**[don’t even try to have a title right now, it’s distracting you]**

1. **Introduction/Framing**
2. Understanding the interrelated dynamics of size- and -abundance based dimensions of biodiversity is key to understanding biodiversity change in the Anthropocene.
   1. Total abundance - i.e. the total number of individual organisms present in a system - and size-based currencies, such as the total biomass or total metabolic flux (“energy use”) of a system, are intertwined, but nonequivalent, measures of biological function.
      1. Abundance is more closely tied to species-level population dynamics, while size-based metrics more directly reflect assemblage-level resource use and contributions to materials fluxes at the broader ecosystem scale (Morlon et al. 2009; Dornelas et al 2011; White et al 2007; Connolly et al. 2005)
   2. While these currencies are naturally linked (Henderson and Magurran 2010; Morlon et al. 2009), changes in size composition can decouple the dynamics of one currency from another (Dornelas et al. 2011; White et al 2004; White et al. 2007; Ernest et al 2009; Yen et al 2017).
      1. This can mean that intuition from one currency may be misleading about others; a trend in numerical abundance might mask something else going on with biomass (White et al. 2004)
      2. Changes in size composition strong enough to decouple currencies may be symptomatic of important changes in ecosystem status
         1. E.g. abundance-biomass comparison curves (Petchey and Belgrano 2010; …); size-biased extinctions (Young et al. 2016; Smith et al. 2018)
         2. Which makes it doubly important that we understand how these dynamics are playing out in the current era of rapid biodiversity change (Fisher et al 2010 ish)
3. It is appropriate to look at these dynamics at the community scale.
   1. This is the scale at which ecological processes (i.e. compensatory dynamics, niche tracking, functional replacement) come into play - in contrast to population or global trends (McGill et al 2015; Dornelas et al 2015; White et al 2007).
   2. At the community scale, the size spectrum links abundance- and size-based currencies (White et al 2007).
   3. To the extent that size is a proxy for other functional traits, changes or consistency in the community-level size structure over time may reflect processes related to niche structure (White et al 2007; Petchey and Belgrano 2010).
      1. Strong size shifts can decouple the relationship between abundance and biomass.
         1. This is well established in aquatic systems, where changes in the scaling between abundance and biomass often signal ecosystem degradation (Petchey and Belgrano 2010; Kerr and Dickie 2001?; Warwick and Clarke 1994 and older refs therein).
         2. Compensatory shifts in the size structure can buffer community function in terms of biomass or energy use against changes in abundance (Terry and Rowe 2015; Ernest et al. 2009; White et al. 2004)
      2. Consistency in the size structure may maintain the relationship between size- and -abundance based currencies, even as species composition, total abundance, and total biomass/total energy use fluctuate over time.
         1. Either due to low turnover
         2. Or through size-structured replacement
         3. Either of which may reflect consistency in niche structure over time (Holling 1992)
      3. Random dynamics/drift may also contribute to the dynamics of the size spectrum - either as neutral population dynamics, or through systematic processes on niche axes orthogonal to size.
4. It is important to improve our understanding of these dynamics for terrestrial animal communities in particular.
   1. Terrestrial animal communities are relatively unknown in terms of size spectrum work (White et al 2007; but see classic bugs, classic birds, Ernest 2005, Thibaulet 2011, Yen et al 2017).
   2. However, they:
      1. Exhibit size structure (Ernest 2005; Thibault et al. 2011)
      2. are experiencing serious and potentially size-structured change, with implications at community, ecosystem, and global scales (Young et al. 2016; Schmitz et al 2018, …).
   3. Case studies have demonstrated that size shifts can decouple N from E (White et al 2004, Yen et al 2017), while others have them moving together (Hernandez et al 2011).
   4. Establishing general commonalities regarding these dynamics has been constrained by a lack of macroecological-scale data on species and size composition for terrestrial animal communities (White et al. 2007; Thibault et al. 2011)
      1. To achieve macro-scale synthesis, we would like
         1. A consistent sampling protocol
         2. Many communities
         3. Long temporal extent
         4. Size \*AND\* abundance data
            1. For a particular taxon, often size or abundan ce - but not both - is the traditional unit of measure (Gotelli et al 2017 or other BioTIME ref)
         5. For the **community** scale
            1. I.e. not population or global, which is most of what we know about terrestrial animals (White et al. 2007; …)
   5. As a result, we do not have a synthetic understanding of either 1) the extent to which changes in the size structure decouple the dynamics of abundance, biomass, and energy use inthese systems, or of 2) the underlying changes in community structure that account for these effects.
5. Here, we begin to address this gap by exploring how temporal changes in species composition and the size spectrum modulate the relationship between total abundance, energy, and biomass for communities of North American breeding birds.
   1. Specifically,
      1. We used allometric scaling to estimate community size and abundance data for the North American Breeding Bird Survey, and evaluated how changes in total abundance, biomass, and energy use have co-varied from 1988-2018.
      2. We also used a null model of functional turnover to explore the extent to which size-structured shifts (as opposed to non-size-structured dynamics) have contributed to the relationship between these currencies over time.
6. **Methods**
7. Bird abundance data
   1. We used data from the Breeding Bird Survey to compare community attributes along each route between the 5-year periods from 1988-1992 and 2014-2018.
      1. We used a discrete time-period comparison (as opposed to continuous-time over the full timeseries) to simplify comparisons between temporal turnover in species composition and the size structure - which are complex, multidimensional distributions - and changes in community-wide total abundance, biomass, and energy use.
         1. We acknowledge that a continuous-time perspective may be better equipped to detect nonlinear dynamics (Macgregor et al 2019) and account for artefacts related to the selected beginning and ending dates (Cusser et al 2020; Balhai et al 2021). Developing continuous-time methods for analyzing complex, multidimensional community distributions such as the size spectrum is an important and ongoing area of methodological development (e.g. Yen et al. 2017).
      2. We used 5-year periods so as to smooth out interannual variability and to account for sampling accumulation effects in characterizing the bird community in each time period (White 2004).
      3. We used the same begin and end dates for all routes in the analysis so as to have a consistent window.
         1. We explored the number of routes in the dataset with complete sampling coverage for two five-year “begin” and “end” periods with start dates ranging from X to X and end dates ranging from X to X, and selected beginning and ending dates of 1988 and 2018 so as to obtain a large number of routes from diverse bird conservation regions, and span a relatively long window of time (could ref Cusser et al. 2020 there).
   2. I have **not** made core/transient distinctions in the most recent set of analyses. In past iterations the results were qualitatively the same between all species, and with transients (present in < 33% of samples) removed.
   3. I have at times subsampled this dataset to include a maximum of 10 routes per bird conservation region, to avoid having some highly-sampled regions overwhelm more sparsely-sampled regions in the aggregate analysis (following Thibault et al. 2011; yields about 200 routes). It doesn’t change the aggregate results, so I’ve been proceeding with the full set of ~500 routes.
8. Estimated size data
   1. BBS contains abundances for all species along a route in each year, but does not include measurements of individual body size.
   2. We generated body size estimates for individual birds assuming that intraspecific size distributions are normally distributed around a species’ mean body size.
      1. Using records of species’ mean and standard deviation body sizes from Dunning (2007), we drew individuals’ body sizes from the appropriate normal distributions.
      2. For species for which there was not a standard deviation recorded in Dunning (n =?), we estimated the standard deviation based on an allometric scaling relationship between mean and standard deviation in body mass (also described in Thibault et al. 2011).
      3. For species with multiple records in Dunning (2007), we used the mean mean and standard deviation body sizes across all records (averaging across sexes, subspecies, and records from different locations). We performed this averaging after estimating any missing standard deviation measurements.
      4. This method does not incorporate intraspecific variation in body size across geographies or over time (Dunning 2007; Gardner et al. 2011). However, it makes it possible to conduct macroecological studies of avian size distributions at a spatial and temporal scale that would otherwise be impossible.
      5. Because we are typically drawing large numbers of individuals, the effects of sampling variability on overall results here are negligible.
   3. For each individual bird observed, we estimated metabolic rate as [pars; Fristoe 2015].
9. Characterizing the size structure
   1. Describing the size structure for bird communities is not as simple as it is for the power-law size spectra generally found in aquatic, forest, and invertebrate systems (refs). The size structure for bird communities is typically multimodal and therefore cannot be adequately summarized via a single slope (Holling 1992; Thibault et al. 2011).
   2. We characterized the size spectrum for each route in each time period using density smoothing through a Gaussian mixture model (Thibault et al. 2011).
      1. Smoothing allows us to avoid arbitrary binning decisions. Gaussian mixture models are specifically designed to work with multimodal frequency distributions and have been used previously to characterize avian ISDs.
      2. We fit a Gaussian mixture model with up to 12 Gaussians to the distribution of log(body mass) of all individuals observed along each route within each time period, and selected the best-fitting model using BIC (all following Thibault et al. 2011).
      3. We characterized the size structure as the density function of the resulting GMM, evaluated at 1000 points from body mass of 1g to 15000g (corresponding to a log() body mass of 0-9.6). We used the same, very wide, range of body sizes for every route, to encompass the full range of body sizes represented in our dataset (mean body masses ranging from 2.65 to 8450g). We rescaled each density function to sum to 1.
10. Change in total abundance, biomass, and energy use over time
11. Change in the size structure over time
    1. To measure change across the entire ISD of a given route between time periods, we used an overlap metric previously developed to compare body size distributions of mammals (Read et al 2018). This metric is calculated as: [the sum of the minimum of each scaled density function at each evaluation point]. This metric ranges from 0-1, with 1 being 100% overlap and 0 being complete dissimilarity.
    2. Because decoupling of N, E, and B is proximally driven by *directional* shifts, we also calculated the mean body size and bmr for each ISD.
12. Change in species composition over time
    1. We calculated two metrics of taxonomic turnover for each route between the time periods.
    2. First, we calculated the taxonomic analog of the overlap metric used on the size spectrum, as: the sum over all species of [the minimum relative abundance of each species in time period 1 or 2]. This metric ranges from 0-1, again with 1 being complete overlap and 0 being complete dissimilarity.
    3. For comparability with more traditional beta-diversity metrics, we also calculated Bray-Curtis dissimilarity between the two time periods.
    4. These metrics generally vary closely with each other.
13. Null models
    1. We used null models preserving observed dynamics in species’ abundance, but randomized with respect to body size, to test for size-structured replacement or systematic size shifts.
       1. We used a null model analogous to null models used to explore patterns in taxonomic and functional beta-diversity more broadly (Swenson et al. 2011; Siefert et al. 2013; He et al. 2021).
       2. For each route, we reassigned species’ trait values - mean and s.d. Body size - drawing without replacement from the species pool.
       3. We ran versions of the null model with local, regional, and continental species pools.
          1. The local species pool was defined as all species ever recorded on that route.
          2. The regional species pool was defined as all species ever recorded on a route, and all species whose resident or breeding ranges (as defined by BirdLife) overlapped that route.
          3. The continental species pool contained all ~400 species present in the dataset.
       4. For each iteration of the null model, we calculated the ISD overlap from beginning to end of the timeseries and constructed a distribution of overlap values. We ran 100 iterations.
       5. We calculated the standardized effect size (Gotelli and Graves 1996) and percentile score of the observed overlap value relative to the null distribution.
       6. We tested if the observed amount of change in the ISD is very high (reflecting a strong size shift) or very low (reflecting size structured replacement) compared to non-size-structured dynamics constrained by observed species turnover and the species pool.
14. **Results**
15. Dynamics of N, E, and M over time
    1. ~50% of the time, temporal comparison non significant
    2. When there is a trend:
       1. Usually a decrease but not a catastrophic one
       2. Usually not a significant interaction over different currencies
       3. When there is a difference…
          1. Usually an increase in size → a less negative slope
          2. Manifests for biomass more frequently than for energy use (because of ¾ scaling)
       4. There is considerable **variability** in the relative change in currencies.
16. Change in taxonomic and size structure over time
    1. Size structure consistently more conserved than species composition
17. Null models
    1. For all species pools, SES and percentile score distributions do not differ from random expectation
18. **Discussion points**
19. Overall, a signal of ~parallel dynamics, and particularly decreases,in abundance, biomass, and energy use over time
    1. About 50% of the time, not significant. But when significant, overwhelmingly 1) a decrease and 2) changing together.
    2. This is consistent with concerns about declines in abundance, but not consistent with size-structured declines amplifying declines in function beyond abundance (Dirzo et al. 2014).
    3. Note that this study is not definitive for biodiversity monitoring
       1. Discrete vs. continuous time
       2. Geographic bias in routes
       3. Continuous-time methods for ISD work, and case studies better targeted for biodiversity monitoring, are both next-steps
20. Relationship usually maintained due to low taxonomic turnover, but not detectably through functional replacement
    1. Low taxonomic turnover may reflect stable niche structure over time.
       1. Absent the empirical basis for parameterizing a null model of species turnover (e.g. the necessary parameters to run neutral simulations), we cannot distinguish between random and systematic dynamics of taxonomic change.
       2. But, we observe pretty low turnover.
    2. There is no dominating signal of functional replacement conserving the size structure beyond what is expected given taxonomic turnover + the species pool.
       1. This null model is inherently conservative, with a high type-II error rate (Ulrich et al. 2017). Not deviating does not necessarily mean there’s no size structured dynamics. There may be *both* size structured replacement and size shifts operating simultaneously, or simply weak/imperfect functional replacement.
       2. Or, birds might be less strongly size-structured than fish, trees, or rodents. There are more ways to be a 20g bird than a 20g pocket mouse.
21. When there is a decoupling of currencies, tends to be an increase in body size → less negative slope in biomass/energy vs abundance
    1. Contrasts with concerns about size-biased extinctions
    2. Consistent with other reports from BBS (Schipper et al. 2016)
    3. May reflect forests in ~recovery over this time period (Schipper et al. 2016)
    4. Get into some case studies here
22. These results might or might not be borne out in other taxonomic groups or other geographic regions.
    1. BBS is on intact habitats in systems that may have been recovering - counter to global trends or trends in areas of particular concern
    2. Next steps should include specifically exploring systems that have undergone major disturbances, and/or a large degree of taxonomic turnover.
    3. And greater taxonomic coverage - comparative work between mammals and birds, for example