

April 27, 2020. **Phylogenetics and conservation biology**

A. The value of biodiversity:

- Ethical: each lineage is a thread in an heirloom fabric that we have the responsibility to pass on to future generations.
- Intellectual: we have a basic need to understand the world, how it came to be, and where we fit in it.
- Ecological: a diversity of interactors is needed for proper function of ecosystems, and a diversity of a replicators is needed as the raw material for natural selection (future evolutionary potential).
- Economic: natural lineages are a potential source for a myriad of products of direct economic benefit (medicines, food, esthetics, shelter, etc.).

B. Criteria than can be used for prioritizing conservation:

- Threat of extirpation/extinction
- Ecological importance -- keystone species; ecosystem services; resilience to climate change
- Rarity

C. Metrics for conservation:

- Taxon-based measures
- Phylogeny-based measures

D. Targets for conservation:

- Individual taxa or lineages
- Landscape and Habitat-based ("communities")

E. Key concepts behind conservation planning (Sarkar et al. 2006)

- Complementarity – 'quantitative contribution to the biodiversity features of a site that are not adequately represented in the existing set'
- Irreplaceability – the contribution of a given site in a potential set of targets to achieve a particular goal
- Vulnerability – probability of persistence of a population or other features of an area

F. Phylogenetics and conservation

There has been tremendous recent progress in understanding the relationships of organisms at all levels, due to two different advances, whose cumulative impact has been great. One advance is theoretical and methodological -- a revolution in how any sort of data can be used to reconstruct phylogenies and interpret evolution and ecology. The other is empirical -- the sudden availability of copious new phylogenetic data from the DNA level and spatial data from digitizing of museum collections. Unfortunately, these advances have not yet made their way fully into applied biology and the critical task of conserving biodiversity.

We systematists understand now that biodiversity is the whole tree of life, not just the named species. There are lineages smaller and larger than the traditional species level. Furthermore, species are not comparable between lineages in any manner. Thus counting


species or measuring their ranges and abundances is a poor measure of biodiversity; we must develop measures of the actual diversity of lineages taking into account their evolutionary properties and phylogenetic position. New quantitative measures for phylogenetic biodiversity, which take into account the number of branch points (and possibly branch lengths) separating two lineages have been developed, which can be applied to rarity assessment and conservation planning. This relatively new phylogenetic worldview can clarify greatly what "rarity" means: *rarity fundamentally means not having many living close relatives*. We can now quantitatively define what we mean by "many" and "close."

As we have discussed already, all "species" are not equal in a phylogenetic sense (or any other sense for that matter). As has been pointed out by a number of pioneering cladistic conservation biologists, conservation priorities can best be set by a consideration of the phylogenetic relationships among species. This is because all attributes of organisms (genetic similarities, ecological roles, morphological specializations) tend strongly to be associated with phylogeny. From the standpoint of preserving the maximum phylogenetic diversity (and its associated attributes), saving a "long-branch" species (i.e., one such as the Coast Redwood or Santa Lucia Fir with much change along the terminal branch, either due to extinction or rapid evolution) should carry a higher priority than saving a "short-branch" species (i.e., a dandelion differing in only a few minor features from near relatives). Furthermore, saving a community of 100 species of diverse phylogenetic relationships should carry a higher priority than saving a community of 200 species belonging to only a few large clades (see the figure below for an illustration of these points). Thus, phylogenetic considerations should play a much more important role in conservation biology than they have to date.

In an ideal world all species could be preserved -- in this world of limited resources (time, money, and public goodwill) indices based on phylogeny are being developed to help us preserve the maximal genetic, morphological, chemical, and ecological diversity. The general public will be much more supportive of species preservation efforts that are carefully focused and justified in this way, rather than of uncritical, across-the-board efforts. Phylogeny reconstruction is thus not just an academic exercise, but rather the fundamental basis of a truly practical taxonomy.

Right. A hypothetical cladogram illustrating the potential role of phylogeny in setting conservation priorities. Shown is a phylogeny of 43 "species"; the branch lengths are proportional in the vertical direction to the number of evolutionary character changes along that branch.

Exercise: if you were offered three alternative conservation scenarios that would save the seven species in either group A or B or C, how would you rank them? How would you explain your ranking to a biodiversity manager who is not familiar with phylogenetic concepts?



G. Introduction to literature

- Cadotte, M. W. and Jonathan Davies, T. 2010. Rarest of the rare: advances in combining evolutionary distinctiveness and scarcity to inform conservation at biogeographical scales. *Diversity and Distributions*, 16: 376–385.
- Chave, J., Chust, G. & Thébaud, C. 2007. The importance of phylogenetic structure in biodiversity studies. In: *Scaling Biodiversity* (eds Storch, D., Marquet, P. & Brown, J.H.), Institute Editions, Santa Fe, pp. 151–167.
- **Faith, D. P. 1992a. Conservation evaluation and phylogenetic diversity. *Biological Conservation* 61:1-10.
- Faith, D. P. 1992b. Systematics and conservation: on predicting the feature diversity of subsets of taxa. *Cladistics* 8:361-373.
- Faith, D. P., Reid C. A. M., & Hunter, J. 2004. Integrating phylogenetic diversity, complementarity, and endemism for conservation assessment. *Conserv. Biol.*, 18, 255-261.
- Faith, D. P., Lozupone, C. A., Nipperess, D. & Knight, R. 2009. The cladistic basis for the phylogenetic diversity (PD) measure links evolutionary features to environmental gradients and supports broad applications of microbial ecology's "phylogenetic beta diversity" framework. *Int. J. Mol. Sci.* 10, 4723-4741.
- Forey, P.L., C. J. Humphries and P. H. Williams. 1994. Systematics and conservation evaluation, Systematics Association Special Volume No. 50. Clarendon Press, Oxford.
- Forest, F., Grenyer, R., Rouget, M., Davies, T. J., Cowling, R. M., Faith, D. P., Balmfor, A., Manning, J. C., Proches, S., van der Bank, M., Reeves, G., Hedderson, T. A. J., & Savolainen, V. 2007. Preserving the evolutionary potential of floras in biodiversity hotspots. *Nature* 445: 757-760.
- Graham, C.H. & P.V.A. Fine 2008. Phylogenetic beta diversity: linking ecological and evolutionary processes across space in time. *Ecology letters*, 11, 1265-1277.
- Hardy O.J. and B. Senterre. 2007. Characterizing the phylogenetic structure of communities by an additive partitioning of phylogenetic diversity. *J. Ecol.* 95: 493-506.
- Helmus M.R., Bland T.J., Williams C.K. & Ives A.R. 2007. Phylogenetic measures of biodiversity. *American Naturalist*, 169, E68-E83
- Kling, M.M., B.D. Mishler, A.H. Thornhill, B.G. Baldwin, and D.D. Ackerly. 2018. Facets of phylodiversity: evolutionary diversification, divergence, and survival as conservation targets. *Philosophical Transactions Royal Society B.* 374: 20170397.
- Mishler, B. D. 1995. Plant systematics and conservation: science and society. *Madroño* 42:103-113.
- Mishler, B. D. 1999. Getting rid of species? Pp. 307-315 in R. Wilson (ed.), *Species: new interdisciplinary essays*. MIT Press.
- Mishler, B. D., N. Knerr, C. E. González-Orozco, A.H. Thornhill, S.W. Laffan, and J.T. Miller. 2014. Phylogenetic approaches to biodiversity, endemism, and conservation, *Nature Communications* 5: 4473.
- Pollock, L.J., Thuiller, W. and Jetz, W., 2017. Large conservation gains possible for global biodiversity facets. *Nature*, 546(7656), p.141.
- Purvis, A., J. L. Gittleman and T. Brooks (eds.). 2005. *Phylogeny and Conservation*. Cambridge University Press. [full book with a diversity of viewpoints]
- Rosauer, D. F., Laffan, S. W., Crisp, M. D., Donnellan, S. C. & Cook, L. G. 2009. Phylogenetic endemism: a new approach to identifying geographical concentrations of evolutionary history. *Molec. Ecol.*, 18, 4061-4072.
- Sarkar S., et al. 2006. Biodiversity conservation planning tools: present status and challenges for the future. *Ann. Rev. Environ. Resour.* 31: 123-159.
- Vane-Wright, R. I., C. J. Humphries and P. H. Williams. 1991. What to protect? -- Systematics and the agony of choice. *Biological Conservation* 55:235-254.
- Villegier, S. & Mouillot, D. (2008) Additive partitioning of diversity including species differences: a comment on Hardy & Senterre (2007). *Journal of Ecology*, 96, 845-848.