

This is a repository copy of *Local factors mediate the response of biodiversity to land use on two African mountains*.

White Rose Research Online URL for this paper:

<https://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/129619/>

Version: Accepted Version

---

**Article:**

Jung, M., Hill, S. L L, Platts, P. J. [orcid.org/0000-0002-0153-0121](https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0153-0121) et al. (7 more authors) (2017) Local factors mediate the response of biodiversity to land use on two African mountains. *Animal Conservation*. pp. 370-381. ISSN 1367-9430

<https://doi.org/10.1111/acv.12327>

---

**Reuse**

Items deposited in White Rose Research Online are protected by copyright, with all rights reserved unless indicated otherwise. They may be downloaded and/or printed for private study, or other acts as permitted by national copyright laws. The publisher or other rights holders may allow further reproduction and re-use of the full text version. This is indicated by the licence information on the White Rose Research Online record for the item.

**Takedown**

If you consider content in White Rose Research Online to be in breach of UK law, please notify us by emailing [eprints@whiterose.ac.uk](mailto:eprints@whiterose.ac.uk) including the URL of the record and the reason for the withdrawal request.

**Local factors mediate the response of biodiversity to land use on two African mountains**

Journal:	<i>Animal Conservation</i>
Manuscript ID	ACV-03-16-OM-065.R3
Manuscript Type:	Original Manuscript
Date Submitted by the Author:	07-Nov-2016
Complete List of Authors:	<p>Jung, Martin; Kobenhavns Universitet Statens Naturhistoriske Museum, Center for Macroecology, Climate and Evolution; University of Sussex School of Life Sciences</p> <p>Hill, Samantha; United Nations Environment Programme World Conservation Monitoring Centre; Natural History Museum, Department of Life Sciences</p> <p>Platts, Philip; University of York, Department of Biology</p> <p>Marchant, Rob; University of York, Environment Department</p> <p>Siebert, Stefan; North-West University, Unit of Environmental Sciences and Management</p> <p>Fournier, Anne; Institut de recherche pour le developpement, Research Unit 208 PALOC (IRD MNHN)</p> <p>Munyekenye, Fred; Nature Kenya</p> <p>Purvis, Andy; Natural History Museum, Department of Life Sciences; Imperial College London Department of Life Sciences</p> <p>Burgess, Neil; Kobenhavns Universitet Statens Naturhistoriske Museum, Center for Macroecology, Climate and Evolution; United Nations Environment Programme World Conservation Monitoring Centre</p> <p>Newbold, Tim; United Nations Environment Programme World Conservation Monitoring Centre; University College London, Centre for Biodiversity and Environment Research, Department of Genetics, Evolution and Environment</p>
Keywords:	Birds, Eastern Arc Mountains, Kilimanjaro, Homegardens, PREDICTS, Taita Hills

1 Local factors mediate the response of biodiversity to land use on two African mountains

2 Martin Jung<sup>1</sup>, Samantha Hill<sup>2, 8</sup>, Philip J. Platts<sup>3</sup>, Rob Marchant<sup>4</sup>, Stefan Siebert<sup>5</sup>, Anne Fournier<sup>6</sup>, Fred B.  
3 Munyekenye<sup>7</sup>, Andy Purvis<sup>8, 9</sup>, Neil D. Burgess<sup>1, 2</sup> and Tim Newbold<sup>2, 10</sup>

4 1. Center for Macroecology, Climate and Evolution, the Natural History Museum of Denmark, Copenhagen,  
5 Denmark

6 2. United Nations Environment Programme World Conservation Monitoring Centre, Cambridge, CB3 0DL,  
7 U.K

8 3. Department of Biology, University of York, York, YO10 5DD, U.K

9 4. York Institute for Tropical Ecosystems (KITE), Environment Department, University of York, York, YO10  
10 5DD, U.K

11 5. Unit of Environmental Sciences and Management, North-West University, Private Bag X6001,  
12 Potchefstroom, 2520, South Africa

13 6. IRD - Institut de recherche pour le développement, Research Unit 208 PALOC (IRD MNHN), Paris,  
14 France

15 7. Nature Kenya, Museum Hill, P.O Box 44486 GPO, 00100 Nairobi, Kenya.

16 8. Department of Life Sciences, Natural History Museum, London SW7 5BD, U.K

17 9. Department of Life Sciences, Imperial College London, Silwood Park, Ascot SL5 7PY, U.K.

18 10. Centre for Biodiversity and Environment Research, Department of Genetics, Evolution and Environment,  
19 University College London, Gower Street, London WC1E 6BT, U.K.

## 20 Abstract

21 Land-use change is the single biggest driver of biodiversity loss in the tropics. Biodiversity models can be  
22 useful tools to inform policy-makers and conservationists of the likely response of species to anthropogenic  
23 pressures, including land-use change. However, such models generalize biodiversity responses across wide  
24 areas and many taxa, potentially missing important characteristics of particular sites or clades. Comparisons of  
25 biodiversity models with independently collected field data can help us understand the local factors that  
26 mediate broad-scale responses.

27 We collected independent bird occurrence and abundance data along two elevational transects in  
28 Mount Kilimanjaro, Tanzania and the Taita Hills, Kenya. We estimated the local response to land use and  
29 compared our estimates with modelled local responses based on a large database of many different taxa across  
30 Africa. To identify the local factors mediating responses to land use, we compared environmental and species  
31 assemblage information between sites in the independent and African-wide data sets.

32 Bird species richness and abundance responses to land use in the independent data followed similar  
33 trends as suggested by the African-wide biodiversity model, however the land-use classification was too coarse  
34 to capture fully the variability introduced by local agricultural management practices. A comparison of

---

<sup>1</sup> Current address: School of Life Science, University of Sussex, Brighton, United Kingdom, BN1 9RH:  
[m.jung@sussex.ac.uk](mailto:m.jung@sussex.ac.uk)

1  
2 35 assemblage characteristics showed that the sites on Kilimanjaro and the Taita Hills had higher proportions of  
3  
4 36 forest specialists in croplands compared to the Africa-wide average. Local human population density, forest  
5  
6 37 cover and vegetation greenness also differed significantly between the independent and Africa-wide datasets.  
7  
8 38 Biodiversity models including those variables performed better, particularly in croplands, but still could not  
9  
10 39 accurately predict the magnitude of local species responses to most land uses, probably because local features  
11  
12 40 of the land management are still missed.

13  
14 41 Overall, our study demonstrates that local factors mediate biodiversity responses to land use and  
15  
16 42 cautions against applying biodiversity models to local contexts without prior knowledge of which factors are  
17  
18 43 locally relevant.

19  
20 44 Keywords:

21  
22 45 Biodiversity model; Birds; Eastern Arc Mountains; Homegardens; Kilimanjaro; PREDICTS; Taita Hills;  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2 463  
4 47 **Introduction**

5  
6  
7 48           Humanity drives global biodiversity decline in many different ways (Butchart et al. 2010). Among the different  
8  
9 49 pressures, anthropogenic land-use change has been shown to have the most severe impact on terrestrial biodiversity  
10 50 (Foley et al. 2005; Jetz et al. 2007; Gibson et al. 2011). A change in land use might greatly reduce the amount or quality  
11 51 of habitat available to species, or contribute to landscape fragmentation resulting in declining species abundance and/or  
12 52 local extinctions (Brooks et al. 2002). Therefore it is of particular interest to understand how assemblages of species  
13 53 respond to land use, and if they can persist in a human-modified landscape (Gardner et al. 2007). Statistical biodiversity  
14 54 models are increasingly applied over broad extents to predict the response of species assemblages to land use (Loh et al.  
15 55 2005; Scholes and Biggs 2005; Alkemade et al. 2009; Newbold et al. 2014a; Newbold et al. 2015). Such models can be  
16 56 based on data from many different taxonomic groups, and can inform policy-makers about biodiversity trends and  
17 57 influence ongoing international debates about relevant mitigation schemes (Pereira et al. 2010; Leadley et al. 2014;  
18 58 CBD 2014). However, in generalising across a wide area, such models likely miss local factors that mediate species'  
19 59 response to land use.  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

29 60           Most biodiversity models employ a coarse land-use classification scheme (eg. Scholes and Biggs 2005;  
30 61 Alkemade et al. 2009; Newbold et al. 2014a; Newbold et al. 2015) that cannot capture the full variability of local land-  
31 62 use systems, often missing important land-use categories such as agroforestry (Scholes and Biggs 2005; Newbold et al.  
32 63 2015). Others ignore the differential responses of taxonomic groups (Alkemade et al. 2009), which can be important  
33 64 (e.g., Gibson et al. 2011; Murphy and Romanuk 2014; Newbold et al. 2014a). Some biodiversity models of local species  
34 65 richness and abundance have found environmental variables such as land-use intensity, human population density and  
35 66 metrics derived from vegetation-greenness data to be influential (Newbold et al. 2014a; De Palma et al. 2015). It is  
36 67 however unclear if the inclusion of these variables is relevant in understanding how the local environment mediates  
37 68 biodiversity responses to land use. Similarly it has been shown that functional characteristics can help explain species'  
38 69 varying responses to land use on a broad scale (Owens and Bennett 2000; Flynn et al. 2009; Newbold et al. 2013; De  
39 70 Palma et al. 2015), but to our knowledge no previous studies have evaluated whether those responses are consistent in a  
40 71 local context. Comparing estimates derived from biodiversity models with local independent data, where the detailed  
41 72 environmental conditions are known and taken into account, could help to identify some of the important local factors  
42 73 that mediate biodiversity responses to land use and ultimately provide insight on how to improve the applicability of  
43 74 biodiversity models.  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2 75 Addressing the question of how biodiversity responds to land use is especially important in sub-Saharan  
3  
4 76 Africa, where the congruent and patchy distribution of both biodiversity and human population leads to a high risk of  
5  
6 77 biodiversity loss (Balmford et al. 2001; Burgess et al. 2007a; Pfeifer et al. 2012). In this study we investigated  
7  
8 78 biodiversity responses to land use in two study areas in east Africa each with different geological, evolutionary and  
9  
10 79 land-use history. We explicitly test if (1) the response of avian diversity to land use is different in those study areas  
11  
12 80 compared to a taxonomically and geographically broad Africa-wide model of local biodiversity responses to land use,  
13  
14 81 (2) investigate potential explanations for any mismatches using remote-sensed data and information on species'  
15  
16 82 ecological characteristics and threat status, to identify the local factors that mediate the local response of biodiversity to  
17  
18 83 land use; and (3) make recommendations for additional factors to be included in biodiversity models and sampling  
19  
20 84 choices for biodiversity surveys.

21 85

22  
23 86 **Methods**24  
25  
26 87 *Assemblage composition data*

27  
28 88 To generate African-wide estimates of how local species richness and abundance respond to land use, we used  
29  
30 89 the database of the **Projecting Responses of Ecological Diversity In Changing Terrestrial Systems (PREDICTS)**  
31  
32 90 project (Hudson et al. 2014; [www.predicts.org.uk](http://www.predicts.org.uk)). While these data cover a broad extent, each individual sampling  
33  
34 91 location covered only a small scale (of comparable grain-size to our independent data – see below). We used only the  
35  
36 92 data sources for Africa (extracted 28/07/2014, see Table SI 1) with land use in each site classified as primary vegetation  
37  
38 93 (1285 sites), secondary vegetation (485), plantation forest (441), cropland (612) and urban (33) habitat (see Hudson et  
39  
40 94 al. 2014 for definitions). Note that ‘urban’ land use referred to all areas of human settlement, including rural villages.  
41  
42 95 Additionally, we also used the information on land-use intensity according to the classification developed by the  
43  
44 96 PREDICTS Project, which combines information on management intensity and proportion of each site impacted (SI  
45  
46 97 Table 2; Hudson et al. 2014). This classification was used so that different land uses could be compared across the  
47  
48 98 different studies, both in the African-wide dataset and the independent field data, and necessarily means that some of the  
49  
50 99 variability in land-use systems is omitted.

51 100 We collected independent field data for birds (herein called ‘independent data’) along two transects on the  
52  
53 101 southern slopes of Mount Kilimanjaro, Tanzania and the Taita Hills, Kenya (Figure 1). Both landscapes are known for  
54  
55 102 their long history of human modification (Conte 2010; Heckmann et al. 2014), while having a contrasting geological  
56  
57 103 age (~ 30 mil. years for Taita compared to ~2 mil. years for Kilimanjaro, see Platts et al. 2011), and each has different  
58  
59 104 sets of endemic species (Hemp 2006a; Burgess et al. 2007b). Data on bird species richness and abundance were  
60

1 105 collected visually and audibly using standardized 10-minute fixed-time point counts (Bibby et al. 2000), of 50-m radius,  
2  
3 106 along each of the transects. While more accurate estimates of biodiversity can be obtained by taking into account  
4  
5 107 detection probability (Buckland et al. 2008), our sampling methodology was chosen to match the sampling scheme of  
6  
7 108 bird studies in the PREDICTS database. Because detectability is likely to be higher in more open habitats, which are  
8  
9 109 often those with higher human land-use activity, our estimates of the effects of human land use on biodiversity (from  
10  
11 110 both the African-wide and independent datasets) are likely to be conservative. Point counts (N=147) were located along  
12  
13 111 the two transects to represent the land uses in the African-wide dataset, and were visited twice between March and May  
14  
15 112 2014. Sites were spread across a wide elevational range in both transects (836-2142 m on Taita and 715-1735 m on  
16  
17 113 Kilimanjaro). Some land use types could only be sampled in particular elevational ranges. For example, primary  
18  
19 114 vegetation only occurs in high elevations on both transects (Figure 1, Figure S4-D). Our survey captured local diversity  
20  
21 115 with total sampling effort comparable to similar studies in the African-wide dataset (24 hours on Kilimanjaro and 25  
22  
23 116 hours on Taita Hills, compared with an average of  $35.15 \pm 15.92$  (SD) sampling hours in the African-wide dataset).  
24  
25 117 Seasonal changes in the abundance of certain bird species might introduce bias into our field study; however, a resurvey  
26  
27 118 of some of the sites in the Taita Hills in a different climatic season showed similar responses of avian diversity to land  
28  
29 119 use (Norfolk et al. in press). Species identity was determined following commonly used visual taxonomic guides and  
30  
31 120 assisted by audio recordings from freely available bird-sound databases (Stevenson and Fanshawe 2004;  
32  
33 121 <http://www.xeno-canto.org> ). In total, 172 different bird species were observed at 147 locations in the two study  
34  
35 122 transects. All sites were classified into the same land uses and land-use intensity as in the African-wide dataset: primary  
36  
37 123 vegetation (39 sites), secondary vegetation (31), plantation forest (27), cropland (69) and urban (14); and within these  
38  
39 124 land uses, minimal, light and intense use-intensity. In the analyses, we treated the Kilimanjaro (74 sites) and Taita Hills  
40  
41 125 (73 sites) transects as independent field studies owing to their distance from each other (~100km) and different  
42  
43 126 geological and evolutionary history.

127

#### 128 *Environmental and assemblage-structure data*

129 We tested whether site-specific variation in land-use intensity, human population density, forest cover and  
130 metrics describing vegetation greenness and vegetation removal mediate local responses to land use in the independent  
131 data compared with the African-wide model estimates. We focussed on those variables because previous biodiversity  
132 models have highlighted their importance for biodiversity (e.g. Newbold et al. 2014a) and because they are readily  
133 available. We extracted forest cover in the year 2000 (the most recent year for which percent forest cover estimates are  
134 available at a fine scale) from recently published remote-sensing data at 30-m resolution (Hansen et al. 2013). For  
135 vegetation greenness and vegetation removal measures, we extracted data from the Moderate Resolution Imaging

1  
2 136 Spectroradiometer (MODIS) MOD13Q1 product (the Normalized Difference Vegetation Index; NDVI) at 250-m  
3  
4 137 resolution. Vegetation removal was estimated by calculating the area under the curve of a linear interpolation of NDVI  
5  
6 138 over the three years prior to and including the year of the study following a method first suggested by Tucker et al.  
7  
8 139 (1981), and adjusted for differences in climate seasonality (Newbold et al. 2014a). Mean NDVI over the same time span  
9  
10 140 was used as a measure of average vegetation greenness, to represent continuous gradients of vegetation density not  
11  
12 141 captured by the forest cover dataset. We chose NDVI as our vegetation indicator (rather than, for example, the  
13  
14 142 Enhanced Vegetation Index) for comparability with previous models (Newbold et al. 2014a). For human population, we  
15  
16 143 used Africa-wide high-resolution (100-m) population density (people per km<sup>2</sup>) estimates for the year 2010 (adjusted to  
17  
18 144 match UN national estimates) from the [www.worldpop.org.uk](http://www.worldpop.org.uk) datasets (Linard et al. 2012). Finally, we included local  
19  
20 145 estimates of elevation from the Shuttle Radar Topography Mission (SRTM) at 90-m resolution (Jarvis et al. 2008).

21 146 We investigated the range of species' characteristics within assemblages in both the Africa-wide dataset and the  
22  
23 147 independent sites, because these characteristics can influence responses to land use (Owens and Bennett 2000; Flynn et  
24  
25 148 al. 2009; Newbold et al. 2013; De Palma et al. 2015) and thus might mediate the effect of land use on biodiversity  
26  
27 149 locally. Due to the limited coverage and biased data on non-vertebrate species in publicly available databases, we  
28  
29 150 limited this comparison to avian species in both datasets. The analysis was further restricted to records in the  
30  
31 151 assemblage data that were determined to species level (98.4% of records), and matched to scientific names in the  
32  
33 152 catalogue of life (<http://catalogueoflife.org/>, see Hudson et al. 2014). In this analysis we focus on ecological rather than  
34  
35 153 morphological characteristics as for many of the African bird species in our analysis morphological traits are still  
36  
37 154 unavailable. We calculated assemblages' average geographic range size, habitat specialization and IUCN threat status.  
38  
39 155 To estimate range size, we calculated the log-transformed total area of bird species' extent-of-occurrence range maps  
40  
41 156 (Birdlife International 2012), after first converting the range map to a 1° grid and restricting it to the continent of Africa.  
42  
43 157 Range size were log-transformed after visual exploration of the data revealed a strong right-skew of range sizes. The  
44  
45 158 current IUCN threat status for each species was obtained using an automatic query of the IUCN web-api  
46  
47 159 (<http://api.iucnredlist.org/>; accessed 05/11/2014). We grouped all species with threat categories CR (Critically  
48  
49 160 endangered), EN (Endangered) and VU (Vulnerable) as threatened species, and species currently assessed as NT (Near  
50  
51 161 threatened) and LC (Least concern) as non-threatened; species classified as NE (Not evaluated) or DD (Data deficient)  
52  
53 162 were not included further in the analysis. IUCN threat was included owing to its high relevance to policy and decision  
54  
55 163 makers. Finally, we downloaded information on species' habitat preferences from IUCN to assess the percentage of  
56  
57 164 individuals in assemblages that are forest specialists, defined as those species for which any kind of forest habitat is  
58  
59 165 considered to be of major importance. For each site, we calculated, for all occurring bird species: 1) the average log-  
60  
166 transformed range size; and the proportion of 2) forest specialist species; and 3) threatened bird species.



167

168 *Data analysis*

169 For each site and dataset, we calculated two biodiversity metrics: species richness as the number of unique observed  
170 taxa; and total species abundance as the sum of the abundances of all taxa (corrected where there was varying sampling  
171 effort within the published studies, Newbold et al. 2014a). We first modelled the average impact of land use with the  
172 African-wide dataset, using generalized linear mixed-effects models (GLMMs: Bolker et al. 2009), with a Gaussian  
173 distribution of errors for log-transformed abundance values and a Poisson distribution for species richness. The use of  
174 GLMMs was necessary to account for differences among studies (e.g. differences in sampling methods, sampling effort  
175 and taxonomic group sampled). These differences were accounted for by including the study identity as a random  
176 intercept. We tested if inclusion of taxonomic grouping as a random intercept improved the model (lower Akaike's  
177 information criterion – AIC); it did not. We also tested whether two other random terms improved model fit: 1) any  
178 spatial block of sampled sites, such as point counts along transects; and 2) land use as a random slope nested within  
179 study. For both models, the best random-effects structure (lowest AIC) contained a random slope of land use nested  
180 within study, and a random intercept for study identity. Initial models were constructed using the recorded land-use  
181 category as a single explanatory variable. Average species richness and total abundance in different land uses in the  
182 independent data were then compared with the coefficients of the land-use-only biodiversity model, with  
183 correspondence assessed using Z-statistics (Cohen et al. 2013), defined as  $Z = \frac{b_{independent} - b_{broad-scale}}{\sqrt{SEb_{independent}^2 + SEb_{broad-scale}^2}}$ , where  $b$   
184 equals the slope of the modelled effect and  $SEb$  its standard error. A z-score is a standardized measurement that  
185 quantifies the offset of one value from a normally distributed mean with values smaller than 1.96 generally indicating  
186 non-significant deviations (Cohen et al. 2013). Because of study-level methodological differences we could only  
187 calculate relative biodiversity values. We used primary vegetation as a baseline for both datasets and calculated the  
188 percentage difference in each other land-use category. Some of the differences between the African-wide model and  
189 independent data might be because the independent data focused only on birds. To assess the extent to which this was  
190 the case, we also developed a African-wide model with the same structure but only containing bird data from the  
191 African-wide dataset (1090 sites).

192 To test whether the addition of more environmental information than just land use could improve the  
193 correspondence between the independent data and the African-wide biodiversity model, we developed a second set of  
194 GLMMs of species richness and total abundance using the African-wide dataset. In these models we again fitted land  
195 use, but this time also land-use intensity (including in interaction with land use) and all continuous environmental  
196 variables (see above). We subjected this model to a model-selection process, by fitting models with all possible additive

1 197 combinations of explanatory variables and selecting the model with the lowest AIC value. The goodness of fit (AIC and  
2  
3 198  $R^2$ , assessed against the model-training data) of the new model and the land-use-only model were compared, and we  
4  
5 199 assessed the importance of the included covariates by summing the AIC weights of all models containing each variable  
6  
7 200 (Burnham & Anderson, 2002). To assess the change in correspondence with the independent data both the best-  
8  
9 201 performing model and a land-use-only model were used to predict abundance and species richness at the independent  
10  
11 202 field-study sites, using the environmental variables.

12  
13 203 We tested the residuals of both the land-use-only and the overall best-fitting model for spatial autocorrelation  
14  
15 204 using a Moran's I test. None of the individual studies showed significant autocorrelation within our models (SI Figure  
16  
17 205 2). All analyses were performed in R (ver. 3.2.2, R Core Team 2014) mainly using lme4 (ver. 1.10, Bolker et al. 2009;  
18  
19 206 Bates et al. 2014) for model fitting, AICcmodavg for model selection (ver. 2.0.3, Mazerolle 2015), spdep for spatial  
20  
21 207 autocorrelation tests (ver. 0.5-88, Bivand and Piras 2015) and MODISTools (ver. 0.94.6, Tuck et al. 2014) for obtaining  
22  
23 208 NDVI data.

24  
25 209

## 26 27 28 210 **Results**

29  
30 211 Responses to land use of both biodiversity metrics were largely consistent between the modelled African-wide  
31  
32 212 estimates and the independent data, although there were large discrepancies for some land uses (Figure 2; log-  
33  
34 213 abundance: median absolute  $Z = 0.991$ , range = 0.06 – 5.76, species richness: median absolute  $Z = 0.728$ , range = 0.037  
35  
36 214 – 2.877). The biggest discrepancy between the independent data and the African-wide biodiversity model was for  
37  
38 215 cropland sites: the independent sites (especially in the Taita Hills transect) had much higher total abundance and species  
39  
40 216 richness than predicted from the Africa-wide dataset (Figure 2). This discrepancy became smaller for abundance if the  
41  
42 217 African-wide model was based only on bird data, but this was not the case for the species richness model (SI Figure 3).  
43  
44 218 There was large uncertainty around the means, especially in the African-wide dataset, reflecting a wide range of  
45  
46 219 responses among different studies (SI Figure 1).

47  
48 220 There were considerable differences in local environmental conditions between the Africa-wide and  
49  
50 221 independent field datasets (Figure 3). Mean vegetation greenness (NDVI) of independent sites in primary vegetation,  
51  
52 222 secondary vegetation and plantation forest were lower than the average African site, whereas the opposite was true for  
53  
54 223 cropland and urban sites in the Taita Hills. Forest cover was higher in primary vegetation and cropland at sites on both  
55  
56 224 independent transects. Independent sites had a higher human population density than the average African sites in all  
57  
58 225 land-use categories, especially urban sites, which had up to 2.5 to 4 times higher density than the African-wide average  
59  
60 226 (Figure 3).

1 227 The full model based on the African-wide dataset, and including all environmental variables as explanatory  
2  
3 228 variables, showed a better fit to the data for both total abundance ( $\Delta AIC = 1591.91$ ,  $\Delta r^2_{GLMM} = 0.08$ ) and species  
4  
5 229 richness ( $\Delta AIC = 4562.48$ ,  $\Delta r^2_{GLMM} = 0.02$ ). However, these models still only explained a low proportion of the  
6  
7 230 observed variation in total abundance (marginal  $r^2_{GLMM} = 0.09$ ) and species richness ( $r^2_{GLMM} = 0.03$ ). Across all candidate  
8  
9 231 models, land use, land-use intensity, their interaction, and vegetation removal were of the greatest relative importance  
10  
11 232 for explaining abundance and species richness (for each of these variables, summed AIC weights,  $\sum AIC_w \approx 1$ ). Human  
12  
13 233 population density was of high importance for species richness ( $\sum AIC_w \approx 1$ ), but less important for abundance ( $\sum AIC_w$   
14  
15 234  $= 0.589$ ). Mean vegetation greenness of the three years before the sampling was more important for abundance ( $\sum AIC_w$   
16  
17 235  $= 0.944$ ) than for species richness ( $\sum AIC_w = 0.506$ ). Elevation was not selected among the explanatory variables in the  
18  
19 236 best model, and was of lower importance for both species richness ( $\sum AIC_w = 0.270$ ) and abundance ( $\sum AIC_w = 0.316$ ).  
20  
21 237 Furthermore, elevation did not show a significant correlation with species richness ( $p > 0.05$ ) at the independent field  
22  
23 238 sites. However the abundance of bird species in the Taita Hills decreased significantly with increasing elevation ( $P <$   
24  
25 239  $0.001$ , Figure S4-B). We found the difference between model-predicted values and observed values in the independent  
26  
27 240 data to be quite mixed depending on the model used, the biodiversity metric considered, and the land use in question  
28  
29 241 (Figure 4). For abundance the land-use-only model (average absolute difference = 19.81%) performed slightly worse in  
30  
31 242 predicting relative abundance compared to the best selected model (average absolute difference = 18.83%), while for  
32  
33 243 species richness the land-use-only model predictions were closer to the observed (average absolute difference =  
34  
35 244 15.47%) than those from the best selected model (average absolute difference = 27.44%). A notable exception was  
36  
37 245 cropland, for which the predictions made by the full model with all environmental factors were substantially better than  
38  
39 246 those made by the land-use only model (Figure 4).

39 247 Bird species at our independent sites were on average more wide-ranged species compared to bird species at  
40  
41 248 sites in the African-wide dataset (Figure 5), with the exception of primary forests in the Taita Hills, where significantly  
42  
43 249 more narrow-ranged species were found. Sites in the independent dataset had similar or lower proportions of forest  
44  
45 250 specialist species than the sites in the African-wide dataset, with the exception of primary vegetation and cropland in the  
46  
47 251 Taita Hills where the proportion of forest specialist birds was higher (Figure 5). Our independent sites had similar  
48  
49 252 proportions of threatened bird species as the average site in the African-wide dataset, but higher proportions in primary  
50  
51 253 vegetation in the Taita Hills study area (Figure 5).

52 254

53  
54  
55 255 **Discussion**

1  
2 256 Our results show that independently observed local biodiversity responses to land use are mostly consistent  
3  
4 257 with an African-wide model estimates. While species richness consistently declines with increasing levels of human  
5  
6 258 land use in most cases (Figure 2), the total abundance stays fairly stable. However, the African-wide model showed that  
7  
8 259 responses to land use vary substantially among different studies (Figure S1); this heterogeneity is especially apparent in  
9  
10 260 urban sites, perhaps because local factors, such as vegetation greenness and proximity to nearby forests, mediate  
11  
12 261 responses. It should be noted however that there are only few urban studies in Africa in the database, indicating that  
13  
14 262 there is a need for further research on the effect of urbanization on biodiversity in this continent. We could not detect  
15  
16 263 any influence of elevation on species richness in either of our independent sites or the African-wide dataset. However,  
17  
18 264 bird abundance decreased with elevation in the Taita Hills, which could be explained by the fact that the low elevation  
19  
20 265 areas receive many nutrients and water, thus increasing resources and diversity of land cover available for many bird  
21  
22 266 species. Similarity of species composition decreased with increasing elevational distance between sites (Figure S4-C),  
23  
24 267 thus indicating a turnover of species assemblages with elevation. Land use has likely added to this effect and might  
25  
26 268 have altered the natural elevational gradient in species richness (McCain 2009). The interaction between elevation and  
27  
28 269 land use however could not be tested with confidence as land use in both study transects is not spread equally across  
29  
30 270 elevations (Figure S4-D). In particular, primary vegetation sites are significantly higher in elevation than other land uses  
31  
32 271 (see next section for possible implications of this for the results). The biggest discrepancy between the biodiversity  
33  
34 272 estimates was for cropland: the independent data had higher values of both biodiversity metrics than predicted from the  
35  
36 273 Africa-wide dataset. This might partly reflect the fact that the field survey sampled only birds: bird-only models of the  
37  
38 274 African-wide datasets decreased the mismatch within cropland, at least for abundance (SI Figure 3). Previous research  
39  
40 275 has shown that taxonomic groups can show different responses to land use (Lawton et al. 1998; Schulze et al. 2004;  
41  
42 276 Newbold et al. 2014a). Birds are highly mobile species, often dependent on various habitats in the surrounding  
43  
44 277 landscape (Haslem and Bennett 2008) and show seasonal fluctuations of activity. Therefore our independent field data  
45  
46 278 will reflect neither the whole assemblage present in the study area nor the general effect of land use on biodiversity. The  
47  
48 279 discrepancy emphasizes the need to collect field data for a set of taxonomic groups that are as representative as  
49  
50 280 possible. In addition to real taxonomic differences in responses to land use, it is likely also that surveying of different  
51  
52 281 taxonomic groups is done at different spatial scales, which could also cause apparent differences in responses among  
53  
54 282 taxa (note however that a previous study using the same dataset found little effect of sampling scale on relative  
55  
56 283 differences in diversity among land uses; Newbold et al. 2015). On the other hand, the African-wide model omits  
57  
58 284 several aspects of the local environmental and ecological conditions, which we discuss in the following sections.  
59  
60

285

286 *Impoverished species pool*

1 287 One explanation for the difference in biodiversity between cropland sites on the Taita Hills and the average  
2  
3 288 cropland site in the Africa-wide model could be that the primary vegetation in Taita Hills has already suffered more  
4  
5 289 biodiversity loss than the average primary-vegetation site in the African-wide dataset. The Taita Hills have a high  
6  
7 290 degree of habitat fragmentation and the lowest overall forest cover in all of the Eastern Arc Mountains (Newmark 1998;  
8  
9 291 Platts et al. 2011), reflecting the long history of human modification and disturbance in the area (Newmark 1998;  
10  
11 292 Brooks et al. 1998; Heckmann et al. 2014). Such conditions might have influenced the response of species richness to  
12  
13 293 land use by leaving assemblages that are impoverished and relatively insensitive to further land-use disturbance  
14  
15 294 (Filippi-Codaccioni et al. 2010); the resulting biota might also show different associations between species  
16  
17 295 characteristics and sensitivity than seen in newly impacted regions (Fritz et al. 2009).

18  
19 296 The greater Kilimanjaro area and the Taita Hills have been used by humans for many centuries (Heckmann et  
20  
21 297 al. 2014). Expeditions undertaken by German missionaries visiting Mount Kilimanjaro noted that the land was already  
22  
23 298 extensively used in the 19th century (Börjeson 2009) and similar evidence suggests that the agricultural terraces of the  
24  
25 299 Taita Hills are centuries old (Conte 2010). These sources indicate that both landscapes have experienced human  
26  
27 300 influence for many centuries. The loss of natural vegetation seems to have accelerated in the last century owing to  
28  
29 301 increasing human population density, colonial forestry operations (Brooks et al. 1998; Hemp 2005; Burgess et al.  
30  
31 302 2007b; Platts et al. 2011) and the ongoing shift from traditional forms of crop cultivation to monoculture farming (Soini  
32  
33 303 2005; Hemp 2006b). Biodiversity models would benefit from incorporating estimates of land-use history, but the  
34  
35 304 currently available data (e.g. Klein Goldewijk et al. 2011) are too coarsely resolved to be very useful.

36 305 Our study sites had on average a similar proportion of forest-dependent species in primary vegetation, but a  
37  
38 306 smaller proportion in plantation forest sites than in the African-wide dataset (Figure 5). However, the average number of  
39  
40 307 narrow-ranged and threatened bird species was higher on the Taita Hills compared to sites across Africa, which reflects  
41  
42 308 the high conservation value of large continuous forest in this global biodiversity hotspot (Burgess et al. 2007b), and  
43  
44 309 suggests that not all sensitive species have yet been lost from assemblages at the Taita Hills. It has been suggested that  
45  
46 310 plantation forests could support conservation efforts if appropriately managed (Brockerhoff et al. 2008). However, this  
47  
48 311 does not seem to be the case for our field sites: plantation forests, such as *Eucalyptus*, pine and *Cypress* stands on Taita  
49  
50 312 Hills had lower abundance and species richness than either primary or secondary vegetation (Figure 2), emphasizing the  
51  
52 313 importance of natural vegetation for local biodiversity conservation (Brooks et al. 1998; Farwig et al. 2008; Gibson et  
53  
54 314 al. 2011). Overall, our results support evidence (Owens and Bennett 2000; Flynn et al. 2009; Newbold et al. 2013; De  
55  
56 315 Palma et al. 2015) that accounting for functional characteristics can add precision to African-wide biodiversity models  
57  
58 316 for certain well-studied taxonomic groups.

1  
2 317 It is also possible that the species pool appears impoverished because the reference primary vegetation sites  
3 318 were located at high elevations, which are probably less diverse naturally. However, this is unlikely to explain our  
4 319 results entirely for three reasons. First, cropland had relatively high biodiversity even when compared with secondary  
5 320 vegetation, which like cropland was found at lower elevations in our field study areas. Second, other human land uses  
6 321 didn't have as high biodiversity as cropland despite also being found at low elevations. Third, the observed mismatch in  
7 322 biodiversity in croplands can be best explained by the occurrence of low-intensity agroforestry systems (known locally  
8 323 as '*homegardens*'), which were located at higher elevations than more intensively used croplands.  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17

324

325 *High-diversity cropland*

19  
20 326 Cropland sites in our independent dataset had relatively high diversity and a possible reason could be the  
21 327 management mode, since the majority of these sites were tropical agroforestry systems known locally as  
22 328 '*homegardens*', which occur in mid-high elevational ranges. Tropical homegardens, such as the Chagga homegardens  
23 329 on Kilimanjaro, have many biodiversity-beneficial characteristics of agroforestry systems such as higher indigenous  
24 330 tree density and permanent or semi-permanent cultivation cycles, thus ensuring consistent vegetation cover and  
25 331 provision of valuable microhabitats (Hemp 2006a; Scales and Marsden 2008; Jose 2009). They can thus contribute to  
26 332 the persistence of species in human-modified landscapes (Bhagwat et al. 2008; Kabir and Webb 2008; Gardner et al.  
27 333 2009), a conclusion which our study supports. The landscape context and proximity to nearby remaining forest  
28 334 fragments could also have led to an increase in species richness.  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36

37 335 We show that the cropland sites in our independent dataset have slightly higher forest cover and mean vegetation  
38 336 greenness than the typical cropland site in Africa (Figure 3). These environmental factors might help explain the  
39 337 discrepancies in estimated avian diversity, and led to better predictions of bird diversity in croplands when included in  
40 338 the models (Figure 4). We suggest that more research on broad-scale environmental variables that are locally relevant is  
41 339 needed to improve models of biodiversity responses to land use. In addition to differences in environmental variables,  
42 340 along both independent study transects, cropland sites were composed of slightly more forest-dependent species than  
43 341 the average cropland site in Africa, showing that the local environmental features of cropland are associated with  
44 342 retention of at least some forest species. We suggest that agricultural management practices and land-use dynamics are  
45 343 important factors to consider in biodiversity models, either by considering the intensity of human land use (Newbold et  
46 344 al. 2015), explicitly recognising agroforestry as distinct land-use type (Alkemade et al. 2009), or by including remote-  
47 345 sensed information on vegetation greenness or tree cover in cropland (Pettorelli et al. 2005; Hansen et al. 2013;  
48 346 Newbold et al. 2014a).  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1 347

2  
3  
4 348 **Conclusion**

5  
6 349 We identified important local factors that mediate biodiversity's response to land use. Biodiversity models  
7  
8 350 might be inaccurate if used to predict land-use impacts on biodiversity at local scales if local conditions do not conform  
9  
10 351 to the average conditions seen in the African-wide dataset. This highlights the importance of local surveys that identify  
11  
12 352 the local conditions and influencing variables before applying generalized biodiversity models in a local context. On the  
13  
14 353 other hand, field data sets need to consider a wide, representative set of taxa in order to be representative of  
15  
16 354 biodiversity's response to land use. The inclusion of local land management information, vegetation data from remote  
17  
18 355 sensing, and species characteristics information can make biodiversity models more applicable to local settings.  
19  
20 356 However more research is needed to identify which variables are locally relevant.

21  
22 35723  
24 358 **Acknowledgements**

25  
26  
27 359 We thank all PREDICTS data contributors for their biodiversity data, which was collated using support from the Natural  
28  
29 360 Environment Research Council (NERC, grant number: NE/J011193/2). Furthermore we would like to thank the Climate  
30  
31 361 Change Impacts on Ecosystem Services and Food Security in Eastern Africa (CHIESA) project (<http://chiesa.icipe.org>)  
32  
33 362 for support of the conducted fieldwork. TN was also supported by a Leverhulme Trust Research Project grant. The  
34  
35 363 biodiversity survey of birds on the independent sites has also been supported by the Danish International Development  
36  
37 364 Agency (DANIDA) in form of a travel grant given to MJ (grant no. A26811). We would furthermore like to thank two  
38  
39 365 anonymous reviewers, who have helped to improve the manuscript. The independent field data is available on request  
40  
41 366 from the authors. This is a contribution from the Imperial College Grand Challenges in Ecosystem and the Environment  
42  
43 367 Initiative. PREDICTS is endorsed by the GEO BON.

44  
45 36846  
47 369 **Bibliography**

48  
49  
50 370 Alkemade R, Van Oorschot M, Miles L, et al (2009) GLOBIO3: A framework to investigate options for reducing global  
51  
52 371 terrestrial biodiversity loss. *Ecosystems* 12:374–390. doi: 10.1007/s10021-009-9229-5  
53  
54  
55 372 Balmford A, Moore JL, Brooks T, et al (2001) Conservation conflicts across Africa. *Science* 291:2616–9. doi:  
56  
57 373 10.1126/science.291.5513.2616  
58  
59  
60

- 1  
2 374 Bates D, Mächler M, Bolker B, Walker S (2014) Fitting Linear Mixed-Effects Models using lme4. ArXiv e-print 51.  
3  
4  
5 375 Bhagwat S a., Willis KJ, Birks HJB, Whittaker RJ (2008) Agroforestry: a refuge for tropical biodiversity? Trends Ecol  
6  
7 376 Evol 23:261–7. doi: 10.1016/j.tree.2008.01.005  
8  
9  
10 377 Bibby CJ, Burgess ND., Hill DA, Mustoe SH (2000) Bird Census Techniques, 2nd edn. Elsevier, California  
11  
12  
13 378 BirdlifeInternational (2015) Bird species distribution maps of the world.  
14  
15  
16 379 Bivand R, Piras G (2015) Comparing Implementations of Estimation Methods for Spatial Econometrics. J Stat Softw  
17  
18 380 63:1–36. doi: 10.18637/jss.v063.i18  
19  
20  
21 381 Bolker BM, Brooks ME, Clark CJ, et al (2009) Generalized linear mixed models: a practical guide for ecology and  
22  
23 382 evolution. Trends Ecol Evol 24:127–135. doi: 10.1016/j.tree.2008.10.008  
24  
25  
26 383 Börjeson L (2009) Using a historical map as a baseline in a land-cover change study of northeast Tanzania. Afr J Ecol  
27  
28 384 47:185–191. doi: 10.1111/j.1365-2028.2008.01068.x  
29  
30  
31 385 Brockerhoff EG, Jactel H, Parrotta J a., et al (2008) Plantation forests and biodiversity: oxymoron or opportunity?  
32  
33 386 Biodivers Conserv 17:925–951. doi: 10.1007/s10531-008-9380-x  
34  
35  
36 387 Brooks T, Lens L, Barnes J, et al (1998) The conservation status of the forest birds of the Taita Hills, Kenya. Bird  
37  
38 388 Conserv Int 8:119–140. doi: 10.1017/S0959270900003221  
39  
40  
41 389 Brooks TM, Mittermeier RA, Mittermeier CG, et al (2002) Habitat loss and extinction in the hotspots of biodiversity.  
42  
43 390 Conserv Biol 16:909–923. doi: 10.1046/j.1523-1739.2002.00530.x  
44  
45  
46 391 Buckland ST, Marsden SJ, Green RE (2008) Estimating bird abundance: making methods work. Bird Conserv Int  
47  
48 392 18:91–108. doi: 10.1017/S0959270908000294  
49  
50  
51 393 Burgess ND, Balmford A, Cordeiro NJ, et al (2007a) Correlations among species distributions, human density and  
52  
53 394 human infrastructure across the high biodiversity tropical mountains of Africa. Biol Conserv 134:164–177. doi:  
54  
55 395 10.1016/j.biocon.2006.08.024  
56  
57  
58 396 Burgess ND, Butynski TM, Cordeiro NJ, et al (2007b) The biological importance of the Eastern Arc Mountains of  
59  
60 397 Tanzania and Kenya. Biol Conserv 134:209–231. doi: 10.1016/j.biocon.2006.08.015



- 1 398 Butchart SHM, Walpole M, Collen B, et al (2010) Global biodiversity: indicators of recent declines. *Science* 328:1164–  
2  
3 399 1168. doi: 10.1126/science.1187512  
4  
5  
6 400 CBD (2014) Global Biodiversity Outlook 4. Montreal, Canada  
7  
8  
9 401 Cohen J, Cohen P, West SG, Aiken LS (2013) Applied multiple regression/correlation analysis for the behavioral  
10  
11 402 sciences, 3rd edn. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Mahwah, New Jersey  
12  
13  
14 403 Conte C (2010) Forest History in East Africa's Eastern Arc Mountains: Biological Science and the Uses of History.  
15  
16 404 *Bioscience* 60:309–313. doi: 10.1525/bio.2010.60.4.9  
17  
18  
19 405 De Palma A, Kuhlmann M, Roberts SPM, et al (2015) Ecological traits affect the sensitivity of bees to land-use  
20  
21 406 pressures in European agricultural landscapes. *J Appl Ecol* 52:1567–1577. doi: 10.1111/1365-2664.12524  
22  
23  
24 407 Farwig N, Sajita N, Böhning-Gaese K (2008) Conservation value of forest plantations for bird communities in western  
25  
26 408 Kenya. *For Ecol Manage* 255:3885–3892. doi: 10.1016/j.foreco.2008.03.042  
27  
28  
29 409 Filippi-Codaccioni O, Devictor V, Bas Y, Julliard R (2010) Toward more concern for specialisation and less for species  
30  
31 410 diversity in conserving farmland biodiversity. *Biol Conserv* 143:1493–1500. doi: 10.1016/j.biocon.2010.03.031  
32  
33  
34 411 Flynn DFB, Gogol-Prokurat M, Nogeire T, et al (2009) Loss of functional diversity under land use intensification across  
35  
36 412 multiple taxa. *Ecol Lett* 12:22–33. doi: 10.1111/j.1461-0248.2008.01255.x  
37  
38  
39 413 Foley J, Defries R, Asner GP, et al (2005) Global consequences of land use. *Science* 309:570–4. doi:  
40  
41 414 10.1126/science.1111772  
42  
43  
44 415 Fritz S, Bininda-Emonds ORP, Purvis A (2009) Geographical variation in predictors of mammalian extinction risk: big  
45  
46 416 is bad, but only in the tropics. *Ecol Lett* 12:538–549. doi: 10.1111/j.1461-0248.2009.01307.x  
47  
48  
49 417 Gardner T, Barlow J, Chazdon R, et al (2009) Prospects for tropical forest biodiversity in a human-modified world. *Ecol*  
50  
51 418 *Lett* 12:561–582. doi: 10.1111/j.1461-0248.2009.01294.x  
52  
53  
54 419 Gardner TA, Barlow J, Parry LW, Peres CA (2007) Predicting the Uncertain Future of Tropical Forest Species in a Data  
55  
56 420 Vacuum. *Biotropica* 39:25–30. doi: 10.1111/j.1744-7429.2006.00228.x  
57  
58  
59 421 Gibson L, Lee TM, Koh LP, et al (2011) Primary forests are irreplaceable for sustaining tropical biodiversity. *Nature*  
60

- 1  
2 422 478:378–381. doi: 10.1038/nature10425  
3  
4  
5 423 Hansen MC, Potapov P V, Moore R, et al (2013) High-resolution global maps of 21st-century forest cover change.  
6  
7 424 Science 342:850–3. doi: 10.1126/science.1244693  
8  
9  
10 425 Haslem A, Bennett AF (2008) Birds in agricultural mosaics: The influence of landscape pattern and countryside  
11  
12 426 heterogeneity. *Ecol Appl* 18:185–196. doi: 10.1890/07-0692.1  
13  
14 427 Heckmann M, Muiruri V, Boom A, Marchant R (2014) Human–environment interactions in an agricultural landscape: A  
15  
16 428 1400-yr sediment and pollen record from North Pare, NE Tanzania. *Palaeogeogr Palaeoclimatol Palaeoecol*  
17  
18 429 406:49–61. doi: 10.1016/j.palaeo.2014.04.005  
19  
20  
21 430 Hemp A (2006a) Vegetation of Kilimanjaro: Hidden endemics and missing bamboo. *Afr J Ecol* 44:305–328. doi:  
22  
23 431 10.1111/j.1365-2028.2006.00679.x  
24  
25  
26 432 Hemp A (2005) Climate change-driven forest fires marginalize the impact of ice cap wasting on Kilimanjaro. *Glob*  
27  
28 433 *Chang Biol* 11:1013–1023. doi: 10.1111/j.1365-2486.2005.00968.x  
29  
30  
31 434 Hemp A (2006b) The Banana Forests of Kilimanjaro: Biodiversity and Conservation of the Chagga Homegardens.  
32  
33 435 *Biodivers Conserv* 15:1193–1217. doi: 10.1007/s10531-004-8230-8  
34  
35  
36 436 Hudson LN, Newbold T, Contu S, et al (2014) The PREDICTS database: a global database of how local terrestrial  
37  
38 437 biodiversity responds to human impacts. *Ecol Evol* 4:4701–4735. doi: 10.1002/ece3.1303  
39  
40  
41 438 Jarvis A, Reuter HI, Nelson A, Guevara E (2008) Hole-filled SRTM for the globe version 4. Available from CGIAR-CSI  
42  
43 439 SRTM 90 m database [srtm.csi.cgiar.org](http://srtm.csi.cgiar.org).  
44  
45  
46 440 Jetz W, Wilcove DS, Dobson AP (2007) Projected impacts of climate and land-use change on the global diversity of  
47  
48 441 birds. *PLoS Biol* 5:e157. doi: 10.1371/journal.pbio.0050157  
49  
50  
51 442 Jose S (2009) Agroforestry for ecosystem services and environmental benefits: an overview. *Agrofor Syst* 76:1–10. doi:  
52  
53 443 10.1007/s10457-009-9229-7  
54  
55  
56 444 Kabir ME, Webb EL (2008) Can homegardens conserve biodiversity in Bangladesh? *Biotropica* 40:95–103. doi:  
57  
58 445 10.1111/j.1744-7429.2007.00346.x  
59  
60

- 1 446 Klein Goldewijk K, Beusen A, Van Drecht G, De Vos M (2011) The HYDE 3.1 spatially explicit database of human-  
2 induced global land-use change over the past 12,000 years. *Glob Ecol Biogeogr* 20:73–86. doi: 10.1111/j.1466-  
3 447 8238.2010.00587.x  
4  
5 448  
6  
7  
8 449 Lawton JH, Bignell DE, Bolton B, et al (1998) Biodiversity inventories, indicator taxa and effects of habitat  
9 modification in tropical forest. *Nature* 391:72–76. doi: 10.1038/34166  
10 450  
11  
12  
13 451 Leadley PW, Krug CB, Alkemade R, et al (2014) Progress towards the Aichi Biodiversity Targets: An Assessment of  
14 Biodiversity Trends, Policy Scenarios and Key Actions. Montreal, Canada  
15 452  
16  
17  
18 453 Linard C, Gilbert M, Snow RW, et al (2012) Population distribution, settlement patterns and accessibility across Africa  
19 in 2010. *PLoS One* 7:e31743. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0031743  
20 454  
21  
22  
23 455 Loh J, Green RE, Ricketts T, et al (2005) The Living Planet Index: using species population time series to track trends  
24 in biodiversity. *Philos Trans R Soc Lond B Biol Sci* 360:289–95. doi: 10.1098/rstb.2004.1584  
25 456  
26  
27  
28 457 Mazerolle M (2015) AICcmodavg: model selection and multimodel inference based on (Q) AIC (c).  
29  
30  
31 458 McCain CM (2009) Global analysis of bird elevational diversity. *Glob Ecol Biogeogr* 18:346–360. doi: 10.1111/j.1466-  
32 459 8238.2008.00443.x  
33  
34  
35 460 Murphy GEP, Romanuk TN (2014) A meta-analysis of declines in local species richness from human disturbances. *Ecol*  
36 *Evol* 4:91–103. doi: 10.1002/ece3.909  
37 461  
38  
39  
40 462 Nakagawa S, Schielzeth H (2013) A general and simple method for obtaining R<sup>2</sup> from generalized linear mixed-effects  
41 models. *Methods Ecol Evol* 4:133–142. doi: 10.1111/j.2041-210x.2012.00261.x  
42 463  
43  
44  
45 464 Newbold T, Hudson LN, Hill SLL, et al (2015) Global effects of land use on local terrestrial biodiversity. *Nature*  
46 520:45–50. doi: 10.1038/nature14324  
47 465  
48  
49  
50 466 Newbold T, Hudson LN, Phillips HRP, et al (2014a) A global model of the response of tropical and sub-tropical forest  
51 biodiversity to anthropogenic pressures. *Proc R Soc B Biol Sci* 281:20141371–20141371. doi:  
52 467 10.1098/rspb.2014.1371  
53 468  
54  
55  
56 469 Newbold T, Scharlemann JPW, Butchart SHM, et al (2013) Ecological traits affect the response of tropical forest bird  
57 species to land-use intensity. *Proc Biol Sci* 280:20122131. doi: 10.1098/rspb.2012.2131  
58 470  
59  
60

- 1  
2 471 Newbold T, Scharlemann JPW, Butchart SHM, et al (2014b) Functional traits, land-use change and the structure of  
3  
4 472 present and future bird communities in tropical forests. *Glob Ecol Biogeogr* 23:1073–1084. doi:  
5  
6 473 10.1111/geb.12186  
7  
8 474 Newmark WD (1998) Forest Area, Fragmentation, and Loss in the Eastern Arc Mountains: Implications For the  
9  
10 475 Conservation of Biological Diversity. *J East African Nat Hist* 87:29–36. doi: 10.2982/0012-  
11  
12 476 8317(1998)87[29:FAFALI]2.0.CO;2  
13  
14  
15 477 Norfolk O, Jung M, Platts PJ, et al (in press) Birds in the matrix: the role of agriculture in avian conservation in the  
16  
17 478 Taita Hills, Kenya. *African Journal of Ecology*  
18  
19  
20 479 Owens IPF, Bennett PM (2000) Ecological basis of extinction risk in birds: Habitat loss versus human persecution and  
21  
22 480 introduced predators. *Proc Natl Acad Sci* 97:12144–12148. doi: 10.1073/pnas.200223397  
23  
24  
25 481 Pereira HM, Leadley PW, Proença V, et al (2010) Scenarios for global biodiversity in the 21st century. *Science*  
26  
27 482 330:1496–1501. doi: 10.1126/science.1196624  
28  
29  
30 483 Pettorelli N, Vik JO, Mysterud A, et al (2005) Using the satellite-derived NDVI to assess ecological responses to  
31  
32 484 environmental change. *Trends Ecol Evol* 20:503–510. doi: 10.1016/j.tree.2005.05.011  
33  
34  
35 485 Pfeifer M, Burgess ND, Swetnam RD, et al (2012) Protected Areas: Mixed Success in Conserving East Africa's  
36  
37 486 Evergreen Forests. *PLoS One* 7:e39337. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0039337  
38  
39  
40 487 Platts PJ, Burgess ND, Gereau RE, et al (2011) Delimiting tropical mountain ecoregions for conservation. *Environ*  
41  
42 488 *Conserv* 38:312–324. doi: 10.1017/S0376892911000191  
43  
44  
45 489 R Core Team (2015) R: A language and environment for statistical computing. <http://www.r-project.org/>.  
46  
47  
48 490 Scales B, Marsden S (2008) Biodiversity in small-scale tropical agroforests: a review of species richness and abundance  
49  
50 491 shifts and the factors influencing them. *Environ Conserv* 35:160–172. doi: 10.1017/S0376892908004840  
51  
52  
53 492 Scholes RJ, Biggs R (2005) A biodiversity intactness index. *Nature* 434:45–9. doi: 10.1038/nature03289  
54  
55  
56 493 Schulze CH, Waltert M, Kessler PJA, et al (2004) Biodiversity indicator groups of tropical land-use systems:  
57  
58 494 Comparing plants, birds, and insects. *Ecol Appl* 14:1321–1333. doi: 10.1890/02-5409  
59  
60

- 1  
2 495 Soini E (2005) Land use change patterns and livelihood dynamics on the slopes of Mt. Kilimanjaro, Tanzania. In:  
3  
4 496 Agricultural Systems. pp 306–323  
5  
6 497 Stevenson T, Fanshawe J (2004) Birds of East Africa: Kenya, Tanzania, Uganda, Rwanda, Burundi. T & AD Poyser,  
7  
8 498 London  
9  
10  
11 499 Tuck SL, Phillips HRP, Hintzen RE, et al (2014) MODISTools - downloading and processing MODIS remotely sensed  
12  
13 500 data in R. Ecol Evol 4:4658–4668. doi: 10.1002/ece3.1273  
14  
15  
16 501 Tucker CJ, Holben BN, Elgin JH, McMurtrey JE (1981) Remote sensing of total dry-matter accumulation in winter  
17  
18 502 wheat. Remote Sens Environ 11:171–189. doi: 10.1016/0034-4257(81)90018-3  
19  
20  
21 503  
22  
23 504  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

Review Copy

Table 1: Best-fit model from among those using all possible combinations of explanatory variables for the African-wide dataset. Pseudo-R<sup>2</sup> values were computed following (Nakagawa and Schielzeth 2013).

Model terms	Model	K	AIC	Δ AIC	LogLik	DF (resid)	R <sup>2</sup> (marginal)	R <sup>2</sup> (conditional)
Land use*Land use intensity + log(Population density) + Vegetation removal + mean Vegetation greenness	log-Abundance	34	3844.27	0	-1888.13	1515	0.088	0.876
Land use ~1		22	5436.18	1591.91	-2696.09	2224	0.009	0.879
Land use * Land use intensity + log(Population density) + Vegetation removal + Forest cover + mean Vegetation greenness	Species richness	35	10920.67	0	-5425.34	1984	0.034	0.926
Land use ~1		22	15483.15	4562.48	-7719.58	2834	0.013	0.919
Land use ~1		18	15484.08	4563.41	-7724.04			




Figure 1: Distribution of studies across Africa coloured by taxonomic group. Bars show the number of sites per latitude coloured by taxonomic group. Highlighted countries indicate the location of the independent field study transects, which consisted of sampling sites along two transects near Mount Kilimanjaro (left) and the Taita Hills (right). All sites are coloured by land use. The background to the panels showing the field transects is a hillshade model derived from SRTM 90m indicating the topographic relief of the sites.




Figure 2: The response of species richness and total abundance to land use, from the Africa-wide model and the independent field data. Land-use categories are primary vegetation (PV), secondary vegetation (SV), plantation forest (PL), cropland (CL) and urban (UR). All coefficients are visualized as proportional difference to primary vegetation (PV), which was set at a baseline of 100%. Error bars show one standard error. Labels on top show the Z-statistic, which quantifies the distance between the independent data and the African-wide modelled estimates, taking into account the uncertainty in both cases. Z-statistics further from zero indicate greater mismatch.







Figure 3: Difference in environmental variables in different land uses, between the Africa-wide and the independent field data ('Kilimanjaro' and 'Taita'). Boxes show the inter-quartile range, while lines show the full range of the data (or 1.5 times the upper and lower quartiles if less extreme). Abbreviations as in Figure 2.



36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

Figure 4: Difference between the relative observed biodiversity values at the field sites, and predicted biodiversity values from the best-selected model and a land-use-only model (see Table 1). Predicted values were obtained by applying the models to the estimated environmental covariates at the field study sites. The predicted model estimates were subtracted from the observed field values. Thus, positive values indicate a model predicting lower biodiversity than was observed with overall smaller bars indicating better fit to the observed. Primary vegetation was used as the baseline and abbreviations are as in Figure 2.




Figure 5: Average assemblage structure in terms of bird species' characteristics, for the Africa-wide and the independent ('Taita' and 'Kilimanjaro') datasets, in different land uses. Range size was measured as the average (log-transformed) extent of occurrence across Africa of all bird species recorded at each site, forest specialism was classified based on the IUCN classification of habitat preference, and threat status was from the IUCN Red List (species classified as critically endangered, endangered or vulnerable were considered to be 'threatened'). For each sites, we calculated the average proportions of species classified as forest specialist or as threatened. Proportions of forest specialist and threatened species was arcsin-squareroot transformed to better highlight differences. Error bars show the standard error of the mean.

## Supporting information




Figure S1: For the broad-scale dataset (black points) and the field sites (coloured points), the relative species richness and abundance values (compared to primary vegetation as a baseline) of all land uses for each individual study. The figure shows that our field-study estimates are always within the range of modelled study-level estimates in the broad-scale dataset. Land-use categories are primary vegetation (PV), secondary vegetation (SV), plantation forest (PL), cropland (CL) and urban (UR).

Table S1: Full list and description of studies in the broad-scale dataset. Studies that looked at multiple taxonomic groups were split into individual studies for the analysis.

First author	Year	Journal title	DOI	NrSites	Land use classes	Taxon	SpeciesRichnes
Naidoo	2004	Animal Conservation	10.1017/S1367943003001185	96	Primary Vegetation,Secondary Vegetation,Cropland	Birds	94
Davis	2005	Environmental Entomology	10.1603/0046-225x(2005)034[1081:eodoas]2.0.co;2	12	Primary Vegetation,Plantation forest	Invertebrates	34
Hoffmann	2005	Belgian Journal of Zoology		2	Secondary Vegetation	Mammals	9
O'Connor	2005	Journal of Applied Ecology	10.1111/j.1365-2664.2005.01065.x	11	Primary Vegetation,Cropland	Plants	220
Scott	2006	Biological Conservation	10.1016/j.biocon.2005.07.014	22	Cropland,Secondary Vegetation,Primary Vegetation	Reptiles,Mammals	17
Lachat	2006	Biodiversity and Conservation	10.1007/s10531-004-1234-6	36	Primary Vegetation,Secondary Vegetation,Plantation forest	Invertebrates	1
Bouyer	2007	Biological Conservation	10.1016/j.biocon.2007.04.001	184	Primary Vegetation,Secondary Vegetation,Cropland	Plants,Invertebrates	67
Basset	2008	Conservation Biology	10.1111/j.1523-1739.2008.01017.x	12	Secondary Vegetation,Urban	Invertebrates	3
Graeme Shannon	2008	Journal of Tropical Ecology	10.1017/S0266467408004951	20	Primary Vegetation	Plants	44
Farwig	2008	Forest Ecology & Management	10.1016/j.foreco.2008.03.042	15	Plantation forest,Primary Vegetation,Secondary Vegetation	Birds	114
Henschel	2008	PhD Thesis		86	Primary Vegetation	Mammals	27
Munyekenye	2008	Ostrich	10.2989/OSTRICH.2008.79.1.4.361	272	Secondary Vegetation,Primary Vegetation,Plantation forest	Birds	129
Oke	2009	African Scientist		5	Primary Vegetation,Plantation forest,Secondary Vegetation	Invertebrates	26
Devineau	2009	Biodiversity and Conservation	10.1007/s10531-008-9574-2	211	Cropland,Primary Vegetation	Plants	329
Hylander	2009	Conservation Biology	10.1111/j.1523-1739.2008.01097.x	167	Plantation forest,Primary Vegetation	Plants	224
Hayward	2009	South African Journal of Wildlife Research	10.3957/056.039.0108	84	Primary Vegetation	Other	48
Lehouck	2009	Oikos	10.1111/j.1600-0706.2009.17300.x	204	Primary Vegetation	Other,Birds	39
Nicolas	2009	Biodiversity and Conservation	10.1007/s10531-008-9572-4	24	Secondary Vegetation,Cropland,Primary Vegetation	Mammals	11
Dures	2010	Biological Conservation	10.1016/j.biocon.2009.12.019	39	Primary Vegetation	Birds	81
Jacobs	2010	Journal of Insect Conservation	10.1007/s10841-010-9270-x	6	Primary Vegetation	Invertebrates	46
Haarmeyer	2010	Biological Conservation	10.1016/j.biocon.2009.11.008	17	Secondary Vegetation	Plants	131

1								
2								
3								
4	Marsh	2010	Biological Conservation	10.1016/j.biocon.2010.03.010	90	Primary Vegetation,Secondary Vegetation,Plantation forest	Invertebrates,Birds	62
5	Gaigher	2010	Journal of Insect Conservation	10.1007/s10841-010-9286-2	10	Primary Vegetation,Plantation forest	Other	22
6	Safian	2011	Journal of Insect Conservation	10.1007/s10841-010-9343-x	7	Primary Vegetation,Secondary Vegetation,Plantation forest	Invertebrates	113
7								
8	Neuschulz	2011	Oikos	10.1111/j.1600-0706.2011.19097.x	36	Primary Vegetation,Cropland,Secondary Vegetation	Birds	90
9	Schumann	2011	Biological Conservation	10.1016/j.biocon.2011.06.018	166	Cropland,Primary Vegetation	Plants	1
10	Phalan	2011	Science	10.1126/science.1208742	32	Primary Vegetation,Plantation forest	Birds,Plants	330
11	Granjon	2011	Mammalian Biology	10.1016/j.mambio.2011.06.003	119	Primary Vegetation,Urban,Cropland	Mammals	21
12	D'Cruze	2011	Animal Conservation	10.1111/j.1469-1795.2011.00459.x	9	Primary Vegetation,Secondary Vegetation,Plantation forest	Reptiles	11
13								
14	Muchane	2012	International Journal of Biodiversity and Conservation	10.5897/ijbc12.030	12	Primary Vegetation,Cropland	Other	3
15	Siebert	2012	Plant Ecology and Evolution	10.5091/plecevo.2011.501	92	Primary Vegetation,Secondary Vegetation,Plantation forest,Urban,Cropland	Plants	799
16	Journal Of Ecology and Natural Environment	2012						
17	Wiafe	2012	Environment	10.5897/JENE11.144	64	Primary Vegetation	Mammals	4
18	Malonza	2012	Herpetotropicos		13	Primary Vegetation,Plantation forest	Amphibia	8
19	Norfolk	2012	Agriculture, Ecosystems and Environment	10.1016/j.agee.2012.08.007	30	Primary Vegetation,Cropland	Invertebrates	20
20	Ofori-Boateng	2013	Biotropica	10.1111/j.1744-7429.2012.00887.x	6	Primary Vegetation,Secondary Vegetation	Amphibia	16
21	Oke	2013	African Journal of Ecology	10.1111/aje.12029	5	Secondary Vegetation,Primary Vegetation	Invertebrates	30
22	Adum	2013	Conservation Biology	10.1111/cobi.12006	48	Primary Vegetation,Plantation forest	Amphibia	24
23	Nakashima	2013	African Zoology	10.3377/004.048.0212	5	Secondary Vegetation,Primary Vegetation	Mammals	3
24	Ndang'ang'a	2013	Ostrich	10.2989/00306525.2013.860929	333	Cropland,Secondary Vegetation	Birds	74
25	Reynolds	2013	African Zoology	10.3377/004.048.0217	56	Secondary Vegetation	Birds	78
26	British Journal of Applied Science & Technology	2013						
27	Hassan	2013	Technology	10.9734/BJAST/2014/2200	32	Primary Vegetation	Birds	90
28	CIFOR	2013	www.cifor.org/mla		100	Plantation forest,Secondary Vegetation,Cropland	Plants	500
29	Norfolk	2013	Basic and Applied Ecology	10.1016/j.baae.2013.10.004	36	Primary Vegetation,Plantation forest,Urban	Plants	84
30	Bösing	2014	Journal of Arid Environments	10.1016/j.jaridenv.2014.02.011	6	Primary Vegetation	Mammals	11
31	Wronski	2014	Journal of Molluscan Studies	10.1093/mollus/eyu008	37	Primary Vegetation,Secondary Vegetation	Invertebrates	55
32								
33								
34								
35								
36								
37								
38								
39								
40								
41								
42								
43								
44								
45								
46								
47								
48								
49								




Figure S2: Tests for spatial autocorrelation within the model residuals, showing the distribution of P-values from sets of Moran's tests on the residuals associated with each individual study. Significant autocorrelation ( $P < 0.05$ ) is indicated by the vertical red line.




Figure S3: The response of species richness and total abundance to land use, from the Africa-wide model (open symbols) and the independent field data for cropland (closed symbols). Here, the Africa-wide models are shown for all taxonomic groups (open circles) and for birds only (open triangles). Land-use categories are primary vegetation (PV), secondary vegetation (SV), plantation forest (PL) and cropland (CL). There is no urban category (UR) for comparison as there were insufficient numbers of urban sites in the broad scale dataset for birds. All values are expressed as the percentage of the baseline values in primary vegetation. Error bars show one standard error.






Figure S4: Effect of elevation (in m) on species richness, log-abundance and species composition for our independent field sites at Taita and Kilimanjaro. Generalized linear model with Poisson errors (for Species richness) and Gaussian errors (for log-abundance) were fitted independently for each transect. Changes in composition were assessed as Sorensen similarity index between all pairs of sites and fitted against the absolute difference in elevation between sites using generalized linear models with Gaussian errors. (A) There was no significant effect of elevation on species richness for either transect, but there was a significant effect for log-abundance in the Taita Hills (B). (C) Species assemblage similarity decreases with elevational differences between sites. (D) Distribution of the land-use classes of our independent sites across the elevational range of both study transects. Land use abbreviations as in Figure S1.

Table S2: The PREDICTS project (Hudson et al., 2014, [www.predicts.org.uk](http://www.predicts.org.uk)) land use and land-use intensity matrix to which all study sites have been classified.

	Minimal use	Light use	Intense use
Primary forest (forest composed of native vegetation, which is not known to have been destroyed during historical times)	Any threats identified are very minor (e.g., very light use) or very limited in the scope of their effect (e.g., hunting of a particular species of limited ecological importance).	One or more threats of moderate intensity (e.g., selective logging) or breadth of impact (e.g., bushmeat extraction), which are not severe enough to markedly change the nature of the ecosystem.	One or more threats that is severe enough to markedly change the nature of the ecosystem (e.g., clear-felling).
Primary Non-Forest (native vegetation, which has not been destroyed recently enough for there to be any discernible impact on vegetation architecture)	Any threats identified are very minor (e.g., very light use) or very limited in the scope of their effect (e.g., hunting of a particular species of limited ecological importance).	One or more threats of moderate intensity (e.g., selective logging) or breadth of impact (e.g., bushmeat extraction), which are not severe enough to markedly change the nature of the ecosystem.	One or more threats that is severe enough to markedly change the nature of the ecosystem (e.g., clear-felling).
Mature Secondary Vegetation (previously destroyed vegetation recovering to natural state rather than being managed to maintain it in a non-natural state; architecture, if not diversity, approaching original complexity)	As for Primary Vegetation-Minimal use	As for Primary Vegetation-Light use	As for Primary Vegetation-Intense use
Intermediate Secondary Vegetation (previously destroyed vegetation recovering to natural state rather than being managed to maintain it in a non-natural state; mixed architecture or mid-successional stage of recovery)	As for Primary Vegetation-Minimal use	As for Primary Vegetation-Light use	As for Primary Vegetation-Intense use
Young Secondary Vegetation (previously destroyed vegetation recovering	As for Primary Vegetation-Minimal use	As for Primary Vegetation-Light use	As for Primary Vegetation-Intense use

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	to natural state rather than being managed to maintain it in a non-natural state; mainly ruderal species and simple architecture; early-successional stage)			
12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Secondary Vegetation (indeterminate age) (previously destroyed vegetation recovering to natural state rather than being managed to maintain it in a non-natural state; age indeterminate)	As for Primary Vegetation-Minimal use	As for Primary Vegetation-Light use	As for Primary Vegetation-Intense use
23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30 31 32 33 34 35 36	Plantation forest	Extensively managed or mixed timber, fruit/coffee, oil-palm or rubber plantations in which native understorey and/or other native tree species are tolerated, which are not treated with pesticide or fertiliser, and which are not clear-felled.	Monoculture fruit/coffee/rubber plantations with limited pesticide input, or mixed species plantations with significant inputs. Monoculture timber plantations of mixed age with no clear-felling. Monoculture oil-palm plantations with no clear-felling.	Monoculture fruit/coffee/rubber plantations with significant pesticide input. Monoculture timber plantations with similarly aged trees or timber/oil-palm plantations with extensive clear-felling.
37 38 39 40 41 42 43 44 45 46 47 48 49 50 51 52 53	Cropland	Low-intensity farms, typically with small fields, mixed crops, crop rotation, little or no inorganic fertiliser use, little or no pesticide use, little or no ploughing, little or no irrigation, little or no mechanisation.	Medium intensity farming, typically showing some but not many of the following: large fields, annual ploughing, inorganic fertiliser application, pesticide application, irrigation, no crop rotation, mechanisation, monoculture crop. Organic farms in developed countries often fall within this category, as may high-intensity farming in developing countries.	High-intensity monoculture farming, typically showing many of the following features: large fields, annual ploughing, inorganic fertiliser application, pesticide application, irrigation, mechanisation, no crop rotation.
54 55 56 57 58 59 60	Pasture	Pasture with minimal input of fertiliser and pesticide, and with low stock density	Pasture either with significant input of fertiliser or pesticide, or with high stock density	Pasture with significant input of fertiliser or pesticide, <i>and</i> with high stock density (high enough to cause significant

	( <i>not</i> high enough to cause significant disturbance or to stop regeneration of vegetation).	(high enough to cause significant disturbance or to stop regeneration of vegetation).	disturbance or to stop regeneration of vegetation).
Urban	Extensive managed green spaces; villages.	Suburban (e.g. gardens), or small managed green spaces in cities.	Fully urban with no significant green spaces.

Review Copy

Table S3: Full model selection table for (log-transformed) abundance. All possible combinations of land use (PREDICTS.LU), land-use intensity (PREDICTS.LUI) Land use/Land-use intensity interaction (LUInter), log-transformed human population density (logpop), forest cover (FC2000), elevation (elev), mean NDVI (meanNDVI) and vegetation offtake (yield.ndvi.corr) were fitted. Shown are the model covariates, the parameter count (K), AIC, delta AIC, the Model likelihood (ModelLik), AIC weights (AICWt), log-likelihood (LL) and cumulative AIC weights (Cum.Wt). ModelLik and AICwt are rounded to the fifth decimal for visual display.

Model covariates	K	AIC	Delta AIC	ModelLik	AICWt	LL	Cum.Wt
LUInter + logpop + yield.ndvi.corr + meanNDVI	34	3844.269	0	1.00000	0.29457	1888.13	0.294573
LUInter + yield.ndvi.corr + meanNDVI	33	3845.503	1.234303	0.53948	0.15892	1889.75	0.453489
LUInter + logpop + yield.ndvi.corr + meanNDVI + elev	35	3846.001	1.732176	0.42059	0.12390	-1888	0.577384
LUInter + yield.ndvi.corr + FC2000 + meanNDVI	34	3846.449	2.17982	0.33625	0.09905	1889.22	0.676434
LUInter + logpop + yield.ndvi.corr + FC2000 + meanNDVI	35	3846.626	2.357402	0.30768	0.09063	1888.31	0.767067
LUInter + yield.ndvi.corr + meanNDVI + elev	34	3846.748	2.479162	0.28951	0.08528	1889.37	0.852348
LUInter + logpop + yield.ndvi.corr + FC2000 + meanNDVI + elev	36	3847.765	3.496445	0.17408	0.05128	1887.88	0.903628
LUInter + yield.ndvi.corr + FC2000 + meanNDVI + elev	35	3848.256	3.987263	0.13620	0.04012	1889.13	0.943749
LUInter + yield.ndvi.corr	32	3850.436	6.167005	0.04580	0.01349	1893.22	0.95724
LUInter + logpop + yield.ndvi.corr	33	3850.454	6.185683	0.04537	0.01337	1892.23	0.970605
LUInter + logpop + yield.ndvi.corr + FC2000	34	3851.611	7.342244	0.02545	0.00750	1891.81	0.978102
LUInter + yield.ndvi.corr + FC2000	33	3851.969	7.700208	0.02128	0.00627	1892.98	0.984369
LUInter + logpop + yield.ndvi.corr + elev	34	3852.429	8.160732	0.01690	0.00498	1892.21	0.989348
LUInter + yield.ndvi.corr + elev	33	3852.431	8.162312	0.01689	0.00497	1893.22	0.994323
LUInter + logpop + yield.ndvi.corr + FC2000 + elev	35	3853.589	9.319884	0.00947	0.00279	1891.79	0.997111
LUInter + yield.ndvi.corr + FC2000 + elev	34	3853.966	9.697042	0.00784	0.00231	1892.98	0.999421

1								
2								
3	PREDICTS.LU + PREDICTS.LUI + logpop +							-
4	yield.ndvi.corr + meanNDVI	27	3859.728	15.45902	0.00044	0.00013	1902.86	0.99955
5	PREDICTS.LU + PREDICTS.LUI + yield.ndvi.corr +							-
6	meanNDVI	26	3860.643	16.37373	0.00028	0.00008	1904.32	0.999632
7	PREDICTS.LU + PREDICTS.LUI + logpop +							-
8	yield.ndvi.corr + meanNDVI + elev	28	3861.481	17.2122	0.00018	0.00005	1902.74	0.999686
9	PREDICTS.LU + PREDICTS.LUI + logpop +							-
10	yield.ndvi.corr + FC2000 + meanNDVI	28	3861.597	17.32805	0.00017	0.00005	-1902.8	0.999737
11	PREDICTS.LU + PREDICTS.LUI + yield.ndvi.corr +							-
12	FC2000 + meanNDVI	27	3862.253	17.98379	0.00012	0.00004	1904.13	0.999774
13								-
14	PREDICTS.LUI + logpop + yield.ndvi.corr + meanNDVI	23	3862.341	18.07208	0.00012	0.00004	1908.17	0.999809
15	PREDICTS.LU + PREDICTS.LUI + yield.ndvi.corr +							-
16	meanNDVI + elev	27	3862.545	18.27588	0.00011	0.00003	1904.27	0.999841
17	PREDICTS.LU + PREDICTS.LUI + logpop +							-
18	yield.ndvi.corr + FC2000 + meanNDVI + elev	29	3863.326	19.05705	0.00007	0.00002	1902.66	0.999862
19								-
20	PREDICTS.LUI + yield.ndvi.corr + meanNDVI	22	3863.473	19.2043	0.00007	0.00002	1909.74	0.999882
21	PREDICTS.LU + PREDICTS.LUI + yield.ndvi.corr +							-
22	FC2000 + meanNDVI + elev	28	3864.119	19.85003	0.00005	0.00001	1904.06	0.999896
23	PREDICTS.LUI + logpop + yield.ndvi.corr + meanNDVI +							-
24	elev	24	3864.234	19.96501	0.00005	0.00001	1908.12	0.99991
25	PREDICTS.LUI + logpop + yield.ndvi.corr + FC2000 +							-
26	meanNDVI	24	3864.25	19.9814	0.00005	0.00001	1908.13	0.999923
27	PREDICTS.LU + PREDICTS.LUI + logpop +							-
28	yield.ndvi.corr	26	3864.83	20.56122	0.00003	0.00001	1906.41	0.999934
29								-
30	PREDICTS.LU + PREDICTS.LUI + yield.ndvi.corr	25	3864.874	20.60512	0.00003	0.00001	1907.44	0.999943
31								-
32	PREDICTS.LUI + yield.ndvi.corr + FC2000 + meanNDVI	23	3865.166	20.89678	0.00003	0.00001	1909.58	0.999952
33								-
34	PREDICTS.LUI + yield.ndvi.corr + meanNDVI + elev	23	3865.441	21.17186	0.00003	0.00001	1909.72	0.999959
35	PREDICTS.LU + PREDICTS.LUI + logpop +							-
36	yield.ndvi.corr + FC2000	27	3866.031	21.76258	0.00002	0.00001	1906.02	0.999965
37	PREDICTS.LUI + logpop + yield.ndvi.corr + FC2000 +							-
38	meanNDVI + elev	25	3866.128	21.85887	0.00002	0.00001	1908.06	0.99997
39								-
40								-
41								-
42								-
43								-
44								-
45								-
46								-
47								-
48								-
49								-

1								
2								
3	PREDICTS.LU + PREDICTS.LUI + yield.ndvi.corr +							
4	FC2000	26	3866.494	22.22537	0.00001	0.00000	1907.25	0.999975
5	PREDICTS.LU + PREDICTS.LUI + logpop +							
6	yield.ndvi.corr + elev	27	3866.822	22.55307	0.00001	0.00000	1906.41	0.999978
7								
8								
9	PREDICTS.LU + PREDICTS.LUI + yield.ndvi.corr + elev	26	3866.874	22.60495	0.00001	0.00000	1907.44	0.999982
10	PREDICTS.LUI + yield.ndvi.corr + FC2000 + meanNDVI							
11	+ elev	24	3867.113	22.84442	0.00001	0.00000	1909.56	0.999985
12								
13	PREDICTS.LUI + logpop + yield.ndvi.corr	22	3867.314	23.04509	0.00001	0.00000	1911.66	0.999988
14								
15	PREDICTS.LUI + yield.ndvi.corr	21	3867.667	23.39856	0.00001	0.00000	1912.83	0.999991
16	PREDICTS.LU + PREDICTS.LUI + logpop +							
17	yield.ndvi.corr + FC2000 + elev	28	3868.021	23.75271	0.00001	0.00000	1906.01	0.999993
18								
19								
20	PREDICTS.LUI + logpop + yield.ndvi.corr + FC2000	23	3868.45	24.181	0.00001	0.00000	1911.22	0.999994
21	PREDICTS.LU + PREDICTS.LUI + yield.ndvi.corr +							
22	FC2000 + elev	27	3868.494	24.22498	0.00001	0.00000	1907.25	0.999996
23								
24	PREDICTS.LUI + yield.ndvi.corr + FC2000	22	3869.212	24.94299	0.00000	0.00000	1912.61	0.999997
25								
26	PREDICTS.LUI + logpop + yield.ndvi.corr + elev	23	3869.314	25.04508	0.00000	0.00000	1911.66	0.999998
27								
28	PREDICTS.LUI + yield.ndvi.corr + elev	22	3869.659	25.38994	0.00000	0.00000	1912.83	0.999999
29	PREDICTS.LUI + logpop + yield.ndvi.corr + FC2000 +							
30	elev	24	3870.449	26.18066	0.00000	0.00000	1911.22	1
31	PREDICTS.LUI + yield.ndvi.corr + FC2000 + elev	23	3871.2	26.93107	0.00000	0.00000	-1912.6	1
32								
33								
34	LUInter + logpop + meanNDVI	33	4104.084	259.8153	0.00000	0.00000	2019.04	1
35								
36	LUInter + meanNDVI	32	4104.626	260.3575	0.00000	0.00000	2020.31	1
37								
38	LUInter + logpop + meanNDVI + elev	34	4104.875	260.6064	0.00000	0.00000	2018.44	1
39								
40	LUInter + meanNDVI + elev	33	4105.689	261.4202	0.00000	0.00000	2019.84	1
41	LUInter + logpop + FC2000 + meanNDVI	34	4106.072	261.8027	0.00000	0.00000	-	1
42								
43								
44								
45								
46								
47								
48								
49								

1								
2								
3						2019.04		
4						-		
5								
6	LUInter + FC2000 + meanNDVI	33	4106.525	262.2567	0.00000	0.00000	2020.26	1
7							-	
8	LUInter + logpop + FC2000 + meanNDVI + elev	35	4106.836	262.5672	0.00000	0.00000	2018.42	1
9							-	
10	LUInter + FC2000 + meanNDVI + elev	34	4107.525	263.256	0.00000	0.00000	2019.76	1
11							-	
12	PREDICTS.LU + PREDICTS.LUI + logpop + meanNDVI	26	4115.069	270.8006	0.00000	0.00000	2031.53	1
13	PREDICTS.LU + PREDICTS.LUI + logpop + meanNDVI +						-	
14	elev	27	4116.165	271.8961	0.00000	0.00000	2031.08	1
15							-	
16	PREDICTS.LU + PREDICTS.LUI + meanNDVI	25	4116.171	271.9019	0.00000	0.00000	2033.09	1
17	PREDICTS.LU + PREDICTS.LUI + logpop + FC2000 +						-	
18	meanNDVI	27	4117.069	272.8005	0.00000	0.00000	2031.53	1
19							-	
20	PREDICTS.LU + PREDICTS.LUI + meanNDVI + elev	26	4117.528	273.2592	0.00000	0.00000	2032.76	1
21							-	
22	PREDICTS.LUI + logpop + meanNDVI	22	4117.746	273.4771	0.00000	0.00000	2036.87	1
23							-	
24	PREDICTS.LU + PREDICTS.LUI + FC2000 + meanNDVI	26	4118.117	273.8479	0.00000	0.00000	2033.06	1
25	PREDICTS.LU + PREDICTS.LUI + logpop + FC2000 +						-	
26	meanNDVI + elev	28	4118.16	273.8911	0.00000	0.00000	2031.08	1
27							-	
28	PREDICTS.LUI + logpop + meanNDVI + elev	23	4118.978	274.7094	0.00000	0.00000	2036.49	1
29							-	
30	PREDICTS.LUI + meanNDVI	21	4119.061	274.7927	0.00000	0.00000	2038.53	1
31	PREDICTS.LU + PREDICTS.LUI + FC2000 + meanNDVI +						-	
32	elev	27	4119.43	275.1616	0.00000	0.00000	2032.72	1
33							-	
34	PREDICTS.LUI + logpop + FC2000 + meanNDVI	23	4119.745	275.476	0.00000	0.00000	2036.87	1
35							-	
36	PREDICTS.LUI + meanNDVI + elev	22	4120.508	276.2392	0.00000	0.00000	2038.25	1
37							-	
38	PREDICTS.LUI + logpop + FC2000 + meanNDVI + elev	24	4120.976	276.707	0.00000	0.00000	2036.49	1
39	PREDICTS.LUI + FC2000 + meanNDVI	22	4121.021	276.752	0.00000	0.00000	-	1
40								
41								
42								
43								
44								
45								
46								
47								
48								
49								



1								
2								
3								
4						2038.51		
5						-		
6	PREDICTS.LUI + FC2000 + meanNDVI + elev	23	4122.429	278.1605	0.00000	0.00000	2038.21	1
7						-		
8	LUInter	31	4225.365	381.0963	0.00000	0.00000	2081.68	1
9						-		
10	LUInter + logpop	32	4225.82	381.5512	0.00000	0.00000	2080.91	1
11						-		
12	LUInter + logpop + elev	33	4226.453	382.1839	0.00000	0.00000	2080.23	1
13						-		
14	LUInter + elev	32	4226.827	382.558	0.00000	0.00000	2081.41	1
15						-		
16	LUInter + logpop + FC2000	33	4226.911	382.6424	0.00000	0.00000	2080.46	1
17						-		
18	LUInter + FC2000	32	4227.284	383.0152	0.00000	0.00000	2081.64	1
19						-		
20	LUInter + logpop + FC2000 + elev	34	4228.217	383.9483	0.00000	0.00000	2080.11	1
21						-		
22	LUInter + FC2000 + elev	33	4228.751	384.482	0.00000	0.00000	2081.38	1
23						-		
24	PREDICTS.LU + PREDICTS.LUI + logpop	25	4235.15	390.8816	0.00000	0.00000	2092.58	1
25						-		
26	PREDICTS.LU + PREDICTS.LUI	24	4235.861	391.5927	0.00000	0.00000	2093.93	1
27						-		
28	PREDICTS.LU + PREDICTS.LUI + logpop + elev	26	4236.647	392.3783	0.00000	0.00000	2092.32	1
29						-		
30	PREDICTS.LU + PREDICTS.LUI + logpop + FC2000	26	4236.832	392.5627	0.00000	0.00000	2092.42	1
31						-		
32	PREDICTS.LU + PREDICTS.LUI + elev	25	4237.493	393.224	0.00000	0.00000	2093.75	1
33						-		
34	PREDICTS.LU + PREDICTS.LUI + FC2000	25	4237.756	393.4871	0.00000	0.00000	2093.88	1
35						-		
36	PREDICTS.LUI + logpop	21	4238.026	393.7577	0.00000	0.00000	2098.01	1
37						-		
38	PREDICTS.LU + PREDICTS.LUI + logpop + FC2000 + elev	27	4238.336	394.0672	0.00000	0.00000	2092.17	1
39						-		
40	PREDICTS.LUI	20	4239.075	394.8065	0.00000	0.00000	-	1
41						-		
42						-		
43						-		
44						-		
45						-		
46						-		
47						-		
48						-		
49						-		

1								
2								
3								
4						2099.54		
5	PREDICTS.LU + PREDICTS.LUI + FC2000 + elev	26	4239.396	395.1272	0.00000	0.00000	-2093.7	1
6							-	
7	PREDICTS.LUI + logpop + elev	22	4239.561	395.2922	0.00000	0.00000	2097.78	1
8							-	
9	PREDICTS.LUI + logpop + FC2000	22	4239.69	395.4208	0.00000	0.00000	2097.84	1
10							-	
11	PREDICTS.LUI + elev	21	4240.732	396.4633	0.00000	0.00000	2099.37	1
12							-	
13	PREDICTS.LUI + FC2000	21	4240.955	396.6866	0.00000	0.00000	2099.48	1
14							-	
15	PREDICTS.LUI + logpop + FC2000 + elev	23	4241.24	396.9717	0.00000	0.00000	2097.62	1
16							-	
17	PREDICTS.LUI + FC2000 + elev	22	4242.624	398.3557	0.00000	0.00000	2099.31	1
18							-	
19	PREDICTS.LU + logpop + yield.ndvi.corr	24	5044.166	1199.898	0.00000	0.00000	2498.08	1
20							-	
21	PREDICTS.LU + logpop + yield.ndvi.corr + elev	25	5044.487	1200.219	0.00000	0.00000	2497.24	1
22							-	
23	PREDICTS.LU + logpop + yield.ndvi.corr + meanNDVI +							
24	elev	26	5044.706	1200.437	0.00000	0.00000	2496.35	1
25							-	
26	PREDICTS.LU + logpop + yield.ndvi.corr + meanNDVI	25	5044.963	1200.694	0.00000	0.00000	2497.48	1
27							-	
28	PREDICTS.LU + logpop + yield.ndvi.corr + FC2000 +							
29	meanNDVI	26	5045.708	1201.439	0.00000	0.00000	2496.85	1
30							-	
31	PREDICTS.LU + logpop + yield.ndvi.corr + FC2000 +							
32	meanNDVI + elev	27	5045.857	1201.589	0.00000	0.00000	2495.93	1
33							-	
34	PREDICTS.LU + logpop + yield.ndvi.corr + FC2000	25	5046.105	1201.836	0.00000	0.00000	2498.05	1
35							-	
36	PREDICTS.LU + logpop + yield.ndvi.corr + FC2000 +							
37	elev	26	5046.487	1202.218	0.00000	0.00000	2497.24	1
38							-	
39	PREDICTS.LU + yield.ndvi.corr + meanNDVI + elev	25	5050.417	1206.148	0.00000	0.00000	2500.21	1
40							-	
41	PREDICTS.LU + yield.ndvi.corr + elev	24	5050.672	1206.403	0.00000	0.00000	2501.34	1
42							-	
43	PREDICTS.LU + yield.ndvi.corr	23	5051.06	1206.791	0.00000	0.00000	2502.53	1
44								
45								
46								
47								
48								
49								

1								
2								
3								
4								
5	PREDICTS.LU + yield.ndvi.corr + meanNDVI	24	5051.557	1207.288	0.00000	0.00000	2501.78	1
6	PREDICTS.LU + yield.ndvi.corr + FC2000 + meanNDVI +							
7	elev	26	5052.229	1207.961	0.00000	0.00000	2500.11	1
8								
9	PREDICTS.LU + yield.ndvi.corr + FC2000 + elev	25	5052.411	1208.142	0.00000	0.00000	2501.21	1
10								
11	PREDICTS.LU + yield.ndvi.corr + FC2000	24	5053.017	1208.748	0.00000	0.00000	2502.51	1
12								
13	PREDICTS.LU + yield.ndvi.corr + FC2000 + meanNDVI	25	5053.148	1208.879	0.00000	0.00000	2501.57	1
14								
15	yield.ndvi.corr	19	5055.335	1211.067	0.00000	0.00000	2508.67	1
16								
17	PREDICTS.LU + logpop + meanNDVI	24	5307.316	1463.047	0.00000	0.00000	2629.66	1
18								
19	PREDICTS.LU + logpop + meanNDVI + elev	25	5308.63	1464.361	0.00000	0.00000	2629.31	1
20								
21	PREDICTS.LU + logpop + FC2000 + meanNDVI	25	5308.73	1464.461	0.00000	0.00000	2629.36	1
22	PREDICTS.LU + logpop + FC2000 + meanNDVI + elev	26	5310.204	1465.936	0.00000	0.00000	-2629.1	1
23								
24								
25	PREDICTS.LU + meanNDVI	23	5312.902	1468.634	0.00000	0.00000	2633.45	1
26								
27	PREDICTS.LU + meanNDVI + elev	24	5313.982	1469.714	0.00000	0.00000	2632.99	1
28								
29	PREDICTS.LU + FC2000 + meanNDVI	24	5314.777	1470.508	0.00000	0.00000	2633.39	1
30								
31	PREDICTS.LU + FC2000 + meanNDVI + elev	25	5315.931	1471.662	0.00000	0.00000	2632.97	1
32								
33	meanNDVI	19	5316.582	1472.313	0.00000	0.00000	2639.29	1
34								
35								
36	PREDICTS.LU + logpop + FC2000 + elev	25	5434.084	1589.816	0.00000	0.00000	2692.04	1
37	PREDICTS.LU + FC2000 + elev	24	5439.595	1595.326	0.00000	0.00000	-2695.8	1
38								
39	PREDICTS.LU + logpop + elev	24	5432.11	1587.842	0.00000	0.00000	2692.06	1
40	PREDICTS.LU + logpop + FC2000	24	5432.402	1588.133	0.00000	0.00000	-2692.2	1
41	PREDICTS.LU + elev	23	5437.656	1593.387	0.00000	0.00000	-	1
42								
43								
44								
45								
46								
47								
48								
49								

							2695.83	
							-	
	PREDICTS.LU + FC2000	23	5438.17	1593.901	0.00000	0.00000	2696.08	1
							-	
	PREDICTS.LU + logpop	23	5430.475	1586.206	0.00000	0.00000	2692.24	1
							-	
	elev	19	5441.679	1597.41	0.00000	0.00000	2701.84	1
							-	
	FC2000	19	5442.255	1597.986	0.00000	0.00000	2702.13	1
							-	
	logpop	19	5435.91	1591.641	0.00000	0.00000	2698.96	1
							-	
	PREDICTS.LU	22	5436.183	1591.915	0.00000	0.00000	2696.09	1

Table S4: Full model selection table for species richness. All possible combinations of land use (PREDICTS.LU), land-use intensity (PREDICTS.LUI) Land use/Land-use intensity interaction (LUInter), log-transformed human population density (logpop), forest cover (FC2000), elevation (elev), mean NDVI (meanNDVI) and vegetation offtake (yield.ndvi.corr) were fitted. Shown are the model covariates, the parameter count (K), AIC, delta AIC, the model likelihood (ModelLik), AIC weights, log-likelihood (LL) and cumulative AIC weights (Cum.Wt). ModelLik and AICwt are rounded to the fifth decimal for visual display

Model covariates	K	AIC	Delta AIC	ModelLik	AICWt	LL	Cum.Wt
LUInter + logpop + yield.ndvi.corr + FC2000 + meanNDVI	35	10920.67	0	1.00000	0.22634	5425.34	0.226343
							-
LUInter + logpop + yield.ndvi.corr	33	10920.71	0.034688	0.98281	0.22245	5427.35	0.448794
							-
LUInter + logpop + yield.ndvi.corr + meanNDVI	34	10921.62	0.952034	0.62125	0.14062	5426.81	0.589411
							-
LUInter + logpop + yield.ndvi.corr + FC2000	34	10921.71	1.038024	0.59511	0.13470	5426.85	0.724109
LUInter + logpop + yield.ndvi.corr + FC2000 + meanNDVI + elev	36	10922.65	1.975058	0.37250	0.08431	5425.32	0.808421
							-
LUInter + logpop + yield.ndvi.corr + elev	34	10922.7	2.025582	0.36320	0.08221	5427.35	0.89063
							-
LUInter + logpop + yield.ndvi.corr + meanNDVI + elev	35	10923.62	2.951892	0.22856	0.05173	5426.81	0.942363
							-
LUInter + logpop + yield.ndvi.corr + FC2000 + elev	35	10923.7	3.032539	0.21953	0.04969	5426.85	0.992052
PREDICTS.LU + PREDICTS.LUI + logpop + yield.ndvi.corr	26	10931.15	10.48308	0.00529	0.00120	-	0.99325

1								
2								
3						5439.58		
4								
5	PREDICTS.LU + PREDICTS.LUI + logpop + yield.ndvi.corr					-		
6	+ FC2000 + meanNDVI	28	10931.56	10.89099	0.00432	0.00098	5437.78	0.994227
7	PREDICTS.LU + PREDICTS.LUI + logpop + yield.ndvi.corr					-		
8	+ FC2000	27	10931.95	11.27773	0.00356	0.00081	5438.97	0.995032
9						-		
10	PREDICTS.LUI + logpop + yield.ndvi.corr	22	10932.3	11.63023	0.00298	0.00067	5444.15	0.995707
11	PREDICTS.LUI + logpop + yield.ndvi.corr + FC2000 +					-		
12	meanNDVI	24	10932.45	11.78284	0.00276	0.00063	5442.23	0.996332
13	PREDICTS.LU + PREDICTS.LUI + logpop + yield.ndvi.corr					-		
14	+ meanNDVI	27	10932.5	11.82845	0.00270	0.00061	5439.25	0.996944
15						-		
16	PREDICTS.LUI + logpop + yield.ndvi.corr + FC2000	23	10932.57	11.89915	0.00261	0.00059	5443.28	0.997534
17	PREDICTS.LU + PREDICTS.LUI + logpop + yield.ndvi.corr					-		
18	+ elev	27	10933.14	12.4702	0.00196	0.00044	5439.57	0.997977
19	PREDICTS.LU + PREDICTS.LUI + logpop + yield.ndvi.corr					-		
20	+ FC2000 + meanNDVI + elev	29	10933.55	12.88052	0.00160	0.00036	5437.78	0.998338
21						-		
22						-		
23	PREDICTS.LUI + logpop + yield.ndvi.corr + meanNDVI	23	10933.74	13.06877	0.00145	0.00033	5443.87	0.998667
24	PREDICTS.LU + PREDICTS.LUI + logpop + yield.ndvi.corr					-		
25	+ FC2000 + elev	28	10933.94	13.27108	0.00131	0.00030	5438.97	0.998964
26						-		
27	PREDICTS.LUI + logpop + yield.ndvi.corr + elev	23	10934.3	13.62841	0.00110	0.00025	5444.15	0.999213
28	PREDICTS.LUI + logpop + yield.ndvi.corr + FC2000 +					-		
29	meanNDVI + elev	25	10934.47	13.79464	0.00101	0.00023	5442.23	0.999442
30	PREDICTS.LU + PREDICTS.LUI + logpop + yield.ndvi.corr					-		
31	+ meanNDVI + elev	28	10934.5	13.82666	0.00099	0.00023	5439.25	0.999667
32	PREDICTS.LUI + logpop + yield.ndvi.corr + FC2000 +					-		
33	elev	24	10934.61	13.94325	0.00094	0.00021	5443.31	0.999879
34	PREDICTS.LUI + logpop + yield.ndvi.corr + meanNDVI +					-		
35	elev	24	10935.74	15.0676	0.00053	0.00012	5443.87	1
36	LUInter + yield.ndvi.corr + meanNDVI + elev	34	11404.4	483.7311	0.00000	0.00000	-5668.2	1
37						-		
38						-		
39	LUInter + yield.ndvi.corr + elev	33	11404.63	483.962	0.00000	0.00000	5669.32	1
40						-		
41	LUInter + yield.ndvi.corr + FC2000 + meanNDVI + elev	35	11404.68	484.0101	0.00000	0.00000	5667.34	1
42						-		
43						-		
44						-		
45						-		
46						-		
47						-		
48						-		
49						-		

1								
2								
3								
4								
5	LUInter + yield.ndvi.corr + meanNDVI	33	11405.08	484.4091	0.00000	0.00000	5669.54	1
6								
7	LUInter + yield.ndvi.corr	32	11405.1	484.4339	0.00000	0.00000	5670.55	1
8								
9	LUInter + yield.ndvi.corr + FC2000 + meanNDVI	34	11405.59	484.9176	0.00000	0.00000	5668.79	1
10								
11	LUInter + yield.ndvi.corr + FC2000 + elev	34	11406.44	485.772	0.00000	0.00000	5669.22	1
12								
13	LUInter + yield.ndvi.corr + FC2000	33	11406.95	486.2824	0.00000	0.00000	5670.48	1
14								
15	PREDICTS.LU + PREDICTS.LUI + yield.ndvi.corr + elev	26	11418.47	497.7985	0.00000	0.00000	5683.23	1
16								
17	PREDICTS.LU + PREDICTS.LUI + yield.ndvi.corr	25	11418.7	498.0322	0.00000	0.00000	5684.35	1
18	PREDICTS.LU + PREDICTS.LUI + yield.ndvi.corr +							
19	meanNDVI + elev	27	11418.73	498.0565	0.00000	0.00000	5682.36	1
20	PREDICTS.LU + PREDICTS.LUI + yield.ndvi.corr +							
21	FC2000 + meanNDVI + elev	28	11418.88	498.2072	0.00000	0.00000	5681.44	1
22	PREDICTS.LU + PREDICTS.LUI + yield.ndvi.corr +							
23	meanNDVI	26	11419.12	498.446	0.00000	0.00000	5683.56	1
24	PREDICTS.LU + PREDICTS.LUI + yield.ndvi.corr +							
25	FC2000 + meanNDVI	27	11419.5	498.8267	0.00000	0.00000	5682.75	1
26								
27	PREDICTS.LUI + yield.ndvi.corr + elev	22	11419.7	499.0331	0.00000	0.00000	5687.85	1
28								
29	PREDICTS.LUI + yield.ndvi.corr + meanNDVI + elev	23	11419.82	499.1495	0.00000	0.00000	5686.91	1
30	PREDICTS.LUI + yield.ndvi.corr + FC2000 + meanNDVI +							
31	elev	24	11419.84	499.1689	0.00000	0.00000	5685.92	1
32	PREDICTS.LU + PREDICTS.LUI + yield.ndvi.corr +							
33	FC2000 + elev	27	11420.16	499.4901	0.00000	0.00000	5683.08	1
34	PREDICTS.LU + PREDICTS.LUI + yield.ndvi.corr +							
35	FC2000	26	11420.45	499.7748	0.00000	0.00000	5684.22	1
36	PREDICTS.LUI + yield.ndvi.corr	21	11420.6	499.9254	0.00000	0.00000	-5689.3	1
37	PREDICTS.LUI + yield.ndvi.corr + FC2000	22	11420.8	500.1341	0.00000	0.00000	-5688.4	1
38								
39	PREDICTS.LUI + yield.ndvi.corr + meanNDVI	22	11420.97	500.3002	0.00000	0.00000	5688.49	1
40								
41								
42								
43								
44								
45								
46								
47								
48								
49								

1								
2								
3								
4								
5	PREDICTS.LUI + yield.ndvi.corr + FC2000 + meanNDVI	23	11421.28	500.6133	0.00000	0.00000	5687.64	1
6								
7	PREDICTS.LUI + yield.ndvi.corr + FC2000 + elev	23	11421.38	500.707	0.00000	0.00000	5687.69	1
8								
9	LUInter + logpop + FC2000 + meanNDVI	34	12226.23	1305.556	0.00000	0.00000	6079.11	1
10	PREDICTS.LU + PREDICTS.LUI + logpop + FC2000 +							
11	meanNDVI	27	12226.74	1306.072	0.00000	0.00000	6086.37	1
12	PREDICTS.LUI + logpop + FC2000 + meanNDVI	23	12226.8	1306.13	0.00000	0.00000	-6090.4	1
13								
14	LUInter + logpop + meanNDVI	33	12227.66	1306.987	0.00000	0.00000	6080.83	1
15								
16	LUInter + logpop + FC2000 + meanNDVI + elev	35	12228.07	1307.399	0.00000	0.00000	6079.03	1
17								
18	PREDICTS.LU + PREDICTS.LUI + logpop + meanNDVI	26	12228.26	1307.591	0.00000	0.00000	6088.13	1
19	PREDICTS.LU + PREDICTS.LUI + logpop + FC2000 +							
20	meanNDVI + elev	28	12228.63	1307.955	0.00000	0.00000	6086.31	1
21								
22	PREDICTS.LUI + logpop + meanNDVI	22	12228.68	1308.011	0.00000	0.00000	6092.34	1
23								
24	PREDICTS.LUI + logpop + FC2000 + meanNDVI + elev	24	12228.75	1308.077	0.00000	0.00000	6090.37	1
25								
26	LUInter + logpop + meanNDVI + elev	34	12229.59	1308.917	0.00000	0.00000	6080.79	1
27	PREDICTS.LU + PREDICTS.LUI + logpop + meanNDVI +							
28	elev	27	12230.22	1309.546	0.00000	0.00000	6088.11	1
29								
30	PREDICTS.LUI + logpop + meanNDVI + elev	23	12230.67	1310.003	0.00000	0.00000	6092.34	1
31	PREDICTS.LU + logpop + yield.ndvi.corr + FC2000 +							
32	meanNDVI + elev	27	13336.61	2415.942	0.00000	0.00000	6641.31	1
33	PREDICTS.LU + yield.ndvi.corr + FC2000 + meanNDVI +							
34	elev	26	13801.11	2880.439	0.00000	0.00000	6874.55	1
35								
36	PREDICTS.LU + logpop + FC2000 + meanNDVI + elev	26	14733.83	3813.157	0.00000	0.00000	7340.91	1
37	PREDICTS.LU + logpop + yield.ndvi.corr + meanNDVI +							
38	elev	26	13336.11	2415.439	0.00000	0.00000	6642.05	1
39	PREDICTS.LU + logpop + yield.ndvi.corr + FC2000 +	26	13334.96	2414.288	0.00000	0.00000	-	1
40								
41								
42								
43								
44								
45								
46								
47								
48								
49								

1								
2								
3	elev					6641.48		
4	PREDICTS.LU + logpop + yield.ndvi.corr + FC2000 +					-		
5	meanNDVI	26	13334.97	2414.301	0.00000	0.00000	6641.49	1
6						-		
7	LUInter + FC2000 + meanNDVI + elev	34	12712.74	1792.066	0.00000	0.00000	6322.37	1
8						-		
9	LUInter + logpop + FC2000 + elev	34	12507.21	1586.54	0.00000	0.00000	6219.61	1
10	PREDICTS.LU + PREDICTS.LUI + FC2000 + meanNDVI +					-		
11	elev	27	12710.92	1790.252	0.00000	0.00000	6328.46	1
12						-		
13	PREDICTS.LU + PREDICTS.LUI + logpop + FC2000 + elev	27	12506.67	1585.998	0.00000	0.00000	6226.33	1
14						-		
15	PREDICTS.LUI + FC2000 + meanNDVI + elev	23	12713.04	1792.369	0.00000	0.00000	6333.52	1
16						-		
17	PREDICTS.LUI + logpop + FC2000 + elev	23	12506.89	1586.223	0.00000	0.00000	6230.45	1
18						-		
19	PREDICTS.LU + FC2000 + meanNDVI + elev	25	15196.37	4275.702	0.00000	0.00000	7573.19	1
20						-		
21	PREDICTS.LU + yield.ndvi.corr + meanNDVI + elev	25	13800.42	2879.748	0.00000	0.00000	6875.21	1
22						-		
23	PREDICTS.LU + yield.ndvi.corr + FC2000 + elev	25	13799.38	2878.709	0.00000	0.00000	6874.69	1
24						-		
25	PREDICTS.LU + yield.ndvi.corr + FC2000 + meanNDVI	25	13801.49	2880.816	0.00000	0.00000	6875.74	1
26						-		
27	PREDICTS.LU + logpop + meanNDVI + elev	25	14733.24	3812.567	0.00000	0.00000	7341.62	1
28						-		
29	PREDICTS.LU + logpop + FC2000 + elev	25	15022.37	4101.702	0.00000	0.00000	7486.19	1
30						-		
31	PREDICTS.LU + logpop + FC2000 + meanNDVI	25	14732.41	3811.744	0.00000	0.00000	7341.21	1
32						-		
33	PREDICTS.LU + logpop + yield.ndvi.corr + elev	25	13334.12	2413.448	0.00000	0.00000	6642.06	1
34						-		
35	PREDICTS.LU + logpop + yield.ndvi.corr + meanNDVI	25	13334.33	2413.657	0.00000	0.00000	6642.16	1
36						-		
37	PREDICTS.LU + logpop + yield.ndvi.corr + FC2000	25	13333.33	2412.661	0.00000	0.00000	6641.67	1
38	LUInter + meanNDVI + elev	33	12713.08	1792.414	0.00000	0.00000	-	1
39						-		
40						-		
41						-		
42						-		
43						-		
44						-		
45						-		
46						-		
47						-		
48						-		
49						-		



1								
2								
3						6323.54		
4						-		
5	LUInter + FC2000 + elev	33	12991.25	2070.58	0.00000	0.00000	6462.63	1
6							-	
7	LUInter + FC2000 + meanNDVI	33	12712.49	1791.819	0.00000	0.00000	6323.24	1
8							-	
9	LUInter + logpop + elev	33	12507.03	1586.36	0.00000	0.00000	6220.52	1
10							-	
11	LUInter + logpop + FC2000	33	12505.21	1584.541	0.00000	0.00000	6219.61	1
12	PREDICTS.LU + PREDICTS.LUI + meanNDVI + elev	26	12711.19	1790.52	0.00000	0.00000	-6329.6	1
13							-	
14	PREDICTS.LU + PREDICTS.LUI + FC2000 + elev	26	12989.29	2068.618	0.00000	0.00000	6468.64	1
15							-	
16	PREDICTS.LU + PREDICTS.LUI + FC2000 + meanNDVI	26	12710.82	1790.154	0.00000	0.00000	6329.41	1
17	PREDICTS.LU + PREDICTS.LUI + logpop + elev	26	12506.79	1586.124	0.00000	0.00000	-6227.4	1
18							-	
19	PREDICTS.LU + PREDICTS.LUI + logpop + FC2000	26	12504.67	1584.001	0.00000	0.00000	6226.34	1
20							-	
21	PREDICTS.LUI + meanNDVI + elev	22	12713.32	1792.65	0.00000	0.00000	6334.66	1
22	PREDICTS.LUI + FC2000 + elev	22	12991	2070.331	0.00000	0.00000	-6473.5	1
23							-	
24	PREDICTS.LUI + FC2000 + meanNDVI	22	12711.88	1791.211	0.00000	0.00000	6333.94	1
25							-	
26	PREDICTS.LUI + logpop + elev	22	12507.38	1586.705	0.00000	0.00000	6231.69	1
27							-	
28	PREDICTS.LUI + logpop + FC2000	22	12504.9	1584.226	0.00000	0.00000	6230.45	1
29							-	
30	PREDICTS.LU + meanNDVI + elev	24	15195.45	4274.784	0.00000	0.00000	7573.73	1
31							-	
32	PREDICTS.LU + FC2000 + elev	24	15484.83	4564.155	0.00000	0.00000	7718.41	1
33	PREDICTS.LU + FC2000 + meanNDVI	24	15196.4	4275.727	0.00000	0.00000	-7574.2	1
34							-	
35	PREDICTS.LU + yield.ndvi.corr + elev	24	13798.43	2877.761	0.00000	0.00000	6875.22	1
36							-	
37	PREDICTS.LU + yield.ndvi.corr + meanNDVI	24	13800.48	2879.805	0.00000	0.00000	6876.24	1
38	PREDICTS.LU + yield.ndvi.corr + FC2000	24	13799.83	2879.156	0.00000	0.00000	-	1
39							-	
40							-	
41							-	
42							-	
43							-	
44							-	
45							-	
46							-	
47							-	
48							-	
49							-	

1								
2								
3						6875.91		
4						-		
5								
6	PREDICTS.LU + logpop + elev	24	15021.23	4100.56	0.00000	0.00000	7486.62	1
7							-	
8	PREDICTS.LU + logpop + meanNDVI	24	14731.66	3810.987	0.00000	0.00000	7341.83	1
9	PREDICTS.LU + logpop + FC2000	24	15020.81	4100.139	0.00000	0.00000	-7486.4	1
10							-	
11	PREDICTS.LU + logpop + yield.ndvi.corr	24	13332.33	2411.659	0.00000	0.00000	6642.16	1
12							-	
13	LUInter + elev	32	12990.03	2069.356	0.00000	0.00000	6463.01	1
14							-	
15	LUInter + meanNDVI	32	12717.09	1796.419	0.00000	0.00000	6326.54	1
16							-	
17	LUInter + FC2000	32	12990.54	2069.865	0.00000	0.00000	6463.27	1
18							-	
19	LUInter + logpop	32	12505.03	1584.36	0.00000	0.00000	6220.52	1
20							-	
21	PREDICTS.LU + PREDICTS.LUI + elev	25	12988.17	2067.496	0.00000	0.00000	6469.08	1
22							-	
23	PREDICTS.LU + PREDICTS.LUI + meanNDVI	25	12710.87	1790.197	0.00000	0.00000	6330.43	1
24							-	
25	PREDICTS.LU + PREDICTS.LUI + FC2000	25	12988.73	2068.064	0.00000	0.00000	6469.37	1
26							-	
27	PREDICTS.LU + PREDICTS.LUI + logpop	25	12504.8	1584.125	0.00000	0.00000	-6227.4	1
28							-	
29	PREDICTS.LUI + elev	21	12990.2	2069.529	0.00000	0.00000	-6474.1	1
30							-	
31	PREDICTS.LUI + meanNDVI	21	12712.1	1791.428	0.00000	0.00000	6335.05	1
32	PREDICTS.LUI + FC2000	21	12989.59	2068.921	0.00000	0.00000	-6473.8	1
33							-	
34	PREDICTS.LUI + logpop	21	12505.38	1584.713	0.00000	0.00000	6231.69	1
35							-	
36	PREDICTS.LU + elev	23	15483.53	4562.863	0.00000	0.00000	7718.77	1
37	PREDICTS.LU + meanNDVI	23	15195.21	4274.539	0.00000	0.00000	-7574.6	1
38							-	
39	PREDICTS.LU + FC2000	23	15484.67	4564.004	0.00000	0.00000	7719.34	1
40							-	
41	PREDICTS.LU + yield.ndvi.corr	23	13798.48	2877.807	0.00000	0.00000	6876.24	1
42							-	
43								
44								
45								
46								
47								
48								
49								

1								
2								
3								
4						-		
5	PREDICTS.LU + logpop	23	15019.67	4098.996	0.00000	0.00000	7486.83	1
6							-	
7	PREDICTS.LU + PREDICTS.LUI	24	12987.55	2066.878	0.00000	0.00000	6469.77	1
8							-	
9	elev	19	15485.01	4564.34	0.00000	0.00000	7723.51	1
10							-	
11	meanNDVI	19	15195.93	4275.261	0.00000	0.00000	7578.97	1
12							-	
13	FC2000	19	15485.48	4564.81	0.00000	0.00000	7723.74	1
14							-	
15	yield.ndvi.corr	19	13798.94	2878.275	0.00000	0.00000	6880.47	1
16							-	
17	logpop	19	15024.02	4103.345	0.00000	0.00000	7493.01	1
18							-	
19	LUInter	31	12989.25	2068.584	0.00000	0.00000	6463.63	1
20	PREDICTS.LUI	20	12988.61	2067.938	0.00000	0.00000	-6474.3	1
21							-	
22							-	
23	PREDICTS.LU	22	15483.15	4562.482	0.00000	0.00000	7719.58	1
24								
25								
26								
27								
28								
29								
30								
31								
32								
33								
34								
35								
36								
37								
38								
39								
40								
41								
42								
43								
44								
45								
46								
47								
48								
49								