



HAL
open science

A framework to quantify the vulnerability of insular biota to global change

Céline Bellard, Clara Marino, Nathalie Butt, José María Fernández-Palacios, François Rigal, Marine Robuchon, Jonathan Lenoir, Severin Irl, Ana Benítez-López, Pol Capdevila, et al.

► To cite this version:

Céline Bellard, Clara Marino, Nathalie Butt, José María Fernández-Palacios, François Rigal, et al.. A framework to quantify the vulnerability of insular biota to global change. 2024. hal-04550966v1

HAL Id: hal-04550966

<https://hal.science/hal-04550966v1>

Preprint submitted on 18 Apr 2024 (v1), last revised 14 Oct 2024 (v2)

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.

1 **A framework to quantify the vulnerability of insular biota to global change**

2 C. Bellard^{1*}, C. Marino^{1,2}, N. Butt³, José M. Fernández-Palacios⁴, F. Rigal⁵, M. Robuchon⁶, J.
3 Lenoir⁷, Severin D. H. Irl⁸, A. Benítez-López⁹, P. Capdevila^{10,11}, G. Zhu¹², Gabriel H. O.
4 Caetano¹, P. Denelle¹³, M. Philippe-Lesaffre¹, A.M. Schipper¹⁴, W.B. Foden^{15,16}, W. Daniel
5 Kissling¹⁷, C. Leclerc¹⁸

6 *Email: celine.bellard@universite-paris-saclay.fr

7
8 ¹ Université Paris-Saclay, CNRS, AgroParisTech, Ecologie Systématique et Evolution, 91190,
9 Gif-sur-Yvette, France

10 ² FRB-Cesab, 5 rue de l'école de médecine, 34000 Montpellier, France

11 ³ School of the Environment, The University of Queensland, St. Lucia, 4072, Queensland,
12 Australia.

13 ⁴ Island Ecology and Biogeography Research Group, Instituto Universitario de Enfermedades
14 Tropicales y Salud Pública de Canarias (IUETSPC), Universidad de La Laguna, Tenerife,
15 Canary Islands, Spain

16 ⁵ Université de Pau et des Pays de l'Adour, E2S UPPA, CNRS, IPREM, 64000 Pau, France

17 ⁶ Joint Research Centre (JRC) of the European Commission, Directorate for Sustainable
18 Resources, Ispra, VA, 21027 Italy

19 ⁷ UMR CNRS 7058 "Ecologie et Dynamique des Systèmes Anthropisés" (EDYSAN),
20 Université de Picardie Jules Verne, Amiens, France

21 ⁸ Biogeography and Biodiversity Lab, Institute of Physical Geography, Goethe-University
22 Frankfurt, 60438 Frankfurt am Main, Germany

23 ⁹ Department of Biogeography and Global Change, Museo Nacional de Ciencias Naturales
24 (BGC-MNCN-CSIC), E-28006 Madrid, Spain

25 ¹⁰ Departament de Biologia Evolutiva, Ecologia i Ciències Ambientals, Facultat de Biologia,
26 Universitat de Barcelona (UB), Spain

27 ¹¹ Institut de Recerca de la Biodiversitat (IRBio), Universitat de Barcelona (UB), Barcelona,
28 Spain.

29 ¹² Department of Entomology, Washington State University, Pullman, Washington State,
30 USA 99163

31
32 ¹³ University of Göttingen, Department of Biodiversity, Macroecology & Biogeography,
33 Büsgenweg 1, 37077 Göttingen, Germany

34
35 ¹⁴ Radboud University, Radboud Institute for Biological and Environmental Sciences,
36 Heyendaalseweg 135, 6525 AJ, Nijmegen, The Netherlands

37 ¹⁵ Cape Research Centre, South African National Parks, 643 Leyds St, Muckleneuk, Pretoria,
38 South Africa.

39 ¹⁶ School for Climate Studies, Stellenbosch University, Private Bag X1 Matieland, 7602.
40 South Africa.

41 ¹⁷ Institute for Biodiversity and Ecosystem Dynamics (IBED), University of Amsterdam, P.O.
42 Box 94240, 1090 GE Amsterdam, The Netherlands

43 ¹⁸ INRAE, Aix Marseille Univ., RECOVER, Aix-en-Provence, France

44

45 Running head : Vulnerability of islands

46 Keywords (6-10) : islands, biodiversity, anthropogenic threats, risk, adaptive capacity,
47 exposure, sensitivity

48

49

50 **Words : 3388**

51 **Figures : 2**

52 **Table : 1**

53 **Box : 2**

54

55

56

57

58

59

60

61

62 **Abstract:**

63 **The majority of vulnerability assessments of biodiversity to global changes have so far**
64 **focused on mainland systems, ignoring islands. However, islands harbour unique**
65 **biodiversity and are epicentres of ongoing extinctions. We thus introduce a new**
66 **framework for quantifying the vulnerability of terrestrial insular biota to multiple**
67 **threats. This framework uses markers of exposure, sensitivity, and adaptive capacity**
68 **that reflect the unique characteristics of island biodiversity, from population to island**
69 **levels. Our framework involves four steps: (1) identifying the scope of the vulnerability**
70 **assessment, (2) selecting the most appropriate markers, (3) computing the vulnerability,**
71 **and (4) provide recommendations for conservation. We discuss the need and urgency to**
72 **deploy this framework to guide evidence-based decisions for the conservation of insular**
73 **biodiversity and for an improved attention of insular biota at the science-policy**
74 **interface.**

75

76

77

78

79

80

81

82

83 **Introduction:**

84 Islands are among the most vulnerable ecosystems affected by global change (Fernández-
85 Palacios et al., 2021). Approximately ca. 75% of extinctions have occurred on islands, and
86 over half of all terrestrial species that face imminent extinction are island-dwellers, with
87 invasive alien species and land-use change, as leading drivers of species' declines. Climate
88 change emerges as a growing threat for island biota and it may interact in unexpected ways
89 with invasive alien species and land-use change (Capdevila et al., 2021; Mantyka-Pringle et
90 al., 2011). As a result, islands are commonly considered the epicentres of past, imminent, and
91 potential future species extinctions (Supplementary appendix S1).

92 At least three reasons can explain the disproportionate vulnerability of island ecosystems.
93 First, insular species are usually intrinsically more sensitive to any given threat due to specific
94 traits deriving from the so-called 'island syndrome' (Benítez-López et al., 2021; Biddick et al.,
95 2019; Lomolino, 1985). Second, insular species are less likely to adapt to new threats due to
96 their inherent demographic features (e.g., small population sizes, naturally fragmented
97 distribution ranges) (Fernández-Palacios et al., 2021). Lastly, the physiography of islands,
98 specifically in the case of isolated, small-sized ones, renders their biota more exposed to
99 threats and also less able to escape compared to their continental counterparts (Harter et al.,
100 2015, p. 201).

101 Despite the urgency needed to protect the unique and highly vulnerable island biodiversity
102 from ongoing global change, insular biota is only briefly mentioned in international
103 biodiversity policy frameworks. In December 2022 the 196 parties of the Convention on
104 Biological Diversity (CBD) adopted the [Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework](#)
105 (GBF), involving 23 action-oriented global targets. Among them, only one target explicitly
106 mentions islands as priority areas for conservation (though not explicitly mentioning insular
107 biota) and only two other targets require strong actions on islands. This lack of attention

108 reflects the scientific bias towards mainland and charismatic species (Albert et al., 2018;
109 Rodrigues et al., 2010), with remote islands being marginally considered in biodiversity
110 assessments, which hinders the development of effective conservation plans on insular biota
111 (Troudet et al., 2017). Here, we introduce a novel framework specifically designed to assess
112 the vulnerability of insular biota to global change, across multiple biodiversity dimensions,
113 and based on insular biota's exposure, sensitivity, and adaptive capacity to multiple threats.
114 We first describe the characteristics that contribute to the vulnerability of island biota to
115 global change, which need to be considered in insular biodiversity vulnerability assessments.
116 Then, we describe how our framework can address some of the ongoing questions on island
117 biota vulnerability.

118


119 **Challenges**

120 *The uniqueness of insular biota enhances their vulnerability to threatening processes*

121 The inherent uniqueness of insular biota (e.g., endemic species, distinct traits, unique
122 lineages) increases their overall vulnerability to global change drivers (Fernández-Palacios et
123 al., 2021). Their isolated nature and complex topography, prone to extreme events, make them
124 more exposed to threats (Russell & Kueffer, 2019) (Figure 1A) because islands per se harbour
125 fewer potential refugia (compared with continental landmasses). Islands are also known to
126 host a large number of endemic species: up to 90% of endemic non-vagile taxa (i.e., non-
127 flying vertebrates, seed plants, molluscs or arthropods) occur in oceanic islands and
128 continental fragments (e.g., Madagascar, Antonelli et al., 2022). Endemics have small
129 population sizes and restricted geographical ranges (sometimes limited to an archipelago, an
130 island or even a single peak, volcano or cliff), increasing their extinction probability (Manes
131 et al., 2021). Iconic examples are the radiation of the Hawaiian silversword alliance, which

132 gave rise to the radiation of Hawaiian Honeycreepers that are particularly vulnerable to threats
 133 (Box 1).

A Why are island biota particularly vulnerable to global change?



134



135

136 **Figure 1:** *A* Conceptual figure of the vulnerability of insular biota to global change with a
 137 non-exhaustive list of the characteristics contributing to each vulnerability component (i.e.,
 138 exposure, sensitivity, and adaptive capacity). For example, insular syndrome traits,
 139 endemicity, and adaptive radiation are characteristics that increase the sensitivity of insular
 140 biota to global change compared to mainland biota, whereas lack of functional redundancy,
 141 disharmonic taxonomic composition, and genetic vulnerability are characteristics that
 142 decrease adaptive capacity. *B* Bias in current climate change vulnerability assessments in
 143 terms of island biota representation, taxonomic representation, and vulnerability components,
 144 numbers calculated from (de los Ríos et al., 2018).

145 Insular species have also evolved distinct and predictable ecological, physiological,
 146 behavioural, morphological, and life-history traits, a phenomenon commonly referred to as

147 the 'island syndrome' (Baeckens & Van Damme, 2020), worsening their sensitivity to current
148 and future anthropogenic threats, including overharvesting, habitat loss, increased drought and
149 alien invasive species (Rozzi et al., 2023; Zizka et al., 2022), (Figure 1A). This phenomenon
150 is for example associated with dioecism in plants, which makes them more likely to disappear
151 if their mutualists disappear, presumably causing higher vulnerability to human induced
152 perturbations (Schrader et al., 2021). The reduced herbivory and predation pressure on islands
153 leads to low levels of spinescence compared to mainland, which makes island species more
154 likely to be affected by the introduction of exotic herbivores and predators (K. Burns, 2016;
155 Clavero et al., 2009, p. 200). The loss of flight capacities also makes insular birds unable to
156 escape from anthropogenic threats (Sayol et al., 2021) and more likely to be threatened by
157 extreme events, such as hurricanes, or gradual environmental change (e.g., progressive
158 directional changes such as climate change) (Burns, 2019; Roff, 1990).

159 Additionally, the intricate and often rugged topography of oceanic islands frequently leads to
160 isolations of populations, which may result in genetic drift and then inbreeding when the
161 population sizes are small. Subsequent island colonization within archipelagos and isolation
162 by distance could too led to high population structure between island (Parmakelis et al., 2015;
163 White & Searle, 2007). These populations are thus more prone to genetic diversity loss, which
164 may lead to fewer opportunities to adapt to changes. Although this does not necessarily
165 increase their vulnerability *per se*, the loss of genetic diversity due to disturbances, especially
166 when exposed to disturbances over a short time period (Inamine et al., 2022), can cause a
167 demographic or genetic collapse. Thus, losing an insular population can cause demographic
168 and genetic loss, whereas it causes only demographic loss on mainland. Because of that, the
169 effective conservation units on islands should be at the population level, rather than species
170 level (e.g., (Melo & O'Ryan, 2007)).

171 Besides population- and species-level characteristics, the composition of insular species'
172 assemblages harbours features that make them more vulnerable. An example is their
173 disharmonic taxonomic composition, which refers to the systematic over- or under-
174 representation of certain taxonomic groups compared to continental assemblages. Notable
175 examples include the absence of several families of non-volant mammals on many isolated
176 islands (Brace et al., 2015), and the over-representation of pteridophytes in plant communities
177 (Kreft et al., 2010). The absence of certain functional groups, although partially compensated
178 by in-situ diversification and differentiation, allows the establishment of new exotic species
179 (Vitousek et al., 1997). These exotic species can exert a new role (predation, competition)
180 unknown to the native community, which is evolutionarily and functionally unequipped to
181 withstand these novel pressures. Additionally, species traits in island communities are often
182 complementary rather than redundant, leading to communities with low functional
183 redundancy (Harter et al., 2015; Whittaker et al., 2014), making them more sensitive to threats
184 (McConkey & Drake, 2015) and with no 'ecological insurance' to replace the missing
185 functions (Loreau et al., 2021).

186 *State of the art of vulnerability assessments on insular biota*

187 Despite the inherent vulnerability of insular biota to global changes, the majority of
188 vulnerability assessments of biodiversity have so far focused on mainland systems, ignoring
189 islands. Climate change vulnerability assessments emerged in the 1990s to pre-empt impacts
190 and prepare appropriate responses (Foden et al., 2019; Solomon et al., 2007). Most definitions
191 concur that a species' vulnerability to a threat is determined by three factors: **exposure**,
192 **sensitivity**, and **adaptive capacity** (Butt et al., 2022; Foden et al., 2013, 2019). Using this
193 definition, a recent review showed that among the 741 studies assessing climate change
194 vulnerability, the large majority focused on mainland systems, and less than one third (n=231)
195 included islands (de los Ríos et al., 2018) (see Table S2 for examples) and with only 136

196 studies associated with a specific insular country. Those island vulnerability assessments were
197 often geographically or taxonomically restricted towards high income countries (e.g.,
198 Australia, the UK, and the USA account for 60% of studies on insular biota), and plants (49%
199 of studies) (Figure 1B). In addition, the large majority of vulnerability assessments do not
200 consider the influence of multiple threats (but see Santos et al., 2021; Sousa et al., 2021; Ureta
201 et al., 2022), which are likely to act together and be exacerbated by climate change (e.g.,
202 habitat loss, overexploitation, biological invasions).

203 Making the assumption that exposure is a suitable proxy for the impact of a particular threat,
204 most vulnerability assessment studies focused on exposure alone, and less than 10% relied on
205 the three specified components of vulnerability (Butt et al., 2016; de los Ríos et al., 2018).

206 The implicit associated assumption is that all species will have equal responses to a threat,
207 which is highly unlikely. In fact, species' responses to threats, either on mainland or islands,
208 are modulated by their traits (Fromm & Meiri, 2021; Leclerc, Villéger, et al., 2020; Marino et
209 al., 2022; Soares et al., 2022). We argue here that, applied to a range of taxa and threats, trait-
210 based vulnerability assessments can provide a useful approach for (i) developing a more
211 comprehensive index of vulnerability to threats, and (ii) informing effective management
212 actions for conservation (Gallagher et al., 2021).

213 **Perspective**


214 We present a conceptual framework divided in four steps that provides a roadmap for
215 vulnerability assessments in insular systems, considering the three components of
216 vulnerability (i.e., exposure, sensitivity, and adaptive capacity; Figure 2). We built upon
217 previous works focused on taxonomic diversity in mainland ecosystems (Foden et al., 2013;
218 Parravicini et al., 2014) to include in our framework various markers for each vulnerability
219 component related to the inherent characteristics of island biota, as well as multiple threats,
220 taxa, and dimensions of diversity (i.e., taxonomic, functional and phylogenetic diversity; TD,

221 FD and PD). The development of this framework is part of a larger initiative to meet
222 international policy targets that better integrate biodiversity threats and dimensions (Box 2).


223 *Step 1: Identify the scope and aim of the vulnerability of insular biota*

224 The first step is to define the scope of the vulnerability assessment in terms of spatial and
225 temporal extent, relevant threats, and studied biota (taxonomic group, biological level,
226 species biogeographical origin). This challenging task is pivotal for the assessment design,
227 which in turn affects the final step of informing conservation actions (Step 4). For example,
228 broad-scale assessments (e.g., at the global extent or among several archipelagos) contribute
229 to strategic planning and to establish a common baseline of vulnerability information (e.g.,
230 IPBES assessments), while local-scale assessments (e.g., within archipelagos or group of
231 islands) are appropriate for informing site-level management decisions. Also at the global
232 scale, special attention should be paid to endemic species or insular populations, since island
233 biodiversity conservation operates at the population level.


① Identify the scope and aim of the vulnerability assessment of insular biota




② Determine the markers of exposure, sensitivity and adaptive capacity



③ Compute measurements of vulnerability and its components



④ From vulnerability assessment to policy relevant conservation actions



234

235 **Figure 2:** Conceptual framework for assessing island biodiversity vulnerability to global
236 change.

237

238

239 *Step 2: Determine the markers of exposure, sensitivity, and adaptive capacity*

240 There are many different relevant markers associated with species' vulnerability to threats.
241 Those markers may vary in type (e.g., ecological or demographic) and organisation level (e.g.,
242 population, species, community, or ecosystem). One can review the scientific literature and
243 elicit expert opinion to identify and collect relevant markers for each component of
244 vulnerability based on the scope and purpose of the assessment. For instance, assessing the
245 vulnerability of terrestrial species to land use change and climate change requires markers of
246 exposure to climate change (e.g., change in precipitation regimes, sea-level rise) and land use
247 change (e.g., urbanization rates, forest conversion into agriculture, infrastructure
248 development, shift from agriculture to tourism). Moreover, a list of biological traits to infer
249 the sensitivity and adaptive capacity of the studied insular species to those threats are needed
250 (Figure 2 and Table S1 for examples of exposure, sensitivity, and adaptive capacity markers).
251 Markers for exposure can be linked to the focal threat(s) or general to global changes, and
252 multiple markers should be used to capture the multiple dimensions of changes (e.g.,
253 temperature change, heat waves, droughts). Species' sensitivity is determined by their
254 intrinsic traits (e.g., climatic niche breadth, habitat specialization, diet breadth, body size,
255 etc.). Some sensitivity traits might be specific to a given threat (e.g., temperature tolerance),
256 while others are general and encompass the sensitivity to different threats (e.g., body size,
257 dependence on interspecific interactions). Note that for both sensitivity and adaptive capacity,
258 a long list of markers is applicable at either the population or species level (see (Thurman et
259 al., 2020) for a list and Table S1). However, markers applicable at the community level such
260 as functional or phylogenetic diversity could also be included (Table 1 for example).

261 Adaptive capacity refers to the ability of insular biota to respond to a stressor by persisting *in*
262 *situ* in the face of threats or novel conditions, or by shifting in space or time (following
263 (Thurman et al., 2020)). Acclimation, behavioural change, phenotypic plasticity and

264 evolutionary adaptation may all contribute to adaptive capacity (Foden et al., 2018; Royer-
265 Tardif et al., 2021). For mobile animals, especially the most vagile organisms, markers of
266 adaptive capacity can incorporate traits linked to movement or mobility (e.g., migration
267 frequency and distance, site fidelity) (Butt et al., 2022; Thurman et al., 2020). Note that for
268 plants and sessile organisms in general, adaptive capacity mostly refers to their capacity to
269 persist *in situ* with mating system and fecundity as strong markers. Finally, adaptive capacity
270 of insular biota can also be modulated by extrinsic factors, such as habitat quality, area
271 connectivity and level of protection, factors which could therefore be included in the measure
272 of adaptive capacity at the system level (i.e., island, archipelago).

273

274

275

276

277

278

279

280

281

282

283

284

	Functional-based markers	Phylogeny-based markers
--	--------------------------	-------------------------

285 **Table 1: Proposed functional-based and phylogeny-based metrics that could be used as**
286 **markers at the community level in vulnerability frameworks.**
287

Sensitivity	<i>Functional rarity:</i>	<i>Phylogenetic endemism:</i>
	<i>Definition</i> - Functional rarity, expressed at the species level, is the combination of the functional uniqueness, the scarcity and the geographic restrictedness of a species (Violle et al., 2017).	<i>Definition</i> - Phylogenetic endemism is the spatial restriction of the phylogenetic diversity of a community (ROSAUER et al., 2009). In other words, this is a relative measure of endemism that represents the degree to which lineages or branches of the tree of life are spatially restricted.
	<i>Rationale</i> - Given that functionally rare species can play a critical role in ecosystem functioning, and that they rarity make them heightened sensitivity to anthropogenic pressures (Davies et al., 2004; Loiseau et al., 2020), areas with a high proportion of functionally rare species are particularly susceptible to threats?	<i>Rationale</i> - Areas with high phylogenetic endemism are characterized by the presence of species that have diversified and evolved in response to specific environmental conditions within a particular location. Among the drivers shaping phylogenetic endemism, climate plays a significant role (Guo et al., 2023), implying that changes in climate conditions may disproportionately affect these species, potentially leading to their decline or extinction.
Adaptive capacity	<i>Functional redundancy:</i>	<i>Phylogenetic distinctiveness:</i>
	<i>Definition</i> - Functional redundancy of a given community reflects the tendency for the constituent species to perform similar functions (Mouillot et al., 2014).	<i>Definition</i> - Phylogenetic distinctiveness reflects the degree of isolation of a species or a group of species within a phylogenetic tree (Pavoine & Ricotta, 2021).
	<i>Rationale</i> - Functional redundancy has been theoretically and empirically linked to the concepts of resistance and resilience of ecosystem functioning to species loss (Biggs et al., 2020) via the insurance hypothesis (McCann, 2000). Hence, more functionally redundant systems should show greater resilience to perturbation (Mouillot et al., 2014) since when a species becomes extinct, its role can be fulfilled by functionally close species. This indirectly reflects the ability of the system to adapt to disturbances.	<i>Rationale</i> - Evolutionarily distinct species or group of species represent uniquely divergent genomes (Warren et al., 2008). Consequently, sets of evolutionarily distinct species are expected to encompass a large proportion of the parental clade's total phylogenetic diversity, which may play a crucial role in ensuring long-term stability and resilience (Cadotte et al., 2012). This implies that communities exhibiting higher phylogenetic distinctiveness are more likely to harbor increased evolutionary potential, enabling them to adapt.

288

289

290 *Step 3: Compute measures of vulnerability and its components*

291 Once all the markers are collected, the next step is to combine those markers to determine a
292 composite vulnerability measure. Of the myriad of vulnerability assessments that already exist
293 (e.g., correlative, trait-based, mechanistic), not all are equivalent in terms of data requirements
294 and objectives (see Foden et al., 2019 for an extensive review on the topic), with the
295 correlative approaches being the most frequently used. Despite the increasing availability of
296 traits for birds, mammals, reptiles, and plants (Díaz et al., 2022; Faurby et al., 2018; Soria et
297 al., 2021; Tobias et al., 2021), trait-based approaches have been barely applied to date.
298 Among the trait-based approaches, most are criteria-based, in which biota are classified into
299 categories of vulnerability from low to high when summing up the different components of
300 vulnerability (hereby referred to as qualitative or semi-quantitative frameworks). To prevent
301 the use of arbitrary thresholds, we propose a continuous quantitative framework where a
302 multicriteria decision analysis can be applied (Leclerc, Courchamp, et al., 2020; Parravicini et
303 al., 2014) and provide continuous values and a ranking of islands or archipelagos based on
304 their vulnerability scores. This technique ranks alternatives according to their distance to
305 positive (i.e., no vulnerability, where exposure and sensitivity are minimized and adaptive
306 capacity is maximized) and negative ideal solutions (see (Leclerc, Courchamp, et al., 2020)
307 for details). Note that alternative approaches exist for combining the three vulnerability
308 components such as additive effect between components (Nyboer et al., 2021) or interacting
309 effect between exposure and sensitivity for instance (Silva Rocha et al., 2024).

310

311 *Step 4: From vulnerability assessment to policy relevant conservation actions*

312 The vulnerability framework developed could be used to increase the fundamental knowledge
313 on vulnerability (Step 1-3) but has also the potential to help implementing biodiversity
314 policies (Step 4, Box 2). For instance, one of the targets of the Global Biodiversity
315 Framework is to minimize the impact of climate change on biodiversity through (among

316 others) mitigation, adaptation and risk disaster reduction actions. Such aims require to use
317 different markers of adaptive capacity through multiple plausible scenarios (e.g., protected
318 areas, habitat intactness) to inform on how different management actions can impact the
319 overall vulnerability. Vulnerability assessments can help targeting the control and eradication
320 of invasive alien species in conservation priority sites such as islands (Target 6), but also
321 identifying the sites that need to be under protection (Target 3) to conserve biodiversity.
322 Effective conservation practice relies on understanding biodiversity's vulnerability through
323 multiple lenses. Where the exposure type is common across species (e.g., inundation, invasive
324 species), the threat itself may be managed through dedicated programs for, like mangrove
325 rehabilitation, or invasive species control (Jones et al., 2016). Finally, beyond its use in
326 current policies, our vulnerability framework could be useful in drafting new policies. Indeed,
327 to set relevant targets in the new policies being drafted (e.g., by [year], reduce by [number] %
328 the number of species threatened by [threat]), policy makers need to know (i) what is the
329 current situation and (ii) what could be the future situation under different scenarios. Our
330 vulnerability framework may provide both, and can contribute to the setting of policy targets
331 that are simultaneously ambitious and reachable for insular biodiversity.

332

333 **Concluding remarks**

334 Given the proliferation of threats that islands are facing, efforts must be made to study island
335 biota in the light of global change, and thus to embrace the whole of biodiversity, mainland
336 and insular, in current vulnerability assessments in international instance such as IPCC or
337 IPBES. Our comprehensive and detailed framework lays the foundations to understand and
338 predict island biodiversity vulnerability to global change. Yet, the outcomes of vulnerability
339 assessments will be challenged by missing data and, in the case of future assessments, by
340 uncertainties about the future trajectories of anthropogenic threats. In this context, it is crucial

341 to estimate the existing uncertainty as well as to communicate this uncertainty (e.g., (Hossain
342 et al., 2019; Rocchini et al., 2011; Tessarolo et al., 2021; Thuiller et al., 2019)), which will
343 ultimately help to identify future research priorities.

344

345

346

347

348

349

350

351

352

353

354

355

356

357

358

359

360 **Glossary:**

361 **Adaptive capacity:** the ability to adapt to changing conditions for an individual, population
362 or a species; this may be via ecological (i.e., physiological and/or behavioural plasticity) or
363 evolutionary adaptation (i.e., through natural selection acting on quantitative traits).

364
365 **Adaptive radiation:** the rapid diversification of a single evolutionary lineage into multiple
366 ecologically or morphologically distinct species.

367 **Exposure:** the extent to which each species' physical environment changes due to global
368 threats. It includes the intensity, magnitude and frequency of the threat(s).

369
370 **Sensitivity:** the intrinsic capacity of species to cope with threats, based on their life-history,
371 ecology, morphology, or behavior.

372
373 **Threats:** external factors that have the potential to impact the viability, abundance,
374 distribution, or behavior of an individual, species, community or an ecosystem.

375
376 **Vulnerability:** susceptibility of a system/species to a negative impact following a threat

377
378
379
380
381
382
383
384
385
386
387
388
389
390
391
392
393
394
395
396
397
398
399
400
401
402
403
404
405
406
407
408

Box 1 The case of the Hawaiian honeycreepers

The Hawaiian Islands constitute an archipelago of eight larger and numerous smaller volcanic

410 | islands in the North Pacific Ocean, in total about 16,644 km² in size, and about 3,200 km from |

411 | the nearest mainland. The islands in the northwest are older and typically smaller, due to |

412 | progressive erosion, while the islands in the southeast are larger and still volcanically active. |


413 | Thanks to the archipelago's extreme isolation and the islands' variation in size and |

414 | environmental conditions, Hawaii has been a hotspot of speciation and adaptive radiation |

415 | (Baldwin & Sanderson, 1998; Lerner et al., 2011; Price, 2004). The Hawaiian honeycreepers |

416 | (Fringillidae: Drepanidinae) represent one of the most iconic examples of adaptive radiation, |

417 which has resulted in a striking variation in bill morphology (Lerner et al., 2011). This strong
 418 adaptive radiation, however, has also led to species with highly restricted ranges and naturally
 419 small population sizes. Hence, little is needed to push these species over the brink of



420 extinction and, to date, at least 36 of the 59 known species of honeycreepers are extinct
 421 (Figure 3a). Extinction has been non-random with respect to the functional trait space of the
 422 species, with extinct species generally larger in size (Figure 3b). The main drivers of past
 423 extinction, as well as current threats to the species, are the introduction of alien species and
 424 the loss of habitat due to conversion to agricultural land. Introduced species include predators
 425 of birds and eggs (rats, cats, dogs), herbivores that modify the habitat (for example, the
 426 extinction of Laysan Honeycreeper *Himatione fraithii* is ascribed to the introduction of
 427 rabbits, which eliminated virtually all vegetation cover from the Laysan islands), and vector
 428 species of infectious diseases, such as avian malaria (Benning et al., 2002). Habitat loss began
 429 with Polynesian colonists, who cleared much of the low-elevation and seasonally dry forest
 430 for agricultural purposes, and was continued by later European colonists, who additionally
 431 converted high-elevation forests for pasturage (Riper & Scott, 2017). Climatic factors
 432 contributed little to past extinctions but are a progressive threat to extant species, especially
 433 because it may lead to an upslope shift of infectious diseases (notably avian malaria)
 434 (Benning et al., 2002).

435
436
437
438
439
440
441
442
443
444
445
446
447
448
449
450
451
452
453
454

Figure 3: Conservation status, threats, and morphospace of Hawaiian Honeycreepers.
(a) IUCN Red List threat status of 59 known species of honeycreeper (LC: least concern, NT: near threatened, VU: vulnerable, EN: endangered, CR: critically endangered, EX: extinct) and prevalence of threats among the 23 extant species (IAS: invasive alien species, HL: habitat loss, CC: climate change and extreme events, OE: over-exploitation, Po: pollution) (b) The morphospace compared between 19 extant honeycreepers (dark grey polygon), 54 extant and extinct honeycreepers (medium grey polygon), and 5,974 extant passerine birds globally (light grey polygon). The morphospaces for the extant species were obtained through a principal component analysis (PCA) based on the eight morphological traits available in AVONET (Tobias et al., 2021), namely bill length from tip to skull along the culmen, bill length to nostrils, bill width and depth to nostrils, tarsal, wing and tail length, and Kipp’s distance. The same eight traits for the extinct honeycreepers were taken from (Matthews et al., 2023). The first two principal components explain 80% of the total morphological variance and are primarily associated with body size (PC1) and tarsus length versus Kipp’s distance (PC2), respectively. The list of species was obtained from (Matthews et al., 2023; Ricklefs, 2017) and the IUCN Red List of Threatened Species v2023-1. Species names were harmonized and duplicates removed based on the taxonomic backbone used by the IUCN.

455 **Box 2| A novel vulnerability framework fit for multiple policies**


456 This novel vulnerability framework proposed for insular biodiversity is particularly relevant
457 to inform various vulnerability policies (in orange) and biodiversity policies (in green) at both
458 international and supranational levels such as the European Union (EU).

459 First, by quantifying the three components of island vulnerability, our framework can directly
460 feed the currently missing biodiversity component of the Multidimensional Vulnerability
461 Index (MVI). The MVI is developed by the Small Island Developing States (SIDS;
462 <https://www.un.org/ohrlls/mvi/>) with the United Nations to characterise the financing help for
463 sustainable development needed in the face of global change (1). The SIDS is a political
464 coalition of 39 low-lying islands that are united by the threat posed by climate change to their
465 survival. In climate change negotiations, they are a loud and powerful voice for upscaling
466 climate action since they are disproportionately affected by climate change consequences. To
467 understand and respond, several assessments of these islands' climate change vulnerability
468 have been carried out (e.g. (UN High Level Panel, 2022; UNFCCC, 2007)), but none includes
469 more than a broad mention of biodiversity impacts. A scientifically rigorous assessment of
470 climate change vulnerability of island biodiversity is, therefore, both extremely important and
471 critically urgent. Our framework can also help EU Member States, which are required to
472 report to the European Commission on their disaster risk management activities, to identify
473 which components of vulnerability they can act on (2). The risk of biodiversity loss has been
474 recently included in the Recommendations for National Risk Assessment for Disaster Risk
475 Management in the EU (Poljansek et al., 2021), but it does not cover specifically insular
476 biodiversity. In that context, our framework can provide a real additional value for the EU
477 Member States with insular territories. Our framework can also further help identifying
478 whether mitigation strategies for islands to reach Target 8 of the Kunming-Montreal Global

479 Biodiversity Framework (hereafter, GBF) should focus on limiting territories' exposure or
480 promoting the adaptive capacity of insular biota (3).

481 Second, our framework can help EU Member States with insular territories to identify and
482 prioritise which species, sites and threats they should use to best mitigate their vulnerability in
483 the context of their National Risk Assessment (4). Such actions can also contribute to (i)
484 identifying the species, sites and to focus the management measures to reach Target 4 of the
485 GBF (5), (ii) determining the most vulnerable islands to invasive alien species to reach Target
486 6 of the GBF (6), and helping EU Member States with insular territories to identify species
487 threatened by invasive alien species on which to focus conservation actions to reach Target 12
488 of the [EU Biodiversity Strategy for 2030](#) (EU BDS, 7).

489 Finally, by providing multiple scenarios of threats trajectories and a list of priority islands for
490 conservation action, our framework can contribute to document the risk of biodiversity loss
491 under different conservation scenarios to EU Member States with insular territories (8). The
492 vulnerability framework could contribute to identifying priority islands for restoration (target
493 2 of the GBF and target 4 of the EU BDS (9)) and for protection (target 3 of the GBF and
494 target 1 of the EU BDS (10)), as well as in determining which invasive alien species should
495 be eradicated or controlled (target 6 of the GBF (11)).



496

497

498

499

500

501

502

503

504 **Funding** : This research is product of the RIVAGE group
 505 funded by the synthesis center CESAB of the French FoundaOon for Research on
 506 Biodiversity

507 (FRB; www.fondationbiodiversite.fr)

508

509

510

511

512

513

514

515

516

517

518

519

520

521

522

523

524

525

526

527

528 Albert, C., Luque, G. M., & Courchamp, F. (2018). The twenty most charismatic species. *PLOS ONE*,
529 13(7), e0199149. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0199149>

530 Antonelli, A., Smith, R. J., Perrigo, A. L., Crottini, A., Hackel, J., Testo, W., Farooq, H., Torres Jiménez,
531 M. F., Andela, N., Andermann, T., Andriamanohera, A. M., Andriambololonera, S., Bachman,
532 S. P., Bacon, C. D., Baker, W. J., Belluardo, F., Birkinshaw, C., Borrell, J. S., Cable, S., ...
533 Ralimanana, H. (2022). Madagascar's extraordinary biodiversity: Evolution, distribution, and
534 use. *Science*, 378(6623), eabf0869. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.abf0869>

535 Baeckens, S., & Van Damme, R. (2020). The island syndrome. *Current Biology*, 30(8), R338–R339.
536 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cub.2020.03.029>

537 Baldwin, B. G., & Sanderson, M. J. (1998). Age and rate of diversification of the Hawaiian silversword
538 alliance (Compositae). *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 95(16), 9402–9406.
539 <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.95.16.9402>

540 Benítez-López, A., Santini, L., Gallego-Zamorano, J., Milá, B., Walkden, P., Huijbregts, M. A. J., &
541 Tobias, J. A. (2021). The island rule explains consistent patterns of body size evolution in
542 terrestrial vertebrates. *Nature Ecology & Evolution*, 5(6), Article 6.
543 <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41559-021-01426-y>

544 Benning, T. L., LaPointe, D., Atkinson, C. T., & Vitousek, P. M. (2002). Interactions of climate change
545 with biological invasions and land use in the Hawaiian Islands: Modeling the fate of endemic
546 birds using a geographic information system. *Proceedings of the National Academy of*
547 *Sciences*, 99(22), 14246–14249. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.162372399>

548 Biddick, M., Hendriks, A., & Burns, K. C. (2019). Plants obey (and disobey) the island rule. *Proceedings*
549 *of the National Academy of Sciences*, 116(36), 17632–17634.
550 <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1907424116>

551 Biggs, C. R., Yeager, L. A., Bolser, D. G., Bonsell, C., Dichiera, A. M., Hou, Z., Keyser, S. R., Khursigara,
552 A. J., Lu, K., Muth, A. F., Negrete Jr., B., & Erisman, B. E. (2020). Does functional redundancy

553 affect ecological stability and resilience? A review and meta-analysis. *Ecosphere*, 11(7),
554 e03184. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ecs2.3184>

555 Brace, S., Turvey, S. T., Weksler, M., Hoogland, M. L. P., & Barnes, I. (2015). Unexpected evolutionary
556 diversity in a recently extinct Caribbean mammal radiation. *Proceedings of the Royal Society*
557 *B: Biological Sciences*, 282(1807), 20142371. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2014.2371>

558 Burns, K. (2016). Spinescence in the New Zealand flora: Parallels with Australia. *New Zealand Journal*
559 *of Botany*, 54(2), 273–289. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0028825X.2015.1130727>

560 Burns, K. C. (2019). *Evolution in Isolation: The Search for an Island Syndrome in Plants*. Cambridge
561 University Press.

562 Butt, N., Halpern, B. S., O'Hara, C. C., Allcock, A. L., Polidoro, B., Sherman, S., Byrne, M., Birkeland, C.,
563 Dwyer, R. G., Frazier, M., Woodworth, B. K., Arango, C. P., Kingsford, M. J., Udyawer, V.,
564 Hutchings, P., Scanes, E., McClaren, E. J., Maxwell, S. M., Diaz-Pulido, G., ... Klein, C. J. (2022).
565 A trait-based framework for assessing the vulnerability of marine species to human impacts.
566 *Ecosphere*, 13(2), e3919. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ecs2.3919>

567 Butt, N., Possingham, H. P., De Los Rios, C., Maggini, R., Fuller, R. A., Maxwell, S. L., & Watson, J. E. M.
568 (2016). Challenges in assessing the vulnerability of species to climate change to inform
569 conservation actions. *Biological Conservation*, 199, 10–15.
570 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biocon.2016.04.020>

571 Cadotte, M. W., Dinnage, R., & Tilman, D. (2012). Phylogenetic diversity promotes ecosystem
572 stability. *Ecology*, 93(sp8), S223–S233. <https://doi.org/10.1890/11-0426.1>

573 Capdevila, P., Noviello, N., Mcrae, L., Freeman, R., & Clements, C. F. (2021). Global patterns of
574 resilience decline in vertebrate populations. *Ecology Letters*, October, 1–12.
575 <https://doi.org/10.1111/ele.13927>

576 Clavero, M., Brotons, L., Pons, P., & Sol, D. (2009). Prominent role of invasive species in avian
577 biodiversity loss. *Biological Conservation*, 142(10), 2043–2049.
578 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biocon.2009.03.034>

579 Davies, K. F., Margules, C. R., & Lawrence, J. F. (2004). A SYNERGISTIC EFFECT PUTS RARE,
580 SPECIALIZED SPECIES AT GREATER RISK OF EXTINCTION. *Ecology*, *85*(1), 265–271.
581 <https://doi.org/10.1890/03-0110>

582 de los Ríos, C., Watson, J. E. M., & Butt, N. (2018). Persistence of methodological, taxonomical, and
583 geographical bias in assessments of species' vulnerability to climate change: A review. *Global*
584 *Ecology and Conservation*, *15*, e00412. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gecco.2018.e00412>

585 Díaz, S., Kattge, J., Cornelissen, J. H. C., Wright, I. J., Lavorel, S., Dray, S., Reu, B., Kleyer, M., Wirth, C.,
586 Prentice, I. C., Garnier, E., Bönsch, G., Westoby, M., Poorter, H., Reich, P. B., Moles, A. T.,
587 Dickie, J., Zanne, A. E., Chave, J., ... Zotz, G. (2022). The global spectrum of plant form and
588 function: Enhanced species-level trait dataset. *Scientific Data*, *9*(1), 755.
589 <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41597-022-01774-9>

590 Faurby, S., Davis, M., Pedersen, R. Ø., Schowaneck, S. D., Antonelli, A., & Svenning, J.-C. (2018).
591 PHYLACINE 1.2: The Phylogenetic Atlas of Mammal Macroecology. *Ecology*, *99*(11), 2626.
592 <https://doi.org/10.1002/ecy.2443>

593 Fernández-Palacios, J. M., Kreft, H., Irl, S. D. H., Norder, S., Ah-Peng, C., Borges, P. A. V., Burns, K. C.,
594 de Nascimento, L., Meyer, J.-Y., Montes, E., & Drake, D. R. (2021). Scientists' warning – The
595 outstanding biodiversity of islands is in peril. *Global Ecology and Conservation*, *31*, e01847.
596 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gecco.2021.e01847>

597 Foden, W. B., Butchart, S. H. M., Stuart, S. N., Vié, J.-C., Akçakaya, H. R., Angulo, A., DeVantier, L. M.,
598 Gutsche, A., Turak, E., Cao, L., Donner, S. D., Katariya, V., Bernard, R., Holland, R. A., Hughes,
599 A. F., O'Hanlon, S. E., Garnett, S. T., Sekercioglu, C. H., & Mace, G. M. (2013). Identifying the
600 world's most climate change vulnerable species: A systematic trait-based assessment of all
601 birds, amphibians and corals. *PloS One*, *8*(6), e65427.
602 <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0065427>

603 Foden, W. B., Young, B. E., Akçakaya, H. R., Garcia, R. A., Hoffmann, A. A., Stein, B. A., Thomas, C. D.,
604 Wheatley, C. J., Bickford, D., Carr, J. A., Hole, D. G., Martin, T. G., Pacifici, M., Pearce-Higgins,

605 J. W., Platts, P. J., Visconti, P., Watson, J. E. M., & Huntley, B. (2018). Climate change
606 vulnerability assessment of species. *Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviews: Climate Change*, July,
607 e551. <https://doi.org/10.1002/wcc.551>

608 Foden, W. B., Young, B. E., Akçakaya, H. R., Garcia, R. A., Hoffmann, A. A., Stein, B. A., Thomas, C. D.,
609 Wheatley, C. J., Bickford, D., Carr, J. A., Hole, D. G., Martin, T. G., Pacifici, M., Pearce-Higgins,
610 J. W., Platts, P. J., Visconti, P., Watson, J. E. M., & Huntley, B. (2019). Climate change
611 vulnerability assessment of species. *WIREs Climate Change*, 10(1), e551.
612 <https://doi.org/10.1002/wcc.551>

613 Fromm, A., & Meiri, S. (2021). Big, flightless, insular and dead: Characterising the extinct birds of the
614 Quaternary. *Journal of Biogeography*, 48(9), 2350–2359. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jbi.14206>

615 Gallagher, R. V., Butt, N., Carthey, A. J. R., Tulloch, A., Bland, L., Clulow, S., Newsome, T., Dudaniec, R.
616 Y., & Adams, V. M. (2021). A guide to using species trait data in conservation. *One Earth*, 4(7),
617 927–936. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.oneear.2021.06.013>

618 Guo, W.-Y., Serra-Diaz, J. M., Eiserhardt, W. L., Maitner, B. S., Merow, C., Violle, C., Pound, M. J., Sun,
619 M., Slik, F., Blach-Overgaard, A., Enquist, B. J., & Svenning, J.-C. (2023). Climate change and
620 land use threaten global hotspots of phylogenetic endemism for trees. *Nature*
621 *Communications*, 14(1), 6950. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-023-42671-y>

622 Harter, D. E. V., Irl, S. D. H., Seo, B., Steinbauer, M. J., Gillespie, R., Triantis, K. A., Fernández-Palacios,
623 J.-M., & Beierkuhnlein, C. (2015). Impacts of global climate change on the floras of oceanic
624 islands – Projections, implications and current knowledge. *Perspectives in Plant Ecology,*
625 *Evolution and Systematics*, 17(2), 160–183. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ppees.2015.01.003>

626 Hossain, M. A., Kujala, H., Bland, L. M., Burgman, M., & Lahoz-Monfort, J. J. (2019). Assessing the
627 impacts of uncertainty in climate-change vulnerability assessments. *Diversity and*
628 *Distributions*, 25(8), 1234–1245. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ddi.12936>

629 Inamine, H., Miller, A., Roxburgh, S., Buckling, A., & Shea, K. (2022). Pulse and Press Disturbances
630 Have Different Effects on Transient Community Dynamics. *The American Naturalist*, 200(4),
631 571–583. <https://doi.org/10.1086/720618>

632 Jones, H. P., Holmes, N. D., Butchart, S. H. M., Tershy, B. R., Kappes, P. J., Corkery, I., Aguirre-muñoz,
633 A., Armstrong, D. P., Bonnaud, E., Burbidge, A. A., Campbell, K., Courchamp, F., Cowan, P. E.,
634 Cuthbert, R. J., Ebbert, S., Genovesi, P., Howald, G., Keitt, B. S., Kress, S. W., ... Croll, D. A.
635 (2016). Invasive mammal eradication on islands results in substantial conservation gains.
636 *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 1–6.
637 <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1521179113>

638 Kreft, H., Jetz, W., Mutke, J., & Barthlott, W. (2010). Contrasting environmental and regional effects
639 on global pteridophyte and seed plant diversity. *Ecography*, 33(2), 408–419.
640 <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1600-0587.2010.06434.x>

641 Leclerc, C., Courchamp, F., & Bellard, C. (2020). Future climate change vulnerability of endemic island
642 mammals. *Nature Communications*, 11(1), 4943. [https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-020-18740-](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-020-18740-x)
643 x

644 Leclerc, C., Villéger, S., Marino, C., & Bellard, C. (2020). Global changes threaten functional and
645 taxonomic diversity of insular species worldwide. *Diversity and Distributions*, 26(4), 402–414.
646 <https://doi.org/10.1111/ddi.13024>

647 Lerner, H. R. L., Meyer, M., James, H. F., Hofreiter, M., & Fleischer, R. C. (2011). Multilocus Resolution
648 of Phylogeny and Timescale in the Extant Adaptive Radiation of Hawaiian Honeycreepers.
649 *Current Biology*, 21(21), 1838–1844. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cub.2011.09.039>

650 Loiseau, N., Mouquet, N., Casajus, N., Grenié, M., Guéguen, M., Maitner, B., Mouillot, D., Ostling, A.,
651 Renaud, J., Tucker, C., Velez, L., Thuiller, W., & Violle, C. (2020). Global distribution and
652 conservation status of ecologically rare mammal and bird species. *Nature Communications*,
653 11(1), 5071. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-020-18779-w>

654 Lomolino, M. V. (1985). Body Size of Mammals on Islands: The Island Rule Reexamined. *The American*
655 *Naturalist*, 125(2), 310–316.

656 Loreau, M., Barbier, M., Filotas, E., Gravel, D., Isbell, F., Miller, S. J., Montoya, J. M., Wang, S.,
657 Aussenac, R., Germain, R., Thompson, P. L., Gonzalez, A., & Dee, L. E. (2021). Biodiversity as
658 insurance: From concept to measurement and application. *Biological Reviews*, 96(5), 2333–
659 2354. <https://doi.org/10.1111/brv.12756>

660 Manes, S., Costello, M. J., Beckett, H., Debnath, A., Devenish-Nelson, E., Grey, K.-A., Jenkins, R., Khan,
661 T. M., Kiessling, W., Krause, C., Maharaj, S. S., Midgley, G. F., Price, J., Talukdar, G., & Vale, M.
662 M. (2021). Endemism increases species' climate change risk in areas of global biodiversity
663 importance. *Biological Conservation*, 257, 109070.
664 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biocon.2021.109070>

665 Mantyka-Pringle, C. S., Martin, T. G., & Rhodes, J. R. (2011). Interactions between climate and habitat
666 loss effects on biodiversity: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Global Change Biology*,
667 n/a-n/a. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2486.2011.02593.x>

668 Marino, C., Leclerc, C., & Bellard, C. (2022). Profiling insular vertebrates prone to biological invasions:
669 What makes them vulnerable? *Global Change Biology*, 28(3), 1077–1090.
670 <https://doi.org/10.1111/gcb.15941>

671 Matthews, T. J., Wayman, J. P., Whittaker, R. J., Cardoso, P., Hume, J. P., Sayol, F., Proios, K., Martin,
672 T. E., Baiser, B., Borges, P. A. V., Kubota, Y., dos Anjos, L., Tobias, J. A., Soares, F. C., Si, X.,
673 Ding, P., Mendenhall, C. D., Sin, Y. C. K., Rheindt, F. E., ... Rigal, F. (2023). A global analysis of
674 avian island diversity–area relationships in the Anthropocene. *Ecology Letters*, 26(6), 965–
675 982. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ele.14203>

676 McCann, K. S. (2000). The diversity-stability debate. *Nature*, 405(6783), 228–233.
677 <https://doi.org/10.1038/35012234>

678 McConkey, K. R., & Drake, D. R. (2015). Low redundancy in seed dispersal within an island frugivore
679 community. *AoB PLANTS*, 7, plv088. <https://doi.org/10.1093/aobpla/plv088>

680 Melo, M., & O'ryan, C. (2007). Genetic differentiation between Príncipe Island and mainland
681 populations of the grey parrot (*Psittacus erithacus*), and implications for conservation.
682 *Molecular Ecology*, 16(8), 1673–1685. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-294X.2006.03128.x>

683 Mouillot, D., Villéger, S., Parravicini, V., Kulbicki, M., Arias-González, J. E., Bender, M., Chabanet, P.,
684 Floeter, S. R., Friedlander, A., Vigliola, L., & Bellwood, D. R. (2014). Functional over-
685 redundancy and high functional vulnerability in global fish faunas on tropical reefs.
686 *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, 111(38),
687 13757–13762. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1317625111>

688 Nyboer, E. A., Lin, H.-Y., Bennett, J. R., Gabriel, J., Twardek, W., Chhor, A. D., Daly, L., Dolson, S.,
689 Guitard, E., Holder, P., Mozzon, C. M., Trahan, A., Zimmermann, D., Kesner-Reyes, K., Garilao,
690 C., Kaschner, K., & Cooke, S. J. (2021). Global assessment of marine and freshwater
691 recreational fish reveals mismatch in climate change vulnerability and conservation effort.
692 *Global Change Biology*, 27(19), 4799–4824. <https://doi.org/10.1111/gcb.15768>

693 Parmakelis, A., Rigal, F., Mourikis, T. P., Balanika, K., Terzopoulou, S., Rego, C., Amorim, I. R., Crespo,
694 L. C. F., Pereira, F. L., Triantis, K. A., Whittaker, R. J., & Borges, P. A. V. (2015). Comparative
695 phylogeography of endemic Azorean arthropods. *BMC Evolutionary Biology*, 15.
696 <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:17414518>

697 Parravicini, V., Villéger, S., Mcclanahan, T. R., Arias-González, J. E., Bellwood, D. R., Belmaker, J.,
698 Chabanet, P., Floeter, S. R., Friedlander, A. M., Guilhaumon, F., Vigliola, L., Kulbicki, M., &
699 Mouillot, D. (2014). Global mismatch between species richness and vulnerability of reef fish
700 assemblages. *Ecology Letters*, 17(9), 1101–1110. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ele.12316>

701 Pavoine, S., & Ricotta, C. (2021). On the relationships between rarity, uniqueness, distinctiveness,
702 originality and functional/phylogenetic diversity. *Biological Conservation*, 263, 109356.
703 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biocon.2021.109356>

704 Poljansek, K., Casajus, V. A., Marin, F. M., Artes, V. T., Boca, R., Bonadonna, C., Branco, A.,
705 Campanharo, W., De, J. A., De, R. D., Dottori, F., Durrant, T., Estreguil, C., Ferrari, D.,

706 Frischknecht, C., Galbusera, L., Garcia, P. B., Giannopoulos, G., Girgin, S., ... Wood, M. (2021,
707 February 23). *Recommendations for National Risk Assessment for Disaster Risk Management*
708 *in EU*. JRC Publications Repository. <https://doi.org/10.2760/80545>

709 Price, J. P. (2004). Floristic biogeography of the Hawaiian Islands: Influences of area, environment
710 and paleogeography. *Journal of Biogeography*, *31*(3), 487–500.
711 <https://doi.org/10.1046/j.0305-0270.2003.00990.x>

712 Ricklefs, R. E. (2017). Historical Biogeography and Extinction in the Hawaiian Honeycreepers. *The*
713 *American Naturalist*, *190*(4), E106–E111. <https://doi.org/10.1086/693346>

714 Riper, C. G. V., & Scott, J. M. (2017). *Limiting factors affecting hawaiian native birds*.
715 <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:244917512>

716 Rocchini, D., Hortal, J., Lengyel, S., Lobo, J. M., Jiménez-Valverde, A., Ricotta, C., Bacaro, G., &
717 Chiarucci, A. (2011). Accounting for uncertainty when mapping species distributions: The
718 need for maps of ignorance. *Progress in Physical Geography: Earth and Environment*, *35*(2),
719 211–226. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0309133311399491>

720 Rodrigues, A. S. L., Gray, C. L., Crowter, B. J., Ewers, R. M., Stuart, S. N., Whitten, T., & Manica, A.
721 (2010). A Global Assessment of Amphibian Taxonomic Effort and Expertise. *BioScience*,
722 *60*(10), 798–806. <https://doi.org/10.1525/bio.2010.60.10.6>

723 Roff, D. A. (1990). The Evolution of Flightlessness in Insects. *Ecological Monographs*, *60*(4), 389–421.
724 <https://doi.org/10.2307/1943013>

725 Rosauer, D., Laffan, S. W., Crisp, M. D., Donnellan, S. C., & Cook, L. G. (2009). Phylogenetic endemism:
726 A new approach for identifying geographical concentrations of evolutionary history.
727 *Molecular Ecology*, *18*(19), 4061–4072. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-294X.2009.04311.x>

728 Royer-Tardif, S., Boisvert-Marsh, L., Godbout, J., Isabel, N., & Aubin, I. (2021). Finding common
729 ground: Toward comparable indicators of adaptive capacity of tree species to a changing
730 climate. *Ecology and Evolution*, *11*(19), 13081–13100. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ece3.8024>

731 Rozzi, R., Lomolino, M. V., van der Geer, A. A. E., Silvestro, D., Lyons, S. K., Bover, P., Alcover, J. A.,
732 Benítez-López, A., Tsai, C.-H., Fujita, M., Kubo, M. O., Ochoa, J., Scarborough, M. E., Turvey, S.
733 T., Zizka, A., & Chase, J. M. (2023). Dwarfism and gigantism drive human-mediated
734 extinctions on islands. *Science*, *379*(6636), 1054–1059.
735 <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.add8606>

736 Russell, J. C., & Kueffer, C. (2019). Island Biodiversity in the Anthropocene. *Annual Review of*
737 *Environment and Resources*, *44*(1), 31–60. [https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-environ-101718-](https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-environ-101718-033245)
738 [033245](https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-environ-101718-033245)

739 Santos, M. J., Smith, A. B., Dekker, S. C., Eppinga, M. B., Leitão, P. J., Moreno-Mateos, D., Morueta-
740 Holme, N., & Ruggeri, M. (2021). The role of land use and land cover change in climate
741 change vulnerability assessments of biodiversity: A systematic review. *Landscape Ecology*,
742 *36*(12), 3367–3382. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10980-021-01276-w>

743 Sayol, F., Steinbauer, J., Blackburn, T., Antonelli, A., & Faurby, S. (2021). Anthropogenic extinctions
744 conceal widespread evolution of flightlessness in birds. *Science Advances*, *6*(49), eabb6095.
745 <https://doi.org/10.1126/sciadv.abb6095>

746 Schrader, J., Wright, I. J., Kreft, H., & Westoby, M. (2021). A roadmap to plant functional island
747 biogeography. *Biological Reviews*, *96*(6), 2851–2870. <https://doi.org/10.1111/brv.12782>

748 Silva Rocha, B., Jamoneau, A., Logez, M., Laplace-Treyture, C., Reynaud, N., & Argillier, C. (2024).
749 Measuring biodiversity vulnerability in French lakes – The IVCLA index. *Science of The Total*
750 *Environment*, *908*, 168205. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2023.168205>

751 Soares, F. C., de Lima, R. F., Palmeirim, J. M., Cardoso, P., & Rodrigues, A. S. L. (2022). Combined
752 effects of bird extinctions and introductions in oceanic islands: Decreased functional diversity
753 despite increased species richness. *Global Ecology and Biogeography*, *31*(6), 1172–1183.
754 <https://doi.org/10.1111/geb.13494>

755 Solomon, S., Qin, D., Manning, Z., Chen, M., Marquis, K.B., Averyt, M., Tignor, & H.L. Miller. (2007).
756 *Contribution of Working Group I to the Fourth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental*
757 *Panel on Climate Change* (p. 996). IPCC.

758 Soria, C. D., Pacifici, M., Di Marco, M., Stephen, S. M., & Rondinini, C. (2021). COMBINE: a coalesced
759 mammal database of intrinsic and extrinsic traits. *Ecology*, 102(6), e03344.
760 <https://doi.org/10.1002/ecy.3344>

761 Sousa, A., Alves, F., Arranz, P., Dinis, A., Fernandez, M., González García, L., Morales, M., Lettrich, M.,
762 Encarnação Coelho, R., Costa, H., Capela Lourenço, T., Azevedo, N. M. J., & Frazão Santos, C.
763 (2021). Climate change vulnerability of cetaceans in Macaronesia: Insights from a trait-based
764 assessment. *Science of The Total Environment*, 795, 148652.
765 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2021.148652>

766 Tessarolo, G., Ladle, R. J., Lobo, J. M., Rangel, T. F., & Hortal, J. (2021). Using maps of biogeographical
767 ignorance to reveal the uncertainty in distributional data hidden in species distribution
768 models. *Ecography*, 44(12), 1743–1755. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ecog.05793>

769 Thuiller, W., Guéguen, M., Renaud, J., Karger, D. N., & Zimmermann, N. E. (2019). Uncertainty in
770 ensembles of global biodiversity scenarios. *Nature Communications*, 10(1), Article 1.
771 <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-019-09519-w>

772 Thurman, L. L., Stein, B. A., Beever, E. A., Foden, W., Geange, S. R., Green, N., Gross, J. E., Lawrence,
773 D. J., LeDee, O., Olden, J. D., Thompson, L. M., & Young, B. E. (2020). Persist in place or shift
774 in space? Evaluating the adaptive capacity of species to climate change. *Frontiers in Ecology*
775 *and the Environment*, 18(9), 520–528. <https://doi.org/10.1002/fee.2253>

776 Tobias, J. A., Sheard, C., Pigot, A. L., Devenish, A. J. M., Yang, J., Neate-Clegg, M. H. C., Alioravainen,
777 N., Weeks, T. L., Barber, R. A., Walkden, P. A., MacGregor, H. E. A., Jones, S. E. I., Vincent, C.,
778 Phillips, A. G., Marples, N. M., Montaña-Centellas, F., Leandro-Silva, V., Claramunt, S., Darski,
779 B., ... Schleuning, M. (2021). AVONET: morphological, ecological and geographical data for
780 all birds. *Ecology Letters*, 25(March), 581–597. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ele.13898>

781 Troudet, J., Grandcolas, P., Blin, A., Vignes-Lebbe, R., & Legendre, F. (2017). Taxonomic bias in
782 biodiversity data and societal preferences. *Scientific Reports*, 7(1), 9132.
783 <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-017-09084-6>

784 UN High Level Panel. (2022). *United Nations High Level Panel on the Development of a*
785 *Multidimensional Vulnerability Index Interim Report*. [https://www.oecd.org/dac/financing-](https://www.oecd.org/dac/financing-sustainable-)
786 [sustainable-](https://www.oecd.org/dac/financing-sustainable-)

787 UNFCCC. (2007). *VULNERABILITY AND ADAPTATION TO CLIMATE CHANGE IN SMALL ISLAND*
788 *DEVELOPING STATES*. the secretariat of the United Nations Framework Convention on
789 Climate Change.
790 [https://unfccc.int/files/adaptation/adverse_effects_and_response_measures_art_48/applica-](https://unfccc.int/files/adaptation/adverse_effects_and_response_measures_art_48/application/pdf/200702_sids_adaptation_bg.pdf)
791 [tion/pdf/200702_sids_adaptation_bg.pdf](https://unfccc.int/files/adaptation/adverse_effects_and_response_measures_art_48/application/pdf/200702_sids_adaptation_bg.pdf)

792 Ureta, C., Ramírez-Barrón, M., Sánchez-García, E. A., Cuervo-Robayo, A. P., Munguía-Carrara, M.,
793 Mendoza-Ponce, A., Gay, C., & Sánchez-Cordero, V. (2022). Species, taxonomic, and
794 functional group diversities of terrestrial mammals at risk under climate change and land-
795 use/cover change scenarios in Mexico. *Global Change Biology*, 28(23), 6992–7008.
796 <https://doi.org/10.1111/gcb.16411>

797 Violle, C., Thuiller, W., Mouquet, N., Munoz, F., Kraft, N. J. B., Cadotte, M. W., Livingstone, S. W., &
798 Mouillot, D. (2017). Functional Rarity: The Ecology of Outliers. *Trends in Ecology & Evolution*,
799 32(5), 356–367. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tree.2017.02.002>

800 Vitousek, P. M., D’Antonio, C. M., Loope, L. L., Rejmanek, M., & Westbrooks, R. (1997). Introduced
801 species: A significant component of Human-caused global environmental change The scope
802 and distribution of invasions. *Journal of Ecology*, 21, 1–16.

803 Warren, D. L., Glor, R. E., & Turelli, M. (2008). Environmental niche equivalency versus conservatism:
804 Quantitative approaches to niche evolution. *Evolution; International Journal of Organic*
805 *Evolution*, 62(11), 2868–2883. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1558-5646.2008.00482.x>

806 White, T. A., & Searle, J. B. (2007). Genetic diversity and population size: Island populations of the
807 common shrew, *Sorex araneus*. *Mol Ecol*, *16*(10), 2005–2016. PubMed.
808 <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-294x.2007.03296.x>

809 Whittaker, R. J., Rigal, F., Borges, P. A. V., Cardoso, P., Terzopoulou, S., Casanoves, F., Pla, L.,
810 Guilhaumon, F., Ladle, R. J., & Triantis, K. A. (2014). Functional biogeography of oceanic
811 islands and the scaling of functional diversity in the Azores. *Proceedings of the National*
812 *Academy of Sciences*, *111*(38), 13709 LP – 13714.

813 Zizka, A., Onstein, R. E., Rozzi, R., Weigelt, P., Kreft, H., Steinbauer, M. J., Bruelheide, H., & Lens, F.
814 (2022). The evolution of insular woodiness. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*,
815 *119*(37), e2208629119. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.2208629119>

816
817
818
819
820
821
822
823
824
825
826
827
828
829
830

Supplementary material :

831
832

833 **Supplementary appendix 1 :**

834 **Islands as past, current, and future epicentres of extinctions:** The IUCN Red List
835 documented nearly 1,000 species as globally extinct or extinct in the wild (IUCN Red list
836 access 04/07/2023). Among the documented extinctions, the overwhelming majority occurred
837 on oceanic or continental islands. Extinction hotspots are located in the Oceanic realm,
838 followed by the Afrotropical realm (e.g., Madagascar) and the Nearctic. Among reported
839 extinctions in the IUCN Red List, the large majority are represented by animal species
840 (>80%), followed by plants. Most of these species have gone extinct because of invasive alien
841 species, but a large number have also concurrently been harmed by wildlife exploitation
842 and/or land use change due to cultivation (Leclerc et al., 2018; Maxwell et al., 2016). In fact,
843 extinct species within insular regions have faced, on average, four threats (i.e., biological
844 invasions, wildlife exploitation, cultivation, and habitat modifications), and the exposure to
845 threats for birds, mammals, amphibians, reptiles, freshwater fish, plants, arthropods, and
846 gastropods continue to increase, with an average of ten threats being faced by threatened
847 species (Leclerc et al., 2018).

848 Moreover, because insular biota makes a disproportionate contribution to global biodiversity
849 in relation to their surface area (Fernández-Palacios et al., 2021), the risk for future
850 extinctions is high. The first extinction due to climate change already occurred on an island
851 near Papua New Guinea (Fulton, 2017). In 2016, *Melomys rubicola* (also called the Bramble
852 Cay melomys) became the very first documented extinction due to climate change (Waller et
853 al., 2017). This small rodent was endemic to a low-island of Bramble Cay in Australia and
854 was periodically recorded from 1978 to 2009. Seven years after its last observation in the field

855 and numerous efforts to trap the species the years after, the species was officially declared
856 extinct. Although only symbolic, compared to a thousand of species already extinct since
857 1500, this is one of the first documented victims of climate change as a major factor of near-
858 future extinctions in our contemporary history. Unfortunately, under future climate change,
859 we can expect that islands will continue to contribute disproportionately to the loss of
860 biodiversity, given that the overwhelming majority of critically endangered species are
861 endemic to island systems, and their inherent characteristics make them extremely vulnerable
862 to global change drivers

863
864
865
866
867
868
869
870
871
872
873
874
875
876
877
878
879
880
881
882
883
884
885
886
887
888
889
890
891
892
893
894
895

896 **Table S1:** Traits and characteristics from population to the community that may be included
 897 in the island biota vulnerability framework (IBVF) with examples of sources where to
 898 calculate or when directly available.
 899

	Traits	Level	Availability
Population dynamic	Growth rate	population	Living planet database (vertebrates), FishGlob (fishes), German vegetation (plants)
	Population size	population	CoralTraits (corals), BIOTime (multiple taxa)
Reproduction	Reproductive strategies	species	GIFT (plants), COMPADRE, GARD (reptiles)
	Mating system	species	
	Clutch size	species	GARD (reptiles), AmphiBio (amphibians), COMBINE (mammals), AVONET (birds)
	Fecundity	species	GARD (reptiles), AmphiBio (amphibians)
	Temperature-dependent sex determination	species	
	Generation time	species	Amniote (vertebrates), CoralTraits (corals), COMPADRE (plants)
	Parental care (time)	species	Amniote (vertebrates)
	Life-cycle	species	TRY (plants), GIFT (plants)
Life-history	Life stage	population	FishBase (fishes), CoralTraits (corals), Amphibio (amphibians)
	Dependence on intraspecific interactions	species	CoralTraits (corals)
	Body dimension (mass/size?)	species	Amniote (vertebrates), TRY (Plants), GIFT (plants), COMBINE (mammals), AVONET (birds).
Acclimatation or evolution	Clonality	species	GIFT (plants), COMPADRE (plants)
	Phenotypic plasticity	population	Noble et al 2018 (reptiles)
	Genetic diversity	population	Miraldo et al. 2016 (mammals)
	Life span	species	AmphiBio (amphibians), GARD (reptiles), GBIF (plants), BIEN (plants)
Ecological characteristics	Climatic niche breadth	species	Global Species Database (vertebrates, invertebrates, plants)
	Endemicity	species	
	Habitat specialization	species	IUCN
	Habitat condition	species	IUCN
	Diet breadth	species	GARD (reptiles), AmphiBio (amphibians), GARD (reptiles), Amphibio (amphibians)
	Nocturnality	species	
	Dependence on water for reproduction, foraging, shelter	species	Amphibio (amphibians)

Movement and mobility	Competitive ability	species	
	Dispersal capacity	species	AVONET (birds), TRY (plants), GIFT (plants)
	Site fidelity	species	
	Migration frequency and distance	species	AVONET (birds)
	Flight efficiency	species	AVONET (birds)
	Number of insular populations	population	
Distribution	Home range	population	HomeRange (mammals)
	Geographic rarity	population	
	Low local abundance	island level	
	Range size	population	IUCN
Community properties	Level of disharmony	community	
	Functional redundancy	community	TRY and GIFT(plants)
	Phylogenetic diversity	community	GIFT, WCVP (plants)
	Richness	community	GIFT, WCVP (plants)
	Intactness	ecosystem	
	Phylogenetic endemism	community	Vertlife (vertebrates), PhylomeDB (plants), GIFT, WCVP (plants)
Inherent vulnerability	Behaviour (aggressiveness)	species	
	Dwarfism-gigantism	species	Meiri et al 2008 (mammals), Meiri 2007 (reptiles), Benítez-López et al. 2021, Rozzi et al. 2023 GIFT (plants)
	Vulnerability to diseases	species	GABiP (amphibians)
	Tolerance to drought		try-db.org (plants), Le Galliard et al. 2021 (reptiles)
	Tolerance to fire	species	try-db.org (plants)
	Endemism	community	GIFT and WCVP (plants)

900

901

902 **References :**

903 Benítez-López, A., Santini, L., Gallego-Zamorano, J. *et al.* The island rule explains consistent
 904 patterns of body size evolution in terrestrial vertebrates. *Nat Ecol Evol* **5**, 768–786 (2021).

905 <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41559-021-01426-y>

906 Broekman, M. J. E., Hoeks, S., Freriks, R., Langendoen, M. M., Runge, K. M., Savenco, E.,
 907 ... & Tucker, M. A. (2023). HomeRange: A global database of mammalian home
 908 ranges. *Global Ecology and Biogeography*, 32(2), 198-205.

909 Brown, M.J.M., Walker, B.E., Black, N., Govaerts, R.H.A., Ondo, I., Turner, R. and Nic
 910 Lughadha, E. (2023), rWCVP: a companion R package for the World Checklist of Vascular
 911 Plants. *New Phytol*, 240: 1355-1365. <https://doi.org/10.1111/nph.18919>

912

913 Denelle, P., Weigelt, P., & Kreft, H. (2023). GIFT—An R package to access the Global
914 Inventory of Floras and Traits. *Methods in Ecology and Evolution*, 14, 2738–2748.
915 <https://doi.org/10.1111/2041-210X.14213>
916

917 Dornelas M, Antão LH, Moyes F, Bates, AE, Magurran, AE, et al. BioTIME: A database of
918 biodiversity time series for the Anthropocene. *Global Ecol Biogeogr.* 2018; 27:760 - 786.
919 <https://doi.org/10.1111/geb.12729>

920 Le Galliard, Jean- François, et al. "A worldwide and annotated database of evaporative water
921 loss rates in squamate reptiles." *Global Ecology and Biogeography* 30.10 (2021): 1938-1950.
922

923 Maitner BS, Boyle B, Casler N, et al. The bien r package: A tool to access the Botanical
924 Information and Ecology Network (BIEN) Database. *Methods Ecol Evol.* 2018; 9: 373–379.
925 <https://doi.org/10.1111/2041-210X.12861>
926

927 Salguero-Gómez, R., Jones, O.R., Archer, C.R., Buckley, Y.M., Che-Castaldo, J., Caswell,
928 H., Hodgson, D., Scheuerlein, A., Conde, D.A., Brinks, E., de Buhr, H., Farack, C.,
929 Gottschalk, F., Hartmann, A., Henning, A., Hoppe, G., Römer, G., Runge, J., Ruoff, T., Wille,
930 J., Zeh, S., Davison, R., Vieregg, D., Baudisch, A., Altwegg, R., Colchero, F., Dong, M., de
931 Kroon, H., Lebreton, J.-D., Metcalf, C.J.E., Neel, M.M., Parker, I.M., Takada, T., Valverde,
932 T., Vélez-Espino, L.A., Wardle, G.M., Franco, M. and Vaupel, J.W. (2015), The compadre
933 Plant Matrix Database: an open online repository for plant demography. *J Ecol*, 103: 202-218.
934 <https://doi.org/10.1111/1365-2745.12334>
935

936 Soria, C. D., M. Pacifici, M. Di Marco, S. M. Stephen, and C. Rondinini. 2021. COMBINE: a
937 coalesced mammal database of intrinsic and extrinsic traits. *Ecology*
938 102(6):e03344. [10.1002/ecy.3344](https://doi.org/10.1002/ecy.3344)

939 Kattge J, Bönisch G, Díaz S, et al. TRY plant trait database – enhanced coverage and open
940 access. *Glob Change Biol.* 2020; 26: 119–188. <https://doi.org/10.1111/gcb.14904>
941

942 Noble, Daniel WA, et al. "A comprehensive database of thermal developmental plasticity in
943 reptiles." *Scientific Data* 5.1 (2018): 1-7.
944

945 Meiri, Shai, Natalie Cooper, and Andy Purvis. "The island rule: made to be broken?."
946 *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences* 275.1631 (2008): 141-148.
947

948 Meiri, Shai. "Size evolution in island lizards." *Global Ecology and Biogeography* 16.6 (2007):
949 702-708.

950 Roberto Rozzi *et al*, Dwarfism and gigantism drive human-mediated extinctions on
951 islands. *Science* 379, 1054-1059 (2023). DOI: [10.1126/science.add8606](https://doi.org/10.1126/science.add8606)

952 Tobias, J.A., Sheard, C., Pigot, A.L., Devenish, A.J.M., Yang, J., Sayol, F., et al. (2022)
953 AVONET: morphological, ecological and geographical data for all birds. *Ecology Letters*, 25,
954 581–597. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ele.13898>
955
956

957

958 **Table S2:** An overview of studies assessing the vulnerability of species to climate change.
 959 This is a non-exhaustive summary that focuses on studies that have been conducted recently,
 960 use trait-based approaches, and include a full assessment of vulnerability with exposure,
 961 sensitivity, and adaptive capacity markers.
 962

Study	Ecosystems	Spatial coverage	Taxa	n	Main findings
(Barry et al., 2023)	Freshwater	Ireland	Fish	32	All species were vulnerable to some effect of climate change with cold water species more vulnerable to climate change than warm water species.
(Boyce et al., 2022)	Marine	Global	Multiple groups (animals, plants, chromists, protozoans, and bacteria)	24,975	Almost 90% of all species are at high or critical risk under high emissions, with exploited species in low-income countries with heavy dependence on fisheries at greatest risk.
(Nyboer et al., 2021)	Freshwater / Marine	Global	Fish	415	Over 20% of recreationally fishes are vulnerable under a high emission scenario, with 72% of vulnerable freshwater fish and 33% of vulnerable diadromous fish being without conservation effort, compared to only 19% for vulnerable marine species.
(Vaz-Canosa et al., 2023)	Terrestrial	Uruguay	Amphibians Reptiles	112	14.6% of amphibians and 10.9% of reptiles were identified as highly vulnerable to climate change.
(Bueno-Pardo et al., 2021)	Marine	Portugal	Fish Invertebrates	74	Under the RCP 8.5 scenario, only two species were classified as at very high vulnerability. Overall vulnerability scores were low, likely due to the high adaptive capacity of species from temperate ecosystems.
(Leclerc et al., 2020)	Terrestrial – insular	Global	Mammals	873	All islands have some degree of vulnerability to future climate change, especially those in the Pacific Ocean. Among endemic mammals, those with long generation times and high food specialization are predicted to be most vulnerable to climate change.
(Ramírez-Bautista et al., 2020)	Terrestrial	Oaxaca State, Mexico	Rodents	55	Under the higher impact (MPI-RCP 8.5) climate scenarios, some level of threat was predicted for all species assessed, with 4 species predicted to be highly vulnerable.

963

964 **References :**

965

966 Barry, J., Radinger, J., Connor, L., Coyne, J., Kelly, S., & Kelly, F. L. (2023). The vulnerability of
 967 Ireland’s freshwater fish to climate change. *Fisheries Management and Ecology*, 30(2), 142–
 968 153. <https://doi.org/10.1111/fme.12606>

969 Boyce, D. G., Tittensor, D. P., Garilao, C., Henson, S., Kaschner, K., Kesner-Reyes, K., Pigot, A.,
970 Reyes, R. B., Reygondeau, G., Schleit, K. E., Shackell, N. L., Sorongon-Yap, P., & Worm, B.
971 (2022). A climate risk index for marine life. *Nature Climate Change*, *12*(9), 854–862.
972 <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41558-022-01437-y>

973 Bueno-Pardo, J., Nobre, D., Monteiro, J. N., Sousa, P. M., Costa, E. F. S., Baptista, V., Ovelheiro, A.,
974 Vieira, V. M. N. C. S., Chícharo, L., Gaspar, M., Erzini, K., Kay, S., Queiroga, H., Teodósio,
975 M. A., & Leitão, F. (2021). Climate change vulnerability assessment of the main marine
976 commercial fish and invertebrates of Portugal. *Scientific Reports*, *11*(1), 2958.
977 <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-021-82595-5>

978 Fernández-Palacios, J. M., Kreft, H., Irl, S. D. H., Norder, S., Ah-Peng, C., Borges, P. A. V., Burns, K.
979 C., de Nascimento, L., Meyer, J.-Y., Montes, E., & Drake, D. R. (2021). Scientists’ warning –
980 The outstanding biodiversity of islands is in peril. *Global Ecology and Conservation*, *31*,
981 e01847. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gecco.2021.e01847>

982 Fulton, G. R. (2017). The Bramble Cay melomys: The first mammalian extinction due to human-
983 induced climate change. *Pacific Conservation Biology*, *23*(1), 1–3.

984 Leclerc, C., Courchamp, F., & Bellard, C. (2018). Insular threat associations within taxa worldwide.
985 *Scientific Reports*, *8*(8), 6393. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-018-24733-0>

986 Leclerc, C., Courchamp, F., & Bellard, C. (2020). Future climate change vulnerability of endemic
987 island mammals. *Nature Communications*, *11*(1), 4943. [https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-020-](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-020-18740-x)
988 [18740-x](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-020-18740-x)

989 Maxwell, S. L., Fuller, R. A., Brooks, T. M., & Watson, J. E. M. (2016). Biodiversity: The ravages of
990 guns, nets and bulldozers. *Nature*, *536*, 143–145. <https://doi.org/10.1038/536143a>.

991 Nyboer, E. A., Lin, H.-Y., Bennett, J. R., Gabriel, J., Twardek, W., Chhor, A. D., Daly, L., Dolson, S.,
992 Guitard, E., Holder, P., Mozzon, C. M., Trahan, A., Zimmermann, D., Kesner-Reyes, K.,
993 Garilao, C., Kaschner, K., & Cooke, S. J. (2021). Global assessment of marine and freshwater
994 recreational fish reveals mismatch in climate change vulnerability and conservation effort.
995 *Global Change Biology*, *27*(19), 4799–4824. <https://doi.org/10.1111/gcb.15768>

996 Ramírez-Bautista, A., Thorne, J. H., Schwartz, M. W., & Williams, J. N. (2020). Trait-based climate
997 vulnerability of native rodents in southwestern Mexico. *Ecology and Evolution*, *10*(12), 5864–
998 5876. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ece3.6323>

999 Vaz-Canosa, P., Laufer, G., Borteiro, C., Baldo, D., Prigioni, C., & Soutullo, A. (2023). Expert-based
1000 assessment of the climate change vulnerability of amphibians and reptiles of Uruguay.
1001 *Environmental Conservation*, *50*(1), 12–21. [https://doi.org/DOI:](https://doi.org/DOI:10.1017/S0376892922000418)
1002 10.1017/S0376892922000418

1003 Waller, N. L., Gynther, I. C., Freeman, A. B., Lavery, T. H., & Leung, L. K.-P. (2017). The Bramble
1004 Cay melomys *Melomys rubicola* (Rodentia: Muridae): A first mammalian extinction caused
1005 by human-induced climate change? *Wildlife Research*, *44*(1), 9–21.

1006
1007
1008
1009
1010
1011
1012
1013
1014
1015
1016
1017
1018
1019
1020
1021
1022
1023
1024
1025
1026