

1 **Clustered versus catastrophic global vertebrate declines**

2
3 Brian Leung^{1,2*}
4 Anna L. Hargreaves¹
5 Dan A. Greenberg³
6 Brian McGill⁴
7 Maria Dornelas⁵
8 Robin Freeman⁶
9

10 ¹Department of Biology, McGill University, Montreal, Quebec, Canada H3A 1B1

11 ²School of Environment, McGill University, Montreal, Quebec, Canada, H3A 2A7

12 ³ Department of Biological Sciences, Simon Fraser University, Burnaby, British Columbia,
13 Canada V5A 1S6

14 ⁴School of Biology and Ecology and Mitchell Center for Sustainability Solutions, University of
15 Maine, Orono, ME USA

16 ⁵ Centre for Biological Diversity, University of St Andrews, St Andrews KY16 9TH, UK

17 ⁶ Indicators and Assessments Unit, Institute of Zoology, Zoological Society of London, London,
18 NW1 4RY

19 *Corresponding author email: brian.leung2@mcgill.ca
20

21 **Summary**

22 Recent analyses have reported catastrophic global declines of vertebrate populations^{1,2}. Yet
23 distilling many trends into a global mean index obscures variation that can inform conservation,
24 and can be sensitive to analytical decisions. For example, whereas earlier analyses estimated a
25 mean vertebrate decline of >50% since 1970 (Living Planet Index: LPI²), we find that this
26 estimate is driven by <3% of populations; excluding these extremely declining populations
27 switches the global trend to an increase. The sensitivity of global mean trends to outliers
28 suggests that more informative indices are needed. We propose an alternative approach,
29 identifying clusters of extreme decline (or increase) that differ statistically from the majority of
30 population trends. We show that, of LPI's 57 taxonomic-geographic systems, 16 systems
31 contain clusters of extreme decline (comprising ~1% of populations, occurring disproportionately
32 in larger animals) and 7 contain extreme increases (~0.4% of populations). The remaining
33 98.6% of populations across all systems showed no mean global trend. However, when
34 analyzed separately, three systems were declining strongly with high certainty (all Indo-Pacific),
35 and seven were declining strongly but with less certainty (mostly reptile-amphibian groups).
36 Accounting for extreme clusters fundamentally alters interpretation of global vertebrate trends
37 and should be used to help prioritize conservation effort.
38
39

40 Main

41
42 Rapid global change is threatening species across the globe¹. Quantifying biodiversity trends is
43 important to assess whether current investment is slowing or reversing declines, and identify
44 regions and taxa of concern. While distilling disparate population trends into a single global
45 index can focus attention on biodiversity trends^{2,3,4}, simple metrics can distort the full picture.

46
47 Estimates of global biodiversity trends vary depending on their data and mathematical model.
48 The most apocalyptic garner extensive press coverage, even when based on controversial data
49 (e.g., ‘biological annihilation’⁵ using trend estimates based largely on expert opinion; ‘insect
50 Armageddon’ based on data disputed by the original collectors⁶). But even analyses of the best
51 available data reach conflicting results. Analysis of a global dataset of abundance time-series
52 estimated that on average vertebrate populations have declined by >50% since 1970 (Living
53 Planet Index²:LPI), but other global analyses found that mean population size^{7,8} and species
54 richness^{9,10} have remained stable over similar timeframes. Explanations for the discrepancies
55 have been proposed^{11, 12, 8, 13}, but not resolved.

56
57 One crucial consideration is that summary indices may be easily misinterpreted. Calculating the
58 geometric mean across populations is the most common and straightforward approach, but is
59 strongly influenced by extremes. To illustrate, imagine an ecosystem in which one population
60 declined by 99%. Even if a second population increased 50 fold or 393 populations increased by
61 1% (i.e. a large net increase) a geometric mean would show a catastrophic 50% decline. Thus,
62 a geometric mean decline of 50% could arise from significant, widespread loss is occurring
63 across many populations (we term this the ‘*Catastrophic declines*’ hypothesis), or from a few
64 extremely-declining populations (we term this the ‘*Clustered declines*’ hypothesis). Both
65 scenarios involve important conservation issues, but suggest vastly different underlying
66 problems and mitigation strategies¹⁴, thus distinguishing between them is of real-world
67 importance.

68
69 We derive a Bayesian hierarchical mixture (BHM) model to distinguish between the
70 *Catastrophic* and *Clustered* decline hypotheses. The model statistically separates population
71 trends into extreme declines, typical trends, and extreme increases (Fig 1), while accounting for
72 time-series size, within population fluctuations, number of populations, and among-population
73 variance. We test declines in abundance for >14 000 vertebrate populations (LPI²¹). We chose
74 LPI data for its impressive scope, because the data and analytical details were publicly
75 available, and because previous analyses of these data suggested widespread, global
76 declines².

77 We first examined whether the previous mean decline estimate of >50%² was sensitive to
78 extreme populations: robust declines would support the *Catastrophe* hypothesis; high sensitivity
79 to few populations would support the *Cluster* hypothesis (Fig 1). We then applied our BHM
80 model to assess the evidence for *Catastrophic* vs. *Clustered* declines globally and by region,
81 taxonomy. Finally, we explore two additional conservation issues. First, we test whether
82 declines occur disproportionately in larger animals (big animals tend to have lower reproductive
83 rates), which might release small animals from predation¹⁸. Second, previous analyses often
84 excluded time-series with few datapoints^{10,12,19}, but small time-series make up most of available
85 data. We test the effects of their exclusion²⁰.

86 Results

87 Sensitivity of Geometric Mean index to extreme populations

88 The geometric mean underlying the LPI analysis was highly sensitive to extreme populations.
89 Excluding only the 2.4% most strongly declining populations (354 of 14700 populations)
90 reversed the estimate of global vertebrate trends from >50% loss to slightly positive growth (Fig
91 2). Similarly, excluding 2.4% of the most strongly increasing populations strengthened the mean
92 decline to 71%. High sensitivity suggests that extreme populations are disproportionately
93 affecting global trend estimates, such that clusters of extreme population decline should be
94 considered explicitly.

95 Evidence for *Clustered* declines

96 Among LPI's 57 domain-realm-taxon systems, 16 systems contained clusters of extreme
97 decline, and 8 contained clusters of extreme growth (3 systems are repeated, i.e. had both
98 clusters of extreme decline and growth; Fig 3, SI Table S2). Together, clusters of extreme
99 decline accounted for only 1% of populations across systems (2% of populations in the 16
100 systems in which they occurred). The mean population trend for extreme declining clusters
101 across the 16 systems was $\theta_2 = -3.94$, or approximately 98% loss per year, and deviated
102 substantially from the mean trend of the primary cluster in those systems. Clusters of extreme
103 growth accounted for 0.4% of populations across systems (2.4% in the 8 systems where they
104 occurred), with $\theta_2 = 3.51$, ie an explosive 33x growth per year (Fig 3, SI Table S2).

105
106 Extreme clusters showed some taxonomic and geographic patterns. The largest cluster of
107 extreme declines was in arctic marine mammals, accounting for 7.6% of populations in that
108 system. However, mammal systems generally had the fewest clusters of extreme decline [19%
109 of 16 systems], followed by reptile/amphibian systems [21% of 14 systems], whereas bird and
110 fish systems had more clusters of extreme declines [31% of 16 and 45% of 11 systems,
111 respectively; Fig 3]. Clusters of extreme decline occurred throughout the world with half
112 occurring in marine realms, whereas extreme increases occurred more in temperate regions or
113 terrestrial realms (Fig 3).

114
115 Extreme population trends occurred predominantly in small time-series. Excluding time-series
116 with <10 points removed all but two extreme clusters, but also removed 52% of the data (see SI
117 Table S3). The higher frequency of extreme trends among small time-series was also apparent
118 in the raw data (Figure 4). Thus the decision of whether to include small time-series will have
119 large effects on the resulting estimates of global trends.

120
121 Body size was related to population trends. Larger species had three times more extreme
122 declines than increases (15 vs 5 clusters of extreme decline vs extreme increase).
123 Comparatively, smaller species had half as many (8) extreme declining and disproportionately
124 more (7) extreme increasing clusters (SI Table S4). While size-specific models included fewer
125 populations, especially for smaller species, the number of clusters was not uniformly lower (as
126 might be expected given a reduction in power), so the differential occurrence of declining versus
127 increasing extreme clusters suggests large animals are more vulnerable to extreme declines.

128

129 Evidence for Catastrophic declines

130 In contrast to the extreme clusters, the primary clusters accounted for the vast majority (98.6%)
131 of populations across the 57 LPI systems. The overall growth rate of primary clusters was close
132 to zero: $\theta_t = -0.00035$, corresponding to $\sim 1.7\%$ loss over 50 years, given a constant rate across
133 populations and time (Fig 5). Also, in contrast to extreme clusters, primary cluster trends were
134 robust to time-series size, as excluding series with < 10 data points yielded a similar overall
135 global trend ($\theta_t = +0.0043$) (Extended data Figure E3).

136

137 While the global BHM model reveals considerably more nuance than a geometric mean index,
138 analyzing across systems still masked important patterns. When systems were analyzed
139 separately (SI Table S2), primary population clusters were strongly declining ($\theta_t < -0.015$) with
140 high certainty (95% credible intervals not overlapping zero) in three systems, all in the Indo-
141 Pacific Realm (freshwater mammals, freshwater birds, terrestrial birds; red distributions, Fig 3).
142 This suggests this region has the highest risk of system-wide decline and should be a
143 conservation priority. In contrast, the primary cluster was increasing with high certainty in seven
144 systems, six of which were in temperate regions. Seven additional systems had strongly
145 declining primary population clusters but with less certainty (95% credible intervals overlapped
146 zero), four of which were amphibian/reptile groups. 14 systems showed strong but low-certainty
147 increases, with no obvious taxonomic nor geographic patterns (Fig 3).

148

149 Each primary cluster also contained variation among populations. In the 10 systems with
150 significant (red) or non-significant (orange) mean declines ($\theta_t < -0.015$), 87% of the individual
151 populations showed strong declines (Fig 5). These 10 systems accounted for $\sim 20\%$ of total
152 global vertebrate populations, but $\sim 61\%$ of strong declines. The multimodality observed in Fig 5,
153 was an outcome of aggregating unimodal primary clusters across systems, and suggests
154 heterogeneous stressor levels among systems (i.e., similar principles as those causing extreme
155 clusters within systems). The remaining $\sim 11\%$ of strongly declining populations were distributed
156 across 47 of 57 systems; it is unclear whether they represent a deviation from natural dynamics
157 expected in any naturally variable system.

158

159 Primary cluster trends were related to body size, but not as predicted. Compared to overall
160 patterns, for larger animals the same systems showed significant declines and increases, but
161 two additional temperate systems showed significant increases (Extended data Fig E4; SI Table
162 S4). Smaller species also appeared to decline more than larger species; there were 27 systems
163 where smaller species had more negative growth rates than larger species, versus 18 where the
164 reverse was true. However, analyses of smaller species were based on a substantially fewer
165 populations and trends were generally not significant (SI Table S4), so patterns remain
166 tentative.

167 **Discussion**

168 By re-analysing the most comprehensive dataset of global wildlife population trends available,
169 we show that previously estimated global declines are driven by a few extremely declining
170 populations. Removing only 2.4% of declining populations reversed the estimated global trends
171 from $> 50\%$ mean decline since 1970 to slightly positive growth. Our BHM model revealed that

172 clusters of extreme decline are widespread and occur disproportionately in larger species, and
173 that a few clusters of extreme increase also exist and occur disproportionately in smaller
174 species. This is consistent with previous arguments of “trophic downgrading”¹⁸.

175
176 Clusters of extreme declines were largely due to small time-series. However, neither random
177 sampling error nor “saw tooth” population dynamics (wherein ultimately stable populations
178 experience sudden declines followed by gradual increases) can fully explain this association
179 (see Supplementary information for full discussion). Additional explanations are needed.
180 Extreme trends could reflect transient populations that naturally leave or enter a survey area²²,
181 which could represent natural dynamics. Alternatively, researchers may stop sampling after
182 populations become (close to) extirpated, although the converse has also been suggested²³. A
183 third possibility is that some regions experience both lower sampling effort and greater declines,
184 such that poor data correlates with factors linked to vulnerability, like lower national wealth or
185 conservation investment. Understanding why small time-series contain so many extreme
186 declines is particularly important given that studies that did not find widespread declines often
187 excluded short time-series^{e.g., 7,10,12}, potentially reconciling divergent findings among studies.

188
189 Once extreme clusters were statistically separated, no global trend remained across typical
190 populations (i.e. primary clusters; 98.6% of populations). However, aggregating systems into
191 one global trend hid important variation. Three systems, all in the Indo-Pacific, showed
192 widespread vertebrate declines across typical populations. Moreover, among typical populations
193 smaller species may be faring worse than larger ones. While tentative given lower sample sizes
194 and high uncertainty, this trend is contrary to common conservation assumptions and so merits
195 additional research.

196
197 Our results emphasize an important point: biodiversity trends within and across regions and
198 taxa are highly disparate. This likely reflects differences in both susceptibility and exposure to
199 anthropogenic environmental change^{24, 25, 26}. Unravelling this variation is imperative to
200 understand where biodiversity is most threatened²⁷ and which conservation actions promote
201 stability or recovery. A productive global conversation about conservation requires that both
202 scientists and media pay more attention to variation and resist the temptation of simple
203 summary indices.

204
205 Shifting the message from ubiquitous catastrophe to foci of concern, also touches on human
206 psychology. Continual negative and guilt-ridden messaging can cause despair, denial and
207 inaction^{28,29}. If everything is declining everywhere, despite the expansion of conservation
208 measures in recent decades, it would be easy to lose hope. Our results identify regions that
209 need urgent action to ameliorate widespread biodiversity declines, but also many systems that
210 appear to be generally stable or improving, and thus reason to hope that our actions can make
211 a difference.

212 **References**

- 213
214 1. IUCN. The IUCN Red List of Threatened Species. Version 2019-3.
215 <<http://www.iucnredlist.org>>. (2019).
216 2. WWF. Living Planet Report 2018: Aiming higher (eds. Grooten N & Almond REA). WWF,
217 Gland, Switzerland. (2018).

- 218 3. Rosenberg, K. V et al. Decline of the North American avifauna. *Science* **366**, 120 – 124
219 (2019).
- 220 4. Sánchez-Bayo, F. & Wyckhuys, K. A. G. Worldwide decline of the entomofauna: A
221 review of its drivers. *Biol. Conserv.* **232** 8–27 (2019).
- 222 5. Ceballos, G., Ehrlich, P. R. & Dirzo, R. Biological annihilation via the ongoing sixth mass
223 extinction signaled by vertebrate population losses and declines. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.*
224 *U. S. A.* **114**, E6089–E6096 (2017).
- 225 6. Willig, M. R. et al. Populations are not declining and food webs are not collapsing at the
226 Luquillo Experimental Forest. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.* **116**, 12143–12144 (2019).
- 227 7. Daskalova, G. N., Myers-Smith, I. H. & Godlee, J. L. All is not decline across global
228 vertebrate populations. Preprint at <https://www.biorxiv.org/content/10.1101/272898v5>.
229 (2018).
- 230 8. Dornelas, M. et al. A balance of winners and losers in the Anthropocene. *Ecol. Lett.* **22**,
231 847–854 (2019).
- 232 9. Vellend, M. et al. Global meta-analysis reveals no net change in local-scale plant
233 biodiversity over time. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.* **110**, 19456–19459 (2013).
- 234 10. Dornelas, M. et al. Assemblage time series reveal biodiversity change but not systematic
235 loss. *Science* **344**, 296–299 (2014).
- 236 11. Gonzalez, A. et al. Estimating local biodiversity change: A critique of papers claiming no
237 net loss of local diversity. *Ecology* **97**, 1949–1960 (2016).
- 238 12. Leung, B., Greenberg, D. A. & Green, D. M. Trends in mean growth and stability in
239 temperate vertebrate populations. *Divers. Distrib.* **23**, 1372–1380 (2017).
- 240 13. McGill, B. J., Dornelas, M., Gotelli, N. J. & Magurran, A. E. Fifteen forms of biodiversity
241 trend in the anthropocene. *Trends Ecol. Evol.* **30**, 104–113 (2015).
- 242 14. Anderson, S. C., Branch, T. A., Cooper, A. B. & Dulvy, N. K. Black-swan events in
243 animal populations. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.* **114**, 3252–3257 (2017).
- 244 15. Carrington, D. Humanity has wiped out 60% of animal populations since 1970, report
245 finds. *The Guardian*. <[https://www.theguardian.com/environment/2018/oct/30/humanity-
246 wiped-out-animals-since-1970-major-report-finds](https://www.theguardian.com/environment/2018/oct/30/humanity-wiped-out-animals-since-1970-major-report-finds)>. (2018)
- 247 16. Chung, E. 60% of world's wildlife has been wiped out since 1970.
248 <<https://www.cbc.ca/news/technology/living-plant-wwf-2018-1.4882819>>. *CBC News*.
249 (2018)
- 250 17. Duncan, R. P., Boyer, A. G. & Blackburn, T. M. Magnitude and variation of prehistoric
251 bird extinctions in the Pacific. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.* **110**, 6436–6441 (2013).
- 252 18. Estes, J.A. et al. Trophic downgrading of planet Earth. *Science* **333**, 301-306 (2011).
- 253 19. Connors, B. M., Cooper, A. B., Peterman, R. M. & Dulvy, N. K. The false classification of
254 extinction risk in noisy environments. *Proc. R. Soc. B Biol. Sci.* **281**, 20132935 (2014).
- 255 20. Hanks, E. M., Hooten, M. B., Baker, F. A. Reconciling multiple data sources to improve
256 accuracy of large-scale prediction of forest disease incidence. *Ecol. Appl.* **21**, 1173–
257 1188 (2011).
- 258 21. LPI. Living Planet Index database. <www.livingplanetindex.org/>. (2016).
- 259 22. Youngflesh, C. & Lynch, H. J. Black-swan events: Population crashes or temporary
260 emigration? *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.* **114**, E8953–E8954 (2017).
- 261 23. Fournier, A. M. V., White, E. R. & Heard, S. B. Site-selection bias and apparent
262 population declines in long-term studies. *Conserv. Biol.* **33**, 1370–1379 (2019).

- 263 24. Newbold, T. et al. Ecological traits affect the response of tropical forest bird species to
264 land-use intensity. *Proc. R. Soc. B Biol. Sci.* **280**, (2013).
- 265 25. Venter, O. et al. Sixteen years of change in the global terrestrial human footprint and
266 implications for biodiversity conservation. *Nat. Commun.* **7**, 1–11 (2016).
- 267 26. Allan, J. R. et al. Hotspots of human impact on threatened terrestrial vertebrates. *PLoS*
268 *Biol.* **17**, (2019).
- 269 27. Blowes, S. A. et al. The geography of biodiversity change in marine and terrestrial
270 assemblages. *Science* **366**, 339–345 (2019).
- 271 28. O’Neill, S. & Nicholson-Cole, S. “Fear won’t do it” Visual and iconic representations. *Sci.*
272 *Commun.* **30**, 355–379 (2009).
- 273 29. Brennan, L. & Binney, W. Fear, guilt, and shame appeals in social marketing. *J. Bus.*
274 *Res.* **63**, 140–146 (2010).

275
276

277 **Figure Legends**

278 **Figure 1. Stylized patterns of system-wide growth rates.** Similar geometric mean population
279 growth rates [$\log(N_{t+1}/N_t)$] can reflect contrasting systems. As a “null” model, systems can be
280 stable (log growth rates centered at zero, middle panel). Deviations can occur in multiple ways.
281 System can have most populations substantially declining (“*Catastrophic*” Hypothesis, top
282 panel) or can have multiple clusters with the majority of populations showing a distribution of
283 growth rates centered around zero, but a small cluster of populations experiencing extreme
284 declines (“*Clustered*” Hypothesis, top-middle panel). Each has the same metric of mean decline
285 (vertical red line = 1.5% annual decline, corresponding to a 50% loss over 50 years), even
286 though most populations in the top-middle panel are stable. The converse can also happen, with
287 a small cluster of extremely increasing populations, but otherwise a stable distribution (bottom-
288 middle panel), or most populations increasing (bottom panel) (vertical blue line = 1.5% annual
289 increase, corresponding to a doubling over 50 years).

291 **Figure 2. Effect of extreme populations on global growth index.** Removing a small fraction
292 of extreme populations strongly influences the geometric growth index, using the LPI dataset.
293 Each line represents a different number of populations removed, ranging from no removals (red
294 line: keeping all 14,700 populations, showing a >50% mean decline), to removing 356
295 populations (yellow line: <2.4% of populations removed switches the global trend from negative
296 to positive). A geometric growth index of one indicates no change (dashed horizontal black line).

298 **Figure 3. Population trends by taxonomic groups and realms.** Top panel shows the
299 terrestrial realm, Middle Panel shows the freshwater realm, and bottom Panel shows the marine
300 realm. Red and blue asterisks denote occurrence of extreme declining clusters (16 systems)
301 and increasing clusters (8 systems), respectively. Distributions show the primary cluster in each
302 system (Red = significant declines, Blue = significant increases, Orange = strong non-significant
303 declines, Green = strong non-significant increases, Yellow = weak changes).

305 **Figure 4. Effect of time series size.** Number of data points in time series versus the mean log
306 of the geometric mean growth rate.

307 **Figure 5. Populations in the primary clusters across all systems,** after removal of extreme
308 clusters. The primary cluster of each system is unimodal, but because systems are experiencing
309 decline (or growth) heterogeneously, plotting distributions across systems shows multimodality.
310 Histograms show significantly declining systems (red), strongly but not significantly declining
311 systems (orange), and weak changes or increases (yellow). Vertical lines show thresholds for
312 strongly declining (-0.015) and strongly increasing (+0.015) growth rates, corresponding to
313 ~50% loss or a doubling (over 50 years), respectively. Distributions of primary clusters were
314 calculated based on the mean and standard deviations from the hierarchical model, and using
315 the system specific weights to adjust for species richness.

316
317

318 Methods

319 Dataset

320

321 The publically available LPI data includes 15241 vertebrate populations from 3510 species²¹.
322 When a species contained both finer resolution estimates within a country (2593 entries) and a
323 country-wide aggregate, we excluded the country-wide aggregate (537 entries), yielding 14700
324 populations. LPI groups species into 57 systems defined by a combination of habitat domain
325 (terrestrial, freshwater, marine), biogeographic realm (terrestrial/freshwater realms =
326 Afrotropical, Nearctic, Neotropical, Palearctic, Indo-Pacific; marine = Arctic, Atlantic north
327 temperate, Atlantic tropical/sub-tropical, Pacific north temperate, Indo-Pacific tropical/sub-
328 tropical, South-temperate/Antarctic), and taxonomic grouping (Fish=Actinopterygii,
329 Elasmobranchii, Holocephali, Myxini, Chondrichthyes, Sarcopterygii, Cephalaspidomorphi;
330 Birds=Aves, Mammals=Mammalia, Herps = Amphibia, Reptilia) (Extended data Figure E5-8).

331

332 To analyze the effect of body size, we obtained information on each taxonomic group. Given the
333 diversity of vertebrate groups in this data set, and the different conventions across groups, we
334 used different measures of body size for each taxonomic Class based on data availability. For
335 birds ($N = 1397$), mammals ($N = 534$), and reptiles (Squamata, $N = 132$; Testudines, $N = 44$;
336 and Crocodylia, $N = 16$) we used estimates of species' mass, in grams, collated in an extensive
337 comparative data set³⁰. When mass data were missing for a species ($N = 14$ birds; $N = 1$
338 mammal; $N = 25$ reptiles), we estimated body mass as the geometric mean of available mass
339 estimates for species in that genus. For fishes (Chondrichthyes, Osteichthyes, Agnatha; $N =$
340 1211), estimates of mass were scarce for most species, so we instead used estimates of total
341 length or standard length, in centimetres, both of which were extracted from FishBase³¹ using
342 the *rfishbase* R package³². These length estimates are an imperfect proxy for size (in terms of
343 mass) given the variability in body plans across groups, but given the large amount of variation
344 across these groups it suffices as a way to broadly categorize species into distinct size classes.
345 For amphibians, we used estimates of snout-vent length (SVL, in mm) as our proxy for body
346 size, as this is the most widely available metric of size across species. Data on SVL for
347 amphibian species ($N = 175$) was extracted from a comprehensive ecological trait dataset:
348 AmphiBio³³.

349 Sensitivity of the “Geometric” indices to extreme population trends

350

351 The LPI analysis was based on a geometric mean approach, calculated by summing across
352 logged growth rates³⁴. We recreated the geometric-mean based analyses (see Supplementary
353 Information 1a for full details and model formulation), and examined the sensitivity of the global
354 estimate to extreme populations. We ordered populations and sequentially removed the largest
355 observed decline, determining the effect of each removal on the global estimate of biodiversity
356 loss. Low sensitivity would indicate that many/most populations are declining, supporting the
357 *Catastrophic* decline hypothesis. High sensitivity, i.e. if removal of relatively few populations
358 switched the strongly negative global trend to neutral or positive, would support the *Clustered*

359 declines hypothesis. For balance, we also examined sensitivity to sequential removal of the
360 greatest increasing populations.

361 Catastrophic vs. Clustered declines approach (BHM model)

362
363 We developed an approach to separate extreme population clusters whose growth or decline
364 statistically deviated from typical population trends, such that a small number of extreme
365 populations would no longer mask trends of the majority of populations (Fig 1). While some
366 summarization is needed to understand global trends, heterogeneous growth rates and
367 potentially multimodal distributions could be expected, given multiple stressors with diverse
368 effects, and differences in species vulnerabilities. We used a Bayesian Hierarchical Mixture
369 (BHM) model as our statistical architecture, as it has several desirable properties: 1) can
370 represent the “null” model and assess deviations from it; 2) allows testing for both negative and
371 positive extremes (sometimes both existed in the same system); 3) quantifies the magnitude
372 and proportion of those extremes; 4) provides a coherent way to separate extreme populations
373 from the majority of populations (the primary cluster), enabling tests of the Clustered and
374 Catastrophic declines hypotheses; 5) provides a measure of uncertainty as a direct outcome of
375 analysis (via the posterior distribution); and 6) accounts for population fluctuations and adjusts
376 for the number of data points in time-series.

377
378 First, we specify the “null” model. Even in a system with no overall trend, we expect stochastic
379 fluctuations in population size. We also expect some populations to be increasing or decreasing
380 during any time interval, given complex, real-world ecological dynamics. Thus, the null model
381 should include among-population heterogeneity, and therefore consists of a distribution of
382 growth rates (Fig 1 middle panel). Statistical deviations from this null model could be caused by
383 a shift in the overall distribution, whereby a system-wide mean growth <0 (i.e., decline) could
384 indicate risk to the entire system, and would support the *Catastrophic declines* hypothesis (Fig 1
385 top panel). Alternatively, statistical deviation from the null model could be caused by a few
386 populations experiencing extreme declines, consistent with the *Clustered declines* hypothesis
387 (Fig 1 mid-top panel).

388
389 To specify our model, we begin with a standard Bayesian hierarchical formulation (i.e., it does
390 not yet contain mixtures of distributions). We define θ, τ as the system-wide mean and variance,
391 respectively, of log-growth rates across all populations in the system (i.e., hyperparameters in
392 Bayesian terminology). θ, τ determine the distribution of log population trends (μ_i), and define
393 the properties of the overall system. However, within population dynamics are also occurring,
394 and the log growth rate for population i at time t are modelled as a population trend (μ_i) and
395 within population fluctuations (σ) (See Supplementary Information 1b for full details and model
396 formulation).

397
398 Using a standard Bayesian hierarchical model, we can test the *Catastrophe* hypothesis by
399 determining the probability that the system-wide mean θ is <0 . Testing the *Cluster* hypothesis
400 however requires a mixture model to assess the evidence for the occurrence of clusters. Thus,
401 we define K is the number of clusters in the mixture, f_k is the fraction of populations in the k th
402 cluster, and θ, τ and \mathbf{f} denote the vectors of parameters for the K clusters.

403
404 To test the *Clustered* hypothesis we modeled three clusters: a primary cluster, corresponding to
405 the typical trend; a negative extreme cluster; and a positive extreme cluster (Figure 1). Although
406 our main interest was in the mechanisms behind apparent global population declines (i.e.
407 *Catastrophic* vs. *Clustered* hypotheses), we also assayed positive extreme clusters so that
408 analyses were not biased to find only negative population trends. We considered four cluster
409 combinations: 1) a single distribution; 2) a primary distribution and a negative extreme
410 distribution; 3) a primary distribution and a positive extreme distribution; or 4) a primary
411 distribution and both positive and negative extreme distributions (Figure 1). For referencing
412 purposes, we denote $k=1$ as the primary cluster, $k=2$ as the negative extreme cluster, and $k=3$
413 as the positive extreme cluster. Note that reality need not be bi(or tri)-modal, but exploring
414 generalities in trends necessitates some aggregation. Nonetheless, the extreme clusters
415 identified by the mixture model could contain multiple extreme modes in the data (or even result
416 from a skewed distribution). With any of these deviations, model selection (see below) would
417 still choose the mixture model as explaining the data better than a single normal distribution.
418 (See Supplementary Information 1c for full details and model formulation).

419
420 We used the (lowest) Deviance Information Criteria (DIC) value to select the mixture model with
421 the strongest statistical evidence³⁵. The *Catastrophic* declines hypothesis would be supported
422 by a mean decline of the primary population cluster ($\theta_1 < 0$ and credible intervals did not
423 overlap zero), and would be particularly severe if the mean θ_1 was also strongly negative (e.g.,
424 $\theta_1 = -0.015$ would correspond to >50% loss over 50 years). The *Clustered* declines hypothesis
425 would be supported if the DIC selected a mixture with a negative extreme cluster (combinations
426 2 or 4 above). Note that the *Catastrophic* and *Clustered declines* hypotheses are not mutually
427 exclusive, as a system could have both a negative extreme cluster and declining primary
428 cluster. A large fraction of populations in the negative extreme cluster (f_2) could also be
429 interpreted as widespread *Catastrophic* declines, but this did not occur in our results. Although
430 our hypotheses focus on understanding declining trends, our model will also detect increases in
431 abundances.

432
433 To estimate model parameters we used Bayesian analyses and the Markov Chain Monte Carlo
434 algorithm, which simultaneously estimated uncertainty. For each Bayesian analysis, we ran 3
435 chains, each with 10000 iterations (3000 used for warm-up). Convergence was determined
436 using $R_{hat} \approx 1$. Values for all parameters across all systems ranged from ($0.999 < R_{hat} <$
437 1.005). Bayesian analyses were conducted using the STAN language³⁶, and processed and
438 analyzed in R³⁷.

439
440 Additionally, we explored the theoretical behavior of each model, including the
441 the geometric mean model, in the presence of clustered declines (see Supplementary
442 Information 1d, 2a), and our *Catastrophic* and *Clustered declines* approach given our selection
443 of priors, application of constraints, and other modeling choices; these simulation analyses
444 showed that our approach yielded appropriate theoretic behavior (see Supplementary
445 information 1e, 2b, Extended data Figure E1). Finally, we conducted sensitivity analyses and
446 showed that results were robust to modelling choices (see Supplementary Information 2c, Table
447 S1, Extended data Figure E2).

448

449

450 Application of the *Catastrophe* and *Clusters* approach to LPI data

451

452 We tested for extreme clusters in each of LPI's 57 domain-realm-taxon systems, by choosing
453 the mixture model with the lowest DIC value. We also examined the number of populations in
454 each cluster, as a fraction of the total number of populations, scaled using the LPI system-
455 specific weightings³⁸ (see Supplementary Information 1f for more details).

456

457 Next, we examined evidence for the *Catastrophic declines* hypothesis in each system by
458 assaying for negative mean growth rates in the primary cluster (θ_1). We defined "high certainty"
459 of decline (or increase) as 95% credible intervals not overlapping zero, and "strong" decline as
460 $\theta_1 < -0.015$, corresponding to a ~50% decline if it persisted for 50 years ($\theta_1 > 0.015$ was used for
461 a strong positive relations, corresponding to a doubling over 50 years).

462

463 We assessed the effect of small time-series on both extreme clusters and trends in primary
464 clusters, by omitting all data with fewer than 10 points, as has often been done in other
465 studies^{e.g.,12}. These small time-series accounted for 52% of the population estimates (7110
466 populations remained in the analysis).

467

468 Finally, we examined whether trends differed between large versus small-bodied animals.
469 Within each Class (but with Agnatha lumped with Osteichthyes), we scaled body size as
470 standard deviations on the natural log-scale – thereby creating an index of relative species size
471 within a taxonomic group. In two cases, we separated out different groups within a Class that
472 had relatively distinct body plans that would influence this size scaling. We scaled size within
473 the Superorder Batoidea (Rajiformes, Myliobatiformes, and Torpediniformes) and separately
474 scaled size for the rest of the Chondrichthyans (Selachimorpha and Holocephali). For the
475 amphibians, we separated out the Orders Caudata and Anura and scaled size within each of
476 these groups. For each taxonomic group we scaled body size and separated species into
477 larger-than-average (henceforth 'larger') versus smaller-than-average (henceforth 'smaller')
478 species. This yielded 9596 populations from 1765 larger species, and 5103 populations from
479 1745 smaller species. We then reran the BHM model for larger animals and again for smaller
480 animals. Body sizes were divided unevenly among habitat domains and realms; 12 domain-
481 realm-taxon systems contained ≤ 1 smaller species so were excluded from the small-animal
482 model.

483

484 **Methods References**

485

486 30. Myhrvold, N. P., Baldrige, E., Chan, B., Sivam, D., Freeman, D. L., Ernest, S. K. M., An
487 amniote life-history database to perform comparative analyses with birds, mammals, and
488 reptiles. *Ecology* **96**, 3109 (2015).

489 31. Froese, R. & Pauly, D. FishBase. World Wide Web electronic publication. version
490 (12/2019) (2019). Available at: www.fishbase.org.

491 32. Boettiger, C., Lang, D. T. & Wainwright, P. C. rfishbase: exploring, manipulating and
492 visualizing FishBase data from R. *J. Fish Biol.* **81**, 2030–2039 (2012).

- 493 33. Oliveira, B. F., São-Pedro, V. A., Santos-Barrera, G., Penone, C. & Costa, G. C.
494 AmphiBIO, a global database for amphibian ecological traits. *Sci. Data* **4**, 170123
495 (2017).
- 496 34. Collen, B. et al. Monitoring Change in Vertebrate Abundance: the Living Planet Index.
497 *Conserv. Biol.* **23**, 317–327 (2009).
- 498 35. Gelman, A., Hwang, J., Vehtari, A. Understanding predictive information criteria for
499 Bayesian models. *Statistics and computing* **24**, 997-1016 (2014).
- 500 36. Carpenter, B. et al. Stan: A probabilistic programming language. *J. Stat. Softw.* **76**,
501 (2017).
- 502 37. R Core Team. R: A language and environment for statistical computing. R Foundation
503 for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria. <<http://www.R-project.org/>>. (2016).
- 504 38. McRae, L., Deinet, S. & Freeman, R. The diversity-weighted living planet index:
505 Controlling for taxonomic bias in a global biodiversity indicator. *PLoS One* **12**, 1–20
506 (2017).

507 **Acknowledgements**

508 We thank E. Hudgins, D. Nguyen, S. Varadarajan, A. Jones for helpful discussions, helpful
509 comments from four anonymous reviewers, and help to create figures from S. Varadarajan and
510 F. Moyes. This work was supported by a Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council
511 (NSERC) Discovery grant to BL.

512

513 **Author contributions**

514 Authors are listed in order of their contributions. BL formulated the BHM model, conducted
515 analyses, and wrote the majority of the ms. AH discussed and clarified the ideas, and also
516 played a central role in writing. DG discussed and clarified the ideas, synthesized the data, and
517 contributed to writing. BM discussed and clarified the ideas, and commented on the ms. MD
518 discussed and clarified the ideas, commented on and improved presentation of the ms. RF
519 discussed and clarified the ideas, and provided insight into the LPI data and analyses.

520

521 There are no competing financial interests.

522

523 **Statement of data availability:**

524 Data can be obtained from the Living Planet Index database. <www.livingplanetindex.org/>.
525 (2016), AmphiBio database from
526 https://figshare.com/articles/Oliveira_et_al_AmphiBIO_v1/4644424>, fishbase database
527 <www.fishbase.org>, and lifehistory traits from
528 <<https://doi.org/10.6084/m9.figshare.c.3308127.v1>>

529

530 **Statement of code availability:**

531 Code for the BHM model is available at: <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.3901586>

532

533 **Supplementary information** is available for this paper.

534

535 Correspondence and requests for materials should be addressed to brian.leung2@mcgill.ca

536

537

538 **Extended Data Figure Headings**

539

540 **Figure E1.** p-p plots showing that the posterior distributions for each estimated parameter are
541 unbiased, and largely follow a 1:1 line for each hyper parameter (σ , τ) as well as the fraction in
542 each cluster (f_1 , $f_2=1-f_1$). The 1:1 line is the theoretic expectation, indicating that the true
543 parameter value to fall below the 0.01 quantile 1% of the time, 0.02 quantile 2% of the time, etc.

544

545 **Figure E2.** The trends of the primary clusters (θ_1), for the main analysis (x-axis) versus the
546 sensitivity analysis (y-axis) for the threshold for extreme clusters (top panel) and the offset when
547 $N=0$ was observed (bottom panel).

548

549 **Figure E3.** Each point represents a trend estimate for the primary cluster of a system, with the
550 full dataset (x-axis) versus data excluding time series with <10 points (y-axis). The red dot was
551 Freshwater Indo-Pacific Mammals, which was reduced from 22 populations (full) to 2
552 populations (only data ≥ 10 points).

553

554 **Figure E4.** Mean trends of primary clusters across systems calculated using the Bayesian
555 Hierarchical Mixture Model. Top) all species (14,700 populations). Middle) only large species
556 (9596 populations). Bottom) only small species (5103 populations). The small species appear to
557 be declining more than large species, although this needs to be interpreted with caution, as
558 most primary distributions did not significantly deviate from zero for small species.

559

560 **Figure E5. Histograms of observed growth rates and output of the Bayesian Hierarchical**
561 **Mixture model for systems 1-16** (blue line – primary cluster, red line – extreme cluster(s) from
562 model). Grey vertical lines show the range of observed values. In comparing model output to
563 data: 1) the variation of the BHM primary cluster (blue line) is much lower than the raw data,
564 because the BHM separates variation in among population trends from variation due to within
565 population fluctuations. 2) The BHM model identifies evidence for extreme clusters in both (e.g.,
566 Terrestrial Indo-Pacific birds) or only one direction (e.g., Terrestrial Neotropical mammals), but
567 not other apparent clusters (e.g., Terrestrial Indo-Pacific herps). The BHM integrates the
568 magnitude of within population fluctuations, time-series sizes, number of populations, among-
569 population variance, and the magnitude and frequency of the extreme populations in
570 determining whether additional (extreme) clusters are needed to account for the observations.

571

572 **Figure E6. Histograms of observed growth rates and output of the Bayesian Hierarchical**
573 **Mixture model for each system 17-32** (blue line – primary cluster, red line – extreme cluster(s)
574 from model). Grey vertical lines show the range of observed values.

575 **Figure E7. Histograms of observed growth rates and output of the Bayesian Hierarchical**
576 **Mixture model for each system 33-48** (blue line – primary cluster, red line – extreme cluster(s)
577 from model). Grey vertical lines show the range of observed values.

578

579 **Figure E8. Histograms of observed growth rates and output of the Bayesian Hierarchical**
580 **Mixture model for each system 49-57** (blue line – primary cluster, red line – extreme cluster(s)
581 from model). Grey vertical lines show the range of observed values.

582

583