species group with parapatric distributions

Improving species range estimates for an arboreal Cecina Babich Morrow¹, Peter J. Galante¹, Jamie M. Kass^{2,3,4}, Mary E. Blair¹

¹Center for Biodiversity and Conservation, American Museum of Natural History; ²Department of Biology, City College of New York; ³Program in Biology, Graduate Center, City University of New York; ⁴Biodiversity and Biocomplexity Unit, Okinawa Institute of Science and Technology Graduate University

- competition between parapatric species.
- species of *Bradypus*.
- maskRangeR for $n \ge 2$ species.

4-degree buffered background region Regularization multipliers: 0.5 to 5 (by 0.5) Feature classes: L, Q, H, LQ, LQH Evaluated using cross-validation with a checkerboard partition



AUC = 0.68, \triangle AICc = 148.69

0.15, AUC = 0.74, Δ AICc = 14.38

0.079, AUC = 0.88, Δ AICc = 30.83

Figure 1. Species distribution models.



NATURAL HISTORY



Link: <u>babichmorrowc.github.io/talk/mammalogy_2019</u> Email: cbabichmorrow@amnh.org





SUPPORT VECTOR MACHINES

We used the maskRangeR package to implement machine learning classifiers called SVMs to delineate spatial boundaries between ranges. <u>Unweighted:</u> all occurrence points are weighted equally <u>Weighted:</u> occurrence points for each species are weighted inversely to the total number of occurrences for the species

We used the SVMs to mask out the predicted ranges of the parapatric congeners. Table 1. For each species: omission rates and number of occurrences from parapatric species within the predicted range.

	B. variegatus	B. tridactylus	B. torquatus
UNWEIGHTED	OR = 0.052 4 <i>B. tridactylus,</i> 22 <i>B. torquatus</i>	OR = 0.022 3 <i>B. variegatus</i>	OR = 0.050 43 <i>B. variegatus</i>
WEIGHTED	OR = 0.128 2 <i>B. tridactylus,</i> 6 <i>B. torquatus</i>	OR = 0.011 11 <i>B. variegatus</i>	OR = 0.014 102 <i>B. variegatus</i>

CONCLUSIONS & FUTURE DIRECTIONS

1. Adding biotic information improves range predictions for *Bradypus*. 2. Weighted SVMs may improve predictions for undersampled species by decreasing omission rate. 3. maskRangeR has been submitted to CRAN. How has deforestation affected these species? Can we model "fuzzy" borders in SVMs?

et al. NEOTROPICAL XENARTHRANS: a data set of occurrence of xenarthran species in the Neotropics. *Ecology* **0**, e02663 2. Anderson, R. P. & Handley, C. O. A new species of three-toed sloth (Mammalia: Xenarthra) from Panama, with a review of the genus Bradypus. Proceedings of the Biological Society of Washington 114, 1–33 (2001). 3. de Moraes-Barros, N., Miyaki, C. Y. & Morgante, J. S. Identifying management units in non-endangered species: the example of the sloth Bradypus variegatus Schinz, 1825. Brazilian Journal of Biology 67, 829-837 (2007). 4. de Moraes Barros, N., Silva, J. A. B. & Morgante, J. S. Morphology, molecular phylogeny, and taxonomic inconsistencies in the study of Bradypus sloths (Pilosa: Bradypodidae). J Mammal 92, 86–100 (2011). 5. Moreira, D. de O. et al. The Distributional Ecology of the Maned Sloth: Environmental Influences on Its Distribution and Gaps in Knowledge. *PLOS ONE* **9**, e110929 (2014). 6. Silva, S. M. *et al.* The curious case of Bradypus variegatus sloths: populations in threatened habitats are biodiversity components needing tection. *Biodivers Conserv* **27**, 1291–1308 (2018) 7. Muscarella, R. et al. ENMeval: An R package for conducting spatially independent evaluations and estimating optimal model complexity for Maxent ecological niche models. *Methods in Ecology and Evolution* 5, 1198–1205 (2014). Version 0.3.0. 8. Phillips, S. J., Anderson, R. P. & Schapire, R. E. Maximum entropy modeling of species geographic distributions. *Ecological Modelling* 190,

231-259 (2006). Version 3.4.1.

MASKED DISTRIBUTIONS

REFERENCES

ACKNOW FDGMENIS