



HAL
open science

On the time lag between human activity and biodiversity in Europe at the national scale

Frédéric Gosselin, Jean-Marc Callois

► **To cite this version:**

Frédéric Gosselin, Jean-Marc Callois. On the time lag between human activity and biodiversity in Europe at the national scale. *Anthropocene*, 2021, 35, 10.1016/j.ancene.2021.100303 . hal-03330338

HAL Id: hal-03330338

<https://hal.inrae.fr/hal-03330338v1>

Submitted on 31 Aug 2021

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.



Distributed under a Creative Commons Attribution - NonCommercial - NoDerivatives 4.0 International License

1 **On the time-lag between human activity and biodiversity in Europe at the national scale**

2

3

Frédéric Gosselin¹ and Jean-Marc Callois²

4

5

¹INRAE, UR EFNO, Domaine des Barres, F-45290 Nogent-Sur-Vernisson, France.

6

Corrsponding author. ORCID Number : 0000-0003-3737-106X. Mail:

7

frederic.gosselin@inrae.fr.

8

² ORCID number : 0000-0002-3358-5725. Mail: jm.callois@gmail.com.

9

10

11

12

13 **Abstract**

14 The relation between the environment and human activity has been the subject of many
15 empirical studies. Complexities such as which indicators related to human activity best
16 represent biodiversity, or time lags between socio-economic activities and biodiversity,
17 remain unclear. This paper tackles these issues based on statistical analysis of the relationship
18 between human activity and biodiversity at the country level in Europe. We used well-adapted
19 statistical models to explain variations in two state indicators, two pressure indicators, and one
20 response indicator representing biodiversity. We focused on (i) the relative efficiency of the
21 various indicators of human activity (notably human population density, human appropriation
22 of net primary productivity, and gross domestic product per area) in predicting the
23 biodiversity indicators, and (ii) possible time lags between metrics representing human
24 activity and biodiversity. Results indicate that gross domestic product per area and human
25 population density best predict the indicators for the biodiversity state, whereas human
26 population density best predicts the indicators of biodiversity pressure. Although the
27 indicators for biodiversity pressure best related to present-day human activity metrics,
28 biodiversity state reveals a time lag of approximately one century. Results suggest that drivers
29 (human population density, density of economic activity) and pressures (land sealing) should
30 serve as primary foci for biodiversity policies. Because of the long time lags (~ one century)
31 between these drivers and the state of biodiversity, policies regarding biodiversity should
32 integrate a long-term view.

33 **Keywords:** species imperilment; sprawl; threatened species; socio-economic drivers; time lag

34 **Introduction**

35 The Intergovernmental Science–Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services
36 (IPBES) assessment on the state of biodiversity and ecosystems in the European region,
37 published in 2018, reported that trends remain negative overall, with potential consequences
38 for the economy and society (IPBES, 2018). The IPBES reached the same conclusion one
39 year later at the global scale (IPBES, 2019). These negative trends related to five direct
40 drivers of biodiversity change (or pressures). They are, in descending order of impact: (1)
41 changes in land and sea use; (2) direct exploitation of organisms; (3) climate change; (4)
42 pollution and (5) invasive alien species. Yet, the underlying societal causes of these pressures
43 were related to indirect drivers of change, notably to governance issues, technological
44 innovation and demographic and economic factors. Economic activity may impact
45 biodiversity through different mechanisms. Pollution may cause various types of harm to
46 indigenous species. Human presence and/or travel can disturb animal activity and,
47 consequently, interfere with ecosystem processes. Encroachment of land due to urbanization
48 and infrastructure can reduce the size of habitats to a critical level or fragment them,
49 rendering metapopulations less viable. In the long term, the encroachment of land can also
50 impoverish the gene pool through isolation, leading to population extinction. Which
51 mechanisms are the most important in explaining the decline in biodiversity is not obvious.
52 Studying which variable representing human activity correlates most to biodiversity, however,
53 can help identify the appropriate types of corrective actions to target.

54 In this research, we therefore sought to identify the socio-economic variables that best
55 correlate to variables indicating current levels of biodiversity at the country scale, and the
56 time lags between the two sets of variables. We chose to examine the country scale, as have
57 many previous studies (e.g., Hoffmann, 2004; Konickova et al., 2006; Clause and York, 2008;
58 Dullinger et al., 2013; Gosselin & Callois, 2018), because some of the data for analysis are

59 more readily available at this scale—for example, proportion of threatened and extinct species
60 and gross domestic product. Additionally, the national scale is still the most relevant for many
61 policies concerning biodiversity and socio-economic issues. More precisely, we addressed the
62 following questions:

63 (i) What are the kinetics of the impact of human activity on biodiversity? Following
64 Dullinger et al. (2013), in hypothesizing time-lag effects between indicators of
65 human activity and those of biodiversity, we posited that past values of socio-
66 economic variables would better explain current variations in biodiversity state
67 indicators .

68 (ii) Which models involving indicators of human activity best explain the values of
69 biodiversity indicators? We hypothesized that simpler, un-transformed or merely
70 log-transformed, models would be at least as efficient as more complex socio-
71 economic models.

72 (iii) What variables representing human activity best explain the variations in the
73 biodiversity indicators—for example, those depending on their proximal link with
74 biodiversity or more general variables of human activity? We hypothesized that
75 the human appropriation of net primary production or the proportion of sealed
76 area, which are potentially more directly related to biodiversity, would better
77 explain the variations of biodiversity indicators than, for example, human
78 population density, especially for the indicators of biodiversity state.

79 The literature relating the state of biodiversity to socio-economic drivers and pressures is now
80 well developed. Findings indicate that drivers such as Gross Domestic Product (GDP) per
81 capita (GDPc; Clausen and York, 2008), human population density (HPD; Brown and
82 Laband, 2006; McKee et al., 2013; Driscoll et al., 2018), the spread of transportation

83 infrastructure (Konvicka et al., 2006) or income inequality (Mikkelsen et al., 2007; Holland et
84 al., 2009) correlate with various measures of biodiversity.

85 Focusing on the link between human population density (HPD) and biodiversity, Luck (2007)
86 reviewed the published empirical literature through a meta-analysis. The author concluded
87 that, despite the geographic and taxonomic skew in the published literature, a positive
88 correlation is apparent between HPD and various biodiversity metrics – mainly related to
89 species richness. That is, the level of biodiversity is greater in densely populated zones. This
90 correlation, however, may be due to the relation between HPD and these biodiversity metrics
91 on the one hand, and other parameters such as ecosystem productivity or energy availability
92 on the other. Some evidence was also apparent of negative relationships between HPD and
93 other biodiversity metrics related to species extinction, but it was weak (Luck, 2007).

94

95 In analyzing how three variables related to economic growth (GDPc, HPD and a metric
96 related to land use intensity—human appropriation of net primary productivity (HANPP)) are
97 related to the proportion of threatened species in European countries, Dullinger et al. (2013)
98 proposed an explanation for the weak evidence reported by Luck (2007). That is, the
99 relationship between current economic and biodiversity variables could be weak because the
100 metrics of biodiversity respond to economic variables with a time lag. Dullinger et al. (2013)
101 proposed that the relationship would become much stronger if the metrics of biodiversity were
102 related to past economic variables. This proposal echoes the well-known notion of extinction
103 debt in ecology (Tilman et al., 1994; Kuussaari et al., 2009), as well as the pioneer ecological
104 studies that identified time lags in the relationship between habitat quantity and configuration
105 and biodiversity (Chamberlain et al., 2000 ; Lindborg and Eriksson, 2004 ; Menéndez et al.,
106 2006 ; Metzger et al., 2009). Most of the latter studies were centered on habitat. Yet, the
107 drivers of variations in past habitat could have even greater time lags for affecting

108 biodiversity (Essl et al., 2015), since the time lags between the initial driver and the habitat
109 pressure should add up to the time lags between habitat and biodiversity.

110 Even though this reasoning provided a new line of analysis, Gosselin (2015) questioned this
111 conclusion on the basis of inadequate statistical tools. When more accurate statistical tools
112 were used to take into account data pseudo-replication and over-dispersion, the significant
113 relationships mostly disappeared, or at least became much less significant. Gosselin and
114 Callois (2018) analyzed the data of Dullinger et al. (2013) together with data on extinct
115 species, biodiversity pressure indicators (land sealing) and response indicators (the proportion
116 of protected areas) in Europe and related them to diverse socio-economic drivers. They found
117 a positive impact on the proportion of threatened and extinct species due to the density of
118 “human activity” (either measured as human population density or as the gross domestic
119 product per unit area of land, GDPa, and especially their logarithm transforms). These results
120 were based on relationships between current socio-economic variables and current
121 biodiversity indicators. Yet, one of the biodiversity indicators used in this study represented
122 past events (the proportion of extinct species), and two indicators related to the accumulation
123 of past decisions (proportion of sealed area and proportion of reserves). Also, for a fourth
124 indicator (proportion of threatened species), past values of socio-economic variables likely
125 predict states of biodiversity better than current values due to time lag effects (cf. supra).

126 Identifying these time lags is a pressing question, according to the International Science-
127 Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services (e.g. IPBES, 2018). Furthermore,
128 Gosselin and Callois (2018) did not incorporate human appropriation of net primary
129 production (HANPP), another metric used by Dullinger et al. (2013). Yet, this metric is an
130 integrated socio-ecological indicator of land-use intensity (Haberl et al., 2013), which is
131 closely related to population density (Krausmann et al., 2009). As such, HANPP has potential
132 to more proximally explain the impact of human activity on biodiversity, and may therefore

133 better explain its variations (Haberl, 1997; Haberl et al., 2004; Vačkář et al., 2016). Finally,
134 Gosselin and Callois (2018) did not include simpler models with the two core human activity
135 variables (HPD and GDPa), which might better explain variations in biodiversity indicators
136 than more complicated models.

137

138 **Material and methods**

139 **Biodiversity indicators**

140 This study sought to relate relevant indicators of biodiversity throughout Europe to economic
141 variables at various dates. We chose indicators that fit the Driving forces, Pressure, State,
142 Impact, Response (DPSIR) framework, in line with Butchart et al. (2010). Even though we
143 did not estimate the DPSIR framework explicitly, we chose five biodiversity indicators
144 positioned in the DPSIR diagram (<http://www.eea.europa.eu/publications/TEC25>), for which
145 data are readily available at national level, as follows (cf. Table SM2 for summary statistics):

- 146 i. Two Pressure indicators related to land sealing: percent of surface area in the country
147 sealed in 2009 (denoted as SEAL) and annual increase in sealing between 2006 and
148 2009 expressed as a percentage (denoted as iSEAL);
- 149 ii. Two indicators of the State and dynamics of Biodiversity: the proportion of extinct
150 and of threatened species in each country for nine different taxonomic groups
151 (vascular plants, bryophytes, mammals, birds, freshwater fishes, reptiles, amphibians,
152 dragonflies and grasshoppers);
- 153 iii. One Response indicator, referring here to societal response (as defined in the DPSIR
154 framework): the percentage of terrestrial area in each country corresponding to
155 protected areas (combining four different types of protected areas as defined by the
156 International Union for Conservation of Nature).

157 Data for this study came from the European Environmental Agency (two Pressure indicators),
158 Eurostat (Response indicator) and Essl et al. (2013) (two State indicators). We did not
159 consider trees as a separate taxonomic group because, at least for some countries, trees were
160 incorporated into evaluations of vascular plants. Our analyses therefore already accounted for
161 them in the vascular plant taxonomic group.

162 **Socio-economic variables**

163 We considered the economic variables in the study as potential drivers of the five Pressure-
164 State-Response (PSR) indicators described above. This approach agrees with the notion of
165 indirect drivers defined by the IPBES (<https://www.ipbes.net/models-drivers-biodiversity-ecosystem-change>). We focused attention on two classical indicators of human activity: gross
166 domestic product (GDP) and human population density (HPD). We tested GDP per area
167 (GDPa) as well as GDP per capita (GDPc) because Gosselin and Callois (2018) found that the
168 density of economic activity (GDPa) had a stronger relationship with biodiversity indicators
169 than economic development per capita (GDPc). We also included the variable built by
170 Dullinger et al. (2013) to estimate human land use intensity: human appropriation of net
171 primary production (HANPP), which is another measure of the spatial density of human
172 activity likely closest to the indicators for PSR biodiversity. Table SM1 provides the list of
173 socio-economic variables from years 1900, 1950 and 2000, found in Dullinger et al. (2013).

175

176 This study considered a list of 22 countries. These countries are the same as those in Dullinger
177 et al. (2013): Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, the Czech Republic, Denmark, Finland, France,
178 Germany, Greece, Hungary, Italy, the Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, the Republic of
179 Ireland, Romania, Slovakia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland and the United Kingdom.

180 **Statistical models and hypotheses**

181 Following Brown and Laband (2006) and Gosselin and Callois (2018), the strategy in
182 this study was based on the estimation and comparison of several simple statistical models.
183 We did not mix different metrics into a single, global metric, nor did we estimate a single
184 statistical, multiple regression model that would have included all the variables. We thus
185 avoided technical and interpretative problems of correlations between variables. We followed
186 a three-step strategy to identify the best socio-economic variables in terms of predictive power
187 and analyze their relationships with biodiversity indicators.

188 First, we addressed the first hypothesis by estimating and comparing the first seven
189 models described in Table 1 (*Null, Economic, Log Economic, Kuznets, Log Kuznets, Area*
190 *Kuznets* and *Log Area Kuznets*) among the three different periods (1900, 1950 and 2000). The
191 2000 versions of these models are very close to the corresponding models in Gosselin and
192 Callois (2018). These models were among the best for which historic data were available.
193 *Economic* refers to models including both GDPc and HPD, two of the main indirect drivers of
194 change according to the IPBES (2019). The *Kuznets* models included different versions of
195 GDP, as well as its square, to account for quadratic relationships with GDP and to allow for
196 possible bell-shaped relationships with GDP, a shape known as the Environmental Kuznets
197 Curve (Selden and Song, 1994). Except for the null model, each model incorporated two
198 socio-economic variables related to a specific theme. We chose to limit the number of
199 variables in the models since we only had a limited number of countries in the data set (22
200 countries) for this study. Therefore, we included at most two socio-economic variables per
201 model, following the $n/10$ guideline of Harrell (2001, p. 61) on the relationship between
202 sample size n and number of estimated hyperparameters. The resulting models were slightly
203 over-parametrized for state indicators (with 21 hyper-parameters estimated compared to a
204 maximum of 19.8 according to Harrell's rule). They were somewhat more over-parametrized

205 for response indicators (12 hyper-parameters compared to a maximum of 8.8 according to
206 Harrell's rule), and much more overparametrized for pressure indicators (5 hyperparameters
207 compared to 2.2 according to Harrell's rule). Our general hypotheses were that explanatory
208 models with 1900 or 1950 data would better explain the Proportion of Extinct species, the
209 Proportion of Sealed areas and the Proportion of Threatened species, since we expected a
210 rather strong time lag for the effects on Biodiversity, similar to the reasoning in Dullinger et
211 al. (2013).

212 In the second step, we compared the best model for each indicator from the first step
213 with simplified univariate explanatory models, *HPD*, *Log HPD*, *GDPa* and *Log GDPa*, for
214 1900, 1950 and 2000 data. This procedure determined, first, whether the relationships could
215 be reduced to such simple univariate models, and second, included less over-parametrized
216 models. We also considered *HANPP* and *Log HANPP* models at the different time periods (cf.
217 Table 1). We expected these two last models to reveal more proximal causes of variations in
218 the indicators, especially for the two State Indicators. For these two indicators, we also
219 included hierarchical versions of the univariate explanatory models described above. We then
220 added a taxonomic random effect on the slope, thus estimating the mean slope across
221 taxonomic groups as well as the standard variation across taxonomic groups of this slope.
222 This procedure yielded models with a number of parameters similar to the models in the first
223 step. This process allowed the relationship to vary across taxonomic groups instead of being
224 fixed to a mean response as in the previous models.

225 In the final step related to the third hypothesis, and only for the two State indicators of
226 biodiversity, we compared the best model involving present explanatory variables from the
227 first two steps with a model including the current proportion of sealed area (SEAL). This
228 procedure determined whether SEAL could serve as a more proximal indicator of the current
229 biodiversity state.

230 Figure SM1 in the Supplementary Materials section (see also Supplementary Materials
231 in Dullinger et al., 2013 for associated graphics) displays the correlations between
232 explanatory variables. We found mildly strong correlations among the group of GDPc
233 variables at different dates, and stronger correlations among HANPP variables and among the
234 group formed by GDPa and HPD variables. The latter two groups had squared Pearson
235 correlations of at least 0.7. These correlations prevented us from formulating models
236 including both GDPa and HPD, or the same variable at different dates.

237

238

239 **Statistical methods**

240 We paid careful attention to the potential over-dispersion of data as well as to the inclusion of
241 random country effects, following Gosselin (2015). We therefore introduced a random
242 country effect into the models involving repeated values per country. We assumed this effect
243 to follow a Gaussian distribution with a zero mean and an estimated standard deviation. This
244 approach allowed inclusion of indeterminacy between country-level explanatory variables and
245 other, unknown, country-level determinants. We used this random country effect, for
246 example, for the two State indicators, which provided proportions of Extinct and Threatened
247 species for different taxonomic groups within each country. For the proportion of extinct or
248 threatened species, we used a logit link function and a beta-binomial distribution to model the
249 number of extinct and threatened species as a proportion of the number of native species and
250 native minus extinct species, respectively. Each taxonomic group had separate estimated
251 intercept and extra-binomial variation fixed parameters. For the proportion of protected areas
252 and the percentage of sealed area and its increment, we used the zero-inflated beta
253 distribution. This distribution is a direct sub-product of the zero-inflated cumulative beta
254 distribution, proposed to analyze plant cover class data (Herpigny and Gosselin, 2015). For

255 sealed areas, we fitted a separate model for area and increment (SEAL and iSEAL) and
256 therefore did not include a random country effect in the corresponding models. We framed the
257 models within a Bayesian setting. For the proportion of protected areas, each category of
258 protected area had separate estimated intercept and variance fixed parameters, but the
259 parameter for zero inflation was the same for the different categories.

260 We used the Stan program embedded in R 3.3.2 through the rstan library (Stan Development
261 Team 2015) to estimate the models described above. The priors of the hyper-parameters were
262 mostly non-informative, except for the proportion of extinct species that required an upper
263 bound at $\exp(10)$ for dispersion levels in order to obtain converging results. All the
264 explanatory variables were centered and scaled to ensure a residual standard deviation of the
265 variable around one while keeping clear control over the level of scaling.

266 The models were compared in terms of predictive capacity with the leave-one-out
267 Information Criterion (LOOIC; Vehtari et al., 2016). For State and Response indicators, we
268 used the marginal version of the LOOIC (Gosselin and Callois, 2018, 2019).

269 We investigated the estimators of the socio-economic parameters with an eye toward
270 the statistical significance and magnitude of the relationships. For statistical significance, we
271 used Bayesian quantiles based on beta random draws (Gosselin, 2011). This paper includes
272 only those cases with a p-value below 5%. To judge the magnitude of Odds-ratios, we
273 analyzed the effect of an increase of one standard deviation at the linear combination level (on
274 the log of odds ratios) for each socio-economic variable, according to guidelines adapted from
275 Daniels et al. (1983) (see Table 5 legend for more details). These ratios are adapted to the
276 framework for magnitude analysis proposed in ecology (e.g., Camp et al., 2008; Barbier et al.,
277 2009).

278 Finally, to gauge the adequacy of the statistical models in relation to the data, we used
279 sampled posterior goodness-of-fit p-values (Gosselin, 2011). These values are based on

280 normalized quantile residuals (Dunn and Smyth, 1996), with discrepancy functions similar to
281 Herpigny and Gosselin (2015) and Godeau et al. (2020). We first diagnosed the distributions
282 of the residuals or the random effects by using their mean, variance, skewness and kurtosis as
283 discrepancy functions. Then, to diagnose potentially ill-modelled relationships for the mean or
284 variance, we used discrepancy functions based on correlations with Hoeffding's D statistic
285 (Harrell, 2001). These functions determined the links between (i) the residuals and the fitted
286 values, (ii) the residuals and each of the explanatory variables, and (iii) the square of the
287 residuals and the fitted values. Hoeffding's D statistic can detect correlations that include
288 linear and non-linear relationships, and increasing or decreasing as well as non-increasing and
289 non-decreasing relationships. Finally, we used two discrepancy functions to diagnose any
290 spatial autocorrelation of country random effects (if they were included in the model) or
291 residuals (if random effects were not included). We fitted a generalized least squares (gls)
292 model with an exponentially decaying spatial autocorrelation (Pinheiro and Bates, 2000) on
293 country random effects or residuals (functions corExp and gls in the nlme library with a
294 nugget), then considered the range and nugget of the gls model as the two final discrepancy
295 functions. These p-values allowed, in sum, diagnosis of the adequacy of the probability
296 distributions used, the adequate specification of the non-linear relationship between
297 explanatory variables and data, the correct specification of variance, the absence of additional
298 spatial autocorrelation and, in cases where the model included country random effects, the
299 adequacy of the probability distribution of the random effect. Given usage of around ten
300 discrepancy functions per model, we only investigated cases with p-values below 0.005.
301 These p-values were applied to the best model associated with each biodiversity variable.

302 **Results**

303 Overall, with Proportion of Protected Areas as a dependent variable, none of the main
304 socio-economic models had better predictive capacity than the Null model (Table 2). For the

305 proportion of Extinct species, the 1900-data versions of the Log Area Kuznets, Area Kuznets,
306 Economic and Log Economic (Table 1) models involving different combinations of three
307 measures of human activity clearly yielded the models with the best predictive capacity
308 (Table 2). The human activities were gross domestic product per area (GDPa), gross domestic
309 product per capita (GDPc) and human population density (HPD). A logical ranking was also
310 apparent over time, with 1950 models being better than 2000 models and worse than 1900
311 models. For Threatened species, a similar result emerged, except that the Economic model
312 had worse predictive capacity than the other socio-economic models. The 1950 and 2000
313 models were somewhat closer to 1900 models than for Extinct species. Yet, we observed the
314 same ranking, with 1900 yielding better models than either 1950 or 2000 (Table 2). For the
315 share of sealed land (SEAL) and its dynamic (iSEAL), the analysis produced the reverse
316 result, since 2000 models with economic variables were best (Table 2). The 1950 models
317 were close to the best models for both SEAL and iSEAL, though the order of ranking was
318 2000, 1950, 1900.

319 Comparing these socio-economic models with simpler, univariate explanatory models
320 (Tables 3 & 4), we found that the univariate model with Log GDPa in 1900 was best, both for
321 Extinct and Threatened species. For Threatened species only, the log of human population
322 density (Log HPD) in 1900 was close to this best model. For SEAL and iSEAL, HPD in 2000
323 (log-transformed for SEAL but not for iSEAL) was the best univariate variable, even yielding
324 the best model for SEAL (Table SM3). Both for state and pressure indicators, the indicator of
325 human appropriation of primary production (HANPP; Dullinger et al., 2013) did not provide
326 models with better predictive capacity than the best univariate or multivariate models (Tables
327 3 & 4). When restricting to the relationship of present socio-economic driver variables to the
328 two State biodiversity indicators and comparing them with the relationship between SEAL
329 and these same indicators, we found that SEAL had better predictive properties for the

330 proportion of Extinct species, and was close to the best models for the proportion of
331 Threatened species (Table SM5).

332 Graphical representations of the relationships also indicated a better link with 1900
333 than 2000 economic variables for Extinct and Threatened species and the reverse for SEAL
334 and iSEAL (Figure 1). Considering the associated estimators (Table 5), results were overall
335 less obvious with only slight differences either in estimator significance (p-value) or in the
336 mean estimated effect of adding 1 standard deviation to the variable (first column). The only
337 strong difference in terms of magnitude was with iSEAL. The models fitted the study data
338 adequately since we did not detect any discrepancy between the data and the best models at a
339 significance level fixed at $p < 0.005$.

340 **Discussion**

341 The finding of no relationship between socio-economic variables with the Response
342 indicator (i.e. the proportion of protected areas in European countries; Table 2) contrasts with
343 previous literature. In a summary of results, Luck (2007) reported a negative relationship
344 between human population density (HPD) and protected areas. The metrics considered for
345 protected areas, however, varied from area proportion to absolute area, which was not the case
346 in the present study, as only area proportion was used. The absence of a statistical relationship
347 may be the outcome of conflicting mechanisms. On the one hand, economic activity and
348 population density raise pressures for land sealing. On the other hand, they may also trigger
349 social demand for protected areas as a reaction to the consequences of land sealing.

350 Second, the importance of 2000 economic drivers in explaining the Pressure indicators
351 (Tables 2 and 5) suggests their closer relationship to the current level of human population
352 density or activity than to those in 1900. This finding was contrary to our expectations for
353 SEAL, which we expected would integrate the cumulative effects of land sealing over many

354 generations and therefore more relevant to economic variables representing the past. Yet, the
355 study of urbanization during the 20th century shows that the link between human activity and
356 land encroachment operates quite quickly. For example, in post-World War II industrial
357 countries, land use changed radically within a time span of a few decades., Colsaet et al.
358 (2018) reported that the most indisputable causal factors were income and population growth.
359 This is consistent with our results (Tables 3, 5 and SM3), which show the foremost
360 contribution of current population density on land sealing indicators.

361 The better explanatory power of the 1900 socio-economic variables and particularly
362 the Kuznets-like models for the current proportion of extinct species should not come as a
363 surprise. Current extinctions reflect past events – although on a relatively unknown time scale
364 –, which themselves are related to past pressures. We therefore expected close relationships
365 between the proportion of extinctions and socio-economic values in 1900 or 1950. It was a
366 priori unclear, however, whether 1900 or 1950 variables would serve as better predictors. The
367 results, with 1900 models clearly having better predictive capacity than 1950 models (Table
368 2), suggest, apparently for the first time, that the causes of current extinction levels are rooted
369 further in the past. The results echo those of Konvicka et al. (2006), however, who found a
370 correlation between butterfly extinctions and railway densities that was interpretable as an
371 indicator of early industrialization.

372 The similar trends for the proportion of threatened species—i.e. models involving
373 1900 values of socio-economic variables better predicted the current proportion of threatened
374 species than those involving 2000 values—were more surprising. These results follow the
375 global message of Dullinger et al. (2013), but for more adequate statistical models and
376 different variables (gross domestic product per capita (GDPc) and gross domestic product per
377 area (GDPa) in Dullinger et al., 2013 and this study, respectively). We therefore confirm the
378 trend for a long-term effect of socio-economic development on the state of biodiversity, and a

379 time lag in the relationship. Results from this study, however, do not allow precise estimate of
380 the length of this time lag nor explanations for this phenomenon, although the time lag is
381 apparently shorter for Threatened than for Extinct species. These empirical results are in line
382 with the concept of extinction debt proposed by Tilman et al. (1994), substantiated by e.g.
383 Vellend et al. (2006) and reviewed by Kuussaari et al. (2009). Findings of macro-level
384 relationships in this study suggest that the relationship between economic drivers and
385 biodiversity erosion may reflect such extinction debt.

386 Results of this study also confirm Gosselin and Callois (2018), in that the two State
387 indicators of biodiversity are mostly related with models that include either Human
388 Population Densities (HPD) or Gross Domestic Product per area (GDPa) (Table 3).. The
389 results also confirm the conclusions of Gosselin and Callois (2018) on the interest of these
390 metrics as biodiversity-driver indicators, though with a logarithm transformation and a time
391 lag of approximately one century. The results are also consistent with previous findings where
392 HPD was significantly associated to the proportion of Threatened or Extinct species or related
393 quantities (Hoffmann, 2004, McPherson and Nieswiadomy, 2005, Luck, 2007 and, to some
394 extent, Pandit and Laband, 2007 and McKee et al., 2013). They also echo McKee and
395 Chambers (2011) on the identification of GDPa rather than mere GDP as a robust variable
396 significantly related with the number of Threatened species. These previous studies, however,
397 did not use HPD or GDPa in 1900 but rather more recent values of HPD or GDPa. In terms of
398 magnitude, starting with proportions of extinct species and threatened species of 3.00% and
399 30.0% respectively, doubling GDPa in 1900 in the study models would increase these
400 proportions to 4.15% ($\pm 0.26\%$) and 33.5% ($\pm 1.1\%$), respectively (based on estimates in Table
401 5). We therefore consider these effects very significant and of intermediate strength.

402 These results lead to a main conclusion that Log GDPa in 1900 is an accurate driver
403 indicator for the two State indicators, and Log HPD in 2000 for the two Pressure indicators.

404 Additionally, SEAL could represent a relevant present pressure indicator for the two State
405 indicators, since it provided relationships with either equivalent (for Threatened species) or
406 better (for Extinct species) predictive quality than the other socio-economic variables in 2000
407 (Table SM5). This conclusion is consistent with the considerable body of work on the impact
408 of land encroachment and urbanization on biodiversity. Louwagie et al. (2017) showed how
409 the process of land sealing reduces biodiversity at different levels. Given our previous results,
410 we conjecture that past land sealing might be an even better Pressure indicator than past
411 GDPa for current proportions of Extinct and Threatened species. This conjecture also agrees
412 with Konvicka et al. (2006), who reported that the density of railway lines was the best socio-
413 economic predictor of past butterfly extinctions in European states. In contrast, the density of
414 highways was not as strongly and consistently related to past butterfly extinctions. The
415 authors interpret this result as an indication that “butterfly losses are attributable to persistent
416 patterns of economic history rather than to the recent situation”

417 Generalizing the results of this study to broader indicators of biodiversity yields
418 conclusions even more pessimistic than previously reported at global levels (e.g., Butchart et
419 al., 2010; Tittensor et al., 2014). Since the processes that reflect in the Pressure indicators
420 (and Driver indicators in our case) are still continuing to increase, and given the time-lag
421 between these processes and the State of biodiversity, one should not expect the State
422 indicators to improve before many decades, if the relationships remain unchanged. This
423 analysis using indicators reveals that biodiversity, like climate change, apparently has a strong
424 temporal inertia in its interactions with its drivers, which highlights the urgent need for
425 protective measures.

426 Patterns of biodiversity loss are obviously more complex than reflected in the simple
427 statistical models used in this paper. Yet, based on goodness-of-fit p-values, the lack of
428 departures from the data indicates that the models are not too simple for the data at hand. In

429 fact, they might be too complex, especially for the two pressure indicators, as revealed by the
430 analyses of the number of parameters estimated relative to the amount of data used (see
431 Statistical Models and Hypotheses section). The results for the two pressure indicators should
432 be taken with care, as they may stem from over-fitted models (Harrell, 2001). Additional
433 analyses, for example with extended data sets with more countries or at smaller spatial scales,
434 with diachronic data sets (e.g. McKee et al., 2013), or using a more integrated framework
435 ,such as structural equation modelling, would be useful.

436 **Policy implications**

437 Although results from this study may suggest that current policy measures may only have
438 effects on biodiversity after decades at best, these results nevertheless provide policymakers
439 with precious knowledge. Understanding how these systems have long time lags should help
440 policymakers better assess the actions they take. They may integrate in their monitoring
441 evaluations of biodiversity policies, for example, the notion that a policy may have no
442 noticeable effect on extinction or threatened species metrics in the short term. One or two
443 decades may not suffice. As results from this study confirm that human population density
444 and especially GDP per area driver biodiversity, and that land sealing may be an important
445 pressure to consider, biodiversity preservation should infuse all economic activity, and not be
446 restricted to local actions such as protected areas.

447 **Conclusion**

448 In conclusion, the analysis presented above enable clear answers to the research questions
449 posed in this paper. First, even at a coarse (country) scale and with a small sample, a clear
450 lagged relationship is apparent between the State of biodiversity and the gross domestic
451 product per area (GDPa). This finding is consistent with the first hypothesis. Considering the
452 different results for Extinct and Threatened species, the typical time lag is apparently about

453 one century, though the time lag between Drivers (human presence and economic activity)
454 and Pressure (land encroachment) appears much shorter.

455

456 Second, in accordance with the second hypothesis, simple models with human population
457 density and GDPa improved modelling predictive capacity for three pressure and state
458 indicators out of four. These results confirm the intuition that human activity as a whole
459 impacts biodiversity, and that more complex models do not necessarily add substantial
460 predictive power.

461

462 Third, the variables representing human activity that best explain variations in biodiversity
463 were Log GDPa in 1900 for the two State indicators, and Log HPD in 2000 for the two
464 Pressure indicators. In contrast with our expectations, including human appropriation of
465 primary productivity did not improve the predictive capacity of the models over these more
466 indirect measures of human activity. In line with our hypothesis, the above results further
467 suggest that the causality between past human activity and the current state of biodiversity
468 may be mediated by human pressure on the land through land encroachment.

469

470 These results suggest that human population density, density of economic activity, and land
471 sealing should serve as primary foci for environmental policies. Because of the short-term
472 view often common for policymaking, such findings steer toward the preservation of natural
473 lands as high priority toward effective mitigation of the loss of biodiversity. Future additional
474 analyses with diachronic data at much finer spatial levels would refine further the estimation
475 of time lags to help guide such policies.

476

477 **Acknowledgements.** This research was supported by the French Ministry of the Ecological
478 Transition through the DEB-Irstea convention (Action S). We thank Victoria Moore for
479 proofreading the English manuscript as well as two anonymous reviewers.

480

481 **Data accessibility (put here because our names are in it)**

482 The code and data that support the findings of this study are openly available in
483 Zenodo at <https://zenodo.org/record/3240962#.XPt6W4gzZPY> (doi:
484 10.5281/zenodo.3240961).

485

486 **References**

487 Barbier, S., Chevalier, R., Loussot, P., Bergès, L., Gosselin, F., 2009. Improving biodiversity
488 indicators of sustainable forest management: tree genus abundance rather than tree genus
489 richness and dominance for understory vegetation in French lowland oak hornbeam forests.
490 *Forest Ecology and Management* 258, S176-S186.
491 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.foreco.2009.09.004>.

492 Brown, R.M., Laband, D.N., 2006. Species imperilment and spatial patterns of development
493 in the United States. *Conservation Biology* 20, 239-244. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1523-](http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1523-1739.2005.00294.x)
494 [1739.2005.00294.x](http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1523-1739.2005.00294.x).

495 Butchart, S.H.M., Walpole, M., Collen, B., Van Strien, A., Scharlemann, J.P.W., Almond,
496 R.E.A., Baillie, J.E.M., Bomhard, B., Brown, C., Bruno, J., Carpenter, K.E., Carr, G.M.,
497 Chanson, J., Chenery, A.M., Csirke, J., Davidson, N.C., Dentener, 2010. Global biodiversity:
498 Indicators of recent declines. *Science* 328, 1164-1168.
499 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1126/science.1187512>.

500 Camp, R.J., Seavy, N.E., Gorresen, P.M., Reynolds, M.H., 2008. A statistical test to show
501 negligible trend: Comment. *Ecology* 89, 1469-1472. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1890/07-0462.1>.

502 Chamberlain, D.E., Fuller, R.J., Bunce, R.G.H., Duckworth, J.C., Shrubbs, M., 2000. Changes
503 in the abundance of farmland birds in relation to the timing of agricultural intensification in
504 England and Wales. *Journal of Applied Ecology* 37, 771-788.
505 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1046/j.1365-2664.2000.00548.x>.

506 Clausen, R., York, R., 2008. Global biodiversity decline of marine and freshwater fish: A
507 cross-national analysis of economic, demographic, and ecological influences. *Social Science*
508 *Research* 37, 1310-1320. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.ssresearch.2007.10.002>.

509 Colsaet, A., Laurans, Y., Levrel, H., 2018. What drives land take and urban land expansion?
510 A systematic review. *Land Use Policy* 79, 339-349.
511 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.landusepol.2018.08.017>.

512 Daniels, S.R., Greenberg, R.S., Ibrahim, M.A., 1983. Etiologic research in pediatric
513 epidemiology. *The Journal of Pediatrics* 102, 494-504. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0022->
514 [3476\(83\)80173-5](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0022-3476(83)80173-5).

515 Driscoll, D.A., Bland, L.M., Bryan, B.A., Newsome, T.M., Nicholson, E., Ritchie, E.G.,
516 Doherty, T.S., 2018. A biodiversity-crisis hierarchy to evaluate and refine conservation
517 indicators. *Nature Ecology and Evolution*, 1-7. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/s41559-018-0504-8>.

518 Dullinger, S., Essl, F., Rabitsch, W., Erb, K.H., Gingrich, S., Haberl, H., Hülber, K., Jarošík,
519 V., Krausmann, F., Kuřn, I., Pergl, J., Pyšek, P., Hulme, P.E., 2013. Europe's other debt crisis
520 caused by the long legacy of future extinctions. *Proceedings of the National Academy of*
521 *Sciences of the United States of America* 110, 7342-7347.
522 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1216303110>

523 Dunn, P.K., Smyth, G.K., 1996. Randomized quantile residuals. *Journal of Computational*
524 *and Graphical Statistics* 5, 236-244. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/10618600.1996.10474708>

525 Essl, F., Dullinger, S., Rabitsch, W., Hulme, P.E., Pyšek, P., Wilson, J.R.U., Richardson,
526 D.M., 2015. Historical legacies accumulate to shape future biodiversity in an era of rapid
527 global change. *Diversity and Distributions* 21, 534-547. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/ddi.12312>.

528 Essl, F., Moser, D., Dirnböck, T., Dullinger, S., Milasowszky, N., Winter, M., Rabitsch, W.,
529 2013. Native, alien, endemic, threatened, and extinct species diversity in European countries.
530 *Biological Conservation* 164, 90-97. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.biocon.2013.04.005>

531 Godeau, U., Bouget, C., Piffady, J., Pozzi, T., Gosselin, F., 2020. The importance of being
532 random! Taking full account of random effects in nonlinear sigmoid hierarchical Bayesian
533 models reveals the relationship between deadwood and the species richness of saproxylic
534 beetles. *Forest Ecology and Management* 465, 118064. [https://doi.org/
535 http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.foreco.2020.118064](https://doi.org/http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.foreco.2020.118064).

536 Gosselin, F., 2011. A New Calibrated Bayesian Internal Goodness-of-Fit Method: Sampled
537 Posterior p-values as Simple and General p-values that Allow Double Use of the Data. *Plos*
538 *One* 6, e14770. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0014770>.

539 Gosselin, F., 2015. Reevaluating Europe's other debt with improved statistical tools.
540 *Biodiversity and Conservation* 24, 205-211. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10531-014-0799-y>.

541 Gosselin, F., Callois, J.M., 2018. Relationships between human activity and biodiversity in
542 Europe at the national scale: Spatial density of human activity as a core driver of biodiversity
543 erosion. *Ecological Indicators* 90, 356-365. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolind.2018.03.010>.

544 Gosselin, F., Callois, J.M., 2019. Corrigendum to "Relationships between human activity and
545 biodiversity in Europe at the national scale: Spatial density of human activity as a core driver
546 of biodiversity erosion" [*Ecol. Indicators* 90 (2018) 356–365]. *Ecological Indicators* 99, 394-
547 395. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolind.2018.12.026>.

548 Haberl, H., 1997. Human appropriation of net primary production as an environmental
549 indicator: Implications for sustainable development. *Ambio* 26, 143-146.

550 Haberl, H., Erb, K.H., Gingrich, S., Kastner, T., Krausmann, F., 2013. Human appropriation
551 of net primary production, stocks and flows of carbon, and biodiversity, in: Lal, R., Lorenz,
552 K., Hüttel, R.F., Schneider, B.U., von Braun, J. (Eds.), *Ecosystem Services and Carbon*
553 *Sequestration in the Biosphere*. Springer, Dordrecht, pp. 313-331.
554 http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/978-94-007-6455-2_13.

555 Haberl, H., Schulz, N.B., Plutzer, C., Erb, K.H., Krausmann, F., Loibl, W., Moser, D.,
556 Sauberer, N., Weisz, H., Zechmeister, H.G., Zulka, P., 2004. Human appropriation of net
557 primary production and species diversity in agricultural landscapes. *Agriculture, Ecosystems*
558 *and Environment* 102, 213-218. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.agee.2003.07.004>.

559 Harrell, F.E., 2001. *Regression Modeling Strategies, With Applications to Linear Models,*
560 *Logistic Regression, and Survival Analysis*. Springer, New York, USA.

561 Herpigny, B., Gosselin, F., 2015. Analyzing plant cover class data quantitatively: customized
562 cumulative zero-inflated beta distributions show promising results. *Ecological Informatics* 26,
563 18-26. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.ecoinf.2014.12.002>.

564 Hoffmann, J.P., 2004. Social and environmental influences on endangered species: a cross-
565 national study. *Sociological Perspectives* 47, 79-107.
566 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1525/sop.2004.47.1.79>.

567 Holland, T.G., Peterson, G.D., Gonzalez, A., 2009. A cross-national analysis of how
568 economic inequality predicts biodiversity loss. *Conservation Biology* 23, 1304-1313.
569 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1523-1739.2009.01207.x>.

570 Ipbes, 2018. Summary for policymakers of the regional assessment report on biodiversity and
571 ecosystem services for Europe and Central Asia of the Intergovernmental Science-Policy
572 Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services. IPBES secretariat, Bonn, Germany, p. 42.

573 Ipbes, 2019. Summary for policymakers of the global assessment report on biodiversity and
574 ecosystem services of the Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and
575 Ecosystem Services. IPBES secretariat, Bonn, Germany, p. 45.

576 Konvicka, M., Fric, Z., Benes, J., 2006. Butterfly extinctions in European states: Do
577 socioeconomic conditions matter more than physical geography? *Global Ecology and*
578 *Biogeography* 15, 82-92. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1466-822X.2006.00188.x>.

579 Krausmann, F., Haberl, H., Erb, K.H., Wiesinger, M., Gaube, V., Gingrich, S., 2009. What
580 determines geographical patterns of the global human appropriation of net primary
581 production? *Journal of Land Use Science* 4, 15-33.
582 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/17474230802645568>.

583 Kuussaari, M., Bommarco, R., Heikkinen, R.K., Helm, A., Krauss, J., Lindborg, R., Ockinger,
584 E., Partel, M., Pino, J., Roda, F., Stefanescu, C., Teder, T., Zobel, M., Steffan-Dewenter, I.,
585 2009. Extinction debt: a challenge for biodiversity conservation. *Trends Ecol. Evol.* 24, 564-
586 571. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.tree.2009.04.011>.

587 Lindborg, R., Eriksson, O., 2004. Historical landscape connectivity affects present plant
588 species diversity. *Ecology* 85, 1840-1845. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1890/04-0367>.

589 Louwagie, G., Gregor, M., Löhnertz, M., Aksoy, E., Schröder, C., Orlitova, E., 2017. Impact
590 of land take and soil sealing on biodiversity, in: Gardi, C. (Ed.), *Urban Expansion, Land*
591 *Cover and Soil Ecosystem Services*. Routledge, pp. 169-180.

592 Luck, G.W., 2007. A review of the relationships between human population density and
593 biodiversity. *Biological Reviews* 82, 607-645. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1469->
594 [185X.2007.00028.x](http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1469-185X.2007.00028.x).

595 McKee, J., Chambers, E., Guseman, J., 2013. Human Population Density and Growth
596 Validated as Extinction Threats to Mammal and Bird Species. *Human Ecology* 41, 773-778.
597 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10745-013-9586-8>.

598 McKee, J.K., Chambers, E.N., 2011. Behavioral mediators of the human population effect on
599 global biodiversity losses, in: Cincotta, R.P., Gorenflo, L.J. (Eds.), *Human Population - its*
600 *influences on Biodiversity*. Springer, Heidelberg, pp. 47-59.

601 McPherson, M.A., Nieswiadomy, M.L., 2005. Environmental Kuznets curve: Threatened
602 species and spatial effects. *Ecological Economics* 55, 395-407.
603 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolecon.2004.12.004>.

604 Menéndez, R., Megías, A.G., Hill, J.K., Braschler, B., Willis, S.G., Collingham, Y., Fox, R.,
605 Roy, D.B., Thomas, C.D., 2006. Species richness changes lag behind climate change.
606 *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences* 273, 1465-1470.
607 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2006.3484>.

608 Metzger, J.P., Martensen, A.C., Dixo, M., Bernacci, L.C., Ribeiro, M.C., Teixeira, A.M.G.,
609 Pardini, R., 2009. Time-lag in biological responses to landscape changes in a highly dynamic
610 Atlantic forest region. *Biological Conservation* 142, 1166-1177.
611 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.biocon.2009.01.033>.

612 Mikkelsen, G.M., Gonzalez, A., Peterson, G.D., 2007. Economic inequality predicts
613 biodiversity loss. *PLoS ONE* 2. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0000444>.

614 Pandit, R., Laband, D.N., 2007. Threatened species and the spatial concentration of humans.
615 *Biodiversity and Conservation* 16, 235-244. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10531-006-9140-8>.

616 Pinheiro, J.C., Bates, D.M., 2000. *Mixed-effects models in S and S-PLUS*. Springer, New
617 York.

618 Selden, T.M., Song, D., 1994. Environmental quality and development: Is there a kuznets
619 curve for air pollution emissions? *Journal of Environmental Economics and Management* 27,
620 147-162. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1006/jeem.1994.1031>.

621 Tilman, D., May, R.M., Lehman, C.L., Nowak, M.A., 1994. Habitat destruction and the
622 extinction debt. *Nature* 371, 65-66. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/371065a0>

623 Tittensor, D.P., Walpole, M., Hill, S.L.L., Boyce, D.G., Britten, G.L., Burgess, N.D.,
624 Butchart, S.H.M., Leadley, P.W., Regan, E.C., Alkemade, R., Baumung, R., Bellard, C.,
625 Bouwman, L., Bowles-Newark, N.J., 2014. A mid-term analysis of progress toward
626 international biodiversity targets. *Science* 346, 241-244.
627 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1126/science.1257484>.

628 Vačkář, D., Harmáčková, Z.V., Kaňková, H., Stupková, K., 2016. Human transformation of
629 ecosystems: Comparing protected and unprotected areas with natural baselines. *Ecological*
630 *Indicators* 66, 321-328. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolind.2016.02.001>.

631 Vehtari, A., Gelman, A., Gabry, J., 2016. Practical Bayesian model evaluation using leave-
632 one-out cross-validation and WAIC. *Statistics and Computing*, 1413-1432.
633 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s11222-016-9696-4>.

634 Vellend, M., Verheyen, K., Jacquemyn, H., Kolb, A., Van Calster, H., Peterken, G., Hermy,
635 M., 2006. Extinction debt of forest plants persists for more than a century following habitat
636 fragmentation. *Ecology* 87, 542-548. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1890/05-1182>.

637

638

Model name	1 st explanatory variable	2 nd explanatory variable
Null	-	-
Economic	GDPc	HPD
Log Economic	log(GDPc)	log(HPD)
Kuznets	GDPc	GDPc ²
Log Kuznets	log(GDPc)	log(GDPc) ²
Area Kuznets	GDPa	GDPa ²
Log Area Kuznets	log(GDPa)	log(GDPa) ²
GDPa	GDPa	–
Log GDPa	log(GDPa)	–
HPD	HPD	–
Log HPD	log(HPD)	–
HANPP	HANPP	–
Log HANPP	log(HANPP)	–

639 Table 1. The thirteen main statistical models estimated with their names and the explanatory
640 variables they contain. GDPc refers to Gross Domestic Product per capita, GDPa to Gross
641 Domestic Product per area, HPD to Human Population Density, HANPP to Human
642 Appropriation of Primary Productivity. Further details on these variables can be found in
643 Table SM1.

644

Model name	Extinct species	Threatened species	Protected Areas	SEAL	iSEAL
Null	39.47	25.26	<u>0.00</u>	44.51	18.34
Economic.2000	18.51	26.24	6.75	17.45	<u>0.00</u>
Economic.1950	9.67	21.47	4.51	13.20	2.17
Economic.1900	2.54	16.81	4.66	23.26	8.84
Log Economic.2000	16.64	10.66	5.29	<u>0.00</u>	4.87
Log Economic.1950	7.82	6.91	4.69	2.65	6.07
Log Economic.1900	0.98	4.92	4.55	14.92	9.03
Kuznets.2000	51.70	34.38	5.75	48.00	20.62
Kuznets.1950	42.14	39.89	4.07	49.05	22.35
Kuznets.1900	17.44	29.48	6.54	43.84	23.31
Log Kuznets.2000	51.78	41.30	7.46	48.02	20.77
Log Kuznets.1950	37.60	42.44	3.01	48.35	21.91
Log Kuznets.1900	17.87	29.78	3.72	42.90	23.00
Area Kuznets.2000	19.52	12.87	9.39	22.76	8.65
Area Kuznets.1950	12.46	5.45	7.89	27.95	18.51
Area Kuznets.1900	0.75	<u>0.00</u>	13.64	26.13	19.83
Log Area Kuznets.2000	18.53	7.73	4.71	20.18	10.84
Log Area Kuznets.1950	7.90	5.23	4.04	19.21	15.77
Log Area Kuznets.1900	<u>0.00</u>	2.51	6.72	20.14	15.47

646 Table 2. Statistical comparison of the socio-economic main models considered at either 1900,
647 1950 and 2000 (rows) to predict different biodiversity indicators (columns). Difference in
648 Leave-one-out Information Criterion (LOOIC) values with the LOOIC of the best model
649 fitted for the different explanatory models (by column). The lower the LOOIC, the better the
650 model. The best model is underlined and models with a LOOIC relatively close to the best
651 model– i.e. within six units of the best model – are in bold (as suggested in Millar, 2009).
652 Only the models pertaining to the same target variable (models in the same column) are
653 comparable. See Tables 1 and SM1 for the content of the models. For the first three columns,
654 the marginal version of the LOOIC is used.

655

Model name	Simpler models	Hierarchical models
Null	39.47	-
Economic.1900	2.54	-
Log Economic.1900	0.98	-
Area Kuznets.1900	0.75	-
Log Area Kuznets.1900	0.00	--
HPD.1900	9.04	20.66
Log HPD.1900	9.04	8.48
GDPa.1900	6.37	5.88
Log GDPa.1900	-1.11	<u>-4.15</u>
Log GDPa.1950	3.83	3.75
Log GDPa.2000	14.45	14.04
HANPP.1900	17.20	17.96
IHANPP.1900	7.06	3.48

656 Table 3. Statistical comparison of the ability of additional univariate explanatory models
657 (rows) to predict the proportion of Extinct species, both with simple models (one effect shared
658 by all taxonomic groups; first column) and hierarchical models (effect varying among
659 taxonomic groups as a random effect; second column). The difference between Leave-one-out
660 Information Criterion (LOOIC) of the model and the LOOIC of the best model in Table 2 for
661 the proportion of Extinct species is indicated. The lower the LOOIC, the better the model. The
662 best model is underlined and models with a LOOIC within six units of the best model – i.e.
663 relatively close to the best model – are in bold. Models in both columns can be compared

664 since they pertain to the same target variable. See Tables 1 and SM1 for the content of the
665 models.

666

Model name	Simpler models	Hierarchical models
Null	25.26	-
Economic.1900	16.81	-
Log Economic.1900	4.92	-
Area Kuznets.1900	0.00	-
Log Area Kuznets.1900	2.51	-
HPD.1900	8.76	9.90
Log HPD.1900	-1.10	0.03
GDPa.1900	17.74	19.10
Log GDPa.1900	<u>-1.17</u>	0.08
Log GDPa.1950	4.95	5.54
Log GDPa.2000	6.70	8.30
HANPP.1900	25.79	26.36
IHANPP.1900	19.57	20.68

667 Table 4. Statistical comparison of the ability of additional univariate explanatory models
668 (rows) to predict the proportion of Threatened species, both with simple models (one effect
669 shared by all taxonomic groups; first column) and hierarchical models (effect varying among
670 taxonomic groups as a random effect; second column). The difference between Leave-one-out
671 Information Criterion (LOOIC) of the model and the LOOIC of the best model in Table 2 for
672 the proportion of Threatened species is indicated. The lower the LOOIC, the better the model.
673 The best model is underlined and models with an LOOIC within six units of the best model –
674 i.e. relatively close to the best model – are in bold. Models in both columns can be compared

675 since they pertain to the same target variable. See Tables 1 and SM1 for the content of the
676 models.

677

678



Variable name	Summary statistics of the estimator – mean (standard deviation)	p-value	Summary impact in log odds ratio of an increase of 1 standard deviation of the variable
Log GDPa.1900 for Extinct species	0.481 (0.096)	0.00003	0+
Log GDPa.1950 for Extinct species	0.467 (0.108)	0.00003	0+
Log GDPa.2000 for Extinct species	0.404 (0.121)	0.00145	0+
Log GDPa.1900 for Threatened species	0.234 (0.074)	0.00176	00+
Log GDPa.1950 for Threatened species	0.234 (0.087)	0.00441	00+
Log GDPa.2000 for Threatened species	0.238 (0.085)	0.00398	00+
Log HPD.2000 for SEAL	0.856 (0.08)	0.00005	0++
Log HPD.1950 for SEAL	0.846 (0.082)	0.00005	0++
Log HPD.1900 for SEAL	0.791 (0.107)	0.00005	0++
HPD.2000 for iSEAL	0.51 (0.107)	0.00002	++
HPD.1950 for iSEAL	0.227 (0.047)	0.00008	0+
HPD.1900 for iSEAL	0.255 (0.077)	0.0018	0+

680 Table 5. Analysis of the estimators of the best socio-economic variables at different dates for
681 the four Biodiversity indicators that are sensitive to these variables. For magnitude analyses
682 (last column), the results of the analyses of adding one standard variable of the best variate on
683 odds ratios were conclusive if 95% of the odds ratio effects were in the interval $[-0.1; 0.1]$
684 (denoted as 000 and qualified as a strongly negligible effect), $[-0.5; 0.5]$ (denoted as 00 and
685 qualified as a moderately negligible effect), $[-1; 1]$ (denoted as 0 and qualified as a weakly
686 negligible effect), $[0.1; +\infty)$ (denoted as + and qualified as a weakly positive effect),
687 $[0.5; +\infty)$ (denoted as ++ and qualified as a moderately positive effect), $[1; +\infty)$ (denoted as
688 +++ and qualified as a strongly positive effect) (as in e.g. Daniels 1983). Estimators are given
689 for the best univariate model (first) and then for the other models with the same variable but at
690 different dates. GDPa refers to Gross Domestic Product per area, HPD to Human Population
691 Density (log-transformed if an “l” is added at the beginning of the name of the variable). For
692 Extinct species, the best model is the hierarchical model, from which we consider the mean
693 effect across the nine taxonomic groups; estimators by Taxon are provided in Table SM4.

694



695 (a) Extinct species

696



697

698 (b) Threatened Species





700

701

702

703 (c) SEAL


704



705

706 (d) iSEAL

707



708

709 Figure 1. Graphical summary of the relationships between the best variable in 1900 (left) and
 710 in 2000 (right) and the four Biodiversity indicators showing relationships with socio-
 711 economic variables. For Extinct and Threatened species, because we have multiple
 712 observations (i.e. taxonomic groups) for each country, the numbers on the y-axis are the Mean
 713 estimates of the country random effect in the Null model. Inside each Figure, we indicate the
 714 Pearson correlation – denoted as r – between the two variables. GDPa refers to Gross
 715 Domestic Product per area, HPD to Human Population Density.

716

717

718

Supplementary material

Name of variable	Explanation, unit and source	Main model including the variable	Summary of variations of the variable
GDPc.2000	Gross Domestic Product per inhabitant in 2000 (unit: 100,000 International Geary–Khamis dollar)	Eco & Kuznets	Untransformed: 16.06 (± 6.63) [3.00; 24.36] Log: 2.65 (± 0.57) [1.10; 3.19]
GDPa.2000	Gross Domestic Product per 1 ha in 2000 (unit: 100,000 International Geary–Khamis dollar)	Kuznets	Untransformed: 2363.55 (± 2455.17) [273.18; 9802.31] Log: 7.27 (± 1.05) [5.61; 9.19]
GDPc.2000 ²	Gross Domestic Product per inhabitant in 2000 (unit: 100,000 International Geary–Khamis dollar)	Eco & Kuznets	Untransformed: 299.87 (± 188.19) [9.01; 593.60] Log: 5.30 (± 1.15) [2.20; 6.39]
GDPa.2000 ²	Gross Domestic Product per 1 ha in 2000 (unit: 100,000 International Geary–Khamis dollar)	Kuznets	Untransformed: 1.1e+07 (± 2.2e+07) [74628.41;

			9.6e+07] Log: 14.54 (± 2.11) [11.22; 18.38]
HPD.2000	Population density in 2000 (unit: inhabitants/ha)	Eco	Untransformed: 138.18 (± 106.34) [14; 454] Log: 4.62 (± 0.89) [2.64; 6.12]
HANPP.2000	Human Appropriation of Primary Productivity in 2000 (unit: %, with 100% corresponding to 1)	Eco	Untransformed: 0.43 (± 0.21) [0.058; 0.92] Log: -0.99 (± 0.59) [-2.85; - 0.079]
GDPc.1950	Gross Domestic Product per inhabitant in 1950 (unit: 100,000 International Geary– Khamis dollar)	Eco & Kuznets	Untransformed: 4.25 (± 1.98) [1.65; 9.06] Log: 1.34 (± 0.47) [0.50; 2.20]
GDPa.1950	Gross Domestic Product per 1 ha in 1950 (unit: 100,000 International Geary–Khamis dollar)	Kuznets	Untransformed: 483.71 (± 502.35) [51.04; 1690.87] Log: 5.68 (± 1.04) [3.93; 7.43]
GDPc.1950^2	Gross Domestic Product per inhabitant in 1950	Eco & Kuznets	Untransformed: 21.83 (± 19.98)

	(unit: 100,000 International Geary–Khamis dollar)		[2.73; 82.16] Log: 2.69 (± 0.94) [1.00; 4.41]
GDPa.1950^2	Gross Domestic Product per 1 ha in 1950 (unit: 100,000 International Geary–Khamis dollar)	Kuznets	Untransformed: 474856.35 (± 837766.19) [2604.67; 2859048.12] Log: 11.36 (± 2.08) [7.87; 14.87]
HPD.1950	Population density in 1950 (unit: inhabitants/ha)	Eco	Untransformed: 104.59 (± 77.79) [10; 282] Log: 4.34 (± 0.90) [2.30; 5.64]
HANPP.1950	Human Appropriation of Primary Productivity in 1950 (unit: %, with 100% corresponding to 1)	Eco	Untransformed: 0.33 (± 0.18) [0.067; 0.73] Log: -1.24 (± 0.58) [-2.70; -0.31]
GDPc.1900	Gross Domestic Product per inhabitant in 1900 (unit: 100,000 International Geary–Khamis dollar)	Eco & Kuznets	Untransformed: 2.36 (± 0.94) [1.22; 4.49] Log: 0.79 (± 0.39) [0.20; 1.50]

GDPa.1900	Gross Domestic Product per 1 ha in 1900 (unit: 100,000 International Geary–Khamis dollar)	Kuznets	Untransformed: 217.81 (\pm 224.68) [13.34; 817.09] Log: 4.85 (\pm 1.15) [2.59; 6.71]
GDPc.1900^2	Gross Domestic Product per inhabitant in 1900 (unit: 100,000 International Geary–Khamis dollar)	Eco & Kuznets	Untransformed: 6.43 (\pm 5.05) [1.50; 20.18] Log: 1.57 (\pm 0.78) [0.40; 3.00]
GDPa.1900^2	Gross Domestic Product per 1 ha in 1900 (unit: 100,000 International Geary–Khamis dollar)	Kuznets	Untransformed: 95625.60 (\pm 180503.21) [178.06; 667634.43] Log: 9.70 (\pm 2.30) [5.18; 13.41]
HPD.1900	Population density in 1900 (unit: inhabitants/ha)	Eco	Untransformed: 79.05 (\pm 54.86) [7; 219] Log: 4.06 (\pm 0.92) [1.95; 5.39]
HANPP.1900	Human Appropriation of Primary Productivity in 1900 (unit: %, with 100% corresponding to 1)	Eco	Untransformed: 0.32 (\pm 0.17) [0.06; 0.76] Log: -1.29 (\pm 0.58) [-2.81; -

			0.28]
--	--	--	-------

720

721 Table SM1. List of economic variables included in the statistical models (cf. Table 2). The summary
 722 of the variations for the variables include the mean (+/- the standard deviation) and in square brackets
 723 the minimum and maximum for the variable in the model for Extinct species (these summary statistics
 724 do not include the repetition of data when a single country is included repeatedly in the analysis). All
 725 the data come from [Dullinger, 2013 ^ny #120369] (2013).

726

Name of variable	Explanation, unit and source	Summary of variations of the variable
Extinct	Number of Extinct species for various taxonomic groups and countries (data from Essl et al. 2013)	Summary statistics for the proportion of Extinct species for each taxonomic group: Vascular Plants: 0.018 (\pm 0.018) [0.0016; 0.088] Bryophytes: 0.024 (\pm 0.02) [0.00; 0.056] Mammals: 0.035 (\pm 0.032) [0.00; 0.13] Birds: 0.031 (\pm 0.023) [0.00; 0.087] Freshwater Fishes: 0.056 (\pm 0.056) [0.00; 0.15] Reptiles: 0.015 (\pm 0.032) [0.00; 0.12] Amphibians: 0.0025 (\pm 0.012) [0.00; 0.056] Dragonflies: 0.035 (\pm 0.037) [0.00; 0.10] Grasshoppers: 0.051 (\pm 0.057) [0.00; 0.22]
Threatened	Number of Threatened species for various taxonomic groups and countries (data from Essl et al. 2013)	Summary statistics for the proportion of Threatened species (excluding Extinct species) for each taxonomic group: Vascular Plants: 0.22 (\pm 0.13) [0.065; 0.56] Bryophytes: 0.23 (\pm 0.097) [0.072; 0.37] Mammals: 0.23 (\pm 0.10) [0.10; 0.44] Birds: 0.29 (\pm 0.11) [0.15; 0.55] Freshwater Fishes: 0.33 (\pm 0.15) [0.093; 0.57] Reptiles: 0.39 (\pm 0.26) [0.00; 0.79] Amphibians: 0.34 (\pm 0.24) [0.00; 0.89] Dragonflies: 0.30 (\pm 0.17) [0.036; 0.57] Grasshoppers: 0.22 (\pm 0.11) [0.069; 0.40]
SEAL	Percent area of country considered as sealed in 2009	2.81 (\pm 1.98) [0.29; 8.22]

	(source: http://www.eea.europa.eu/data-and-maps/indicators/imperviousness-change/assessment)	
iSEAL	Annual percent increase in the country area that was sealed between 2006 and 2009 (source: http://www.eea.europa.eu/data-and-maps/indicators/imperviousness-change/assessment)	0.033 (\pm 0.019) [0.01; 0.089]
PA1	Proportional area of country in IUCN Category 1	0.011 (\pm 0.025) [0.00; 0.086]
PA2	Proportional area of country in IUCN Category 2	0.024 (\pm 0.03) [0.00; 0.10]
PA3	Proportional area of country in IUCN Category 3	0.0021 (\pm 0.0062) [0.00; 0.029]
PA4	Proportional area of country in IUCN Category 4	0.031 (\pm 0.04) [0.00038; 0.16]

728 Table SM2. List of the biodiversity indicators used in this paper. The summary of the variations for
729 the variables include the mean (+/- the standard deviation) and in square brackets the minimum and
730 maximum for the variable.

731

Model name	SEAL	iSEAL
Null	44.51	18.34
Economic.2000	17.45	<u>0.00</u>
Log Economic.2000	0.00	4.87
Economic.1950	13.20	2.17
Log Economic.1950	2.65	6.07
GDPa.2000	24.30	5.36
Log GDPa.2000	18.54	8.46
HPD.2000	17.70	0.75
Log HPD.2000	<u>-2.21</u>	2.54
HPD.1950	11.76	5.38
Log HPD.1950	0.07	5.53
HANPP.2000	11.93	8.93
Log HANPP.2000	9.31	10.61

733

734 Table SM3. Statistical comparison of additional univariate models (rows) to predict the two
735 pressure biodiversity indicators (columns). Difference between Leave-one-out Information
736 Criterion (LOOIC) of the model and the LOOIC of the best model in Table 2 for the
737 proportion of Sealed area in 2009 (SEAL) and the increase in that proportion between 2006
738 and 2009 (iSEAL) (columns). The lower the LOOIC, the better the model. The best model is
739 underlined and models with an LOOIC within six units of the best model – i.e. relatively close
740 to the best model – are in bold. Only the models pertaining to the same target variable
741 (column heading) are comparable. See Tables 1 and SM1 for the content of the models.

Variable name	Taxon	Summary statistics of the estimator – mean (standard deviation)	p-value	Summary impact in log odds ratio of an increase of 1 standard deviation of the variable
Log GDPa.1900	Vascular Plants	0.356 (0.128)	0.00359	0+
Log GDPa.1900	Bryophytes	0.509 (0.161)	0.00061	0+
Log GDPa.1900	Mammals	0.516 (0.139)	0.00023	0+
Log GDPa.1900	Birds	0.292 (0.151)	0.0298	0
Log GDPa.1900	Fishes	0.544 (0.157)	0.00045	0+
Log GDPa.1900	Reptiles	0.299 (0.263)	0.12923	0
Log GDPa.1900	Amphibians	0.498 (0.297)	0.03758	
Log GDPa.1900	Dragonflies	0.623 (0.217)	0.00042	+
Log GDPa.1900	Grasshoppers	0.691 (0.232)	0.00008	+
Log GDPa.1950	Vascular Plants	0.391 (0.133)	0.0032	0+
Log GDPa.1950	Bryophytes	0.464 (0.159)	0.0032	0+
Log GDPa.1950	Mammals	0.488 (0.141)	0.00046	0+
Log GDPa.1950	Birds	0.336 (0.156)	0.02077	0
Log GDPa.1950	Fishes	0.536 (0.158)	0.00021	0+
Log GDPa.1950	Reptiles	0.314 (0.255)	0.10858	0
Log GDPa.1950	Amphibians	0.5 (0.268)	0.024	+
Log GDPa.1950	Dragonflies	0.585 (0.209)	0.00035	+
Log GDPa.1950	Grasshoppers	0.589 (0.203)	0.00049	+
Log GDPa.2000	Vascular Plants	0.272 (0.157)	0.04517	0

Log GDPa.2000	Bryophytes	0.446 (0.16)	0.00285	0+
Log GDPa.2000	Mammals	0.419 (0.147)	0.00285	0+
Log GDPa.2000	Birds	0.339 (0.155)	0.01933	0
Log GDPa.2000	Fishes	0.448 (0.157)	0.00224	0+
Log GDPa.2000	Reptiles	0.317 (0.213)	0.07399	0
Log GDPa.2000	Amphibians	0.418 (0.234)	0.0305	0
Log GDPa.2000	Dragonflies	0.491 (0.199)	0.00299	0+
Log GDPa.2000	Grasshoppers	0.483 (0.192)	0.00358	0+

742

743 Table SM4. Analysis of the estimators of the best socio-economic variables at different dates
744 for the proportion of Extinct species, by taxonomic group. For magnitude analyses (last
745 column), the results of the analyses of adding one standard variable of the best variate on odds
746 ratios were conclusive if 95% of the odds ratio effects were in the interval $[-0.1; 0.1]$
747 (denoted as 000 and qualified as a strongly negligible effect), $[-0.5; 0.5]$ (denoted as 00 and
748 qualified as a moderately negligible effect), $[-1; 1]$ (denoted as 0 and qualified as a weakly
749 negligible effect), $[0.1; +\infty)$ (denoted as + and qualified as a weakly positive effect),
750 $[0.5; +\infty)$ (denoted as ++ and qualified as a moderately positive effect), $[1; +\infty)$ (denoted as
751 +++ and qualified as a strongly positive effect) (as in e.g. Daniels 1983). The best model was
752 the hierarchical model at date 1900. For each taxonomic group, estimated tend to decrease
753 with date, except for Birds and Reptiles, for which they tend to increase with date, and
754 vascular plants and amphibians, for which 1900 and 1950 estimators were very close and
755 greater than 2000 estimator.

756

757


Model name	Extinct species	Threatened species
Null	22.83	17.53
Log Economic.2000	0.0	2.93
Log Kuznets.2000a	1.89	0.0
HPD20001	-1.68	<u>-4.65</u>
Log GDPa.2000	-2.21	-1.03
Log SEAL	<u>-10.67</u>	-0.28

758

759 Table SM5. Statistical comparison of additional univariate models in 2000 (rows) to predict
760 the two state biodiversity indicators (columns). Difference in Leave-one-out Information
761 Criterion (LOOIC) values with the LOOIC of the best model with current values of socio-
762 economic variables in Table 2, for additional univariate models involving only current values
763 of variables for the proportion of Extinct and Threatened species. The lower the LOOIC, the
764 better the model. The best model is underlined and models with an LOOIC within six units of
765 the best model – i.e. relatively close to the best model – are in bold. Only the models
766 pertaining to the same target variable (column heading) are comparable. It should be noted
767 that for extinct species, the best present model was the bivariate model involving
768 untransformed SEAL and iSEAL (Difference in LOOIC of -14.18). See Tables 1 and SM1 for
769 the content of the models.

770

variable clustering (varclus) - with correlations



773

method : average

774 Figure SM1. Variable clustering for the explanatory variables used in the paper. The correlation metric

775 was the Pearson correlation and the method used to summarize multiple correlations was the average

776 method. Variables linked at a value close to one are on average closely correlated while variables

777 linked at a value close to zero have a low level of correlation.