Bird species' centrality in seed–dispersal networks varies within climatic niches

4 authors, including:

G. Moulatlet
The University of Arizona
90 PUBLICATIONS   **1,291** CITATIONS

SEE PROFILE

Wesley Dáttilo
Institute of Ecology INECOL
266 PUBLICATIONS   **4,250** CITATIONS

SEE PROFILE

Fabricio Villalobos
Institute of Ecology INECOL
182 PUBLICATIONS   **4,483** CITATIONS

SEE PROFILE

1 **Bird species' centrality in seed-dispersal networks varies within climatic niches**

2 Gabriel M. Moulatlet[1,2], Wesley Dáttilo[3], W. Daniel Kissling[4], Fabricio Villalobos[1,*]

3 [1]Red de Biología Evolutiva, Instituto de Ecología A.C., Xalapa, Veracruz, Mexico

4 [2]Arizona Institute for Resilience, University of Arizona, Tucson, USA

5 [3]Red de Ecoetología, Instituto de Ecología A.C., Xalapa, Veracruz, Mexico

6 [4]Institute for Biodiversity and Ecosystem Dynamics, University of Amsterdam, The Netherlands

7

8 [*]Correspondence to Fabricio Villalobos (fabricio.villalobos@gmail.com). Phone: +52-228-8421800

9 ext. 3020. Instituto de Ecología A.C. Carretera Antigua a Coatepec 351, Col. El Haya, Xalapa,

10 Veracruz. C.P. 91073. Mexico

11

12 **Short running title:** Species centrality in climatic niche space

15 **Authorship statement:** FV conceived the initial idea, improved by input from all authors. GMM, WD

16 and FV planned the study. GMM performed analyses and wrote the first draft with help from FV. All

17 authors extensively discussed results and contributed to manuscript preparation.

18 **Data accessibility statement:** Data available from the FigShare Digital Repository (https://figshare.

19 com/s/6d409efbed4f9d0c239e)

20 Abstract: 150 words

21 Main text: 4754 words

22 References: 75

23 Elements: 1 table and 3 figures

24 **Abstract**

25 Understanding how the functional role of species within seed-dispersal networks varies across

26 geographical and climatic gradients can reveal the mechanisms driving network organization. Using

27 data for 157 bird species from all continents, we evaluated the variation of species' centrality within

28 local networks across species' climatic niches (occupied climatic conditions) and in response to proxies

29 of competition (number of co-occurring bird species) and resource availability (number of co-occurring

30 plant species). We found that species' centrality increases towards the climatic niche centroid for most

31 bird species. The effect of competition on species' centrality was usually opposite to that of resources

32 (i.e., when one was positive, the other was negative), regardless of the network's position within the

33 climatic niche space. Taken together, our results show that species' centrality within seed-dispersal

34 networks is influenced by the climatic suitability of network location, supporting the niche centrality

35 hypothesis, whereas competition and resource availability exert opposing effects.

36

37 **Introduction**

38 A broadly recognized pattern in ecology is that some species have a disproportionate role in maintaining

39 ecosystem functions in their communities (Mouquet *et al.* 2013). This is because species are not isolated

40 entities and are connected within complex networks of interactions, where keystone species tend to be

41 more central (Martín González *et al.* 2010; Mello *et al.* 2015) by interacting with many other species

42 via multiple direct and indirect pathways (Escribano-Avila *et al.* 2018). Such central species may also

43 influence the co-evolutionary convergence of traits of interacting partners (i.e. trait matching;

44 Guimarães-Jr et al., 2011). Giving their importance, the extinction of central species from networks

45 could increase coextinctions and decrease network robustness (Emer *et al.* 2018). Evaluating species'

46 centrality requires moving from the "network" to the "species" analytical perspective. Contrary to

47 evaluating the spatial variation of interactions as described by network properties at particular sites or

48 communities with the "network" perspective (Dupont *et al.* 2009; Perea *et al.* 2013; Trøjelsgaard &

49 Olesen 2013), the "species" perspective involves the consideration of those networks where the focal

50   species participates across its geographical distribution. From this perspective, species' ecological

51   attributes such as their climatic (Grinellian) niches (Soberón 2007) and phenotypic traits (e.g., Tobias

52   *et al.* 2022) can be combined with their network properties (i.e. centrality) and those derived from their

53   geographic co-occurrence (i.e., competition and resources availability). In combination, these species'

54   properties allow determining the spatial variation in how species interact with each other and their

55   drivers at broad spatial scales (Windsor *et al.* 2022).

56   Because the geographic distribution of species usually covers different environmental conditions at

57   distinct localities, their biotic interactions can vary along environmental gradients within their

58   geographic ranges (e.g., partner composition, frequency, and dependency) (Dehling *et al.* 2014). In this

59   sense, the number of co-occurring species (i.e., those with overlapping ranges) within the range of a

60   focal species determines its diversity field. Accordingly, if we consider species from the same guild or

61   their resources, the set of species that have been reported to co-occur with a focal species can be used

62   to define its interaction field and thus potential competitors or resources, respectively (Sánchez-

63   Barradas *et al.* 2023). These concepts are important in understanding the variation in species centrality

64   in mutualistic networks, since a focal species can only interact with those species present in its diversity

65   field, and not with those that are not present therein because of co-occurrence limitations imposed by

66   geographic and ecological boundaries (Martins *et al.* 2022).

67   There is evidence that the variation in biotic interactions along species' geographic ranges could be

68   determined by population characteristics (Gaston 2009). For instance, species abundance is usually

69   considered to decline from the centre towards the edge of the geographic range of a species (Brown,

70   1984). The main assumption behind this idea is that climatic conditions are more favourable and stable

71   at the centre of a species' geographic range and become gradually less favourable towards the periphery

72   (the centre-periphery hypothesis [CPH]; Brown 1984; Martínez-Meyer *et al.* 2013; Pironon *et al.* 2017).

73   The CPH has been systematically tested with discordant outcomes in geographic space, such that

74   species abundances are not always higher at the centre of their geographic distributions (Brown, 1984,

75   Sagarin & Gaines 2002; Lira-Noriega & Manthey 2014; Pironon *et al.* 2015; Dallas *et al.* 2017; Santini

76   *et al.* 2019). Instead, several studies have suggested that the climatic niche space (i.e. the climatic

conditions where a species thrives) would be more appropriate to assess the species' abundance variability, mainly because such variability responds to the arrangement of climatic conditions with higher population performance and abundance at the niche centroid where optimal conditions are met (Hoffmann & Blows 1994; Lira-Noriega & Manthey 2014; Maguire 1973; Martínez-Meyer *et al.* 2013). Because species relative abundance is one of the main factors that determines their role in a network (Krishna *et al.* 2008; Vázquez *et al.* 2007), it thus seems plausible that the variation in species' centrality in ecological networks could be associated with the location of those networks along the climatic niche space, as determined by the geographic distribution of a focal species.

Competition is also important for determining species' centrality within networks because it may increase the energetic costs of resource acquisition (Hall *et al.* 1992; MacArthur 1960), but also because it can lead to species displacement by stronger competitors and shape the organization of mutualistic networks (Dáttilo *et al.* 2014; de M. Santos *et al.* 2012). Moreover, competition reduces the ability of each species to adapt to local environmental conditions at their range limits (Case & Taper 2000). Thus, a species may be more or less central in networks depending on the number of co-existing competitors across its range (Cazelles *et al.* 2016; Pedraza & Bascompte 2021). In the same vein, species co-occur with different sets of resource species across their range, determining the potential interaction links that a focal species can establish in the networks it participates across its occupied localities (Dehling *et al.* 2022). Therefore, the interaction field of a species can be used to define the number of potential competitors as well as resources across its geographic range (Sánchez-Barradas *et al.* 2023). Assuming the existence of areas within a species' geographic range where climatic conditions are optimal allowing it to reach high centrality, an intriguing and poorly understood issue is whether competition and resources influence the chances of a species to become more central in these areas.

Using a species perspective within seed-dispersal networks, we here investigated the variation in bird species' centrality along their climatic niches and how it is related to competition (measured as the number of co-occurring bird species, i.e., the diversity field of bird species) and resource availability (measured as the number of co-occurring plant species, i.e., the diversity field of plant species). We chose seed-dispersal networks because they are excellent model systems to evaluate species' ecosystem

4

104   functions (Schleuning *et al.* 2015) and because birds have wide distributions and are the main seed

105   dispersers, establishing mutualistic interactions with most angiosperms' families, an interaction that is

106   fundamental for biodiversity maintenance (Fleming & John Kress 2011). Moreover, seed dispersal

107   networks have been studied in basically all continents and biogeographical regions (Windsor *et al.*

108   2022), making it possible to put together datasets of global relevance.

109   In this study, we used a dataset of 314 seed-dispersal networks with 1264 bird species and 2903 plant

110   species/morphospecies from 11 biographical regions to ask how bird species centrality from seed-

111   dispersal networks varies within their climatic niche spaces. Our hypothesis was that the centrality of

112   each focal bird species within seed-dispersal networks is higher at the centre of the climatic niche space,

113   according to the predictions of the CPH. Moreover, we envisioned four possible scenarios for the

114   interplay among climatic niche space, competition, and resource availability in determining species'

115   centrality (Table 1). In scenario *a*, the centrality of a focal species should be higher at the centre of its

116   climatic niche with no effect of competition and resource availability. In this case, a focal species'

117   centrality is higher where the climatic conditions are optimal, independently of its biotic interactions.

118   In scenario *b*, a focal species is more central towards its niche centre, but its centrality is also influenced

119   by competition and resource availability acting in opposite directions, with the focal species being more

120   central towards the niche centre where more resources are available and there is less competition or

121   vice-versa. In scenario *c*, both resources and competition are higher at the niche centre, so that the focal

122   species is more central when overall diversity is high. Alternatively, in scenario *d*, a focal species may

123   not be more central at its niche centre, but at the niche border, where less resources are available and

124   because competition may reduce the access to resources for the populations at the centre of the climatic

125   niche space. Overall, these four scenarios are not mutually exclusive, but rather gradients that can

126   advance our understanding of how species' centrality within mutualistic networks varies across their

127   climatic niches over broad spatial scales.

128   **Methods**

129   *Species data*

We used the dataset of individual species centrality in bird-plant seed-dispersal networks compiled by Moulatlet et al. (2023). This dataset consists of studies describing mutualistic networks of seed dispersal compiled from the scientific literature, using the Web of Science (WoS), Scopus and Google Scholar databases, from two specialised databases (the Interaction Web Data Base [https://www.nceas.ucsb.edu/interactionweb] and Web of Life [http://www.web-of-life.es/2.0/index.php]) and searched in the repositories GitHub (https://github.com) and DRYAD (https://datadryad.org).

For each bird species in the dataset, we downloaded the geographic ranges (i.e., extents of occurrence) from the Birdlife project (www.birdlife.org). We then selected 157 focal species (Table S1) from thirty-seven families based on two criteria that aimed to minimize sampling bias (Borregaard & Rahbek 2010): 1) species that were present in at least five networks, considering the minimum number of degrees of freedom needed in our data analysis (see below); and 2) species whose occurrences in the networks were not spatially clustered within their geographic ranges. For the second criterium, we visually inspected the spatial distribution of networks where each focal species participates within their geographic ranges.

Species centrality in networks

Species centrality was based on four species-level centrality metrics for each individual network: i) degree (the number of links of each species), ii) betweenness (the proportion of the shortest paths linking any pair of nodes in a network), iii) closeness (the shortest connections between a species and every other network species) and iv) Katz centrality (a measure of the distance, in terms of all possible pathways, between the focal node and all other nodes of the network). Each metric was first standardised by calculating the z-scores in each network. Then, the four metrics were combined using a PCA analysis, where the first PCA axis (PC1) represented the centrality of species, with the highest positive values associated to those species that are more central in a network, as has been suggested in previous studies (Burin *et al.* 2021; Dáttilo *et al.* 2016; Guimarães *et al.* 2017; Maia *et al.* 2019). The centrality values were calculated for each species in the individual networks. Because each species has been present in at least five networks, centrality values were calculated for each species in each network it

157 occurs. For convenience when interpreting the PC1 values and ranking species from 0 (more peripheral)

158 to the highest positive value (more central), PC1 values were rescaled to non-zero, positive-only values

159 by adding up the absolute value of the minimum score plus a millesimal unit to each centrality value

160 (Cruz *et al.* 2022; Moulatlet *et al.* 2023). In this manner, all PC1 values were greater than zero while

161 keeping the original order and distance among them.

162 *Explanatory variables*

163 Our predictor variables of species' centrality were the position of each network within the climatic niche

164 space relative to its centre (see below), resource availability and competition, as measured by the

165 number of co-occurring plant and bird species in each network, respectively (Figure S1). The number

166 of potential competitors as well as resources was defined by the number of both plant and bird species

167 in the interaction field of a focal species (Sánchez-Barradas *et al.* 2023).

168 We used the ellipsoid envelope model (EEM, Farber & Kadmon, 2003) to characterize species' climatic

169 niches based on their geographic occurrences. EEM yields a closer approximation to a fundamental

170 niche estimate than other methods that fit arbitrary shapes to the occurrence points in climatic space

171 (Jiménez *et al.* 2019). Furthermore, EEMs are suitable for modelling a high number of species, as they

172 require considerably fewer assumptions and decisions regarding parameters (Nuñez-Penichet *et al.*

173 2021). To build EEMs, we first downloaded from the Global Biodiversity Information Facility database

174 (GBIF; https://www.gbif.org/) a maximum of 1000 spatially random occurrences for each species using

175 the rgbif R package (Chamberlain *et al.* 2022). We cleaned the data by removing duplicates and records

176 with uncertain or missing coordinates. We also removed records at distances less than 15 km from one

177 another (spatial thinning; Nuñez-Penichet et al., 2021). EEMs were built for each focal species using

178 the ellipsenm R package (Cobos *et al.* 2022).

179 The environmental variables used to characterize species niches in EEM were obtained from the

180 WorldClim v.2.1 (Fick & Hijmans 2017) at a resolution of 10' (~18.5 km^2 at the Equator). We extracted

181 climatic data for each occurrence record with the R package 'terra' (Hijmans *et al.* 2022). We selected

182 variables BIO1 (Annual Mean Temperature), BIO5 (Max Temperature of Warmest Month), BIO6 (Min

183   Temperature of Coldest Month), BIO12 (Annual Precipitation), BIO16 (Precipitation of Wettest

184   Quarter) and BIO17 (Precipitation of Driest Quarter), as these are suitable variables to delimit the

185   climatic niche spaces (Nuñez-Penichet *et al.* 2021).

186   To characterize climatic niches of species it is important to delimit the accessible area of a modelled

187   species prior to the modelling (Barve *et al.* 2011). For that, we determined the accessible area as the

188   convex polygon with 100 km buffer around the occurrence points of each species. The bioclimatic

189   variables were masked to that area. Then, we built EEM using the default parameters of the *ell_model*

190   function (modelling method "covat", confidence level = 95% and single replicates) of the R package

191   ellipsenm (Cobos *et al.* 2022). The error assumed for the occurrence data was 5%, meaning that 5% of

192   the occurrence data are potentially climatic outliers, and therefore not included in the EEM. From each

193   model, we identified the niche centroid, i.e., the values that characterized the centre of species climatic

194   niche and that can be interpreted as the optimal conditions for species' performance (Hoffmann &

195   Blows 1994; Soberón 2007).

196   Finally, to obtain the distance of each network to the centroid of the species' climatic niche (i.e.,

197   network's niche position), we calculated the Mahalanobis distance of the climatic conditions where

198   each network was located to those conditions at the niche centroid. Based on the distribution of values

199   of all Mahalanobis distances, as assessed with a histogram, we excluded those networks with distances

200   25% greater than the median values (3rd quartile), as they were visually inspected as possible outliers.

201   Our analytical tests were performed using only occurrence information, following Weber et al., (2017)

202   who indicated that occurrence data could be used to map and describe environmental suitability as a

203   surrogate for abundance information.

204   Predictor variables were not correlated to each other across all networks. Pearson's correlation between

205   resources and niche position was $r = -0.05$ ($p = 0.002$), between competition and niche position was $r =$

206   -0.002 ($p = 0.91$) and between competition and resources was $r = 0.46$ ($p < 0.001$).

207   *Data analysis*

208 We used simple and multiple linear regression models to test the relationship between species' centrality

209 (PC1; dependent variable) and the explanatory variables network distance to niche centroid,

210 competition, and resources availability. All variables were scaled prior the analyses using the function

211 "scale", from the base R package. The variables competition and resources availability were tested with

212 their raw or log-transformed values in independent models for each species to fit the assumptions of

213 normality. Model selection was done by choosing the one with the lowest Akaike Information Criterium

214 corrected for small samples (AICc; Anderson & Burnham 2002). All three predictor variables were kept

215 in the models at a first moment. Then, we proceeded with a stepwise selection of the variables on the

216 previously selected best models using the function "step", from base R. The standardized beta

217 coefficients of each species model (only models significant at $r2 > 0.2$ and $p < 0.05$) were then classified

218 in the hypothetical scenarios presented in Table 1.

219 We also tested whether the centrality values of each focal species (PC1, dependent variable) differed

220 among scenarios (independent variable) using one-way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) followed by

221 the post-hoc Tukey test. This analysis was done to test whether species centrality values (i.e., high, or

222 low centrality within the range of all species centrality values) were an indicator of each focal species

223 relation with the tested variables.

224 **Results**

225 Regression models were statistically significant for 90 of the 157 species studied (58%). Out of the

226 species with significant models, the most representative families were Thraupidae (14 species, 15.5%)

227 and Tyrannidae (10 of species, 11.1%). In the statistically significant models, the standardized beta

228 coefficients for resources showed no directional trend when compared to standardized beta coefficients

229 for niche position (Figure 1a); while the standardized beta coefficients for competition were negatively

230 related with the standardized beta coefficients for niche position (Figure 1b).

231 *Effects of niche, competition, and resources on species' centrality*

232 For the 90 bird species whose regression models were significant, we found that 27 of them (30%)

233 showed higher centrality towards the centre of their niche spaces; 17 species (18.9%) were more central

9

234 towards the border of their niche spaces; and for 45 species (50%) centrality was not related to the niche

235 position (Figure 2).

236 Only four species (*Camptostoma obsoletum* [Tyrannidae], *Dumetella carolinensis* [Mimidae],

237 *Euphonia chlorotica* [Fringillidae] and *Phoenicurus phoenicurus* [Muscicapidae]) were more central at

238 the niche centre without having significant standardized beta coefficients for competition and resource

239 variables (scenario *a*; Figure S2a). For 20 species whose resources and competition had significant

240 opposite effects when being more central at the niche centre (scenario *b*), six of these had a negative

241 effect of resources, meaning more resources and less competition at the niche centre, whereas seven

242 species had a positive effect of resources, meaning more resources and less competition at the niche

243 border (Figure S2b). The other seven species had no resource effect (standardized effect equals zero).

244 Under scenario *c*, the direction of the standardized beta coefficients was the same for three species,

245 meaning that competition and resources were also positively related to centrality at the niche centre

246 (Figure S2c). An exception was *Pachyramphus polychopterus* (Tityridae)*,* who had negative direction

247 for all variables, meaning that its centrality was highest at the niche centre, where there was less

248 competition and less resources. Seventeen species fell within scenario *d*, with their centrality being

249 positively related to the niche position, meaning that species' network centrality increased with the

250 distance to the niche centroid (Figure 2d). For these species, the majority had opposite effects of

251 resources and competition, so that when one was positive, the other was negative (and vice-versa). Only

252 the species *Colius striatus* (Coliidae) had both competition and resources with same effect direction

253 (negative).

254 The other half of bird species showed no relationship between their network centrality and niche

255 position, being only affected by resources and/or competition (Figure S3), with varying effects of these

256 two variables. Apart from *Tangara xanthocephala* (Thraupidae), which had positive standardized beta

257 coefficients for both competition and resources, all the other species had opposite effects of resources

258 and competition.

259   The ANOVA test for differences in species' centralities between scenarios (Figure 3A) showed that

260   centrality values of species classified within each the four scenarios were not significantly different.

261   The mean centrality of the 157 initially selected species was similar to that of the 90 species significantly

262   related to the evaluated variables (4.48 and 4.49, respectively; Figure 3B).

Discussion

264   Our results revealed how the interplay between climatic niche position, resource availability, and

265   intraguild competition can define the variation of the role that bird species play within seed dispersal

266   networks. Previous studies have addressed how centrality of bird species in seed-dispersal networks is

267   related to their geographic, evolutionary and environmental characteristics (Burin *et al.* 2021; Moulatlet

268   *et al.* 2023; Pigot *et al.* 2016), but, to our knowledge, this is the first study evaluating how bird centrality

269   varies across their geographic ranges in relation to their occupied climatic niches and how this variation

270   follows the predictions of the centre-periphery hypothesis (CPH) in climatic space (Martínez-Meyer et

271   al. 2013). We could evaluate the variation in centrality of focal species in multiple networks (minimum

272   6 and maximum 79) within their climatic niche spaces, and thereby show that the variation in species'

273   centrality suggests the existence of climatically suitable areas where species can achieve high

274   abundance and high centrality, which might form the substrate for evolutionary and ecological

275   dynamics.

Centrality closer to the niche centre and the effect of competition and resources

277   Our results showed that for 30% of the evaluated bird species the centrality was higher towards the

278   centroid of their climatic niches, where the climatic conditions are optimal (Maguire 1973, Martínez-

279   Meyer et al. 2013). Most likely, for those species the optimal climatic conditions are the most important

280   driver of their interaction role as they allow species to attain high abundances (Martínez-Meyer et al.

281   2013, Weber et al. 2017, Osorio-Olvera et al. 2020). Indeed, species roles may be highly dictated by

282   species' abundances in the network they participate (Laurindo *et al.* 2020; Pizo *et al.* 2022). Previous

283   studies suggested that species can be considered to be at their ecophysiological optimum at the niche

284   centre (Hoffmann & Blows 1994) when compared to the niche border, where climatic conditions would

285   not be adequate (Perez-Navarro *et al.* 2022; VanDerWal *et al.* 2009). Thus, this result is an agreement

286   with the predictions of the CPH, when applied to the niche space instead of the geographical space

287   (Osorio-Olvera et al. 2020).

288   For the species under scenarios *b* and *c*, centrality did increase with increasing resources towards the

289   climatic niche centroid. Our results suggest that optimal climatic conditions for a focal bird species do

290   not solely influence its centrality in mutualistic networks, as has been previously found for plant species

291   (Gómez & Perfectti 2012), but that the resources are also a key factor in determining species centrality

292   along the niche space. On one hand, resources might define species centrality when more resources

293   increase the chances of a focal species to establish links with more plant partners and to become a

294   generalist (Dehling *et al.* 2014). On the other hand, more resource may increase the chances of

295   specialization (i.e. making species less central) between birds and plants by increasing the possibilities

296   of trait-matching, especially in resources-rich networks (Medeiros *et al.* 2018), although specialization

297   has also been associated with lower resource availability (Schleuning *et al.* 2012). As we could not find

298   differences in the centrality values for the species classified into our four hypothetical scenarios,

299   indications of specialization could not be tested. Thus, our results only suggest that increasing resources

300   availability may help to make a species more important in its interactions towards its niche centre,

301   effectively combining the benefits of both abiotic and biotic factors. It is important to note that we

302   considered resource availability as the total number of plant species reported within the studied

303   networks, which can certainly be lower than the actual number of available plant species in the

304   community. Given that not all plant species in a community are necessarily dispersed by birds, we

305   consider our approach conservative at least while still informative based on empirical information.

306   We also found that for the species classified under the scenarios *b* and *c*, it was possible that centrality

307   was higher towards their niche centre when competition was lower at that same position. Indeed, we

308   predicted that when competition was the highest at the niche centre, species would be more central in

309   networks away from this centre (i.e., towards their niche border), as competition would reduce the

310   access to resources for the populations at the centre of the climatic niche space, displacing the

311   populations to the niche border (Case & Taper 2000). The need to include competition as a driving

factor of varying ecological interactions across species geographic ranges has been recently highlighted (Early & Keith 2019), but few attempts to map those interactions have been made so far (Braz *et al.* 2020). Intraguild competition has been proposed as a limiting factor when resources are not sufficient for ecologically similar species (MacArthur 1960; Palmer *et al.* 2003). If that assumption holds true for seed-dispersal networks, competition with ecologically similar species may define centrality, as higher competitors may be in advantage for resource acquisition and may even cause the displacement of weaker competitors (Dáttilo *et al.* 2022; de M. Santos *et al.* 2012; Maia *et al.* 2019).

Centrality at the niche border and the effect of competition and resources

Despite several of the evaluated species showed higher centrality towards their niche centre, as predicted by the CPH in climatic niche space, around 18% of the species (scenario *d*) showed that their centrality was highest towards the niche border. Contrary to our predictions, for 40% of these species, competition was also the highest at the niche border, so competition does not seem to negatively affect the role of these species in their interaction networks. Instead, the higher co-occurrence of species in a network may be related to the role executed by species. For example, an increased number of co-occurring species may lead to a high centrality of a focal species when the competitors tend to be more specialized (Bascompte *et al.* 2003).

No niche effect with opposite effect of competition and resources

Results for half of our evaluated species (*n* = 45) did not fit any of our scenarios. Indeed, for these species there was no effect of the occupied climatic conditions in their centrality, but the presence of competitors and availability of resources did affect their centrality. This result highlights the importance of interspecific biotic interactions in driving specie's centrality, which suggests that for some species 1) centrality is a species' characteristic that is independent of their occupied climatic conditions, and/or 2) that the strength of biotic factors may override the effect of climate, i.e., that the complex effects of competition in the evaluated networks may outpace the effects of climatic conditions in determining the areas in which species can be central in their interactions across its climatic niche space.

337   Despite centrality values being quite variable among the evaluated species, no difference in species'

338   centrality values were detected among the proposed scenarios. As such, independent of potential

339   differences among species and their particular values of centrality (low or high, on average), the

340   interactive role of species across their occupied networks is influenced by the climatic conditions of

341   such network locations relative to the optimal conditions for the species (i.e., their niche centroid).

342   Accordingly, the effect of climatic suitability on species could be extended to other aspects of their

343   performance beyond population dynamics (e.g., abundance structure, as originally proposed by the

344   Centre-Periphery hypothesis in climatic space; Martínez-Meyer et al. 2013) such as their ecological

345   role and importance and its impact on evolutionary dynamics (Thompson 2005; Burin *et al.* 2021).

346   *Ecological meaning of the scenarios*

347   Our approach can lend support to the theory of the geographic mosaic of coevolution (Thompson, 2005).

348   Applying the assumptions of the geographic mosaic of coevolution, interactions of focal species in

349   ecological networks across their complete geographic ranges could serve as a template to identify hot-

350   and coldspots of species interactions. In this case, hotspots would be those areas where the centrality of

351   a focal species increases with resources availability and decreases with competition in a network,

352   whereas coldspots of interaction would then be those areas where centrality is either negatively or not

353   related to resource availability and positively related to competition. The importance of mapping the

354   conditions where species become more central is because central species may drive the coevolution of

355   both plant and bird species in a community (Bascompte *et al.* 2003; Medeiros *et al.* 2018). However,

356   the possibilities of establishing links with plant species vary according to the biogeographic region

357   where the network is located (Kissling *et al.* 2012) as well as the habitat type (Friedemann *et al.* 2022)

358   and quality (Emer *et al.* 2018). The approach of geographic mosaic of coevolution to study interaction

359   networks along climatic niches of species could reveal how interactions are being established and

360   evolving in the landscape, but its application would require finer scale data on pairwise species

361   interactions such as measures of adaptation and selection (Thompson 2009).

362   *Conclusions*

In this study we evaluated how the centrality of bird species in seed-dispersal networks varies within

their climatic niches and how this variation depends on the interplay between resource availability and

competition. We also found that these two factors can have opposite or the same direction effects in

explaining centrality depending on the position of the network within the species' climatic niche space.

Actual information on resource and competition variation, beyond the proxies used here, is scarce in

the literature and should be considered in further studies, as we found that they are key factors in

determining species centrality. By conducting studies including other taxa and types of interactions that

help us understand the factors that determine the spatial and climatic variation of species' centrality will

contribute to the understanding and potential conservation of species and their ecosystem services.

Acknowledgements

References

Anderson, D. & Burnham, K. (2002). *Model selection and multi-model inference*. second. Springer-Verlag Berlin Heidelberg, New York.

Arita, H.T., Christen, J.A., Rodríguez, P. & Soberón, J. (2008). Species Diversity and Distribution in Presence-Absence Matrices: Mathematical Relationships and Biological Implications. *The American Naturalist*, 172, 519–532.

Barve, N., Barve, V., Jiménez-Valverde, A., Lira-Noriega, A., Maher, S.P., Peterson, A.T., *et al.* (2011). The crucial role of the accessible area in ecological niche modeling and species distribution modeling. *Ecological Modelling*, 222, 1810–1819.

Bascompte, J., Jordano, P., Melián, C.J. & Olesen, J.M. (2003). The nested assembly of plant–animal mutualistic networks. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 100, 9383–9387.

Blanchet, F.G., Cazelles, K. & Gravel, D. (2020). Co-occurrence is not evidence of ecological interactions. *Ecology Letters*, 23, 1050–1063.

Borregaard, M.K. & Rahbek, C. (2010). Causality of the Relationship between Geographic Distribution and Species Abundance. *The Quarterly Review of Biology*, 85, 3–25.

Braz, A.G., de Viveiros Grelle, C.E., de Souza Lima Figueiredo, M. & Weber, M. de M. (2020). Interspecific competition constrains local abundance in highly suitable areas. *Ecography*, 43, 1560–1570.

Brown, J.H. (1984). On the Relationship between Abundance and Distribution of Species. *The American Naturalist*, 124, 255–279.

Burin, G., Guimarães, P.R. & Quental, T.B. (2021). Macroevolutionary stability predicts interaction patterns of species in seed dispersal networks. *Science*, 372, 733–737.

Case, T.J. & Taper, M.L. (2000). Interspecific Competition, Environmental Gradients, Gene Flow, and the Coevolution of Species' Borders. *The American Naturalist*, 155, 583–605.

Cazelles, K., Araújo, M.B., Mouquet, N. & Gravel, D. (2016). A theory for species co-occurrence in interaction networks. *Theor Ecol*, 9, 39–48.

401 Chamberlain, S., Oldoni, D. & Waller, J. (2022). rgbif: Interface to the Global Biodiversity
402   Information Facility API.
403 Cobos, M.E., Osorio-Olvera, L., Soberon, J., Peterson, A.T., Barve, V. & Barve, N. (2022). ellipsenm:
404   Ecological Niche's Characterizations Using Ellipsoids.
405 Cruz, C.P., Luna, P., Guevara, R., Hinojosa-Díaz, I.A., Villalobos, F. & Dáttilo, W. (2022). Climate
406   and human influence shape the interactive role of the honeybee in pollination networks
407   beyond its native distributional range. *Basic and Applied Ecology*, 63, 186–195.
408 Dallas, T., Decker, R.R. & Hastings, A. (2017). Species are not most abundant in the centre of their
409   geographic range or climatic niche. *Ecology Letters*, 20, 1526–1533.
410 Dáttilo, W., Cruz, C.P., Luna, P., Ratoni, B., Hinojosa-Díaz, I.A., Neves, F.S., *et al.* (2022). The
411   Impact of the Honeybee Apis mellifera on the Organization of Pollination Networks Is
412   Positively Related with Its Interactive Role throughout Its Geographic Range. *Diversity*, 14,
413   917.
414 Dáttilo, W., Díaz-Castelazo, C. & Rico-Gray, V. (2014). Ant dominance hierarchy determines the
415   nested pattern in ant–plant networks. *Biological Journal of the Linnean Society*, 113, 405–
416   414.
417 Dáttilo, W., Lara-Rodríguez, N., Jordano, P., Guimarães, P.R., Thompson, J.N., Marquis, R.J., *et al.*
418   (2016). Unravelling Darwin's entangled bank: architecture and robustness of mutualistic
419   networks with multiple interaction types. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological*
420   *Sciences*, 283, 20161564.
421 Dehling, D.M., Dalla Riva, G.V., Hutchinson, M.C. & Stouffer, D.B. (2022). Niche Packing and
422   Local Coexistence in a Megadiverse Guild of Frugivorous Birds Are Mediated by Fruit
423   Dependence and Shifts in Interaction Frequencies. *The American Naturalist*, 199, 855–868.
424 Dehling, D.M., Töpfer, T., Schaefer, H.M., Jordano, P., Böhning-Gaese, K. & Schleuning, M. (2014).
425   Functional relationships beyond species richness patterns: trait matching in plant–bird
426   mutualisms across scales. *Global Ecology and Biogeography*, 23, 1085–1093.
427 Dupont, Y.L., Padrón, B., Olesen, J.M. & Petanidou, T. (2009). Spatio-temporal variation in the
428   structure of pollination networks. *Oikos*, 118, 1261–1269.
429 Early, R. & Keith, S.A. (2019). Geographically variable biotic interactions and implications for
430   species ranges: XXXX. *Global Ecol Biogeogr*, 28, 42–53.
431 Emer, C., Galetti, M., Pizo, M.A., Guimarães Jr., P.R., Moraes, S., Piratelli, A., *et al.* (2018). Seed-
432   dispersal interactions in fragmented landscapes – a metanetwork approach. *Ecology Letters*,
433   21, 484–493.
434 Escribano-Avila, G., Lara-Romero, C., Heleno, R. & Traveset, A. (2018). Tropical Seed Dispersal
435   Networks: Emerging Patterns, Biases, and Keystone Species Traits. In: *Ecological Networks*
436   *in the Tropics: An Integrative Overview of Species Interactions from Some of the Most*
437   *Species-Rich Habitats on Earth* (eds. Dáttilo, W. & Rico-Gray, V.). Springer International
438   Publishing, Cham, pp. 93–110.
439 Farber, O. & Kadmon, R. (2003). Assessment of alternative approaches for bioclimatic modeling with
440   special emphasis on the Mahalanobis distance. *Ecological Modelling*, 160, 115–130.
441 Fick, S.E. & Hijmans, R.J. (2017). WorldClim 2: new 1-km spatial resolution climate surfaces for
442   global land areas. *International Journal of Climatology*, 37, 4302–4315.
443 Fleming, T.H. & John Kress, W. (2011). A brief history of fruits and frugivores. *Acta Oecologica*,
444   Frugivores and Seed Dispersal: Mechanisms and Consequences of a Key Interaction for
445   Biodiversity, 37, 521–530.
446 Friedemann, P., Côrtes, M.C., de Castro, E.R., Galetti, M., Jordano, P. & Guimarães Jr, P.R. (2022).
447   The individual-based network structure of palm-seed dispersers is explained by a rainforest
448   gradient. *Oikos*, 2022.
449 Gaston, K.J. (2009). Geographic range limits: achieving synthesis. *Proceedings of the Royal Society*
450   *B: Biological Sciences*, 276, 1395–1406.
451 Gómez, J.M. & Perfectti, F. (2012). Fitness consequences of centrality in mutualistic individual-based
452   networks. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, 279, 1754–1760.
453 Guimarães Jr, P.R., Jordano, P. & Thompson, J.N. (2011). Evolution and coevolution in mutualistic
454   networks. *Ecology Letters*, 14, 877–885.

455 Guimarães, P.R., Pires, M.M., Jordano, P., Bascompte, J. & Thompson, J.N. (2017). Indirect effects
456   drive coevolution in mutualistic networks. *Nature*, 550, 511–514.
457 Hall, C.A.S., Stanford, J.A. & Hauer, F.R. (1992). The Distribution and Abundance of Organisms as a
458   Consequence of Energy Balances along Multiple Environmental Gradients. *Oikos*, 65, 377.
459 Hijmans, R., Bivand, R., Forner, K., Ooms, J., Pebesma, E. & Sunner, M. (2022). Package 'terra.'
460 Hoffmann, A.A. & Blows, M.W. (1994). Species borders: ecological and evolutionary perspectives.
461   *Trends in Ecology & Evolution*, 9, 223–227.
462 Jiménez, L., Soberón, J., Christen, J.A. & Soto, D. (2019). On the problem of modeling a fundamental
463   niche from occurrence data. *Ecological Modelling*, 397, 74–83.
464 Kissling, W.D., Sekercioglu, C.H. & Jetz, W. (2012). Bird dietary guild richness across latitudes,
465   environments and biogeographic regions. *Global Ecology and Biogeography*, 21, 328–340.
466 Krishna, A., Guimarães Jr, P.R., Jordano, P. & Bascompte, J. (2008). A neutral-niche theory of
467   nestedness in mutualistic networks. *Oikos*, 117, 1609–1618.
468 Laurindo, R. de S., Vizentin-Bugoni, J., Tavares, D.C., Mancini, M.C.S., Mello, R. de M. & Gregorin,
469   R. (2020). Drivers of bat roles in Neotropical seed dispersal networks: abundance is more
470   important than functional traits. *Oecologia*, 193, 189–198.
471 Lira-Noriega, A. & Manthey, J.D. (2014). Relationship of Genetic Diversity and Niche Centrality: A
472   Survey and Analysis. *Evolution*, 68, 1082–1093.
473 de M. Santos, G.M., Aguiar, C.M.L., Genini, J., Martins, C.F., Zanella, F.C.V. & Mello, M.A.R.
474   (2012). Invasive Africanized honeybees change the structure of native pollination networks in
475   Brazil. *Biol Invasions*, 14, 2369–2378.
476 MacArthur, R. (1960). On the Relative Abundance of Species. *The American Naturalist*, 94, 25–36.
477 Maguire, Bassett. (1973). Niche Response Structure and the Analytical Potentials of Its Relationship
478   to the Habitat. *The American Naturalist*, 107, 213–246.
479 Maia, K.P., Rasmussen, C., Olesen, J.M. & Guimarães, P.R. (2019). Does the sociality of pollinators
480   shape the organisation of pollination networks? *Oikos*, 128, 741–752.
481 Martín González, A.M., Dalsgaard, B. & Olesen, J.M. (2010). Centrality measures and the importance
482   of generalist species in pollination networks. *Ecological Complexity*, 7, 36–43.
483 Martínez-Meyer, E., Díaz-Porras, D., Peterson, A.T. & Yáñez-Arenas, C. (2013). Ecological niche
484   structure and rangewide abundance patterns of species. *Biol. Lett.*, 9, 20120637.
485 Martins, L.P., Stouffer, D.B., Blendinger, P.G., Böhning-Gaese, K., Buitrón-Jurado, G., Correia, M.,
486   *et al.* (2022). Global and regional ecological boundaries explain abrupt spatial discontinuities
487   in avian frugivory interactions. *Nat Commun*, 13, 1–13.
488 Medeiros, L.P., Garcia, G., Thompson, J.N. & Guimarães, P.R. (2018). The geographic mosaic of
489   coevolution in mutualistic networks. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 115,
490   12017–12022.
491 Mello, M.A.R., Rodrigues, F.A., Costa, L. da F., Kissling, W.D., Şekercioğlu, Ç.H., Marquitti,
492   F.M.D., *et al.* (2015). Keystone species in seed dispersal networks are mainly determined by
493   dietary specialization. *Oikos*, 124, 1031–1039.
494 Moulatlet, G., Dáttilo, W. & Villalobos, F. (2022). Species-level drivers of avian centrality within
495   seed-dispersal networks across different levels of organization.
496 Moulatlet, G.M., Dáttilo, W. & Villalobos, F. (2023). Species-level drivers of avian centrality within
497   seed-dispersal networks across different levels of organisation. *Journal of Animal Ecology*,
498   n/a.
499 Mouquet, N., Gravel, D., Massol, F. & Calcagno, V. (2013). Extending the concept of keystone
500   species to communities and ecosystems. *Ecology Letters*, 16, 1–8.
501 Nuñez-Penichet, C., Cobos, M.E. & Soberon, J. (2021). Non-overlapping climatic niches and
502   biogeographic barriers explain disjunct distributions of continental Urania moths. *Frontiers of
503   Biogeography*, 13.
504 Palmer, T.M., Stanton, M.L. & Young, T.P. (2003). Competition and Coexistence: Exploring
505   Mechanisms That Restrict and Maintain Diversity within Mutualist Guilds. *The American
506   Naturalist*, 162, S63–S79.
507 Pedraza, F. & Bascompte, J. (2021). The joint role of coevolutionary selection and network structure
508   in shaping trait matching in mutualisms. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological
509   Sciences*, 288, 20211291.

Perea, R., Delibes, M., Polko, M., Suárez-Esteban, A. & Fedriani, J.M. (2013). Context-dependent fruit–frugivore interactions: partner identities and spatio-temporal variations. *Oikos*, 122, 943–951.

Perez-Navarro, M.A., Broennimann, O., Esteve, M.A., Bagaria, G., Guisan, A. & Lloret, F. (2022). Comparing climatic suitability and niche distances to explain populations responses to extreme climatic events. *Ecography*, 2022, e06263.

Pigot, A.L., Trisos, C.H. & Tobias, J.A. (2016). Functional traits reveal the expansion and packing of ecological niche space underlying an elevational diversity gradient in passerine birds. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, 283, 20152013.

Pironon, S., Papuga, G., Villellas, J., Angert, A.L., García, M.B. & Thompson, J.D. (2017). Geographic variation in genetic and demographic performance: new insights from an old biogeographical paradigm. *Biological Reviews*, 92, 1877–1909.

Pironon, S., Villellas, J., Morris, W.F., Doak, D.F. & García, M.B. (2015). Do geographic, climatic or historical ranges differentiate the performance of central versus peripheral populations? *Global Ecology and Biogeography*, 24, 611–620.

Pizo, M.A., Fontanella, A.B., Carlo, T.A. & González-Castro, A. (2022). Abundance predominates over niche factors as determinant of the frequency of interactions between frugivorous birds and plants. *Biotropica*, 54, 627–634.

Sagarin, R.D. & Gaines, S.D. (2002). The 'abundant centre' distribution: to what extent is it a biogeographical rule? *Ecology Letters*, 5, 137–147.

Sánchez-Barradas, A., Dáttilo, W., Santiago-Alarcon, D., Kissling, W.D. & Villalobos, F. (2023). Combining Geographic Distribution and Trait Information to Infer Predator–Prey Species-Level Interaction Properties. *Diversity*, 15, 61.

Santini, L., Pironon, S., Maiorano, L. & Thuiller, W. (2019). Addressing common pitfalls does not provide more support to geographical and ecological abundant-centre hypotheses. *Ecography*, 42, 696–705.

Schleuning, M., Fründ, J. & García, D. (2015). Predicting ecosystem functions from biodiversity and mutualistic networks: an extension of trait-based concepts to plant–animal interactions. *Ecography*, 38, 380–392.

Schleuning, M., Fründ, J., Klein, A.-M., Abrahamczyk, S., Alarcón, R., Albrecht, M., *et al.* (2012). Specialization of Mutualistic Interaction Networks Decreases toward Tropical Latitudes. *Current Biology*, 22, 1925–1931.

Soberón, J. (2007). Grinnellian and Eltonian niches and geographic distributions of species. *Ecology Letters*, 10, 1115–1123.

Thompson, J.N. (2005). *The Geographic Mosaic of Coevolution*. *The Geographic Mosaic of Coevolution*. University of Chicago Press.

Thompson, J.N. (2009). The Coevolving Web of Life. *The American Naturalist*, 173, 125–140.

Tobias, J.A., Sheard, C., Pigot, A.L., Devenish, A.J.M., Yang, J., Sayol, F., *et al.* (2022). AVONET: morphological, ecological and geographical data for all birds. *Ecology Letters*, 25, 581–597.

Trøjelsgaard, K. & Olesen, J.M. (2013). Macroecology of pollination networks. *Global Ecology and Biogeography*, 22, 149–162.

VanDerWal, J., Shoo, L.P., Johnson, C.N. & Williams, S.E. (2009). Abundance and the Environmental Niche: Environmental Suitability Estimated from Niche Models Predicts the Upper Limit of Local Abundance. *The American Naturalist*, 174, 282–291.

Vázquez, D.P., Melián, C.J., Williams, N.M., Blüthgen, N., Krasnov, B.R. & Poulin, R. (2007). Species abundance and asymmetric interaction strength in ecological networks. *Oikos*, 116, 1120–1127.

Villalobos, F. & Arita, H.T. (2010). The diversity field of New World leaf-nosed bats (Phyllostomidae): Diversity field of Phyllostomidae. *Global Ecology and Biogeography*, 19, 200–211.

Weber, M.M., Stevens, R.D., Diniz-Filho, J.A.F. & Grelle, C.E.V. (2017). Is there a correlation between abundance and environmental suitability derived from ecological niche modelling? A meta-analysis. *Ecography*, 40, 817–828.

563   Windsor, F.M., van den Hoogen, J., Crowther, T.W. & Evans, D.M. (2022). Using ecological
564   networks to answer questions in global biogeography and ecology. *Journal of Biogeography*,
565   jbi.14447.

566

567

Table

Table 1. Schematic representation of the conceptual hypothesis tested in this study with the respective references. The variables competition (C), resources (R) and the distance to the climatic niche centre (N) were used to explain the centrality of a focal species in multiple regression models. Depending on the direction and slope of the relationship between centrality and the variables (positive or negative [regular lines]), species could be classified into four hypothetical scenarios (a, b, c, and d).

| Hypothesis	Scenarios	Graphical representation	References
Centrality is higher at the centre of the niche space	a) No effects of resources and competition		(Brown 1984; Martínez-Meyer *et al.* 2013; Pironon *et al.* 2017)
	b) Opposite effect/direction of resources and competition		(Case & Taper 2000; Hall *et al.* 1992; MacArthur 1960)
	c) Same effect/direction of resources and competition		(Guimarães Jr *et al.* 2011)
Centrality is higher at the border of the niche space	d) Resources and/or competition drives species away from the niche optima		This study

20

Figure captions

579 Figure 1. Relation between the standardized beta coefficients from regression models between resources

580 and niche position (a), and between competition and niche position (b), as obtained for each focal

581 species.

582 Figure 2. Standardized beta coefficients for each focal species as obtained from multiple regression

583 models. For each species, the standardized beta coefficients can be positive or negative, and the

584 magnitude of the value in relation to zero (dashed line) indicates the effect size. Standardized beta

585 coefficients are shown for the variables niche position (a), competition (b) and resources (c) in relation

586 to the mean centrality values in all the networks the species participated. Generalized additive models

587 were adjusted for the relationship between mean centrality values and each of the variables.

588 Figure 3. Mean centrality values as represented by a) the distribution of the mean centrality values of

589 each focal species in the hypothetical scenarios a, b, c and d explained in Figure 1 plus the scenario

590 where there was no significant relation between a focal species centrality and the distance to the niche

591 centre (No niche effect); and b) the count of 157 species initially selected (grey bars) and the 90 species

592 that were significantly related to the tested variables (red bars).

593

594   Fig. 1

a) R^2=0.03, p=0.83

b) R^2=0.13, p<0.05

595

596

a) $R^2=0.22$, $p<0.05$

b) $R^2=0.09$, $p=0.06$

c) $R^2=0.01$, $p=0.57$

599   Fig 3.

600