

[nature](#) > [nature reviews biodiversity](#) > [перспективы](#) > Статья

Перспектива | Опубликовано: 06 февраля 2026 г.

Наука и политика в области биоразнообразия нуждаются в большем количестве сравнительных исследований

[Дамарис Зурелл](#) ✉, [Сесиль Х. Альберт](#), [Greta Bocedi](#), [Natalie J. Briscoe](#), [Lauren B. Buckley](#), [Samuel J. L. Gascoigne](#), [Andrew Gonzalez](#), [Gurutzeta Guillera-Aroita](#), [Nick J. B. Isaac](#), [Dirk N. Karger](#), [Carolyn J. Lundquist](#), [Cory Merow](#), [Juliano Sarmiento Cabral](#), [Katrin Schifferle](#), [Santiago J. E. Velazco](#) & [Марк К. Урбан](#)

[Природа Рассматривает Биоразнообразие](#) (2026)

Абстрактный

Чтобы остановить ускоряющееся сокращение глобального биоразнообразия, необходимы надежные модели для прогнозирования будущих изменений и принятия обоснованных политических решений. Климатические модели, особенно проекты по взаимному сравнению моделей, сыграли ключевую роль в развитии механистического понимания причин изменения климата, связанных с антропогенным воздействием. Аналогичные проекты по взаимному сравнению моделей биоразнообразия (BMIP), появившиеся только в последнее десятилетие, могли бы повторить этот успех. В этой статье мы кратко рассказываем о существующих проектах BMIP и выделяем возможности, пробелы и трудности, связанные с их разработкой, опираясь на опыт проектов по взаимному сравнению климатических моделей. Моделирование биоразнообразия на основе исторических данных позволяет получить ценные сведения о потенциальных глобальных и региональных тенденциях изменения биоразнообразия и связанных с ними

неопределенностях, а также помогает определить, какие факторы влияют на изменения биоразнообразия, на основе стандартизированных исторических данных. В дальнейшем при моделировании биоразнообразия на основе исторических данных следует применять механистические подходы, создавать структуры управления и обеспечивать открытый доступ к инструментам моделирования и данным. Благодаря стратегическим инвестициям в инфраструктуру данных, возможности моделирования и глобальное управление, инициативы по мониторингу биоразнообразия могут внести значимый вклад в реализацию Куньминско-Монреальской глобальной рамочной программы в области биоразнообразия, предоставляя надежные прогнозы для поддержки разработки политики и планирования действий в различных пространственных масштабах и при различных сценариях. Для реализации этой концепции необходима согласованная международная координация, увеличение финансирования и активный обмен знаниями.

Ключевые моменты

- Проекты по взаимному сравнению моделей биоразнообразия (BMIP) представляют собой скоординированную и стандартизированную экспериментальную базу для систематического сравнения моделей биоразнообразия, обеспечивающую единообразие исходных данных, сценариев и результатов.
- Инициативы по моделированию биоразнообразия особенно полезны как для решения общих вопросов, связанных с моделированием биоразнообразия, так и для поддержки национальных и международных действий, направленных на достижение целей и выполнение задач Глобальной рамочной программы в области биоразнообразия.
- Создание исторических эталонных наборов данных имеет решающее значение для проверки моделей биоразнообразия, определения причинно-следственных связей, межсистемного понимания

прогностической эффективности и сложности моделей, а также для повышения достоверности прогнозов.

- Укрепление международного сотрудничества, координации и обмена знаниями, а также расширение участия общественности повысят актуальность, прозрачность и эффективность национальных планов по борьбе с малярией.
- Establishing clear governance structures for BMIPs, including mechanisms for overseeing modelling activities, infrastructure and community consultation and strategies for long-term funding, is essential for ensuring the sustainability and effectiveness of BMIPs.

This is a preview of subscription content, [access via your institution](#)

Access options

Access through your institution

Buy this article

- Purchase on SpringerLink
- Instant access to the full article PDF.

39,95 €

[Buy Now](#)

Subscribe to this journal

Receive 12 digital issues and online access to articles

118,99 € per year
only 9,92 € per issue

[Learn more](#)

Prices may be subject to local taxes which are calculated during checkout

Additional access options:

- [Log in](#)
- [Learn about institutional subscriptions](#)
- [Read our FAQs](#)
- [Contact customer support](#)

References

1. Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services. *Global Assessment Report on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services* (IPBES, 2019).
 2. Scheffers, B. R. et al. The broad footprint of climate change from genes to biomes to people. *Science* **354**, aaf7671 (2016).
 3. Urban, M. C. Climate change extinctions. *Science* **386**, 1123–1128 (2024).
 4. Convention on Biological Diversity. *Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework. Decision CBD/COP/DEC/15/4* (CBD, 2022).
 5. Urban, M. C. Projecting biological impacts from climate change like a climate scientist. *WIREs Clim. Change* **10**, e585 (2019).
 6. Purvis, A. Bending the curve of biodiversity loss requires a ‘satnav’ for nature. *Philos. Trans. R. Soc. B* **380**, 20230210 (2025).
 7. Grimm, V., Johnston, A. S. A., Thulke, H.-H., Forbes, V. E. & Thorbek, P. Three questions to ask before using model outputs for decision support. *Nat. Commun.* **11**, 4959 (2020).
-

8. Urban, M. C. et al. Coding for life: designing a platform for projecting and protecting global biodiversity. *BioScience* **72**, 91–104 (2022).

9. Zurell, D. et al. Spatially explicit models for decision-making in animal conservation and restoration. *Ecography* **4**, e05787 (2022).

10. Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services. *The Methodological Assessment Report on Scenarios and Models of Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services* (IPBES, 2016).

11. Dietze, M. et al. Near-term ecological forecasting for climate change action. *Nat. Clim. Change* **14**, 1236–1244 (2024).

12. Touzé-Peiffer, L., Barberousse, A. & Le Treut, H. The Coupled Model Intercomparison Project: history, uses, and structural effects on climate research. *WIREs Clim. Change* **11**, e648 (2020).

13. IPCC. *Climate Change 2021: The Physical Science Basis* (Cambridge Univ. Press, 2021).

14. Griffies, S. M. et al. OMIP contribution to CMIP6: experimental and diagnostic protocol for the physical component of the Ocean Model Intercomparison Project. *Geosci. Model Dev.* **9**, 3231–3296 (2016).

15. Notz, D. et al. The CMIP6 Sea-Ice Model Intercomparison Project (SIMIP): understanding sea ice through climate-model simulations. *Geosci. Model Dev.* **9**, 3427–3446 (2016).

16. Rosenzweig, C. et al. The Agricultural Model Intercomparison and Improvement Project (AgMIP): protocols and pilot studies. *Agric. For. Meteorol.* **170**, 166–182 (2013).

17. Hantson, S. et al. The status and challenge of global fire modelling. *Biogeosciences* **13**, 3359–3375 (2016).

18. Durack, P. J. et al. The Coupled Model Intercomparison Project (CMIP): reviewing project history, evolution, infrastructure and implementation. *EGUsphere* <https://doi.org/10.5194/egusphere-2024-3729> (2025).

19. Novaglio, C. et al. The past and future of the Fisheries and Marine Ecosystem Model Intercomparison Project. *Earth's Future* **12**, e2023EF004398 (2024).

20. Frieler, K. et al. Assessing the impacts of 1.5 °C global warming – simulation protocol of the Inter-Sectoral Impact Model Intercomparison Project (ISIMIP2b). *Geosci. Model Dev.* **10**, 4321–4345 (2017).

21. Tittensor, D. P. et al. A protocol for the intercomparison of marine fishery and ecosystem models: Fish-MIP v1.0. *Geosci. Model Dev.* **11**, 1421–1442 (2018).

22. Tittensor, D. P. et al. Next-generation ensemble projections reveal higher climate risks for marine ecosystems. *Nat. Clim. Change* **11**, 973–981 (2021).

23. Lotze, H. K. et al. Global ensemble projections reveal trophic amplification of ocean biomass declines with climate change. *Proc. Natl Acad. Sci. USA* **116**, 12907–12912 (2019).

24. Blanchard, J. L. et al. Detecting, attributing, and projecting global marine ecosystem and fisheries change: FishMIP 2.0. *Earth's Future* **12**, e2023EF004402 (2024).
-
25. Ortega-Cisneros, K. et al. An integrated global-to-regional scale workflow for simulating climate change impacts on marine ecosystems. *Earth's Future* **13**, e2024EF004826 (2025).
-
26. Eddy, T. D. et al. Global and regional marine ecosystem models reveal key uncertainties in climate change projections. *Earth's Future* **13**, e2024EF005537 (2025).
-
27. Kim, H. et al. A protocol for an intercomparison of biodiversity and ecosystem services models using harmonized land-use and climate scenarios. *Geosci. Model Dev.* **11**, 4537–4562 (2018).
-
28. Pereira, H. M. et al. Global trends and scenarios for terrestrial biodiversity and ecosystem services from 1900 to 2050. *Science* **384**, 458–465 (2024).
-
29. Frieler, K. et al. Scenario setup and forcing data for impact model evaluation and impact attribution within the third round of the Inter-Sectoral Impact Model Intercomparison Project (ISIMIP3a). *Geosci. Model Dev.* **17**, 1–51 (2024).
-
30. Hof, C. et al. Bioenergy cropland expansion may offset positive effects of climate change mitigation for global vertebrate diversity. *Proc. Natl Acad. Sci. USA* **115**, 13294–13299 (2018).
-

31. Mahnken, M. et al. Accuracy, realism and general applicability of European forest models. *Glob. Change Biol.* **28**, 6921–6943 (2022).

32. Fordham, D. A. et al. How complex should models be? Comparing correlative and mechanistic range dynamics models. *Glob. Change Biol.* **24**, 1357–1370 (2018).

33. Briscoe, N. J. et al. Can dynamic occupancy models improve predictions of species' range dynamics? A test using Swiss birds. *Glob. Change Biol.* **27**, 4269–4282 (2021).

34. Buckley, L. B. et al. Can mechanism inform species' distribution models? *Ecol. Lett.* **13**, 1041–1054 (2010).

35. Farmer, G. T. & Cook, J. *Climate Change Science: A Modern Synthesis, Vol. 1 The Physical Climate* (Springer, 2013).

36. Eyring, V. et al. Overview of the Coupled Model Intercomparison Project Phase 6 (CMIP6) experimental design and organization. *Geosci. Model Dev.* **9**, 1937–1958 (2016).

37. Tebaldi, C. & Knutti, R. The use of the multi-model ensemble in probabilistic climate projections. *Philos. Trans. R. Soc. A* **365**, 2053–2075 (2007).

38. Guillemot, H. in *A Critical Assessment of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change* (eds De Pryck, K. & Hulme, M.) 126–136 (Cambridge Univ. Press, 2022).

39. Ruane, A. C. et al. The Vulnerability, Impacts, Adaptation and Climate Services Advisory Board (VIACS AB v1.0) contribution to CMIP6. *Geosci. Model Dev.* **9**, 3493–3515 (2016).
-
40. Ruane, A. C. et al. CMIP7 data request: impacts and adaptation priorities and opportunities. *EGUsphere* <https://doi.org/10.5194/egusphere-2025-3408> (2025).
-
41. CMIP Panel. MIP best practice guidance. *Zenodo* <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.10572155> (2024).
-
42. Dormann, C. F. et al. Correlation and process in species distribution models: bridging a dichotomy. *J. Biogeogr.* **39**, 2119–2131 (2012).
-
43. Cabral, J. S., Valente, L. & Hartig, F. Mechanistic simulation models in macroecology and biogeography: state-of-art and prospects. *Ecography* **40**, 267–280 (2017).
-
44. Levins, R. The strategy of model building in population ecology. *Am. Sci.* **54**, 421–431 (1966).
-
45. Botkin, D. B., Janak, J. F. & Wallis, J. R. Some ecological consequences of a computer model of forest growth. *J. Ecol.* **60**, 849 (1972).
-
46. Bugmann, H. & Seidl, R. The evolution, complexity and diversity of models of long-term forest dynamics. *J. Ecol.* **110**, 2288–2307 (2022).
-
47. Bugmann, H. A review of forest gap models. *Clim. Change* **51**, 259–305 (2001).
-

48. Porter, W. P., Mitchell, J. W., Beckman, W. A. & DeWitt, C. B. Behavioral implications of mechanistic ecology: thermal and behavioral modeling of desert ectotherms and their microenvironment. *Oecologia* **13**, 1–54 (1973).
-
49. Briscoe, N. J. et al. Mechanistic forecasts of species responses to climate change: the promise of biophysical ecology. *Glob. Change Biol.* **29**, 1451–1470 (2023).
-
50. Booth, T. H. Why understanding the pioneering and continuing contributions of BIOCLIM to species distribution modelling is important. *Austral Ecol.* **43**, 852–860 (2018).
-
51. Watters, G. M. et al. Physical forcing and the dynamics of the pelagic ecosystem in the eastern tropical Pacific: simulations with ENSO-scale and global-warming climate drivers. *Can. J. Fish. Aquat. Sci.* **60**, 1161–1175 (2003).
-
52. Pastor, J. & Post, W. M. Response of northern forests to CO₂-induced climate change. *Nature* **334**, 55–58 (1988).
-
53. Busby, J. R. in *Greenhouse: Planning for Climate Change* (ed. Pearman, G. I.) 387–398 (CSIRO, 1988).
-
54. McDonald, K. A. & Brown, J. H. Using montane mammals to model extinctions due to global change. *Conserv. Biol.* **6**, 409–415 (1992).
-
55. Carey, P. D. Disperse: a cellular automaton for predicting the distribution of species in a changed climate. *Glob. Ecol. Biogeogr. Lett.* **5**, 217 (1996).
-

56. Jager, H. I., Van Winkle, W. & Holcomb, B. D. Would hydrologic climate changes in Sierra Nevada streams influence trout persistence? *Trans. Am. Fish. Soc.* **128**, 222–240 (1999).

57. Shuter, B. J. & Post, J. R. Climate, population viability, and the zoogeography of temperate fishes. *Trans. Am. Fish. Soc.* **119**, 314–336 (1990).

58. Schwartz, M. W. Modelling effects of habitat fragmentation on the ability of trees to respond to climatic warming. *Biodivers. Conserv.* **2**, 51–61 (1993).

59. Hinch, S. G. et al. Potential effects of climate change on marine growth and survival of Fraser River sockeye salmon. *Can. J. Fish. Aquat. Sci.* **52**, 2651–2659 (1995).

60. Kearney, M., Porter, W. P., Williams, C., Ritchie, S. & Hoffmann, A. A. Integrating biophysical models and evolutionary theory to predict climatic impacts on species' ranges: the dengue mosquito *Aedes aegypti* in Australia. *Funct. Ecol.* **23**, 528–538 (2009).

61. Botkin, D. B. et al. Forecasting the effects of global warming on biodiversity. *BioScience* **57**, 227–236 (2007).

62. Levin, S. A. Ecosystems and the biosphere as complex adaptive systems. *Ecosystems* **1**, 431–436 (1998).

63. Bellard, C., Bertelsmeier, C., Leadley, P., Thuiller, W. & Courchamp, F. Impacts of climate change on the future of biodiversity. *Ecol. Lett.* **15**, 365–377 (2012).

64. Nadeau, C. P. & Urban, M. C. Eco-evolution on the edge during climate change. *Ecography* **42**, E3276–E3284 (2019).
-
65. Pereira, H. M. et al. Essential biodiversity variables. *Science* **339**, 277–278 (2013).
-
66. Foden, W. B. et al. Identifying the world's most climate change vulnerable species: a systematic trait-based assessment of all birds, amphibians and corals. *PLoS ONE* **8**, e65427 (2013).
-
67. Foden, W. B. et al. Climate change vulnerability assessment of species. *WIREs Clim. Change* **10**, e551 (2019).
-
68. Pacifici, M. et al. Assessing species vulnerability to climate change. *Nat. Clim. Change* **5**, 215–224 (2015).
-
69. Akçakaya, H. R. Viability analyses with habitat-based metapopulation models. *Popul. Ecol.* **42**, 45–53 (2000).
-
70. Akçakaya, H. R., Butchart, S. H. M., Mace, G. M., Stuart, S. N. & Hilton-Taylor, C. Use and misuse of the IUCN red list criteria in projecting climate change impacts on biodiversity. *Glob. Change Biol.* **12**, 2037–2043 (2006).
-
71. Elith, J. & Leathwick, J. R. Species distribution models: ecological explanation and prediction across space and time. *Annu. Rev. Ecol. Evol. Syst.* **40**, 677–697 (2009).
-
72. Zurell, D. et al. A standard protocol for reporting species distribution models. *Ecography* **43**, 1261–1277 (2020).
-

73. Guisan, A., Thuiller, W. & Zimmermann, N. E. *Habitat Suitability and Distribution Models: With Applications in R* (Cambridge Univ. Press, 2017).
-
74. Kattge, J. et al. TRY – a global database of plant traits. *Glob. Change Biol.* **17**, 2905–2935 (2011).
-
75. Enquist, B. J., Condit, R., Peet, R. K., Schildhauer, M. & Thiers, B. M. Cyberinfrastructure for an integrated botanical information network to investigate the ecological impacts of global climate change on plant biodiversity. Preprint at *PeerJ Preprints* <https://doi.org/10.7287/peerj.preprints.2615v2> (2016).
-
76. Salguero-Gómez, R. et al. COMADRE: a global data base of animal demography. *J. Anim. Ecol.* **85**, 371–384 (2016).
-
77. Wüest, R. O. et al. Macroecology in the age of big data – where to go from here? *J. Biogeogr.* **47**, 1–12 (2020).
-
78. Tobias, J. A. et al. AVONET: morphological, ecological and geographical data for all birds. *Ecol. Lett.* **25**, 581–597 (2022).
-
79. Elith, J. et al. Novel methods improve prediction of species' distribution from occurrence data. *Ecography* **29**, 129–151 (2006).
-
80. Cheaib, A. et al. Climate change impacts on tree ranges: model intercomparison facilitates understanding and quantification of uncertainty. *Ecol. Lett.* **15**, 533–544 (2012).
-

81. Bahlburg, D., Thorpe, S. E., Meyer, B., Berger, U. & Murphy, E. J. An intercomparison of models predicting growth of Antarctic krill (*Euphausia superba*): the importance of recognizing model specificity. *PLoS ONE* **18**, e0286036 (2023).

82. Zurell, D. et al. Benchmarking novel approaches for modelling species range dynamics. *Glob. Change Biol.* **22**, 2651–2664 (2016).

83. Ruane, A. C. et al. Carbon–temperature–water change analysis for peanut production under climate change: a prototype for the AgMIP Coordinated Climate-Crop Modeling Project (C3MP). *Glob. Change Biol.* **20**, 394–407 (2014).

84. Daigneault, A. et al. How the future of the global forest sink depends on timber demand, forest management, and carbon policies. *Glob. Environ. Change* **76**, 102582 (2022).

85. Briscoe, N. J. et al. Forecasting species range dynamics with process-explicit models: matching methods to applications. *Ecol. Lett.* **22**, 1940–1956 (2019).

86. Urban, M. C. et al. Improving the forecast for biodiversity under climate change. *Science* **353**, aad8466 (2016).

87. Merow, C., Bois, S. T., Allen, J. M., Xie, Y. & Silander, J. A. Climate change both facilitates and inhibits invasive plant ranges in New England. *Proc. Natl Acad. Sci. USA* **114**, E3276–E3284 (2017).

88. Briscoe, N. J., Kearney, M. R., Taylor, C. A. & Wintle, B. A. Unpacking the mechanisms captured by a correlative species distribution model to improve predictions of climate refugia. *Glob. Change Biol.* **22**, 2425–2439 (2016).
-
89. Zurell, D. et al. Predicting the way forward for the global biodiversity framework. *Proc. Natl Acad. Sci. USA* **122**, e2501695122 (2025).
-
90. Yates, K. L. et al. Outstanding challenges in the transferability of ecological models. *Trends Ecol. Evol.* **33**, 790–802 (2018).
-
91. Bouchet, P. J. et al. Better model transfers require knowledge of mechanisms. *Trends Ecol. Evol.* **34**, 489–490 (2019).
-
92. Petchey, O. L. et al. The ecological forecast horizon, and examples of its uses and determinants. *Ecol. Lett.* **18**, 597–611 (2015).
-
93. Gonzalez, A., Chase, J. M. & O'Connor, M. I. A framework for the detection and attribution of biodiversity change. *Philos. Trans. R. Soc. B* **378**, 20220182 (2023).
-
94. Malchow, A.-K., Hartig, F., Reeg, J., Kéry, M. & Zurell, D. Demography–environment relationships improve mechanistic understanding of range dynamics under climate change. *Philos. Trans. R. Soc. B* **378**, 20220194 (2023).
-
95. McGowan, P. J. K. et al. Understanding and achieving species elements in the Kunming–Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework. *BioScience* **74**, 614–623 (2024).
-

96. Bell-James, J. & Watson, J. E. M. Ambitions in national plans do not yet match bold international protection and restoration commitments. *Nat. Ecol. Evol.* **9**, 417–424 (2025).
-
97. Meyer, C., Kreft, H., Guralnick, R. & Jetz, W. Global priorities for an effective information basis of biodiversity distributions. *Nat. Commun.* **6**, 8221 (2015).
-
98. Meyer, C., Weigelt, P. & Kreft, H. Multidimensional biases, gaps and uncertainties in global plant occurrence information. *Ecol. Lett.* **19**, 992–1006 (2016).
-
99. Dornelas, M. et al. BioTIME: a database of biodiversity time series for the Anthropocene. *Glob. Ecol. Biogeogr.* **27**, 760–786 (2018).
-
100. Gonzalez, A. et al. A global biodiversity observing system to unite monitoring and guide action. *Nat. Ecol. Evol.* **7**, 1947–1952 (2023).
-
101. Cabral, J. S. et al. The road to integrate climate change projections with regional land-use–biodiversity models. *People Nat.* **6**, 1716–1741 (2024).
-
102. Navarro, L. M. et al. Integrating historical sources for long-term ecological knowledge and biodiversity conservation. *Nat. Rev. Biodivers.* **1**, 657–670 (2025).
-
103. Hartig, F. et al. Novel community data in ecology-properties and prospects. *Trends Ecol. Evol.* **39**, 280–293 (2024).
-

104. Pollock, L. J. et al. Harnessing artificial intelligence to fill global shortfalls in biodiversity knowledge. *Nat. Rev. Biodivers.* **1**, 166–182 (2025).
-
105. Reichstein, M. et al. Deep learning and process understanding for data-driven Earth system science. *Nature* **566**, 195–204 (2019).
-
106. Ling, F. et al. Diffusion model-based probabilistic downscaling for 180-year East Asian climate reconstruction. *npj Clim. Atmos. Sci.* **7**, 131 (2024).
-
107. Moreno-Mateos, D. et al. Anthropogenic ecosystem disturbance and the recovery debt. *Nat. Commun.* **8**, 14163 (2017).
-
108. Watts, K. et al. Ecological time lags and the journey towards conservation success. *Nat. Ecol. Evol.* **4**, 304–311 (2020).
-
109. Kause, A. et al. Confidence levels and likelihood terms in IPCC reports: a survey of experts from different scientific disciplines. *Clim. Change* **173**, 2 (2022).
-
110. Grimm, V. Ecology needs to overcome siloed modelling. *Trends Ecol. Evol.* **38**, 1122–1124 (2023).
-
111. Griffith, J. et al. BON in a Box: an open and collaborative platform for biodiversity monitoring, indicator calculation, and reporting. *BioScience* <https://doi.org/10.1093/biosci/biaf189> (2026).
-

112. Grimm, V. et al. The ODD protocol for describing agent-based and other simulation models: a second update to improve clarity, replication, and structural realism. *J. Artif. Soc. Soc. Simul.* **23**, 7 (2020).
-
113. Grimm, V. et al. Towards better modelling and decision support: documenting model development, testing, and analysis using TRACE. *Ecol. Model.* **280**, 129–139 (2014).
-
114. Giorgi, F. Thirty years of regional climate modeling: where are we and where are we going next? *J. Geophys. Res.* **124**, 5696–5723 (2019).
-
115. Hanski, I. et al. Ecological and genetic basis of metapopulation persistence of the Glanville fritillary butterfly in fragmented landscapes. *Nat. Commun.* **8**, 14504 (2017).
-
116. Jackson, J., Childs, D. Z., Mar, K. U., Htut, W. & Lummaa, V. Long-term trends in wild-capture and population dynamics point to an uncertain future for captive elephants. *Proc. R. Soc. B* **286**, 20182810 (2019).
-
117. Rosen, A. et al. Tracking shifts in forest structural complexity through space and time in human-modified tropical landscapes. *Ecography* **2024**, e07377 (2024).
-
118. Hoeinghaus, D. J., Winemiller, K. O. & Agostinho, A. A. Hydrogeomorphology and river impoundment affect food-chain length of diverse neotropical food webs. *Oikos* **117**, 984–995 (2008).
-

- 119.** Valavi, R., Guillera-Arroita, G., Lahoz-Monfort, J. J. & Elith, J. Predictive performance of presence-only species distribution models: a benchmark study with reproducible code. *Ecol. Monogr.* **92**, e01486 (2022).
-
- 120.** Araújo, M. B., Pearson, R. G., Thuillers, W. & Erhard, M. Validation of species-climate impact models under climate change. *Glob. Change Biol.* **11**, 1504–1513 (2005).
-
- 121.** Sofaer, H. R., Jarnevich, C. S. & Flather, C. H. Misleading prioritizations from modelling range shifts under climate change. *Glob. Ecol. Biogeogr.* **27**, 658–666 (2018).
-
- 122.** Wheatley, C. J. et al. Climate change vulnerability for species—assessing the assessments. *Glob. Change Biol.* **23**, 3704–3715 (2017).
-

Acknowledgements

D.Z. and K.S. are supported by DFG Grant No. 518316503. S.J.L.G. is funded by the Novo Nordisk Challenge Programme grant number NNF20OC0060118. G.B. is funded by a Royal Society University Research Fellowship (UF160614).

Author information

Authors and Affiliations

Institute of Biochemistry and Biology, University of Potsdam, Potsdam, Germany

Damaris Zurell & Katrin Schifferle

Institut Méditerranéen de Biodiversité et d'Ecologie, Aix Marseille University, CNRS, IRD and Avignon University, Aix-en-Provence, France

Cécile H. Albert

School of Biological Sciences, University of Aberdeen, Aberdeen, UK

Greta Bocedi & Samuel J. L. Gascoigne

School of Agriculture, Food and Ecosystem Sciences, University of Melbourne, Melbourne, Victoria, Australia

Natalie J. Briscoe & Gurutzeta Guillera-Arroita

Department of Biology, University of Washington, Seattle, WA, USA

Lauren B. Buckley

Department of Biology, Group on Earth Observations Biodiversity Observation Network, McGill University, Montreal, Quebec, Canada

Andrew Gonzalez

Pyrenean Institute of Ecology, CSIC, Jaca, Spain

Gurutzeta Guillera-Arroita

UK Centre for Ecology & Hydrology, Wallingford, UK

Nick J. B. Isaac

Swiss Federal Research Institute WSL, Birmensdorf, Switzerland

Dirk N. Karger

School of Environment, The University of Auckland, Auckland, New Zealand

Carolyn J. Lundquist

National Institute of Water & Atmospheric Research, Hamilton, New Zealand

Carolyn J. Lundquist

Coastal Marine Ecosystems Research Centre (CMERC), Central Queensland University, Gladstone Marina, Queensland, Australia

Carolyn J. Lundquist

Department of Ecology and Evolutionary Biology, University of Connecticut, Storrs, CT, USA

Cory Merow & Mark C. Urban

Center of Biological Risk, University of Connecticut, Storrs, CT, USA

Cory Merow & Mark C. Urban

Biodiversity Modelling and Environmental Change, School of Biosciences, University of Birmingham, Birmingham, UK

Juliano Sarmento Cabral

Ecological Modelling, Bonner Institute for Organismal Biology – Department of Plant Biodiversity, University of Bonn, Bonn, Germany

Juliano Sarmento Cabral

Instituto de Biología Subtropical, Consejo Nacional de Investigaciones Científicas y Técnicas, Universidad Nacional de Misiones, Puerto Iguazú, Argentina

Santiago J. E. Velazco

Department of Geography, San Diego State University, San Diego, CA, USA

Santiago J. E. Velazco

Contributions

D.Z., S.J.L.G., J.S.C, K.S., S.J.E.V. and M.C.U. researched data for the article. D.Z., A.G. and M.C.U. contributed substantially to discussion of the content. D.Z., C.H.A., G.B., N.J.B., L.B.B., G.G.-A., N.J.B.I., C.M., J.S.C., S.J.E.V. and M.C.U wrote the article. All authors reviewed and/or edited the manuscript before submission.

Corresponding author

Correspondence to [Damaris Zurell](#).

Ethics declarations

Competing interests

The authors declare no competing interests.

Peer review

Peer review information

Nature Reviews Biodiversity thanks Alice Johnston, who co-reviewed with Harriet Gold; and the other, anonymous, reviewer(s) for their contribution to the peer review of this work.

Additional information

Publisher's note Springer Nature remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.

Related links

BES-SIM: <https://bes-sim.org/>

BON in a Box: <https://boninabox.geobon.org/>

FishMIP: <https://fishmip.org>

GEO BON EcoCode: <https://geobon.org/ecocode-modelling-life-on-earth/>

ISIMIP: <https://www.isimip.org/>

Supplementary information

Supplementary information

Rights and permissions

Springer Nature or its licensor (e.g. a society or other partner) holds exclusive rights to this article under a publishing agreement with the author(s) or other rightsholder(s); author self-archiving of the accepted manuscript version of this article is solely governed by the terms of such publishing agreement and applicable law.

Reprints and permissions

About this article

Cite this article

Zurell, D., Albert, C.H., Bocedi, G. et al. Biodiversity science and policy need more model intercomparisons. *Nat. Rev. Biodivers.* (2026). <https://doi.org/10.1038/s44358-026-00134-4>

Accepted

15 January 2026

Published

06 February 2026

Version of record

06 February 2026

DOI

<https://doi.org/10.1038/s44358-026-00134-4>

Subjects [Biodiversity](#) • [Ecological modelling](#)

Nature Reviews Biodiversity (*Nat. Rev. Biodivers.*) | ISSN 3005-0677 (online)