Consistent covariation of dispersal, life history and thermal niches across terrestrial arthropods

Garben Logghe[1,2] (ORCID: 0000-0003-2000-7982)

Femke Batsleer[1] (ORCID: 0000-0001-5893-5966)

Guillermo Fandos[3] (ORCID: 0000-0003-1579-9444)

Dirk Maes[2,4] (ORCID: 0000-0002-7947-3788)

Dries Bonte[1] (ORCID: 0000-0002-3320-7505)*

1 Ghent University, Department of Biology, Karel Lodewijk Ledeganckstraat 35, 9000 Ghent, Belgium

2 Research Institute for Nature and Forest (INBO), Herman Teirlinckgebouw, Havenlaan 88 Bus 73, 1000 Brussels, Belgium

3 Department of Biodiversity, Ecology and Evolution, Facultad de Ciencias Biológicas, Complutense University of Madrid

4 Radboud Institute for Biological and Ecological Sciences (RIBES), Radboud University, PO Box 9010, Nijmegen NL-6500 GL, The Netherlands

***Corresponding author**: D. Bonte, Ghent University, Department of Biology, K. L. Ledeganckstraat 35, 9000 Ghent, Belgium. E-mail: dries.bonte@ugent.be

Key words: Arthropoda, syndromes, fast-slow continuum, dispersal, life-history, climate change

Type of article: Letter

Number of words

Abstract: 149

Main text (excluding abstract, acknowledgements, references, table and figure legends): 4043

Number of references: 86

Number of figures: 4

Number of Tables: 0

Statement of Authorship

Garben Logghe, Femke Batsleer, Dirk Maes and Dries Bonte conceived the framework of the study. Garben Logghe collected the trait data. Guillermo Fandos and Garben Logghe developed the statistical analysis. Garben Logghe wrote the first draft of the manuscript. All authors contributed substantially to interpretation of the results and revision of the manuscript.

Data accessibility statement

The complete dataset on arthropod life histories and ecological traits can be found on GBIF: https://doi.org/10.15468/75g5z9. The filtered dataset specific to this study can be accessed on Zenodo: 10.5281/zenodo.14527806.

Abstract

Arthropods, as ectotherms, are experiencing global declines, with many species facing the need to either acclimate or disperse in response to climate change. Understanding to which degree life history, dispersal and thermal niche traits covary is key to improve distribution forecasting under climate change. We quantified life history, dispersal and thermal range covariation among 4000 Western European arthropod species spanning eight orders, considering phylogenetic relationships to account for common ancestry. We demonstrate the existence of two independent axes of life history variation: the fast-slow continuum and the reproductive strategy axis. Species at the fast end of the continuum have higher dispersal capacities and broader thermal niches than slower species. The resulting syndromes were surprisingly consistent across orders. These trait combinations, which generally enhance range-shifting potential, point to the emergence of two distinct groups of arthropods: those well-suited and those less equipped to mitigate the effects of future climate change.

Introduction

Climate change is an escalating global problem, threatening numerous species across various taxonomic groups (Bellard *et al.* 2012; Habibullah *et al.* 2022; Maxwell *et al.* 2019). Species may cope with changing climatic conditions by acclimatisation and/or adaptation to the experienced novel conditions, or by tracking their climate window through dispersal (MacLean & Beissinger 2017). The pace at which species expand or shift their distribution will critically depend on their life histories—such as survival, reproduction and development—that determine population growth rate and overall demography. Furthermore, this rate of range shifts will be shaped by their dispersal capacity and ability to acclimate to novel conditions (MacLean & Beissinger 2017). Forecasting biodiversity under climate change (Settele *et al.* 2014; Urban 2019), therefore, relies on our ability to incorporate accurate trait data into extinction risk projections (La Sorte & Jetz 2010; Thomas *et al.* 2004), thereby informing vulnerability assessments (Foden *et al.* 2013; Foden & Young 2016) and refining predictions of emerging community assemblages (Stralberg *et al.* 2009; Williams & Jackson 2007). For arthropods, such an approach seems to be most urgent since any detailed species-specific assessment will fail to provide the needed insights in light of their steep global decline (Wagner 2020), which potentially jeopardizes the crucial ecosystem services these organisms provide (Yang & Gratton 2014).

Species are expected to show intrinsic life history trade-offs, positioning them along a “slow-fast” continuum (Beukhof *et al.* 2019; Gaillard *et al.* 1989; Promislow & Harvey 1990). Slow-living species have longer development times and lifespans, prioritizing resource allocation toward offspring survival rather than fecundity, while fast-living species adopt the opposite strategy (Reynolds 2003). In theory, slow-living species are better adapted to stable environments and have, therefore, greater difficulty recovering from stochastic mortality events (Pianka 1970). Due to similar evolutionary pressures stemming from environmental instability, dispersal rates are expected to be lower in species with slow life histories (Beckman *et al.* 2018; Stevens *et al.* 2013). Body size, however, may have contrasting effects. While smaller body sizes are typically linked to a fast-paced lifestyle, larger body sizes are often

positively correlated with greater dispersal ability (Hillaert *et al.* 2018; Jenkins *et al.* 2007; MacLean & Beissinger 2017; Sekar 2012). Predicted relationships between species' dispersal and life history traits are therefore highly variable, both among and within species (Bonte 2025).

Both dispersing towards new areas and staying within a changing environment comes with certain costs, such as the risk of staying or settling in environments where conditions may be unfavourable (Bonte *et al.* 2012). Such limitations should be especially pronounced in ecological specialists, as they will suffer most from local environmental changes and/or experience greater challenges in establishing populations in unfamiliar habitats (Gilman *et al.* 2010; Hill *et al.* 2001; Pöyry *et al.* 2009; Warren *et al.* 2001). In the context of climate change, thermal tolerance is a particularly important niche component in shaping distribution patterns. A species' thermal niche encompasses several critical factors, including its thermal minimum (the lowest temperature it can endure), thermal maximum (the highest temperature it can tolerate) and thermal range (the span between these extremes) (Gvoždík 2018). Species with narrow thermal niche breadths – those with limited tolerance to temperature variation – are generally expected to be more vulnerable to climate change (Grinder & Wiens 2023; Saupe *et al.* 2015), facing greater risks during dispersal as they attempt to track their optimal temperature conditions. Given this pivotal role of a species' thermal niche in determining both distribution ranges and dispersal costs, it can be expected to have shaped the evolution of both life histories (Carbonell & Stoks 2020; Hampe & Jump 2011) and dispersal (Hillaert *et al.* 2015; Travis *et al.* 2012).

Traits underlying life history variation can show complex covariation and are integrated into so-called syndromes (Dammhahn *et al.* 2018; Polverino *et al.* 2018; Wright *et al.* 2019). Similarly, dispersal syndromes notify covariations between dispersal and other traits, and have been documented across various taxonomic groups (Beckman *et al.* 2018; Buoro & Carlson 2014; Ronce & Clobert 2012; Stevens *et al.* 2013, 2014). Understanding the organisation of trait syndromes not only allows us to estimate missing trait data (Stevens *et al.* 2013; Whitmee & Orme 2013) in understudied taxa, but also allows more accurate forecasting of species distributions under environmental change (Weil *et al.* 2023).

Given the urgency to understand and predict arthropod distributions under future climate change, we aim to identify covariations between dispersal, life history and thermal niche widths across a wide range of Western European species. If dispersal and thermal range are independent of life history traits, they should form separate axes of variation alongside the fast-slow continuum. Conversely, if dispersal and thermal range covary with life history traits, their inclusion will allow further application of the current fast-slow continuum into the context of global change. Such trait relationships may have important implications for species' vulnerability to climate warning. For example, a positive correlation between thermal niche breadth and dispersal ability would suggest interspecific differences in vulnerability, as species with high dispersal capacity and broad thermal tolerance are likely to be more resilient. In contrast, a negative correlation between these traits could indicate trade-offs that limit persistence – enabling species to respond through either range shifts or thermal tolerance, but not both. Similar advantages or trade-offs may also emerge from covariation with life history strategies. Given the vast diversity in arthropod morphology, lifestyles and dispersal modes, we expect different taxa to exhibit significant variation in both the direction and strength of these trait covariations. Additionally, we explore whether these syndromes are phylogenetically conserved, as shared evolutionary history may drive similar trait associations in closely related species, eventually shaping their responses to environmental changes and range shifts.

Material and Methods

Data description

The data used for this study was sourced from the dataset described by Logghe et al. (2025), which contains information on 28 life history and ecological traits for 4874 terrestrial arthropod species. We focused on eight arthropod orders for which data on both dispersal and life history was available: Araneae, Coleoptera, Hemiptera, Hymenoptera, Isopoda, Lepidoptera, Odonata and Orthoptera. Two orders, Diptera and Opiliones, were excluded due to lacking data. This resulted in a dataset containing 4343 species. From this dataset, we selected nine traits related to demography (life history), dispersal (movement) and physiology (thermal niche), relevant for predicting range shifts under climate change (Estrada *et al.* 2016; Urban *et al.* 2016). Appendix S.1 shows the number of data points for every trait within each order.

We selected body size as a central trait, since it is shown to correlate with both life history and thermal limits (e.g. Berger et al., 2008; Hillaert et al., 2018; Klockmann et al., 2017). In this study, we use the adult body length (measured in millimetres) as a proxy for body size. In contrast to several other highly correlated , relevant measures of body size (i.e., body mass, volume; Ganihar 1997; Martin *et al.* 2014), body length is always reported in the primary literature. To avoid introducing additional and unquantifiable uncertainty in our analyses, we retained this metric rather than transforming it to one of the derived metrics that require assumptions about body shape that are not consistently documented, even within taxonomic orders.

As demographic traits, we selected development time, fecundity and voltinism. Development time is defined as the duration between egg laying and adult emergence, expressed in days. Fecundity is defined as the number of offspring a female could produce during her lifetime, while voltinism refers to the maximum number of generations a species could complete in a single year. Note that the maximum value for voltinism is used, as the number of generations can vary annually and across regions. All these trait values were obtained from primary literature (see Logghe *et al.* 2025).

Next, we derived metrics of dispersal, defined here as the movement of an organism to a location of reproduction (Clobert *et al.* 2009). In this study, we do not consider dispersal capacity as a specific distance range as the latter is most often biased by the spatiotemporal extent of the study. Instead, we translated various recorded dispersal proxies – often highly variable across and even within orders – to an individual trait representing a species' general motivation to disperse away from its current location (Bonte & Dahirel 2017). We thus rely on the assumption that dispersal capacity – reflected in traits such as movement speed, mean dispersal distance, wing load or wing development – is positively associated with dispersal propensity. This relationship has been experimentally tested in only a few groups (e.g. Araneae, Diptera), and is for other taxa inferred from expert judgement (see the supplement of Logghe *et al.* 2025 for a full list of sources). We consider this assumption reasonable, as typical (inverse power-family) dispersal kernels show a statistical correlation between dispersal propensity (i.e. frequency of dispersal distances beyond the individual's social neighbourhood) and mean dispersal distance (Bitume *et al.* 2013; Clobert *et al.* 2009; Cousens *et al.* 2008). Therefore, we standardized values from the literature onto a standardized scale ranging from 0.1 to 1 (Logghe *et al.*, 2025). On this scale, a value of 0.1 represents a largely philopatric species that rarely disperses, while a value of 1 corresponds to a highly mobile and dispersive species. Importantly, these scores are always relative within the same taxonomic order, meaning that for instance a butterfly with score 1 does not necessarily show the same dispersal capacity (in terms of absolute distance covered) as a spider with the same score.

Finally, we included measures of each species' thermal niche, specifically thermal mean, minimum, maximum and range. These metrics were derived by overlaying GBIF species distribution data with a raster of climate records, allowing us to assess the climate conditions under which species currently occur. Using zonal statistics for raster values within defined geographic zones, we calculated the average, lowest and highest annual temperatures (in °C) experienced across each species' geographic range (see Logghe *et al.* 2025 for technical details). As distribution data were obtained directly from GBIF, our estimates represent the realised thermal niche, defined here as the range of temperature

conditions a species experiences within its known distribution. While using GBIF data may introduce observer bias, we expect this bias to be reduced in our study, as we focus on well-documented species that are more likely to have reliable and comprehensive trait data available. This approach does not necessarily capture the full physiological (or fundamental) thermal limits of a species. Instead, it reflects the environmental temperatures species currently encounter – conditions that may be shaped by factors such as dispersal constraints or biotic interactions. However, we intentionally excluded species that are endemic to certain geographic distinct locations. Ranges of species strictly engaged in host-specific interactions may be primarily constrained by the distribution of the host rather than by its ow thermal niche. We did not include such highly specialised species, and the few considered are documented to shift hosts within their geographic range (e.g., more specialistic herbivores or parasitoids). We do acknowledge that experimentally measured physiological limits and optima would provide a more direct estimate of thermal tolerance, but such data are not available for the included broad range of arthropod species.

It is important to note that this study does not account for intraspecific variation in trait values. The literature mostly reports mean values, occasionally accompanied by minimum and maximum ranges, but rarely with proper variability statistics. We thus developed a species-level meta-analysis, using mean trait values to explore broad patterns of trait covariation across the phylogenetic tree.

Statistical analysis

To account for the influence of shared evolutionary history on trait similarities, we controlled for phylogenetic relatedness in all analyses. This approach ensured that observed relationships between traits reflected ecological or evolutionary patterns, rather than being influenced by common ancestry. Phylogenetic correction was essential to meet the assumption of statistical independence, as trait values are often not independent due to phylogenetic relatedness. To achieve this, we constructed a phylogenetic tree including all species in the dataset, which served as the basis for subsequent

195 analyses. The tree was built by linking species names to the Open Tree Taxonomy database, which
196 contains data on known phylogenetic relationships ("rotl" package) (Michonneau *et al.* 2016). Branch
197 lengths were added to the tree using the "ape" package (Paradis & Schliep 2019) and calculated with
198 Grafen's method (Grafen 1989), which transforms a cladogram into an ultrametric tree by scaling
199 internal node heights according to the number of descendant taxa. This approach assumes a
200 speciational model of divergence, where evolutionary change is linked to speciation events rather than
201 elapsed time. The resulting tree is appropriate for use with comparative methods that assume
202 Brownian motion trait evolution (i.e. traits evolve via a random walk with constant variance over time).

203 To examine how life history and thermal traits are distributed across arthropod orders, we performed
204 a phylogenetic principal component analysis (PCA) using the "phyl.pca" function from the "phytools"
205 package (Revell 2012). Unlike standard PCA, this method incorporates phylogenetic relationships,
206 correcting for the lack of independence between species due to common ancestry. The analysis was
207 conducted on a subset of the dataset that included only the 200 species for which complete data on
208 all traits were available.

209 Bayesian Generalized Linear models were employed to assess whether covariations were present
210 between the selected traits ("brms" package) (Bürkner 2021). Given the strong phylogenetic signal
211 across the tree of life, the variation in data quantity and quality among orders, and our aim to detect
212 and understand potential divergence in the covariations across arthropod orders, we analysed every
213 order separately. Trait data on body size, fecundity and development time underwent log
214 transformation before analysis to reduce the skewness of the data. Each trait combination was run
215 twice for every order, with the dependent and independent variables interchanged. Given the strong
216 phylogenetic signals among orders, we chose not to construct a single multivariate model, also to avoid
217 potential biases arising from uneven patterns of missing data among taxa. Additionally, separate
218 models allowed us to account for different error structures, depending on the nature of each trait.
219 Each model was, therefore, fitted with a distribution appropriate to its independent variable: zero-

220 one-inflated beta for voltinism, binomial for dispersal and Gaussian for the remaining variables. The
221 models were run using 4 chains and 4000 iterations, with a burn-in period of 1000. Non-informative
222 flat priors were used for the model parameters. Phylogenetic distances between species were derived
223 from a phylogenetic distance matrix derived from the previously mentioned phylogenetic tree
224 ("geiger" package) (Matthew *et al.* 2014). These distances were incorporated into every Bayesian
225 model as blocking factors, to ensure that phylogenetic relationships were considered when the
226 covariation between traits is estimated. Convergence of the models was checked by examining the
227 effective sample size (>1000) for each chain as well as Gelman-Rubin statistic (Rhat < 1.1) among
228 chains. Effect sizes were deemed clearly determined when 0 was not included in the 95% credibility
229 intervals of the posteriors.

230 Finally, we assessed the phylogenetic signal using Pagel's Lambda for each considered trait and
231 arthropod order (Pagel 1999). This is a metric that estimates how much closely related species
232 resemble each other compared to expectations under a Brownian motion model of evolution (Pearse
233 *et al.* 2025). Pagel's Lambda typically ranges from 0 (indicating no influence of phylogenetic
234 relationships on trait values) to 1 (indicating trait values are entirely explained by phylogenetic
235 relationships). We calculated this metric using the "phylosig" function from the "phytools" package
236 (Revell 2012).

237 R version 4.0.4 (R Core Team 2021) was used to perform all data analyses.

Results

Data on dispersal capacity, life history traits and thermal niche were obtained from an existing dataset described by Logghe et al. (2025). From this dataset, we selected eight arthropod orders with sufficiently high data quality, resulting in a refined dataset comprising over 4000 species and nine functional traits. As a first exploration of these data, we conducted a phylogenetically corrected PCA on a subset of species with complete data for all traits. This analysis revealed no distinct separation among orders, suggesting that covariations may be consistent across taxonomic groups (Figure 1). PC1 shows a strong positive relationship with voltinism and dispersal, while it also strongly negatively correlates with development time (Appendix S.2). Additionally, it exhibits a positive correlation with thermal mean and range, though this relationship is not as strong as with the other traits. In contrast, PC2 is strongly positively correlated with fecundity and size. These results indicate the existence of covariations between dispersal, life history, body size and thermal niche across arthropod orders.



Figure 1: phylogenetically corrected PCA results for arthropod species for which data on all traits was available (n=200). Dots represent species with symbol colour and shape according to their taxonomic order. Arrows represent the direction and magnitude of each variable's contribution to the principal components. Ellipses represent 95% confidence intervals around species scores for each arthropod order, illustrating group-level patterns in trait space.

Given the strong phylogenetic clustering of traits across the eight orders (Figure 2), we employed Bayesian Generalized Linear models to identify trait covariations within each of these. This approach reduces model complexity and allows us to infer potential convergence of trait covariations in an understandable, qualitative manner. Each model accounted for phylogenetic relatedness between species, ensuring that observed relationships reflect ecological and evolutionary patterns. Our results reveal multiple trait syndromes within various arthropod orders (Appendix S.3). In most orders, there is a clear positive relationship between fast development, voltinism and dispersal (Figure 3). Additionally, temperature niche components tend to covary positively with dispersal capacity, fecundity and size in most orders. Covariations between other trait combinations are always present within at least one order. However, these are highly order specific and, therefore, not generalizable across arthropod orders.



Figure 2: Overview of the distribution of trait values across the phylogenetic tree for dispersal (λ = 0.983), fecundity (λ = 0.988), thermal range (λ = 0.863) and body size (λ = 0.993). To facilitate comparison between the trees, we selected only species with data available for all four traits (n = 297). Fecundity and body length were log-transformed to improve clarity of the figure by creating a smoother colour gradient.



Figure 3: Overview of trait covariations across each order, represented as a correlation matrix. Each grid of the matrix is divided into eight cells, with each cell representing one order. The taxa are, from left to right and top to bottom: Araneae, Coleoptera, Hemiptera, Hymenoptera, Isopoda, Lepidoptera, Odonata and Orthoptera. Red cells indicate a clearly determined (0 not included in the 95 credibility interval) negative relationship, blue cells indicate a clearly determined positive relationship, and grey cells show that the relationship was not clearly determined. White cells denote that this trait combination was not assessed for the given order, due to either an absence of data for one of the traits or convergence issues. Sample sizes for every covariation were determined by the trait with the least available data (see Appendix S.1).

To estimate how much trait values are determined by common ancestry between species from the same order, we calculated the phylogenetic signal for every trait and arthropod order (Figure 4). On average, body size and development time showed very strong phylogenetic signals, suggesting these traits are generally strongly influenced by phylogeny. In contrast, thermal mean, thermal range and fecundity appeared largely independent of phylogeny in most arthropod orders. Finally, the phylogenetic signal for dispersal displayed considerable variation, indicating that the influence of phylogenetic relationships differs substantially between orders (Appendix S.4).



Figure 4: Overview of the phylogenetic signal (Pagel's Lambda) for every assessed trait for each arthropod order. Arthropod orders are from top to bottom: Lepidoptera, Coleoptera, Hymenoptera, Hemiptera, Orthoptera, Odonata, Isopoda and Araneae. Colours represent the strength of phylogenetic signal, with higher values (darker red) indicating that trait values are more explained by phylogenetic relationships. The grey squares indicate that the phylogenetic signal was not calculated for that trait and order due to a lack of data. Sample sizes for every order and trait can be found in Appendix S.1.

287 # Discussion

288 Our quantitative synthesis across a wide range of Western European arthropods indicates that
289 dispersal, life history and thermal niche are tightly connected, implying similar evolutionary pressures
290 on these traits. While there are notable differences between orders, these relationships remain largely
291 consistent across taxa, suggesting that trait covariations can be generalized to a broad range of
292 arthropod species. This remarkable consistency across arthropod orders was one of the most
293 surprising findings of this study, given the extraordinary diversity of dispersal mechanisms and life
294 history strategies within the phylum. Such uniformity could have important implications for modelling
295 the future effects of climate change, suggesting that detailed trait information for every species might
296 not be as necessary as previously suggested (Urban *et al.* 2016). Instead, missing trait values could
297 potentially be inferred from accessible trait data, facilitating broader, more efficient predictions.
298 However, we would like to emphasize that these results should not be directly applied to mechanistic
299 modelling, as such applications require a thoughtful translation from traits to population dynamics or
300 ecosystem properties.

301 A considerable amount of interspecific life history trait variation in arthropods can be attributed to the
302 slow-fast continuum, with a clear distinction between species with fast (i.e. short development times)
303 and slow (i.e. long development times) lifecycles. Interestingly, development time appears closely tied
304 to dispersal capacity, as we observed clear covariations between development time, voltinism and
305 dispersal across various orders. Previous research has shown similar patterns, with high dispersal
306 ability often linked with fast life history strategies (Beckman *et al.* 2018; Stevens *et al.* 2013; Weil *et al.*
307 2022). Given that most insects disperse only in their winged adult stages, this dispersal-life history
308 syndrome may have evolved as a bet-hedging strategy in response to unstable environments, allowing
309 for rapid relocation when conditions become unfavourable (Snyder 2011; Southwood 1977).
310 Interestingly, we found limited evidence to suggest that fast-living species produce more offspring, a
311 pattern that would typically be anticipated within the slow-fast continuum framework (Reynolds

312 2003). While Lepidoptera and Coleoptera did show a clear negative relationship between fecundity
313 and development time, our analyses suggest that the reproductive axis of variation is as good as
314 independent from the developmental axis. We thus show that the independence of these two distinct
315 axes of life history variation is rather a rule than an exception, as was previously reported for plants
316 (Salguero-Gómez *et al.* 2016) and vertebrates (Gaillard *et al.* 1989; Sæther 1987; Stearns 1983).

317 Our results suggest that thermal range has played a role in shaping the evolution of dispersal in
318 arthropods, with most orders showing a positive relationship between realised thermal niche breadth
319 and dispersal ability. This relationship likely arises from the costs associated with dispersing to new
320 environments, where the risk of encountering unfavourable climatic conditions is high (Bonte *et al.*
321 2012). A broader thermal niche breadth reduces this risk by increasing the chances that newly
322 colonised areas fall within the species' tolerable thermal range. However, the causal relationship could
323 also work in reverse, as limited dispersal capacity may constrain a species' realised thermal niche by
324 restricting access to potentially suitable regions, despite physiological tolerance to those climates (Sax
325 *et al.* 2013). In other words, the realised thermal niche, as considered in this study, would be narrower
326 than the fundamental thermal niche, simply because of dispersal limitations. Implementation of other
327 niche components such as diet or habitat specialisation could have provided a more holistic view on
328 the relationship between dispersal and ecological generalisation. It is worthwhile to notice that the
329 retrieved thermal niche-body size relationships were predominantly negative, which aligns with
330 experimentally derived patterns of lower thermal tolerance in large-bodied animals (Gunderson 2024).

331 Besides thermal niche breadth, thermal optima also covary with dispersal ability. Across nearly all
332 assessed arthropod orders, species adapted to warmer climates exhibit higher dispersal capacities.
333 Although cold-adapted species may face greater risks from climate change and thus might benefit
334 more from range shifting as a mitigation strategy, their generally lower dispersal capacities make
335 spreading a less viable option (Tayleur *et al.* 2016). Furthermore, our findings indicate that low
336 dispersal capacity often covaries with slower life histories, which hampers colonization success due to

slower population growth rates and, therefore, elevated vulnerability to stochastic extinction (Caswell & Hastings 1980). Consequently, the arthropod species most at risk from temperature changes due to climate change are also those least equipped to mitigate its effects through range shifts - a trend also noted in European mammals (Morrison *et al.* 2018).

Phylogenetic signals were highly variable and strongly influenced by both the specific trait and arthropod order being assessed. Body size and development time showed strong phylogenetic conservation in most orders, while thermal niche was largely independent of common ancestry. Dispersal and fecundity present an interesting pattern, being strongly conserved in some orders but showing minimal phylogenetic influence in others. A strong phylogenetic signal in body size was expected, as closely related species often share a similar morphology. Development time is typically linked to size, as larger species require more time to accumulate tissue (Blueweiss *et al.* 1978; Calder 1996). However, our data do not fully support the idea that larger arthropod species develop more slowly, as only Coleoptera showed a clear positive relationship between body size and development time. Instead, it appears that closely related arthropod species have evolved similar pace-of-life strategies due to comparable life cycle characteristics (Taylor & Karban 1986). The weak phylogenetic signal in thermal traits aligns nicely with earlier findings suggesting directional selection driven by physiological constraints and experienced thermal conditions within species' range over evolutionary history (Bennett *et al.* 2021). The variable phylogenetic signal for dispersal capacity likely reflects the diverse dispersal mechanisms across arthropod orders. For example, dispersal in flying insects like Lepidoptera and Odonata tends to be body size-dependent, with larger species typically showing higher mobility (Kuussaari *et al.* 2014; Sekar 2012; Wootton 2020). In Coleoptera and Hemiptera, dispersal capacity is closely tied to hind wing development, a trait that is also strongly phylogenetically conserved (Braendle *et al.* 2006; Roff 1986, 1994). For taxa with more passive dispersal mechanisms, a lower phylogenetic signal in dispersal capacity is expected, as dispersal is less directly linked to specific morphological traits. In Araneae, for instance, nearly all species show ballooning behaviour regardless of size, with larger species typically ballooning as juveniles. Dispersal propensity in spiders

is thus more strongly correlated with habitat stability and specialization, factors that are generally independent of phylogenetic lineage (Bonte *et al.* 2006).

Data accessibility statement

The complete dataset on arthropod life histories and ecological traits can be found on GBIF: https://doi.org/10.15468/75g5z9. The filtered dataset specific to this study can be accessed on Zenodo: 10.5281/zenodo.14527806.

References

Beckman, N.G., Bullock, J.M. & Salguero-Gómez, R. (2018). High dispersal ability is related to fast life-history strategies. *Journal of Ecology*, 106, 1349–1362.

Bellard, C., Bertelsmeier, C., Leadley, P., Thuiller, W. & Courchamp, F. (2012). Impacts of climate change on the future of biodiversity. *Ecology Letters*, 15, 365–377.

Bennett, J.M., Sunday, J., Calosi, P., Villalobos, F., Martínez, B., Molina-Venegas, R., *et al.* (2021). The evolution of critical thermal limits of life on Earth. *Nature Communications*, 12, 1198.

Berger, D., Walters, R. & Gotthard, K. (2008). What limits insect fecundity? Body size- and temperature-dependent egg maturation and oviposition in a butterfly. *Functional Ecology*, 22, 523–529.

Beukhof, E., Frelat, R., Pecuchet, L., Maureaud, A., Dencker, T.S., Sólmundsson, J., *et al.* (2019). Marine fish traits follow fast-slow continuum across oceans. *Scientific Reports*, 9, 1-9.

Bitume, E.V., Bonte, D., Ronce, O., Bach, F., Flaven, E., Olivieri, I., *et al.* (2013). Density and genetic relatedness increase dispersal distance in a subsocial organism. *Ecology Letters*, 16, 430–437.

Blueweiss, L., Fox, H., Kudzma, V., Nakashima, D., Peters, R. & Sams, S. (1978). Relationships between body size and some life history parameters. *Oecologia*, 37, 257–272.

Bonte, D. (2025). Integrating dispersal in life history. In: *Life history evolution: Traits, Interactions, and Applications* (eds. Segoli, M. & Wajnberg, E.). Wiley, Hoboken, NJ, pp. 175–185.

Bonte, D. & Dahirel, M. (2017). Dispersal: a central and independent trait in life history. *Oikos*, 126, 472–479.

Bonte, D., Van Dyck, H., Bullock, J.M., Coulon, A., Delgado, M., Gibbs, M., *et al.* (2012). Costs of dispersal. *Biological Reviews*, 87, 290–312.

Bonte, D., Vanden Borre, J., Lens, L. & Maelfait, J.-P. (2006). Geographical variation in wolf spider dispersal behaviour is related to landscape structure. *Animal Behaviour*, 72, 655–662.

Braendle, C., Davis, G.K., Brisson, J.A. & Stern, D.L. (2006). Wing dimorphism in aphids. *Heredity*, 97, 192–199.

Buoro, M. & Carlson, S.M. (2014). Life-history syndromes: Integrating dispersal through space and time. *Ecology Letters*, 17, 756–767.

Bürkner, P.-C. (2021). Bayesian Item Response Modeling in R with brms and Stan. *Journal of Statistical Software*, 100, 1–54.

Calder, W.A. (1996). *Size, Function, and Life History*. Dover Publications, New York.

Carbonell, J.A. & Stoks, R. (2020). Thermal evolution of life history and heat tolerance during range expansions toward warmer and cooler regions. *Ecology*, 101, e03134.

Caswell, H. & Hastings, A. (1980). Fecundity, developmental time, and population growth rate: An analytical solution. *Theoretical Population Biology*, 17, 71–79.

Clobert, J., Le Galliard, J.-F., Cote, J., Meylan, S. & Massot, M. (2009). Informed dispersal, heterogeneity in animal dispersal syndromes and the dynamics of spatially structured populations. *Ecology Letters*, 12, 197–209.

Cousens, R., Dytham, C. & Law, R. (2008). *Dispersal in Plants: A Population Perspective*. Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Dammhahn, M., Dingemanse, N.J., Niemelä, P.T. & Réale, D. (2018). Pace-of-life syndromes: a framework for the adaptive integration of behaviour, physiology and life history. *Behavioural Ecology and Sociobiology*, 72, 62, s00265-018-2473-y.

Estrada, A., Morales-Castilla, I., Caplat, P. & Early, R. (2016). Usefulness of Species Traits in Predicting Range Shifts. *Trends in Ecology & Evolution*, 31, 190–203.

Foden, W.B., Butchart, S.H.M., Stuart, S.N., Vié, J.-C., Akçakaya, H.R., Angulo, A., *et al.* (2013). Identifying the World's Most Climate Change Vulnerable Species: A Systematic Trait-Based Assessment of all Birds, Amphibians and Corals. *PLoS ONE*, 8, e65427.

Foden, W.B. & Young, B.E. (2016). *IUCN SSC guidelines for assessing species' vulnerability to climate change. Version 1.0*. IUCN Species Survival Commission, Cambridge, England.

Gaillard, J.-M., Pontier, D., Allainé, D., Lebreton, J.D., Trouvilliez, J., Clobert, J., *et al.* (1989). An Analysis of Demographic Tactics in Birds and Mammals. *Oikos*, 56, 59-76.

Ganihar, S.R. (1997). Biomass estimates of terrestrial arthropods based on body length. *Journal of Biosciences*, 22, 219–224.

Gilman, S.E., Urban, M.C., Tewksbury, J., Gilchrist, G.W. & Holt, R.D. (2010). A framework for community interactions under climate change. *Trends in Ecology & Evolution*, 25, 325–331.

Grafen, A. (1989). The phylogenetic regression. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal society of London*, Biological Sciences, 326, 119–157.

Grinder, R.M. & Wiens, J.J. (2023). Niche width predicts extinction from climate change and vulnerability of tropical species. *Global Change Biology*, 29, 618–630.

Gunderson, A.R. (2024). Disentangling physiological and physical explanations for body size-dependent thermal tolerance. *Journal of Experimental Biology*, 227, jeb245645.

Gvoždík, L. (2018). Just what is the thermal niche? *Oikos*, 127, 1701–1710.

Habibullah, M.S., Din, B.H., Tan, S.-H. & Zahid, H. (2022). Impact of climate change on biodiversity loss: global evidence. *Environmental Science and Pollution Research*, 29, 1073–1086.

Hampe, A. & Jump, A.A. (2011). Climate relicts: Past, Present, Future. *Annual Review of Ecology, Evolution, and Systematics*, 42, 313–333.

Hill, J.K., Thomas, C.D. & Huntley, B. (2001). Climate and recent range changes in butterflies. In: *"Fingerprints" of Climate Change* (eds. Walther, GR., Burga, C.A. & Edwards, P.J.). Springer, Boston, pp. 77–88.

Hillaert, J., Boeye, J., Stoks, R. & Bonte, D. (2015). The evolution of thermal performance can constrain dispersal during range shifting. *Journal of Biological Dynamics*, 9, 317–335.

Hillaert, J., Hovestadt, T., Vandegehuchte, M.L. & Bonte, D. (2018). Size-dependent movement explains why bigger is better in fragmented landscapes. *Ecology and Evolution*, 8, 10754–10767.

Jenkins, D.G., Brescacin, C.R., Duxbury, C.V., Elliott, J.A., Evans, J.A., Grablow, K.R., *et al.* (2007). Does size matter for dispersal distance? *Global Ecology and Biogeography*, 16, 415–425.

Klockmann, M., Günter, F. & Fischer, K. (2017). Heat resistance throughout ontogeny: body size constrains thermal tolerance. *Global Change Biology*, 23, 686–696.

Kuussaari, M., Saarinen, M., Korpela, E., Pöyry, J. & Hyvönen, T. (2014). Higher mobility of butterflies than moths connected to habitat suitability and body size in a release experiment. *Ecology and Evolution*, 4, 3800–3811.

La Sorte, F.A. & Jetz, W. (2010). Projected range contractions of montane biodiversity under global warming. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, 277, 3401–3410.

Logghe, G., Batsleer, F., Maes, D., Permentier, T., Berg, M.P., Brosens, D., *et al.* (2025). An in-depth dataset of northwestern European arthropod life histories and ecological traits. *Biodiversity Data Journal*, 13, e146785.

MacLean, S.A. & Beissinger, S.R. (2017). Species' traits as predictors of range shifts under contemporary climate change: A review and meta-analysis. *Global Change Biology*, 23, 4094–4105.

Martin, C.A., Proulx, R. & Magnan, P. (2014). The biogeography of insects' length-dry mass relationships. *Insect Conservation and Diversity*, 7, 413–419.

Matthew, P., Eastman, J.M., Slater, G.J., Brown, J.W., Uyeda, J.C., FitzJohn, R.G., *et al.* (2014). geiger v2.0: an expanded suite of methods for fitting macroevolutionary models to phylogenetic trees. *Bioinformatics*, 30, 2216–2218.

Maxwell, S.L., Butt, N., Maron, M., McAlpine, C.A., Chapman, S., Ullmann, A., *et al.* (2019). Conservation implications of ecological responses to extreme weather and climate events. *Diversity and Distributions*, 25, 613–625.

Michonneau, F., Brown, J.W. & Winter, D.J. (2016). rotl: an R package to interact with the Open Tree of Life data. *Methods in Ecology and Evolution*, 7, 1476–1481.

Morrison, L., Estrada, A. & Early, R. (2018). Species traits suggest European mammals facing the greatest climate change are also least able to colonize new locations. *Diversity and Distributions*, 24, 1321–1332.

Pagel, M. (1999). Inferring the historical patterns of biological evolution. *Nature*, 401, 877–884.

Paradis, E. & Schliep, K. (2019). ape 5.0: an environment for modern phylogenetics and evolutionary analyses in R. *Bioinformatics*, 35, 526–528.

Pearse, W.D., Davies, T.J. & Wolkovich, E.M. (2025). How to Define, Use, and Interpret Pagel's λ (Lambda) in Ecology and Evolution. *Global Ecology and Biogeography*, 34, e70012.

Pianka, E.R. (1970). On r- and K-Selection. *The American Naturalist*, 104, 592–597.

Polverino, G., Santostefano, F., Díaz-Gil, C. & Mehner, T. (2018). Ecological conditions drive pace-of-life syndromes by shaping relationships between life history, physiology and behaviour in two populations of Eastern mosquitofish. *Scientific Reports*, 8, 1-10.

Pöyry, J., Luoto, M., Heikkinen, R.K., Kuussaari, M. & Saarinen, K. (2009). Species traits explain recent range shifts of Finnish butterflies. *Global Change Biology*, 15, 732–743.

Promislow, D.E.L. & Harvey, P.H. (1990). Living fast and dying young: A comparative analysis of life-history variation among mammals. *Journal of Zoology*, 220, 417–437.

R Core Team. (2021). R: A language and environment for statistical computing.

Revell, L.J. (2012). phytools: An R package for phylogenetic comparative biology (and other things). *Methods in Ecology and Evolution*, 3, 217–223.

Reynolds, J.D. (2003). Life histories and extinction risk. In: *Macroecology*. Blackwell Publishing, Oxford, pp. 195–217.

Roff, D.A. (1986). The Evolution of Wing Dimorphism in Insects. *Evolution*, 40, 1009–1020.

Roff, D.A. (1994). The evolution of flightlessness: Is history important? *Evolutionary Ecology*, 8, 639–657.

Ronce, O. & Clobert, J. (2012). Dispersal syndromes. In: *Dispersal Ecology and Evolution*. Oxford University Press, Oxford, pp. 119–138.

Sæther, B.-E. (1987). The Influence of Body Weight on the Covariation between Reproductive Traits in European Birds. *Oikos*, 48, 79-88.

Salguero-Gómez, R., Jones, O.R., Jongejans, E., Blomberg, S.P., Hodgson, D.J., Mbeau-Ache, C., *et al.* (2016). Fast–slow continuum and reproductive strategies structure plant life-history variation worldwide. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 113, 230–235.

Saupe, E.E., Qiao, H., Hendricks, J.R., Portell, R.W., Hunter, S.J., Soberón, J., *et al.* (2015). Niche breadth and geographic range size as determinants of species survival on geological time scales. *Global Ecology and Biogeography*, 24, 1159–1169.

Sax, D.F., Early, R. & Bellemare, J. (2013). Niche syndromes, species extinction risks, and management under climate change. *Trends in Ecology & Evolution*, 28, 517–523.

Sekar, S. (2012). A meta-analysis of the traits affecting dispersal ability in butterflies: can wingspan be used as a proxy?: Factors affecting dispersal ability in butterflies. *Journal of Animal Ecology*, 81, 174–184.

Settele, J., Scholes, R., Betts, R., Bunn, S.E., Leadley, P., Nepstad, D., *et al.* (2014). Terrestrial and inland water systems. In: *Climate change 2014: Impacts, adaptation, and vulnerability. Fifth assessment report of the Intergovernmental Panel of Climate Change*. Cambridge University Press, New York, NY, pp. 1–153.

Snyder, R.E. (2011). Leaving home ain't easy: non-local seed dispersal is only evolutionarily stable in highly unpredictable environments. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B*, 278, 739–744.

Southwood, T.R.E. (1977). Habitat, the Templet for Ecological Strategies? *Journal of Animal Ecology*, 46, 336-365.

Stearns, S.C. (1983). The Influence of Size and Phylogeny on Patterns of Covariation among Life-History Traits in the Mammals. *Oikos*, 41, 173-187.

Stevens, V.M., Trochet, A., Blanchet, S., Moulherat, S., Clobert, J. & Baguette, M. (2013). Dispersal syndromes and the use of life-histories to predict dispersal. *Evolutionary Applications*, 6, 630–642.

Stevens, V.M., Whitmee, S., Le Galliard, J., Clobert, J., Böhning-Gaese, K., Bonte, D., *et al.* (2014). A comparative analysis of dispersal syndromes in terrestrial and semi-terrestrial animals. *Ecology Letters*, 17, 1039–1052.

Stralberg, D., Jongsomjit, D., Howell, C.A., Snyder, M.A., Alexander, J.D., Wiens, J.A., *et al.* (2009). Re-Shuffling of Species with Climate Disruption: A No-Analog Future for California Birds? *PLoS ONE*, 4, e6825.

Tayleur, C.M., Devictor, V., Gaüzère, P., Jonzén, N., Smith, H.G. & Lindström, Å. (2016). Regional variation in climate change winners and losers highlights the rapid loss of cold-dwelling species. *Diversity and Distributions*, 22, 468–480.

Taylor, F. & Karban, R. (1986). *The Evolution of Insect Life Cycles*. Proceedings in Life Sciences. Springer New York, New York.

Thomas, C.D., Cameron, A., Green, R.E., Bakkenes, M., Beaumont, L.J., Collingham, Y.C., *et al.* (2004). Extinction risk from climate change. *Letters to Nature*, 427, 145-148.

Travis, J.M.J., Mustin, K., Bartoń, K.A., Benton, T.G., Clobert, J., Delgado, M.M., *et al.* (2012). Modelling dispersal: an eco-evolutionary framework incorporating emigration, movement, settlement behaviour and the multiple costs involved. *Methods in Ecology and Evolution*, 3, 628–641.

Urban, M.C. (2019). Projecting biological impacts from climate change like a climate scientist. *WIREs Climate Change*, 10, e585.

Urban, M.C., Bocedi, G., Hendry, A.P., Mihoub, J.-B., Pe'er, G., Singer, A., *et al.* (2016). Improving the forecast for biodiversity under climate change. *Science*, 353, aad8466.

Wagner, D.L. (2020). Insect Declines in the Anthropocene. *Annu. Rev. Entomol.*, 65, 457–480.

Warren, M.S., Hill, J.K., Thomas, J.A., Asher, J., Fox, R., Huntley, B., *et al.* (2001). Rapid responses of British butterflies to opposing forces of climate and habitat change. *Letters to Nature*, 414, 65–69.

Weil, S., Gallien, L., Lavergne, S., Börger, L., Hassler, G.W., Nicolaï, M.P.J., *et al.* (2022). Chameleon biogeographic dispersal is associated with extreme life history strategies. *Ecography*, 2022, e06323.

Weil, S.-S., Gallien, L., Nicolaï, M.P.J., Lavergne, S., Börger, L. & Allen, W.L. (2023). Body size and life history shape the historical biogeography of tetrapods. *Nature Ecology & Evolution*, 7, 1467–1479.

Whitmee, S. & Orme, C.D.L. (2013). Predicting dispersal distance in mammals: a trait-based approach. *Journal of Animal Ecology*, 82, 211–221.

Williams, W.W. & Jackson, S.T. (2007). Novel climates, no-analog communities, and ecological surprises. *Palaeoecology*, 5, 475–482.

Wootton, R. (2020). Dragonfly flight: morphology, performance and behaviour. *International Journal of Odonatology*, 23, 31–39.

Wright, J., Bolstad, G.H., Araya-Ajoy, Y.G. & Dingemanse, N.J. (2019). Life-history evolution under fluctuating density-dependent selection and the adaptive alignment of pace-of-life syndromes. *Biological Reviews*, 94, 230–247.

Yang, L.H. & Gratton, C. (2014). Insects as drivers of ecosystem processes. *Current Opinion in Insect Science*, 2, 26–32.

Acknowledgements

The authors would like to thank all contributors to the original dataset from which this study's data were sampled: Tristan Permentier, Matty P. Berg, Pallieter De Smedt, Jonas Hagge, Jorg Lambrechts, Marc Pollet and Fons Verheyde. The computational resources (Stevin Supercomputer Infrastructure) and services used in this work were provided by the VSC (Flemish Supercomputer Center), funded by Ghent University, FWO and the Flemish Government – department EWI. Finally, the authors extend their gratitude to the Flemish Research Fund for their support of the Scientific Research Network EVENET (W001322N). All arthropod icons used in this paper originate from Noun Project (CC BY-NC-ND 2.0): Spider by Matthew Davis, Beetle by Rachel Siao, Cicada by Alejandro Capellan, wasp by Parkji Sun, isopod by Pham Thanh Lôc, Moth by Parkji Sun, Dragonfly by Hermine Blanquart and Cricket by Ed Harrison.

Funding

Garben Logghe was funded by an FWO-INBO doctoral fellowship (grant nr: 1130223N).

Ethics declarations

The authors declare that they have no competing interests.