

**THE INFLUENCE OF ACCESSIBILITY TO CITIES ON BIODIVERSITY CHANGE**

*By*

**DANIELA GARGYA**

in partial fulfilment of the requirement for the

Degree of BSc with Honours in

Ecological and Environmental Sciences with Management

May 2020

# Abstract/ Summary

Globally, biodiversity is changing in complex ways in a time of accelerating human impact. We lack real-world data how large-scale anthropogenic activity, as a prominent contemporary global change driver, is directly and indirectly influencing the reshuffling of ecological communities. Here, I quantify the influence of human impact captured with the metric accessibility to cities on ecological assemblages worldwide by analysing change in 5787 time-series across birds, mammals, plants and invertebrates. Surprisingly, I found that for every 10% increase in accessibility, species replacement (turnover) decreases by 5%. Turnover was highest for invertebrates and mammals and lowest for birds and plants. My findings demonstrate the complexity of real-world biodiversity change and challenge the assumption that current conservation focus on protecting wilderness areas might not be sufficient to achieve biodiversity conservation goals.

Linking human impact with biodiversity change can provide the needed evidence and predictions for better international policy making in the light of our rapidly changing Anthropocene.

questions current conservation priorities focussed on protecting wilderness areas.

# Table of contents

Contents

[Abstract/ Summary 2](#_Toc38970976)

[Table of contents 3](#_Toc38970977)

[Acknowledgments 3](#_Toc38970978)

[List of abbreviations 4](#_Toc38970979)

[Introduction 5](#_Toc38970980)

[Background 5](#_Toc38970981)

[Objectives and research questions 6](#_Toc38970982)

[Research hypotheses 7](#_Toc38970983)

[Predictions 7](#_Toc38970984)

[Methods 8](#_Toc38970985)

[Databases 8](#_Toc38970986)

[Data processing 9](#_Toc38970987)

[Statistical/data analysis 9](#_Toc38970988)

[Results 11](#_Toc38970989)

[Discussion 16](#_Toc38970990)

[Conclusions 21](#_Toc38970991)

[References 21](#_Toc38970992)

[Appendices 21](#_Toc38970993)

# Acknowledgments

I would like to thank blab la and blab la.

# List of abbreviations

CI Confidence Interval

BAIC Before after impact control

# Introduction

## Background

Globally, humans have modified 50% of terrestrial land cover, leading to major pressures on the biosphere and its inhabitants (IPBES, 2020). Increasing human population and the growth of cities and road networks, which predicate the equity agenda of the UN by advancing accessibility (UN, 2015), are expected to cause additional impacts on the natural environment. Large scale human activity has profoundly altered abundance, richness and composition of ecological assemblages in complex ways. The consequences for ecosystem processes, such as their temporal and spatial resilience are not fully understood. Disentangling drivers of complex biodiversity change and establishing effective conservation practices without compromising human development is an urgent issue. However, we currently only have a limited quantitative understanding of how global change drivers, such as large-scale human activity, influence local patterns of biodiversity over time.

Importance link local and global BD  
Human alterations to the environment have been widely viewed as a main contributor to the global-scale biodiversity crisis, with elevating rates of species extinction. However, studies reveal a more complex picture that is very dependent on the scales and biodiversity metrices used (McGill *et al.*, 2015; Chase *et al.*, 2019). While local alpha diversity seems to show no decrease in species richness, global biodiversity seems to decline (Butchart *et al.*, 2010; Dornelas *et al.*, 2014, ISla?). At the same time, local communities show high species turnover (changes in the composition of ecological communities), potentially indicating a different type of biodiversity change; large scale reorganization of communities leading to homogenization across space (Blowes *et al.*, 2019). This homogeneity leads to a decrease in biodiversity over larger scales and has serious implications on the ability of species communities to adapt to future environmental changes (Eriksson and Hillebrand, 2019). Thus, it is very important to understand local biodiversity and its relations to global biodiversity changes to be able to predict how biodiversity will change.

Importance temporal trends and real-world data  
Local biodiversity’s changes due to human activity are a topic of ongoing controversy. While some research reports a general negative trend of richness and population abundance following human impact such as land-use change, other studies reveal both increases and decreases at the local level. The controversy can be linked back to difference in methods used – the spatiotemporal design of the study. While former relies on space-for-time and modelling study designs, latter directly observes change over time with real-world data. Real world data heavily depends on long-term data availability, whereas space-for-time approaches have been criticised for missing out important temporal aspects such as ecological lags and community self-regulation. Given existing compilations of real-world biodiversity records, understanding real-world changes and the complexity of it is essential to advance our understanding.

How to capture human impact  
Humans have driven biodiversity change mainly through habitat change, exploitation, pollution, climate change and invasive species. It is difficult to capture the difference aspects of human influences (and their interactions). Previous studies have focussed on individual types of environmental change such as forest loss and land-use changes/transitions. However, we know little about the effect of multiple types of human activities acting together and how they influence the reshuffling of ecological communities. The metric accessibility which is a measure of the closest travel time to the next urban centre can be seen as a proxy for multiple human influences. An increase in this metric goes along with increase of road network, urbanisation and human activities linked to urbanisation such as land-use changes and agricultural activity. Therefore, it can capture changes to the environment and its inhabitants such as habitat fragmentation, land-use change, alien species, habitat loss as a cumulative measure. For many of the human influences mentioned above, it can be hypothesized that effects are further enhanced/driven by local human population density.

Importance to understand functional biodiversity and traits -> Taxa  
Influence of humans have returned mixed results, with some studies reporting increases of biodiversity due to human influence, whilst other found strong declines (or general finding). Demonstrating a general pattern has been hindered by species-specific interaction between land-use change and biodiversity dynamics, as well as the influence of other drivers on biodiversity change. Other drivers include climate change etc. The interaction of taxa-specific can add to understanding overall and allows more specific targeting of conservation efforts.

## Objectives and research questions

My aim is to quantify how global change drivers influence ecological communities over time. Specifically, I will focus on large-scale human activity captured in the metric accessibility to cities, and human population density on temporal changes on ecological community composition overall and across taxa. These drivers are an indirect representation of large- scale human activity and capture big parts of the alteration of our planet. I will test if these drivers of global change explain heterogenous biodiversity change found across our planet. To achieve this, I investigate the influence of accessibility to cities on ecological assemblages worldwide and across taxa by analysing change in 5787 time series, addressing the following questions:

1. Do sites with higher accessibility to cities experience more changes in assemblage composition over time (temporal turnover) than locations with lower accessibility?
   1. How does the duration of ecological monitoring influence the magnitude of detected temporal turnover trends?
2. How is temporal turnover influenced by an interaction between human population density and accessibility?
3. How does temporal turnover of ecological communities respond to levels of accessibility across taxa (birds, mammals, terrestrial invertebrates, terrestrial plants)?

## Research hypotheses

I hypothesize that there will be a positive relationship between higher accessibility to cities and greater temporal turnover. The magnitude of temporal turnover increases for sites which have been monitored over longer durations. The relationship between accessibility to cities and temporal turnover is steeper, when human population density is higher (all positive). When looking at individual taxa, I hypothesize that taxa will have different responses to high and low levels of accessibility, with both positive and negative relationships present. Those hypotheses will be tested against the null hypotheses of no relationship (or negative relationship) between level of accessibility and temporal turnover, and human population density and temporal turnover.

## Predictions

Preregistration? https://osf.io/pua5m/?view\_only=575f6a48587245f3b6971235bcf32b3f

I predict greater temporal turnover with greater exposure of accessibility to cities, as an alteration of the natural environment benefits some species, while damaging others, influencing community composition. I predict greater temporal turnover in sites which have been monitored over longer durations, as the effect of turnover becomes more apparent over time. I predict the relationship between accessibility and temporal turnover to be steeper, when human population density is higher, as high HPD increases the pressures on the natural systems, leading to higher turnover. I predict both positive and negative trends to be present among taxa, as they have differences in ecological requirements.

If I find support for my null hypotheses, this will indicate that the metric accessibility to cities cannot capture the most relevant human impact on biodiversity, questioning the justification for humanly undisturbed places. If the results are in line with my alternative hypotheses, this will demonstrate the importance of humanly undisturbed places for the conservation of biodiversity.

# Methods

To quantitively test the consequences on ecological communities of large-scale anthropogenic activity globally, I used 3 global databases.

## Databases

WHERE TO PUT FIGURE BIOTIME?  
ADD OTHER FIGURES?  
SAMPLE SIZES?  
CONCEPTUAL DIAGRAM?  
REASON WHY NO RAREFACTION

***BioTIME Database – biodiversity time series data***

The currently largest database of temporal community time series spans 4,970,128 (UPDATE) records of richness and abundances of species globally, covering a range of taxa, including birds, mammals, invertebrates and plants (Dornelas *et al.*, 2018). I analysed 5788 time series from 181 different studies from terrestrial (UNIQUE?) places around the globe that are part of the BioTIME database as of 12/03/2020. I used all available data that met my inclusion criteria: part of the terrestrial realm, minimum study duration of 5 years, at least 15 studies per taxa, no more than 2000 plots per study, plot fixed to one location and at least 2 survey points per plot. The time-series used represent repeated studies of species abundance and identity of all species found within an ecological community. The data collection of BioTIME was consistent within studies but not between studies.

The BioTIME database is limited in its even representation of different taxa and latitudes. It underrepresents reptiles and amphibians and the tropics and polar regions (see Figure 1).

PROTECTED AREAS?

***Accessibility to cities 2015 data***

To quantify large scale human impact (of roads and urbanisation), I extracted an accessibility to cities metric from the malariaatlas project Accessibility to cities 2015 global database. This database calculates least-cost-path land-based travel time to the nearest densely populated area (between 85 degrees north and 60 degrees south) at a 30 arc seconds X and Y resolution. Areas with >1,500 inhabitants/km² or a majority of built-up land cover types coincident with a population centre of at least 50,000 inhabitants are defined as densely populated areas.

***Human population density dataset***

I derived population density data from the Gridded Population of the World, Version 4: Population Density, Revision 11 database (CIESIN, 2018). Human population density was defined as number of persons per square kilometre, based on national censuses counts and population registers. Data is available 2015 at a 30 arc-second resolution.

## Data processing

MENTION R?  
MENTION PACKAGES?  
MENTION BIOMASS TYPES ETC?   
MENTION THAT BIOTIME WAS NOT STANDARDISED CELL SIZE/SAMPLE EFFORT?  
CENTERING OTHER VARIABLES?  
GLOBAL GRID CELL?  
MENTION BD DOES NOT COVER RANGE OOF ACCESSIBLITY AND HPD? Extra paragraph  
TURNOVER INDEPENDENT OF RICHNESS CHANGE?

I quantified temporal changes in community composition within sites, as the turnover component of beta diversity (species replacement rather than abundance) at the last data point available relative to the first observation data point within the time period outlined above. This was the dominant part of biodiversity change in the BioTIME dataset (REF). I bound the scores of turnovers between zero and one, where zero is no change in community composition and one indicates that all of the original species have been replaced.

I harmonized both accessibility and human population density dataset to a standard global grid size of 25km² by taking the mean value of the grid cell. MENTION SENSITIVITY TO SCALE FROM SENSITVITY ANALYSIS. I bound the scores extracted between zero and one, where zero is not accessible/low human population density and one is very accessible/ high human population density respectively.

## Statistical/data analysis

EXACT MODEL (LINEAR?)  
DISTRIBUTION INTERCEPT ~1? LOGIT LINK FUNCTION? % FALLING INTO EACH CATEGORY (0,1,0-1)  
FORMULAS?

All statistical analysis was conducted in R v. 3.6.1. (REF R). To quantify the influences of accessibility and human population density on turnover of ecological communities, I used a hierarchical Bayesian modelling framework based on a Markov chain Monte Carlo (MCMC) method. All Bayesian models were created in a Stan computational framework and accessed through the {brms} package (REF). The models are based one a zero one inflated beta distribution to reflect the properties of turnover (bound between, and including, zero and one).

**Explanation models response variables, fixed effects, random effects**

CENTERING OF DATA HERE?  
STATE MODEL EQUATION?

I modelled turnover as my response variable. Fixed effects were (scaled) accessibility and duration of the time-series. Area was not included as a fixed effect, as it did not have a significant effect on turnover (SAME FOR DURATION THOUGH?). To answer Research question 3, human population density was included as a fixed effect, as well as the interaction between accessibility and human population density. To account for autocorrelation of both methods and to some extent space, Study ID was included as a random effect. A model including a grid cell, more directly accounting for spatial autocorrelation did not converge, so the term was excluded. Taxa was included as a random effect, as I wanted to remove the variation of different taxa to the overall/ no expected effect taxa and turnover?

Ggpredict?

(Coding scheme for categorical value of human population density)

**Model explanation (priors, iterations).**

The models will be based on a zero one inflated beta distribution.(HERE OR BEFORE?)

I ran the model first with both random intercepts and slopes for taxa but as no model convergence was achieved, I ran them with only random intercept. Allowed turnover to vary by random slope and intercept?

I used the default priors as they are weakly informative and I have no ecological backup to assume otherwise. The default priors are:

I ran the models with 6000 iterations, with a warmup of 2000 iterations. Alpha? Treedepth? I assessed convergence visually by examining trace plots and by using Rhat values.

As I will be using a Bayesian framework, my inferences will be based on the posterior distribution of each fixed effect. They will be considered significant if the lower and upper 95% credible intervals don’t overlap zero. I will conclude all results, regardless of the direction or magnitude of the effect size.

**Alternatives to measuring variables?**

**Sensitivity analysis**Different scales extraction  
Better temporally matched data

Full R script in appendix, preregistration

# Results

*The Results Section contains text that summarises the findings of the research referring to all figures, tables and statistical results. Include the primary results, ordered logically (often from most important to least works well). Maintain the order that you present your results through out all parts of the dissertation. Data should only be presented once in either tables or figures in the main text or appendix. Often, it is recommended to write the results section first, so that you can write the methods that are appropriate to describe the results presented, then you can write the discussion next about these results, the introduction to introduce the relevant literature for the scientific story that you are telling and finally the conclusions and abstract – this approach is called writing backwards.*

*Statistical results when reported in the text, tables or figure captions must include the test used (ANOVA, Linear model, Linear mixed effects model, GLM, etc.), sample size (N) or degrees of freedom, effect size and error (e.g., slope and error around the slope), test statistic (t-value, F statistic, etc.), model fit (R2, pseudo R2, etc.) if appropriate and p-value. P-values alone are incomplete statistical reporting (see http://www.nature.com/news/statisticians-issue-warning-overmisuse-of-p-values-1.19503). Full statistical results, additional figures or tables and raw data can be included in an Appendix. For guidelines on how to report specific statistical tests refer to the scientific*

*literature and discuss you're your supervisor. All code for statistical analyses should be included in the appendix for students that are using coding based statistical software such as R.*

*Questions:*

* *How to put sample size*
* *Limitations of results in results section?*
* *Visualising vs modelling*
* *Include sensitivity analysis here?*
* *Put distribution of variables?*

Standardized effect sizes were calculated by dividing the model slopes by the standard deviation of the dependent variable

**Temporal turnover and accessibility (Research Question 1)**

1. Do sites with higher accessibility to cities experience more changes in assemblage composition over time (temporal turnover) than locations with lower accessibility?

How does the duration of ecological monitoring influence the magnitude of detected temporal turnover trends?

Contrary to my predictions, I found that temporal turnover has decreased as accessibility is increasing across the 5787 time-series surveyed (slope = -1.05, CI = -1.59 to -0.51, Figure 1, see Table 1 for more model outputs). On average, for every 10% increase in accessibility, turnover increases by 4%.

For every 10% increase in accessibility, communities become 5% more similar

temporal turnover is decreasing by 10% as accessibility is increasing by 10%. In line with my predictions (see preregistration), the duration of the observation influenced the magnitude of the detected temporal turnover trends, with higher turnover increases for longer observations of sites.





Figure 2. Jaccard turnover has increased for higher levels of accessibility across 5788 time-series globally (slope = 0.05, CI = 0.03 to 0.07, Figure 1, see Table 1 for more model outputs). Grey points represent raw data. Lines and error bands represent model predictions and 95% credible intervals, respectively. Colour coding of lines represent differing duration of monitoring. See trace plots and model Rhat values in appendix confirming model convergence.



*The results of the temporal turnover model revealed an increase of temporal turnover across levels of accessibility. Therefore, I found support of my initial prediction of accessibility increasing temporal turnover, and thus accept the alternative hypothesis. Study area had no significant effect on temporal turnover (slope = 0.05, CI = - 0.03 to 0.07). Latitude? Results to be taken with caution?* Examining the posterior means of the random terms, study ID, taxa and broad grid cell, revealed among Study ID variation (variance = 0.4, CI 0.3 – 0.5), and little within study ID variation (variance blabla). Same for taxa and broad grid cell. Full model output can be found in Appendix X.


**Taxa-specific responses to different levels of accessibility (Research Question 2)**

Quantification of results?

Visualising raw temporal turnover data among taxa revealed no clear differences between the temporal turnover of individual taxa on different levels of accessibility (Figure 3). Terrestrial plants’ and birds’ responses, have increased turnover as accessibility is increasing. Among the 4 taxa, terrestrial plants have experiences the greatest temporal turnover increase by 23% for every 10% increase in accessibility. Mammals and terrerstrial invertebrates show no clear pattern. TALK ABOUT DISTRIBUTION OF DATA?







BAR PLOT/ BOX PLOT WITH EFFECT SIZES OF EACH TAXA

SCATTER PLOT FOR EACH TAXA?


The model which compared temporal turnover among taxa revealed that there is no significant difference between taxa’s individual temporal turnover response on accessibility (slope blabla). Interaction taxa:accessibility?. 2 responede, 2 not. Caution with interpretation?


Model predictions confirmed my hypothesis of.. mention other fixed effect response tp that. + random terms

Sensitivity analysis results?

Visual examination trace plots, model convergence, shortcomings of the model

**Relationship between accessibility and human population density on temporal turnover (Research Question 3)**





# Discussion

*The object of the discussion is to summarise your major findings and place your findings in the context of previous studies current state of knowledge in the literature. When you discuss your own work and that of others, back up your opinions with evidence and citations. The first paragraph of the discussion should contain a summary of your major findings (usually 2 – 4 points) and a brief summary of the implications of your findings and should make reference to whether you found support for your hypotheses or how you answered your research questions. The following paragraphs will usually describe each of these findings in greater detail making reference to previous studies. Often the discussion will include a paragraph describing the limitations of your study and the potential for future research.*

*Recap biological result 1,2,3 -> together these suggest X*

*Choose 3 reasons why not*

*PUT SENSTIVITY ANALYSIS RESULTS IN HERE*

*Rest: limitations on why #1-#3 aren’t perfect for proving X but can argue that they’re pretty good, and you can put X back into the context of the literature again.*

Main findings  
My analysis of 5788 time-series in XX unique locations globally did not show an increase of turnover with increasing accessibility. Contrary to my prediction, turnover was XX% higher in less accessible sites, suggesting a rejection of my hypothesis of a positive relationship between turnover and increasing accessibility.   
Furthermore, I provide evidence for possible negative responses to low accessibility, questioning our current understanding of benefits of sites with low human impact (such as protected areas). The lack of positive responses of turnover to accessibility could be due to the complexity of real-world biodiversity change, interactions between different effects of human impacts and indirect effects of large-scale human impact.   
The taxa-specific relationships between accessibility and turnover demonstrate that all studied taxa experience higher turnover at lower accessibility with decreasing biodiversity change as accessibility increases. My findings of negative responses to low accessibility highlight the complexity of real-world communities and the importance for considering temporal dynamics and interactive effects of land-use change when planning and implementing conservation schemes (refer back to possible reasons).

**Complexity of real-world biodiversity changes in particular of temporal turnover**Recent advances in our understanding of biodiversity started to question the narrative of universal declines in biodiversity measured through richness and abundance caused by human impact. Global assessments which have found diversity declines with land-use changes to more human dominated landscapes (Newbold), have been criticised for using space-for-time approaches (Gergana) which don’t account for ecological lags and community self-regulation (Temporal baselines). Instead the use of temporal trends was suggested, ideally with a before-impact-after-control approach as this has been suggested to better reveal complexity of real-world changes.

As richness and abundance cannot capture complex biodiversity changes, the question remains how large-scale human impact captured in the metric accessibility relates to temporal turnover. Accessibility can be seen as a metric capturing influences ranging from urbanisation, roads and transport network to land-use dominated by agriculture and pollution. Such human impact alters habitat and resource availability and increases alien species potential and habitat fragmentation, all indicating to an expected higher turnover, as extinction and immigration risks increase accordingly.

Temporal turnover seems to be even more complex than that as changes in the environment do not always respond to higher temporal turnover. Recent studies (Gergana and human impacts one?) that also assessed temporal turnover also found highly complex changing biodiversity. In line with the narrative of increasing environmental change causing increasing turnover, Daskalova et al found increase of temporal turnover after forest loss and the turnover of habitat conversions were highest when converted to agriculture and urban areas. However, there was no significant effect of magnitude of forest loss on turnover. This might indicate that a disturbance is a disturbance and changes in biodiversity can only be assessed in presence/ absence but not through magnitude. Therefore, either our current understanding of temporal turnover and its relation to environmental disturbnace is limited so far and more complex than thought and/ or there are inherent limitations in the methodology of temporal turnover.

**Potential shortcomings of temporal turnover**

Shortcomings of using time-series (Gonzalez, de palma) could be due to mismatches between the record of the potential negative impact of human activity and the response of the ecological community. Large-scale human impact such as land-conversion, road building etc could have occurred outside of biodiversity monitoring period. This is further enhanced by accessibility being an accumulated variable. Most human impacts related to accessibility such as roads and urban centres have been present before the monitoring period of the time-series (early 20th century) as time-series span an average duration of 12 years only. Forest cover change has been found to peak biodiversity change 6-13 years after. Further complicating is the presence of ecological lags which can last up to 50 years (Gergana), making it even more difficult to record and evaluate biodiversity change in relation to human impact.

Mismatch assemblages monitored and localised impacts of accessibility; but I want to capture large scale changes?

**Complex interactions of species vulnerability to environmental change (TAXA)**

Despite complex dynamics of temporal turnover, here I am exploring potential reasons why temporal turnover is higher at lower levels of accessibility. Both scale of disturbance and scale of monitoring plays a role. Ultimately, biodiversity change is coupled to species vulnerability to disturbances. The vulnerability might differ depending on both the type of disturbance, which are a ranging because nature of accessibility; but also depending on characteristica of the species themselves. As turnover is affected by dispersal processes and metacommunity dynamics, species mobility plays an important role (Vellend, 2010), as does the degree of specialisation in the use of resources (niche width). These processes apply both within taxonomic groups and among. In general, for habitat loss and fragmentation caused by land-use changes more mobile species are better able to move among distant habitat fragments, than less mobile species. Contrary research suggests that more mobile species, having larger home ranges rely on larger habitat patches and therefore might be more sensitive to habitat fragmentation. Additionally, the impact at larger scale is more important for mobile organisms. Interactions between these two processes further play a role as with increased specialisation (narrow niche width) rely more on mobility to succeed than generalist species.

Again, my results reflect the complexity of dynamics of the interaction between scales and vulnerabilities. (Due to problems with model convergence, I can only present results that evaluate the relationship between temporal turnover and taxa and not taxa’s different responses to turnover across levels of accessibility.) I presented taxa-specific relationships between temporal turnover and taxa (Figure 4), in particular showing that terrestrial invertebrates followed by mammals show higher temporal turnover than birds and mammals (QUANTIFICATION). All taxa show some degree of temporal turnover (QUANTIFICATION). However, generally birds can be considered highly mobile and plants less mobile (reference HI paper), but that was not reflected in the amount of turnover experienced.

Importance of looking at real-world communities, understanding biodiversity better when looking at compositional changes and considering scale: both at level of impact and observation. Implications for conservation?

**Other drivers and potential interactions**

The coincidence between the presence of other drivers and/or their potential interaction with impacts captured in accessibility might explain higher turnover in less accessible sites. Next to land-use change, climate change is a common global driver of biodiversity change. Climate change displays geographic heterogenous patterns. Recent studies have created maps of global anthropogenic threats including climate change and other large scale human impacts, joining effects of multiple drivers. Less accessible sites might coincide with regions that are experiencing more extreme climate change, which can lead to biodiversity change (Isla paper?).   
  
As accessibility is proxy for many different kind of human impacts, some might interact. Some might be additive, other antagonist and other interactive. Furthermore, other variables might have affect on turnover, such as climate change and other human pressures; link to further research?

**Indirect large-scale human impact**Another explanation for higher turnover at lower accessibility can indicate either a higher baseline turnover and a reduction of it through human activities. However, baseline is much lower (Dornelas) and potential interaction with human activities have been explored before. However, these findings might implicate that we do not understand temporal biodiversity dynamics at low human impact sides yet compared to better studied large scale human impacts. Other studies have focussed on more direct environmental changes (forest, land-use change) but I look at broader human impact (EXPLORED BEFORE). Studies with focus on low human impact areas, often titled wilderness, have found that such areas reduce extinciotn risk of species by 50%. Again, those studies were conducted with modelling approaches and did not use real-world temporal data. In order to put the most effective conservation measurements in place, we need to understand what is going on both in areas with low human impact and with high human impact using real-world data.

**Limitations**

**Data availability and methodology**

Taxonomic, spatial and temporal imbalances  
results sensitivity analysis here?  
spatial under/overrepresentation of sites modified by human activities? No points at low accessibility

**Statistical analysis**

The BioTime data compilation was not big enough (yet) to allow for an interaction effect between accessibility and human population density neither to include random slopes and intercepts for taxa as model convergence was not achieved. Talk about priors?

**Direction for future studies**Interesting further studies include the interaction effects between different global drivers. More temporal studies in less accessible areas. Biotic homogenisation.

# Conclusions

*The conclusion paragraph should put your findings into the broader context of the literature and explain how you have filled the knowledge gap that you have identified in the introduction. This is your chance to present to your reader the major take-home messages of your dissertation research. It should be similar in content to the last sentence of your summary abstract.*

# References

# Appendices