

Environmental heterogeneity patterns plant species richness and turnover in two hyperdiverse floras

Running title: Environmental heterogeneity and plant species richness

Ruan van Mazijk, Michael D. Cramer and G. Anthony Verboom

Department of Biological Sciences, University of Cape Town, Rondebosch, South Africa

Corresponding author: RVM (ruanvmazijk@gmail.com, +27 21 650 3684)

ORCID nos.: RVM: 0000-0003-2659-6909, MDC: 0000-0003-0989-3266, GAV: 0000-0002-1363-9781

Abstract

Aim: To quantify the explanatory power of heterogeneity in predicting plant species richness and turnover here in the Greater Cape Floristic Region and in the Southwest Australia Floristic Region. We compare the environmental heterogeneity in each region, how species richness and turnover interact in each region to produce the observed patterns of richness, and what different forms of environmental heterogeneity better predict richness in each region. We expect the Cape to be more heterogeneous in most environmental axes, and at a finer grain, such that the consequent high levels of species turnover explain the Cape's greater species richness per unit area. We also conjecture that edaphic heterogeneity will be an important factor in predicting richness in SW Australia.

Location: The Greater Cape Floristic Region (GCFR) in southwest Africa, and the Southwest Australia Floristic Region (SWAFR)

Taxon: Vascular plants

Methods: Geospatial data, floral occurrence data → regression analyses, non-parametric statistics

Results:

Main conclusions:

Keywords: biodiversity, environmental heterogeneity, fynbos, Greater Cape Floristic Region, kwongan, macroecology, species richness, species turnover, vascular plants, Southwest Australia Floristic Region

Acknowledgements

This work was funded by the South African Department of Science and Technology (DST) and the National Research Foundation (NRF) under the DST-NRF Innovation Honours Scholarship (to RVM), and by the South African Association of Botanists (SAAB) Honours Scholarship (to RVM).

1 Introduction

Biodiversity represents the variety of living things, and the variety of ecological and evolutionary processes responsible for it (Bohn & Amundsen, 2004). Studying the distribution of biodiversity in space is a major avenue of biological research (???; Kreft & Jetz, 2007). Regional-scale geographic patterns in species richness

have long been studied, particularly in biodiversity hotspots (Cook et al., 2015). The spatial distribution of species richness can be explained in terms of the physical environment. Properties of the environment have been suggested to influence species richness in three ways: (i) productivity, water, and energy to enable organismal growth, and resources (i.e. niche space) to support a wider range of species (Gaston, 2000; Kreft & Jetz, 2007; Mouchet et al., 2015); (ii) stability, which enables species' persistence; and (iii) heterogeneity, which enables ecological speciation and possible barriers to gene flow, and with a wider variety of environments to facilitate species' co-existence (Thuiller et al., 2006; Mouchet et al., 2015; Cramer & Verboom, 2016). The physical environment, then, can be used to explain species richness in a local-deterministic sense, and in a historical context (Ricklefs, 1987).

The maintenance of species richness, particularly the coexistence of high numbers of species in biodiversity hotspots, is often regarded as “paradoxical” (Hart et al., 2017), and is a central problem in ecology (Ricklefs, 1987; Kreft & Jetz, 2007; Hart et al., 2017). Species richness is constrained by the ability of habitats to support a variety of species—its ecological carrying capacity (Mateo et al., 2017). This is exemplified in approaches to modelling species richness as a function of environmental predictors in a correlative framework (“macro-ecological models”; Mateo et al., 2017). Macro-ecological models of species richness implicitly assume that communities are saturated, following species-area and species-energy relationships, and at equilibrium with the environment (Mateo et al., 2017).

A solution to the paradox of species coexistence is environmental heterogeneity (EH): a more heterogeneous environment has a larger environmental space, and can thus facilitate co-existence between species at the scale of that heterogeneity. EH can also stimulate ecological speciation, should the region be environmentally stable over evolutionary time-scales. Heterogeneity in the physical environment is known to be positively associated with species richness (Rensburg et al., 2002; Hart et al., 2017), and has been demonstrated to do so across many taxa—e.g. Canadian butterflies (??), European vertebrates (Mouchet et al., 2015), South African birds (Rensburg et al., 2002), in communities along marine continental margins (Levin et al., 2010), French scarab beetles (Lobo et al., 2004), and for global terrestrial plants (Kreft & Jetz, 2007). The spatial scale of heterogeneity, or “grain” of the environment, is important to consider (Hart et al., 2017), in the same way that the spatial of absolute environmental conditions has also been considered (???; Baudena et al., 2015; Mouchet et al., 2015). Species co-existence and biodiversity maintenance is indeed suggested to be scale-dependent (Hart et al., 2017).

EH is often under-represented in macro-ecological models of species richness, and has recently been found to explain up to ca. 95% of biome level species richness across South Africa (Cramer & Verboom, 2016). Models that include EH yield better estimates of the richness of the Cape flora, as they account for the role heterogeneous environments such as those in the Cape facilitate species coexistence (Thuiller et al., 2006; Cramer & Verboom, 2016). Mediterranean-type terrestrial biodiversity hotspots, such as the Cape flora included in the models by Cramer & Verboom (2016), present interesting study systems in which to investigate the relationship between the environment and species richness. These systems exhibit far greater species richness than predicted by their areas, productivities and latitudes (Cowling et al., 1996; Kreft & Jetz, 2007). There are five Mediterranean biodiversity hotspots on Earth: the California Floristic Province, the Mediterranean Basin, the Chilean Winter Rainfall-Valdivian Forests, the Greater Cape Floristic Region, and the Southwest Australia Floristic Region (Cowling et al., 1996; Hopper & Gioia, 2004; Cook et al., 2015). These ecosystems have regular fire-cycles (Cowling et al., 1996), climatic buffering, and long term stability (Kreft & Jetz, 2007), shrubby, sclerophyllous flora (Hopper & Gioia, 2004). Together, they account for ca. 20% of global vascular plant species, yet only ca. 5% of global land surface areas (Cowling et al., 1996). Various hypotheses have been proposed to explain the high levels of plant species richness in these regions (Cook et al., 2015). The species accumulation hypothesis states that the stability of these regions has allowed many species to accrue. The species co-existence hypothesis states that these hotspots may facilitate greater degrees of species co-existence in smaller spatial areas, due to fine-scale heterogeneity in their environments. Indeed, EH has evolutionary implications too, stimulating ecological speciation across sharp environmental gradients.

Both the Southwest Australia Floristic Region (SWAFR) and the Greater Cape Floristic Region (GCFR) are Mediterranean-type biodiversity hotspots, particularly in terms of plant species. Where the GCFR (with an area of ca. 189,000 km²) is known to contain about 11,400 plant species (about 0.060 species per km²), the

SWAFR (area of ca. 270,000 km²) has about 3,700 species (0.014 species per km²) (???). So, the GCFR has ca. 4.3 times as many species per km² as the SWAFR. The GCFR and SWAFR are appropriately often compared, due to the similarities between their environments (e.g. oligotrophic soils, an oceanically buffered moderate climate) and their plants' ecologies (Hopper & Gioia, 2004). These two regions present unique flora out of the five Mediterranean systems, with high levels of endemism (Cowling et al., 1996), and many obligate fire-adapted species (Cowling et al., 1996). Similarities withstanding, the SWAFR is topographically and edaphically distinct from the GCFR. The SWAFR former is topographically rather uniform (i.e. flat)—uniquely so among the world's five Mediterranean-climate regions (Hopper & Gioia, 2004)). The SWAFR possesses a mesoscale chronosequence dune system (Laliberte et al., 2014; Cook et al., 2015), while the GCFR is mountainous, topographically heterogeneous, and therefore associated with a large degree of spatial climatic variability, with a fine-scale mosaic of geologies and soils (Cowling et al., 1996; Cramer et al., 2014; Verboom et al., 2017) . Both regions have sources of edaphic heterogeneity, but at different scales. This edaphic variability may aid in explaining the species richness in these regions (Beard et al., 2000; Verboom et al., 2017). EH can stimulate ecological speciation, should the region be stable over evolutionary time-scales, as is likely the case in both the GCFR and the SWAFR (Wardell-Johnson & Horwitz, 1996; Hopper & Gioia, 2004; Lambers et al., 2010; Cramer et al., 2014; Laliberte et al., 2014; Cook et al., 2015). For the GCFR, this richness is largely known to result from long term climatic stability, and fine grain variation in geology and soils (Cramer et al., 2014). The question thus arises whether heterogeneity is a significant contributor to SWAFR species richness as is likely the case in the GCFR. In the absence of topographic variability in the SWAFR, it is proposed that the heterogeneity of that region is due to the juxtaposition of soil types (Laliberte et al., 2014; Cook et al., 2015), creating extreme edaphic variation.

1.1 Hypothesis-v1

Our main hypothesis is that the greater abiotic heterogeneity in the Cape, and the finer grain of that heterogeneity, compared to that of the SWA, accounts for the Cape's greater species richness per unit area. We expect the relationships between EH, species richness, and species turnover in these two regions to demonstrate this. As stated above, heterogeneous environments can (i) support diverse species assemblages, and (ii) stimulate ecological speciation. Thus, we expect species richness to covary with heterogeneity. Additionally, as one moves across a heterogeneous landscape, we expect to find greater turnover in community composition, as different environments support different species. Thus, areas of greater turnover should also be more rich, due to potential complementarity between neighbouring communities increasing total richness. Thus, we expect that EH positively influences species richness and species turnover, and that species turnover itself positively influences species richness.

1.2 Hypothesis-v2

Aim: This study investigates the role EH plays in explaining vascular plant species richness in the Cape and SWA. We compare the relative importance of heterogeneity between the two regions, as heterogeneity has the evolutionary role of facilitating speciation, and the ecological role of supporting diverse species assemblages. Spatial scale of that heterogeneity is also considered, as the heterogeneity-richness relationship can vary with habitat grain-size.

Our hypotheses concern the Cape and SWA's environments and floras. Our main hypothesis is that the Cape possesses greater abiotic heterogeneity, and at finer grain, compared to SWA, such as to explain the Cape's greater species richness per unit area, and proposed greater levels of species turnover between areas. We also conjecture that the heterogeneity that predicts species richness in SWA will be more pronounced in terms of edaphic variables. Here we attempt to assess six key predictions of this hypothesis, additionally investigating a seventh prediction to test the conjectured role of edaphic heterogeneity in SWA. Dealing with the two regions' environments, we assess (i) whether the Cape environment is more heterogeneous than that of SWA and (ii) whether the Cape environment has more pronounced heterogeneity at finer scales than that of SWA. Dealing with the distribution of species in the two regions, we assess (iii) whether the Cape exhibits greater levels of species turnover between areas, such as to (iv) explain the greater species richness per unit area of

the Cape compared to SWA. Relating each regions' environment and flora, we finally assess (v) whether species richness and species turnover are adequately predicted by EH in both regions and whether (vii) Species richness and species turnover are better predicted by different forms of EH in either region (e.g. the importance of edaphic heterogeneity in SWA).

...

We employ classical statistical methods to analyse publicly available geospatial and species occurrence datasets.

2 Materials and methods

2.1 Overview

These analyses required definitions of the boundaries of the two regions, environmental data for each, and geospatially-explicit vascular plant occurrence records, all based on publicly available data. The environmental variables chosen (Table 1) for this study were intended to cover a reasonable spread of climatic, edaphic, and ecologically relevant environmental axes, and are not intended to be exhaustive. We selected variables describing topography (elevation), productivity (NDVI), soil status, and climate and climatic seasonality.

We carried out this investigation using four principal spatial scales: $0.05^\circ \times 0.05^\circ$ squares (the finest common resolution among the environmental data sources used), quarter degree squares (QDS) (Larsen et al., 2009), half degree squares (HDS) (Larsen et al., 2009) and three-quarter degree squares (3QDS). Note, at least for the Cape, most plant occurrence records are only accurate to QDS level. Thus, any analysis involving species data was necessary limited to scales above and including QDS. Analyses were performed in R v3.5.0 (R Core Team, 2018). Version-numbers of specific R packages used are presented in the bibliography, or in text where applicable.

2.2 Environmental data sources

Geospatially-explicit raster layers were acquired for a selection of environmental variables (Table 1), for the regions of interest. Here, the GCFR was treated as the areas occupied by the Succulent Karoo and Fynbos biomes in the current delineation of South Africa's biome boundaries (Mucina & Rutherford, 2006). The SWAFR was treated as the areas occupied by the Southwest Australia savanna, Swan Coastal Plain Scrub and Woodlands, Jarrah-Karri forest and shrublands, Southwest Australia woodlands, Esperance mallee, and Coolgardie woodlands in the World Wildlife Fund Terrestrial Ecoregions dataset (Olson et al., 2001) in order to closely match the currently delineated SWAFR (Gioia & Hopper, 2017, Hopper & Gioia (2004)). For the sake of readability, we shall refer to the GCFR and SWAFR simply as the Cape and SWA from hereon.

Raster data were re-projected to a common coordinate reference: WGS84 (NIMA, 2000), using the "rgdal" (???) package in R (R Core Team, 2018). All data were re-sampled to 0.05° resolution using the "resample" function in the R package "raster" (???), with the "bilinear" method.

An emphasis was made on using satellite-derived environmental data in this work, in order to minimise differences in data quality and methodologies between the Cape and SWA. Additionally, satellite-derived data have been shown to benefit regional-scale species distribution models (Deblauwe et al., 2016), thus motivating their use in this regional-scale study. The environmental data used in this study were derived from NASA's SRTM digital elevation model (Farr et al., 2007), NASA's MODIS/Terra spectroradiometric data for land surface temperature and NDVI, the Climate Hazards Group's CHIRPS rainfall dataset (Funk et al., 2015), and the International Soil Reference and Information Centre's SoilGrids250m edaphic dataset (Hengl et al., 2017) (Table 1). SRTM and MODIS are entirely derived from satellite measurements, whereas CHIRPS is interpolated from weather station data with satellite-derived radiometric measurements. SoilGrids250m is a machine-learning derived product, based on soil measurements as a function of many

covariates, including MODIS and STRM sources (see Hengl et al., 2017), using random-forests and other classification-tree-based methods, including gradient-boosting. For the soil data considered here (Table 1), we used depth-interval weighted average values as the value for a particular soil variable in a given place.

Climatic and spectral data arise from satellites monitoring properties of the Earth’s surface through time. We therefore use the mean annual values for rainfall, surface temperature, and NDVI across space in our analyses. Pronounced seasonality of rainfall is a known feature of Mediterranean systems (???). known toand timing, namely precipitation in the driest quarter (PDQ) and temperature in the ... describe!->

2.3 Plant occurrence data

Geospatially-explicit records of vascular plant occurrences were downloaded from the Global Biodiversity Information Facility (GBIF, Table 1). Queries were made for tracheophyte records from within the borders of the Cape and SWA as treated here (GBIF, 24 July 2017, GBIF (24 July 2017)). Only records with defined species and intra-specific ranks were kept. Intra-specific occurrences were treated as simply being representative of their species. This resulted in 1 unique species names in the Cape, and 1 in SWA.

We cleaned these data using the R package “taxise” (???, (???)) to check that these species names had accepted-status among taxonomic databases. I queried two major taxonomic databases: the Global Name Resolver (GNR), and the Taxonomic Name Resolution Service (TNRS). Should one of either service return at least one match for a given name, then that name was deemed accepted. Those names for which no full binomial matches were found in either database were excluded from the final list of species. The number of species names excluded totalled at 1 and 1 for the Cape and SWA respectively. Especially for SWA, these numbers may be deemed appreciably high. But, the occurrence records that would be dropped, as a consequence of these names’ removals, seemed to be distributed randomly in geographic space in both regions. As such, any effect of the loss of these records in this analysis is uniform within the two regions.

After the unaccepted names were removed, it was important to ensure that a species was not listed under multiple synonyms. Such cases would skew the species richness data used in this study. In light of this, the remaining names were queried in the Tropicos and Integrated Taxonomic Information System (ITIS) databases for their known synonyms, using “taxize”. These were collated to produce a nomenclatural “thesaurus” for the Cape and SWA species. This consisted of a list of the accepted species names in a region, each associated with a list of known synonyms. I amended species’ names in the GBIF occurrence data, in order ensure species were listed under only one of these synonyms, as follows: For each entry in the thesaurus, for each synonym of that entry, if that synonym appeared in the GBIF species list, I replaced all appearances of that synonym in the species list with the original name from the thesaurus-entry that that synonym came from.

Lastly, I removed any species from both regions that are invasive aliens or non-indigenous. Alien species lists for plants in South Africa and Australia were acquired from the IUCN’s Global Invasive Species Database (<http://www.iucngisd.org/gisd/>).

The final total plant species richness in each region was 12991 and 8074 for the Cape and SWA respectively. These final collections of species occurrence records were converted to raster-layers, wherein pixel-values represented the species, genus and family richness of vascular plants within that pixel. These rasters were produced at QDS, HDS, and 3QDS resolutions.

2.4 Analyses

2.4.1 Quantifying environmental heterogeneity

First, in order to assess predictions (i) and (ii), we needed to describe the EH in both regions. Using the R package “raster” (???), we used a modified version of the “roughness” index in the “terrain” function: for a three by three neighbourhood of cells, our index of roughness is the average square-root of the squared difference between each of the n neighbour cells’ values x_i and the central focal cell’s value x_{focal} :

$$Roughness = \frac{1}{n} \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^n (x_{focal} - x_i)^2} \quad (1)$$

Note, in order to use as much data from within regions' borders as possible, roughness was computed if a focal cell had at least one neighbour cell—that is, roughness is defined where $n_{x_{focal}} \geq 1$. Using this index of heterogeneity, we produced raster layers of each of our nine environmental variable's heterogeneity. We compared the distributions of roughness values in each variable in each region with non-parametric Mann-Whitney U -tests, as almost all variables could not be normalised by log-transformations. We also compare the effect size of the Cape vs SWA using the “common language effect size” (CLES), using the R package “canprot”. The CLES is the proportion of all pairwise comparisons between two sample groups' observations where one group's value is greater than the other. In our case, of all pairwise comparisons of a variable's roughness values between the Cape and SWA, we calculated the CLES as the proportion of pairs where Cape roughness values were greater than that of SWA. This allowed us to assess prediction (i). To compare the spatial scales of heterogeneity (prediction [(ii)] [Hypothesis-v2] between each region, we repeated this analysis at all four spatial scales. Once again, this entailed recalculating the roughness layer for each variable after the original layer (0.05 degrees resolution) had been rescaled to each of the coarser resolutions.

2.4.2 Relating species richness and species turnover

Regarding predictions (iii) and (iv), we wished to compare the relative importance of species turnover in each region as a predictor of species richness.

First, for (iii), we compared the degree of species turnover in general in each region by computing all pairwise Jaccard distances (???) between QDS' communities. We then regressed these turnover values for each pair of cells against the physical distance between the centres of those cells. The range of turnover values was found to be highest at small distances (Figure 1a), and indeed complete species turnover between cell pairs was observed at all distances. Thus we used quantile regressions of the 5% quantile of species turnover as a function of geographic distances (using “quantreg” (???) in R). This allowed us to compare the lower bounds of species turnover between the Cape and SWA.

Regarding prediction (iv), to test how turnover between sites predicts richness across sites, we regressed the species richness in coarse scale cells against the average richness of and average turnover between the constituent fine scale cells within a the coarse scale cell. Moreover, average turnover between fine scale cells excluded turnover values between a cell and itself (necessarily 0), and only included turnover values between between cell-pairs once (i.e. between cells a and b and not again between b and a , as these are necessarily the same). We focussed on this relationship with HDS as the coarse scale and QDS as the fine scale—as there are four QDS within each HDS, and QDS was the highest precision to which our species data were recorded. Mean QDS richness for a given HDS-cell is based on four QDS-cells. Mean QDS turnover for a given HDS-cell is based on the turnover between $n = \binom{4}{2} = 6$ QDS pairs (namely pairs $QDS_{1,2}$, $QDS_{1,3}$, $QDS_{1,4}$, $QDS_{2,3}$, $QDS_{2,4}$ and $QDS_{3,4}$).

Thus, we regress coarse scale richness as follows:

$$\widehat{S_{HDS_i}} = \beta_0 + \beta_1 \overline{S_{QDS_i}} + \beta_2 \overline{T_{QDS_i}} + \beta_3 SWA_i + \beta_4 \overline{S_{QDS_i}} SWA_i + \beta_5 \overline{T_{QDS_i}} SWA_i + \epsilon_i \quad (2)$$

where $\epsilon \sim N(\bar{x}, \sigma^2)$, and $\overline{S_{QDS}}$ is $\log(x + 1)$ -transformed. This model allows us to compare the spatial-scaling drivers of species richness in either region: whether coarse scale increases in species richness are determined more by (a) being composed of richer—but more similar—communities or by (b) being composed of many different communities. These represent the two logical extremes.

2.4.3 Predicting species richness and turnover with environmental heterogeneity

3 Results

3.1 Describing environmental heterogeneity numerically across scales

Across all variables considered, the Cape is more environmentally heterogeneous in the majority of pairwise comparisons of grid-cells ($CLES > 0.50$, Mann-Whitney U -test: $P < 0.05$, Figure 1). The Cape is thus more environmentally heterogeneous than SWA overall, but the degree to which it is more heterogeneous varies between environmental variables. These effects vary somewhat with the spatial scale concerned. In some variables, the differentiation between Cape and SWA heterogeneity lessens at coarser scales (Figure 1). Indeed, when comparing the overall ranking and medians of Cape vs SWA roughness values for each variable, we only find non-significant differences at the coarser 3QDS scale (Mann-Whitney U tests, $P > 0.05$, Figure 1).

Most obviously, and as expected, topographic heterogeneity is greatest in the Cape (Figure 1a). Though SWA has a slightly wider distribution of elevational roughness values at coarse scales (e.g. 3QDS, Figure 1a) compared to fine scales (0.05°), so does the Cape. As such, the relative difference between the two regions seems invariant with spatial scale ($CLES \approx 0.95$, Figure 1).

This concurs with our expectations, as the Cape is mountainous and known to have steep elevational gradients (??), while SWA is much more topographically uniform.

Intuitively, then, elevation serves as a “benchmark test” for our comparisons of EH here, as it is well known and expected that the Cape should be more elevationally heterogeneous than SWA. Additionally, we can conclude that although there are greater extreme values of Cape elevational roughness at $0.05^\circ \times 0.05^\circ$ scales, larger sections of land (i.e. 3QDS-cells) are more different from each other in the Cape than the same sized sections are different from each other in SWA.

Climatic heterogeneity presents less differentiation between the Cape and SWA than elevational roughness, though still the Cape predominates (Figure ??b). Notably, the difference between Cape and SWA mean annual rainfall and land surface temperature heterogeneity lessens when considered at coarse spatial scales (3QDS scale, Figure ??b). Rainfall seasonality (PDQ), however, is similarly more heterogeneous in the Cape across all spatial scales considered.

Biological productivity, as measured by NDVI, varies spatially to a similar extent in the Cape and SWA (i.e. is more similarly heterogeneous, $CLES < 0.60$, Figure 1c).

Concerning edaphic variables (Figure 1d), the Cape and SWA are similarly heterogeneous at coarser scales, particularly in terms of CEC and Soil C.

We can differentiate the Cape and SWA environments based on which environmental axes are more heterogeneous in either region, as they differ somewhat in this regard.

3.2 Species richness as determined by species turnover

Following quantile regressions of the 5%-quantile of pairwise species turnover against the distance between pairs' sites (Figure 2a), there is evidence that SWA exhibits a lower lowermost-bound of observed species turnover. This is because of the relative positive influence of a site's being “from the Cape”, as opposed to SWA, on the 5%-quantile of species turnover (“Cape”-term, $P < 0.001$, Table 2). As expected, species turnover was greatest between distant pairs of QDS ($P < 0.001$, Table 2, Figure 2a).

When plotting coarse scale richness (HDS) against fine scale richness and turnover (QDS) (Figure 2b,c), we see that for a mean QDS richness, Cape HDS are generally more species rich than SWA HDS. Also, for a given mean QDS turnover, Cape HDS are generally more species rich than SWA HDS. For the sake of interpretation, it is appealing to think of the graph inverted: for a given HDS richness (taken as the

horizontal axis now), the Cape is less rich and has less turnover between QDS than SWA. However, the graph was plotted as presented for the sake of agreement with the regression model (below), which does support the sentiment of an inverted interpretation.

Following the regressions of coarse scale richness (HDS) against fine scale richness and turnover (QDS) (Equation (2)), we see a significant negative interaction between SWA and mean QDS richness (Table 3), supporting the visually obvious difference between the Cape in SWA in Figure 2b.

Assume HDS scale richness is the integration of QDS scale richness and turnover between QDS. We can see that HDS richness “saturates” as a function of QDS richness at a lower HDS richness level in SWA than in the Cape. Alternatively, the QDS richness required to attain a given HDS richness is much lower in the Cape—Cape QDS richness is more “powerful” and has a greater impact on HDS richness than QDS richness in SWA. In other words: the rate of change in HDS richness \sim QDS richness in the Cape is *faster*, as is evident in the negative slope effect of the SWA on the logarithmic slope relative to the Cape.

Now for HDS richness \sim QDS turnover. HDS richness declines with increasing turnover. Why? Let us turn the process on its head: why does high turnover arise from low richness QDS? Well, when richness is low, possible opportunities for high turnover increase.

4 Discussion

Conclusion: The Cape is more generally environmentally heterogeneous than the SWA, as expected (see prediction (i)). Though, there are cases where the SWA is arguably at-least-as-heterogeneous as the Cape, and we can observe here extreme regions of high edaphic heterogeneity, at fine scales, in SWA. These surpass the edaphic heterogeneity of the Cape, supporting our seventh prediction/conjecture.

We also have support for prediction (ii), as seen in Fig. ??.

I have provided support for the hypothesis that the difference in plant species richness between the GCFR and SWAFR is accounted for by the fact that the GCFR is more abiotically heterogeneous than the SWAFR. As expected, the GCFR is shown to possess (i) a quantifiably more heterogeneous environment, and (ii) is heterogeneous at a finer spatial scale than the SWAFR. I have shown that vascular plant species richness (iii) can be explained in terms of environmental conditions, including environmental heterogeneity, in both the GCFR and SWAFR. Also, I have shown that (iv) the set of environmental axes that explain plant species richness, both absolute and as heterogeneity, differs between the GCFR and SWAFR. These findings contribute towards an understanding of the ecological conditions that facilitate species coexistence (and likely stimulate ecological speciation) in these two regions.

These two regions present differentiable environmental spaces, each with heterogeneity varying across spatial scales. The clear separation of the regions’ topographic features is as expected (Figures ??A, ??). Indeed, topography seems to be the most striking distinction between the regions. The Cape region has been found previously to have the second highest median topographic heterogeneity of the five Mediterranean-climate regions (Bradshaw & Cowling, 2014). The GCFR has a much wider range of scales exhibited in the heterogeneity across its environmental axes. Notably, each region has finer scale heterogeneity in some variables, and coarser scale in others—neither region is necessarily more fine or coarse than the other, as it depends on the variable concerned. BRT-models of species richness in both regions reveal species richness to depend on those environmental axes that differentiate the two regions (Figures ??), ??). The importance of variables is also shown to vary with spatial scale (Figure ??), as previously suggested may be the case when modelling geographic patterns of biodiversity (Baudena et al., 2015). Indeed, as Cowling et al. (1996) describes differing patterns of species richness across spatial scales, so do the predictors of those patterns vary with scale (Hart et al., 2017).

The fact that a combination of absolute and roughness variables is also as predicted by the hypothesis in this study. In the models developed by Cramer & Verboom (2016) for South Africa, roughness in topography was largely superseded as an important predictor of species richness by other roughness variables. My models, however, did not show this. Similar to the study by Rensburg et al. (2002), my models revealed roughness in

topography and other variables to be important. Although, Rensburg et al. (2002) considered differences within pixels, as opposed to this study, which considered differences between pixels. My models, those of Cramer & Verboom (2016), and those of Rensburg et al. (2002), do not all concur as to the role of roughness in elevation vs. more biologically meaningful variables in explaining species richness. The source of these discrepancies is unclear, though no doubt complex. The complements of environmental variables and methodologies used in these studies do differ, limiting extensive comparison between these analyses.

The determinants of vascular plant species are shown to be region specific (Figures ??, ??, ??). The importance of MAP and roughness in rainfall seasonality (PCV) in predicting richness in the SWAFR (Figure ??I, ??J), aligns with the steep climatic gradients observed there (Cook et al., 2015). The soil variables that determine plant species richness in the model for the SWAFR (Figures ??K, ??L) differ to those that determine richness in the GCFR (Figures ??G, ??H), further highlighting the edaphic differences between these two regions. Although both are nutrient leached systems, the SWAFR is flat, with soil-chronosequences (Laliberte et al., 2014; Cook et al., 2015), while the GCFR is mountainous (Cowling et al., 1996; Cramer et al., 2014; Verboom et al., 2017). The importance of roughness in soil density, and absolute texture, in the SWAFR (Figures ??K, ??L) highlights the changes in soil that are associable with age of the substrate (e.g. particle size) as being biologically relevant to species richness. The positive effect of soil clay content on species richness in the SWAFR aligns with the findings of Laliberte et al. (2014) that richness in the SWAFR increases with soil age.

NDVI is more heterogeneous across the GCFR than the SWAFR (Figures ??A). The fact that thermal variables tend to be more rough in the GCFR (Figure ??A) is likely due to possible covariance of the MODIS/Terra products with topography, as MODIS data used here describes land surface temperature. As the GCFR is topographically rugged, the roughness of NDVI may arise from this. Despite this, NDVI is an integrating variable, which captures information about productivity, light availability, and soil nutrients (Power et al., 2017). The fact that absolute NDVI contributes to predicting species richness in the GCFR, especially at finer spatial scales (Figure ??E) demonstrates the role of ecological productivity in facilitating the coexistence diverse species assemblages. Environmental heterogeneity, then, is integral to explaining patterns of species richness, but must be considered along with resource- and energy-availability axes. In so much as a diverse environmental space supports more species, the materials and productivity required for biota to thrive are also needed to support species (???; Gaston, 2000; Bøhn & Amundsen, 2004; Kreft & Jetz, 2007). As such, my findings, along with those of previous studies (Rensburg et al., 2002; Thuiller et al., 2006; Kreft & Jetz, 2007; Cramer & Verboom, 2016), suggest that there is ecological and evolutionary consequence to resource availability *and* environmental heterogeneity, in that they tend to be positively associated with species richness.

The combined BRT-model of species richness for both regions reveals soil clay content as an important predictor, at coarse spatial scales, despite this variable not being particularly important within each region separately (Figure ??). Though this model does not strictly consider the regions as separate, this finding may indicate that the relationship between clay content and species richness differs between the regions. So far as clay content can be used to predict species richness, it matters more to those predictions when applied to large sections (i.e. coarse scales) of each regions.

Kreft & Jetz (2007) modelled global terrestrial vascular plant species richness, which focussed on primarily absolute environmental values, underestimated the richness of the Cape flora. Though Kreft & Jetz (2007) did include topographic heterogeneity in their predictor set, topography is often a proxy for more biologically meaningful variables (Cramer & Verboom, 2016). This explains why the inclusion of these variables (e.g. roughness in mean annual precipitation) yields more accurate predictions of species richness. Indeed, Thuiller et al. (2006) also included topographic heterogeneity. Cramer & Verboom (2016) described 68% of species richness at the QDS scale across South Africa. Regarding the GCFR, depending on whether one consults pseudo- R^2 (Table 3), the ratio of mean predicted to observed richness per grid-cell (Table 5), or the distributions of predicted vs. observed richness values per grid-cell (Figure ??), I have achieved a similarly suitable level of predictive accuracy. There is, though, still unexplained species richness in light of my models. As Cramer & Verboom (2016), Rensburg et al. (2002), Thuiller et al. (2006), and Mouchet et al. (2015) have done, these macro-ecological models are a-historical. Evolutionary considerations of species richness in geographic space are worthwhile, especially in regions with environments stable over evolutionary time.

The findings here are correlative. There are, however, many proposed mechanisms to explain the correlative signals demonstrated here. My findings support the hypothesis that Mediterranean systems' plant species richness is a function of spatial variability in environmental conditions. This can stimulate diversification, and maintain that diversity by providing a range of habitats for species co-existence. Oligotrophic soils can stimulate an increase in functional diversity, through the evolution of diverse nutrient acquisition strategies (Lambers et al., 2010; Verboom et al., 2017) (e.g. sclerophylly (Cramer et al., 2014; Cook et al., 2015)). An aspect of the environment I have neglected to consider is fire, shown to also contribute to predictions here in the GCFR (Cramer & Verboom, 2016). Cardillo (2012) have shown the structuring forces behind species co-occurrence patterns, and thus likely species richness, differ between species-pairs with different post-fire responses and those with similar post-fire responses.

Though the GCFR was correctly predicted to have, on average, more species per grid-cell at HDS and 3QDS scales than the SWAFR, this was not the case for QDS grid-cells (Table 5). This demonstrates that the GCFR is indeed overall more rich in plant species than the SWAFR, but a given HDS in the SWAFR contains fewer species than a given GCFR HDS. Thus, the greater richness in the GCFR is a product of greater turnover in species at spatial scales no more coarse than the HDS. Species turnover is an interesting aspect to species richness studies, as it species turnover is implicit to species-area and co-existence-area relationships (Hart et al., 2017). One could expect patterns of endemism and species turnover to concur with patterns in environmental heterogeneity to some degree.

Following from the understanding that functionally diverse assemblages, which are more likely to be more species rich, are likely to arise and/or occur in areas with diverse ecological pressures (Molina-Venegas et al., 2015), one would expect, then, heterogeneous habitats such as those in Mediterranean-type biodiversity hotspots to exhibit high levels functional beta diversity along steep environmental gradients (Molina-Venegas et al., 2015). If the niches concerning these functions are phylogenetically conserved among those biota, then one would also expect high levels of species and phylogenetic beta diversity along these gradients (Molina-Venegas et al., 2015). This concurs with the notion put forward by Power et al. (2017), wherein megadiverse systems such as these represent the results of "phylogenetic niche conservatism on a heterogeneous landscape". Thus, species and phylogenetic turnover should covary with environmental heterogeneity in some way. Indeed, endemism, at certain scales, could also follow this pattern. Thuiller et al. (2006) demonstrated that there is phylogenetic and biome related determinants of species richness. This makes sense, in light of the difficulty of crossing biome boundaries in Mediterranean systems (Power et al., 2017). NDVI and light availability, and the heterogeneity therein, are associated with high levels of floristic turnover (Power et al., 2017). This may be indicative of ecological specialisation precluding species from crossing these boundaries, thus increasing the level of endemism within a region, while also increasing the level of turnover, and thus likely species richness, along environmental gradients. Although, this may be debated. Beard et al. (2000) state that the high levels of endemism in SWAFR are function of habitat specialisation to soil mosaics. Cf. Laliberte et al. (2014), who say that this endemism is likely due to environmental filtering along these soil turnover sequences, as opposed to the juxtaposition of specialised species along soil gradients.

I have demonstrated support for the idea that environmental heterogeneity is positively associated with species richness, particularly Mediterranean systems. In the SWAFR and the GCFR, high levels of endemism and biodiversity are also likely the results of long-term landscape and climatic stability (Hopper, 1979). Thus, the roles of environmental variability through space, and stability through time, are the two main ways in which the environment relates to biodiversity in these regions.

Table captions

Captions are also repeated alongside their respective tables for readability.

Table 1

Georeferenced vascular plant species occurrence and environmental data sources used in this study. Abbreviations are as follows: MAP, mean annual precipitation; PDQ, precipitation in the driest quarter; CEC, cation exchange capacity.

Table 2

Estimated coefficients and significances (P -value) following quantile regression of the 5%-quantile ($\tau = 0.05$) of pairwise vascular plant species turnover (Jaccards distance) as a function of the geographic distance (km, \log -transformed) between QDS cells. The Cape term represents the difference between Cape and SWA species turnover, for a given geographic distance.

Table 3

Estimated coefficients and significances (P -value) following multiple linear regression of HDS species richness against the mean QDS species richness ($\log(x + 1)$ -transformed) and turnover (Jaccards distance) within a given HDS, of the form in Equation (2). The Cape was fit as the baseline, hence SWA represents the categorical term here. This was model was better fitting than a similar model without a region category ($\Delta AIC = 90.56$). Note, this model does not represent those curves plot in Figure 2 (there, the curves are from simple linear regressions of the variables in each panel, separated by region).

Table 4

Comparisons of Akaike information criterion values (small sample-size-corrected, AIC_c) of various geographically weighted regressions (GWR) of \log -transformed species richness as a function of various sets of environmental variables. Models were fit for the Cape and SWA richness and environmental data both separately and together. GWR methods preclude the need for a categorical predictor for the Cape vs SWA, as the longitudinal (and to a lesser extent latitudinal) differences between the regions allows local regression coefficients in each region to differ.

Figure captions

Captions are also repeated alongside their respective figures for readability.

Figure 1

Comparisons of different types of environmental heterogeneity in the Cape and SWA—namely for (a) elevation, (b) climatic variables, (c) NDVI and (d) soil variables—in each panel consisting of three sub-panels per variable type. The upper row of panels shows example distributions of roughness values (Equation (1)), showing the different extremes in environmental heterogeneity observed in each region when compared at fine (0.05°) and coarse (3QDS) scales. Each distribution has under it area 1. Distributions were constructed with Gaussian kernels, with bandwidth following Silverman’s “rule of thumb” (???). In the lower row of panels, these distributions of roughness values were compared between the Cape and SWA at each of the four spatial scales, not just 0.05° and 3QDS, using non-parametric Mann-Whitney U -tests to test for differences. The “common language effect size” ($CLES$, see text) describes these differences (b). U -tests for almost all environmental variables yielded significant differences ($P < 0.05$) between Cape and SWA values (NS, non-significant differences).

Figure 2

Regressions involving plant species richness and turnover. Species turnover (as Jaccards distance) between QDS-pairs increases as pairs are more geographically separated (a). Species turnover was calculated for all possible pairs of cells, but only the turnover values for a random 5000 pairs in each region have been plotted, for clarity. Fitted lines represent the 5%-quantile regressions of turnover as a function of log-distance for each region separately. Following a 5%-quantile regression of turnover as a function of log-distance with region as a categorical variable (Table 2), a significant interaction between distance and region was found ($P < 0.001$), such that the Cape positively effects the distance slope term. Scatter-plots of HDS-scale species richness against the average QDS-scale richness in a given HDS (b) and the average species turnover between QDS in a given HDS (c). Curves represent simples linear regressions of HDS richness against these two respective independent variables (note, mean QDS richness was $\log(x + 1)$ -transformed), separately for each region, for illustration of the two regions' differences, for interpretation alongside Table 3.

References

- Baudena, M., Sánchez, A., Georg, C.-P., Ruiz-Benito, P., Rodríguez, M.Á., Zavala, M.A., & Rietkerk, M. (2015) Revealing patterns of local species richness along environmental gradients with a novel network tool. *Scientific Reports*, **5**, 11561.
- Beard, J.S., Chapman, A.R., & Gioia, P. (2000) Species richness and endemism in the Western Australian flora. *Journal of Biogeography*, **27**, 1257–1268.
- Bradshaw, P.L. & Cowling, R.M. (2014) Landscapes, rock types, and climate of the Greater Cape Floristic Region. *Fynbos: Ecology, evolution and conservation of a megadiverse region* (ed. by N. Allsopp, J.F. Colville, and G.A. Verboom), pp. 26–46. Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Bøhn, T. & Amundsen, P.-A. (2004) Ecological Interactions and Evolution: Forgotten Parts of Biodiversity? *BioScience*, **54**, 804.
- Cardillo, M. (2012) The phylogenetic signal of species co-occurrence in high-diversity shrublands: different patterns for fire-killed and fire-resistant species. *BMC Ecology*, **12**, 21.
- Cook, L.G., Hardy, N.B., & Crisp, M.D. (2015) Three explanations for biodiversity hotspots: small range size, geographical overlap and time for species accumulation. An Australian case study. *New Phytologist*, **207**, 390–400.
- Cowling, R.M., Rundel, P.W., Lamont, B.B., Arroyo, M.K., & Arianoutsou, M. (1996) Plant diversity in mediterranean-climate regions. *Trends in Ecology and Evolution*, **11**, 362–366.
- Cramer, M.D. & Verboom, G.A. (2016) Measures of biologically relevant environmental heterogeneity improve prediction of regional plant species richness. *Journal of Biogeography*, 1–13.
- Cramer, M.D., West, A.G., Power, S.C., Skelton, R., & Stock, W.D. (2014) Plant ecophysiological diversity. *Fynbos: Ecology, evolution and conservation of a megadiverse region* pp. 248–272. Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Deblauwe, V., Droissart, V., Bose, R., Sonké, B., Blach-Overgaard, A., Svenning, J.C., Wieringa, J.J., Ramesh, B.R., Stévant, T., & Couvreur, T.L.P. (2016) Remotely sensed temperature and precipitation data improve species distribution modelling in the tropics. *Global Ecology and Biogeography*, **25**, 443–454.
- Farr, T., Rosen, P., Caro, E., Crippen, R., Duren, R., Hensley, S., Kobrick, M., Paller, M., Rodriguez, E., Roth, L., Seal, D., Shaffer, S., Shimada, J., Umland, J., Werner, M., Oskin, M., Burbank, D., & Alsdorf, D. (2007) The shuttle radar topography mission. *Reviews of Geophysics*, **45**, 1–33.
- Funk, C.C., Peterson, P.J., Landsfeld, M., Pedreros, D.H., Verdin, J., Shukla, S., Husak, G., Rowland, J.D., Harrison, L., Hoell, A., & Michaelsen, J. (2015) The climate hazards infrared precipitation with stations—a new environmental record for monitoring extremes. *Scientific Data*, **2**, 150066.

529 Gaston, K.J. (2000) Global patterns in biodiversity. *Nature*, **405**, 220–227.

530 GBIF (24 July 2017) GBIF Occurrence Download..

531 GBIF (24 July 2017) GBIF Occurrence Download..

532 Gioia, P. & Hopper, S.D. (2017) A new phytogeographic map for the Southwest Australian Floristic Region
533 after an exceptional decade of collection and discovery. *Botanical Journal of the Linnean Society*, **184**, 1–15.

534 Hart, S.P., Usinowicz, J., & Levine, J.M. (2017) The spatial scales of species coexistence. *Nature Ecology &*
535 *Evolution*, **1**, 1066–1073.

536 Hengl, T., Mendes de Jesus, J., Heuvelink, G.B.M., Ruiperez Gonzalez, M., Kilibarda, M., Blagoti?, A.,
537 Shangguan, W., Wright, M.N., Geng, X., Bauer-Marschallinger, B., Guevara, M.A., Vargas, R., MacMillan,
538 R.A., Batjes, N.H., Leenaars, J.G.B., Ribeiro, E., Wheeler, I., Mantel, S., & Kempen, B. (2017)
539 SoilGrids250m: Global gridded soil information based on machine learning. *PLoS ONE*, **12**, e0169748.

540 Hopper, S.D. (1979) Biogeographical Aspects of Speciation in the Southwest Australian Flora. *Annual*
541 *Review of Ecology and Systematics*, **10**, 399–422.

542 Hopper, S.D. & Gioia, P. (2004) The Southwest Australian Floristic Region: Evolution and Conservation of a
543 Global Hot Spot of Biodiversity. *Annual Review of Ecology, Evolution, and Systematics*, **35**, 623–650.

544 Kreft, H. & Jetz, W. (2007) Global patterns and determinants of vascular plant diversity. *Proceedings of the*
545 *National Academy of Sciences*, **104**, 5925–5930.

546 Laliberte, E., Zemunik, G., & Turner, B.L. (2014) Environmental filtering explains variation in plant
547 diversity along resource gradients. *Science*, **345**, 1602–1605.

548 Lambers, H., Brundrett, M.C., Raven, J.A., & Hopper, S.D. (2010) Plant mineral nutrition in ancient
549 landscapes: high plant species diversity on infertile soils is linked to functional diversity for nutritional
550 strategies. *Plant and Soil*, **334**, 11–31.

551 Larsen, R., Holmern, T., Prager, S.D., Maliti, H., & Røskoft, E. (2009) Using the extended quarter degree
552 grid cell system to unify mapping and sharing of biodiversity data. *African Journal of Ecology*, **47**, 382–392.

553 Levin, L.A., Sibuet, M., Gooday, A.J., Smith, C.R., & Vanreusel, A. (2010) The roles of habitat heterogeneity
554 in generating and maintaining biodiversity on continental margins: an introduction. *Marine Ecology*, **31**, 1–5.

555 Lobo, J.M., Jay-robert, P., Lumaret, J.-p., Lobo, J.M., Jay-robert, P., & Lumaret, J.-p. (2004) Modelling the
556 Species Richness Distribution for French Aphodiidae (Coleoptera, Scarabaeoidea). *Ecography*, **27**, 145–156.

557 Mateo, R.G., Mokany, K., & Guisan, A. (2017) Biodiversity Models: What If Unsaturation Is the Rule?
558 *Trends in Ecology & Evolution*, **32**, 556–566.

559 Molina-Venegas, R., Aparicio, A., Slingsby, J.A., Lavergne, S., & Arroyo, J. (2015) Investigating the
560 evolutionary assembly of a Mediterranean biodiversity hotspot: Deep phylogenetic signal in the distribution
561 of eudicots across elevational belts. *Journal of Biogeography*, **42**, 507–518.

562 Mouchet, M., Levers, C., Zupan, L., Kuemmerle, T., Plutzar, C., Erb, K., Lavorel, S., Thuiller, W., &
563 Haberl, H. (2015) Testing the effectiveness of environmental variables to explain European terrestrial
564 vertebrate species richness across biogeographical scales. *PLoS ONE*, **10**, 1–16.

565 Mucina, L. & Rutherford, M.C. (2006) *The vegetation of South Africa, Lesotho and Swaziland*. South
566 African National Biodiversity Institute,

567 NIMA (2000) Amendment 1. 3 January 2000. Department of Defense World Geodetic System 1984. Its
568 Definition and Relationships with Local Geodetic Systems. 1–3.

569 Olson, D.M., Dinerstein, E., Wikramanayake, E.D., Burgess, N.D., Powell, G.V.N., Underwood, E.C.,
570 D’amico, J.A., Itoua, I., Strand, H.E., Morrison, J.C., & Others (2001) Terrestrial Ecoregions of the World:
571 A New Map of Life on Earth: A new global map of terrestrial ecoregions provides an innovative tool for
572 conserving biodiversity. *BioScience*, **51**, 933–938.

573 Power, S.C., Verboom, G.A., Bond, W.J., & Cramer, M.D. (2017) Environmental correlates of biome-level
574 floristic turnover in South Africa. *Journal of Biogeography*, **44**, 1745–1757.

575 R Core Team (2018) *R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing. Version 3.5.0*. R
576 Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria.

577 Rensburg, B.J. van, Chown, S.L., & Gaston, K.J. (2002) Species Richness, Environmental Correlates, and
578 Spatial Scale: A Test Using South African Birds. *The American Naturalist*, **159**, 566–577.

579 Ricklefs, R.E. (1987) Community diversity: relative roles of local and regional processes. *Science, New Series*,
580 **235**, 167–171.

581 Thuiller, W., Midgley, G.F., Rouget, M., Cowling, R.M., F. Midgley, G., Rougeti, M., & M. Cowling, R.
582 (2006) Predicting patterns of plant species richness in megadiverse South Africa. *Ecography*, **29**, 733–744.

583 Verboom, G.A., Stock, W.D., & Cramer, M.D. (2017) Specialization to extremely low-nutrient soils limits the
584 nutritional adaptability of plant lineages. *The American Naturalist*, **In press**,.

585 Wardell-Johnson, G. & Horwitz, P. (1996) Conserving biodiversity and the recognition of heterogeneity in
586 ancient landscapes: a case study from south-western Australia. *Forest Ecology and Management*, **85**,
587 219–238.

588 **Biosketches**

589 **Ruan van Mazijk** is a Masters student broadly interested in comparative biology and ...

590 **Michael D. Cramer**

591 **G. Anthony Verboom**

592 **Author contributions**

593 MDC and GAV conceived the study question, which RVM investigated under their supervision for his BSc
594 Hons project. The analyses and programming work were largely devised by RVM, with input from the other
595 authors, and was carried out by RVM. RVM wrote the first draft of the manuscript and all authors
596 contributed equally thereafter.

Table 1: Georeferenced vascular plant species occurrence and environmental data sources used in this study. Abbreviations are as follows: MAP, mean annual precipitation; PDQ, precipitation in the driest quarter; CEC, cation exchange capacity.

Variable	Source	Citation
Plant species occurrences	GBIF	??, ??
Elevation	SRTM v2.0	??
NDVI	MODIS (MOD13C2)	??
Climatic variables		
MAP	CHIRPS v2.0	??
PDQ	CHIRPS v2.0	
Surface T	MODIS (MOD11C3)	??
Soil variables (SoilGrids250m)		
CEC	CECSOL M 250m	??
Clay	CLYPPT M 250m	
Soil C	OCDENS M 250m	
pH	PHIKCL M 250m	

Table 2: Estimated coefficients and significances (P -value) following quantile regression of the 5%-quantile ($\tau = 0.05$) of pairwise vascular plant species turnover (Jaccards distance) as a function of the geographic distance (km, \log -transformed) between QDS cells. The Cape term represents the difference between Cape and SWA species turnover, for a given geographic distance.

Term	Estimate	P -value
Intercept	-0.311	< 0.001
\log (Distance between cells)	0.093	< 0.001
Cape	0.388	< 0.001
\log (Distance between cells) \times Cape	-0.026	< 0.001

Table 3: Estimated coefficients and significances (P -value) following multiple linear regression of HDS species richness against the mean QDS species richness ($\log(x + 1)$ -transformed) and turnover (Jaccards distance) within a given HDS, of the form in Equation (2). The Cape was fit as the baseline, hence SWA represents the categorical term here. This was model was better fitting than a similar model without a region category ($\Delta AIC = 90.56$). Note, this model does not represent those curves plot in Figure 2 (there, the curves are from simple linear regressions of the variables in each panel, separated by region).

Term	Estimate	P -value
Intercept	-3062.297	< 0.001
\log (Mean QDS richness + 1)	595.574	< 0.001
Mean QDS turnover	338.589	0.534
SWA	2905.604	0.001
\log (Mean QDS richness + 1) \times SWA	-333.908	< 0.001
Mean QDS turnover \times SWA	-1246.109	0.073

Table 4: Comparisons of Akaike information criterion values (small sample-size-corrected, AIC_c) of various geographically weighted regressions (GWR) of \log -transformed species richness as a function of various sets of environmental variables. Models were fit for the Cape and SWA richness and environmental data both separately and together. GWR methods preclude the need for a categorical predictor for the Cape vs SWA, as the longitudinal (and to a lesser extent latitudinal) differences between the regions allows local regression coefficients in each region to differ.

Model predictors	AIC_c	ΔAIC_c	w_{AIC_c}
Cape:			
Absolute variables	2112.49	0.00	1.00
Non-elevation variables	2179.35	66.86	0.00
All	2192.59	80.10	0.00
Soil variables	2197.76	85.28	0.00
Roughness variables	2208.43	95.94	0.00
Non-soil variables	2218.08	105.59	0.00
Elevation	2267.30	154.81	0.00
Null	3099.37	986.89	0.00
SWA:			
Absolute variables	826.47	0.00	0.69
Non-elevation variables	828.29	1.82	0.28
All	833.44	6.97	0.02
Soil variables	835.92	9.45	0.01
Non-soil variables	848.57	22.11	0.00
Roughness variables	868.89	42.42	0.00
Elevation	970.19	143.73	0.00
Null	27172.21	26345.74	0.00
Both:			
Absolute variables	1286.27	0.00	1.00
Roughness variables	1338.16	51.89	0.00
Non-elevation variables	1364.26	77.98	0.00
Elevation	1371.30	85.02	0.00
Soil variables	1371.47	85.19	0.00
Non-soil variables	1380.38	94.11	0.00
All	1390.78	104.50	0.00
Null	1404.05	117.78	0.00




Figure 1: Comparisons of different types of environmental heterogeneity in the Cape and SWA—namely for (a) elevation, (b) climatic variables, (c) NDVI and (d) soil variables—in each panel consisting of three sub-panels per variable type. The upper row of panels shows example distributions of roughness values (Equation (1)), showing the different extremes in environmental heterogeneity observed in each region when compared at fine (0.05°) and coarse (3QDS) scales. Each distribution has under it area 1. Distributions were constructed with Gaussian kernels, with bandwidth following Silverman’s “rule of thumb” (???). In the lower row of panels, these distributions of roughness values were compared between the Cape and SWA at each of the four spatial scales, not just 0.05° and 3QDS, using non-parametric Mann-Whitney U -tests to test for differences. The “common language effect size” ($CLES$, see text) describes these differences (b). U -tests for almost all environmental variables yielded significant differences ($P < 0.05$) between Cape and SWA values (NS, non-significant differences).




Figure 2: Regressions involving plant species richness and turnover. Species turnover (as Jaccards distance) between QDS-pairs increases as pairs are more geographically separated (a). Species turnover was calculated for all possible pairs of cells, but only the turnover values for a random 5000 pairs in each region have been plotted, for clarity. Fitted lines represent the 5%-quantile regressions of turnover as a function of log-distance for each region separately. Following a 5%-quantile regression of turnover as a function of log-distance with region as a categorical variable (Table 2), a significant interaction between distance and region was found ($P < 0.001$), such that the Cape positively effects the distance slope term. Scatter-plots of HDS-scale species richness against the average QDS-scale richness in a given HDS (b) and the average species turnover between QDS in a given HDS (c). Curves represent simple linear regressions of HDS richness against these two respective independent variables (note, mean QDS richness was $\log(x + 1)$ -transformed), separately for each region, for illustration of the two regions' differences, for interpretation alongside Table 3.