

# IDK

Peter D. Smits<sup>1,\*</sup>

1. University of Chicago, Chicago, Illinois 60637.

\* Corresponding author; e-mail: psmits@uchicago.edu.

*Manuscript elements:*

*Keywords:*

*Manuscript type:* Article

Prepared using the suggested L<sup>A</sup>T<sub>E</sub>X template for *Am. Nat.*

# Introduction

When are ecotypes enriched or depleted?

A regional species pool is the set of species which form communities in a specific region; local communities are subsets of the regional pool. The composition of a regional species pool changes over time due to speciation, migration, extinction. Local scale processes like resource competition only affect the regional species pool if all communities are affected.

Fourth-corner modeling is concerned with explaining either species abundance or presence/absence as a product of species traits, environmental factors, and the interaction between these factors. In modern ecological studies, the matrix being modeled is of species occurrence at localities distributed in region. In this study, the matrix being modeled is of species occurrence in temporal bins across the Cenozoic in North America. These dimensions are all axes of the same three dimensional occurrence matrix: species by locality by time.

One of the greatest challenges with analyzing species occurrence data is the inherent incompleteness of any sample CITATION. In the modern, only presences are certain as an absence can be caused by both the species being truly absent or the species never having been sampled CITATION. For paleontological data in the context of this study, the incomplete preservation of fossil communities combined with the incomplete sampling of what fossils there are means that the true times of origination or extinction may not be observed CITATION.

## Materials and Methods

### Taxon occurrences and species-level information

All fossil occurrence information was downloaded from the Paleobiology Database. Occurrences (PBDB) were restricted to all Mammalia sampled in North America between the Maastrichtian and Gelasian stages. Taxonomic, stratigraphic, and ecological metadata for each occurrence was included. The raw data is available for download at <http://goo.gl/2slgeU>.

This raw data was then sorted, cleaned, and manipulated programmatically prior to analysis.

Species taxonomic assignments given by the PBDB were updated for accuracy and consistency. For example, species classified in the order Artiodactyla were reclassified as Cetartiodactyla. These re-assignments follow ? and were based on CITATIONS. Additionally, Taxa who’s life habit was classified as either volant (i.e. Chiroptera) or aquatic (e.g. Cetacea) were excluded from this analysis because of both differences in fossilization potential and applicability to the study of terrestrial species pools.

The life habit and dietary categories provided through the PBDB were coarsened to increase per ecotype sample size; this coarsening follows the same procedure as ?. Additionally, life habit category was further modified to break-up the vague “ground-dwelling” category; re-classifying these species by ankle posture gives more precise information about that species’ environmental context. Ground-dwelling taxa were reassigned following ? by species taxonomic context. Species ecotype is defined as the interaction between life habit and diet categories. Ecotype categories with less than 10 species having ever been that combination were excluded, yielding a total of 18 of 21 possible ecotypes.

Table 1: Species trait assignments in this study are a coarser version of the information available in the PBDB. Information was coarsened to improve per category sample size and uniformity and followed this table.

This study		PBDB categories
Diet	Carnivore	Carnivore
	Herbivore	Browser, folivore, granivore, grazer, herbivore.
	Insectivore	Insectivore.
	Omnivore	Frugivore, omnivore.
Locomotor	Arboreal	Arboreal.
	Ground dwelling	Fossorial, ground dwelling, semifossorial, saltatorial.
	Scansorial	Scansorial.

Table 2: Posture assignment based on taxonomy

Order	Family	Stance
	Ailuridae	plantigrade
Continued on next page		

**Table 2 – continued from previous page**

Order	Family	Stance
Dinocerata	Allomyidae	plantigrade
	Amphicyonidae	plantigrade
	Amphilemuridae	plantigrade
	Anthracotheriidae	digitigrade
	Antilocapridae	unguligrade
	Apheliscidae	plantigrade
	Aplodontidae	plantigrade
	Apternodontidae	scansorial
	Arctocyonidae	unguligrade
	Barbourofelidae	digitigrade
	Barylambdidae	plantigrade
	Bovidae	unguligrade
	Camelidae	unguligrade
	Canidae	digitigrade
	Cervidae	unguligrade
	Cimolodontidae	scansorial
	Coryphodontidae	plantigrade
	Cricetidae	plantigrade
	Cylindrodontidae	plantigrade
	Cyriacotheriidae	plantigrade
	Dichobunidae	unguligrade
	Dinocerata	unguligrade
	Dipodidae	digitigrade
	Elephantidae	digitigrade
	Entelodontidae	unguligrade
Continued on next page		

**Table 2 – continued from previous page**

Order	Family	Stance
Lagomorpha	Eomyidae	plantigrade
	Erethizontidae	plantigrade
	Erinaceidae	plantigrade
	Esthonychidae	plantigrade
	Eutypomyidae	plantigrade
	Felidae	digitigrade
	Florentiamyidae	plantigrade
	Gelocidae	unguligrade
	Geolabididae	plantigrade
	Glyptodontidae	plantigrade
	Gomphotheriidae	unguligrade
	Hapalodectidae	plantigrade
	Heteromyidae	digitigrade
	Hyaenidae	digitigrade
	Hyaenodontidae	digitigrade
	Hypertragulidae	unguligrade
	Ischyromyidae	plantigrade
	Jimomyidae	plantigrade
		digitigrade
	Leptictidae	plantigrade
	Leptochoeridae	unguligrade
	Leptomerycidae	unguligrade
	Mammutidae	unguligrade
	Megalonychidae	plantigrade
	Megatheriidae	plantigrade
Continued on next page		

**Table 2 – continued from previous page**

Order	Family	Stance
Mesonychia	Mephitidae	plantigrade
	Merycoidodontidae	digitigrade
		unguligrade
	Mesonychidae	digitigrade
	Micropternodontidae	plantigrade
	Mixodectidae	plantigrade
	Moschidae	unguligrade
	Muridae	plantigrade
	Mustelidae	plantigrade
	Mylagaulidae	fossorial
	Mylodontidae	plantigrade
	Nimravidae	digitigrade
	Nothrotheriidae	plantigrade
		unguligrade
Notoungulata	Oromerycidae	unguligrade
	Oxyaenidae	digitigrade
	Palaeomerycidae	unguligrade
	Palaeoryctidae	plantigrade
	Pampatheriidae	plantigrade
	Pantolambdidae	plantigrade
	Periptychidae	digitigrade
		unguligrade
Perissodactyla	Phenacodontidae	unguligrade
		plantigrade
Primates		plantigrade
	Procyonidae	plantigrade
Continued on next page		

**Table 2 – continued from previous page**

Order	Family	Stance
	Proscalopidae	plantigrade
	Protoceratidae	unguligrade
	Reithroparamyidae	plantigrade
	Sciuravidae	plantigrade
	Sciuridae	plantigrade
	Simimyidae	plantigrade
	Soricidae	plantigrade
	Suidae	digitigrade
	Talpidae	fossorial
	Tayassuidae	unguligrade
	Tenrecidae	plantigrade
	Titanoideidae	plantigrade
	Ursidae	plantigrade
	Viverravidae	plantigrade
	Zapodidae	plantigrade

40

Species mass information was gathered from multiple different sources where a plurality of the body  
size estimates are from the PBDB. Body part measurements for many species are also available  
through the PBDB. Just as with ?, these measurements and corresponding regression equations  
were used to get mass estimates for more species. Additional mass estimates and body part  
measurements were sourced from CITATIONS, the Neogene Old World Database as in ?. Mass was  
log-transformed and then mean-centered and rescaled by dividing by two-times its standard  
deviation; this insures that the magnitude of effects for both continuous and discrete covariates are  
comparable and follows CITATION.

48

Table 3: Regression equations used in this study for estimating body size. Equations are presented with reference to taxonomic grouping, part name, and reference.

Group	Equation	log(Measurement)	Source
General	$\log(m) = 1.827x + 1.81$	lower m1 area	?
General	$\log(m) = 2.9677x - 5.6712$	mandible length	?
General	$\log(m) = 3.68x - 3.83$	skull length	?
Carnivores	$\log(m) = 2.97x + 1.681$	lower m1 length	?
Insectivores	$\log(m) = 1.628x + 1.726$	lower m1 area	?
Insectivores	$\log(m) = 1.714x + 0.886$	upper M1 area	?
Lagomorph	$\log(m) = 2.671x - 2.671$	lower toothrow area	?
Lagomorph	$\log(m) = 4.468x - 3.002$	lower m1 length	?
Marsupials	$\log(m) = 3.284x + 1.83$	upper M1 length	?
Marsupials	$\log(m) = 1.733x + 1.571$	upper M1 area	?
Rodentia	$\log(m) = 1.767x + 2.172$	lower m1 area	?
Ungulates	$\log(m) = 1.516x + 3.757$	lower m1 area	?
Ungulates	$\log(m) = 3.076x + 2.366$	lower m2 length	?
Ungulates	$\log(m) = 1.518x + 2.792$	lower m2 area	?
Ungulates	$\log(m) = 3.113x - 1.374$	lower toothrow length	?

All fossil occurrences from 64 to 2 million years ago (Mya) were binned into 31 2 million year (My) bins. This temporal length was chosen because it is approximately the resolution of the North American mammal fossil record.

## Environmental and temporal covariates

The group-level covariates in this study are descriptors of species' environmental context, such as global temperature and floral interval.

Global temperature was calculated from Mg/Ca isotope data across the Cenozoic CRAMER CITATION. WHY DID I DO THIS? TOM EZARD HAS USED THIS AND IT IS PROBABLY BETTER THAN THE ZACHOS CURVE. Two aspects of the Mg/Ca-based temperature curve were included in this analysis: mean and range. Both were calculated as the mean of all respective estimates for each 2 My temporal bins. Both mean and range were then rescaled as above: subtract mean, divide by twice the standard deviation.

Floral interval is a holistic descriptor of which taxonomic groups are present and their relative



62 modernity of those taxa for a given temporal interval CITATION. Graham CITATION defines four  
intervals from the Cretaceous to the Pliocene; only three of these intervals are included in this  
64 analysis.

## Modelling species occurrence

66 Two different models were used in this study: a pure-presence model and a birth-death model. Both  
models at their core are hidden Markov model with an absorbing state. The difference between  
68 these two models is if the probability of a species origination and survival are considered equal or  
different.

## 70 Data augmentation

All presence/absence observations are incomplete. The hidden Markov model at the core of this  
72 analysis allows for observed absences to be used meaningfully to estimate the number of unobserved  
species. Of specific concern in this analysis is the unknown “true” size of the dataset; how many  
74 species could have actually been observed? While many species have been observed, the natural  
incompleteness of all observations, especially in the case of paleontological data, there are obviously  
76 many species which were never sampled.

Let  $N$  be the total number of observed species,  $M$  be the upper limit of possible species that could  
78 have existed given a model of species presence, and  $N^*$  is the all-zero histories where  $N^* = M - N$ .  
This approach assumes that  $\hat{N} \sim \text{Binomial}(M, \psi)$  where  $\hat{N}$  is the estimated “true” number of  
80 species and  $\psi$  is the probability that any augmented species should actually be “present.” Because  
 $M$  is user defined, this approach effectively gives  $\psi$  a uniform prior over  $N$  to  $M$  CITATION. For a  
82 more detailed explanation of data augmentation and its application here, please see CITATION,  
CITATION, and CITATION. For this study,  $M = N + \lfloor N/4 \rfloor$ .

84 Data imputation is the process of estimating missing data for partially observed covariates  
CITATION, this is simple in a Bayesian context because data are also parameters CITATION.

Augmented species also have no known mass so a mass estimate must be imputed for each possible species CITATION ROYLE. This procedure assumes that mass values for augmented species are from the same distribution as observed species. The distribution of observed mass values is estimated as part of the model, and new mass values are then generated from this distribution. This approach is an example of imputing data missing completely at random CITATION. Because log mass values are rescaled as a part of this study, the body mass distribution is already known ( $\mathcal{N}(0, 0.5)$ ); augmented species body mass just simply drawn from this distribution.

In addition to body mass information, the augmented species need an ecotype classification. Because these species are completely unknown, they were all classified as “augmented,” an additional grouping indicating their unknown biology. This classification has no biological interpretation.

## Observation process

The type of hidden Markov model used in this study has three characteristic probabilities: probability  $p$  of observing a species given that it is present, probability  $\phi$  of a species surviving from one time to another, and probability  $\pi$  of a species first appearing CITATION. In this formulation, the probability of a species going extinct is  $1 - \pi$ . For the pure-presence model  $\phi = \pi$ , while for the birth-death model  $\phi \neq \pi$ .

The probability of observing a species that is present  $p$  is modeled as a logistic regression was a time-varying intercept and species mass as a covariate. The effect of species mass on  $p$  was assumed linear and constant over time and given a prior reflecting a possible positive relationship; these assumptions are reflected in the structure of the model Equation 1. The parameters associated with this part of the model are described in Table 4.

$$\begin{aligned} y_{i,t} &\sim \text{Bernoulli}(p_{i,t} z_{i,t}) \\ p_{i,t} &= \text{logit}^{-1}(\alpha_0 + \alpha_1 m_i + r_t) \\ r_t &\sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma) \end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

Table 4: Observation parameters

Parameter	dimensions	explanation
$y$	$N \times T$	observed species presence/absence
$z$	$N \times T$	“true” species presence/absence
$p$	$T$	probability of observing a species that is present at time $t$
$m$	$N$	species log mass, rescaled
$\alpha_0$	1	average log-odds of $p$
$\alpha_1$	1	change in average log-odds of $p$ per change mass
$r$	$T$	difference from $\alpha_0$ associated with time $t$
$\sigma$	1	standard deviation of $r$

### Pure-presence process

For the pure-presence model there is only a single probability dealing with the presence of a species  $\theta$ . This probability was modeled as multi-level logistic regression with both species-level and group-level covariates CITATION. The parameters associated with pure-presence model are presented in Table 5 and the full sampling statement in Equation 2.

The species-level of the model (Eq. 2) is a logistic regression with varying-intercept that varies by ecotype. Additionally, species mass was included as a covariate associated with two regression coefficients allowing a quadratic relationship with log-odds of occurrence. This assumption is based on the known distribution of mammal body masses where species with intermediate mass values are more common than either small or large bodied species. These assumptions are also reflected in the choice of priors for these regression coefficients.

The values of each ecotype’s intercept are themselves modeled as regressions using the group-level covariates associated with environmental context. Each of these regressions has an associated variance of possible values of each ecotype’s intercept CITATION. In addition, the covariances between ecotype intercepts, given this group-level regression, are modeled CITATION.

Following recommendations from CITATION, CITATION, CITATION all parameters not modeled elsewhere were given weakly informative priors. Weakly informative means that priors do not necessarily encode actual prior information but instead help regularize or weakly constrain posterior estimates. These priors have a concentrated probability density around and near zero; this has the

Table 5: Parameters for the model of presence in the pure-presence model

Parameter	dimensions	explanation
$z$	$N \times T$	“true” species presence/absence
$\theta$	$N \times T - 1$	probability of $z = 1$
$a$	$T - 1 \times D$	ecotype-varying intercept; mean value of log-odds of $\theta$
$m$	$N$	species log mass, rescaled
$b_1$	1	effect of species mass on log-odds of $\theta$
$b_2$	1	effect of species mass, squared, on log-odds of $\theta$
$U$	$T \times D$	matrix of group-level covariates
$\gamma$	$U \times D$	matrix of group-level regression coefficients
$\Sigma$	$D \times D$	covariance matrix of $a$
$\Omega$	$D \times D$	correlation matrix of $a$
$\tau$	$D$	vector of standard deviations for each ecotype $a_d$

126 effect of tempering our estimates and help prevent overfitting the model to the data CITATION.

$$\begin{aligned}
y_{i,t} &\sim \text{Bernoulli}(p_{i,t}z_{i,t}) & \alpha_0 &\sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1) \\
p_{i,t} &= \text{logit}^{-1}(\alpha_0 + \alpha_1 m_i + r_t) & \alpha_1 &\sim \mathcal{N}(1, 1) \\
r_t &\sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma) & \sigma &\sim \mathcal{N}^+(1) \\
z_{i,t} &\sim \text{Bernoulli}(\theta_{i,t}) & b_1 &\sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1) \\
\theta_{i,t} &= \text{logit}^{-1}(a_{t,j[i]} + b_1 m_i + b_2 m_i^2) & b_2 &\sim \mathcal{N}(-1, 1) \\
a &\sim \text{MVN}(u\gamma, \Sigma) & \gamma &\sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1) \\
\Sigma &= \text{diag}(\tau)\Omega\text{diag}(\tau) & \tau &\sim \mathcal{N}^+(1) \\
& & \Omega &\sim \text{LKJ}(2)
\end{aligned} \tag{2}$$

### Birth-death process

128 In the birth-death model,  $\phi \neq \pi$  and so each of these probabilities are modeled separately but in a  
similar manner to how  $\theta$  is modeled in the pure-presence model (Eq. 2). The parameters associated  
130 with the birth-death presence model are presented in Table 6 and the full sampling statement,  
including observation (Eq. 1), is described in Equation 3.

Table 6: Parameters for the model of presence in the pure-presence model

Parameter	dimensions	explanation
$z$	$N \times T$	“true” species presence/absence
$\phi$	$N \times T - 1$	probability of $z_{-,t} = 1   z_{-,t-1} = 0$
$\pi$	$N \times T - 1$	probability of $z_{-,t} = 1   z_{-,t-1} = 1$
$a^\phi$	$T - 1 \times D$	ecotype-varying intercept; mean value of log-odds of $\theta$
$a^\pi$	$T - 1 \times D$	ecotype-varying intercept; mean value of log-odds of $\theta$
$m$	$N$	species log mass, rescaled
$b_1^\phi$	1	effect of species mass on log-odds of $\phi$
$b_1^\pi$	1	effect of species mass on log-odds of $\pi$
$b_2^\phi$	1	effect of species mass, squared, on log-odds of $\phi$
$b_2^\pi$	1	effect of species mass, squared, on log-odds of $\pi$
$U$	$T \times D$	matrix of group-level covariates
$\gamma^\phi$	$U \times D$	matrix of group-level regression coefficients
$\gamma^\pi$	$U \times D$	matrix of group-level regression coefficients
$\Sigma^\phi$	$D \times D$	covariance matrix of $a^\phi$
$\Sigma^\pi$	$D \times D$	covariance matrix of $a^\pi$
$\Omega^\phi$	$D \times D$	correlation matrix of $a^\phi$
$\Omega^\pi$	$D \times D$	correlation matrix of $a^\pi$
$\tau^\phi$	$D$	vector of standard deviations for each ecotype $a_d^\phi$
$\tau^\pi$	$D$	vector of standard deviations for each ecotype $a_d^\pi$

- 132 Similar to the pure-presence model, both  $\phi$  and  $\pi$  are modeled as logistic regressions with  
varying-intercept and one covariate associated with two parameters. The possible relationships  
134 between mass and both  $\phi$  and  $\pi$  are reflected in the parameterization of the model and choice of  
priors (Eq. 3).
- 136 The intercepts of  $\phi$  and  $\pi$  both vary by species ecotype and those values are themselves the product  
of group-level regression using environmental factors as covariates (Eq. 3); this is identical to the  
138 pure presence model (Eq. 2).

$$\begin{aligned}
y_{i,t} &\sim \text{Bernoulli}(p_{i,t}z_{i,t}) & \Sigma^\phi &= \text{diag}(\tau^\phi)\Omega^\phi\text{diag}(\tau^\phi) \\
p_{i,t} &= \text{logit}^{-1}(\alpha_0 + \alpha_1 m_i + r_t) & \Sigma^\pi &= \text{diag}(\tau^\pi)\Omega^\pi\text{diag}(\tau^\pi) \\
r_t &\sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma) & \rho &\sim \text{U}(0, 1) \\
\alpha_0 &\sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1) & b_1^\phi &\sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1) \\
\alpha_1 &\sim \mathcal{N}(1, 1) & b_1^\pi &\sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1) \\
\sigma &\sim \mathcal{N}^+(1) & b_2^\phi &\sim \mathcal{N}(-1, 1) \\
z_{i,1} &\sim \text{Bernoulli}(\rho) & b_2^\pi &\sim \mathcal{N}(-1, 1) \\
z_{i,t} &\sim \text{Bernoulli}\left(z_{i,t-1}\pi + \sum_{x=1}^t (1 - z_{i,x})\phi_t\right) & \gamma^\phi &\sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1) \\
& & \gamma^\pi &\sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1) \\
\phi_{i,t} &= \text{logit}^{-1}(a_{t,j[i]}^\phi + b_1^\phi m_i + b_2^\phi m_i^2) & \tau^\phi &\sim \mathcal{N}^+(1) \\
\pi_{i,t} &= \text{logit}^{-1}(a_{t,j[i]}^\pi + b_1^\pi m_i + b_2^\pi m_i^2) & \tau^\pi &\sim \mathcal{N}^+(1) \\
a^\phi &\sim \text{MVN}(u\gamma^\phi, \Sigma^\phi) & \Omega^\phi &\sim \text{LKJ}(2) \\
a^\pi &\sim \text{MVN}(u\gamma^\pi, \Sigma^\pi) & \Omega^\pi &\sim \text{LKJ}(2)
\end{aligned} \tag{3}$$

## Posterior inference and model adequacy

Programs that implement joint posterior inference for the above models (Eqs. 2, 3) were  
 implemented in the probabilistic programming language Stan CITATION. The models used here  
 both feature latent discrete parameters in the large matrix  $z$  (Tables 4, 5, 6; Eqs. 1, 2, 3). All  
 methods for posterior inference implemented in Stan are derivative based which causes  
 complications for actually implementing the above models because integers do not have derivatives.  
 Instead of implementing a latent discrete parameterization, the posterior probabilities of all possible  
 states of the latent parameters  $z$  were estimated (i.e. marginalized).

Species durations at minimum range-through from the FAD to the LAD, but the incompleteness of  
 all observations means that the actual time of origination or extinction is unknown. The

marginalization approach used here means that the probabilities all possible histories for a species  
are calculated, from the end members of the species having existed for the entire study interval and  
the species having only existed between the directly observed FAD and LAD to all possible  
intermediaries CITATION.

The combined size of the dataset and large number of parameters in both models (Eqs. 2, 3),  
specifically the total number of latent parameters that are the matrix  $z$ , means that stochastic  
approximate posterior inference is computationally very slow even using HMC. Instead, an  
approximate Bayesian approach was used: variational inference. A recently developed automatic  
variational inference algorithm called “automatic differentiation variational inference” (ADVI) is  
implemented in Stan and was used here CITATION. ADVI assumes that the posterior is Gaussian  
but still yields a true Bayesian posterior; this assumption is similar to quadratic approximation of  
the likelihood function used in maximum likelihood inference CITATION. The principal limitation  
of assuming the joint posterior is Gaussian is that the true topology of the log-posterior isn’t  
represented; this is a particular burden for scale parameters which are bound to be positive (e.g.  
standard deviation).

After fitting both models (Eqs. 2, 3) using ADVI, model adequacy and quality of fit was assessed  
using a series of posterior predictive checks CITATION CITATION. Because all Bayesian models  
are inherently generative, simulations of new data sets is “free” CITATION. By simulating many  
theoretical data sets using the observed covariate information the congruence between predictions  
made by the model and the observed empirical data can be assessed. By combining multiple  
posterior predictive tests of congruence between empirical and simulated values of interest, the  
holistic adequacy of the model can be analyzed CITATION.

An example posterior predictive check used in this study was comparing the observed average  
number of observations per species to a distribution of simulated averages; if the empirically  
observed value sits in the middle of the distribution than the model is adequate in reproducing the  
observed number of occurrences per species.

Posterior simulations for time series are start with the values at  $t = 1$  and then just simulating

176 forward.

## Acknowledgements

178 I would like to thank K. Angielczyk, M. Foote, P. D. Polly, and R. Ree for helpful discussion and  
advice. This entire study would not have been possible without the Herculean effort of the  
180 many contributors to the Paleobiology Database. In particular, I would like to thank J. Alroy and  
M. Uhen for curating most of the mammal occurrences recorded in the PBDB. This is Paleobiology  
182 Database publication XXX.