

Note to reader: This chapter was primarily written in 2011 and will be published in a book,(still being edited). This can be cited according to its arXiv reference; please contact me for details of later publication.

Chapter 6: Predicting distributions of invasive species

Jane Elith

School of Botany
The University of Melbourne
Parkville, Victoria, Australia.

email: j.elith@unimelb.edu.au

6.1 Introduction

In a newly invaded region, invasive species may progress through the stages of introduction, establishment, and dispersal to a full range. This chapter provides information on predicting the final stage, commonly referred to as the potential distribution of the species in the invaded range. In contrast, the preceding chapter ("Mapping risks and impacts of invasive alien species with dynamic simulation models") has described methods for modelling the whole invasion process. The reason for dedicating one chapter to predicting distributions is that there is currently much interest in this world-wide, and many bio-security organizations will be faced with questions of whether and how to embark on such a task, or how to interpret predictions that others have provided. Collective names for these models can be confusing, because the same names can be used for distinctly different aims and models. So here, regardless of other uses of the words, mention of pest risk mapping, climate matching, niche mapping, and predicting potential distributions will all mean the same thing: a model or process that aims to produce a map of those areas likely to be suitable for the species. The advantages of such maps are obvious: armed with mapped predictions, species can be screened for those likely to become pests (i.e., likely to cause harm), monitoring programs can target areas most likely to be infested, arrangements can be established for cost-sharing between jurisdictions within a larger region, and so on (Cook et al. 2007; Richardson & Thuiller 2007; Brunel et al. 2010).

Many governments, agencies and organizations now invest in some form of pest risk mapping. As yet there appear to be no complete systems for mapping; most are examples, or case studies for particular species, or prototype systems. For instance Pratique (<https://secure.fera.defra.gov.uk/pratique/index.cfm>) is a European Union initiative broadly targeting pest risk analysis, but with components focusing on mapping ranges; in the USA the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service (APHIS) can conduct risk assessments using NAPPFAST (Magarey 2007); in Australia the Department of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries (DAFF) uses a simple climate matching system (CLIMATE) to predict climate suitability for species of biosecurity concern (e.g. Bomford et al. 2007). Globally, there is interest in linking biodiversity databases with modelling tools that would allow pest risk mapping anywhere throughout the world (<http://wiki.tdwg.org/InvasiveSpecies>), but with understandable uncertainty about the likely quality of the outputs.

This chapter begins with brief mention of approaches for modelling broad ecological units or climates (Section 6.2). The focus then shifts to single species models, covering the conceptual bases (section 6.3) and the methods (sections 6.4-6.5) but primarily focusing on these from the viewpoint of typical issues that arise in trying to fit the models. In other words, it is more about the process of thinking about the data and the modelling problem than it is about one technique versus another. The chapter will include a mix of commentary based on my own research, review and advice, with the intention of providing interpretation of the current state of the science and commentary on useful ways forward. It links most strongly to Chapter 5, because predictive mapping is an important input to dynamic simulation models.

6.2 Community or climate-based mapping

Some approaches for modelling potential ranges of invasive species focus on biological or environmental units aggregated above the species level. For instance, Richardson and Thuiller (2007) predicted the global distribution of seven South African biomes. They suggested the results, which were essentially a biologically-orientated climate matching, would be useful for screening species' introduction risks. Baker et al. (2000) reviewed applications of climate-based mapping that map climate independent of any species response, giving examples both in environmental space (e.g. the early climographs of Cook 1925) and geographic space (e.g. the "Match Climates" option in CLIMEX; Sutherst 2003). Brunel et al. (2010) proposed that Köppen-Geiger climate zones and world hardiness zones provide ecoclimatic information relevant to screening potential invasive plant species for the EPPO (the European and Mediterranean Plant Protection Organization). Thomas and Ohlemüller (2010) used rainfall and temperature information to map similar climates both locally and globally and then to estimate likelihood of invasion ("invasibility"), assuming that similar non-local climates represent potential source locations of invasive species. Their maps for both current and future climates suggested increases in invasibility with climate change (e.g., Fig. 1).

These types of models or data summaries can be used to develop understanding of general patterns of invasions, and to achieve a broad overview of whether a region is even remotely likely to be suitable for a species of concern

(or alternatively whether the climates of two regions overlap, and therefore whether one poses a potential risk for the other). In that sense they could be considered useful background information or a first step for assessing invasive potential.

6.3 The conceptual basis for predicting potential distributions of invasive species

In many situations predictions are needed for a particular species. Users require mapped estimates of where species could persist in a given region, and this is related to questions about the biotope – i.e. the geographic location of the species' niche. In the species modelling arena most niche definitions rely on Hutchinson's viewpoint (Hutchinson 1957) – namely that the *fundamental* niche is a multi-dimensional hyper-volume with "permissive conditions and requisite resources as its axes" (Colwell & Rangel 2009), in which every point corresponds to a state that would allow the species to exist indefinitely. The dimensions of this niche are limited to that subset of all possible conditions that directly affect fitness of the organism (Kearney 2006). In practice, modellers often focus on the species' response to climate, though this is not essential nor most relevant for some species and spatial extents (Hulme 2003). For a clear explanation of Hutchinson's niche ideas, the links between niche (environmental) and biotope (geographic) space, and implications for species modelling, see Colwell & Rangel (2009).

The full fundamental niche need not be apparent, even globally, at a given time. Hence the concept of the *potential* niche was introduced by Jackson and Overpeck (2000) to describe those portions of the fundamental niche (those environments) that actually exist somewhere in geographic space at a specified time. The idea of modelling a potential distribution of an invasive species in a region is related to this definition. The *realized* niche – i.e. where the species actually occurs – is usually a smaller environmental volume (or geographic area) than the fundamental and potential niches. Hutchinson (1957) saw the realized niche as a subset of the fundamental niche limited by biotic interactions – for instance, by the presence of competitors or predators, or the absence of mutualists. Others (e.g. Pulliam 2000) further refined the definition to allow for source-sink theory and dispersal limitations. Thus, sink populations could allow the realized niche to be larger than the fundamental niche, and constraints to dispersal and past disturbances can limit the realized niche beyond the effects of biotic interactions.

These differences between the realized and fundamental niches are relevant to invasive species, particularly when we consider the realized niche in native ranges versus the global potential or fundamental niche. Invasive species often persist in environments in their invaded ranges that were either not occupied by them (because of dispersal or biotic limitations) or that were non-existent in their native range. That is, they are able to expand into parts of their fundamental niche not available in their native range (Le Maitre et al. 2008). Methods best suited to modelling the potential distribution of an invasive species in any new region are therefore those that most directly estimate the fundamental niche. Whilst these will usually overestimate the final distribution of the invasive species in the invaded range, they will at least show what could be occupied if the species is able to spread everywhere and if biotic conditions are suitable.

A final complication in modelling invasive species is that their spread may not simply represent the expression of the fundamental niche as set by the gene pool in their native range. Instead, new conditions in the invaded range may provoke adaptive evolution (Huey et al. 2005; Colwell & Rangel 2009). Whilst not a priority for this chapter, methods for exploring adaptive genetic change and predicting traits likely to be under selection pressure are relevant to invasive species and an important topic for understanding the ecology and biogeography of invasive species (Ackerly 2003; Alexander & Edwards 2010).

6.4 Methods aiming to model and map the fundamental niche: mechanistic models.

The previous section provides reasoning for preferring methods that model biological traits that are directly related to the fundamental niche of the species. I will refer to these as mechanistic models. So-called because they focus on mechanisms or processes rather than patterns, mechanistic models could – depending on the way a particular model is set up - include eco-physiological models, biophysical models, life history models, phenological models, foraging energetic models and models based on functional traits (Morin & Lechowicz 2008, Kearney & Porter 2009, Buckley et al. 2010). For our purposes, the main criterion for including a model in this general class is

that it attempts to capture the dominant processes contributing to survival and fecundity, and links these to environmental data in a way that enables mapped predictions of the niche. These models are not fitted to species location data, and are therefore free from the problem that occurrence records are tied to the realized niche. Instead, they focus on the processes and physiological limits that constrain the distribution and abundance of species.

Kearney and Porter (2009) review the potential to apply principles of biophysical ecology to modelling species distributions, and include information on how to model key functional traits of a range of organisms (e.g. dry- and wet-skinned ectotherms, endotherms, aquatic organisms and plants). Their software (NicheMapper; <http://www.zoology.wisc.edu/faculty/por/por.html>) is available though quite complex to use, and further development is underway (Kearney, pers. comm.). Examples of applications include Porter et al. (2002), Kearney and Porter (2004), Kearney et al. (2008, 2010). These models require information on the morphology, physiology and behaviour of species (e.g. how endotherms balance metabolic rate and heat loss at various temperatures), and a means for "translating" the environment experienced by the animal to the landscape-scale GIS (geographic information system) data usually available for mapping.

In related examples, Buckley et al. (2010) use three mechanistic models (a biophysical model, a life history model and a foraging energetic model) to model a butterfly and a lizard and Morin and others (Chuine & Beaubien 2001, Morin & Lechowicz 2008, Morin & Thuiller 2009) use a phenological model, Phenofit, to model trees. Phenofit focuses on the impacts of physiological stress on fitness, and on the synchronization of developmental stages with seasonal variations in climate (Morin & Thuiller 2009).

These authors and others (e.g. Hijmans & Graham 2006) have compared mechanistic models with correlative ones (i.e. those based on relationships between observed species locations and measured or estimated environmental conditions), often showing congruence of predictions in the regions in which the correlative model was trained, and a range of outcomes (congruence to dissimilarity) for predictions to novel times or places (Kearney et al. 2010; Morin & Thuiller 2009). Kearney and Porter (2009) compare the likely strengths and weaknesses of mechanistic and correlative models, and Dormann et al. (2012) provide an interesting discussion of the apparent dichotomy between mechanistic and correlative models.

Mechanistic models are the subject of active research programs, but are less frequently attempted than correlative models owing to the complexity of the models and the time it takes to gather appropriate data and fit models. Conceptually it is appealing to focus on process and understand the constraints to distribution, because these will then be applicable in any geographic region or future time providing the species does not evolve different tolerances in new environments. Despite the fact they are theoretically well suited to invasive species and several reviews recommend them (e.g. Kearney & Porter 2009, Buckley et al. 2010, Gallien et al. 2010), few applications to invasive species exist (but see Kearney et al. 2008 and Elith et al. 2010 for a cane toad example). Of course, even though compatible with the modelling problem, these models will not be perfect. The most likely errors and uncertainties stem from the need to identify key processes (is there enough information to pinpoint these, and is the model sufficient to include and combine them appropriately?) parameterise the models appropriately (are relevant experimental data available?) (Kearney & Porter 2009; Buckley et al. 2010), and match microclimate or laboratory measurements to the broad scale climatic variables available for mapping. Given the time and expertise needed to fit these models, I expect them to be most useful for species of exceptional importance, or as a guide to likely distributions if generalised versions can be made available that could serve as templates for sets of physiologically similar species.

6.5 Methods that use information on the realized niche

Most predictions of a species' invasion potential are based on models fitted to observed location data (Venette et al. 2010). That is, data from the native range (and perhaps additional data) are used to characterise and predict suitable conditions elsewhere, as described in the following sections. The information is orientated towards key issues that arise in trying to fit such models. In other words, it is more about the process of thinking about the data and the modelling problem than it is about one technique versus another. This reflects my viewpoint that the issues are critically important, and the modelling problem is one that requires careful thought. Throughout, I will use the term "correlative models" (Box 1, and Dormann et al. 2012) to refer to most of these models, because they are pattern-based models that, in various ways depending on the method, quantify the relationship between a species presence (or presence-absence or abundance) and a set of environmental covariates. That is, I use "correlation" in the broad sense of relations between variables, in this case between a response (the species) and one or more predictors or covariates. A model that does not fall completely into this class is CLIMEX (Box 2) which, whilst relying on species records, has a more process-based orientation than correlative species distribution models (SDMs). The term "pest risk models" will include CLIMEX, but "SDMs" or "correlative models" will not. This is for convenience of discussion; obviously CLIMEX could also be termed a species distribution model. Box 1 provides background to the more general (and original) use of correlative models for modelling species other than invasive species and introduces the phrase "equilibrium SDM" for such applications, Box 2 describes CLIMEX, and Box 3 outlines the broad classes of correlative models. Table 1 summarizes key references and examples of invasive species applications. If you are unfamiliar with these models, reading the Boxes should give enough background for the following sections. Note that correlative models – sometimes with additional components to include processes of dispersal – have been used to fit and predict distributions entirely in the invaded range, but these models are generally not considered here (but see section 6.5.2) because they require specialised methods and are usually only relevant where a species has been in a country for a considerable time.

Box 1: Correlative models – their general use in ecology

Correlative methods include a range of techniques variously referred to as species distribution models (SDMs), ecological niche models (ENMs), bioclimatic envelopes, profile methods or climate matching techniques. None of these were originally designed to model invasive species. Instead, they were intended for modelling a species – environment relationship, and perhaps map it, but only the current distribution of the species within the sampled geographic extent (Elith & Leathwick 2009). I will refer to this original use as "equilibrium SDM", even though ecologists will recognise that use of the word "equilibrium" opens up many questions about time frame, dispersal barriers, effects of disturbance and so on (see Franklin 2010 and Peterson et al. 2011). It is important to keep this history in mind when reading the SDM literature and considering the range of methods available, because it provides context for interpreting what people have done and why they have done it. For instance, some equilibrium SDMs use geographic space rather than environmental space as the predictors of occurrence (e.g., convex hulls, kernel density estimators and kriging; Elith & Leathwick 2009). These might be useful where data are very sparse or where geographic space strongly determines distributions, but they are not useful for predicting the distribution of invasive species in new, geographically remote, areas. The more common use of environmental predictors is based on the belief that – at most scales and in most regions – environment is important in structuring distributions (section 6.5.4).

The literature on SDMs has expanded rapidly in the last ten years, and tutorials, books and reviews are regularly emerging. See, for example, Pearson (2007), Guisan & Zimmermann (2000), Austin (2002, 2007), Guisan & Thuiller (2005), Schröder (2008), Elith & Leathwick (2009) and Franklin (2010). Equilibrium SDMs have been fitted for terrestrial, marine and freshwater species, and from macroecological (coarse grain, large extent) to local (fine grain, small extent) scales. Models using well-designed survey data and ecologically relevant predictor variables have produced useful insights and reliable predictions to new sites within the sampled regions (Ysebaert et al. 2002; Bio et al. 2002; Leathwick & Austin 2001). Predictions have provided key inputs for conservation planning and resource management, for identifying new sites for rare species surveys, and for global analyses of species distributions (Fleishman et al. 2001; Ferrier 2002; Zimmermann et al. 2007; Rangel et al. 2006). Because equilibrium SDMs aim to predict within the range of the training data, users have tended to evaluate their performance at points within that range – e.g. using cross-validation; or by assessing whether the modelled relationships are ecologically sensible.

6.5.1 Issue 1: What niche can be characterised by these models?

Section 6.3 discusses fundamental and realized niches, a critical issue for pest risk models. The dual concepts of environmental ("niche") and geographic ("biotope") space make it clear that in order to characterise the environmental niche well, records of species locations must be taken from regions in which the species has had opportunity to spread to all suitable locations in geographic space. Hence it is logical to focus on places where the species is most likely to be at equilibrium – i.e., the native range.

It is not possible to make a definitive statement about exactly what niche is being modelled by *equilibrium* SDMs (Box 1), but it is most closely related to the realized niche (Austin et al. 1990; Austin 2002; Colwell & Rangel 2009; Jiménez-Valverde et al. 2008; Soberon & Nakamura 2009). The species data, choice of predictor variables and modelling method all affect the outcome. For instance, imagine being fortunate enough to have a large, comprehensive and unbiased sample of the abundance of a species across its whole range. From these, one might expect to successfully model the realized niche. However, if the available predictor variables lack some important dimension of the niche (e.g. soil phosphorus for plants needing high levels of phosphorus) or the modelling method is incapable of fitting the shape of relationship truly present, then the niche will be imperfectly modelled. The aim, therefore, in fitting an SDM for an invasive species is to do as much as possible to at least characterize the realized niche well (excluding sink populations) and beyond that, to move towards approximating the fundamental niche. An early application of this idea (Booth et al. 1988) expanded the native range climatic profile for thirteen eucalypt species using forestry trial plot results from Africa, intending to better characterize the fundamental niche to inform successful tree introductions for plantations. Most of the following sections include discussion on how species records, predictors, the model and the prediction extent all affect how accurately the realized niche is modelled, and resulting implications for prediction of invasive potential.

Similar issues apply to CLIMEX (Box 2) because the model is often primarily fitted using location data, so the predicted distribution may be closer to the realized than the fundamental niche, depending on the extent to which the species has been dispersal limited and on the amount of additional physiological data (Lawson et al. 2010). Physiological data, if reliable and if successfully rescaled to be consistent with the predictor information, should allow the prediction to edge closer to the fundamental niche (Box 2).


For predicting potential distributions of invasive species, one drawback of being tied to observation records is that biotic interactions affect the outcome: the realized niche in the native range is usually affected by pathogens, pests, competitors and predators. In some instances, invasive species have shown evidence of release from inhibiting biotic factors, so models from the native ranges that included biotic interactions were not good predictors of distributions in the invaded range (Le Maitre et al. 2008). This is an inherent weakness of models based on the realized niche. Biotic interactions are notoriously difficult to include as predictors, because their effect is almost always confounded with the effects of other covariates (Leathwick and Austin 2001). Researchers often hope that biotic interactions are variable enough across the species range that a reasonable-sized sample will smooth over local biotic effects. This will only sometimes apply, so use of these models for predicting other than the realized niche is problematic. Solutions may not exist, but one way to counteract this problem is to collate available knowledge on the impact of biotic interactions on the native range of a species, and use that as a guide to likely errors in predicted distributions. Models for species without significant pathogens, pests and competitors are likely to be most accurate.

Box 2: CLIMEX

CLIMEX is a commercially available modelling method first published in the 1980s that has now been applied to many species and adopted world-wide in various agencies and governmental departments (Sutherst and Maywald 1985; Sutherst 2003). It was specifically developed for modelling invasive species. The primary output is a mapped prediction of the favourability of a set or grid of locations for a given species, though the model does produce a suite of additional information to allow further understanding of species response to climate. CLIMEX requires location records of a species in its native range, and uses these with climate data and other optional relevant information (locations of persistent populations in invaded regions; relative abundance; seasonal phenology; laboratory data) to infer a species' climatic requirements. The model is based on population process concepts of how a species responds to environment, attempting to characterise growth and stress responses to weekly climatic conditions. The current version (v. 3; Sutherst et al. 2007) of the program includes six growth indices (temperature, moisture, light, radiation, substrate, diapause/dormancy) over which a 7th, biotic interactions, can be used as a multiplier. There are up to eight stress indices

based on temperature and moisture (heat, cold, dry and wet, and their interactions e.g. hot and dry) plus two constraints to persistence that can be imposed over all others: length of growing season and obligate diapause / dormancy / vernalisation. The various indices and constraints aim to cover the major mechanisms by which terrestrial species respond to their environments.

The model is conceptualized as providing two main “seasons” for the species: one for population growth and one for population survival. This is directly relevant to invasive species as new geographical regions can be determined as holding suitable environments for population persistence or population growth – the latter most related to pest status. In fitting the model, decisions are required about which indices or constraints are relevant to the species, and how to estimate their parameters. Growth indices relate to seasonal population growth and mostly require four parameters to be set (see inset graph). Stress indices are defined by a threshold value and an accumulation rate, and stress is assumed to accumulate exponentially with time. Parameters are often set by starting with template values, then iteratively altering them and assessing the effects of those changes on predicted distributions, usually by comparing with known locations in the native and perhaps invaded ranges (section 6.5.2; Sutherst 2003; Sutherst and Maywald 2005; Kriticos et al. 2011). Experimental results or expert knowledge can be used to set parameters; these may require subjective adjustment so that their information is directly relevant to the long term averaged climate data (section 6.5.4) used in the model. Underpinning the model with as many experimentally derived parameters as possible lowers the reliance on location data and should ultimately produce a more biologically relevant model, provided the experimental data are correct and relevant to field conditions.



Final mapped values include the annual average esoclimatic index (EI; equation 1a,b) and annual average growth index (GI). The model is estimated, though, on weekly data, so seasonal variation in suitability can be inferred. This can be a major advantage over correlative methods if these have not included seasonality predictors (i.e., the vast majority of applications). Variation in climatic suitability across years can also be explored through use of yearly rather than long term averaged data, based on the assumption that these yearly variations are meaningful to the species. Note that the components of the final indices are multiplicative (equation 1a,b), meaning that a low value for any will result in a low prediction. Each component index is scaled equally, from 0 to 1, meaning that each included component contributes equally to the outcome.

$$\text{Weekly Growth Index} = GI_W = TI_W \times MI_W \times RI_W \times SV_W \times LI_W \times DI_W \dots\dots\dots \text{eq'n 1a}$$

where indices on the right side are weekly Temperature, Moisture, Radiation, Substrate, Light and Diapause indices, respectively

$$\text{Esoclimatic Index} = EI = GI_A \times SI \times SX \dots\dots\dots \text{eq'n 1b}$$

where GI_A is the annual growth index (mean of GI_W), SI is the annual stress index (comprising multiplicative cold, dry, heat and wet stresses), and SX is the annual stress interaction index (comprising multiplicative cold-dry, cold-wet, hot-dry and hot-wet stresses).

Authors refer to this as a process oriented or mechanistic model (e.g. Kriticos and Leriche 2010) because (1) the model components consider environmental impacts on the species in a growth/stress framework, similar to process-based population models; (2) growth and stress are calculated for weekly time steps across the year, mimicking population responses. However the common use of species data to help fit CLIMEX models creates a clear distinction from the mechanistic models described in Section 6.3.3.

The strengths of CLIMEX for prediction of potential distributions are that it provides a coherent framework for including a range of information (expert knowledge, laboratory data, geographic locations, records of relative abundance) and simple tools for exploring the effect of competitors / mutualists on species distributions. Its authors have emphasized the importance of understanding both the ecology of the species and the frailty of data, and have invested time and effort into explaining the model and correcting poor applications. The component indices (e.g. figure above) are restricted to being relatively simple and are constructed so they must define physiological limits, meaning that they should predict sensibly outside their ranges. Nevertheless, if the model is predicting to novel climates and if species

locations are the only available data, the model will be uninformed about the species response in those novel climates, as for other SDMs (section 6.5.5).

The structure and assumptions of CLIMEX bring with them limitations for pest risk mapping, as do those of any model. As explained in the issues sections, reliance on location data has consequences for the modelled niche (section 6.5.1) and for sensitivity to sample size (section 6.5.2). The model structure might be incorrect for some species: responses might be more complex or smoother than the programmed piecewise linear model, and growth and stress might not comprise multiplicative responses to variables that are equally weighted. The model mainly focuses on climate, so inference will be limited (particularly for species with few presence records) if other abiotic variables, biotic interactions, dispersal limitations and disturbances also impact presence records. Whilst CLIMEX has been widely applied, many modellers choose alternative methods. Reasons may include: (a) corporate ownership of CLIMEX, influencing cost and willingness of public data modellers to use it; (b) limitation to one software implementation, restricting clever innovations by users, programmable links to other commonly used software (e.g. R), and use of batch files for sensitivity analyses and the like; (c) a perception that the coarse gridded output provides less useful spatial detail than that attainable from SDMs applied to finer scale data. This may well be a false impression, depending on the quality of input data. It is also now an historic problem since finer grain data are now available (Kriticos et al. 2012); (d) temporal extent: the existing climate data packaged with the program spans 1961-1990 and this may not be relevant to recent invasions; (e) possibly an aversion to methods that appear to require more research and perhaps more subjective decisions.

Box 3: Overview of modelling methods for correlative SDMs

A plethora of methods exist for modelling equilibrium species distributions, and a growing body of reviews and texts describes and compares them (Guisan & Zimmermann 2000; Peterson 2006; Thuiller et al. 2008; Elith & Leathwick 2009a b; Franklin 2010; Peterson et al. 2011). Table 1 provides examples of several techniques (with acronyms used hereafter), key references and invasive species mapping examples. All methods have free versions available for public use. Here I will simply give an overview of the main categories of model, and of important differences affecting their use for invasive species modelling.

One set of methods model environments at presence locations, making no comparison with the range of environments in the broader landscape, or at absence sites. Envelope methods are one example. These define the hyper-rectangle that bounds species records in multi-dimensional environmental space, in some cases dealing with relative frequencies of records e.g., by quantifying percentiles of the distribution. Variables can be weighted equally or unequally or the response to the most limiting variable can be used for prediction (as in BIOCLIM, Nix 1986). Related techniques (detailed in Franklin 2010) use distance metrics such as the Gower metric or Mahalanobis distance to predict the environmental similarity between records of occurrence and all unvisited sites. A modern machine learning method, the one-class support vector machine, has also been applied to modelling invasive species (Guo et al. 2005; Drake & Bossenbroek 2009). This focusses on finding boundaries that optimally separate occupied environments from all others. Conceptually, the appeal of this entire group of methods is that it deals directly with the most common type of data available – presence-only records – and requires none of the additional decisions or assumptions about relevant regions, implied absences and so on that the discriminative techniques require. This group is dependent on a representative sample of presence locations (as are others), and is adversely affected by bias in the records (e.g. towards urban centres; Aikio et al. 2010) because there is generally no information on what has been sampled. It is also subject to the usual problems of chance correlations with irrelevant predictors. Some techniques are somewhat biologically unrealistic – e.g. those that equally weight variables. Nevertheless, some of these are currently methods of choice in biosecurity because they are relatively simple to use and interpret.

All other methods require comparison of presence points with some other class. Some were especially developed for modelling equilibrium distributions based on presence-only data (e.g. ENFA, GARP, MaxEnt). Others are techniques designed for modelling binomial (i.e. two class) data (or in some cases counts or continuous responses) which can be adapted in various ways if used with presence-only species records. Examples include regression and classification methods such as generalized linear and additive models (GLMs and GAMs), decision trees, ensembles of trees including boosted regression trees (BRTs) and random forests (RFs). Artificial neural networks (ANNs) are also used. Details of

how these methods work are varied and better left to dedicated publications (Table 1). All are fitted to species records and environmental data. Many rely on additive terms within the model (e.g. GLMs, GAMs, MaxEnt, BRT) which means that even if conditions are suboptimal according to one variable, another can compensate. In contrast, non-parametric multiplicative regression (NPMR; Table 1) is based on multiplicative terms and is therefore more like CLIMEX (Box 2) in model structure. Many are capable of modelling interactions between variables (i.e., the response to one variable depends on the value of another). Common applications of several (e.g. GLMs, GAMs) tend to ignore this capacity, whereas others (e.g. BRTs, RFs, MaxEnt) allow it by default.

Comparisons of methods show that –for modelling species at equilibrium – the methods do vary in their abilities to retrieve known responses and to predict within the training range of the data (Moisen & Frescino 2002; Elith et al. 2006; Heikinnen et al. 2007; Elith & Graham 2009). For instance, MaxEnt, tree ensembles and regression methods flexible enough to fit ecologically plausible relationships tend to perform well. Comparisons for invasive species modelling are more difficult because "truth" about the potential distribution in the invaded range is unknown. There seems to be a general opinion emerging that smoother models (ones less tightly fitted to the known records) are more likely to predict well, because they do not focus on details of the sampled distribution that might result from survey biases, local responses to biota and so on. Smoother models can be fitted for methods capable of highly complex fits by limiting degrees of freedom and model complexity (e.g. Elith et al. 2010; Falk & Mellert 2011). I do not think there is as yet enough information to make strong conclusions about this idea, though the reasoning seems logical. Studies with artificial species would be useful but are rare. More generally, in my opinion a good approach for choosing a method is to select it based on information on its known performance, theoretical considerations of how it works, and technical details including whether its settings can be easily altered and explored and whether it will interface and run well with the types and amounts of data likely to be used. Understanding how a method works, and the implications of default or selected settings, is particularly important for invasive species. Remaining comments on correlative models and particularly the challenges in using them for pest risk mapping are included in relevant issues sections (6.5.1 to 6.5.7).

6.5.2 Issue 2: How species records affect the predicted distribution

All pest risk mapping methods benefit from accurate records from the full native range of the species. This will be universally true, because the aim is to characterise all environments in which the species can persist. 'Accurate' refers to both locational accuracy (do the coordinates properly represent the sample, to a precision relevant to the grain of the environmental data?) and taxonomic accuracy - e.g. is this record truly for this species? (Funk & Richardson 2002; Reddy & Davalos 2003; Schulman et al. 2007; Hortal et al. 2008; Elith & Leathwick 2009b; Robertson et al. 2010; Anderson 2012); which is the correct taxonomic unit? (e.g. is the invasive pathogen a subspecies? - Elith et al. 2013). Record date is also important to accuracy because the record needs to be relevant to the temporal range covered by the available predictors.

Number of records, and their frequency in both environmental and geographic space, has varying importance depending on the modelling method. For instance, CLIMEX is affected by the number of records to varying degrees depending on the amount of physiological data. Without such data, CLIMEX requires at least one record in each of the important combinations of environmental conditions (as defined by the axes of the environmental space described by the predictors) inhabited by the species (Lawson et al. 2010). Geographic proximity of records is unimportant in CLIMEX, and having more than one record in a given environmental combination does not help model fitting except to confirm that such conditions are suitable. However, few records limit the number of parameters that can be meaningfully fitted in CLIMEX if the records are from location with similar climates. In such cases, some indices would have to remain undefined, or a range of values fitted and their effect on the outcome evaluated (Van Klinken et al. 2009). Similar limitations apply to correlative SDMs because response data (in this case, species records) are needed to fit model parameters, and few records limit how many parameters can be fitted - i.e., they limit the complexity of the model (in regression this concept is called "events per variable"; Harrell 2006). Further, most correlative SDM methods use the relative frequency of records in different environments to make inference on relative suitability, so sample bias will affect them. This problem is particularly severe for presence-only data (i.e. records of presence, unaccompanied by records of absence) because the lack of surveyed absences means there is no information in the data on what sites have been sampled (Phillips et al. 2009). A model may reflect the bias in the records more than the distribution of the species. There appears little research targeted at defining typical biases for invasive species records (e.g., do collectors tend to record presences in unexpected

environments rather than randomly?), though in the equilibrium SDM literature research on quantifying biases and on methods for dealing with them in models are gradually emerging (e.g. Hortal et al. 2008; Phillips et al. 2009; Fithian and Hastie 2012; and for invasive species: Wu et al. 2005, Wolmarans et al. 2010). These need ongoing attention. Some correlative SDMs are also affected by proximity of records in geographic space because they assume that each record is an independent sample, which is untrue for records in close proximity (Legendre 1993). Discussion of spatial autocorrelation in model residuals is relevant here (Bio et al. 2002; Rangel et al. 2006; Dormann et al. 2007). All of these considerations imply that data need to be carefully screened before use. This is particularly important when using data from online databases because errors and duplication of records are extremely common (Graham et al. 2004; Robertson et al. 2010).

The type of data (e.g. presence-only, presence-absence, or abundance) is also important. Presence-only data are most often mentioned and used in invasive species SDMs because they are the most common type available, and efforts at digitizing and correcting them are active and ongoing (Graham et al. 2004, and see sources for data in Woodbury & Weinstein 2008; Herborg et al. 2009,). Rapidly developing technologies offer intriguing possibilities for gathering and storing data (including citizen science projects, and use of mobile phones to capture images and upload data). However there are many reasons for preferring presence-absence data for correlative modelling, because they provide information on what has been surveyed, as discussed in the next section. Abundance data would be even more useful for invasive species, if they indicated relative fitness of the species across a landscape (see, for example, Olfert et al. 2006, Hooten et al. 2007, van Klinken et al. 2009). Several SDM methods can use, or at least be informed by, abundance data including CLIMEX and generalized regression methods that can model count data (e.g. Poisson regression; Potts & Elith 2006; Fithian and Hastie 2012). For invasive species, presence-absence and abundance data will only be reliable in regions occupied long enough for the species to have had opportunity to persist (and reach stable population states, in the case of abundance data), or to die out. Because the aim is to characterise suitable conditions as comprehensively as possible (Section 6.5.1), it is worth gathering all reliable records that are available (i.e. from multiple sources and surveys, but without creating duplicates). Combining data across different surveys does create some difficulties, though, because differing survey efforts will result in differing densities of presence records (Hulme and Weser 2011; Fithian and Hastie 2012).

A final consideration is whether to restrict the model to one based on native range data, or include records from the invaded range. Use of presence or abundance records from the invaded range is a two-edged sword. Their advantage is that they are likely to expand the range of environments and biota represented in the data (Jiménez Valverde et al. 2011), and hence can potentially edge the modelled niche towards the fundamental niche. This is the logic in using them in CLIMEX (e.g. van Klinken et al. 2009); it can also be useful for strict presence-only (one-class) methods (e.g. Booth 1990), though the lack of equilibrium in the invaded range brings difficulties for interpreting relative frequencies of occurrence in places with active invasion fronts. For two-class methods (Box 3) use of such records creates additional conceptual problems in relation to how to set the non-positive case (see next section), and how to make a composite dataset that reflects even survey effort. Even so, several studies support use of some invaded range data (e.g. Broennimann & Guisan 2008). In the extreme – that is, the majority of data from invaded ranges - the lack of equilibrium in that range is certain to cause problems for correlative models unless sophisticated models are used – ones that adjust for variation in propagule pressure and the geographic (spatial) processes of spread (Rouget and Richardson 2003; Cook et al. 2007; Williams et al. 2008; Elith et al. 2010). All of these problems relating to lack of equilibrium in the invaded range stem from violation of the basic assumption of SDMs (Franklin 2010), that records are sufficiently well structured to give information on the environments suitable for the species. A species that is spreading will have records that mix environmental preferences with spatial dispersal limitations, and the effects are difficult to untangle.

6.5.3: Issue 3: The different views of background records, pseudo-absences and absences

As mentioned in Box 3, many correlative SDM methods applied to presence-only data compare the presence records (the positive case) with another case. This approach is used for equilibrium SDMs based on natural history collections (museums, herbaria, on-line data portals; Graham et al. 2004) and for quantifying resource use by animals within available areas (Manly 2002). The meaning of the non-positive case varies in subtle but important ways. For some methods and interpretations, non-positive is taken to mean background or landscape or available locations – conditions that can be characterized independently of where the species is present. That interpretation

applies to ENFA and MaxEnt, and some modellers also view it as the best approach for modelling presence-only data with logistic regression. Presence-background enables a coherent view of how to use regression models for such data (Phillips et al. 2009; Ward et al. 2009; Keating & Cherry 2004; Phillips & Elith 2011; Fithian and Hastie 2012). So far, most uses of regression (e.g. GLMs, GAMs, BRT) with presence-only / background data use naïve models. These do not specifically deal with the problems of presence-only / background data (e.g., that the background points might have a presence at or near them), and do not attempt to model the actual probability of presence because prevalence is unknown (e.g. Elith et al. 2006). Whilst these appear to work reasonably well in some cases, they are not ideal, and current statistical research unifying ideas of density estimation, Inhomogeneous Poisson Process (IPP) models and logistic regression (Fithian and Hastie 2012) propose useful new ideas.

Other viewpoints treat the non-positive case as absence or pseudo-absence. The name "pseudo-absence" is used interchangeably in the literature to refer to either background or implied absence, but here it will mean implied absence. Methods that avoid presence records in sampling pseudo-absences implicitly accept this second view of the data – these include GARP and some uses of regression. For regression, pseudo-absences are either placed anywhere except where presences occur, or outside a geographic or environmental buffer around presence records. For instance, Engler et al. (2004) used one model to discover areas with low predicted probability of presence, then sampled these to use as pseudo-absences in regression. The species modelling literature (for both equilibrium and invasive species) includes several suggestions about how to establish sensible locations for pseudo-absences or to define reliable absences in the absence of surveyed absences (LeMaitre et al. 2008; Lobo et al. 2010). In my opinion the "background" viewpoint requires fewer ad-hoc decisions and allows a more rigorous statistical framework.

Across both of these interpretations, correlative models require decisions about the extent (i.e. the landscape area) to be sampled for background or pseudo-absence points. Users of GARP and MaxEnt have not always understood the importance of this decision, failing to recognise that the model samples background from any region with data in the GIS predictor variables. So, for instance, if global maps are used without masks for a species whose native range is within South America, background will be sampled from the whole world. This implies that the species has had opportunity to reach anywhere, and only occurs in South America (Figure 2). Such unlimited dispersal opportunity is generally uncommon. Instead, background extent should be restricted to a region or to continents that could reasonably be assumed to have been available to the species (Barve et al. 2011; Elith et al. 2011)

True absence data (through comprehensive survey) are relatively rare, but bring several advantages. For instance, absence data provide information on what has been surveyed, and overcome many problems in survey bias. For invasive species modelling, they are only likely to be useful in the native range, unless there is clear evidence in the invaded range that the species has had sufficient time and opportunity to spread to, and persist in, surveyed areas or unless specialised models are used (e.g. Václavík & Meentemeyer 2009). There has been some discussion of the disadvantages of absence data in the correlative distribution modelling literature, though to my mind this is overstated. Biotic interactions, dispersal constraints and disturbances affect the distribution of absences (e.g., Jiménez-Valverde et al. 2008) but presence records will be affected similarly, so this seems a weak argument against absence data (Elith et al. 2011). Presence-absence records remove the need to assume random surveys or deal with survey bias, and so are valuable and worth collecting. The important problem with survey-based absence records stems from imperfect detection (i.e. false negative records; Jiménez-Valverde et al. 2008; Hirzel and Le Lay 2008), though there are a number of methods available now for dealing with imperfect detection in correlative SDMs (e.g. Wintle et al. 2004; Eraud et al. 2007; Hooten et al. 2007). Also, data need to be used at a grain (spatial resolution) relevant to the species and application, meaning that fine-scale absences may not be informative (e.g. Falk and Mellert 2011). CLIMEX does not formally use absence data, though information on absence is required or assumed in fitting stress indices (which bound the geographic distribution). In the face of considerable uncertainty about absence, the effect of various assumptions could be explored in sensitivity analyses of the parameters limiting the stress indices.

What this all means for invasive species modelling is that that user needs to be aware of the assumptions of their method and the requirements for background / absence data. Concepts of the niche and of accessible environments are important (section 6.3). I expect it will take some time to come to a coherent view of the best way to treat these data in correlative methods, so users need to stay abreast of developments.

6.5.4 Issue 4: Choice of predictor variables.

SDMs for invasive species usually focus on climatic variables. This is partly because climate dominates distributions at global scales (see discussion of scale in Elith and Leathwick 2009), and partly because the only globally coherent terrestrial datasets to date have been climate-based, usually long-term averaged data (see Woodbury and Weinstein 2008, Herborg et al. 2009, Franklin 2010 for examples and sources). The latter is changing quickly. For terrestrial species, soils, topographic data, and measures of climate variability are being prepared globally, some at fine resolution (B. McGill and R. Guralnick, pers. comm.), and coarse resolution marine datasets are now available with a suite of useful predictors (e.g. Tyberghein et al. 2011). Methods are also developed for modelling river networks and summarising environmental conditions throughout the network, taking connectivity into account (Leathwick et al. 2008), though global rivers databases suitable for modelling are currently unavailable. It is reasonable to expect substantial improvements within the next ten years in the quality and quantity of globally complete and biologically relevant predictors for both marine and terrestrial ecosystems. Additional predictors will provide more opportunity to select scales relevant to the modelling problem, and predictors most directly relevant to a species of interest. I expect that predictors that characterise climate extremes and variability will be particularly useful for modelling invasive species, because they characterise processes and impacts important to species' persistence (e.g. Zimmermann et al. 2009)

This issue of selecting ecologically relevant variables for correlative models is particularly important for modelling invasive species, but also discussed in the equilibrium SDM literature. Two viewpoints are evident. The first is that intelligent prior selection of variables, informed by existing knowledge and theory, will create the firmest foundation for a useful model (MacNally 2000, Austin & Van Niel 2011). Mellert et al. (2011) call this hypothesis-driven modelling. Austin (2002) argues strongly for the use of proximal variables that will best represent the resources and direct gradients that influence species. More distal predictors - such as elevation or ocean depth - rarely directly affect species distributions but instead do so indirectly through their relationships with more functionally relevant (proximal) predictors such as temperature. The problem with using distal predictors is that they are only relevant to the species through their correlations with the proximal ones, and these correlations tend to change across landscapes and continents. A model fit in one region cannot be guaranteed to predict reliably to another region with different correlations between variables (Elith et al. 2010; Jiménez Valverde et al. 2011; Dormann et al. 2012). The concept of choosing ecologically relevant variables merges with thinking behind mechanistic models, and some have discussed the possibility of using mechanistic models to provide physiologically informed predictors for correlative models (Morin & Thuiller 2009; Kearney et al. 2010; Elith et al. 2010).

The alternative view, that a model should be given the full suite of available predictors so it can discover the most relevant, is common in data mining / machine learning disciplines. Whilst analyses using machine learning methods and hundreds or thousands of predictors have impressive results in some fields of data analysis, success relies on large and unbiased samples of the measured response, and these are rarely available in ecology.

Many examples exist of careful selection of variables for invasive species modelling including Thuiller et al. (2005), Drake & Bossenbroek (2009) and Rodda et al. (2011). It is also not hard to find examples of the alternative approach - the most common being use of all nineteen temperature and rainfall variables from the Worldclim (Hijmans et al. 2005) dataset. So far there is limited critique in the literature of the effect of these choices, and very few studies include sensitivity analyses of the effect of choices on model predictions. However, examples are emerging (Peterson and Nakazawa 2008; LeMaitre and Thuiller 2008; Rödder and Lötters 2010; Rodda et al. 2011) and I expect they will confirm the importance of informed selection of directly relevant variables. Once a candidate set of variables is selected, iteration between model fitting and evaluation (sections 6.5.6 and 6.5.7) might suggest the need for changes to the set of candidate variables (see Falk & Mellert 2011 for an example).

Issues of variable selection from extensive GIS datasets are not relevant to CLIMEX (Box 2), because the supplied data are limited to a selection of variables available at the time of development and deemed relevant by the authors. These are long term averaged terrestrial climate data (temperature, rainfall, humidity) that are either site-based (corresponding to ~ 3000 meteorological stations world-wide) or gridded at 0.5° (~50km). Additional data can be added by users, and finer resolution gridded data are now available for use within CLIMEX (Kriticos and Leriche 2010; Kriticos et al. 2012).

6.5.5: Issue 5: Novel environments

In many cases models fitted to native range data will be predicting into novel environments. This is true for all methods because it is related to the data used to fit the models. The general problem of using correlative models to predict to new geographic regions is often termed "transferability"; when this involves prediction to new environments "extrapolation" is occurring. Here the interplay between geographic and environmental space comes to the fore: new geographic regions need not, but often do, harbour new environments.

For CLIMEX, it is recommended that parameters are either not set, or that a range of likely options are examined, for indices based on predictor values that are so different in the invaded range that they can't be set with available data (Van Klinken et al. 2009). Much of the early correlative SDM literature on transferability of models failed to determine whether novel environments occur, or used methods for identifying novelty such as simple data summaries or PCAs that – whilst useful – weren't spatially mapped (e.g. Randin et al. 2006). This makes the results difficult to interpret. Mapping novel environments (Williams et al. 2007; Elith et al. 2010) helps interpretation of model output and guides users as to where predictions may be highly unreliable. Novel environments can occur either because the climates in the invaded range are outside the ranges of the training data as assessed on a univariate basis, or because new combinations emerge, implying changed correlations between variables. If environments are outside the bounds of the data (whether in univariate or multivariate space), knowledge of how the model extrapolates is essential (see column on partial plots in Table 1). That is, outside the range of the training data, what trend does the fitted function follow? It is surprising that there has been so little attention to this in the SDM literature for invasive species, though perhaps that reflects the complexity of the topic. Models are usually fitted over multiple predictors, and analyzing extrapolation with partial response plots and the like (i.e. one variable at a time, where the response over the others is held at some constant value; e.g. Figure 3) – whilst useful – does not provide a complete picture. For models including interactions (e.g. models based on decision trees, or regression models with interaction terms), understanding how the model predicts in multi-dimensional environmental space is important (Zurrell et al. 2012).

The main concern is that using a correlative model to extrapolate outside the range of the training data is using it outside the realm of "safe practice". The models have not been developed for this problem, so methods have not been developed for controlling the models appropriately. Research is only now starting to emerge where models have been carefully controlled through choice of predictors, limiting degrees of freedom in transformations of predictors, and controlling the edges of fitted functions e.g. by weighting data (Mellert et al. 2011). I envisage future research on how to fit models that predict well in likely directions of change, how to identify novel environments (including substantially changed correlation structures), and how to control model behaviour to predict in ecologically realistic ways. Simulated data can be useful for exploring how models extrapolate (Fensterer 2010). Modelling methods that have no facility for visualising fitted functions (Table 1) are failing to report vital information, and methods where fitted functions can be controlled (e.g., specialised splines in regression models) will be more easily extended for this application. CLIMEX (Box 2) and NAPPFAST (Magarey et al. 2007) were specifically for invasive species, so have functions that are more likely appropriately controlled (depending on how well the model is developed). There is no reason that correlative models could not also be developed to use prior information from experts or experiments to control how the model extrapolates.

6.5.6: Issue 6: Evaluating predictions

SDMs for species at equilibrium can be evaluated in various ways – for instance, by assessing variable importance and fitted functions and deciding whether the model is consistent with ecological knowledge about the species (Elith & Leathwick 2009b), by exploring the patterns in residuals, and by testing predictive performance, ideally at independent sites not used in model training. Emphasis is usually on the last, and statistical summaries including area under the receiver operating characteristic curve (AUC), kappa, and explained deviance are generally given precedence (Fielding & Bell 1997; Pearce & Ferrier 2000; Franklin 2010)

Some of these methods (particularly the site-based statistical summaries) have been carried over from equilibrium SDM research into invasive species modelling, though they are often not particularly appropriate (Jiménez-Valverde et al. 2011). The aim of model evaluation should be to test whether the model is appropriate for its intended application (Rykiel 1996). Since prediction in the native range is not the aim, the fact that a model can do this successfully is reassuring but not ultimately a strong test. The problem is clear: the potential distribution in the

invaded range is unknown and thus test data are not available. Distributional data in the invaded range are unlikely to provide a reliable test of model performance because the species is likely to be invading and therefore presences may not indicate persistence and absences will be unreliable. More attention should be given to the problem of evaluation, including how to simulate data useful for model testing (Austin et al. 2006; Fensterer 2010). Models need to be assessed for their ecological relevance – for instance, by using expert knowledge, by sourcing additional data especially physiological information, or by comparison with completely independent models that do not use distributional records. Evaluation could also target questions about the sensitivity of the model to choices made in the modelling process (see following section). Methods for perturbing or resampling data that tested model behaviour in environments most common in the invaded range might be also useful. Because the problem of predicting potential invasive distribution is – from a modelling viewpoint – quite similar to the problem of predicting changes in distribution with climate change, progress on evaluation methods in that arena is likely to be transferable to invasive species (see Falk and Mellert 2011 for an interesting example).

6.5.7: Issue 7: Dealing with uncertainty

This section relies on a mix of information from equilibrium SDMs and invasive species applications (including models of spread in invaded ranges) because pest risk mapping examples do not comprehensively address the topic. Uncertainty in predictions emanates from multiple sources including those discussed in previous sections. Whilst there have been a number of theoretical treatments and reviews of sources of uncertainty in correlative equilibrium SDMs and related fields (Elith et al. 2002; Kangas & Kangas 2004; Leyk et al. 2005; Barry & Elith 2006; Ascough et al. 2008; Rocchini et al. 2011), relatively little has been done in practice to characterise the final effect of likely uncertainties on modelled predictions (but see Gutzwiller & Barrow 2001; Dormann et al. 2008; Johnson & Gillingham 2008; Van Niel & Austin 2007; Leung et al. 2012; Elith et al. 2013). This is largely because it is difficult to quantify errors, and the problem seems overwhelming once possible errors are scoped. Uncertainty is only partly characterised by confidence intervals from models (Elith et al. 2002; Kuhn et al. 2006). Rocchini et al. (2011) emphasise the need for "maps of ignorance" to depict areas where the reliability of predictions is either known or unknown, and suggest potential approaches for producing these.

Most research has targeted important components of uncertainty, including bias in species records (e.g. Argaez et al. 2005, Hortal et al. 2008, Rodda et al. 2011), uncertainty in predictors (Kriticos and Leriche 2010; Van Niel and Austin 2007), and differences between modelling methods (Pearson et al. 2006) or different parameterisations of one model (Hartley et al. 2006). Ensembles of correlative methods are favoured by some modellers (e.g. Thuiller 2003, Araujo et al. 2005; Roura-Pascual et al. 2009, Stohlgren et al. 2010, Caphina and Anastácio 2010) as a means of dealing with the sometimes extreme variation in predictions across methods. Their aim is to emphasize agreement of predictions and quantify model-based uncertainty. However, these are not problem-free, particularly for invasive species. Ensemble SDM methods are usually based on standard application of the component modelling methods (e.g. GLMs, GAMs, Mahalanobis distance, BRT) with default settings chosen by the ensemble programmer, and any weighting of the ensemble components based on predictive performance to some set of sites. Since point-based predictive performance is usually impossible to evaluate meaningfully for invasive species, the ensemble components are often simply averaged (Araujo & New 2007). It is unclear whether the variation between components of the ensemble (i.e. between individual methods) is largely due to unrealistic models that have not been thoroughly explored and evaluated, rather than real uncertainty between predictions. In my opinion, use of ensembles is only a good idea if the component models have been rigorously evaluated (e.g. Falk & Mellert 2011). There are several reasons. Available species data sets are rarely so large and error-free that it can be left to a model to "sort out the mess". The shapes of modelled responses require evaluation. Default settings may not be appropriate, – for instance - the model might be too complex (e.g. often the case with machine learning methods using standard settings) or too simple (e.g. only linear fits in GLMs). Extent of extrapolation needs to be evaluated, especially as it interacts with the shape of the modelled response (section 6.5.6).

A useful approach for exploring uncertainty in any model is to fit multiple parameterisations to test the many judgments made in fitting the model (Ray & Burgman 2006; Van Klinken et al. 2009; Taylor Kumar 2012; Elith et al. 2013). Another angle for exploring uncertainty is to ask what type and amount of uncertainty would lead to a changed decision based on the model, or which decision or action is robust to estimated uncertainty (e.g. Moilanen et al. 2006; Yemshanov et al. 2010; Elith et al. 2013). Alternatively, adaptive surveillance approaches can be used by starting with models based on existing information (even if inadequate), then iteratively updating the models

with new information resulting from actions aimed at achieving some mix of management and data collection (McCarthy & Parris 2008; Joslin Moore pers.comm.).

Whilst it might be easier to believe a model is accurate, it is important to face the range of likely uncertainties but to communicate them in a way that aids decision-making and future data collection. Further research – particularly focussing on how to make a practically useful evaluations of uncertainty – will progress informed use of predictions (Venette et al. 2010).

6.6 CONCLUSIONS

Many practitioners will need to use models based on data from the realized niche, whether as a stop-gap measure before better methods are available, or because these might remain one of the only options for many species. An obvious question is which method to adopt. In my opinion, a better question is what expertise to develop, because these models require understanding. A skilled analyst is important for understanding the issues; they can also learn more than one method, and choose ones that suit their data and species. Methods like CLIMEX that have been specifically developed for invasive species have some features that make them safer to use (for instance, the way their indices can be controlled to extrapolate beyond the realised niche) but they will not suit all species nor all situations, and it is useful to continue development of other methods and tools. Some researchers have been optimistic that correlative models will predict with high precision (e.g. Peterson 2003); whilst that may be true for some species at some scales of evaluation, I believe that the issues discussed above makes substantial errors in interpretation and prediction reasonably likely. I am hopeful that ongoing developments will produce models better suited to the task, and tools to help practitioners to better understand predictions and their uncertainties.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Thanks to Terry Walshe, Yvonne Buckley, Matt Hill and Karl Mellert for thoughtful comments on drafts.

REFERENCES

- Ackerly, D. D. (2003). Community assembly, niche conservatism, and adaptive evolution in changing environments. *International Journal of Plant Sciences*, **164**, S165-S184.
- Aikio, S., Duncan, R. P. & Hulme, P. E. (2010). Herbarium records identify the role of long-distance spread in the spatial distribution of alien plants in New Zealand. *Journal of Biogeography*, **37**, 1740-1751.
- Alexander, J. M. & Edwards, P. J. (2010). Limits to the niche and range margins of alien species. *Oikos*, **119**, 1377-1386.
- Anderson, R.P. (2012) Harnessing the world's biodiversity data: promise and peril in ecological niche modeling of species distributions. *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences*, **1260**, 66-80.
- Araújo, M. B. & New, M. (2007). Ensemble forecasting of species distributions. *Trends in Ecology & Evolution*, **22**, 42-47.
- Araújo, M. B., Whittaker, R. J., Ladle, R. J. & Erhard, M. (2005). Reducing uncertainty in projections of extinction risk from climate change. *Global Ecology & Biogeography*, **14**, 529-538.
- Argaez, J. A., Christen, J. A., Nakamura, M. & Soberon, J. (2005). Prediction of potential areas of species distributions based on presence-only data. *Environment and Ecological statistics*, **12**, 27-44.
- Ascough Ii, J. C., Maierb, H. R., Ravalicob, J. K. & Strudley, M. W. (2008). Future research challenges for incorporation of uncertainty in environmental and ecological decision-making *Ecological Modelling*, **219**, 383-399.
- Austin, M. P. (2002). Spatial prediction of species distribution: an interface between ecological theory and statistical modelling. *Ecological Modelling*, **157**, 101-118.
- Austin, M. P. (2007). Species distribution models and ecological theory: A critical assessment and some possible new approaches. *Ecological Modelling*, **200**, 1-19.
- Austin, M. P., Belbin, L., Meyers, J. A., Doherty, M. D. & Luoto, M. (2006). Evaluation of statistical models used for predicting plant species distributions: role of artificial data and theory. *Ecological Modelling*, **199**, 197-216.
- Austin, M. P., Nicholls, A. O. & Margules, C. R. (1990). Measurement of the realized qualitative niche: environmental niches of five eucalypt species. *Ecological Monographs*, **60**, 161-177.
- Austin, M. P. & Van Niel, K. P. (2011). Improving species distribution models for climate change studies: variable selection and scale. *Journal of Biogeography*, **38**, 1-8.
- Baker, R. H. A., Sansford, C. E., Jarvis, C. H., et al. (2000). The role of climatic mapping in predicting the potential geographical distribution of non-indigenous pests under current and future climates. *Agriculture, Ecosystems & Environment*, **82**, 57-71.
- Barry, S. C. & Elith, J. (2006). Error and uncertainty in habitat models. *Journal of Applied Ecology*, **43**, 413-423.

- Barve, N., Barve, V., Jiménez-Valverde, A., *et al.* (2011). The crucial role of the accessible area in ecological niche modeling and species distribution modeling. *Ecological Modelling*, **222**, 1810-1819.
- Bio, A. M. F., De Becker, P., De Bie, E., Huybrechts, W. & Wassen, M. (2002). Prediction of plant species distribution in lowland river valleys in Belgium: modelling species response to site conditions. *Biodiversity and Conservation*, **11**, 2189-2216.
- Bomford, M., Barry, S. C. & Lawrence, E. (2010). Predicting establishment success for introduced freshwater fishes: a role for climate matching. *Biological Invasions*, **12**, 2559-2571.
- Booth, T. H., Nix, H. A., Hutchinson, M. F. & Jovanovic, T. (1988). Niche analysis and tree species introduction. *Forest Ecology and Management*, **23**, 47-59.
- Broennimann, O. & Guisan, A. (2008). Predicting current and future biological invasions: both native and invaded ranges matter. *Biology Letters*, **4**, 585-589.
- Broennimann, O., Treier, U. A., Müller-Schärer, H., *et al.* (2007). Evidence of climatic niche shift during biological invasion. *Ecology Letters*, **10**, 701-709.
- Brunel, S., Branquart, E., Fried, G., *et al.* (2010). The EPPO prioritization process for invasive alien plants. *EPPO Bulletin*, **40**, 407-422.
- Buckley, L. B., Urban, M. C., Angilletta, M. J., *et al.* (2010). Can mechanism inform species' distribution models? *Ecology Letters*, **13**, 1041-1054.
- Burgman, M. A., Breininger, D. R., Duncan, B. W. & Ferson, S. (2001). Setting reliability bounds on Habitat Suitability Indices. *Ecological Applications*, **11**, 70-78.
- Busby, J. R. (1991). BIOCLIM - a bioclimate analysis and prediction system. IN MARGULES, C. R. & AUSTIN, M. P. (Eds.) *Nature Conservation: Cost Effective Biological Surveys and Data Analysis*. Canberra, Australia, CSIRO.
- Capinha, C. & Anastácio, P. (2010). Assessing the environmental requirements of invaders using ensembles of distribution models. *Diversity and Distributions*, **17**, 13-24.
- Chuine, I. & Beaubien, E. G. (2001). Phenology is a major determinant of tree species range. *Ecology Letters*, **4**, 500-510.
- Colwell, R. K. & Rangel, T. F. (2009). Hutchinson's duality: The once and future niche. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, **106**, 19651-19658.
- Cook, D. C., Thomas, M. B., Cunningham, S. A., Anderson, D. L. & De Barro, P. J. (2007). Predicting the economic impact of an invasive species on an ecosystem service. *Ecological Applications*, **17**, 1832-1840.
- Cook, W. C. (1925). The distribution of the alfalfa weevil (*Phytonomus posticus* Gyll.). A study in physical ecology. *Journal of Agricultural Research*, **30**, 479-491.
- De'ath, G. & Fabricius, K. E. (2000). Classification and regression trees: a powerful yet simple technique for ecological data analysis. *Ecology*, **81**, 3178-3192.
- Dormann, C. F., McPherson, J. M., Araujo, M. B., *et al.* (2007). Methods to account for spatial autocorrelation in the analysis of species distributional data: a review. *Ecography*, **30**, 609-628.
- Dormann, C. F., Puschke, O., García-Marquez, J., Lautenbach, S. & Schröder, B. (2008). Components of uncertainty in species distribution analysis: A case study of the Great Grey Shrike *Lanius excubitor*. *Ecology* **89**, 3371-3386.
- Dormann, C. F., Elith, J., Bacher, S., *et al.* (2012 online early). Collinearity: a review of methods to deal with it and a simulation study evaluating their performance.
- Dormann, C. F., Schymanski, S.J., Cabral, J., *et al.* (2012) Correlation and process in species distribution models: bridging a dichotomy. *Journal of Biogeography*, **39**, 2119-2131.
- Drake, J. M. & Bossenbroek, J. M. (2009). *Profiling ecosystem vulnerability to invasion by zebra mussels with support vector machines*, Heidelberg, ALLEMAGNE, Springer.
- Elith, J., Burgman, M. A. & Regan, H. M. (2002). Mapping epistemic uncertainties and vague concepts in predictions of species distribution. *Ecological Modelling*, **157**, 313-329.
- Elith, J. & Graham, C. (2009). Do they? How do they? WHY do they differ? -- on finding reasons for differing performances of species distribution models. *Ecography*, **32**, 66-77.
- Elith, J., Graham, C. H., Anderson, R. P., *et al.* (2006). Novel methods improve prediction of species' distributions from occurrence data. *Ecography*, **29**, 129-151.
- Elith, J., Kearney, M. & Phillips, S. J. (2010). The art of modelling range-shifting species *Methods in Ecology and Evolution*, **1**, 330-342.
- Elith, J. & Leathwick, J. R. (2009). The contribution of species distribution modelling to conservation prioritization. IN MOILANEN, A., WILSON, K. A. & POSSINGHAM, H. P. (Eds.) *Spatial Conservation Prioritization: Quantitative Methods & Computational Tools*. Oxford University Press.
- Elith, J. & Leathwick, J. R. (2009). Species distribution models: ecological explanation and prediction across space and time. *Annual Review of Ecology, Evolution and Systematics*, **40**, 677-697.
- Elith, J., Phillips, S. J., Hastie, T., *et al.* (2011). A statistical explanation of MaxEnt for ecologists. *Diversity and Distributions*, **17**, 43-57.
- Elith, J., Simpson, J., Hirsch, M. & Burgman, M.A. (2013 in press) Taxonomic uncertainty and decision making for biosecurity: spatial models for myrtle/guava rust. *Australasian Plant Pathology*.
- Engler, R., Guisan, A. & Rechsteiner, L. (2004). An improved approach for predicting the distribution of rare and endangered species from occurrence and pseudo-absence data. *Journal of Applied Ecology*, **41**, 263-274.

- Eraud, C., Boutin, J., Roux, D. & Faivre, B. (2007). Spatial dynamics of an invasive bird species assessed using robust design occupancy analysis: the case of the Eurasian collared dove (*Streptopelia decaocto*) in France. *JOURNAL OF BIOGEOGRAPHY*, **34**, 1077-1086.
- Falk, W. & Mellert, K. H. (2011). Species distribution models as a tool for forest management planning under climate change: risk evaluation of *Abies alba* in Bavaria. *Journal of Vegetation Science*, no-no.
- Fensterer, V. (2010) Statistical methods in niche modelling for the spatial prediction of forest tree species. Diploma thesis, Ludwig-Maximilians-University Munich. <http://www.osti.gov/eprints/topicpages/documents/record/277/2903664.html>
- Ferrier, S., Watson, G., Pearce, J. & Drielsma, M. (2002). Extended statistical approaches to modelling spatial pattern in biodiversity: the north-east New South Wales experience. I. Species-level modelling. *Biodiversity and Conservation*, **11**, 2275-2307.
- Fielding, A. H. & Bell, J. F. (1997). A review of methods for the assessment of prediction errors in conservation presence/absence models. *Environmental Conservation*, **24**, 38-49.
- Fithian, W. & Hastie, T. (2012) Statistical models for presence-only data: finite-sample equivalence and addressing observer bias. <http://arxiv.org/abs/1207.6950>.
- Fleishman, E., Macnally, R., Fay, J. P. & Murphy, D. D. (2001). Modeling and predicting species occurrence using broad-scale environmental variables: an example with butterflies of the Great Basin. *Conservation Biology*, **15**, 1674-1685.
- Franklin, J. (2010). *Mapping Species Distributions: Spatial Inference and Prediction*, Cambridge, UK, Cambridge University Press.
- Funk, V. & Richardson, K. (2002). Systematic data in biodiversity studies: Use it or lose it. *Systematic Biology*, **51**, 303-316.
- Gallien, L., Münkemüller, T., Albert, C. H., Boulangeat, I. & Thuiller, W. (2010). Predicting potential distributions of invasive species: where to go from here? *Diversity and Distributions*, **16**, 331-342.
- Gevrey, M. & Worner, S. P. (2006). Prediction of global distribution of insect pest species in relation to climate by using an ecological informatics method. *Journal of Economic Entomology*, **99**, 979-986.
- Graham, C. H., Ferrier, S., Huettman, F., Moritz, C. & Peterson, A. T. (2004). New developments in museum-based informatics and applications in biodiversity analysis. *Trends in Ecology and Evolution*, **19**, 497-503.
- Guisan, A. & Thuiller, W. (2005). Predicting species distribution: offering more than simple habitat models. *Ecology Letters*, **8**, 993-1009.
- Guisan, A. & Zimmerman, N. E. (2000). Predictive habitat distribution models in ecology. *Ecological Modelling*, **135**, 147-186.
- Guo, Q., Guo, Q., Kelly, M. & Graham, C. H. (2005). Support vector machines for predicting distribution of Sudden Oak Death in California. *Ecological Modelling*, **182**, 75.
- Gutzwiller, K. J. & Barrow, W. C. (2001). Bird-landscape relations in the Chihuahuan Desert: Coping with uncertainties about predictive models. *Ecological Applications*, **11**, 1517-1532.
- Harrell, F. E. (2006). General aspects of fitting regression models. *Regression Modeling Strategies: with applications to linear models, logistic regression, and survival analysis*. 2 ed. New York, Springer.
- Hartley, S., Harris, R. & Lester, P. J. (2006). Quantifying uncertainty in the potential distribution of an invasive species: climate and the Argentine ant. *Ecology Letters*, **9**, 1068-1079.
- Hastie, T., Tibshirani, R. & Friedman, J. H. (2009). *The elements of statistical learning: data mining, inference, and prediction, second edition*, New York, Springer-Verlag.
- Heikkinen, R. K., Luoto, M., Kuussaari, M. & Toivonen, T. (2007). Modelling the spatial distribution of a threatened butterfly: Impacts of scale and statistical technique. *Landscape and Urban Planning*, **79**, 347-357.
- Herborg, L. M., Drake, J. M., Rothlisberger, J. D. & Bossenbroek, J. M. (2009). Identifying suitable habitat for invasive species using ecological niche models and the policy implications of range forecasts. IN KELLER, R. P., LODGE, D. M., LEWIS, M. A. & SHOGREN, J. F. (Eds.) *Bioeconomics of invasive species: integrating ecology, economics, policy and management*. New York, Oxford University Press.
- Hijmans, R. J. & Graham, C. H. (2006). The ability of climate envelope models to predict the effect of climate change on species distributions. *Global Change Biology*, **12**, 1-10.
- Hirzel, A. H. & Le Lay, G. (2008). Habitat suitability modelling and niche theory. *Journal of Applied Ecology*, **45**, 1372-1381.
- Hooten, M. B., Wikle, C. K., Dorazio, R. M. & Royle, J. A. (2007). Hierarchical Spatiotemporal Matrix Models for Characterizing Invasions. *Biometrics*, **63**, 558-567.
- Hortal, J., Jiménez-Valverde, A., Gómez, J. F., Lobo, J. M. & Baselga, A. (2008). Historical bias in biodiversity inventories affects the observed environmental niche of the species. *Oikos*, **117**, 847-858.
- Huey, R. B., Gilchrist, G. W. & Hendry, A. P. (2005). Using invasive species to study evolution: case studies with *Drosophila* and salmon. IN SAX, D. F., STACHOWICZ, J. J. & GAINES, S. D. (Eds.) *Species invasions: insights into ecology, evolution and biogeography*. Massachusetts, USA, Sinauer Associates Inc.
- Hulme, P. E. (2003). Biological invasions: winning the science battles but losing the conservation war? *Oryx*, **37**, 178-193.
- Hulme, P. E. & Weser, C. (2011 in press). Mixed messages from multiple information sources on invasive species: a case of too much of a good thing? *Diversity and Distributions*.
- Hutchinson, G. E. (1957). Concluding remarks. Cold Spring Harbour Symposium. *Quantitative Biology*, **22**, 415-427.
- Inglis, G. J., Hurren, H., Oldman, J. & Haskew, R. (2006). Using habitat suitability index and particle dispersion models for early detection of marine invaders. *Ecological Applications*, **16**, 1377-1390.

- Jackson, S. T. & Overpeck, J. T. (2000). Responses of plant populations and communities to environmental changes of the late quaternary. *Paleobiology*, **26**, 194-200.
- Jiménez-Valverde, A., Lobo, J. M. & Hortal, J. (2008). Not as good as they seem: the importance of concepts in species distribution modelling. *Diversity and Distributions*, **14**, 885-890.
- Jiménez-Valverde, A., Peterson, A., Soberón, J., *et al.* (2011). Use of niche models in invasive species risk assessments. *Biological Invasions* **13**, 2785-2797.
- Johnson, C. J. & Gillingham, M. P. (2008). Sensitivity of species-distribution models to error, bias, and model design: an application to resource selection functions for woodland caribou. *Ecological Modelling*, **213**, 143-155.
- Kangas, A. S. & Kangas, J. (2004). Probability, possibility and evidence: approaches to consider risk and uncertainty in forestry decision analysis. *Forest Policy and Economics*, **6**, 169-188.
- Kearney, M. (2006). Habitat, environment and niche: what are we modelling? *Oikos*, **115**, 186-191.
- Kearney, M., Phillips, B. L., Tracy, C. R., *et al.* (2008). Modelling species distributions without using species distributions: the cane toad in Australia under current and future climates. *Ecography*, **31**, 423-434.
- Kearney, M. & Porter, W. (2009). Mechanistic niche modelling: combining physiological and spatial data to predict species' ranges. *Ecology Letters*, **12**, 334-350.
- Kearney, M. & Porter, W. P. (2004). Mapping the fundamental niche: physiology, climate and the distribution of nocturnal lizards across Australia. *Ecology*, **85**, 3119-3131.
- Kearney, M. R., Wintle, B. A. & Porter, W. P. (2010). Correlative and mechanistic models of species distribution provide congruent forecasts under climate change. *Conservation Letters*, **3**, 203-213.
- Keating, K. A. & Cherry, S. (2004). Use and interpretation of logistic regression in habitat selection studies. *Journal of Wildlife Management*, **68**, 774-789.
- Kriticos, D. J. & Leriche, A. (2010). The effects of spatial data precision on fitting and projecting species niche models. *Ecography*, **33**, 115-127.
- Kriticos, D. J., Watt, M. S., Potter, K. J. B., *et al.* (2011). Managing invasive weeds under climate change: considering the current and potential future distribution of *Buddleja davidii*. *Weed Research*, **51**, 85-96.
- Kriticos, D. J., Webber, B. L., Leriche, A., *et al.* (2012) CliMond: global high-resolution historical and future scenario climate surfaces for bioclimatic modelling. *Methods in Ecology and Evolution*, **3**, 53-64
- Kühn, I., Bierman, S. M., Durka, W. & Klotz, S. (2006). Relating geographical variation in pollination types to environmental and spatial factors using novel statistical methods. *New Phytologist*, **172**, 127-139.
- Lawson, B. E., Day, M. D., Bowen, M., Van Klinken, R. D. & Zalucki, M. P. (2010). The effect of data sources and quality on the predictive capacity of CLIMEX models: An assessment of *Teleonemia scrupulosa* and *Octotoma scabripennis* for the biocontrol of *Lantana camara* in Australia. *Biological Control*, **52**, 68-76.
- Le Maitre, D. C., Thuiller, W. & Schonegevel, L. (2008). Developing an approach to defining the potential distributions of invasive plant species: a case study of *Hakea* species in South Africa. *Global Ecology and Biogeography*, **17**, 569-584.
- Leathwick, J. R. & Austin, M. P. (2001). Competitive interactions between tree species in New Zealand's old-growth indigenous forests. *Ecology*, **82**, 2560-2573.
- Leathwick, J. R., Elith, J., Chadderton, L., Rowe, D. & Hastie, T. (2008). Dispersal, disturbance, and the contrasting biogeographies of New Zealand's diadromous and non-diadromous fish species. *Journal of Biogeography*, **35**, 1481-1497.
- Legendre, P. (1993). Spatial autocorrelation: trouble or new paradigm? *Ecology*, **74**, 1659-1673.
- Leung, B., Roura-Pascual, N., Bacher, S., *et al.* (2012) TEASIng apart alien species risk assessments: a framework for best practices. *Ecology Letters*, **15**, 1475-1493.
- Leyk, S., Boesch, R. & Weibel, R. (2005). A Conceptual Framework for Uncertainty Investigation in Map-based Land Cover Change Modelling. *Transactions in GIS*, **9**, 291-322.
- Lobo, J. M., Jiménez-Valverde, A. & Hortal, J. (2010). The uncertain nature of absences and their importance in species distribution modelling. *Ecography*, **33**, 103-114.
- Mac Nally, R. (2000). Regression and model-building in conservation biology, biogeography and ecology: the distinction between - and reconciliation of - 'predictive' and 'explanatory' models. *Biodiversity and Conservation*, **9**, 665-671.
- Magarey, R. D., Fowler, G. A., Borchert, D. M., *et al.* (2007). NAPPFAST: An Internet System for the Weather-Based Mapping of Plant Pathogens. *Plant Disease*, **91**, 336-345.
- Manly, B. F. J., Mcdonald, L. L., Thomas, D. L., Mcdonald, T. L. & Erickson, W. P. (2002). *Resource selection by animals - statistical design and analysis for field studies. 2nd Edition.*, Dordrecht, Kluwer Academic.
- Mccarthy, M. A. & Parris, K. M. (2008). Optimal marking of threatened species to balance benefits of information with impacts of marking. *Conservation Biology*, **22**, 1506-1512.
- Mccune, B. (2006). Non-parametric models with automatic interactions. *Journal of Vegetation Science*, **17**, 819-830.
- Mellert, K. H., Fensterer, V., Küchenhoff, H., *et al.* (2011). Hypothesis-driven species distribution models for tree species in the Bavarian Alps. *Journal of Vegetation Science*, no-no.
- Moilanen, A., Wintle, B., Elith, J. & Burgman, M. (2006). Uncertainty analysis for regional-scale reserve selection. *Conservation Biology*, **20**, 1688-1697.

- Moisen, G.G., Freeman, E. A., Blackard, J. A., *et al.* (2006). Predicting tree species presence and basal area in Utah: a comparison of stochastic gradient boosting, generalized additive models, and tree-based methods. *Ecological Modelling*, **199**, 176-187.
- Morin, X. & Lechowicz, M. J. (2008). Contemporary perspectives on the niche that can improve models of species range shifts under climate change. *Biology Letters*, **4**, 573-576.
- Morin, X. & Thuiller, W. (2009). Comparing niche- and process-based models to reduce prediction uncertainty in species range shifts under climate change. *Ecology*, **90**, 1301-1313.
- Nix, H. (1986). A biogeographic analysis of Australian elapid snakes. IN LONGMORE, R. (Ed.) *Atlas of Elapid snakes of Australia*. Canberra, Australian Government Publishing Service.
- Olfert, O., Hallett, R., Weiss, R. M., Soroka, J. & Goodfellow, S. (2006). Potential distribution and relative abundance of swede midge, *Contarinia nasturtii*, an invasive pest in Canada. *Entomologia Experimentalis Et Applicata*, **120**, 221-228.
- Pearce, J. & Ferrier, S. (2000). Evaluating the predictive performance of habitat models developed using logistic regression. *Ecological Modelling*, **133**, 225-245.
- Pearson, G. P., Thuiller, W., Araujo, M. B., *et al.* (2006). Model-based uncertainty in species range prediction. *Journal of Biogeography*, **33**, 1704-1711.
- Pearson, R. G. (2007). Species' distribution modeling for conservation educators and practitioners. American Museum of Natural History.
- Peterson, A. T. (2003). Predicting the geography of species' invasions via ecological niche modeling. *The Quarterly Review of Biology*, **78**, 419-433.
- Peterson, A. T. (2006). Uses and requirements of ecological niche models and related distributional models. *Biodiversity Informatics*, **3**, 59-72.
- Peterson, A. T., Soberon, J., Pearson, R. G., *et al.* (2011) *Ecological Niches and Geographic Distributions*. Princeton University Press.
- Phillips, S. J., Anderson, R. P. & Schapire, R. E. (2006). Maximum entropy modeling of species geographic distributions. *Ecological Modelling*, **190**, 231-259.
- Phillips, S. J., Dudík, M., Elith, J., *et al.* (2009). Sample selection bias and presence-only distribution models: implications for background and pseudo-absence data. *Ecological Applications*, **19**, 181-197.
- Phillips, S.J. & Elith, J. (2011) Logistic methods for resource selection functions and presence-only species distribution models. *Proceedings of the Twenty-Fifth AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, pp. 1384-1389. San Francisco, USA.
- Porter, W. P., Sabo, J. L., Tracy, C. R., Reichman, O. J. & Ramankutty, N. (2002). Physiology on a landscape scale: plant-animal interactions. *Integrative and Comparative Biology*, **42**, 431-453.
- Potts, J. & Elith, J. (2006). Comparing species abundance models. *ECOLOGICAL MODELLING*, **199**, 153-163.
- Pulliam, H. R. (2000). On the relationship between niche and distribution. *Ecology Letters*, **3**, 349-361.
- Randin, C. F., Dirnbock, T., Dullinger, S., *et al.* (2006). Are niche-based species distribution models transferable in space? *Journal of Biogeography*, **33**, 1689-1703.
- Rangel, T. F. L. V. B., Diniz-Filho, J. A. F. & Bini, L. M. (2006). Towards an integrated computational tool for spatial analysis in macroecology and biogeography. *Global Ecology and Biogeography*, **15**, 321-327.
- Ray, N. & Burgman, M. A. (2006). Subjective uncertainties in habitat suitability maps. *Ecological Modelling*, **195**, 172-186.
- Reddy, S. & Dávalos, L. M. (2003). Geographical sampling bias and its implications for conservation priorities in Africa. *Journal of Biogeography*, **30**, 1719-1727.
- Reusser, D. A. & Lee, H. (2008). Predictions for an invaded world: a strategy to predict the distribution of native and non-indigenous species at multiple scales. *ICES Journal of Marine Science: Journal du Conseil*, **65**, 742-745.
- Richardson, D. M. & Thuiller, W. (2007). Home away from home - objective mapping of high-risk source areas for plant introductions. *Diversity and Distributions*, **13**, 299-312.
- Robertson, M. P., Cumming, G. S. & Erasmus, B. F. N. (2010). Getting the most out of atlas data. *Diversity and Distributions*, **16**, 363-375.
- Rocchini, D., Mcglinn, D., Ricotta, C., Neteler, M. & Wohlgemuth, T. (2011). Landscape complexity and spatial scale influence the relationship between remotely sensed spectral diversity and survey-based plant species richness. *Journal of Vegetation Science*, no-no.
- Rodda, G. H., Jarnevich, C. S. & Reed, R. N. (2009). What parts of the US mainland are climatically suitable for invasive alien pythons spreading from Everglades National Park? . *Biological Invasions*, **11**, 241-252.
- Rodda, G. H., Jarnevich, C. S. & Reed, R. N. (2011). Challenges in Identifying Sites Climatically Matched to the Native Ranges of Animal Invaders. *PloS One*, **6**, e14670.
- Rouget, M. & Richardson, D. M. (2003). Inferring process from pattern in plant invasions: A semimechanistic model incorporating propagule pressure and environmental factors. *American Naturalist*, **162**, 713-724.
- Roura-Pascual, N., Brotons, L., Peterson, A. T. & Thuiller, W. (2009). Consensual predictions of potential distributional areas for invasive species: a case study of Argentine ants in the Iberian Peninsula. *Biological Invasions*, **11**, 1017-1031.
- Rykiel, E. J. J. (1996). Testing ecological models: the meaning of validation. *Ecological Modelling*, **90**, 229-244.

- Schröder, B. (2008). Challenges of species distribution modeling belowground. *Journal of Plant Nutrition and Soil Science*, **171**, 325-337.
- Schulman, L., Toivonen, T. & Ruokolainen, K. (2007). Analysing botanical collecting effort in Amazonia and correcting for it in species range estimation. *Journal of Biogeography*, **34**, 1388-1399.
- Soberón, J. & Nakamura, M. (2009). Niches and distributional areas: Concepts, methods, and assumptions. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, **106**, 19644-19650.
- Steiner, F. M., Schlick-Steiner, B. C., Vanderwal, J., *et al.* (2008). Combined modelling of distribution and niche in invasion biology: a case study of two invasive *Tetramorium* ant species. *Diversity and Distributions*, **14**, 538-545.
- Stohlgren, T. J., Ma, P., Kumar, S., *et al.* (2010). Ensemble Habitat Mapping of Invasive Plant Species. *Risk Analysis*, **30**, 224-235.
- Sutherst, R. W. (2003). Prediction of species geographical ranges. *Journal of Biogeography*, **30**, 805-816.
- Sutherst, R. W. & Maywald, G. F. (1985). A computerised system for matching climates in ecology. *Agriculture, Ecosystems and Environment*, **13**, 281-299.
- Sutherst, R. W., Maywald, G. F. & Kriticos, D. J. (2007). *Climex User Guide v.3*. Melbourne, Australia, Hearne Scientific Software Pty Ltd.
- Taylor, S. & Kumar, L. (2012) Sensitivity Analysis of CLIMEX Parameters in Modelling Potential Distribution of *Lantana camara* L. *PloS One*, **7**, e40969.
- Thomas, C. D. & Ohlemüller, R. (2010). Climate change and species' distributions: an alien future? IN PERRINGS, C., MOONEY, H. & WILLIAMSON, M. (Eds.) *Bioinvasions and Globalization: Ecology, Economics, Management and Policy*. Oxford, U.K., Oxford University Press.
- Thuiller, W. (2003). BIOMOD - Optimizing predictions of species distributions and projecting potential future shifts under global change. *Global Change Biology*, **9**, 1353-1362.
- Thuiller, W., Albert, C., Araújo, M. B., *et al.* (2008). Predicting global change impacts on plant species' distributions: future challenges. *Perspectives in Plant Ecology, Evolution and Systematics*, **9**, 137-152.
- Thuiller, W., Richardson, D. M., Pysek, P., *et al.* (2005). Niche-based modelling as a tool for predicting the risk of alien plant invasions at a global scale. *Global Change Biology*, **11**, 2234-2250.
- Tyberghein, L., Verbruggen, H., Pauly, K., *et al.* (2011 in press). Bio-ORACLE: a global environmental dataset for marine species distribution modeling. *Global Ecology and Biogeography*.
- Václavík, T. & Meentemeyer, R. K. (2009). Invasive species distribution modeling (iSDM): Are absence data and dispersal constraints needed to predict actual distributions? *Ecological Modelling*, **220**, 3248-3258.
- Van Klinken, R. D., Lawson, B. E. & Zalucki, M. P. (2009). Predicting invasions in Australia by a Neotropical shrub under climate change: the challenge of novel climates and parameter estimation. *Global Ecology and Biogeography*, **18**, 688-700.
- Van Niel, K. P. & Austin, M. P. (2007). Predictive vegetation modeling for conservation: Impact of error propagation from digital elevation data. *Ecological Applications*, **17**, 266-280.
- Venette, R. C., Kriticos, D. J., Magarey, R. D., *et al.* (2010). Pest Risk Maps for Invasive Alien Species: A Roadmap for Improvement. *BioScience*, **60**, 349-362.
- Ward, G., Hastie, T., Barry, S. C., Elith, J. & Leathwick, J. R. (2009). Presence-only data and the EM algorithm. *Biometrics*, **65**, 554-563.
- Williams, J. W., Jackson, S. T. & Kutzbach, J. E. (2007). Projected distributions of novel and disappearing climates by 2100 AD. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, **104**, 5738-5742.
- Williams, N. S. G., Hahs, A. K. & Morgan, J. W. (2008). A dispersal-constrained habitat suitability model for predicting invasion of alpine vegetation. *Ecological Applications*, **18**, 347-359.
- Wintle, B. A., McCarthy, M. A., Parris, K. M. & Burgman, M. A. (2004). Precision and bias of methods for estimating point survey detection probabilities. *Ecological Applications*, **14**, 703-712.
- Wolmarans, R., Robertson, M. P. & Van Rensburg, B. J. (2010). Predicting invasive alien plant distributions: how geographical bias in occurrence records influences model performance. *Journal of Biogeography*, **37**, 1797-1810.
- Woodbury, P. B. & Weinstein, D. A. (2008). Availability of spatial data. In: *Forest Encyclopedia Network*. .
- Wu, S. H., Rejmanek, M., Grotkopp, E. & Ditomaso, J. M. (2005). Herbarium records, actual distribution, and critical attributes of invasive plants: genus *Crotalaria* in Taiwan. *Taxon*, **54**, 133-138.
- Yemshanov, D., Koch, F. H., Ben-Haim, Y. & Smith, W. D. (2010). Robustness of risk maps and survey networks to knowledge gaps about a new invasive pest. *Risk Analysis*, **30**, 261-276.
- Ysebaert, T., Meire, P., Herman, P. M. J. & Verbeek, H. (2002). Macroinvertebrate species response surfaces along estuarine gradients: prediction by logistic regression. *Marine Ecology Progress Series*, **225**, 79-95.
- Zimmermann, N., Edwards, T., Moisen, G., Frescino, T. & Blackard, J. (2007). Remote sensing-based predictors improve distribution models of rare, early successional and broadleaf tree species in Utah. *JOURNAL OF APPLIED ECOLOGY*, **44**, 1057-1067.
- Zimmermann, N. E., Yoccoz, N. G., Edwards, T. C., *et al.* (2009). Climatic extremes improve predictions of spatial patterns of tree species. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, **106**, 19723-19728.
- Zurrell, D., Elith, J. & Schröder, B. (2012) Predicting to new environments: tools for visualizing model behaviour and impacts on mapped distributions. *Diversity and Distributions*, **18**, 628-634.

Table 1: Example correlative methods for modeling species distributions

General class	Model (abbreviaition)	Species data ¹	Partial plots ² for effect on response	Comment	References for (a) explaining model; (b) invasive application
Expert model	Habitat Suitability Index (HSI)	expert	Y	Use expert knowledge for shape of species response	(a) Burgman <i>et al.</i> (2001) (b) Inglis <i>et al.</i> (2006)
Expert model	Expert	expert / P	N	Use expert knowledge to select variables and perhaps to inform about presence	(a, b) Rodda <i>et al.</i> (2009)
Climate envelope	BIOCLIM	P	N	Delimits climate envelope only using presence data, sometimes using percentiles. Prediction from most extreme (limiting) variable	(a) Busby (1991) (b) Booth (1988)
Machine Learning	One-class Support Vector Machines (SVM)	P	N	Few uses but being included in some ensembles.	(a) Hastie Tibshirani & Friedman (2009) (b) Guo <i>et al.</i> (2005); Drake & Bossenbroek (2009)
Factor analysis	Ecological Niche Factor Analysis (ENFA)	P-bg	N	Also known as "Biomapper"	(a) Hirzel <i>et al.</i> (2002) (b) Steiner <i>et al.</i> (2008)
Machine Learning	Genetic Algorithm for Ruleset Production (GARP)	P-bg	N	Widely used; final model is an average over best selected rules.	(a,b) Peterson (2003)
Machine Learning	MaxEnt	P-bg	Y	Widely used; complexity of model can be adjusted by choice of features and adjusting regularization	(a) Phillips <i>et al.</i> (2006); Elith <i>et al.</i> 2011 (b) Rodda <i>et al.</i> 2011
Regression	Generalised Linear or Additive Models	various	Y	Statistical regression methods; GAMs allow smoothed data-driven functions	(a) Hastie Tibshirani & Friedman (2009) (b) Mellert <i>et al.</i> 2011

	(GLMs or GAMs)				
Regression	Nonparametric multiplicative regression (NPMR)	various	Y	Implemented in "Hyperniche"; only found invasive examples use invaded range data	(a) McCune (2006) (b) Reusser & Lee (2008)
Machine Learning	Decision tree	various	Y	AKA classification and regression trees (CART); more often used for decision analysis eg on whether species will become invasive or not	(a) Hastie Tibshirani & Friedman (2009); De'ath & Fabricius (2000) (b) Václavík & Meentemeyer 2009 (only in invasive range)
Machine Learning	Ensembles of trees (boosted regression trees, BRT; random forests, RF)	various	(Y)	Most invasive species examples are within ensembles. Automatically model interactions unless stumps used.	(a) Hastie Tibshirani & Friedman (2009) (b) Broennimann et al. 2007
Machine Learning	Artificial Neural Nets (ANN)	various	(Y)	One of the earliest machine learning methods to be used in species modelling; regarded as good general purpose algorithm	(a) Hastie Tibshirani & Friedman (2009) (b) Gevrey and Worner (2006)
Ensembles	Ensembles of any type of models	N/A	N	Several examples emerging, with varied approaches for selecting the component models	(a) Thuiller (2003) (b) Broenniman et al. (2007); Stohlgren et al. (2010)

¹ P = presence only; PA = presence-absence; bg = background; various – can be used with a range of responses; see section 6.5.3 for use with P data

² Y=yes, N=no, (Y)= in some implementations

Figure 1: see Thomas and Ohlemüeller (2010), fig 2.2B. (permissions not obtained for arXiv publication)

=====




Figure 2: Predictions for the distribution of a hypothetical species located in South America (black dots), using (a) background of South America, and (b) background of the whole world. Modelling method: MaxEnt with linear and quadratic features and five candidate predictors (aridity, humidity, mean temperature of the wettest quarter, highest monthly temperature, minimum monthly precipitation). Colours show the logistic output predictions, red high (0.8 to 1.0) and green low (0.2-0.4). All non-zero predictions are within the environmental range of the training data (i.e. the models are not predicting to novel environments).




Figure 3 – Example of tool for exploring components of predictions for the species modelled in Figure 2. The right pane shows components of the prediction (top panel) and partial plots for each predictor; vertical blue lines in these show the conditions at the location indicated by the arrow. This is from an interactive map produced by MaxEnt (Elith et al. 2010)