SUPPORTING INFORMATION

Using species richness and functional traits predictions to constrain assemblage predictions from stacked species distribution models

Manuela D'Amen, Anne Dubuis, Rui F. Fernandes, Freitag Julien Pottier, Loïc Pellissier and Antoine Guisan

Appendix S1 Assemblage evaluation metrics and supplementary results.

Table S1 Confusion matrix used to compute the assemblage evaluation metrics.

		observed		
þ		0	1	
icte	0	TN	FN	
pred	1	FP	ТР	

Figure S1 Results from true skill statistic (TSS) thresholding criterion: the boxplots compare results from the 'trait range' rule test for single traits and all their combinations when using TSS to binarize the SDM predictions. The metrics utilized in the comparison are: (a) species richness error, i.e. predicted SR – observed SR (first column), (b) prediction success, i.e. sum of correctly predicted presences and absences divided by the total species number (second column), and (c) Sørensen index, i.e. a statistic used to compare the similarity of two samples (third column). Abbreviations: H, height; SLA, specific leaf area of the community; SM, seed mass.



	GAM	GBM	GLM
AUC mean	0.803	0.783	0.799
AUC stdev	0.078	0.081	0.077
TSS mean	0.541	0.507	0.537
TSS stdev	0.142	0.137	0.142

 Table S2 Summary of the SDMs evaluation results.

Table S3 Values of Spearman correlation test between observed and predicted values of traitpercentiles.

Percentile	Trait	ρ
1^{st}	Н	0.711
1^{st}	SLA	0.759
1^{st}	SM	0.152
99 th	Н	0.859
99 th	SLA	0.584
99 th	SM	0.514
5^{th}	Н	0.825
5 th	SLA	0.803
5^{th}	SM	0.350
95 th	Н	0.887
95 th	SLA	0.652
95 th	SM	0.528
10^{th}	Н	0.848
10^{th}	SLA	0.814
10^{th}	SM	0.550
90 th	Н	0.867
90^{th}	SLA	0.677
90 th	SM	0.645

Appendix S3 Comparison of the assemblage predictions coming from the application of the trait range rule with three pairs of percentiles. Abbreviations: SSDM, sum of binary SDMs; H, height; SLA, specific leaf area of the community; SM, seed mass.

