Competition and environmental gradients structure assemblages of Canidae across the planet

Distribution patterns in Canidae

Lucas M. V. Porto^{1,2*}, Rampal S. Etienne¹, and Renan Maestri²

¹*Groningen Institute for Evolutionary Life Sciences, University of Groningen, PO Box 11103, 9700 CC Groningen, The Netherlands;*

²*Programa de Pós-Graduação em Ecologia, Universidade Federal do Rio Grande do Sul, PO Box: 15007, Porto Alegre, Rio Grande do Sul, Brazil.*

**E-mail corresponding author: lucasmvporto@gmail.com*

* <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8862-9839>

The phylogenetic information of assemblages carries the signature of ecological and evolutionary processes that assembled these communities. Identifying the mechanisms that shape communities is not simple, as they can vary spatially. Here, we investigated how the phylogenetic structure of Canidae across the globe is affected by the environment and competition. We first identified phylogenetically clustered and overdispersed assemblages of canids over the planet taking into account regional pools of species in South and North America, Eurasia, and Africa. Then, we applied Structural Equation Models in these communities in order to identify the effect of temperature, vegetation cover, human impact, and body size dissimilarity on the spatial distribution of the phylogenetic information of canids. Only southern South America and the Middle East had strong phylogenetic clustered patterns, while the rest of the planet predominantly showed overdispersed assemblages. Body size dissimilarity and vegetation cover were the most important variables to explain the spatial patterns of phylogenetic structure in clustered and overdispersed communities, respectively. Canidae community composition across the world presents significant patterns of clustering and overdispersion, which vary following mainly the environmental gradient, suggesting habitat filtering as the main force acting on Canidae assemblages.

Keywords: Community assembly, community Phylogenetics, habitat filtering, NRI, overdispersion, phylogenetic clustering.

1. Introduction

38 The assembly of an ecological community is influenced by several biotic and
39 abiotic factors (Webb 2000, Webb et al. 2002, Westoby 2006), including competition
40 and habitat filtering. On the one hand, the competitive exclusion principle predicts that
41 ecologically similar species cannot coexist if resources are limiting, and under
42 phylogenetic trait conservatism, this implies that communities will be phylogenetically
43 overdispersed (Darwin 1859, Elton 1946, Leibold 1998, Webb et al. 2002). On the other
44 hand, phylogenetically closely related species likely share traits that allow them to
45 tolerate a specific environment (Jarvinen 1982, Weiher et al. 1998, Webb et al. 2002, Di
46 Marco and Santini 2015), which implies phylogenetic clustering of species in an
47 ecological community. Because this also applies to traits that are linked to competitive
48 ability, competition may also lead to phylogenetic clustering (Mayfield and Levine
49 2010, HilleRisLambers et al. 2012). If one can rule out this possibility, patterns of
50 phylogenetic overdispersion or clustering are indicative of competition and habitat
51 filtering, respectively, if the relevant traits are phylogenetically conserved. If traits are
52 not conserved, overdispersion may be due to trait convergence of distant species, and
53 clustering could be a result of historical processes that limited species' dispersion from
54 their ancestral ranges (Webb, 2000; Webb et al., 2002; Cavender-Bares et al., 2004;
55 Kraft et al., 2007).

56 Webb (2000) and Webb et al. (2002) described how communities can be tested
57 for phylogenetic overdispersion or clustering by comparing the value of a community
58 metric to that of a null distribution of randomized communities. One such metric is the
59 net relatedness index (NRI), where negative values of NRI are indicative of
60 overdispersion, while positive values indicate clustering (Webb, 2000; Webb et al.,
61 2002). They suggested that randomized communities can be obtained by permuting the
62 presence-absence pattern on the phylogenetic tree. Pigot & Etienne (2015) argued that
63 such a permutation approach does not yield a proper null distribution because it ignores
64 speciation, colonization, and extinction dynamics. They developed a method that does
65 take these processes into account and found that a null community (i.e. without habitat
66 filtering or competition, but with speciation, colonization and extinction dynamics)
67 would be overdispersed relative to the randomized community resulting from
68 permutation. While absolute values for phylogenetic dispersions are therefore difficult
69 to interpret, relative values are still informative: one can still compare dispersion
70 patterns between communities and ask why some communities are more overdispersed
71 or clustered than others. Many studies have used the phylogenetic approach described
72 by Webb (2000) and Webb et al. (2002) to understand how the phylogenetic
73 information of clades is structured through space (Cavender-Bares et al. 2004, Helmus
74 et al. 2007, Kress et al. 2009, Kraft and Ackerly 2010, Goberna et al. 2014, Yang et al.
75 2014, Miazaki et al. 2015, Cadotte and Tucker 2017, Pérez-Valera et al. 2017, Zhang et
76 al. 2018, Kusumoto et al. 2019). The majority of these studies have shown that

overdispersion dominates at small scales, while clustering better explains the structure of communities at large scales. These findings demonstrate that the interpretation of the mechanisms acting in a community is scale-dependent (Webb et al. 2008). In this light, it is interesting to note that a large number of studies on phylogenetic structuring of communities are at small scales (see Cardillo, Gittleman, & Purvis, 2008).

Another difficulty in studies on the phylogenetic structure of communities relates to how abiotic and biotic factors are treated as independent forces acting on a community. Although habitat filtering and competition are contrasted in their effect on community structure, they occur together in natural communities (Ackerly 2003, Cadotte and Tucker 2017). Over the last decade, several studies have attempted to understand how much each mechanism influences communities (Kraft and Ackerly 2010, Goberna et al. 2014, Cadotte and Tucker 2017, Pérez-Valera et al. 2017, Zhang et al. 2018, Kusumoto et al. 2019). The results have been inconclusive. Cadotte & Tucker (2017) noted that “it is likely that most observational data reported as evidence for environmental filtering, in fact, reflect the combined effects of the environment and local competition.” To overcome these issues, one needs a detailed analysis of whether traits are conserved or not on a phylogenetic tree and of how patterns of phylogenetic dispersion vary with environmental variables.

Here, we assess patterns of phylogenetic dispersion in the family Canidae across the world. As canids are present in all continents, except in Antarctica (Wang and Tedford 2008, Wilson and Mittermeier 2009), and have a well-resolved phylogenetic tree (Porto et al., 2019), they are an ideal group to test how the phylogenetic structure of a whole clade was structured over the world by the influence of environmental filters and competition forces through time. The phylogeny of extant canids presents 36 species distributed in three distinct clades (Porto et al. 2019) with a variety of patterns: multiple species of a single genus, multiple genera of only one species, species with continental distributions, and also geographically restricted species. We explore, using Structural Equation Models (SEM), how phylogenetic dispersion patterns relates to environmental variables and to dissimilarity in body size (a measure of competition among canids).

2. Material and methods

2.1 Data compilation

Canids’ range maps were compiled from the IUCN Red List for all the 36 species (IUCN 2019). We processed these maps using ArcGIS (ESRI, 2019) to generate a presence-absence matrix of species within defined grids cells of 300 x 300 km (hereafter, assemblages). We used 3° grid cells because canids have very large home ranges. For each grid cell, we extracted average values for three environmental variables (mean temperature, vegetation cover, and human footprint) (Center for International

Earth Science Information Network 2005, Fick and Hijmans 2017, USGS 2019). Temperature is the most significant environmental gradient at the global scale, and can strongly affect food-web structure and interaction strength of species (Bideault et al. 2019). Vegetation cover is suggested to have played a major role in the evolution of Canidae (Figueirido et al. 2015), and together with temperature, it constitutes two of the most commonly used variables in studies that evaluate species distributions (Porfirio et al. 2014). Human footprint was included in the models following Di Marco & Santini (2015), who found that human impacts explain the distribution of terrestrial mammals better than biological traits. Canid body sizes (head + body length) were obtained from the females of each species using the Handbook of the Mammals of the World (Wilson and Mittermeier 2009) and also from the Animal Diversity Web (ADW) (Myers et al. 2018) (Table S1). We used only the female body size to standardize the data due to sexual dimorphisms that a few species of canids present.

Other environmental variables were not taken into account for various reasons. Annual precipitation and primary productivity (Fick and Hijmans 2017) presented, within the assemblages addressed here (grid cells), high correlation with vegetation cover and temperature, respectively (Figure S1), which we already used in our models. The elevation gradient, which is commonly used in studies for different groups, was not considered here because only two species of Canidae have distributions that extend into mountains, so it is of little value in our study. Finally, including too many abiotic variables may bias the results toward environmental filtering.

We then calculated, for each grid cell, the body size dissimilarity among the canids within each assemblage using the decoupled trait approach proposed by De Bello et al. (2017) (*dcFdist*). This approach calculates functional differences between species accounting for the shared evolutionary history. Thus, we can measure how different canids within communities are, based on their body size, while accounting for their ancestry. Body size dissimilarity was used as a measure of competition. It is suggested by Finarelli (2007) that trends in body size were driven by interactions between species over the evolution of Canidae. One expects competition to be largest between species of similar body size, and if body size is evolutionarily conserved, competition causes phylogenetically related species to displace one another, so only phylogenetically distant species remain. Analyses were performed in R 4.0-2. (R Development Core Team 2020) using the raster package 3.3-13 (Hijmans and Etten 2012).

2.2 Phylogenetic data analyses

We used the phylogeny presented by Porto et al. (2019) that includes all 36 extant canid species and one recently extinct. The phylogeny was constructed through Bayesian inference based on 23 genes and 68 osteological characters. We removed the extinct species *Dusicyon australis* from this tree because there is no environmental data

155 available for the region where the species lived before the year of its extinction (1876).
 156 To investigate how body size is distributed over the phylogeny, we calculated its
 157 phylogenetic signal using the *K*-statistic (Blomberg and Garland 2003) with the R
 158 package Phytools 0.7-47 (Revell 2012). Values of $K \leq 1$ describe less phylogenetic
 159 signal than expected under a Brownian motion model of character evolution, while
 160 values of $K > 1$ describe data with more phylogenetic signal than expected under
 161 Brownian motion.

162 To analyze phylogenetic dispersion patterns over the planet, we first calculated
 163 the standardized effect size of mean pairwise distances in communities (MPD) for each
 164 assemblage using the package Picante 1.8-2 (Kembel et al. 2010). As distributions of
 165 canids are not global, and some species are geographically restricted, historical
 166 processes (i.e. speciation and dispersal limitation) could influence our results. Thus, we
 167 set a null model with regional pools (instead of a global pool). We divided the world
 168 into 4 regional pools (South America = 10 species, North America = 9 species, Africa =
 169 12 species, and Eurasia = 11 species); only few canids inhabit more than one continent
 170 (N. America + Eurasia: 2 species, Africa + Eurasia: 2 species, N. America + Eurasia +
 171 Africa: 1 species). Species richness spatial gradient and distributions are indicated in
 172 Figures S2 and S3, respectively.

173 Our null model randomized the community matrix (from each one of the four
 174 regions) 999 times by drawing canids from pool of species occurring in at least one
 175 community. Our null model shuffles taxa labels and re-calculates MPD, keeping
 176 richness fixed. The 999 null values constituted a null distribution to which the observed
 177 value was compared. We then calculated the net relatedness index (NRI) for the
 178 assemblages within each region using phylogenies containing only the species
 179 inhabiting those specific areas. We obtained the NRI from MPD as follows:

$$NRI = -1 \times \frac{Observed\ MPD - Expected\ MPD}{SD(Expected\ MPD)}$$

181
 182 Larger (positive) NRI values imply a more phylogenetically clustered
 183 assemblage while smaller (negative) NRI values indicate more phylogenetic
 184 overdispersion. We chose the MPD to measure the relatedness of canids because it is
 185 probably the most popular measure for computing the phylogenetic distance between a
 186 given group of species which makes it easier for our results to be compared with the
 187 findings from other biological groups.

188

189 2.3 Structural equation models

190 To test the influence of biotic and abiotic variables on NRI patterns we used
 191 Structural Equation Models (SEM) (Mitchel 1992, Wang et al. 2013). SEM allow

testing the contribution of different variables while accounting for potential correlations between them. We did not specify *a priori* whether any of these correlations had positive or negative effects. Our predictor variables (observed variables) were mean temperature, vegetation cover, human footprint, and body size dissimilarity. We assumed that all predictor variables affect NRI values and that there is a latent variable connected to our five observed ones to explain the covariation in the measurements. We tested four models (Figure 1), which differ as follows. Model 1 assumes that the human footprint has an impact on global temperature, which in turn affects vegetation cover. Model 2 is similar to model 1, but the human footprint affects vegetation cover, and the temperature is influenced by both variables. Neither of these two models have the influence of environmental variables on body size, but Models 3 and 4 do. In Model 3, body size dissimilarity is assumed to be influenced by vegetation and temperature, because higher values of these variables indicate more resources and hence may affect the level of competition which in turn can drive body size dissimilarity. Vegetation influences temperature in areas with high human density, but temperature also influences vegetation cover, for example, higher temperatures are associated with tropical forests. In Model 4, human footprint is assumed to have an effect on temperature and vegetation due to urbanization, and different from Model 3, there is no influence of vegetation on temperature.

Because SEM analyses on all assemblages (phylogenetically overdispersed and clustered) simultaneously could mask some effect related to the predictor variables, we did not only analyze all data together, but we also conducted the SEM analyses separately for assemblages with negative NRI values and assemblages with positive NRI values. We conducted these analyses through maximum-likelihood estimation using the R package lavaan 0.6-7 (Rosseel 2012), and the models were compared using the Akaike information criterion (AIC) (Akaike 1973). Spatial autocorrelation was taken into account during the analyses using the package semTools 0.5-3 through the function “*spatialCorrect*” (Jorgensen et al. 2020). During the SEMs, the function takes a weighted matrix that reflects the intensity of the geographic relationship between observations and calculates Moran's I for the residuals of all variables. If there is spatial autocorrelation in our dataset, the function spatially corrects it via Moran's I.

Another way to identify the mechanisms acting in communities would be applying the null model of assembly proposed by Pigot & Etienne (2015), DAMOCLES. This model considers the historical effects of speciation, colonization, and local extinction acting over time to determine the present composition of the community. However, DAMOCLES needs more species than we usually have in our communities to reliably estimate parameters.

3. Results

Phylogenetic signal in body size was high across the phylogeny of canids ($K = 1.31$, $p < 0.01$). The NRI values showed a dominance of overdispersed assemblages around the planet. Only southern South America and the Middle East had strong phylogenetic clustered patterns (Figure 2A). Asia presented a gradient of phylogenetic structure, as its southern and northern parts had clustered and overdispersed patterns, respectively, while its central region had no defined phylogenetic structure. Mean temperature, vegetation cover, human footprint, and body size dissimilarity also varied considerably across the world (Figures 2B, 2C, 2D, 2E).

Structural Equation Model 4 was selected as the best model for the three NRI analyses (negative NRI, positive NRI, and all NRI together), two AIC units better than the second-best model, model 3, in all cases (Table 1). The weights of model 4 were 0.831 for analyses with negative NRI, 0.863 for positive NRI and 0.744 for all NRI together. Model 3 presented weights of 0.168, 0.136 and 0.255 for negative, positive and all NRI together analyses, respectively. Models 1 and 2, with no influence of environmental variables on body size dissimilarity, performed poorly (weights less than 0.001). In Model 4, all predictor variables influenced NRI values, but also human footprint influenced vegetation and temperature, which in turn influenced vegetation cover and body size dissimilarity.

For all NRI data (Figure 3A), model 4 showed that the environmental variables temperature ($p < 0.01$, effect = 0.18) and vegetation ($p < 0.01$, effect = -0.33) were the most important to explain the spatial distribution of phylogenetic structure of canids (Table 2). Model 4 also showed that body size dissimilarity had a non-significant effect on NRI ($p = 0.164$), while human footprint had very weak influence on the phylogenetic structure of canids ($p < 0.01$, effect = 0.07).

In the analysis on only the communities with positive NRI values, model 4 indicated that body size dissimilarity, our proxy for competition, was the most important variable to explain the phylogenetic composition within assemblages ($p < 0.01$, effect = -0.64) (Figure 3B, Table 3), indicating that the more dissimilar the communities in terms of body size, the less phylogenetically close the species within these communities were.

In the analysis on only the communities with negative NRI values (Figure 3C), the environmental variables were the ones with the largest influence on phylogenetic dispersion. Based on model 4, vegetation cover was the most important variable ($p < 0.01$, effect = -0.36), suggesting that as vegetation cover increases, negative NRI decreases (becomes more negative), leading to species within these communities to become more phylogenetically distant (Table 4). Temperature ($p < 0.01$, effect = -0.18) and body size dissimilarity ($p < 0.01$, effect = -0.14) also had a considerable negative effect on NRI.

4. Discussion

The composition of canid communities across the world shows both negative and positive values of NRI and is influenced by distinct factors in different continents. However, it seems that, environmental filters played a greater role than traits related to biotic factors to explain the phylogenetic composition of assemblages of canids. This pattern was found in the analysis with all communities and in the analysis with negative NRI assemblages only (Figures 3A and 3C). Nevertheless, the biotic factor was very important in positive NRI assemblages (Figure 3B). This prominent effect could only be detected because we did the analyses separately, which supports the idea that it is necessary to separate the phylogenetic information (clustered and overdispersed patterns) to have a better understanding on how distinct variables structure assemblages through space.

The main factor structuring assemblages with negative NRI values was the vegetation cover, indicating that canids become less closely related as vegetation cover increases. However, the best model suggests that overdispersed communities are maintained due to the combined effect of vegetation cover, temperature, and body size dissimilarity (Figure 3C).

Interestingly, the relationship between body size dissimilarity and NRI had the same direction in positive and negative NRI communities. In clustered communities, species were less phylogenetically close as body size dissimilarity increased, while in overdispersed communities, phylogenetically distant species were associated with larger body size dissimilarity. Note that body size dissimilarity has been corrected for phylogenetic signal, so this body size variation was more than can be expected from shared evolutionary history. Hence, this implies that species are much more dissimilar in their body sizes at very negative NRI values (highly overdispersed communities) and more similar in their body sizes at very positive NRI values (highly clustered communities).

The relationship between body size dissimilarity and NRI might be explained by two distinct processes. In phylogenetically clustered communities our proxy for competition was the variable with the strongest influence on NRI values, but this pattern may actually be controlled by an environmental filter (which is the force we would expect to be dominant in communities with species that are phylogenetically more closely related than expected by chance), because temperature and vegetation cover had strong effects on body size dissimilarity, and therefore competition seems to be unlikely as the main force in these communities. Thus, body size must have played an important role in species persistence under the effect of some filter generated by both environmental variables. By contrast, in overdispersed communities competition may not have influenced these regions due to the low association between body size dissimilarity and NRI, but if it acted on these assemblages it may be explained by

309 competition after secondary contact, because in overdispersed communities there are no
310 longer such strong effects of environmental variables on body size. These explanations
311 assume that clustered communities undergo mostly sympatric speciation whereas
312 overdispersed communities assembled through immigration after allopatric speciation.
313 This seems to be in line with the results from Porto et al. (2021), on the origin and
314 dispersal of the Canidae lineages. They show that highly clustered communities, such as
315 the Middle East and South America, present several lineages that originated within
316 these regions. Furthermore, highly overdispersed regions, such as North America,
317 Europe and South Africa, are inhabited by lineages of distinct clades, where many have
318 their origins outside these regions.

319 The overdispersed pattern presented by assemblages of canids living in North
320 America, Europe, and the northern part of Asia was probably due to a large number of
321 distinct species of the genera *Vulpes*, *Canis*, and *Urocyon* that coexist within these areas
322 and are very phylogenetically distant, being separated around 12 million years ago (Ma)
323 (Porto et al. 2019). Species from these three genera have very distinct diet, habitat type,
324 and social behavior (Wang and Tedford 2008, Wilson and Mittermeier 2009).

325 For phylogenetically clustered assemblages, human footprint did not present any
326 significant influence on NRI values (Figure 3B), and only a very small effect in both
327 other sets of analyses (Figure 3A and 3C). This is surprising because Di Marco &
328 Santini (2015) demonstrated that human impacts influence the geographical distribution
329 of terrestrial mammals better than the biological traits of species. Anthropogenic
330 impacts seem to be important to understand the spatial distribution of the phylogenetic
331 information of Canidae, considering the reports of endemic canids in the Americas
332 constantly losing habitat and being killed by humans (Hoffmann et al. 2011), but our
333 analyses do not support this.

334 We emphasize the better performance that models with environmental variables
335 influencing body size dissimilarity had compared to the ones that did not. This suggests
336 environmental control of body size dissimilarity. For overdispersed assemblages, as
337 temperature decreases, dissimilarity increases, suggesting greater competition in colder
338 regions of the planet. In clustered communities, temperature strongly affects body size
339 dissimilarity too, showing that as temperature increases, species become similar in their
340 sizes (less dissimilarity), suggesting that warm regions within clustered assemblages,
341 such as deserts and tropical forests, have imposed a much greater environmental filter
342 on canids than cold regions. Our finding is contrary to what was proposed by
343 Dobzhansky (1950), who argued that biotic factors are more limiting in the tropics,
344 while abiotic conditions are more important at higher latitudes. However, our finding
345 may not be so surprising given that the first ancestors of the living canids were probably
346 packing hunters with medium body sizes, around 70 cm (Wang and Tedford 2008, Porto
347 et al. 2019). Deserts and tropical forests may act as a strong filter to canids with such a

lifestyle because food is scarce in deserts and pack hunting is difficult inside dense forests. An alternative explanation may be differential diversification rates. Pigot & Etienne (2015) showed that allopatric speciation creates overdispersed patterns, suggesting that for canids speciation might be higher at higher latitudes. Although SEMs in clustered and overdispersed communities indicated a negative correlation between NRI and temperature, this effect is positive when all-NRI values are analyzed together. We are aware of this apparent contradiction, but it makes clear that splitting the data in positive and negative NRI reveals more direct relationships whereas relationships are more indirect in the all-NRI scenario.

Even though canids are not very dispersal limited, because they can travel long distances (Wang and Tedford 2008, Wilson and Mittermeier 2009), they may still tend to be found in higher numbers near their center of diversification than far from it. This can also help to understand the phylogenetic structure of the Middle East and the southern portion of South America, which, based on the fossil records and biogeographical models, had major diversification events of foxes and South American canids, respectively (Wang and Tedford 2008, Porto et al. 2021). Ecological speciation within these regions might have generated species' phylogenetic clustering. In these areas the number of endemic species is high, and speciation tends to generate similar trait values (Gillespie 2004).

The majority of studies of the phylogenetic structure within communities concerns plants or focus on small geographic scales. Nevertheless, some studies with vertebrates at large spatial scales have demonstrated contrasting patterns of phylogenetic composition. Cooper, Rodríguez, & Purvis, (2008) found a tendency of overdispersion in assemblages of New world monkeys, Australasian possums, and North American ground squirrels. Yan et al. (2016), however, found phylogenetic clustering for Mammalia, Aves, Reptilia, and Amphibia from China. And Cardillo (2011) demonstrated an unstructured phylogenetic pattern on African carnivore's assemblages. Here we presented a case where both patterns are important to understand community composition across the planet, depending on the region studied.

Larger geographical scales are expected to generate more phylogenetic clustering than overdispersion because the rate of speciation increases with more space available (Losos and Schluter 2000) due to higher habitat heterogeneity (Kneitel and Chase 2004), and thus sister species are more likely to co-occur at larger scales. Even though we found some areas with phylogenetic clustering (Figure 2A), there was a dominance of overdispersed communities, indicating that the scale we used (300 km × 300 km) may still be too small for clustering to kick in. Therefore, we anticipate that using an even larger scale, e.g. the biome scale, will reveal clustering. Studying community structure at that scale, however, is no longer very informative, exactly because of the large expected biogeographic contribution to phylogenetic dispersion.

387 Sandel (2018) suggested that, if there is substantial variation in species richness
388 along the geographical gradient, the effects that biotic and abiotic factors have on
389 community assembly should not be assessed by only comparing index values, because
390 NRI may depend on species richness. However, this is not the case here, as the species
391 richness spatial gradient for Canidae does not present considerable variation over the
392 planet (Figure S2).

393 The mechanisms that influence the assembly of a community can act in complex
394 ways (Ricklefs 1987, 2015). In this study we used both a phylogenetic approach and an
395 approach based on environmental variables and traits. We demonstrated that canid
396 community composition across the world presents substantial patterns of clustering and
397 overdispersion that follow mainly the environmental gradient, suggesting habitat
398 filtering as the main force acting on Canidae assemblages.

399

400 **Acknowledgements**

401 We thank Vanderlei Debastiani for the help and suggestions during the analysis. This
402 study was financed in part by the Coordenação de Aperfeiçoamento de Pessoal de Nível
403 Superior - Brazil (CAPES) and by the University of Groningen. RSE thanks the Dutch
404 Research Council (NWO) for funding through a VICI grant.

405

406 **References**

- 407 Ackerly, D. D. 2003. Community Assembly, Niche Conservatism, and Adaptive Evolution in Changing
408 Environments. - *Int. J. Plant Sci.* 164: S165–S184.
- 409 Akaike, H. 1973. Information Theory and an Extension of the Maximum Likelihood Principle. - Springer,
410 New York, NY.
- 411 Bideault, A. et al. 2019. Temperature Modifies Consumer-Resource Interaction Strength Through Its
412 Effects on Biological Rates and Body Mass. - *Front. Ecol. Evol.* in press.
- 413 Blomberg, S. P. and Garland, T. 2003. Testing for phylogenetic signal in comparative data: behavioral
414 traits are more labile. - *Evolution* (N. Y.) 57: 717–745.
- 415 Cadotte, M. W. and Tucker, C. M. 2017. Should Environmental Filtering be Abandoned? - *Trends Ecol.*
416 *Evol.* 32: 429–437.
- 417 Cardillo, M. 2011. Phylogenetic structure of mammal assemblages at large geographical scales: Linking
418 phylogenetic community ecology with macroecology. - *Philos. Trans. R. Soc. B Biol. Sci.* 366:
419 2545–2553.
- 420 Cardillo, M. et al. 2008. Global patterns in the phylogenetic structure of island mammal assemblages. -
421 *Proc. R. Soc. B Biol. Sci.* 275: 1549–1556.
- 422 Cavender-Bares, J. et al. 2004. Phylogenetic Overdispersion in Floridian Oak Communities. - *Am. Nat.*
423 163: 823–843.
- 424 Center for International Earth Science Information Network 2005. Gridded Population of the World,
425 Version 3 (GPWv3): Population Density Grid.
- 426 Cooper, N. et al. 2008. A common tendency for phylogenetic overdispersion in mammalian assemblages.
427 - *Proc. R. Soc. B Biol. Sci.* 275: 2031–2037.
- 428 Darwin, C. 1859. On the origin of species. - John Murray.
- 429 Davies, T. J. et al. 2007. Species co-existence and character divergence across carnivores. - *Ecol. Lett.* 10:
430 146–152.
- 431 De Bello, F. et al. 2017. Decoupling phylogenetic and functional diversity to reveal hidden signals in
432 community assembly. - *Methods Ecol. Evol.* 8: 1200–1211.
- 433 Di Marco, M. and Santini, L. 2015. Human pressures predict species' geographic range size better than
434 biological traits. - *Glob. Chang. Biol.* 21: 2169–2178.
- 435 Dobzhansky, T. 1950. Evolution in the tropics. - *Am. Sci.* 38: 209–211.

436 Elton, C. 1946. Competition and the Structure of Ecological Communities. - J. Anim. Ecol. 15: 54–68.
437 ESRI (Environmental Systems Resource Institute) 2019. ArcGIS Desktop Help 10.2. Geostatistical
438 Analyst. in press.
439 Fick, S. E. and Hijmans, R. J. 2017. New 1-km spatial resolution climate surfaces for global land areas. -
440 Int. J. Climatol. in press.
441 Figueirido, B. et al. 2015. Habitat changes and changing predatory habits in North American fossil
442 canids. - Nat. Commun. 6: 7976.
443 Finarelli, J. A. 2007. Mechanisms behind Active Trends in Body Size Evolution of the Canidae
444 (Carnivora: Mammalia). - Am. Nat. 170: 876–885.
445 Gillespie, R. 2004. Community Assembly Through Adaptive Radiation in Hawaiian Spiders. - Science
446 (80-.). 303: 356–359.
447 Goberna, M. et al. 2014. Abiotic stress tolerance and competition-related traits underlie phylogenetic
448 clustering in soil bacterial communities. - Ecol. Lett. 17: 1191–1201.
449 Helmus, M. R. et al. 2007. Helmus et al. 2007. American Naturalist.pdf. - Am. Nat. 169: 69–83.
450 Hijmans, R. J. and Etten, J. van 2012. raster: Geographic analysis and modeling with raster data. R
451 package version 2.0-12. in press.
452 HilleRisLambers, J. et al. 2012. Rethinking Community Assembly through the Lens of Coexistence
453 Theory. - Annu. Rev. Ecol. Evol. Syst. 43: 227–248.
454 Hoffmann, M. et al. 2011. The changing fates of the world’s mammals. - Philos. Trans. R. Soc. B Biol.
455 Sci. 366: 2598–2610.
456 IUCN 2019. The IUCN Red List of Threatened Species. Version 2019-2.
457 Jarvinen, O. 1982. Species-To-Genus Ratios in Biogeography: A Historical Note. - J. Biogeogr. 9: 363–
458 370.
459 Jorgensen, T. D. et al. 2020. semTools: Useful tools for structural equation modeling. R package version
460 0.5-3. in press.
461 Kembel, S. W. et al. 2010. Picante: R tools for integrating phylogenies and ecology. - Bioinformatics 26:
462 1463–1464.
463 Kneitel, J. M. and Chase, J. M. 2004. Trade-offs in community ecology: linking spatial scales and species
464 coexistence. - Ecol. Lett. 7: 69–80.
465 Kraft, N. J. B. and Ackerly, D. D. 2010. Functional trait and phylogenetic tests of community assembly
466 across spatial scales in an Amazonian forest. - Ecol. Monogr. 80: 401–422.
467 Kraft, N. J. B. et al. 2007. Trait Evolution , Community Assembly, and the Phylogenetic Structure of
468 Ecological Communities. - Am. Nat. 170: 271–283.
469 Kress, W. J. et al. 2009. Plant DNA barcodes and a community phylogeny of a tropical forest dynamics
470 plot in Panama. - Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A. 106: 18621–18626.
471 Kusumoto, B. et al. 2019. Reconciling Darwin’s naturalization and pre-adaptation hypotheses: An
472 inference from phylogenetic fields of exotic plants in Japan. - J. Biogeogr.: 1–12.
473 Leibold, M. A. 1998. Similarity and local co-existence of species in regional biotas. - Evol. Ecol. 12: 95–
474 110.
475 Losos, J. B. and Schluter, D. 2000. Analysis of an evolutionary species–area relationship. - Nature 408:
476 847–850.
477 Mayfield, M. M. and Levine, J. M. 2010. Opposing effects of competitive exclusion on the phylogenetic
478 structure of communities. - Ecol. Lett. 13: 1085–1093.
479 Miazaki, A. S. et al. 2015. Environmental severity promotes phylogenetic clustering in campo rupestre
480 vegetation. - Acta Bot. Brasilica 29: 561–566.
481 Mitchel, R. J. 1992. Testing Evolutionary and Ecological Hypotheses Using Path Analysis and Structural
482 Equation Modelling Author. - Funct. Ecol. 6: 123–129.
483 Myers, P. et al. 2018. The Animal Diversity Web.
484 Pearson, R. G. and Dawson, T. P. 2003. Predicting the impacts of climate change on the Blackwell
485 Publishing Ltd. distribution of species: are bioclimate envelope models useful? - Glob. Ecol.
486 Biogeogr. 12: 361–371.
487 Pérez-Valera, E. et al. 2017. Fire modifies the phylogenetic structure of soil bacterial co-occurrence
488 networks. - Environ. Microbiol. 19: 317–327.
489 Pigot, A. L. and Etienne, R. S. 2015. A new dynamic null model for phylogenetic community structure. -
490 Ecol. Lett. 18: 153–163.
491 Poessel, S. A. et al. 2013. Patterns of human–coyote conflicts in the Denver Metropolitan Area. - J. Wildl.
492 Manage. 77: 297–305.
493 Porfirio, L. L. et al. 2014. Improving the use of species distribution models in conservation planning and
494 management under climate change. - PLoS One 9: 1–21.
495 Porto, L. M. V. et al. 2019. Evolutionary relationships among life-history traits in Caninae (Mammalia:

496 Carnivora). - Biol. J. Linn. Soc. 128: 311–322.
 497 Porto, L. M. V. et al. 2021. Explosive diversification following continental colonizations by canids. -
 498 Prepr. doi <https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.01.08.425986> in press.
 499 R Development Core Team 2020. R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing. R
 500 Foundation for Statistical Computing. Vienna, Austria. in press.
 501 Revell, L. J. 2012. phytools: an R package for phylogenetic comparative biology (and other things). -
 502 Methods Ecol. Evol. 3: 217–223.
 503 Ricklefs, R. E. 1987. Community diversity: relative roles of local and regional processes. - Science (80-
 504). 235: 167–171.
 505 Ricklefs, R. E. 2015. Intrinsic dynamics of the regional community. - Ecol. Lett. 18: 497–503.
 506 Rosseel, Y. 2012. lavaan: An R Package for Structural Equation Modeling. - J. Stat. Softw. 48: 1–36.
 507 Sandel, B. 2018. Richness-dependence of phylogenetic diversity indices. - Ecography (Cop.). 41: 837–
 508 844.
 509 USGS 2019. Global Land Cover Facility digital database Available.
 510 Wang, X. and Tedford, R. H. 2008. Dogs: Their Fossil Relatives and Evolutionary History. - Columbia
 511 University Press.
 512 Wang, I. J. et al. 2013. Quantifying the roles of ecology and geography in spatial genetic divergence. -
 513 Ecol. Lett. 16: 175–182.
 514 Webb, C. O. 2000. Exploring the phylogenetic structure of ecological communities: An example for rain
 515 forest trees. - Am. Nat. 156: 145–155.
 516 Webb, C. O. et al. 2002. Phylogenies and Community Ecology. 33: 475–505.
 517 Webb, C. O. et al. 2008. Phylocom: Software for the analysis of phylogenetic community structure and
 518 trait evolution. - Bioinformatics 24: 2098–2100.
 519 Weiher, E. et al. 1998. Community assembly rules, morphological dispersion, of plant species the
 520 coexistence. - Oikos 81: 309–322.
 521 Westoby, M. 2006. Phylogenetic ecology at world scale, a new fusion between ecology and evolution. -
 522 Ecology 87: 163–165.
 523 Wilson, D. E. and Mittermeier, R. A. 2009. Handbook of the Mammals of the World – Volume 1 (DE
 524 Wilson and RA Mittermeier, Eds.). - Lynx Edicions.
 525 Yan, C. et al. 2016. Species co-occurrence and phylogenetic structure of terrestrial vertebrates at regional
 526 scales. - Glob. Ecol. Biogeogr. 25: 455–463.
 527 Yang, J. et al. 2014. Functional and phylogenetic assembly in a Chinese tropical tree community across
 528 size classes, spatial scales and habitats. - Funct. Ecol. 28: 520–529.
 529 Zhang, Q. et al. 2018. Competition and habitat filtering jointly explain phylogenetic structure of soil
 530 bacterial communities across elevational gradients. - Environ. Microbiol. 20: 2386–2396.
 531

532 Declaration section

533 Ethics approval and consent to participate

534 Not applicable.

535

536 Consent for publication

537 Not applicable.

538

539 Availability of data and material

540 All data generated or analyzed during this study are included in this published article.

541

542 Competing interests

543 We have no competing interests.

544

545 Funding

546 L.M.V.P. is supported by CAPES and by the University of Groningen. R. M. is
547 supported by UFRGS, CAPES, and CNPq (406497/2018-4). R.S.E. is supported by the
548 Dutch Research Council (NOW) through a VICI grant.

549

550 Authors' contributions

551 L.M.V.P. conceived and designed the study and analyses. L.M.V.P. performed the
552 analyses. L.M.V.P. wrote the first draft of the manuscript. R.S.E. and R.M. commented
553 on the methods and contributed to substantial revisions on the draft.

554

555

556 Figure list

557

558

559 Figure 1. Schematic representations of the four Structural Equation Models tested in this
560 study. The same models were used for communities with only negative, only positive,
561 and all NRI values through separate analyses. Arrows indicate the direction of the
562 effects of the variables. Orange arrows indicate different effects added to the model
563 compared to the previous model. All models present a latent (hidden) variable
564 connected to all five observed ones, but this is not represented here as it would
565 unnecessarily pollute the images.

566

567
568 Figure 2. NRI and variables across the world. (A) NRI values for each assemblage
569 showing that phylogenetic dispersion of canids varies spatially. Assemblages colored in
570 blue present negative NRI values indicating that species within these areas are
571 phylogenetically more dissimilar. Assemblages colored in red represent positive NRI
572 values, where species are phylogenetically more similar. (B) Values of the global
573 average temperature used in this study measured in Celsius ($^{\circ}\text{C}$). (C) Global pattern of
574 log-transformed vegetation cover percentage. (D) Body size dissimilarity (cm) among
575 canids for each pixel. (E) Values of the human footprint (people per square kilometer).
576

577
578 Figure 3. Best-fitting Structural Equation Model for the total NRI (A), clustered
579 communities. i.e. with positive NRI (B), and overdispersed communities, i.e. with
580 negative NRI (C). Positive and negative effects are indicated by red and blue arrows,
581 respectively. Arrow thickness is scaled to illustrate the relative effect of each variable.
582 Only significant effects (arrows) are shown ($p < 0.01$).
583

584 **Table list**

585

586 Table 1. Akaike information criterion ranking of the four models of Structural Equation

587 Models tested for negative, positive, and total NRI values.

Models	df	Negative NRI			Positive NRI			Total NRI		
		AIC	ΔAIC	Weights	AIC	ΔAIC	Weights	AIC	ΔAIC	Weights
Model 4	13	17004.48	0	0.831	5293.122	0	0.863	24802.79	0	0.744
Model 3	14	17006.48	2	0.168	5295.122	2	0.136	24804.79	2	0.255
Model 2	10	17855.08	850.6	1.44E-185	5713.294	420.172	4.21E-92	25906.05	1103.26	1.9E-241
Model 1	10	17855.08	850.6	1.44E-185	5713.294	420.172	4.21E-92	25906.05	1103.26	1.9E-241

588

589

590 Table 2. Results of the best-fitting Structural Equation Model (model 4) for all NRI

591 values indicating the effect size among biotic and abiotic variables.

Regressions:		Estimate	Std Err	P	Effect
NRI ~	Body size dissimilarity	0.119	0.085	0.164	0.038
	Human footprint	0.007	0.002	0.003	0.079
	Temperature	0.008	0.001	< 0.01	0.188
	Vegetation cover	-0.014	0.001	< 0.01	-0.333
Temperature ~	Human footprint	0.663	0.051	< 0.01	0.321
Vegetation cover ~	Human footprint	-0.191	0.052	< 0.01	-0.093
	Temperature	0.404	0.025	< 0.01	0.408
Body size dissimilarity ~	Temperature	-0.005	0	< 0.01	-0.345
	Vegetation cover	-0.002	0	< 0.01	-0.177

* P of the model (<0.01)

592

593

594

595

596

597

598

599

Table 3. Results of the best-fitting Structural Equation Model (model 4) for positive NRI values indicating the effect size among biotic and abiotic variables.

Regressions:		Estimate	Std Err	P	Effect
Positive NRI ~	Body size dissimilarity	-1.299	0.101	< 0.01	-0.642
	Human footprint	0.001	0.002	0.609	0.021
	Temperature	-0.004	0.002	< 0.01	-0.103
	Vegetation cover	0.003	0.002	0.169	0.059
Temperature ~	Human footprint	0.317	0.077	< 0.01	0.203
Vegetation cover ~	Human footprint	0.069	0.057	0.228	0.062
	Temperature	-0.04	0.037	0.273	-0.056
Body size dissimilarity ~	Temperature	-0.009	0.001	< 0.01	-0.53
	Vegetation cover	-0.008	0.001	< 0.01	-0.324

* P of the model (<0.01)

Table 4. Results of the best-fitting Structural Equation Model (model 4) for negative NRI values indicating the effect size among biotic and abiotic variables.

Regressions:		Estimate	Std Err	P	Effect
Negative NRI ~	Body size dissimilarity	-0.25	0.053	< 0.01	-0.144
	Human footprint	-0.003	0.001	0.036	-0.06
	Temperature	-0.004	0.001	< 0.01	-0.188
	Vegetation cover	-0.007	0.001	< 0.01	-0.361
Temperature ~	Human footprint	0.69	0.064	< 0.01	0.313
Vegetation cover ~	Human footprint	-0.195	0.065	< 0.01	-0.084
	Temperature	0.527	0.029	< 0.01	0.503
Body size dissimilarity ~	Temperature	-0.005	0	< 0.01	-0.44
	Vegetation cover	-0.001	0	< 0.01	-0.11

* P of the model (<0.01)

Supplementary material

Figure S1. (A) Correlation between annual temperature and primary productivity ($R^2 = 0.92$, $p < 0.01$). (B) Correlation between vegetation cover and annual precipitation ($R^2 = 0.74$, $p < 0.01$). Only values extracted from the assemblages used here are represented in the correlations.

619

620 Figure S2. Species richness spatial gradient for all 36 Canidae species in this study.

621

622

623 Figure S3. Species distributions indicated along the tips of the phylogeny from Porto et
624 al. (2019) that was used in our study.

625

626 Table S1. Body size of the 36 species of canids used in this study. The body size
627 measurements used here are actually the head + body length measurements obtained
628 from the females of each species.

Species	Body size (cm)
<i>Atelocynus microtis</i>	86
<i>Canis adustus</i>	85.5
<i>Canis aureus</i>	78
<i>Canis anthus</i>	78
<i>Canis latrans</i>	84
<i>Canis lupus</i>	108.5
<i>Canis mesomelas</i>	88
<i>Canis rufus</i>	112
<i>Canis simensis</i>	94.4
<i>Cerdocyon thous</i>	67.25
<i>Chrysocyon brachyurus</i>	105
<i>Cuon alpinus</i>	111.75
<i>Lycaon pictus</i>	115.75
<i>Nyctereutes procyonoides</i>	59.75
<i>Otocyon megalotis</i>	53.35
<i>Lycalopex culpaeus</i>	69
<i>Lycalopex fulvipes</i>	52.15
<i>Lycalopex griseus</i>	58.05
<i>Lycalopex gymnocercus</i>	65.85
<i>Lycalopex sechurae</i>	64
<i>Lycalopex vetulus</i>	58.5
<i>Speothos venaticus</i>	66.25
<i>Urocyon cinereoargenteus</i>	56.9
<i>Urocyon littoralis</i>	53
<i>Vulpes bengalensis</i>	47
<i>Vulpes cana</i>	57.35
<i>Vulpes chama</i>	57.35
<i>Vulpes corsac</i>	47.5
<i>Vulpes ferrilata</i>	56.25
<i>Vulpes macrotis</i>	50.25
<i>Vulpes pallida</i>	46.5
<i>Vulpes rueppellii</i>	47.5
<i>Vulpes velox</i>	52
<i>Vulpes vulpes</i>	63.5
<i>Vulpes zerda</i>	36.4
<i>Vulpes lagopus</i>	60

629