# A new distributional model coupling environmental and biotic factors

2 3 4

1

Trinidad Ruiz Barlett<sup>a</sup>, María Fabiana Laguna<sup>b</sup>, Guillermo Abramson<sup>b, c</sup>, Adrian Monjeau<sup>a</sup>, Gabriel Martin<sup>d</sup>

5 6

<sup>a</sup> Fundación Bariloche and CONICET, R8402AGP, San Carlos de Bariloche, Argentina

8 <sup>b</sup> Centro Atómico Bariloche and CONICET, R8402AGP, San Carlos de Bariloche, Argentina

<sup>c</sup> Instituto Balseiro, R8402AGP, San Carlos de Bariloche, Argentina

10 <sup>d</sup> Centro de Investigación Esquel de Montaña y Estepa Patagónica (CIEMEP) CONICET – Universidad

11 Nacional de la Patagonia San Juan Bosco, Roca 780, CP 9200, Esquel, Chubut, Argentina

12

13 ABSTRACT (252 words)

14 Species distribution models (SDM) are the spatial surrogate of the suitability of a species in the 15 biophysical aspect, since they are based on predicting their presence using climatic and environmental indicators. SDMs are satisfactory at regional scales, where biological interactions such as predation 16 and competition do not influence distribution. However, at the local scale, they are incomplete for 17 18 characterizing the ecology of a species since the algorithms do not include information about biotic variables. In this paper, we present a mathematical model that couples biophysical and biotic 19 20 interactions in a spatially explicit way. We used a distributional database of 12 species of sigmodontine rodents from Argentine Patagonia as a study case. We performed numerical simulations 21 22 of the dynamics of each rodent from a stochastic and spatially explicit population model. The biophysical suitability of each species was modeled using Maxent, which generated an indicator of 23 24 its patch colonization capacity. The vegetation cover of each patch was characterized with remote sensing indices, associating the coverage with the pressure of aerial predation. The effect of 25 26 interspecific competition was modeled from the assembly rules proposed by Fox. The initial 27 occupation conditions for each species were proposed as known sites of occurrence, and the temporal evolution of these systems was compared with that obtained from using random initial occupation 28 29 conditions. The results obtained allow expanding the description of the ecosystems studied and show 30 a great capacity for prediction, so it is expected that this new modeling tool can be used to predict possible future ecological scenarios. 31

32

### 33 RESUMEN (269 palabras)

34 Los modelos de distribución de especies (SDM por sus siglas en inglés) representan espacialmente la 35 idoneidad de una especie en el aspecto biofísico, ya que se basan en predecir la presencia utilizando indicadores climáticos y ambientales. Los SDM son satisfactorios a escalas regionales, donde las 36 37 interacciones biológicas como la depredación y la competencia no influyen en la distribución. Sin 38 embargo, a escala local, son incompletos para caracterizar la ecología de una especie, va que los algoritmos no incluyen información sobre variables bióticas. En este trabajo presentamos un modelo 39 40 matemático que acopla interacciones biofísicas y bióticas de manera espacialmente explícita. Hemos utilizado como caso de estudio una base de datos distribucionales de 12 especies de roedores 41 sigmodontinos en la Patagonia Argentina. Realizamos simulaciones numéricas de la dinámica de cada 42 43 roedor a partir de un modelo poblacional estocástico y espacialmente explícito. La idoneidad biofísica 44 de cada especie se modeló utilizando Maxent, con lo que generamos un indicador de su capacidad de colonización de parches. Se caracterizó la cobertura de vegetación de cada parche con índices de 45

46 sensores remotos, asociando la cobertura con la presión de depredación aérea. El efecto de la 47 competencia interespecífica se modeló a partir de las reglas de ensamble planteadas por Fox. Se 48 propuso como condición de ocupación inicial para cada especie los sitios de presencia conocidos y 49 se comparó la evolución temporal de estos sistemas con la obtenida a partir de utilizar condiciones 50 de ocupación inicial al azar. Los resultados obtenidos permiten ampliar la descripción de los 51 ecosistemas estudiados y muestran una gran capacidad de predicción, por lo que se espera que pueda 52 utilizarse esta nueva herramienta modelística para predecir posibles escenarios ecológicos futuros.

53

54 KEYWORDS: Mathematical model, biotic interactions, Fox's rule, rodents.

55 56

57 58 59

#### **TOTAL WORDS: 8109 (ONLY TEXT)** 1. Introduction (1040 words)

60"Why do they say you are invincible?"61"Because I've never fought."62-attributed to the creator of aikido, Morihei Ueshiba63

The use of mathematical models to describe and analyze ecological systems has 64 experienced significant growth in recent years. They generate predictions, but they are also 65 66 a tool that allows ordering and systematizing assumptions within a framework, enabling the elucidation of complex biological systems. In recent years, species distribution models 67 (SDMs) have played an increasingly important role in studying the distribution patterns of 68 organisms (Guisan and Thuiller, 2005). The "suitability models" aim at identifying the most 69 70 influential variables explaining species presence (or presence/absence), and generate potential distribution maps based on different environmental characteristics and scenarios 71 72 (Felicísimo et al., 2005), representing a species environmental realized niche (Soberón, 73 2007). Predictive spatial modeling based on the analysis of environmental parameters and 74 the presence of species is widely used in environmental, ecological and conservation studies, 75 among others (Yanga et al., 2013; Matyukhina et al., 2014; Yuan et al., 2015).

The distribution of a species results from the dynamic interaction of biotic and abiotic factors, although most research has focused on the latter. However, biotic relationships influence the distribution of species greatly, albeit at different scales (Jablonski, 2008). Competition, for example, can lead to species occupying only a fraction of their potential range (Anderson et al., 2002; Pearson and Dawson, 2003; Mateo et al., 2011). This is an important factor that is mostly absent in species distribution studies (Davis et al., 1998; 82 Fitzpatrick et al., 2007), as with other interactions such as facilitation, pollination, herbivory or predation (Sánchez Cordero and Martínez-Meyer, 2000; Hebblewhite et al., 2005; Mateo 83 84 et al., 2011). At the local level, the ecological processes that determine to a greater extent the diversity of species in communities are habitat selection and ecological interactions 85 (competition and predation), as well as local extinction processes due to stochastic events. 86 The presence and intensity of these processes give rise to different types of communities 87 88 (Ricklefs and Schluter, 1993; Moreno et al., 2007). Mechanisms that facilitate species coexistence are differences in morphology, diet, and foraging behavior (Kotler, 1989; Scott 89 90 and Dunstone, 2000).

Although incorporating all biotic relationships into models would probably be 91 92 challenging, the almost universal lack of knowledge about their dynamics at individual species' levels means they are ignored when generating SDMs. Known extrapolation 93 94 algorithms generally do not receive information on biotic variables (Soberón and Peterson, 95 2005), and intra- and interspecific competition have been modeled only for some simple 96 systems (Bascompte and Solé, 1998). This is undoubtedly a field that will develop in the 97 immediate future, since sufficient maturity has been reached in the techniques to tackle more 98 complex tasks, such as these (Mateo et al., 2011).

In this context, mathematical simulations can provide additional support. The effects of biotic interactions are invisible on a regional scale and only begin to manifest themselves from 1:10,000 downwards (between 0.1 and 100 ha) (our observations). Similar problems of scale appear when interpreting species assemblages. Interspecific competition spatially segregates species, particularly when they belong to the same trophic guild (Brown et al., 2002), establishing rules of coexistence or exclusion that are manifested only at micro or local scale.

A common methodology for modeling populations with heterogeneous distributions is metapopulation modeling (Levins and Culver, 1971). In metapopulation models, local populations (or subpopulations) of a given species reside in areas that have a certain spatial structure. Each subpopulation is made up of a set of interacting and reproducing individuals, which present a relatively independent dynamic and have finite probabilities of becoming extinct and of colonizing new territories. Each subpopulation is considered to inhabit an area or "patch," so a metapopulation can be characterized as a network of patches occupied by groups of individuals with characteristic migration rates between patches. Metapopulations occupy an arrangement of patches of variable habitat suitability. At this level of description, these patches are the only spatial resource, and can be colonized or vacated according to specified rules. Patches can also be destroyed and become unsuitable for colonization, representing spatial heterogeneity and landscape fragmentation, as in Bascompte and Solé (1998) and Abramson et al. (2017).

119 In Laguna et al. (2015), a mathematical model of a simple food web with two herbivores and one predator was analyzed. Competing herbivores were represented by sheep 120 121 and guanacos, while the puma (Puma concolor) represented the predator. The proposed 122 model combined the concepts of metapopulations and patch dynamics, and included an 123 explicit hierarchical competition between species, affecting their prospect of colonizing an empty patch by having to compete with other species. Based on that work, in the present 124 125 study we consider the assemblage of sigmodontine rodents that inhabit Patagonia, incorporating additional information about the environmental suitability for each species 126 127 (based on our Maxent SDMs; Ruiz Barlett et al., 2019), known presence sites, hierarchical 128 competition between species, and a proxy for aerial predation.

Fox's assembly rule (1987) states that the incorporation of a new species into a 129 community depends on the type of configuration of its previous occupants. When a level of 130 organization without trophic redundancy is completed (for example a herbivore, an omnivore 131 and a granivore), a redundant species can only enter when the first level is complete. The 132 communities that conform to the rule of assembly are the "favorable states". In other words, 133 134 if there are three species in the same site, it is unlikely that two of them belong to the same trophic guild (e.g., both herbivores), as these are the "unfavorable states". Kelt et al. (1995) 135 136 established that the species of rodents studied in this work follow Fox's rule.

In Ruiz Barlett et al. (2019) we generated potential distribution models for sigmodontine rodent species that inhabit the Andean-Patagonian forest region and adjacent areas, and we analyzed the main climatic variables influencing them. Based on these analyses, the objective of the present work was to mathematically model the effect of biotic factors (namely, interspecific competition and predation) on the specific composition of rodent assemblages. For this, stochastic numerical simulations of rodent species dynamics were modeled using a spatially explicit metapopulation methodology as described below. We hypothesized that species competition for food resources and aerial predation influence the distribution and composition of Patagonian sigmodontine assemblages. The presence and/or absence of each biotic factor is expected to have significant effects on the possibility of colonizing a new patch and on the spatial arrangement of rodent populations, and these effects are visible with the proposed simulation model.

- 149
- 150

#### 2. Materials and methods (1908 words)

151 152

### 2.1. Area and species studied

153

154 Since we are interested in the influence of biotic factors on the distribution of rodents at a local scale, we selected a study area within the geographical distribution of the 155 156 rodent species of interest, comprising the Andean and transition (forest-steppe ecotone) zones of northwestern Patagonia in Argentina, including Nahuel Huapi National Park and its 157 158 surroundings (from 38° to 42° South and 68° to 72° West, ~200,000 km<sup>2</sup>). The climate of this region is temperate-cold (Paruelo et al., 1999) with a steep precipitation gradient from 159 west to east, and a moderate temperature gradient. Annual precipitation ranges from  $\sim 4000$ 160 mm in the Valdivian rainforest to  $\sim 230$  mm in the Patagonian steppe (Prohaska, 1976), and 161 162 elevation ranges from 3000 to 500 m. These extremes occur within less than 150 km from west to east, producing some of the sharpest abiotic and biotic transitions on earth 163 (Quintanilla Pérez, 1983; Veblen and Lorenz, 1988). 164

165

166 The following twelve rodent (Rodentia, Cricetidae, Sigmodontinae) species were 167 included in our analyses: Abrothrix hirta, A. olivacea, Geoxus valdivianus, Notiomys edwardsii, and Paynomys macronyx (Abrothrichini); Oligoryzomys longicaudatus 168 (Oryzomyini); Eligmodontia morgani, Loxodontomys micropus and Phyllotis xanthopygus 169 (Phyllotini); Euneomys chinchilloides and Irenomys tarsalis (Euneomyini); and Reithrodon 170 171 auritus (Reithrodontini) (Pardiñas et al., 2015; Patton et al., 2015). These species are a subset of those previously studied in Ruiz Barlett et al. (2019), and were chosen because they are 172 173 those from which we have information about known sites of presence in the study area.

#### 2.2 Mathematical model with biotic interactions

176

177 Numerical simulations of the dynamics of each rodent species were carried out with a stochastic and spatially explicit metapopulation model, similar to the one proposed by 178 Laguna et al. (2015). In this approach, the different subpopulations from the twelve species 179 inhabit a grid that represents the study area. Each subpopulation of each species can colonize 180 181 a neighboring patch with a probability that depends on: 1) suitability, 2) the interspecific competition provided by Fox's rule, and 3) the intraspecific competition that underlies the 182 183 metapopulation approach. Besides, each species also has a probability of vacating a patch due to: 4) aerial predation, and 5) different biotic factors, modeled as a local extinction within 184 185 that patch. To specify these processes for each species, the model takes into account the 186 following conditions at each cell:

187

Potential suitability. For each species, this is the value obtained from the Maxent
 SDMs, as generated in Ruiz Barlett et al. (2019) from specific sites of presence and
 environmental variables. It weighs the probability of colonization of an available
 patch by a given species.

- 192 2. Fox's rule. As discussed above, this is used to model the effects of competitive
  193 interactions between different rodent species. Together with the definition of a
  194 hierarchy within each guild, the rule determines a competitive hierarchy that
  195 influences the order of arrival of each species to the local assembly into a given patch.
- Intraspecific competition. Metapopulation models prevent the occupation of a patch
   by a subpopulation of a species that is already occupying the site.
- 4. The vegetation cover at each site is used as a proxy of the probability of predation,
  given that a higher ground cover provides more protection from aerial predators and
  consequently decreases the predation risk. In other words, in areas with little or no
  vegetation, rodents are more likely to be preyed upon. In this work we use two
  different vegetation indices: NDVI and MSAVI.
- 5. The local extinction rate emulates death from natural causes or complete migration
  from a patch. Given that the mean lifespan of all the rodent species considered is
  similar (Jones et al., 2009; Pacifici et al., 2013), we used the same local extinction

value (equivalent to a life expectancy of between 1 and 2 years) for all of themand in all patches.

208

6.

209

2.3 Model implementation

210



211

212 Figure 1. Schematic representation of the methodology used.

213

We consider a square grid of patches that can be either vacant or occupied by one or more of the species. Time advances discretely and, at each time step, the state of occupation of a patch is dictated by a stochastic process depending on the ecological processes described above: colonization, predation, and local extinction (Fig. 1). They were implemented asfollows:

219

220 *Colonization* 

221

A first element to consider is the **colonization capacity** of a species. The ability to 222 223 colonize a patch depends on how it is suited by the species' ecological requirements. We used the environmental suitability information obtained from the SDMs, previously 224 225 calculated for each species (Ruiz Barlett et al., 2019), as a measure of this. Then, the colonization capacity of site *i* by species *j* is the suitability, adequately normalized between 226 227 0 and 1 to be used as a probability. Furthermore, the colonization of a patch by a given species will depend on the number of neighboring patches occupied by that species (the greater the 228 229 number of neighboring patches occupied, the greater the probability of becoming occupied). Mathematically, the probability of colonization of patch *i* by species *j* is calculated as follows: 230

231

 $C(i,j) = 1 - [1 - suitability(i,j)]^{N}$ 

where N is the number of neighboring patches that are occupied at the time.

233

Another ingredient to consider in the colonization process is competitive 234 interactions between species. They were established by Fox's rule, which groups species 235 into trophic guilds, as analyzed in Kelt et al. (1995). According to Fox's rule, species from 236 237 different trophic guilds do not have interspecific competition to occupy a patch, while those within the same guild have a hierarchy that must be considered. To complement Kelt's 238 classification, we assumed that the superior competitor is the one with the largest body size, 239 240 since larger body mass leads to relatively higher fitness (Predavec, 2000). The hierarchical 241 order was determined according to body weight for each species obtained from Secretaría de 242 Ambiente y Desarrollo Sustentable de la Nación y Sociedad Argentina para el Estudio de los 243 Mamíferos (2019). In order to implement this rule, species were classified into four trophic 244 guilds, identifying their hierarchical position in the food web, and ordered by descending 245 hierarchy as follows:

Descending hierarchy (i)	Herbivores (h <sub>i</sub> )	Granivores (g <sub>i</sub> )	Animalivores (a <sub>i</sub> )	Omnivores (o <sub>i</sub> )
1	Reithrodon auritus	Oligoryzomys longicaudatus	Paynomys macronyx	Abrothrix hirta
2	Euneomys chinchilloides	Eligmodontia morgani	Geoxus valdivianus	Abrothrix olivacea
3	Loxodontomys micropus		Notiomys edwardsii	
4	Phyllotis xanthopygus			
5	Irenomys tarsalis			

248

249 Then, the colonization proceeds as follows: 1) the superior competitor of a randomly chosen trophic guild is the one that has priority to colonize any patch that is not already occupied by 250 the same species (intraspecific competition), and will do so with probability C(i, j)251 252 (suitability); 2) an inferior competitor will only be able to colonize a patch which is not already occupied by the same species, nor by a superior competitor of the same guild 253 254 (interspecific hierarquical competition), and again, the probability of this happening is C(i, j); and 3) even if the cell is suitable for a species, if it is already occupied by another 255 256 species from the same guild and not all other guilds are present on the cell, that species is 257 forbidden from accessing the patch (Fox's rule).

- 258
- 259 Predation

260

For predation, an aerial predator (for example, an owl) was simulated by prey exposure obtained indirectly from vegetation indices (NDVI and MSAVI) of the study area. Vegetation cover, such as rosehip (*Rosa eglanteria*), shrubs and colihue cane (*Chusquea culeou*) provides protection from predators, while areas without or with scarce vegetation are more exposed to aerial predation. In the model, the values of vegetation indices were normalized to lie in the interval [0,1] so that the probability of predation is defined at each site *i* as:

$$Predation(i) = [1 - VI(i)]^{\alpha}$$

where *VI* is NDVI or MSAVI, and  $\alpha = 0.25$ . This functional form gives a probability of predation that decays monotonically with the vegetation cover. The value of the coefficient  $\alpha$  was chosen phenomenologically, since it gives a range of almost linear decay at low values of *VI*, while turning down rapidly only when the protection provided by the cover approaches 1. The precise form of the function is not particularly important, but a departure from linearity, as provided by the exponent  $\alpha$ , ensures that the *VI* does not underestimate predation in forest areas, which would be unrealistic.

Vegetation index (NDVI) with a resolution of 0.86 km was taken from Ruiz Barlett et al.
(2019). Besides, vegetation indices with a resolution of 30 meters were generated using
Landsat 8 images, with dates from 2018-01-13 to 2018-02-07, obtained from
www.earthexplorer.usgs.gov. Images were processed and NDVI and MSAVI indices were
generated using SNAP (SNAP, 2014) and QGis software (QGIS Development Team, 2011).

281 Local extinction

282

At each step of time, each subpopulation has a probability e of becoming extinct (the same for all species and all patches). This probability of **local extinction** accounts for both death due to natural causes and the possibility of migration, and in both cases the effect is the same: the vacating of a patch by a given species.

- 287
- 288 2.4 Model dynamics
- 289

We studied the dynamics of this model through computer simulations performed on a system enclosed by impenetrable barriers. To perform a typical realization, we defined the parameters of the model and set an initial condition of patch occupation. We consider two different initial conditions (IC):

294 IC<sub>1</sub>: At time zero, the only patches occupied on the grid are those containing the known sites of presence of each species in the selected study area (see in Ruiz Barlett et al., 295 296 2019).

297

 $IC_2$ : At time zero, each species randomly occupies any cell on the grid in a given proportion. We tested values between 0.01% and 20% of patches occupied by each species. 298

299 From these initial conditions, the dynamics rules produce a temporal evolution of 300 the occupation of cells in the system, through colonization, predation and local extinction. After a transient period of time, a steady state is achieved where there are fluctuations but no 301 302 substantial changes in the occupation of patches for a considerable number of steps, as shown 303 below. The temporal evolution of the fraction of patches occupied for each species during 304 the whole process is recorded. Also, when the steady state is reached, we perform measurements of the number of visits that each species makes in each patch. The value 305 306 obtained corresponds to the fraction of time that the species occupied the patch in the steady state. We present these results as color maps and name them *distribution maps*. The patches 307 308 that were visited the most, represented with warm colors, are visited half the time (that is, 309 about 500 times in a simulation that lasts 1000 steps). The cells with cold colors (blue, light blue) indicate that, although environmentally favorable areas, they are less visited by the 310 species. 311

- 312
- 313

#### 2.5 Scenarios analyzed

314

315 Numerical simulations were performed in grids of two different sizes. We call Model 1 the one corresponding to a system with patches of 0.86 km forming a grid of 316 317 480×480 sites (with a total of 230,400 patches). Besides, Model 2 corresponds to a system with patches of 30 m in a grid of 12,992×12,992 sites (with a total of 168,766,080 patches). 318 The reason for adding Model 2 has to do with the fact that effects of biotic interactions are 319 320 manifested only at micro or local scales.

321 We use Model 1 to analyze how and to what extent each ecological process 322 influences the behavior of the species, and how much the steady state of the system depends 323 on the two different initial conditions, IC1 and IC2. In this case we use as a proxy for aerial predation only the vegetation index NDVI. 324

- 325 The following scenarios were generated:
- -Scenario A, or "complete," including all the ecological processes discussed above:
  colonization (including suitability, Fox's rule, and hierarchy), predation (VI: NDVI) and
  local extinction;
- -Scenario B, including predation and local extinction, but excluding competition;
- -Scenario C, including competition and local extinction, but excluding predation
  (i.e., without NDVI);
  - -Scenario D, with competition and predation, but excluding extinction.
- Besides, with Model 2 we study only the complete scenario (scenario A) with random initial conditions (IC2). In this case, two vegetation indices with a resolution of 30 m were used: NDVI and MSAVI. The potential distribution maps generated with Maxent, with pixels with a resolution of 0.86 km, were converted to 30 m patches.
- To analyze the relevance of the scale in the biotic interactions we compare the distribution maps obtained with the two patch resolutions (Models 1 and 2).
- 339

- **340 3. Results**
- 341

To determine the influence of biotic factors in the distribution of rodents through the proposed model, we first analyzed scenarios with different initial conditions and then the behavior of species for the different scenarios detailed in the previous section using the Models 1 and 2.

346

- 347 *3.1 Initial conditions*
- 348

To analyze how much the steady state of the system depends on the initial occupancy of the species, we use Model 1 to perform numerical simulations under different initial conditions. As we said, with IC2 we tested fractions of patches initially occupied in the range [0.1% - 20%], and compared with the behavior observed with IC1. In Fig. 2 we show a comparison for the cases with IC1 and IC2=0.1%, as they have a similar number of initially occupied patches. In both cases, the fraction of occupied patches is initially very small (about  $10^{-3}$ ), and for this reason the curves seem to start from zero. The fraction of occupied patches

356 in the steady state is almost identical, the difference between ICs is the shorter time necessary to reach the steady state in the model with a random distribution starting point (IC2), than for 357 358 the model with known sites of presence (IC1). As expected, the larger the fraction of initially occupied sites, the faster the system reaches the stationary state: a system with IC2=20% 359 360 reaches the steady state 50 times faster than a system with IC1 (not shown here). However, the fraction of patches occupied at the steady state is the same for all the IC studied, and this 361 362 result suggests a remarkable robustness of the results. It is worth noting that, while IC2 is computationally more efficient, IC1 is ecologically better justified. In the following section 363 364 we show the simulations generated with IC2=0.1%, in order to maintain the proportion of initially occupied sites in similar proportion to IC1. 365





#### PLACE FIGURE 2 HERE



Figure 2. Evolution of systems with two different initial conditions, showing the fraction of patches
occupied as a function of time. Left: known sites of presence for each species (IC1). Right: random
distribution sites (IC2=0.1%). Species are h<sub>1</sub>: *Reithrodon auritus*, h<sub>2</sub>: *Euneomys chinchilloides*, h<sub>3</sub>: *Loxodontomys micropus*, h<sub>4</sub>: *Phyllotis xanthopygus*, h<sub>5</sub>: *Irenomys tarsalis*, g<sub>1</sub>: *Oligoryzomys longicaudatus*, g<sub>2</sub>: *Eligmodontia morgani*, a<sub>1</sub>: *Paynomys macronyx*, a<sub>2</sub>: *Geoxus valdivianus*, a<sub>3</sub>: *Notiomys edwardsii*, o<sub>1</sub>: *Abrothrix hirta*, o<sub>2</sub>: *Abrothrix olivacea*.

We analyze the expansion of the species in the very first moments of evolution, when the progress is linear with time. This regime allowed us to calculate the speeds at which species colonize the patches for the two ICs studied (see Fig. 3). When comparing the speeds in both cases, we found that the case with random initial conditions (IC2) was faster (Fig. 3), 380 the fastest species being A. olivacea (02) and P. xanthopygus (h5), and the lowest one L. micropus (h<sub>3</sub>) in both, IC1 and IC2 cases. A similar pattern was found in the model with 381 382 known sites of presence as starting point (IC1), but the order of species following the first two was a little different. But perhaps the most interesting result was observed for IC2, where 383 384 within each guild the superior competitors presented the lowest rate of expansion with respect to the species of the same guild. 385

386

#### PLACE FIGURE 3 HERE



387

388 Figure 3. Speed of progress of the species during the first 15 time steps: comparison of the two IC. Dispersion bars are included. 389

390

- 391 3.2 Model 1: scenarios
- 392

393

In order to separate the contribution of each ecological process to the behavior of the system, we perform numerical simulations with the different scenarios described in the 394 previous section. In Fig. 4 we show the evolution of the fraction of patches occupied by each 395 species for scenarios A, B, C and D. Scenario A and B are similar, although some species 396 397 have different occupations. The absence of predation (scenario C) greatly modifies the 398 fraction of occupied patches, which is higher for all species (between 0,8 - 1 for several species). As a consequence, the system needs more time to reach steady state (see Fig. 4, C).
Besides, scenario D, without local extinction, is very similar to scenario A (Fig. 4, D).

The species with the largest occupation area in all scenarios is *A. olivacea* (o<sub>2</sub>), meaning that competition and predation have little impact on its colonization. Species with more restricted occupation areas are *Geoxus valdivianus* (a<sub>2</sub>), *Irenomys tarsalis* (h<sub>5</sub>) and *Phyllotis xanthopygus* (h<sub>4</sub>).

405 The species ordering varies slightly between scenarios, especially from the second species onwards: the first is always A. olivacea (o<sub>2</sub>) but the second and third are Paynomys 406 407 macronyx (a<sub>1</sub>), A. hirta (o<sub>1</sub>) and O. longicaudatus (g<sub>1</sub>) in scenario A, whereas in scenario B, 408 A. olivacea is followed by Euneomys chinchilloides ( $h_2$ ) and P. macronyx ( $a_1$ ). A close group 409 of species in scenario C is observed, with A. olivacea  $(o_2)$ , O. longicaudatus  $(g_1)$  and P *xanthopygus* (h<sub>4</sub>) followed by almost all the other species with high patch occupancy. The 410 411 order of species in scenario D is the same as in scenario A, except for a slight change in some 412 species like E. chinchilloides (h<sub>2</sub>) or O. longicaudatus (g<sub>1</sub>). Competition and predation were 413 the most important variables shaping the rodent community at this scale, and the influence 414 of local extinction was small when compared to the other studied variables.

415

416

#### PLACE FIGURE 4 HERE



Figure 4. Evolution curves of species occupations for the different scenarios. Scenario A: complete
scenario. Scenario B: without Fox' rule. Scenario C: without predation (NDVI). Scenario D: without
local extinction. Note the different scales in each case. Species are h<sub>1</sub>: *Reithrodon auritus*, h<sub>2</sub>: *Euneomys chinchilloides*, h<sub>3</sub>: *Loxodontomys micropus*, h<sub>4</sub>: *Phyllotis xanthopygus*, h<sub>5</sub>: *Irenomys tarsalis*, g<sub>1</sub>: *Oligoryzomys longicaudatus*, g<sub>2</sub>: *Eligmodontia morgani*, a<sub>1</sub>: *Paynomys macronyx*, a<sub>2</sub>: *Geoxus valdivianus*, a<sub>3</sub>: *Notiomys edwardsii*, o<sub>1</sub>: Abrothrix hirta, o<sub>2</sub>: Abrothrix olivacea.

425 In scenarios A and B, where extinction has little weight and predation has more 426 weight, rodent species quickly spread across a lower number of patches compared to scenario 427 C (without predation), leading to rapid segregation. However, without predation and at the same time-span, the species are not entirely spatially segregated, as is the case in scenarios 428 429 A and B, which take longer to stabilize (temporally speaking) and occupy many more 430 patches. For example, among the herbivores that inhabit the steppe (R. auritus and E. chinchilloides), strong spatial segregation is observed following Fox's rule. The model 431 suggests that E. chinchilloides is not common in areas where R. auritus is present, even 432 433 though the area is suitable for both species according to Maxent's potential distribution maps 434 (see Supplementary Material 1). The fraction of patches occupied for E. chinchilloides at the

435 beginning of the simulation increases rapidly, and decreases as the occupied patches of R. auritus (h1) increase (Figure 4, A). In scenarios without predation and without Fox's rule 436 437 (Figure 4, B and C), the increase in occupied patches is monotonic, without decreasing, which could indicate the significant impact that predation and competition have on these species. 438 439 In scenario A for *I. tarsalis* (h5) and *G. valdivianus* (a2), patch colonization is limited within their environment to areas where L. micropus (h3) and P. macronyx (a1) did not colonize. 440 441 Both I. tarsalis (h5) and G. valdivianus (a2) in scenarios B and C saw an increase in the occupied patches of both species. E. morgani, in the model presents a fraction of 0.05 of 442 443 occupied patches in the complete scenario, which increases to 0.12 without Fox's rule, 444 whereas in the model without predation it reaches 0.8.

445

To illustrate the dynamical behavior of the metapopulations, we show in Fig. 5 snapshots at different simulation times of the occupancy of two species (*O. longicaudatus* and *E. morgani*). Starting from IC1 (the known presence sites), species colonize new patches as time evolves (t = 1, 10, 40, 150 and 500), until reaching a final steady state where no further changes are observed (1000 steps in these examples). Complementary information can be obtained from the distribution maps generated for the different scenarios.

- 452
- 453

### PLACE FIGURE 5 HERE





Figure 5. Snapshots of the evolution of the simulations. Left: *Oligoryzomys longicaudatus* (g<sub>1</sub>).
Right: *Eligmodontia morgani* (g2). The simulation time of each snapshot is indicated in the figure.

457 In Figure 6 we show the distribution maps of scenarios A (complete) and B (without Fox's Rule) together with the SDMs generated with Maxent, for three species (maps of the 458 459 remaining species are presented in Supplementary Material 1). In the distribution maps, the area occupied by species with the complete model (scenario A) is reduced with respect to the 460 461 ideal area (>50%) of the Maxent SDM maps for species E. chinchilloides ( $h_2$ ), P. 462 xanthopygus (h<sub>4</sub>), I. tarsalis (h<sub>5</sub>), E. morgani (g<sub>2</sub>) and G. valdivianus (a<sub>2</sub>). This might be due 463 to aerial predation and competition for resources. In contrast, in A. hirta (o<sub>1</sub>), A. olivacea (o<sub>2</sub>), 464 O. longicaudatus (g<sub>1</sub>), R. auritus (h<sub>1</sub>), L. micropus (h<sub>3</sub>) and P. macronyx (a<sub>1</sub>) the occupied 465 area was greater than the Maxent ideal area of each species.

When comparing the fraction of occupied patches in the steady state, with and without Fox rule, the species that do not present changes in occupancy are the two omnivores, *O. longicaudatus* (g<sub>1</sub>), *P. macronyx* (a<sub>1</sub>), *R. auritus* (h<sub>1</sub>). The species that increase the fraction of occupied patches without Fox's rule are *E. chinchilloides* (h<sub>2</sub>), *I. tarsalis* (h<sub>5</sub>), *E. morgani* (g<sub>2</sub>) and *G. valdivianus* (a<sub>1</sub>), showing to be sensitive to competitors. Between species from the same guild, as in *O. longicaudatus* (g<sub>1</sub>) and *E. morgani* (g<sub>2</sub>), a change in distribution maps is observed with and without Fox's rule, between scenario A and B (see Fig. 6).

P. xanthopygus (h4) is the species with the largest predation pressure observed in the model. This species displays a very low occupancy in Scenario A, close to 0 (Fig. 4, A). The map presents two areas of reduced distribution compared to the potential distribution map of Maxent (Supplementary material 1, h4); the same thing happens in the case without Fox's rule. In the absence of predation, this species increases its occupancy abruptly over time, being one of the species with the highest fraction of patches occupied in the simulation (Fig. 4, C).

480

#### PLACE FIGURE 6 HERE



*o<sub>2</sub>: Abrothrix olivacea* 









Figure 6. Left: SDMs generated with Maxent. Center: Distribution maps with Model 1 in Scenario
A. Right: Distribution maps with Model 1 in Scenario B. Maps for the other species are presented in
Supplementary Material 1.

495

To quantify the difference between distribution maps of Scenarios A and B we calculate the mean occupations in the steady state (averaging the last 100 steps) in both cases (Fig. 7, left panel). Again, *A. olivacea* (o<sub>2</sub>) was the species that occupied the highest average number of patches in the steady state, with and without Fox's rule.

500 Besides, the relative difference in occupations for each species, given by  $\Delta occup =$  $\frac{occupation (scenario B) - occupation(scenario A)}{2}$  was calculated to get a measure of each species' 501 occupation (scenario B) gain from not competing (Fig. 7, right panel). When comparing the fraction of occupied 502 503 patches in the steady state, with and without Fox's rule, the species that did not present 504 changes in occupancy were the two omnivores, and the superiors of each trophic guild, O. 505 longicaudatus (g1), P. macronyx (a1), and R. auritus (h1). The species that increased the fraction of occupied patches without Fox's rule were E. chinchilloides (h<sub>2</sub>), I. tarsalis (h<sub>5</sub>), 506 E. morgani (g<sub>2</sub>) and G. valdivianus (a<sub>2</sub>), showing to be sensitive to competitors. Among the 507 animalivore species, *P. macronyx* (a<sub>1</sub>) occupied more patches than *G. valdivianus* (a<sub>2</sub>). 508



Figure 7. The final states of the average occupancy in the steady state, with and without Fox's rule
(right) and difference in occupations (left).

513 3.3 Model 2: resolution 30 meters

514

515 Since the biotic factors of competition and predation are visible at a local -patch-516 scale, we carried out numerical simulations with the Model 2, using recently available images 517 with a resolution of 30 meters. In Figure 8 we show the distribution maps for three species 518 and two different vegetation indices (NDVI and MSAVI) for the calculation of aerial 519 predation. The maps of the other species are presented in Supplementary Material 2.

The reason behind the inclusion of the MSAVI index is that it is more suited for areas with sparse vegetation than NDVI. However, in general, the distribution maps obtained with MSAVI present the same distribution patterns than the ones obtained with NDVI, but smaller areas of high occupancy for some species, as *E. chinchilloides* (h<sub>2</sub>), *L. micropus* (h<sub>3</sub>) or *O. longicaudatus* (g<sub>1</sub>).

525 Compared maps at both resolutions (Figs. 6 and 8, and their respective 526 Supplementary materials) showed similar results, albeit with small patches of occupancy 527 appearing at the 30 m resolution model that were not visible in Model 1, as is the case in *P*. 528 *xanthopygus* (h<sub>4</sub>), *E. morgani* (g<sub>2</sub>), *G. valdivianus* (a<sub>2</sub>), *I. tarsalis* (h<sub>5</sub>) and *A. hirta* (o<sub>1</sub>). In the species with the largest area of occupancy, *A. olivacea* (o<sub>2</sub>), the area with the highest
occupancy is smaller in Model 2 (Fig. 8) than in Model 1 (Fig. 6). An opposite behavior is
observed for *R. auritus* (h<sub>1</sub>), where the main area of occupancy is smaller in Model 2,
although several dispersed patches are observed. In *E. chinchilloides* (h<sub>2</sub>), on the other hand,
the main area of occupancy is greater and, again, dispersed patches are observed (see Supl.
Mat. 2).

### PLACE FIGURE 8 HERE

- 536 o<sub>2</sub>: *Abrothrix olivacea*







Figure 8 Distribution maps of Model 2. Left: NDVI, Right: MSAVI. (The maps of the other species are in Supplementary material 2).

561

*E. morgani* ( $g_2$ ) seems to suffer from competitive exclusion by *O. longicaudatus* ( $g_1$ ), with a distribution reduced to small patches where the competitor is present. *G. valdivianus* ( $a_2$ ) and *I. tarsalis* ( $h_5$ ), species living in the Patagonian forest, also compete in their trophic groups occupying small patches throughout the area, in coincidence with known sites of presence of each species, a pattern that was not visible in Model 1.

567

568

#### 3.4 Overlap between the model and real data

569

Distribution maps can be used to quantify the degree of overlap between the patches most visited by a given species in the metapopulation model and the sites where it was actually found. We use the maps generated with Model 2 for the two vegetation indices, NDVI and MSAVI, and IC2=0.1% to evaluate the proportion of coincidence of sites inside or outside the areas for each species (see Table 1). In both cases, the species that do not overlap are *G. valdivianus* (a<sub>2</sub>), *I. tarsalis* (h<sub>5</sub>), *E. morgani* (g<sub>2</sub>) and *P. xanthopygus* (h<sub>4</sub>), whereas the rest of the species have a good match.

#### PLACE TABLE 1 HERE

578

# 579 Table 1. Table of coincidences with sites of presence of each species, for two implementations of580 Model 2, with NDVI and MSAVI (c: coincidences).

581

	Category	N° sites of presence	NDVI		MSAVI	
Specie			c	%	с	%
Reithrodon auritus	h1	5	2	40	2	40
Euneomys chinchilloides	h2	19	13	68	14	74
Loxodontomys micropus	h3	43	25	58	24	56
Phyllotis xanthopygus	h4	5	0	0	0	0
Irenomys tarsalis	h5	30	1	3	2	7
Oligoryzomys longicaudatus	g1	47	43	91	43	91
Eligmodontia morgani	g2	28	1	4	0	0
Paynomys macronyx	a1	45	41	91	41	91
Geoxus valdivianus	a2	44	1	2	0	0
Notiomys edwardsii	a3	3	2	67	2	67
Abrothrix hirta	o1	57	52	91	53	93
Abrothrix olivaceus	o2	37	34	92	33	89

582

Two other ways to evaluate the degree of overlap between the known data and those 583 obtained with the model are shown in Fig. 9. One metric, named intersection in the figure, 584 585 corresponds to calculating the ratio between the number of patches with occupancy higher than 10% and the number of sites of presence. The other is the scalar product between the 586 normalized vectors of presence and occupation. In this last case, no occupation threshold is 587 needed (as the 10% used in the first one). High values of these quantities indicate that the 588 589 model is good at predicting the sites where the species was actually found. It is worth noting 590 that the species that present low values of these quantities coincide with those in Table 1, while the remaining ones have coincidence values greater than 50%. 591

- 592
- 593

# PLACE FIGURE 9 HERE





596

Figure 9. Overlap between presences and occupations, characterized by two metrics: intersection and 597 scalar product, as defined in the text.

The results presented in this section show that rodent species are strongly affected by 599 biotic factors, especially aerial predation and, to a lesser extent, competition and extinction. 600 601 Both aerial predation and competition for resources have effects on the evolution of the 602 species and on the maps of the final stage.

603

#### 604 **4** Discussion 605

606

On a continental or regional scale, climate is the dominant factor in delimiting the 607 geographic range, while, at more local scales, factors such as topography and land cover type 608 609 become increasingly important. At progressively smaller scales, factors including biotic interactions and microclimate may become most relevant, since climate and topography 610 611 become invariant (Pearson and Dawson, 2003). Our models show how interspecific interactions (i.e., predation, competition) shape a rodent community at a scale of 1=10.000612 or below. The distribution models generated through numerical simulations using 613 environmental variables (from SDMs) and biotic variables are consistent, showing a clear 614

615 effect of predation and competition in the spatial arrangement of the different species of 616 rodents. Pearson and Dawson (2003) showed that biotic interactions have important impacts 617 on the distribution of species. They define the natural system as a complex network of interactions and feedback between species, so changes in the distribution of a single one may 618 have important repercussions on the distribution of many others. Therefore, modeling 619 strategies based solely on bioclimatic envelopes can, in some cases, lead to distributions on 620 621 a continental or regional scale that lose predictive power on a local scale. Through the simulation models presented here, we described how populations and their distributions are 622 623 altered by predation and competition, showing experimentally how species influence each other's distribution, following Fox's (assembly) rule. 624

The coincidence of the final states of both ICs suggests a remarkable robustness in our results. Models evolved from an initial condition consisting of sites of known presence achieve a density similar to those that use randomly distributed sites for initial conditions. In addition, we tested much larger initial densities (20% of the sites initially occupied), and in all the cases the same steady state was reached, showing independence of the initial conditions.

631

#### 632 *4.1 Biotic variables*

The effect of predation is the biotic variable that showed the hightest influence with 633 the spatial arrangement or habitat selection of the studied species. We observed that the 634 absence of predation greatly modified the occupation models: all species show a considerable 635 636 increase in the fraction of occupied patches, without reaching a balance. The models showed areas (or patches) that rodent species could occupy if predators were eliminated or non-637 638 existent. Indeed, the ecosystem can undergo a drastic change if a key species is eliminated, and in most cases the keystone species is a predator that can control the distribution and 639 population of large numbers of prey species (Mills et al., 1993; Laguna et al., 2015). Such 640 cases of top-down control of the ecosystem have even been the subject of field 641 642 experimentation (Terborgh et al., 2001). In our study, the vegetation cover provided shelter and reduced predation risk (Bisceglia, 2014; Corbalán, 2004). As such, predation acts as a 643 644 selective pressure, influencing habitat selection (rodents tend to use covered sites to a greater 645 extent) and foraging activity (Guidobono, 2013). Some rodents inhabiting arid environments,

where vegetation cover can be very low or inexistent, live in rocky areas that could also beused as refuges (such as *E. chinchilloides*; Pearson and Christie, 1991; Pardiñas et al., 2003).

The factor with the largest influence in the specific composition of rodent assemblages in the study area is interspecific competition. Models generated without Fox's rule (scenario B) show effects in both the evolution curves of some species and the final spatial occupation. This rule reduces the occupied sites, the proportion of patches that some species occupy is greater and in less time in the absence of competition, while it does not modify the occupancy for other species (e.g. *E. morgani* and *O. longicaudatus* respectively).

654

655

#### 4.2 Types of communities

Generalist or eurytopic species such as L. micropus, O. longicaudatus and P. 656 657 macronyx can occupy and proliferate in a wide variety of habitats in the forest and in the broad ecotone between the forest and the Patagonian steppe. These species show, in the 658 659 indicators studied with Maxent, a wide range of tolerance to climatic and environmental 660 variables. They are the species that occupy the largest number of patches. In contrast, habitat specialists such as *E. chinchilloides* have a much narrower niche breadth and, consequently, 661 occupy the few patches of habitat where it can proliferate, usually with little or no presence 662 663 of competitors (Brown, 1995; Pearson, 1987). They are the ones that occupy the least number of patches. 664

665 The omnivore species of the genus Abrothrix occupied more patches in total in all 666 scenarios. Omnivory can be a form of adaptation to the unpredictability of the environment, since these generalist and opportunistic species vary their diet according to the local and 667 seasonal availability of food resources (Noy-Meir 1979, 1980; Corbalán, 2004). Abrothrix 668 hirta appears to be a "local specialist" (Fox and Morrow, 1981) in response to the availability 669 670 of local resources; it is strongly insectivorous in semi-arid regions (Meserve, 1981), but strongly fungivorous in forested regions (Meserve et al., 1988). Regarding Abrothrix 671 olivacea, in a heavily altered pine plantation Muñoz-Pedreros et al. (1990) found it to be 672 673 herbivorous. However, in less disturbed habitats, this species has been shown to be quite omnivorous (Meserve, 1981; Pearson and Pearson, 1982; Meserve et al., 1988). 674

This differential use or resource partitioning facilitates the coexistence of species within a community (Kotler and Brown, 1988; Shenbrot et al., 1999). The diverse geographic adaptations exhibited by these species result in distinct efficiencies in resource acquisition from the ecosystem and subsequent biomass conversion. In that sense, a surrogate of their success could be the number of patches occupied in the model, if each patch has the same density of individuals of each species. Following this assumption, generalist and omnivorous species, by avoiding competition for specialized resources, are the most "successful" in terms of the breadth of their geographic range (measured in number of occupied patches in the model).

684

685

#### 4.3 Different spatial resolutions

686 Species minimize the energy costs of interspecific competition through niche 687 segregation, especially in the habitat and trophic dimensions. Such segregation determines 688 the spatial arrangement of populations at a given site. The version of our model with 30 689 meters of resolution has brought us closer to a description of this process.

690 The different resolutions of patches allowed differentiating the effect of competition by Fox's rule and that of aerial predation in the distribution map obtained in the steady state 691 692 of the model. These factors that operate at a scale of patches, are reflected even better at 30 693 m resolution. It is at this scale (for example, under a patch of shrubs) that intra-guild exclusion 694 among rodents occurs. Moving from under the canopy of perennial shrubs to bare ground within a few meters of the bush edge, rodents undergo striking and important changes with 695 696 respect to microclimate, substrate, resource availability, and predation risk (Kotler and 697 Brown, 1988). The apparent coexistence at the scale of 1 km conceals this spatial segregation, 698 driven by Fox's rule, that operates at another scale. As the simulation progresses, with smaller 699 patches and greater detail of vegetation cover, colonization or predation interactions are 700 greater for the total study area and spatial arrangement changes for some species.

Habitat selection is a process by which an animal chooses from among alternative available habitat resources (Johnson, 1980; Litvaitis et al., 1994); it is a hierarchical process (Hutto, 1985) that can occur at a variety of spatial scales from the macrohabitat to the microhabitat level (Kotler and Brown, 1988). The importance of the spatial scale in habitat selection studies has been demonstrated by diverse authors and can directly influence results and their interpretation (Morris, 1987; Corbalan, 2006).

708

#### 4.4 Vegetation indices

709 We used different vegetation indices to evaluate the effect of each one on the models, 710 and across the different habitats found in the study area. To the east is the Patagonian steppe, 711 with low vegetation cover, and to the west the Patagonian forests with abundant coverage. 712 The NDVI, which is arguably the most used index in remote sensing, has the advantage of 713 being calculated in a very simple way, while its disadvantages are the low efficiency to normalize the effect of the soil and its lower sensitivity to the presence of dense vegetation 714 715 (Gilabert, 1997; Kinderknecht et al., 2017). We also used the modified soil adjusted 716 vegetation index (MSAVI) because in areas with sparse vegetation, surface reflectance and 717 vegetation indices are influenced by exposed soil (Huete, 1988; Qi et al., 1994; Huete et al., 2002). Probably, for the species that inhabit the steppe (such as *E. morgani*, *E. chinchilloides*) 718 719 the model with MSAVI could better represent their distributional pattern than the ones with 720 NDVI, improving the resolution in areas of scarce coverage, and allowing a better 721 discrimination of small patches of vegetation. For forest-dwelling species, however, NDVI 722 may be a good option.

It is important to note that the results of the model, regarding the effect of predation, 723 may be simplified and biased by the fact that we used an indirect proxy for it, in terms of the 724 725 role played by vegetation cover, as represented by the vegetation indices. Future versions of these models may consider the influence of terrestrial predators, such as foxes, cats, grisons 726 and marsupials, which may be less influenced by vegetation cover compared to aerial 727 728 predators. However, habitat suitability in terms of vegetation cover, could be a determining factor for the population growth of the species most vulnerable to aerial predation (Bisceglia 729 730 2014). This author agrees that patches with greater vegetation cover offer shelter, reducing the risk of predation, and in many cases providing a greater availability of food (Thompson, 731 732 1982; Jaksic, 1986; Simonetti, 1989). For an assemblage of Chilean small mammals, all species showed a clear preference for closed shrubby environments, and a strong response to 733 734 simulated predation (Simonetti, 1989).

735

736 *4.5 Model* 

737 The novel combination of Maxent and Fox's rule within the same simulation model, also including vegetation indexes, allows us to discriminate the effect of competition and 738 739 predation on the number of occupied patches. There is an important distinction between how 740 a species would function on its own and how it does in the presence of competitors (Leibold, 1995; Crawley, 1997; Pearson and Dawson, 2003). The fact that competition and predation 741 742 influences the distribution of a species was recognized in experiments (Davis et al., 1998). 743 Predation is a fluctuating biotic interaction, with strong temporary effects and on some members of the ensemble only (Meserve et al., 2003). In this way, the possibility arises that 744 745 rodent populations are regulated not only by a bottom-up mechanism (of availability of resources), but also by a top-down mechanism (presence of predators) (Bisceglia, 2014; 746 747 Meserve et al., 2003).

Members of the same assemblage can respond differently to the same environmental 748 749 conditions (Meserve et al., 2003, 2011; Haythornthwaite and Dickman, 2006), coexisting in the same habitats. The simulation model suggests that predation pressure does not necessarily 750 751 change the spatial distribution of the species, but rather regulates the abundance of 752 individuals and, by maintaining a balance of competing species, mitigates competitive exclusion and allows coexistence. This means that the absence or presence of a species should 753 754 not necessarily be expected due to predation, since the main impact is on relative abundance, 755 which is invisible on maps and metapopulation models. For this reason, results of the biotic interaction models generated in this study focused on distribution (and not abundance), and 756 must be interpreted within the conceptual framework of spatially explicit ecological niche 757 758 modeling and metapopulation models. In this context, the role of biotic interactions in the 759 delimitation of species distribution areas may be somewhat blurred, but this is precisely 760 because they are distribution models and not abundance models, where results would be 761 expected most prominent in terms of the role of biotic interactions. It is interesting to note 762 here that one of the reasons why competition seems to have no influence on the range of these species, as has been documented for large vertebrates occupying the habitat matrix and 763 764 not small patches, may be because in the case of small mammals the process operates at a microscale in heterogeneous environments. Competition does not influence geographical 765 766 distribution, it only influences local spatial arrangement.

767	The models resulting from this work provide a first approximation from real data				
768	(i.e., known presence sites of different species living in the study area), including				
769	environmental information from SDMs, and incorporating the influence of biotic				
770	interactions. Following a metapopulation methodology where the species initially inhabit the				
771	patches where their known site of presence is located, with different rules and probability				
772	data, they may or may not colonize a neighboring patch, be predated, or become extirpated.				
773	These models allow studying population dynamics combining information on individual				
774	species traits and habitats, including physical barriers or anthropic effects, with real field				
775	data. We hope this can be a starting point for new models analyzing species populations,				
776	allowing us to predict future scenarios in a changing environment, such as the effect of				
777	climate change.				
778					
779	Conclusions				
780					
781	From the results of this work, the following could be tested in other study sites and				
782	with other species, with a view to looking for general processes and patterns:				
783					
784	• The predictive power of climatic indicators decreases at the local scale because they				
785	become spatially invariant, becoming irrelevant to explain species dynamics at				
786	smaller spatial scales.				
787	• At local scales, the composition of species assemblages in heterogeneous patches is				
788	driven by interspecific competition, the mechanism of which follows rules of				
789	coexistence linked to their trophic guild.				
790	• The smaller the scale, the greater the influence of biotic factors and the intervention				
791	of chance, that is, stochastic processes that escape the patterns that can be				
792	deterministically modeled.				
793	• Species belonging to the same trophic guild are segregated in habitat preference,				
794	minimizing coexistence in the same habitat patch.				
795	• Predation pressure influences the pattern of occupation of patches with different				
796	cover or quality of refuge.				

A complete distribution model must include the influence of climate in the conformation of the set of regional species (gamma diversity), and the influence of biotic interactions in the conformation of the structure of local assemblages (alpha diversity), which determine the arrangement of microhabitat spatial patches, and spatial disposition as a surrogate of processes driven by the abundance of species.

- The most successful species in occupying patches (surrogate of the size of the geographic range) are the omnivorous and habitat generalists, that is, those that best avoid competitive interference for resources.
- We find a notable similarity with the strategy of never fighting to never be defeated,
   as stated in the quote from the Aikido sensei that we used at the beginning of the
   paper. The energy saved by avoiding fighting can be redistributed into gaining
   occupied territory. Can we learn from mice?
- 809
- 810

812

811 Acknowledgements

The authors acknowledge several funding agencies: CONICET (PIP 112-20170100008 CO), ANPCyT (PICT 2018-01181), UNCuyo (SIIP 06/C045-T1). GMM thanks E.
Watkins and M. Simeon for economic support.

816

G. Abramson would like to thank the Isaac Newton Institute for Mathematical
Sciences, Cambridge, for support and hospitality during the programme *Mathematics of movement: an interdisciplinary approach to mutual challenges in animal ecology and cell biology* where work on this paper was undertaken. This work was supported by EPSRC grant
no EP/R014604/1.

822

823 824

## 825 **References**

- Abramson, G., Laguna, M. F, Kuperman, M. N., Monjeau, J. A., Lanata, J. L, 2017. On the roles of hunting and
  habitat size on the extinction of megafauna. Quaternary International 121, 12–23.
  https://doi.org/10.1016/j.quaint.2015.08.043
- Anderson, R. P., Peterson, A. T., Gomez-Laverde, M., 2002. Using niche-based GIS modeling to test geographic
   predictions of competitive exclusion and competitive release in South American pocket mice. Oikos, 98,
   3–16. https://doi.org/10.1034/j.1600-0706.2002.t01-1-980116.x
- Bascompte, J., Solé, R. V., 1998. Effects of habitat destruction in a prey-predator metapopulation model, Journal
   of Theoretical Biology 195, 383–393. https://doi.org/10.1006/jtbi.1998.0803

Bisceglia, S. B. C., 2014. Los efectos de los cambios en las condiciones climáticas y ambientales sobre un
ensamble de roedores sigmodontinos y la respuesta de sus principales depredadores en un área protegida
de la ecorregión del Monte. Ph.D. disertación. Facultad de Ciencias Exactas y Naturales. Universidad de
Buenos Aires.

- 839 Brown, J. H. 1995. Macroecology. The University of Chicago Press, Chicago, Illinois.
- Brown, J. H., Kelt, D. A., Fox, B. J., 2002. Assembly rules and competition in desert rodents. American Naturalist
   160, 815–818.
- Corbalán, V., 2006. Microhabitat selection by murid rodents in the Monte Desert of Argentina. Journal of Arid
   Environments 65, 102–110. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jaridenv.2005.07.006
- Corbalán, V. E., 2004. Uso de hábitat y ecología poblacional de pequeños mamíferos del desierto del Monte
   central, Mendoza, Argentina. Ph.D. dissertation. Universidad Nacional de La Plata, La Plata, Argentina.
   https://doi.org/10.35537/10915/4564
- 847 Crawley, M. J., 1997. The structure of plant communities. Plant ecology (ed. by M.J. Crawley), pp. 475–531.
  848 Blackwell Science, Oxford.
- Bavis, A. J., Jenkinson, L. S, Lawton, J. H., Shorrocks, B., Wood, S., 1998. Making mistakes when predicting
   shifts in species range in response to global warming. Nature 391, 783–786.
- Felicísimo, A. M., Gómez A., Muñoz J., 2005. Potential distribution of forest species in dehesas of Extremadura
  (Spain). In: Schnabel S & A Ferreira (eds) Sustainability of agrosilvopastoral systems-dehesa. Advances
  in GeoEcology 37, 231–246. Catena Verlag, Reiskirchen.
- Fitzpatrick, M. C., Weltzin, J. F., Sanders, N. J., Dunn, R. R., 2007. The biogeography of prediction error: Why
  does the introduced range of the fire ant over-predict its native range? Global Ecology and Biogeography
  16, 24–33. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1466-8238.2006.00258.x
- 857 Fox, B. J. 1987. Species assembly and the evolution of com- munity structure. Evolutionary Ecology 1, 201–213.
- Fox, L. R., Morrow, P. A., 1981. Specialization: Species property or local phenomenon? Science 211, 887–893.
  DOI: 10.1126/science.211.4485.887.
- Gilabert, M. A., González-Piqueras, J., García-Haro, J., 1997. Acerca de los índices de vegetación. Revista de teledetección, 8(10).
- Guidobono, J. S., 2013. Dinámica poblacional de roedores en agroecosistemas y su relación con variables
   ambientales. Ph.D. dissertation, Facultad de Ciencias Exactas y Naturales. Universidad de Buenos Aires.
- Guisan, A., Thuiller, W., 2005. Predicting species distribution: Offering more than simple habitat models.
   Ecology Letters 8, 993–1009. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1461-0248.2005.00792.x
- Haythornthwaite, A., Dickman, C. R., 2006. Distribution, abundance and individual strategies: a multi-scale
  analysis of dasyurid marsupials in arid central Australia. Ecography 29, 285–300.

- 868 Hebblewhite M., Merrill, E. H., Mcdonald, T.L., 2005. Spatial decomposition of predation risk using resource
  869 selection functions: An example in a wolf-elk predator-prey system. OIKOS 111, 101–111.
  870 https://doi.org/10.1111/j.0030-1299.2005.13858.x
- 871 Huete, A. R., 1988. A soil-adjusted vegetation index (SAVI). Remote Sens. Environ. 25, 295–309.
   872 https://doi.org/10.1016/0034-4257(88)90106-X.
- Huete, A., Didan, K., Miura, T., Rodriguez, E. P., Gao, X., Ferreira, L. G., 2002. Overview of the radiometric
  and biophysical performance of the MODIS vegetation indices. Remote Sens. Environ. 83, 195–213.
  https://doi.org/10.1016/S0034-4257(02)00096-2.
- Hutto, R. L., 1985. Habitat selection by nonbreeding migratory land birds. In: Cody, M.L. (Ed.), Habitat Selection
  in Birds. Academic Press, Orlando, FL, pp. 455–476.
- Jablonski, D., 2008. Biotic interactions and macroevolution: extensions and mismatches across scales and levels.
  Evolution, 62: 715–739. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1558-5646.2008.00317.x.
- Jaksic, F. M., 1986. Predation upon small mammals in shrublands and grasslands of southern South America:
   ecological correlates and presumable consequences. Revista Chilena de Historia Natural 59, 209–221.
- Johnson, D. H., 1980. The comparison of usage and availability measurements for evaluating resource preference.
   Ecology 61, 65–71.
- Jones K., Bielby, J., Cardillo, M., Fritz, S., O'Dell, J., Orme, C.D.L., Safi, K., Sechrest, W., Boakes, E.H.,
  Carbone, C., Connolly, C., Cutts, M.J., Foster, J.K., Grenyer, R., Habib, M., Plaster C.A., Price, S.A.,
  Rigby, E.A., Rist, J., Teacher, A., Bininda-Emonds, O.R.P., Gittleman, J.L., Mace, G.M., Purvis, A.,
  Michener, W.K., 2009. PanTHERIA: a species-level database of life history, ecology, and geography of
  extant and recently extinct mammals. Ecology 90(9): 2648.
- Kelt, D. A., Taper, M. L., Meserve, P. L., 1995. Assessing the impact of competition on community assembly: a case study using small mammals. Ecology 76, 1283–1296.
- Kinderknecht, L. E., Brizuela, A. B., Aguirre, C. A., Kemerer, A. C., 2017. Analysis of NDVI, SAVI and
  MSAVI2 indices in function with the height of the terrain in Crespo, Entre Ríos. Scientia Interfluvius 8,
  42–52.
- Kotler, B. P., 1989. Temporal variation in the structure of a desert rodent community. In: Morris, D. W.,
  Abramsky, Z., Fox, B. J., Willig, M. R. (Eds.), Patterns in the structure of mammalian communities, pp.
  127–139. Texas: Texas Technical University Press. 266 pp.
- Kotler, B., Brown, J., 1988. Environmental heterogeneity and the coexistence of desert rodents. Annual Review
   of Ecology and Systematics 19, 281–307. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.es.19.110188.001433
- Laguna, M. F., Abramson, G., Kuperman, M. N., Lanata, J. L., Monjeau, J. A., 2015. Mathematical model of
  livestock and wildlife: Predation and competition under environmental disturbances. Ecological
  Modelling 309–310, 110–117. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolmodel.2015.04.020
- 902 Leibold, M. A., 1995. The niche concept revisited: mechanistic models and community context. Ecology, 76,
  903 1371–1382.

- 904 Levins, R., Culver, D., 1971. Regional Coexistence of Species and Competition between Rare Species. PNAS.
  905 68, 1246–1248.
- 906 Litvaitis, J. A., Titus, K., Anderson, E. M., 1994. Measuring vertebrate use of terrestrial habitats and foods. In:
  907 Bookhout, Th. A. (Ed.), Research and Management Techniques for Wildlife and Habitats. The Wildlife
  908 Society, Bethesda, MD, pp. 254–262.
- 909 Mateo, R. G., Felicísimo, A. M., Muñoz, J., 2011. Modelos de distribución de especies: Una revisión sintética.
  910 Revista Chilena de Historia Natural 84, 217–240. http://dx.doi.org/10.4067/S0716-911 078X2011000200008
- 912 Matyukhina, D. C., Miquelle, D. G., Murzinc, A. A., Pikunovc, D. G., Fomenkod, P. V., Aramilev, V. V., 913 Litvinov, M. N., Salkina, G. P., Seryodkinc, I. V., Nikolaevg, I. G., Kostyriag, A. V., Gaponovh, V., Yudin ,V. G., Dunishenko Y. M., Smirnov, E. N., Korkishkok, V. G., Marino, J., 2014. Assessing the 914 915 influence of environmental parameters on Amur Tiger distribution in the Russian Far East using a 916 approach. Achievements in the Sciences Maxent modeling Life 8. 95-100. 917 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.als.2015.01.002.
- 918 Meserve, P. L., 1981. Trophic relationships among small mammals in a Chilean semiarid thorn scrub community.
   919 Journal of Mammalogy 62, 304–314.
- 920 Meserve, P. L., Kelt, D. A., Previtali, M. A., Milstead, W. B., Gutiérrez, J. R., 2011. Global climate change and
  921 small mammal populations in north-central Chile. Journal of Mammalogy 92, 1223–1235.
  922 https://doi.org/10.1644/10-MAMM-S-267.1
- 923Meserve, P. L., Kelt, D. A., Milstead, W. B., Gutiérrez, J. R., 2003. Thirteen years of shifting top- down and924bottom-upcontrol.BioScience53,633–646.https://doi.org/10.1641/0006-9253568(2003)053[0633:TYOSTA]2.0.CO;2
- 926 Meserve, P. L., Lang, B. K., Patterson, B. D., 1988. Trophic relationships of small mammals in a Chilean
  927 temperate rainforest, Journal of Mammalogy 69, 721–730, https://doi.org/10.2307/1381627
- 928 Mills, L. S., Soule, M. E., Doak, D. F., 1993. The keystone-species concept in ecology and conservation.
  929 BioScience 43 (4), 219–224.
- 930 Moreno, C. E., Verdú, J. R., Arita, H. T., 2007. Elementos ecológicos e históricos como determinantes de la diversidad de especies en comunidades. Sociedad Entomológica Aragonesa (S.E.A.) Monografías 3er
  932 Milenio M3M, 7, 179–192.
- 933 Morris, D. W., 1987. Ecological scale and habitat use. Ecology 68, 362–369.
- 934 Muñoz-Pedreros et al., 1990. Control of small mammals in a pine plantation (Central-Chile) by modification of
   935 the habitat on predators (*Tyto alba Strigiforme* and *Pseudalopex spp* Canidae), Acta Oecologica 11, 251–
   936 261.
- 937 Noy-Meir, I. 1979/80. Structure and function of desert ecosystems. Israel Journal of Botany 28, 1–19.
- Pacifici M., Santini, L., Di Marco, M., Baisero, D., Francucci, L., Grottolo Marasini, G., Visconti, P., Rondinini,
  C., 2013. Generation length for mammals. Nature Conservation 5, 87–94.

- 940 Pardiñas, U. F. J., P. Teta, and J. Salazar-Bravo. 2015. A new tribe of sigmodontinae rodents (Cricetidae).
  941 Mastozoología neotropical 22,171–186.
- Pardiñas, U. F. J., Teta, P., Cirignoli, S., Podesta, D. H., 2003. Micromamíferos (Didelphimorphia y Rodentia)
  de norpatagonia extra andina, Argentina: taxonomía alfa y biogeografía. Mastozoología Neotropical 10,
  69–113.
- Paruelo, J. M., Beltrán, A., Jobbágy, E., Sala, O. E., Golluscio, R. A., 1999. The climate of Patagonia: general
  patterns and controls on biotic processes. Ecología Austral 8, 85–101.
- Patton, J. L., Pardiñas, U. F. J., D'Elía, G., 2015. Mammals of South America, volume 2—rodents. The University
  of Chicago Press, Chicago, Illinois.
- Pearson, O. P., 1987. Mice and the postglacial history of the Traful Valley of Argentina. Journal of Mammalogy68, 469–478.
- 951 Pearson, O. P., Pearson, A. K., 1982. Ecology and biogeography of the southern rainforests of Argentina.
  952 Mammalian biology in South America (M. Mares & H. Genoways, eds.). The Pymatuning Symposia in
  953 Ecology 6, Special Publications Series, Pittsburgh.
- Pearson, O. P., Christie, M. I., 1991. Sympatric species of *Euneomys* (Rodentia, Cricetidae). Studies on
   Neotropical Fauna and Environment 26, 121–127.
- 956 Pearson, R. G., Dawson, T. P., 2003. Predicting the impacts of climate change on the distribution of species: are
  957 bioclimate envelope models useful? Global Ecology & Biogeography 12, 361–371.
  958 https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1466-822X.2003.00042.x
- 959 Predavec, M. 2000. Food limitation in Australian desert rodents: experiments using supplementary feeding. –
  960 Oikos 91, 512 522.
- 961 Prohaska, F., 1976. The climate of Argentina, Paraguay and Uruguay. Pp. 13-122 in Climates in Central and
  962 Southern America. World Survey of Climatology, Vol. 12 (ed. W. Schwerdtfeger). Elsevier, Amsterdam.
- 963 QGis Development Team, 2011. QGIS geographic information system. Open source geospatial foundation
   964 project. http://qgis.osgeo.org.
- 965 Quintanilla Pérez, V., 1983. Geografía de Chile. Tomo III. Biogeografía. Instituto Geográfico Militar. 230 pp.
- 966 Ruiz Barlett, T., Martin, G. M., Laguna, M. F., Abramson, G., Monjeau, A., 2019. Climatic constraints and the
  967 distribution of Patagonian mice. Journal of Mammalogy 100, 1979-1991.
  968 https://doi.org/10.1093/jmammal/gyz149.
- Sánchez-Cordero, V., Martínez-Meyer, E., 2000. Museum specimen data predict crop damage by tropical rodents.
   Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences USA 97, 7074- 7077.
- 971 Scott, D. M., Dunstone, N., 2000. Environmental determinants of the composition of desert-living rodent
  972 communities in the north-east Badia region of Jordan. Journal of Zoology 251, 481-494.

- 973 Secretaría de Ambiente y Desarrollo Sustentable de la Nación y Sociedad Argentina para el Estudio de los
   974 Mamíferos (eds.) (2019). Categorización 2019 de los mamíferos de Argentina según su riesgo de
   975 extinción. Lista Roja de los mamíferos de Argentina. Versión digital: http://cma.sarem.org.ar.
- 976 Shenbrot, G. I., Krasnov, B. R., Rogovin, K. A., 1999. Spatial ecology of desert rodent communities.
  977 SpringerVerlag. 292 pp.
- 978 Simonetti, J. A., 1989. Microhabitat use by small mammals in Central Chile. Oikos 56,309-318.
- 979 SNAP ESA Sentinel Application Platform v9.0.0, http://step.esa.int
- Soberón, J. 2007. Grinnellian and Eltonian niches and geographic distributions of species. Ecology Letters, 10, 1115–1123. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1461-0248.2007.01107.x
- 982 Soberón, J., Peterson, A. T., 2005. Interpretation of models of fundamental ecological niches and species'
   983 distributional areas. Biodiversity Informatics 2, 1–10.
- 984 Terborgh, J., Lopez, L., Núñez, P., Rao, M., Shahabuddin, G., Orihuela, G., Riveros, M., Ascanio, R., Adler, G
  985 .H., Lambert, T. D., Balbas, L., 2001. Ecological meltdown in predator-free forest fragments. Science
  986 294, 1923–1926.
- 987 Thompson, S. D., 1982. Structure and species composition of desert heteromyid rodent species assemblages:
  988 Effects of a simple habitat manipulation. Ecology 63, 1313–1321.
- Veblen, T. T., Lorenz, D. C., 1988. Recent vegetation changes along the forest/steppe ecotone of northern
  Patagonia. Annals of the Association of American Geographers 78, 93-111.
- Yanga, X., Kushwahab, S. P. S., Saranb, S., Xuc, J., Royb, P. S., 2013. Maxent modeling for predicting the
  potential distribution of medicinal plant, *Justicia adhatoda* L. in Lesser Himalayan foothills. Ecological
  Engineering 51, 83–87.
- Yuan, H. S., Wei, Y. L., Wang, X. G., 2015. Maxent modeling for predicting the potential distribution of
   Sanghuang, an important group of medicinal fungi in China. Fungal Ecology 17, 140–145.
- 996