**

As general ecosystem categories are broken down into more precisely defined habitats, it

 requires more detailed knowledge of the species adaptations to distinguish between them. Many of Olson's vegetation groups represent a continuum of cover that are, at least at the worldwide comparison, too detailed to differentiate when broad generalities are sought. We suggest using three worldwide tropical major ecosystems in mammalian community structure analyses: "Humid, closed forests", "Seasonal or interrupted forests and grasslands", and "Seasonal, open drylands". Our results also demonstrate that community structures defined by both dietary and locomotor adaptations are powerful discriminators of tropical ecosystems and habitats across the continents we examined, but body mass should be interpreted with caution when the research question pertains to multiple continents. 

### **1. INTRODUCTION**

 The use of mammalian communities as proxies for past habitats and environmental conditions has a long established history (e.g. Andrews *et al.,* 1979). Such synecological studies may employ a taxonomic approach in which communities with similar taxonomic compositions are considered to have inhabited analogous environments (Simpson, 1943; Fleming, 1973). However, a "taxon-free" approach is favoured by palaeoecologists concerned about the difficulties in identifying species in the fossil record and the assumption that fossil taxa behaved the same as their modern forms (Harrison, 1962; Andrews *et al*., 1979; Andrews and Hixson, 2014). Such studies focus on how the resident species exploit available spatial and trophic niches irrespective of taxonomic identity through an evaluation of each taxon's adaptations to specific ecological variables, including dietary preferences and locomotor patterns. 

 Freed from the need to identify specific taxa, communities from different continents and time periods can be compared, giving us the tools to analyse past environmental changes, palaeoclimates and habitat distribution on a global scale. However, many mammalian community studies are restricted to a single geographical realm (e.g. Andrews et al., 1979; Reed, 1997, 1998; Mendoza et al., 2004), with few concentrating specifically on mammalian communities between continents (e.g. Kelt *et al.,* 1996; Andrews & Humphrey, 1999; Rodríguez et al., 2006). An implicit assumption in these studies is that mammalian communities from the same types of environment will have similar community structures between continents.

 Comparisons of communities from different world regions can reveal global generalities, assuming that the relationship between size and abundance of species within specific geographical locations and habitats tells us something about the partitioning of resources in natural communities (Peters & Raelson, 1984; Fa and Purvis, 1997). For example, the distribution of species in various classes of body sizes, feeding adaptations, and food 103 habits suggest that the structure of Old and New World tropical mammalian communities is very similar (Fleming, 1973). However, other research demonstrates that despite general resemblances communities from regions with similar climates can radically differ in certain features (Dubost, 1984; Fleagle and Reed, 1996; Fa and Purvis 1997; Rodríguez *et al*., 2006), possibly relating to historic effects. Ecosystems evolve over time (Olson, 1966; Andrews *et al*., 1979; Janis 1993); tectonic, regional, historical and climatic processes may all play a role. Mountain uplift (e.g. the rainshadow cast by the uplift of the East African rift; blocking of the monsoonal winds to Central Asia by uplift of Himalayas), changes in oceanic circulation (opening of Drake's passage between Antarctica and Australia, resulting in a cold circumpolar current around Antarctica), closing of the Tethys sea in Late Miocene to form the Mediterranean, isolation (e.g. Australia with its unique fauna), interchange between continents (e.g. the Great American Interchange of the late Pliocene) and major ecosystem changes (e.g. the current arid configuration of Sahara at the end of the Holocene climatic optimum) each contribute to differences between regional species pools and vegetation (Janis 1993; De Vivo and Carmignotto 2004; Louys et al., 2011; Fortelius 2013; Owen-Smith 2013). This presents a challenge in distinguishing between historical and ecological factors in community structure (Endler 1982) and likewise suggests that mammal community structures around the world will present some significant differences.

 In light of this, we analyse modern mammalian community structures across the tropical belt of four continents: the Americas, Africa, Asia and Australia, which is frequently neglected. We address the following question: can tropical habitats across the world be differentiated on the basis of their mammalian community structures? **2. METHODS 2.1. Localities** This study includes 169 extant tropical localities between 23° 30 N and 23° 30 S (Fig. 1, Appendix S1 in Supporting Information) from previously published studies including Andrews, *et al* (1979) (n= 23), Andrews & Humphrey (1999) (n=16), Reed (1997) (n=18) and Reed (2008) (n=8) and the database compiled by the National Center for Ecological Analysis and Synthesis (NCEAS) workshop on Mammalian Communities (see Badgley *et al*. 2001; van Dam *et al*. 2001; Damuth *et al*. 2002) (n=100). This is supplemented by four unpublished localities from P. Andrews (n=3) and K. Reed (n=1). We endeavoured to use only communities comprised of more than 20 species to ensure completeness of the locality species lists, although in some cases (i.e. tundra and montaneous habitats) the

Coordinates for each locality were taken from Andrews *et al*. (1979), Andrews & Humphrey

number is naturally not likely to be this high (Appendix S1).

 (1999), the NCEAS database and WDPA, the World Database on Protected Areas (IUCN and UNEP 2009). Site-specific references were also consulted (Appendix S1).

### 2.2. **Vegetation categories**

 We used the vegetation classification system of the "Major World Ecosystem Complexes Ranked by Carbon in Live Vegetation" GIS dataset, which characterises the vegetative cover of the Earth's land surface in 0.5 by 0.5 degree grid cells (Olson *et al*., 1983, 1985). The classes can be applied across continents because the system explicitly uses natural vegetation categories without defaulting to generalised physiognomic categories or specific vegetation types (i.e. coconut groves) like those considered in other systems (White, 1983; Eiten, 1992; Lawesson, 1994).

 Olson *et al*. (1983) organises vegetation categories into a hierarchical structure with six levels of increasing complexity. Our analyses are conducted at three different levels corresponding to Olson *et al.*'s (1983) third, fourth and sixth. Their third level, which describes the landscape, is a broad grouping which we call '*major ecosystems'*. The fourth we call '*minor ecosystems'*, which takes into account latitudinal and altitudinal effects. Their sixth level takes into account temperature, moisture and seasonality. For this we use the term '*vegetation category*' (Table 1). We excluded seven categories associated with human impact and agriculture (Leemans *et al*, 1996) and 11 marginal categories that did not describe our localities. Detailed descriptions of selected categories are found in Olson *et al*. (1983).

Localities may cover tens or thousands of kilometres of space depending on whether they

 are national parks, small conservancies, etc. This is not unlike other community analyses (e.g. Reed, 1998; Mendoza *et al.,* 2004). Although one can expect there to be some variation in topography and vegetation on the ground, especially where larger localities are concerned, our samples were selected for their relative homogeneity. Each locality was assigned to a vegetation category by comparing the detailed descriptions in our primary 177 sources to those of Olson's to further ensure that we were correct in our interpretation and that each of the localities did not include multiple broad vegetation complexes. The comparison was first made against the vegetation groups within the same grid cells where the localities are situated, then against the neighbouring ones, followed by those applicable to the tropical region of the locality's country and finally for the whole country. The number of localities included in each vegetation category is summarised in Table 2.

- 
- 2.3. **Locality species lists**
- 

 Species lists for each locality are derived from the published literature (Appendix S1; S2). We only consider species weighing more than 500g (n=607), as micromammals may be under-sampled in modern studies and are poorly represented in fossil sites. We restrict our analysis to non-volant mammals and exclude Chiroptera, Sirenia and Cetacea. This follows a well-established practice of excluding these groups in palaeoecommunity analyses due to the practical difficulties with including them as fossil species; they do not frequently fossilise or they are fossilised under very different taphonomic conditions compared to other, land-dwelling- or larger mammals. Given this, and their rarity in the fossil record, most workers thus exclude them (e.g. Andrews *et al*., 1979; Reed, 1998; Kovarovic *et al*., 2002; Mendoza *et al.,* 2004; Louys *et al.,* 2011). All of the species were matched against the taxonomy of Wilson and Reeder (2005).

## 2.4. **Ecological variables**



2.4.3. *Diet*

 The dietary variable is divided into two levels of food resource preference (Table 3). Diet Level 1 represents the broadest categories of feeding strategy: animalivorous, frugivorous and herbivorous (Miljutin, 2009). Diet Level 2 follows that of Eisenberg (1981) with some 227 modifications: mixed-feeders are added to the herbivore group, and aerial insectivores and foliage-gleaning insectivores are combined into one category: insectivores. As with locomotion, where a species was described in multiple references, the mostly frequently cited dietary preference was used (Appendix S2).

#### 2.5. **Analysis**

 Community structure data may be summarised in two ways: as raw counts of species in 235 each category at each locality or converted to a percentage of the total number of species at each locality. Percentage data is common (Harrison, 1962; Fleming, 1973; Andrews *et al*., 1979; Reed 1997, 1998; Kovarovic *et al*., 2002; Louys, 2007; Louys *et al*., 2009; 2011), raw count data much less so (Mendoza *et al*., 2004, 2005; Rodríguez *et al*., 2006). However, the use of percentages is potentially problematic because they generate a closed system (Aitchison 1986; Hernández & Vrba, 2006), giving rise to the so called 'closure problem' (Butler, 1981) in which the variables lack statistical independence (Jackson, 1997). It is most noticeable with few variables and decreases in magnitude as the number of variables is increased (Grayson, 1984; Jackson, 1997). As some of our analyses had only three groups, we use the number of species within each group transformed to log2(x) + 1 for x > 0, where x is the number of species (Anderson *et al*., 2006; decostand in R package vegan (Oksanen *et al*., 2007)). After transformation, a

 Bray–Curtis distance matrix was calculated (Bray & Curtis, 1957; Legendre & Legendre, 1998). Analyses were conducted in R 3.0.0, using R-packages *stats* and *vegan* (Oksanen *et al*., 2007; R Development Core Team, 2005).

 We tested spatial autocorrelation using the Mantel test (Mantel, 1967). Mantel r of association between Bray-Curtis dissimilarity and distance among sites ranged from a moderate of 0.43 (Mass) to a low of 0.16 (Locomotion) with randomization P-value of 0.001 (999 permutations, results not shown). Mantel correlograms showed that spatial correlation is highest in 414, 1243, 2072, and 2901 km class indices, i.e. localities which are closer together (within a continent) did tend to have more similar species composition. However, both CAP and NPMANOVA (see below) are non-parametric tests and, as such, are not affected by autocorrelation. If the observations are correlated with one another (e.g., temporally or spatially), then randomly shuffling them will eliminate this inherent structure, if it is present (Anderson, 2005). Therefore, a sensitivity analysis was performed using the original Bray-Curtis distance and the distance between NMDS space. The results were visualized with a Shepard plot (not shown here). For two axes (k=2), the resulting stress values were 0.09, 0.11, 0.12, and 0.15 for body mass, locomotion, diet level 1, and diet level 2 respectively. Values <0.1 correspond to a good ordination and values <0.2 still provide useful 2-dimensional ordination of the data (Clarke and Warwick, 2001).

 We performed a constrained ordination (CAP, Canonical Analysis of Principal Coordinates; Anderson and Willis, 2003) to determine if there are differences among mammalian communities. CAP finds the canonical axis that best separates groups in multivariate space, and it also tests the hypothesis of no significant differences in multivariate location among groups. We plotted the product-moment correlation coefficient for each ecological





# 3.3. **Mammalian community structures in Olson's categories** 3.3.1. *Major forest and woodland (FW) and sub-categories within it* FW differs from the other major ecosystems; the only exception is "major wetlands" (WL). It has the largest number of frugivorous and arboreal species compared with more open ecosystems "grass and shrub complexes" (GS) and "tundra and desert" (TD). SIMPER indicates that the lower number of herbivorous species in FW and the lower number of arboreal species in "interrupted woods" (IW) distinguish these two ecosystems. At the minor ecosystem level, the "main tropical/subtropical forest" (TSF) had similar results as FW. The "mid-latitude broad-leaved and mixed forest" (MBF) differed from the IW ecosystems by having lower number of subterranean-terrestrial species. MBF had also fewer terrestrial species than "main grassland or shrubland" (MGS), and more arboreal- terrestrial species than "nonpolar desert or semidesert" (SDS). At the vegetation level, TSF has three sub-groups. These groups are dissimilar between each other and most of the other vegetation groups. However, there were no significant differences between the "tropical dry forest and woodland" (RGD) vs. "tropical savanna and woodlands" (SGW) and "tropical/subtropical broad-leaved humid forest" (TBS) vs. "Tropical montane complexes" (TMC) pairs (Tables 6, 7). 3.3.2. *Interrupted Woods (IW) and sub-categories within it*

 IW differed from the other major ecosystems, WL being the only exception. However, at the minor ecosystem level, the "other dry woods mosaics" (DWM) could be differentiated from the wetlands by having fewer arboreal species.

 At the vegetation level, there were no significant differences between SGW and the "warm or hot shrub and grassland" (MGS) nor between the SGW and RGD as mentioned earlier (Tables 6, 7).

3.3.3. *Grass and Shrub complexes (GS)*

 This major ecosystem had only one minor ecosystem and vegetation group, MGS. GS differs from the other major ecosystems at some of the four community variables. At the minor ecosystem level, MGS did not differ from "nonpolar desert or semidesert" (SDS) and, at the vegetation level, MGS was not different from "tropical savanna and woodlands" (SGW) or "desert and semidesert, (no winter snow)" (SDS) (Tables 6, 7). 3.3.4. *Tundra and Desert (TD) and sub-categories within it*

 TD differs from the other major ecosystems. It had the least number of species in all of the community variables. TD is divided into two minor ecosystems, SDS and "tundra, arctic 367 desert and ice" (TUN<sup>1</sup>), but they do not differ. As mentioned above, MGS and SDS were similar with each other, but MGS and TUN were not (Tables 6, 7).

### 3.3.5. *Major Wetlands (WL)*

 1 The only localities from TUN were high Alpine tundra localities from South America.

This major ecosystem had only one vegetation category, "warm or hot wetlands,

 swamp/marsh" (SWP). WL is the only major ecosystem that does not differ from FW and IW. At the vegetation level, it can only be differentiated from forested (TBS, TRF) or open habitats (SDS, TUN) (Tables 6, 7).

### 4. **DISCUSSION**

 We tested whether tropical habitats across the world can be differentiated on the basis of their mammalian community structures. Generally, our results show that the diet and locomotion categories differentiate the communities best, while body mass performed poorly. As Olson's categories become more tightly defined, the number of ecological variable groups required for differentiation becomes higher. Differences between treeless categories, such as desert and grasslands, are not significant.

4.1. **Ecological variables**

 Differences noted between dietary categories are largely accounted for by the number of frugivores. At Diet Level 2, this signal comes from frugivore-granivores (FG) and frugivore- herbivores (FH) (but see ordination in CAP where frugivore-omnivores are also important, Fig. 2a). Many of these species are primates but there are other frugivorous groups, such as ungulates, also present in high numbers in tropical forests which are under-represented in open habitats such as savannas and grasslands (Bodmer, 1990).

Others have found that the separation of vegetation groups relates more to the

 grazer/browser continuum, rather than the abundance of frugivores (Sponheimer *et al.*, 1999; Janis *et al*., 2000). In our study, the number of herbivores (mainly grazers and browsers in SIMPER, grazers and mixed-feeders in the CAP ordination) is important only at the minor ecosystem and vegetation level where "interrupted woods" (IW) and treeless areas like grasslands and tundra, are differentiated from each other. Animalivorous groups 401 do not impact on the differences between major or minor ecosystems but, at the vegetation level, the low number of carnivorous species in MGS distinguishes this habitat from RGD. Similar results were obtained by Reed (1997, 1998) where frugivores, fruit/insect eaters and grazers discriminated between habitats with no clear contribution from animalivorous taxa. Herbivores and frugivores are mainly primary or secondary consumers while 406 animalivores are higher in the trophic hierarchy. This may be the reason why habitats are reflected more by their primary and secondary consumers and the 'signal' from the primary production weakens towards the top of the trophic hierarchy.

 When we compare results between Diet Level 1 and 2, the differentiation of the major and minor ecosystems and the vegetation categories is based on similar variables which relate 412 to the abundance of frugivores and herbivores. The differences are more nuanced when we consider Diet Level 2, with between one and six variables required to distinguish between various habitat pairs. The broader classification (i.e. Diet Level 1), requiring a consideration of only frugivory and herbivory, may make it a more robust approach for worldwide ecosystem and vegetation comparisons, although clearly less detail is captured. 

 In terms of the locomotion groups, the number of arboreally adapted species differentiates closed (FW, IW) from open habitats (GS, TD). This is a conclusion borne out by many others (Reed 1997; Louys *et al*., 2011) who also demonstrate that an abundance of

 arboreal species indicates the presence of well-developed tree cover. Primates and tree- dwelling rodents comprise the majority of these taxa. The higher number of terrestrial- aquatic species in wetlands (WL) only separated it from TD; otherwise WL did not differentiate from FW and IW. We conjecture that the species lists from wetlands include taxa from nearby areas that periodically visit for drinking and maybe counted as inhabitants of both areas because they are observed in each. Interestingly, the number of terrestrial species contributed very little to the differences between community structures in SIMPER. Terrestriality may be too general of a category for describing species that move about on the land surface. By adding more detailed locomotor classes (i.e. cursorial), the separation between open and closed habitats could be clearer. In the CAP analysis, the number of subterranean-terrestrial and terrestrial species did distinguish between humid and forested localities (TBS, TRF) and seasonal or less forested areas (RGD, STW, SGW, MGS). Seasonality and the inconsistent availability of food throughout the year can be dealt with in two ways: migration, which requires terrestrial movement, or by caching food resources, which subterranean-terrestrial species generally do.

 Body mass categories did not clearly differentiate community structures, particularly in vegetation categories. This may be a consequence of the scale of the investigation. Work by Brown and Maurer (1989) has shown that the frequency distribution of body sizes appears to be general; it is modal and skewed towards smaller species when large areas (i.e. continents or biomes) are sampled, whereas there are approximately equal numbers 442 of species in each size category in smaller, local areas. They suggest that a strong negative interaction prevents local coexistence of similar-sized species, so one would therefore not expect that community structures could be distinguished at this scale. However, further analysis of the data showed that the size ranges of mammals differed on  each continent. Africa has a higher proportion of larger mammals, whilst America and Australia have smaller species with Asia somewhere in between (Fig. 2d). This pattern is also observable in the palaeontological record of the Pleistocene and is likely to have roots deep in time (Janis 1993; De Vivo and Carmignotto 2004; Louys *et al.,* 2011; Fortelius 2013; Owen-Smith 2013).

 We found that only the number of small (0.5-8 kg, 8-45 kg) and large (360+ kg) species has the highest contribution (SIMPER) for some of the community pairs. The importance of small species is likely that, as a group, there is more variety in both dietary preferences and locomotion. Large species are almost always terrestrial herbivores, separating grasslands and savannas from forests, whereas small species can be arboreal, terrestrial, subterranean, as well as insectivores, frugivores, and herbivores. Although a recent study (M. Rodríguez *et al*., 2006) has shown that body size can be useful, this is only clear at higher latitudes suggesting that the warmer the annual temperature, the less likely body size is helpful in distinguishing habitats.

4.2. **Distinguishing Olson's categories**

 Generally, major ecosystems can be differentiated by the dietary and locomotor adaptations of their constituent species, but body mass is not a robust discriminator. For example, mass does not differentiate the FW-IW-GS continuum. This is likely to relate to historical differences between the continents that have resulted in unique body size ranges that are not correlated with habitat (Louys *et al.*, 2011).

 Minor ecosystems, particularly forested areas, are the easiest to distinguish from other categories. However, some pairs share similar mammalian community structures. These include MGS-SDS and SDS-TUN. Most of these are open environments that gradually transform into each other across the landscape and are likely to share species that are comfortably adapted to ecotones and a wider array of ecological conditions.

 At the detailed level of vegetation category, the general pattern of differences between forested and open areas are still noticeable: the number of frugivorous and arboreal species account for most of the differences. However, the same types of pairs that did not differentiate at the minor ecosystem level can now be distinguished. These include SGW- RGD; SGW-MGS; TMC-TBS; MGS-SDS and SDS-TUN. The division of the minor ecosystem TSM into SGW and TMC reveals the true nature of this group: SGW represents more open and seasonal areas and TMC is more forested. This may be the reason why SGW does not clearly differ from RGD and MGS. Both SGW and RGD have some number of dry months during the year, are widespread and often mixed vegetation complexes (Olson *et al.,* 1983). SGW is a mosaic that contains dry, grassy areas as well as places that are similar to tropical seasonal forests. On the other hand, RGD may also alternate with grassy savannas, so that points of separation become arbitrary (Olson *et al.,* 1983). In the constrained ordination (CAP), RGD plotted near or within the SGW, STW, and MGS, which indicates that seasonality plays a major role for the mammalian composition of this vegetation group. TMC consists of rainy forests that may be locally denser than nearby lowlands and are more similar to woodlands, such as RGD (Olson *et al.,* 1983). Other studies have subsumed montane forests into a general forest category (e.g. Reed, 1998). Although Olson classifies TMC as a part of interrupted woods (due to lower mean carbon density), our results also suggest that the community structure of TMC is similar to forest

complexes and that it is not appropriate to consider this habitat a part of IW.

### **4.3. Palaeoecological implications**

 Our study confirms that palaeoecological reconstructions of tropical fossil localities based on dietary and locomotor variables can be obtained. Questions raised regarding the appropriateness of modern comparative datasets derived from localities across multiple continents are possibly unwarranted, unless body size has been given significant consideration. This is not to say that ecological differences between the continents do not exist in the structure of communities. We showed some body mass differences with results similar to others (e.g. Smith *et al.,* 2004; Louys *et al.,* 2011), particularly in demonstrating that Africa has a higher number of large-bodied taxa; our tentative suggestion is that the differences are perhaps more meaningful than other workers who emphasise that body size distributions across continents are not significant (e.g. Smith *et al.,* 2004). . For example, during the drier late Pleistocene last glacial maximum, the body mass groups of mammalian faunas in South America and Africa were quite similar. However, during the wetter Holocene climatic optimum there was a decrease in open vegetation areas that lead to the loss of larger-sized mammal lineages in South America, whilst they survived in Africa. As a result, today Africa is richer in the number of species above 5 kg (De Vivo and Carmignotto 2004). In addition, Louys *et al.,* (2011) hypothesise that faunal exchange over the past several million years between Africa and Asia contributes to community convergence, whereas the much longer separation of the New World from the Old World relates to differences between their communities. Furthermore, they posit that historical factors function on a much longer temporal scale in shaping community structure, which

 suggests that some caution is warranted in selecting comparative communities from across the world for palaeoecological reconstructions of sites located on a continent that has been long separated from the others, or for analyses involving deep time. This can be interpreted from our results, too. Although we did not analyse continental differences in the other ecovariables, our results show only relatively small numbers of similar mammalian community structures within worldwide tropical vegetation classes. This indicates that historical and ecological factors are shaping mammalian community structure slightly differently in relatively similar primary production environments. (Endler 1982). In addition to caveats regarding the usefulness of body mass as a habitat discriminator, our results provide an additional principal observation for palaeoecological community studies. Some vegetation groups represent a continuum of cover (TMC-TBS-TRF, RGD- SGW-MGS-SDS) that are, at least at the worldwide comparison, too detailed to differentiate when broad generalities are sought. This may be related to the methodology, in which habitats on this continuum are forced into discrete categories for the sake of analysis. The ecological reality is that differences between these groups are probably much more subtle than these discrete categories can be analysed using our ordination- based approaches and other common tests. One way around this problem may be to focus on reconstructing not habitat categories specifically, but the variable amount of canopy cover available in them, as Louys, *et al.,* 2015 have done. However, one may seek more ecological detail than this, whereby the use of well-defined habitat categories is both convenient and analytically manageable. Where this option is pursued, we suggest using three worldwide tropical major ecosystems: "Humid, closed forests" that contains TMC, TBS, and TRF; "Seasonal or interrupted forests and grasslands" that contains RGD, SGW, and STW; and "Seasonal, open drylands" that contains MGS, SDS, and TUN (TBC and SWP were difficult to differentiate from the other groups so they are excluded from our

 three groups; the former exists mostly in mid-latitudes and is a marginal habitat in the Tropics, whilst the latter is a generalised category that can be found naturally within many other habitats). These broad groups are similar in structure to those described by Mendoza *et al*. (2004): "evergreen forests", "wooded savannahs that share grass and browse" and "arid communities with sparse plant cover". They identified these in strictly African communities, but they appear to hold at the global level, as well, further highlighting their utility in ecological reconstructions. Interestingly, these authors do not consider locomotion in their study, but assign each large mammal taxon to a group which combines feeding strategy and body size.

 The data as we have analysed them herein demonstrate their wide applicability in distinguishing between modern habitats and, by extension, fossil localities where relatively complete species lists can be obtained. We appreciate that defining palaeospecies is not a straightforward task, but since we find that more precise habitat reconstructions are every bit as possible as broad ecosystem discrimination where increasingly detailed species information is analysed, palaeontological research should continue to approach questions of individual species adaptive complexes, as well as palaeocommunity structures and habitat affiliations.

### **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

 We wish to thank Mikael Fortelius for suggesting this study and Peter Andrews whose earlier studies inspired it. We thank Peter Andrews, John Damuth, and Kaye Reed for assistance with mammalian datasets. We are grateful to Lee Hsiang Liow, Mikael



### **REFERENCES**

- Aitchison, J. (1986) *The statistical analysis of compositional data.* Springer, Netherlands.
- Anderson, M.J. (2001) A new method for non‐parametric multivariate analysis of variance.
- *Austral Ecology* **26,** 32-46.
- Anderson, M.J., (2005) PERMANOVA. Permutational multivariate analysis of variance.
- Department of Statistics, University of Auckland, Auckland.
- Anderson, M.J. & Willis, T.J. (2003) Canonical analysis of principal coordinates: a useful
- method of constrained ordination for ecology. *Ecology* **84,** 511-525.
- Anderson, M.J., Ellingsen, K.E. & McArdle, B.H. (2006) Multivariate dispersion as a measure of beta diversity. *Ecology Letters* **9,** 683-693.
- Andrews, P. & Humphrey, L. (1999) African Miocene environments and the transition to
- early hominines. *African Biogeography, Climate Change, and Human Evolution.*(ed. by
- T.G. Bromage & F. Schrenk), pp. 282-300. Oxford University Press, New York.
- Andrews, P. & Hixson, S. (2014) Taxon-free methods of palaeoecology. *Annales Zoologici Fennici* **51,** 269-284.
- Andrews, P., Lord, J.M. & Evans, E.M.N. (1979) Patterns of Ecological Diversity in Fossil
- and Modern Mammalian Faunas. *Biological Journal of the Linnean Society* **11,** 177-205.
- *Paleontology* **21 (suppl.), 30A**.
- Bodmer, R.E. (1990) Ungulate frugivores and the browser-grazer continuum. *Oikos* **57,** 319-325.
- Bray, J.R. & Curtis, J.T. (1957) An ordination of the upland forest communities of southern Wisconsin. *Ecological Monographs* **27,** 325-349.
- Brown, J.H. & Maurer, B.A. (1989) Macroecology: the division of food and space among
- species on continents. *Science* **243,** 1145-1150.
- Butler, J. (1981) Effect of various transformations on the analysis of percentage data.
- *Journal of the International Association for Mathematical Geology* **13,** 53-68.
- Clarke, K.R. (1993) Non-parametric multivariate analyses of changes in community
- structure. *Austral Ecology* **18,** 117-143.
- Clarke, K., and R. Warwick. 2001. Change in marine communities: an approach to
- statistical analysis and interpretation. Second edition. Primer-E Ltd., Plymouth, UK
- Damuth, J., Fortelius, M., Andrews, P., Badgley, C., Hadly, E.A., Hixon, S., Janis, C.,
- Madden, R.H., Reed, K., Smith, F.A., Theodor, J., Van Dam, J.A., Van Valkenburgh, B. &
- Werdelin, L. (2002) Reconstructing mean annual precipitation based on mammalian dental
- morphology and local species richness. *Journal of Vertebrate Paleontology* **22 (suppl.),**
- **48A**.
- De Vivo, M. and Carmignotto, A.P. (2004) Holocene Vegetation Change and the Mammal Faunas of South America and Africa. *Journal of Biogeography* **31**, 943–957.
- Dubost, G. (1984) Comparison of the diets of frugivorous forest ruminants of Gabon. *Journal of Mammalogy* **65,** 298-316.
- Eisenberg, J.F. (1981) *The mammalian radiations: an analysis of trends in evolution, adaptation, and behavior.* University of Chicago Press.
- Eiten, G. (1992) How Names Are Used for Vegetation. *Journal of Vegetation Science* **3,**  419-424.
- Endler, J.A. (1982) Problems in Distinguishing Historical from Ecological Factors in
- Biogeography. American Zoologist **22**, 441–452.
- Fa, J.E. & Purvis, A. (1997) Body size, diet and population density in Afrotropical forest
- mammals: a comparison with neotropical species. *Journal of Animal Ecology* **66,** 98-112.
- Fleagle, J.G. & Reed, K.E. (1996) Comparing primate communities: a multivariate
- approach. *Journal of human evolution* **30,** 489-510.
- Fleming, T.H. (1973) Numbers of Mammal Species in North and Central American Forest
- Communities. *Ecology* **54,** 555-563.
- Fortelius, M. (2013) The grassiness of all flesh. *Journal of Biogeography* **40,** 1213-1214.
- Grayson, D.K. (1984) *Quantitative zooarchaeology: topics in the analysis of archaeological*
- *faunas.* Academic Press. Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.
- Harrison, J.L. (1962) The Distribution of Feeding Habits Among Animals in a Tropical Rain Forest. *Journal of Animal Ecology* **31,** 53-63.
- Hernández Fernández, M. & Vrba, E.S. (2006) Plio-Pleistocene climatic change in the
- Turkana Basin (East Africa): Evidence from large mammal faunas. *Journal of human*
- *evolution* **50,** 595-626.
- IUCN and UNEP. (2009) *The World Database on Protected Areas (WDPA). UNEP-WCMC. Cambridge, UK. Available from [http://www.wdpa.org](http://www.wdpa.org/)*
- Jackson, D.A. (1997) Compositional data in community ecology: the paradigm or peril of proportions? *Ecology* **78,** 929-940.
- Janis, C.M. (1993) Tertiary Mammal Evolution in the Context of Changing Climates,
- Vegetation, and Tectonic Events. *Annual Review of Ecology and Systematics* **24**, 467– 500.
- Janis, C.M., Damuth, J. & Theodor, J.M. (2000) Miocene ungulates and terrestrial primary productivity: where have all the browsers gone? *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America* **97,** 7899-7904.
- Jones, K.E., Bielby, J., Cardillo, M., Fritz, S.A., O'Dell, J., Orme, C.D.L., Safi, K., Sechrest, W., Boakes, E.H. & Carbone, C. (2009) PanTHERIA: a species-level database of life history, ecology, and geography of extant and recently extinct mammals. *Ecology* **90,**  2648-2648.
- Kelt, D.A., Brown, J.H., Heske, E.J., Marquet, P.A., Morton, S.R., Reid, J.R.W., Rogovin,
- K.A., Shenbrot, G. (1996) Community structure of desert small mammals: comparisons
- across four continents. *Ecology* **77,** 746-761.
- Kovarovic, K., Andrews, P. & Aiello, L. (2002) The palaeoecology of the Upper Ndolanya
- Beds at Laetoli, Tanzania. *Journal of Human Evolution* **43,** 395-418.
- Lawesson, J.E. (1994) Some Comments on the Classification of African Vegetation. *Journal of Vegetation Science* **5,** 441-444.
- Leemans, R., Cramer, W. & Van Minnen, J.G. (1996) Prediction of global biome
- distribution using bioclimatic equilibrium models. *Global Change: Effects on Coniferous*
- *Forests and Grasslands. SCOPE* (ed. by A.I. Breymeyer, D.O. Hall, J.M. Melillo & G.I.
- Ågren), pp. 414-450. John Wiley and Sons, New York.
- Legendre, P. & Legendre, L. (1998) Numerical Ecology (2nd English edition) Elsevier
- Science BV. *Amsterdam, the Netherlands*.
- Lintulaakso, K. (2013) *MammalBase — Database of recent mammals.*
- *[http://www.mammalbase.net.](http://www.mammalbase.net./)*
- Liow, L.H., Fortelius, M., Bingham, E., Lintulaakso, K., Mannila, H., Flynn, L. & Stenseth,
- N.C. (2008) Higher origination and extinction rates in larger mammals. *Proceedings of the*
- *National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America* **105,** 6097-6102.
- Liow, L.H., Fortelius, M., Lintulaakso, K., Mannila, H. & Stenseth, N.C. (2009) Lower
- Extinction Risk in Sleep-or-Hide Mammals. *American Naturalist* **173,** 264-272.

 Louys, J., Meloro, C., Elton, S., Ditchfield, P. & Bishop, L.C. (2011) Mammal community structure correlates with arboreal heterogeneity in faunally and geographically diverse habitats: implications for community convergence. *Global Ecology and Biogeography* **20**, 717-729.

 Louys, J., Meloro, C., Elton, S., Ditchfield, P. & Bishop, L.C. (2015) Analytical framework for reconstructing heterogeneous environmental variables from mammal community structure. *Journal of Human Evolution* **78,** 1-11.

Louys, J. (2007) *Ecology and extinction of Southeast Asia's megafauna. PhD Thesis,* 

University of New South Wales Sydney, Australia.

 Louys, J., Travouillon, K.J., Bassarova, M. & Tong, H. (2009) The use of protected natural areas in palaeoecological analyses: assumptions, limitations and application. *Journal of Archaeological Science* **36,** 2274-2288.

 Mendoza, M., Janis, C.M. & Palmqvist, P. (2005) Ecological patterns in the trophic-size structure of large mammal communities: a 'taxon-free' characterization. *Evolutionary Ecology Research* **7,** 505-530.

Mendoza, M., Goodwin, B. & Criado, C. (2004) Emergence of community structure in

terrestrial mammal-dominated ecosystems. *Journal of theoretical biology* **230,** 203-214.

 Miljutin, A. (2009) Substrate utilization and feeding strategies of mammals: description and classification. *Estonian Journal of Ecology* **58,** 60–71.

Oksanen, J., Kindt, R., Legendre, P., O'Hara, B., Stevens, M.H.H., Oksanen, M.J. &

Suggests, M. (2007) The vegan package. *Community ecology package* .

- Olson, E.C. (1966) Community evolution and the origin of mammals. *Ecology* **47,** 291-302.
- Olson, J.S., Watts, J.A. & Allison, L.J. (1983) Carbon in live vegetation of major world ecosystems. Oak Ridge National Laboratory, Oak Ridge TN.
- Olson, J.S., Watts, J.A. & Allison, L.J. (1985) Major World Ecosystem Complexes Ranked 715 by Carbon in Live Vegetation (NDP-017).
- Owen‐Smith, N. (2013) Contrasts in the large herbivore faunas of the southern continents
- in the late Pleistocene and the ecological implications for human origins. *Journal of*
- *Biogeography* **40,** 1215-1224.
- Peters, R.H. & Raelson, J.V. (1984) Relations between individual size and mammalian
- population density. *American Naturalist* **124**, 498-517.
- R Development Core Team. (2005) R: A language and environment for statistical
- computing. *R foundation for Statistical Computing*.
- Reed, K.E. (2008) Paleoecological patterns at the Hadar hominin site, Afar Regional State,
- Ethiopia. *Journal of human evolution* **54,** 743-768.
- Reed, K.E. (1998) Using Large Mammal Communities to Examine Ecological and
- Taxonomic Structure and Predict Vegetation in Extant and Extinct Assemblages.
- *Paleobiology* **24,** 384-408.
- Reed, K.E. (1997) Early hominid evolution and ecological change through the African Plio-
- Pleistocene. *Journal of human evolution* **32,** 289-322.

 Rodríguez, J., Hortal, J. & Nieto, M. (2006) An evaluation of the influence of environment and biogeography on community structure: the case of Holarctic mammals. *Journal of Biogeography* **33,** 291-303.

Rodríguez, M.Á., López‐Sañudo, I.L. & Hawkins, B.A. (2006) The geographic distribution

of mammal body size in Europe. *Global Ecology and Biogeography* **15,** 173-181.

 Simpson, G.G. (1943) Mammals and the nature of continents. *American Journal of Science* **241,** 1-31.

Smith, F.A., Brown, J.H., Haskell, J.P., Lyons, S.K., Alroy, J., Charnov E.L., Dayan, T.,

Enquist, B.J., Morgan Ernest, S.K., Hadly, E.A., Jones, K.E., Kauman, D.M., Marquet,

P.A., Maurer, B.A., Niklas, K.J., Porter, W/P/. Tiffney, B., Willig, M.R. (2004) Similarity of

 mammalian body size across the taxonomic hierarchy and across space and time. *The American Naturalist* **163,** 672-691.

Sponheimer, M., Reed, K.E. & Lee-Thorp, J.A. (1999) Combining isotopic and

ecomorphological data to refine bovid paleodietary reconstruction: a case study from the

Makapansgat Limeworks hominin locality. *Journal of human evolution* **36,** 705-718.

van Dam, J.A., Andrews, P., Badgley, C., Damuth, J., Fortelius, M., Hadly, E.A., Hixson,

S., Janis, C., Madden, R.H., Reed, K., Smith, F.A., Theodor, J., Van Valkenburgh, B. &

Werdelin, L. (2001) Within-habitat mammal diversity and productivity and their Recent

patterns across latitude. *Journal of Vertebrate Paleontology* **21 (suppl), 43A**.

- White, F. & Unesco. (1983) *The vegetation of Africa: a descriptive memoir to accompany*
- *the Unesco/AETFAT/UNSO vegetation map of Africa.* Unesco.
- Wilson, D.E. & Reeder, D.A.M. (2005) *Mammal species of the world: a taxonomic and geographic reference.* Johns Hopkins University Press.
- 

### **BIOSKETCH**

- **Kari Lintulaakso** is a PhD student at the University of Helsinki. He specialises in recent
- mammals and his main interest is linking current mammalian community structures with
- key environmental factors that can be used in palaeoclimatological and environmental

studies.

- **Kris Kovarovic** is a Senior Lecturer in Human Evolution at Durham University, UK. She
- specialises in mammalian community palaeoecology, ungulate ecomorphology and the use
- of fossil mammals in reconstructing the environment of hominin evolution.

### **SUPPORTING INFORMATION**

- Additional Supporting Information may be found in the online version of this article:
- **Appendix S1:** 169 localities from within the tropical belt
- **Appendix S2:** Locality species and ecological variable assignments