AARHUS UNIVERSITY

Coversheet

This is the accepted manuscript (post-print version) of the article.

Contentwise, the accepted manuscript version is identical to the final published version, but there may be differences in typography and layout.

How to cite this publication

Please cite the final published version:

Doughty, C. E., Faurby, S. and Svenning, J.-C. (2016), The impact of the megafauna extinctions on savanna woody cover in South America. *Ecography*, 39: 213–222. doi:10.1111/ecog.01593

Publication metadata

Title:	The impact of the megafauna extinctions on savanna woody cover in South America
Author(s):	Doughty, C. E., Faurby, S. and Svenning, J.-C.
Journal:	Ecography
DOI/Link:	https://www.doi.org/10.1111/ecog.01593
Document version:	Accepted manuscript (post-print)

This is the peer reviewed version of the following article: [Doughty, C. E., Faurby, S. and Svenning, J.-C. (2016), The impact of the megafauna extinctions on savanna woody cover in South America. *Ecography*, 39: 213–222. doi:10.1111/ecog.01593], which has been published in final form at [https://www.doi.org/10.1111/ecog.01593]. This article may be used for non-commercial purposes in accordance with Wiley Terms and Conditions for Self-Archiving.

General Rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognize and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the public portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

If the document is published under a Creative Commons license, this applies instead of the general rights.

The impact of the megafauna extinctions on savanna woody cover in South America

Christopher E. Doughty¹, Søren Faurby², Jens-Christian Svenning²

*1. Environmental Change Institute, School of Geography and the Environment, University of
Oxford, South Parks Road, Oxford OX1 3QY, UK*

*2. Section for Ecoinformatics & Biodiversity, Department of Bioscience, Aarhus University,
Ny Munkegade 114, DK-8000 Aarhus C, Denmark*

Key words: megafauna, woody cover, savanna, extinctions

20

21 **Abstract**

22 Has land surface cover in South America been impacted by the loss of most large herbivores
23 following the severe Pleistocene and early Holocene megafauna extinctions on this continent?
24 Here, we estimate how mean savanna woody biomass may have changed in the Americas
25 following these extinctions by creating an empirical model to understand how large
26 herbivores impact savanna woody biomass. To create this empirical model, we combine a
27 large recently published dataset of savanna woody cover from Lehmann et al. (2014)
28 (N=2154 plots) with estimates of mammals ranges and weights from the IUCN database. We
29 evaluate how variables such as number of megaherbivores (mammal species ≥ 1000 kg),
30 $\log_{10}$ sum species weights, and total # of mammal species predict changes to woody cover by
31 using both ordinary least squares regression analysis (OLS) and Simultaneous Auto-
32 Regressive (SAR) analysis to control for spatial autocorrelation. Both # of megaherbivores
33 and $\log_{10}$ sum species weights, which both disproportionately weight for megaherbivores,
34 significantly explained much (~5-13%) variance in woody cover, but the third variable
35 weighting all animals equally, did not. We then combined these biotic variables with abiotic
36 variables such as temperature, precipitation, and fire frequency to create a model predicting
37 36% of the variance of savanna woody cover. We used this model combined with estimated
38 range maps of extinct South American megafauna to estimate that had those South American
39 megafauna not gone extinct, total savanna woody cover in South America could possibly
40 have decreased by ~29% and that savannas would likely have been more open like current
41 African savannas.

42

43

45

46 **Introduction**

47 To what extent do large animals shape their environments and how does this compare to
48 other abiotic inputs such as temperature, rainfall or fire? Trees clearly dominate in very wet
49 ecosystems and grasses dominate in drier ecosystems, but in intermediate ecosystems large
50 animals may play an important role in determining the ratios of grasses versus trees (Bond
51 2005, Sandom et al. 2014a). Bond (2005) defined such areas as “ecosystems uncertain” on in
52 his “brown” world model, where he hypothesized that such regions may be consumer
53 controlled, with consumers being fire, animals, or both. It is important to understand the
54 drivers of these ecosystems because savannas cover 20% of the global land surface and
55 account for 30% of terrestrial net primary production (NPP) (Field et al. 1998).

56 Tropical savanna vegetation is dominated by a combination of C4 grasses and
57 disturbance-tolerant woody species (Ratnam. et al. 2011), whose distributions can vary over
58 time and space (Murphy et al. 2014, Sankaran et al. 2005). It has been speculated that the
59 processes controlling the presence of these trees are similar throughout the major savanna
60 regions of the world in Africa, Australia, and South America (Bond 2008, Knapp et al. 2004).
61 However, other studies have shown large differences between savannas across continents
62 (Lehmann et al. 2011, Staver et al. 2011). Understanding the abiotic drivers of savanna
63 woody tree cover was the subject of a recent study where data from 2154 sites in South
64 America, Africa and Australia were aggregated (Lehmann et al. 2014). This study found that
65 increasing moisture availability drives increases in tree basal area, whereas fire reduces tree
66 basal area. However, among continents, the magnitude of these effects varied substantially,
67 so that no single model adequately represented savanna woody biomass across these regions,
68 and South America did not fit well within the model framework.

Why might South America be functionally different than the other regions? South America had a drastic loss of large animals with 59 species of South American megafauna going extinct during the Late Pleistocene and early Holocene (Sandom et al. 2014b), which was a part of a global loss of large animals between ~50 to ~7 kybp, with 97 genera of large animals going extinct (Barnosky et al. 2004). Importantly, all South American megaherbivores (herbivores ≥ 1 ton in body weight) were lost ($n = 15$ spp.(Owen-Smith 2013)) and even most herbivores ≥ 500 kg went extinct, with just some species of tapirs (*Tapirus* spp.) surviving to the present day. Africa, in contrast, has maintained a rich fauna of large herbivores until the present-day, albeit some species have experienced massive range losses in recent decades. How did these prehistoric extinctions affect ecosystem processes? Large herbivores can have major impacts on the vegetation structure, including the balance between trees and grasses. This is, in particular, the case for megaherbivores, which due to their near-immunity to non-human predation on adults (although juveniles may be vulnerable) are not top-down regulated and can attain high densities at which they may radically transform vegetation structure (Owen-Smith 1987). The loss of megafauna could also have had major effects on seed dispersal (Janzen and Martin 1982, Pires et al. 2014) and nutrient biogeochemistry (Doughty et al. 2013, Zimov et al. 1995). Until recently it has been difficult to definitively attribute ecosystem changes to the now extinct megafauna because little that was known about their behaviour. Due to the drastic nature of the extinctions in South America, we would expect to see a larger potential impact on vegetation there than almost anywhere. During the late Pleistocene, South America had a predominance of very large herbivores, while most of Australia's mammalian herbivores were comparably small and those of Africa were intermediate (Owen-Smith 2013).

There are biogeographical, paleontological and experimental reasons to think that these large-animal extinctions may have impacted savanna woody surface cover. For instance,

we can broadly compare savanna tree cover in Africa (with megafauna) to South America (largely without). At a given soil moisture status, Africa has substantially fewer trees than South America (Murphy and Bowman 2012), which could be partially due to the lack of megaherbivores in South America. Paleo-data generally indicates an increase of woody biomass around the time of the megafauna extinctions, but in the past it was difficult to determine whether the increased woody biomass was the cause of the extinctions or an effect of them. The difficulty was compounded because megafauna remains are rare, especially in the lakes that generally archive late Quaternary pollen records. However, spores of *Sporormiella*, a dung fungus, could be used as a proxy for megafauna abundance because it has been shown that in the lake pollen records, they follow the end-Pleistocene megafauna population decline: they are abundant in late-glacial sediments, rare through the Holocene, and increase in abundance with the historic introduction of domestic grazers (Davis and Shafer 2006). This *Sporormiella* data generally indicate that the extinctions tended to be followed by an increase in tree cover versus vice versa. For instance, vegetation changed drastically in the Eastern US (Gill et al. 2009) following the megafauna extinctions. Another recent study using *Sporormiella* data found that human arrival was correlated with the extinctions of the Australian megafauna, which then caused a major change in vegetation through a combination of reduced herbivory and increased fire (Rule. et al. 2012). There are currently no similar studies that we are aware of for South America.

There is also now abundant experimental evidence that large animals may impact land surface cover. Exclosure experiments, experiments that use fences to remove herbivores from ecosystems, show ecosystems with increased tree cover. One of the most comprehensive studies to document this was a recent aircraft campaign that flew over two similar African savanna ecosystems. The only difference between the two was that in one, all animals >5kg were excluded, while in the other, they were included. Woody cover increased ~9% over ~36

years in the system without large herbivores, especially elephants (Asner and Levick. 2012, Asner et al. 2009). This study demonstrates that elephants are chiefly responsible for the tree falls, and can uproot up to 1500 trees per elephant per year (Duffy et al. 1999).

What role might herbivores play on woody cover abundance? Here we propose a very simple study to address this question by reanalysing the Lehmann et al. dataset, but incorporating the impact of herbivores in the model (Lehmann et al. 2014). The original study does not analyse the impact of animals because the authors state that “globally, data availability on herbivore abundance is sparse and unreliable”. However, the IUCN database provides a reasonable estimate of animal range and we therefore use this database to estimate herbivory. Likewise, we now have a rough estimate of the ranges of the now extinct megafauna that we can use to estimate how woody surface cover might have changed if those animals still existed (Faurby and Svenning. submitted-a). We ask the following questions:

1. Does adding extant mammal diversity and biomass– and in particular large species - improve empirical global models (OLS and SAR) of woody savanna cover over just abiotic inputs?

2. Based on these results, how might savanna woody surface cover in South America be different if the continent had maintained its rich abundance of Pleistocene megafauna?

Methods –

Data

We use the recently published dataset from Lehmann et al. (2014) that has data on woody biomass (WB), temperature, effective rainfall, seasonality, drought index, and fire frequency from 2154 plots in South America, Africa and Australia (variables described in Table 1 - for any methodological details regarding these variables see Lehmann et al. (2014). We combine this dataset with terrestrial mammal ranges, based on 43,444 individual range maps (IUCN 2010) and the body masses of these species (Faurby and Svenning. submitted-b, Smith et al. 2003). For every mammal in the IUCN database we converted its range vectors into rasters (4 pixels per degree) and tested whether each of the coordinates listed in the Lehmann et al. (2014) paper were within this area. However, resolution differences between the two datasets may contribute to error in our analysis.

To understand the impact of animal size on woody biomass, we then divided our animal data into three categories, # of mammals > 1000 kg (current megaherbivore diversity), log10 sum of average species weight biomass (species richness weighted by biomass), and total # of mammals (current terrestrial mammal diversity) (shown spatially in Figure 1). We removed all bats (order Chiroptera) from the analysis because they are mammals that will not impact woody surface cover (however, bats are important seed dispersers). We did not use a variable that estimates species density because of the great uncertainty in estimating population densities for extinct megafauna and due to little population density data for existing species. However, such a variable could potentially provide a more accurate estimate in the future.

To estimate the impact of the now extinct megafauna on woody biomass, we created a dataset of the ranges and weights of extinct megafauna. The taxonomy for extinct species followed (Faurby and Svenning submitted-b). This dataset is based on historical information when available or alternatively based on a method similar to the co-existence approach to infer paleoclimate based on co-occurring taxa (Mosbrugger and Utescher 1997). We combine this with the current IUCN mammal database to estimate mammal distributions as they would have been today without any extinctions or regional extirpations. In this dataset we include the historical ranges of animals as they would have been prior to human hunting and land use change. For this last variable we also take the log10 sum of average species weight biomass and refer to this variable as present world with extinct megafauna. We therefore divide our data into present world with extinct megafauna which includes extant species and their historical range (where available) plus extinct species and the other animal variables which only include extant species within their current ranges. There is uncertainty involved in predicting range maps and mean weights of extinct species. For this reason, as a sensitivity study we vary the number and weights of extinct megafauna by $\pm 20\%$ (Faurby and Svenning submitted-a) and show Figure 7 under a high and low scenario in SOM Figure 3.

Data analysis –

We used the Ordinary Least Squares (OLS) multiple regression models for our environmental variables (temperature, precipitation and fire – see table 1 for details) alongside our biotic variables to predict woody biomass. Whenever spatial data are plotted there is a risk of autocorrelation because plots closer to each other will have more similar signals than plots far from each other. Therefore, we used a spatial regression models that takes spatial autocorrelation into account (Dormann et al. 2007) by using (Simultaneous Auto-Regressive (SAR) error models (Dormann et al. 2007). To reduce the potential of spatial autocorrelation,

we reduced our sample size to 1256 by eliminating all, but one plot within the same quarter of a pixel. We chose these plots in several different ways, but all methods had broadly similar results. Following this reduction of our dataset, our correlogram (SOM Figure 1) indicates vastly reduced spatial autocorrelation. SAR models were fit using the R library ‘spdep’ following Pedersen et al. (2014) (Pedersen et al. 2014). We examined possible neighbourhood definitions to determine how effective each was at removing residual autocorrelation from model predictions. For our SAR analyses, the dataset has many close sample points but fewer isolated ones, and we therefore define neighbourhoods by distance to reference point. In our case, we tried distances from 20km to 100km and found that Akaike’s Information Criterion (AIC) was minimized at 90km. For model comparison we used AIC, corrected for small sample size, which compares the model explanatory power while compensating for additional model parameters. Therefore, our SAR model assumes that the value of a given cell is a function of the parameter values and the values of the cells within 90km. By accounting for spatial autocorrelation, the effects estimated by the SAR models may more reflect local effects, while effects estimated by the OLS models may more reflect broad-scale patterns. We estimate the overall model performance (pseudo-R²) of the SAR model by calculating the square of the correlation between the predicted (only the predictor and not the spatial parts) and the raw values. We will refer to this as pseudo-R² in the paper even though we note that several different estimates of model fit are frequently referred to as pseudo-R² (Group 2014).

208

209 **Results**

210 We predicted woody biomass (WB) using each variable individually with both OLS and SAR
211 analysis (Table 1). Current megaherbivore diversity and species richness weighted by
212 biomass were both highly significant, explaining 6 and 13% of the variance respectively in
213 WB. Current terrestrial mammal diversity, in contrast, was not significant and did not explain
214 much variance in woody biomass (Table 2). Of the abiotic variables, ER, drought, and MAT
215 were each highly significant and each explained a significant portion of the variance (Table
216 2).

217 We then took the significant variables from the individual models (species richness
218 weighted by biomass, ER, drought, and MAT, but also fire because fire has previously been
219 found to predict savanna ecosystem structure (Lehmann et al. 2014)) and combined them to
220 create a stronger model for predicting woody biomass. We used mammal biomass rather than
221 megaherbivore diversity, both because it explained more variance individually and because
222 the 1000kg cut off was potentially an arbitrary threshold for a process that likely has a
223 continuous relationship with body size. The combined OLS and SAR models both explained
224 36% of the variance (Table 3). If we remove the animal variables in the multivariate model,
225 the r^2 of both models drop by 0.03. The SAR model was strongly supported by AIC over the
226 OLS model, but the two had broadly similar regression coefficients (Table 3 and Figure 1).

227 South American plots had much higher woody biomass than African plots and slightly
228 higher WB than Australian plots (Figure 2a). South American plots had greater effective
229 rainfall and drought index, with lower values in both African and Australian plots (Figure 2b
230 and c). African and Australian plots also were warmer and more fire prone than South
231 American plots (Figure 2d and e). African plots averaged 2.7 species > 1000kg with the other

continents both having zero (Figure 2f). Species richness weighted by biomass is also greatest in African plots, followed by South American and Australian plots (Figure 2g). In contrast, South American plots had more total extant mammal species than either African or Australian plots (Figure 2h). However, when late Quaternary extinct as well as locally extirpated species are also included, the mammal biomass is similar in South American and African plots, but lower in Australian plots (Figure 2i).

Which of the variables in our model are the most important in determining continental variation in woody biomass? We can estimate the importance of each variable by multiplying its SAR regression coefficient (Table 3) by its mean value for each continent. Effective rainfall has the largest impact on continental variation with a $\sim 29 \text{ Mg C ha}^{-1}$ difference predicted between WB in South America and Africa (Figure 3). In contrast, fire apparently has very little impact on WB in our model for any of the continents. Drought and MAT both impact WB by $\sim 15 \text{ Mg C ha}^{-1}$, but with opposite signs. Species richness weighted by biomass decreases WB by $\sim 15 \text{ Mg C ha}^{-1}$ in Africa relative to having no animals due to the larger number of megafauna and by about $7\text{--}9 \text{ Mg C ha}^{-1}$ in Australia and South America. However, after including the Pleistocene megafauna (present world with extinct megafauna) mammals decreased WB by a similar amount ($\sim 16 \text{ Mg C ha}^{-1}$) in both South America and Africa, but only by 7 Mg C ha^{-1} in Australia. Therefore, adding the megafauna back into South America decreased mean WB by $\sim 7 \text{ Mg C ha}^{-1}$ in our model (Figure 3).

We estimate WB for each continent and compare this to measured continental averaged WB values (Figure 4). The model, while using the variable “species richness weighted by biomass”, greatly under predicts South America’s WB versus measured values, while slightly over predicting WB in Africa (SOM Figure 2). Therefore, when we use the variable present world with extinct megafauna to predict WB, we correct for the inherent

residual continental differences. For instance, the SAR model under predicts WB in South America by $\sim 6 \text{ Mg C ha}^{-1}$, and, thus, we add 6 Mg C ha^{-1} to our model results. After this correction, we estimate that woody biomass in savannas in South America has increased by 29% due to the late Quaternary extinctions and extirpations (Figure 4). However, there are large regional differences within South America. In Figure 5a, we show the difference between variables “species richness weighted by biomass” and “present world with extinct megafauna” overlaid with our estimates of changes to WB for each plot (circles) with and without the extinct animals. There is a clear correlation. Where there were many extinctions of large animals, such as in present day Argentina, there are predictions of increases in WB of greater than 20 Mg C ha^{-1} (red circles) following the extinctions. Where there are fewer predictions of large animal extinctions, such as in northern South America, there is very little change in predictions of WB. Therefore, we predict the biggest change in WB would have been in Southern Brazil, Uruguay, and Argentina (see Figure 6 for artistic depictions of possible species living in these regions). We plot a histogram and find that WB has a median decrease of $\sim 10 \text{ Mg C ha}^{-1}$, but with individual plot losses of up to 80 Mg C ha^{-1} (Figure 5b).

Finally, we create a spatially explicit map showing expected percentage decline in woody surface cover from today’s estimated values if the Pleistocene megafauna still existed (Figure 7). We use maps of ET, drought, MAT, species richness weighted by biomass and fire to estimate percentage woody cover. From this, we subtract the estimated impact of the now extinct megafauna and find that woody cover in most regions would be $\sim 80\%$ of today’s values. In Southern South America, the percentage decline in woody surface cover drops to below 50% in parts. This is a function of the many large, now extinct herbivores that lived in this region as well as lower expected tree cover due to environmental conditions. In other words, in Southern South America, our model predicts that the environment reduces almost all the savanna tree cover and the megafauna would have removed what little tree cover remained.

Discussion

How might South American biogeography have looked without the end-Pleistocene and early Holocene extinctions? Here, we broadly estimate that the savanna regions would have been more open with, on average ~29% less woody biomass in the savanna zones, making them more similar to mean tree cover found in African savannas (Figure 4). Why might megaherbivores have such a large impact on land cover? Owen-Smith originally proposed a "keystone herbivore" hypothesis, where, due to their invulnerability to non-human predation on adults, megaherbivores (>1000 kg) attain saturation densities at which they may radically transform vegetation structure and composition. According to the theory, the elimination of megaherbivores elsewhere in the world at the end of the Pleistocene and in the early Holocene would have drastically changed vegetation structure and in the process eliminated habitat for smaller animals that also went extinct (Owen-Smith 1987). We do, however, note that such an interpretation is not universally accepted and other groups have concluded the opposite with climate driven changes to vegetation in South America causing the extinctions of the medium and smaller sized animals (de Vivo and Carmignotto 2004).

Our work also supports the idea that large regions of the planet were once herbivore controlled, as stated in the "brown Earth" hypothesis of Bond (2005). This hypothesis tried to answer the question of why forests dominate in some landscapes, but grasslands in others. Previous ecological theory would have supposed that climate controlled vegetation type, or more specifically, that the availability of moisture and energy controlled plant growth. Polis (1999) reviewed the original 'green world' hypothesis of Hairston et al. (1960), and found that terrestrial vegetation is mainly determined by climate, but with herbivores having a more

localized impact (Hairston et al. 1960, Polis 1999). However, prior to the extinctions, there were many more megaherbivores (animals >1000 kg) at saturation densities likely leading to vegetation controlled by herbivores in many more savanna regions of the planet. In fact, although today we think of Africa as the land of megaherbivores, prior to the extinctions, South America had a higher abundance of megaherbivores, with South America having a predominance of very large herbivores (N=15) (Figure 6), while most of Australia's mammalian herbivores were relatively small and those of Africa were intermediate (Owen-Smith 2013). Therefore, we might have expected South American megafauna, prior to their extinction, to have had the largest impact on land surface cover.

It does not seem surprising that large mammal herbivores impact savanna tree cover, because there is abundant experimental and paleontological data that demonstrate that animals (and large animals specifically), can play an important role in controlling vegetation cover. For instance, in Kruger National park, when elephants are excluded from a region, there is abundant evidence of a large increase in tree cover (Asner and Levick 2012, Asner et al. 2009). Likewise recent paleontological studies demonstrate that there was an increase in woody surface cover following the extinctions of the Pleistocene megafauna (Gill et al. 2009, Rule et al. 2012, Sandom et al. 2014a). The importance of herbivores was recently highlighted in South American savannas in a recent study that found that grazing and grass competition additively diminished the risk of woody establishment in a wet Argentinian savanna (Maciasa et al. 2014).

How do megaherbivores specifically affect vegetation structure? Megaherbivores, such as elephants, have disproportionate effects on the mortality of adult shrubs, by pulling them out (Pringle et al. 2014), and trees, by pushing them over and breaking them (Asner and Levick 2012) due to their large size and strength. In addition, they also debark trees and feed

on saplings (Staver and Bond 2014). Following their extinctions, it is thought that plant matter might accumulate and provide fuel for increased wildfires (Bond 2010).

Grazers may have had a very different effect on woody vegetation than browsers. Therefore, it is important to determine the guild (grazers or browsers) of the extinct animals. This can be done using carbon d13 isotopic data because grasses have a different isotopic signature than do trees and this isotopic signature is incorporated into the fossil remains. A recent comprehensive meta-study on this topic found that region mattered and some species changed between grazers and browsers by region (Franca, L. D. et al. 2015). This study separated the results into four regions: the Brazilian Intertropical Region where *Equus* was a grazer, *Stegomastodon* and *Toxodon* were mixed-feeders, and *Eremotherium* and *Palaeolama* were browsers. In the Amazon region where *Stegomastodon* and *Toxodon* were browsers. In Southern Brazil, Uruguay and northern Argentina where *Equus* and *Toxodon* were grazers while the mixed-feeders included all the other taxa such as *Nothrotherium*, *Stegomastodon*, *Hippidion*, *Scelidodon*, *Scelidotherium*, *Neosclerocalyptus*, *Glyptodon*, *Macrauchenia*, and *Palaeolama*. None of the taxa analyzed in this region were exclusively browsers. In Ecuador and Peru *Equus* was a grazer and *Stegomastodon* was a mixed-feeder (Franca, L. D. et al. 2015). Therefore, according to this work, the only consistent grazer was the genus *Equus* which we removed from our analysis. This removal had only a very minor impact on our results.

Our model simulations predict that with megafauna, South America's land surface would have been transformed into more open savannas with less abundant woodlands. In practice, what might this mean for the hyper-diverse cerrado regions of Brazil, or the *chiquitano* dry woodlands of Bolivia? We hypothesize that woody encroachment is much greater than it would have otherwise have been, but total levels of biodiversity would likely

have been similar or increased with the large animals (Galetti 2004). The more closed woodlands may have increased stress on currently existing animals that co-evolved with the megafauna in the likely more open ecosystems (Owen-Smith 1987). South American savannas are some of the most threatened ecosystems on the planet with rates of clearing often higher than the Amazon forest (Hansen et al. 2013). The extinctions have already transformed and stressed these valuable ecosystems and the results of this study should not be seen as justification for further transformation to agriculture.

Here we predict that savannas likely had less woody biomass and present day dry forests would have been more savannah-like with mega-herbivores. Also, there is evidence that carbon content of forests decreased as large-seeded fruit trees decreased in abundance (Doughty et al. in review, Janzen and Martin 1982). At this time it is difficult to access the net carbon impact of the megafauna extinctions on South America? Such land surface changes would also have affected climate beyond just their carbon impact, but would have impacted both albedo and evapotranspiration as well (Doughty 2013, Doughty et al. 2010). Tree cover in the tropics generally leads to cooling while tree cover in high latitude regions generally leads to warming (Bonan 2008) and future studies are necessary to determine the net climate impact of land surface changes on global climate. At this point there are too many uncertain variables to estimate the net climate impact of the extinctions.

Would the ecological roles previously performed by the now extinct megafauna simply have shifted to the remaining smaller herbivores following the extinctions? This is a highly uncertain issue, but there are a few reasons to think that it would not. The first is simply size. For instance, elephants and other large herbivores have unique impact on forest structure by breaking and knocking down trees that cannot be replicated by smaller animals (Asner et al. 2012). Predation likely would have kept smaller animals from experiencing a population boom following the extinctions. Beetles associated with herbivore dung were

379 better represented during the Last Interglacial (132,000–110,000 y B.P.) than in the early
380 Holocene (10,000–5,000 y B.P.) (Sandom et al. 2014a). If dung beetles are a proxy for dung
381 quantity, and dung quantity is a proxy for smaller mammal numbers, then this indicates their
382 numbers had not recovered into the early Holocene. However, there are now significant
383 numbers of domestic cattle, especially in Southern South America (SOM Figure 4), that may
384 have taken some of the ecological roles of the megafauna (Barnosky 2008).

385 There is currently an ongoing debate on rewilding or the refaunaation through
386 restoration of extant species to their original geographical distributions (Galetti 2004,
387 Oliveira-Santos and Fernandez 2010). Part of the debate of restoring animals is to restore
388 their ecological function. Here we have shown that this likely includes reducing woody cover
389 in savanna ecosystems. Why might this be important for biodiversity or valuable to humanity?
390 For instance, increased openness in savannas may increase the biodiversity of some savannas
391 (Campos-Krauer and Wisely 2011, Hoogesteijn and Hoogesteijn 2010, Piana and Marsden
392 2014). Also, currently, in some regions of the world, grasslands are undergoing a rapid shift
393 from herbaceous to woody-plant dominance, possibly due to increased atmospheric
394 concentrations of CO₂ or the reduction of fire events due to conservation initiatives (Archer
395 1995). One recent study quantified how this increase in woody cover might reduce
396 productivity of pasture land and found a reduction of between 0.6 and 1.6 reproductive cows
397 per square kilometre for each 1% increase in tree cover (Anadon et al. 2014). In a future with
398 more woody encroachment of pastures, could the addition of megaherbivores remove woody
399 cover, making pastures more productive for cattle? In other words, a mixed, biodiverse
400 pasture including megaherbivores could actually be more productive than a monoculture of
401 cattle (SOM Figure 4).

402 This study offers the first evidence that South America's land surface cover may have
403 been drastically transformed following the severe Pleistocene and early Holocene megafauna

extinctions on this continent. However, the statistical methodology used in this paper is simple and the trends we predict might be more accurately predicted using a more mechanistic approach which could be used to help better predict mega-herbivore effects on woody biomass. Overall, the large empirical dataset highlights the potential role of megafauna on reducing woody cover and thus finds evidence for Bond's "brown world" hypothesis of consumer controlled regions of the planet.

Acknowledgments

JCS was supported by the European Research Council (ERC-2012-StG-310886-HISTFUNC). CED acknowledges funding from the John Fell Fund.

418 **Table 1** – Detailed descriptions of each of the variables used in the empirical models.

Variable	Description
Current megaherbivore diversity	# of mammals >1000kg from the IUCN database
Species richness weighted by biomass	Log10 of sum of masses of all mammals from the IUCN database
Current terrestrial mammal diversity	# of all mammals from the IUCN database
Present world with extinct megafauna	Log10 of sum of masses of all mammals from the IUCN database + extinct megafauna from Faurby and Svenning (submitted).
Effective rainfall	Effective Rainfall defined as the difference between mean annual precipitation (MAP) and mean annual potential evapotranspiration (PET),
Rainfall seasonality	Rainfall seasonality ranges from 0 (all months contribute equally to total annual rainfall) to 100 (all rainfall fell in one month).
Drought index	Foley's Drought Index (Foley, J. C. 1957) is calculated for each month of each year as actual annual rainfall for three years before every month less the expected (long-term average) rainfall for that period, divided by the MAP.

Temperature range	Annual range in mean monthly temperature
Mean annual temperature (MAT)	Mean annual temperature
Fire frequency	Satellite derived fire histories for each region and used the monthly data layers from 2000 to 2010 from the MODIS (MCD45A1) fire product.

419

420

421

422

423 **Table 2** – Results of the Ordinary-least-squares (OLS) models and SAR model for each
 424 variable separately as a predictor of woody biomass (WB) ranked by smallest AIC. We
 425 include slope value and significance, AIC score and percent variance explained.

Variable	WB-OLS	WB-SAR	AIC-OLS	AIC-SAR	R ²
ER	0.03±0.00***	0.03±0.00***	11646	11346	0.31
MAT	0.27±0.014***	-0.25±0.03***	11805	11398	0.22
Drought	42.30±2.20***	33.50±4.50***	11809	11417	0.22
Species richness weighted by biomass	-9.13±0.65***	-8.56±0.96**	11939	11426	0.13
Current megaherbivore diversity	-5.48±0.68***	-3.70±1.40**	12043	11451	0.05
Current terrestrial mammal diversity	-0.00±0.02	0.05±0.05	12121	11456	0
Fire	-0.23±0.40	-0.71±0.40	12122	11457	0
Temp	-0.01±0.03	-0.09±0.06	12122	11458	0
Season	0.28±0.07***	0.05±0.14	12107	11460	0.01
*** (p<0.001), ** (p<0.01) and * (p<0.05), unmarked are not significant (p>0.05).					

426

427

428

429

430

Table 3 – Results of the Ordinary-least-squares (OLS) and SAR multiple linear regression models with and without mammals plus environmental predictors to predict woody biomass (WB).

Variable	OLS-Species richness weighted by biomass	SAR-Species richness weighted by biomass
ER	0.02±0.00***	0.03±0.00***
MAT	0.04±0.03	0.065±0.05
Drought	18.60±2.70***	15.35±4.60***
Species richness weighted by biomass	-4.44±0.63***	-3.52±0.91***
Fire	-0.62±0.33	-0.74±0.37*
R2	0.36	(pseudo) 0.36
AIC	11563	11328
*** (p<0.001),		
** (p<0.01) and		
* (p<0.05), unmarked are not significant (p>0.05).		

439

440 Figures

441

442 **Figure 1** – (a) Current megaherbivore diversity or # of mammals >1000kg, (b) species
 443 richness weighted by biomass or the log10 sum of all mammals combined species weight
 444 excluding bats, (c) current terrestrial mammal diversity or all mammals in each pixel
 445 excluding bats, and (d) present world with extinct megafauna or the log10 sum of all
 446 mammals combined species weight excluding bats but including extinct megafauna.

447

449

450 **Figure 2** – Mean continental values $\pm$ se for woody biomass, effective rainfall, drought index,
451 mean annual temperature, current megaherbivore diversity, species richness weighted by
452 biomass, current terrestrial mammal diversity, present world with extinct megafauna late
453 Quaternary extinct as well for South America, Africa, and Australia.

454

455

456 **Figure 3** – Mean estimated continental impact of each variable (coefficient for SAR from
 457 table 3 multiplied by mean continental value) in our model for South America (black), Africa
 458 (white), and Australia (grey).

459

460

Figure 4 – Continental averaged measured (black) woody biomass versus modelled based on the results of the SAR equations with the now extinct megafauna (present world with extinct megafauna) (white). Error bars are standard error. Residual errors between measured and modelled results were removed from the predicted values. Model coefficients are from the SAR model and listed in column 2 table 3.

Figure 5 – (a) Log10 difference between “species richness weighted by biomass” and “present world with extinct megafauna” shown for all South America. Colored circles ($N=213$) are the difference in estimated plot woody vegetation cover between actual plot values and those simulated including the now extinct megafauna. For the circles, red is a decrease (modelled minus measured) of more than 20 Mg C ha^{-1} , green is a decrease of between 20 and 0 Mg C ha^{-1} , blue is an increase of between 0 and 20 Mg C ha^{-1} , and black is an increase of $>20 \text{ Mg C ha}^{-1}$. Coefficients used to model the estimates are from the SAR model and listed in column 3 table 3. (b) A histogram of the change in woody biomass (modelled with present-natural fauna minus measured) in South America.

Figure 6 – Artwork of some of the now extinct South American Megafauna including, from front to back: small to mid-size terror bird species of either *Phorusrhacinae*, *Patagornithinae* or *Mesembriornithinae*, *Arctotherium angustidens*, the largest bear in history, *Megatherium americanum*, *Glyptodon clavipes*, *Notiomastodon platensis*, formerly known as *Stegomastodon* sp., *Panthera onca*, the Pleistocene jaguar, and *Toxodon platensis*. Illustrator credit Shuhei Tamura with art found at <http://jagroar.deviantart.com/art/>.

Figure 7 – A spatial map of the potential fraction woody cover in present day savanna regions if the now extinct South American megafauna still existed. We use variables ER, drought, MAT, fire, and “species richness weighted by biomass” in our empirical SAR model to predict woody biomass. We then run this model substituting “present world with extinct megafauna” and show the percent decrease in woody cover.

501 **References**

- 502 Anadon, J. D. et al. 2014. Effect of woody-plant encroachment on livestock production in
 503 North and South America. — *P Natl Acad Sci USA* 111: 12948-12953.
- 504 Archer, S. 1995. Tree-Grass Dynamics in a *Prosopis*-Thornscrub Savanna Parkland -
 505 Reconstructing the Past and Predicting the Future. — *Ecoscience* 2: 83-99.
- 506 Asner, G. P. and Levick, S. R. 2012. Landscape-scale effects of herbivores on treefall in
 507 African savannas. — *Ecol Lett* 15: 1211-1217.
- 508 Asner, G. P. et al. 2009. Large-scale impacts of herbivores on the structural diversity of
 509 African savannas. — *P Natl Acad Sci USA* 106: 4947-4952.
- 510 Barnosky, A. D. et al. 2004. Assessing the causes of Late Pleistocene extinctions on the
 511 continents. — *Science* 306: 70-75.
- 512 Bonan, G. B. 2008. Forests and climate change: Forcings, feedbacks, and the climate benefits
 513 of forests. — *Science* 320: 1444-1449.
- 514 Bond, W. (ed.) 2010. Consumer control by megafauna and fire. — Island Press.
- 515 Bond, W. J. 2005. Large parts of the world are brown or black: A different view on the
 516 'Green World' hypothesis. — *J Veg Sci* 16: 261-266.
- 517 Bond, W. J. 2008. What Limits Trees in C-4 Grasslands and Savannas? — *Annu Rev Ecol*
 518 *Evol S* 39: 641-659.
- 519 Campos-Krauer, J. M. and Wisely, S. M. 2011. Deforestation and cattle ranching drive rapid
 520 range expansion of capybara in the Gran Chaco ecosystem. — *Global Change Biol* 17:
 521 206-218.
- 522 Davis, O. K. and Shafer, D. S. 2006. Sporormiella fungal spores, a palynological means of
 523 detecting herbivore density. — *Palaeogeogr Palaeoclimatol* 237: 40-50.
- 524 de Vivo, M. and Carmignotto, A. P. 2004. Holocene vegetation change and the mammal
 525 faunas of South America and Africa. — *J Biogeogr* 31: 943-957.
- 526 Dormann, C. F. et al. 2007. Methods to account for spatial autocorrelation in the analysis of
 527 species distributional data: a review. — *Ecography* 30: 609-628.
- 528 Doughty, C. E. 2013. Preindustrial Human Impacts on Global and Regional Environment. —
 529 *Annu Rev Env Resour* 38: 503-527.
- 530 Doughty, C. E. et al. 2010. Biophysical feedbacks between the Pleistocene megafauna
 531 extinction and climate: The first human-induced global warming? — *Geophys Res*
 532 *Lett* 37: -.
- 533 Doughty, C. E. et al. 2013. The legacy of the Pleistocene megafauna extinctions on nutrient
 534 availability in Amazonia. — *Nat Geosci* 6: 761-764.
- 535 Doughty, C. E. et al. in review. Megafauna extinction, tree species range reduction, and
 536 carbon storage in Amazonian forests. — *Ecography*
- 537 Duffy, K. J. et al. 1999. Realistic parameter assessment for a well known elephant-tree
 538 ecosystem model reveals that limit cycles are unlikely. — *Ecological Modelling* 121:
 539 115-125.
- 540 Faurby, S. and Svenning, J. C. submitted-a. Historic and prehistoric human-driven extinctions
 541 have reshaped global mammal diversity patterns. —
 542 <http://biorxiv.org/content/early/2015/04/01/017368>
- 543 Faurby, S. and Svenning, J. C. submitted-b. A species-level phylogeny of all extant and late
 544 Quaternary extinct mammals using a novel heuristic-hierarchical Bayesian approach.
 545 — *Mol Phylogenet Evol*

- Field, C. B. et al. 1998. Primary production of the biosphere: Integrating terrestrial and oceanic components. — *Science* 281: 237-240.
- Foley, J. C. 1957. Droughts in Australia. Review of records from earliest years of settlement to 1955. . — *Bulletin No. 47, Bureau of Meteorology, Commonwealth of Australia, Melbourne.*
- Franca, L. D. et al. 2015. Review of feeding ecology data of Late Pleistocene mammalian herbivores from South America and discussions on niche differentiation. — *Earth-Sci Rev* 140: 158-165.
- Galetti, M. 2004. Parks of the Pleistocene: recreating the Cerrado and the Pantanal with megafauna. . — *Natureza & conservaço* 2: 93-100.
- Gill, J. L. et al. 2009. Pleistocene Megafaunal Collapse, Novel Plant Communities, and Enhanced Fire Regimes in North America. — *Science* 326: 1100-1103.
- Group, U. S. C. 2014. What are pseudo R-squareds? — http://www.ats.ucla.edu/stat/mult_pkg/faq/general/Psuedo_RSquareds.htm (accessed February 13 2014)
- Hairston, N. G. et al. 1960. Community Structure, Population Control, and Competition. — *Am Nat* 94: 421-425.
- Hansen, M. C. et al. 2013. High-Resolution Global Maps of 21st-Century Forest Cover Change. — *Science* 342: 850-853.
- Hoogesteijn, R. and Hoogesteijn, A. 2010. CATTLE RANCHING AND BIODIVERSITY CONSERVATION AS ALLIES IN SOUTH AMERICA'S FLOODED SAVANNAS. — *Great Plains Research: A Journal of Natural and Social Sciences*
- IUCN 2010. IUCN Red List of Threatened Species. Version 2010.4.
- Janzen, D. H. and Martin, P. S. 1982. Neotropical Anachronisms - the Fruits the Gomphotheres Ate. — *Science* 215: 19-27.
- Knapp, A. K. et al. 2004. Generality in ecology: testing North American grassland rules in South African savannas. — *Front Ecol Environ* 2: 483-491.
- Lehmann, C. E. R. et al. 2014. Savanna Vegetation-Fire-Climate Relationships Differ Among Continents. — *Science* 343: 548-552.
- Lehmann, C. E. R. et al. 2011. Deciphering the distribution of the savanna biome. — *New Phytol* 191: 197-209.
- Lewis, S. L. et al. 2013. Above-ground biomass and structure of 260 African tropical forests. — *Philos T R Soc B* 368:
- Maciasa, D. et al. 2014. Grazing and neighborhood interactions limit woody encroachment in wet subtropical savannas. — *Basic and Applied Ecology* 15: 661-668.
- Mosbrugger, V. and Utescher, T. 1997. The coexistence approach - a method for quantitative reconstructions of Tertiary terrestrial palaeoclimate data using plant fossils. — *Palaeogeogr Palaeocl* 134: 61-86.
- Murphy, B. P. and Bowman, D. M. J. S. 2012. What controls the distribution of tropical forest and savanna? — *Ecol Lett* 15: 748-758.
- Murphy, B. P. et al. 2014. Fire regimes and woody biomass dynamics in Australian savannas. — *J Biogeogr* 41: 133-144.
- Oliveira-Santos, L. G. R. and Fernandez, F. A. S. 2010. Pleistocene Rewilding, Frankenstein Ecosystems, and an Alternative Conservation Agenda. — *Conserv Biol* 24: 4-5.
- Owen-Smith, N. 1987. Pleistocene extinctions: the pivotal role of megaherbivores. — *Palaeobiology* 13: 351-362.
- Owen-Smith, N. 2013. Contrasts in the large herbivore faunas of the southern continents in the late Pleistocene and the ecological implications for human origins. — *J Biogeogr* 40: 1215-1224.

- Pedersen, R. O. et al. 2014. Macroecological Evidence for Competitive Regional-Scale Interactions between the Two Major Clades of Mammal Carnivores (Feliformia and Caniformia). — *Plos One* 9:
- Piana, R. P. and Marsden, S. J. 2014. Impacts of cattle grazing on forest structure and raptor distribution within a neotropical protected area. — *Biodivers Conserv* 23: 559-572.
- Pires, M. M. et al. 2014. Reconstructing past ecological networks: the reconfiguration of seed-dispersal interactions after megafaunal extinction. — *Oecologia* 175: 1247-1256.
- Polis, G. A. 1999. Why are parts of the world green? Multiple factors control productivity and the distribution of biomass. — *Oikos* 86: 3-15.
- Pringle, R. M. et al. 2014. Low functional redundancy among mammalian browsers in regulating an encroaching shrub (*Solanum campylacanthum*) in African savannah. — *P Roy Soc B-Biol Sci* 281:
- Ratnam, J. et al. 2011. When is a 'forest' a savanna, and why does it matter? — *Global Ecol Biogeogr* 20: 653-660.
- Rule, S. et al. 2012. The Aftermath of Megafaunal Extinction: Ecosystem Transformation in Pleistocene Australia. — *Science* 335: 1483-1486.
- Sandom, C. et al. 2014b. Global late Quaternary megafauna extinctions linked to humans, not climate change. — *P Roy Soc B-Biol Sci* 281:
- Sandom, C. J. et al. 2014a. High herbivore density associated with vegetation diversity in interglacial ecosystems. — *P Natl Acad Sci USA* 111: 4162-4167.
- Sankaran, M. et al. 2005. Determinants of woody cover in African savannas. — *Nature* 438: 846-849.
- Smith, F. A. et al. 2003. Body mass of late quaternary mammals. — *Ecology* 84: 3403-3403.
- Staver, A. C. et al. 2011. The Global Extent and Determinants of Savanna and Forest as Alternative Biome States. — *Science* 334: 230-232.
- Staver, A. C. and Bond, W. J. 2014. Is there a 'browse trap'? Dynamics of herbivore impacts on trees and grasses in an African savanna. — *J Ecol* 102: 595-602.
- Zimov, S. A. et al. 1995. Steppe-Tundra Transition - a Herbivore-Driven Biome Shift at the End of the Pleistocene. — *Am Nat* 146: 765-794.