

Has land use pushed terrestrial biodiversity beyond the planetary boundary? A global assessment

Article (Supplemental Material)

Newbold, Tim, Hudson, Lawrence N, Arnell, Andrew P, Contu, Sara, De Palma, Adriana, Ferrier, Simon, Hill, Samantha L L, Hoskins, Andrew J, Lysenko, Igor, Phillips, Helen R P, Burton, Victoria J, Chng, Charlotte W T, Emerson, Susan, Gao, Di, Pask-Hale, Gwilym et al. (2016) Has land use pushed terrestrial biodiversity beyond the planetary boundary? A global assessment. *Science*, 353 (6296). pp. 288-291. ISSN 0036-8075

This version is available from Sussex Research Online: <http://sro.sussex.ac.uk/id/eprint/62053/>

This document is made available in accordance with publisher policies and may differ from the published version or from the version of record. If you wish to cite this item you are advised to consult the publisher's version. Please see the URL above for details on accessing the published version.

Copyright and reuse:

Sussex Research Online is a digital repository of the research output of the University.

Copyright and all moral rights to the version of the paper presented here belong to the individual author(s) and/or other copyright owners. To the extent reasonable and practicable, the material made available in SRO has been checked for eligibility before being made available.

Copies of full text items generally can be reproduced, displayed or performed and given to third parties in any format or medium for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes without prior permission or charge, provided that the authors, title and full bibliographic details are credited, a hyperlink and/or URL is given for the original metadata page and the content is not changed in any way.



Supplementary Materials for

Has land use pushed terrestrial biodiversity beyond the planetary boundary?
A global assessment

Tim Newbold^{1,2,*}, Lawrence N. Hudson³, Andrew P. Arnell¹, Sara Contu³, Adriana De Palma^{3,4}, Simon Ferrier⁵, Samantha L. L. Hill^{1,3}, Andrew J. Hoskins⁵, Igor Lysenko⁴, Helen R. P. Phillips^{3,4}, Victoria J. Burton³, Charlotte W.T. Chng³, Susan Emerson³, Di Gao³, Gwilym Pask-Hale³, Jon Hutton^{1,6}, Martin Jung^{7,8}, Katia Sanchez-Ortiz³, Benno I. Simmons³, Sarah Whitmee², Hanbin Zhang³, Jörn P.W. Scharlemann⁸, Andy Purvis^{3,4}

correspondence to: t.newbold@ucl.ac.uk

This PDF file includes:

Materials and Methods
Figs. S1 to S7
Tables S1 to S7

26 **Materials and Methods**

27 The models were based on biodiversity data from the PREDICTS (Projecting
28 Responses of Ecological Diversity In Changing Terrestrial Systems) Project database
29 (21). An extract of this database was taken on 28th April 2015. This extract consisted of
30 2.38 million records, from 413 published sources (31–437) or unpublished datasets with a
31 published methodology, of the occurrence or abundance of 39,123 species from 18,659
32 sites in all of the world's 14 terrestrial biomes. The site-level data used to construct the
33 models are publicly available from the Natural History Museum's Data Portal (doi:
34 <http://dx.doi.org/10.5519/0073893>). The data are reasonably representative of major
35 taxonomic groups (Fig. S1A) and of terrestrial biomes (Fig. S1B). For studies where
36 sampling effort differed among the sites sampled, abundance values were corrected by
37 dividing by sampling effort (i.e. assuming that abundance increases linearly with
38 increasing effort). We derived two measures of biodiversity for each of the sites in our
39 dataset: sampled total abundance of organisms and sampled species richness. Because it
40 is not clear which of the many species-based measures of biodiversity most directly
41 relates to the biodiversity-ecosystem functioning research, the main focus of this paper is
42 on abundance-based measures and the corresponding planetary boundary (9).

43 We considered four human-pressure variables shown previously (3) to explain
44 differences in local biodiversity among sites: land use (Table S7), land-use intensity
45 (Table S7), human population density and distance to the nearest road. Human population
46 density and distance to nearest road were log transformed and rescaled to a zero-to-one
47 scale prior to analysis; proximity to the nearest road (as referred to in the main text) is
48 simply the negative of log-transformed distance to the nearest road, such that higher
49 values indicate higher pressure. We also considered two-way interactions between land
50 use and each of the other variables. We chose these variables for the availability of fine-
51 resolution mapped estimates, which enable spatial projections to be made from the
52 models. Responses of biodiversity to these variables were modelled using generalized
53 linear mixed-effects models. For sampled species richness we used a model with Poisson
54 errors and a log link, while for (log-transformed) sampled total abundance we used a
55 model with Gaussian errors and an identity link. A random effect of study identity was
56 used to account for variation among studies in sampling methods and effort, differences
57 in the taxonomic groups sampled, and coarse spatial differences in climate and other
58 aspects of the environment. A random effect of spatial block nested within study, to take
59 account of the spatial design of sampling. Spatial blocks were defined by the data
60 entrants based on the maps and coordinates of sampled sites. A random slope of land use
61 within study accounted for study-level variation in the relationship between land use and
62 sampled biodiversity. Backward stepwise selection of fixed effects was used to select the
63 minimum adequate model (438), with inclusion or exclusion of terms based on likelihood
64 ratio tests (with a threshold $P < 0.05$). All models were developed using the lme4 Version
65 1.1-7 package (439) in R Version 3.2.2 (440). Spatial autocorrelation tests, performed as
66 in (3), showed significant spatial autocorrelation in the model residuals for only slightly
67 more of the modelled datasets than expected by chance: 6.1% in the case of species
68 richness, and 5.9% in the case of total abundance.

69 To project mapped estimates of local biodiversity in the year 2005, we used fine-
70 resolution maps of each of the four human pressure variables. The maps of land use were
71 generated by downscaling (23) the harmonized land-use dataset for 2005 (441). The

72 harmonized land-use data describe the proportion of each 0.5° (approximately 50 km²)
73 grid cell in each of five land uses (primary vegetation, secondary vegetation, cropland,
74 pasture and urban). We used generalized additive models (GAM) with quasibinomial
75 errors and a logistic link to relate coarse-scale estimates of each of the five land uses to
76 nine putative explanatory variables at fine resolution (30 arc-seconds; approximately 1
77 km²): evapotranspiration (442), temperature (443), precipitation (443), topographic
78 wetness (444), slope (444), soil carbon (445), accessibility to humans (446), human
79 population density (24) and principal components of land cover (447). We then took the
80 fine-grained fitted values from the GAMs and rescaled them multiplicatively until the
81 aggregated mean for each 0.5° grid cell matched the estimates from the harmonized land-
82 use data. The rescaled fitted values were then subjected to a constrained optimization
83 algorithm, taking into account error estimates from the GAMs, to generate land-use
84 estimates for all five land uses that summed to 1 within each grid cell. We entered the
85 final estimates back into the GAMs as response variables, and the whole procedure was
86 iterated until the mean inter-iteration difference of predicted values was ≤ 0.001 . Grid
87 cells under ice or water (448, 449) were excluded from the analysis, and were masked
88 from the final land-use maps. For full details on downscaling methodology see (23). The
89 land-use data are freely available: <http://doi.org/10.4225/08/56DCD9249B224>.

90 In a previous study (3), to estimate spatial patterns of land-use intensity, we used
91 generalized linear models (with binomial errors and a logistic link), for each level of
92 intensity within each land use, to relate the proportion of each 0.5° grid cell under this
93 combination of land use and intensity to three explanatory variables: the proportion of the
94 cell under the land use in question, human population density and United Nations sub-
95 region. Information on land-use intensity was obtained from the Global Land Systems
96 dataset (450); see (3) for the reclassification used. To run these generalized linear models
97 for every 30-arc-second grid cell was computationally infeasible. Therefore, we applied
98 the coarse-resolution models developed for the previous study (3) at the fine resolution
99 used here, assuming that the relationships are the same at both scales. We obtained a
100 gridded map of human population density at 30-arc-second resolution and a vector map
101 of the world's roads from NASA's Socioeconomic Data and Applications Centre (24,
102 25). To calculate a gridded map of distance to nearest road, we used Python code written
103 for the *arcpy* module of ArcMap Version 10.3 (451), first to project the vector map of
104 roads onto an equal-area (Behrmann) projection, then to calculate the average distance to
105 the nearest road within each 782-m grid cell using the 'Euclidean Distance' function, and
106 finally to reproject the resulting map back to a WGS 1984 projection at 30-arc-second
107 resolution. Maximum estimated values across the terrestrial surface of human population
108 density and distance to nearest road in 2005 were 8.3% and 20% higher, respectively,
109 than the maximum values observed in the modelled dataset. To ensure that extrapolating
110 did not create unrealistic projections, we set all grid cells with values higher than the
111 maximum observed to be equal to this maximum observed value (this affected 0.002% of
112 grid cells for human population density and 5.6% of grid cells for distance to nearest
113 road). We could not estimate the expected species richness with absolutely no influence
114 of roads because it is impossible to collect a sample of biodiversity under such a situation
115 in the present day.

116 To generate estimates of the intactness of ecological assemblages in terms of within-
117 sample species richness and abundance, we multiplied the coefficients of the minimum

118 adequate models described above by the proportion of each grid cell under each land-use
119 and use-intensity combination, and by log-transformed and rescaled (using the same
120 rescaling as in the models) human population density or distance to nearest road. We
121 assumed that human population density and distance to nearest road were constant within
122 grid cells. The resulting values were summed across all coefficients and the intercept
123 added to give the model estimate of log-transformed species richness or total abundance
124 within each grid cell. We calculated the exponential of these values to estimate actual
125 species richness and total abundance. Finally, to calculate the relative intactness of
126 assemblages relative to a baseline with no human impacts, we calculated expected
127 species richness and total abundance for a grid cell composed entirely of primary
128 vegetation with minimal human use, with zero human population density, and at a
129 distance to roads equal to the maximum value observed in the modelling data (195 km).
130 Estimating uncertainty analytically for mixed-effects models requires generating an n -by-
131 n matrix, where n is the number of grid cells in the projection; this was computationally
132 intractable. Instead we generated 20 random draws (a greater number would have
133 required a long computer run-time) of values for all of the model coefficients, from a
134 multivariate normal distribution accounting for the covariance among modelled
135 coefficients. These random draws of parameters were used to generate 20 replicate
136 projections, from which 95% confidence limits were calculated for each analysis. All of
137 the calculations described in this paragraph were undertaken using Python code
138 implemented within the `arcpy` module of ArcMap Version 10.3 (451), using the 'Raster
139 Calculator' function; except for the multivariate random draw of coefficient values,
140 which was performed in R Version 3.2.2 using the 'mvrnorm' function in the MASS
141 package Version 7.3-43.

142 Scholes & Biggs (11) explicitly exclude alien species from the calculation of
143 biodiversity intactness. Because it is not generally known which species are native and
144 which not, we use modelled average compositional similarity between sites in primary
145 vegetation and sites under other land uses as a multiplier on our land-use coefficients (on
146 a 0-1 scale, rescaled such that primary-primary comparisons have a value of 1). To
147 generate these modelled estimates of compositional similarity, we calculated asymmetric
148 pairwise assemblage similarities between all possible pairs of sites within each study in
149 the data set, where one site in the pair was in primary vegetation. Primary vegetation may
150 contain species that are not truly native to an area, especially in landscapes with a long
151 history of human modification; and landscape-level effects of land-use change may have
152 already removed some originally-present species even from sites in primary vegetation.
153 Therefore, our estimates of compositional similarity are likely to be biased upwards.
154 Asymmetric values were used to focus on the probability that a species sampled in non-
155 primary vegetation was also found in primary vegetation. To remove the possibility for
156 pseudo-replication, we selected as independent contrasts all site comparisons on the off-
157 diagonal of a randomized site-by-site matrix (452). Site-by-site matrices were
158 randomised 100 times to generate 100 datasets of independent comparisons.
159 Compositional similarity was measured using an asymmetric version of the Jaccard Index
160 (J) for the projections of species richness, and an asymmetric version of the abundance-
161 based Jaccard Index (J_a) (453) for the projections of total abundance:
162

163 $J = \frac{a}{a + c}$

164

165 $J_a = \frac{UV}{V}$

166

167 where a is the number of species shared between the two sampled sites, c is the
 168 number of species only found in the site not in primary vegetation, U is the summed
 169 relative abundance in the primary-vegetation site of all species found in both sites, and V
 170 is the summed relative abundance in the non-primary site of all species found in both
 171 sites.

172 Assemblage compositional similarities in each of the 100 datasets were modelled as
 173 a function of the combination of land uses represented and the distance (geographic,
 174 climatic and elevational) between sites. Full details of how assemblage compositional
 175 similarity was modelled are given in (22). Average coefficients across the 100 models
 176 describing average compositional similarity between primary vegetation and all other
 177 land uses (including primary vegetation itself) were rescaled so that comparisons of
 178 primary vegetation to itself had a value of 1 (to avoid conflating natural spatial turnover
 179 with land-use impact). These rescaled coefficients were then multiplied by the modelled
 180 coefficients describing differences in species richness and total abundance among land
 181 uses, to estimate the number of species or individuals present in each land use that are
 182 also expected to be present in primary vegetation. The rescaled coefficients are publicly
 183 available from the Natural History Museum’s Data Portal (doi:
 184 <http://dx.doi.org/10.5519/0073893>).

185 Although our way of calculating BII differs from that proposed by Scholes & Biggs
 186 (11), we also attempt to estimate the “average abundance of a large and diverse set of
 187 organisms in an area, relative to their reference populations” (11). If I_{ijk} is the population
 188 of species group i in ecosystem j under land use k , relative to a pre-industrial population
 189 in the same ecosystem type, then Scholes & Biggs (11) define the biodiversity intactness
 190 index (BII) to be:

191

192
$$\text{BII} = 100 \times (\sum_i \sum_j \sum_k R_{ij} A_{jk} I_{ijk}) / (\sum_i \sum_j \sum_k R_{ij} A_{jk})$$

193


194 where R_{ij} is the species richness of taxon i in ecosystem j and A_{jk} is the area of
 195 ecosystem j under land use k . Scholes & Biggs (11) used expert opinion when estimating
 196 average BII for seven southern African countries, in the absence of sufficient primary
 197 data. They considered birds, mammals, amphibians, reptiles and angiosperms but not
 198 arthropods, again because of a lack of information.

199 Our implementation of the BII differs in that we have used primary data on sampled
 200 local species abundance – for a wide range of animal (vertebrates and invertebrates),
 201 plant and fungal taxa – in place of expert opinion, and our statistical models incorporate
 202 other pressures as well as land use itself. Rather than weighting by areas of ecosystems
 203 and species-richness of taxa, we have collated and analysed a data set that is reasonably
 204 representative in terms of biomes (Fig. S1B) and taxa (Fig. S1A). Our data set is not yet
 205 adequate to support fitting models for each biome and taxon separately, which may lead
 206 to our estimates being biased for some biomes. Despite our very large number of records,

207 hierarchical mixed-effects models for individual biomes or taxa would require data from
208 a larger number of published studies than is available for some taxa and biomes. As in
209 (11), in the absence of pre-industrial data, we have used minimally-impacted sites as the
210 reference condition.


211 We overlaid our estimates of the intactness of ecological assemblages with global
212 maps describing the distribution of biomes (449), Conservation International's
213 biodiversity hotspots (28), Conservation International's High Biodiversity Wilderness
214 Areas (454) and human population density (24). All of these overlays were performed
215 using Python code for ArcMap Version 10.3 (451), using the 'Zonal Statistics' functions
216 after first projecting all maps into an equal-area (Behrmann) projection.
217

218 **Fig. S1.**



219 **Fig. S1. Taxonomic (A) and biogeographic (B) representativeness of the records**
 220 **used to model biodiversity responses to land use.** (A) Correlation, for major taxonomic
 221 groups (magenta – invertebrates; red– vertebrates; green – plants and fungi; grey – other),
 222 between the estimated number of described species (455) and the number of species
 223 represented in the dataset. (B) Correlation between the percentage of global primary
 224 productivity within a biome (449) and the percentage of sites in the dataset within that
 225 biome (A: Tundra; B: Boreal forests/taiga; C: Temperate conifer forests; D: Temperate
 226 broadleaf and mixed forests; E: Montane grasslands and shrublands; F: Temperate
 227 grasslands, savannas and shrublands; G: Mediterranean forests, woodland and scrub; H:
 228 Deserts and xeric shrublands; J: Tropical and subtropical grasslands, savannas and
 229 shrublands; K: Tropical and subtropical coniferous forests; L: Flooded grasslands and
 230 savannas; M: Tropical and subtropical dry broadleaf forests; N: Tropical and subtropical
 231 moist broadleaf forests; P: Mangroves).
 232
 233

234

235 **Fig. S2**

236

237

238

239

240

241

242

243

244

245

246


247

248

249

Fig. S2. Response of sampled total abundance to human pressures: (A) land use, and (B) the interaction between land use and human population density. Human population is shown on a rescaled axis (as fitted in the models). (A) shows total abundance as a percentage of that found in minimally used primary vegetation, with 95% confidence intervals; multiple points within each land-use type show, from left to right, increasing intensity of human use (two classes for secondary vegetation and urban; three classes for all other land uses). B shows absolute mean total abundance for a given combination of pressures, with shading indicating $\pm 0.5 \times \text{SEM}$, for clarity. Land uses in B are shown in the same colours as in A. Mixed-effects models are robust to unbalanced designs (456), such as the data spanning different ranges of human population density for each of the land uses. Dropping all urban sites almost no effect on the other model coefficients (Fig. S6). Full statistical results are given in Table S5.


250 **Fig. S3**



251 **Fig. S3. Response of sampled species richness to human pressures:** (A) land use, (B)
 252 the interaction between land use and human population density, and (C) the interaction
 253 between land use and distance to nearest road. Human population and distance to nearest
 254 road are shown on rescaled axes (as fitted in the models). (A) shows species richness as a
 255 percentage of that found in minimally used primary vegetation, with 95% confidence
 256 intervals; multiple points within each land-use type show, from left to right, increasing
 257 intensity of human use (two classes for secondary vegetation and urban; three classes for
 258 all other land uses). B and C show absolute mean species richness for a given
 259


260 combination of pressures, with shading indicating $\pm 0.5 \times \text{SEM}$, for clarity. Land uses in
261 B and C are shown in the same colours as in A. Mixed-effects models are robust to
262 unbalanced designs (456), such as the data spanning different ranges of human
263 population density for each of the land uses. Dropping all urban sites almost no effect on
264 the other model coefficients (Fig. S7). Full statistical results are given in Table S6.
265

266 **Fig. S4**



267 **Fig. S4. Biodiversity intactness of ecological assemblages** in terms of the total
268 abundance of originally occurring species, as a percentage of their total abundance in
269 minimally disturbed primary vegetation (Biodiversity Intactness Index; BII). Blues areas
270 are those within, and red areas those beyond proposed (9) safe limits for biodiversity, in
271 terms of BII. A high-resolution raster of this map can be freely downloaded (doi:
272 <http://dx.doi.org/10.5519/0009936>).
273
274

275 **Fig. S5**



276

277

278

279

280


281

282

283


Fig. S5. The proportion of the terrestrial surface exceeding the proposed (9) planetary boundary across the range of uncertainty in the boundary's position. Steffen et al. (9) suggested that the planetary boundary for BII could range anywhere between 30 and 90%, which has a large effect on the proportion of the land surface exceeding the boundary. The dashed grey line indicates the 58.1% of terrestrial area that falls below the precautionary BII threshold of 90%.

284 **Fig. S6**



285 **Fig. S6. In models with no urban sites, the response of sampled total abundance to**
 286 **human pressures:** (A) land use, and (B) the interaction between land use and human
 287 **human pressures:** (A) land use, and (B) the interaction between land use and human
 288 population density. The modelled coefficients are robust to the exclusion of urban sites,
 289 which cause an unbalanced design. All plotting conventions are as in Fig. S2.
 290
 291
 292
 293

294 **Fig. S7**



295
 296 **Fig. S7. In models with no urban sites, the response of sampled species richness to**
 297 **human pressures:** (A) land use, (B) the interaction between land use and human
 298 population density, and (C) the interaction between land use and distance to nearest road.
 299 The modelled coefficients are robust to the exclusion of urban sites, which cause an
 300 unbalanced design. All plotting conventions are as in Fig. S3.

301 **Table S1.**

302 **Table S1. Numbers of species represented in the dataset by major taxonomic group,**
 303 **both for species represented in the complete dataset and species with only abundance**
 304 **data.**

Taxon	N species (all data)	N species (abundance data)
Amphibia	415	365
Annelida	40	40
Arachnida	2288	2288
Archaeognatha	11	11
Ascomycota	762	613
Aves	3232	3033
Basidiomycota	514	399
Blattodea	33	33
Bryophyta	862	694
Chilopoda	52	52
Coleoptera	6164	5955
Collembola	161	155
Crustacea	57	52
Dermaptera	20	20
Diplopoda	89	89
Diplura	1	1
Diptera	1475	1475
Embioptera	4	4
Ephemeroptera	4	4
Ferns and allies	392	332
Fungoid protists	1	1
Glomeromycota	31	31
Gymnosperms	70	57
Hemiptera	1214	1214
Hymenoptera	4639	4338
Isoptera	154	109
Lepidoptera	2911	2849
Magnoliophyta	11995	9003
Mammalia	547	500
Mantodea	5	5
Mecoptera	6	6
Mollusca	429	378
Nematoda	172	172
Neuroptera	36	36
Odonata	96	96
Onychophora	1	1
Orthoptera	155	154
Pauropoda	6	6

Phasmida	2	2
Phthiraptera	3	3
Platyhelminthes	6	6
Protura	5	5
Psocoptera	28	28
Reptilia	397	335
Siphonaptera	4	4
Symphyla	5	5
Thysanoptera	50	50
Thysanura	1	1
Trichoptera	17	17
Zoraptera	1	1
Other	243	192

305
306

307 **Table S2.**

308 **Table S2. Biodiversity intactness of the world's terrestrial biomes (449) in terms of**
 309 **species richness ('richness') and total organism abundance ('abundance'),** colour
 310 coded according to the status of biodiversity with respect to boundaries proposed as safe
 311 limits for ecosystem function (5, 9): red = boundary crossed (> 20% loss of richness; >
 312 10% loss of abundance); orange = boundary approached (>10% loss of richness; > 5%
 313 loss of abundance); green = not close to boundary. Values are given as overall net
 314 changes including species not found in primary vegetation ('all species') and intactness
 315 considering only originally present species ('original species'). Text in parentheses
 316 indicates 95% confidence limits.

Biome	Intactness (abundance)		Intactness (richness)	
	All species	Original species	All species	Original species
Temperate Grasslands, Savannas and Shrublands	73 (67.3 - 85)	68 (62.8 - 78.3)	67.6 (60.7 - 76.4)	65.2 (61 - 76.9)
Mediterranean Forests, Woodlands and Scrub	83.1 (76.7 - 90.1)	78.3 (73.9 - 87)	71.8 (65 - 82.7)	69.8 (65.5 - 82.7)
Montane Grasslands and Shrublands	82 (73.9 - 93.7)	77.1 (71.4 - 89.1)	72.4 (67.4 - 81.8)	70.2 (66.3 - 81.9)
Tropical and Subtropical Grasslands, Savannas and Shrublands	85.5 (76.5 - 97.9)	80.5 (73.9 - 91.9)	74.1 (68.3 - 85.3)	72 (68 - 84.8)
Flooded Grasslands and Savannas	85.7 (79.1 - 96.2)	81.1 (77 - 90.8)	74.2 (68.4 - 85)	72.2 (68 - 84.8)
Temperate Broadleaf and Mixed Forests	90 (80.2 - 99.5)	85.9 (79.2 - 96.1)	74.8 (67.5 - 86.2)	73.1 (66.6 - 86.3)
Tropical and Subtropical Dry Broadleaf Forests	90.1 (81.1 - 99.9)	86.3 (79.9 - 96.3)	75.9 (69.4 - 87.6)	74.4 (68.4 - 87.5)
Deserts and Xeric Shrublands	82 (75.6 - 93)	78.3 (73.5 - 86.7)	76.2 (71 - 85.1)	74.5 (71.6 - 85.5)
Tropical and Subtropical Coniferous Forests	95 (85.2 - 105.1)	90.9 (84.4 - 102.9)	77.2 (70.5 - 90)	75.6 (68.1 - 89.2)
Mangroves	95.6 (84.8 - 108)	92.2 (84.4 - 104.9)	78.9 (72.5 - 89.9)	77.5 (69.8 - 89.6)
Temperate Conifer Forests	89.2 (84.3 - 94.7)	86.2 (83 - 91.9)	79.2 (73.8 - 89.1)	78 (74.5 - 89)
Tropical and Subtropical Moist Broadleaf Forests	95.9 (89 - 104)	93.2 (88.7 - 101.4)	82.8 (77.4 - 92.8)	81.7 (75.7 - 92.4)
Boreal Forests/Taiga	96.3 (92.7 - 99)	95.5 (92.3 - 98.1)	88.8 (84.1 - 96.9)	88.5 (85.9 - 96.8)
Tundra	99.7 (98.5 - 100.7)	99.5 (98.4 - 100.4)	94.8 (91.8 - 100.1)	94.8 (93.2 - 99.8)

317

318 **Table S3.**

319 **Table S3. Biodiversity intactness of the world's terrestrial Biodiversity Hotspots (28)**
 320 **in terms of species richness ('richness') and total organism abundance**
 321 **('abundance').** Colours and labels are as in Table 1. Text in parentheses indicates 95%
 322 confidence limits.

Hotspot	Intactness (abundance)		Intactness (richness)	
	All species	Original species	All species	Original species
Cape Floristic Region	72.5 (62.9 - 89.3)	66.5 (59 - 80.4)	67.2 (60.2 - 78.7)	64.4 (60 - 78)
Succulent Karoo	64.2 (50.3 - 87)	59.4 (52.8 - 79.6)	67.8 (60.1 - 78.1)	65.2 (58.2 - 82.3)
New Zealand	72.5 (63.7 - 86.2)	68.1 (62.7 - 79.8)	70.2 (63.5 - 79.7)	68 (63.4 - 80.9)
Southwest Australia	73.5 (64.4 - 84.6)	69.8 (63.5 - 79.5)	71.4 (64.1 - 80)	69.6 (64.8 - 81.5)
Maputaland-Pondoland-Albany	82.6 (76.3 - 93)	77.2 (73.1 - 88.8)	71.7 (65.4 - 84.3)	69.3 (65.6 - 83.5)
Mediterranean Basin	87.4 (77.6 - 98.6)	82.1 (74.5 - 95.2)	71.9 (64.4 - 83.9)	69.8 (62.8 - 83.5)
Mountains of Central Asia	86.2 (76.2 - 99.5)	80.7 (73.7 - 94.2)	72.4 (65.7 - 84)	70.1 (63.9 - 83.2)
Cerrado	80.2 (72.2 - 91.7)	75.7 (69.7 - 85.7)	72.9 (67.6 - 82.5)	70.9 (66.8 - 82.4)
Caucasus	90.3 (78.9 - 102.9)	85.3 (76.7 - 99)	73.1 (65.1 - 86.2)	71.1 (63.1 - 84.9)
Madagascar and the Indian Ocean Islands	89.6 (77.6 - 106.2)	83.6 (74.7 - 99)	73.1 (66.2 - 87.5)	70.7 (64.2 - 85.6)
Irano-Anatolian	92.3 (81.2 - 107)	86.7 (78.4 - 102.4)	73.6 (65.9 - 86.9)	71.4 (62.9 - 85.6)
Atlantic Forest	89.8 (79.8 - 102)	84.8 (77.8 - 97.3)	73.8 (66.6 - 86.2)	71.7 (64.3 - 85.2)
Caribbean Islands	92.9 (80.1 - 108.1)	88.1 (77.5 - 104.3)	74.3 (66.8 - 88.1)	72.5 (64.3 - 86.5)
California Floristic Province	83.4 (78.6 - 87.6)	80.1 (75 - 86.5)	74.5 (68.6 - 83.9)	73.1 (69.9 - 84.1)
Mountains of Southwest China	90.4 (80.2 - 103.6)	85.5 (78.6 - 98.4)	74.6 (67.8 - 86.7)	72.5 (65.1 - 85.9)
Horn of Africa	88.3 (76.7 - 103.4)	83.1 (75.1 - 96.1)	74.6 (68.3 - 87.7)	72.4 (67.1 - 86)
Himalaya	90.4 (80.4 - 101.8)	86.2 (78.8 - 99)	74.7 (68.2 - 86.2)	72.9 (66 - 86)
Coastal Forests of Eastern Africa	95.8 (85.2 - 111.9)	90.2 (81.7 - 105.1)	76 (68.8 - 89.9)	73.9 (65.8 - 88.8)
Eastern Afromontane	99.5 (86 - 113.4)	94.1 (84.9 - 112.8)	76.6 (69.5 - 90.6)	74.7 (65.1 - 90.3)

Published in *Science* DOI: 10.1126/science.aaf2201

Philippines	94.9 (78 - 114.4)	91.6 (77.7 - 106.5)	76.7 (68.7 - 89.1)	75.5 (66.1 - 88.8)
Madrean Pine-Oak Woodlands	91.8 (83 - 102.8)	87.6 (82.4 - 97.4)	76.8 (70.4 - 89)	75.1 (69 - 88.1)
Western Ghats and Sri Lanka	99.1 (79.9 - 122.9)	95.7 (80.4 - 113.9)	77.1 (69 - 90.8)	75.9 (66.4 - 90.5)
Guinean Forests of West Africa	100.9 (87.2 - 114.7)	95.6 (86.9 - 113.8)	77.1 (69.5 - 91.8)	75.2 (66 - 91.6)
Mesoamerica	96.4 (86.3 - 108)	92.1 (85.4 - 104.1)	77.9 (71 - 91.1)	76.2 (68.4 - 90.3)
Tumbes-Choco-Magdalena	93.5 (84.5 - 105.9)	89.3 (83 - 100.1)	78.1 (71.9 - 90)	76.4 (69.2 - 88.9)
Polynesia-Micronesia	91.8 (85 - 99.2)	88.8 (85.2 - 96.5)	78.2 (72.8 - 90)	77 (72.1 - 89.5)
Tropical Andes	91.6 (84.1 - 102.2)	87.9 (83.2 - 96.4)	78.7 (72.8 - 90.9)	77.2 (72 - 90.1)
Japan	100.9 (85.2 - 114.5)	97.7 (85.9 - 114.7)	79.1 (71 - 93.5)	78 (70.3 - 93.5)
Chilean Winter Rainfall and Valdivian Forests	91.2 (84.7 - 100.1)	88.1 (84.4 - 95.6)	79.9 (74.5 - 91.5)	78.6 (74.7 - 90.9)
Indo-Burma	98.3 (83.6 - 112.5)	95.8 (85 - 107.9)	80.6 (72.7 - 93.7)	79.7 (71 - 93.4)
Sundaland	96.5 (86.5 - 106.7)	94.4 (87.5 - 102.5)	82.1 (75.4 - 92.9)	81.3 (74.2 - 92.8)
New Caledonia	97.4 (90.9 - 102.8)	95.5 (91.2 - 102.2)	83.1 (75.5 - 94.7)	82.2 (79.2 - 95.3)
Wallacea	100.5 (88.1 - 111.4)	98.7 (90.3 - 108.6)	83.5 (76 - 96.5)	82.8 (74.8 - 96.3)
East Melanesian Islands	104 (91.3 - 114.1)	103.4 (94.5 - 112.1)	90.5 (83.9 - 101.5)	90.2 (82.2 - 102.5)

323

324

325 **Table S4.**

326 **Table S4. Biodiversity intactness of the world’s High Biodiversity Wilderness Areas**
 327 **(454) in terms of species richness (‘richness’) and total organism abundance**
 328 **(‘abundance’)**. Colours and labels are as in Table 1. Text in parentheses indicates 95%
 329 confidence limits.

High Biodiversity Wilderness Area	Intactness (abundance)		Intactness (richness)	
	All species	Original species	All species	Original species
North American Deserts	76.6 (67.1 - 90.9)	72.2 (66.1 - 85.6)	72.5 (66.8 - 82.2)	70.4 (66 - 83.7)
Miombo-Mopane Woodlands and Savannas	90.9 (79.6 - 105.9)	86.6 (77.8 - 97.9)	77.7 (71.8 - 89.5)	76 (70.2 - 89)
Congo Forests	96.5 (86.9 - 107.8)	93.9 (85.3 - 102.3)	83.3 (77.5 - 95.5)	82.3 (76.6 - 95.8)
New Guinea	99 (91.7 - 105.5)	97.8 (93.1 - 102.9)	89.3 (85 - 97)	88.8 (83.5 - 97.5)
Amazonia	94.9 (90.7 - 98.8)	93.6 (90.5 - 97.1)	89.4 (86.3 - 94.8)	88.8 (86.7 - 94.8)

330

331

332 **Table S5.**

333 **Table S5. Results of backward stepwise model selection (457) on model of sampled**
 334 **total abundance.** Terms considered were land use (LandUse), land-use intensity
 335 (UseIntensity), human population density (HPD), distance to nearest road (DR), and
 336 interactions between land use and the other variables. Interaction terms were compared
 337 first, and then removed to test main effects. HPD and DR were fitted as quadratic
 338 polynomials. We report here chi-square values (χ^2), degrees of freedom (DF) and P-
 339 values (P). Variables within significant interactions were retained in the final model, even
 340 if the main effect of that variable was not significant.

Term	χ^2	DF	P
LandUse	9.42	5, 33	0.093
UseIntensity	33.6	2, 28	< 0.001
HPD	13.7	1, 28	< 0.001
DR	0.382	1, 35	0.54
LandUse:UseIntensity	62.2	13, 53	< 0.001
LandUse:HPD	21.7	10, 53	0.017
LandUse:DR	13.8	10, 63	0.18

341

342

343 **Table S6.**

344 **Table S6. Results of backward stepwise model selection (457) on model of sampled**
 345 **species richness.** Terms considered were land use (LandUse), land-use intensity
 346 (UseIntensity), human population density (HPD), distance to nearest road (DR), and
 347 interactions between land use and the other variables. Interaction terms were compared
 348 first, and then removed to test main effects. HPD and DR were fitted as quadratic
 349 polynomials. We report here chi-square values (χ^2), degrees of freedom (DF) and P-
 350 values (P). Variables within significant interactions were retained in the final model, even
 351 if the main effect of that variable was not significant.

Term	χ^2	DF	P
LandUse	429	5, 13	< 0.001
UseIntensity	19.0	2, 13	< 0.001
HPD	17.6	1, 13	< 0.001
DR	0.39	1, 15	0.53
LandUse:UseIntensity	408	13, 43	< 0.001
LandUse:HPD	41.2	10, 43	< 0.001
LandUse:DR	57.2	10, 43	< 0.001

352

353

354 **Table S7.**

355 **Table S7. Land-use and land-use-intensity classification definitions.**

Level 1 Land Use	Predominant Land Use	Minimal use	Light use	Intense use
No evidence of prior destruction of the vegetation	Primary forest	Any disturbances identified are very minor (e.g., a trail or path) or very limited in the scope of their effect (e.g., hunting of a particular species of limited ecological importance).	One or more disturbances of moderate intensity (e.g., selective logging) or breadth of impact (e.g., bushmeat extraction), which are not severe enough to markedly change the nature of the ecosystem. Primary sites in suburban settings are at least Light use.	One or more disturbances that is severe enough to markedly change the nature of the ecosystem; this includes clear-felling of part of the site too recently for much recovery to have occurred. Primary sites in fully urban settings should be classed as Intense use.
	Primary Non-Forest	As above	As above	As above
Recovering after destruction of the vegetation	Mature Secondary Vegetation	As for Primary Vegetation-Minimal use	As for Primary Vegetation-Light use	As for Primary Vegetation-Intense use
	Intermediate Secondary Vegetation	As for Primary Vegetation-Minimal use	As for Primary Vegetation-Light use	As for Primary Vegetation-Intense use
	Young Secondary Vegetation	As for Primary Vegetation-Minimal use	As for Primary Vegetation-Light use	As for Primary Vegetation-Intense use
	Secondary Vegetation (indeterminate age)	As for Primary Vegetation-Minimal use	As for Primary Vegetation-Light use	As for Primary Vegetation-Intense use
Human use (agricultural)	Plantation forest	Extensively managed or mixed timber, fruit/coffee, oil-palm or rubber plantations in which native understorey and/or other native tree species are tolerated, which are not treated with pesticide or fertiliser, and which have not been recently (< 20 years) clear-felled.	Monoculture fruit/coffee/rubber plantations with limited pesticide input, or mixed species plantations with significant inputs. Monoculture timber plantations of mixed age with no recent (< 20 years) clear-felling. Monoculture oil-palm plantations with no recent (< 20 years) clear-felling.	Monoculture fruit/coffee/rubber plantations with significant pesticide input. Monoculture timber plantations with similarly aged trees or timber/oil-palm plantations with extensive recent (< 20 years) clear-felling.
Human use (agricultural)	Cropland	Low-intensity farms, typically with small fields, mixed crops, crop rotation, little or no inorganic fertiliser use, little or no pesticide use, little or no ploughing, little or no irrigation, little or no mechanisation.	Medium intensity farming, typically showing some but not many of the following: large fields, annual ploughing, inorganic fertiliser application, pesticide application, irrigation, no crop rotation, mechanisation, monoculture crop. Organic farms in developed countries often fall within this category, as may high-intensity farming in developing countries.	High-intensity monoculture farming, typically showing many of the following features: large fields, annual ploughing, inorganic fertiliser application, pesticide application, irrigation, mechanisation, no crop rotation.

	Pasture	Pasture with minimal input of fertiliser and pesticide, and with low stock density (<i>not</i> high enough to cause significant disturbance or to stop regeneration of vegetation).	Pasture either with significant input of fertiliser or pesticide, or with high stock density (high enough to cause significant disturbance or to stop regeneration of vegetation).	Pasture with significant input of fertiliser or pesticide, <i>and</i> with high stock density (high enough to cause significant disturbance or to stop regeneration of vegetation).
Human use (urban)	Urban	Extensive managed green spaces; villages.	Suburban (e.g. gardens), or small managed or unmanaged green spaces in cities.	Fully urban with no significant green spaces.

356

357