



RESEARCH PAPER

WILEY

Global Ecology
and BiogeographyA Journal of
Macroecology

Spatial overlaps between the global protected areas network and terrestrial hotspots of evolutionary diversity

Barnabas H. Daru¹  | Peter C. le Roux² | Jeyanthi Gopalraj³ | Daniel S. Park⁴  | Ben G. Holt^{5,6} | Michelle Greve²

¹Department of Life Sciences, Texas A&M University–Corpus Christi, Corpus Christi, Texas

²Department of Plant and Soil Sciences, University of Pretoria, Pretoria, South Africa

³Department of Zoology and Entomology, University of Pretoria, Pretoria, South Africa

⁴Department of Ecology and Evolutionary Biology, University of Arizona, Tucson, Arizona

⁵Marine Biological Association of the United Kingdom, Plymouth Marine Laboratory, Plymouth, United Kingdom

⁶Center for Macroecology, Evolution and Climate, Natural History Museum of Denmark, University of Copenhagen, Copenhagen Ø, Denmark

Correspondence

Barnabas H. Daru, Department of Life Sciences, Texas A&M University–Corpus Christi, Corpus Christi, TX 78412, USA.
Email: barnabas.daru@tamucc.edu

Editor: Erica Fleishman

Abstract

Aim: A common approach for prioritizing conservation is to identify concentrations (hotspots) of biodiversity. Such hotspots have traditionally been designated on the basis of species-level metrics (e.g., species richness, endemism and extinction vulnerability). These approaches do not consider phylogenetics explicitly, although phylogenetic relationships reflect the ecological, evolutionary and biogeographical processes by which biodiversity is generated, distributed and maintained. The aim of this study was to identify hotspots of phylogenetic diversity and compare these with hotspots based on species-level metrics and with the existing protected areas network.

Location: Global.

Time period: Contemporary.

Major taxa studied: Terrestrial vertebrates (mammals, birds and amphibians) and angiosperms.

Methods: We used comprehensive phylogenies and distribution maps of terrestrial birds, mammals, amphibians and angiosperms to identify areas with high concentrations of phylogenetic diversity, phylogenetic endemism, and evolutionary distinctiveness and global endangerment. We compared the locations of these areas with those included within the current network of protected areas and concentrations of species-level indices: species richness, species endemism and species threat.

Results: We found spatial incongruence among the three evolutionary diversity metrics in each taxonomic group. Spatial patterns of diversity and endemism also differed among taxonomic groups, with some differences between vertebrates and angiosperms. Complementarity analyses of phylogenetic diversity identified the minimal area that encapsulates the full branch lengths for each taxonomic group. The current network of protected areas and species-level hotspots largely does not overlap with areas of high phylodiversity.

Main conclusion: Overall, < 10% of hotspot areas were designated as protected areas. Patterns of diversity, endemism and vulnerability differ among taxonomic groups.

KEYWORDS

amphibians, angiosperms, biodiversity hotspots, birds, complementarity, global conservation, mammals

1 | INTRODUCTION

Areas with relatively high concentrations of species richness (SR) and endemism (hotspots) reflect ecological and evolutionary patterns and processes. Such hotspots can guide allocation of limited conservation resources (e.g., Forest et al., 2007). Traditionally, hotspots have been designated on the basis of species-level metrics (e.g., SR, endemism and extinction vulnerability; Ceballos & Ehrlich, 2006; Myers, Mittermeier, Mittermeier, Fonseca, & Kent, 2000; Orme et al., 2005). These approaches do not capture important facets of biological diversity, such as phylogenetic diversity or latent risk of extinction (see Daru, Bank, & Davies, 2015; Davies & Cadotte, 2011; Forest et al., 2007). Along these lines, studies have demonstrated that protected areas do not overlap with concentrations of avian or mammalian phylogenetic diversity (e.g., Brum et al., 2017; Pollock, Thuiller, & Jetz, 2017; Rosauer, Pollock, Linke, & Jetz, 2017). Given that some species have more distinctive evolutionary histories than others (Faith, 1992; Vane-Wright, Humphries, & Williams, 1991), non-random extinction of species can result in some clades losing a higher proportion of species than others (Davies & Yessoufou, 2013). Recent large-scale phylogenetic efforts make global quantification of such variation in evolutionary history possible, and the explicit incorporation of such information can facilitate more informed conservation decisions.

Phylogenetic information is increasingly integrated into the process of defining areas of conservation priority at various spatial and taxonomic scales (e.g., Brum et al., 2017; Daru et al., 2015; Daru & le Roux, 2016; Devictor et al., 2010; Pollock et al., 2015, 2017; Rosauer et al., 2017; Sechrest et al., 2002; Zupan et al., 2014). However, previous attempts to integrate phylogeny into global hotspot designations have been limited in taxonomic scope, focusing solely on vertebrates (Brum et al., 2017; Fritz & Rahbek, 2012; Mazel et al., 2014; Pollock et al., 2017; Rosauer et al., 2017; Sechrest et al., 2002), despite the fact that spatial patterns of phylogenetic diversity can differ among taxonomic groups (Park & Razafindratsima, 2019). Until recently, phylogenetic information has not been widely available for the majority of taxa, hindering efforts to incorporate phylogeny into global-scale conservation efforts.

The phylogenetic equivalents of the traditional species-level hotspot metrics include phylogenetic diversity (PD; the phylogenetic equivalent of SR) (Faith, 1992), phylogenetic endemism (PE; a variant of species endemism) (Rosauer, Laffan, Crisp, Donnellan, & Cook, 2009), and evolutionary distinctiveness and global endangerment (EDGE; a phylogenetic equivalent of threats to a species) (Isaac, Turvey, Collen, Waterman, & Baillie, 2007). These metrics quantify different facets of evolutionary diversity (Tucker et al., 2017). Phylogenetic diversity is the sum of the lengths of branches that connect a set of species to the root of a phylogenetic tree (Faith, 1992). Phylogenetic endemism quantifies the degree to which a substantial proportion of phylogenetic diversity is restricted to the study area (Rosauer et al., 2009). Evolutionary distinctiveness and

global endangerment combine evolutionary distinctiveness (ED; i.e., phylogenetic isolation of a species) with global endangerment (GE) status as defined by the International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN) (Isaac et al., 2007).

Phylogenetic endemism and EDGE represent geographically and threat-weighted variants of PD. Areas with high PE capture phylogenetic diversity not represented elsewhere, reflecting, for example, extinctions of ancient lineages (i.e., palaeoendemism) (Purvis, Agapow, Gittleman, & Mace, 2000). On the one hand, this provides new opportunities for defining biodiversity hotspots more holistically (Buerki et al., 2015; Daru et al., 2015; Redding & Mooers, 2006), although the practicalities of implementation of conservation plans may limit the application of the identified priorities. On the other hand, EDGE can be used to infer areas inhabited by taxa that are both evolutionarily distinct and globally endangered.

Here, we integrate data on the phylogeny and geographical distribution of three major groups of terrestrial vertebrates (amphibians, mammals and birds) and angiosperms to explore congruence among biodiversity hotspots designated by different phylogenetic metrics. First, we contrast hotspots of PD, PE and EDGE for each taxonomic group. We then compare our phylodiversity hotspots with the hotspots of Myers et al. (2000), which were based on species endemism and degree of threat, and test whether residuals from the regressions of species-level hotspots and their phylogenetic variants have strong spatial structure. We identify conservation gaps by assessing the coverage of the species-level hotspots and phylodiversity hotspots.

2 | METHODS

2.1 | Geographical distribution data

We obtained distributional data for vertebrates from maps in the IUCN Red List database of the native extent-of-occurrence of all terrestrial mammals ($n = 5,283$ species), amphibians ($n = 6,337$) and terrestrial birds ($n = 10,079$) (<http://www.iucnredlist.org/technical-documents/spatial-data>). We standardized taxonomic ranks with Frost (2009) and data from the American Museum of Natural History (AMNH; <http://research.amnh.org/vz/herpetology/amphibia/index.php>) for amphibians, Gill, Wright, and Donsker (2009) for birds, and Wilson and Reeder (2005) for mammals.

Given that there were no species-level global data on the distributions of angiosperms, we assembled data on the global distribution of angiosperms at the genus level. Although we recognize that SR among genera may differ across taxonomic groups, in the absence of sufficient species-level data, we considered a genus-based analysis to be the best alternative. First, we compiled a worldwide genus checklist from a list of 32,223 angiosperm species within 8,179 genera for which phylogenetic information was available (Zanne et al., 2014). We used The Plant List (www.plantlist.org) as our taxonomic authority. Second, to generate geographical distributions, we used the R package *rgbif* (Chamberlain, Ram, Barve,

& McGlinn, 2015). We extracted locality records from the Global Biodiversity Information Facility (<http://www.gbif.org>) for 6,483 of the 8,179 angiosperm genera for which > 10 spatially explicit records remained after data cleaning. We cleaned the data by removing points in the sea, duplicate records and records with inverted latitude and longitude coordinates. We also restricted the data to the native ranges of each genus, which we estimated by searching the literature and then assigning each genus to one or more of the following continental classes: the Americas (North and South America), Eurasia (Europe and Asia), Africa, Australia, Australasia (Asia and Australia) and Oceania.

We used the cleaned locality records (presence-only data), 10,000 background points and Maxent (Phillips, Anderson, & Schapire, 2006) to model the distribution of each angiosperm genus. We used eigenvector-based spatial filters to account for the restricted distribution of most taxa (Blach-Overgaard, Svenning, Dransfield, Greve, & Balslev, 2010). To generate spatial filters, we used the coordinates of the centroid of each grid cell to generate a pairwise geographical connectivity matrix among grid cells that covered all land on Earth (except Antarctica) at a grain of $1^\circ \times 1^\circ$. We then used the default settings in SAM (Spatial Analysis in Macroecology; Rangel, Diniz-Filho, & Bini, 2010) to establish a truncation distance for the eigenvector-based spatial filtering, resulting in a total of 150 spatial filters. These filters were subsequently resampled to a resolution of 5 min. We included the first 14 spatial filters (see Supporting Information Appendix S1, Figure S1) and 19 bioclimatic variables (also at 5 min resolution) from WorldClim (Hijmans, Cameron, Parra, Jones, & Jarvis, 2005) as predictor variables (following the approach of Blach-Overgaard et al., 2010). We used the equal training sensitivity and specificity threshold (Liu, Berry, Dawson, & Pearson, 2005) to create presence-absence maps for each genus in Maxent. We evaluated model performance with the area under the receiver operator curve (Bewick, Cheek, & Ball, 2004). We aggregated the final outputs from Maxent at a resolution of $110 \text{ km} \times 110 \text{ km}$ to match the resolution of the vertebrate data.

Given that sampling effort is spatially unequal, we tested the sensitivity of our analyses to incomplete sampling of angiosperm genera. We mapped the genera for which geographical data were missing (or inadequate for inclusion) onto the global phylogeny to assess whether their phylogenetic distributions were random or clustered (Supporting Information Appendix S1, Figure S2). We also analysed the three groups of vertebrates at the genus level (Supporting Information Appendix S1, Figure S3) and found strong correlations between hotspots defined at the genus level versus species level.

2.2 | Phylogenetic data

We used a dated amphibian phylogeny from Isaac, Redding, Meredith, and Safi (2012), derived from the amphibian generic-level supertree (Frost et al., 2006) and updated with species-level taxonomy (Frost, 2007) and molecular phylogeny (Roelants et al., 2007). Our mammal phylogeny was a supertree derived from

Bininda-Emonds et al. (2007), which is the most recent time-calibrated phylogeny of the mammals of the world. We used a consensus phylogeny for all land and non-pelagic bird species, which was based on a distribution of 500 phylogenies from Jetz, Thomas, Joy, Hartmann, and Mooers (2012; downloaded from <https://birdtree.org>). Our angiosperm phylogeny was a dated molecular phylogeny for 32,223 angiosperm species inferred from seven genes (Zanne et al., 2014). We sampled one species from each angiosperm genus for our analyses (following Forest et al., 2007).

2.3 | Data analyses

We overlaid the range map for each taxon on equal-area grids (each cell c. $110 \text{ km} \times 110 \text{ km}$; see also Rosauer & Jetz, 2015) to record the presence or absence of the species or genus within grid cells. We considered a species or genus present if any of its range overlapped a grid cell. We removed coastal grid cells with < 50% land from analyses. We included only taxa that were represented in both the phylogeny and the distribution maps. The data we analysed included 26,415 taxa: 4,732 mammal species, 9,886 bird species, 5,314 amphibian species and 6,483 angiosperm genera.

To map phylodiversity hotspots, we chose metrics that closely followed Myers et al. (2000): PD, PE and EDGE, which were calculated for each grid cell.

We expressed phylogenetic diversity (PD) as:

$$PD = \sum_{i \in I} L_i,$$

where L_i is the length of branch i in the set of branches I in the phylogeny pool.

We expressed PE as:

$$PE = \sum_{i \in I} \frac{L_i}{R_i},$$

where $\{I\}$ is the set of branches connecting species to the root of a phylogenetic tree; L_i is the length of branch i , expressed as proportion of the total length of the tree; and R_i is the area inhabited by the clade.

We expressed EDGE as:

$$EDGE_i = \ln(1 + ED_i) + GE_i \times \ln(2),$$

where ED was calculated with the *evol.distinct* function in the R library picante (Kembel et al., 2010) and represents the partitioning of phylogenetic branch lengths by the total number of species subtending them, then weighting species on the basis of the amount of unique evolutionary history they represent (Cadotte & Davies, 2010; Isaac et al., 2007). Global endangerment represents species threat, calculated as the expected probability of extinction over 100 years of each taxon i in the phylogeny (Redding & Mooers, 2006), scaled as follows: least concern = 0.001, near threatened and conservation dependent = 0.01, vulnerable = 0.1, endangered = 0.67, and critically

endangered = 0.999. Given that PD and PE are sums and are properties of an area, whereas EDGE represents species values per cell, we summed EDGE values for each grid cell (for a similar approach, see Safi, Armour-Marshall, Baillie, & Isaac, 2013). Thus, to quantify EDGE, we calculated ED on the basis of the full phylogeny of the group, combined with GE scores from IUCN (see EDGE equation above), before taking the sum per cell. We could not compute EDGE for angiosperms because the IUCN does not provide threat categories for them; therefore, we only calculated and summed ED values per grid cell.

We calculated SR as the total number of species (or genera) in each grid cell. We used the *weighted endemism* function in BIODIVERSE (Laffan, Lubarsky, & Rosauer, 2010) to calculate species-weighted endemism (WE) as the sum of the number of species present in each cell in a local neighbourhood, weighting each by the fraction of the area they inhabit (Laffan & Crisp, 2003). We calculated PD with the *pd* function in the R package picante (Kembel et al., 2010), and PE with the R function *phylogenetic.endemism* (Guerin & Lowe, 2015). To calculate both PD and PE, we used the species \times row matrix and the phylogenetic tree of the species.

We used residuals from a local regression (LOESS) to identify areas in which evolutionary diversity was higher or lower than expected by running LOESS of PD against SR, PE against WE, and EDGE against GE. Expectations were based on SR (or genus richness for angiosperms), WE and GE.

We defined hotspots for each metric as the 2.5% of grid cells with the highest values (Ceballos & Ehrlich, 2006; Orme et al., 2005). We also conducted a sensitivity analysis to investigate the effect of variation in the size of hotspots by steadily increasing the hotspot

threshold percentage (from 1, 2.5, 5, 7.5, 10, 12.5 to 50%), examining whether different threshold percentage values altered the areas identified as hotspots during our analyses.

In addition to mapping the phylodiversity hotspots, we mapped hotspots of complementarity with a greedy algorithm that maximizes SR and PD in as few grid cells as possible. The complementarity analysis calculates the degree to which an area contributes unrepresented species or shared phylogenetic branches to a set of areas. We then compared the complementarity cells against a random selection of cells.

We tested the overlap between the global terrestrial network of reserves and the phylodiversity hotspots with the most recent (December 2015) version of the World Database on Protected Areas (IUCN, 2015). We conducted our analysis on the basis of all terrestrial protected areas in IUCN categories I–VI and determined the proportion of protected area overlapping each hotspot and complementarity cell for each taxonomic group.

We conducted statistical analyses in R (R Core Team, 2015) and used the Research Computing Clusters of Harvard University (<https://rc.fas.harvard.edu/>).

3 | RESULTS

Hotspots of amphibians, mammals, birds and angiosperms that were based on PD, PE and EDGE were concentrated in 29 clusters (covering 4–6% of the geographical ranges of these taxonomic groups; Figure 1). These phylogenetically informed hotspots (phylodiversity hotspots) are chiefly located in Mesoamerica, the Tropical Andes,




FIGURE 1 Phylodiversity hotspots generated by identifying the equal-area grid cells (c. 110 km \times 110 km) with the highest 2.5% of phylogenetic diversity, phylogenetic endemism, and evolutionary distinctiveness and global endangerment for each taxonomic group. The map is in Robinson projection. See the Supporting Information (Appendix S1, Figures S6–S9) for taxon-specific hotspots

West Africa, Central Africa, the Maputo-Pondoland-Albany Centre of Endemism, Madagascar, Eastern Australia, Papua New Guinea, New Caledonia and South-Central China (Figure 1). The locations of many phylodiversity hotspots were similar to those of hotspots defined by species-level methods (Supporting Information Appendix S1, Figure S4), but several were not, including Central Chile, Honshu, New Caledonia, Appalachia and Texas.

There was low spatial congruence among the various evolutionary diversity metrics for the different taxonomic groups. Between 8 and 23% of hotspot grid cells were identified as hotspots by all three metrics (Figure 2). The low congruence could reflect the small size of the hotspots. Increasing the percentage of cells considered as phylodiversity hotspots did not increase overlap appreciably until 10% were designated as hotspots (Supporting Information Appendix

S1, Figure S5). Nonetheless, values of the diversity metrics for each grid cell were positively correlated, with $r = 0.6$ – 0.7 for all metrics and for each taxonomic group (Supporting Information Appendix S1, Tables S1–4). All three diversity metrics for each taxonomic group were concentrated in the tropics, including South America, Africa and Southeast Asia (Supporting Information Appendix S1, Figures S6–S9).

Given that values of species-level metrics for designating biodiversity hotspots covary with values of phylogenetic metrics (Morlon et al., 2011; Rodrigues & Gaston, 2002) (Supporting Information Appendix S1, Figure S10), decoupling phylogenetic patterns from species-level indices is challenging. Our LOESS analysis indicated that, after accounting for species richness, areas of exceptionally high evolutionary diversity for each taxonomic group are widely




FIGURE 2 Spatial congruence among phylodiversity hotspots based on phylogenetic diversity (PD), phylogenetic endemism (PE), and evolutionary distinctiveness and global endangerment (EDGE) for: (a) amphibians, (b) mammals, (c) birds, and (d) angiosperms. Values in Venn diagrams are percentages of the total number of hotspot grid cells (highest 2.5%). Overlap references the number of phylogenetic metrics

dispersed (Supporting Information Appendix S1, Figure S11) and have low degrees of spatial congruence (Supporting Information Appendix S1, Figure S12).

Our complementarity analysis indicated that the phylogenetic branch lengths of all amphibians could be represented once in a set of 855 cells, mammal branch lengths in 739 cells, birds in 467 cells and angiosperm genera in 312 cells (Supporting Information Appendix S1, Figure S13). These sets of cells are geographically dispersed, including in regions that were not identified as hotspots.

The percentage of hotspot cells not included within the existing global network of reserves ranged from 24% (angiosperms) to 36% (mammals) (Figure 3a). Eighteen per cent (mammals) to 22% (angiosperms) of hotspot cells had < 2% overlap with protected areas (Figure 3a). At least 10% of the area of 9% of amphibian, 10% of mammal and bird and 12% of angiosperm hotspot cells overlapped protected areas (Rodrigues et al., 2004; Venter et al., 2014) (overlap increased as the size of hotspots increased). The percentage of phylodiversity hotspot cells that did not overlap those of Myers et al. (2000) ranged from 32% (angiosperms) to 47% (mammals) (Figure 3b). At least 10% of the area of 47% of amphibian and mammal, 50% of bird and 65% of angiosperm phylodiversity hotspot cells overlapped the hotspots of Myers et al. (2000).

4 | DISCUSSION

We conducted the first global evaluation of the spatial distribution of terrestrial phylogenetic diversity of amphibians, mammals, birds and angiosperms. Our method is consistent with the vision of Myers et al. (2000) for biodiversity hotspots; to represent all taxonomic groups maximally.

Although there was low spatial congruence among three evolutionary diversity metrics for the different taxonomic groups, we found that the three types of diversity overlap in some areas in the tropics (South America, Africa and Southeast Asia). These areas reflect a complex biogeographical history of speciation, extinction and dispersal (Chown & Gaston, 2000; Daru, Elliott, Park, & Davies, 2017; Rosenzweig, 1995). The general lack of spatial overlap suggests that one diversity metric cannot be used reliably as a surrogate for others.

Areas such as the Andes and Amazon in South America, and Madagascar, often emerge as high-priority conservation areas for vertebrates (e.g., Brum et al., 2017; Pollock et al., 2017; Rosauer & Jetz, 2015). However, high-priority areas for the conservation of other taxonomic groups may differ. For instance, the hotspots in East Africa overlap several important biodiversity areas, including




FIGURE 3 Percentage of overlap between phylodiversity hotspots and: (a) current protected areas, or (b) biodiversity hotspots identified by Myers et al. (2000) (EDGE = evolutionary distinctiveness and global endangerment; GAP = proportion of phylogenetic hotspot cells that do not overlap protected areas or biodiversity hotspots; PD = phylogenetic diversity; PE = phylogenetic endemism)

the Eastern Arc mountains, Albertine Rift Mountains and Kenya Highlands that provide unique habitats for endemic birds (Jetz, Rahbek, & Colwell, 2004; Stattersfield, Crosby, Long, & Wege, 1998), plants (Lovett, 1988; Yessoufou, Daru, & Davies, 2012) and mammals (Davenport et al., 2006; Olson & Dinerstein, 1998). Given that these East African regions are associated with mountain areas, they might indicate the role of past and present barriers facilitating speciation and beta diversity in the region (Graves, 1988; Rahbek, 1997). Likewise, the Cape Floristic region of southern Africa has very high species richness and endemism of angiosperms, reflecting the radiation of 33 angiosperm clades c. 18–8 Ma (Linder, 2003). Southeast Australia is another angiosperm phylodiversity hotspot (owing to the presence of long phylogenetic branches resulting from historical extinctions; Thornhill et al., 2016) that does not correspond to hotspots of vertebrate phylodiversity. The Atlantic coastal forest of southeastern Amazonia is a phylodiversity hotspot for amphibians, birds and angiosperms, potentially reflecting areas of special evolutionary history, such as high in situ speciation, with low dispersal rates (Jönsson & Holt, 2015). Central Chile and Honshu also have high concentrations of angiosperm phylodiversity. Southern Chile has high palaeoendemism, whereas northern Chile is a centre of neo-endemism (Scherson et al., 2017). Although tropical rainforests have high SR of amphibians (Fritz & Rahbek, 2012), our analysis also highlights the Appalachian Mountains and mesic regions of Texas in North America as hotspots for amphibians, driven mainly by the presence of mole salamanders (Ambystomatidae) and lungless salamanders (Plethodontidae) endemic to these regions. Another feature of interest is the phylodiversity hotspots across the West African Forests. These hotspots are driven mainly by a concentration of distinct clades of mammals (e.g., Hippopotamidae) and amphibians, and might suggest that a large proportion of the unique evolutionary history in the region can be explained by biogeographical barriers, such as the formation of the Dahomey Gap, a rainforest fragmentation in West Africa during the late Holocene (Salzmann & Hoelzmann, 2005).

Although PE and EDGE both have properties of PD (Supporting Information Appendix S1, Figure S14), we found that these two metrics were not highly correlated. For instance, evolutionarily distinct species tend to have distinct traits (Redding, DeWolff, & Mooers, 2010). An analysis of PE demonstrated that past climate and geographical isolation at the Last Glacial Maximum might have generated and maintained deep lineages with narrow ranges in mammals (Rosauer & Jetz, 2015). Thus, if the goal is to protect areas of exceptional phylogenetic history, it may be worthwhile to protect areas with disproportionately high phylodiversity relative to their species-level variants.

To enable comparison of ED (which represents species values) with PD and PE (which both represent summations and are properties of areas), we summed EDGE per cell. In the present study, summed EDGE values per cell were correlated strongly with the number of threatened taxa present in the same cell. Therefore, we believe that summed EDGE might be a phylogenetic equivalent of species threat. Irrespective of the correlation between summed EDGE values and the

number of threatened species per cell (or other standard environmental variables; see e.g., Safi et al., 2013), summed EDGE values might identify high concentrations of the world's phylogenetically distinctive and most endangered vertebrates and angiosperms.

Likewise, although the summations of ED and PD are expected to be correlated, the two metrics are calculated differently and represent distinctly different components of phylodiversity. We calculated ED on the basis of the full phylogeny of the group before taking the sum per cell. Therefore, ED is independent of clade size, whereas PD is sensitive to differences in species richness (i.e., number of tips present). Thus, summed ED in a cell will not equal PD, except where all species in the phylogeny are present in the cell. Variation in evolutionary processes, such as extinction rates or speciation of lineages, can result in substantial differences in the distributions of ED and PD. Given that EDGE is associated with species, not grid cells, it does not encapsulate complementarity explicitly. Jensen, Mooers, Caccione, and Russello (2016) proposed i-HEDGE (iterative heightened evolutionary distinctiveness and global endangerment) as a means of representing the extinction risk of all species. i-HEDGE accounts for complementarity by iteratively down-weighting species at high risk of extinction if closely related species are less threatened. This approach could be applied across areas (as demonstrated for PD complementarity in our study).

Consistent with suggestions that mountain ranges often represent hotspots of species richness and endemism (Hoorn, Mosbrugger, Mulch, & Antonelli, 2013; Quintero & Jetz, 2018), we found that many phylodiversity hotspots (e.g., the Drakensberg in southern Africa, Eastern Arc, Hengduan, Himalayas, Andes) were montane. Some of these mountain ranges, including the Drakensberg, which abuts Maputo-Pondoland-Albany in southern Africa, and the Hengduan Mountains in China, are hotspots for angiosperms but not vertebrates. We acknowledge that the spatial resolution of our global analyses was coarse and did not address fine-resolution environmental heterogeneity (which is often pronounced in montane areas).

4.1 | Phylodiversity hotspots as units for real-world conservation

Hotspots analyses have not been well integrated into on-the-ground conservation decision-making for reasons ranging from data unavailability and budget constraints to social, economic and political factors (Balmford, 2003). However, as more phylogenetic information and species distribution data become available, phylodiversity increasingly might inform real-world conservation planning. For instance, the Australian government intends to expand conservation areas, and facilitated a partnership among researchers, local communities and private land managers to identify priority areas on the basis of evolutionary heritage (Laity et al., 2015; Rosauer et al., 2018). Likewise, although Conservation International (CI; www.conservation.org) adopted Myers' concept of hotspots (Myers et al., 2000) as the blueprint for their conservation activities, CI's mission has expanded to include other facets of biodiversity (Olson, 2010).

Although phylodiversity hotspots are not necessarily more informative than hotspots based on species endemism or species richness, phylodiversity hotspots can represent evolutionary history and, potentially, adaptive capacity. However, the overlap between hotspot cells and protected areas did not meet the 10% threshold, the minimal percentage of a range that must be overlapped by protected areas in order for the species to be considered covered (Rodrigues et al., 2004; Venter et al., 2014).

Despite the potential of phylodiversity hotspots for preserving evolutionary heritage, there are gaps and potential biases in phylogenetic data and analytical methods. The results of global analyses of other taxonomic groups (e.g., insects or fungi) might differ from the results in the present study, but data on those taxonomic groups are not comparable to the data we used here. Museum collections, the source of our data on angiosperms and vertebrates, are extensive but rarely reflect systematic sampling (Daru et al., 2018; Meyer, Weigelt, & Kreft, 2016). As more data become readily available through ongoing digitization efforts and as new methods of phylogenetic analysis are developed, some gaps and biases might be reduced.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We thank Texas A&M University-Corpus Christi, Harvard University and the University of Pretoria for logistic support. Special thanks to Nashak P. Daru for help with data collation. We thank the Editors and two anonymous reviewers for their insightful comments.

AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS

B.H.D. designed the study and ran the analyses with help from P.C.R. and M.G. B.H.D. wrote the manuscript with substantial contributions from all co-authors.

ORCID

Barnabas H. Daru  <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2115-0257>

Daniel S. Park  <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2783-530X>

REFERENCES

- Balmford, A. (2003). Conservation planning in the real world: South Africa shows the way. *Trends in Ecology and Evolution*, 18, 435–438. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0169-5347\(03\)00217-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0169-5347(03)00217-9)
- Bewick, V., Cheek, L., & Ball, J. (2004). Statistics review 13: Receiver operating characteristics curves. *Critical Care*, 8, 508–512.
- Bininda-Emonds, O. R., Cardillo, M., Jones, K. E., MacPhee, R. D., Beck, R. M., Grenyer, R., ... Purvis, A. (2007). The delayed rise of present-day mammals. *Nature*, 446, 507–512. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nature05634>
- Blach-Overgaard, A., Svenning, J.-C., Dransfield, J., Greve, M., & Balslev, H. (2010). Determinants of palm species distributions across Africa: The relative roles of climate, non-climatic environmental factors, and spatial constraints. *Ecography*, 33, 380–391. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1600-0587.2010.06273.x>
- Brum, F. T., Graham, C. H., Costa, G. C., Hedges, S. B., Penone, C., Radeloff, V. C., ... Davidson, A. D. (2017). Global priorities for conservation across multiple dimensions of mammalian diversity. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences USA*, 114, 7641–7646. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1706461114>
- Buerki, S., Callmander, M. W., Bachman, S., Moat, J., Labat, J. N., & Forest, F. (2015). Incorporating evolutionary history into conservation planning in biodiversity hotspots. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, 370, 20140014. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rstb.2014.0014>
- Cadotte, M. W., & Davies, T. J. (2010). Rarest of the rare: Advances in combining evolutionary distinctiveness and scarcity to inform conservation at biogeographical scales. *Diversity and Distributions*, 16, 376–385. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1472-4642.2010.00650.x>
- Ceballos, G., & Ehrlich, P. R. (2006). Global mammal distributions, biodiversity hotspots, and conservation. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences USA*, 103, 19374–19379. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.0609334103>
- Chamberlain, S., Ram, K., Barve, V., & McGlinn, D. (2015). *rgbif: Interface to the Global 'Biodiversity' Information Facility 'API'. R package version 0.8.8*. Retrieved from <http://CRAN.R-project.org/package=rgbif>
- Chown, S. L., & Gaston, K. J. (2000). Areas, cradles and museums: The latitudinal gradient in species richness. *Trends in Ecology and Evolution*, 15, 311–315. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0169-5347\(00\)01910-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0169-5347(00)01910-8)
- Daru, B. H., & le Roux, P. C. (2016). Marine protected areas are insufficient to conserve global marine plant diversity. *Global Ecology and Biogeography*, 25, 324–334. <https://doi.org/10.1111/geb.12412>
- Daru, B. H., Elliott, T. L., Park, D. S., & Davies, T. J. (2017). Understanding the processes underpinning patterns of phylogenetic regionalization. *Trends in Ecology and Evolution*, 32, 845–860. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tree.2017.08.013>
- Daru, B. H., Park, D. S., Primack, R. B., Willis, C. G., Barrington, D. S., Whitfeld, T. J. S., ... Davis, C. C. (2018). Widespread sampling biases in herbaria revealed from large-scale digitization. *New Phytologist*, 217, 939–955. <https://doi.org/10.1111/nph.14855>
- Daru, B. H., Van der Bank, M., & Davies, T. J. (2015). Spatial incongruence among hotspots and complementary areas of tree diversity in southern Africa. *Diversity & Distributions*, 21, 769–780. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ddi.12290>
- Davenport, T. R. B., Stanley, W. T., Sargis, E. J., De Luca, D. W., Mpunga, N. E., Machaga, S. J., & Olson, L. E. (2006). A new genus of African monkey, *Rungwecebus*: Morphology, ecology, and molecular phylogenetics. *Science*, 312, 1378–1381. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1125631>
- Davies, T. J., & Cadotte, M. W. (2011). Quantifying biodiversity—Does it matter what we measure? In F. E. Zachos & J. C. Habel (Eds.), *Biodiversity hotspots* (pp. 43–60). Heidelberg, Germany: SpringerVerlag.
- Davies, T. J., & Yessoufou, K. (2013). Revisiting the impacts of non-random extinction on the tree-of-life. *Biology Letters*, 9, 20130343. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rsbl.2013.0343>
- Devictor, V., Mouillot, D., Meynard, C., Jiguet, F., Thuiller, W., & Mouquet, N. (2010). Spatial mismatch and congruence between taxonomic, phylogenetic and functional diversity: The need for integrative conservation strategies in a changing world. *Ecology Letters*, 13, 1030–1040. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1461-0248.2010.01493.x>
- Faith, D. P. (1992). Conservation evaluation and phylogenetic diversity. *Biological Conservation*, 61, 1–10. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0006-3207\(92\)91201-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/0006-3207(92)91201-3)
- Forest, F., Grenyer, R., Rouget, M., Davies, T. J., Cowling, R. M., Faith, D. P., ... Savolainen, V. (2007). Preserving the evolutionary potential of floras in biodiversity hotspots. *Nature*, 445, 757–760. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nature05587>
- Fritz, S. A., & Rahbek, C. (2012). Global patterns of amphibian phylogenetic diversity. *Journal of Biogeography*, 39, 1373–1382. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2699.2012.02757.x>

- Frost, D. R. (2007). *Amphibian species of the world* (an Online Reference, version 5). Retrieved from <http://research.amnh.org/herpetology/amphibia/index.html>
- Frost, D. R. (2009). *Amphibian species of the world: An online reference*. Version 5.3. Retrieved from <http://research.amnh.org/vz/herpetology/amphibia/index.php>
- Frost, D. R., Grant, T., Faivovich, J., Bain, R. H., Haas, A., Haddad, C. F. B., ... Donnellan, S. C. (2006). The amphibian tree of life. *Bulletin of the American Museum of Natural History*, 297, 1–370. [https://doi.org/10.1206/0003-0090\(2006\)297\[0001:TATOL\]2.0.CO;2](https://doi.org/10.1206/0003-0090(2006)297[0001:TATOL]2.0.CO;2)
- Gill, F., Wright, M., & Donsker, D. (2009). *IOC World Bird Names, version 2.2*. Retrieved from www.worldbirdnames.org
- Graves, G. R. (1988). Linearity of geographic range and its possible effect on the population-structure of Andean birds. *The Auk*, 105, 47–52.
- Guerin, G. R., & Lowe, A. J. (2015). Mapping phylogenetic endemism in R using georeferenced branch extents. *SoftwareX*, 3–4, 22–26. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.softx.2015.10.002>
- Hijmans, R. J., Cameron, S. E., Parra, J. L., Jones, P. G., & Jarvis, A. (2005). Very high resolution interpolated climate surfaces for global land areas. *International Journal of Climatology*, 25, 1965–1978. <https://doi.org/10.1002/joc.1276>
- Hoorn, C., Mosbrugger, V., Mulch, A., & Antonelli, A. (2013). Biodiversity from mountain building. *Nature Geosciences*, 6, 154–154. <https://doi.org/10.1038/ngeo1742>
- Isaac, N. J. B., Redding, D. W., Meredith, H. M., & Safi, K. (2012). Phylogenetically-informed priorities for amphibian conservation. *PLoS ONE*, 7, e43912. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0043912>
- Isaac, N. J., Turvey, S. T., Collen, B., Waterman, C., & Baillie, J. E. (2007). Mammals on the EDGE: Conservation priorities based on threat and phylogeny. *PLoS ONE*, 2, e296. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0000296>
- IUCN and UNEP-WCMC. (2015). *The World Database on Protected Areas (WDPA)*. Cambridge, UK: UNEP-WCMC. Retrieved from www.protectedplanet.net
- Jensen, E. L., Mooers, A. Ø., Cacccone, A., & Russello, M. A. (2016). I-HEDGE: Determining the optimum complementary sets of taxa for conservation using evolutionary isolation. *PeerJ*, 4, e2350. <https://doi.org/10.7717/peerj.2350>
- Jetz, W., Rahbek, C., & Colwell, R. K. (2004). The coincidence of rarity and richness and the potential signature of history in centres of endemism. *Ecology Letters*, 7, 1180–1191. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1461-0248.2004.00678.x>
- Jetz, W., Thomas, G. H., Joy, J. B., Hartmann, K., & Mooers, A. O. (2012). The global diversity of birds in space and time. *Nature*, 491, 444–448. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nature11631>
- Jönsson, K. A., & Holt, B. G. (2015). Islands contribute disproportionately high amounts of evolutionary diversity in passerine birds. *Nature Communications*, 6, 8538. <https://doi.org/10.1038/ncomms9538>
- Kembel, S. W., Cowan, P. D., Helmus, M. R., Cornwell, W. K., Morlon, H., Ackerly, D. D., ... Webb, C. O. (2010). Picante: R tools for integrating phylogenies and ecology. *Bioinformatics*, 26, 1463–1464. <https://doi.org/10.1093/bioinformatics/btq166>
- Laffan, S. W., & Crisp, M. D. (2003). Assessing endemism at multiple spatial scales, with an example from the Australian vascular flora. *Journal of Biogeography*, 30, 511–520. <https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1365-2699.2003.00875.x>
- Laffan, S. W., Lubarsky, E., & Rosauer, D. F. (2010). Biodiverse, a tool for the spatial analysis of biological and related diversity. *Ecography*, 33, 643–647. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1600-0587.2010.06237.x>
- Laity, T., Laffan, S. W., González-Orozco, C. E., Faith, D. P., Rosauer, D. F., Byrne, M., ... Newport, K. (2015). Phylodiversity to inform conservation policy: An Australian example. *Science of the Total Environment*, 534, 131–143. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2015.04.113>
- Linder, H. P. (2003). The radiation of the Cape flora, southern Africa. *Biological Reviews*, 78, 597–638. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S14647931030006171>
- Liu, C., Berry, P. M., Dawson, T. P., & Pearson, R. G. (2005). Selecting thresholds of occurrence in the prediction of species distributions. *Ecography*, 28, 385–393. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.0906-7590.2005.03957.x>
- Lovett, J. C. (1988). Endemism and affinities of the Tanzanian montane forest flora. *Systematic Botany, Missouri Botanical Garden*, 25, 591–598.
- Mazel, F., Guilhaumon, F., Mouquet, N., Devictor, V., Gravel, D., Renaud, J., ... Thuiller, W. (2014). Multifaceted diversity–area relationships reveal global hotspots of mammalian species, trait and lineage diversity. *Global Ecology and Biogeography*, 23, 836–847. <https://doi.org/10.1111/geb.12158>
- Meyer, C., Weigelt, P., & Kreft, H. (2016). Multidimensional biases, gaps and uncertainties in global plant occurrence information. *Ecology Letters*, 19, 992–1006. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ele.12624>
- Morlon, H., Schwikl, D. W., Bryant, J. A., Marquet, P. A., Rebelo, A. G., Taus, C., ... Green, J. L. (2011). Spatial patterns of phylogenetic diversity. *Ecology Letters*, 14, 141–149. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1461-0248.2010.01563.x>
- Myers, N., Mittermeier, R. A., Mittermeier, C. G., da Fonseca, G. A. B., & Kent, J. (2000). Biodiversity hotspots for conservation priorities. *Nature*, 403, 853–858. <https://doi.org/10.1038/35002501>
- Olson, D. (2010). *A decade of conservation by the Critical Ecosystem Partnership Fund 2001–2010: An independent evaluation of CEPF's global impact* (p. 100). Arlington, Virginia: Conservation Earth for the Critical Ecosystem Partnership Fund.
- Olson, D. M., & Dinerstein, E. (1998). The Global 200: A representation approach to conserving the earth's most biologically valuable ecoregions. *Conservation Biology*, 12, 502–515. <https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1523-1739.1998.012003502.x>
- Orme, C. D., Davies, R. G., Burgess, M., Eigenbrod, F., Pickup, N., Olson, V. A., ... Owens, I. P. (2005). Global hotspots of species richness are not congruent with endemism or threat. *Nature*, 436, 1016–1019. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nature03850>
- Park, D. S., & Razafindratsima, O. H. (2019). Anthropogenic threats can have cascading homogenizing effects on the phylogenetic and functional diversity of tropical ecosystems. *Ecography*, 42, 148–161. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ecog.03825>
- Phillips, S. J., Anderson, R. P., & Schapire, R. E. (2006). Maximum entropy modeling of species geographic distributions. *Ecological Modelling*, 190, 231–259. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolmodel.2005.03.026>
- Pollock, L. J., Rosauer, D. F., Thornhill, A. H., Kujala, H., Crisp, M. D., Miller, J. T., & McCarthy, M. A. (2015). Phylogenetic diversity meets conservation policy: Small areas are key to preserving eucalypt lineages. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, 370, 20140007. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rstb.2014.0007>
- Pollock, L. J., Thuiller, W., & Jetz, W. (2017). Large conservation gains possible for global biodiversity facets. *Nature*, 546, 141–144. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nature22368>
- Purvis, A., Agapow, P. M., Gittleman, J. L., & Mace, G. M. (2000). Nonrandom extinction and the loss of evolutionary history. *Science*, 288, 328–330. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.288.5464.328>
- Quintero, I., & Jetz, W. (2018). Global elevational diversity and diversification of birds. *Nature*, 555, 246–250. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nature25794>
- R Core Team. (2015). *R: A language and environment for statistical computing*. Vienna, Austria: R Foundation for Statistical Computing. Retrieved from <http://www.R-project.org/>
- Rahbek, C. (1997). The relationship among area, elevation, and regional species richness in neotropical birds. *The American Naturalist*, 149, 875–902. <https://doi.org/10.1086/286028>

- Rangel, T. F., Diniz-Filho, J. A. F., & Bini, L. M. (2010). SAM: A comprehensive application for spatial analysis in macroecology. *Ecography*, 33, 46–50. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1600-0587.2009.06299.x>
- Redding, D. W., & Mooers, A. Ø. (2006). Incorporating evolutionary measures into conservation prioritization. *Conservation Biology*, 20, 1670–1678. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1523-1739.2006.00555.x>
- Redding, D. W., DeWolff, C. V., & Mooers, A. Ø. (2010). Evolutionary distinctiveness, threat status, and ecological oddity in primates. *Conservation Biology*, 24, 1052–1058. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1523-1739.2010.01532.x>
- Rodrigues, A. S. L., & Gaston, K. J. (2002). Maximising phylogenetic diversity in the selection of networks of conservation areas. *Biological Conservation*, 105, 103–111. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0006-3207\(01\)00208-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0006-3207(01)00208-7)
- Rodrigues, A. S. L., Akçakaya, H. R., Andelman, S. J., Bakarr, M. I., Boitani, L., Brooks, T. M., & ... Yan, X. (2004). Global gap analysis: Priority regions for expanding the global protected-area network. *BioScience*, 54, 1092–1100. [https://doi.org/10.1641/0006-3568\(2004\)054\[1092:GGAPRF\]2.0.CO;2](https://doi.org/10.1641/0006-3568(2004)054[1092:GGAPRF]2.0.CO;2)
- Roelants, K., Gower, D. J., Wilkinson, M., Loader, S. P., Biju, S. D., Guillaume, K., ... Bossuyt, F. (2007). Global patterns of diversification in the history of modern amphibians. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences USA*, 104, 887–892. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.0608378104>
- Rosauer, D. F., & Jetz, W. (2015). Phylogenetic endemism in terrestrial mammals. *Global Ecology and Biogeography*, 24, 168–179. <https://doi.org/10.1111/geb.12237>
- Rosauer, D. F., Byrne, M., Blom, M. P. K., Coates, D. J., Donnellan, S., Doughty, P., ... Moritz, C. (2018). Real-world conservation planning for evolutionary diversity in the Kimberley, Australia, sidesteps uncertain taxonomy. *Conservation Letters*, 2018, e12438. <https://doi.org/10.1111/conl.12438>
- Rosauer, D., Laffan, S. W., Crisp, M. D., Donnellan, C., & Cook, L. G. (2009). Phylogenetic endemism: A new approach for identifying geographical concentrations of evolutionary history. *Molecular Ecology*, 18, 4061–4072. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-294X.2009.04311.x>
- Rosauer, D. F., Pollock, L. J., Linke, S., & Jetz, W. (2017). Phylogenetically informed spatial planning is required to conserve the mammalian tree of life. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, 284, 20170627. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2017.0627>
- Rosenzweig, M. L. (1995). *Species diversity in space and time*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Safi, K., Armour-Marshall, K., Baillie, J. E. M., & Isaac, N. J. B. (2013). Global patterns of evolutionary distinct and globally endangered amphibians and mammals. *PLoS ONE*, 8, e63582. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0063582>
- Salzmann, U., & Hoelzmann, P. (2005). The Dahomey Gap: An abrupt climatically induced rain forest fragmentation in West Africa during the late Holocene. *The Holocene*, 15, 190–199. <https://doi.org/10.1191/0959683605hl799rp>
- Scherson, R. A., Thornhill, A. H., Urbina-Casanova, R., Freyman, W. A., Pliscoff, P. A., & Mishler, B. D. (2017). Spatial phylogenetics of the vascular flora of Chile. *Molecular Phylogenetics and Evolution*, 112, 88–95. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ympev.2017.04.021>
- Sechrest, W., Brooks, T. M., da Fonseca, G. A. B., Konstant, W. R., Mittermeier, R. A., Purvis, A., ... Gittleman, J. L. (2002). Hotspots and the conservation of evolutionary history. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences USA*, 99, 2067–2071. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.251680798>
- Stattersfield, A. J., Crosby, M. J., Long, A. J., & Wege, D. C. (1998). *Endemic bird areas of the world: Priorities for biodiversity conservation*. Cambridge, UK: Bird Life International.
- Thornhill, A. H., Mishler, B. D., Knerr, N. J., González-Orozco, C. E., Costion, C. M., Crayn, D. M., ... Miller, J. T. (2016). Continental-scale spatial phylogenetics of Australian angiosperms provides insights into ecology, evolution and conservation. *Journal of Biogeography*, 43, 2085–2098. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jbi.12797>
- Tucker, C. M., Cadotte, M. W., Carvalho, S. B., Davies, T. J., Ferrier, S., Fritz, S. A., ... Mazel, F. (2017). A guide to phylogenetic metrics for conservation, community ecology and macroecology. *Biological Reviews*, 92, 698–715. <https://doi.org/10.1111/brv.12252>
- Vane-Wright, R. I., Humphries, C. J., & Williams, P. H. (1991). What to protect—Systematics and the agony of choice. *Biological Conservation*, 55, 235–254. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0006-3207\(91\)90030-D](https://doi.org/10.1016/0006-3207(91)90030-D)
- Venter, O., Fuller, R. A., Segan, D. B., Carwardine, J., Brooks, T., Butchart, S. H., ... Watson, J. E. (2014). Targeting global protected area expansion for imperiled biodiversity. *PLoS Biology*, 12, e1001891. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pbio.1001891>
- Wilson, D. E., & Reeder, D. M. (2005). *Mammal species of the world: A taxonomic and geographic reference* (3rd ed.). Baltimore, MD: John Hopkins University Press.
- Yessoufou, K., Daru, B. H., & Davies, T. J. (2012). Phylogenetic patterns of extinction risk in the Eastern Arc ecosystems, an African biodiversity hotspot. *PLoS ONE*, 7, e47082. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0047082>
- Zanne, A. E., Tank, D. C., Cornwell, W. K., Eastman, J. M., Smith, S. A., FitzJohn, R. G., ... Beaulieu, J. M. (2014). Three keys to the radiation of angiosperms into freezing environments. *Nature*, 506, 89–92. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nature12872>
- Zupan, L., Cabeza, M., Maiorano, L., Roquet, C., Devictor, V., Lavergne, S., ... Thuiller, W. (2014). Spatial mismatch of phylogenetic diversity across three vertebrate groups and protected areas in Europe. *Diversity & Distributions*, 6, 674–685. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ddi.12186>

BIOSKETCH

BARNABAS H. DARU is an Assistant Professor of Biology at Texas A&M University–Corpus Christi. He integrates ecological data, museum records and biogeography to explore the mechanistic processes underlying the origin, distribution and maintenance of biodiversity, bearing in mind how this understanding can guide real-world conservation decisions. More about his research is available at <https://barnabasdaru.com/>

SUPPORTING INFORMATION

Additional supporting information may be found online in the Supporting Information section at the end of the article.

How to cite this article: Daru BH, le Roux PC, Gopalraj J, Park DS, Holt BG, Greve M. Spatial overlaps between the global protected areas network and terrestrial hotspots of evolutionary diversity. *Global Ecol Biogeogr*. 2019;28:757–766. <https://doi.org/10.1111/geb.12888>