

Extrapolation in species distribution modelling. application to Southern Ocean marine species.

Charlène Guillaumot, Camille Moreau, Bruno Danis, Thomas Saucède

▶ To cite this version:

Charlène Guillaumot, Camille Moreau, Bruno Danis, Thomas Saucède. Extrapolation in species distribution modelling. application to Southern Ocean marine species.. Progress in Oceanography, 2020, 188, pp.102438. 10.1016/j.pocean.2020.102438. hal-02985372

HAL Id: hal-02985372 https://hal.science/hal-02985372v1

Submitted on 17 Oct 2022

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers. L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.



Distributed under a Creative Commons Attribution - NonCommercial 4.0 International License

Extrapolation in species distribution modelling.

2

Application to Southern Ocean marine species

- 3
- 4 **Authors**: Guillaumot Charlène^{1,2}, Moreau Camille^{1,2}, Danis Bruno¹, Saucède Thomas²
- 5 1 Laboratoire de Biologie Marine, Université Libre de Bruxelles, Avenue F.D.Roosevelt, 50. CP 160/15. 1050
- 6 BRUXELLES, BELGIUM
- 2 UMR 6282 Biogéosciences, Univ. Bourgogne Franche-Comté, CNRS, EPHE, 6 bd Gabriel F-21000 Dijon,
 France
- 9
- 10 Keywords: Multivariate Environmental Similarity Surface (MESS), marine species, Antarctic,
- 11 modelling relevance, conservation issues
- 12

13 **ABSTRACT**

Species distribution modelling (SDM) has been increasingly applied to Southern Ocean case studies over the past decades, to map the distribution of species and highlight environmental settings driving species distribution. Predictive models have been commonly used for conservation purposes and supporting the delineation of marine protected areas, but model predictions are rarely associated with extrapolation uncertainty maps.

19 In this study, we used the Multivariate Environmental Similarity Surface (MESS) index to quantify 20 model uncertainty associated to extrapolation. Considering the reference dataset of environmental 21 conditions for which species presence-only records are modelled, extrapolation corresponds to the 22 part of the projection area for which one environmental value at least falls outside of the reference

23 dataset.

Six abundant and common sea star species of marine benthic communities of the Southern Ocean were used as case studies. Results show that up to 78% of the projection area is extrapolation, i.e. beyond conditions used for model calibration. Restricting the projection space by the known species ecological requirements (e.g. maximal depth, upper temperature tolerance) and increasing the size of presence datasets were proved efficient to reduce the proportion of extrapolation areas. We estimate that multiplying sampling effort by 2 or 3 fold should help reduce the proportion of

30 extrapolation areas down to 10% in the six studied species.

31 Considering the unexpectedly high levels of extrapolation uncertainty measured in SDM 32 predictions, we strongly recommend that studies report information related to the level of 33 extrapolation. Waiting for improved datasets, adapting modelling methods and providing such 34 uncertainy information in distribution modelling studies are a necessity to accurately interpret 35 model outputs and their reliability.

36 Introduction

37 Among the broad array of analytical tools developed for marine ecology studies over the last two 38 decades, Species Distribution Modelling (SDM) has been increasingly used (Peterson 2001, Elith 39 et al. 2006, Austin 2007, Gobeyn et al. 2019) and applied to Southern Ocean pelagic (Pinkerton et al. 2010, Freer et al. 2019), benthic organisms (Loots et al. 2007, Pierrat et al. 2012, Basher and 40 41 Costello 2016, Xavier et al. 2016, Gallego et al. 2017, Guillaumot et al. 2018a, 2018b, Fabri-Ruiz 42 et al. 2019, Jerosch et al. 2019) and even marine mammals (Nachtsheim et al. 2017). SDM 43 represents a complementary approach to individual-based modelling and eco-physiological 44 experiments, guickly and synthetically identifying environmental correlates of species distribution 45 (Brotons et al. 2012, Feng and Papes 2017, Feng et al. 2020). SDM is also used to define species 46 distribution spatial range (Nori et al. 2011, Walsh and Hudiburg 2018) and can be used as decision 47 criteria for conservation purposes (Guisan et al. 2013, Marshall et al. 2014). For instance, it is 48 currently used in proposals developed by national committees of the CCAMLR (Commission for 49 the Conservation of Antarctic Marine Living Resources) to support the definition and delineation of 50 marine protected areas (Ballard et al. 2012, CCAMLR report WG-FSA-15/64, Arthur et al. 2018).

51

52 Applying SDM to Southern Ocean case studies is particularly challenging due to major constraints 53 and biases that may reduce modelling performance. As for many oceanographic studies, access to 54 environmental data with high temporal and spatial resolutions is difficult (Davies et al. 2008, 55 Robinson et al. 2011). Antarctic coastal areas, in particular, are rarely accessed and documented 56 due to logistical constraints, access being for example impossible during the austral winter due to 57 sea ice cover (De Broyer et al. 2014). The availability of species absence records is also a limiting 58 factor to modelling performances and model calibrations (Brotons et al. 2004, Wisz and Guisan 59 2009). Models are usually based on a limited number of presence-only records and limited number 60 of sampling sites, which are both spatially aggregated in the vicinity of scientific stations, where 61 access is frequent and datasets from different seasons, have been compiled over decades and 62 even beyond (De Broyer et al. 2014, Guillaumot et al. 2018a, Fabri-Ruiz et al. 2019, Guillaumot et 63 al. 2019).

64

When generating a SDM, the model is fit to data with a given range of value for each environmental descriptor (i.e. the calibration range). When transferring model predictions, a portion of the environment may cover additionnal conditions that are outside this calibration range: these are non-analog conditions and the model extrapolates (Randin et al. 2006, Williams and Jackson 2007, Williams et al. 2007, Fitzpatrick and Hargrove 2009, Owens et al. 2013, Yates et al. 2018). Considering the limited number of species presence-only records occupied by each marine benthic species, and the poor quality and precision of environmental descriptors available for modelling

- Southern Ocean species distributions (Guillaumot et al. 2018a, Fabri-Ruiz et al. 2019), a large
 proportion of cells might be expected to be extrapolations beyond the calibration range of the
 model.
- 75

The Multivariate Environmental Similarity Surface (MESS) approach analyses spatial extrapolation by extracting environmental values covered by presence-only records and estimates areas where environmental conditions are outside the range of conditions contained in the calibration area (Elith et al. 2010). The method considers that extrapolation occurs when at least one environmental descriptor value is outside the range of the environment envelop for model calibration (more details given in Appendix 4).

82 The MESS approach was initially used to determine the environmental barriers to the invasion of 83 the cane toad in Australia, when facing new environments and under future conditions (Elith et al. 2010). Implemented in MaxEnt (Elith et al. 2011), MESS was subsequently used by several 84 85 authors for defining the climatic limits to the colonisation of new environments by non-native 86 species, such as the American bullfrog in Argentina (Nori et al. 2011), for studying contrasts between native and potential ecological niches like in the study of the spotted knapweed 87 88 (Centaurea stoebe) (Broennimann et al. 2014), or for defining the limits to model transferability and 89 predicting the distribution of trees under future environmental conditions (Walsh and Hudiburg 90 2018).

91 More recently, the MESS approach was used to define model uncertainties related to extrapolation 92 (Escobar et al. 2015, Li et al. 2015, Cardador et al. 2016, Luizza et al. 2016, Iannella et al. 2017, 93 Milanesi et al. 2017, Silva et al. 2019) and extrapolation areas where environmental conditions are 94 non-analog to conditions of model calibration (Fitzpatrick and Hargrove 2009, Anderson 2013). 95 Associating uncertainty information to model predictions has been acknowledged as a necessity 96 for reliable interpretations of model predictions (Grimm and Berger 2016, Yates et al. 2018). It is 97 also a requirement for specifying the level of risk associated with predictions and evaluating 98 whether uncertainty can be mitigated to improve model outcomes (Guisan et al. 2013).

99

This study addresses the importance of extrapolation and associated uncertainties in SDMs generated at broad spatial scale for Southern Ocean species: an analysis that is seldom performed although important to characterise model reliability. Using the case study of six abundant and common sea star species in marine benthic communities, objectives of this work are to evaluate the importance of extrapolation proportions in wide projection areas, and to provide some methodological clues to mitigate the effects of extrapolation and improve model accuracy.

- 106
- 107

108 Methods

109 Studied species and environmental descriptors

110 The distribution of six sea star species (Asteroidea : Echinodermata) was studied (Table 1). The 111 six species, Acodontaster hodgsoni (Bell, 1908), Bathybiaster loripes (Sladen, 1889), Glabraster 112 antarctica (Smith, 1876), Labidiaster annulatus Sladen, 1889, Odontaster validus Koehler, 1906 113 and Psilaster charcoti (Koehler, 1906) are abundant and common in benthic communities in the 114 Southern Ocean. The biology, ecology and distribution of these species have been extensively studied and are relatively well documented (McClintock et al. 2008, Mah and Blake 2012, 115 116 Lawrence 2013). Presence-only records were compiled from a recently updated database, thoroughly scrutinised with the World Register of Marine Species (WoRMS Editorial Board 2016), 117 118 to delete potential discrepancies, update taxonomy and correct for georeferencing errors (Moreau 119 et al. 2018).

120 Models were generated for the different species using 298 to 851 presence-only records, and 121 projected at different depth ranges (Table 1). The distributions of these presence-only records are 122 contrasting between species (Appendix 1), with A. hodgsoni, B. loripes and G. antarctica having an 123 Antarctic and sub-Antarctic distribution, with an important number of data available for *B. loripes* 124 and G. antarctica but less data for A. hodgsoni (respectively 591, 851 and 298 presence-only 125 records). L. annulatus has a distribution mainly gathered in the sub-Antarctic region with few data 126 available (375 presence-only records). O. validus and P. charcoti are mainly present on the coasts 127 of the Antarctic shelf.

- 128
- 129 130

Table 1. Sea star species investigated in the present study. The number of presence-only records
available was summed up after removal of duplicates from each grid cell pixel. Image sources:
Brueggeman 1998, BIOMAR ULB database (P. Pernet), proteker.net, B121 expedition (Q.
Jossart).

	Acodontaster hodgsoni (Bell, 1908)	<i>Bathybiaster</i> <i>loripes</i> (Sladen, 1889)	<i>Glabraster</i> <i>antarctica</i> (Smith, 1876)	<i>Labidiaster</i> <i>annulatus</i> Sladen, 1889	<i>Odontaster</i> <i>validus</i> Koehler, 1906	<i>Psilaster</i> <i>charcoti</i> (Koehler, 1906)
		Picture: © P. Parnet (ULE, Biel	X			
Presence- only records number	298	591	851	375	337	353
Model maximum depth	1500 m	4000 m	4000 m	1500 m	1500 m	4000 m

148

149 Environmental descriptors selected from the dataset provided were at 150 https://data.aad.gov.au/metadata/records/environmental layers. These are oceanography raster 151 layers that mostly describe the physical and geochemical environment south of 45°S with a 0.1° 152 grid-cell resolution (approximately 11km wide in latitude). Among the 58 environmental descriptors 153 provided, only those that fulfilled the analysis performed by Guillaumot et al. (2020) were selected: 154 'distance' layers and 'extreme' layers were not selected because the interpretation of their 155 respective contributions to niche models is complex or weak and collinear descriptors were also 156 discarded for a Variance Inflation Factor (VIF) > 10 (Naimi et al. 2014). A set of 14 to 16 species-157 specific layers that characterise temperature, salinity, food availability and habitat characteristics 158 were therefore used for model calibration (Table S2).

159

160 Models calibration

161 Species Distribution Models (SDMs) were generated using the Boosted Regression Trees (BRT), a 162 machine-learning approach that was already calibrated for Southern Ocean case studies 163 (Guillaumot et al. 2018, Guillaumot et al. 2019) and was proved efficient to provide accurate 164 models with good transferability performance, that is good ability to project model in space and 165 time (Elith et al. 2008, Reiss et al. 2011, Heikkinen et al. 2012, Guillaumot et al. 2019). In order to 166 minimalize the effect of presence-only records aggregation on model predictions, background data 167 were randomly sampled in the environment following the probabilities defined by a Kernel Density 168 Estimation (KDE) (see Phillips et al. 2009 for general principles, Guillaumot et al. 2018a, 2018b

169 and Fabri-Ruiz et al. 2019 for applications). The number of background records was selected 170 equal to the number of presence-only records (Barbet-Massin et al. 2012). The KDE was 171 established based on the aggregation of benthos sampling effort provided in the Biogeographic 172 Atlas of the Southern Ocean (De Broyer et al. 2014, map available in supplementary material of 173 Guillaumot et al. (2019)). One hundred SDMs were generated and averaged for each species, with 174 background data randomly sampled following the KDE for each replicate.

175 SDMs were calibrated and reliability tested using a spatial cross-validation procedure. For each 176 species, several procedures were compared following Guillaumot et al. (2019). The studied area 177 was randomly subdivided into 2 to 6 areas of similar surfaces (longitude-split spatial folds), with 178 presence and background data selected from one to three areas for model training and from the 179 remaining areas for model testing. The "6-fold CLOCK" cross-validation approach was selected for 180 B. loripes, G. antarctica, L. annulatus and O. validus and the "2-fold CLOCK" procedure was 181 selected for A. hodgsoni and P. charcoti, according to the best percentage of test data correctly 182 classified (Appendix 3).

The Maximum sensitivity plus specificity threshold (MaxSSS), considered the most appropriate threshold for presence-only SDM (Liu et al. 2013) was used to binarize models into suitable (>MaxSSS value) and unsuitable areas (<MaxSSS value). This threshold was used to measure the proportion of test data correctly classified. Modelling performances were also assessed using the three following metrics: Area Under the Receiver Operating Curve (AUC, Fielding and Bell 1997), the Point Biserial Correlation between predicted and observed values (COR, Elith et al. 2006) and the True Skill Statistics (TSS, Allouche et al. 2006).

190

Two analyses were performed: in Analysis #0 ('no-depth limited'), SDMs were projected on the entire Southern Ocean surface (south of 45°S) and in Analysis #1 ('depth limited'), SDM projections and background samplings were restricted to areas limited by a maximum depth threshold defined for each species based on the available species presence-only records (Table 1).

196

197 MESS calculation

The MESS was measured using the *dismo* R package (Hijmans et al. 2017) and following the guidelines provided in Elith et al. (2010). Pixels for which at least one environmental descriptor has a value that is outside the range of environmental values defined by presence-only records (calibration range) were considered to be extrapolation (i.e when MESS estimate gets negative values, Appendix 4). The proportion of extrapolation areas (i.e. the proportion of cells defined as extrapolations over the total projection area) was calculated and compared between species. On SDM projection maps, extrapolated pixels were displayed in black.

- Environmental parameters responsible for extrapolation were estimated by modifying the code provided in Elith et al. (2010). Detailed R scripts are available at
- 207 https://github.com/charleneguillaumot/THESIS. Methodological details are provided in Appendix 4.208
- 209

210 Influence of the number and distribution of presence-only records on extrapolation

211 The proportion of extrapolation areas may vary with presence-only sampling effort. In order to 212 study the influence of the number and distribution of these presence-only records on the proportion 213 of extrapolation areas, two analyses were performed. First, several SDMs were generated with 214 different numbers of presence-only records, following the chronological addition of new presence-215 only records through time, from 1980 to 2016. Second, SDMs generated with 10% to 100% (10% 216 increments, so 10 subsets) of the entire presence-only dataset were compared. In this analysis, in 217 contrast to the previous one, presence-only records are randomly sampled among the datasets 218 available.

In these two analyses, SDMs were projected on the environmental space limited by the maximum depth defined for each species (Table 1), 100 model replicates were generated and averaged in each case and spatial autocorrelation (SAC) was estimated to assess the influence of presenceonly records aggregation on modelling performances. The significance of SAC was tested using the Moran I index computed on model residuals (Luoto et al. 2005, Crase et al. 2012).

224

The relationship between the number of presence-only records used in SDM and the relative proportion of extrapolation areas was characterised using linear regressions. This allowed, for each model, estimation of the minimum number of presence-only records required to obtain a 'reasonable' proportion of extrapolation area arbitrarily set to a 10% threshold.

229

230 **Results**

231 Extrapolation and the extent of projection areas

All generated SDMs are accurate and performant, with high AUC (AUC>0.91), TSS (TSS>0.559) and COR (COR>0.68) values, low standard deviations and good percentages of correctly classified presence-only test data (77 to 90 %) (Table 2). Descriptors that contribute the most to SDMs are depth (22 to 34%), minimum POC (6 to 21%), POC standard deviation (8 to 20%), mean ice cover depth (7 to 17%) and mixed layer depth (3 to 10%). Contrasts between species are in the respective percentage of contribution of these descriptors. Descriptors that drive the most species distribution are similar between species (Appendix 5).

240 Models projected on the entire Southern Ocean (Analysis #0, 'no-depth limited') extrapolate on an 241 area covering between 15 to 78% of the entire projection area, and 19 to 45% of the area initially 242 predicted as suitable to the species distribution (Table 2, Fig. 1). Extrapolation areas cover more 243 than 50% of the projection area for A. hodgsoni (78.6%), P. charcoti (67.8%), L. annulatus (64.8%) 244 and O. validus (51.9%) and more than 30% of suitable areas (Table 2). For these four species, 245 depth is responsible for 25 to 68% of extrapolation (Appendix 5). Geomorphology, mean ice cover 246 and POC standard deviation are layers also contributing to 2 to 7% for extrapolation (Appendix 5). 247 These descriptors that highly contribute to MESS also contribute to the model, and there are no 248 descriptors for which the contribution to MESS is important whereas the contribution to the model 249 is not substantial (Appendix 5).

250

In models projected on areas restrained in depth (Analysis #1, 'depth limited'), the percentage of extrapolation area sharply decreases from 59 to 18% according to the species (Table 2). However, model performances also decrease, with AUC values going down to 0.885, TSS values to 0.419 and COR values to 0.475. The percentage of correctly classified test data is much lower and more variable for the shallowest species *A. hogdsoni* (from 90 \pm 6.26% to 45.5 \pm 8.1%), *L. annulatus* (77.7 \pm 15.2 % to 57.98 \pm 20%) and *O. validus* (from 85.4 \pm 9.6% to 57.68 \pm 21%). For all species, predicted suitable areas increase two-fold.

Overall, descriptor contributions to the model remain unchanged between the two analyses, except for depth contribution that decreases to around 10% on average for all the species. In contrast, in Analysis #1, depth contribution to the MESS is very low (0.64 to 5.8%), except for *P. charcoti* (16.3%). Mean ice cover is the layer that contributes the most to extrapolation, extrapolation areas mainly corresponding to Weddel and Amundsen seas.

- 263
- 264
- 265
- 266
- 267
- 268
- 269
- 270
- 271
- 272
- 273
- 274
- 275
- 276

Table 2. Modelling performances for each species. Average and standard deviation values of the
100 model replicates. Pres. NB: number of presences-only records available for modelling
(duplicates excluded); AUC: Area Under the Curve; TSS: True Skills Statistic; COR: Biserial
Correlation.

Analysis #0, no-depth limited								
Species	Pres. NB	AUC	TSS	COR	Correctly classified test data (%)	Suitable area (% total area)	Extrapolation area (% total area)	Extrapolation area (% total area)
Acodontaster hodgsoni	298	0.925 ± 0.02	0.579 ± 0.04	0.735 ± 0.06	90 ± 6.26	8.86	78.6	35.3 ± 4.1
Bathybiaster loripes	591	0.910 ± 0.02	0.559 ± 0.07	0.68 ± 0.09	80.6 ± 10.9	8.55	29.1	21.9 ± 4.4
Glabraster antarctica	851	0.929 ± 0.01	0.58 ± 0.05	0.719 ± 0.07	85.45 ± 6.34	7.95	15.73	19.9 ± 3.9
Labidiaster annulatus	375	0.95 ± 0.03	0.598 ± 0.07	0.730 ± 0.14	77.7 ± 15.2	3.33	64.83	42.1 ± 10.5
Odontaster validus	337	0.953 ± 0.01	0.605 ± 0.05	0.746 ± 0.09	85.4 ± 9.6	6.89	51.9	45.2 ± 5.65
Psilaster charcoti	353	0.911 ± 0.02	0.58 ± 0.03	0.723 ± 0.04	87.7 ± 4.8	8.90	67.9	32.5 ± 4.71
282								

Analysis #1, depth limited								
Species	Pres. NB	AUC	TSS	COR	Correctly classified test data (%)	Suitable area (% total area)	Extrapolation area (% total area)	Extrapolation area (% total area)
Acodontaster hodgsoni	298	0.823 ± 0.05	0.419 ± 0.1	0.475 ± 0.14	45.5 ± 18.1	17.49	40.6	27.5 ± 8.5
Bathybiaster loripes	591	0.887 ± 0.03	0.513 ± 0.08	0.607 ± 0.12	78.4 ± 11	15.75	18.2	20.8 ± 4.8
Glabraster antarctica	851	0.915 ± 0.01	0.537 ± 0.08	0.654 ± 0.1	81.8 ± 7.7	14.08	23.9	18.64 ± 3.5
Labidiaster annulatus	375	0.918 ± 0.03	0.482 ± 0.16	0.563 ± 0.25	57.98 ± 20	8.88	59.5	38.7 ± 14.6
Odontaster validus	337	0.908 ± 0.03	0.504 ± 0.13	0.586 ± 0.17	57.68 ± 21	11.64	51.5	38.3 ± 6.97
Psilaster charcoti	353	0.885 ± 0.02	0.546 ± 0.04	0.665 ± 0.06	83 ± 6.6	15.40	35.78	33.2 ± 5.1



284

285 Figure 1. Maps of extrapolation areas covering SDM predictions, generated with all presence-only 286 records available for the studied species. Left panel: projection area not limited in depth (Analysis 287 #0), right panel: projection area limited to -1,500 m and -4,000 m depth (Analysis #1), according to 288 the species (A. hodgsoni, L. annulatus, O. validus until 1,500 m; B. loripes, G. antarctica, P. 289 charcoti until 4,000 m; Table 1). (a) Acodontaster hodgsoni, (b) Bathybiaster loripes, (c) Glabraster 290 antarctica, (d) Labidiaster annulatus, (e) Odontaster validus, (f) Psilaster charcoti. Extrapolation 291 areas displayed in black; pixels colored by the yellow-red color palette provide SDM distribution 292 probabilities (comprised between 0 and 1); bathymetric chart in shades of blue.

293

294 Extrapolation and the number of presence-only records

Model performance and size of extrapolation area were compared between models run with different numbers of presence-only records, following the chronological addition of new samples (from 1980 to 2016). From 1980 to 2016, the number of presence-only records collected during oceanographic campaigns has increased from 1.9 to 3.3 times according to the species (1.9 times for *O. validus*, 3.3 times for *A. hodgsoni*)(Fig. 2a). Spatial autocorrelation between presence-only records varies between species, with the highest Moran's I scores obtained for *L. annulatus, O. validus* and *A. hodgsoni*. The highest Moran's I values were mainly calculated for the oldest
 presence-only subsets (1980), strenghtening the fact that the addition of new presence-only
 records with additional campaigns reduces spatial autocorrelation (Table S7).

304

Model performance increases (higher AUC scores) with the addition of new presence-only records, for all species except for models of *A. hodgsoni* and *B. loripes* for which AUC values are stable (Table S6). Similarly, the percentage of correctly classified test data presents important standard deviation values and improves with the addition of new presence-only records, except for *O. validus* (10% decrease) (Fig. 2).

310

For all species, the addition of new data reduces the percentage of extrapolation over the total projection area (-30.7% for *A. hodgsoni*, -12.7% for *B. loripes*, -20.5% for *G. antarctica*, -17.6% for

313 L. annulatus, -10.2% for O. validus and -11% for P. charcoti, i.e. differences between the two

extrapolation % values) and over the species suitable area as well (Fig. 2, Table S6).

315





Figure 2. Evolution of model performances with the increase of data (chronological addition of presence-only records, by 5-year periods, from 1980 to 2016). (A) Number of presence-only

records available to generate the model; (B) Mean correctly classified test data (%) (standard deviation values available in Table S7); (C) Proportion of grid-cell pixels of the projection area that are extrapolations (%). The maximal number of presence-only records present in Table 2 may not be reached here because some collection dates remain unknown.

323

324 The decrease of extrapolation with the addition of presence-only records was tested by running, for 325 each species a series of models with different subsets of presence-only records randomly sampled 326 from the total dataset. One hundred model replicates were progressively run with 10 to 100% of 327 the total dataset and proportions of extrapolation areas were computed accordingly (Fig. 3, Table 328 S7). Results confirm that the addition of presence-only records strongly reduces proportions of 329 extrapolation areas. Proportions of extrapolation areas also vary between species models as a 330 function of depth. Low proportions of extrapolation areas are obtained in models run for deep 331 species and large datasets (e.g. 8.2% for 591 records in *B. loripes* and 23.9% for 851 records in *G.* 332 antarctica). In contrast, models run for shallower species show higher proportions of extrapolation 333 areas (40.6% for 298 records in A. hodgsoni, 51.5% for 375 records in L. annulatus and 35.8% for 337 records in O. validus). For these last species, spatial autocorrelation values are also higher 334 335 compared to other species (Table S7).

336



Figure 3. Boxplot diagrams representing the decrease of proportions of extrapolation areas (in % of the total projection area) with addition of presence-only records used to generate model replicates (in % of data available, see Table 1 and Table S7), for: (a) *Acodontaster hodgsoni*, (b)

342 *Bathybiaster loripes*, (c) *Glabraster antarctica*, (d) *Labidiaster annulatus*, (e) *Odontaster validus*, (f) 343 *Psilaster charcoti*. For each box, mean values (blue dots) and outliers (black dots) are shown for 344 the 100 model replicates. Some boxes are missing for low percentages of presence-only records 345 (10 to 30%, corresponding to close or less than 100 presence-only records) that do not allow 346 models to be generated.

347

348 A linear regression model was fit to the relationship between the number of presence-only records 349 and proportions of extrapolation areas. For all species, regression coefficients are all negative and 350 tested significant showing that proportions of extrapolation areas decrease with the addition of new 351 records (Table 3). The intersection point between regression models and the (arbitrary) 10% 352 extrapolation threshold was used to provide an estimate of the minimum number of records 353 required for each species model to have an "adequate" proportion of extrapolation areas of 10%. 354 This minimum number of presence-only records is reached for none of the studied species, and 355 according to species, the number of presence-only records available should be increased at least 356 by 1.6 to 3.3 times (Table 3).

357

Table 3. Equations of simple linear regressions between the number of presence-only records *X* and the average proportion of extrapolation areas *Y* (Table 2, significance levels: * p<0.1, ** p<0.05). The estimate of the number of presence-only records necessary to have a minimum "adequate" arbitrary proportion of extrapolation areas of 10% is given in the last column

Species	Equation	R ²	Estimated Pres.NB. (with multiplier of actual Pres.NB. available)		
Acodontaster hodgsoni	Y=-0.1358X + 73.616**	0.60	468 (x 1.6)		
Bathybiaster loripes	Y=-0.0249X + 28.974*	0.42	762 (x 1.3)		
Glabraster antarctica	Y=-0.0304X + 44.991**	0.61	1151 (x 1.4)		
Labidiaster annulatus	Y=-0.0913X + 88.078**	0.85	855 (x 2.3)		
Odontaster validus	Y=-0.0561X + 71.112**	0.93	1089 (x 3.2)		
Psilaster charcoti	Y=-0.0301X + 44.613*	0.37	1150 (x 3.3)		

362

363

364

365 **Discussion**

366 Modelling performances and extrapolation

SDMs were generated for Southern Ocean sea star species, with contrasting distributions and different numbers of presence-only records available (Table 1, Appendix 1). Overall, species presence-only records are spatially concentrated in the most accessible and visited areas of the Southern Ocean. Most of the sea star samples were collected close to the coasts of the Western Antarctic Peninsula, the Ross Sea and sub-Antarctic Islands such as the Kerguelen Islands. Consequently, high spatial autocorrelation values were computed, for *L. annulatus* and *O. validus* in particular (Table S6).

374

375 Overall, models all show good performances (Table 2), the spatial cross-validation procedure 376 ensuring a relevant evaluation of modelling performances when using spatially aggregated data 377 (Muscarella et al. 2014, Dhingra et al. 2016, Guillaumot et al. 2019). However, models show high 378 proportions of extrapolation areas, with extrapolation covering up to 78% of the projection area in 379 A. hodgsoni model (Table 2). This means that even if models are evaluated as accurate, model 380 extrapolation area can concern up to three quarters of the projection area! Assessing the 381 proportion of the projection area for which models extrapolate is therefore necessary as a 382 complementary statistic to adapt modelling methods and improve model predictions. Masking 383 projections by extrapolation uncertainties is also important to perform accurate interpretations.

384

385 Extrapolation uncertainty maps have already been associated to SDM projections once in the 386 context of the Southern Ocean, by Torres et al. (2015) in their study of the grey petrel Procellaria 387 cinerea, performed at the scale of the Southern Ocean. More recently, the MESS approach has 388 been introduced in the methodological paper of Guillaumot et al. (2019), showing an extrapolation 389 area covering 64% of the projection area for the distribution model of the sea star O. validus, the 390 most studied benthic invertebrate of the Southern Ocean. However, uncertainties associated to 391 extrapolation were not provided in most model projections performed for Southern Ocean species 392 studies. For instance, modelled distributions performed for the sea urchins Sterechinus neumaveri 393 and Sterechinus diadema (Pierrat et al. 2012) were generated using a relative low number of 394 presence-only records (241 and 332, respectively). Based on results of the present study, 395 extrapolation could be expected to cover up to 60% of modelled distribution areas for these last 396 two species. Further Southern Ocean species distribution models were generated with sometimes 397 less than 100 presence-only records (see Guillaumot et al. 2018b and Fabri-Ruiz et al. 2019 for 398 instance), suggesting that extrapolation could cover up to 70% of projection areas as visible in 399 models of A. hodgsoni and P. charcoti performed in our study with few records (Fig. 2, Table S6, 400 Table S7).

401

402 In addition to model uncertainties associated to extrapolation, other biases can alter the 403 performance of SDMs generated at broad spatial scales including the spatial and temporal 404 aggregation of data (Hortal et al. 2008, Tessarolo et al. 2014, 2017), the selection and quality of
405 environmental descriptors (Davies et al. 2008, Synes and Osborne 2011), the choice of modelling
406 algorithms and the definition of model settings (Hartley et al. 2006, Marmion et al. 2009). Providing
407 such uncertainty information, highlighted with some model statistics is very much encouraged
408 here, as they are essential to model interpretation (Beale and Lennon 2012, Guisan et al. 2013,
409 Yates et al. 2018).

410

411 How can we reduce model extrapolation? Enriching SDMs with knowledge of species

412 ecology

413 One objective of this work was to provide some methods to mitigate the effect of extrapolation on 414 model uncertainties. Our results show clear contrasts between models generated for "deep" and 415 "shallow" species, with lower proportions of extrapolation areas computed for deep species models 416 (29.1 and 15.73% respectively for B. loripes and G. antarctica). The model generated for P. 417 charcoti departs from this general scheme, with extrapolation reaching 67.9% of the projection 418 area. This is due to the strong spatial aggregation of records and the small presence-only record 419 dataset available in deeper habitats. Depth is indeed responsible for 58.1% of the extrapolation for 420 P. charcoti (Appendix 5). Indeed, the erroneous characterization of species occupied space, due to 421 an incomplete sampling, has been identified as a significant source of bias in SDM predictions 422 (Hortal et al. 2007, 2008, Rocchini et al. 2011, Sánchez-Fernández et al. 2011, Titeux et al. 2017, 423 El-Gabbas and Dormann 2018).

424

425 Limiting model projection areas to biogeographically, or ecologically "realistic" depth ranges can 426 help reduce extrapolation as exemplified in the present study, for models of A. hodgsoni and P. 427 charcoti, for which extrapolation was reduced from 78.6 to 40.6% and 67.9 to 35.8% respectively 428 (Table 2). Restraining model projection areas based on species ecological or physiological 429 tolerance thresholds is a common approach in ecological modelling using experimental data or 430 field observations (Kearney and Porter 2009, Hare et al. 2012, De Villiers et al. 2013). Knowledge 431 of species ecology and physiology can also be useful to delineate transferability areas (Feng and 432 Papes 2017) and improve distribution models, as recently shown for Southern Ocean species 433 (Guillaumot et al. 2018a, Guillaumot et al. 2019). Feng et al. (2020) developed a new modelling 434 algorithm, called *Plateau*, which uses experimental data to define upper temperature conditions in 435 distribution models. For temperature and salinity, physiological experiments and field observations 436 can be used in models to determine species tolerance thresholds. This requires knowledge about 437 the species ecology and physiology and the input from specialists, all conditions that remain 438 difficult to meet, regarding deep sea species of the Southern Ocean (Gage 2004, Gutt et al. 2010, 439 De Broyer and Danis 2011). Moreover, several studies suggested that some Southern Ocean 440 species might have found refuges in deep sea habitats in the past, during glacial maxima, which

makes species depth range difficult to precise when deep and shallow populations have not been
differentiated into distinct taxonomic units yet (Rogers 2007, Arango et al. 2011, Havermans et al.
2011, Near et al. 2012).

444

445 How can we reduce extrapolation? Improving sampling effort

446 Increased sampling effort over enlarged areas allows the production of larger datasets from which 447 many records can be used to generate reliable models with reduced extrapolation areas. In this 448 study, proportions of extrapolation areas proportionally decreased when increased numbers of 449 presence-only records were used to generate models. The occurrence datasets were significantly 450 augmented between 1980 and 2016, with a number of presence-only records multiplied by 1.9 to 451 3.3 times according to the studied species, which allowed reduction of model extrapolation from 452 10.2 to 30.7% according to the species (Fig. 2, Table S6). However, results suggest that about 453 twice the number of presence-only records actually available would be necessary to reduce 454 extrapolation down to a "satisfactory" threshold of 10% of the projection area (Table 3).

455

456 Generating reliable and stable models using a sufficient number of presence-only records is 457 essential. In this study, some models could not be run when the number of presence-only records 458 was too low (approaching 150 presence-only records or less) compared to the broad extent of the 459 projection area and the spatial aggregation of these data (Table S7). Considering that the spatial 460 cross-validation procedure splits the initial dataset into training and test data, and that at each step, 461 75% of these training data are randomly sampled by BRT to iterately create a model tree (and 462 generate stochasticity in the procedure), the final number of presence-only records available to 463 describe the presence data - environment relationship becomes too low (around 37.5% of the 464 initial number of presence-only records).

465 The lowest number of presence-only records required to build a reliable model is species-466 dependent as not all presence-only records are equally informative, due to species-specific 467 relationships between records and the environment. When models are generated using BRT, 468 records that bring no new environmental information to the model are dropped because they are 469 not informative enough to improve the construction of BRT trees. Pruning non-informative data 470 also reduces the total number of presence-only records available to generate a model (Elith et al. 471 2008). This is strongly related to prevalence that is, the ratio between the number of presence-only 472 records and the size of the projection area (Jiménez-Valverde et al. 2009, Santika 2011, Barbet-473 Massin et al. 2012). In order to accurately describe a vast projection area and be able to create a 474 model, it is necessary to gather a substantial amount of information about the geographic 475 environmental conditions and about species known distribution. If a limited number of records is 476 available and these data are aggregated in space (i.e. weakly informative), the first trees produced 477 by BRT will contain most of the model deviance, but as no new information is provided, the model will quickly overfit because redundant information is provided by close presence-only records.Eventually, this will make the model collapse.

480 Increasing the number of presence-only records is proved an efficient alternative to generate more 481 relevant models (Stockwell and Peterson 2002, Feeley and Silman 2011, van Proosdij et al. 2016), 482 but the spatial distribution of these records is of importance as well (Yates et al. 2018). A uniform 483 distribution of records over the entire projection area reduces spatial autocorrelation and optimizes 484 the sampling and representativeness of environmental conditions under which species can thrive. 485 In this study, the spatial aggregation of species records was particularly high for two species, O. 486 validus and L. annulatus. It was estimated that the number of supplementary presence-only 487 records necessary to reach a proportion of extrapolation areas of 10% should be twice as high as it 488 is for other species (Table 3). Additional data are necessary to improve the establishment of the 489 relationship between species distribution and the environment because species records are less 490 informative when aggregated than when they are evenly distributed.

491

492 The Southern Ocean covers contrasting environmental conditions, biogeographic regions and 493 ecoregions (Pierrat 2011, Fabri-Ruiz et al. 2020). Ideally, both species presence and absence 494 should be recorded in each ecoregion for an accurate description of the occupied space (Torres et 495 al. 2015). Because such a sampling effort is usually not achievable, nor realistic, alternatives would 496 consist of (1) a relevant adjustment of projection areas, with for instance the combination of 497 several SDM projections using different grid sizes according to what is available. Generating SDM 498 projections for large areas and combining results with projections zoomed in on areas where more 499 environmental detail is available would provide more relevant and realistic modelled species 500 distributions (Seo et al. 2009, Anderson and Raza 2010). (2) In order to compensate for the lack of 501 presence-record availability, the 'ensembles of small models' approach is another alternative. This 502 method fits a set of bivariate models (i.e. generated with two environmental descriptors only), 503 within a hierarchic multi-scale framework (i.e. zooming in and out in space from local to regional 504 predictions), and finally averages this ensemble of models with a weighted ensemble approach, 505 which subsequently provides more accurate and robust model predictions (Lomba et al. 2010, 506 Breiner et al. 2015, Habibzadeh and Ludwig 2019).

507

508 Some limitations to the MESS approach

The MESS approach can reveal parts of projection areas where models extrapolate. Extrapolation however can be over-estimated. Indeed, extrapolation is considered as soon as the value of a single environmental descriptor falls outside the range of the known species environmental requirements. But, some extreme values would not limit but can promote species presence: this is the case for descriptors relating to food resource availability (e.g. chlorophyll a, POC concentrations...), for which a high pixel value exceeding the range of values recorded based on species presences will be still considered as extrapolation, although more food usually meanssuitable conditions for species distribution.

517 Some fine-tuning of the MESS approach would imply to identify, for each pixel, which descriptor is 518 responsible for extrapolation and filter the conditions for which the model should really extrapolate.

519 Such an approach was developed by Owens et al. (2013), who used the MOP method (Mobility 520 Oriented Parity). Based on multivariate analyses, they determined if pixels contain a combination 521 of environmental conditions that should induce extrapolation. In contrast to the MESS approach, 522 the MOP method can directly differentiate proportions of extrapolation areas according to the 523 combination of descriptors responsible for extrapolation. Another complex alternative is the ExDet 524 tool, developed by Mesgaran et al. (2014), which also accounts for multivariate extrapolation 525 possibilities, i.e. extrapolation linked to novel combinations between covariates.

526 In this study, the MESS approach was favored as a more strict and conservative method to 527 highlight the importance of extrapolation, the effect of data quantity and quality, and the relevance 528 of the proposed corrections. The MESS is also simpler to apply and well suited to exploratory 529 studies.

530

531 Conclusions

This study shows that when modelling species distribution on broad scale areas, such as the Southern Ocean, important proportions of predicted distribution probabilities (suitable or not) are model extrapolations. This extrapolation uncertainty relies on the completeness of species sampling, and the definition of its occupied space to calibrate the model. Extrapolation occurs in areas where habitat suitability is unknown as no information on species presence or absence is provided.

538

539 Reducing extrapolation is possible by combining SDM with ecological and physiological knowledge 540 of species requirements (e.g. depth range, temperature tolerance thresholds). Increased sampling 541 effort over enlarged areas also allows the production of more reliable models with reduced 542 extrapolation areas and our study shows that doubling the number of presence-only records 543 available to generate the model would help reduce the extrapolation area down to 10% of the 544 projected area.

545 While more data samples remain unavailable, some methods are increasingly developed to 546 improve model performances, by adjusting the extent of the projection area or by generating and 547 aggregating several small ensemble models.

549 Finally, present results call for a widespread use of extrapolation maps and uncertainties 550 associated to model predictions in model outputs, along with information about the quantity of 551 presence-only records available, the quality and resolution of environmental descriptors and the 552 state of our knowledge of species ecology. These are all essential information needed to support 553 model interpretations, as also stated in recent publications that review best practices in ecological 554 modelling (Araújo et al. 2019, Zurell et al. 2020).

555

556 Acknowledgements

557 This work was supported by a "Fonds pour la formation à la Recherche dans l'Industrie et 558 l'Agriculture" (FRIA) and "Bourse fondation de la mer" grants to C. Guillaumot.

559 This is contribution no. 46 to the vERSO project (www.versoproject.be), funded by the Belgian 560 Science Policy Office (BELSPO, contract n°BR/132/A1/vERSO). Research was also financed by 561 the "Refugia and Ecosystem Tolerance in the Southern Ocean" project (RECTO; 562 BR/154/A1/RECTO) funded by the Belgian Science Policy Office (BELSPO), this study being 563 contribution number 23.

```
564
```

- 565
- 566

567

568

569

570

571

572

573

574

575

576

577

579 **References**

Allouche, O., Tsoar, A. & Kadmon, R. (2006). Assessing the accuracy of species distribution models: prevalence, kappa and the true skill statistic (TSS). *Journal of Applied Ecology*, 43(6), 1223-1232.

583

Anderson, R.P. & Raza, A. (2010). The effect of the extent of the study region on GIS models of species geographic distributions and estimates of niche evolution: preliminary tests with montane rodents (genus Nephelomys) in Venezuela. *Journal of Biogeography*, 37(7), 1378-1393.

587

Anderson, R.P. (2013). A framework for using niche models to estimate impacts of climate change
on species distributions. *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences*, 1297(1), 8-28.

590

Arango, C.P., Soler-Membrives, A. & Miller, K.J. (2011). Genetic differentiation in the circum—
Antarctic sea spider Nymphon australe (Pycnogonida; Nymphonidae). *Deep Sea Research Part II: Topical Studies in Oceanography*, 58(1-2), 212-219.

594

Araújo, M. B., Anderson, R. P., Barbosa, A. M., Beale, C. M., Dormann, C. F., Early, R., ... &
O'Hara, R. B. (2019). Standards for distribution models in biodiversity assessments. Science
Advances, 5(1), eaat4858.

Arthur, B., Hindell, M., Bester, M., De Bruyn, P.N., Goebel, M.E., Trathan, P. & Lea, M.A. (2018).
Managing for change: Using vertebrate at sea habitat use to direct management efforts. *Ecological Indicators*, 91, 338-349.

602

Austin, M. (2007). Species distribution models and ecological theory: a critical assessment and
some possible new approaches. *Ecological modelling*, 200(1-2), 1-19.

605

Austin, M.P. & Van Niel, K.P. (2011). Improving species distribution models for climate change
studies: variable selection and scale. *Journal of Biogeography*, 38(1), 1-8.

608

Ballard, G., Jongsomjit, D., Veloz, S.D. & Ainley, D.G. (2012). Coexistence of mesopredators in an
intact polar ocean ecosystem: the basis for defining a Ross Sea marine protected area. *Biological Conservation*, 156, 72-82.

612

Barbet-Massin, M., Jiguet, F., Albert, C.H. & Thuiller, W. (2012). Selecting pseudo-absences for
species distribution models: how, where and how many?. *Methods in ecology and evolution*, 3(2),
327-338.

- 616
- 617 Basher, Z. & Costello, M.J. (2016). The past, present and future distribution of a deep-sea shrimp 618 in the Southern Ocean. *PeerJ*, 4, e1713.
- 619
- Beale, C.M., & Lennon, J.J. (2012). Incorporating uncertainty in predictive species distribution
 modelling. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, 367(1586), 247258.
- 623
- Breiner, F.T., Guisan, A., Bergamini, A. & Nobis, M.P. (2015). Overcoming limitations of modelling
 rare species by using ensembles of small models. *Methods in Ecology and Evolution*, 6(10), 12101218.
- 627
- Broennimann, O., Mráz, P., Petitpierre, B., Guisan, A. & Müller-Schärer, H. (2014). Contrasting
 spatio-temporal climatic niche dynamics during the eastern and western invasions of spotted
 knapweed in North America. *Journal of Biogeography*, 41(6), 1126-1136.
- 631
- Brotons, L., Thuiller, W., Araújo, M.B. & Hirzel, A.H. (2004). Presence-absence versus presenceonly modelling methods for predicting bird habitat suitability. *Ecography*, 27(4), 437-448.
- 634
- Brotons, L., De Cáceres, M., Fall, A. & Fortin, M.J. (2012). Modeling bird species distribution
 change in fire prone Mediterranean landscapes: incorporating species dispersal and landscape
 dynamics. *Ecography*, 35(5), 458-467.
- 638
- Brueggeman, P. (1998). Underwater Field Guide to Ross Island & McMurdo Sound, Antarctica.
 The National Science Foundation's Office of Polar Progams sponsored Norbert Wu.–Univ.
 California, San Diego.
- 642
- 643 Cardador, L., Carrete, M., Gallardo, B. & Tella, J.L. (2016). Combining trade data and niche
 644 modelling improves predictions of the origin and distribution of non-native European populations of
 645 a globally invasive species. *Journal of Biogeography*, 43(5), 967-978.
- 646
- 647 CCAMLR report WG-FSA-15/64, access at https://www.ccamlr.org/fr/wg-fsa-15/64. August 2020.
- 648
- 649 Crase, B., Liedloff, A.C. & Wintle, B.A. (2012). A new method for dealing with residual spatial
 650 autocorrelation in species distribution models. *Ecography*, 35(10), 879-888.
- 651

- Davies, A. J., Wisshak, M., Orr, J.C. & Roberts, J.M. (2008). Predicting suitable habitat for the
 cold-water coral *Lophelia pertusa* (Scleractinia). *Deep Sea Research Part I: Oceanographic Research Papers*, 55(8), 1048-1062.
- 655

De Broyer, C. & Danis, B. (2011). How many species in the Southern Ocean? Towards a dynamic
inventory of the Antarctic marine species. *Deep sea research Part II: Topical studies in oceanography*, 58(1-2), 5-17.

- 659
- De Broyer, C., Koubbi, P., Griffiths, H.J., Raymond, B., d'Udekem d'Acoz, C., Van de Putte, A.P.,
 ... Ropert-Coudert, Y. (2014). Biogeographic atlas of the Southern Ocean (p. 498). C. De Broyer,
 & P. Koubbi (Eds.). Cambridge: Scientific Committee on Antarctic Research.
- 663

De Villiers, M., Hattingh, V. & Kriticos, D.J. (2013). Combining field phenological observations with
distribution data to model the potential distribution of the fruit fly *Ceratitis rosa* Karsch (Diptera:
Tephritidae). *Bulletin of Entomological Research*, 103(1), 60-73.

- 667
- Dhingra, M.S., Artois, J., Robinson, T.P., Linard, C., Chaiban, C., Xenarios, I. ... & Von
 Dobschuetz, S. (2016). Global mapping of highly pathogenic avian influenza H5N1 and H5Nx
 clade 2.3. 4.4 viruses with spatial cross-validation. *Elife*, 5, e19571.
- 671
- El-Gabbas, A., & Dormann, C.F. (2018). Wrong, but useful: regional species distribution models
 may not be improved by range-wide data under biased sampling. *Ecology and evolution*, 8(4),
 2196-2206.

- Elith, J., Graham, H., Anderson, C.P., Dudík, R., Ferrier, M., Guisan, A. ... & Li, J. (2006). Novel
 methods improve prediction of species' distributions from occurrence data. *Ecography*, 29(2), 129151.
- 679
- Elith, J., Leathwick, J.R. & Hastie, T. (2008). A working guide to boosted regression trees. *Journal of Animal Ecology*, 77(4), 802-813.
- 682
- Elith, J., Kearney, M. & Phillips, S. (2010). The art of modelling range shifting species. *Methods in Ecology and Evolution*, 1(4), 330-342.
- 685
- Elith, J., Phillips, S.J., Hastie, T., Dudík, M., Chee, Y.E., Yates, C.J., 2011. A statistical explanation
 of MaxEnt for ecologists. *Diversity and Distributions*, 17, 43–57.
- 688

Escobar, L.E., Ryan, S.J., Stewart-Ibarra, A.M., Finkelstein, J.L., King, C.A., Qiao, H. & Polhemus,
M.E. (2015). A global map of suitability for coastal Vibrio cholerae under current and future climate
conditions. *Acta tropica*, 149, 202-211.

692

Fabri-Ruiz, S., Danis, B., David, B. & Saucède, T. (2019). Can we generate robust species
distribution models at the scale of the Southern Ocean?. *Diversity and distributions*, 25(1), 21-37.

Fabri-Ruiz, S., Danis, B., Navarro, N., Koubbi, P., Laffont, R. & Saucède, T. (2020). Benthic
ecoregionalization based on echinoid fauna of the Southern Ocean supports current proposals of
Antarctic Marine Protected Areas under IPCC scenarios of climate change. *Global Change Biology*.

700

Feeley, K.J. & Silman, M.R. (2011). Keep collecting: accurate species distribution modelling
 requires more collections than previously thought. *Diversity and distributions*, 17(6), 1132-1140.

- Feng, X. & Papeş, M. (2017). Can incomplete knowledge of species' physiology facilitate
 ecological niche modelling? A case study with virtual species. *Diversity and Distributions*, 23(10),
 1157-1168.
 - 707

Feng, X., Liang, Y., Gallardo, B. & Papeş, M. (2020). Physiology in ecological niche modeling:
using zebra mussel's upper thermal tolerance to refine model predictions through Bayesian
analysis. *Ecography*, 43(2), 270-282.

711

Fielding, A.H. & Bell, J.F. (1997). A review of methods for the assessment of prediction errors in
conservation presence/absence models. *Environmental Conservation*, 24(1), 38-49.

714

Fitzpatrick, M.C. & Hargrove, W.W. (2009). The projection of species distribution models and the
problem of non-analog climate. *Biodiversity and Conservation*, 18(8), 2255.

717

Freer, J.J., Tarling, G.A., Collins, M.A., Partridge, J.C. & Genner, M.J. (2019). Predicting future
distributions of lanternfish, a significant ecological resource within the Southern Ocean. *Diversity and Distributions*, 25(8), 1259-1272.

721

Gage, J.D. (2004). Diversity in deep-sea benthic macrofauna: the importance of local ecology, the
larger scale, history and the Antarctic. *Deep Sea Research Part II: Topical Studies in Oceanography*, 51(14-16), 1689-1708.

- Gallego, R., Dennis, T.E., Basher, Z., Lavery, S. & Sewell, M.A. (2017). On the need to consider
 multiphasic sensitivity of marine organisms to climate change: A case study of the Antarctic acorn
 barnacle. *Journal of Biogeography*, 44, 2165–2175.
- 729

Gobeyn, S., Mouton, A.M., Cord, A.F., Kaim, A., Volk, M. & Goethals, P.L. (2019). Evolutionary
algorithms for species distribution modelling: A review in the context of machine learning. *Ecological modelling*, 392, 179-195.

733

Grimm, V. & Berger, U. (2016). Robustness analysis: Deconstructing computational models for
ecological theory and applications. *Ecological Modelling*, 326, 162-167.

736

Guillaumot, C., Martin, A., Eléaume, M., & Saucède, T. (2018a). Methods for improving species
distribution models in data-poor areas: example of sub-Antarctic benthic species on the Kerguelen
Plateau. *Marine Ecology Progress Series*, 594, 149-164.

740

Guillaumot, C., Fabri-Ruiz, S., Martin, A., Eléaume, M., Danis, B., Féral, J.P. & Saucède, T.
(2018b). Benthic species of the Kerguelen Plateau show contrasting distribution shifts in response
to environmental changes. *Ecology and evolution*, 8(12), 6210-6225.

744

Guillaumot, C., Danis B. & Saucède, T. (2020). Selecting environmental descriptors is critical to
modelling the distribution of Antarctic benthic species. *Polar Biology*. 1-19.

747

Guillaumot, C., Artois, J., Saucède, T., Demoustier, L., Moreau, C., Eléaume, M. ... & Danis, B.
(2019). Broad-scale species distribution models applied to data-poor areas. *Progress in oceanography*, 175, 198-207.

751

Guisan, A., Tingley, R., Baumgartner, J.B., Naujokaitis-Lewis, I., Sutcliffe, P.R., Tulloch, A.I. ... &
Martin, T.G. (2013). Predicting species distributions for conservation decisions. *Ecology letters*,
16(12), 1424-1435.

755

Gutt, J., Hosie, G. & Stoddart, M., (2010). Marine Life in the Antarctic. In: McIntyre A.D. (Ed.). Life
in the World's Oceans: Diversity, Distribution and Abundance. Wiley-Blackwell, Oxford, pp. 203–
220.

759

Habibzadeh, N. & Ludwig, T. (2019). Ensemble of small models for estimating potential abundance
of Caucasian grouse (Lyrurus mlokosiewiczi) in Iran. *Ornis Fennica*, 96(2), 77-89.

763 Hare, J. A., Wuenschel, M.J. & Kimball, M.E. (2012). Projecting range limits with coupled thermal 764 tolerance-climate change models: an example based on gray snapper (Lutianus griseus) along the 765 US east coast. PLoS One, 7(12), e52294. 766 767 Hartley, S., Harris, R., & Lester, P.J. (2006). Quantifying uncertainty in the potential distribution of 768 an invasive species: climate and the Argentine ant. Ecology letters, 9(9), 1068-1079. 769 770 Havermans, C., Nagy, Z.T., Sonet, G., De Broyer, C. & Martin, P. (2011). DNA barcoding reveals 771 new insights into the diversity of Antarctic species of Orchomene sensu lato (Crustacea: 772 Amphipoda: Lysianassoidea). Deep Sea Research Part II: Topical Studies in Oceanography, 58(1-773 2), 230-241. 774 775 Heikkinen, R.K., Marmion, M. & Luoto, M. (2012). Does the interpolation accuracy of species 776 distribution models come at the expense of transferability?. *Ecography*, 35(3), 276-288. 777 778 Hijmans, R.J., Phillips, S., Leathwick, J., Elith, J. & Hijmans, M.R. (2017). Package 'dismo'. Circles, 779 9(1). https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=dismo 780 781 Hortal, J., Lobo, J.M. & Jiménez-Valverde, A. (2007). Limitations of biodiversity databases: case 782 study on seed-plant diversity in Tenerife, Canary Islands. Conservation Biology, 21(3), 853-863. 783 784 Hortal, J., Jiménez-Valverde, A., Gómez, J.F., Lobo, J.M. & Baselga, A. (2008). Historical bias in 785 biodiversity inventories affects the observed environmental niche of the species. Oikos, 117(6), 786 847-858. 787 788 lannella, M., Cerasoli, F. & Biondi, M. (2017). Unraveling climate influences on the distribution of 789 the parapatric newts Lissotriton vulgaris meridionalis and L. italicus. Frontiers in Zoology, 14(1), 790 55. 791 792 Jerosch, K., Scharf, F.K., Deregibus, D., Campana, G.L., Zacher, K., Pehlke, H. ... & Abele, D. 793 (2019). Ensemble modelling of Antarctic macroalgal habitats exposed to glacial melt in a polar 794 fjord. Frontiers in Ecology and Evolution, 7, 207. 795 796 Jiménez-Valverde, A., Lobo, J.M. & Hortal, J. (2009). The effect of prevalence and its interaction 797 with sample size on the reliability of species distribution models. Community Ecology, 10(2), 196-798 205. 799

- Kearney, M. & Porter, W. (2009). Mechanistic niche modelling: combining physiological and spatial
 data to predict species' ranges. *Ecology letters*, 12(4), 334-350.
- 802
- Lawrence, J.M. (Ed.). (2013). *Starfish: biology and ecology of the Asteroidea*. JHU Press.
 804
- Li, G., Du, S. & Guo, K. (2015). Correction: Evaluation of Limiting Climatic Factors and Simulation
 of a Climatically Suitable Habitat for Chinese Sea Buckthorn. *PloS one*, 10(8), e0136001.
- 807
- Liu, C., White, M. & Newell, G. (2013). Selecting thresholds for the prediction of species occurrence with presence-only data. *Journal of Biogeography*, 40(4), 778-789.
- 810
- Lomba, A., Pellissier, L., Randin, C., Vicente, J., Moreira, F., Honrado, J. & Guisan, A. (2010).
 Overcoming the rare species modelling paradox: a novel hierarchical framework applied to an
 Iberian endemic plant. *Biological conservation*, 143(11), 2647-2657.
- 814
- Loots, C., Koubbi, P. & Duhamel, G. (2007). Habitat modelling of *Electrona antarctica*(Myctophidae, Pisces) in Kerguelen by generalized additive models and geographic information
 systems. *Polar Biology*, 30, 951-959.
- 818
- Luizza, M.W., Wakie, T., Evangelista, P.H. & Jarnevich, C.S. (2016). Integrating local pastoral knowledge, participatory mapping, and species distribution modeling for risk assessment of invasive rubber vine (Cryptostegia grandiflora) in Ethiopia's Afar region. *Ecology and Society*, 21(1), 1-22.
- 823
- Luoto, M., Pöyry, J., Heikkinen, R.K. & Saarinen, K. (2005). Uncertainty of bioclimate envelope models based on the geographical distribution of species. *Global Ecology and Biogeography*, 14(6), 575-584.
- 827
- Mah, C.L. & Blake, D.B. (2012). Global diversity and phylogeny of the Asteroidea (Echinodermata). *PloS one*, 7(4), e35644.
- 830
- Marmion, M., Luoto, M., Heikkinen, R.K. & Thuiller, W. (2009). The performance of state-of-the-art
 modelling techniques depends on geographical distribution of species. *Ecological Modelling*, *220*(24), 3512-3520.
- 834
- Marshall, C.E., Glegg, G.A. & Howell, K.L. (2014). Species distribution modelling to support marine
 conservation planning: the next steps. *Marine Policy*, 45, 330-332.

- 837
- McClintock, J.B., Angus, R.A., Ho, C.P., Amsler, C.D. & Baker, B.J. (2008). Intraspecific agonistic
 arm-fencing behavior in the Antarctic keystone sea star *Odontaster validus* influences prey
 acquisition. *Marine Ecology Progress Series*, 371, 297-300.
- 841
- Mesgaran, M. B., Cousens, R. D., & Webber, B. L. (2014). Here be dragons: a tool for quantifying
 novelty due to covariate range and correlation change when projecting species distribution models.
 Diversity and Distributions, 20(10), 1147-1159.
- 845
- Milanesi, P., Herrando, S., Pla, M., Villero, D. & Keller, V. (2017). Towards continental bird distribution models: environmental variables for the second European breeding bird atlas and identification of priorities for further surveys. *Vogelwelt*, 137, 53-60.
- 849
- Moreau, C., Mah, C., Agüera, A., Améziane, N., Barnes, D., Crokaert, G. ... & Jażdżewska, A.
 (2018). Antarctic and sub-Antarctic Asteroidea database. *ZooKeys*, 747, 141-156.
- 852
- Muscarella, R., Galante, P.J., Soley-Guardia, M., Boria, R.A., Kass, J.M., Uriarte, M. & Anderson,
 R.P. (2014). ENM eval: An R package for conducting spatially independent evaluations and
 estimating optimal model complexity for Maxent ecological niche models. *Methods in Ecology and Evolution*, 5(11), 1198-1205.
- 857
- Nachtsheim, D.A., Jerosch, K., Hagen, W., Plötz, J. & Bornemann, H. (2017). Habitat modelling of
 crabeater seals (*Lobodon carcinophaga*) in the Weddell Sea using the multivariate approach
 Maxent. *Polar Biology*, 40(5), 961-976.

- Naimi B., Hamm N.A., Groen T.A., Skidmore A.K. & Toxopeus A.G. (2014). Where is positional
 uncertainty a problem for species distribution modelling? *Ecography*, 37(2), 191-203.
- 864
- Near, T.J., Dornburg, A., Kuhn, K.L., Eastman, J.T., Pennington, J.N., Patarnello, T. ... & Jones,
 C.D. (2012). Ancient climate change, antifreeze, and the evolutionary diversification of Antarctic
 fishes. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 109(9), 3434-3439.
- 868
- Nori, J., Akmentins, M.S., Ghirardi, R., Frutos, N. & Leynaud, G.C. (2011). American bullfrog
 invasion in Argentina: where should we take urgent measures?. *Biodiversity and Conservation*,
 20(5), 1125-1132.
- 872

- Owens, H.L., Campbell, L.P., Dornak, L.L., Saupe, E.E., Barve, N., Soberón, J. ... & Peterson, A.T.
 (2013). Constraints on interpretation of ecological niche models by limited environmental ranges
 on calibration areas. *Ecological Modelling*, 263, 10-18.
- 876

Peterson, A.T. (2001). Predicting species' geographic distributions based on ecological niche
modeling. *The Condor*, 103(3), 599-605.

879

Phillips, S.J., Dudík, M., Elith, J., Graham, C.H., Lehmann, A., Leathwick, J. & Ferrier, S. (2009).
Sample selection bias and presence-only distribution models: implications for background and
pseudo-absence data. *Ecological Applications*, 19(1), 181-197.

883

884 Pierrat, B. (2011). Macroécologie des échinides de l'océan Austral: Distribution, Biogéographie et
885 Modélisation (Doctoral dissertation).

886

Pierrat, B., Saucède, T., Laffont, R., De Ridder, C., Festeau, A., & David, B. (2012). Large-scale
distribution analysis of Antarctic echinoids using ecological niche modelling. *Marine Ecology Progress Series*, 463, 215-230.

890

Pinkerton, M.H., Smith, A.N., Raymond, B., Hosie, G.W., Sharp, B., Leathwick, J.R. & BradfordGrieve, J.M. (2010). Spatial and seasonal distribution of adult *Oithona similis* in the Southern
Ocean: predictions using boosted regression trees. *Deep Sea Research Part I: Oceanographic Research Papers*, 57(4), 469-485.

895

Randin, C.F., Dirnböck, T., Dullinger, S., Zimmermann, N.E., Zappa, M. & Guisan, A. (2006). Are
niche-based species distribution models transferable in space?. *Journal of biogeography*, 33(10),
1689-1703.

899

Reiss, H., Cunze, S., König, K., Neumann, H. & Kröncke, I. (2011). Species distribution modelling
of marine benthos: a North Sea case study. *Marine Ecology Progress Series*, 442, 71-86.

902

Pocchini, D., Hortal, J., Lengyel, S., Lobo, J.M., Jimenez-Valverde, A., Ricotta, C. ... & Chiarucci,
A. (2011). Accounting for uncertainty when mapping species distributions: the need for maps of
ignorance. *Progress in Physical Geography*, 35(2), 211-226.

906

Robinson, L.M., Elith, J., Hobday, A.J., Pearson, R.G., Kendall, B.E., Possingham, H.P. &
Richardson, A.J. (2011). Pushing the limits in marine species distribution modelling: lessons from
the land present challenges and opportunities. *Global Ecology and Biogeography*, 20(6), 789-802.

- 910
- 911 Rogers, A.D. (2007). Evolution and biodiversity of Antarctic organisms: a molecular perspective.
 912 *Philosophical transactions of the royal society B: Biological sciences*, 362(1488), 2191-2214.
- 913
- 914 Sánchez-Fernández, D., Lobo, J.M. & Hernández-Manrique, O.L. (2011). Species distribution
 915 models that do not incorporate global data misrepresent potential distributions: a case study using
 916 Iberian diving beetles. *Diversity and Distributions*, 17(1), 163-171.
- 917
- Santika, T. (2011). Assessing the effect of prevalence on the predictive performance of species
 distribution models using simulated data. *Global Ecology and Biogeography*, 20(1), 181-192.
- Seo, C., Thorne, J.H., Hannah, L. & Thuiller, W. (2009). Scale effects in species distribution
 models: implications for conservation planning under climate change. *Biology letters*, 5(1), 39-43.
- Silva, B.P.C., Silva, M.L.N., Avalos, F.A.P., de Menezes, M.D. & Curi, N. (2019). Digital soil
 mapping including additional point sampling in Posses ecosystem services pilot watershed,
 southeastern Brazil. *Scientific Reports*, 9(1), 1-12.
- 927
- Stockwell, D.R., & Peterson, A.T. (2002). Effects of sample size on accuracy of species distribution
 models. *Ecological modelling*, 148(1), 1-13.
- 930
- Synes, N.W. & Osborne, P.E. (2011). Choice of predictor variables as a source of uncertainty in
 continental-scale species distribution modelling under climate change. *Global Ecology and Biogeography*, 20(6), 904-914.
- 934
- Tessarolo, G., Rangel, T.F., Araújo, M.B. & Hortal, J. (2014). Uncertainty associated with survey
 design in Species Distribution Models. *Diversity and Distributions*, 20(11), 1258-1269.
- 937
- Tessarolo, G., Ladle, R., Rangel, T. & Hortal, J. (2017). Temporal degradation of data limits
 biodiversity research. *Ecology and evolution*, 7(17), 6863-6870.
- 940
- Titeux, N., Maes, D., Van Daele, T., Onkelinx, T., Heikkinen, R.K., Romo, H. ... & Schweiger, O.
 (2017). The need for large-scale distribution data to estimate regional changes in species richness
 under future climate change. *Diversity and Distributions*, 23(12), 1393-1407.
- 944

Torres, L.G., Sutton, P.J., Thompson, D.R., Delord, K., Weimerskirch, H., Sagar, P.M. ... & Phillips, 945 946 R.A. (2015). Poor transferability of species distribution models for a pelagic predator, the grey 947 petrel, indicates contrasting habitat preferences across ocean basins. PLoS One, 10(3), e0120014. 948 949 van Proosdij, A.S., Sosef, M.S., Wieringa, J.J. & Raes, N. (2016). Minimum required number of 950 specimen records to develop accurate species distribution models. *Ecography*, 39(6), 542-552. 951 952 Walsh, E. & Hudiburg, T.W. (2018). A Framework for Forest Landscape and Habitat Suitability 953 Model Integration to Evaluate Forest Ecosystem Response to Climate Change. AGUFM, 2018, 954 GC11G-0989. 955 956 Williams, J.W. & Jackson, S.T. (2007). Novel climates, no-analog communities, and ecological 957 surprises. Frontiers in Ecology and the Environment, 5(9), 475-482. 958 959 Williams, J.W., Jackson, S.T. & Kutzbach, J.E. (2007). Projected distributions of novel and 960 disappearing climates by 2100 AD. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 104(14), 961 5738-5742. 962 963 Wisz, M.S. & Guisan, A. (2009). Do pseudo-absence selection strategies influence species 964 distribution models and their predictions? An information-theoretic approach based on simulated 965 data. BMC Ecology, 9(1), 8. 966 967 WoRMS Editorial Board (2016) World Register of Marine Species. <u>http://www.marinespecies.org</u> 968 [Accessed: 2016-05-23] 969 970 Xavier, J.C., Raymond, B., Jones, D.C. & Griffiths, H. (2016). Biogeography of Cephalopods in the 971 Southern Ocean using habitat suitability prediction models. *Ecosystems*, 19, 220–247. 972 973 Yates, K. L., Bouchet, P. J., Caley, M. J., Mengersen, K., Randin, C. F., Parnell, S., ... & Dormann, 974 C. F. (2018). Outstanding challenges in the transferability of ecological models. Trends in ecology 975 & evolution, 33(10), 790-802. 976 977 Zurell, D., Zimmermann, N. E., Gross, H., Baltensweiler, A., Sattler, T., & Wüest, R. O. (2020). 978 Testing species assemblage predictions from stacked and joint species distribution models. 979 Journal of Biogeography, 47(1), 101-113. 980