Introduction

Author for correspondence:
Thomas H. G. Ezard
e-mail: t.ezard@soton.ac.uk

THE ROYAL SOCIETY PUBLISHING

The challenges to inferring the regulators of biodiversity in deep time

Thomas H. G. Ezard[1,2], Tiago B. Quental[3] and Michael J. Benton[4]

[1]Ocean and Earth Sciences, National Oceanography Centre Southampton, University of Southampton Waterfront Campus, European Way, Southampton SO14 3ZH, UK
[2]Centre for Biological Sciences, University of Southampton, Life Sciences Building 85, Highfield Campus, Southampton SO17 1BJ, UK
[3]Departamento de Ecologia, Universidade de São Paulo, São Paulo, SP 05508-900 Brazil
[4]School of Earth Sciences, University of Bristol, Bristol BS8 1RJ, UK

THGE, 0000-0001-8305-6605; MJB, 0000-0002-4323-1824

Attempts to infer the ecological drivers of macroevolution in deep time have long drawn inspiration from work on extant systems, but long-term evolutionary and geological changes complicate the simple extrapolation of such theory. Recent efforts to incorporate a more informed ecology into macroevolution have moved beyond the descriptive, seeking to isolate generating mechanisms and produce testable hypotheses of how groups of organisms usurp each other or coexist over vast timespans. This theme issue aims to exemplify this progress, providing a series of case studies of how novel modelling approaches are helping infer the regulators of biodiversity in deep time. In this Introduction, we explore the challenges of these new approaches. First, we discuss how our choices of taxonomic units have implications for the conclusions drawn. Second, we emphasize the need to embrace the interdependence of biotic and abiotic changes, because no living organism ignores its environment. Third, in the light of parts 1 and 2, we discuss the set of dynamic signatures that we might expect to observe in the fossil record. Finally, we ask whether these dynamics represent the most ecologically informative foci for research efforts aimed at inferring the regulators of biodiversity in deep time. The papers in this theme issue contribute in each of these areas.

1. Introduction

Organisms respond to their environments. This link regulates biodiversity, but its complexity complicates efforts to provide unequivocal evidence for supposedly simple expectations. The challenge is to disentangle how environmental, ecological and evolutionary processes interact in deep time when they cannot be observed directly. Palaeobiology and evolutionary biology have long drawn inspiration from methods initially developed for population ecology [1,2], where the chief regulator of biodiversity is often purported to be density-dependence: population growth rate falls as population size increases due to resource limitation [3]. The co-option of population ecological theory into palaeobiology has a distinguished history [4], but a simple re-interpretation of elementary ecology to the macroecological and macroevolutionary scale is compromised by the vast timespans, which provide scope for environmental, (micro)evolutionary and geological change. Simple plots of species' diversity through time reveal coarse dynamical patterns of how the diversity of life on Earth has fluctuated [5], but do not uncover which underlying mechanisms generate such higher level patterns [6].

The outcomes of interactions among living organisms can be experimentally manipulated to tease apart direct causes of births and deaths. These interactions can have negative (competition, predation) or positive (mutalism, symbiosis) consequences for a focal species. The outcome of the interactions depends on the abiotic arena in which those species coexist: the victorious species in ecological competition is the one that can persist on the lowest amount of the

limiting resource [7]. It is difficult to move from small-scale experiments to large temporal and spatial scales [8] because of substantial changes in the terms of reference: carrying capacities in population biology restrict population growth directly by resource limitation [3,9], whereas an analogous limit at supraspecific level, and over hundreds of thousands or millions of years, would be an emergent higher level phenomenon from genuine interactions among individuals moving together through space and time.

Traditionally, deep-time regulators of biodiversity have polarized into biotic versus abiotic controls [6], with biotic interactions argued to dominate in the near term and abiotic upheaval imparting the clearer signal over long time scales [10]. The biotic, organismal, ecological perspective is commonly associated with the Red Queen hypothesis originally proposed by Van Valen to explain the apparently age-independent extinction probabilities among ecologically homogeneous groups [11]. In his original formulation, Van Valen considered the deterioration of the environment to include both the biotic and abiotic environment, but palaeontologists have usually credited most biodiversity change to abiotic factors [10,12]. The false dichotomy between the supposed superiority of biotic versus abiotic factors in regulating biodiversity [6,10,13] echoes the analogous debate in population ecology [9]. While population ecologists concluded that the abiotic environment acts as soft tissue on top of a hard density-dependent 'skeleton' [9], ecologists working in deep time have to accept that any purported diversity-dependent analogy is an emergent property from accumulating organismal responses to the biotic and abiotic environments with which they interact. These organismal responses are liable to evolve substantially through time.

Evolutionary rates multiply by many orders of magnitude when measured at laboratory scales of days and months, when compared to historical time spans of years and decades and palaeontological spans of millions, or hundreds of millions, of years [14]. Analysts are in effect measuring different aspects of a single fractal phenomenon where some rates are generational changes, while others are the outcomes of phenomena averaged over long-term environmental change. Most palaeontologists will never be as confident as experimental biologists that the individuals and species they study genuinely interacted at a given time in a given location, but that does not mean that it is impossible to study biotic interactions in deep time. Indeed, progress towards more ecologically informed macroevolution has shifted over the past 5 years from a predominantly descriptive pattern-based approach [15], to one in which we now aim to isolate which ecological mechanisms determined the origination, proliferation and extinction of biodiversity.

This theme issue aims to synthesize this progress. Our Introduction to the manuscripts, which reviews the state of the art and showcases advances in contemporary modelling and data extraction techniques, lays the foundations required for methods to extract the mechanisms that regulate biodiversity in deep time. We begin with how our analytical choices affect the results we obtain.

2. Individuals, populations, species and genera

Although ecologists can characterize biodiversity more broadly than simply counting species, most deep-time studies cannot directly quantify abundance or biomass data. A few notable exceptions exist: coarse estimates suggest that biomass [16] and primary productivity [17] might have increased during the Phanerozoic. While a few taxon-free approaches infer the structure and stability of food webs [18] or characterize the patterns of ecospace occupancy [19,20], deep-time investigations into the regulators of biodiversity are, for the most part, limited to counting taxonomic units through time.

Linnaeus wrote in *Fundamenta Botanica* that both genus and species are genuine entities of nature [21]. Mayr [22] argued that species, now considered the canonical unit for macroevolution, obey ecological rules, but conceded that genera also represent a biological reality. The integrated taxonomic evidence that distinct genera occupy morphospace discontinuously and rarely hybridize among themselves due to their long histories of separation [23] support the basic tenet for reproductively isolated taxonomic units. The same could be argued for any higher, clade-based taxa, whatever category names one might wish to apply, provided they reflect fundamentally different organismal constructions.

Acknowledging all the vagaries of matching category terms to clades, Benton [5] showed broadly similar genus and species diversity curves, both of which differed markedly from the corresponding higher order and family curves (see also [24] for an updated version on the Carnivora). The smoothness at higher taxonomic levels (e.g. families and orders) and the apparent evidence for upper limits to diversity [4,5] is, in part, a function of artificial constructs (naming by scientists), in part, incompleteness and structure of the rock record [25,26] and also some genuine biotic interactions. A logistic curve at the level of orders or classes might mask increasing diversification at species level within a continuously branching tree [5], but need not correspond in any simple way to lower level processes: the marine invertebrates, for example, reach a single equilibrium without the component clades doing so [27].

Given that morphology and species classification within taxa are not necessarily coupled [28], the different diversity trajectories among different levels of the taxonomic hierarchy [5] result in part from taxonomic practices that influence extinction risk [29]. Raup [30] proposed that if species follow Van Valen's law [11] of random extinction with respect to age among homogeneous groups, then genera cannot. There is a difference between the durations of species and genera because species' longevity is determined solely by extinction, assuming genuine speciation occurred in the first instance, whereas the longevity of a genus is determined by both speciation and extinction of the constituent species. Additional confusion of macroevolutionary longevity arises through pseudospeciation and pseudoextinction [31], which occur when sufficient anagenetic change causes scientists to award a new name to a novel morphological form despite a lack of cladogenetic lineage splitting. Such pseudo-speciated morphospecies are therefore often named from the anagenetic appearance of a novel character rather than post-speciation divergence from an ancestral species.

To illustrate how taxonomic practices and taxonomic resolution impact our ability to reject fundamental evolutionary laws, we analysed durations of Cenozoic Era macroperforate planktonic foraminifer genera, evolutionary species *sensu* Simpson (defined by the first appearance of a morphological gap, i.e. post-speciation divergence, between sister taxa,

Figure 1. Rejection of Van Valen's law in Cenozoic Era macroperforate planktonic foraminifera [33] depends on the level of biological organization used in the analysis. We define the homogeneous group for analysis by controlling for morphotype (presence/absence of keels, symbionts and spines), depth habitat, changes in overall climate [34,35] and overall standing diversity. The scale parameter determines the curvature in extinction risk according to the Weibull distribution; a value of 1 reduces the Weibull to its simpler exponential distribution of constant extinction risk. Maximum-likelihood estimates and 95% parametric confidence intervals are shown. See also electronic supplementary material, table S1, for parameter values and further explanation.

[29,31,32]) and morphospecies (defined by the first appearance of a novel character) compiled by Aze et al. [33]. To ensure we were comparing homogeneous groups of species [11], we followed Ezard et al. [13] in assigning morphological innovations associated with feeding ecology and depth habitat to each species or genus, and accounted for the changing Cenozoic climate using the Zachos et al. [34,35] δ^{18}O oxygen isotope compilation of deep-sea benthic carbonates and the changing biotic environment using the natural logarithm of the number of contemporaneous morphospecies, evolutionary species or genera (as appropriate). All these explanatory variables were fixed at origination, which encodes the idea that conditions early in a species' or genus' existence leave long-lasting signatures on its duration [36]. Morphospecies and evolutionary species show age-specific patterns of extinction: extinction risk increases with the age of each species (see also [37] for morphospecies; these morphospecies and evolutionary species' results were published in [29]). The genus durations, on the other hand, cannot be distinguished from Van Valen's law of constant extinction (figure 1), although part of that failure to reject is likely due to the much lower sample size of genus versus species counts. Interpreting these numbers, including the possibility that the age-specific extinction patterns arise due to a veil line (implying we fail to document the shortest lived species), demonstrates how analysing different levels of the Linnaean hierarchy can generate different extinction risks during a taxon's existence. Altered extinction risks change species longevities, which, as a consequence, change the strength of any inferred diversity-dependent regulation [29].

Any empirical correspondence between the species and genus diversity curves [5] should not therefore be taken to

imply that analyses at either species or genus level are equivalent. Genus-level origination encodes substantially more divergent ecologies than those perceived by speciation: higher taxonomy is, in one sense, a crude index of morphological disparity through time [38]. If speciation is in fact a rather easy and common process that perpetually produces ecologically similar species [39], then it could be argued that the limits to long-term equilibrium models of diversification [40] are not regulated by speciation but rather by origination of evolutionarily significant units at higher taxonomic levels [41–44]. Equilibrial assumptions are more common for species-level analyses performed by neontologists than analyses on higher taxa [45], which contradicts the empirical palaeontological evidence [5] and standard palaeontological practice [4,27,46–48].

The assumption of the species as the canonical unit of study has long held, but the inconvenient truth is that a species, like all higher order taxa in the Linnaean system, contains heterogeneous amounts of intraspecific variation through the spatial organization of populations and distribution of cryptic genetic types. The reality is that genera and species both contain relevant, but distinct, information for what regulates biodiversity over long time scales. The re-emergence of the biological reality of higher taxa has in part been stimulated through the increasing size of molecular phylogenies, and thus statistical power, to identify multiple thresholds which reveal that molecular diversification cannot be explained by species-level divergences alone [41,42]. The more resolved level exhibits greater fluctuations [4], which may or may not be of genuine biological interest for identifying the principles behind patterns of biodiversity.

3. Biotic and abiotic contributions to stochastic macroevolutionary dynamics

Sepkoski argued that a stochastic version of his fixed finite upper limit to taxon diversity was 'probably more typical of natural systems' than his deterministic analytical solutions [4]. Population ecologists have long used year-to-year fluctuations in abundance to reveal that environmental stochasticity acts on a density-dependent framework [9,49]. One simplistic partitioning [49,50] is that the cause of any deviation from a deterministic density-dependent framework is either due to an environmental factor that affects the realized fitness of all individuals concurrently (environmental stochasticity: σ_e^2), or due to winners and losers from particular individual interactions that average out in the long term (demographic stochasticity: σ_d^2). Taken together, year-to-year fluctuations in population abundance σ_λ^2 can be written as:

$$\sigma_\lambda^2 = \sigma_e^2 + \frac{\sigma_d^2}{N}.$$

N refers to the number of individuals. Demographic stochasticity is defined by a sum of squares statistic for the relative variation among individual fitnesses in a given time interval. Environmental stochasticity is calculated by the residual of observed versus expected change, minus the difference caused by individual interactions [51], and therefore assumes a uniform response in all individuals (e.g. in our context here,

an increase in background origination rates). While this binary classification forms a crass straw man, this simplistic polarization echoes the palaeobiological dichotomy into either the biotic, organismal Red Queen school [11,52] or the supposed alternative of an abiotic, environmental Court Jester [12]. The mutual dependence between the hypotheses has only recently been acknowledged [6,10,13].

Assuming that the number of species saturates following logistic growth [4], calculating environmental and demographic stochasticity statistics for evolutionary species of Cenozoic Era macroperforate planktonic foraminifera [33] suggests that differential responses among species explains, on average, about three times as much variation as the changing environment (0.087 versus 0.029). This result is unsurprising. The waxing and waning of relative abundance reported at species [13,53] and genus levels [27,54], as well as among higher taxa [55], is evidence that there are always winners and losers from environmental change. In deep time, the key challenge is to identify why some groups of species are winners and others losers, beyond the patterns that can be generated assuming neutral dynamics [56,57].

The stochastic population theory used above [49–51] predicts that environmental stochasticity will dominate dynamics for sufficiently large populations (i.e. N large) such that the differences among individuals can therefore be neglected. In our example, demographic stochasticity dominates because the units are species, which are much less abundant than individuals. The species–area relationship is one of the best ecological laws in determining the number of species that can coexist within a given biome, but the fragmentation of an area has been argued to be as influential as area per se in terms of driving macroevolutionary diversification shifts [58,59]. In this volume, Jordan et al. [60] find that neutral theory, in which all species are assumed to be functionally equivalent [56], on a fragmenting supercontinent cannot explain the post-Jurassic increase in terrestrial species richness. The results suggest a role for some biotic factors, either a competitive advantage or some other founder effect over and above geographical isolation, in the subsequent adaptation and expansion of the clade, even if the precise generating mechanism remains to be identified.

After demographic and environmental stochasticity, the third fundamental cause of fluctuations in population dynamics is measurement error [50]. Palaeontologists have to worry about which fossils enter the rocks and which fossils are found [61]. Preservation biases include organismal factors (skeletons or not; slow or fast reproducers; population size), their habitats (marine, river and lake settings are more often preserved than coasts, uplands and forests) and the subsequent history of the rock (is it eroded or buried; is it metamorphosed or not; is it covered by younger rocks?). Human biases include accessibility (is the rock at the surface; is the rock in reach of people?), geographical location (e.g. Europe versus South America) and research interest (e.g. diatoms versus dinosaurs). On the whole, older rocks are less available than younger rocks because the chances of burial under younger rocks increase with age. Much emphasis has been placed on this temporal pattern: Raup [61] and Alroy [27] argue that this burial bias explains nearly all of the substantial rise in biodiversity through the Phanerozoic, and tie this to a model in which global biodiversity reached modern levels over 400 Ma.

The biased distribution of fossils in time and/or space motivated the development of methods to 'correct' for the vagaries of the rock record [62–65]. Commonly used sampling proxies, such as counts of collections, localities or formations, accrue in close connection with the species count [66]. Residuals-based approaches [64,65] compare a sampling proxy (e.g. formations count; rock outcrop area) and then identify and remove a sampling trend, with the residuals from the trend line interpreted as the true biological signal. Acknowledging the limitations of formation counts as a sampling indicator, it remains controversial whether the correlation between rock and species counts, or the residuals from that correlation, represents the holy grail of biological truth [66]. Rarefaction [62] and shareholder quorum subsampling [27] have proved less controversial methods, but still imply that the geological drives the biological. Integrated approaches, which calculate the error due to incomplete preservation and biological diversity simultaneously, promise to place both on an even footing [24,67–70].

In this volume, Starrfelt & Liow [71] propose a method to identify true levels of bias, and so true levels of historical biodiversity, for particular clades in the fossil record. Their new TRiPS method (True Richness estimated using a Poisson Sampling model) is based on the assumption that a particular fossil species, if observed multiple times in a given time interval, has a relatively high probability of fossilization and discovery by palaeontologists. Starrfelt & Liow apply their method to the fossil record of dinosaurs, and estimate that there were 1536 genera and 1936 species of dinosaurs in all and that the numbers tramping across the Earth at any time ranged up to 300 in the latest Cretaceous, when diversity was highest. The method could revolutionize the ways in which palaeontologists and evolutionists in general treat fossil record data on ancient biodiversity.

The difficulty of extracting the biological signal from the geological noise was formalized by Raup et al.'s [72] pioneering work simulating phylogenetic diversification. At a given point in time, Raup et al. [72] assumed that each species has an equal probability of going extinct and an equal probability of giving rise to a descendant daughter species. These assumptions evoke the equal-rates Markov model of diversification [57] and Hubbell's Neutral Theory [56] for a clade fluctuating around its supposed equilibrium (assuming, in the latter case, that the birth and death rates are similar). A simple null model with constant rates was able to recover the diversity trajectories seen in the fossil record without recourse to ecological explanation [72]. 'Familiarity with the 'patterns' that random processes create is . . . essential' for all scientists [57, p. 2] because 'it is fatally easy to read a pattern into stochastically generated data' [73, p. 246]. Asserting a role for ecological regulators of biodiversity requires the rejection of appropriate null models that incorporate the temporal inconsistencies of fossilization [57]. Systematic geological structure can generate seductive impressions on macroevolutionary signals, such as bursts of genus origination [26], the clumping of last occurrence dates into apparently accelerated extinction events [74] as the ranges of higher taxa are bounded by mass extinctions [75]. Despite this warning for any literal reading of the fossil record, running Raup et al.'s simulations using empirically defined parameter estimates suggested that the fluctuations in fossil taxon counts most likely result from changes in the diversification dynamics rather than a constant-rate process [76].

Figure 2. Simplified schematic of the main regulators of biodiversity during a snapshot in deep time for a given clade. The strength and existence of interactions can change through time. We do not indicate the impacts of space in the schematic because it is assumed that if species are interacting, then, to some extent, their ranges must overlap. Coloured boxes denote distinct ecological types, which compete among each other and respond differentially to the same biotic and abiotic signals. (Online version in colour.)

4. The regulators and their signatures

Macroevolutionary diversification is the net outcome of speciation and extinction. The regulators of biodiversity act differentially through these two rates as different ecologies compete with each another, filtering global biotic and abiotic environmental change, to shape variation among contemporaneous species in their speciation probability and extinction risk (figure 2). Understanding the interplay between organismal biology and environmental change holds the key to identifying the generating mechanisms of macroevolutionary dynamics [13].

Although fossil data are increasingly being used in phylogenetic comparative methods [69,70,77], the key interaction between biology and the environment is still rarely incorporated. This is in part explained by the lack of methods, but also by the nature of the data. Phylogenetic studies using only extant taxa often reconstruct evolutionary history from a single time slice and are therefore blind to dynamic associations between biological and environmental change, as well as sequential evolutionary changes that influence the evolutionary fate of lineages [78]. This coupling of the biotic response to abiotic environmental change emphasizes one limitation of a simple extrapolation of population ecology theory into a macroevolutionary context. Sepkoski [4] assumed a single fixed equilibrium level of species diversity through hundreds of millions of years, which is a strong assumption if we hypothesize that environmental resources affect the outcome of competition [7] in deep time [46,79].

Competitive interactions might be the most commonly discussed biotic driver of diversification rate changes. Both origination and extinction rates have been reported as diversity-dependent and both can generate equilibrial dynamics in biodiversity [4,80,81]. At a finer taxonomic resolution than assumed by Alroy [80] or Foote [81], speciation rate seems to respond more closely than extinction rate to changes in within-clade diversity (figure 3; see also [13,46]), but this balance of influence need not be constant for all time [81]. Species interactions are increasingly being recognized as capable of leaving an impact on clade diversification through a variety of modes [82,83] and not simply slowdowns in diversification rate with increasing levels of standing diversity [84,85].

The dominant mode of macroevolutionary competition likely depends on how we define its arena. Unlike the case in figure 3, which analyses the whole Canidae family as a homogeneous unit, Silvestro et al. [53] reported little diversity-dependent speciation within each Canidae subfamily as a distinct guild [86] and evoked interspecific competition among subfamilies in a broader species pool, in which all species compete for similar resources. Under such a scenario, clade replacement selectively drives less competitive guilds to extinction [86]. This difference between figure 3 and Silvestro et al. [53] leads to the more refined hypothesis that biotic competition *between* closely interacting groups of species will leave a signature in extinction rates, whereas competition *within* closely interacting groups of species will leave a signature in speciation probability.

Developing this line of thought in this volume, Marshall & Quental [87] explore the hotly debated question of limits on diversification [40,79]. Verbal interpretations of a diversity dependence mechanism built into a dynamic carrying capacity exist [40,88], but an environmental regulator of such dynamic limits has not been identified statistically. Marshall & Quental [87] argue that an appropriate definition of the species pool and the consideration of time-variable carrying capacities could reconcile evidence of bounded versus unbounded diversification. The authors propose a diversity-dependent modelling framework with a carrying capacity varying through time as a result of changing either intrinsic diversification rates or the strength of the diversity-dependent effect. Importantly, their approach allows resolution of a long-standing debate about whether total global biodiversity has been held at equilibrium levels for long spans of time, or whether global biodiversity never reaches such levels.

Global-scale analyses are fundamentally restricted by biogeographic variation. The latitudinal diversity gradient is one of the most frequently described macroecological patterns [89], but has not been constant through time [90]. The tropics are cited as both a cradle of and a museum for diversity [91,92], with the consequence being that these biomes act as net exporters of biodiversity to other regions [92,93]. In this volume, Fenton et al. [94] investigate when and how the modern latitudinal diversity gradient in calcareous zooplankton became established. The authors construct latitudinal diversity gradients in deep time as an independent dataset to assess whether any putative driver has a dominant underlying cause or reflects multiple factors acting in concert [91,92], including the statistical artefact of the mid-domain effect [95]. Fenton et al. [94] demonstrate no latitudinal diversity gradient at the beginning of the Eocene epoch, but that the modern-day pattern was established by the Eocene–Oligocene Transition 33.7 Ma.

If specialist species depend intimately on their native biome to persist, then any climate change that alters the spatial extent of these biomes will rapidly lead to their extinction. Exploring the interactions of species and their geographical ranges over ecological and evolutionary timescales has been hard. In this volume, Villalobos et al. [96] explore how species co-occur with other species and find that in the long term, species respond individualistically to major climatic shifts, while more stable climates allowed less phylogenetically variable, yet richer palaeocommunities to settle. The authors calculate phylogenetic fields, the co-occurrence patterns

Figure 3. Diversity-dependent controls acts more strongly through speciation than extinction in Cenozoic Era planktonic foraminifera [33] and Canidae over the last 40 Myr [53]. Number of species was calculated at the start of each bin and regressed against speciation or extinction rate in the next 1 Myr. Regression lines correct for overdispersion and non-constant variance with the mean. Solid lines indicate statistically significant relationships ($p < 0.01$), while dashed lines indicate non-significant ($p > 0.05$) relationships. (Online version in colour.)

among species and their phylogenetic structure within individual species ranges, for living and extinct mammal species over long spans of time, to explore how individual species interact with predators, prey and competitors, and with major changes in physical environments.

Although these methods can be readily applied in deep time, reconstructing species interactions is only useful when the spatial distribution of communities can be accurately estimated. The preservational biases of the fossil record are exacerbated when variations through space and time require analytical attention. In this volume, Silvestro *et al.* [97] develop flexible new dispersal–extinction approaches that use fossil data to infer macroevolutionary and biogeographic processes while taking into account the incompleteness (temporal and spatial) of the fossil record [98,99]. The impact of migration is not symmetric [97,100], implying a role for biotic interactions among already existing species and the new invaders in determining macroevolutionary fates. A major problem with most methods that use extant data only is the fact that ancestral geographical ranges inferred from phylogenies might be blind to local past extinction and temporal changes in the asymmetry of dispersal rates. Silvestro *et al.* [97] applied their method to a genus-level empirical dataset of Cenozoic terrestrial plants. Their empirical results suggest a predominant dispersal from Eurasia to North America in the Eocene climatic cooling period, but a higher dispersal from North America to Eurasia during the more stable climatic period between 32 and 14 Ma. The most recent 10 Myr are characterized by a more symmetric dispersal between both continents, and higher extinction rates in Eurasia.

Empirical studies focus increasingly on geographical range as a predictor of extinction, but evidence is mixed: large geographical range buffers fossil taxa against background extinction [101] and contemporary extinction risk [102], but might be futile in the face of mass extinction [103]. Geographical range forms a composite trait not expressed by individuals but by the populations they form, that is, like a putative upper limit to species richness, another emergent phenomenon from lower level processes. While space can reveal the extent of a given ecological interaction, and different spatial extents

impact the probability of speciation [104] and extinction [49], unpicking any ecological catalyst of macroevolution requires identification of the characters that define a species' functional role in their communities [20].

5. Beyond counts and towards ecological significance

While most deep-time studies on biodiversity dynamics focus on counting taxa (however defined), such counts have limited ability to indicate ecosystem functioning [105]. Phenotypic traits provide this ecosystem functioning and determine the ecological redundancy of given species within a community [106]. Experimental studies indicate that initial species losses have relatively little impact on the healthy functioning of the ecosystem, but that increasing drops in species richness provoke increasing declines of functioning through nonlinear feedbacks [107]. The limitations of taxon counts as a coarse presence/absence metric for inferring the link between organism and its environment have long been acknowledged, as have those of simply measuring abundance. 'It is time we stopped simply counting taxa and tracking their numbers over time, and began looking at them, measuring them and estimating their ecological roles' [108, p. 340]. Mass extinction events generate high levels of species extinction, but might slightly reduce [109] or fundamentally change [110] ecological functioning in the clade. More informative dimensions exist and better describe the state of a given assemblage or community [94,105,111].

In this volume, Missa *et al.* [112] use computer simulations to show, under Neutral Theory [56] with alternative modes of speciation, that species–area relationships and species-abundance distributions reach their equilibriums after species richness. Phylogenetic patterns of biodiversity either do not (e.g. phylogenetic diversity) or take far longer to converge (e.g. tree imbalance and gamma statistics). The authors also show that the mode and magnitude of speciation strongly affect the time taken for ecological patterns to reach their equilibrium. The authors conclude:

'Given that real metacommunities may not have reached equilibrium in terms of species richness, it would be unwise for users of the Neutral Theory of Biodiversity to continue assuming that other biodiversity patterns, which take even longer to converge to equilibrium, are themselves at equilibrium' [112].

One of the reasons for the resurgence of interest in higher taxa is that they, if robustly defined, are more intimately linked to fundamental morphological reconfiguration than species [38]. The principal way in which functional types are defined in deep time is by assigning ecological roles to certain characters [113]. The environment moderates both the number of ways that organisms can persist, and also the efficiency of a particular method: the number of hypercarnivores, defined by a common dental morphology [114], has been roughly constant through time, despite ongoing turnover in named species [115]. Although taxon diversity and morphological disparity are not always coupled [116], morphological disparity within a clade typically saturates more rapidly than taxon diversity counts [117]. Obtaining accurate estimates of this disparity is fundamental to adoption of trait-based approaches for their use in inferring niche breadth and stability, as well as the strength of ecological interactions [118,119]. In this volume, Hsiang et al. [120] describe algorithmic procedures to rapidly extract size and shape phenotypic data in microfossil communities, providing the robust sample sizes from which trait (co)variation can be accurately estimated. Hsiang et al. [120] use their workflow to compare and contrast dendrograms obtained through morphological, ecological and phylogenetic data. Another potential use is to compare the multivariate morphological data that underpins the dendrograms and so assess the relative contributions of evolutionary or ecological processes via simultaneous alterations to phylogeny, environment and species abundance. A focus on morphological traits promises to 'bind the past and present together' [121] as a common analytical currency for analysis in deep time and the present day. The challenge ahead is therefore to identify ecologically meaningful traits that are incompletely rendered by higher taxon definitions [121,122].

Although the fossil record is the most direct way to access the role of different regulators [78], it has also, until recently, been blind to preservation of certain body parts and physiological functions that might be very relevant ecologically. In this volume, Trueman et al. [123] review ecogeochemical methods to recover individual scale information from macrofossil remains, and thus study food web structure, nutrient fluxes and population connectivity in contemporary deep-sea fish systems. Deep-sea fishes share with fossils many of the problems in extracting trait data: difficult-to-access material and vanishingly rare evidence of direct interactions among individuals. The authors provide a balanced perspective of the potential impact of the approach. While evidence exists that symbiosis influences macroevolutionary dynamics in deep time [13], other areas are less well understood: trace element analysis can indicate population connectivity in the focal modern deep-sea fishes, but remain unproven in deep time [123]. Adoption of such techniques to yield data on behaviour and physiology promises a more holistic (beyond morphology) view of the interplay between organism and its environment in deep time.

Selection pressure and long-term rates of evolution are regulated by ecological opportunity [124], but any response to selection depends on individual form [125,126]. Individual form matters because individuals in species are characterized by a distinctive set of traits, many of which covary. Selection on one trait can generate a response to selection in others [126], implying that we need multivariate approaches within functional modules [127]. The decoupling of size and wing shape, for example, differs among distinct subfamilies of fossil birds and occurred as a precursor to flight [128]. Despite Simpson's evocative 'choppy sea' metaphor of a dynamic adaptive landscape [129], there are 'dismally few' empirical estimates of how the constraints imposed by trait covariance evolve during a species' existence [130].

Multivariate changes in ecologically relevant traits offer strong potential to better understand the processes that bridge micro- and macroevolution [131]. If there are no strictly macroevolutionary processes [132], then we need a finer resolution to unpick the circumstances that promote ecological divergence to become fixed through some speciation events, but not in others. Coarse macroecological proxies, even when calculated as integrated variables over the whole duration of each lineage [133], show negligible explanatory power to predict molecular divergence, albeit among a very limited number of species [134] evoking the hypothesis that molecular divergence is accelerated during speciation events [135]. It is now widely accepted that evolutionary divergence can be rapid [14,136], and its rate covaries negatively with the interval being studied [14]. While diversity dynamics need the fossil record to understand the dual roles of speciation and extinction [78], fine temporal resolution might reveal that the ecological regulators of biodiversity actually operate chiefly in a punctuated fashion during post-speciation divergence, rather than throughout a species' existence once its ecological role is, to a large extent, established.

6. Conclusion

> It is my hope that future work will not reject the question of competition in macroevolution out of hand, but will explore it with new models that are more sophisticated than coupled logistic equations and can use these accumulating paleontological data to produce far more predictive, and therefore testable, statements about how species replace one another over the vast spans of evolutionary time. [137, p. 245]

The challenge is not to find a dynamic signature of ecological interactions in macroevolutionary dynamics, but rather to isolate a particular generating mechanism from the many sources of bias, the role of random chance and the disparity of potential outcomes. Continued dialogue and ever-closer union of fossil and modern approaches will prove essential in maintaining this momentum [138]. Concluding this volume, Price et al. [138] extend the argument that morphological traits 'bind the past and present together' [121] to an explicitly functional context, arguing that this focus alongside greater integration across biodiversity research silos will enable scientists to better understand how lower level ecological and evolutionary processes scale up and down.

It is difficult to separate the role of the biotic and abiotic environments. Recent methodological and data advances, many showcased within this theme issue, nonetheless offer increased hope for a brighter future in which we gain a better understanding of how ecological mechanisms regulate the interplay between organismal biology and environmental change to drive macroevolutionary dynamics.

8

rstb.royalsocietypublishing.org   *Phil. Trans. R. Soc. B* **371**: 20150216

Short biographies

Thomas H. G. Ezard is NERC Advanced Research Fellow across Ocean & Earth Sciences and the Centre for Biological Sciences at the University of Southampton. He leads a group that investigates the interaction of environmental change and population structure, attempting to contextualize evolutionary and ecological dynamics through a demographic lens. His interdisciplinary group most often develops the interface of mathematical and statistical methods for application in the life sciences. Current projects include an individual-based perspective on macroevolution using fossilized foraminifera, and the drivers of transient booms and busts in human population growth.

Tiago B. Quental is Assistant Professor at the Department of Ecology of the University of São Paulo. He leads a research group focused on understanding spatial and temporal patterns of biodiversity and the mechanisms involved in generating species diversity. His research interests are not limited to a specific taxonomic group but are instead motivated by a range of questions and structured around them. At the moment, he is particularly interested in understanding the role of biotic interactions on biodiversity changes in deep time. The main tools used to approach those questions are molecular phylogenies, fossil record, ecological data and numerical simulation.

Michael J. Benton is Professor of Vertebrate Palaeontology at the University of Bristol. He researches fossil reptiles of the Triassic, including the origin of the dinosaurs, and is particularly interested in the deep-time evolution of life, especially the roles of mass extinctions and adaptive radiations. He is currently investigating questions concerning the quality of the fossil record, the meaning of long-term global diversity curves in terms of models for the evolution of life, the nature of the Permo-Triassic mass extinction and its role in extinction and in opening opportunities for a massive recovery of life in the Triassic.

References

1. Kurtén B. 1954 Population dynamics: a new method in paleontology. *J. Paleontol.* **28**, 286–292.

2. Watson HW, Galton F. 1875 On the probability of the extinction of families. *J. R. Anthropol. Inst. Great Brit. Ireland* **4**, 138–144. (doi:10.2307/2841222)

3. Nicholson AJ. 1957 The self-adjustment of populations to change. *Cold Spring Harb. Symp. Quant. Biol.* **22**, 119–163. (doi:10.1101/SQB.1957.022.01.017)

4. Sepkoski JJ. 1978 Kinetic-model of Phanerozoic taxonomic diversity. 1. Analysis of marine orders. *Paleobiology* **4**, 223–251.

5. Benton MJ. 1997 Models for the diversification of life. *Trends Ecol. Evol.* **12**, 490–495. (doi:10.1016/S0169-5347(97)84410-2)

6. Jablonski D. 2008 Biotic interactions and macroevolution: extensions and mismatches across scales and levels. *Evolution* **62**, 715–739. (doi:10.1111/j.1558-5646.2008.00317.x)

7. Tilman D. 1981 Tests of resource competition theory using four species of Lake Michigan algae. *Ecology* **62**, 802–815. (doi:10.2307/1937747)

8. Turchin P, Wood SN, Ellner SP, Kendall BE, Murdoch WW, Fischlin A, Casas J, McCauley E, Briggs CJ. 2003 Dynamical effects of plant quality and parasitism on population cycles of larch budmoth. *Ecology* **84**, 1207–1214. (doi:10.1890/0012-9658(2003)084[1207:DEOPQA]2.0.CO;2)

9. Coulson T, Rohani P, Pascual M. 2004 Skeletons, noise and population growth: the end of an old debate? *Trends Ecol. Evol.* **19**, 359–364. (doi:10.1016/j.tree.2004.05.008)

10. Benton MJ. 2009 The Red Queen and the Court Jester: species diversity and the role of biotic and abiotic factors through time. *Science* **323**, 728–732. (doi:10.1126/science.1157719)

11. van Valen L. 1973 A new evolutionary law. *Evol. Theory* **1**, 1–30.

12. Barnosky AD. 2001 Distinguishing the effects of the Red Queen and Court Jester on Meiocene mammal evolution in the northern Rocky Mountains. *J. Vertebr. Paleontol.* **21**, 172–185. (doi:10.1671/0272-4634(2001)021[0172:DTEOTR]2.0.CO;2)

13. Ezard THG, Aze T, Pearson PN, Purvis A. 2011 Interplay between changing climate and species' ecology drives macroevolutionary dynamics. *Science* **332**, 349–351. (doi:10.1126/science.1203060)

14. Gingerich PD. 2001 Rates of evolution on the time scale of the evolutionary process. *Genetica* **112**, 127–144. (doi:10.1023/A:1013311015886)

15. McInnes L et al. 2011 Integrating ecology into macroevolutionary research. *Biol. Lett.* **7**, 644–646. (doi:10.1098/rsbl.2011.0358)

16. Bambach RK. 1993 Seafood through time: changes in biomass, energetics, and productivity in the marine ecosystem. *Paleobiology* **19**, 372–397.

17. Holland SM, Scalafani JA. 2015 Phanerozoic diversity and neutral theory. *Paleobiology* **41**, 369–376. (doi:10.1017/pab.2015.10)

18. Roopnarine PD, Angielczyk KD. 2015 Community stability and selective extinction during the Permian–Triassic mass extinction. *Science* **350**, 90–93. (doi:10.1126/science.aab1371)

19. Bambach RK, Bush AM, Erwin DH. 2007 Autecology and the filling of ecospace: key metazoan radiations. *Palaeontology* **50**, 1–22. (doi:10.1111/j.1475-4983.2006.00611.x)

20. Bush AM, Bambach RK. 2011 Paleoecologic megatrends in marine Metazoa. *Annu. Rev. Earth Planet. Sci.* **39**, 241–269. (doi:10.1146/annurev-earth-040809-152556)

21. Bartlett HH. 1940 The concept of the genus. *Bull. Torrey Bot. Club* **67**, 349–389. (doi:10.2307/2481068)

22. Mayr E. 1969 *Principles of systematic zoology*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.

23. Rothfels CJ, Johnson AK, Hovenkamp PH, Swofford DL, Roskam HC, Fraser-Jenkins CR, Windham MD, Pryer KM. 2015 Natural hybridization between genera that diverged from each other approximately 60 million years ago. *Am. Nat.* **185**, 433–442. (doi:10.1086/679662)

24. Liow LH, Finarelli JA. 2014 A dynamic global equilibrium in carnivoran diversification over 20 million years. *Proc. R. Soc. B* **281**, 2013–2312. (doi:10.1098/rspb.2013.2312)

25. Foote M. 2001 Inferring temporal patterns of preservation, origination, and extinction from taxonomic survivorship analysis. *Paleobiology* **27**, 602–630. (doi:10.1666/0094-8373(2001)027<0602:ITPOPO>2.0.CO;2)

26. Peters SE. 2005 Geologic constraints on the macroevolutionary history of marine animals. *Proc. Natl Acad. Sci. USA* **102**, 12 326–12 331. (doi:10.1073/pnas.0502616102)

27. Alroy J. 2010 The shifting balance of diversity among major marine animal groups. *Science* **329**, 1191–1194. (doi:10.1126/science.1189910)

28. Foote M. 1993 Discordance and concordance between morphological and taxonomic diversity. *Paleobiology* **19**, 185–204.

29. Ezard THG, Pearson PN, Aze T, Purvis A. 2012 The meaning of birth and death (in macroevolutionary birth-death models). *Biol. Lett.* **8**, 139–142. (doi:10.1098/rsbl.2011.0699)

30. Raup DM. 1978 Cohort analysis of generic survivorship. *Paleobiology* **4**, 1–15.

31. Stanley SM. 1979 *Macroevolution: pattern and process*. San Francisco, CA: WH. Freeman and Co.

32. Simpson GG. 1951 The species concept. *Evolution* **5**, 285–298. (doi:10.2307/2405675)

33. Aze T, Ezard THG, Purvis A, Coxall HK, Stewart DRM, Wade BS, Pearson PN. 2011 A phylogeny of Cenozoic macroperforate planktonic foraminifera from fossil data. *Biol. Rev.* **86**, 900–927. (doi:10.1111/j.1469-185X.2011.00178.x)

34. Zachos J, Pagani M, Sloan L, Thomas E, Billups K. 2001 Trends, rhythms, and aberrations in global climate 65 Ma to present. *Science* **292**, 686–693. (doi:10.1126/science.1059412)

35. Zachos JC, Dickens GR, Zeebe RE. 2008 An early Cenozoic perspective on greenhouse warming and carbon-cycle dynamics. *Nature* **451**, 279–283. (doi:10.1038/nature06588)

36. Liow LH, Skaug HJ, Ergon T, Schweder T. 2010 Global occurrence trajectories of microfossils: is the rise and persistence of species influenced by environmental volatility? *Paleobiology* **36**, 224–252. (doi:10.1666/08080.1)

37. Doran NA, Arnold AJ, Parker WC, Huffer FW. 2006 Is extinction age dependent? *PALAIOS* **21**, 571–579. (doi:10.2110/palo.2006.p06-055r)

38. Levinton JS. 1979 A theory of diversity equilibrium and morphological evolution. *Science* **204**, 335–336. (doi:10.1126/science.204.4390.335)

39. Mallet J. 2008 Hybridization, ecological races and the nature of species: empirical evidence for the ease of speciation. *Phil. Trans. R. Soc. B* **363**, 2971–2986. (doi:10.1098/rstb.2008.0081)

40. Rabosky DL, Hurlbert AH. 2015 Richness at continental scales is dominated by ecological limits. *Am. Nat.* **185**, 572–583. (doi:10.1086/680850)

41. Barraclough TG, Humphreys AM. 2015 The evolutionary reality of species and higher taxa in plants: a survey of post-modern opinion and evidence. *New Phytol.* **207**, 291–296. (doi:10.1111/nph.13232)

42. Humphreys AM, Barraclough TG. 2014 The evolutionary reality of higher taxa in mammals. *Proc. R. Soc. B* **281**, 20132750. (doi:10.1098/rspb.2013.2750)

43. Bokma F, Baek SK, Minnhagen P. 2014 50 years of inordinate fondness. *Syst. Biol.* **63**, 251–256. (doi:10.1093/sysbio/syt067)

44. Maruvka YE, Shnerb NM, Kessler DA, Ricklefs RE. 2013 Model for macroevolutionary dynamics. *Proc. Natl Acad. Sci USA* **110**, E2460–E2469. (doi:10.1073/pnas.1220014110)

45. Barraclough TG. 2010 Evolving entities: towards a unified framework for understanding diversity at the species and higher levels. *Phil. Trans. R. Soc. B* **365**, 1801–1813. (doi:10.1098/rstb.2009.0276)

46. Alroy J. 1996 Constant extinction, constrained diversification, and uncoordinated stasis in North American mammals. *Palaeogeog. Palaeoclimatol. Palaeoecol.* **127**, 285–311. (doi:10.1016/S0031-0182(96)00100-9)

47. Sepkoski JJ. 1979 Kinetic-model of Phanerozoic taxonomic diversity. 2. Early Phanerozoic families and multiple equilibria. *Paleobiology* **5**, 222–251.

48. Sepkoski JJ. 1984 A kinetic-model of Phanerozoic taxonomic diversity. 3. Post-Paleozoic families and mass extinction. *Paleobiology* **10**, 246–267.

49. Lande R, Engen S, Sæther B-E. 2003 *Stochastic population dynamics in ecology and conservation*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

50. May RM. 1974 *Complexity and stability in model ecosystem*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

51. Engen S, Bakke O, Islam A. 1998 Demographic and environmental stochasticity: concepts and definitions. *Biometrics* **54**, 840–846. (doi:10.2307/2533838)

52. Stenseth NC, Smith JM. 1984 Coevolution in ecosystems—Red Queen evolution or stasis. *Evolution* **38**, 870–880. (doi:10.2307/2408397)

53. Silvestro D, Antonelli A, Salamin N, Quental TB. 2015 The role of clade competition in the diversification of North American canids. *Proc. Natl Acad. Sci. USA* **112**, 8684–8689. (doi:10.1073/pnas.1502803112)

54. Blois JL, Zarnetske PL, Fitzpatrick MC, Finnegan S. 2013 Climate change and the past, present, and future of biotic interactions. *Science* **341**, 499–504. (doi:10.1126/science.1237184)

55. Meng J, McKenna MC. 1998 Faunal turnovers of Palaeogene mammals from the Mongolian Plateau. *Nature* **394**, 364–367. (doi:10.1038/28603)

56. Hubbell SJ. 2001 *The unified neutral theory of biodiversity and biogeography*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

57. Nee S. 2006 Birth–death models in macroevolution. *Annu. Rev. Ecol. Evol. Syst.* **37**, 1–17. (doi:10.1146/annurev.ecolsys.37.091305.110035)

58. Valentine JW, Foin TC, Peart D. 1978 A provincial model of Phanerozoic marine diversity. *Paleobiology* **4**, 55–66.

59. Sepkoski Jr JJ. 1976 Species diversity in the Phanerozoic: species–area effect. *Paleobiology* **2**, 298–303.

60. Jordan SMR, Barraclough TG, Rosindell J. 2016 Quantifying the effects of the break up of Pangaea on global terrestrial diversification with neutral theory. *Phil. Trans. R. Soc. B* **371**, 20150221. (doi:10.1098/rstb.2015.0221)

61. Raup DM. 1972 Taxonomic diversity during the Phanerozoic. *Science* **177**, 1065–1071. (doi:10.1126/science.177.4054.1065)

62. Foote M. 1992 Rarefaction analysis of morphological and taxonomic diversity. *Paleobiology* **18**, 1–16.

63. Alroy J *et al.* 2001 Effects of sampling standardization on estimates of Phanerozoic marine diversification. *Proc. Natl Acad. Sci. USA* **98**, 6261–6266. (doi:10.1073/pnas.111144698)

64. Smith AB, McGowan AJ. 2007 The shape of the Phanerozoic marine palaeodiversity curve: how much can be predicted from the sedimentary rock record of Western Europe? *Palaeontology* **50**, 1–10. (doi:10.1111/j.1475-4983.2007.00693.x)

65. Lloyd GT, Pearson PN, Young JR, Smith AB. 2012 Sampling bias and the fossil record of planktonic foraminifera on land and in the deep sea. *Paleobiology* **38**, 569–584. (doi:10.1666/11041.1)

66. Benton MJ. 2015 Palaeodiversity and formation counts: redundancy or bias? *Palaeontology* **58**, 1003–1029. (doi:10.1111/pala.12191)

67. Liow LH, Reitan T, Harnik PG. 2015 Ecological interactions on macroevolutionary time scales: clams and brachiopods are more than ships that pass in the night. *Ecol. Lett.* **18**, 1030–1039. (doi:10.1111/ele.12485)

68. Morlon H, Parsons TL, Plotkin JB. 2011 Reconciling molecular phylogenies with the fossil record. *Proc. Natl Acad. Sci. USA* **108**, 16 327–16 332. (doi:10.1073/pnas.1102543108)

69. Heath TA, Huelsenbeck JP, Stadler T. 2014 The fossilized birth–death process for coherent calibration of divergence-time estimates. *Proc. Natl Acad. Sci. USA* **111**, E2957–E2966. (doi:10.1073/pnas.1319091111)

70. Zhang C, Stadler T, Klopfstein S, Heath TA, Ronquist F. 2015 Total-evidence dating under the fossilized birth–death process. *Syst. Biol.* **65**, 228–249. (doi:10.1093/sysbio/syv080)

71. Starrfelt J, Liow LH. 2016 How many dinosaur species were there? Fossil bias and true richness estimated using a Poisson sampling model. *Phil. Trans. R. Soc. B* **371**, 20150219. (doi:10.1098/rstb.2015.0219)

72. Raup DM, Gould SJ, Schopf TJM, Simberloff DS. 1973 Stochastic models of phylogeny and evolution of diversity. *J. Geol.* **81**, 525–542. (doi:10.1086/627905)

73. Maynard Smith J. 1989 The causes of extinction. *Phil. Trans. R. Soc. Lond. B* **325**, 241–252. (doi:10.1098/rstb.1989.0086)

74. Holland SM, Patzkowsky ME. 2015 The stratigraphy of mass extinction. *Palaeontology* **58**, 903–924. (doi:10.1111/pala.12188)

75. Erwin DH. 1994 The Permo-Triassic extinction. *Nature* **367**, 231–236. (doi:10.1038/367231a0)

76. Stanley SM, Signor PW, Lidgard S, Karr AF. 1981 Natural clades differ from "random" clades: simulations and analyses. *Paleobiology* **7**, 115–127.

77. Slater GJ, Harmon LJ. 2013 Unifying fossils and phylogenies for comparative analyses of diversification and trait evolution. *Methods Ecol. Evol.* **4**, 699–702. (doi:10.1111/2041-210X.12091)

78. Quental TB, Marshall CR. 2010 Diversity dynamics: molecular phylogenies need the fossil record. *Trends Ecol. Evol.* **25**, 434–441. (doi:10.1016/j.tree.2010.05.002)

79. Harmon LJ, Harrison S. 2015 Diversity is dynamic and unbounded at local and continental scales. *Am. Nat.* **185**, 584–593. (doi:10.1086/680859)

80. Alroy J. 2008 Dynamics of origination and extinction in the marine fossil record. *Proc. Natl Acad. Sci. USA* **105**, 11 536–11 542. (doi:10.1073/pnas.0802597105)

81. Foote M. 2000 Origination and extinction components of taxonomic diversity: Paleozoic and post-Paleozoic dynamics. *Paleobiology* **26**, 578–605. (doi:10.1666/0094-8373(2000)026<0578:OAECOT>2.0.CO;2)

82. Cornell HV. 2013 Is regional species diversity bounded or unbounded? *Biol. Rev.* **88**, 140–163. (doi:10.1111/j.1469-185X.2012.00245.x)

83. Voje KL, Holen ØH, Liow LH, Stenseth NC. 2015 The role of biotic forces in driving macroevolution: beyond the Red Queen. *Proc. R. Soc. B* **282**, 20150186. (doi:10.1098/rspb.2015.0186)

84. Phillimore AB, Price TD. 2008 Density-dependent cladogenesis in birds. *PLoS Biol.* **6**, 483–489. (doi:10.1371/journal.pbio.0060071)

85. Etienne RS, Haegeman B, Stadler T, Aze T, Pearson PN, Purvis A, Phillimore AB. 2012 Diversity-dependence brings molecular phylogenies closer to agreement with the fossil record. *Proc. R. Soc. B* **279**, 1300–1309. (doi:10.1098/rspb.2011.1439)

86. Van Valkenburgh B. 1999 Major patterns in the history of carnivorous mammals. *Annu. Rev. Earth Planet. Sci.* **27**, 463–493. (doi:10.1146/annurev.earth.27.1.463)

87. Marshall CR, Quental TB. 2016 The uncertain role of diversity dependence in species diversification and the need to incorporate time-varying carrying capacities. *Phil. Trans. R. Soc. B* **371**, 20150217. (doi:10.1098/rstb.2015.0217)

88. Foote M. 2010 The geological history of biodiversity. In *Evolution since Darwin: the first 150 years*. (eds MA Bell, DJ Futuyma, WF Eanes, JS Levinton) pp. 479–510. Sunderland, MA: Sinauer Associates.

89. Hillebrand H. 2004 On the generality of the latitudinal diversity gradient. *Am. Nat.* **163**, 192–211. (doi:10.1086/381004)

90. Mannion PD, Upchurch P, Benson RBJ, Goswami A. 2013 The latitudinal biodiversity gradient through deep time. *Trends Ecol. Evol.* **29**, 42–50. (doi:10.1016/j.tree.2013.09.012)

91. Jablonski D, Roy K, Valentine JW. 2006 Out of the tropics: evolutionary dynamics of the latitudinal diversity gradient. *Science* **314**, 102–106. (doi:10.1126/science.1130880)

92. Jablonski D, Belanger CL, Berke SK, Huang S, Krug AZ, Roy K, Tomasovych A, Valentine JW. 2013 Out of the tropics, but how? Fossils, bridge species, and thermal ranges in the dynamics of the marine latitudinal diversity gradient. *Proc. Natl Acad. Sci. USA* **110**, 10 487–10 494. (doi:10.1073/pnas.1308997110)

93. Kiessling W, Simpson C, Foote M. 2010 Reefs as cradles of evolution and sources of biodiversity in the Phanerozoic. *Science* **327**, 196–198. (doi:10.1126/science.1182241)

94. Fenton IS, Pearson PN, Dunkley Jones T, Farnsworth A, Lunt DJ, Markwick P, Purvis A. 2016 The impact of Cenozoic cooling on assemblage diversity in planktonic foraminifera. *Phil. Trans. R. Soc. B* **371**, 20150224. (doi:10.1098/rstb.2015.0224)

95. Colwell RK, Hurtt GC. 1994 Nonbiological gradients in species richness and a spurious Rapoport effect. *Am. Nat* **144**, 570–595. (doi:10.1086/285695)

96. Villalobos F, Carotenuto F, Raia P, Diniz-Filho JAF. 2016 Phylogenetic fields through time: temporal dynamics of geographical co-occurrence and phylogenetic structure within species ranges. *Phil. Trans. R. Soc. B* **371**, 20150220. (doi:10.1098/rstb.2015.0220)

97. Silvestro D, Zizka A, Bacon CD, Cascales-Miñana B, Salamin N, Antonelli A. 2016 Fossil biogeography: a new model to infer dispersal, extinction and sampling from palaeontological data. *Phil. Trans. R. Soc. B* **371**, 20150225. (doi:10.1098/rstb.2015.0225)

98. Wagner PJ, Marcot JD. 2013 Modelling distributions of fossil sampling rates over time, space and taxa: assessment and implications for macroevolutionary studies. *Methods Ecol. Evol.* **4**, 703–713. (doi:10.1111/2041-210X.12088)

99. Matzke NJ. 2013 Probabilistic historical biogeography: new models for founder-event speciation, imperfect detection, and fossils allow improved accuracy and model-testing. *Front. Biogeogr.* **5**, 242–248.

100. Pires MM, Silvestro D, Quental TB. 2015 Continental faunal exchange and the asymmetrical radiation of carnivores. *Proc. R. Soc. B* **282**, 20151952. (doi:10.1098/rspb.2015.1952)

101. Payne JL, Finnegan S. 2007 The effect of geographic range on extinction risk during background and mass extinction. *Proc. Natl Acad. Sci. USA* **104**, 10 506–10 511. (doi:10.1073/pnas.0701257104)

102. Purvis A, Gittleman JL, Cowlishaw G, Mace GM. 2000 Predicting extinction risk in declining species. *Proc. R. Soc. Lond. B* **267**, 1947–1952. (doi:10.1098/rspb.2000.1234)

103. Dunhill AM, Wills MA. 2015 Geographic range did not confer resilience to extinction in terrestrial vertebrates at the end-Triassic crisis. *Nat. Commun.* **6**, 7980. (doi:10.1038/ncomms8980)

104. Kisel Y, Barraclough TG. 2010 Speciation has a spatial scale that depends on levels of gene flow. *Am. Nat.* **175**, 316–334. (doi:10.1086/650369)

105. Mace GM *et al.* 2014 Approaches to defining a planetary boundary for biodiversity. *Glob. Environ. Change* **28**, 289–297. (doi:10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2014.07.009)

106. Reich PB, Tilman D, Isbell F, Mueller K, Hobbie SE, Flynn DFB, Eisenhauer N. 2012 Impacts of biodiversity loss escalate through time as redundancy fades. *Science* **336**, 589–592. (doi:10.1126/science.1217909)

107. Cardinale BJ *et al.* 2012 Biodiversity loss and its impact on humanity. *Nature* **486**, 59–67. (doi:10.1038/nature11148)

108. van Valkenburgh B, Janis CM. 1993 Historical diversity patterns in North American large herbivores and carnivores. In *Species diversity in ecological communities* (eds RE Ricklefs, D Schluter), pp. 330–340. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

109. Foster WJ, Twitchett RJ. 2014 Functional diversity of marine ecosystems after the Late Permian mass extinction event. *Nat. Geosci.* **7**, 233–238. (doi:10.1038/ngeo2079)

110. Bambach RK, Knoll AH, Sepkoski JJ. 2002 Anatomical and ecological constraints on Phanerozoic animal diversity in the marine realm. *Proc. Natl Acad. Sci. USA* **99**, 6854–6859. (doi:10.1073/pnas.092150999)

111. Mason NWH, de Bello F, Mouillot D, Pavoine S, Dray S. 2013 A guide for using functional diversity indices to reveal changes in assembly processes along ecological gradients. *J. Veg. Sci.* **24**, 794–806. (doi:10.1111/jvs.12013)

112. Missa O, Dytham C, Morlon H. 2016 Understanding how biodiversity unfolds through time under neutral theory. *Phil. Trans. R. Soc. B* **371**, 20150226. (doi:10.1098/rstb.2015.0226)

113. Foote M. 1994 Morphological disparity in Ordovician–Devonian crinoids and the early saturation of morphological space. *Paleobiology* **20**, 320–344.

114. Van Valkenburgh B. 1991 Iterative evolution of hypercarnivory in canids (Mammalia: Carnivora): evolutionary interactions among sympatric predators. *Paleobiology* **17**, 340–362.

115. Slater GJ. 2015 Iterative adaptive radiations of fossil canids show no evidence for diversity-dependent trait evolution. *Proc. Natl Acad. Sci. USA* **112**, 4897–4902. (doi:10.1073/pnas.1403666111)

116. Ruta M, Angielczyk KD, Fröbisch J, Benton MJ. 2013 Decoupling of morphological disparity and taxic diversity during the adaptive radiation of anomodont therapsids. *Proc. R. Soc. B* **280**, 20131071. (doi:10.1098/rspb.2013.1071)

117. Hughes M, Gerber S, Wills MA. 2013 Clades reach highest morphological disparity early in their evolution. *Proc. Natl Acad. Sci. USA* **110**, 13 875–13 879. (doi:10.1073/pnas.1302642110)

118. Violle C, Enquist BJ, McGill BJ, Jiang L, Albert CH, Hulshof C, Jung V, Messier J. 2012 Viva la variance! A reply to Nakagawa & Schielzeth.

Trends Ecol. Evol. **27**, 475–476. (doi:10.1016/j.tree.2012.06.004)

119. Bolnick DI et al. 2011 Why intraspecific trait variation matters in community ecology. *Trends Ecol. Evol.* **26**, 183–192. (doi:10.1016/j.tree.2011.01.009)

120. Hsiang AY, Elder LE, Hull PM. 2016 Towards a morphological metric of assemblage dynamics in the fossil record: a test case using planktonic foraminifera. *Phil. Trans. R. Soc. B* **371**, 20150227. (doi:10.1098/rstb.2015.0227)

121. Eronen JT, Polly PD, Fred M, Damuth J, Frank DC, Mosbrugger V, Scheidegger C, Stenseth NC, Fortelius M. 2010 Ecometrics: the traits that bind the past and present together. *Integr. Zool.* **5**, 88–101. (doi:10.1111/j.1749-4877.2010.00192.x)

122. Parr CS, Guralnick R, Cellinese N, Page RDM. 2012 Evolutionary informatics: unifying knowledge about the diversity of life. *Trends Ecol. Evol.* **27**, 94–103. (doi:10.1016/j.tree.2011.11.001)

123. Trueman CN, Chung M-T, Shores D. 2016 Ecogeochemistry potential in deep time biodiversity illustrated using a modern deep-water case study. *Phil. Trans. R. Soc. B* **371**, 20150223. (doi:10.1098/rstb.2015.0223)

124. Simpson GG. 1953 *The major features of evolution*. New York, NY: Columbia University Press.

125. Wright SG. 1968 *Evolution and the genetics of populations*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

126. Lande R. 1979 Quantitative genetic analysis of multivariate evolution, applied to brain–body size allometry. *Evolution* **33**, 402–416. (doi:10.2307/2407630)

127. Goswami A, Smaers JB, Soligo C, Polly PD. 2014 The macroevolutionary consequences of phenotypic integration: from development to deep time. *Phil. Trans. R. Soc. B* **370**, 20130254. (doi:10.1098/rstb.2013.0254)

128. Puttick MN, Thomas GH, Benton MJ. 2014 High rates of evolution preceded the origin of birds. *Evolution* **68**, 1497–1510. (doi:10.1111/evo.12363)

129. Simpson GG. 1944 *Tempo and mode in evolution*. New York, NY: Columbia University Press.

130. Estes SE, Arnold SJ. 2007 Resolving the paradox of stasis: models with stabilizing selection explain evolutionary divergence on all timescales. *Am. Nat.* **169**, 227–244. (doi:10.1086/510633)

131. Arnold SJ, Pfrender ME, Jones AG. 2001 The adaptive landscape as a conceptual bridge between micro- and macroevolution. *Genetica* **112**, 9–32. (doi:10.1023/A:1013373907708)

132. Futuyma DJ. 2015 Can modern evolutionary theory explain macroevolution? In *Macroevolution* (eds E Serrelli, N Gontier), pp. 29–85. Basel, Germany: Springer.

133. Welch JJ, Waxman D. 2008 Calculating independent contrasts for the comparative study of substitution rates. *J. Theor. Biol.* **251**, 667–678. (doi:10.1016/j.jtbi.2007.12.015)

134. Ezard THG, Thomas GH, Purvis A. 2013 Inclusion of a near-complete fossil record reveals speciation-related molecular evolution. *Methods Ecol. Evol.* **4**, 745–753. (doi:10.1111/2041-210x.12089)

135. Pagel M, Venditti C, Meade A. 2006 Large punctuational contribution of speciation to evolutionary divergence at the molecular level. *Science* **314**, 119–121. (doi:10.1126/science.1129647)

136. Pelletier F, Garant D, Hendry AP. 2009 Eco-evolutionary dynamics. *Phil. Trans. R. Soc. B* **364**, 1483–1489. (doi:10.1098/rstb.2009.0027)

137. Sepkoski JJ. 1996 Competition in macroevolution: the double wedge revisited. In *Evolutionary paleobiology* (eds D Jablonski, DH Erwin, JH Lipps). pp. 211–255. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

138. Price SA, Schmitz L. 2016 A promising future for integrative biodiversity research: an increased role of scale-dependency and functional biology. *Phil. Trans. R. Soc. B* **371**, 20150228. (doi:10.1098/rstb.2015.0228)

11

rstb.royalsocietypublishing.org *Phil. Trans. R. Soc. B* **371**: 20150216