Explaining the primate extinction crisis: predictors of extinction risk and active threats

Maria J.A. Creighton[a] & Charles L. Nunn[bc]

[a]Department of Biology, Duke University, Durham, North Carolina, USA

[b]Department of Evolutionary Anthropology, Duke University, Durham, North Carolina, USA

[c]Global Health Institute, Duke University, Durham, North Carolina, USA

*Author for correspondence: maria.creighton@duke.edu; Department of Biology, Duke University, 130 Science Drive, Durham, NC 27708, USA; ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1337-1946

DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST: None

ABSTRACT:

Explaining why some species are disproportionately impacted by the extinction crisis is of critical importance for conservation biology as a science and for proactively protecting species that are likely to become threatened in the future. Using the most current data on threat status, population trends, and threat types for 446 primate species, we advance previous research on the determinants of extinction risk by including a wider array of phenotypic traits as predictors, filling gaps in these trait data using multiple imputation, and considering more explicitly the mechanisms that connect organismal traits to extinction risk. Our Bayesian phylogenetically controlled analyses reveal that larger-bodied and insular species exhibit higher threat status, while those that are more omnivorous and live in larger groups have lower threat status. The same traits are not linked to risk when repeating our analyses with older IUCN data, suggesting that the traits that influence species risk are changing as anthropogenic effects continue to transform natural landscapes. We also show that larger-bodied and arboreal species are more susceptible to key threats responsible for primate population declines. Collectively, these results provide new insights to the determinants of primate extinction and identify the mechanisms (i.e., threats) that link traits to risk.

INTRODUCTION:

Anthropogenic activity is causing species to disappear at an alarming rate. However, not all species are affected equally: some species show no changes in abundance while others are increasing in abundance as human activity increases. Explaining why some species are more susceptible to extinction than others has become a major goal of conservation biologists as these contributions help to both explain current extinction patterns and allow for proactive protection of species possessing traits that could increase their probability of becoming imperiled. Previous studies have shown that phenotypic traits affect a species' susceptibility to extinction (Chichorro et al., 2019). Physical traits such as large body size and life history traits such as long generation lengths have been associated with increased risk of extinction (Purvis et al., 2000; Cardillo & Bromham, 2001; Cardillo et al., 2005; Lee & Jetz, 2011; Matthews et al., 2011). Behavioral traits have also been linked to increased extinction risk, including small group size and reduced innovativeness (Davidson et al., 2009; 2012; Ducatez et al., 2020).

While much effort has been put toward identifying how different traits covary with extinction risk, important knowledge gaps have limited the effectiveness of these analyses. First,

32   only a handful of studies have incorporated a broad range of traits in a single analysis. Chichorro

33   et al. (2019) reviewed studies investigating the correlates of extinction risk and found significant

34   variability in the traits that were investigated (or controlled for). In addition, some traits have only

35   recently been linked to extinction risk, such as behavioral flexibility (Ducatez et al., 2020), and

36   thus have not been widely investigated across clades.

37   Second, the relationship between the actual anthropogenic drivers of environmental change

38   that are responsible for extinction and species traits are understudied in many clades (e.g., in

39   primates; Estrada et al., 2017), limiting the impact of these comparative studies in applied

40   conservation (Cardillo & Meijaard, 2012). Identifying which threats are most impactful to species

41   with different trait types would enable actionable conservation steps. This could include mitigating

42   key threats in susceptible species' ranges and identifying which species are most likely to be

43   vulnerable to certain types of environmental change in the future. Despite this possible benefit of

44   considering specific threats, previous studies have been mostly limited to linking traits and species'

45   threat status, although a few exceptions have incorporated consideration of threats into these

46   analyses (e.g., Purvis et al., 2005; González-Suárez et al., 2013; Murray et al., 2014).

47   Lastly, we lack information on relevant traits for many species, resulting in incomplete

48   data. The species for which we lack data may be systematically biased towards those that are more

49   difficult to study, such as arboreal or nocturnal species. In addition to reducing statistical power,

50   removing these species from analyses has potential to bias observed relationships between

51   variables (Nakagawa & Freckleton, 2008) and can result in a loss of real information when some

52   traits included in an analysis have better data coverage than others.

53   Primates have been especially important in studies assessing predictors of extinction risk

54   (Purvis et al., 2000; Purvis et al., 2005; Matthews et al., 2011; Machado et al., 2022). Primates are

55   one of the most threatened animal clades, with ~65% of species at risk of extinction (IUCN, 2021).

56   The number of threatened primate species is on the rise (up ~5% in approximately 5 years), yet

57   the last comprehensive assessment of the major determinants of primate extinction risk was

58   published over 20 years ago (Purvis et al., 2000). The number of recognized primate species has

59   changed dramatically since earlier studies, having more than doubled from 180 to over 500 in the

60   past few decades (Rylands & Mittermeier, 2014; Creighton et al. 2022). As a result of these

61   taxonomic changes and limitations of older phylogenies, older studies focused on a relatively small

62   number of currently recognized primate species. More speciose and up-to-date phylogenies have

63   recently become available (Upham et al., 2019) in addition to a greater quantity and quality of trait

64   data for many species. These contributions create an opportunity for the inclusion of more

65   described primate species in comparative analyses, bringing us closer to capturing the true scope

66   of primate diversity. Primates are crucial components of tropical biodiversity, core players in the

67   function of ecosystems, and central to many cultures and religions (Estrada et al., 2017). It is thus

68   an urgent goal to determine which biological and behavioral traits contribute to primate extinction

69   vulnerability and how these traits interact with anthropogenic impacts to contribute to population

70   declines.

71   Here, we analyze the biological and behavioral determinants of primate extinction risk

72   using a phylogenetic comparative approach. We investigate the relationship between multiple

73   phenotypic traits and two measures of extinction risk reported by the International Union for

74   Conservation of Nature (IUCN): threat status and population trend. We then assess how these same

75   traits covary with vulnerability to the major threats facing primate species. This research addresses

76   the gaps above by including multiple traits in the analysis and using imputation approaches based

77   on phylogeny and phenotypic traits to fill in data for species with missing trait values. In addition,

78   by investigating population trends and specific threats, we improve understanding of the

79   connections between specific traits and the abundance of primates.

80   We focus on 10 key traits with proposed links to extinction risk (Table 1).

81

82   Table 1: The predicted direction of effect of biological and behavioral traits on extinction risk.

Trait:	Expected risk high when:	Reason:
Body mass (g)	Large body	Animals with large bodies have slow life histories and have been previously shown to be at increased extinction risk (Cardillo & Bromham, 2001; Cardillo et al., 2005).
Generation length (yrs)	Long generations	Slow life histories mean fewer generations to adapt to environmental changes (Purvis et al., 2000).
Home range size (ha)	Large home range size	Species that have individuals that maintain large home ranges are particularly vulnerable to habitat

		loss, degradation, and edge effects (Woodroffe & Ginsberg, 1998; Purvis et al., 2000).
Group size	Small group size	Small group size has been associated with heightened extinction risk, perhaps because large groups reduce predation and enhance foraging (Davidson et al., 2009; 2012).
Brain volume (cm^3)	Small brain volume	Large relative brain size is a proxy of general intelligence and behavioral flexibility (Reader et al., 2011; Navarrete et al., 2016), which have been associated with reduced extinction risk in birds (Ducatez et al., 2020).
Omnivory (true or false)	False	Animals with a large dietary breadth can rely on a wider range of food types when resources become limited (Boyles & Storm, 2007).
Social system	Polygynandry	Species characterized by complex social organization are hypothesized to have larger critical population sizes (i.e., more individuals must persist to maintain what is considered to be a healthy population) and may therefore go extinct more quickly than species in simpler social systems (Höglund, 1996).
Lifestyle	Arboreal	Strictly arboreal species are disproportionately affected from losing habitat via deforestation (Munstermann et al., 2022).
Insularity (true or false)	True	Island ecosystems are particularly vulnerable to anthropogenic change due to small population sizes, low habitat availability, and low functional redundancy (Biber, 2002; Blackburn et al., 2004; Leclerc et al., 2018).
Nocturnal (true or false)	Diurnal	Diurnal species are more likely to be disturbed by human activity (e.g., traffic) and diurnal activity

has been connected to extinction risk (Purvis et al., 2000).

83

84 **METHODS:**

85 DATA:

86 We collected information on threat status (least concern = LC, near threatened = NT, vulnerable =

87 VU, endangered = EN, critically endangered = CR, data deficient = DD, and not evaluated = NE)

88 and population trend (increasing = I, stable = S, decreasing = D, and unknown = U), from the

89 IUCN (2021) for 446 primate species present in the ultrametric primate phylogeny published by

90 Upham et al. (2019) (Figure 1). We also collected a list of active threat types affecting each species

91 in the IUCN (2021) as defined by the Salafsky et al. (2008) threat classification system: 1 =

92 residential and commercial development, 2 = agriculture and aquaculture, 3 = energy production

93 and mining, 4 = transportation and service corridors, 5 = biological resource use, 6 = human

94 intrusions and disturbance, 7 = natural system modifications, 8 = invasive and other problematic

95 species and genes, 9 = pollution, 10 = geological events, and 11 = climate change and severe

96 weather.

97

Figure 1: Phylogenetic distribution of threat status and population trends (IUCN, 2021) for 446 primate species in the Upham et al. (2019) phylogeny. Images of representative species are presented next to family labels. Codes for threat status: data deficient = DD, not evaluated = NE, least concern = LC, near threatened = NT, vulnerable = VU, endangered = EN, and critically endangered = CR. Codes for population trend: unknown = U, increasing = I, stable = S, and decreasing = D (IUCN, 2021).

For each of the 446 species in our dataset, we recorded data on 10 different biological and behavioral traits that have been proposed to be associated with extinction risk from various sources: body mass (g) (Galán-Acedo et al., 2019), generation length (yrs) (IUCN, 2021), home range size (ha) (Galán-Acedo et al., 2019), group size (Rowe & Myers, 2011), brain volume (Powell et al., 2017), omnivory (true or false), social system (solitary, pair-living, harem polygyny and polygynandry) (DeCasien et al., 2017; Rowe & Myers, 2011 and other sources), lifestyle

7

112   (arboreal, terrestrial, or both) (Rowe & Myers, 2011 and other sources), insular (true or false)

113   (inferred from range data available in Rowe & Myers, 2011; IUCN, 2021), and nocturnal (true or

114   false) (Estrada et al 2017; IUCN, 2021). The full list of references for trait values is available in

115   the Supplementary Data. Table 1 summarizes how we expected each trait to be associated with

116   primate extinction risk. Previous studies have included geographic range size as a covariate in

117   similar analyses (e.g., Purvis et al., 2000; Machado et al., 2022). However, a species' geographic

118   range size is one of the main criteria used by the IUCN to assign threat status: species with small

119   population sizes that have small or restricted geographic ranges are considered to be more

120   imperiled (IUCN, 2021) (i.e., threatened species have small geographic ranges by definition).

121   Because we were interested in how biological and behavioral trait contribute to extinction risk,

122   including effects on what geographic ranges they are able to occupy, we did not include geographic

123   range size in our analysis. Notably, by including insularity in our analysis we controlled for the

124   fact that species on small islands may not be able to maintain geographic ranges large enough to

125   be considered healthy by the IUCN due to geographic barriers.

126   Following Powell et al. (2017), for sexually dimorphic clades (size difference > 10%) only

127   brain volume and body mass data from adult females were used in analysis. For all other species,

128   averages for all adults measured in the original source were used. Species found exclusively on

129   Madagascar, Borneo, or Sumatra were not scored as insular since these islands are large enough

130   to support large geographic ranges comparable to many mainland species. Further details on

131   operational definitions and trait coding are provided in the Supplementary Materials, along with a

132   correlation matrix of all traits and response variables (Figure S1), and a comparison of trait data

133   from different sources (Figures S2, S3, and S4).

134

135   ANALYSIS:

136   *Trait imputation*

137   The availability of data varied across the species in our dataset. Percentages of species with missing

138   trait data were: body mass (6%), omnivory (17%), generation length (23%), home range size

139   (25%), group size (39%), and brain volume (46%). Restricting the analysis to only species with

140   observed data on all traits reduced our sample size of species by over half (e.g., to from n=430 to

141   n=151 in our analysis of threat status). We thus opted to use multiple imputation to avoid losing

142   species from our analysis where one or more traits had missing observations. The main advantage

143   of imputation is that it avoids a loss of statistical power caused by reduced sample sizes due to

144   missing trait data and that it reduces potential biases in parameter estimates caused by eliminating

145   missing observations (see Nakagawa & Freckleton, 2008). For instance, if missing observations

146   are not missing completely at random, the relationship between two variables could change when

147   they are excluded from analysis (Nakagawa & Freckleton, 2008). In analyses with more than one

148   independent variable imputation also prevents the loss of real information if some variables have

149   better data coverage than others. For example, if an analysis has one independent variable with

150   100% data coverage and a second independent variable with only 80% data coverage, imputation

151   will allow all observations for the first trait to be kept in the analysis by substituting the 20% of

152   missing values for the second variable.

153   Multiple imputation was accomplished using phylogenetic information and data for other

154   traits. We started with phylogenetic multiple imputation using 100 randomly sampled trees

155   available from Upham et al. (2019). The imputation of traits was ordered so that imputed

156   information could be used to inform subsequent model fits along with phylogenetic information

157   (e.g., once body mass was imputed it was used to inform model fits for the imputation of other

158   variables). From each tree, we generated a variance-covariance matrix which we then dissolved

159   into 445 eigenvectors using the 'PVRdecomp' function from the R package PVR (Santos et al.,

160   2018). Using forward-backward model selection, we determined which phylogenetic eigenvectors

161   and traits had the best support for inclusion in models predicting each trait with missing data based

162   on Akaike information criterion (AICc) scores using the 'stepAIC' function from the MASS R

163   package (Ripley et al., 2013). We chose how many eigenvectors to include in model selection for

164   the imputation based on model performance in cross validation (Table S1). The top model for each

165   trait was used to impute values for each species missing data using the 'predict' function from the

166   car package in R (Fox et al., 2012). To propagate error, we then used the fits and standard

167   deviations associated with predicted values to take a randomly sampled trait value for each species

168   from the normal or binomial distribution (depending on whether traits were continuous or binary).

169   This imputation process was repeated once for each tree, resulting in 100 imputed datasets.

170   We performed a leave-one-out cross-validation of each imputation, where we removed observed

171   datapoints and used our imputation method to predict their value. When comparing these

172   predictions to the actual observed datapoints performance proved to be good in all cases (predictive

173   accuracy > 0.8 for continuous variables and area under the ROC curve > 0.8 for binary variables;

174   see Table S1).

175

176   *Modelling threat status, population trends, and threat types*

177   We ran multiple models to test predictors of three types of outcomes for primate populations. First,

178   we tested which biological and behavioral traits are associated with the threat status of a species.

179   Second, we tested the effects of species' behavioral and biological traits on population trends (i.e.,

180   population growth or decline). Third, we tested which traits were associated with species

181   susceptibility to the most important threats that primate species face.

182   To determine which biological and behavioral traits are associated with threat status, we

183   ran two phylogenetic generalized linear mixed models using Bayesian approximation as

184   implemented in the MCMCglmm R package (Hadfield, 2010). The first model had an ordinal error

185   structure, and the response variable was an ordinal measure of threat status scored as follows:

186   LC=0, NT=1, VU=2, EN=3, and CR=4 (Butchart et al., 2007). We ran the second model with a

187   threshold error structure; here the response variable was threat status scored as a binary outcome

188   where species were scored as either being threatened (VU, EN, or CR) (scored as 1) or not

189   threatened (NT or LC) (scored as 0).

190   To test the effects of traits on population trends we ran a third phylogenetic generalized

191   linear mixed model with a threshold error structure (Hadfield, 2010). In this model, each species

192   was assigned a binary outcome of either declining (scored as 1) or not declining (i.e., stable or

193   increasing) (scored as 0).

194   Finally, to determine which biological and behavioral traits were associated with species'

195   susceptibility to the most important threats that primate species face, we ran five phylogenetic

196   generalized linear mixed models with threshold error structures (Hadfield, 2010), one for each of

197   the top five threats to primates identified by the IUCN (2021). These top five threats identified for

198   primate species were: 1 = residential and commercial development (35% of species), 2 =

199   agriculture and aquaculture (80%), 3 = energy production and mining (22%), 5 = biological

200   resource use (82%), and 7 = natural system modifications (23%). Here, each of our five models

201   had a binary outcome of 1 (indicating that a species was affected by a particular threat) or 0

202   (indicating that a species was not affected by the threat).

203   Each model described above was run on 100 imputed datasets and phylogenies to account

204   for uncertainty in phylogeny and trait estimates (Nakagawa & De Villemereuil, 2019). Models ran

205   a total of 550,001 iterations, with a thinning interval of 500 and a burn-in of 50,000 to ensure

206   convergence had occurred. We confirmed convergence had occurred by assessing trace plots after

207   analyses finished running (Hadfield, 2010). Species were dropped from analyses when the true

208   value of a response variable was unknown by the IUCN (2021) (e.g., if the threat status was DD

209   or NE). Traits were included as fixed effects and continuous variables were ln-transformed,

210   centered with respect to the mean, and scaled by 2 standard deviations in all models to make their

211   effect sizes comparable to those reported for binary variables (Gelman, 2008). We used a weakly

212   informative gelman prior for fixed effects.

213   We also tested the hypothesis that some traits previously shown to be associated with

214   primate extinction risk are losing signal as more species become imperiled, for example, if

215   anthropogenic threats are becoming so overwhelming that all species are beginning to suffer

216   regardless of their attributes. This analysis involved repeating our analyses of threat status using

217   an older IUCN threat status data and species list (obtained from Harcourt & Parks, 2003).

218   To interpret the output from our Bayesian analyses, we provide (i) the distribution of

219   posterior means for tests from all 100 imputed datasets in graphical form (Figures 2 and 3), (ii) the

220   89% credible intervals (per McElreath, 2018) from the full posterior distribution of estimates in

221   graphical form (Figures 2 and 3), and (iii) the percentage of iterations from each set of 100 models

222   that were consistently positive or negative (Tables S2 to S13). We focused on results that were

223   most supported based on these outcomes. For the purposes of providing an estimate of the

224   magnitude of an effect in the main text, posterior means were pooled across datasets using Rubin's

225   rules (Nakagawa & De Villemereuil, 2019) (hereafter, "pooled posterior mean").

226

227   **RESULTS:**

228   *Predictors of threat status and population trends*

229   When scored as an ordinal outcome (LC=0, NT=1, VU=2, EN=3, and CR=4), threat status was

230   positively associated with insularity (pooled posterior mean = 1.217; 100% of 100,100 posterior

231   estimates > 0) and, albeit not as strongly, with body mass (pooled posterior mean = 0.995; 94%

232   estimates > 0) (Figure 2; Tables S2) across 430 species with known threat statuses. Ordinal threat

233   status was negatively associated with omnivory (pooled posterior mean = -0.475; 95% estimates

234   < 0) and group size (pooled posterior mean = -0.601; 95% estimates < 0) (Figure 2; Table S2). In

235   our analysis using older IUCN data, we found that only insularity (pooled posterior mean = 2.255;

236   100% estimates > 0) and home range size (pooled posterior mean = 1.532; 100% estimates > 0)

237   were associated with threat status (ordinal) in the predicted direction (Table S3).

238   Threat status was not strongly associated with any biological or behavioral traits when

239   scored as a binary response (Figure 2; Table S4). We repeated this analysis removing imputed

240   datapoints to see if their inclusion affected the lack of strong associations. We also ran three

241   separate models with body mass, generation length, and brain volume as sole predictors to

242   determine if correlations among these predictors (see Figure S1) in the full models affected the

243   results. Results from these additional analyses again consistently showed no strong effect of any

244   traits (Tables S5 and S6). In our analysis using older IUCN data, we found that insularity (pooled

245   posterior mean = 2.565; 100% estimates > 0) and home range size (pooled posterior mean = 1.116;

246   99% estimates > 0) were associated with threat status (binary) in the predicted direction (Table

247   S7). Population trend was not consistently associated with any biological or behavioral traits across

248   401 species with known population trends (Figure 2; Table S8).

249

250   <u>Figure 2:</u> Outcomes from three sets of models testing the relationship between traits and: threat

251   status scored as an ordinal variable (first panel), threat status scored as a binary variable (second

252   panel), and population trend scored as a binary variable (third panel). Each cell contains 100

253   posterior means (plotted as translucent diamonds) with their associated 89% credible intervals

12

254   (plotted as translucent horizontal lines) obtained from 100 MCMCglmm models run with 100

255   randomly sampled phylogenies across 100 trait datasets with missing datapoints obtained through

256   multiple imputation. Darker shading behind effects interpreted in text. Continuous variables were

257   ln-transformed, centered with respect to the mean, and scaled by 2 standard deviations.

258

259   *Predictors of specific threat types*

260   Our analyses of threat types included 404 species with known threats (Tables S9 to S13). Species

261   with larger body masses were more likely to be affected by threat 1 = residential and commercial

262   development (pooled posterior mean = 1.001; 96% estimates > 0; Table S9) and threat 3 = energy

263   production and mining (pooled posterior mean = 1.267; 99% estimates > 0; Table S11) (Figure 3).

264   Insularity was negatively associated with threat 1 = residential and commercial development

265   (pooled posterior mean = -0.755; 98% estimates < 0; Table S9), threat 3 = energy production and

266   mining (pooled posterior mean = -1.811; 100% estimates < 0; Table S11), and threat 7 = natural

267   system modifications (pooled posterior mean = -1.312; 100% estimates < 0; Table S13) (Figure

268   3). Species living a strictly arboreal lifestyle were more likely to be affected by threat 1 =

269   residential and commercial development than strictly terrestrial species (i.e., the baseline) (pooled

270   posterior mean = 1.023; 97% estimates > 0; Table S9) (Figure 3).

271

13

272   Figure 3: Outcomes from five sets of models testing the relationship between traits and species

273   susceptibility to: threat 1 = residential and commercial development (first panel), threat 2 =

274   agriculture and aquaculture (second panel), threat 3 = energy production and mining (third panel),

275   threat 5 = biological resource use (fourth panel), and threat 7 = natural system modifications (fifth

276   panel). Each cell contains 100 posterior means (plotted as translucent diamonds) with their

277   associated 89% credible intervals (plotted as translucent horizontal lines) obtained from 100

278   MCMCglmm models run with 100 randomly sampled phylogenies across 100 trait datasets with

279   missing datapoints obtained through multiple imputation. Darker shading behind effects

280   interpreted in text. Continuous variables were ln-transformed, centered with respect to the mean,

281   and scaled by 2 standard deviations.

282

283   **DISCUSSION:**

284   We investigated the correlates of extinction risk and threat susceptibility in primates using

285   phylogenetic comparative methods to analyze the most complete and up-to-date set of trait data

286   and IUCN data. One novelty of our approach involved the use of phylogenetic and trait-based

287   imputation of missing data. Our analyses revealed that larger-bodied and more insular species

288   exhibit higher threat status, while those that are more omnivorous or live in larger groups have

289   lower threat status. When looking at specific threats, we found that larger-bodied and arboreal

290   species are more vulnerable to key threats, while insular species are less vulnerable to these threats.

291   Our analyses with binary outcomes included threat status scored as threatened versus non-

292   threatened and population trend scored as declining versus not declining. These analyses revealed

293   that most traits are not strong predictors of whether a given primate species is considered

294   threatened (contrary to findings in other taxonomic groups, such as birds; Lee & Jetz, 2011). When

295   we scored threat status ordinally – with five ranked categories from least concern to critically

296   endangered – higher threat status was associated with insularity, large body mass, omnivory, and

297   small group size, consistent with our predictions for these traits. Therefore, primate species that

298   are most imperiled, and thus score highest in ordinal threat status, do tend to be those with

299   biological and behavioral predispositions to extinction.

300   We also considered how the effects of predictors changed over time. When applying the

301   same methods to analyze a 1999 IUCN dataset, we found that insularity and home range size

302   shared a positive relationship with both binary and ordinal threat status, but other traits were not

303   meaningfully associated with threat status. This pattern of results using newer versus older data

304   indicates that some traits (i.e., home range size) are becoming less important to extinction risk as

305   the effects of anthropogenic activity become increasingly overwhelming. The fact that traits

306   identified in our analysis of ordinal 2021 threat status (i.e., body mass, group size, and omnivory)

307   do not come out as strongly in our analysis with older data could indicate that these traits are

308   beginning to have a larger signal over time, or that the larger number of species in our 2021 dataset

309   (a consequence of taxonomic reevaluations in many clades; Creighton et al., 2022) enabled us to

310   more powerfully detect effects of these traits.

311   Previous studies have found an effect of variables not shown to explain meaningful

312   variation in our analysis. For example, Ducatez et al. (2020) investigated whether threat status

313   covaries with innovativeness, which is a known measure of behavioral flexibility associated with

314   general intelligence (Reader & Laland, 2002; Reader et al., 2011). We did not find an effect of

315   brain size, another known measure of behavioral flexibility and general intelligence (Reader et al.,

316   2011; Creighton et al. 2021), and correlate of innovativeness, in our analysis. The caveats

317   associated with each of these measures is discussed in Creighton et al. (2021), including the

318   difficultly of adequately controlling for literature effort when estimating innovativeness and the

319   small sample sizes used to estimate average brain sizes for many species. However, our difference

320   in results could point to the fact that different traits contribute to heightened extinction risk for

321   these two clades, and that the relationship between some traits and extinction risk may be far more

322   complicated than originally expected. Species with higher behavioral flexibility and general

323   intelligence may be less at risk of extinction because they are better equipped to find novel

324   solutions that allow them to overcome environmental challenges (Beever et al., 2017; Ducatez et

325   al., 2020). However, the relationship between behavioral flexibility and extinction may be more

326   complex, particularly in a clade like primates where innovations are frequent and human conflict

327   is common. Certain behavioral innovations can help species to avoid human conflict and endure

328   habitat modifications, such as novel approaches for accessing foods or shifting to new food

329   resources (Beever et al., 2017). However, other innovative behaviors can increase human-wildlife

330   conflict. In many primate species, crop-raiding and garbage eating have become common practice

331   and indicate their flexibility to survive in changing environments (e.g., chimpanzees and baboons;

332   Maples et al., 1976; Hahn et al., 2003; Hockings et al., 2009). These behaviors bring animals in

333   direct conflict with humans and, in some cases, attract them to lower quality habitats. Future

334 contributions should further address the paradox of how flexibility both helps and hinders survival,

335 and what this means for species' persistence.

336 In analyses assessing predictors of direct threats, we found that strictly arboreal species

337 were more likely to be threatened with residential and commercial development – a major driver

338 of deforestation in many regions. We also found that species with large body masses were more

339 likely to be affected by residential and commercial development and energy production and

340 mining. Thus, the tendency of larger bodied species to be severely threatened is likely influenced

341 by development and energy/mining activities. Finally, insular species were less likely to be

342 vulnerable to multiple threats (residential and commercial development, energy production and

343 mining, and natural system modifications) despite being more likely to be highly threatened. This

344 indicates that the high threat statuses of insular species may not be driven by anthropogenic

345 activity. Instead, their small geographic ranges enforced by geographic barriers could simply make

346 it impossible to maintain healthy population sizes, despite not being subject to major threats.

347 There are some limitations to our analyses. One issue involves correlated predictor

348 variables. Body mass, generation length, and brain volume were highly correlated in our dataset

349 (correlation coefficients range between 0.6 and 0.9). We included these predictors in the same

350 models to identify how they independently contributed to extinction risk and threat vulnerability

351 (Freckleton, 2002). However, this creates the possibility of collinearity in model estimates for

352 these variables. Increased uncertainty (i.e., wide credible intervals) around estimates for these three

353 traits indeed point to some collinearity among estimates. We therefore investigated the effects of

354 these variables individually in separate models, which yielded largely consistent results. Secondly,

355 like most previous studies, response variables in our analysis come from IUCN assessments. While

356 the IUCN maintains the largest global dataset on species extinction risk and threats useful for

357 comparative analyses, these measures are vulnerable to errors in empirical data and in models used

358 to estimate population declines and extinction risk (Rueda-Cediel et al., 2018). As a result, there

359 is likely to be uncaptured uncertainty associated with the measures of extinction risk used in our

360 analyses.

361 Information about how biological and behavioral traits contribute to species' susceptibility

362 to direct threats has been a persistent knowledge gap in the conservation literature, particularly for

363 primates (Estrada et al., 2017). We provide a first step in addressing this knowledge gap by linking

364 traits to key threats responsible for population declines. This approach has potential to be expanded

16

365 to other clades. Understanding the biological and behavioral predictors of threat susceptibility in

366 broader range of taxa could help groups like the IUCN to identify which threats pose the most

367 imminent harm to species with shared characteristics. There is also an opportunity to apply the

368 knowledge contributed here to projections about which species are next to become threatened: we

369 propose that factoring in traits and threat information could provide more powerful inference and

370 will lead to more proactive monitoring of species that face the greatest risks in the future. For

371 instance, strictly arboreal species living in regions with residential development may be expected

372 to decline at a faster rate than other species without these characteristics.

373   In summary, by taking advantage of statistical approaches for dealing with missing data

374 and Bayesian inference, we have shown that multiple traits contribute to primate threat status. Our

375 findings suggest that the effects of some traits, such as home range size, have weakened over the

376 past 20 years, indicating that the traits that influence a species' threat status are changing as

377 anthropogenic effects continue to transform natural landscapes. Other characteristics shown to

378 affect extinction risk in other clades, such as behavioral flexibility, do not appear to affect primate

379 extinction risk, suggesting that different processes likely govern extinction in different clades.

380 Focusing on mitigating key threats, as identified here, from susceptible species' geographic ranges

381 will be an important and necessary step for future recovery.

382

387

388 Data and code for this manuscript will be made available on publication through Zenodo.

389

390 **REFERENCES:**

391 Beever, E. A., Hall, L. E., Varner, J., Loosen, A. E., Dunham, J. B., Gahl, M. K., ... & Lawler, J.

392   J. (2017). Behavioral flexibility as a mechanism for coping with climate change. *Frontiers*

393   *in Ecology and the Environment,* 15, 299-308.

394 Biber, E. (2002). Patterns of endemic extinctions among island bird species. *Ecography*, 25, 661-

395   676.

17

396   Blackburn, T. M., Cassey, P., Duncan, R. P., Evans, K. L., & Gaston, K. J. (2004). Avian extinction
397   and mammalian introductions on oceanic islands. *Science*, 305, 1955-1958.

398   Boyles, J. G., & Storm, J. J. (2007). The perils of picky eating: dietary breadth is related to
399   extinction risk in insectivorous bats. *PLoS One*, 2, e672.

400   Butchart, S. H., Resit Akçakaya, H., Chanson, J., Baillie, J. E., Collen, B., Quader, S., ... & Hilton-
401   Taylor, C. (2007). Improvements to the red list index. *PloS One*, 2, e140.

402   Cardillo, M., & Bromham, L. (2001). Body size and risk of extinction in Australian mammals.
403   *Conservation Biology*, 15, 1435-1440.

404   Cardillo, M., Mace, G. M., Jones, K. E., Bielby, J., Bininda-Emonds, O. R., Sechrest, W., ... &
405   Purvis, A. (2005). Multiple causes of high extinction risk in large mammal species.
406   *Science*, 309, 1239-1241.

407   Cardillo, M., & Meijaard, E. (2012). Are comparative studies of extinction risk useful for
408   conservation? *Trends in Ecology & Evolution*, 27, 167-171.

409   Chichorro, F., Juslén, A., & Cardoso, P. (2019). A review of the relation between species traits
410   and extinction risk. *Biological Conservation*, 237, 220-229.

411   Creighton, M. J., Greenberg, D. A., Reader, S. M., & Mooers, A. Ø. (2021). The role of
412   behavioural flexibility in primate diversification. *Animal Behaviour*, 180, 269-290.

413   Creighton, M. J., Luo, A. Q., Reader, S. M., & Mooers, A. Ø. (2022). Predictors of taxonomic
414   inflation and its role in primate conservation. *Animal Conservation*.

415   Davidson, A. D., Boyer, A. G., Kim, H., Pompa-Mansilla, S., Hamilton, M. J., Costa, D. P., ... &
416   Brown, J. H. (2012). Drivers and hotspots of extinction risk in marine mammals.
417   *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 109, 3395-3400.

418   Davidson, A. D., Hamilton, M. J., Boyer, A. G., Brown, J. H., & Ceballos, G. (2009). Multiple
419   ecological pathways to extinction in mammals. *Proceedings of the National Academy of*
420   *Sciences*, 106, 10702-10705.

421   DeCasien, A. R., Williams, S. A., & Higham, J. P. (2017). Primate brain size is predicted by diet
422   but not sociality. *Nature Ecology & Evolution*, 1, 1-7.

423   Ducatez, S., Sol, D., Sayol, F., & Lefebvre, L. (2020). Behavioural plasticity is associated with
424   reduced extinction risk in birds. *Nature Ecology & Evolution*, 4, 788-793.

425   Estrada, A., Garber, P. A., Rylands, A. B., Roos, C., Fernandez-Duque, E., Di Fiore, A., ... & Li,
426   B. (2017). Impending extinction crisis of the world's primates: Why primates matter. *Science Advances*, 3, e1600946.

428   Fox, J., Weisberg, S., Adler, D., Bates, D., Baud-Bovy, G., Ellison, S., ... & Monette, G. (2012). Package 'car'. Retrieved from: https://cran.r-project.org/web/packages/car/index.html.

430   Freckleton, R. P. (2002). On the misuse of residuals in ecology: regression of residuals vs. multiple regression. *Journal of Animal Ecology*, 71, 542–545.

432   Galán-Acedo, C., Arroyo-Rodríguez, V., Andresen, E., & Arasa-Gisbert, R. (2019). Ecological traits of the world's primates. *Scientific Data*, 6, 1-5.

434   Gelman, A. (2008). Scaling regression inputs by dividing by two standard deviations. *Statistics in Medicine*, 27, 2865–2873.

436   González-Suárez, M., Gómez, A., & Revilla, E. (2013). Which intrinsic traits predict vulnerability to extinction depends on the actual threatening processes. *Ecosphere*, 4, 1-16.

438   Hadfield, J. D. (2010). MCMC methods for multi-response generalized linear mixed models: the MCMCglmm R package. *Journal of Statistical Software*. 33, 1–22.

440   Hahn, N. E., Proulx, D., Muruthi, P. M., Alberts, S., & Altmann, J. (2003). Gastrointestinal parasites in free-ranging Kenyan baboons (*Papio cynocephalus and P. anubis*). *International Journal of Primatology*, 24, 271-279.

443   Harcourt, A. H., & Parks, S. A. (2003). Threatened primates experience high human densities: adding an index of threat to the IUCN Red List criteria. *Biological Conservation*, 109, 137-149.

446   Hockings, K. J., Anderson, J. R., & Matsuzawa, T. (2009). Use of wild and cultivated foods by chimpanzees at Bossou, Republic of Guinea: feeding dynamics in a human-influenced environment. *American Journal of Primatology*, 71, 636-646.

449   Höglund, J. (1996). Can mating systems affect local extinction risks? Two examples of lek-breeding waders. *Oikos*, 77, 184-188.

451   IUCN. (2021). The IUCN Red List of Threatened Species Version 2021-1. IUCN Red List of Threatened Species. Retrieved from: https://www.iucnredlist.org/en.

453   Leclerc, C., Courchamp, F., & Bellard, C. (2018). Insular threat associations within taxa worldwide. *Scientific Reports*, 8, 1-8.

Lee, T. M., & Jetz, W. (2011). Unravelling the structure of species extinction risk for predictive conservation science. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, 278, 1329-1338.

Machado, F. F., Jardim, L., Dinnage, R., Brito, D., & Cardillo, M. (2022). Diet disparity and diversity predict extinction risk in primates. *Animal Conservation*.

Maples, W. R., Maples, M. K., Greenhood, W. F., & Walek, M. L. (1976). Adaptations of crop-raiding baboons in Kenya. *American Journal of Physical Anthropology*, 45, 309-315.

Matthews, L. J., Arnold, C., Machanda, Z., & Nunn, C. L. (2011). Primate extinction risk and historical patterns of speciation and extinction in relation to body mass. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, 278, 1256-1263.

McElreath, R. (2018). Statistical rethinking: A Bayesian course with examples in R and Stan. Chapman and Hall/CRC, New York.

Munstermann, M. J., Heim, N. A., McCauley, D. J., Payne, J. L., Upham, N. S., Wang, S. C., & Knope, M. L. (2022). A global ecological signal of extinction risk in terrestrial vertebrates. *Conservation Biology*, 36, e13852.

Murray, K. A., Verde Arregoitia, L. D., Davidson, A., Di Marco, M., & Di Fonzo, M. M. (2014). Threat to the point: improving the value of comparative extinction risk analysis for conservation action. *Global Change Biology*, 20, 483-494.

Nakagawa, S., & De Villemereuil, P. (2019). A general method for simultaneously accounting for phylogenetic and species sampling uncertainty via Rubin's rules in comparative analysis. *Systematic Biology*, 68, 632-641.

Nakagawa, S., & Freckleton, R. P. (2008). Missing inaction: the dangers of ignoring missing data. *Trends in Ecology & Evolution*, 23, 592-596.

Navarrete, A. F., Reader, S. M., Street, S. E., Whalen, A., & Laland, K. N. (2016). The coevolution of innovation and technical intelligence in primates. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, 371, 20150186.

Powell, L. E., Isler, K., & Barton, R. A. (2017). Re-evaluating the link between brain size and behavioural ecology in primates. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, 284, 20171765.

484   Purvis, A., Cardillo, M., Grenyer, R., & Collen, B. (2005). Correlates of extinction risk: phylogeny,
485   biology, threat and scale. In Purvis, A., Gittleman, J.L., & Brooks, T. (Eds.), *Phylogeny*
486   *and Conservation* (pp. 295-316). Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

487   Purvis, A., Gittleman, J. L., Cowlishaw, G., & Mace, G. M. (2000). Predicting extinction risk in
488   declining species. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, 267, 1947-
489   1952.

490   Reader, S. M., Hager, Y., & Laland, K. N. (2011). The evolution of primate general and cultural
491   intelligence. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, 366,
492   1017-1027.

493   Reader, S. M., & Laland, K. N. (2002). Social intelligence, innovation, and enhanced brain size in
494   primates. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 99, 4436-4441.

495   Ripley, B., Venables, B., Bates, D. M., Hornik, K., Gebhardt, A., Firth, D., & Ripley, M. B. (2013).
496   Package 'MASS'. CRAN Repository, See http://cran.r-
497   projectorg/web/packages/MASS/MASS.pdf.

498   Rowe, N., & Myers, M. (2011). *All the world's primates*. Primate Conservation, Inc. Retrieved
499   from: https://www.alltheworldsprimates.org.

500   Rueda-Cediel, P., Anderson, K. E., Regan, T. J., & Regan, H. M. (2018). Effects of uncertainty
501   and variability on population declines and IUCN Red List classifications. *Conservation*
502   *Biology*, 32, 916-925.

503   Rylands, A. B., & Mittermeier, R. A. (2014). Primate taxonomy: species and conservation.
504   *Evolutionary Anthropology*, 23, 8-10.

505   Salafsky, N., Salzer, D., Stattersfield, A. J., Hilton-Taylor, C. R. A. I. G., Neugarten, R., Butchart,
506   S. H., ... & Wilkie, D. (2008). A standard lexicon for biodiversity conservation: unified
507   classifications of threats and actions. *Conservation Biology*, 22, 897-911.

508   Santos, T., Diniz-Filho, J. A., e Luis, T. R., Bini, M., & Santos, M. T. (2018). Package 'PVR'.
509   Retrieved from: https://cran.r-project.org/web/packages/PVR/index.html.

510   Upham, N. S., Esselstyn, J. A., & Jetz, W. (2019). Inferring the mammal tree: Species-level sets
511   of phylogenies for questions in ecology, evolution, and conservation. *PLoS Biology*, 17, 1-
512   44.

513   Woodroffe, R., & Ginsberg, J. R. (1998). Edge effects and the extinction of populations inside
514   protected areas. *Science*, 280, 2126-2128.