

MINI-REVIEW

Alternative biome states challenge the modelling of species' niche shifts under climate change

Juli G. Pausas¹  | William J. Bond^{2,3}

¹Centro de Investigaciones sobre Desertificación (CIDE-CSIC), Valencia, Spain

²Department of Biological Sciences, University of Cape Town, Cape Town, South Africa

³South African Environmental Observation Network, National Research Foundation, Claremont, South Africa

Correspondence

Juli G. Pausas

Email: juli.g.pausas@ext.uv.es; juli.g.pausas@csic.es

Funding information

Ministerio de Ciencia, Innovación y Universidades, Grant/Award Number: PGC2018-096569-B-I00

Handling Editor: Jason Fridley

Abstract

1. It is common to characterise the species niche using climate and global species distribution maps. This is then used to predict changes in distribution under a warming climate. This approach assumes that climate is a major driver of species distribution and that each species responds individually (*sensu* Gleason) to climate.
2. However, in many world landscapes, for a given climate, strikingly different vegetation types co-occur: forests and non-forests. These two alternative biome states are maintained by different feedback processes and have radically different species with contrasting shade and disturbance tolerance traits.
3. We propose that to improve predictions of species distribution changes under a novel climate, we need to consider the presence or absence of forest shade, as species are likely to respond individually only within their forest or non-forest biome, and not across biomes.
4. *Synthesis*. By considering shade as a biotic filter in niche modelling, we are not only improving our predictive capacity, but we are also reconciling the two views of communities: both the individualistic (within biome) and the organismal (across biomes) views of the community concept become relevant and complementary.

KEYWORDS

alternative stable states, biomes, community, light environment, open ecosystems, shade, species niche, species response

1 | GLEASON'S INDIVIDUALISTIC ASSUMPTION RECONSIDERED

The question of whether species are organised as collectives of integrated interacting assemblages (Clements, 1936) or behave individualistically (Gleason, 1926) is a century-old debate in ecology that is still to be resolved (Loreau, 2020). The debate has re-emerged in recent decades with an initial widespread acceptance

of the Gleasonian assumption when using species distribution models (SDMs) for exploring climate change impacts on biodiversity (Conradi et al., 2020; Thuiller et al., 2005). Climate change can be predicted from general circulation models while species responses to those changes can be explored using statistical models of their niche dimensions along environmental axes. The latter assumes that climate factors are major causes of species distributional changes over a template of varying geologies, and that each

This is an open access article under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivs License, which permits use and distribution in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited, the use is non-commercial and no modifications or adaptations are made.

© 2021 The Authors. *Journal of Ecology* published by John Wiley & Sons Ltd on behalf of British Ecological Society

species responds individually along climatic axes (Figure 1a). Here we challenge both assumptions.

Conceptually, the abundance and distribution of a plant species can be represented as a function of light, temperature, soil nutrients, water, CO₂, disturbance and biota (Austin & Van Niel, 2011). In practice, climate variables are the most widely used in SDMs, probably because they are more available at broad scales. There have been attempts to include biological interactions in predictive models (Boulangéat et al., 2012; Wisz et al., 2013); however, the underlying assumption remains that the main drivers are climate and soil variables; interactions are often inferred from co-occurrence along those main gradient (Wilkinson et al., 2021). A few studies consider differing light regimes in SDMs, recognising that different aspects and topographies generate distinct light environments that

favour different sets of species (Austin & Van Niel, 2011; Higgins et al., 2012; Nieto-Lugilde et al., 2015).

Here we argue that the light regime created by canopy trees, that is, forest shade and its presence or absence, profoundly influences the distribution of many species across the world as it filters the assembly of species by their shade tolerance. And, as we will see below, this filter generates different environmental conditions associated with different disturbance regimes, and thus requiring divergent physiological adaptations (Valladares & Niinemets, 2008; Zellweger et al., 2020) and disturbance response traits (Bond, 2019; Pausas & Bond, 2020a). The presence or absence of forest shade is therefore a major factor in determining species distribution and global biodiversity. Given that many open (light demanding) ecosystems are threatened, it is important to be able to predict their fate under global change. We propose that considering forest shade in SDMs, or using mechanistic models that explicitly consider vegetation feedbacks, may help in this regard while improving our understanding of community assembly.




FIGURE 1 Classical pattern of species response curves along a climate gradient (a), and the alternative pattern along the same climatic gradient when considering the shading factor (b). Note that in the driest and the wettest section of the gradient, we find open (e.g. grassland) and closed (forest) biomes, respectively; but at intermediate levels of the gradient, both are possible depending mainly on the disturbance regimes and feedback processes (alternative biome states, ABS; Pausas & Bond, 2020a). Thus, under the intermediate levels of the gradient, species that may seem to coexist when considering climate only (a) are not really coexisting but occurring in drastically different biomes

2 | ALTERNATIVE BIOME STATES: EXCEPTIONS TO DETERMINISTIC CLIMATE CONTROL

In climates suitable for forests, ecosystems with low levels of tree cover, and therefore open to sun-loving species, are anomalies for the hypothesis that climate determines vegetation (Bond, 2019). Yet over the last decade, mosaics of closed forest and open (non-forest) ecosystems dominated by shade-intolerant grasses or shrubs have been recognised as alternative stable states in a diversity of environments (Bond, 2019; Cramer et al., 2019; Dantas et al., 2016; Hirota et al., 2011; Overbeck et al., 2015; Ratajczak et al., 2014; Ratnam et al., 2016; Staver et al., 2011). These states can be considered 'biomes' (Box 1) since they differ in the dominant growth forms (Alternative Biome States, ABS; Pausas & Bond, 2020a). The open and closed biomes are stable as they can persist over generations at a site. They are 'alternative' because they can occupy the same substrate and occur in the same climate; and they can switch states rapidly relative to periods of stability (Bond, 2019; Hirota et al., 2011; Pausas & Bond, 2020a; Staver et al., 2011).

Open ecosystems in landscapes also supporting forests have long been considered as early successional. The supposed anthropogenic origins of open biomes have stifled research for most of the 20th century and this continues to lead to misconceptions today (Noss et al., 2015; Pausas & Bond, 2019). However, both fossil and phylogenetic studies have shown that sun-loving lineages are ancient and millions of years older than human deforestation (Bond, 2019; Carpenter et al., 2015; Edwards et al., 2010; Feurdean et al., 2015; Maurin et al., 2014; Simon et al., 2009). Fire, often considered the most destructive human tool, has been burning vegetation for over 400 million years (Pausas & Keeley, 2009; Scott, 2000). Livestock 'degradation' of vegetation was preceded by millions of years of consuming and trampling plants by mammalian megafauna, and before them, by dinosaurs and other tetrapods for at least 300 million

BOX 1 The biome concept

Humboldt and Bonpland (1807) noted that there were analogous vegetation formations in geographically disjunct but climatically similar regions. These vegetation formations (*sensu* Schimper, 1903) correspond to a current common use of the term 'biome', that is, vegetation dominated by the set of life-forms prevailing in a given climate (for a historical review, see Mucina, 2019). This definition, in which vegetation physiognomy and climate are linked, has been the basis of many global vegetation/ecosystem classifications (Walter, 1973; Whittaker, 1975) and it is based on the idea of strongly convergent evolution by climate. More recently, Woodward et al. (2004) recognised that this biome definition makes vegetation and climate indistinguishable, and thus it limits our understanding of the processes behind vegetation patterns; and they suggested defining biome in terms of only plant physiognomy (i.e. based on the dominant, or the mixture of dominant, growth forms). Defining biomes based on the vegetation physiognomy (see below) enables assessing the relative influence of various environmental factors (including climate, soil type, herbivory or fire regimes).

Table in Box 1. Examples of structurally based (climate independent) biomes at different resolution levels (the coarsest on the left).

Closed biomes	Forests	Needle-leaved forests Broad-leaved winter deciduous forests Broad-leaved summer deciduous forests Broad-leaved evergreen forests Sclerophyllous forests
Open biomes	Savannas	C4 savannas with broad-leaved trees Coniferous woodlands Eucalypt woodlands
	Shrublands	Sclerophyllous shrublands Heathlands Low shrublands
	Grasslands	C3-dominated grasslands/steppes C4-dominated grasslands

[Correction added on 18 November 2021, after first online publication: The term Eucalypt woodlands has been deleted from the heading Open biomes - Shrublands.]

years. Open biomes and their biota are now known to be ancient and diverse, and so must be included in global change assessments of biodiversity responses (Veldman et al., 2015).

3 | FEEDBACK PROCESSES MAINTAIN CONTRASTED ENVIRONMENTS

Open (non-forests) and closed (forest) biomes are maintained by different stabilising feedback processes that are generated by contrasted disturbance regimes (Bowman et al., 2015; Dantas et al., 2016; Pausas & Bond, 2020a). Frequent fires and/or large herbivores maintain open biomes and enable a dominance of shade-intolerant graminoids or shrubs; and these plants further enhance frequent fires and/or grazing that maintain the open light-saturated state. In contrast, in closed biomes, shade limits the growth of understory plants, and thus limits fuel for fires and forage for large herbivores (Charles-Dominique et al., 2018). Forests create micro-environmental conditions (e.g. higher humidity, lower temperatures and lower wind speed) that inhibit fire spread while enhancing the growth of forest trees (Hoffmann, Jaconis, et al., 2012; Newberry et al., 2020). These two feedback processes are essential for maintaining different biomes in a given environment, and they generate divergent microenvironmental conditions.

The forest feedback creates environmental conditions different from the macroclimate (De Frenne et al., 2021; Zellweger et al., 2020), including higher humidity, lower temperatures and lower wind speed. Environmental conditions in open biomes are a mirror image, with lower humidity, higher temperatures, higher wind speed and sufficient light to grow a dense vegetation of highly flammable, or palatable, grasses and shrubs (Hoffmann, Jaconis, et al., 2012; Little et al., 2012; Newberry et al., 2020). Forests may also diverge from open grasslands and shrublands in accumulating nutrients such as nitrogen, potassium and calcium in the topsoil, whereas these are depleted in open biomes, especially when frequently burnt (Table 1; Cramer et al., 2019; Pausas & Bond, 2020b). Root systems of both juvenile and adult forest woody plants diverge from those of open biomes (Hoffmann et al., 2004; Ma et al., 2018) so that a suite of physiologically divergent traits develops around the presence or absence of a forest canopy.

4 | TAXONOMIC AND FUNCTIONAL DIFFERENCES IN THE BIOTA

The consequences of different conditions between open and closed biomes are profound and not only related to different physiognomy and growth patterns; they imply different

TABLE 1 Contrasted characteristics between open and close biomes are produced by the different feedbacks influencing tree density and shade with cascading effects at different scales. In open biomes, several traits are variable among different types (e.g. grasslands, shrublands) or disturbance type (fire, grazing). Examples of open and close biomes are given in Box 1

Trait	Open biomes	Closed biomes	Examples ^a
Woody plants			
Tree bark thickness, bark growth	Variable	Low	1, 2, 3
Stem bud protection	Variable	Low	4
Resprouting ability	High, basal	Low	
Below-ground bud bank	Common	Rare	5
Hydraulic fire resistance	High	Low	6
Root/shoot	High	Low	7
Leaf area (m ² /g)	Lower	Higher	8
Spines	Variable	Low	9
Shade tolerance	Intolerant	Tolerant	10, 11
Shape (height, width)	Shorter, wider	Taller, narrower	12, 2
Leaf area/branch mass	Lower	Higher	11
Light plasticity	Lower	Higher	13
Herbaceous plants			
Grass photosynthesis	C ₄	C ₃	11, 14, 15
Community and ecosystem			
Leaf Area Index	Lower	Higher	13
Grass cover	Variable	Low	11
Vertebrate herbivory	Higher	Lower	9
Fire frequency	Higher	Lower	16
Dominant biogeochemical feedback driver	Fire, herbivores	Microbes (litter decomposition)	17
Local effect on soils	Leaching	Enriching	17, 18
Topsoil fertility	Lower	Higher	18
Microclimate (in relation to macroclimate)	Similar	Colder, moister, less wind	19, 20, 21

^a1 Charles-Dominique et al. (2017); 2 Hoffmann et al. (2003); 3 Pausas (2015); 4 Charles-Dominique et al. (2018); 5 Pausas et al. (2018); 6 West et al. (2016); 7 Hoffmann et al. (2004); 8 Hoffmann and Franco (2003); 9 Charles-Dominique et al. (2016); 10 Bazzaz (1979); 11 Charles-Dominique et al. (2018); 12 Dantas and Pausas (2020); 13 Power et al. (2019); 14 Edwards et al. (2010); 15 Pilon et al. (2020); 16 Dantas et al. (2013); 17 Pausas and Bond (2020b); 18 Cramer et al. (2019); 19 Newberry et al. (2020); 20 Zellweger et al. (2020); 21: De Frenne et al. (2021).

species composition with contrasting traits in each biome (Aleman et al., 2020; Charles-Dominique et al., 2017, 2018; Dantas et al., 2013), even under the same climate (Table 1). Open biomes are dominated by shade-intolerant species that cannot colonise forests, while forests maintain shade-tolerant trees that are burnt or browsed to death in open environments. Forest trees can colonise the open biomes only if disturbance is excluded, probably coping with high light levels thanks to their high plasticity (Power et al., 2019). In such conditions, savanna trees may require some time to die but will fail to recruit (e.g. transitional forests with coexisting forest and savanna trees). Dynamics and elimination by shade are much faster for the ground layer of open biomes (Newberry et al., 2020), which include a large proportion of their biodiversity (Baker et al., 2020). When tropical forests have patches or glades of grasses, they are often C₃ species, in contrast to adjacent savannas and grasslands that are dominated by C₄ grasses (Charles-Dominique et al., 2018; Edwards et al., 2010; Pilon et al., 2021; Solofondranohatra et al., 2018).

Given the different disturbance regimes in each biome, plants in open and closed biomes have dramatically different traits related to fire and herbivore resistance. These include higher insulation of buds limiting fire injury in open biomes (Burrows, 2002; Charles-Dominique et al., 2015), thinner bark in forests (Charles-Dominique et al., 2017; Lawes et al., 2013; Pausas, 2015), higher prevalence of resprouting structures in open biomes (Pausas et al., 2018) and different structural defences such as spinescence (common in open biomes where mammal browsing is high; Charles-Dominique et al., 2016; Dantas & Pausas, 2020). The net effect is a pronounced floristic and functional divergence between forest and open biomes (Table 1).

The importance of shade (or its mirror opposite, openness) is also conspicuous for fauna, as it provides contrasting habitat for a myriad of animals. And this distinction is not exclusive for large vertebrates that dominate open habitats (Bond, 2019). For instance, the most important factor determining the assembly of ant species in Australia is whether they live in an open or closed biome (Andersen, 2019);

and South African forests and shrublands also differ in the assembly of Collembola, with contrasted functional traits in each biome (Liu et al., 2020). Open/closed environments have also generated species divergences in animals, including elephants (Rohland et al., 2010), birds (Slabbekoorn & Smith, 2002) and even hominids (Roberts et al., 2016).

5 | IMPLICATIONS FOR GLOBAL CHANGE IMPACTS ON BIODIVERSITY

If open biomes were determined primarily by climate and soils, then predicting the future of species from these physical variables would be reasonable (e.g. Conradi et al., 2020; Gardner et al., 2020). However, the existence of open biomes where forests can grow forces consideration of the existence of feedback processes that maintain open states. Mosaics of open and closed biomes are globally widespread and occur under many climates (Pausas & Bond, 2020a; Staver et al., 2011). Forest/grassy biome mosaics are common in the tropics and subtropics of Africa and South America (Staver et al., 2011), and occur in Australia (Baker et al., 2020; Wood & Bowman, 2012), south-east Asia (Ratnam et al., 2016) and North America (Noss, 2012). Forest-steppe mosaics are common in a vast area of Eurasia (Erdős et al., 2017; Feurdean et al., 2015). Based on ecoregion maps, open biomes cover about one-third of the world's vegetated land surface (Bond, 2019). By ignoring the biotic response to shade in species distribution models, we are likely to fail to predict the different biodiversity futures in open versus closed biomes.

For instance, despite the many examples of ABS from Africa, a recent vegetation modelling exercise for this continent (Conradi et al., 2020) only used climate and soils, without considering processes and feedbacks related to the presence/absence of a tree shade; thus the model was not able to simulate alternative biome states (as admitted by the authors). A striking example is Madagascar, a biodiversity hotspot where grasslands are widespread, diverse and include numerous species endemic to open habitats on the island (Solofondranohatra et al., 2018, 2020). In the Madagascar highlands (and in other parts of Africa), Conradi et al. (2020)'s model predicted climatic suitability for trees, climbers and grasses but could not predict the observed sharp mosaic of forest patches in grassland. Grassland fires are lethal to forest trees while forest trees are lethal for shade-intolerant grasses (which hardly coexist in Madagascar). The distinction between forested and open habitat is also crucial for Madagascar rich fauna, and the forest-dwelling mouse lemur is an emblematic example (Quéméré et al., 2012). Considering feedback processes and the associated forest/non-forest environmental filter is just as important in other regions with grassy biomes (Bond, 2016, 2019; Buisson et al., 2019; Murphy et al., 2016; Pausas & Bond, 2020; Veldman et al., 2015). If a significant part of the world vegetation and diversity is strongly controlled by fire and herbivory, then it is not possible to predict the distribution of species by just climate and soil alone.

While there has been considerable public and scientific concern over loss of forests and their 'savannisation' due to extreme fires,

there has been far less concern over loss of biodiversity in open biomes due to expanding forests (e.g. Baker et al., 2020). Yet, disruption of consumers, especially through fire suppression, or changing the type and density of herbivores, can cause cascading effects to these systems. Fire suppression caused the loss of large tracts of the species-rich southern grasslands in the United States (Noss, 2012) and forest expansion is swallowing up what is left (Nowacki & Abrams, 2015). Fire suppression in nature reserves in the Brazilian cerrado caused the loss of the rich sun-loving cerrado plant species, especially the herbaceous layer, and their replacement by shade-tolerant trees and shrubs (Abreu et al., 2017; Durigan & Ratter, 2016). And conifer plantations in old growth grasslands have led to the loss of the rich forb flora which has failed to re-colonise areas many decades after the forests were felled (Veldman et al., 2015). These cascading losses had nothing to do with climate change and everything to do with human interventions in managing the consumers that maintain open biomes. Restoring ecological processes that maintain open biomes (e.g. rewilding, prescribed grazing, wildfire management, prescribed burns) are slowly being promoted for biodiversity conservation (Driscoll et al., 2010; Perino et al., 2019).

Changes in the growing conditions for woody plants should also affect the tree layer and the mix of forest and non-forest. An important global change impact is the effect of increasing CO₂ on trees. Fires maintain open biomes by limiting the growth of tree saplings to adults (fire-trap). Faster sapling growth under CO₂ fertilisation should enable more trees to reach the size threshold to escape the flames, thus speeding forest expansion into open biomes (Bond & Midgley, 2012). In fact, when incorporating CO₂ into vegetation modelling, woody plants largely increase (Higgins & Scheiter, 2012). Because of the open/closed dichotomy of species and their traits, major loss of open habitat biodiversity can be expected as they close over with trees (Baker et al., 2020; Midgley & Bond, 2015) and this may go unnoticed if our models are unable to predict it.

An additional concern is an intentional massive increase in tree cover as a form of geoengineering intended to decarbonise the Earth. There are several high-profile tree-planting programmes endorsed by the UN, the IUCN, governments and industry. These are being targeted at areas of low tree cover—open biomes—without consideration of their unique and diverse biota (Bond, 2019; Veldman et al., 2015). There is clearly a need to explicitly consider the future of alternative closed and open biomes in global change modelling.

6 | MODELLING BEYOND GLEASONIAN ASSUMPTIONS

The Gleasonian view of communities suggests that communities are assembled by species that respond individually along environmental gradients and thus cannot form bounded units (Gleason, 1926). This view lacks any consideration of stabilising feedback processes generating divergent biotically determined environments and mosaics in a given climate. The overlapping response curve along a climate gradient (Figure 1a) may indicate plant

coexistence (and potentially competitive interactions) only if they occur in the same biome (Figure 1b). That is, the individualistic continuum of species along climatic gradients is expected within the same biome but not across biomes. Thus, responses to climate and geology do not necessarily reflect the species niche; the physical environmental axes are relevant only if nested within the appropriate physiognomically defined biome. Fitting species distribution models or using climate limits in biome modelling for projecting future distributions is inappropriate for extensive regions with alternative biome states.

Is it possible to incorporate the biological effect of shade as a major environmental filter in SDMs? The availability of large databases of species localities, and habitat preferences has made it possible to consider responses to climate change for thousands of species (Conradi et al., 2020). A few studies have demonstrated that shade (i.e. tree cover) can also be added as a significant habitat requirement for plants (Nieto-Lugilde et al., 2015). However, defining biologically determined light environments may not be straightforward, as the resolution of global tree cover maps may not be the most appropriate for depicting ABS. Among the difficulties are divergent views on the meaning of 'forest'. For instance, FAO describes 'forests' as ecosystems with tree cover as low as 10%, thereby muddling ecologically and functionally distinct closed and open biomes (Sasaki & Putz, 2009). The increasing availability of quantitative field-based vegetation data at the global scale (Bruehlheide et al., 2019) may facilitate the estimation of the shade factor. The use of new remote sensing technologies including new satellites, drones and airborne LiDAR (Emilien et al., 2021; Ferraz et al., 2020; Valbuena et al., 2020) can also provide quantitative data to discriminate between closed and open ecosystems at large scales. Field information is also available to calibrate remote sensing data. For instance, both in Brazil and in southern Africa, field studies suggest thresholds of leaf area index (LAI) above which grasses (and fire) are absent (Charles-Dominique et al., 2018; Hoffmann, Geiger, et al., 2012; Pilon et al., 2020). Field measurements of microclimate (e.g. Zellweger et al., 2020) can also be used for calibration; when the appropriate data are available, it can be incorporated into SDM (Lembrechts et al., 2019; Nieto-Lugilde et al., 2015). There are also a range of statistical methods for fitting complex SDM including species interactions that could indirectly include the shade factor (for a recent revision, see Norberg et al., 2019). The joint species distribution models may prove especially promising (Warton et al., 2015; Wilkinson et al., 2021; see caveats in Poggiato et al., 2021) as they can model entire species assemblages to environmental conditions assuming common responses to some factors (e.g. shade tolerance). Thus, these tools may help moving from Gleasonian assumptions to a more Clementsian view of communities.

Another approach for accounting for ABS is including the processes that maintain open biomes (fire, grazing) into correlative SDMs. For instance, fire-related variables explained additional variation not captured by climatic variables, resulting in increased model performance when modelling species distribution in the Cape Floristic Region of South Africa (Tucker et al., 2012). More difficult

may be including variables related to grazing especially at broad (global) scales. In fact, there is limited tradition to simultaneously consider the three ecological dimensions, that is, environmental parameters, species interactions and disturbance, to understand biogeographical patterns (3D-ecology; Pausas & Lamont, 2018).

Process-based models, such as dynamic vegetation models (DVM), can also be used at the community level for inferring ABS (Lasslop et al., 2016; Moncrieff et al., 2014); their added advantage is their dynamic nature and the possibility of including other global change drivers (e.g. CO₂ effects, disturbance regime shifts; Higgins & Scheiter, 2012; Sato et al., 2021). Some of these models do not directly simulate the feedback process that generate ABS, but they are used for testing different initial conditions. For instance, results simulating African biomes in response to changing CO₂ (Moncrieff et al., 2016) suggest that DVM are highly sensitive to initial conditions; predictions showed extensive savannas and grasslands (similar to 20th-century African vegetation) when using initial conditions resembling late glacial vegetation, but forests were much more widespread if the historical initial condition was ignored. The simulations also showed widespread loss of conditions favouring alternative biome states and the expansion of forests primarily because of elevated CO₂ effects (Moncrieff et al., 2016). Consequently, species associated with open biomes would be at high risk of extinction because of the spread of forest, regardless of their individualistic responses to changing climate. A few DVMs explicitly simulate feedbacks and ABS; for instance, a local scale simulation study in southern Brazil highlighted the importance of the initial spatial pattern (not just abundance) of the different alternative states (Blanco et al., 2014). More research is needed to be able to explicitly simulate feedback processes at broad scales, and thus to predict expansions and contractions of biomes in landscape mosaics and across biogeographical units.

Overall, a wide range of tools are available for exploring the global change responses of the biodiversity in alternative biome states; it is the conceptual framework that has been missing.

7 | CONCLUDING REMARKS

Ancient open biomes are common in climates that can support forests (alternative biome states). They encompass a significant proportion of world regions, including many biodiversity hotspots such as Brazilian cerrado, Cape fynbos, Mediterranean-type shrublands and other major centres of species richness such as the Campos rupestres of Brazil, African grasslands and savannas, pine savannas of the southern USA, or Eurasian forest-steppes. We know a little about their response to global drivers, and models not considering alternative biome states are likely to fail in their biodiversity projections. There is an immediate and major threat to the future of many of these open habitats, not only because of increasing tree cover with declining herbivory and fire and the continuous increase in atmospheric CO₂, but also because of the international support for planting trillions of trees or expanding forested areas to millions of km²

worldwide. Failure to model the implications, or to acknowledge the importance of non-forested ecosystems and their sun-loving biota, could lead to a major loss of species over the next few decades as trees start shading out the forest floor. Lacking appropriate modelling tools may mean unpredictable and unnoticed biodiversity losses with little room for management actions for conservation.

There is a need to incorporate ABS in vegetation modelling. For process-based models, the most appropriate would be to include the necessary feedback processes. For correlative-based niche models, incorporating forest shade as a biotic filter may provide a way to incorporate ABS, and thus improve our biodiversity response predictions under global change. By doing so, we are also reconciling the two community concept views (Figure 1): both the individualistic (within biome) and the organismal (across biomes) are relevant and complementary. That is, both Gleason's and Clements's perspective of community remain useful concepts in ecology.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This research has been performed under the framework of the projects FIROTIC (PGC2018-096569-B-I00, Spanish government). Authors declare no conflict of interest.

AUTHOR'S CONTRIBUTIONS

J.G.P. and W.J.B. conceived the idea; J.G.P. wrote the first draft; J.G.P. and W.J.B. wrote the final version and gave final approval for publication.

PEER REVIEW

The peer review history for this article is available at <https://publons.com/publon/10.1111/1365-2745.13781>.

DATA AVAILABILITY STATEMENT

No original data were used in this study.

ORCID

Juli G. Pausas  <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3533-5786>

REFERENCES

- Abreu, R. C. R., Hoffmann, W. A., Vasconcelos, H. L., Pilon, N. A., Rossatto, D. R., & Durigan, G. (2017). The biodiversity cost of carbon sequestration in tropical savanna. *Science Advances*, 3(8), e1701284. <https://doi.org/10.1126/sciadv.1701284>
- Aleman, J. C., Fayolle, A., Favier, C., Staver, A. C., Dexter, K. G., Ryan, C. M., Azihou, A. F., Bauman, D., te Beest, M., Chidumayo, E. N., Comiskey, J. A., Cromsigt, J. P. G. M., Dessard, H., Doucet, J.-L., Finckh, M., Gillet, J.-F., Gourlet-Fleury, S., Hempson, G. P., Holdo, R. M., ... Swaine, M. D. (2020). Floristic evidence for alternative biome states in tropical Africa. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, 117(45), 28183–28190. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.2011515117>
- Andersen, A. N. (2019). Responses of ant communities to disturbance: Five principles for understanding the disturbance dynamics of a globally dominant faunal group. *Journal of Animal Ecology*, 88(3), 350–362. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1365-2656.12907>
- Austin, M. P., & Van Niel, K. P. (2011). Improving species distribution models for climate change studies: Variable selection and scale. *Journal of Biogeography*, 38(1), 1–8. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2699.2010.02416.x>
- Baker, A. G., Catterall, C., Benkendorff, K., & Fensham, R. J. (2020). Rainforest expansion reduces understorey plant diversity and density in open forest of eastern Australia. *Austral Ecology*, 45(5), 557–571. <https://doi.org/10.1111/aec.12871>
- Bazzaz, F. A. (1979). The physiological ecology of plant succession. *Annual Review on Ecology & Systematics*, 10, 351–371. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.es.10.110179.002031>
- Blanco, C. C., Scheiter, S., Sosinski, E., Fidelis, A., Anand, M., & Pillar, V. D. (2014). Feedbacks between vegetation and disturbance processes promote long-term persistence of forest-grassland mosaics in south Brazil. *Ecological Modelling*, 291, 224–232. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolmodel.2014.07.024>
- Bond, W. J. (2016). Ancient grasslands at risk. *Science*, 351(6269), 120–122. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aad5132>
- Bond, W. J. (2019). *Open ecosystems: Ecology and evolution beyond the forest edge*. Oxford University Press.
- Bond, W. J., & Midgley, G. F. (2012). Carbon dioxide and the uneasy interactions of trees and savannah grasses. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London, Series B: Biological Sciences*, 367(1588), 601–612. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rstb.2011.0182>
- Boulangeat, I., Gravel, D., & Thuiller, W. (2012). Accounting for dispersal and biotic interactions to disentangle the drivers of species distributions and their abundances. *Ecology Letters*, 15(6), 584–593. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1461-0248.2012.01772.x>
- Bowman, D. M. J. S., Perry, G. L. W., & Marston, J. B. (2015). Feedbacks and landscape-level vegetation dynamics. *Trends in Ecology & Evolution*, 30(5), 255–260. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tree.2015.03.005>
- Bruelheide, H., Dengler, J., Jiménez-Alfaro, B., Purschke, O., Hennekens, S. M., Chytrý, M., Pillar, V. D., Jansen, F., Kattge, J., Sandel, B., Aubin, I., Biurrun, I., Field, R., Haider, S., Jandt, U., Lenoir, J., Peet, R. K., Peyre, G., Sabatini, F. M., ... Zverev, A. (2019). SPlot – A new tool for global vegetation analyses. *Journal of Vegetation Science*, 30(2), 161–186. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jvs.12710>
- Buisson, E., Stradic, S. L., Silveira, F. A. O., Durigan, G., Overbeck, G. E., Fidelis, A., Fernandes, G. W., Bond, W. J., Hermann, J.-M., Mahy, G., Alvarado, S. T., Zaloumis, N. P., & Veldman, J. W. (2019). Resilience and restoration of tropical and subtropical grasslands, savannas, and grassy woodlands. *Biological Reviews*, 94(2), 590–609. <https://doi.org/10.1111/brv.12470>
- Burrows, G. E. (2002). Epicormic strand structure in *Angophora*, *Eucalyptus* and *Lophostemon* (Myrtaceae)—Implications for fire resistance and recovery. *New Phytologist*, 153, 111–131. <https://doi.org/10.1046/j.0028-646X.2001.00299.x>
- Carpenter, R. J., Macphail, M. K., Jordan, G. J., & Hill, R. S. (2015). Fossil evidence for open, Proteaceae-dominated heathlands and fire in the Late Cretaceous of Australia. *American Journal of Botany*, 102(12), 2092–2107. <https://doi.org/10.3732/ajb.1500343>
- Charles-Dominique, T., Beckett, H., Midgley, G. F., & Bond, W. J. (2015). Bud protection: A key trait for species sorting in a forest-savanna mosaic. *New Phytologist*, 207(4), 1052–1060. <https://doi.org/10.1111/nph.13406>
- Charles-Dominique, T., Davies, T. J., Hempson, G. P., Bezeng, B. S., Daru, B. H., Kabongo, R. M., Maurin, O., Muasya, A. M., van der Bank, M., & Bond, W. J. (2016). Spiny plants, mammal browsers, and the origin of African savannas. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, 113(38), E5572–E5577. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1607493113>
- Charles-Dominique, T., Midgley, G. F., & Bond, W. J. (2017). Fire frequency filters species by bark traits in a savanna-forest mosaic. *Journal of Vegetation Science*, 28, 728–735. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jvs.12528>
- Charles-Dominique, T., Midgley, G. F., Tomlinson, K. W., & Bond, W. J. (2018). Steal the light: Shade vs fire adapted vegetation in

- forest-savanna mosaics. *New Phytologist*, 218(4), 1419–1429. <https://doi.org/10.1111/nph.15117>
- Clements, F. E. (1936). Nature and structure of the climax. *The Journal of Ecology*, 24(1), 252–284. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2256278>
- Conradi, T., Slingsby, J. A., Midgley, G. F., Nottebrock, H., Schweiger, A. H., & Higgins, S. I. (2020). An operational definition of the biome for global change research. *New Phytologist*, 227(5), 1294–1306. <https://doi.org/10.1111/nph.16580>
- Cramer, M. D., Power, S. C., Belev, A., Gillson, L., Bond, W. J., Hoffman, M. T., & Hedin, L. O. (2019). Are forest-shrubland mosaics of the Cape Floristic Region an example of alternate stable states? *Ecography*, 42(4), 717–729. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ecog.03860>
- Dantas, V. L., Batalha, M. A., & Pausas, J. G. (2013). Fire drives functional thresholds on the savanna-forest transition. *Ecology*, 94(11), 2454–2463. <https://doi.org/10.1890/12-1629.1>
- Dantas, V. L., Hirota, M., Oliveira, R. S., & Pausas, J. G. (2016). Disturbance maintains alternative biome states. *Ecology Letters*, 19, 12–19. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ele.12537>
- Dantas, V. L., & Pausas, J. G. (2020). Megafauna biogeography explains plant functional trait variability in the tropics. *Global Ecology and Biogeography*, 29(8), 1288–1298. <https://doi.org/10.1111/geb.13111>
- De Frenne, P., Lenoir, J., Luoto, M., Scheffers, B. R., Zellweger, F., Aalto, J., Ashcroft, M. B., Christiansen, D. M., Decocoq, G., Pauw, K. D., Govaert, S., Greiser, C., Gril, E., Hampe, A., Jucker, T., Klings, D. H., Koelemeijer, I. A., Lembrechts, J. J., Marrec, R., ... Hylander, K. (2021). Forest microclimates and climate change: Importance, drivers and future research agenda. *Global Change Biology*, 27(11), 2279–2297. <https://doi.org/10.1111/gcb.15569>
- Driscoll, D. A., Lindenmayer, D. B., Bennett, A. F., Bode, M., Bradstock, R. A., Cary, G. J., Clarke, M. F., Dexter, N., Fensham, R., Friend, G., Gill, M., James, S., Kay, G., Keith, D. A., MacGregor, C., Russell-Smith, J., Salt, D., Watson, J. E. M., Williams, R. J., & York, A. (2010). Fire management for biodiversity conservation: Key research questions and our capacity to answer them. *Biological Conservation*, 143(9), 1928–1939. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biocon.2010.05.026>
- Durigan, G., & Ratter, J. A. (2016). The need for a consistent fire policy for Cerrado conservation. *Journal of Applied Ecology*, 53(1), 11–15. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1365-2664.12559>
- Edwards, E. J., Osborne, C. P., Stromberg, C. A. E., Smith, S. A., & C 4 Grasses Consortium. (2010). The origins of C4 grasslands: Integrating evolutionary and ecosystem science. *Science*, 328(5978), 587–591. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1177216>
- Emilien, A.-V., Thomas, C., & Thomas, H. (2021). UAV & satellite synergies for optical remote sensing applications: A literature review. *Science of Remote Sensing*, 3, 100019. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.srs.2021.100019>
- Erdős, L., Tölgyesi, C. S., Bátor, Z., Semenishchenkov, Y. A., & Magnes, M. (2017). The influence of forest/grassland proportion on the species composition, diversity and natural values of an eastern Austrian forest-steppe. *Russian Journal of Ecology*, 48(4), 350–357. <https://doi.org/10.1134/S1067413617040063>
- Ferraz, A., Saatchi, S. S., Longo, M., & Clark, D. B. (2020). Tropical tree size-frequency distributions from airborne lidar. *Ecological Applications*, 30(7), e02154. <https://doi.org/10.1002/eap.2154>
- Feurdean, A., Marinova, E., Nielsen, A. B., Liakka, J., Veres, D., Hutchinson, S. M., Braun, M., Timar-Gabor, A., Aсталos, C., Mosburgger, V., & Hickler, T. (2015). Origin of the forest steppe and exceptional grassland diversity in Transylvania (central-eastern Europe). *Journal of Biogeography*, 42(5), 951–963. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jbi.12468>
- Gardner, A. S., Maclean, I. M. D., & Gaston, K. J. (2020). A new system to classify global climate zones based on plant physiology and using high temporal resolution climate data. *Journal of Biogeography*, 47, 2091–2101. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jbi.13927>
- Gleason, H. A. (1926). The individualistic concept of plant association. *Bulletin of the Torrey Botanical Club*, 53, 7–26.
- Higgins, S. I., O'Hara, R. B., Bykova, O., Cramer, M. D., Chuine, I., Gerstner, E.-M., Hickler, T., Morin, X., Kearney, M. R., Midgley, G. F., & Scheiter, S. (2012). A physiological analogy of the niche for projecting the potential distribution of plants. *Journal of Biogeography*, 39(12), 2132–2145. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2699.2012.02752.x>
- Higgins, S. I., & Scheiter, S. (2012). Atmospheric CO₂ forces abrupt vegetation shifts locally, but not globally. *Nature*, 488(7410), 209–212.
- Hirota, M., Holmgren, M., Van Nes, E. H., & Scheffer, M. (2011). Global resilience of tropical forest and savanna to critical transitions. *Science*, 334(6053), 232–235.
- Hoffmann, W. A., & Franco, A. C. (2003). Comparative growth analysis of tropical forest and savanna woody plants using phylogenetically independent contrasts. *Journal of Ecology*, 91, 475–484. <https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1365-2745.2003.00777.x>
- Hoffmann, W. A., Geiger, E. L., Gotsch, S. G., Rossatto, D. R., Silva, L. C. R., Lau, O. L., Haridasan, M., & Franco, A. C. (2012). Ecological thresholds at the savanna-forest boundary: How plant traits, resources and fire govern the distribution of tropical biomes. *Ecology Letters*, 15(7), 759–768. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1461-0248.2012.01789.x>
- Hoffmann, W. A., Jaconis, S. Y., Mckinley, K. L., Geiger, E. L., Gotsch, S. G., & Franco, A. C. (2012). Fuels or microclimate? Understanding the drivers of fire feedbacks at savanna-forest boundaries. *Austral Ecology*, 37(6), 634–643. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1442-9993.2011.02324.x>
- Hoffmann, W. A., Orthen, B., & Do Nascimento, P. K. V. (2003). Comparative fire ecology of tropical savanna and forest trees. *Functional Ecology*, 17(6), 720–726. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2435.2003.00796.x>
- Hoffmann, W. A., Orthen, B., & Franco, A. C. (2004). Constraints to seedling success of savanna and forest trees across the savanna-forest boundary. *Oecologia*, 140(2), 252–260. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00442-004-1595-2>
- Humboldt, A. V., & Bonpland, A. (1807). *Essai sur la géographie des plantes*. Chez Levrault, Schoell et compagnie.
- Lasslop, G., Brovkin, V., Reick, C. H., Bathiany, S., & Kloster, S. (2016). Multiple stable states of tree cover in a global land surface model due to a fire-vegetation feedback. *Geophysical Research Letters*, 43(12), 6324–6331. <https://doi.org/10.1002/2016GL069365>
- Lawes, M. J., Midgley, J. J., & Clarke, P. J. (2013). Costs and benefits of relative bark thickness in relation to fire damage: A savanna/forest contrast. *Journal of Ecology*, 101(2), 517–524. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1365-2745.12035>
- Lembrechts, J. J., Nijs, I., & Lenoir, J. (2019). Incorporating microclimate into species distribution models. *Ecography*, 42(7), 1267–1279. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ecog.03947>
- Little, J. K., Prior, L. D., Williamson, G. J., Williams, S. E., & Bowman, D. M. J. S. (2012). Fire weather risk differs across rain forest–Savanna boundaries in the humid tropics of north-eastern Australia. *Austral Ecology*, 37, 915–925. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1442-9993.2011.02350.x>
- Liu, W. P. A., Phillips, L. M., Terblanche, J. S., Janion-Scheepers, C., & Chown, S. L. (2020). Strangers in a strange land: Globally unusual thermal tolerance in Collembola from the Cape Floristic Region. *Functional Ecology*, 38(8), 1601–1612. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1365-2435.13584>
- Loreau, M. (2020). The ecosystem. In A. Dobson, D. Tilman, & R. D. Holt (Eds.), *Unsolved problems in ecology* (pp. 218–224). Princeton University Press.
- Ma, Z., Guo, D., Xu, X., Lu, M., Bardgett, R. D., Eissenstat, D. M., McCormack, M. L., & Hedin, L. O. (2018). Evolutionary history resolves global organization of root functional traits. *Nature*, 555, 94–97. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nature25783>
- Maurin, O., Davies, T. J., Burrows, J. E., Daru, B. H., Yessoufou, K., Muasya, A. M., van der Bank, M., & Bond, W. J. (2014). Savanna

- fire and the origins of the 'underground forests' of Africa. *New Phytologist*, 204(1), 201–214. <https://doi.org/10.1111/nph.12936>
- Midgley, G. F., & Bond, W. J. (2015). Future of African terrestrial biodiversity and ecosystems under anthropogenic climate change. *Nature Climate Change*, 5(9), 823–829. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nclimate2753>
- Moncrieff, G. R., Scheiter, S., Bond, W. J., & Higgins, S. I. (2014). Increasing atmospheric CO₂ overrides the historical legacy of multiple stable biome states in Africa. *New Phytologist*, 201(3), 908–915. <https://doi.org/10.1111/nph.12551>
- Moncrieff, G. R., Scheiter, S., Langan, L., Trabucco, A., & Higgins, S. I. (2016). The future distribution of the savannah biome: Model-based and biogeographic contingency. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, 371(1703), <https://doi.org/10.1098/rstb.2015.0311>
- Mucina, L. (2019). Biome: Evolution of a crucial ecological and biogeographical concept. *New Phytologist*, 222(1), 97–114. <https://doi.org/10.1111/nph.15609>
- Murphy, B. P., Andersen, A. N., & Parr, C. L. (2016). The underestimated biodiversity of tropical grassy biomes. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, 371, 20150319. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rstb.2015.0319>
- Newberry, B. M., Power, C. R., Abreu, R. C. R., Durigan, G., Rossatto, D. R., & Hoffmann, W. A. (2020). Flammability thresholds or flammability gradients? Determinants of fire across savanna-forest transitions. *New Phytologist*, 228(3), 910–921. <https://doi.org/10.1111/nph.16742>
- Nieto-Lugilde, D., Lenoir, J., Abdulhak, S., Aeschmann, D., Dullinger, S., Gégout, J.-C., Guisan, A., Pauli, H., Renaud, J., Theurillat, J.-P., Thuiller, W., Es, J. V., Vittoz, P., Willner, W., Wohlgemuth, T., Zimmermann, N. E., & Svenning, J.-C. (2015). Tree cover at fine and coarse spatial grains interacts with shade tolerance to shape plant species distributions across the Alps. *Ecography*, 38(6), 578–589. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ecog.00954>
- Norberg, A., Abrego, N., Blanchet, F. G., Adler, F. R., Anderson, B. J., Anttila, J., Araújo, M. B., Dallas, T., Dunson, D., Elith, J., Foster, S. D., Fox, R., Franklin, J., Godsoe, W., Guisan, A., O'Hara, B., Hill, N. A., Holt, R. D., Hui, F. K. C., ... Ovaskainen, O. (2019). A comprehensive evaluation of predictive performance of 33 species distribution models at species and community levels. *Ecological Monographs*, 89(3), e01370. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ecm.1370>
- Noss, R. F. (2012). *Forgotten grasslands of the south: Natural history and conservation*. Island Press.
- Noss, R. F., Platt, W. J., Sorrie, B. A., Weakley, A. S., Means, D. B., Costanza, J., Peet, R. K., & Richardson, D. (2015). How global biodiversity hotspots may go unrecognized: Lessons from the North American Coastal Plain. *Diversity and Distributions*, 21(2), 236–244. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ddi.12278>
- Nowacki, G. J., & Abrams, M. D. (2015). Is climate an important driver of post-European vegetation change in the Eastern United States? *Global Change Biology*, 21(1), 314–334. <https://doi.org/10.1111/gcb.12663>
- Overbeck, G. E., Vélez-Martin, E., Scarano, F. R., Lewinsohn, T. M., Fonseca, C. R., Meyer, S. T., Müller, S. C., Ceotto, P., Dadalt, L., Durigan, G., Ganade, G., Gossner, M. M., Guadagnin, D. L., Lorenzen, K., Jacobi, C. M., Weisser, W. W., & Pillar, V. D. (2015). Conservation in Brazil needs to include non-forest ecosystems. *Diversity and Distributions*, 21(12), 1455–1460. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ddi.12380>
- Pausas, J. G. (2015). Bark thickness and fire regime. *Functional Ecology*, 29(3), 315–327. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1365-2435.12372>
- Pausas, J. G., & Bond, W. J. (2019). Humboldt and the reinvention of nature. *Journal of Ecology*, 107(3), 1031–1037. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1365-2745.13109>
- Pausas, J. G., & Bond, W. J. (2020a). Alternative biome states in terrestrial ecosystems. *Trends in Plant Science*, 25(3), 250–263. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tplants.2019.11.003>
- Pausas, J. G., & Bond, W. (2020b). On the three major recycling pathways in terrestrial ecosystems. *Trends in Ecology & Evolution*, 35(9), 767–775. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tree.2020.04.004>
- Pausas, J. G., & Keeley, J. E. (2009). A burning story: The role of fire in the history of life. *BioScience*, 59(7), 593–601. <https://doi.org/10.1525/bio.2009.59.7.10>
- Pausas, J. G., & Lamont, B. B. (2018). Ecology and biogeography in 3D: The case of the Australian Proteaceae. *Journal of Biogeography*, 45(7), 1469–1477. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jbi.13348>
- Pausas, J. G., Lamont, B. B., Paula, S., Appezzato-da-Glória, B., & Fidelis, A. (2018). Unearthing belowground bud banks in fire-prone ecosystems. *New Phytologist*, 217(4), 1435–1448. <https://doi.org/10.1111/nph.14982>
- Perino, A., Pereira, H. M., Navarro, L. M., Fernández, N., Bullock, J. M., Ceaușu, S., Cortés-Avizanda, A., van Klink, R., Kummerle, T., Lomba, A., Pe'er, G., Plieninger, T., Rey Benayas, J. M., Sandom, C. J., Svenning, J.-C., & Wheeler, H. C. (2019). Rewilding complex ecosystems. *Science*, 364(6438), eaav5570. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aav5570>
- Pilon, N. A. L., Cava, M. G. B., Hoffmann, W. A., Abreu, R. C. R., Fidelis, A., & Durigan, G. (2020). The diversity of post-fire regeneration strategies in the cerrado ground layer. *Journal of Ecology*, 109, 154–166. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1365-2745.13456>
- Pilon, N. A. L., Durigan, G., Rickenback, J., Pennington, R. T., Dexter, K. G., Hoffmann, W. A., Abreu, R. C. R., & Lehmann, C. E. R. (2021). Shade alters savanna grass layer structure and function along a gradient of canopy cover. *Journal of Vegetation Science*, 32(1), e12959. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jvs.12959>
- Poggiato, G., Münkemüller, T., Bystrova, D., Arbel, J., Clark, J. S., & Thuiller, W. (2021). On the interpretations of joint modeling in community ecology. *Trends in Ecology & Evolution*, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tree.2021.01.002>
- Power, S. C., Verboom, G. A., Bond, W. J., & Cramer, M. D. (2019). Does a tradeoff between trait plasticity and resource conservatism contribute to the maintenance of alternative stable states? *New Phytologist*, 223(4), 1809–1819. <https://doi.org/10.1111/nph.15981>
- Quéméré, E., Amelot, X., Pierson, J., Crouau-Roy, B., & Chikhi, L. (2012). Genetic data suggest a natural prehuman origin of open habitats in northern Madagascar and question the deforestation narrative in this region. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, 109(32), 13028–13033. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1200153109>
- Ratajczak, Z., Nippert, J. B., & Ocheltree, T. W. (2014). Abrupt transition of mesic grassland to shrubland: Evidence for thresholds, alternative attractors, and regime shifts. *Ecology*, 95(9), 2633–2645. <https://doi.org/10.1890/13-1369.1>
- Ratnam, J., Tomlinson, K. W., Rasquinha, D. N., & Sankaran, M. (2016). Savannas of Asia: Antiquity, biogeography, and an uncertain future. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, 371(1703), <https://doi.org/10.1098/rstb.2015.0305>
- Roberts, P., Boivin, N., Lee-Thorp, J., Petraglia, M., & Stock, J. (2016). Tropical forests and the genus *Homo*. *Evolutionary Anthropology*, 25(6), 306–317. <https://doi.org/10.1002/evan.21508>
- Rohland, N., Reich, D., Mallick, S., Meyer, M., Green, R. E., Georgiadis, N. J., Roca, A. L., & Hofreiter, M. (2010). Genomic DNA sequences from mastodon and woolly mammoth reveal deep speciation of forest and savanna elephants. *PLOS Biology*, 8(12), e1000564. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pbio.1000564>
- Sasaki, N., & Putz, F. E. (2009). Critical need for new definitions of "forest" and "forest degradation" in global climate change agreements. *Conservation Letters*, 2(5), 226–232. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1755-263X.2009.00067.x>
- Sato, H., Kelley, D. I., Mayor, S. J., Martin Calvo, M., Cowling, S. A., & Prentice, I. C. (2021). Dry corridors opened by fire and low CO₂ in Amazonian rainforest during the Last Glacial Maximum. *Nature*

- Geoscience*, 14(8), 578–585. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41561-021-00777-2>
- Schimper, A. F. W. (1903). *Plant-geography upon a physiological basis*. Clarendon Press.
- Scott, A. C. (2000). Pre-quaternary history of fire. *Palaeogeography, Palaeoclimatology, Palaeoecology*, 164, 297–345.
- Simon, M. F., Grether, R., De Queiroz, L. P., Skema, C., Pennington, R. T., & Hughes, C. E. (2009). Recent assembly of the Cerrado, a Neotropical plant diversity hotspot, by in situ evolution of adaptations to fire. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, 106(48), 20359–20364. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.0903410106>
- Slabbekoorn, H., & Smith, T. B. (2002). Habitat-dependent song divergence in the little greenbul: An analysis of environmental selection pressures on acoustic signals. *Evolution*, 56(9), 1849–1858. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.0014-3820.2002.tb00199.x>
- Solofondranohatra, C. L., Vorontsova, M. S., Hackel, J., Besnard, G., Cable, S., Williams, J., Jeannoda, V., & Lehmann, C. E. R. (2018). Grass functional traits differentiate forest and savanna in the Madagascar Central Highlands. *Frontiers in Ecology and Evolution*, 6(184). <https://doi.org/10.3389/fevo.2018.00184>
- Solofondranohatra, C. L., Vorontsova, M. S., Hempson, G. P., Hackel, J., Cable, S., Vololoniaina, J., & Lehmann, C. E. R. (2020). Fire and grazing determined grasslands of central Madagascar represent ancient assemblages. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, 287(1927), 20200598. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2020.0598>
- Staver, A. C., Archibald, S., & Levin, S. A. (2011). The global extent and determinants of savanna and forest as alternative biome states. *Science*, 334(6053), 230–232. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1210465>
- Thuiller, W., Lavorel, S., & Araújo, M. B. (2005). Niche properties and geographical extent as predictors of species sensitivity to climate change. *Global Ecology and Biogeography*, 14, 347–357. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1466-822X.2005.00162.x>
- Tucker, C. M., Rebelo, A. G., & Manne, L. L. (2012). Contribution of disturbance to distribution and abundance in a fire-adapted system. *Ecography*, 35, 348–355. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1600-0587.2011.06948.x>
- Valbuena, R., O'Connor, B., Zellweger, F., Simonson, W., Vihervaara, P., Maltamo, M., Silva, C. A., Almeida, D. R. A., Danks, F., Morsdorf, F., Chirici, G., Lucas, R., Coomes, D. A., & Coops, N. C. (2020). Standardizing ecosystem morphological traits from 3D information sources. *Trends in Ecology & Evolution*, 35(8), 656–667. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tree.2020.03.006>
- Valladares, F., & Niinemets, Ü. (2008). Shade tolerance, a key plant feature of complex nature and consequences. *Annual Review of Ecology, Evolution, and Systematics*, 39(1), 237–257. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.ecolsys.39.110707.173506>
- Veldman, J. W., Buisson, E., Durigan, G., Fernandes, G. W., Le Stradic, S., Mahy, G., Negreiros, D., Overbeck, G. E., Veldman, R. G., Zaloumis, N. P., Putz, F. E., & Bond, W. J. (2015). Toward an old-growth concept for grasslands, savannas, and woodlands. *Frontiers in Ecology and the Environment*, 13(3), 154–162. <https://doi.org/10.1890/140270>
- Walter, H. (1973). *Vegetation of the earth in relation to climate and the ecological conditions*. English Universities Press.
- Warton, D. I., Blanchet, F. G., O'Hara, R. B., Ovaskainen, O., Taskinen, S., Walker, S. C., & Hui, F. K. C. (2015). So many variables: Joint modeling in community ecology. *Trends in Ecology & Evolution*, 30(12), 766–779. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tree.2015.09.007>
- West, A. G., Nel, J. A., Bond, W. J., & Midgley, J. J. (2016). Experimental evidence for heat plume-induced cavitation and xylem deformation as a mechanism of rapid post-fire tree mortality. *New Phytologist*, 211, 828–838. <https://doi.org/10.1111/nph.13979>
- Whittaker, R. H. (1975). *Community and ecosystems* (2nd ed., p. 385). MacMillan Publishing Co., Inc.
- Wilkinson, D. P., Golding, N., Guillera-Aroita, G., Tingley, R., & McCarthy, M. A. (2021). Defining and evaluating predictions of joint species distribution models. *Methods in Ecology and Evolution*, 12(3), 394–404. <https://doi.org/10.1111/2041-210X.13518>
- Wisz, M. S., Pottier, J., Kissling, W. D., Pellissier, L., Lenoir, J., Damgaard, C. F., Dormann, C. F., Forchhammer, M. C., Grytnes, J.-A., Guisan, A., Heikkinen, R. K., Høye, T. T., Kühn, I., Luoto, M., Maiorano, L., Nilsson, M.-C., Normand, S., Öckinger, E., Schmidt, N. M., ... Svenning, J.-C. (2013). The role of biotic interactions in shaping distributions and realised assemblages of species: Implications for species distribution modelling. *Biological Reviews*, 88(1), 15–30. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1469-185X.2012.00235.x>
- Wood, S., & Bowman, D. J. S. (2012). Alternative stable states and the role of fire–vegetation–soil feedbacks in the temperate wilderness of southwest Tasmania. *Landscape Ecology*, 27(1), 13–28. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10980-011-9677-0>
- Woodward, F. I., Lomas, M. R., & Kelly, C. K. (2004). Global climate and the distribution of plant biomes. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London. Series B: Biological Sciences*, 359(1450), 1465–1476. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rstb.2004.1525>
- Zellweger, F., De Frenne, P., Lenoir, J., Vangansbeke, P., Verheyen, K., Bernhardt-Römermann, M., Baeten, L., Hédli, R., Berki, I., Brunet, J., Van Calster, H., Chudomelová, M., Decocq, G., Dirnböck, T., Durak, T., Heinken, T., Jaroszewicz, B., Kopecký, M., Máliš, F., ... Coomes, D. (2020). Forest microclimate dynamics drive plant responses to warming. *Science*, 368(6492), 772–775. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aba6880>

How to cite this article: Pausas, J. G., & Bond, W. J. (2021). Alternative biome states challenge the modelling of species' niche shifts under climate change. *Journal of Ecology*, 109, 3962–3971. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1365-2745.13781>