



**HAL**  
open science

## Elevational shift in seed plant distributions in China's mountains over the last 70 years

Kuiling Zu, Jonathan Roger Michel Henri Lenoir, Jingyun Fang, Zhiyao Tang, Zehao Shen, Chengjun Ji, Chengyang Zheng, Ao Luo, Wenqi Song, Niklaus Zimmermann, et al.

► **To cite this version:**

Kuiling Zu, Jonathan Roger Michel Henri Lenoir, Jingyun Fang, Zhiyao Tang, Zehao Shen, et al.. Elevational shift in seed plant distributions in China's mountains over the last 70 years. *Global Ecology and Biogeography*, 2023, 32 (7), pp.1098-1112. 10.1111/geb.13692 . hal-04262552

**HAL Id: hal-04262552**

**<https://hal.science/hal-04262552>**

Submitted on 27 Oct 2023

**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 4.0 International License

# **Title page**

## **Title:**

**Elevational shift in seed plant distributions in China's mountains over the last 70 years**

**Running Title : Elevational shifts of plants in China**

## **List of Authors:**

Kuiling Zu<sup>1,2</sup>, Jonathan Lenoir<sup>3</sup>, Jingyun Fang<sup>1,4</sup>, Zhiyao Tang<sup>1</sup>, Zehao Shen<sup>1</sup>, Chengjun Ji<sup>1</sup>, Chengyang Zheng<sup>1</sup>, Ao Luo<sup>1</sup>, Wenqi Song<sup>1</sup>, Niklaus E. Zimmermann<sup>5</sup>, Loïc Pellissier<sup>5,6</sup>, Zhiheng Wang<sup>1\*</sup>

## **Institutional affiliations:**

<sup>1</sup>Institute of Ecology, and Key Laboratory for Earth Surface Processes of the Ministry of Education, College of Urban and Environmental Sciences, Peking University, Beijing 100871, China

<sup>2</sup>Key Laboratory of National Forestry and Grassland Administration on Forest Ecosystem Protection and Restoration of Poyang Lake Watershed, College of Forestry, Jiangxi Agricultural University, Nanchang 330045, China

<sup>3</sup>UMR CNRS 7058 “Ecologie et Dynamique des Systèmes Anthropisés” (EDYSAN), Université de Picardie Jules Verne, 1 Rue des Louvels, 80000 Amiens, France

<sup>4</sup>College of Ecology and Environmental Sciences, Yunnan University, Chenggong, Kunming 650500, China

<sup>5</sup>Landscape Ecology, Institute of Terrestrial Ecosystems, Department of Environmental Systems Science, ETH Zürich, Zürich, Switzerland

<sup>6</sup>Unit of Land Change Science, Swiss Federal Research Institute WSL, Birmensdorf, Switzerland

## **Author for correspondence:**

\*Email: zhiheng.wang@pku.edu.cn

Telephone: 010-62745157

## **Acknowledgements:**

We gratefully thank the data supports by the National Specimen Information Infrastructure (NSII). We also thank Nawal Shrestha and Yaoqi Li for discussion and help improving the manuscript. This work was supported by the Strategic Priority Research Program of Chinese Academy of Sciences (XDB31000000), the Natural Science Foundation of Jiangxi, China (20224BAB213033), Jiangxi Provincial Department of Education Science and Technology Research Project (GJJ2200433), the National Key Research Development Program of China (2018YFA0606104; #2017YFA0605101) and the National Natural Science Foundation of China (#32125026, #31988102).

## **Biosketch:**

**Kuiling Zu** is a teacher at Jiangxi Agricultural University, and she did postdoctoral work at Peking University, and interested in macroecology and botany, currently studying the impacts of global changes on plant resources. Her current research interest is to explore the response of species distributions and phenology to climate change.

## 1 **Abstract**

2 **Aim:** Significant changes in species elevational ranges in mountains have been repeatedly  
3 documented, yet the direction, magnitude and drivers of these shifts remain controversial.  
4 Presently, there is still lacking evidence about the general nature of species elevational range  
5 shifts in eastern Eurasia in response to anthropogenic climate change. By using historical  
6 specimen records and recent field observations for 735 seed plant species across 29 China's  
7 mountains, we assessed changes in species' elevational centroids and their drivers.

8 **Location:** China.

9 **Time period:** 1950 - 2018.

10 **Major taxa studied:** Seed plant species.

11 **Methods:** The elevation records of all sampled occurrences in each mountain during the two  
12 time periods were estimated, and the null models were developed to test the sampling bias.  
13 Ecological niche models (ENMs) were used to evaluate the relative importance of climate  
14 factors in constraining each species distribution. Generalized linear models (GLMs) to test the  
15 relationships between the centroid elevational range shifts of species and different drivers.

16 **Results:** We found that 54% of the species shifting upward and 46% downhill. However,  
17 species' elevational shifts significantly differed among species and mountains. Herbaceous and  
18 lowland species moved upward faster than woody and high-elevation species. Species in  
19 temperate mountains and in mountains with taller elevational gradients moved upward, while  
20 species in subtropical mountains and in mountains with shorter elevational gradients moved  
21 downward. Precipitation changes experienced by species, species' climatic adaptations, several  
22 species' functional traits and mountain size all contributed to explain the magnitude of species'  
23 centroid elevational range shifts.

24 **Main conclusions:** Our results highlight complex biodiversity redistribution of seed plants  
25 across Chinese mountains, not necessarily conforming to the trend of species upward shifts in  
26 elevation. Changes in precipitation regimes may blur the simplistic assumption of isotherm  
27 tracking. This study fills an important geographic shortfall for our understanding of biodiversity  
28 redistribution under anthropogenic climate change.

## 29 **KEYWORDS**

30 biodiversity redistribution, climate change, climatic niche, elevational gradients, macroecology,  
31 precipitation, upslope range shifts, velocity of species range shift

## 1 INTRODUCTION

Anthropogenic climate change is a global threat that has the potential to impact species distributions and ecosystem functioning (Pecl et al., 2017). To better understand the possible impacts of climate change on species distributions, studies have examined the responses of individual species in different mountains and taxonomic groups worldwide (Chen et al., 2009; Crimmins et al., 2011; Freeman et al., 2018; Lenoir et al., 2008; Moritz, 2008; Rumpf et al., 2019; Telwala, 2013; Zu et al., 2021). These original reports collectively provide strong evidence that most species moved upward as climate warmed, while some moved downward or did not move (Lenoir et al., 2010; Maggini et al., 2011). Indeed, based on original studies and meta-analyses strictly or partly focusing on species elevational range shifts, we know that: (1) not all species are moving upward; (2) regional differences in species responses exist; and (3) each biotic response depends on local (and sometimes idiosyncratic) drivers (Chen et al., 2009; Freeman et al., 2021; Lenoir et al., 2020; Parmesan, 2003; Vitasse et al., 2021). Although a few recent studies assessed the elevational changes in species distributions (Wen et al., 2017; Zu et al., 2021) and treelines (Liang et al., 2016; Shi et al., 2020) where data is scarce, there is still lacking evidence about the general nature of species elevational range shifts in eastern Eurasia in response to recent climate change. Hence, filling this geographical gap can help reaching a truly global assessment on biodiversity redistribution in mountain ecosystems worldwide (Feeley et al., 2017; Lenoir & Svenning, 2013; Lenoir & Svenning, 2015).

Mountain regions are biodiversity hotspots and their complex and diverse environments provided refugia under past climatic fluctuations since the Quaternary (López-Pujol et al., 2011; Sandel et al., 2011). Recent studies indicated that warming rate in the European Alps is projected to be 1.6 to 2.5 times faster than the average warming rate observed over the northern hemisphere during the 20th century (Vitasse et al., 2021). For most regions of China, temperatures have been observed to have increased by a rate of 0.05°C/yr between 1961 and 2004 (Wang et al., 2010). More importantly, Nogués-Bravo et al. (2007) predicted that air temperature would increase by 0.30 to 0.45°C per decade until 2100. Temperature has long been considered as the most important driver limiting plants' and animals' distributions along elevational gradients in mountain ecosystems (Grinnell, 1917). However, the general and

1  
2  
3  
4 61 overly simplistic hypothesis that increasing temperature is the main determinant pushing  
5  
6 62 species to shift their elevational range upwards ignores the potential compounding effect of  
7  
8 63 precipitation changes (Crimmins et al., 2011) or other abiotic as well as biotic factors (Lenoir  
9  
10 64 et al., 2010). In line with this result, Grytnes et al. (2014) showed that climate warming alone  
11  
12 65 had low explanatory power to explain the observed elevational range shifts of alpine plants  
13  
14 66 across European mountains. However, the relative effects of global warming and precipitation  
15  
16 67 changes on species range shifts in mountains remain controversial. Moreover, whether the  
17  
18 68 response of different mountain plants to climate change is consistent across mountains and  
19  
20 69 which factors influence species' elevational redistributions under climate change remains  
21  
22 70 largely unknown for most Asian mountains.

23 71 The impact of changes in abiotic (e.g., temperature and precipitation) is not enough to  
24  
25 72 explain the direction and magnitude of species elevational range shifts. Indeed, species intrinsic  
26  
27 73 abilities to cope with these changes matter too. Overall, species with different life forms may  
28  
29 74 respond differently to the same amount of change in environmental conditions (Stewart &  
30  
31 75 Dalen, 2010). For instance, Lenoir et al. (2008) reported that short-lived herbaceous plant  
32  
33 76 species shifted farther upward than long-lived woody plants (trees and shrubs), which can be  
34  
35 77 attributed to the differences in life cycles and the respective capacity to migrate through  
36  
37 78 effective seed dispersal and successful seed germination. Moreover, recent analyses focusing  
38  
39 79 on mountain regions in Europe and worldwide suggests that low-elevation species shifted  
40  
41 80 upward faster than high-elevation species (Mamantov et al., 2021; Rumpf et al., 2018).  
42  
43 81 Consequently, the velocity of elevational range shifts in response to climate change varied  
44  
45 82 among different life forms and across elevations. Inconsistent responses of different species to  
46  
47 83 climate change imply that species interactions are likely to change over multiple trophic levels  
48  
49 84 (Vitasse et al., 2021), thus affecting the structures and functioning of mountain ecosystems at  
50  
51 85 different elevations. Hence, more data are needed on species elevational range shifts to forecast  
52  
53 86 these future disruptions within existing ecological networks, especially for understudied regions  
54  
55 87 such as Asian mountains.

56 88 Herbarium specimens are sustainable and persistent, providing accurate information on  
57  
58 89 species distributions during both past and present collecting times (Holmes et al., 2016; Page  
59  
60

90 & Riccardi, 2015). The collection density of herbarium specimens in China's mountains is  
91 considered intensive and complete according to the database of Chinese vascular plant  
92 distributions (Yang et al., 2014). Therefore, herbarium specimens are a key resource to improve  
93 our understanding of the impacts of climate change on species distributions and redistributions  
94 through space and time (James et al., 2018). In this study, we combined old herbarium  
95 specimens with recent botanical field surveys to investigate changes in the elevational  
96 distributions of 735 seed plant species across 29 mountains in China. We aimed to: (1) assess  
97 the direction and magnitude of species centroid elevational shifts along the elevational gradients  
98 in China's mountains since the 1950s, assuming a general trend in seed plant species in China  
99 to shift upward in elevation (Zu et al., 2021); (2) explore the main determinants of the observed  
100 changes in range centroids across the studied mountains, assuming that temperature changes  
101 won't be the main or only driver (Grytnes et al., 2014); (3) compare the magnitude of centroid  
102 range shifts between herbaceous and woody plants, assuming greater magnitudes of range shifts  
103 for short-lived herbs (Lenoir et al., 2008); and (4) compare the difference in centroid range  
104 shifts between low- and high-elevation species, expecting greater magnitudes of range shifts  
105 for low-elevation species (Mamantov et al., 2021; Rumpf et al., 2018).

## 106 **2 MATERIALS AND METHODS**

### 107 **2.1 The study area**

108 The study area covers 29 mountain sites in China (Figure 1; Table S1), which are mainly  
109 distributed across 18 distinct mountain ranges, including the Qionglai, Bayankela, Hengduan,  
110 Changbai, Yanshan, Wuling, Lvliang, Daba, Wuyi, Dalou, Miaoling, Lushan, Nanling,  
111 Himalayan, Qinling, Tianshan, Taihang, and Aertai Mountain Range. These mountain sites are  
112 distributed across 15 provinces and 3 climatic zones (Plateau, Temperate and Subtropics) within  
113 China.

114 There are 12 mountain sites that are located in the climatic zone of Qinghai-Tibet Plateau in  
115 western China. The highest mountain is Mt. Namjagbarwa, which is located at the eastern edge  
116 of the Himalayan Mountain Range in the southeast of the Qinghai-Tibet Plateau, reaching its  
117 highest elevation at 7782 m. Eight mountain sites are located in the Hengduan Mountain Range,  
118 the core biodiversity hotspot in south central China (Myers, 2000). The tallest mountain in that

1  
2  
3  
4 119 mountainous area is Mt. Gongga with an elevation peaking at 7556 m (Zu et al., 2021). The  
5  
6 120 Hengduan Mountain Range is affected by the Indian and Pacific Ocean monsoon circumfluence,  
7  
8 121 resulting in a distinct wet season during summer and autumn and a dry season during winter  
9  
10 122 and spring. This region is characterized by a sharp elevational gradient from approximately 70  
11  
12 123 to 7556 m, offering an exceptionally long and diverse range of topographical and climatic  
13  
14 124 conditions for studying species elevational range shifts in response to climate change (Wu et  
15  
16 125 al., 2013). The Qionglai Mountain Range is adjacent to the Hengduan Mountain Range, which  
17  
18 126 is located in the Sichuan province. Two mountain sites belong to the Qionglai Mountain Range:  
19  
20 127 the Siguniang (SGN) and Balang (BL) site, with the highest elevation being 6250 m and 5072  
21  
22 128 m, respectively.

23 129 There are 10 mountain sites that are located in the climatic zone of the subtropics in southern  
24  
25 130 China. The lowest mountain ranges are the Lushan and Maoer Mountain Range in southeast  
26  
27 131 China, with the highest elevations being 1474 m and 2142 m, respectively. Mt. Hualong (HL)  
28  
29 132 and Mt. Shennongjia (SNJ) are located in the Daba Mountain Range, which constitute the main  
30  
31 133 body of China's North-South Transitional Zone (Zhang et al., 2021). Mt. Fanjing (FJ), Mt.  
32  
33 134 Fenghuang (FH) and Mt. Leigong (LG) are located in the Guizhou province while Mt. Jinfo  
34  
35 135 (JF) is located at the northeast of the Dalou Mountain Range with the highest elevation being  
36  
37 136 2251 m.

38  
39 137 Our study region also includes seven mountain sites that are located in the temperature  
40  
41 138 climate zone in the northern part of China. Mt. Taibai is the summit of the Qinling Mountain  
42  
43 139 Range and the highest mountain in eastern China – reaching its highest elevation at 3767 m  
44  
45 140 (Zhang & Chen, 2014). Noteworthy, our study region also covers the Changbai Mountain  
46  
47 141 Range which is located in the northeast of China and is situated on the border between China  
48  
49 142 and North Korea (Bai et al., 2008). The forested areas in this mountain range is distributed  
50  
51 143 below 2000 m and the typical zonal vegetation is a mixed forest made of Korea pines and broad-  
52  
53 144 leaved tree species.

## 54 145 **2.2 Data on seed plant species**

55  
56 146 Plant distribution data across the 29 mountain sites in China were obtained from: (1) historical  
57  
58 147 specimens collected during the past 70 years and available through museum and herbarium  
59  
60



1  
2  
3  
4 148 collections as well as (2) original field surveys and resurveys carried out during the past 20  
5  
6 149 years. Herbarium records were extracted from the National Specimen Information  
7  
8 150 Infrastructure (NSII, <http://www.nsii.org.cn>, accessed on November 11, 2019) and the Chinese  
9  
10 151 Virtual Herbarium (CVH, <http://www.cvh.ac.cn>). In total, 10918077 herbarium specimens were  
11  
12 152 extracted for all seed plant species in China, covering about 34000 species. Besides, between  
13  
14 153 2000 and 2019, we carried out original botanical surveys in: the Changbai Mountain Range; the  
15  
16 154 Xiaowutai Mountain Range; the Gongga Mountain Range; the Taibai Mountain Range; and in  
17  
18 155 several other mountain ranges of smaller extents. Botanical surveys were carried out in  
19  
20 156 vegetation plots of 600 m<sup>2</sup> (20 m × 30 m), which were established along elevational transects  
21  
22 157 from low to high elevations with an elevational interval of about 50 m between two subsequent  
23  
24 158 vegetation plots. The vegetation plots selected for each elevation represented the zonal  
25  
26 159 vegetation types in the areas. In each vegetation plot, we also measured the diameter at breast  
27  
28 160 height (DBH) of all tree individuals with a DBH > 3 cm (Fang et al., 2012).

29 161 To ensure data quality, we cleaned the plant species distribution data as following. As a first  
30  
31 162 step, we extracted the botanical specimen data of each county of the corresponding mountain  
32  
33 163 site, counted the number of plant specimens in each site and determined the searched area within  
34  
35 164 each mountain site. Then, we cleaned up the geographical names and verified the accuracy of  
36  
37 165 plant distribution points within each mountain site. We excluded duplicate specimens and  
38  
39 166 specimens lacking information on their exact geographical locations, and only included records  
40  
41 167 with correct information (e.g., elevation record and collection year). Finally, over 5000  
42  
43 168 complete records were selected across the 29 mountain sites. The total number of herbarium  
44  
45 169 specimens we selected for each mountain site are shown in Table 1. As a second step, we  
46  
47 170 standardized the species names of all records based on the Catalogue of Life (COL,  
48  
49 171 <http://www.catalogueoflife.org/>) which was supplemented with the plant list (TPL,  
50  
51 172 <http://www.theplantlist.org/>) as well as the Taxonomic Name Resolution Service (TNRS,  
52  
53 173 <http://tnrs.iplantcollaborative.org/>). As a third step, in order to assess changes in species'  
54  
55 174 elevational distributions between the historical and present times, we divided our dataset of  
56  
57 175 species occurrence records into two distinct periods: 1950 - 1988 vs. 1989 - 2018. The threshold  
58  
59 176 time of 1988 / 1989 was chosen because mean annual temperature in China started to  
60

1  
2  
3  
4 177 significantly increase at this time (Wang et al., 2010). Finally, for statistical reason, we selected  
5 178 only seed plant species with at least 10 unique occurrence records for each of the two studied  
6  
7 179 periods within a given mountain site. The number of the selected seed plant species considered  
8  
9 180 per site is shown in Table 1 and Figure S1. The occurrence records for the selected seed plant  
10  
11 181 species per site during the first period (1950 - 1988) and the second period (1989 - 2018) is  
12  
13 182 displayed in Figure S2. The centroid elevation per species was calculated in each mountain  
14  
15 183 range during the two time periods, using the average summary statistic across all sampled  
16  
17 184 occurrences during a given time period, within a given mountain range and for a given focal  
18  
19 185 species. Because the centroid elevation represents the distribution center of the populations for  
20  
21 186 each species, and therefore it can represent the elevation shifts.

### 23 187 **2.3 Climate data**

24  
25 188 The climate data (daily temperature and precipitation data covering the period 1951 - 2015 and  
26  
27 189 available from the Geographic Data Sharing Infrastructure, College of Urban and  
28  
29 190 Environmental Science, Peking University: <http://geodata.pku.edu.cn>) for all 29 mountain sites  
30  
31 191 were extracted from 54 standard meteorological stations across China (Figure S3). These 54  
32  
33 192 meteorological stations are representative of the macroclimatic conditions experienced within  
34  
35 193 our study areas. For each of the 29 studied mountain sites, we first calculated the mean annual  
36  
37 194 temperature (MAT, °C), the total amount of annual precipitations (AP, mm) and the annual  
38  
39 195 actual evapotranspiration (AET, mm). These three climatic variables were computed for each  
40  
41 196 year during the entire period of 1951 - 2015. Then, we computed the mean of each of the three  
42  
43 197 variables for the periods 1951 - 1988 and 1989 - 2015 separately before estimating the mean  
44  
45 198 changes in MAT, AP and AET between the two periods. The climatic variable AET was  
46  
47 199 calculated following the Thornthwaite and Hare formula (Huntley, 1993), based on the mean  
48  
49 200 monthly temperature and precipitation data. The climatic time series across the 54  
50  
51 201 meteorological stations showed clear trends of climate warming and precipitation decrease but  
52  
53 202 a less clear trend of change in AET between the two studied periods (Figure S4, S5, and S6).  
54  
55 203 In addition to that, we also computed seasonal changes by focusing on the change in  
56  
57 204 temperatures and precipitations during summer (May - July) and winter (November - Next  
58  
59 205 January) separately and for each of the 29 mountain sites (Figure S7).  
60

## 2.4 Complementary drivers of changes in species' centroid elevational position

Besides climatic drivers, being the usual culprits responsible for species range shifts under anthropogenic climate change, we extracted information on additional potential drivers to explain the variation we found in species' centroid elevational range shifts of seed plants. First, we downloaded a spatial layer of the human footprint index (HI) at 1km resolution from the Last of the Wild (v2, LWP-2, 2005; <https://sedac.ciesin.columbia.edu>) and extracted HI values across our 29 mountain sites. Then, we extracted data on atmospheric nitrogen deposition from a national dataset providing atmospheric inorganic nitrogen deposition across China from 1996 to 2015 (spatial raster layers at 1 km × 1 km resolution) (Jia et al., 2019). From this raster layer, we calculated the mean nitrogen deposition across each of the 29 mountain sites.

Previous studies suggest that mountain size, in terms of the length of the tallest elevational gradient within a given mountain range, could significantly influence the distribution of treelines and snowlines in southeastern Eurasia (Yao & Zhang, 2014). In order to assess the impact of the mountain size on the observed species' centroid elevational range shifts, we used the difference between the highest and lowest elevation (i.e., the elevation range) within each of the 29 mountain sites to represent the site-specific mountain size. The highest elevation of each mountain were obtained from Wang et al. 2004, and the lowest elevation of each mountain was obtained from literature collections (Table S2).

We also compiled data on several plant species functional traits, including: lifeform (herbaceous vs woody plants), the main reproductive system (SexSyst), and fruit type. These trait data were obtained from Flora of China (<http://www.iplant.cn/foc>), Flora Reipublicae Popularis Bulgaricae (<http://www.iplant.cn/frps>) and other provincial and local floras in China.

## 2.5 Data analysis

We calculated the centroid elevational position of each species in each of the 29 mountain sites during each time period separately (1950 - 1988 vs. 1989 - 2018) by averaging the elevation records of all sampled occurrences of a given species within a given mountain and during a given time period. The shift in the species' centroid elevation position within each mountain site was computed as the raw difference in the species' centroid position, for the focal mountain site, between the baseline (1950 - 1988) and resurvey period (1989 - 2018): resurvey minus

1  
2  
3  
4 235 baseline position. Pairwise Student  $t$  tests were used to test the significance in the mean  
5  
6 236 difference in species' centroid elevational position between the two studied time periods, for  
7  
8 237 each mountain site separately. We also calculated the proportion of species shifting upward and  
9  
10 238 downward for each mountain site separately. To test whether there is a sampling bias caused  
11  
12 239 by a tendency that current researchers would sample at higher or lower elevations than in the  
13  
14 240 past, we built null models to estimate the null expectation of the elevation change in the centroid  
15  
16 241 position of a given species, for each of the 29 mountains separately, under the actual sampling  
17  
18 242 effort per mountain site. The specific methods and steps to build the null models is the same as  
19  
20 243 the one we used in a previous study focusing on one of the study site: Mt. Gongga (Zu et al.,  
21  
22 244 2021). To test the influence of species lifeform on species' centroid elevational range shifts, we  
23  
24 245 used Student  $t$  tests to compare the mean elevation shifts of herbaceous and woody plants, for  
25  
26 246 each mountain separately.

27 247 In order to estimate whether climate changes influence species elevational shifts, we  
28  
29 248 estimated the climate changes (Change in MAT and Change in AP) experienced by each species.  
30  
31 249 To assess the effects of several climatic drivers constraining each species distribution and thus  
32  
33 250 potentially explaining the observed magnitude of species' centroid elevational range shifts, we  
34  
35 251 first collected data on the global distribution of each of the 735 studied species and then  
36  
37 252 rendered an ecological niche modelling (ENM) approach. To do so, we used the MaxEnt  
38  
39 253 algorithm to estimate the relative importance of six climatic variables in explaining each species  
40  
41 254 distribution. We followed the exact same methodology as described in Zu et al. (2021) for one  
42  
43 255 study site on Mt. Gongga. In short, the global distribution ranges of species were obtained from  
44  
45 256 online databases including: the Global Biodiversity Information Facility (GBIF,  
46  
47 257 <http://www.gbif.org/>); the Chinese Virtual Herbarium (CVH, <http://www.cvh.ac.cn/>); the  
48  
49 258 National Specimen Information Infrastructure (NSII, <http://www.nsii.org.cn/>); RAINBIO  
50  
51 259 (Dauby et al., 2016); and the Botanical Information and Ecology Network (BIEN,  
52  
53 260 <http://bien.nceas.ucsb.edu/bien/biendata/>), etc. The climate data were from WorldClim  
54  
55 261 (<https://www.worldclim.org/data/worldclim21.html>). Then, once the relative importance of  
56  
57 262 each of the above-mentioned climatic variables were estimated from the ENM approach, we  
58  
59 263 used generalized linear models (GLMs) to test the strength of the relationship between the  
60  
264 magnitude of species' centroid elevational range shifts and the relative importance of each of  
265 the six studied climatic drivers. In addition to these six explanatory variables, we also tested the

1  
2  
3  
4 266 influence of HI and atmospheric nitrogen deposition. Finally, we also assessed the relationship  
5 267 between species' centroid elevational range shifts and the historical mean elevation position  
6  
7 268 (cf. baseline position) for each species in the 29 mountain sites. All analyses were conducted in  
8  
9 269 R version 3.5.3 (R Core Team, 2019).

### 11 270 **3 RESULTS**

#### 13 271 **3.1 Changes in species' centroid elevational position in different mountains**

15 272 Between the periods 1950-1988 and 1989-2018, we found that 54% ( $\pm 21\%$ ) of the studied seed  
16  
17 273 plant species shifted the centroids of their elevational ranges upward across the 29 mountain  
18  
19 274 sites. However, the proportion of species with upward centroid elevational shifts significantly  
20  
21 275 varied among mountain sites. Specifically, 17 of the 29 mountain sites had higher proportions  
22  
23 276 of species shifting upward ( $69\% \pm 9\%$ , on average), while 10 mountain sites had lower  
24  
25 277 proportions of species shifting upward ( $29 \pm 10\%$ , on average) (Figure 1). The two remaining  
26  
27 278 mountain sites (Mt. Huanggang and Mt. Tiangeer) had even proportions of species shifting  
28  
29 279 upward and downward (Figure 1; Table 1). After accounting for the difference in sampling  
30  
31 280 efforts between time periods, the proportions of species shifting upward vs. downward across  
32  
33 281 the 29 mountain sites remained similar (Table S3). These results indicate that most plant species  
34  
35 282 in the 29 studied mountain sites have shifted their elevational distributions during the past 70  
36  
37 283 years, and that these elevational range shifts were not the result of a sampling bias.

#### 38 284 **3.2 The driving factors of species' centroid elevational range shifts**

40 285 We found that precipitation changes as experienced by species (i.e., the relative importance of  
41  
42 286 changes in AP between 1951 - 1988 and 1989 - 2015), mean climatic conditions (i.e., the  
43  
44 287 relative importance of MAT, AP and AET during 1951 - 2015), species' intrinsic characteristics  
45  
46 288 (i.e., elevational range size, fruit type, family and genus) and mountain sites' properties  
47  
48 289 (climatic region, longitude and mountain size) all significantly contributed to explain the  
49  
50 290 magnitude of species' centroid elevational range shifts (Table 2). These variables collectively  
51  
52 291 explained 66% ( $R^2 = 0.66$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ) of the total variance in species' centroid elevational range  
53  
54 292 shifts across all mountains.

56 293 Specifically, the mean magnitude of species' centroid elevational range shifts were  
57  
58 294 negatively correlated with mean annual temperature and changes in summer and winter  
59  
60

1  
2  
3  
4 295 precipitation, while positively correlated with mountain size (Figure 1 and Figure S8). In other  
5  
6 296 words, species tend to move further upward in mountains located in colder regions, within tall  
7  
8 297 mountain ranges and in mountains located in drier regions.

9  
10 298 The climatic adaptation of a species was significantly correlated with its shift in centroid  
11  
12 299 elevation. Specifically, the centroid elevation shifts of species were positively correlated with  
13  
14 300 the climatic adaptation to mean temperature of coldest quarter (MTCQ) and precipitation  
15  
16 301 seasonality (PS), but negatively correlated with the climatic adaptation to precipitation of  
17  
18 302 warmest quarter (PWQ) (Figure 2). Moreover, species with differing fruit types showed  
19  
20 303 different elevational shifts (Figure S9a). In different climate regions, species centroid  
21  
22 304 elevational shifts differed. For instance, species in subtropics regions tended to shift downward,  
23  
24 305 while those inhabiting the Qinghai-Tibet Plateau tended to upward shifts on average (Figure  
25  
26 306 S9b). The centroid elevation shifts of species were negatively correlated with longitude, and  
27  
28 307 positively correlated with the relative elevation (Figure 2).

### 29 308 **3.3 Differences in elevational shifts of herbaceous and woody plants**

30  
31 309 The magnitude of species' centroid elevational range shifts differed between herbaceous and  
32  
33 310 woody plants. Herbs tended to move upward in the Qinghai-Tibet Plateau, while woody plants  
34  
35 311 tended to move upward in the Temperate zone (Figure S9c). As mean annual temperature  
36  
37 312 decreases, both herbaceous and woody plants shifted further upward (Figure S8). In cold  
38  
39 313 mountains, upward range shifts of herbs (+90 m, on average) was greater than that of woody  
40  
41 314 plants (+74 m, on average). In warm mountains, downward range shift of herbs (-170 m, on  
42  
43 315 average) was greater than that of woody plants (-50 m, on average) (Figure 3). Both the  
44  
45 316 elevational range shifts of herbs and woody plants were influenced by the change in  
46  
47 317 precipitation seasonality. However, the elevational shifts of herbs were also significantly  
48  
49 318 influenced by mountain size (Figure S8).

### 50 319 **3.4 The relationship between species' centroid elevational range shifts and the historical** 51 52 320 **mean elevation of species distribution**

53  
54 321 We found that species' centroid elevational range shifts were negatively correlated with the  
55  
56 322 historical mean elevation position of species in nine out of the 29 studied mountain sites (Table  
57  
58 323 S4). The mountains with the strongest negative correlation values are mainly Mt. Xiaowutai  
59  
60

1  
2  
3  
4 324 (XWT, 0.55) and Mt. Lushan (LS, 0.49) (Figure 4). In these mountains, the high-elevation  
5 325 species tended to shift downward, while the low-elevation species tended to shift upward,  
6  
7 326 resulting in a mid-elevation concentration. The results in these mountains support the  
8  
9 327 hypotheses of a negative relationship between the magnitude and direction of elevational range  
10  
11 328 shifts and the historical position of species along the studied elevational gradients, suggesting  
12  
13 329 that lowland species move upward while alpine species move downward. In contrast, the  
14  
15 330 remaining 20 mountains sites did not support this hypothesis (Table S4).

#### 17 331 **4 DISCUSSION**

19 332 We assessed the changes in species' range centroid along elevational gradients using historical  
20  
21 333 and recent (1950 - 1988 vs. 1989 - 2018) occurrence records for 735 seed plant species across  
22  
23 334 29 mountains in China and explored the drivers of these changes in species distribution over  
24  
25 335 time. Similarly to previous meta-analyses (Chen et al., 2011; Lenoir et al., 2020; Mamantov et  
26  
27 336 al., 2021), we found that not all studied species are moving upward along the studied elevational  
28  
29 337 gradients of our 29 mountain sites in China. Yet, we found a much larger proportion of species  
30  
31 338 shifting their centroid elevation position downward in comparison with these former meta-  
32  
33 339 analyses reporting not more than 20% of species shifting downward against 46% based on our  
34  
35 340 findings. Moreover, we found that herbaceous plant species shifted their centroid elevation  
36  
37 341 further upward, by +16 m on average, than woody plants did, which is consistent with a former  
38  
39 342 study reporting faster rates of upward range shifts for herbs than for woody plants in French  
40  
41 343 mountain forests (Lenoir et al., 2008). Centroid shifts show negative relationships with the  
42  
43 344 average elevation of species in 23 mountains, suggesting that lowland species have shifted  
44  
45 345 upward farther than high-elevation species. Overall, our results suggest that species in  
46  
47 346 mountains are not necessarily moving upward following and according to the rather simplistic  
48  
49 347 isotherm-tracking expectation. Instead, species may demonstrate more complex elevational  
50  
51 348 redistribution in response to environmental changes. The elevational redistributions we found  
52  
53 349 in our study are not entirely due to climate change (e.g. climate warming), but are additionally  
54  
55 350 influenced by other factors such as, among others described below, changes in precipitation  
56  
57 351 regimes, which supports former findings (Crimmins et al., 2011; Grytnes et al., 2014). Our  
58  
59 352 results indicate that several factors contribute to the elevational changes of species in Chinese  
60

1  
2  
3  
4 353 mountains: (1) climate change and species' climatic adaptations; (2) mountain properties; (3)  
5 354 the functional traits of different species.

#### 7 355 **4.1 Effect of climate change and species' climatic adaptations on elevational shifts**

9 356 Climatic conditions in Chinese mountains have significantly changed over the past 70 years,  
11 357 which has influenced species' elevational distributions. Our results indicate that the amount of  
13 358 climate change as experienced by seed plant species significantly influenced the direction and  
15 359 magnitude of species' centroid elevational range shifts. This finding is consistent with previous  
17 360 studies reporting that changes in temperature and precipitation regimes play an important role  
19 361 in species' elevational redistributions (Chen et al., 2009; Grytnes et al., 2014). Previous studies  
21 362 suggested that the overall trend of upward range shifts of forest plant species in France is mainly  
23 363 driven by climate warming (Lenoir et al., 2008), while the overall trend of downward range  
25 364 shifts of woody plants in California is chiefly influenced by precipitation changes (Crimmins  
27 365 et al., 2011). However, our study suggests that temperature changes as experienced by seed  
29 366 plant species do not necessarily play an important role in explaining the overall trend of  
31 367 elevational range shifts in Chinese mountains. In contrast, changes in annual precipitation  
33 368 between the two studied periods and as experienced by species had a significant negative effect  
35 369 on species elevational range shifts (Figure S8). Our findings regarding the insignificant effect  
37 370 of temperature changes over time on the magnitude of species' centroid elevational range shifts  
39 371 might stem from a spatial mismatch between climate as measured by weather stations and  
41 372 climate as experienced by living organisms. Indeed, air temperatures as measured by  
43 373 standardized weather stations normally differ from the actual surface temperatures that low-  
45 374 stature alpine plants may experience in-situ, inside their habitats (Daniel & Körner, 2011). This  
47 375 suggests that macroclimatic conditions as measured by meteorological stations may to some  
49 376 extent lead to low accuracy in predicting species redistributions. Recent studies analyzed multi-  
51 377 decadal understory microclimate dynamics in European forests and provided evidence that  
53 378 responses of forest community to climate change are most closely related to microclimate rather  
55 379 than macroclimate changes (Zellweger et al., 2019). This indicates that local microclimate may  
57 380 hold the key to understand biotic responses, such as species elevational range shifts, to  
59 381 anthropogenic climate change (Alexander et al., 2018; De Frenne et al., 2013; Devictor et al.,  
60



1  
2  
3  
4 382 2012).

5 383 In this study, lowland species tended to shift upward faster than high-elevation species in  
6  
7 384 23 mountains. This result is consistent with a recent finding that most lowland species across  
8  
9 385 20 montane transects moved upward farther than the high-elevation species (Mamantov et al.,  
10  
11 386 2021). Our results together with previous studies seem to indicate a general trend for species  
12  
13 387 elevational redistribution to be more pronounced at low elevations than at high elevations in  
14  
15 388 response to anthropogenic climate change. In general, the increase in temperature conditions  
16  
17 389 over time is stronger in highland regions than in the lowlands (Pepin et al. 2015), and the  
18  
19 390 stronger warming and precipitation decrease have negative effects on plant nutrient use and  
20  
21 391 resorption efficiencies for the lowland species (Zu et al., 2021). This might be one of the reasons  
22  
23 392 for the stronger upward shifts of lowland species. Moreover, lowland plant species normally  
24  
25 393 have narrower thermal tolerances (including temperature and precipitation) so that they need to  
26  
27 394 migrate farther upward to track their thermal niche (Smith, 2018).

28  
29 395 Interestingly, we found that the adaptation of species to climate has significant effects on  
30  
31 396 the elevational changes of species. Specifically, the adaptation of species to winter temperature  
32  
33 397 and precipitation seasonality was positively correlated with species elevational changes, and  
34  
35 398 hence significantly contributed to the upward shifts of species. For instance, the global  
36  
37 399 distribution ranges of two lowland species, *Sorbus discolor* and *Cerastium arvense*, were  
38  
39 400 strongly influenced by both winter temperature and precipitation seasonality, and their  
40  
41 401 elevation distribution ranges shifted 72.5 m and 128.9 m upslope, respectively. In contrast, we  
42  
43 402 found that the adaptation of species to higher summer precipitation was negatively related to  
44  
45 403 the elevation shifts, suggesting that species having strong adaptability to the summer  
46  
47 404 precipitation tends to shifts downhill along the elevation gradients. For instance, the global  
48  
49 405 distribution range of *Paederia foetida* and *Pericampylus glaucus* in subtropical mountains were  
50  
51 406 dominated by summer precipitation, and their elevation range shifted downhill by 177.4 m and  
52  
53 407 94.9 m, respectively. Plant species in these mountains appear to track climatic water balance  
54  
55 408 by shifting their elevational distributions downhill. This is consistent with the previous finding  
56  
57 409 that change in precipitation leads to downward shifts of plant species in California (Crimmins  
58  
59 410 et al., 2011).  
60

1  
2  
3  
4 411 Our results indicated that some plant species showed no or little elevational shifts.  
5  
6 412 Previous studies suggest that the local persistence of plant populations may be the result of  
7  
8 413 microenvironment on species persistence. Micro-environmental conditions including  
9  
10 414 topography, soil, hydrological characteristics, and microclimate could create a multitude of  
11  
12 415 microhabitats offering refugial persistence to some plant species (Rabasa et al., 2013; Daniel &  
13  
14 416 Körner, 2011). The non-existent or slow migration of some plant species might be also the  
15  
16 417 reason that these species having limited ability to expand into newly climatically suitable  
17  
18 418 habitat due to dispersal and/or recruitment limitation (Feeley, 2012). If this condition continues  
19  
20 419 into the future, these species with little or on elevational shifts will face risks of extinctions due  
21  
22 420 to reduced habit areas and population sizes under future climate changes.

#### 23 421 **4.2 Effect of mountain properties on elevational shifts of species**

24  
25 422 Our results indicate that in addition to the effects of climate change and species' climate  
26  
27 423 adaptation on species elevational redistributions, the size of the mountains (i.e. measured as the  
28  
29 424 difference between the highest and lowest elevations of a mountain) plays an important role in  
30  
31 425 determining species' elevational distribution shifts. The mean magnitude of upward shifts and  
32  
33 426 the proportions of species with upward shifts were both higher in larger mountains (Figure 2).  
34  
35 427 For instance, the mountains in the Qinghai-Tibet Plateau have higher elevational range (i.e.  
36  
37 428 larger mountains) compared with the mountains in other regions, and the upward movement of  
38  
39 429 the species are larger. Studies indicated that the plant species' optimum elevation movement  
40  
41 430 along the elevational gradient since 1970s was significantly influenced by the mountain  
42  
43 431 topography and summit heights in European Alps (Holmes et al., 2016). Based on studies of  
44  
45 432 516 forest lines in the Northern Hemisphere, a recent meta-analysis indicates that mountains  
46  
47 433 size explains 48.9% of variations in the distribution of forest lines, which also supports our  
48  
49 434 finding that mountains size influences the redistribution of woody plants in response to climate  
50  
51 435 changes (Yao & Zhang, 2014; Zhao et al., 2014). Our results together with previous findings  
52  
53 436 suggest that higher mountains may provide more suitable habitats for species to move upward.

54 437 Moreover, our results showed that species in temperate mountains tended to shift upward,  
55  
56 438 while species in warm and wet mountains (i.e. those in subtropical regions) tended to shift  
57  
58 439 downward. In line with our results, a recent study also demonstrated downward shifts of  
59  
60

1  
2  
3  
4 440 centroid elevations of plant species living in subtropical mountains (O'Sullivan & Jump, 2020).  
5  
6 441 In subtropical regions, the low seasonal temperature variation reduces overlap in thermal  
7  
8 442 regimes between lowlands and high altitudes, and species tend to have narrow adaptations to  
9  
10 443 temperatures (Shrestha et al., 2018). Lowland species may be restricted to lower elevations  
11  
12 444 because of their limited tolerance to cold stress (Heatwole et al., 1969), while high-elevation  
13  
14 445 species are generally not limited by warm temperature and are therefore able to move to lowland  
15  
16 446 regions (Ghalambor et al., 2006). This explained the results that the high-elevation species in  
17  
18 447 subtropical mountains (e.g. EM, SNJ, BL, HG, JF, LS) tended to shifts downward. Besides, the  
19  
20 448 interaction among species (e.g. species competition), topography and anthropogenic influences  
21  
22 449 may also contribute to the downward elevation shifts of plant species in subtropical mountains  
23  
24 450 (Bhatta, 2018). Recent studies indicate that in subtropical mountains, high-elevation species  
25  
26 451 cannot survive the lowlands because they are often outcompeted by the more competitive  
27  
28 452 lowland species, not due to physiological limitations (Mamantov et al., 2021; Zu et al., 2021).  
29  
30 453 If climate warming reduces the competitive fitness of lowland species, then higher elevation  
31  
32 454 species tend to shift downslope more easily (Rabasa et al., 2013). How species' elevational  
33  
34 455 redistributions may influence species interactions in subtropical regions requires urgent  
35  
36 456 attention.

### 37 457 **4.3 Effect of functional traits on elevational shifts of species**

38  
39 458 Our finding demonstrates that the elevational shifts of species in response to climate change  
40  
41 459 may vary among species with different functional traits (including life forms and fruit types).  
42  
43 460 First, several previous studies have demonstrated that the distributions of species with different  
44  
45 461 lifeforms may respond to climate change differently. For example, studies on plants' elevational  
46  
47 462 distributions in the French Alps in Europe (Lenoir et al., 2008) and the Mt. Gongga in China  
48  
49 463 (Zu et al., 2021) and on the forest communities in Switzerland (Küchler, 2014) all showed that  
50  
51 464 herbaceous species had faster upslope shifts than trees and shrubs. In contrast, a recent review  
52  
53 465 on species elevational shifts in the European Alps showed that the optimum elevations of long-  
54  
55 466 lived woody plants were shifting upward at the same rate with non-alpine herbaceous plants  
56  
57 467 (Vitasse et al., 2021). These findings suggest that the conclusions on the responses of woody  
58  
59 468 and herbaceous plants remain controversial. In this study, our result showed that the direction  
60

1  
2  
3  
4 469 and magnitude of elevational shifts in China' mountains differed between life forms. We found  
5  
6 470 that herbaceous plants shifted their elevational centroids significantly faster than woody plants  
7  
8 471 in 15 mountains. The reason for these differences between the elevational shifts of woody and  
9  
10 472 herbaceous plant species in response to climate change may be partly due to the fact that  
11  
12 473 different lifeforms have different climate adaptation and physiological properties (Grytnes et  
13  
14 474 al., 2014). Generally, the woody plants are long-lived species and have deeper roots, and they  
15  
16 475 seem to be less sensitive to the soil water (Wang et al., 2020). On the contrary, herbaceous  
17  
18 476 species have shorter life cycles and shallower roots than woody species, and they tend to be  
19  
20 477 more sensitive to precipitation changes (Lande, 1993).

21 478 The rate and distance of elevational shifts of species may also be influenced by other  
22  
23 479 functional traits in addition to lifeform (Alexander et al., 2018; Matteodo et al., 2016). In this  
24  
25 480 study, we found that species with different fruit types shifted their centroid elevations in  
26  
27 481 different trends and with different magnitudes. For instance, the species with samara fruits (e.g.,  
28  
29 482 *Acer oliverianum* and *Betula albosinensis*) shifted their centroid elevations upward, while the  
30  
31 483 species with caryopsis fruits (e.g., *Eulalia speciose* and *Bromus remotiflorus*) shifted their  
32  
33 484 centroid elevations downhill. This is because samara fruits are easily dispersed by wind, while  
34  
35 485 caryopsis fruits tend to drop to the ground directly or beneath the parent plants. Moreover,  
36  
37 486 species elevational shifts also significantly different between different genera and families. This  
38  
39 487 is likely because different genera and families normally have different functional traits, climatic  
40  
41 488 adaptation and evolutionary history (Li et al., 2017; Losos, 2011). These results suggest that  
42  
43 489 species distributions of different taxonomic groups may respond differently to environmental  
44  
45 490 changes, and hence may have different risks of local extinction under future environmental  
46  
47 491 change scenarios. In this study, there are only 20 gymnosperm species for which we had  
48  
49 492 sufficient data while we had good time series for 715 angiosperm species in total. Indeed,  
50  
51 493 gymnosperm and angiosperm species have very different traits and climate adaptation, hence  
52  
53 494 we also assumed that the magnitude of elevation range shifts will be different between both  
54  
55 495 taxonomic groups. Yet, we found no significant difference in the magnitude of mean elevational  
56  
57 496 range shifts between gymnosperm and angiosperm species ( $t = 1.1132$ ,  $df = 19.754$ ,  $p\text{-value} =$   
58  
59 497  $0.279$ ), most likely due to the extremely low sample size for gymnosperms relative to  
60

1  
2  
3  
4 498 angiosperms.

5 499 Finally, we suggest to consider both regional and species characteristics in future  
6  
7 500 researches related to elevational range shifts. We recommend to focus on the taxon that is more  
8  
9 501 sensitive to climate change and in fragile biodiversity regions. For species that tend to shift  
10  
11 502 upward, those living at high-elevational regions will face more climatic and competitive  
12  
13 503 pressures than lowland species, and thus should be given much more attentions under future  
14  
15 504 climate warming. On the contrary, for species that tend to shift downhill, the lowland species  
16  
17 505 and their natural habitats are more vulnerable to climate change and intensive human pressure  
18  
19 506 (e.g. tourism and recreation). Compared with traditional suggestions to protect or restore species  
20  
21 507 habitats, we recommend to protect dispersal corridors of species to improve their dispersal  
22  
23 508 processes along the elevational or latitudinal gradients. Our study provides essential scientific  
24  
25 509 references for managing protected areas in China's mountain regions.

#### 26 27 510 **COMPETING INTEREST STATEMENT**

28  
29 511 The authors declare no competing interests.

#### 30 31 512 **DATA AVAILABILITY STATEMENT**

32  
33 513 The data used in the analyses of the paper are uploaded to the Dryad website  
34  
35 514 (<https://doi.org/10.5061/dryad.r7sqv9sj0>). The data of study regions and the total number of  
36  
37 515 herbarium specimens are provided in the Supporting Information (Table S1); The climate data  
38  
39 516 that support this study are available from the Geographic Data Sharing Infrastructure, College  
40  
41 517 of Urban and Environmental Science, Peking University (<http://geodata.pku.edu.cn>), and  
42  
43 518 WorldClim (<https://www.worldclim.org/data/worldclim21.html>). The distribution data of plant  
44  
45 519 species were from the National Specimen Information Infrastructure (NSII,  
46  
47 520 <http://www.nsii.org.cn>), the Chinese Virtual Herbarium (CVH, <http://www.cvh.ac.cn>), Global  
48  
49 521 Biodiversity Information Facility (GBIF, <http://www.gbif.org/>), and the Botanical Information  
50  
51 522 and Ecology Network (BIEN, <http://bien.nceas.ucsb.edu/bien/biendata/>). The human footprint  
52  
53 523 data is from the Last of the Wild (<https://sedac.ciesin.columbia.edu>).

54  
55 524

#### 56 57 525 **REFERENCES**

58  
59 526 Alexander, J. M., Chalmandrier, L., Lenoir, J., Burgess, T. I., Essl, F., Haider, S., . . . & Pellissier, L. (2018). Lags

- 527 in the response of mountain plant communities to climate change. *Glob Chang Biol*, 24(2), 563-579.
- 528 Bai, F., Sang, W., Li, G., Liu, R., Chen, L., & Wang, K. (2008). Long-term protection effects of National Reserve  
529 to forest vegetation in 4 decades: biodiversity change analysis of major forest types in Changbai Mountain  
530 Nature Reserve, China. *Sci China C Life Sci*, 51(10), 948-958.
- 531 Bhatta, K. P., Grytnes, J. A., & Vetaas O. R. (2018). Downhill shift of alpine plant assemblages under  
532 contemporary climate and land-use changes. *Ecosphere*, 9, e02084.
- 533 Chen, I. C., Shiu, H., Benedick, S., Holloway, J. D., Chey, V.K., Barlow, H.S., Hill, J.K., & Thomas, C. D. (2009).  
534 Elevation increases in moth assemblages over 42 years on a tropical mountain. *PANS*, 106, 1479-1483.
- 535 Crimmins, S. M., Solomon, Z. D., Jonathan, A. G., John, T. A., & Alison, R. M. (2011). Changes in Climatic  
536 Water Balance Drive Downhill Shifts in Plant Species' Optimum Elevations. *Science*, 331, 324-327.
- 537 Dauby, G., Zaiss, R., Blach-Overgaard, A., Catarino, L., Damen, T., Deblauwe, V., . . . & Couvreur, T. L. (2016).  
538 RAINBIO: a mega-database of tropical African vascular plants distributions. *PhytoKeys*(74), 1-18.
- 539 De Frenne, P., Rodriguez-Sanchez, F., Coomes, D. A., Baeten, L., Verstraeten, G., Vellend, M., . . . & Verheyen,  
540 K. (2013). Microclimate moderates plant responses to macroclimate warming. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A*,  
541 110(46), 18561-18565.
- 542 Devictor, V., van Swaay, C., Brereton, T., Brotons, L., Chamberlain, D., Heliölä, J., . . . & Jiguet, F. (2012).  
543 Differences in the climatic debts of birds and butterflies at a continental scale. *Nature Climate Change*,  
544 2(2), 121-124.
- 545 Fang, J., Shen, Z., Tang, Z., Wang, X., Wang, Z., Feng, J., . . . & Zheng, C. (2012). Forest community survey and  
546 the structural characteristics of forests in China. *Ecography*, 35(12), 1059-1071.
- 547 Feeley, K. J. (2012). Distributional migrations, expansions, and contractions of tropical plant species as revealed  
548 in dated herbarium records. *Global Change Biology*, 18(4), 1335-1341.
- 549 Feeley, K. J., Stroud, J. T., Perez, T. M., & Kühn, I. (2017). Most 'global' reviews of species' responses to climate  
550 change are not truly global. *Diversity and Distributions*, 23(3), 231-234.
- 551 Freeman, B. G., Lee-Yaw, J. A., Sunday, J. M., & Hargreaves, A. L. (2018). Expanding, shifting and shrinking:  
552 The impact of global warming on species' elevational distributions. *Global Ecology and Biogeography*,  
553 27(11), 1268-1276.
- 554 Freeman, B. G., Song, Y., Feeley, K. J., & Zhu, K. (2021). Montane species track rising temperatures better in the  
555 tropics than in the temperate zone. *Ecol Lett*, 24(8), 1697-1708.
- 556 Ghalambor, C. K., Huey, R. B., Martin, P. R., Tewksbury, J. J., & Wang, G. (2006). Are mountain passes higher  
557 in the tropics? Janzen's hypothesis revisited. *Integr Comp Biol*, 46(1), 5-17.
- 558 Grinnell, J. (1917). Field tests of theories concerning distributional control. . *The American Naturalist*, 51, 115.
- 559 Grytnes, J. A., Kapfer, J., Jurasinski, G., Birks, H. H., Henriksen, H., Klanderud, K., . . . & Birks, H. J. B. (2014).  
560 Identifying the driving factors behind observed elevational range shifts on European mountains. *Global  
561 Ecology and Biogeography*, 23(8), 876-884.
- 562 Heatwole, H., Edwin Villalon, T. H. L., Muiiz, A., & Matta, A. (1969). Some Aspects of the Thermal Ecology of  
563 Puerto Rican Anoline Lizar. *Journal Of Herpetology*, 3, 65-77.
- 564 Holmes, M. W., Hammond, T. T., Wogan, G. O., Walsh, R. E., LaBarbera, K., Wommack, E. A., . . . & Nachman,  
565 M. W. (2016). Natural history collections as windows on evolutionary processes. *Mol Ecol*, 25(4), 864-  
566 881.
- 567 Huntley, B. (1993). Species-richness in north-temperate zone forests. *Journal of Biogeography*, 20, 163-180.
- 568 James, S. A., Soltis, P. S., Belbin, L., Chapman, A. D., Nelson, G., Paul, D. L., & Collins, M. (2018). Herbarium  
569 data: Global biodiversity and societal botanical needs for novel research. *Appl Plant Sci*, 6(2), e1024.
- 570 Jia, Y., Wang, Q., Zhu, J., Chen, Z., He, N., & Yu, G. (2019). A spatial and temporal dataset of atmospheric

- 1  
2  
3 571 inorganic nitrogen wet deposition in China (1996-2015). *China Scientific Data*, 4, 8-17.
- 4 572 KÜchler, M., KÜchler, H., Bedolla, A., & Wohlgemuth, T. (2014). Response of Swiss forests to management and  
5 573 climate change in the last 60 years. *Annals of Forest Science*, 72(3), 311-320.
- 6 574 Lande, R. (1993). Risks of Population Extinction from Demographic and Environmental Stochasticity and Random  
7 575 Catastrophes. *The American Naturalist*, 142, 911-927.
- 8 576 Lenoir, J., Bertrand, R., Comte, L., Bourgeaud, L., Hattab, T., Murienne, J., & Grenouillet, G. (2020). Species  
9 577 better track climate warming in the oceans than on land. *Nat Ecol Evol*, 4(8), 1044-1059.
- 10 578 Lenoir, J., Gégout, J. C., Guisan, A., Vittoz, P., Wohlgemuth, T., Zimmermann, N. E., . . . Svenning, J.-C. (2010).  
11 579 Going against the flow: potential mechanisms for unexpected downslope range shifts in a warming  
12 580 climate. *Ecography*.
- 13 581 Lenoir, J., & Svenning, J. C. (2013). Latitudinal and Elevational Range Shifts under Contemporary Climate  
14 582 Change. In *Encyclopedia of Biodiversity* (pp. 599-611).
- 15 583 Lenoir, J., & Svenning, J. C. (2015). Climate-related range shifts - a global multidimensional synthesis and new  
16 584 research directions. *Ecography*, 38(1), 15-28.
- 17 585 Lenoir, J., Gégout, J.C., Marquet, P.A., de Ruffray, P., & Brisse, H. (2008). A Significant Upward Shift in Plant  
18 586 Species Optimum Elevation During the 20th Century. *Science*, 320, 1778-1781.
- 19 587 Li, D., Ives, A. R., & Waller, D. M. (2017). Can functional traits account for phylogenetic signal in community  
20 588 composition? *New Phytol*, 214(2), 607-618.
- 21 589 Liang, E., Wang, Y., Piao, S., Lu, X., Camarero, J. J., Zhu, H., . . . & Penuelas, J. (2016). Species interactions slow  
22 590 warming-induced upward shifts of treelines on the Tibetan Plateau. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A*, 113(16),  
23 591 4380-4385.
- 24 592 López-Pujol, J., Zhang, F. M., Sun, H. Q., Ying, T. S., & Ge, S. (2011). Mountains of Southern China as “Plant  
25 593 Museums” and “Plant Cradles”: Evolutionary and Conservation Insights. *Mountain Research and  
26 594 Development*, 31(3), 261-269.
- 27 595 Losos, J. B. (2011). Seeing the forest for the trees: the limitations of phylogenies in comparative biology.  
28 596 (American Society of Naturalists Address). *Am Nat*, 177(6), 709-727.
- 29 597 Maggini, R., Lehmann, A., Kéry, M., Schmid, H., Beniston, M., Jenni, L., & Zbinden, N. (2011). Are Swiss birds  
30 598 tracking climate change? *Ecological Modelling*, 222(1), 21-32.
- 31 599 Mamantov, M. A., Gibson-Reinemer, D. K., Linck, E. B., Sheldon, K. S., & Lenoir, J. (2021). Climate-driven  
32 600 range shifts of montane species vary with elevation. *Global Ecology and Biogeography*, 30(4), 784-794.
- 33 601 Matteodo, M., Ammann, K., Verrecchia, E. P., & Vittoz, P. (2016). Snowbeds are more affected than other  
34 602 subalpine-alpine plant communities by climate change in the Swiss Alps. *Ecol Evol*, 6(19), 6969-6982.
- 35 603 Moritz, C., Pattern, J.L., Conroy, C. J., Parra, J. L., White, G.C., Beissinger, S.R. . (2008). Impact of a Century of  
36 604 Climate Change on Small-Mammal Communities in Yosemite National Park, USA. *Science*, 322, 261-  
37 605 264.
- 38 606 Nogués-Bravo, D., Araújo, M. B., Errea, M. P., & Martínez-Rica, J. P. (2007). Exposure of global mountain  
39 607 systems to climate warming during the 21st Century. *Global Environmental Change*, 17(3-4), 420-428.
- 40 608 Myers, N., Mittermeier, R. A., Mittermeier, C. G., Fonseca, G., & Kent, J. (2000). Biodiversity hotspots for  
41 609 conservation priorities. *Nature*, 403, 853-858.
- 42 610 O'Sullivan, K. S. W., Ruiz-Benito, P., Chen, J. C., & Jump, A. S. (2020). Onward but not always upward:  
43 611 individualistic elevational shifts of tree species in subtropical montane forests. *Ecography*, 44(1), 112-  
44 612 123.
- 45 613 Page, L. M., MacFadden, B. J., Fortes, J. A., Soltis, P. S., & Riccardi, G. (2015). Digitization of Biodiversity  
46 614 Collections Reveals Biggest Data on Biodiversity. *BioScience*, 65(9), 841-842.

- 1  
2  
3 615 Parmesan, C. Y. G. (2003). Aglobally coherent fingerprint of climate change impacts across natural systems.  
4 616 *Nature*, 42, 37-42.
- 5  
6 617 Pecl, G. T., Araujo, M. B., Bell, J. D., Blanchard, J., Bonebrake, T. C., Chen, I. C., . . . & Williams, S. E. (2017).  
7 618 Biodiversity redistribution under climate change: Impacts on ecosystems and human well-being. *Science*,  
8 619 355(6332). doi:10.1126/science.aai9214
- 9  
10 620 Rabasa, S. G., Granda, E., Benavides, R., Kunstler, G., Espelta, J. M., Ogaya, R., . . . & Valladares, F. (2013).  
11 621 Disparity in elevational shifts of European trees in response to recent climate warming. *Glob Chang Biol*,  
12 622 19(8), 2490-2499.
- 13  
14 623 Rumpf, S. B., Hulber, K., Klöner, G., Moser, D., Schutz, M., Wessely, J., . . . & Dullinger, S. (2018). Range  
15 624 dynamics of mountain plants decrease with elevation. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A*, 115(8), 1848-1853.
- 16 625 Rumpf, S. B., Hulber, K., Wessely, J., Willner, W., Moser, D., Gattringer, A., . . . & Dullinger, S. (2019).  
17 626 Extinction debts and colonization credits of non-forest plants in the European Alps. *Nat Commun*, 10(1),  
18 627 4293.
- 19  
20 628 Sandel, B., Arge, L., Dalsgaard, B., Davies, R. G., Gaston, K. J., Sutherland, W. J., & Svenning, J. C. (2011). The  
21 629 influence of Late Quaternary climate-change velocity on species endemism. *Science*, 334(6056), 660-664.
- 22  
23 630 Scherrer, D., & Körner, C. (2011). Topographically controlled thermal-habitat differentiation buffers alpine plant  
24 631 diversity against climate warming. *Journal of Biogeography*, 38(2), 406-416.
- 25 632 Scherrer, D., Schmid, S., & Korner, C. (2011). Elevational species shifts in a warmer climate are overestimated  
26 633 when based on weather station data. *Int J Biometeorol*, 55(4), 645-654.
- 27  
28 634 Shi, H., Zhou, Q., Xie, F., He, N., He, R., Zhang, K., . . . & Dang, H. (2020). Disparity in elevational shifts of  
29 635 upper species limits in response to recent climate warming in the Qinling Mountains, North-central China.  
30 636 *Sci Total Environ*, 706, 135718.
- 31  
32 637 Shi, Z., Wang, F., Zhang, K., & Chen, Y. (2014). Diversity and distribution of arbuscular mycorrhizal fungi along  
33 638 altitudinal gradients in Mount Taibai of the Qinling Mountains. *Can J Microbiol*, 60(12), 811-818.
- 34 639 Shrestha, N., Su, X., Xu, X., & Wang, Z. (2018). The drivers of high Rhododendron diversity in south-west China:  
35 640 Does seasonality matter? *Journal of Biogeography*, 45(2), 438-447.
- 36  
37 641 Smith, M. A. (2018). Janzen's mountain passes hypothesis is comprehensively tested in its fifth decade. *Proc Natl*  
38 642 *Acad Sci U S A*, 115(49), 12337-12339.
- 39  
40 643 Stewart, J. R., Lister, A. M., Barnes, I., & Dalen, L. (2010). Refugia revisited: individualistic responses of species  
41 644 in space and time. *Proc Biol Sci*, 277(1682), 661-671.
- 42 645 R Core Team, 2019. R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing. R Foundation for Statistical  
43 646 Computing, Vienna, Austria.
- 44  
45 647 Telwala, Y., Brook, B. W., Manish, K., & Pandit, M. K. (2013). Climate-induced elevational range shifts and  
46 648 increase in plant species richness in a Himalayan biodiversity epicentre. *PLoS One*, 8(2), e57103.
- 47 649 Vitasse, Y., Ursenbacher, S., Klein, G., Bohnenstengel, T., Chittaro, Y., Delestrade, A., . . . & Lenoir, J. (2021).  
48 650 Phenological and elevational shifts of plants, animals and fungi under climate change in the European  
49 651 Alps. *Biol Rev Camb Philos Soc*, 96(5), 1816-1835.
- 50  
51 652 Wang, S., Wang, Z., Piao, S., & Fang, J. (2010). Regional differences in the timing of recent air warming during  
52 653 the past four decades in China. *Chinese Science Bulletin*, 55(19), 1968-1973. doi:10.1007/s11434-010-  
53 654 3236-y
- 54  
55 655 Wang, X. P., Wang Z. H., & Fang J. Y. (2004). Mountain ranges and peaks in China. *Biodiversity Science*, 12,  
56 656 206 -212.
- 57  
58 657 Wang, Y., Lyu, T., Luo, A., Li, Y., Liu, Y., Freckleton, R. P., . . . & Wang, Z. (2020). Spatial Patterns and Drivers  
59 658 of Angiosperm Sexual Systems in China Differ Between Woody and Herbaceous Species. *Front Plant*  
60



- 1  
2  
3 659 *Sci*, 11, 1222.
- 4 660 Wen, Z., Wu, Y., Ge, D., Cheng, J., Chang, Y., Yang, Z., . . . & Yang, Q. (2017). Heterogeneous distributional  
5 661 responses to climate warming: evidence from rodents along a subtropical elevational gradient. *BMC Ecol*,  
6 662 17(1), 17.
- 7  
8 663 Wu, Y., Yang, Q., Wen, Z., Xia, L., Zhang, Q., & Zhou, H. (2013). What drives the species richness patterns of  
9 664 non-volant small mammals along a subtropical elevational gradient? *Ecography*, 36(2), 185-196.
- 10 665 Yang, W., Ma, K., & Kreft, H. (2014). Environmental and socio-economic factors shaping the geography of  
11 666 floristic collections in China. *Global Ecology and Biogeography*, 23(11), 1284-1292.
- 12 667 Yao, Y., & Zhang, B. (2014). The mass elevation effect of the Tibetan Plateau and its implications for Alpine  
13 668 treelines. *International Journal of Climatology*, 35(8), 1833-1846.
- 14 669 Zellweger, F., De Frenne, P., Lenoir, J., Rocchini, D., & Coomes, D. (2019). Advances in Microclimate Ecology  
15 670 Arising from Remote Sensing. *Trends Ecol Evol*, 34(4), 327-341.
- 16 671 Zhang, X., Zhang, B., Wang, J., Yu, F., Zhao, C., & Yao, Y. (2021). North-south vegetation transition in the  
17 672 eastern Qinling-Daba Mountains. *Journal of Geographical Sciences*, 31(3), 350-368.
- 18 673 Zhao, F., Zhang, B., Pang, Y., & Yao, Y. (2014). A study of the contribution of mass elevation effect to the  
19 674 altitudinal distribution of timberline in the Northern Hemisphere. *Journal of Geographical Sciences*,  
20 675 24(2), 226-236.
- 21 676 Zu, K., Wang, Z., Zhu, X., Lenoir, J., Shrestha, N., Lyu, T., . . . & Zhou, J. (2021). Upward shift and elevational  
22 677 range contractions of subtropical mountain plants in response to climate change. *Sci Total Environ*, 783,  
23 678 146896.
- 24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## TABLES AND FIGURES

TABLE 1. Summary information on the 29 studied mountain sites and the average range shifts of the centroid elevational position across all species occurring in a given mountain site.

| Mountain range    | Mount             | Abbr. | Lat (°N) | Long (°E) | Total_num | N   | Up-ratio | Shift(m) |
|-------------------|-------------------|-------|----------|-----------|-----------|-----|----------|----------|
| Qionglai(邛崃山)     | Balang(巴郎山)       | BL    | 31.167   | 102.917   | 13502     | 114 | 0.42     | -33.12   |
| Bayankela(巴颜喀拉山脉) | Bayankela(巴颜喀拉山)  | BYKL  | 34.204   | 97.659    | 11936     | 18  | 0.61     | 50.21    |
| Hengduan(横断山脉)    | Baimang(白茫雪山)     | BMX   | 28.183   | 99.117    | 13705     | 21  | 0.67     | 53.94    |
| Changbai(长白山脉)    | Baitou(白头山)       | BT    | 41.983   | 128.083   | 13498     | 29  | 0.59     | 17.56    |
| Yanshan(燕山山脉)     | Dongling(东灵山)     | DL    | 39.733   | 115.5     | 14267     | 13  | 0.38     | -86.32   |
| Qionglai(邛崃山脉)    | Emei(峨眉山)         | EM    | 29.6     | 103.5     | 5451      | 25  | 0.8      | 440.46   |
| Wuling(武陵山脉)      | Fanjing(梵净山)      | FJ    | 27.917   | 108.767   | 7146      | 22  | 0.41     | -415.29  |
| Wuling(武陵山脉)      | Fenghuang(凤凰山)    | FH    | 28.11    | 108.68    | 8188      | 5   | 0.6      | -37.16   |
| Hengduan(横断山脉)    | Gaoligong(高黎贡山)   | GLG   | 25.267   | 98.783    | 11047     | 35  | 0.2      | -173.28  |
| Hengduan(横断山脉)    | Gongga(贡嘎山)       | GG    | 29.6     | 101.883   | 27669     | 83  | 0.64     | 135.74   |
| Lvliang(吕梁山脉)     | Guandi(关帝山孝文山)    | GD    | 37.8     | 110.8     | 7123      | 13  | 0.69     | 15.73    |
| Hengduan(横断山脉)    | Haba(哈巴雪山)        | HB    | 27.45    | 100.117   | 5503      | 7   | 0.57     | 92.84    |
| Daba(大巴山脉)        | Hualong(化龙山)      | HL    | 32.054   | 109.419   | 5387      | 5   | 0.8      | 116.47   |
| Wuyi(武夷山脉)        | Huanggang(黄岗山)    | HG    | 27.8     | 117.6     | 11821     | 54  | 0.48     | 15.46    |
| Dalou(大娄山脉)       | Jinfo(金佛山)        | JF    | 29.25    | 108.333   | 40841     | 231 | 0.4      | -57.85   |
| Hengduan(横断山脉)    | Kagebo(卡格薄峰)      | KGB   | 28.449   | 98.575    | 5372      | 38  | 0.66     | 97.76    |
| Hengduan(横断山脉)    | Laojun(老君山)       | LJ    | 26.703   | 99.75     | 6254      | 16  | 0.19     | -179.05  |
| Miaoling(苗岭)      | Leigong(雷公山)      | LG    | 26.417   | 108.25    | 6276      | 5   | 0.8      | -26.2    |
| Lushan(庐山)        | Lushan(庐山)        | LS    | 29.55    | 115.967   | 19261     | 31  | 0.16     | -218.86  |
| Nanling(南岭)       | Maoer(猫儿山)        | ME    | 25.918   | 110.42    | 7105      | 22  | 0.36     | -144.65  |
| Himalayas(喜马拉雅山脉) | Nanjiabawa(南迦巴瓦峰) | NJBW  | 29.633   | 95.067    | 5037      | 6   | 0.67     | -14.38   |
| Hengduan(横断山脉)    | Queer(雀儿山)        | QE    | 31.77    | 99.05     | 6251      | 13  | 0.69     | 346.99   |
| Daba(大巴山脉)        | Shennongjia(神农架)  | SNJ   | 31.667   | 110.583   | 59131     | 61  | 0.59     | 134.8    |
| Qionglai(邛崃山脉)    | Siguniang(四姑娘山)   | SGN   | 31       | 103.217   | 6412      | 10  | 0.9      | 155.53   |
| Qinling(秦岭)       | Taibai(太白山)       | TB    | 33.95    | 107.75    | 8295      | 46  | 0.72     | 196.38   |
| Tianshan(天山山脉)    | Tiangeer(天格尔峰)    | TGE   | 43.168   | 86.623    | 8717      | 18  | 0.5      | 18.87    |
| Hengduan(横断山脉)    | Wuliang(无量山)      | WL    | 24.45    | 100.733   | 6850      | 7   | 0.71     | 153.52   |
| Taihan(太行山脉)      | Xiaowutai(小五台山)   | XWT   | 39.967   | 114.833   | 5360      | 12  | 0.17     | -60.97   |
| Aertai(阿尔泰山脉)     | Youyi(友谊峰)        | YYF   | 49.1     | 87.817    | 5706      | 6   | 0.33     | 1.59     |

Mount: the name of each of the 29 studied mountain site; Total\_num: the total number of herbarium specimens for each of the 29 mountain sites. N: the total number of selected seed plant species in each of the 29 mountain sites; Up-ratio: the percentage of species shifting upward for each mountain site; Shift: the mean range shift of the centroid elevational position across all species of a given mountain site and between the two study periods (1950-1988 vs. 1980-2018).

TABLE 2 The multiple regression model evaluating the relationships between species elevational shifts and climate change experienced by species, the climatic adaptation of species, species properties and mountain properties

| Type               | Variation                  | Df              | Sum Sq          | Mean Sq        | F             | p                   |
|--------------------|----------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|----------------|---------------|---------------------|
| Climate change     | Change in tem              | 1               | 37051           | 37051          | 0.43          | 0.51                |
|                    | <b>Change in pre</b>       | <b>1</b>        | <b>345512</b>   | <b>345512</b>  | <b>3.99</b>   | <b>0.04*</b>        |
|                    | Importance of TS           | 1               | 3304            | 3304           | 0.04          | 0.85                |
| Climatic adaption  | Importance of MTWQ         | 1               | 46407           | 46407          | 0.54          | 0.46                |
|                    | <b>Importance of MTCQ</b>  | <b>1</b>        | <b>414136</b>   | <b>414136</b>  | <b>4.78</b>   | <b>0.03*</b>        |
|                    | <b>Importance of PS</b>    | <b>1</b>        | <b>578382</b>   | <b>578382</b>  | <b>6.68</b>   | <b>0.01*</b>        |
|                    | <b>Importance of PWQ</b>   | <b>1</b>        | <b>357892</b>   | <b>357892</b>  | <b>4.13</b>   | <b>0.04*</b>        |
|                    | Importance of PCQ          | 1               | 75940           | 75940          | 0.88          | 0.35                |
|                    | Elevation                  | 1               | 75603           | 75603          | 0.87          | 0.35                |
|                    | <b>Range</b>               | <b>1</b>        | <b>294868</b>   | <b>294868</b>  | <b>3.40</b>   | <b>0.07.</b>        |
|                    | Life form                  | 2               | 94746           | 47373          | 0.55          | 0.58                |
|                    | SexSyst                    | 2               | 348638          | 174319         | 2.01          | 0.13                |
|                    | <b>Fruit type</b>          | <b>13</b>       | <b>1903992</b>  | <b>146461</b>  | <b>1.69</b>   | <b>0.06.</b>        |
| Species properties | <b>Family</b>              | <b>109</b>      | <b>15435053</b> | <b>141606</b>  | <b>1.64</b>   | <b>&lt;0.001***</b> |
|                    | <b>Genus</b>               | <b>224</b>      | <b>31068140</b> | <b>138697</b>  | <b>1.60</b>   | <b>&lt;0.001***</b> |
|                    | <b>Re-elevation</b>        | <b>1</b>        | <b>3235916</b>  | <b>3235916</b> | <b>37.37</b>  | <b>&lt;0.001***</b> |
|                    | Latitude                   | 1               | 5789            | 5789           | 0.07          | 0.80                |
|                    | <b>Longitude</b>           | <b>1</b>        | <b>498763</b>   | <b>498763</b>  | <b>5.76</b>   | <b>0.02*</b>        |
|                    | <b>Climate regions</b>     | <b>2</b>        | <b>533050</b>   | <b>266525</b>  | <b>3.08</b>   | <b>0.04*</b>        |
|                    | <b>Mountain properties</b> | <b>Mountain</b> | <b>23</b>       | <b>8981946</b> | <b>390519</b> | <b>4.51</b>         |
|                    | Residuals                  | 452             | 39143600        | 86601          |               |                     |

Change in tem: the temperature changes experienced by each species; Change in pre: the precipitation changes experienced by each species; TS: temperature seasonality; MTWQ: mean temperature of warmest quarter; MTCQ: mean temperature of coldest quarter; PS: Precipitation seasonality; PWQ: precipitation of warmest quarter; PCQ: precipitation of coldest quarter. .p<0.1, \*, p < 0.05, \*\*, p < 0.01, \*\*\*, p < 0.001.

FIGURE 1 (a) The locations of the 29 study mountains and the ratio of species experiencing upward and downhill elevational shifts in these mountains. (b, c) The changes in the average magnitude of species' elevational shifts as functions of the average temperature (b) and size (c) of the mountains. In (a), blue bars indicated the ratio of species with upward shifts, and red bars indicated the ratios of species with downhill shifts. In (b) and (c), blue circles indicated the average magnitude of upward shifts, red triangles indicated the magnitude of downhill shifts, and white square indicated non-significant elevational shifts. The abbreviations of mountain names are shown in Table 1




FIGURE 2 Relationships between the changes in optimum elevations and the climatic adaptation of species. The climatic adaptation was represented by the importance of climate factors in determining the global distribution ranges of the studied species (see Methods for details). MTCQ: mean temperature of coldest quarter; PS: Precipitation seasonality; PWQ: precipitation of warmest quarter




FIGURE 3 The average magnitude of elevational shifts (a) and relative species percentage of upward shifts (b) for herbaceous and woody plant species shown along the gradient of mean temperature of mountains. The abbreviations of mountain names are shown in Table 1





FIGURE 4 The relationship between the centroid elevation shifts and elevational distributions of species in different mountains. The x-axes represent the historical centroid elevation of species, and the y-axes represent the changes in the centroid elevation between the two studied periods. The 95% confidence intervals of the regression lines are shown in grey. The abbreviations of mountain names are shown in Table 1



## Supplemental Figures and Tables

**Figure S1:** The species numbers studied in each mountains.

**Figure S2:** Elevational distribution of the selected species occurrence records through time for each mountain.

**Figure S3:** The standard meteorological stations were used in this study.

**Figure S4:** Change in temperature between historical (1950 - 1988) and present time (1989 - 2015) periods at long-term meteorological stations in China's mountains.

**Figure S5:** Change in precipitations between historical (1950 - 1988) and present time (1989 - 2015) periods at long-term meteorological stations in China's mountains.

**Figure S6:** Change in AET between historical (1950 - 1988) and present time (1989 - 2015) periods at long-term meteorological stations in China's mountains.

**Figure S7:** Change in summer/winter temperatures and precipitations between historical (1950 - 1988) and present time (1989 - 2015) periods at long-term meteorological stations in China' mountains.

**Figure S8:** Relationships between changes in optimum elevations and the importance of climate factors.

**Figure S9:** Relationships of the changes in optimum elevations with the functional traits of species, and the elevational shifts of herbs and woody plants in different climate regions (c). The functional traits included fruit types (a), and climate regions (b).

**Table S1:** The mountain sites located in China.

**Tables S2:** The lowest elevational data from literature.

**Table S3:** The random shifts in the species' centroid elevation calculated after the



1  
2  
3  
4 resampling of the historical and current survey records for each mountain.  
5

6 **Table S4:** The relationship between elevational shifts and elevation. The red indicate  
7  
8 the significant relationship.  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

For Peer Review

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## Supplementary Materials for

### **Elevational shift in seed plant distributions in China's mountains over the last 70 years**

For Peer Review

## Supplemental Figures and Tables

**Figure S1:** The species numbers studied in each mountains.

**Figure S2:** Elevational distribution of the selected species occurrence records through time for each mountain.

**Figure S3:** The standard meteorological stations were used in this study.

**Figure S4:** Change in temperature between historical (1950 - 1988) and present time (1989 - 2015) periods at long-term meteorological stations in China's mountains.

**Figure S5:** Change in precipitations between historical (1950 - 1988) and present time (1989 - 2015) periods at long-term meteorological stations in China's mountains.

**Figure S6:** Change in AET between historical (1950 - 1988) and present time (1989 - 2015) periods at long-term meteorological stations in China's mountains.

**Figure S7:** Change in summer/winter temperatures and precipitations between historical (1950 - 1988) and present time (1989 - 2015) periods at long-term meteorological stations in China' mountains.

**Figure S8:** Relationships between changes in optimum elevations and the importance of climate factors.

**Figure S9:** Relationships of the changes in optimum elevations with the functional traits of species, and the elevational shifts of herbs and woody plants in different climate regions (c). The functional traits included fruit types (a), and climate regions (b).

**Table S1:** The mountain sites located in China.

**Tables S2:** The lowest elevational data from literature.

**Table S3:** The random shifts in the species' centroid elevation calculated after the

1  
2  
3  
4 resampling of the historical and current survey records for each mountain.  
5

6 **Table S4:** The relationship between elevational shifts and elevation. The red indicate  
7  
8 the significant relationship.  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

For Peer Review





Figure S1: The species numbers studied in each mountains.

33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60






Figure S2: Elevational distribution of the selected species occurrence records through time for each mountain.




Figure S3: The standard meteorological stations were used in this study.







Figure S4: Change in temperature between historical (1950 - 1988) and present time (1989 - 2015) periods at long-term meteorological stations in

China's mountains.



1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6 Figure S5: Change in precipitations between historical (1950 - 1988) and present time (1989 - 2015) periods at long-term meteorological stations  
7  
8 in China's mountains.  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46

For Peer Review




Figure S6: Change in AET between historical (1950 - 1988) and present time(1989 - 2015) periods at long-term meteorological stations in China's mountains.




Figure S7: Change in summer/winter temperatures and precipitations between historical (1950 - 1988) and present time (1989 - 2015) periods at

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46

long-term meteorological stations in China' mountains.

For Peer Review




Figure S8: Relationships between changes in optimum elevations and the importance of climate factors. The x-axes are MAT, MAP, AET, changes in MAT, MAP, AET, relative elevation(Reele), Seasonal changes in MAT(CTsummer and CTwinter) and Seasonal changes in MAP(CPsummer and CPwinter), atmospheric nitrogen deposition(ND), and human footprint index (HI). The Y-axes represent changes in optimum elevation for all

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46

species, the shifts of herbs plants and the shifts of woody.

For Peer Review






Figure S9: Relationships of the changes in optimum elevations with the functional traits of species, and the elevational shifts of herbs and woody plants in different climate regions (c). The functional traits included fruit types (a), and climate regions (b).

Table S1: The mountain sites located in China.

| Mountain range    | Mount            | Abbr. | Lat (°N) | Long (°E) | The highest elevation | Relevation(max elevation-min elevation) | Province | climate region |
|-------------------|------------------|-------|----------|-----------|-----------------------|---|----------|----------------|
| Qionglai(邛崃山)     | Balang(巴郎山)      | BL    | 31.167   | 102.917   | 5072                  | 3072                                    | Sichuan  | Plateau        |
| Bayankela(巴颜喀拉山脉) | Bayankela(巴颜喀拉山) | BYKL  | 34.204   | 97.659    | 5267                  | 1667                                    | Qinghai  | Plateau        |
| Hengduan(横断山脉)    | Baimang(白茫雪山)    | BMX   | 28.183   | 99.117    | 5430                  | 3500                                    | Yunnan   | Plateau        |
| Changbai(长白山脉)    | Baitou(白头山)      | BT    | 41.983   | 128.083   | 2691                  | 1591                                    | Jilin    | Temperate      |
| Yanshan(燕山山脉)     | Dongling(东灵山)    | DL    | 39.733   | 115.5     | 2303                  | 1803                                    | Beijing  | Temperate      |
| Qionglai(邛崃山脉)    | Emei(峨眉山)        | EM    | 29.6     | 103.5     | 3099                  | 2700                                    | Sichuan  | Subtropics     |
| Wuling(武陵山脉)      | Fanjing(梵净山)     | FJ    | 27.917   | 108.767   | 2493                  | 2000                                    | Guizhou  | Subtropics     |
| Wuling(武陵山脉)      | Fenghuang(凤凰山)   | FH    | 28.11    | 108.68    | 2572                  | 1572                                    | Guizhou  | Subtropics     |

|    |                |                 |     |        |         |        |      |           |            |
|----|----------------|-----------------|-----|--------|---------|--------|------|-----------|------------|
| 1  |                |                 |     |        |         |        |      |           |            |
| 2  |                |                 |     |        |         |        |      |           |            |
| 3  |                |                 |     |        |         |        |      |           |            |
| 4  |                |                 |     |        |         |        |      |           |            |
| 5  | Hengduan(横断山脉) | Gaoligong(高黎贡山) | GLG | 25.267 | 98.783  | 3374   | 3000 | Yunnan    | Plateau    |
| 6  |                |                 |     |        |         |        |      |           |            |
| 7  |                |                 |     |        |         |        |      |           |            |
| 8  | Hengduan(横断山脉) | Gongga(贡嘎山)     | GG  | 29.6   | 101.883 | 7556   | 6466 | Sichuan   | Plateau    |
| 9  |                |                 |     |        |         |        |      |           |            |
| 10 |                |                 |     |        |         |        |      |           |            |
| 11 | Lvliang(吕梁山脉)  | Guandi(关帝山孝文山)  | GD  | 37.8   | 110.8   | 2831   | 2051 | Shanxi    | Temperate  |
| 12 |                |                 |     |        |         |        |      |           |            |
| 13 | Hengduan(横断山脉) | Haba(哈巴雪山)      | HB  | 27.45  | 100.117 | 5396   | 3846 | Yunnan    | Plateau    |
| 14 |                |                 |     |        |         |        |      |           |            |
| 15 |                |                 |     |        |         |        |      |           |            |
| 16 | Daba(大巴山脉)     | Hualong(化龙山)    | HL  | 32.054 | 109.419 | 2917   | 2537 | Shanxi    | Subtropics |
| 17 |                |                 |     |        |         |        |      |           |            |
| 18 |                |                 |     |        |         |        |      |           |            |
| 19 | Wuyi(武夷山脉)     | Huanggang(黄岗山)  | HG  | 27.8   | 117.6   | 2158   | 1808 | Fujian    | Subtropics |
| 20 |                |                 |     |        |         |        |      |           |            |
| 21 | Dalou(大娄山脉)    | Jinfo(金佛山)      | JF  | 29.25  | 108.333 | 2251   | 1911 | Chongqing | Subtropics |
| 22 |                |                 |     |        |         |        |      |           |            |
| 23 |                |                 |     |        |         |        |      |           |            |
| 24 | Hengduan(横断山脉) | Kagebo(卡格薄峰)    | KGB | 28.449 | 98.575  | 6740   | 4700 | Yunnan    | Plateau    |
| 25 |                |                 |     |        |         |        |      |           |            |
| 26 | Hengduan(横断山脉) | Laojun(老君山)     | LJ  | 26.703 | 99.75   | 4247   | 2697 | Yunnan    | Plateau    |
| 27 |                |                 |     |        |         |        |      |           |            |
| 28 |                |                 |     |        |         |        |      |           |            |
| 29 | Miaoling(苗岭)   | Leigong(雷公山)    | LG  | 26.417 | 108.25  | 2179   | 1500 | Guizhou   | Subtropics |
| 30 |                |                 |     |        |         |        |      |           |            |
| 31 |                |                 |     |        |         |        |      |           |            |
| 32 | Lushan(庐山)     | Lushan(庐山)      | LS  | 29.55  | 115.967 | 1474   | 1140 | Jiangxi   | Subtropics |
| 33 |                |                 |     |        |         |        |      |           |            |
| 34 | Nanling(南岭)    | Maoer(猫儿山)      | ME  | 25.918 | 110.42  | 2141.5 | 1862 | Guangxi   | Subtropics |
| 35 |                |                 |     |        |         |        |      |           |            |
| 36 |                |                 |     |        |         |        |      |           |            |
| 37 |                |                 |     |        |         |        |      |           |            |
| 38 |                |                 |     |        |         |        |      |           |            |
| 39 |                |                 |     |        |         |        |      |           |            |
| 40 |                |                 |     |        |         |        |      |           |            |
| 41 |                |                 |     |        |         |        |      |           |            |
| 42 |                |                 |     |        |         |        |      |           |            |
| 43 |                |                 |     |        |         |        |      |           |            |
| 44 |                |                 |     |        |         |        |      |           |            |
| 45 |                |                 |     |        |         |        |      |           |            |
| 46 |                |                 |     |        |         |        |      |           |            |

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46

|                   |                   |      |        |         |      |      |          |            |
|-------------------|-------------------|------|--------|---------|------|------|----------|------------|
| Himalayas(喜马拉雅山脉) | Nanjiabawa(南迦巴瓦峰) | NJBW | 29.633 | 95.067  | 7782 | 5682 | Xizang   | Plateau    |
| Hengduan(横断山脉)    | Queer(雀儿山)        | QE   | 31.77  | 99.05   | 6168 | 4000 | Sichuan  | Plateau    |
| Daba(大巴山脉)        | Shennongjia(神农架)  | SNJ  | 31.667 | 110.583 | 3106 | 2706 | Hubei    | Subtropics |
| Qionglai(邛崃山脉)    | Siguniang(四姑娘山)   | SGN  | 31     | 103.217 | 6250 | 4050 | Sichuan  | Plateau    |
| Qinling(秦岭)       | Taibai(太白山)       | TB   | 33.95  | 107.75  | 3767 | 3000 | Shanxi   | Temperate  |
| Tianshan(天山山脉)    | Tiangeer(天格尔峰)    | TGE  | 43.168 | 86.623  | 4562 | 3000 | Xinjiang | Temperate  |
| Hengduan(横断山脉)    | Wuliang(无量山)      | WL   | 24.45  | 100.733 | 3254 | 2200 | Yunnan   | Plateau    |
| Taihan(太行山脉)      | Xiaowutai(小五台山)   | XWT  | 39.967 | 114.833 | 2870 | 2070 | Hebei    | Temperate  |
| Aertai(阿尔泰山脉)     | Youyi(友谊峰)        | YYF  | 49.1   | 87.817  | 4374 | 2000 | Xinjiang | Temperate  |

“Relevation (max elevation-min elevation)” means the relative elevation, and it is the value of the highest elevation minus the lowest elevation.

Tables S2: The lowest elevational data from literature.

- 
- Cao W, Li Y. Vertical pattern of flora from Changbai Mountain, China .Journal of Beijing Forestry University. 2008, 30(4): 53-58.
- Du J, Hao M, Tian Z, et al. A study on the plant diversity of Xiaowutai Mountain district. Herbei Journal of forestry and orchard research. 2016, 31(01): 88-93.
- Fu Z. Floristic and geographical components of seed plants in Hualong Mountain, southern Shaanxi Province. Geographical research. 1997, (02): 73-81.
- Gao LL, Yang HJ, Liu GZ, Wang CH, Yang GP, Cai CT. Diversity of medicinal vascular plant resources in Wuliangshan National Nature Reserve , Yunnan , China. Plant Science Journal, 2018, 36(2): 203-210.
- Gu HY, Li CH. Biodiversity and flora of the mixed evergreen and deciduous broadleaved forest in Emei. Bulletin of Botanical Research. 2006, (05): 618-623.
- Gu HY, Li CH. Preliminary Study on the *Pteridophytes* Flora of Emei Mountain. Acta Bot. Boreal. Occident. Sin. 2008, (02): 2381-2387.
- Hu XX, Zheng WC, Li JQ, et al. Tianpei Guan Preliminary survey on mammal and bird diversity at Siguniang Mountains National Nature Reserve, Sichuan, China. Biodiversity Science. 2018, 26 (12): 1325-1331.
- Li HW, Zhao YF. Plant diversity of Baimaxueshan National Nature Reserve. Guihaia. 2007, (01): 71-76.
- Li J, Teng CD. Vertical distribution of vegetation in Guandi Mountain. Journal of Shanxi University (Natural Science Edition). 1979, (01): 144-149.
- Liu JL, Chen K, Wang JY, Chen WH. Comparative Study on Seed Plant Flora between Southern and Northern Gaoligong Mountains. Journal of Tropical and Subtropical Botany. 2016, 24(3): 327 -332.
- Liu JY, Liu JJ, Han QS. Pteridophyte flora in Taibaishan Nature Reserve of Shaanxi Province. Guihaia, 2014, 34(1): 77-83.
- Ou ZY, Pang SL, He F, et al. Variation and Correlation of Leaf Functional Traits of Common Plants at Main Peak of Mao'er Mountain, Guangxi. Guangxi Forestry Science. 2021,50(05):557-562.
- Peng H. The Endemism in the Flora of Seed Plants in Mt. Wuliangshan. Acta Botanica Yunnanica. 1997, (01): 3-16.
- Peng TL, Tie J. Wild plant resources in Shennongjia Nature Reserve and its protection measures. Journal of Changzhi University. 2010, 27(05): 23-26.
- Song XT, Shao XM, Sun Y, et al. Research on the bryoflora of Dongling Mountain , Beijing , China. Plant Science Journal, 2018, 36(4): 554-561.
- Wang J. Study on the Flora of Spermatophyte in Xinluhai Nature Reserve of the Queer Mountain. Journal of Anhui Agri. Sci. 2012, 40(21): 11020-11021.
- Wang LG, Xu C. Preliminary Study on Plant Resources Magnoliaceae, Wuyi Mountain National Nature Reserve, Fujian Province. Fujian Forestry Science and Technology. 2010, 37(02): 90-93.
-

- 
- 1  
2  
3 Wang PL, Zhong AW, Liang TJ, Chen BH. Investigation and Conservation of Germplasm  
4 Resources of Wild seed plants in Lushan Mountain. *Guizhou Agricultural Sciences*. 2016,  
5 44(04): 12-16.  
6  
7 Wu RX, Xiong KN, Li R. Characteristics of spermatophyte flora of Fanjing Mountain and its  
8 phytogeographical significance. *Guihaia*, 2017, 37(10): 1348-1354.  
9  
10 Wu XJ, Yu CY. Vegetation Distribution Characteristics and Diversity Conservation in  
11 Habaxueshan Provincial Nature Reserve. *Forest Inventory and Planning*, 2020, 45(1): 47-51.  
12  
13 Wu YH. The Floristic Characteristics in the Region of Bayan Har Mountains. *Acta Botanica*  
14 *Yunnanica*. 2004, (06): 587-603.  
15  
16 Yang HY, Luo XQ, Yang F. Algae flora of Leigong Mountain Nature Reserve of Guizhou.  
17 *Guihaia*. 2014, 34(04): 570-574.  
18  
19 Yi SR, Huang Y. Preliminary Study on Seed Flora in Jinfo Mountain Nature Reserve. *Acta*  
20 *Botanica Sinica Northwest China*, 2004, (01): 83-93.  
21  
22 Yu WWG, Zhu LT, Wang SE, et al. Study on the flora of Changbai Mountain. *Journal of*  
23 *Shandong Normal University (Natural Science Edition)*, 2006, (02): 115-117.  
24  
25 Zhang HB. Investigation on the Construction Status of Laojun Mountain National Park in Lijiang.  
26 *Yunnan Social Sciences*, 2013, (03): 96-99.  
27  
28 Zhao Q, Zhang Y, Yuan L, et al. Preliminary investigation on medicinal fungi resources in  
29 Laojunshan, Yunnan Province. *Chinese Journal of Microbiology*, 2006, (04): 85-88.  
30  
31 Zu KL, Luo A, Shrestha N, et al. Altitudinal biodiversity patterns of seed plants along Gongga  
32 Mountain in the southeastern Qinghai-Tibetan Plateau. *Ecology and Evolution*, 2019, 9:9586-  
33 9596.  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60
-

Table S3: The random shifts in the species' centroid elevation calculated after the resampling of the historical and current survey records for each mountain.

| Mountain range    | Mount            | Abbr. | downward species |     |            | upward species |    |           |
|-------------------|------------------|-------|------------------|-----|------------|----------------|----|-----------|
|                   |                  |       | t                | df  | p          | t              | df | p         |
| Qionglai(邛崃山)     | Balang(巴郎山)      | BL    | 5.7924           | 63  | 2.39E-07   | -12.142        | 49 | < 2.2e-16 |
| Bayankela(巴颜喀拉山脉) | Bayankela(巴颜喀拉山) | BYKL  | 2.5854           | 5   | 0.04911    | -5.4648        | 11 | 0.0001964 |
| Hengduan(横断山脉)    | Baimang(白茫雪山)    | BMX   | 5.26             | 6   | 0.001901   | -1.8095        | 13 | 0.09354   |
| Changbai(长白山脉)    | Baitou(白头山)      | BT    | 1.7506           | 12  | 0.1055     | -3.4488        | 4  | 0.02608   |
| Yanshan(燕山山脉)     | Dongling(东灵山)    | DL    | 1.7625           | 6   | 0.1285     | -5.1134        | 5  | 0.003728  |
| Qionglai(邛崃山脉)    | Emei(峨眉山)        | EM    | 4.8982           | 4   | 0.008055   | -2.6158        | 19 | 0.017     |
| Wuling(武陵山脉)      | Fanjing(梵净山)     | FJ    | 6.2574           | 12  | 0.00004208 | -3.8442        | 8  | 0.004918  |
| Wuling(武陵山脉)      | Fenghuang(凤凰山)   | FH    | 4.7051           | 1   | 0.1333     | -0.6637        | 2  | 0.5752    |
| Hengduan(横断山脉)    | Gaoligong(高黎贡山)  | GLG   | 2.9785           | 17  | 0.008432   | -3.3971        | 6  | 0.01455   |
| Hengduan(横断山脉)    | Gongga(贡嘎山)      | GG    | 10.84            | 18  | < 0.001    | -3.97          | 52 | 0.0002    |
| Lvliang(吕梁山脉)     | Guandi(关帝山孝文山)   | GD    | 5.4114           | 3   | 0.01238    | -5.804         | 8  | 0.0004033 |
| Hengduan(横断山脉)    | Haba(哈巴雪山)       | HB    | 2.6428           | 2   | 0.1183     | -1.5516        | 3  | 0.2186    |
| Daba(大巴山脉)        | Hualong(化龙山)     | HL    | —                |     |            | 3.603          | 3  | 0.03668   |
| Wuyi(武夷山脉)        | Huanggang(黄冈山)   | HG    | 6.5888           | 27  | 4.56E-07   | -6.1212        | 25 | 2.127E-06 |
| Dalou(大娄山脉)       | Jinfo(金佛山)       | JF    | 4.1557           | 133 | 0.0000577  | -21.055        | 96 | < 2.2e-16 |
| Hengduan(横断山脉)    | Kagebo(卡格薄峰)     | KGB   | 5.0916           | 12  | 0.0002655  | -5.4549        | 24 | 0.0000132 |
| Hengduan(横断山脉)    | Laojun(老君山)      | LJ    | 1.8963           | 12  | 0.08225    | -3.5976        | 2  | 0.06933   |

|    |                 |                   |      |        |    |            |         |    |            |
|----|-----------------|-------------------|------|--------|----|------------|---------|----|------------|
| 1  |                 |                   |      |        |    |            |         |    |            |
| 2  |                 |                   |      |        |    |            |         |    |            |
| 3  |                 |                   |      |        |    |            |         |    |            |
| 4  |                 |                   |      |        |    |            |         |    |            |
| 5  | Miaoling(苗岭)    | Leigong(雷公山)      | LG   | —      |    |            | -1.9746 | 3  | 0.1428     |
| 6  | Lushan(庐山)      | Lushan(庐山)        | LS   | 0.8541 | 25 | 0.4012     | -26.477 | 4  | 0.00001209 |
| 7  | Nanling(南岭)     | Maoer(猫儿山)        | ME   | 3.6141 | 13 | 0.003146   | -6.0956 | 7  | 0.0004932  |
| 8  | Himalayas(喜马拉雅山 |                   |      |        |    |            |         |    |            |
| 9  | 脉)              | Nanjiabawa(南迦巴瓦峰) | NJBW | 1.7692 | 1  | 0.3275     | -5.8342 | 3  | 0.01003    |
| 10 |                 |                   |      |        |    |            |         |    |            |
| 11 | Hengduan(横断山脉)  | Queer(雀儿山)        | QE   | 7.7699 | 3  | 0.004435   | -3.668  | 8  | 0.006328   |
| 12 |                 |                   |      |        |    |            |         |    |            |
| 13 | Daba(大巴山脉)      | Shennongjia(神农架)  | SNJ  | 3.8511 | 20 | 0.0009962  | -9.1901 | 39 | 2.65E-11   |
| 14 | Qionglai(邛崃山脉)  | Siguniang(四姑娘山)   | SGN  | -0.478 | 8  | 0.6456     | —       |    |            |
| 15 | Qinling(秦岭)     | Taibai(太白山)       | TB   | 7.7445 | 9  | 0.00002866 | 7.7175  | 35 | 4.64E-09   |
| 16 | Tianshan(天山山脉)  | Tiangeer(天格尔峰)    | TGE  | 8.9414 | 8  | 0.00001944 | -2.1882 | 8  | 0.06009    |
| 17 | Hengduan(横断山脉)  | Wuliang(无量山)      | WL   | 1.4907 | 1  | 0.3762     | -2.5967 | 4  | 0.06026    |
| 18 | Taihan(太行山脉)    | Xiaowutai(小五台山)   | XWT  | 0.1616 | 9  | 0.8752     | -5.2865 | 1  | 0.119      |
| 19 | Aertai(阿尔泰山脉)   | Youyi(友谊峰)        | YYF  | 4.3688 | 3  | 0.02218    | -3.6829 | 1  | 0.1688     |
| 20 |                 |                   |      |        |    |            |         |    |            |
| 21 |                 |                   |      |        |    |            |         |    |            |
| 22 |                 |                   |      |        |    |            |         |    |            |
| 23 |                 |                   |      |        |    |            |         |    |            |
| 24 |                 |                   |      |        |    |            |         |    |            |
| 25 |                 |                   |      |        |    |            |         |    |            |
| 26 |                 |                   |      |        |    |            |         |    |            |
| 27 |                 |                   |      |        |    |            |         |    |            |
| 28 |                 |                   |      |        |    |            |         |    |            |
| 29 |                 |                   |      |        |    |            |         |    |            |
| 30 |                 |                   |      |        |    |            |         |    |            |
| 31 |                 |                   |      |        |    |            |         |    |            |
| 32 |                 |                   |      |        |    |            |         |    |            |
| 33 |                 |                   |      |        |    |            |         |    |            |
| 34 |                 |                   |      |        |    |            |         |    |            |
| 35 |                 |                   |      |        |    |            |         |    |            |
| 36 |                 |                   |      |        |    |            |         |    |            |
| 37 |                 |                   |      |        |    |            |         |    |            |
| 38 |                 |                   |      |        |    |            |         |    |            |
| 39 |                 |                   |      |        |    |            |         |    |            |
| 40 |                 |                   |      |        |    |            |         |    |            |
| 41 |                 |                   |      |        |    |            |         |    |            |
| 42 |                 |                   |      |        |    |            |         |    |            |
| 43 |                 |                   |      |        |    |            |         |    |            |
| 44 |                 |                   |      |        |    |            |         |    |            |
| 45 |                 |                   |      |        |    |            |         |    |            |
| 46 |                 |                   |      |        |    |            |         |    |            |



Table S4: The relationship between elevational shifts and elevation. The red indicate the significant relationship.

| Mountain range    | Mount             | Abbr. | slope | r <sup>2</sup> | p    |
|-------------------|-------------------|-------|-------|----------------|------|
| Qionglai(邛崃山)     | Balang(巴郎山)       | BL    | -0.23 | 0.06           | 0.01 |
| Bayankela(巴颜喀拉山脉) | Bayankela(巴颜喀拉山)  | BYKL  | -0.33 | 0.11           | 0.18 |
| Hengduan(横断山脉)    | Baimang(白茫雪山)     | BMX   | -0.09 | 0.03           | 0.50 |
| Changbai(长白山脉)    | Baitou(白头山)       | BT    | -0.12 | 0.03           | 0.40 |
| Yanshan(燕山山脉)     | Dongling(东灵山)     | DL    | -0.29 | 0.08           | 0.36 |
| Qionglai(邛崃山脉)    | Emei(峨眉山)         | EM    | -0.73 | 0.39           | 0.00 |
| Wuling(武陵山脉)      | Fanjing(梵净山)      | FJ    | 0.34  | 0.05           | 0.44 |
| Wuling(武陵山脉)      | Fenghuang(凤凰山)    | FH    | 0.17  | 0.11           | 0.58 |
| Hengduan(横断山脉)    | Gaoligong(高黎贡山)   | GLG   | 0.03  | 0.00           | 0.87 |
| Hengduan(横断山脉)    | Gongga(贡嘎山)       | GG    | -0.13 | 0.05           | 0.03 |
| Lvliang(吕梁山脉)     | Guandi(关帝山孝文山)    | GD    | -0.41 | 0.26           | 0.08 |
| Hengduan(横断山脉)    | Haba(哈巴雪山)        | HB    | -0.42 | 0.24           | 0.26 |
| Daba(大巴山脉)        | Hualong(化龙山)      | HL    | 0.15  | 0.27           | 0.37 |
| Wuyi(武夷山脉)        | Huanggang(黄岗山)    | HG    | -0.36 | 0.13           | 0.01 |
| Dalou(大娄山脉)       | Jinfo(金佛山)        | JF    | -0.25 | 0.22           | 0.00 |
| Hengduan(横断山脉)    | Kagebo(卡格薄峰)      | KGB   | -0.06 | 0.02           | 0.47 |
| Hengduan(横断山脉)    | Laojun(老君山)       | LJ    | -0.11 | 0.02           | 0.58 |
| Miaoling(苗岭)      | Leigong(雷公山)      | LG    | -2.28 | 0.73           | 0.06 |
| Lushan(庐山)        | Lushan(庐山)        | LS    | -0.52 | 0.49           | 0.00 |
| Nanling(南岭)       | Maoer(猫儿山)        | ME    | -0.37 | 0.08           | 0.21 |
| Himalayas(喜马拉雅山脉) | Nanjiabawa(南迦巴瓦峰) | NJBW  | -0.01 | 0.00           | 0.96 |
| Hengduan(横断山脉)    | Queer(雀儿山)        | QE    | 0.50  | 0.19           | 0.14 |
| Daba(大巴山脉)        | Shennongjia(神农架)  | SNJ   | -0.54 | 0.32           | 0.00 |
| Qionglai(邛崃山脉)    | Siguniang(四姑娘山)   | SGN   | -0.09 | 0.02           | 0.68 |
| Qinling(秦岭)       | Taibai(太白山)       | TB    | -0.45 | 0.29           | 0.00 |
| Tianshan(天山山脉)    | Tiangeer(天格尔峰)    | TGE   | 0.20  | 0.04           | 0.41 |
| Hengduan(横断山脉)    | Wuliang(无量山)      | WL    | -0.01 | 0.00           | 0.99 |
| Taihan(太行山脉)      | Xiaowutai(小五台山)   | XWT   | -0.44 | 0.55           | 0.02 |
| Aertai(阿尔泰山脉)     | Youyi(友谊峰)        | YYF   | -0.39 | 0.58           | 0.08 |