Supplementary Information

Sequeira *et al*.

Transferring Biodiversity Models for Conservation: Opportunities and Challenges

Contents

Search details for Figure 2

Cumulative number of peer-reviewed journal articles listed on the ISI Web of Science (webofknowledge.com) were calculated after searching within the subjects *Ecology*, *Biodiversity Conservation*, *Environmental Sciences*, *Zoology*, *Marine Freshwater Biology* and *Fisheries* as of 7th August 2016. Only papers written in English were considered. Biodiversity models were defined as per (Tulloch et al. 2016), with the addition of the following the keywords: “SDM*”, “environmental niche mod*”, “climat* envelope”, “resource selection function”, “climat* matching mod*” and “potential habitat distribution model*”, where * denote wildcard characters. Publications addressing transferability were identified by refining the search query using the terms “transferab*”, “extrapol*”, “hindcast*”, “forecast*”, “generalit*”, “transference”, “project*”, “backcast*”, “generalizability” and “generalizability”.

Appendix S1: Complete list of references included in Table 1 and Table 2

1. Barbosa, A.M. et al. (2009) Transferability of environmental favourability models in geographic space: The case of the Iberian desman (Galemys pyrenaicus) in Portugal and Spain. Ecol Model 220 (5), 747-754.
2. Thuiller, W. et al. (2004) Effects of restricting environmental range of data to project current and future species distributions. Ecography 27, 165-172.
3. Randin, C.F. et al. (2006) Are niche-based species distribution models transferable in space? J Biogeogr 33 (10), 1689-1703.
4. Williams-Tripp, M. et al. (2012) Modeling rare species distribution at the edge: The case for the vulnerable endemic Pyrenean desman in France. The Scientific World Journal 2012, art612965.
5. Pearson, R.G. et al. (2007) Predicting species distributions from small numbers of occurrence records: A test case using cryptic geckos in Madagascar. J Biogeogr 34 (1), 102-117.
6. Wisz, M.S. et al. (2008) Effects of sample size on the performance of species distribution models. Divers Distrib 14 (5), 763-773.
7. Zharikov, Y. et al. (2009) Interplay between physical and predator landscapes affects transferability of shorebird distribution models. Landsc Ecol 24 (1), 129-144.
8. Edwards, T.C. et al. (2006) Effects of sample survey design on the accuracy of classification tree models in species distribution models. Ecol Model 199 (2), 132-141.
9. Hirzel, A. and Guisan, A. (2002) Which is the optimal sampling strategy for habitat suitability modelling? Ecol Model 157 (2-3), 331-341.
10. Barnes, M.A. et al. (2014) Geographic selection bias of occurrence data influences transferability of invasive Hydrilla verticillata distribution models. Ecol Evol 4 (12), 2584-2593.

11. Lobo, J.M. et al. (2007) How does the knowledge about the spatial distribution of Iberian dung beetle species accumulate over time? Divers Distrib 13 (6), 772-780.
12. Varela, S. et al. (2014) Environmental filters reduce the effects of sampling bias and improve predictions of ecological niche models. Ecography 37 (11), 1084-1091.
13. Dextrase, A.J. et al. (2014) Modelling occupancy of an imperilled stream fish at multiple scales while accounting for imperfect detection: implications for conservation. Freshw Biol 59 (9), 1799-1815.
14. Zipkin, E.F. et al. (2012) Evaluating the predictive abilities of community occupancy models using AUC while accounting for imperfect detection. Ecol Appl 22 (7), 1962-1972.
15. Bamford, A.J. et al. (2009) Trade-offs between specificity and regional generality in habitat association models: A case study of two species of African vulture. J Appl Ecol 46 (4), 852-860.
16. Graf, R. et al. (2006) On the generality of habitat distribution models: A case study of capercaillie in three Swiss regions. Ecography 29 (3), 319-328.
17. Vanreusel, W. et al. (2007) Transferability of species distribution models: A functional habitat approach for two regionally threatened butterflies. Conserv Biol 21 (1), 201-212.
18. Domisch, S. et al. (2013) Choice of study area and predictors affect habitat suitability projections, but not the performance of species distribution models of stream biota. Ecol Model 257, 1-10.
19. Dobrowski, S.Z. et al. (2011) Modeling plant ranges over 75 years of climate change in California, USA: Temporal transferability and species traits. Ecol Monogr 81 (2), 241-257.

20. Fielding, A.H. and Bell, J.F. (1997) A review of methods for the assessment of prediction errors in conservation presence/absence models. Environ Conserv 24 (01), 38-49.
21. Vaughan, I. and Ormerod, S. (2005) The continuing challenges of testing species distribution models. Ecology 42, 720-730.
22. Jiménez-Valverde, A. and Lobo, J. (2006) The ghost of unbalanced species distribution data in geographical model predictions. Divers Distrib 12 (5), 521-524.
23. Duque-Lazo, J. et al. (2016) Transferability of species distribution models: The case of Phytophthora cinnamomi in Southwest Spain and Southwest Australia. Ecol Model 320, 62-70.
24. García-Callejas, D. and Araújo, M.B. (2016) The effects of model and data complexity on predictions from species distributions models. Ecol Model 326, 4-12.
25. Hijmans, R.J. and Graham, C.H. (2006) The ability of climate envelope models to predict the effect of climate change on species distributions. Glob Chang Biol 12 (12), 2272-2281.
26. Lauria, V. et al. (2015) Spatial transferability of habitat suitability models of Nephrops norvegicus among fished areas in the Northeast Atlantic: Sufficiently stable for marine resource conservation? PloS one 10 (2), e0117006.
27. McAlpine, C. et al. (2008) Can multiscale models of species’ distribution be generalized from region to region? A case study of the koala. J Appl Ecol 45 (2), 558-567.
28. Merow, C. et al. (2014) What do we gain from simplicity versus complexity in species distribution models? Ecography 37 (12), 1267-1281.
29. Moreno-Amat, E. et al. (2015) Impact of model complexity on cross-temporal transferability in Maxent species distribution models: An assessment using paleobotanical data. Ecol Model 312, 308-317.

30. Verbruggen, H. et al. (2013) Improving transferability of introduced species' distribution models: New tools to forecast the spread of a highly invasive seaweed. PLoS ONE 8 (6), e68337.
31. Huang, J. et al. (2016) Temporal transferability of stream fish distribution models: Can uncalibrated SDMs predict distribution shifts over time? Divers Distrib 22 (6), 651-662.
32. Sundblad, G. et al. (2009) Transferability of predictive fish distribution models in two coastal systems. Estuarine, Coastal and Shelf Science 83 (1), 90-96.
33. Barrientos, R. and de Dios Miranda, J. (2012) Can we explain regional abundance and road-kill patterns with variables derived from local-scale road-kill models? Evaluating transferability with the European polecat. Divers Distrib 18 (7), 635-647.
34. Martin, J. et al. (2012) Brown bear habitat suitability in the Pyrenees: Transferability across sites and linking scales to make the most of scarce data. J Appl Ecol 49 (3), 621-631.
35. Murray, J. et al. (2011) Evaluating model transferability for a threatened species to adjacent areas: Implications for rock-wallaby conservation. Austral Ecol 36 (1), 76-89.
36. Sequeira, A.M. et al. (2016) Transferability of predictive models of coral reef fish species richness. J Appl Ecol 53 (1), 64-72.
37. Torres, L.G. et al. (2015) Poor transferability of species distribution models for a pelagic predator, the grey petrel, indicates contrasting habitat preferences across ocean basins. PLoS ONE 10 (3), e0120014.
38. Crase, B. et al. (2014) Incorporating spatial autocorrelation into species distribution models alters forecasts of climate-mediated range shifts. Glob Chang Biol 20 (8), 2566-2579.
39. Guisan, A. and Thuiller, W. (2005) Predicting species distribution: Offering more than simple habitat models. Ecol Lett 8 (9), 993-1009.

40. Schadt, S. et al. (2002) Assessing the suitability of central European landscapes for the reintroduction of Eurasian lynx. J Appl Ecol 39 (2), 189-203.
41. Swanson, A.K. et al. (2013) Spatial regression methods capture prediction uncertainty in species distribution model projections through time. Glob Ecol Biogeogr 22 (2), 242-251.
42. Breiner, F.T. et al. (2015) Overcoming limitations of modelling rare species by using ensembles of small models. Methods Ecol Evol 6 (10), 1210-1218.
43. Crimmins, S.M. et al. (2013) Evaluating ensemble forecasts of plant species distributions under climate change. Ecol Model 266, 126-130.
44. Scales, K.L. et al. (2016) Identifying predictable foraging habitats for a wide-ranging marine predator using ensemble ecological niche models. Divers Distrib 22 (2), 212-224.
45. Wenger, S.J. and Olden, J.D. (2012) Assessing transferability of ecological models: An underappreciated aspect of statistical validation. Methods Ecol Evol 3 (2), 260-267.
46. Dambach, J. and Rödder, D. (2011) Applications and future challenges in marine species distribution modeling. Aquat Conservat Mar Freshwat Ecosyst 21 (1), 92-100.
47. Strauss, B. and Biedermann, R. (2007) Evaluating temporal and spatial generality: How valid are species–habitat relationship models? Ecol Model 204 (1-2), 104-114.
48. Wang, L. and Jackson, D.A. (2014) Shaping up model transferability and generality of species distribution modeling for predicting invasions: Implications from a study on Bythotrephes longimanus. Biol Invasions 16 (10), 2079-2103.
49. Araújo, M.B. and Luoto, M. (2007) The importance of biotic interactions for modelling species distributions under climate change. Glob Ecol Biogeogr 16 (6), 743-753.
50. Bateman, B.L. et al. (2012) Biotic interactions influence the projected distribution of a specialist mammal under climate change. Divers Distrib 18 (9), 861-872.

51. Godsoe, W. et al. (2015) Information on biotic interactions improves transferability of distribution models. Am Nat 185 (2), 281-290.
52. Heikkinen, R.K. et al. (2007) Biotic interactions improve prediction of boreal bird distributions at macro-scales. Glob Ecol Biogeogr 16 (6), 754-763.
53. Hof, A.R. et al. (2012) How biotic interactions may alter future predictions of species distributions: Future threats to the persistence of the arctic fox in Fennoscandia. Divers Distrib 18 (6), 554-562.
54. Pellissier, L. et al. (2013) Combining food web and species distribution models for improved community projections. Ecol Evol 3 (13), 4572-4583.
55. Tylianakis, J.M. et al. (2008) Global change and species interactions in terrestrial ecosystems. Ecol Lett 11 (12), 1351-1363.
56. Wisz, M.S. et al. (2013) The role of biotic interactions in shaping distributions and realised assemblages of species: Implications for species distribution modelling. Biological Reviews 88 (1), 15-30.
57. Austin, M.P. and Van Niel, K.P. (2011) Improving species distribution models for climate change studies: Variable selection and scale. J Biogeogr 38 (1), 1-8.
58. Heinänen, S. et al. (2012) High resolution species distribution models of two nesting water bird species: A study of transferability and predictive performance. Landsc Ecol 27 (4), 545-555.
59. Budic, L. et al. (2016) Squares of different sizes: effect of geographical projection on model parameter estimates in species distribution modeling. Ecol Evol 6 (1), 202-211.
60. Cord, A.F. et al. (2014) Remote sensing data can improve predictions of species richness by stacked species distribution models: A case study for Mexican pines. J Biogeogr 41 (4), 736-748.

61. Deblauwe, V. et al. (2016) Remotely sensed temperature and precipitation data improve species distribution modelling in the tropics. Glob Ecol Biogeogr.
62. Zimmermann, N.E. et al. (2010) Climatic extremes improve predictions of spatial patterns of tree species. Proc Natl Acad Sci Unit States Am 106 (Supplement 2), 19723-19728.
63. Graham, M.H. (2003) Confronting multicollinearity in ecological multiple regression. Ecology 84 (11), 2809-2815.
64. Kamino, L.H. et al. (2012) Challenges and perspectives for species distribution modelling in the neotropics. Biology letters 8 (3), 324-326.
65. Tuanmu, M.N. et al. (2011) Temporal transferability of wildlife habitat models: Implications for habitat monitoring. J Biogeogr 38 (8), 1510-1523.
66. Fernández, M. et al. (2012) Does adding multi-scale climatic variability improve our capacity to explain niche transferability in invasive species? Ecol Model 246, 60-67.
67. Porfirio, L.L. et al. (2014) Improving the use of species distribution models in conservation planning and management under climate change. PloS one 9 (11), e113749.
68. Pearman, P.B. et al. (2008) Niche dynamics in space and time. Trends Ecol Evol 23 (3), 149-158.
69. Howard, C. et al. (2014) Improving species distribution models: The value of data on abundance. Methods Ecol Evol 5 (6), 506-513.
70. Kharouba, H.M. et al. (2009) Historically calibrated predictions of butterfly species' range shift using global change as a pseudo-experiment. Ecology 90 (8), 2213-2222.
71. Phillips, S.J. (2008) Transferability, sample selection bias and background data in presence-only modelling: A response to Peterson et al.(2007). Ecography 31 (2), 272-278.

72. Acevedo, P. et al. (2014) Generalizing and transferring spatial models: a case study to predict Eurasian badger abundance in Atlantic Spain. Ecol Model 275, 1-8.
73. Fernández, M. and Hamilton, H. (2015) Ecological niche transferability using invasive species as a case study. PloS one 10 (3), e0119891.
74. Heikkinen, R.K. et al. (2012) Does the interpolation accuracy of species distribution models come at the expense of transferability? Ecography 35 (3), 276-288.
75. McPherson, J.M. and Jetz, W. (2007) Effects of species' ecology on the accuracy of distribution models. Ecography 30 (1), 135-151.
76. Syphard, A.D. and Franklin, J. (2010) Species traits affect the performance of species distribution models for plants in southern California. J Veg Sci 21 (1), 177-189.
77. Zhang, L. et al. (2015) Consensus forecasting of species distributions: The effects of niche model performance and niche properties. PloS one 10 (3), e0120056.
78. Grenouillet, G. et al. (2011) Ensemble modelling of species distribution: The effects of geographical and environmental ranges. Ecography 34 (1), 9-17.
79. Manel, S. et al. (2001) Evaluating presence–absence models in ecology: The need to account for prevalence. J Appl Ecol 38 (5), 921-931.
80. Santika, T. (2011) Assessing the effect of prevalence on the predictive performance of species distribution models using simulated data. Glob Ecol Biogeogr 20 (1), 181-192.
81. Evangelista, P.H. et al. (2008) Modelling invasion for a habitat generalist and a specialist plant species. Divers Distrib 14 (5), 808-817.
82. Segurado, P. and Araujo, M. (2004) An evaluation of methods for modelling species distributions. J Biogeogr 31, 1555-1568.
83. Wogan, G.O. (2016) Life history traits and niche instability impact accuracy and temporal transferability for historically calibrated distribution models of North American birds. PloS one 11 (3), e0151024.

84. Muñoz, A.R. et al. (2015) An approach to consider behavioral plasticity as a source of uncertainty when forecasting species' response to climate change. Ecol Evol 5 (12), 2359-2373.

85. Bell, D.M. and Schlaepfer, D.R. (2016) On the dangers of model complexity without ecological justification in species distribution modeling. Ecol Model 330, 50-59.

86. Elith, J. and Graham, C.H. (2009) Do they? How do they? Why do they differ? On finding reasons for differing performances of species distribution models. Ecography 32 (1), 66-77.

87. Fitzpatrick, M.C. and Hargrove, W.W. (2009) The projection of species distribution models and the problem of non-analog climate. Biodivers Conserv 18 (8), 2255-2261.

88. Mannocci, L. et al. (2015) Extrapolating cetacean densities beyond surveyed regions: habitat-based predictions in the circumtropical belt. J Biogeogr 42 (7), 1267-1280.

89. Mesgaran, M.B. et al. (2014) Here be dragons: A tool for quantifying novelty due to covariate range and correlation change when projecting species distribution models. Divers Distrib 20 (10), 1147-1159.

90. Rödder, D. and Engler, J.O. (2012) Disentangling interpolation and extrapolation uncertainties in species distribution models: A novel visualization technique for the spatial variation of predictor variable collinearity. Biodiversity Informatics 8 (1).

91. Zanini, F. et al. (2009) The transferability of distribution models across regions: An amphibian case study. Divers Distrib 15 (3), 469-480.

92. Zurell, D. et al. (2012) Predicting to new environments: Tools for visualizing model behaviour and impacts on mapped distributions. Divers Distrib 18 (6), 628-634.

93. Whittingham, M.J. et al. (2007) Should conservation strategies consider spatial generality? Farmland birds show regional not national patterns of habitat association. Ecol Lett 10 (1), 25-35.

94. Bridges, M.E., Nonindigenous plant species distributions: Modeling the role of human disturbances and predicting management responses, Montana State University, 2012, p. 179.

95. Dirnböck, T. et al. (2003) A regional impact assessment of climate and land-use change on alpine vegetation. J Biogeogr 30 (3), 401-417.

96. Marshall, L. et al. (2015) Testing projected wild bee distributions in agricultural habitats: predictive power depends on species traits and habitat type. Ecol Evol 5 (19), 4426-4436.

97. Warren, D.L. et al. (2008) Environmental niche equivalency versus conservatism: quantitative approaches to niche evolution. Evolution 62 (11), 2868-2883.

98. Rödder, D. and Lötters, S. (2010) Explanative power of variables used in species distribution modelling: an issue of general model transferability or niche shift in the invasive Greenhouse frog (Eleutherodactylus planirostris). Naturwissenschaften 97 (9), 781-796.

99. Whittingham, M.J. et al. (2003) Do habitat association models have any generality? Predicting skylark Alauda arvensis abundance in different regions of southern England. Ecography 26 (4), 521-531.

100. Thomas, J.A. and Bovee, K.D. (1993) Application and testing of a procedure to evaluate transferability of habitat suitability criteria. River Res Appl 8 (3), 285-294.

101. Mäki-Petäys, A. et al. (2002) Transferability of habitat suitability criteria of juvenile Atlantic salmon (Salmo salar). Can J Fish Aquat Sci 59 (2), 218-228.

102. Gray, T.N. et al. (2009) Generality of models that predict the distribution of species: Conservation activity and reduction of model transferability for a threatened bustard. Conserv Biol 23 (2), 433-439.