Title: Predicting Bird Distributions Under Global Change

Authors & Affiliations:

MacPherson¹, M.P., Burgio^{2,3}, K.R., DeSaix⁴, M.G., Freeman⁵, B.G., Herbert⁶, J., Herman⁷, R., Jirinec⁸, V., Shonfield⁹, J., Slager¹⁰, D.L., van Rees¹¹, C.B., and J.E. Jankowski⁵

1. Louisiana State University Museum of Natural Sciences, Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge, LA, USA
2. New York City Audubon Society, New York, NY, USA
3. Department of Ecology and Evolutionary Ecology, University of Connecticut, Storrs, CT, USA
4. Department of Biology, Colorado State University, Fort Collins, CO, USA
5. Biodiversity Research Centre and Department of Zoology, University of British Columbia, Vancouver, BC, Canada
6. Ecology and Evolutionary Biology, Tulane University, New Orleans, LA, USA
7. Department of Ecology and Evolution, Stony Brook University, NY
8. School of Renewable Natural Resources, Louisiana State University and LSU AgCenter, Baton Rouge, LA, USA
9. LGL Limited, Cambridge, ON, Canada
10. Department of Biology, University of Washington, Seattle, WA, USA
11. River Basin Center & Odum School of Ecology, University of Georgia

Author Contributions:

Maggie MacPherson - concept, symposium organizer, symposium participant, writing & revising, editing full manuscript, topic editor (abstract, theory) and co-editor (temporal resolution of data types), figures, tables.

Kevin R. Burgio - concept, overall project support, symposium participant, writing & revising, conceptualizing and constructing figures, editing full manuscript, topic co-editor (methods & data types for spatial data)

Matthew G. DeSaix – symposium participant, writing & revising, topic co-editor (temporal resolution of data types)

Ben Freeman - symposium participant, writing, publication approach/ideas, topic editor (discussion)

Vitek Jirinec - symposium participant, writing & revising, topic co-editor (logistical methods and data types for occurrence data), figures.

John Herbert - symposium participant, writing, topic co-editor (methods & data types for spatial data)

Julia Shonfield - symposium participant, writing & revising, topic editor (introduction)

David Slager – symposium participant, writing & revising, topic editor (literature cited), topic co-editor (logistical methods and data types for occurrence data)

Rachael Herman - writing, topic co-editor (logistical methods and data types for occurrence data)

Charles van Rees – writing & revising, topic editor (analytical methods), figures.

Jill Jankowski – concept, symposium participant, writing & revising, editing full manuscript

ABSTRACT

Global change creates an urgent need to predict spatial responses of biota to support the conservation of sufficient habitat to maintain biodiversity. We present species distribution model theory and a synthesis of avian literature on approaches to collecting occurrence data, selecting explanatory variables and analytical processes currently in use to predict future distributions. We find that interpreting the validity of current predictive distributions is hindered by variation in spatio-temporal resolution of data sets that force hypothesis testing under the Grinnellian niche concept. Broadly, the capacity of species to shift their geographic ranges under land use and climate change is expected to be limited by both large scale (i.e., the physiological or fundamental niche) and small scale (i.e., the realized or tolerance niche) factors. We highlight the strengths and weaknesses of widely used explanatory variables and analytical approaches tailored to macrohabitat characteristics and the Grinnellian niche concept. This synthesis addresses if and how current approaches align with theory and makes recommendations for future directions to improve the accuracy of predictive distribution modelling.

KEY WORDS: species distribution model, environmental niche model, predictive distribution modeling, global change, climate change.

INTRODUCTION

Anthropogenic pressures on climate and land cover lead to altered ecosystems across, and have consequences for the geography of species distributions (Parmesan & Yohe, 2003). This creates an urgent need for understanding species spatial responses to global change and ensuring conservation of suitable habitat that supports population persistence and conserves biodiversity.

The accuracy of current predictive species distribution models, however, is limited due to variation in temporal and spatial resolution of datasets. The capacity of species to change their geographic ranges is limited by both large-scale factors (i.e., things that distinguish range-wide patterns like temperature and rainfall patterns - macrohabitat) and small-scale factors (i.e., things that drive responses by individuals like biotic interactions and resource availability - microhabitat). In this review, we explore the utility of predictive distribution modelling in guiding conservation action in birds. We focus on avian biodiversity because birds are excellent indicators of environmental change, may be more vulnerable to climate change than some other taxa (e.g., mammals), and they have the most widespread and in-depth databases on distributions (Morrison, 1986; Riddell et al., 2021). Insights from avian literature may also be generalizable to other taxa because birds display a wide variety of life history strategies, and citizen science initiatives and long-term research programs have yielded an abundance of predictive distribution literature (Şekercioğlu et al., 2019).

A multitude of factors can ultimately influence how species, populations and individuals respond to changing climate regimes. Individuals may lack flexibility in tracking relevant environmental cues to adjust the timing of life history events and to accommodate novel ecological circumstances. Alternatively, even when species are flexible in timing life history events, they may be unable to modulate behavior in response to environmental anomalies that affect recruitment. For example, advancing egg laying dates to match earlier spring warming temperatures may have negative consequences for nestling survival when the chances of cold snaps are decoupled from warming trends caused by climate change (Shipley et al., 2020). Predicting how species distributions could be altered (shift, contract or expand) with global change may be species-specific (Hallman & Robinson, 2020; Radosavljevic & Anderson, 2014),

but research into how particular axes of climate change affect species with different life history strategies, foraging guilds or habitat affinities provides promising insight that may apply to a wider number of unstudied species (e.g., changing rainfall regimes - Brawn et al., 2017; advances in spring phenology and breeding success - Sander et al., 2020).

A major gap in our understanding of how organisms may respond to changing environments lies in movement behavior. In birds, research on migration routes and resource tracking is well established in the Northern Hemisphere (Faaborg et al., 2010; Thorup et al., 2017), although much less information is available for species that undergo seasonal movements in the Southern Hemisphere. In the speciose Neotropics, >50% of bird species are known to be migratory, and an increase in knowledge of seasonal movements in remaining species could augment this estimate this by up to 15% (Jahn et al., 2020; Rappole, 1995). Complexity is added by varied seasonal movements that avian species undertake, including austral migrants (Jahn et al., 2004, 2013), elevational migrants (Barçante et al., 2017; Hsiung et al., 2018), partial migrants (Sekercioglu, 2010) and others with intratropical migration routes (e.g., Resplendent Quetzal - Papeş et al., 2012; Three-wattled Bellbird - Powell & Bjork, 1995) or extended daily foraging routines (e.g., Oilbirds - Holland et al., 2009). Migratory bird species have been shown to decline when the timing of annual life history events are mismatched with peaks in food availability (Møller et al., 2008; Sander et al., 2020). On the other hand, multiple species of Nearctic-Neotropical migrants are advancing dates of spring migration and breeding behavior in response to warming spring temperatures (Dunn & Møller, 2019; Pecl et al., 2017; Shipley et al., 2020), offering support to the idea of “evolutionary rescue” such that existing variation within annual programs may yield previously unknown adaptive potential (Helm et al., 2019). In this review, we use literature on predictive bird distribution modelling to inform future work

predicting the importance of dispersal limitation, biotic interactions and estimates of the fundamental niche to understand climate-driven distributional shifts in birds and other taxa.

With specific attention on global temperature increases caused by climate change, responses to shifting thermal environments will be varied and complex. Janzen’s “seasonality hypothesis” suggests that tropical organisms should be particularly sensitive to anomalies in ambient conditions because their physiology is adapted to a relatively constant environment (Janzen, 1967). This idea has since received much empirical support (Sheldon et al., 2018), and highlighted the tropics for having a high concentration of thermal specialists that are vulnerable to climate change (Mora et al., 2013). Tropical ectotherms (i.e., arthropod prey) tend to live near the upper limits of their thermal optima and are therefore sensitive to even small temperature increases (Deutsch et al., 2008). Endotherms (like birds), on the other hand, have the capacity to tolerate ambient temperatures past their thermoneutral zone by raising metabolic activity to produce evaporative cooling, but this increases energy and water demands at temperature extremes (Gardner et al., 2011; Huey et al., 2012). Still, few studies have considered the potential effects on presumably more thermally flexible endotherms due to changes in a more thermally sensitive ectothermic prey base (Grady et al., 2019). An important consequence stemming from Janzen’s hypothesis is that lowland tropical species could be particularly affected by novel conditions supplied by global change, resulting in broad-scale biotic attrition, except for populations immediately adjacent to montane regions, which would have some access to upslope thermal refugia (*sensu* Brodie et al., 2017; Colwell et al., 2008). At least some studies have shown that tropical birds are unlikely to experience acute thermal limits to their distributions (Londoño et al., 2015, 2017). While species may have a sufficient thermal margin to defend against climate warming (Pollock et al., 2021), they will likely experience added

thermoregulatory costs in response to shifting thermal regimes or movements (Londoño et al., 2017). As the effects of increased temperature on populations can interact with critical ecological and life-history parameters, temperature is expected to impact both current distributions and species' responses to changing thermal environments.

Our review aims to synthesize theory, methods, and data sources widely used to predict bird distributions under global change, and to highlight best-practices and opportunities for innovation and refinement. Understanding where species occur and why some areas are occupied but not others is essential for developing conservation and management plans. For most species, knowledge of their distribution is limited to areas that have been surveyed. However, predictive distribution modelling is important to identify areas for protection or management. Modelling wide-ranging, unevenly distributed, cryptic, or difficult to survey species all present problems for understanding factors driving occupancy. Understanding how behaviors and life history traits are linked to patterns of occupancy requires focused investigation but are nevertheless critical layers for informative distribution models. Here, we bring together the issues complicating predictive distribution modelling to offer a solutions-oriented approach to habitat conservation under global change.

PREDICTIVE DISTRIBUTION MODEL THEORY

The current dogma of species distribution modelling falls into two categories: 1) species distribution models (hereafter SDMs) that comprise presence records and abiotic data, and 2) ecological niche models (hereafter ENMs) that explicitly estimate the accessible environment (Soberón & Peterson, 2005). These approaches are meant to have high spatial accuracy but are not meant to inform on cause-and-effect species-habitat relationships (Merow et al., 2013).

116 Models can be based on different niche perspectives, which present unique frameworks for
 117 estimating drivers of occupancy across a species' range. The Grinnellian class of niche reflects
 118 abiotic drivers of site occupancy (Elton, 1927; Soberón, 2007; Wisz et al., 2013) and SDMs are
 119 mainly built under the Grinnellian niche concept (Figure 1; Saupe et al., 2012). Coarse-scale
 120 variables describing ecosystem characteristics are often the most relevant for predicting shifting
 121 distributions across large spatial extents. In comparison, the Eltonian class of niche includes
 122 estimates of biotic interactions and resource-consumer dynamics that are only quantifiable at
 123 local scales (Figure 1; Elton, 1927; Soberón, 2007). Finally, the Hutchinsonian class of niche
 124 reflects the functional role of a species, which is often estimated using functional traits and
 125 species' habitat requirements based on functional traits (Rosado et al., 2016), and projects the
 126 probability of site occupancy beyond study areas, including estimates of dispersal probabilities in
 127 ENMs (Figure 1). A species' ability to move beyond their current realized niche depends on the
 128 relative importance of abiotic factors, biotic interactions, and dispersal probability that operate at
 129 different spatial scales (Jankowski et al., 2013).

Figure 1. The “BAM” diagram. The relationship between “B” - biotic, “A” - abiotic, and “M” - movement (also thought of as “access” and defined by dispersal ability) with respect to the authors of various niche theories (left). The location of realized, tolerance, and fundamental niche along the intersection of two hypothetical climate variables (right). Sax et al. (2013) present an update to niche theory that considers three components of a species niche: 1) the “realized niche”, i.e., conditions within the native range, 2) the “fundamental niche” - conditions, in which a species could thrive if it were introduced there, and 3) the “tolerance niche” - conditions, in which individuals could survive, but likely unable to maintain populations over the long-term. The fundamental niche is the set of appropriate abiotic conditions, and the realized niche is a smaller area where both abiotic and biotic environments are suitable. Theoretically not all of the realized niche could be accessible and so the potential range is yet smaller because it reflects only the area that is suitable and also accessible to the species. Occurrence is not

expected outside of the colored areas. The occupied area is represented by G_0 , and G_1 reflects appropriate conditions that have not or cannot be accessed by the species (as described by Saupe et al., 2012).

Assessing occurrence or abundance along abiotic gradients is important for predicting future range shifts under global change, as this relates directly to species' and populations' responses to the environment. The gradual shifts in temperature and rainfall regimes can be expected to align with changes in species responses, reflecting the shifts in optimal ambient conditions and resulting in altered patterns of probability of occurrence or abundance. It is important to note that ENM products are only able to predict the probability of site occupancy within the range of abiotic conditions measured within current range boundaries, so will be limited where climate change introduces novel climates (e.g., Williams et al., 2007).

Spatial ecology theory dictates that species respond to continuous environmental gradients through gradual changes in abundance, as individuals experience shifting conditions moving toward or away from environmental optima over space (Austin, 2005, 2007). However, populations may also show thresholds in abiotic tolerances or in response to biotic factors that change their response shape (e.g., creating asymmetric or skewed response functions; e.g., Oksanen & Minchin, 2002). For example, the asymmetric abiotic stress (AASL) hypothesis predicts a steeper decrease in a species' probability of occurrence toward the more stressful end of a species' distribution, which has been supported in a number of vascular plant species (Dvorský et al., 2017). Other threshold-type effects can result in asymmetric responses shown across multiple species in communities (e.g., sharp ecotone boundaries, appearance of dominant predators or competitors; Jankowski et al., 2013). Identifying response shapes is of practical

interest to understand the impact of abiotic and biotic factors on occupancy. Comparisons across species distinguish commonalities and differences in responses to gradients and can point to key environmental variables driving patterns in community organization.

Heterogeneity within landscapes is important to consider in determining whether populations would be able to respond (in time and space) to changing conditions. Landscapes can vary in ways that affect both the phenology of resources (time) or availability of habitat (space); such variability can be tracked if conditions change at a pace that populations could respond to. Examples of this include species adapted to annually ephemeral or temporally patchy habitats such as wetlands and grasslands; species accustomed to such environments may have dispersal strategies that predispose them to better track climate (e.g., *Elaenia cristata* - Ritter et al., 2021). In other cases, habitat and resources are spatially patchily distributed, and the ability of species to respond to changing conditions may be more taxon-specific for those that rely on spatiotemporal heterogeneity that is naturally patchy. Examples of this include habitat specialists in naturally patchy habitats such as Amazonian white sand habitats (e.g., *Elaenia ruficeps* - Ritter et al., 2021).

Microclimate refugia allow animals to buffer themselves from acutely unfavorable conditions. One example of this is through behavioral thermoregulation. Ambient temperature is almost never constant in terrestrial environments—it varies by time, and by habitat, often at very small scales (Scheffers et al., 2014, 2017). Biologists have long understood that mobile animals exploit thermal heterogeneity to maintain optimal body temperature (Angilletta Jr & Angilletta, 2009; Angilletta et al., 2009; Cowles & Bogert, 1944; Porter et al., 1973; Stevenson, 1985). For cold-adapted species in a heating world, this can be achieved by shifting activity times to cooler periods of the year and day, and by moving to microhabitats that supply cooler microclimates.

This capacity to compensate for unfavorable ambient temperature by behavioral thermoregulation, known as the “Bogert Effect” (Huey et al., 2003), can at least partly mitigate the harmful effects of climate warming (Huey et al., 2012). However, behavioral thermoregulation is contingent on access to cooler areas and periods; animals already occurring in the most buffered environments have limited options for escape when conditions change. Furthermore, individuals could experience additional pressured from biotic interactions with species moving into their habitat to thermoregulate (Huey et al., 2012).

Dispersal limitation is one of three fundamental aspects of distribution theory (Figure 1). Understanding barriers to distributions caused by dispersal limitation has been of great interest, for example, in bird species unable to cross areas of unsuitable habitat, and has been studied both experimentally (e.g., Moore et al., 2008) and theoretically (e.g., Ribas et al., 2012, 2018). Selection pressures driving morphology, such as migratory compared to sedentary life histories, may also play a role in physically limiting dispersal distance (Capurcho et al., 2020; Claramunt et al., 2012; MacPherson et al., 2021; Sheard et al., 2020). Life history strategies also dictate the demographic trends in dispersal; for example, in many species it is the inexperienced young that disperse into new areas away from the territories of their parents (e.g., Florida Scrub Jay - Suh et al., 2020). Dispersal limitation is thus a complex and difficult-to-quantify aspect of predictive distribution modelling that is nevertheless fundamental for predicting the probability of range shifts with global change. Coupling studies of distribution modelling with quantifiable measures of dispersal capacity is an important next step toward making more informed predictions of species responses to changing environments (Travis et al., 2013; Urban et al., 2013).

Generally, when confronted with climate change, species change in one of three ways: 1) by going extinct, 2) surviving by shifting their geographic range, or 3) evolving in place.

Evidence from the fossil record suggests all three responses are common (Graham et al., 1996; Smith et al., 1995). The capacity to adapt or evolve *in situ* in response to climate change has been relatively understudied (Parmesan & Matthews, 2005). A recent meta-analysis of existing studies of phenological and morphological adaptations to climate change concluded that adaptation, while variable among taxa, will not likely work on a sufficient scale to mitigate the worst effects of ongoing climate change, whereas phenological adaptation (e.g., timing of reproduction or migration) may mitigate such effects, albeit imperfectly (Radchuk et al., 2019). The expectation that species with short generation times should be able to survive by evolving in place remains understudied. Advancing such research is hampered by the difficulty of conducting experiments on large numbers of species at sufficient time scales needed to develop a comprehensive framework (Holt et al., 2005; Pierson et al., 2015). Variability among taxa and short time scales signal that selection pressure has yet to be strong enough to produce measurable changes, though it appears that species shift their phenology faster where climate change velocity is faster (Poloczanska et al., 2013). Among abiotic drivers, mainly precipitation changes (but also temperature) seem to underlie adaptive responses to climate change (Caruso et al., 2017; Siepielski et al., 2017). Dramatic changes in climate over the remainder of this century are expected (Figure 2) with many species likely unable to survive in the areas they presently occupy (Ceballos et al., 2015; Sax et al., 2013). Ramping up efforts that prioritize long-term monitoring of populations will be important for informing predictions of the resiliency of species to climate change.

Figure 2. Current climate and predicted change in climate of global terrestrial biomes.

Climographs of (A) temperate and (B) tropical and subtropical global terrestrial biomes.

Projected changes in temperature and precipitation regimes for (C) temperate and (D) tropical and subtropical global terrestrial biomes. While some areas are predicted to have increased or decreased precipitation in the future, no areas are expected to have lower or stable temperatures. Temperature increases are predicted to be higher in temperate biomes, while changes in precipitation are greater for tropical biomes. Climographs built from The World Wildlife Fund terrestrial ecoregions (<https://www.worldwildlife.org/publications/terrestrial-ecoregions-of-the-world>) and current climate (2021-2040) from CanESM5 middle of the road scenario (SSP3-7.0)

accessed from Worldclim (<https://www.worldclim.org/data/cmip6/cmip6climate.html>). The projected change is modeled as the difference between current climate (2021-2040, described above) and future climate using the worst-case scenario (SSP4-6.0; 2081-2100) from CanESM5 global climate model data (Meinshausen et al., 2020). Species' presence, and thus biodiversity, is highly influenced by biome type, which shifts from one form to another according to temperature and rainfall regimes (Whittaker 1975). Projected changes in temperature and precipitation may cause global terrestrial biomes to shift in space, but spatial gains and losses by different biomes over time may not occur in synchrony with habitat needs to maintain biodiversity (Dorazio et al., 2015). R code for producing this figure can be found at https://github.com/mmacphe/Global_Change_Biomes.

Extinction risk (and conversely, population viability) centers on declining population and small population paradigms. Population declines are driven by deterministic (demographic, abiotic, and biotic) factors that cause reduction to small numbers (e.g., the Allee effect), and also by stochastic factors, which dominate the extinction dynamics of small populations (Caughley, 1994; Morris & Doak, 2002; Smith et al., 2021). The abiotic shifts in conditions due to climate change and the resulting shifts in species distributions play a role in both types of population dynamics. Shifting distributions can cause temporary or permanent reductions in habitat area (Thomas et al., 2006; van Rees & Reed, 2018), lowering carrying capacity and driving population declines at local or regional scales, or reducing connectivity and creating isolated subpopulations that are more susceptible to small-population dynamics (Anderson et al., 2009). The degree to which changing distributions result in commonly observed conservation impacts depends on a diversity of species traits including habitat preference and associations, phenotypic

plasticity, and current range and population size (Jiguet et al., 2007; Visser, 2008). Notably, research based solely on changes in distributions tends to predict widespread extinctions due to the aforementioned mechanisms, but plasticity, dispersal, and adaptation appear to have been key for many species' resilience to past and current climate change (Moritz & Agudo, 2013). For example, the Galapagos finches are a well-known example of phenotypic plasticity in bill morphology in response to environmental change (Grant & Grant, 2020; Grant & Weiner, 2017; Weiner, 1994).

OCCURRENCE DATA FOR PREDICTIVE DISTRIBUTION MODELLING

Occurrence data through time is the foundation for understanding species responses to global change. To assess whether a change in distribution has occurred or will occur, researchers require historical records to establish a baseline for comparison, followed by surveys at one or more subsequent time points. Although birds are among the best studied animals, early baseline inventories are still rare, and often consist of field notes (Reznick et al., 1994), which present challenges particularly in reconstructing past abundances (Shaffer et al., 1998). Alternatively, museum records are among the best sources of historical occurrence data, though they primarily supply presence/absence data only (Shaffer et al., 1998).

In contrast to sparse information from the past, modern ornithologists benefit from technological advances that offer unprecedented information on bird occurrence. As birds are such mobile organisms, these include devices that can track individuals beyond specific field research sites (satellite imagery - Borowicz et al., 2018; sophisticated automated biodiversity data collection - Kitzes & Schricker, 2019; for birds within appropriate size ranges - McKinnon & Love, 2018; and online citizen science efforts - Sullivan et al., 2009, 2014). They improve our

understanding of avian ecology by identifying previously unknown species-habitat relationships (Jirinec et al., 2016), migratory routes (Jahn et al., 2016, 2021; Stanley et al., 2012, 2015), foraging areas and behaviors (including accessing microhabitat refuges - Wolfson et al., 2020), and wintering distributions (Renfrew et al., 2013). These advances facilitate discovery of species responses to global change by revealing locations outside of direct observation. Aside from emerging technologies, simpler bird monitoring approaches implemented in the past at large scales have amassed rich longitudinal data (e.g., breeding bird surveys and regional atlases), and band recoveries across the globe continue to supply information on bird population trends and distributions (MacPherson et al., in prep).

A major challenge for predictive models is rarity or sparseness of point occurrence data. Even with many potential sources of occurrence data, knowledge of bird distributions still varies greatly by species, habitat, and geography. For example, rare, nocturnal, and/or secretive species and those in remote areas are difficult to detect and model accurately (MacKenzie et al., 2005; Stralberg et al., 2015). Rarity is a common characteristic of species in diverse tropical communities and remains a major challenge for constructing species distribution and environmental niche models for tropical species. Still, there are approaches to modelling rare species, for example, using Bayesian network analysis (Hamilton et al., 2015) or “ensemble small models” (ESMs; Breiner et al., 2015; see “Analytical Methods” section, below).

Decisions about which type of occurrence data is best for predicting distributions under global change varies based on the trade-off between addressing processes affecting the core distribution versus a more holistic understanding that includes unique responses at range boundaries, during different life history activities, or between different sex and age classes. Understanding of distributions could be improved by increasing the number of studies examining

range edges, and at finer temporal resolutions; “snapshots” in time do not provide a complete picture of spatial resource requirements for individuals or populations. Passive acoustic monitoring and long-term studies remain promising approaches for capturing relative abundance data to estimate population dynamics with respect to global change (Pérez-Granados et al., 2019; Pérez-Granados & Schuchmann, 2020; Sugai et al., 2020). Trait databases are gaining momentum as sources of functional diversity to test hypotheses under the Hutchinsonian niche concept (Gallagher et al., 2020; Leclerc et al., 2020; Matuoka et al., 2020). In particular, exploring how functional roles of species change across abiotic gradients can dramatically improve our understanding of abiotic tolerances to more accurately predict range dynamics. For example, bill size has been shown to be important for thermoregulation in birds (e.g., Danner & Greenberg, 2015) and a study of functional trait structure along a tropical elevational gradient in Malaysian Borneo linked larger bills in low elevation communities with thermal tolerance (Boyce et al., 2019). Current shortfalls in avian occurrence data (summarized by Lees et al., 2020) require an integrated approach to predicting bird distributions with global change. Although most efforts to collect occurrence data are from small spatial areas (e.g., from individual field research sites) and coarse resolutions (Table 1), even incomplete general natural history knowledge gained across spatial and temporal resolutions remains key to identifying important explanatory variables responsible for supporting site occupancy now and into the future.

Table 1. Geospatial context of common occurrence data sources for birds and explanatory variables. Most occurrence data and explanatory variable data layers are of coarse spatial and temporal resolution, making them useful for testing hypotheses under the Grinnellian class of

niche. Occurrence data sources with fine spatial and temporal resolution are not as common and require higher economic investment for acquiring location data (i.e., GPS tags) or physically tracking individual birds (i.e., radio-tracking) but could be important for testing hypotheses under the Eltonian class of niche. For a more detailed assessment of temporal categories for avian occurrence data see MacPherson et al. (in prep).

Geospatial data qualities	Examples of occurrence data sources	Examples of explanatory variables
Large spatial area, coarse spatial and/or temporal resolution	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Remote sensing assets (satellite imagery, aerial imagery etc.) •Automated radiotelemetry •Geolocators •eBird •Stable hydrogen isotopes •Genetic data 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Long-term averages in stable climates (e.g., WorldClim) •Land cover (e.g., MODIS, GlobCover, SPOT) •Phenology and vegetation indices (e.g., MODIS, Landsat) •Climate record (e.g., NCDC, ClimateNA, ClimateSA) •Atmospheric weather reanalyses (e.g., ERA, GPM, TRMM, NCEP)
Small spatial area, coarse spatial and/or temporal resolution	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Citizen science (e.g., Breeding Bird Surveys, Christmas Bird Counts) •Natural history collections •Field notes •Point count surveys •Passive acoustic monitoring •Long-term datasets •Bird banding data 	
Large spatial area, fine spatial and/or temporal resolution	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •GPS tags 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Digital elevation models (e.g., ASTER) •Vegetation indices (e.g., SPOT)
Small spatial area, fine spatial and/or temporal resolution	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •VHF radio-tags 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Personal weather data loggers •Weather station data

SELECTING APPROPRIATE EXPLANATORY VARIABLES

Predicting distributions into the future relies on accurate assessments of current life history requirements. In this section, we synthesize the spatial and temporal resolution of explanatory variables commonly used to match distributions with habitat and resource needs. Producing sound predictive models requires suitable proxies for resource or habitat needs that are ecologically relevant (e.g., Burns et al., 2020; Randin et al., 2020). To scale up to entire distributions, there must be an underlying knowledge of a species' life history that effectively

links the lives of individuals to the explanatory variable (or proxy variable) associated with site occupancy. Predicting distributions into a future where the distributions of food webs will shift requires a breadth in knowledge of life history information to predict the probability of species ranges shifting individually or with their entire biotic community. This task is complicated by the potentially differing needs for each life history stage or demographic, which is often the case for birds (e.g., habitat requirements may differ between fledglings and adults). While the main considerations are the spatial and temporal resolutions of explanatory variables, biotic interactions can also play a critical role, and may need to be considered on a species-specific basis.

SPATIAL RESOLUTION OF EXPLANATORY VARIABLES

Selecting the correct spatial resolution of explanatory variables is key to producing the most accurate assessments of range shifts under global change. Passively remotely sensed spatial products (e.g., NDVI and BIOCLIM variables) can be proxies for features of the environment being used by individuals. Active remote sensing systems, for example light detection and ranging (LiDAR) has also been used to predict occupancy by light-demanding versus shade-tolerant plant species (Wüest et al., 2020). LiDAR can also offer direct measurements of structural features of habitat (e.g., vertical distribution of forest canopy elements and foliage density) useful in predicting species occupancy (e.g., Goetz et al., 2010). Remotely sensed variables are thought to reflect a contingency of resources assuming the data product conveys mutual information on a shared spatiotemporal scale with the amount of food resources (Riotte-Lambert & Matthiopoulos, 2020). There are some satisfying interpretations of the ecological relevance of these remotely sensed products (see Bridge et al., 2016 (EVI); Renfrew et al., 2013

(NDVI; Tøttrup et al., 2012 (drought)), although the typical purpose of using these large scale variables is for spatial accuracy and not causal relationships, in that remotely sensed variables generally serve as proxies for features of the environment used by individuals.

Nevertheless, many remotely sensed abiotic products do intend to reflect a direct habitat resource or type. Habitat characteristics (i.e., land cover) are most often identified with remotely sensed data, which depending on the sensor, can have a variety of resolutions. Medium-high spatial resolutions ($\leq 30\text{m}$, e.g., Landsat, Sentinel) are useful to pair with more precise occurrence data (e.g., GPS tags, point counts; Shirley et al., 2013), whereas low spatial resolution (e.g., MODIS) can be useful for occurrence data such as geolocators or weather radar (Heim et al., 2020). The temporal resolution of remotely sensed data is a limitation, especially when modelling the dynamic nature of migratory birds and habitat changes (MacPherson et al., 2018; Roslin et al., 2021). The limitations in remotely sensed spatio-temporal resolution should not be a deterrent in SDMs, however, because the information gained is not possible with other data sources (He et al., 2015; Randin et al., 2020). Still, applied interpretations when spatial and/or temporal resolutions do not match should be made with caution.

TEMPORAL RESOLUTION OF EXPLANATORY VARIABLES

The temporal predictability of resources is important for predicting future distributions because annual life history strategies are dependent upon correctly timing life cycle events with required resources. For example, it is widely held that birds breeding at high latitudes must correctly time the hatching of young with annual insect emergence to maximize fledging success, and early arrival to breeding grounds may enhance reproductive success (Alerstam, 2011; Kokko et al., 2006; Nilsson et al., 2013; Smith & Moore, 2005). Predictive distribution models are expected to

be the most accurate when species-habitat correlations are assessed using occurrence and environmental data gathered from the same time-period. However, the temporal resolution of occurrence data is much finer than that at which environmental data is typically collected; this can create a mismatch that limits the questions that can be answered using current approaches. The habitat requirements for fulfilling life history needs may vary depending upon the particular life history event (i.e., mate acquisition, rearing young, molting, migrating, etc.) and the species life history strategy. Life history strategies vary in birds from those that have evolved to rely on consistent resource availability (e.g., in the case of dietary or habitat specialists that cannot live outside of narrow environmental conditions), to periodic resource abundance (e.g., seasonal, annual, inter-annual weather patterns that drive migratory or irruptive population movements), or unreliable resource availability (e.g., in nomadic taxa), and it is important to match locality data in time to environmental data for accurate species-habitat assessment.

The temporal resolutions for widely used climate data varies, with trade-offs between temporal and spatial resolution in addition to the state of products limiting the types of distribution questions that can be informed by them (Table 1). Here, we demonstrate this point by explaining temperature and rainfall data sources because these are the two most widely used and generally important environmental factors in species distribution modelling (Bradie & Leung, 2017). The finest spatial and temporal resolution of environmental data is typically from weather station data from the nearest station to the research site (e.g., from <https://www.wunderground.com/history>) or by collecting weather data alongside occurrence data using data loggers available from various manufacturers (e.g., Meter, Truebner). The ERA5-Land dataset provides fine scale (hourly) temperature and precipitation data, but at a 9 km spatial resolution from January 1981 to present

(<https://cds.climate.copernicus.eu/cdsapp#!/dataset/reanalysis-era5-land?tab=overview>). National Centers for Environmental Prediction (NCEP) provides global temperature and precipitation data (four-times daily) data at a 0.25 x 0.25 degree grid resolution from 1948-present (<https://psl.noaa.gov/data/gridded/data.ncep.reanalysis.surface.html>). WorldClim is a commonly used source of environmental data and the current version (2.1) provides global monthly values of min and max temperature, and precipitation averaged from 1970-2000 (Fick & Hijmans, 2017). Historical monthly min and max temperature, and total precipitation data used for hindcasting are averaged by decade from 1960-2018 (Fick & Hijmans, 2017; Harris et al., 2014). BioClim data are 19 quarterly estimates derived from WorldClim monthly temperature and rainfall values that are thought to be more biologically meaningful than raw temperature or rainfall data (Busby, 1991). Bioclimatic variables have been averaged for the years 1970-2000 to generate monthly estimates (Fick & Hijmans, 2017). Despite being powerful tools for assessing macroclimate associations, caution should be used when using the most accessible climate products to assess the probability of future range locations.

To build robust predictive models, it is necessary to match the spatial and temporal resolution of the occurrence data with that of the habitat characteristics. The temporal resolution of remotely sensed data is a limitation, especially when modelling the dynamic nature of migratory birds where dynamic seasonal habitat changes drive short-term habitat quality (e.g., seasonally flooded mudflat habitat for migrating shorebirds; Twedt, 2013). Google Earth Engine (a java script based platform where one can write their own code to integrate many satellite products and independently calculate indices such as NDVI) is a flexible tool that can facilitate identifying the correct temporal resolution of land cover data to robustly test explanatory power of land cover variables. Examples of data sets in Google Earth Engine include vegetation indices

(Landsat, ~2 weeks temporal resolution), products for creating land cover classifications (SPOT, ~1 month), and land cover datasets (e.g., GlobCover, Cropland Data Layers, National Land Cover Database; Table 1).

BIOTIC FACTORS

Modeling future range shifts in response to global change rarely considers biotic factors. This omission is the main reason why an assumption of SDMs - that the species is at equilibrium with their environment - is rarely, if ever, met (Pearson & Dawson, 2003). If this assumption were true, a species' realized and fundamental niche would completely overlap as long as the species could access all available suitable niche space (Figure 1). Consideration of biotic factors has the potential to significantly enrich the field of predictive distribution modelling with more accurate forecasts, and here we synthesize leading research contributing to this end at both the intraspecific and interspecific level.

There remains a gap in statistical approaches that account for biotic interactions in forecasting species distributions. It is thought that biotic interactions vary along abiotic gradients such that biotic interactions can either enhance or reduce predicted ranges (Louthan et al., 2015). However, because capturing this information requires both high spatial and high temporal accuracy across all abiotic scenarios within the realized niche, there are few examples to draw from. One promising approach to including biotic interactions in predictive spatial modelling is the development of causal models that estimate the influence of interspecific competition using co-occurrence data (e.g., Staniczenko et al., 2017). The scope and strength of biotic factors may be correlated with abiotic pressures (Louthan et al., 2015), and may differ depending upon which range edge is being considered. For example, much work has been done in the bird literature to

improve our understanding of species-habitat relationships through the study of hybrid zones, which typically occupy only one part of a species range (e.g., Taylor et al., 2014). Quantification of biotic factors, like the ones described here, requires targeted species-specific research to test hypotheses within the Eltonian and Hutchinsonian classes of niche. This research is mainly done within small spatial extents and without consideration of temporal or spatial resolution (e.g., co-occurrence records from different time periods or datasets with different spatial resolutions - Atauchi et al., 2018; Palacio & Girini, 2018; see also König et al., 2021), but some research has been done at large spatial extents and coarse resolutions (e.g., Acorn Woodpecker occurrence with Colombian Oaks in the Northern Andes - Freeman & Mason, 2015).

Modelling future range shifts in response to global change must consider the role of intraspecific biotic factors that shape current distributions. Intraspecific competition can drive density-dependent range shifts in migratory species such that interannual selection of wintering locations are dependent on group size and food availability (Corre et al., 2020). Dispersal limitation can contribute to inadequacies in recruitment to new or population sink sites, limiting population recovery or range shifts despite available habitat (Palma et al., 2020). The ability to update behaviors when circumstances change (behavioral flexibility) may be key for driving range shifts or expansions under global change (Blaisdell et al., 2020). Further, bird species capable of behavioral innovation (a.k.a. plasticity) often have lower risk of extinction, as they are better able to adapt to changing ecosystems and habitat destruction (Ducatez et al., 2020; Reed et al., 1999). Additionally, metapopulation dynamics can affect the introgression of adaptive traits such that maladaptive traits restrict range shifts under global change (e.g., Garcia-R & Matzke, 2021; Lavretsky et al., 2020). Each of these examples are implicitly expected to vary across

abiotic gradients, highlighting the importance of assessing the probability of site occupancy beyond the core of a species distribution.

Perhaps more difficult is estimating the strength of interspecific biotic factors in shaping distributions because this requires a breadth of natural history knowledge beyond that of the species in question. However, interspecific biotic factors are thought to have strong influences on the probability of site occupancy. Species may be excluded through predator/prey dynamics where patches of habitat occupied by a species' predator may be less likely to be occupied by the species being studied (Léandri-Breton & Bêty, 2020). Interspecific competition can also exclude species and is often assessed using co-occurrence data (Elsen et al., 2017; Freeman et al., 2016, 2019; Jankowski et al., 2010). Commensalisms, where one organism benefits from the presence of another organism and the other unaffected, can also facilitate site occupancy (Aitken & Martin, 2007). Including data on the presence of predators, competitors, and commensalisms in SDMs can be a useful addition to improving models (Jankowski et al., 2013). Alternatively, the spatial overlap with other taxa may have little influence if the focal species exhibits behavioral avoidance (e.g., via interference competition - Jaeger, 1970; or predator-prey dynamics - Lukas et al., 2021) or the spatio-temporal scope of data are not aligned.

The utility of SDMs to guide predictions of distributions under global change will certainly be limited by the spatio-temporal resolution of environmental variables. Even when researchers are mindful when selecting environmental data suited to answer questions about their occurrence data (i.e., using ecologically relevant environmental and climate data across biologically relevant space and timescales), a challenge remains in combining and contrasting the Grinnellian class of niche (e.g., climate variables) against other niche classes that require finer temporal and spatial data (e.g., density of interacting species). This problem can further

complicate predictive models if site occupancy is dependent on time-lags, as is the case in some migratory species (Bridge et al., 2016), and is explored further in the following “Analytical Methods” section.

ANALYTICAL METHODS

Predictive models of species distributions can be divided into correlative versus mechanistic approaches (Figure 3). Correlative models elucidate relationships between species occurrence and spatially explicit explanatory variables and can be viewed as hypothesis generating tools. Data to parameterize correlative models are more readily available, making them the dominant source of predictive distribution models. Mechanistic models are hypothesis-testing tools that incorporate physiological tolerance to predict where species will be capable of persisting within their physiological limits (Guisan & Zimmermann, 2000).

Figure 3. Analytical processes for species distribution models. Left: important terms used in describing distribution model data. Right: Parallel workflows for example correlative versus mechanistic predictive modelling.

Descriptions of range characteristics that are the outcome of correlative SDMs can help us better understand species and their sensitivities to global change. MAXENT is one of the most popular SDM approaches, widely used for its ability to use presence-only datasets where true absence or non-detection data are typically hard to find (Elith & Leathwick, 2007; Merow et al., 2013). MAXENT has been useful for modelling distributions of rare or cryptic species due to its apparent high performance with small or incomplete datasets (Aubry et al., 2017; Pearson et al., 2007; Phillips et al., 2006; Wisz et al., 2008; but see also Marini et al., 2009). Boosted regression trees (BRTs) are one of many machine learning techniques well-suited to modelling complex ecological data because they can handle different types of predictor variables, fit complex nonlinear relationships, accommodate missing data and automatically handle interaction effects between predictors (Elith et al., 2008; Graham et al., 2008). BRTs have been used to predict bird distributions using occurrence data for waterfowl (Barker et al., 2014), shorebirds (Dalgarno et al., 2017), seabirds (Oppel et al., 2012), and owls (Domahidi et al., 2019). Hierarchical Bayesian models can integrate various data types (e.g., presence-absence, presence-only, count data) to create reliable spatio-temporal distribution models (Hefley & Hooten, 2015). Using continuous spatial predictor variables such as land cover, the abundance and distribution of species can be predicted over a continuous latent surface (Chakraborty et al., 2010), which has been useful with waterfowl aerial survey data (Herbert et al., 2018, 2021). Generalized linear models (GLMs) and generalized additive models (GAMs) can be employed to understand distributions across multiple environmental conditions and also conceptualize patterns in distributions of abundances across environmental gradients (Augustin et al., 1996; Smith & Edwards, 2021). GAMs can be used to estimate species' response curves with smoothing functions, which offer more flexibility

to capture complex shapes not possible with GLMs (e.g., Maggini et al., 2011). One drawback to GAMs, however, is that evaluation of response shapes (e.g., optima, skewness) is done through visual inspection rather than statistically. Huisman-Olff-Fresco (HOF) models are used to predict occupancy along abiotic gradients and are particularly useful in evaluating alternative shapes of species responses to gradients, for example, if changes in abundance do not exhibit the widely assumed symmetric Gaussian functions, but instead show asymmetric, threshold-like changes in occupancy over space. HOF response curves can be used to highlight distinct distribution patterns such as species replacements, allowing inference of potential biotic interactions that are otherwise difficult to measure (Jansen & Oksanen, 2013). The choice of predictive SDM technique and quality of SDM product are based predominantly on the type of occurrence data available and secondarily on spatiotemporal matching of explanatory variables.

Mechanistic approaches to SDMs model physico-chemical processes that drive species' presence. More specifically, biophysical models predict areas where physico-chemical processes meet life history needs (Kearney, 2006; Michael Kearney & Porter, 2009). For example, a biophysical model for the endangered Night Parrot (*Pezoporus occidentalis*) shows how air temperature increases of 3 °C would lead to lethal levels of dehydration (Kearney et al., 2016). Bayesian networks (BNs) are another type of mechanistic model that go beyond species-habitat correlations by also considering processes that influence occupancy across space and time (i.e., site access and selection - Jones, 2001). Originally employed to model human judgement (Pearl, 1985), BNs have only recently been adapted for predictive SDMs (MacPherson et al., 2018; Staniczenko et al., 2017). Mechanistic models are informed by causal relationships based on empirical research or expert knowledge, the latter of which are referred to as belief networks (Drew & Collazo, 2014; MacPherson et al., 2018). Mechanistic models enable the identification

of the most important variables driving distribution patterns through mapping the fundamental niche, which is helpful to inform conservation and management decisions when circumstances change.

Conservation plans rely on SDMs for future species distributions, despite the small, but growing, body of literature on ways to incorporate climate change into conservation planning (Jones & Cheung, 2015; Loyola et al., 2013; Nakao et al., 2013; Terribile et al., 2012). Using correlative predictive models is likely to overestimate range shifts and extinction risk due to the violations of common assumptions in correlative distribution modeling. For example, SDMs tend to violate the assumption that the individual species is currently at equilibrium within its environment (Early & Sax, 2014; Sax et al., 2013) and do not take into account species interactions (Pearson & Dawson, 2003). Despite these criticisms, SDMs remain the “best” widely accessible approach currently in use for identifying potential future habitat-area (Tingley et al., 2014).

Ensemble modeling strategies, in which the predictions of multiple approaches are combined or used simultaneously, are often suggested to better encompass the range of uncertainty in prediction (Araújo & New, 2007). This method accounts for the fact that model choice is often the greatest source of quantifiable uncertainty in species distribution modeling, and reduces sources of bias from the use of a single algorithm (Dormann et al., 2008; Jarnevich et al., 2017). Implementing ensembles of five or more of the algorithms and approaches described above has been greatly facilitated by software packages like BIOMOD (Thuiller et al., 2009) and VisTrails SAHM (Morissette et al., 2013), which bring methods together into a single analytical environment. Ensembles can be used to assess a range of potential projected outcomes, forming a “bounding box” or “consensus” across algorithm predictions (Araújo & New, 2007).

Analysis with model ensembles typically involves scaling and averaging model outputs and, often weighting these by some measurement of model performance such as “area under the curve” score.

The ongoing “big data revolution” in many fields including ornithology (La Sorte et al., 2018) has increased use of artificial intelligence for data handling and analysis (Xia et al., 2020), especially in correlative distribution modeling. Machine learning algorithms like MAXENT (Merow et al., 2013), random forests (Mi et al., 2017), neural networks (e.g., Manel et al., 1999), deep learning (Benkendorf & Hawkins, 2020) and boosted regression trees (Elith et al., 2006) are now commonly applied SDMs, and are valued for prediction and interpolation. They are excellent tools for insight into potential future shifts under global change (Elith, 2017).

DISCUSSION

Predicting where species will live in a warmer future is a central goal of modern ecology. This effort has recast the basic research question of what limits distribution of species – why a species lives *here* but not *there* – as an applied question. Species are already on the move in response to recent decades of warming (and, depending on the region, predicted trends of reduced or increased rainfall; Figure 2), supporting long-held theory that climate limits species’ geographic ranges (Tingley et al., 2009). However, the match between species’ distributions and climatic conditions is often weak; species vary considerably in their observed responses to recent climate change. These observations indicate that we are still in the early stages of ecological forecasting. In this research review, we have highlighted the theory underpinning how climate is related to species’ distributions and focused especially on the types of data sources and analytic approaches

that are useful for predictive modeling of species' geographic responses to ongoing climate change.

Here we briefly highlight three motivating questions to guide future research; the answers to these questions are particularly likely to generate useful insights.

1. Is dispersal a rate-limiting step in range expansions?

The proximate driver of range shifts is dispersal; ranges expand when individuals move beyond the existing range limit. Dispersal constraints are thus one obvious explanation for cases where species' observed range shifts are failing to track changing climate. Birds have incredible capacities for dispersal (e.g., Slager, 2020), making it tempting to gloss over a possible role for dispersal constraints in avian range shifts, including unexplored topics such as site fidelity. However, tropical species often show extreme limitations on dispersal, suggesting that longer-distance range shifts (e.g., across latitudes) may be slow, particularly when landscapes are patchy, or when species show high specialization to their associated habitats. In the temperate zone, even some long-distance migrants may show incredible site fidelity to breeding (and wintering) territories (Winger et al., 2019), which suggests the possibility that rapid range shifts may be difficult to achieve. Lastly, dispersal may be possible but may introduce a new trade-off with other components of the annual life cycle, such as migration. For example, the ability of boreal breeding birds to take advantage of newly available forest habitat in the Arctic may be constrained by a trade-off with ever-increasing migration distances.

2. Are species particularly rare at their range limits?

Ecological theory assumes that species are most abundant at the center or core of their range and become progressively rarer towards their range limits (the "abundant-center hypothesis; Brown, 1984). However, empirical patterns of abundance often fail to fit these expectations. Whether the abundant-center hypothesis generally holds or not is now a matter of debate (e.g., Dallas et al., 2020), and the answer may have consequences for rates of species' range shifts. For example, low abundances at range edges could lead to slower rates of range shifts than if abundance distributions are more uniform across a core-to-limit transect through a species' geographic range. This could be due to simple numeric effects – range shifts are easier when there are more individuals at the range edge to start with – or to genetic effects. That is, low abundances (and hence lower genetic diversity) could reduce local rates of adaptation at range edges, with gene flow from the abundant range center swamping any effect of local adaptation at the range edge that would facilitate range expansion when conditions change (Haldane, 1956; but see Kottler et al., 2021). Studies on invasive species have the potential to improve our understanding of the mechanisms that promote expansion from original range boundaries (e.g., the tolerance niche of the Asian Openbill Bird - Lei & Liu, 2021; and climate matching in the European Bee-eater - Stiels et al., 2021).

3. How does land use change interact with climate change?

Like most of the range shift literature, we have focused in this review on predicting species' responses to changes in climate per se. But species are shifting (or failing to shift) their ranges in landscapes that, more often than not, are dominated by human activities. Studies that simultaneously incorporate both land use and climate change as drivers of distributional change are few in number but hold great promise for several reasons. First, land use change is an

obvious driver of species' distributions; many species simply do not persist in landscapes with extreme levels of human control. Second, appropriate habitat for most species in human-dominated landscapes consists of habitat patches of varying sizes with varying levels of connectivity (e.g., Neilan et al., 2019). This fact elevates the role of dispersal in determining whether patches (and, scaled-up to a larger geographic scale, regions) are occupied by a given species. Third, habitat change directly affects local-scale climate. Fragmented forests, for example, average substantially warmer and drier than primary forests (Kapos, 1989), and "urban heat islands" alter local temperatures that are known to affect bird distributions (in migrants - Bonnet-Lebrun et al., 2020; and residents - Latimer & Zuckerberg, 2021). Hence, land use change can act as a multiplier of temperature effects on species.

The consequences of climate change for species are potentially severe, with widespread predictions of extinctions. Some evidence suggests these dire predictions may be coming true. For example, warming temperatures have led to local extinctions in mountaintop communities in southeastern Peru as species shift their geographic ranges to track climate, a potential harbinger of the possible extinction of high elevation tropical species (Feeley et al., 2012; Freeman et al., 2018; Rehm & Feeley, 2016). Yet species may be more resilient than models assume; for example, genetic data indicate that many species were able to persist through dramatic climate fluctuations in the Pleistocene (Bocalini et al., 2021; Song et al., 2020; Wogan et al., 2020).

CONCLUSION

Humans have already made Earth hotter than it has been since before the Pleistocene (~ 2 million years ago). This rapid change in Earth's climate has set species on the move and led to a plethora

of scientific research aimed at predicting where species will live in the coming decades as warming continues. These predictions, though frequently made, are seldom tested. Without this crucial step of model validation, it is impossible to assess the usefulness of predictive models. Here, we have presented theory and highlighted a range of data sources and analytical approaches that can be used to predict species' geographic responses to climate change. Ever-greater computational power, combined with increasingly large datasets of species occurrence and landscape covariates, permit the use of greater complexity in models. However, more complex does not necessarily equate to better. The litmus test for any predictive model is how well it predicts reality. To this end, we advocate for an increasing focus on collecting empirical data that matches the spatio-temporal resolution of occurrence data with environmental variables, tests hypotheses beyond the Grinnellian class of niche, and directly evaluates model predictions (e.g., using mechanistic SDMs or resurveys). For example, the long-term predictions from models whose predictions are not met over the short-term are unlikely to be helpful. Determining species' resiliency will depend on accurate estimates of the fundamental niche including which attributes make some species more vulnerable than others, which abiotic gradients are the most important to consider for the promotion of population persistence, and including biotic interactions in predictive, validated models. The ongoing pursuit of meaningful predictive distribution models under land use and climate change will be of great utility.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors declare that we have no sources of conflict of interest affecting the objectivity of the presented topic. This manuscript is the result of a synthesis on how ornithologists predict bird distributions under global change that was presented in a series of talks at the North American Ornithological Congress, 2020. We sincerely thank the organizers of this conference for their support throughout the COVID-19 pandemic. Thank you also to the participants of the Predicting Bird Distributions Under Global Change symposium, including William Lewis. This research was funded in part by a U.S. Geological Survey Northwest Climate Adaptation Science Center award G17AC000218 to C.B. van Rees. The manuscript was approved by the Director of the

Louisiana State University Agricultural Center as manuscript number 2021-XXX-XXXX. The authors would also like to thank (in alphabetical order by last name) Nicholas Mason, Subir Shakya, Philip Stouffer, David Vander Pluym, and Brenna Wells who provided important discussion of the topics presented in this manuscript during its development.

LITERATURE CITED

- Aitken, K. E. H., & Martin, K. (2007). The importance of excavators in hole-nesting communities: Availability and use of natural tree holes in old mixed forests of western Canada. *Journal of Ornithology*, 148(2), 425–434. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10336-007-0166-9>
- Alerstam, T. (2011). Optimal bird migration revisited. *Journal of Ornithology*, 152(1), 5–23. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10336-011-0694-1>
- Anderson, B. j, Akçakaya, H. r, Araújo, M. b, Fordham, D. a, Martinez-Meyer, E., Thuiller, W., & Brook, B. w. (2009). Dynamics of range margins for metapopulations under climate change. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, 276(1661), 1415–1420. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2008.1681>
- Angilletta Jr, M. J., & Angilletta, M. J. (2009). *Thermal adaptation: A theoretical and empirical synthesis*.
- Angilletta, M. J., Sears, M. W., & Pringle, R. M. (2009). Spatial dynamics of nesting behavior: Lizards shift microhabitats to construct nests with beneficial thermal properties. *Ecology*, 90(10), 2933–2939. <https://doi.org/10.1890/08-2224.1>
- Araújo, M. B., & New, M. (2007). Ensemble forecasting of species distributions. *Trends in Ecology & Evolution*, 22(1), 42–47. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tree.2006.09.010>
- Atauchi, P. J., Peterson, A. T., & Flanagan, J. (2018). Species distribution models for Peruvian plantcutter improve with consideration of biotic interactions. *Journal of Avian Biology*, 49(3), jav-01617. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jav.01617>
- Aubry, K. B., Raley, C. M., & McKelvey, K. S. (2017). The importance of data quality for generating reliable distribution models for rare, elusive, and cryptic species. *PLOS ONE*, 12(6), e0179152. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0179152>

- 740 Augustin, N. H., Mugglestone, M. A., & Buckland, S. T. (1996). An autologistic model for the spatial
741 distribution of wildlife. *Journal of Applied Ecology*, 33(2), 339–347.
742 <https://doi.org/10.2307/2404755>
- 743 Austin, M. (2005). Vegetation and environment: Discontinuous and continuous. *Vegetation Ecology*, 52–
744 84.
- 745 Austin, M. (2007). Species distribution models and ecological theory: A critical assessment and some
746 possible new approaches. *Ecological Modelling*, 200(1), 1–19.
747 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolmodel.2006.07.005>
- 748 Barçante, L., Vale, M. M., & Alves, M. A. S. (2017). Altitudinal migration by birds: A review of the
749 literature and a comprehensive list of species. *Journal of Field Ornithology*, 88(4), 321–335.
750 <https://doi.org/10.1111/jofo.12234>
- 751 Barker, N. K. S., Cumming, S. G., & Darveau, M. (2014). Models to predict the distribution and
752 abundance of breeding ducks in Canada. *Avian Conservation and Ecology*, 9(2), art7.
753 <https://doi.org/10.5751/ACE-00699-090207>
- 754 Benkendorf, D. J., & Hawkins, C. P. (2020). Effects of sample size and network depth on a deep learning
755 approach to species distribution modeling. *Ecological Informatics*, 60, 101137.
756 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecoinf.2020.101137>
- 757 Blaisdell, A., Seitz, B., Rowney, C., Folsom, M., MacPherson, M., Deffner, D., & Logan, C. (2020). *Do*
758 *the more flexible individuals rely more on causal cognition? Observation versus intervention in*
759 *causal inference in great-tailed grackles*. PsyArXiv. <https://doi.org/10.31234/osf.io/z4p6s>
- 760 Bocalini, F., Bolívar-Leguizamón, S. D., Silveira, L. F., & Bravo, G. A. (2021). Comparative
761 phylogeographic and demographic analyses reveal a congruent pattern of sister relationships
762 between bird populations of the northern and south-central Atlantic Forest. *Molecular*
763 *Phylogenetics and Evolution*, 154, 106973. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ympev.2020.106973>
- 764 Bonnet-Lebrun, A.-S., Manica, A., & Rodrigues, A. S. L. (2020). Effects of urbanization on bird
765 migration. *Biological Conservation*, 244, 108423. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biocon.2020.108423>

766 Borowicz, A., McDowall, P., Youngflesh, C., Sayre-McCord, T., Clucas, G., Herman, R., Forrest, S.,
767 Rider, M., Schwaller, M., Hart, T., Jenouvrier, S., Polito, M. J., Singh, H., & Lynch, H. J. (2018).
768 Multi-modal survey of Adélie penguin mega-colonies reveals the Danger Islands as a seabird
769 hotspot. *Scientific Reports*, 8(1), 3926. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-018-22313-w>
770 Boyce, A. J., Shakya, S., Sheldon, F. H., Moyle, R. G., & Martin, T. E. (2019). Biotic interactions are the
771 dominant drivers of phylogenetic and functional structure in bird communities along a tropical
772 elevational gradient. *The Auk*, 136(ukz054). <https://doi.org/10.1093/auk/ukz054>
773 Bradie, J., & Leung, B. (2017). A quantitative synthesis of the importance of variables used in MaxEnt
774 species distribution models. *Journal of Biogeography*, 44(6), 1344–1361.
775 <https://doi.org/10.1111/jbi.12894>
776 Brawn, J. D., Benson, T. J., Stager, M., Sly, N. D., & Tarwater, C. E. (2017). Impacts of changing rainfall
777 regime on the demography of tropical birds. *Nature Climate Change*, 7(2), 133–136.
778 <https://doi.org/10.1038/nclimate3183>
779 Breiner, F. T., Guisan, A., Bergamini, A., & Nobis, M. P. (2015). Overcoming limitations of modelling
780 rare species by using ensembles of small models. *Methods in Ecology and Evolution*, 6(10),
781 1210–1218. <https://doi.org/10.1111/2041-210X.12403>
782 Bridge, E. S., Ross, J. D., Contina, A. J., & Kelly, J. F. (2016). Do molt-migrant songbirds optimize
783 migration routes based on primary productivity? *Behavioral Ecology*, 27(3), 784–792.
784 <https://doi.org/10.1093/beheco/arv199>
785 Brodie, J. F., Strimas-Mackey, M., Mohd-Azlan, J., Granados, A., Bernard, H., Giordano, A. J., &
786 Helmy, O. E. (2017). Lowland biotic attrition revisited: Body size and variation among climate
787 change ‘winners’ and ‘losers.’ *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*,
788 284(1847), 20162335. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2016.2335>
789 Brown, J. H. (1984). On the Relationship between Abundance and Distribution of Species. *The American*
790 *Naturalist*, 124(2), 255–279. <https://doi.org/10.1086/284267>

791 Burns, P., Clark, M., Salas, L., Hancock, S., Leland, D., Jantz, P., Dubayah, R., & Goetz, S. J. (2020).
792 Incorporating canopy structure from simulated GEDI lidar into bird species distribution models.
793 *Environmental Research Letters*, 15(9), 095002. <https://doi.org/10.1088/1748-9326/ab80ee>
794 Busby, J. R. (1991). BIOCLIM – A bioclimate analysis and prediction system. In C. R. Margules & M. P.
795 Austin (Eds.), *Nature Conservation: Cost Effective Biological Surveys and Data Analysis* (pp.
796 64–68). CSIRO.

797 Capurro, J. M. G., Ashley, M. V., Tsuru, B. R., Cooper, J. C., & Bates, J. M. (2020). Dispersal ability
798 correlates with range size in Amazonian habitat-restricted birds. *Proceedings of the Royal Society*
799 *B: Biological Sciences*, 287(1939), 20201450. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2020.1450>

800 Caruso, C. M., Martin, R. A., Sletvold, N., Morrissey, M. B., Wade, M. J., Augustine, K. E., Carlson, S.
801 M., MacColl, A. D. C., Siepielski, A. M., & Kingsolver, J. G. (2017). What Are the
802 Environmental Determinants of Phenotypic Selection? A Meta-analysis of Experimental Studies.
803 *The American Naturalist*, 190(3), 363–376. <https://doi.org/10.1086/692760>

804 Caughley, G. (1994). Directions in conservation biology. *Journal of Animal Ecology*, 63(2), 215–244.
805 <https://doi.org/10.2307/5542>

806 Ceballos, G., Ehrlich, P. R., Barnosky, A. D., García, A., Pringle, R. M., & Palmer, T. M. (2015).
807 Accelerated modern human-induced species losses: Entering the sixth mass extinction. *Science*
808 *Advances*, 1(5), e1400253. <https://doi.org/10.1126/sciadv.1400253>

809 Chakraborty, A., Gelfand, A. E., Wilson, A. M., Latimer, A. M., & John A. Silander, J. (2010). Modeling
810 large scale species abundance with latent spatial processes. *The Annals of Applied Statistics*, 4(3),
811 1403–1429. <https://doi.org/10.1214/10-AOAS335>

812 Claramunt, S., Derryberry, E. P., Remsen, J. V., & Brumfield, R. T. (2012). High dispersal ability inhibits
813 speciation in a continental radiation of passerine birds. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B:*
814 *Biological Sciences*, 279(1733), 1567–1574. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2011.1922>

- 815 Colwell, R. K., Brehm, G., Cardelús, C. L., Gilman, A. C., & Longino, J. T. (2008). Global warming,
816 elevational range shifts, and lowland biotic attrition in the wet tropics. *Science*, 322(5899), 258–
817 261. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1162547>
- 818 Corre, M. L., Dussault, C., & Côté, S. D. (2020). Where to spend the winter? The role of intraspecific
819 competition and climate in determining the selection of wintering areas by migratory caribou.
820 *Oikos*, 129(4), 512–525. <https://doi.org/10.1111/oik.06668>
- 821 Cowles, R. B., & Bogert, C. M. (1944). A preliminary study of the thermal requirements of desert
822 reptiles. *Bulletin of the American Museum of Natural History*, 83(5), 261–296.
- 823 Dalgarno, S., Mersey, J. E., Gedalof, Z., & Lemon, M. (2017). Species-environment associations and
824 predicted distribution of Black Oystercatcher breeding pairs in Haida Gwaii, British Columbia,
825 Canada. *Avian Conservation and Ecology*, 12(2), art9. [https://doi.org/10.5751/ACE-01094-](https://doi.org/10.5751/ACE-01094-120209)
826 120209
- 827 Dallas, T. A., Santini, L., Decker, R., & Hastings, A. (2020). Weighing the Evidence for the Abundant-
828 Center Hypothesis. *Biodiversity Informatics*, 15(3), 81–91.
829 <https://doi.org/10.17161/bi.v15i3.11989>
- 830 Danner, R. M., & Greenberg, R. (2015). A critical season approach to Allen’s rule: Bill size declines with
831 winter temperature in a cold temperate environment. *Journal of Biogeography*, 42(1), 114–120.
832 <https://doi.org/10.1111/jbi.12389>
- 833 Deutsch, C. A., Tewksbury, J. J., Huey, R. B., Sheldon, K. S., Ghalambor, C. K., Haak, D. C., & Martin,
834 P. R. (2008). Impacts of climate warming on terrestrial ectotherms across latitude. *Proceedings of*
835 *the National Academy of Sciences*, 105(18), 6668–6672.
- 836 Domahidi, Z., Shonfield, J., Nielsen, S. E., Spence, J. R., & Bayne, E. M. (2019). Spatial distribution of
837 the Boreal Owl and Northern Saw-whet Owl in the boreal region of Alberta, Canada. *Avian*
838 *Conservation and Ecology*, 14(2), art14. <https://doi.org/10.5751/ACE-01445-140214>

- 839 Dormann, C. F., Purschke, O., Márquez, J. R. G., Lautenbach, S., & Schröder, B. (2008). Components of
840 Uncertainty in Species Distribution Analysis: A Case Study of the Great Grey Shrike. *Ecology*,
841 89(12), 3371–3386. <https://doi.org/10.1890/07-1772.1>
- 842 Drew, A., & Collazo, J. (2014). *Bayesian networks as a framework to step-down and support Strategic*
843 *Habitat Conservation of data-poor species: A case study with King Rail (Rallus elegans) in*
844 *Eastern North Carolina and Southeastern Virginia*. US Fish and Wildlife Service.
845 <https://doi.org/10.13140/2.1.4430.5920>
- 846 Ducatez, S., Sol, D., Sayol, F., & Lefebvre, L. (2020). Behavioural plasticity is associated with reduced
847 extinction risk in birds. *Nature Ecology & Evolution*, 4(6), 788–793.
848 <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41559-020-1168-8>
- 849 Dunn, P. O., & Møller, A. P. (2019). *Effects of climate change on birds*. Oxford University Press.
- 850 Dvorský, M., Macek, M., Kopecký, M., Wild, J., & Doležal, J. (2017). Niche asymmetry of vascular
851 plants increases with elevation. *Journal of Biogeography*, 44(6), 1418–1425.
852 <https://doi.org/10.1111/jbi.13001>
- 853 Early, R., & Sax, D. F. (2014). Climatic niche shifts between species' native and naturalized ranges raise
854 concern for ecological forecasts during invasions and climate change. *Global Ecology and*
855 *Biogeography*, 23(12), 1356–1365. <https://doi.org/10.1111/geb.12208>
- 856 Elith, J. (2017). Predicting Distributions of Invasive Species. In *Invasive Species: Risk Assessment and*
857 *Management* (pp. 93–129). Cambridge University Press.
- 858 Elith, J., H. Graham, C., P. Anderson, R., Dudík, M., Ferrier, S., Guisan, A., J. Hijmans, R., Huettmann,
859 F., R. Leathwick, J., Lehmann, A., Li, J., G. Lohmann, L., A. Loiselle, B., Manion, G., Moritz,
860 C., Nakamura, M., Nakazawa, Y., McC. M. Overton, J., Townsend Peterson, A., ... E.
861 Zimmermann, N. (2006). Novel methods improve prediction of species' distributions from
862 occurrence data. *Ecography*, 29(2), 129–151. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2006.0906-7590.04596.x>

863 Elith, J., & Leathwick, J. (2007). Predicting species distributions from museum and herbarium records
864 using multiresponse models fitted with multivariate adaptive regression splines. *Diversity and*
865 *Distributions*, 13(3), 265–275. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1472-4642.2007.00340.x>

866 Elith, J., Leathwick, J. R., & Hastie, T. (2008). A working guide to boosted regression trees. *Journal of*
867 *Animal Ecology*, 77(4), 802–813. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2656.2008.01390.x>

868 Elsen, P. R., Tingley, M. W., Kalyanaraman, R., Ramesh, K., & Wilcove, D. S. (2017). The role of
869 competition, ecotones, and temperature in the elevational distribution of Himalayan birds.
870 *Ecology*, 98(2), 337–348. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ecy.1669>

871 Elton, C. (1927). *Animal ecology*. Sidgwick & Jackson.

872 Faaborg, J., Holmes, R. T., Anders, A. D., Bildstein, K. L., Dugger, K. M., Gauthreaux, S. A., Heglund,
873 P., Hobson, K. A., Jahn, A. E., Johnson, D. H., Latta, S. C., Levey, D. J., Marra, P. P., Merkord,
874 C. L., Nol, E., Rothstein, S. I., Sherry, T. W., Sillett, T. S., Thompson, F. R., & Warnock, N.
875 (2010). Recent advances in understanding migration systems of New World land birds.
876 *Ecological Monographs*, 80(1), 3–48. <https://doi.org/10.1890/09-0395.1>

877 Feeley, K. J., Rehm, E. M., & Machovina, B. (2012). perspective: The responses of tropical forest species
878 to global climate change: acclimate, adapt, migrate, or go extinct? *Frontiers of Biogeography*,
879 4(2). <https://doi.org/10.21425/F5FBG12621>

880 Fick, S. E., & Hijmans, R. J. (2017). WorldClim 2: New 1-km spatial resolution climate surfaces for
881 global land areas. *International Journal of Climatology*, 37(12), 4302–4315.
882 <https://doi.org/10.1002/joc.5086>

883 Freeman, B. G., Freeman, A. M. C., & Hochachka, W. M. (2016). Asymmetric interspecific aggression in
884 New Guinean songbirds that replace one another along an elevational gradient. *Ibis*, 158(4), 726–
885 737. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ibi.12384>

886 Freeman, B. G., & Mason, N. A. (2015). The geographic distribution of a tropical montane bird is limited
887 by a tree: Acorn Woodpeckers (*Melanerpes formicivorus*) and Colombian oaks (*Quercus*

humboldtii) in the Northern Andes. *PLOS ONE*, 10(6), e0128675.

<https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0128675>

Freeman, B. G., Scholer, M. N., Ruiz-Gutierrez, V., & Fitzpatrick, J. W. (2018). Climate change causes upslope shifts and mountaintop extirpations in a tropical bird community. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 115(47), 11982–11987. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1804224115>

Freeman, B. G., Tobias, J. A., & Schluter, D. (2019). Behavior influences range limits and patterns of coexistence across an elevational gradient in tropical birds. *Ecography*, 42(11), 1832–1840. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ecog.04606>

Gallagher, R. V., Falster, D. S., Maitner, B. S., Salguero-Gómez, R., Vandvik, V., Pearse, W. D., Schneider, F. D., Kattge, J., Poelen, J. H., Madin, J. S., Ankenbrand, M. J., Penone, C., Feng, X., Adams, V. M., Alroy, J., Andrew, S. C., Balk, M. A., Bland, L. M., Boyle, B. L., ... Enquist, B. J. (2020). Open Science principles for accelerating trait-based science across the Tree of Life. *Nature Ecology & Evolution*, 4(3), 294–303. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41559-020-1109-6>

Garcia-R, J. C., & Matzke, N. J. (2021). Trait-dependent dispersal in rails (Aves: Rallidae): Historical biogeography of a cosmopolitan bird clade. *Molecular Phylogenetics and Evolution*, 159, 107106. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ympev.2021.107106>

Gardner, J. L., Peters, A., Kearney, M. R., Joseph, L., & Heinsohn, R. (2011). Declining body size: A third universal response to warming? *Trends in Ecology & Evolution*, 26(6), 285–291. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tree.2011.03.005>

Goetz, S. J., Steinberg, D., Betts, M. G., Holmes, R. T., Doran, P. J., Dubayah, R., & Hofton, M. (2010). Lidar remote sensing variables predict breeding habitat of a Neotropical migrant bird. *Ecology*, 91(6), 1569–1576. <https://doi.org/10.1890/09-1670.1>

Grady, J. M., Maitner, B. S., Winter, A. S., Kaschner, K., Tittensor, D. P., Record, S., Smith, F. A., Wilson, A. M., Dell, A. I., Zarnetske, P. L., Wearing, H. J., Alfaro, B., & Brown, J. H. (2019). Metabolic asymmetry and the global diversity of marine predators. *Science*, 363(6425). <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aat4220>

914 Graham, C. H., Elith, J., Hijmans, R. J., Guisan, A., Peterson, A. T., & Loiselle, B. A. (2008). The
915 influence of spatial errors in species occurrence data used in distribution models. *Journal of*
916 *Applied Ecology*, 45(1), 239–247. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2664.2007.01408.x>

917 Graham, R. W., Lundelius, E. L., Graham, M. A., Schroeder, E. K., Toomey, R. S., Anderson, E.,
918 Barnosky, A. D., Burns, J. A., Churcher, C. S., Grayson, D. K., Guthrie, R. D., Harington, C. R.,
919 Jefferson, G. T., Martin, L. D., McDonald, H. G., Morlan, R. E., Semken, H. A., Webb, S. D.,
920 Werdelin, L., & Wilson, M. C. (1996). Spatial Response of Mammals to Late Quaternary
921 Environmental Fluctuations. *Science*, 272(5268), 1601–1606.
922 <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.272.5268.1601>

923 Grant, P. R., & Grant, B. R. (2020). How and Why Species Multiply. In *How and Why Species Multiply*.
924 Princeton University Press.
925 <https://www.degruyter.com/document/doi/10.1515/9781400837946/html>

926 Grant, P. R., & Weiner, J. (2017). *Ecology and Evolution of Darwin's Finches (Princeton Science*
927 *Library Edition): Princeton Science Library Edition*.

928 Guisan, A., & Zimmermann, N. E. (2000). Predictive habitat distribution models in ecology. *Ecological*
929 *Modelling*, 135(2), 147–186. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0304-3800\(00\)00354-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0304-3800(00)00354-9)

930 Haldane, J. B. S. (1956). The relation between density regulation and natural selection. *Proceedings of the*
931 *Royal Society of London. Series B - Biological Sciences*, 145(920), 306–308.
932 <https://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.1956.0039>

933 Hallman, T. A., & Robinson, W. D. (2020). Comparing multi- and single-scale species distribution and
934 abundance models built with the boosted regression tree algorithm. *Landscape Ecology*, 35(5),
935 1161–1174. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10980-020-01007-7>

936 Hamilton, S. H., Pollino, C. A., & Jakeman, A. J. (2015). Habitat suitability modelling of rare species
937 using Bayesian networks: Model evaluation under limited data. *Ecological Modelling*, 299, 64–
938 78. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolmodel.2014.12.004>

939 Harris, I., Jones, P. D., Osborn, T. J., & Lister, D. H. (2014). Updated high-resolution grids of monthly
940 climatic observations – the CRU TS3.10 Dataset. *International Journal of Climatology*, 34(3),
941 623–642. <https://doi.org/10.1002/joc.3711>

942 He, K. S., Bradley, B. A., Cord, A. F., Rocchini, D., Tuanmu, M.-N., Schmidtlein, S., Turner, W.,
943 Wegmann, M., & Pettorelli, N. (2015). Will remote sensing shape the next generation of species
944 distribution models? *Remote Sensing in Ecology and Conservation*, 1(1), 4–18.
945 <https://doi.org/10.1002/rse2.7>

946 Hefley, T. J., & Hooten, M. B. (2015). On the existence of maximum likelihood estimates for presence-
947 only data. *Methods in Ecology and Evolution*, 6(6), 648–655. [https://doi.org/10.1111/2041-](https://doi.org/10.1111/2041-210X.12340)
948 210X.12340

949 Heim, W., Heim, R. J., Beermann, I., Burkovskiy, O. A., Gerasimov, Y., Ktitorov, P., Ozaki, K., Panov,
950 I., Sander, M. M., Sjöberg, S., Smirenski, S. M., Thomas, A., Tøttrup, A. P., Tiunov, I. M.,
951 Willemoes, M., Hölzel, N., Thorup, K., & Kamp, J. (2020). Using geolocator tracking data and
952 ringing archives to validate citizen-science based seasonal predictions of bird distribution in a
953 data-poor region. *Global Ecology and Conservation*, 24, e01215.
954 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gecco.2020.e01215>

955 Helm, B., Van Doren, B. M., Hoffmann, D., & Hoffmann, U. (2019). Evolutionary response to climate
956 change in migratory Pied Flycatchers. *Current Biology*, 29(21), 3714–3719.e4.
957 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cub.2019.08.072>

958 Herbert, J. A., Chakraborty, A., Naylor, L. W., Beatty, W. S., & Krementz, D. G. (2018). Effects of
959 landscape structure and temporal habitat dynamics on wintering mallard abundance. *Landscape*
960 *Ecology*, 33(8), 1319–1334. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10980-018-0671-7>

961 Herbert, J. A., Chakraborty, A., Naylor, L. W., & Krementz, D. G. (2021). Habitat associations of
962 wintering dabbling ducks in the Arkansas Mississippi Alluvial Valley: Implications for waterfowl
963 management beyond the mallard. *Wildlife Biology*, 2021(1). <https://doi.org/10.2981/wlb.00792>

- 964 Holland, R. A., Wikelski, M., Kümme, F., & Bosque, C. (2009). The secret life of oilbirds: New
965 insights into the movement ecology of a unique avian frugivore. *PLOS ONE*, 4(12), e8264.
966 <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0008264>
- 967 Holt, R. D., Keitt, T. H., Lewis, M. A., Maurer, B. A., & Taper, M. L. (2005). Theoretical models of
968 species' borders: Single species approaches. *Oikos*, 108(1), 18–27. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.0030-1299.2005.13147.x>
- 970 Hsiung, A. C., Boyle, W. A., Cooper, R. J., & Chandler, R. B. (2018). Altitudinal migration: Ecological
971 drivers, knowledge gaps, and conservation implications. *Biological Reviews*, 93(4), 2049–2070.
972 <https://doi.org/10.1111/brev.12435>
- 973 Huey, R. B., Hertz, P. E., & Sinervo, B. (2003). Behavioral drive versus behavioral inertia in evolution: A
974 null model approach. *The American Naturalist*, 161(3), 357–366. <https://doi.org/10.1086/346135>
- 975 Huey, R. B., Kearney, M. R., Krockenberger, A., Holtum, J. A. M., Jess, M., & Williams, S. E. (2012).
976 Predicting organismal vulnerability to climate warming: Roles of behaviour, physiology and
977 adaptation. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, 367(1596),
978 1665–1679. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rstb.2012.0005>
- 979 Jaeger, R. G. (1970). Potential Extinction Through Competition Between Two Species of Terrestrial
980 Salamanders. *Evolution*, 24(3), 632–642. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2406842>
- 981 Jahn, A. E., Buechley, E., Bugoni, L., Cereghetti, J., Repenning, M., Marra, P. P., & Ryder, T. B. (2021).
982 Variable Seasonal Movement Dynamics Among Individual Snail Kites (*Rostrhamus sociabilis*) In
983 South America. *Journal of Raptor Research*. <https://doi.org/10.3356/JRR-20-77>
- 984 Jahn, A. E., Cueto, V. R., Fontana, C. S., Guaraldo, A. C., Levey, D. J., Marra, P. P., & Ryder, T. B.
985 (2020). Bird migration within the Neotropics. *The Auk*, 137(ukaa033).
986 <https://doi.org/10.1093/auk/ukaa033>
- 987 Jahn, A. E., Cueto, V. R., Fox, J. W., Husak, M. S., Kim, D. H., Landoll, D. V., Ledezma, J. P., Lepage,
988 H. K., Levey, D. J., Murphy, M. T., & Renfrew, R. B. (2013). Migration timing and wintering

989 areas of three species of flycatchers (*Tyrannus*) breeding in the Great Plains of North America.
990 *The Auk*, 130(2), 247–257. <https://doi.org/10.1525/auk.2013.13010>

991 Jahn, A. E., Levey, D. J., & Smith, K. G. (2004). Reflections across hemispheres: A system-wide
992 approach to New World bird migration. *The Auk*, 121(4), 1005–1013.
993 <https://doi.org/10.1093/auk/121.4.1005>

994 Jahn, A. E., Seavy, N., Bejarano, V., Guzmán, M. B., Provinciatio, I. C. C., Pizo, M., & MacPherson, M.
995 (2016). *Intra-tropical migration and wintering areas of Fork-tailed Flycatchers (Tyrannus*
996 *savana) breeding in São Paulo, Brazil*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF03544339>

997 Jankowski, J. E., Londoño, G. A., Robinson, S. K., & Chappell, M. A. (2013). Exploring the role of
998 physiology and biotic interactions in determining elevational ranges of tropical animals.
999 *Ecography*, 36, 001–012.

1000 Jankowski, J. E., Robinson, S. K., & Levey, D. J. (2010). Squeezed at the top: Interspecific aggression
1001 may constrain elevational ranges in tropical birds. *Ecology*, 91(7), 1877–1884.
1002 <https://doi.org/10.1890/09-2063.1>

1003 Jansen, F., & Oksanen, J. (2013). How to model species responses along ecological gradients – Huisman–
1004 Olff–Fresco models revisited. *Journal of Vegetation Science*, 24(6), 1108–1117.
1005 <https://doi.org/10.1111/jvs.12050>

1006 Janzen, D. H. (1967). Why mountain passes are higher in the tropics. *The American Naturalist*, 101(919),
1007 233–249.

1008 Jarnevich, C. S., Talbert, M., Morisette, J., Aldridge, C., Brown, C. S., Kumar, S., Manier, D., Talbert, C.,
1009 & Holcombe, T. (2017). Minimizing effects of methodological decisions on interpretation and
1010 prediction in species distribution studies: An example with background selection. *Ecological*
1011 *Modelling*, 363, 48–56. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolmodel.2017.08.017>

1012 Jiguet, F., Gadot, A.-S., Julliard, R., Newson, S. E., & Couvet, D. (2007). Climate envelope, life history
1013 traits and the resilience of birds facing global change. *Global Change Biology*, 13(8), 1672–1684.
1014 <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2486.2007.01386.x>

- 1015 Jirinec, V., Isdell, R. E., & Leu, M. (2016). Prey availability and habitat structure explain breeding space
1016 use of a migratory songbird. *The Condor*, 118(2), 309–328. <https://doi.org/10.1650/CONDOR->
1017 15-140.1
- 1018 Jones, J. (2001). Habitat selection studies in avian ecology: A critical review. *The Auk*, 118(2), 557–562.
1019 <https://doi.org/10.1093/auk/118.2.557>
- 1020 Jones, M. C., & Cheung, W. W. L. (2015). Multi-model ensemble projections of climate change effects
1021 on global marine biodiversity. *ICES Journal of Marine Science*, 72(3), 741–752.
1022 <https://doi.org/10.1093/icesjms/fsu172>
- 1023 Kapos, V. (1989). Effects of isolation on the water status of forest patches in the Brazilian Amazon.
1024 *Journal of Tropical Ecology*, 5(2), 173–185. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0266467400003448>
- 1025 Kearney, M. (2006). Habitat, environment and niche: What are we modelling? *Oikos*, 115(1), 186–191.
1026 <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2006.0030-1299.14908.x>
- 1027 Kearney, M., & Porter, W. (2009). Mechanistic niche modelling: Combining physiological and spatial
1028 data to predict species' ranges. *Ecology Letters*, 12(4), 334–350. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1461->
1029 0248.2008.01277.x
- 1030 Kearney, M. R., Porter, W. P., & Murphy, S. A. (2016). An estimate of the water budget for the
1031 endangered night parrot of Australia under recent and future climates. *Climate Change*
1032 *Responses*, 3(1), 14. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40665-016-0027-y>
- 1033 Kitze, J., & Schrick, L. (2019). The necessity, promise and challenge of automated biodiversity
1034 surveys. *Environmental Conservation*, 46(4), 247–250.
1035 <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0376892919000146>
- 1036 Kokko, H., Gunnarsson, T. G., Morrell, L. J., & Gill, J. A. (2006). Why do female migratory birds arrive
1037 later than males? *Journal of Animal Ecology*, 75(6), 1293–1303. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365->
1038 2656.2006.01151.x

- 1039 König, C., Wüest, R. O., Graham, C. H., Karger, D. N., Sattler, T., Zimmermann, N. E., & Zurell, D.
1040 (2021). Scale dependency of joint species distribution models challenges interpretation of biotic
1041 interactions. *Journal of Biogeography*, 0, 1–11. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jbi.14106>
1042 Kottler, E. J., Dickman, E. E., Sexton, J. P., Emery, N. C., & Franks, S. J. (2021). Draining the Swamping
1043 Hypothesis: Little Evidence that Gene Flow Reduces Fitness at Range Edges. *Trends in Ecology*
1044 *& Evolution*, 36(6), 533–544. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tree.2021.02.004>
1045 La Sorte, F. A., Lepczyk, C. A., Burnett, J. L., Hurlbert, A. H., Tingley, M. W., & Zuckerberg, B. (2018).
1046 Opportunities and challenges for big data ornithology. *The Condor*, 120(2), 414–426.
1047 <https://doi.org/10.1650/CONDOR-17-206.1>
1048 Latimer, C. E., & Zuckerberg, B. (2021). Habitat loss and thermal tolerances influence the sensitivity of
1049 resident bird populations to winter weather at regional scales. *Journal of Animal Ecology*, 90(2),
1050 317–329. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1365-2656.13332>
1051 Lavretsky, P., McInerney, N. R., Mohl, J. E., Brown, J. I., James, H. F., McCracken, K. G., & Fleischer,
1052 R. C. (2020). Assessing changes in genomic divergence following a century of human-mediated
1053 secondary contact among wild and captive-bred ducks. *Molecular Ecology*, 29(3), 578–595.
1054 <https://doi.org/10.1111/mec.15343>
1055 Léandri-Breton, D.-J., & Bêty, J. (2020). Vulnerability to predation may affect species distribution:
1056 Plovers with broader arctic breeding range nest in safer habitat. *Scientific Reports*, 10(1), 5032.
1057 <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-020-61956-6>
1058 Leclerc, C., Villéger, S., Marino, C., & Bellard, C. (2020). Global changes threaten functional and
1059 taxonomic diversity of insular species worldwide. *Diversity and Distributions*, 26(4), 402–414.
1060 <https://doi.org/10.1111/ddi.13024>
1061 Lees, A. C., Rosenberg, K. V., Ruiz-Gutierrez, V., Marsden, S., Schulenberg, T. S., & Rodewald, A. D.
1062 (2020). A roadmap to identifying and filling shortfalls in Neotropical ornithology. *The Auk*,
1063 137(4), NA. <https://doi.org/10.1093/auk/ukaa048>

- 1064 Lei, Y., & Liu, Q. (2021). Tolerance niche expansion and potential distribution prediction during Asian
1065 openbill bird range expansion. *Ecology and Evolution*, 00, 1–13.
1066 <https://doi.org/10.1002/ece3.7456>
- 1067 Londoño, G. A., Chappell, M. A., Castañeda, M. del R., Jankowski, J. E., & Robinson, S. K. (2015).
1068 Basal metabolism in tropical birds: Latitude, altitude, and the ‘pace of life.’ *Functional Ecology*,
1069 29(3), 338–346. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1365-2435.12348>
- 1070 Londoño, G. A., Chappell, M. A., Jankowski, J. E., & Robinson, S. K. (2017). Do thermoregulatory costs
1071 limit altitude distributions of Andean forest birds? *Functional Ecology*, 31(1), 204–215.
1072 <https://doi.org/10.1111/1365-2435.12697>
- 1073 Louthan, A. M., Doak, D. F., & Angert, A. L. (2015). Where and when do species interactions set range
1074 limits? *Trends in Ecology & Evolution*, 30(12), 780–792.
1075 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tree.2015.09.011>
- 1076 Loyola, R. D., Lemes, P., Nabout, J. C., Trindade-Filho, J., Sagnori, M. D., Dobrovolski, R., & Diniz-
1077 Filho, J. A. F. (2013). A straightforward conceptual approach for evaluating spatial conservation
1078 priorities under climate change. *Biodiversity and Conservation*, 22(2), 483–495.
1079 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10531-012-0424-x>
- 1080 Lukas, J., Auer, F., Goldhammer, T., Krause, J., Romanczuk, P., Klamser, P., Arias-Rodriguez, L., &
1081 Bierbach, D. (2021). *Diurnal Changes in Hypoxia Shape Predator-Prey Interaction in a Bird-
1082 Fish System*. <https://doi.org/10.14279/depositonce-11735>
- 1083 MacKenzie, D. I., Nichols, J. D., Sutton, N., Kawanishi, K., & Bailey, L. L. (2005). Improving inferences
1084 in population studies of rare species that are detected imperfectly. *Ecology*, 86(5), 1101–1113.
1085 <https://doi.org/10.1890/04-1060>
- 1086 MacPherson, M., Burgio, K., van Rees, C., DeSaix, M., Slager, D., Jirinec, V., Herman, R., Herbert, J.,
1087 Shonfield, J., Freeman, B., & Jankowski, J. (In Prep). *Assessing the use of occurrence data in
1088 predicting avian responses to climate change*.

- 1089 MacPherson, M. P., Jahn, A. E., & Mason, N. A. (2021). Morphology of migration: Associations between
1090 wing shape, bill morphology, and migration in kingbirds (Tyrannus). *BioRxiv*,
1091 2021.04.06.438708. <https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.04.06.438708>
- 1092 MacPherson, M. P., Jahn, A. E., Murphy, M. T., Kim, D. H., Cueto, V. R., Tuero, D. T., & Hill, E. D.
1093 (2018). Follow the rain? Environmental drivers of Tyrannus migration across the New World.
1094 *The Auk*, 135(4), 881–894. <https://doi.org/10.1642/AUK-17-209.1>
- 1095 MacPherson, M. P., Webb, E. B., Raedeke, A., Mengel, D., & Nelson, F. (2018). A review of Bayesian
1096 belief network models as decision-support tools for wetland conservation: Are water birds
1097 potential umbrella taxa? *Biological Conservation*, 226, 215–223.
1098 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biocon.2018.08.001>
- 1099 Maggini, R., Lehmann, A., Kéry, M., Schmid, H., Beniston, M., Jenni, L., & Zbinden, N. (2011). Are
1100 Swiss birds tracking climate change?: Detecting elevational shifts using response curve shapes.
1101 *Ecological Modelling*, 222(1), 21–32. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolmodel.2010.09.010>
- 1102 Manel, S., Dias, J. M., Buckton, S. T., & Ormerod, S. J. (1999). Alternative methods for predicting
1103 species distribution: An illustration with Himalayan river birds. *Journal of Applied Ecology*,
1104 36(5), 734–747. <https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1365-2664.1999.00440.x>
- 1105 Marini, M. Â., Barbet-Massin, M., Lopes, L. E., & Jiguet, F. (2009). Predicted climate-driven bird
1106 distribution changes and forecasted conservation conflicts in a Neotropical savanna. *Conservation*
1107 *Biology*, 23(6), 1558–1567. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1523-1739.2009.01258.x>
- 1108 Matuoka, M. A., Benchimol, M., Almeida-Rocha, J. M. de, & Morante-Filho, J. C. (2020). Effects of
1109 anthropogenic disturbances on bird functional diversity: A global meta-analysis. *Ecological*
1110 *Indicators*, 116, 106471. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolind.2020.106471>
- 1111 McKinnon, E. A., & Love, O. P. (2018). Ten years tracking the migrations of small landbirds: Lessons
1112 learned in the golden age of bio-logging. *The Auk*, 135(4), 834–856.
1113 <https://doi.org/10.1642/AUK-17-202.1>

- 1114 Merow, C., Smith, M. J., & Silander, J. A., Jr. (2013). A practical guide to MaxEnt for modeling species'
1115 distributions: What it does, and why inputs and settings matter. *Ecography*, 36(10), 1058–1069.
1116 <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1600-0587.2013.07872.x>
- 1117 Mi, C., Huettmann, F., Guo, Y., Han, X., & Wen, L. (2017). Why choose Random Forest to predict rare
1118 species distribution with few samples in large undersampled areas? Three Asian crane species
1119 models provide supporting evidence. *PeerJ*, 5, e2849. <https://doi.org/10.7717/peerj.2849>
- 1120 Møller, A. P., Rubolini, D., & Lehikoinen, E. (2008). Populations of migratory bird species that did not
1121 show a phenological response to climate change are declining. *Proceedings of the National*
1122 *Academy of Sciences*, 105(42), 16195–16200. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.0803825105>
- 1123 Moore, R. P., Robinson, W. D., Lovette, I. J., & Robinson, T. R. (2008). Experimental evidence for
1124 extreme dispersal limitation in tropical forest birds. *Ecology Letters*, 11(9), 960–968.
1125 <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1461-0248.2008.01196.x>
- 1126 Mora, C., Frazier, A. G., Longman, R. J., Dacks, R. S., Walton, M. M., Tong, E. J., Sanchez, J. J., Kaiser,
1127 L. R., Stender, Y. O., Anderson, J. M., Ambrosino, C. M., Fernandez-Silva, I., Giuseffi, L. M., &
1128 Giambelluca, T. W. (2013). The projected timing of climate departure from recent variability.
1129 *Nature*, 502(7470), 183–187. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nature12540>
- 1130 Morisette, J. T., Jarnevich, C. S., Holcombe, T. R., Talbert, C. B., Ignizio, D., Talbert, M. K., Silva, C.,
1131 Koop, D., Swanson, A., & Young, N. E. (2013). VisTrails SAHM: Visualization and workflow
1132 management for species habitat modeling. *Ecography*, 36(2), 129–135.
1133 <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1600-0587.2012.07815.x>
- 1134 Moritz, C., & Agudo, R. (2013). The future of species under climate change: Resilience or decline?
1135 *Science*, 341(6145), 504–508. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1237190>
- 1136 Morris, W. F., & Doak, D. F. (2002). *Quantitative conservation biology: Theory and practice of*
1137 *population viability analysis*. Sinauer Associates.

- 1138 Morrison, M. L. (1986). Bird populations as indicators of environmental change. In R. F. Johnston (Ed.),
1139 *Current Ornithology: Volume 3* (pp. 429–451). Springer US. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4615-](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4615-6784-4_10)
1140 [6784-4_10](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4615-6784-4_10)
- 1141 Nakao, K., Higa, M., Tsuyama, I., Matsui, T., Horikawa, M., & Tanaka, N. (2013). Spatial conservation
1142 planning under climate change: Using species distribution modeling to assess priority for adaptive
1143 management of *Fagus crenata* in Japan. *Journal for Nature Conservation*, 21(6), 406–413.
1144 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jnc.2013.06.003>
- 1145 Neilan, W. L., Barton, P. S., McAlpine, C. A., Wood, J. T., & Lindenmayer, D. B. (2019). Contrasting
1146 effects of mosaic structure on alpha and beta diversity of bird assemblages in a human-modified
1147 landscape. *Ecography*, 42(1), 173–186. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ecog.02981>
- 1148 Nilsson, C., Klaassen, R. H. G., & Alerstam, T. (2013). Differences in speed and duration of bird
1149 migration between spring and autumn. *The American Naturalist*, 181(6), 837–845.
1150 <https://doi.org/10.1086/670335>
- 1151 Oksanen, J., & Minchin, P. R. (2002). Continuum theory revisited: What shape are species responses
1152 along ecological gradients? *Ecological Modelling*, 157(2), 119–129.
1153 [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0304-3800\(02\)00190-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0304-3800(02)00190-4)
- 1154 Oppel, S., Meirinho, A., Ramírez, I., Gardner, B., O’Connell, A. F., Miller, P. I., & Louzao, M. (2012).
1155 Comparison of five modelling techniques to predict the spatial distribution and abundance of
1156 seabirds. *Biological Conservation*, 156, 94–104. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biocon.2011.11.013>
- 1157 Palacio, F. X., & Girini, J. M. (2018). Biotic interactions in species distribution models enhance model
1158 performance and shed light on natural history of rare birds: A case study using the straight-billed
1159 reedhaunter *Limnortyx rectirostris*. *Journal of Avian Biology*, 49(11), e01743.
1160 <https://doi.org/10.1111/jav.01743>
- 1161 Palma, A. C., Goosem, M., Fensham, R. J., Goosem, S., Preece, N. D., Stevenson, P. R., & Laurance, S.
1162 G. W. (2020). Dispersal and recruitment limitations in secondary forests. *Journal of Vegetation*
1163 *Science*, 32, e12975. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jvs.12975>

- 1164 Papeş, M., Peterson, A. T., & Powell, G. V. N. (2012). Vegetation dynamics and avian seasonal
1165 migration: Clues from remotely sensed vegetation indices and ecological niche modelling.
1166 *Journal of Biogeography*, 39(4), 652–664. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2699.2011.02632.x>
- 1167 Parmesan, C., & Matthews, J. (2005). *Biological Impacts of Climate Change*.
1168 <https://doi.org/10.17226/12491>
- 1169 Parmesan, C., & Yohe, G. (2003). A globally coherent fingerprint of climate change impacts across
1170 natural systems. *Nature*, 421(6918), 37–42. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nature01286>
- 1171 Pearl, J. (1985). Bayesian networks: A model of self-activated memory for evidential reasoning.
1172 *Proceedings of the 7th Conference of the Cognitive Science Society*.
- 1173 Pearson, R. G., & Dawson, T. P. (2003). Predicting the impacts of climate change on the distribution of
1174 species: Are bioclimate envelope models useful? *Global Ecology and Biogeography*, 12(5), 361–
1175 371. <https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1466-822X.2003.00042.x>
- 1176 Pearson, R. G., Raxworthy, C. J., Nakamura, M., & Peterson, A. T. (2007). Predicting species
1177 distributions from small numbers of occurrence records: A test case using cryptic geckos in
1178 Madagascar. *Journal of Biogeography*, 34(1), 102–117. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2699.2006.01594.x>
- 1180 Pecl, G. T., Araújo, M. B., Bell, J. D., Blanchard, J., Bonebrake, T. C., Chen, I.-C., Clark, T. D., Colwell,
1181 R. K., Danielsen, F., Evengård, B., Falconi, L., Ferrier, S., Frusher, S., Garcia, R. A., Griffis, R.
1182 B., Hobday, A. J., Janion-Scheepers, C., Jarzyna, M. A., Jennings, S., ... Williams, S. E. (2017).
1183 Biodiversity redistribution under climate change: Impacts on ecosystems and human well-being.
1184 *Science*, 355(6332). <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aai9214>
- 1185 Pérez-Granados, C., Bota, G., Giralt, D., Barrero, A., Gómez-Catasús, J., Rosa, D. B.-D. L., & Traba, J.
1186 (2019). Vocal activity rate index: A useful method to infer terrestrial bird abundance with
1187 acoustic monitoring. *Ibis*, 161(4), 901–907. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ibi.12728>
- 1188 Pérez-Granados, C., & Schuchmann, K.-L. (2020). Monitoring the annual vocal activity of two enigmatic
1189 nocturnal Neotropical birds: The Common Potoo (*Nyctibius griseus*) and the Great Potoo

- 1190 (Nyctibius grandis). *Journal of Ornithology*, 161(4), 1129–1141. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10336->
- 1191 020-01795-4
- 1192 Phillips, S. J., Anderson, R. P., & Schapire, R. E. (2006). Maximum entropy modeling of species
- 1193 geographic distributions. *Ecological Modelling*, 190(3), 231–259.
- 1194 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolmodel.2005.03.026>
- 1195 Pierson, J. C., Beissinger, S. R., Bragg, J. G., Coates, D. J., Oostermeijer, J. G. B., Sunnucks, P.,
- 1196 Schumaker, N. H., Trotter, M. V., & Young, A. G. (2015). Incorporating evolutionary processes
- 1197 into population viability models. *Conservation Biology*, 29(3), 755–764.
- 1198 <https://doi.org/10.1111/cobi.12431>
- 1199 Pollock, H. S., Brawn, J. D., & Cheviron, Z. A. (2021). Heat tolerances of temperate and tropical birds
- 1200 and their implications for susceptibility to climate warming. *Functional Ecology*, 35(1), 93–104.
- 1201 <https://doi.org/10.1111/1365-2435.13693>
- 1202 Poloczanska, E. S., Brown, C. J., Sydeman, W. J., Kiessling, W., Schoeman, D. S., Moore, P. J., Brander,
- 1203 K., Bruno, J. F., Buckley, L. B., Burrows, M. T., Duarte, C. M., Halpern, B. S., Holding, J.,
- 1204 Kappel, C. V., O'Connor, M. I., Pandolfi, J. M., Parmesan, C., Schwing, F., Thompson, S. A., &
- 1205 Richardson, A. J. (2013). Global imprint of climate change on marine life. *Nature Climate*
- 1206 *Change*, 3(10), 919–925. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nclimate1958>
- 1207 Porter, W. P., Mitchell, J. W., Beckman, W. A., & DeWitt, C. B. (1973). Behavioral implications of
- 1208 mechanistic ecology. *Oecologia*, 13(1), 1–54. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00379617>
- 1209 Powell, G. V. N., & Bjork, R. (1995). Implications of intratropical migration on reserve design: A case
- 1210 study using *Pharomachrus mocinno*. *Conservation Biology*, 9(2), 354–362.
- 1211 <https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1523-1739.1995.9020354.x>
- 1212 Radchuk, V., Reed, T., Teplitsky, C., van de Pol, M., Charmantier, A., Hassall, C., Adamík, P.,
- 1213 Adriaensen, F., Ahola, M. P., Arcese, P., Miguel Avilés, J., Balbontin, J., Berg, K. S., Borrás, A.,
- 1214 Burthe, S., Clobert, J., Dehnhard, N., de Lope, F., Dhondt, A. A., ... Kramer-Schadt, S. (2019).

- 1215 Adaptive responses of animals to climate change are most likely insufficient. *Nature*
- 1216 *Communications*, 10(1), 3109. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-019-10924-4>
- 1217 Radosavljevic, A., & Anderson, R. P. (2014). Making better Maxent models of species distributions:
- 1218 Complexity, overfitting and evaluation. *Journal of Biogeography*, 41(4), 629–643.
- 1219 <https://doi.org/10.1111/jbi.12227>
- 1220 Randin, C. F., Ashcroft, M. B., Bolliger, J., Cavender-Bares, J., Coops, N. C., Dullinger, S., Dirnböck, T.,
- 1221 Eckert, S., Ellis, E., Fernández, N., Giuliani, G., Guisan, A., Jetz, W., Joost, S., Karger, D.,
- 1222 Lembrechts, J., Lenoir, J., Luoto, M., Morin, X., ... Payne, D. (2020). Monitoring biodiversity in
- 1223 the Anthropocene using remote sensing in species distribution models. *Remote Sensing of*
- 1224 *Environment*, 239, 111626. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rse.2019.111626>
- 1225 Rappole, J. H. (1995). *The ecology of migrant birds: A neotropical perspective*. Smithsonian institution
- 1226 Press.
- 1227 Reed, J. M., Boulinier, T., Danchin, E., & Oring, L. W. (1999). Informed Dispersal. In V. Nolan, E. D.
- 1228 Ketterson, & C. F. Thompson (Eds.), *Current Ornithology* (pp. 189–259). Springer US.
- 1229 https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4757-4901-4_5
- 1230 Rehm, E., & Feeley, K. J. (2016). Many species risk mountain top extinction long before they reach the
- 1231 top. *Frontiers of Biogeography*, 8(1). <https://doi.org/10.21425/F5FBG27788>
- 1232 Renfrew, R. B., Kim, D., Perlut, N., Smith, J., Fox, J., & Marra, P. P. (2013). Phenological matching
- 1233 across hemispheres in a long-distance migratory bird. *Diversity and Distributions*, 19(8), 1008–
- 1234 1019. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ddi.12080>
- 1235 Reznick, D., Baxter, R. J., & Endler, J. (1994). Long-term studies of tropical stream fish communities:
- 1236 The use of field notes and museum collections to reconstruct communities of the past. *Integrative*
- 1237 *and Comparative Biology*, 34(3), 452–462. <https://doi.org/10.1093/icb/34.3.452>
- 1238 Ribas, C. C., Aleixo, A., Gubili, C., d'Horta, F. M., Brumfield, R. T., & Cracraft, J. (2018). Biogeography
- 1239 and diversification of Rhegmatorhina (Aves: Thamnophilidae): Implications for the evolution of

- 1240 Amazonian landscapes during the Quaternary. *Journal of Biogeography*, 45(4), 917–928.
- 1241 <https://doi.org/10.1111/jbi.13169>
- 1242 Ribas, C. C., Aleixo, A., Nogueira, A. C. R., Miyaki, C. Y., & Cracraft, J. (2012). A palaeobiogeographic
- 1243 model for biotic diversification within Amazonia over the past three million years. *Proceedings of*
- 1244 *the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, 279(1729), 681–689.
- 1245 <https://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2011.1120>
- 1246 Riddell, E. A., Iknayan, K. J., Hargrove, L., Tremor, S., Patton, J. L., Ramirez, R., Wolf, B. O., &
- 1247 Beissinger, S. R. (2021). Exposure to climate change drives stability or collapse of desert
- 1248 mammal and bird communities. *Science*, 371(6529), 633–636.
- 1249 <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.abd4605>
- 1250 Riotte-Lambert, L., & Matthiopoulos, J. (2020). Environmental Predictability as a Cause and
- 1251 Consequence of Animal Movement. *Trends in Ecology and Evolution*, 35(2), 163–174.
- 1252 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tree.2019.09.009>
- 1253 Ritter, C. D., Coelho, L. A., Capurcho, J. M., Borges, S. H., Cornelius, C., & Ribas, C. C. (2021). Sister
- 1254 species, different histories: Comparative phylogeography of two bird species associated with
- 1255 Amazonian open vegetation. *Biological Journal of the Linnean Society*, 132(1), 161–173.
- 1256 <https://doi.org/10.1093/biolinnean/blaa167>
- 1257 Rosado, B. H. P., Figueiredo, M. S. L., Mattos, E. A. de, & Grelle, C. E. V. (2016). Eltonian shortfall due
- 1258 to the Grinnellian view: Functional ecology between the mismatch of niche concepts. *Ecography*,
- 1259 39(11), 1034–1041. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ecog.01678>
- 1260 Roslin, T., Antão, L., Hällfors, M., Meyke, E., Lo, C., Tikhonov, G., Delgado, M. del M., Gurarie, E.,
- 1261 Abadonova, M., Abduraimov, O., Adrianova, O., Akimova, T., Akkiev, M., Ananin, A.,
- 1262 Andreeva, E., Andriychuk, N., Antipin, M., Arzamascev, K., Babina, S., ... Ovaskainen, O.
- 1263 (2021). Phenological shifts of abiotic events, producers and consumers across a continent. *Nature*
- 1264 *Climate Change*, 11(3), 241–248. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41558-020-00967-7>

- 1265 Sander, M., Chamberlain, D., Mermillon, C., Alba, R., Jähnig, S., Rosselli, D., & Lisovski, S. (2020).
1266 *Reduced breeding success suggests trophic mismatch despite timely arrival in an alpine songbird*
1267 [Preprint]. [https://assets.researchsquare.com/files/rs-137126/v1/650443e6-45ba-470a-814c-](https://assets.researchsquare.com/files/rs-137126/v1/650443e6-45ba-470a-814c-47dde4d049d7.pdf)
1268 [47dde4d049d7.pdf](https://assets.researchsquare.com/files/rs-137126/v1/650443e6-45ba-470a-814c-47dde4d049d7.pdf)
- 1269 Saupe, E. E., Barve, V., Myers, C. E., Soberón, J., Barve, N., Hensz, C. M., Peterson, A. T., Owens, H.
1270 L., & Lira-Noriega, A. (2012). Variation in niche and distribution model performance: The need
1271 for a priori assessment of key causal factors. *Ecological Modelling*, 237–238, 11–22.
1272 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolmodel.2012.04.001>
- 1273 Sax, D. F., Early, R., & Bellemare, J. (2013). Niche syndromes, species extinction risks, and management
1274 under climate change. *Trends in Ecology & Evolution*, 28(9), 517–523.
1275 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tree.2013.05.010>
- 1276 Scheffers, B. R., Edwards, D. P., Diesmos, A., Williams, S. E., & Evans, T. A. (2014). Microhabitats
1277 reduce animal’s exposure to climate extremes. *Global Change Biology*, 20(2), 495–503.
1278 <https://doi.org/10.1111/gcb.12439>
- 1279 Scheffers, B. R., Edwards, D. P., Macdonald, S. L., Senior, R. A., Andriamahohatra, L. R., Roslan, N.,
1280 Rogers, A. M., Haugaasen, T., Wright, P., & Williams, S. E. (2017). Extreme thermal
1281 heterogeneity in structurally complex tropical rain forests. *Biotropica*, 49(1), 35–44.
1282 <https://doi.org/10.1111/btp.12355>
- 1283 Sekercioglu, C. H. (2010). Partial migration in tropical birds: The frontier of movement ecology. *Journal*
1284 *of Animal Ecology*, 79(5), 933–936. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2656.2010.01739.x>
- 1285 Şekerciöğlü, C., Wenny, D. G., & Whelan, C. J. (2019). *Why birds matter: Avian ecological function and*
1286 *ecosystem services*.
1287 [http://chicago.universitypressscholarship.com/10.7208/chicago/9780226382777.001.0001/upso-](http://chicago.universitypressscholarship.com/10.7208/chicago/9780226382777.001.0001/upso-9780226382463)
1288 [9780226382463](http://chicago.universitypressscholarship.com/10.7208/chicago/9780226382777.001.0001/upso-9780226382463)

- 1289 Shaffer, H. B., Fisher, R. N., & Davidson, C. (1998). The role of natural history collections in
1290 documenting species declines. *Trends in Ecology & Evolution*, 13(1), 27–30.
1291 [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0169-5347\(97\)01177-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0169-5347(97)01177-4)
- 1292 Sheard, C., Neate-Clegg, M. H. C., Alioravainen, N., Jones, S. E. I., Vincent, C., MacGregor, H. E. A.,
1293 Bregman, T. P., Claramunt, S., & Tobias, J. A. (2020). Ecological drivers of global gradients in
1294 avian dispersal inferred from wing morphology. *Nature Communications*, 11(1), 2463.
1295 <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-020-16313-6>
- 1296 Sheldon, K. S., Huey, R. B., Kaspari, M., & Sanders, N. J. (2018). Fifty years of mountain passes: A
1297 perspective on Dan Janzen’s classic article. *The American Naturalist*, 191(5), 553–565.
1298 <https://doi.org/10.1086/697046>
- 1299 Shipley, J. R., Twining, C. W., Taff, C. C., Vitousek, M. N., Flack, A., & Winkler, D. W. (2020). Birds
1300 advancing lay dates with warming springs face greater risk of chick mortality. *Proceedings of the*
1301 *National Academy of Sciences*, 117(41), 25590–25594. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.2009864117>
- 1302 Shirley, S. M., Yang, Z., Hutchinson, R. A., Alexander, J. D., McGarigal, K., & Betts, M. G. (2013).
1303 Species distribution modelling for the people: Unclassified landsat TM imagery predicts bird
1304 occurrence at fine resolutions. *Diversity and Distributions*, 19(7), 855–866.
1305 <https://doi.org/10.1111/ddi.12093>
- 1306 Siepielski, A. M., Morrissey, M. B., Buoro, M., Carlson, S. M., Caruso, C. M., Clegg, S. M., Coulson, T.,
1307 DiBattista, J., Gotanda, K. M., Francis, C. D., Hereford, J., Kingsolver, J. G., Augustine, K. E.,
1308 Kruuk, L. E. B., Martin, R. A., Sheldon, B. C., Sletvold, N., Svensson, E. I., Wade, M. J., &
1309 MacColl, A. D. C. (2017). Precipitation drives global variation in natural selection. *Science*,
1310 355(6328), 959–962. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aag2773>
- 1311 Slager, D. L. (2020). Seasonal and directional dispersal behavior in an ongoing dove invasion. *Journal of*
1312 *Avian Biology*, 51(2). <https://doi.org/10.1111/jav.02332>
- 1313 Smith, A. C., & Edwards, B. P. M. (2021). North American Breeding Bird Survey status and trend
1314 estimates to inform a wide range of conservation needs, using a flexible Bayesian hierarchical

- 1315 generalized additive model. *Ornithological Applications*, 123(duaa065).
- 1316 <https://doi.org/10.1093/ornithapp/duaa065>
- 1317 Smith, B. T., Gehara, M., & Harvey, M. G. (2021). The demography of extinction in eastern North
- 1318 American birds. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, 288(1944), 20201945.
- 1319 <https://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2020.1945>
- 1320 Smith, F. A., Betancourt, J. L., & Brown, J. H. (1995). Evolution of Body Size in the Woodrat over the
- 1321 Past 25,000 Years of Climate Change. *Science*, 270(5244), 2012–2014.
- 1322 <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.270.5244.2012>
- 1323 Smith, R. J., & Moore, F. R. (2005). Arrival timing and seasonal reproductive performance in a long-
- 1324 distance migratory landbird. *Behavioral Ecology and Sociobiology*, 57(3), 231–239.
- 1325 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00265-004-0855-9>
- 1326 Soberón, J. (2007). Grinnellian and Eltonian niches and geographic distributions of species. *Ecology*
- 1327 *Letters*, 10(12), 1115–1123. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1461-0248.2007.01107.x>
- 1328 Soberón, J., & Peterson, A. T. (2005). INTERPRETATION OF MODELS OF FUNDAMENTAL
- 1329 ECOLOGICAL NICHES AND SPECIES' DISTRIBUTIONAL AREAS. In *Biodiversity*
- 1330 *Informatics* (Vol. 2, pp. 1–10).
- 1331 [https://kuscholarworks.ku.edu/bitstream/handle/1808/20560/soberon_interpretation.pdf?sequence](https://kuscholarworks.ku.edu/bitstream/handle/1808/20560/soberon_interpretation.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y)
- 1332 [=1&isAllowed=y](https://kuscholarworks.ku.edu/bitstream/handle/1808/20560/soberon_interpretation.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y)
- 1333 Song, G., Zhang, R., Machado-Stredel, F., Alström, P., Johansson, U. S., Irestedt, M., Mays, H. L.,
- 1334 McKay, B. D., Nishiumi, I., Cheng, Y., Qu, Y., Ericson, P. G. P., Fjeldså, J., Peterson, A. T., &
- 1335 Lei, F. (2020). Great journey of Great Tits (*Parus major* group): Origin, diversification and
- 1336 historical demographics of a broadly distributed bird lineage. *Journal of Biogeography*, 47(7),
- 1337 1585–1598. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jbi.13863>
- 1338 Staniczenko, P. P. A., Sivasubramaniam, P., Suttle, K. B., & Pearson, R. G. (2017). Linking
- 1339 macroecology and community ecology: Refining predictions of species distributions using biotic
- 1340 interaction networks. *Ecology Letters*, 20(6), 693–707. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ele.12770>

- 1341 Stanley, C. Q., MacPherson, M., Fraser, K. C., McKinnon, E. A., & Stutchbury, B. J. M. (2012). Repeat
1342 tracking of individual songbirds reveals consistent migration timing but flexibility in route. *PLOS*
1343 *ONE*, 7(7), e40688. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0040688>
- 1344 Stanley, C. Q., Mckinnon, E. A., Fraser, K. C., Macpherson, M. P., Casbourn, G., Friesen, L., Marra, P.
1345 P., Studds, C., Ryder, T. B., Diggs, N. E., & Stutchbury, B. J. M. (2015). Connectivity of wood
1346 thrush breeding, wintering, and migration sites based on range-wide tracking. *Conservation*
1347 *Biology*, 29(1). <https://doi.org/10.1111/cobi.12352>
- 1348 Stevenson, R. D. (1985). The relative importance of behavioral and physiological adjustments controlling
1349 body temperature in terrestrial ectotherms. *The American Naturalist*, 126(3), 362–386.
1350 <https://doi.org/10.1086/284423>
- 1351 Stiels, D., Bastian, H.-V., Bastian, A., Schidelko, K., & Engler, J. O. (2021). An iconic messenger of
1352 climate change? Predicting the range dynamics of the European Bee-eater (*Merops apiaster*).
1353 *Journal of Ornithology*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10336-021-01867-z>
- 1354 Stralberg, D., Matsuoka, S. M., Hamann, A., Bayne, E. M., Sólomos, P., Schmiegelow, F. K. A., Wang,
1355 X., Cumming, S. G., & Song, S. J. (2015). Projecting boreal bird responses to climate change:
1356 The signal exceeds the noise. *Ecological Applications*, 25(1), 52–69. [https://doi.org/10.1890/13-](https://doi.org/10.1890/13-2289.1)
1357 [2289.1](https://doi.org/10.1890/13-2289.1)
- 1358 Sugai, L. S. M., Desjonquères, C., Silva, T. S. F., & Llusia, D. (2020). A roadmap for survey designs in
1359 terrestrial acoustic monitoring. *Remote Sensing in Ecology and Conservation*, 6(3), 220–235.
1360 <https://doi.org/10.1002/rse2.131>
- 1361 Suh, Y. H., Pesendorfer, M. B., Tringali, A., Bowman, R., & Fitzpatrick, J. W. (2020). Investigating
1362 social and environmental predictors of natal dispersal in a cooperative breeding bird. *Behavioral*
1363 *Ecology*, 31(3), 692–701. <https://doi.org/10.1093/beheco/araa007>
- 1364 Sullivan, B. L., Aycrigg, J. L., Barry, J. H., Bonney, R. E., Bruns, N., Cooper, C. B., Damoulas, T.,
1365 Dhondt, A. A., Dietterich, T., Farnsworth, A., Fink, D., Fitzpatrick, J. W., Fredericks, T.,
1366 Gerbracht, J., Gomes, C., Hochachka, W. M., Iliff, M. J., Lagoze, C., La Sorte, F. A., ... Kelling,

1367 S. (2014). The eBird enterprise: An integrated approach to development and application of citizen
1368 science. *Biological Conservation*, 169, 31–40. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biocon.2013.11.003>

1369 Sullivan, B. L., Wood, C. L., Iliff, M. J., Bonney, R. E., Fink, D., & Kelling, S. (2009). eBird: A citizen-
1370 based bird observation network in the biological sciences. *Biological Conservation*, 142(10),
1371 2282–2292. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biocon.2009.05.006>

1372 Taylor, S. A., White, T. A., Hochachka, W. M., Ferretti, V., Curry, R. L., & Lovette, I. (2014). Climate-
1373 Mediated Movement of an Avian Hybrid Zone. *Current Biology*, 24(6), 671–676.
1374 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cub.2014.01.069>

1375 Terribile, L. C. (2012). Areas of climate stability of species ranges in the Brazilian Cerrado:
1376 Disentangling uncertainties through time. *Natureza & Conservação*, 10(2), 152–159.
1377 <https://doi.org/10.4322/natcon.2012.025>

1378 Thomas, C. D., Franco, A. M. A., & Hill, J. K. (2006). Range retractions and extinction in the face of
1379 climate warming. *Trends in Ecology & Evolution*, 21(8), 415–416.
1380 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tree.2006.05.012>

1381 Thorup, K., Tøttrup, A. P., Willemoes, M., Klaassen, R. H. G., Strandberg, R., Vega, M. L., Dasari, H. P.,
1382 Araújo, M. B., Wikelski, M., & Rahbek, C. (2017). Resource tracking within and across
1383 continents in long-distance bird migrants. *Science Advances*, 3(1), e1601360.
1384 <https://doi.org/10.1126/sciadv.1601360>

1385 Thuiller, W., Lafourcade, B., Engler, R., & Araújo, M. B. (2009). BIOMOD – a platform for ensemble
1386 forecasting of species distributions. *Ecography*, 32(3), 369–373. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1600-0587.2008.05742.x>

1387

1388 Tingley, M. W., Darling, E., & Wilcove, D. S. (2014). Fine- and coarse-filter conservation strategies in a
1389 time of climate change. *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences*, 1322(The Year in Ecology
1390 and Conservation Biology), 92–109. <https://doi.org/10.1111/nyas.12484>

- 1391 Tingley, M. W., Monahan, W. B., Beissinger, S. R., & Moritz, C. (2009). Birds track their Grinnellian
1392 niche through a century of climate change. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*,
1393 *106*(Supplement 2), 19637–19643. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.0901562106>
- 1394 Tøttrup, A. P., Klaassen, R. H. G., Kristensen, M. W., Strandberg, R., Vardanis, Y., Lindström, Å.,
1395 Rahbek, C., Alerstam, T., & Thorup, K. (2012). Drought in Africa caused delayed arrival of
1396 European songbirds. *Science*, *338*(6112), 1307–1307. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1227548>
- 1397 Travis, J. M. J., Delgado, M., Bocedi, G., Baguette, M., Bartoń, K., Bonte, D., Boulangeat, I., Hodgson, J.
1398 A., Kubisch, A., Penteriani, V., Saastamoinen, M., Stevens, V. M., & Bullock, J. M. (2013).
1399 Dispersal and species' responses to climate change. *Oikos*, *122*(11), 1532–1540.
1400 <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1600-0706.2013.00399.x>
- 1401 Twedt, D. J. (2013). Foraging Habitat for Shorebirds in Southeastern Missouri and its Predicted Future
1402 Availability. *Wetlands*, *33*(4), 667–678. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13157-013-0422-0>
- 1403 Urban, M. C., Zarnetske, P. L., & Skelly, D. K. (2013). Moving forward: Dispersal and species
1404 interactions determine biotic responses to climate change. *Annals of the New York Academy of*
1405 *Sciences*, *1297*, 44–60. <https://doi.org/10.1111/nyas.12184>
- 1406 van Rees, C. B., & Reed, J. M. (2018). Predicted effects of landscape change, sea level rise, and habitat
1407 management on the extirpation risk of the Hawaiian common gallinule (*Gallinula galeata*
1408 *sandvicensis*) on the island of O'ahu. *PeerJ*, *6*, e4990. <https://doi.org/10.7717/peerj.4990>
- 1409 Visser, M. E. (2008). Keeping up with a warming world; assessing the rate of adaptation to climate
1410 change. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, *275*(1635), 649–659.
1411 <https://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2007.0997>
- 1412 Weiner, J. (1994). *The Beak of the Finch: A Story of Evolution in Our Time*.
1413 <https://doi.org/10.5860/choice.32-1538>
- 1414 Williams, J. W., Jackson, S. T., & Kutzbach, J. E. (2007). Projected distributions of novel and
1415 disappearing climates by 2100 AD. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, *104*(14),
1416 5738–5742. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.0606292104>

1417 Winger, B. M., Auteri, G. G., Pegan, T. M., & Weeks, B. C. (2019). A long winter for the Red Queen:
1418 Rethinking the evolution of seasonal migration. *Biological Reviews*, 94(3), 737–752.
1419 <https://doi.org/10.1111/brv.12476>

1420 Wisz, M. S., Hijmans, R. J., Li, J., Peterson, A. T., Graham, C. H., & Guisan, A. (2008). Effects of
1421 sample size on the performance of species distribution models. *Diversity and Distributions*, 14(5),
1422 763–773. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1472-4642.2008.00482.x>

1423 Wisz, M. S., Pottier, J., Kissling, W. D., Pellissier, L., Lenoir, J., Damgaard, C. F., Dormann, C. F.,
1424 Forchhammer, M. C., Grytnes, J.-A., Guisan, A., Heikkinen, R. K., Høye, T. T., Kühn, I., Luoto,
1425 M., Maiorano, L., Nilsson, M.-C., Normand, S., Öckinger, E., Schmidt, N. M., ... Svenning, J.-C.
1426 (2013). The role of biotic interactions in shaping distributions and realised assemblages of
1427 species: Implications for species distribution modelling. *Biological Reviews*, 88(1), 15–30.
1428 <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1469-185X.2012.00235.x>

1429 Wogan, G. O. U., Voelker, G., Oatley, G., & Bowie, R. C. K. (2020). Biome stability predicts population
1430 structure of a southern African aridland bird species. *Ecology and Evolution*, 10(9), 4066–4081.
1431 <https://doi.org/10.1002/ece3.6175>

1432 Wolfson, D. W., Fieberg, J. R., & Andersen, D. E. (2020). Juvenile Sandhill Cranes exhibit wider ranging
1433 and more exploratory movements than adults during the breeding season. *Ibis*, 162(2), 556–562.
1434 <https://doi.org/10.1111/ibi.12786>

1435 Wüest, R. O., Bergamini, A., Bollmann, K., & Baltensweiler, A. (2020). LiDAR data as a proxy for light
1436 availability improve distribution modelling of woody species. *Forest Ecology and Management*,
1437 456, 117644. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foreco.2019.117644>

1438 Xia, J., Wang, J., & Niu, S. (2020). Research challenges and opportunities for using big data in global
1439 change biology. *Global Change Biology*, 26(11), 6040–6061. <https://doi.org/10.1111/gcb.15317>

1440
1441