UNIVERSITY OF BIRMINGHAM

University of Birmingham Research at Birmingham

Land-use change interacts with island biogeography to alter bird community assembly

Zhao, Yuhao; Mendenhall, Chase; Matthews, Tom; Wang, Duorum; Li, Wande; Liu, Xiangxu; Tang, Shupei; Han, Peng; Wei, Guangpeng; Kang, Yi; Wu, Chenxiao; Wang, Rui; Zeng, Di; Frishkoff, Luke O.; Si, Xingfeng

DOI:

10.1098/rspb.2023.2245

License.

Creative Commons: Attribution (CC BY)

Document Version
Peer reviewed version

Citation for published version (Harvard):

Zhao, Y, Mendenhall, C, Matthews, T, Wang, D, Li, W, Liu, X, Tang, S, Han, P, Wei, G, Kang, Y, Wu, C, Wang, R, Zeng, D, Frishkoff, LO & Si, X 2024, 'Land-use change interacts with island biogeography to alter bird community assembly', *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, vol. 291, no. 2018, 20232245. https://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2023.2245

Link to publication on Research at Birmingham portal

General rights

Unless a licence is specified above, all rights (including copyright and moral rights) in this document are retained by the authors and/or the copyright holders. The express permission of the copyright holder must be obtained for any use of this material other than for purposes permitted by law.

- •Users may freely distribute the URL that is used to identify this publication.
- •Users may download and/or print one copy of the publication from the University of Birmingham research portal for the purpose of private study or non-commercial research.
- •User may use extracts from the document in line with the concept of 'fair dealing' under the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988 (?)
 •Users may not further distribute the material nor use it for the purposes of commercial gain.

Where a licence is displayed above, please note the terms and conditions of the licence govern your use of this document.

When citing, please reference the published version.

Take down policy

While the University of Birmingham exercises care and attention in making items available there are rare occasions when an item has been uploaded in error or has been deemed to be commercially or otherwise sensitive.

If you believe that this is the case for this document, please contact UBIRA@lists.bham.ac.uk providing details and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate.

Download date: 02. May. 2024

1 Land-use change interacts with island biogeography to alter

- 2 bird community assembly
- 3 Yuhao Zhao¹, Chase D. Mendenhall², Thomas J. Matthews^{3,4}, Duorun Wang¹, Wande
- 4 Li¹, Xiangxu Liu¹, Shupei Tang¹, Peng Han¹, Guangpeng Wei¹, Yi Kang¹, Chenxiao
- 5 Wu¹, Rui Wang¹, Di Zeng¹, Luke O. Frishkoff⁵, Xingfeng Si¹*
- 6 ¹Zhejiang Zhoushan Archipelago Observation and Research Station, Institute of Eco-Chongming,
- 7 Zhejiang Tiantong Forest Ecosystem National Observation and Research Station, School of
- 8 Ecological and Environmental Sciences, East China Normal University, Shanghai 200241, China;
- ⁹ Section of Birds, Carnegie Museum of Natural History, Pittsburgh, PA 15213, USA;
- 10 ³GEES (School of Geography, Earth and Environmental Sciences) and Birmingham Institute of
- 11 Forest Research, University of Birmingham, Birmingham, B15 2TT, UK;
- 12 ⁴CE3C Centre for Ecology, Evolution and Environmental Changes/Azorean Biodiversity Group
- 13 / CHANGE Global Change and Sustainability Institute and Universidade dos Açores Faculty
- of Agricultural Sciences and Environment, PT-9700-042, Angra do Heroísmo, Açores, Portugal;
- ⁵Department of Biology, University of Texas at Arlington, Arlington, TX 76019, USA.
- 17 **ORICD:** Yuhao Zhao (0000-0002-8985-9633), Chase D. Mendenhall (0000-0002-
- 18 4789-0587), Thomas J. Matthews (0000-0002-7624-244X), Wande Li (0000-0003-
- 19 2363-9563), Di Zeng (0000-0003-2780-3738), Luke Frishkoff (0000-0001-5738-
- 20 2140), Xingfeng Si (0000-0003-4465-2759)
- 21 *Corresponding author: Xingfeng Si
- 22 Email: sixf@des.ecnu.edu.cn

16

- 23 **Abstract:** Anthropogenic activities have reshaped biodiversity on islands worldwide.
- However, it remains unclear how island attributes and land-use change interactively
- shape multiple facets of island biodiversity through community assembly processes.
- To answer this, we conducted bird surveys in various land-use types (mainly forest
- and farmland) using transects on 34 oceanic land-bridge islands in the largest
- archipelago of China. We found that bird species richness increases with island area
- and decreases with isolation, regardless of the intensity of land-use change. However,
- 30 forest-dominated habitats exhibited lower richness than farmland-dominated habitats.
- 31 Island bird assemblages generally comprised species that share more similar traits or
- 32 evolutionary histories (i.e., functional and/or phylogenetic clustering) than expected if
- assemblages were randomly assembled. Contrary to our expectations, we observed
- that bird assemblages in forest-dominated habitats were more clustered on large and
- 35 close islands, whereas assemblages in farmland-dominated habitats were more
- 36 clustered on small islands. These contrasting results indicate that land-use change
- interacts with island biogeography to alter the community assembly of birds on
- 38 inhabited islands. Our findings emphasize the importance of incorporating human-
- modified habitats when examining the community assembly of island biota, and
- 40 further suggest that agricultural landscapes on large islands may play essential roles in
- 41 protecting countryside island biodiversity.
- 42 **Keywords:** Anthropocene, biodiversity conservation, countryside island
- 43 biogeography, farmland, functional trait, oceanic island

1. Introduction

44

Islands are hotspots of biodiversity that make up 5.3% of the global land area but 45 support around 20% of the world's species [1,2]. However, the decline and turnover 46 47 of biodiversity on islands due to anthropogenic activities are more rapid than 48 anywhere else [3]. A primary driver of island biodiversity decline is land-use change 49 [4,5], especially the conversion of natural forests into agricultural lands and 50 settlements [6-8]. Therefore, it is critical to disentangle the effects of human activities 51 on island biodiversity from those of natural biophysical island characteristics [9] to 52 better understand the drivers of biodiversity loss and to inform conservation strategies 53 aimed at mitigating further biodiversity declines. 54 The Equilibrium Theory of Island Biogeography (hereafter ETIB) postulates that 55 larger islands have lower extinction rates (i.e., area effect) and more remote islands 56 have lower colonization rates (i.e., distance effect) [10], resulting in the positive 57 species—area and negative species—isolation relationships. In contrast to ETIB, which 58 is generally discussed in the context of biodiversity in natural habitats, countryside 59 biogeography highlights the importance of human-dominated landscapes (e.g., 60 farmland habitats) in supporting biodiversity [11,12]. Linking countryside 61 biogeography and island biogeography thus provides an alternative framework, 62 namely countryside island biogeography, which can be used to frame conservation science in human-dominated landscapes on inhabited islands [13,14]. To date, few 63 64 studies have explored how human-modified habitats affect species diversity patterns

in true island systems (*i.e.*, islands surrounded by water). Moreover, these studies often do so by surveying only one or a small number of island(s) [15-17], probably due to the efforts required to sample multiple habitats across different islands. To the best of our knowledge, no study has explored the *interactive* effect of island biogeography (*e.g.*, island area and isolation) and land-use change on biodiversity across multiple inhabited true islands — a key component of countryside island biogeography.

In naturally forested regions, ecological theory predicts that all else being equal farmland habitats harbour lower richness than forest habitats because they provide fewer complex niches and resources, and have generally been present for a much shorter period of time than adjacent forests (*i.e.*, there has been little time for new taxa to originate via speciation), especially on small and remote islands (figure 1a) [18-21]. In other words, species richness on small and remote islands should be more affected by land-use change than on large and close islands (*i.e.*, there is expected to be an interactive effect between island characteristics and land-use change) (figure 1b).

Clarifying the processes and mechanisms underpinning community assembly is key to understanding the maintenance of biodiversity [22]. Researchers have recently incorporated species traits and evolutionary histories into ETIB to try to better understand community assembly processes on islands [23,24]. Suppose species with strong dispersal abilities are more likely to successfully colonise islands and/or that

the subsequent probability of survival is related to specific habitat availability on different islands (e.g., the availability of mature trees on islands is essential for treeroosting species). Under these circumstances, relative to a larger species pool, insular assemblages will comprise a subset of species that share similar functional traits (i.e., functional clustering) [25,26] which confer a survival advantage in specific insular environments [27]. If these traits are phylogenetically conserved, which is generally common [28], insular assemblages will also comprise groups of species that are more similar in terms of their evolutionary history than expected (i.e., phylogenetic clustering). A contrasting theoretical prediction is that closely related species that share similar traits or resource requirements are more likely to compete due to the limited resource on (particularly small) islands [29]. In this case, island biotas are expected to comprise species with distinct traits and/or evolutionary histories (i.e., functional and/or phylogenetic overdispersion) [25,26] through competitive exclusion of closely related species. However, empirical studies of various taxa have found the structure of island assemblages is, in general, phylogenetically and functionally clustered [26,30,31]. Given the presence of severe environmental filters and limited habitat diversity, in addition to the increased role of dispersal filtering, on small and remote islands, one may expect community structure on these types of islands to be even more phylogenetically and functionally clustered [32] (figure 1c). As such, we may expect that community structure patterns will change across island area and isolation gradients (i.e., structure—area and structure—isolation relationships).

86

87

88

89

90

91

92

93

94

95

96

97

98

99

100

101

102

103

104

105

106

The aforementioned expectations relate to assemblages on islands that still maintain full forest cover [33]. However, land-use change, a feature of almost all inhabited islands globally, may impact community assembly in insular biotas, leading to altered community structure. The transformation of forests to farmland typically reduces habitat diversity and complexity at certain scales (*e.g.*, per transect), resulting in more homogenised assemblages in farmland, especially on large and close islands where human activities are more frequent [34,35]. Thus, we predict that community structure in farmland-dominated habitats on islands will be even more clustered (*i.e.*, species are more closely related and functionally similar than expected) than in forest-dominated habitats, as only a few insular species can likely tolerate significant human disturbance (*i.e.*, the conversion of forest to farmland acts as a strong environmental filter) [18,36].

In this study, we examined whether there are interactive effects of land-use type and island attributes (area and isolation) on bird assemblages in the Zhoushan Archipelago, the largest archipelago in China with > 1,000 continental (oceanic land-bridge) islands. To address this question, we surveyed birds during the breeding season along transects with varying proportions of land-use types (primarily forest and farmland) on 34 islands that span a gradient of island area and isolation in the archipelago. We used these data to test three predictions. 1) The species richness of bird assemblages will increase with island area and decrease with isolation, in accordance with the predictions of ETIB (figure 1b). 2) The phylogenetic and

functional community structure of bird assemblages will be clustered on the study islands, and the degree of clustering will decrease with island area and increase with isolation (figure 1c). 3) There will be an interactive effect of land-use change (*i.e.*, the presence of human-modified habitats) and island biogeographic variables on insular bird richness and community assembly. Specifically, the species—area relationship and species—isolation relationship are expected to be steeper along transects with an increasing proportion of farmland and a decreasing proportion of forest (figure 1b). In addition, birds inhabiting farmland-dominated transects are predicted to be more compositionally similar across islands (*i.e.*, phylogenetic and functional redundancy) compared to those in forest-dominated transects, resulting in flatter structure—area and structure—isolation relationships with increasing farmland cover along a transect (figure 1c).

2. Methods

2.1 Study site

123°25′E), in eastern China (figure 2). The region belongs to the subtropical oceanic monsoon zone, with a strong seasonal climate (*i.e.*, hot summers and cold winters). The average temperature between April to June in 2020 and 2021 (*i.e.*, surveying period) was 20.73°C (data from China Meteorological Administration;

Our study is situated in the Zhoushan Archipelago (29°31′–31°04′N, 121°30′–

148 http://lishi.tianqi.com). The subtropical evergreen broadleaf forest is the dominant

vegetation on the islands of the Zhoushan Archipelago, along with coniferous forests, grasslands, and shrubs [37,38]. The Zhoushan Archipelago provides an excellent opportunity to test the interactive effects of human land use and island biophysical characteristics on island community diversity and assembly for a number of reasons. First, archaeological evidence indicates that humans have continuously occupied the archipelago since at least the Neolithic (i.e., 5,000 years ago) [39], resulting in complex landscapes (including some agricultural lands) on most islands. The primary agricultural crops cultivated on the islands include rice, maize, sweet potato, oilseed rape, as well as various vegetables and fruits, all of which are patchily distributed within and across islands (http://zstj.zhoushan.gov.cn/col/col1229615782/index.html). Second, background information on the region's biota is well-known, given that research on the archipelago has been undertaken since the 1850s [40,41]. Lastly, as the focus is on birds, the effect of evolutionary processes (e.g., in situ speciation) can be largely ignored, given the relatively short geological history of the islands being separated from the mainland (about 7,000–9,000 years).

149

150

151

152

153

154

155

156

157

158

159

160

161

162

163

164

165

166

167

168

We selected 34 islands across a gradient of island area and isolation (*i.e.*, island size and the nearest coast-to-coast distance from each island to the mainland), and considering the habitat types present on the islands. In other words, we particularly looked for small and remote islands that have farmland habitats (*e.g.*, Island S31, with area = 0.24 km^2 and isolation = 65.82 km). We calculated island area and isolation

using ArcGIS based on a meter-resolution dataset of global coastlines [42] (electronic supplementary material, table S1).

2.2 Field survey and bird data

We located transects for bird surveys on each island based on the available forest (*i.e.*, the dominant vegetation along the transect is evergreen broadleaf forest) and farmland (*i.e.*, the transect runs through multiple crops in farmers' fields). The number of transects on each island was roughly proportional to island area [43]. The length of most transects was around 2 km, with a few being 1 km because of logistical restrictions (*i.e.*, cliffs or inaccessible terrain on, the mostly smaller, islands) (see more details in electronic supplementary material, table S1). As a result, we set a total of 70 transects on 34 study islands.

We conducted breeding bird surveys along each transect from April to June in

we conducted breeding bird surveys along each transect from April to June in 2020 and 2021, respectively. During each breeding season, the survey was conducted twice within a one-month interval, which is the maximum effort we could afford in the field [44], so we undertook four replicated surveys for each transect during two sampling years. In each survey, at least two trained observers walked the transect at a constant speed (1–2 km/h depending on the terrain) while maintaining the overall surveying time of around 1.5 hours to make the sampling efforts comparable. The observers recorded the number of individuals of all bird species seen or heard within a 50 m distance on both sides of the transect. Surveys ran from half an hour after dawn

to 11:00 h, and from 15:00 h to half an hour before sunset. We did not conduct surveys when it was rainy or windy.

All bird species recorded were native species (*i.e.*, there are no introduced species in the study region). This study only considered breeding birds (resident and summer species) that mainly use terrestrial habitats on islands, excluding species that rely on aquatic habitats (*e.g.*, diving birds, ducks, and gulls) or are only active at night (*i.e.*, *Caprimulgus indicus*) (electronic supplementary material, table S2).

2.3 Land-use types along each transect

To assess the land-use types along each transect, we utilized the WorldCover 2021 v200 product (https://esa-worldcover.org/en), which provides land-use information at a resolution of 10 m worldwide. The product includes 11 primary land-use classes and has an overall accuracy of 76.7% based on the validation report [45]. While our primary focus was on forest and farmland habitats, we also recognized the significance of human settlements as habitats for certain species, such as the barn swallow (Hirundo rustica) and red-rumped swallow (Hirundo daurica) on the study islands. Therefore, we selected three land-use types to represent the transect habitat composition: farmland, forest, and settlements. These three land-use types accounted for nearly 87% of the total land-use cover across the 70 transects. We manually checked and corrected the land-use type along each transect based on Google Earth

and field observations, where necessary (electronic supplementary material, figure S1).

To calculate the percentage cover of the three land-use types, we chose a 50-m buffer area. This buffer area was selected because we recorded bird observations within a 50 m distance on both sides of the transect. Note that we have also calculated the land-use cover using 100-m and 200-m buffer areas, and the results were qualitatively similar (electronic supplementary material, tables S3–S5). Therefore, for the subsequent analyses, we used the results obtained from 50-m buffer areas. We did not consider larger buffer areas as the study was conducted on islands – including many small islands – and using larger buffers would often result in the inclusion of large areas of water.

2.4 Species traits and phylogeny

For each species, we sourced data on body length, body mass, bill length, wing length, tail length, and tarsus length from a bird trait dataset specific to China [46]. The traits we chose are highly associated with birds' ecological niches (*i.e.*, diets and behaviours) [47] (See electronic supplementary material, text S1 for more details on the choice of traits and sources). Before conducting the analyses, we log₁₀-transformed body mass to stabilize the variance and to normalize the distribution [48]. Bill length, wing length, tail length, and tarsus length were divided by body length to ensure these trait values are independent of body size [49] (electronic supplementary

material, table S6). Because body mass and body length were highly correlated (Pearson's r = 0.92, p < 0.001), we excluded body length from the analyses.

We then built a functional dendrogram using a modified version of neighborjoining clustering [50] based on a Gower dissimilarity distance matrix of the five
morphological traits (scaled and centered). This clustering method minimizes
functional space distortion [51], and we observed that the functional dendrogram
provided a high quality representation of the distances between species in the Gower
dissimilarity distance matrix (0.98, measured by the standardised inverse of mean
squared deviation [52], with 1 representing the maximum quality). The functional
dendrogram was built using the *tree.build* function in the 'BAT' package [53].

To obtain an avian phylogeny, we downloaded 5,000 posterior phylogenetic trees under the option of 'Hackett All Species: a set of 10,000 trees with 9,993 OTUs each' from BirdTree (http://birdtree.org) [54], including only the species recorded in our study. We then constructed a maximum clade credibility tree across 5,000 pseudo-posterior samples using the software TreeAnnonator v1.8.2 [55]. The resulting consensus tree was used for subsequent phylogenetic analyses.

2.5 Sampling completeness and phylogenetic signal

Before undertaking statistical analyses, we tested the sampling completeness of each transect based on the species presence/absence matrix derived from four replicated surveys. The sampling completeness was calculated using the *iNEXT* function in the

'iNEXT' package [56]. Most transects had relatively high sampling completeness, with the exception of a single small island (S33, 64%; electronic supplementary material, table S1).

We estimated the phylogenetic signal of species traits (*i.e.*, body mass, relative bill length, relative wing length, relative tail length, and relative tarsus length) with Blomberg's K [57] and Pagel's λ [58] using the *phylosig* function in the 'phytools' package [59]. All morphological traits had significant phylogenetic signals (p < 0.001; electronic supplementary material, table S7), indicating that the selected traits are phylogenetically conserved.

2.6 Metrics of bird richness and community structure

We first calculated the number of species (species richness, SR) along each transect.

To estimate phylogenetic community structure, we used the standardized effect size (SES) of mean pairwise phylogenetic distance (MPD), denoted as SES.MPD, which represents the phylogenetic relatedness of species within an assemblage [28].

Similarly, for functional community structure, we calculated the standardized effect size (SES) of mean pairwise functional distance (MFD), denoted as SES.MFD [60].

MPD and MFD were calculated using our maximum clade credibility phylogenetic tree and functional dendrogram, respectively. The values of SES.MPD and SES.MFD were calculated using the 'shuffling tip' null model approach. This null model randomly shuffled the taxa labels of each phylogenetic tree or functional

dendrogram (*i.e.*, the species pool of the null model was the archipelago species list, see also below) while retaining the structure of the community data [61]. We ran the null model 999 times and recalculated the MPD and MFD of each randomised community. The equation of SES is:

SES =
$$(Obs - Mean_{null})/SD_{null}$$
,

where Obs is the observed MPD or MFD on each transect, and Mean $_{null}$ and SD $_{null}$ are the mean and standard deviation values of 999 randomisations for the MPD and MFD of each transect.

SES.MPD and SES.MFD measure species relatedness in the observed community compared to species randomly sampled from the species pool. Specifically, SES values of MPD and MFD < 0 suggest phylogenetic or functional clustering (species share similar traits or evolutionary histories), SES values > 0 suggest phylogenetic or functional overdispersion (species share distinct traits or evolutionary histories), and SES values ≈ 0 indicate a random phylogenetic or functional community structure [28]. SES values less than -1.96 or greater than 1.96 indicate significant clustering or overdispersion, respectively ($\alpha = 0.05$). The SES.MPD and SES.MFD metrics were calculated using the *ses.mpd* function in 'picante' package [62].

During our sampling, we found several species that occurred on all islands (e.g., light-vented bulbul [*Pycnonotus sinensis*]). Thus, based on the concept of dispersion-field species pools [63], we considered the species pool to comprise all species that

were observed on the study islands. However, we recognise that the selection of a specific species pool could potentially affect the community structure results [64]. To confirm the robustness of our results, we ran additional analyses where we expanded the species pool by incorporating bird species occurring on (i) the study islands but that were not sampled by us, and (ii) the surrounding mainland, based on a citizen bird surveying database (*i.e.*, China Bird Report; http://www.birdreport.cn/), and in both cases recalculated the community structure metrics. We found that the results based on the different species pools are qualitatively the same. We thus only report in the main manuscript the findings from the analyses including all observed species from the study islands as the species pool. Please see electronic supplementary material, text S2 for more information about the results from analyses of alternative species pools.

2.7 Statistical analyses

Our study was conducted at the transect level (*i.e.*, the unit of analysis is a transect), so we applied linear mixed-effect regression models (LMM), with island identity as a random effect (*i.e.*, random intercept), to regress bird richness and community structure per transect against the fixed effects using the *lmer* function in the 'lme4' package [65]. To test if bird richness and community structure follow the predictions of the Equilibrium Theory of Island Biogeography, we used either island area or isolation as the fixed effect in the LMM. In a separate model, we used the percentage

cover of each land-use type (forest, farmland, and settlement) as a fixed effect to test the bivariate relationships between bird richness and community structure and landuse type. Finally, to test if there are any interactive effects of land-use change and island attributes on bird richness and community structure, we fitted a model with island area/isolation and the percentage cover of each land-use type, including an interaction term between island area/isolation and each land-use type (e.g., island area × farmland cover). Note we also conducted analyses using multivariate models (i.e., models contain island area, isolation, the percentage cover of forest, farmland, and settlement, as well as the interaction term between island area/isolation and each landuse type as fixed effect) and the results are qualitatively the same as univariate models described above (see electronic supplementary material, text 3 and tables S8–S11). We thus put the results based on multivariate models into the supplementary material and only reported the results based on univariate models in the main text. Island area was log₁₀-transformed to normalize model residuals. There were only weak correlations between the percentage cover of each land-use type and island area or isolation (|Pearson's r| < 0.4; electronic supplementary material, table S12). Model residual assumptions were visually checked, and the residuals met the assumptions of linear models. All analyses were conducted in R version 4.1.2 [66].

333

334

335

332

315

316

317

318

319

320

321

322

323

324

325

326

327

328

329

330

331

3. Results

3.1 Effect of island area, isolation, and land-use types on species richness

transect-level species richness (SR) significantly increased with island area (t = 3.22, df = 24.6, p < 0.01; figure 3a) and decreased with isolation (t = -6.33, df = 68, p < 0.001; figure 3b), according to our LMMs. We note, however, the effect of island area

Consistent with the predictions of the Equilibrium Theory of Island Biogeography,

on SR could be partially explained by the transect length (i.e., sampling effect) as we

also found transect length had a positive effect on SR (please see electronic

supplementary material, text S3 for more details).

In addition, transect-level SR had significant relationships with the three landuse types (electronic supplementary material, table S13). Specifically, SR increased with increasing farmland cover (t = 4.4, df = 41.5, p < 0.001; figure 3c) and settlement cover (t = 3.51, df = 46, p < 0.01; figure 3d), but decreased with increasing forest cover (t = -4.63, df = 41.9, p < 0.001; figure 3e). However, the land-use type did not affect SR–area and –isolation relationships as we did not find any interactive effects of island area (or isolation) and the percentage cover of each land-use type (electronic supplementary material, figures S2 and S3, table S14). In general, SR was higher in farmland-dominated habitats than in forest-dominated habitats (electronic supplementary material, figure S4a).

3.2 Effects of island area, isolation, and land-use types on bird phylogenetic and

functional community structure

The overall phylogenetic and functional community structure (SES.MPD and SES.MFD) was more clustered than expected by chance in most transects (figure 4), indicating that phylogenetic and functional clustering of bird assemblages on all study islands was pervasive. Community structure in farmland-dominated transects was less clustered than forest-dominated transects (electronic supplementary material, figure S4b). SES.MPD and SES.MFD did not vary systematically with island area and isolation (electronic supplementary material, table S13), but they both increased with increasing farmland cover (SES.MPD: t = 4.39, df = 47.3, p < 0.001; SES.MFD: t =3.47, df = 66.6, p < 0.001; electronic supplementary material, figure S5c) and settlement cover (SES.MPD: t = 2, df = 57.4, p = 0.05; SES.MFD: t = 1.78, df = 68, p = 0.05= 0.08; electronic supplementary material, figure S5e), and decreased with increasing forest cover (SES.MPD: t = -3.78, df = 42.8, p < 0.001; SES.MFD: t = -2.96, df = 61, p < 0.01; electronic supplementary material, figure S5d). Furthermore, SES.MFD was affected by the interactive effect of island area and farmland cover (t = 2.17, df = 65, p = 0.03; electronic supplementary material, table S14). Transects with a larger proportion of farmland on larger islands and transects with less farmland cover on smaller islands tended to support bird assemblages with less clustered functional structure (figure 4e). Additionally, the patterns of bird phylogenetic and functional community structure (i.e., SES.MPD and SES.MFD) showed similar trends along the interactive gradient of area and isolation with forest cover (island area x forest cover for SES.MPD: t = -2.8, df = 65.6, p < 0.01, for

356

357

358

359

360

361

362

363

364

365

366

367

368

369

370

371

372

373

374

375

376

SES.MFD: t = -2.8, df = 64.6, p < 0.01; isolation x forest cover for SES.MPD: t = 2.92, df = 58.5, p < 0.01, for SES.MFD: t = 2.25, df = 63.7, p = 0.03; electronic supplementary material, table S14). This indicates clustered community structure in transects on large and close islands with a high proportion of forest cover, as well as clustered community structure on small and remote islands with a low proportion of forest cover (figure 4c, 4d, 4g, and 4h; electronic supplementary material, figures S6b, S6e, S7b, and S7e). Settlement cover did not exhibit an interactive effect with island attributes on bird community structure (electronic supplementary material, figures S6c, S6f, S7c, and S7f, table S14).

4 Discussion

Human activities have extensively modified habitats on 75% of the global land surface, including many islands worldwide. However, assessing the impact of landuse change on islands presents challenges as it is generally unclear whether there are interactive effects between land-use change and natural island attributes (*e.g.*, area and isolation) on the diversity and community assembly of island faunas. To answer this question, we undertook sampling across multiple habitats on islands within the largest Chinese archipelago.

We found that both the phylogenetic and functional structure (SES.MPD and SES.MFD) of island bird assemblages were clustered relative to random assemblages. Specifically, bird assemblages in farmland-dominated habitats tended to be more

phylogenetically and functionally clustered on small islands. In contrast, forest bird assemblages were more clustered on large islands and islands close to the mainland.

These results suggest that there is indeed an interaction between land-use change and classic island biogeographic variables in shaping bird community assembly.

4.1 Variations in species richness across island attributes and land-use types

[71] species in the same island system.

We found positive species—area relationships and negative species—isolation relationships in this study (figure 3a; electronic supplementary material, text S4 and figure S8a, S8b). The positive species—area relationship is well-studied: larger islands harbour more species as they support larger populations and contain more diverse habitat types, a greater number of habitats, and more diverse resources [67,68]. This near-universal pattern has been observed in butterflies [69], frogs [70], and bryophyte

Dispersal limitation may be a driver of the negative species—isolation relationships observed (see also [44] for a more comprehensive measures of isolation in examining dispersal limitation in the same archipelago). Although most bird species (especially the summer migrants; electronic supplementary material, table S2) can fly over open water, some species are seemingly unwilling to due to a natural fear of water [72]. For example, two summer migrants with good dispersal ability, the black bulbul (*Hypsipetes leucocephalus*) and Swinhoe's minivet (*Pericrocotus cantonensis*), are distributed widely across most of the study islands but do not occur

on several remote islands with a distance > 65 km from the mainland. Additionally, extended analysis showed that remote islands possess bird species with higher average dispersal abilities (measured by the hand-wing index, see electronic supplementary material, text S5 and figure S9b for more details). Taken together, these results indicate that a 'landscape of fear' and/or limited dispersal ability may restrict the distribution of some species during the breeding season in our study system [30].

419

420

421

422

423

424

425

426

427

428

429

430

431

432

433

434

435

436

437

438

439

Surprisingly, bird species richness was relatively high in transects dominated by farmland, despite the fact that there are more bird species preferring forest habitats [41 of 96 species] than farmland habitats [27 of 96 species] (electronic supplementary material, table S2). We also found bird species richness increased with the proportion of human-modified habitats (i.e., farmland and settlement), while decreasing with increasing forest cover. These findings contrast with studies conducted on mainland areas, where forests should typically have more species than surrounding agricultural lands [21,73]. Several reasons may explain these patterns. (a) On inhabited islands, the resources in farmland and settlements (e.g., food and nesting substrate) may be abundant and relatively easy to access for certain species. Thus, many species may be able to utilize the human-modified habitats, leading to higher species richness in sites with a greater coverage of farmland and settlements. In this study, many species disproportionately occur in farmland-dominated habitats, including common moorhen [Gallinula chloropus], scaly-breasted munia [Lonchura punctulata], and intermediate

egret [Mesophoyx intermedia]) — all species that are known to associate strongly with agricultural habitats [73] (electronic supplementary material, table S2, figures S10 and S11). (b) Although we found more forest bird species in our study islands (electronic supplementary material, table S2), bird species in forest-dominated habitats have lower average dispersal ability (electronic supplementary material, figure S9d), indicating that forest species tend to be more dispersal limited. In contrast, bird species in farmland habitats had higher average dispersal ability (electronic supplementary material, figure S9c), indicating that bird species in farmland have better abilities to disperse between habitat patches, and in turn lead to higher observed richness. (c) Alternatively, it is also possible that forests are important for birds to roost at night, but our surveys were only conducted in the daytime, ignoring this function forests provide.

4.2 Bird phylogenetic and functional community structure across island

attributes and land-use types

Phylogenetic and functional community structure (*i.e.*, SES.MPD and SES.MFD) was clustered on almost all islands, indicating the possibility that environmental filtering is an important assembly process in the archipelago [27]. However, unlike species richness, bird community structure did not show clear patterns along the gradients of island area and isolation, indicating increasing phylogenetic and functional redundancy with increasing species richness. In other words, the higher species

richness of bird assemblages on large and close islands does not involve the addition of extra functional roles.

461

462

463

464

465

466

467

468

469

470

471

472

473

474

475

476

477

478

479

480

As shown above, we found that there was an interaction between the structure area and -isolation relationships and land-use types. Specifically, bird assemblages in farmland-dominated habitats on small islands were more phylogenetically and functionally clustered than larger ones, consistent with our prediction (figures 1c, 4a, and 4e; electronic supplementary material, figures S6a and S7a). Farmland on small islands often contains limited types of crops. For example, on island S31, the crops are mainly vegetables that are sparsely cultivated by local farmers (electronic supplementary material, figure S12). As a result, only disturbance-tolerant bird species can persist in such habitats. Indeed, we found species on this transect are all passerines, and several common (i.e., present on other farmland habitats) but functionally and phylogenetically distinct species in this region were lacking, such as cattle egret (Bubulcus ibis) and Chinese pond heron (Ardeola bacchus) (electronic supplementary material, figures S10 and S11), resulting in a highly redundant community [36]. Conversely, farmland on large islands may have higher net primary productivity due to more diverse agricultures and more intensive management [74,75]. The greater niche opportunities provided by farmland on large islands not only support more species, but also support species with a broader range of lifehistory traits [76], leading to less clustered structure.

Contrary to our expectation, assemblages in forest-dominated habitats were more clustered on large and close islands, and we observed a positive functional and phylogenetic clustering—area relationship on islands covered by forest (figures 4c and 4g). A possible explanation is that, on large islands, while the amount of total forested area is often relatively large, vegetation composition is similar (electronic supplementary material, figure S13) and often fragmented, separated by roads, villages, and farmland [37,38]. This fragmented forest mosaic is likely only able to support a set of phylogenetically and functionally similar species that are able to persist in these conditions (*i.e.*, high species turnover but low phylogenetic and functional turnover) [26], leading to high clustering on forest transects on large islands.

The relationship between bird community structure in forest-dominated habitats and isolation is broadly consistent (*i.e.*, decreasing clustering with increasing isolation). In this study, forest-dominated habitats on remote islands contain several species that are functionally and phylogenetically distinct from other species (electronic supplementary material, figures S8 and S9), such as Eurasian hoopoe (*Upupa epops*), Chinese pond heron (*A. bacchus*), cattle egret (*B. ibis*), and yellow bittern (*Ixobrycus sinensis*). Most of these species are summer migrants and are known to be able to persist in farmland habitats with shallow water [73]. We argue that they may preferentially inhabit more remote islands to avoid the intense human disturbance and exploit food resources in more pristine forests. It is worth noting that these species have relatively

long bills which may facilitate capturing mobile prey (*e.g.*, insects and reptiles) in forest habitats [77]. In addition, some individuals may travel to islands close to the mainland where they prefer to look for external food resources supplemented by farmland. Consequently, only forest habitats on less isolated islands lack these distinct species, resulting in a relatively high clustering pattern.

507

508

509

510

511

512

513

514

515

516

517

518

519

520

521

522

502

503

504

505

506

4.3 Conservation implications

We found that farmland-dominated habitats support more species than forestdominated habitats on the study islands (electronic supplementary material, figure S4). The importance of agricultural land in supporting substantial biodiversity in fragmented landscapes on the mainland [12,78,79] is a key component of the framework of countryside biogeography. Here, we moved a step further to identify that farmland habitats also support high bird diversity on islands in our study system, providing evidence that species can tolerate or thrive in insular human-modified habitats [80]. Countryside island biogeography can thus provide valuable perspectives for the conservation of island biodiversity, particularly on islands with large amounts of human-modified habitats [81]. Importantly, we found that the effect of farmland depends on the relative proportion of various land-use types, as well as the size of a particular island. Birds in farmland-dominated habitats have relatively less clustered structure on large islands than in forest-dominated habitats and vice versa (figures 4a, 4c, 4e, and 4g). Meanwhile, forest-dominated habitats on remote islands also have

relatively less clustered bird assemblages (figures 4d and 4h). Thus, concerning further anthropogenic development on the islands studied here, we argue that it is better to leave small and remote islands – where the remaining natural forest habitat can support relatively higher biodiversity – undeveloped.

527

528

529

530

531

532

533

534

535

536

537

538

539

540

541

542

526

523

524

525

4.4 Caveats

Our study is limited by the uneven sampling design across islands, necessitated by logistical restrictions related to small island size. Although we conducted additional analyses to account for this sampling effect (see electronic supplementary material, text S3), our results should still be interpreted with caution as we cannot fully exclude the sampling effect in the analyses. Additionally, our use of continuous proportional land-use variables inherently produces collinearity issues (e.g., forest and farmland covers were negatively correlated: Pearson's r = -0.86). The existence of collinearity issues results in the difficulty of interpreting the effect of cover type because an observed effect of increasing farmland could actually be an effect of decreasing forest cover, and vice versa. An alternative way to solve the collinearity issue is to use categorical land-use variables (i.e., designating transects as forest or farmland). However, categorical land-use variables will loss detailed information, such as the pattern of community structure shifting along a gradient of forest/farmland cover (as shown in Figure 4). We suggest that further studies should pinpoint the location of

each bird record and measure point-based land uses to fully tease apart the precise effects of land-use types in this system.

The lower richness and clustered structure of bird communities in forest-dominated habitats could also relate to the legacy effect associated with historical landscape configurations [82,83]. Unfortunately, suitable historical land-use data were unavailable to investigate this phenomenon. However, legacy effects in our study archipelago should be relatively weak for several reasons. First, land-use change on the study islands has a long history (~5,000 years), indicating contemporary communities have had considerable time to respond to past modifications. Second, the larger number of forest species in the species pool, including the pools that incorporated nearby mainland species (electronic supplementary material, tables S2 and S15), indicates that historic human activities have not substantially restricted these taxa from occupying study islands.

5 Conclusion

Our results emphasize the need to better understand how anthropogenic effects and standard island biogeographic variables interact to determine community assembly mechanisms in human-dominated island landscapes. Although the relationship between species richness and island area and isolation remained consistent across land use types, functional and phylogenetic community structure (measured by SES.MPD and SES.MFD) were higher in farmland-dominated habitats on large islands, illustrating the

564	importance of farmland in sustaining island bird diversity. Examining the interactive
565	effect of land-use and island attributes, a novel frontier in countryside island
566	biogeography, provides a promising research avenue to better understand the
567	distribution of island biodiversity across human-dominated ecosystems, ultimately
568	enabling more accurate predictions of the future trajectory of biodiversity in the
569	Anthropocene.
570	
571	Acknowledgments and Funding
572	This study was supported by National Nature Science Foundation of China (grant no.
573	32311520284, 32071545, 32101278, and 32371590), the Technology Innovation
574	Center for Land Spatial Eco-restoration in Metropolitan Area, Ministry of Natural
575	Resources, and the Program for Professor of Special Appointment (Eastern Scholar)
576	(no. TP2020016).
577	
578	Competing Interest Statement: The authors declare no conflict of interest.
579	
580	Data availability: The data used in this study have been uploaded on Dryad (link:
581	https://datadryad.org/stash/share/38izdimqLPECiQW5Kd42Ct7aF6AzslwHx27JLF6b
582	mUw).
583	
584	References

- 1. Kier G, Kreft H, Lee TM, Jetz W, Ibisch PL, Nowicki C, et al. A global assessment of endemism
- and species richness across island and mainland regions. Proceedings of the National Academy of
- 587 Sciences. 2009; 106(23):9322–7. (doi:10.1073/pnas.0810306106)
- 588 2. Whittaker RJ, Fernández-Palacios JM, Matthews TJ, Borregaard MK, Triantis KA. Island
- biogeography: Taking the long view of nature's laboratories. Science. 2017;
- 590 357(6354):eaam8326.
- 3. Nogué S, Santos AMC, Birks HJB, Björck S, Castilla-Beltrán A, Connor S, et al. The human
- dimension of biodiversity changes on islands. Science. 2021; 372(6541):488–91.
- 593 (doi:10.1126/science.abd6706)
- 4. Newbold T, Hudson LN, Hill SLL, Contu S, Lysenko I, Senior RA, et al. Global effects of land
- 595 use on local terrestrial biodiversity. Nature. 2015; 520(7545):45–50. (doi:10.1038/nature14324)
- 596 5. Castilla-Beltrán A, de Nascimento L, Fernández-Palacios J-M, Whittaker Robert J, Willis Kathy J,
- Edwards M, et al. Anthropogenic transitions from forested to human-dominated landscapes in
- southern Macaronesia. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences. 2021;
- 599 118(40):e2022215118. (doi:10.1073/pnas.2022215118)
- 600 6. Rolett B, Diamond J. Environmental predictors of pre-European deforestation on Pacific islands.
- Nature. 2004; 431(7007):443–6. (doi:10.1038/nature02801)
- 7. Wood JR, Alcover JA, Blackburn TM, Bover P, Duncan RP, Hume JP, et al. Island extinctions:
- processes, patterns, and potential for ecosystem restoration. Environmental Conservation. 2017;
- 604 44(4):348–58. Epub 2017/07/24. (doi:10.1017/S037689291700039X)
- 8. Stephens L, Fuller D, Boivin N, Rick T, Gauthier N, Kay A, et al. Archaeological assessment
- reveals Earth's early transformation through land use. Science. 2019; 365(6456):897–902.
- 607 (doi:10.1126/science.aax1192)
- 608 9. Helmus MR, Mahler DL, Losos JB. Island biogeography of the Anthropocene. Nature. 2014;
- 609 513(7519):543–6. (doi:10.1038/nature13739)
- 10. MacArthur RH, Wilson EO. The theory of island biogeography. Princeton: Princeton University
- 611 Press; 1967.
- 11. Mendenhall CD, Karp DS, Meyer CFJ, Hadly EA, Daily GC. Predicting biodiversity change and
- averting collapse in agricultural landscapes. Nature. 2014; 509(7499):213–7.
- 614 (doi:10.1038/nature13139)
- 615 12. Daily G. Countryside biogeography and the provision of ecosystem services: 104-113 (en)
- RAVEN, P.(ed.) Nature and human society: The quest for a sustainable world. National Research
- 617 Council. National Academy Press, Washington, DC; 1997.
- 618 13. Soulé ME. What is conservation biology? BioScience. 1985; 35(11):727–34.
- 619 14. Gibson L, Lynam AJ, Bradshaw CJA, He F, Bickford DP, Woodruff DS, et al. Near-Complete
- Extinction of Native Small Mammal Fauna 25 Years After Forest Fragmentation. Science. 2013;
- 621 341(6153):1508. (doi:10.1126/science.1240495)
- 15. Picanço A, Rigal F, Matthews TJ, Cardoso P, Borges PAV. Impact of land-use change on flower-
- visiting insect communities on an oceanic island. Insect Conservation and Diversity. 2017;
- 624 10(3):211–23. (doi:10.1111/icad.12216)

- 16. Jesse WAM, Behm JE, Helmus MR, Ellers J. Human land use promotes the abundance and
- diversity of exotic species on Caribbean islands. Global Change Biology. 2018; 24(10):4784–96.
- 627 (doi:10.1111/gcb.14334)
- 628 17. Steibl S, Franke J, Laforsch C. Tourism and urban development as drivers for invertebrate
- diversity loss on tropical islands. Royal Society Open Science. 2021; 8(10):210411.
- 630 (doi:10.1098/rsos.210411)
- 18. Etard A, Pigot AL, Newbold T. Intensive human land uses negatively affect vertebrate functional
- diversity. Ecology Letters. 2022; 25(2):330–43. (doi:10.1111/ele.13926)
- 19. Nowakowski AJ, Frishkoff LO, Thompson ME, Smith TM, Todd BD. Phylogenetic
- homogenization of amphibian assemblages in human-altered habitats across the globe.
- Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences. 2018; 115(15):E3454.
- 636 (doi:10.1073/pnas.1714891115)
- **20**. Pillay R, Venter M, Aragon-Osejo J, González-del-Pliego P, Hansen AJ, Watson JEM, et al.
- Tropical forests are home to over half of the world's vertebrate species. Frontiers in Ecology and
- 639 the Environment. 2022; 20(1):10–5. (doi:10.1002/fee.2420)
- 640 21. Frishkoff LO, Karp DS, M'Gonigle LK, Mendenhall CD, Zook J, Kremen C, et al. Loss of avian
- phylogenetic diversity in neotropical agricultural systems. Science. 2014; 345(6202):1343.
- 642 22. Hillerislambers J, Adler PB, Harpole WS, Levine JM, Mayfield MM. Rethinking community
- assembly through the lens of coexistence theory. Annual Review of Ecology, Evolution, and
- 644 Systematics. 2012; 43(43):227–48.
- 645 23. Carvajal-Endara S, Hendry AP, Emery NC, Davies TJ. Habitat filtering not dispersal limitation
- shapes oceanic island floras: species assembly of the Galápagos archipelago. Ecology Letters.
- 647 2017; 20(4):495–504. (doi:10.1111/ele.12753)
- 648 24. Ottaviani G, Keppel G, Gotzenberger L, Harrison S, Opedal OH, Conti L, et al. Linking Plant
- Functional Ecology to Island Biogeography. Trends in Plant Science. 2020; 25(4):329–39.
- 650 (doi:10.1016/j.tplants.2019.12.022)
- 651 25. Triantis KA, Rigal F, Whittaker RJ, Hume JP, Sheard C, Poursanidis D, et al. Deterministic
- assembly and anthropogenic extinctions drive convergence of island bird communities. Global
- 653 Ecology and Biogeography. 2022; 31(9):1741–55. (doi:10.1111/geb.13556)
- 26. Si X, Cadotte MW, Davies TJ, Antonelli A, Ding P, Svenning J-C, et al. Phylogenetic and
- functional clustering illustrate the roles of adaptive radiation and dispersal filtering in jointly
- shaping late-Quaternary mammal assemblages on oceanic islands. Ecology Letters. 2022;
- 657 25(5):1250–62. (doi:10.1111/ele.13997)
- 658 27. Cadotte MW, Tucker CM. Should Environmental Filtering be Abandoned? Trends in Ecology and
- 659 Evolution. 2017; 32(6):429–37. (doi:10.1016/j.tree.2017.03.004)
- 28. Webb CO, Ackerly DD, Mcpeek MA, Donoghue MJ. Phylogenies and Community Ecology.
- Ecology, Evolution, and Systematics. 2002; 8(33):475–505.
- 662 29. Sobral FL, Cianciaruso MV. Functional and phylogenetic structure of forest and savanna bird
- assemblages across spatial scales. Ecography. 2016; 39(6):533–41. (doi:10.1111/ecog.00903)
- 30. Si X, Cadotte MW, Zeng D, Baselga A, Zhao Y, Li J, et al. Functional and phylogenetic structure
- of island bird communities. Journal of Animal Ecology. 2017; 86(3):532–42. (doi:10.1111/1365-
- 666 2656.12650)

- 31. Ross SRPJ, Friedman NR, Janicki J, Economo EP. A test of trophic and functional island
- biogeography theory with the avifauna of a continental archipelago. Journal of Animal Ecology.
- 669 2019; 88(9):1392–405. (doi:10.1111/1365-2656.13029)
- 670 32. Matthews TJ, Rigal F, Kougioumoutzis K, Trigas P, Triantis KA. Unravelling the small-island
- effect through phylogenetic community ecology. Journal of Biogeography. 2020; 47(11):2341–52.
- 672 (doi:/10.1111/jbi.13940)
- 33. Zhao Y, Dunn RR, Zhou H, Si X, Ding P. Island area, not isolation, drives taxonomic,
- phylogenetic and functional diversity of ants on land-bridge islands. Journal of Biogeography.
- 675 2020; 47(8):1627–37. (doi:10.1111/jbi.13860)
- 34. Nogué S, de Nascimento L, Froyd CA, Wilmshurst JM, de Boer EJ, Coffey EED, et al. Island
- biodiversity conservation needs palaeoecology. Nature Ecology & Evolution. 2017; 1(7):0181.
- 678 (doi:10.1038/s41559-017-0181)
- 35. Liu J, Liu T, Zhou Y, Chen Y, Lu L, Jin X, et al. Plant diversity on islands in the Anthropocene:
- Integrating the effects of the theory of island biogeography and human activities. Basic and
- 681 Applied Ecology. 2023; 72: 45–53. (doi:10.1016/j.baae.2023.07.006)
- 36. Cannon PG, Gilroy JJ, Tobias JA, Anderson A, Haugaasen T, Edwards DP. Land-sparing
- agriculture sustains higher levels of avian functional diversity than land sharing. Global Change
- 684 Biology. 2019; 25(5):1576–90. (doi:10.1111/gcb.14601)
- 685 37. The Editorial Board of the Island Chronicles of China. The Island Chronicles of China (Vol.
- Zhejiang no. 1) The northern part of Zhoushan Archipelago. Beijing: Ocean Press. 2014a. In
- Chinese.
- 688 38. The Editorial Board of the Island Chronicles of China. The Island Chronicles of China (Vol.
- Zhejiang no. 2) The southern part of Zhoushan Archipelago. Beijing: Ocean Press. 2014b. In
- 690 Chinese.
- 691 39. Wang H, Chen J. Neolithic ruins discovered in Zhoushan archipelago. Archeology. 1983; 6(1):4–
- 692 9. In Chinese.
- 693 40. Cantor T. LIII.—General Features of Chusan, with remarks on the Flora and Fauna of that Island.
- 694 Journal of Natural History. 1842; 9(60):481–93.
- 41. Zhuge Y, Jiang S, Zheng Z, Fang G. Preliminary Studies on Geographical Ecology of Birds and
- Mammals on Some Islands of Zhejiang Province. Acta Zoologica Sinica. 1986; 31(1):74–85.
- 42. Liu C, Shi R, Zhang Y, Shen Y, Ma J, Wu L, et al. 2015: How Many Islands (Isles, Rocks), How
- Large Land Areas, and How Long of Shorelines in the World?—Vector Data Based on Google
- Earth Images. Journal of Global Change Data & Discovery. 2019; 3(2):124–48.
- 43. Schoereder JH, Galbiati C, Ribas CR, Sobrinho TG, Sperber CF, DeSouza O, et al. Should we use
- proportional sampling for species—area studies? Journal of Biogeography. 2004; 31(8):1219–26.
- 702 (doi:10.1111/j.1365-2699.2004.01113.x)
- 703 44. Wang D, Zhao Y, Tang S, Liu X, Li W, Han P, et al. Nearby large islands diminish biodiversity of
- the focal island by a negative target effect. Journal of Animal Ecology. 2023; 92(2):492–502.
- 705 (doi:10.1111/1365-2656.13856)
- 706 45. Zanaga D, Van De Kerchove R, Daems D, De Keersmaecker W, Brockmann C, Kirches G, et al.
- 707 ESA WorldCover 10 m 2021 v200. 2022. (doi: 10.5281/zenodo.7254221)

- 708 46. Wang Y, Song Y, Zhong Y, Chen C, Zhao Y, Zeng D, et al. A dataset on the life-history and
- ecological traits of Chinese birds. Biodiversity Science. 2021; 29(9):1149–53. In Chinese with
- 710 English abstract.
- 711 47. Pigot AL, Sheard C, Miller ET, Bregman TP, Freeman BG, Roll U, et al. Macroevolutionary
- 712 convergence connects morphological form to ecological function in birds. Nature Ecology &
- 713 Evolution. 2020; 4(2):230–9. (doi:10.1038/s41559-019-1070-4)
- 714 **48**. Zuur AF, Ieno EN, Elphick CS. A protocol for data exploration to avoid common statistical
- 715 problems. Methods in Ecology and Evolution. 2010; 1(1):3–14. (doi:10.1111/j.2041-
- 716 210X.2009.00001.x)
- 717 **49**. Díaz S, Kattge J, Cornelissen JHC, Wright IJ, Lavorel S, Dray S, et al. The global spectrum of plant form and function. Nature. 2016; 529(7585):167–71. (doi:10.1038/nature16489)
- 719 **50**. Gascuel O. BIONJ: an improved version of the NJ algorithm based on a simple model of sequence
- data. Molecular Biology and Evolution. 1997; 14(7):685-95.
- 721 (doi:10.1093/oxfordjournals.molbev.a025808)
- 722 51. Cardoso P, Guillerme T, Mammola S, Matthews TJ, Rigal F, Graco-Roza C, et al. Calculating
- functional diversity metrics using neighbor-joining trees. bioRxiv. 2022:2022.11.27.518065.
- 724 (doi:10.1101/2022.11.27.518065)
- 725 **52**. Maire E, Grenouillet G, Brosse S, Villéger S. How many dimensions are needed to accurately
- assess functional diversity? A pragmatic approach for assessing the quality of functional spaces.
- 727 Global Ecology and Biogeography. 2015; 24(6):728–40. (doi:10.1111/geb.12299)
- 728 53. Cardoso P, Rigal F, Carvalho JC. BAT Biodiversity Assessment Tools, an R package for the
- measurement and estimation of alpha and beta taxon, phylogenetic and functional diversity.
- 730 Methods in Ecology and Evolution. 2015; 6(2):232–6. (doi:10.1111/2041-210X.12310)
- 731 54. Jetz W, Thomas Gavin H, Joy Jeffrey B, Redding David W, Hartmann K, Mooers Arne O. Global
- Distribution and Conservation of Evolutionary Distinctness in Birds. Current Biology. 2014;
- 733 24(9):919–30.(doi:10.1016/j.cub.2014.03.011)
- 734 55. Drummond AJ, Suchard MA, Xie D, Rambaut A. Bayesian Phylogenetics with BEAUti and the
- 735 BEAST 1.7. Molecular Biology and Evolution. 2012; 29(8):1969–73.
- 736 (doi:10.1093/molbev/mss075)
- 737 56. Hsieh T, Ma K, Chao A. iNEXT: an R package for rarefaction and extrapolation of species
- diversity (Hill numbers). Methods in Ecology and Evolution. 2016; 7(12):1451–6.
- 739 57. Blomberg SP, Garland T, Ives AR. Testing for phylogenetic signal in comparative data:
- behavioral traits are more labile. Evolution. 2003; 57(4):717–45.
- 741 **58.** Pagel M. Inferring the historical patterns of biological evolution. Nature. 1999; 401:877–84.
- 742 (doi:10.1038/44766)
- 743 59. Revell LJ. phytools: an R package for phylogenetic comparative biology (and other things).
- 744 Methods in Ecology and Evolution. 2012; 3(2):217–23. (doi:10.1111/j.2041-210X.2011.00169.x)
- 745 **60**. Cadotte MW, Carboni M, Si X, Tatsumi S. Do traits and phylogeny support congruent community
- diversity patterns and assembly inferences? Journal of Ecology. 2019; 107(5):2065–77.
- 747 (doi:10.1111/1365-2745.13247)
- 748 **61**. Swenson NG. Functional and Phylogenetic Ecology in R: Springer New York; 2014.

- 749 **62**. Kembel SW, Cowan PD, Helmus MR, Cornwell WK, Morlon H, Ackerly DD, et al. Picante: R
- tools for integrating phylogenies and ecology. Bioinformatics. 2010; 26(11):1463–4.
- 751 (doi:10.1093/bioinformatics/btq166)
- 63. Lessard J-P, Borregaard Michael K, Fordyce James A, Rahbek C, Weiser Michael D, Dunn
- Robert R, et al. Strong influence of regional species pools on continent-wide structuring of local
- 754 communities. Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences. 2012; 279(1727):266–74.
- 755 (doi:10.1098/rspb.2011.0552)
- 756 64. Hébert K, Millien V, Lessard J-P. Source pool diversity and proximity shape the compositional
- uniqueness of insular mammal assemblages worldwide. Journal of Biogeography. 2021;
- 758 48(9):2337–49. (doi:10.1111/jbi.14156)
- 759 **65.** Bates D, Mächler M, Bolker B, Walker S. Fitting linear mixed-effects models using lme4. Journal of Statistical Software. 2015; 67:1–48.
- 761 66. R Core Team. R: A language and environment for statistical computing. Vienna, Austria: R
 762 Foundation for Statistical Computing; 2021.
- 763 67. Wardle DA, Hörnberg G, Zackrisson O, Kalela-Brundin M, Coomes DA. Long-Term Effects of
- Wildfire on Ecosystem Properties Across an Island Area Gradient. Science. 2003; 300(5621):972–
- 765 5. (doi:10.1126/science.1082709)
- 766 **68**. Matthews TJ, Triantis KA, Whittaker RJ. The species–area relationship: theory and application:
- 767 Cambridge University Press; 2021.
- 768 69. Chen C, Xu A, Wang Y. Area threshold and trait–environment associations of butterfly
- assemblages in the Zhoushan Archipelago, China. Journal of Biogeography. 2021; 48(4):785–97.
- 770 (doi:10.1111/jbi.14037)
- 771 70. Li Y, Jari N, Li D. Nested distribution of amphibians in the Zhoushan archipelago, China: can
- selective extinction cause nested subsets of species? Oecologia. 1998; 113(4):557–64.
- 773 (doi:10.1007/s004420050409)
- 774 71. Yu J, Shen L, Li D, Guo S. Determinants of bryophyte species richness on the Zhoushan
- Archipelago, China. Basic and Applied Ecology. 2019; 37:38–50.
- 776 (doi:10.1016/j.baae.2019.05.002)
- 777 72. Diamond JM. Flightlessness and fear of flying in island species. Nature. 1981; 293(5833):507–8.
- 778 73. Hendershot JN, Smith JR, Anderson CB, Letten AD, Frishkoff LO, Zook JR, et al. Intensive
- farming drives long-term shifts in avian community composition. Nature. 2020; 579(7799):393–6.
- 780 (doi:10.1038/s41586-020-2090-6)
- 781 74. Huang Y, Zhang W, Sun W, Zheng X. Net Primary Production of Chinese Croplands from 1950
- 782 to 1999. Ecological Applications. 2007; 17(3):692–701. (doi:10.1890/05-1792)
- 783 75. Piao S, Fang J, Zhou L, Zhu B, Tan K, Tao S. Changes in vegetation net primary productivity
- from 1982 to 1999 in China. Global Biogeochemical Cycles. 2005; 19(2).
- 785 (doi:10.1029/2004GB002274)
- 786 76. Estrada-Carmona N, Sánchez AC, Remans R, Jones SK. Complex agricultural landscapes host
- more biodiversity than simple ones: A global meta-analysis. Proceedings of the National
- 788 Academy of Sciences. 2022; 119(38):e2203385119. (doi:10.1073/pnas.2203385119)

- 789 77. Herrel A, Podos J, Huber SK, Hendry AP. Bite performance and morphology in a population of
- Darwin's finches: implications for the evolution of beak shape. Functional Ecology. 2005;
- 791 19(1):43–8. (doi:10.1111/j.0269-8463.2005.00923.x)
- 792 78. Mendenhall CD, Frishkoff LO, Santos-Barrera G, Pacheco J, Mesfun E, Quijano FM, et al.
- Countryside biogeography of Neotropical reptiles and amphibians. Ecology. 2014; 95(4):856–70.
- 794 (doi:10.1890/12-2017.1)
- 795 79. Frishkoff LO, Ke A, Martins IS, Olimpi EM, Karp DS. Countryside Biogeography: the Controls
- of Species Distributions in Human-Dominated Landscapes. Current Landscape Ecology Reports.
- 797 2019; 4(2):15–30. (doi:10.1007/s40823-019-00037-5)
- 798 80. Frishkoff LO, Hadly EA, Daily GC. Thermal niche predicts tolerance to habitat conversion in
- tropical amphibians and reptiles. Global Change Biology. 2015; 21(11):3901–16.
- 800 (doi:10.1111/gcb.13016)
- 801 81. Martin DA, Andrianisaina F, Fulgence TR, Osen K, Rakotomalala AANA, Raveloaritiana E, et al.
- Land-use trajectories for sustainable land system transformations: Identifying leverage points in a
- global biodiversity hotspot. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences. 2022;
- 804 119(7):e2107747119. (doi:10.1073/pnas.2107747119)
- 805 82. Le Provost G, Badenhausser I, Le Bagousse-Pinguet Y, Clough Y, Henckel L, Violle C, et al.
- Land-use history impacts functional diversity across multiple trophic groups. Proceedings of the
- National Academy of Sciences. 2020; 117(3):1573-9. (doi:10.1073/pnas.1910023117)
- 808 83. García-Navas V, Thuiller W. Farmland bird assemblages exhibit higher functional and
- phylogenetic diversity than forest assemblages in France. Journal of Biogeography. 2020;
- 810 47(11):2392–404. (doi:10.1111/jbi.13950)