

1 **On Some Problems of Estimating Fundamental Niche from Physiological Data**

2

3 Gutiérrez-Ruelas Jesús Salvador ⁽¹⁾

4 Jiménez, Laura ⁽⁴⁾

5 Quiroz-Reyes, Ana Patricia ⁽³⁾

6 Sotelo-Pedroza, Sabrina Cherizar ⁽³⁾

7 Soberon, Jorge ⁽⁴⁾

8 (1) División de Ingeniería, Universidad de Sonora, Blvd. Luis Encinas y Rosales S/N, Col.
9 Centro Hermosillo, Sonora, México

10 (2) División de Ciencias Exactas y Naturales, Universidad de Sonora, Blvd. Luis Encinas
11 y Rosales S/N, Col. Centro Hermosillo, Sonora, México

12 (3) División de Ciencias Biológicas y de la Salud, Universidad de Sonora, Blvd. Luis
13 Encinas y Rosales S/N, Col. Centro Hermosillo, Sonora, México

14 (4) Department of Ecology and Evolutionary Biology and Biodiversity Institute,
15 University of Kansas, 1235 Jayhawk Blvd., Lawrence, KS, USA

16

17 **Abstract**

18 Hutchinson proposed the idea of the fundamental niche, determined by physiological
19 properties of a species, more than 50 years ago. The idea remains both central to ecological
20 thinking and largely unexplored experimentally. In this note, we describe some problems of
21 using physiological experiments databases to estimate fundamental niches, show some
22 solutions, and the apply our solution to testing the prediction that fundamental niches
23 contain realized niches, for some species of marine fishes and terrestrial beetles. Our results
24 were concordant with Hutchinson's predictions.

25

26 **Introduction**

27 In its modern form, the discipline called species distribution modeling (SDM) is based on the
28 estimation of limits of tolerance to environmental variables, or ecological niche modeling
29 (ENM) (Guisan & Zimmermann, 2000; Peterson et al., 2011). There is a relationship between
30 geographical regions and their environmental features, called "Hutchinson's Duality"
31 (Colwell & Rangel, 2009) and this relationship enables estimating observed limits of

32 tolerance in multivariate space, and then projecting them in geographical space, to obtain
33 estimates of distributions.

34 In practice all the above can be done by software ignoring most of the conceptual framework.
35 For instance, the package Maxent (Phillips, Anderson, & Schapire, 2006) simply asks for: (i)
36 sets of coordinates of observations and, (ii) for sets of raster files representing environmental
37 variables, and it performs the calculations that characterize the occurrence points in the
38 multivariate environmental space. This is then are projected to geographic space. The entire
39 procedure can be performed without mentioning the term “niche” even once.

40 However, several niche concepts are central to the interpretation of the procedures and results
41 of most software used to estimate distributions. The basic idea is that of fundamental niche.
42 A fundamental niche is the set of environmental combinations that produce a population
43 fitness capable of sustaining viable populations (Drake, 2015; Holt, 2009; Hutchinson, 1957;
44 Peterson et al., 2011) in the absence of biotic interactions. This is essentially a physiological
45 concept, abstract and theoretical. In symbols, if $f(\mathbf{v})$ is the function mapping environmental
46 combinations into fitness, then the fundamental niche is $\mathbf{F}=\{\mathbf{v} \mid f(\mathbf{v}) > 0\}$. The fundamental
47 niche was originally conceived by Hutchinson as a simple rectangle in the multivariate
48 environmental space, but soon people started using other shapes, for instance, ellipsoids
49 (Brown, 1984; Drake, 2015; Maguire Jr, 1973), which somehow imply a structure (the
50 expression in fitness units of regions of tolerance and their covariances) of fitness in
51 environmental space. The fundamental niche is what evolves. In other words, the limits of
52 tolerance and the covariations among them is what can be inherited and selected by
53 evolutionary processes. The fundamental niche then deserves its name.

54

55 Now, notice that different regions of the world, and at different times, may have different
56 environmental combinations. Therefore, we need a second niche concept, an “existing”
57 fundamental niche, an idea introduced very briefly by Hutchinson(1957) and then elaborated
58 by Jackson and Overpeck (2000). The existing niche is the fundamental niche actually
59 existing in a given region, and at a given time. If the environments in a region \mathbf{M} , at a time t
60 are symbolized by $\mathbf{E}(\mathbf{M}, t) = \{\mathbf{v} \mid \mathbf{v} \text{ exists in region } \mathbf{M} \text{ at time } t\}$ then the existing niche is

61 $\mathbf{F}^*(\mathbf{M}, t) = \mathbf{E}(\mathbf{M}, t) \cap \mathbf{F}$. The existing niche is the combination of the physiological limits of
62 tolerance expressed in a given region and time. It combines physiology with environment.

63

64 Finally, the environments in which a species can be observed are further limited by biotic
65 interactions and by accessibility to movements. This defines the actual subset of the existing
66 niche where a species can be observed. Any actual field observation will have to come from
67 the existing niche restricted by availability, interactions and movements. The resulting set of
68 actually observed environments is called the realized niche, denoted by $\mathbf{R}(\mathbf{M}, t)$.

69 Hutchinson (1957) proposed a simple inequality relating the fundamental and the realized.
70 Using the existing niche, and the symbols we defined above, the inequality is:

71 (1.1)
$$\mathbf{F} \supseteq \mathbf{F}^*(\mathbf{M}, t) = \mathbf{F} \cap \mathbf{E}(\mathbf{M}, t) \supseteq \mathbf{R}(\mathbf{M}, t)$$

72 Soberón & Arroyo-Peña (2017) tested this inequality, but some of the subtleties of doing it
73 were not well discussed. An extremely important question, the one we will explore here, is
74 how can one combine physiological experimental data with climatic data, to establish the
75 comparison in equation (1.1). This is by no means a simple operation (Addo-Bediako,
76 Chown, & Gaston, 2000; Angilletta Jr & Angilletta, 2009; Bozinovic, Calosi, & Spicer, 2011;
77 Kearney & Porter, 2009), mainly because physiological experiments are performed on
78 simplified conditions, measuring variables that are not necessarily the ones that characterize
79 environments in the field. To test equation (1.1) we will get data for the fundamental niches
80 from a database of estimations of ranges of tolerance to extreme temperatures (Bennet et al.
81 2018), and data for the realized niches from occurrence reports, obtained from the Global
82 Biodiversity Information Facility (GBIF; (Robertson et al., 2014).

83 The data required to estimate fundamental niches would be ideally derived from estimations
84 of fitness under factorial experimental design. This is a task very seldom attempted, with the
85 usual handful of exceptions (Birch, 1953; Hooper et al., 2008). Following Soberon &
86 Arroyo-Peña (2017), we will use a single-variable (temperature) approximation to estimate
87 the fundamental niche. We know that this is a very coarse approximation, but there is simply
88 no data available on multivariate niche measurements using experiments. Even our single
89 variable approach has some problems that we will discuss below.

90

91 **Methods**

92 The objective of the present work is to illustrate some of the problems of attempting to
93 relate temperature-tolerance data, obtained physiologically. To estimate fundamental niches
94 we obtained data on ranges of temperature tolerance from the database GlobTherm
95 <https://datadryad.org/resource/doi:10.5061/dryad.1cv08/7> (Bennet et al. 2018). The ways
96 they report extremes vary considerably between taxonomic groups, and some ways were
97 unsuitable to estimation of fundamental niches. As examples, we included data from
98 mammals, beetles and fish. For mammals, the Thermal Neutral Zone is reported, which is a
99 range of temperature within which metabolic activity remains constant. This range is not
100 really a good measure of the fundamental niche. For the beetles and fishes, 100% mortality
101 lower and higher temperatures are reported. These are certainly compatible definition of a
102 fundamental niche.

103

104 We also obtained information about the realized niche from records of species' geographic
105 occurrences. These were obtained from the Global Biodiversity Information Facility (GBIF;
106 <http://www.gbif.org>). Validation of the taxonomic name of each species was done through
107 consultation of The International Union for Conservation of Nature's Red List of Threatened
108 Species (IUCN; <https://www.iucnredlist.org/>) as well as other available biodiversity
109 databases. We downloaded 1,739 points for mammals, 14,141 for fishes, and 3,558 for
110 beetles. We subjected the data to a cleaning process by removing data fields that were either
111 not relevant to our study or were incomplete or inconsistent (Costello & Wieczorek, 2014).
112 This was done using Microsoft Excel and the R package 'dismo'. We filtered data for cases
113 with no georeference, occurrence records, repeated observations, records with no decimal
114 precision, switches between longitude and latitude, changes in sign of geographic coordinates
115 and using the program QGIS we were able to filter records outside the region of interest by
116 mapping the occurrences in a world map raster.

117

118 Once this was done, we extracted bioclimatic variables for each species coordinates from
119 WorldClim (<https://www.worldclim.org>). We used the annual mean temperature (bio1),
120 maximum temperature of warmest month (bio5) and annual precipitation (bio12) in the

121 spatial resolution of 10 minutes (~340 km²) which we then used to create one single raster
122 file and then extracted the environmental values for each occurrence point using the R
123 package ‘raster.’

124

125 To create an estimate of the accessible region we used the World Wildlife Fund map of the
126 ecoregions of each continent (Olson et al., 2001)

127 <https://www.arcgis.com/home/item.html?id=67e8c7ce18f744f0b0e067c1e2247b6c>).

128 We extracted the ecoregion which matched the coordinates previously obtained for each
129 species. We then assigned names and a code for each ecoregion in order to facilitate the
130 manipulation of the data.

131

132 We then obtained a particular number of coordinates for both fish and beetles at random in
133 order to reduce the sampling bias. In the case of the beetles species, there was a large
134 difference between the number of samples found in the UK regions and the rest of the
135 European continent (Spain, Belgium and the Netherlands). In order to remedy this we took
136 1000 samples at random from England and 1000 samples at random from the rest of the
137 continent, thus taking into account the sampling bias that would otherwise interfere with the
138 results. The same was done with the fish species.

139

140 We then used the gathered information with RStudio to fit a smooth histogram (a kernel
141 density) to make a model of realized niche as well as the temperature in the M area for each
142 species of fish and beetles. Hutchinson’s hypothesis is that the range of the fundamental
143 would contain the observations (realized niche).

144

145 We also estimated the proportion of available environmental space that a particular species
146 uses, by estimating the integral of the minimum between the black and green curves (Soberon
147 & Arroyo-Peña, 2017).


148

149

150 **Results**

151 The data on ranges of temperature tolerance obtained from the GlobTherm database were
152 very contrasting in concept and in methodology. We found that they were not adequate to
153 describe the fundamental niche in case of mammals, since GlobTherm reports a Thermal
154 Neutral Zone (Bennet et al. 2018) which represents a range where metabolic activity does
155 not change, therefore it encompasses an narrow and extremely favorable range, as we show
156 in Figure 1, a random example out of the 61 cases of mammals in the database. All examples
157 of mammals have very narrow TNZ ranges, often completely outside the actual observations.

158




159

160 Figure 1. Range of Thermal Neutral Zone for one species of a desert mouse (blue and red
161 lines), the smooth histogram of the available mean yearly temperature (times 10: BIO1
162 bioclimatic variable) in the M zone for *Peromyscus eremicus* (black line), and the smooth
163 histogram of the GBIF observations (green line).

164

165 On the contrary, the data on ranges of temperature tolerance obtained from GlobTherm
166 proved sufficient in the case of beetles and fish species, because these ranges are defined in
167 terms of 50% and 100% mortality. These are able to portray a reasonable model for the
168 fundamental niche for these species. In Figure 2 we present the data points used for the
169 marine species, and in figure 3 the data records for the beetle species.


170



171

172 Fig. 2 Map of occurrences of the fish species *Abudedefduf saxatilis*, *Haemulon bonariense*,
173 *Lutjanus apodus* and *Scarus iseri* along with the environmental availability region (M).

174




175

176 Fig. 3 Map of occurrences of the beetle species *Agabus brunneus*, *A. didymus* and *A.*
177 *ramblae* along with their environmental availability (M).

178

179 In figure 4-5 we present the results of niche measures for the fish and beetle species.

180




181

182 Figure 4. Graphs representing the fundamental niche, existent niche and realized niche of
183 the species of fish *Abudefduf saxati* (A), *Haemulon bonar* (B), *Lutjanus apodus* (C) and
184 *Scarus iseri* (D); where the maximum temperature (red) and minimum temperature (blue)

185 constitute the fundamental niche, the environmental availability M is the black line, and the
186 number of species occurrences (green) is the realized niche.

187



188

189 Figure 5. Graphs representing the fundamental niche, existent niche and realized niche of
190 the species of beetle *Agabus brunneus* (A), *A. didymus* (B) and *A. ramblae* (C); where the
191 maximum temperature (red) and minimum temperature (blue) constitute the fundamental
192 niche, the environmental availability M (black) is the environmental availability in M and
193 the number of species occurrences (green) is the realized niche.

194

195 Finally, in table 1 we present the proportion of environmental space occupied by the species,
196 as estimated from occurrences from the GBIF database.

197

198 Discussion

199 An important lesson from our results is that data of tolerance curves, even for the simplified
200 case of a single variable, cannot be simply assumed to represent a fundamental niche in the
201 sense of Hutchinson. Hutchinson (1957) defined the niche in terms of fitness, and unless the
202 experiments have a direct relationship to fitness, their use as proxies for fundamental niches
203 is problematic. The Thermal Neutral Zone for the endotherms, as reported in the GlobTherm
204 database (Bennet et al. 2018) fail to fulfill this criteria, and should not be used as a proxy for
205 the range of positive fitness. On the other hand, the 100% mortality critical temperatures are
206 indeed represent a fitness range, albeit a bit extreme.

207 Using the ranges compatible with the concept of fundamental niche, Hutchinson's inequality
208 is proved, adding confirmatory evidence to previous results by Soberon & Arroyo-Peña
209 (2017). In all the examples we present estimating the fundamental niche with the 100%

210 critical range of temperatures, the entire available range of environments occurs inside the
211 fundamental niche. This means that the entire region of hypothetical availability (M) could
212 be occupied. This is certainly not the case, and there are several reasons why there may be
213 empty regions of accessible and favorable space. The first one was proposed by Hutchinson
214 (1957): maybe there are negative interactors (competitors or predators) preventing the
215 expansion of the range of a species. The second one may be the result of using a single
216 variable as a proxy to a multivariate niche. Other variables may be limiting the actual
217 distribution of the species, but we are measuring just one. By adding variables one add
218 constraints to a niche function (Soberón & Arroyo-Peña, 2017), and therefore reduces the
219 proportion of available environmental space used. The third reason is very similar to the
220 second: unoccupied favorable temperatures may be due to lack of suitable habitat. Habitat,
221 as opposed to climate, may be a limiting factor. For instance, in the case of the freshwater
222 beetles *Agabus*, climate may be favorable but if the correct type of freshwater body is lacking,
223 the species may not be present. The value of the integrals in table 1 represent the proportion
224 of available climate actually used by the species (assuming the GBIF data is representative).

225 The above point illustrates the need to have a hypothesis about accessible geographic space,
226 or M (Barve et al. 2011). An M hypothesis is not only indispensable when using software
227 sensitive to the background data, like Maxent (VanDerWal, Shoo, Johnson, & Williams,
228 2009), but also to interpret the results of any niche modeling. Knowledge about the amount
229 of available niche space suggests whether missing factors are present.

230 The work we present here should be regarded as an exploration into the problems of
231 estimating fundamental niches. The main problem is the lack of experimental data, relating
232 many relevant variables to fitness values. This is an obvious problem, and it is very puzzling
233 to notice how little, comparatively, experimental work has been done to address it. Besides
234 temperature physiological ranges, only a handful of experiments include two variables
235 (Birch, 1953; Hooper et al, 2008), and none, to our knowledge, more than 2. This represents
236 an open field of research for the future.

237

238

239

240 Table 1. Data and occupied niche for the species of beetles and fishes selected.

241 *Subjects of study values and characteristics*

Species	Tmax	tmin	Max Metric	Min Metric	Niche width	Occurrences	Clean Occurrences	Phylum	Class	Order	Family
<i>Agabus brunneus</i>	46.4	-8.5	LT100	LT100	0.92	1012	514	Arthropoda	Insecta	Coleoptera	Dytiscidae
<i>Agabus didymus</i>	44.8	-9	LT100	LT100	0.51	5313	2885	Arthropoda	Insecta	Coleoptera	Dytiscidae
<i>Agabus ramblae</i>	44.5	-6.8	LT100	LT100	0.95	114	114	Arthropoda	Insecta	Coleoptera	Dytiscidae
<i>Abudefduf saxatilis</i>	40	10	LT100	LT100	0.42	9989	5242	Chordata	Actinopteri	Perciformes	Pomacentridae
<i>Haemulon bonariense</i>	40	15	LT100	LT100	0.56	120	61	Chordata	Actinopteri	Perciformes	Haemulidae
<i>Lutjanus apodus</i>	40	10	LT100	LT100	0.27	9987	6872	Chordata	Actinopteri	Perciformes	Lutjanidae
<i>Scarus iseri</i>	35	10	LT100	LT100	0.44	9997	1796	Chordata	Actinopteri	Perciformes	Labridae

242

243 **Bibliografía**

244 Addo-Bediako, A., Chown, S. L., & Gaston, K. J. (2000). Thermal tolerance, climatic variability and

245 latitude. *Proceedings. Biological sciences / The Royal Society*, 267(1445), 739-745.

246 <https://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2000.1065>

247 Angilletta Jr, M. J., & Angilletta, M. J. (2009). *Thermal adaptation: A theoretical and empirical*

248 *synthesis*. Oxford University Press.

- 249 Birch, L. C. (1953). Experimental Background to the Study of the Distribution and Abundance of
250 Insects: I. The Influence of Temperature, Moisture and Food on the Innate Capacity for
251 Increase of Three Grain Beetles. *Ecology*, 34(4), 698-711. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1931333>
- 252 Bozinovic, F., Calosi, P., & Spicer, J. I. (2011). Physiological correlates of geographic range in
253 animals. *Annual Review of Ecology, Evolution, and Systematics*, 42, 155-179.
- 254 Brown, J. H. (1984). On the relationship between abundance and distribution of species. *The*
255 *american naturalist*, 124(2), 255-279.
- 256 Colwell, R. K., & Rangel, T. F. (2009). Hutchinson's duality: The once and future niche. *Proceedings*
257 *of the National Academy of Sciences*, 106(Supplement_2), 19651-19658.
258 <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.0901650106>
- 259 Costello, M. J., & Wieczorek, J. (2014). Best practice for biodiversity data management and
260 publication. *Biological Conservation*, 173, 68-73.
261 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biocon.2013.10.018>
- 262 Drake, J. M. (2015). Range bagging: A new method for ecological niche modelling from presence-
263 only data. *Journal of the Royal Society Interface*, 12(107), 20150086.
- 264 Guisan, A., & Zimmermann, N. E. (2000). Predictive habitat distribution models in ecology.
265 *Ecological modelling*, 135(2-3), 147-186.
- 266 Holt, R. D. (2009). Bringing the Hutchinsonian niche into the 21st century: Ecological and
267 evolutionary perspectives. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*,
268 106(Supplement 2), 19659-19665.
- 269 Hooper, H. L., Connon, R., Callaghan, A., Fryer, G., Yarwood-Buchanan, S., Biggs, J., ... Sibly, R. M.
270 (2008). THE ECOLOGICAL NICHE OF *DAPHNIA MAGNA* CHARACTERIZED USING
271 POPULATION GROWTH RATE. *Ecology*, 89(4), 1015-1022. [https://doi.org/10.1890/07-](https://doi.org/10.1890/07-0559.1)
272 0559.1

- 273 Hutchinson, G. E. (1957). Concluding remarks Cold Spring Harbor Symposia on Quantitative
274 Biology, 22: 415–427. *GS SEARCH*.
- 275 Kearney, M., & Porter, W. (2009). Mechanistic niche modelling: Combining physiological and
276 spatial data to predict species' ranges. *Ecology Letters*, 12(4), 334-350.
277 <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1461-0248.2008.01277.x>
- 278 Maguire Jr, B. (1973). Niche response structure and the analytical potentials of its relationship to
279 the habitat. *The American Naturalist*, 107(954), 213-246.
- 280 Peterson, A. T., Soberón, J., Pearson, R. G., Anderson, R. P., Martínez-Meyer, E., Nakamura, M., &
281 Araújo, M. B. (2011). Ecological niches and geographic distributions Princeton University
282 Press. *Princeton, NJ 328pp*.
- 283 Phillips, S. J., Anderson, R. P., & Schapire, R. E. (2006). Maximum entropy modeling of species
284 geographic distributions. *Ecological modelling*, 190(3-4), 231–259.
- 285 Robertson, T., Döring, M., Guralnick, R., Bloom, D., Wieczorek, J., Braak, K., ... Desmet, P. (2014).
286 The GBIF Integrated Publishing Toolkit: Facilitating the Efficient Publishing of Biodiversity
287 Data on the Internet. *PLoS ONE*, 9(8), e102623.
288 <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0102623>
- 289 Soberón, J., & Arroyo-Peña, B. (2017). Are fundamental niches larger than the realized? Testing a
290 50-year-old prediction by Hutchinson. *PLOS ONE*, 12(4), e0175138.
291 <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0175138>
- 292 VanDerWal, J., Shoo, L. P., Johnson, C. N., & Williams, S. E. (2009). Abundance and the
293 Environmental Niche: Environmental Suitability Estimated from Niche Models Predicts the
294 Upper Limit of Local Abundance. *The American Naturalist*, 174(2), 282-291.
295 <https://doi.org/10.1086/600087>
- 296

