Received: 2 August 2019 | Revised: 23 September 2019 | Accepted: 25 September 2019

DOI: 10.1111/geb.13020

MACROECOLOGY 30TH ANNIVERSARY

Global Ecology and Biogeography A Journal of Macroecology WILEY

Unifying macroecology and macroevolution to answer fundamental questions about biodiversity

Brian J. McGill[1] | Jonathan M. Chase[2,3] | Joaquín Hortal[4] | Isaac Overcast[5] | Andrew J. Rominger[6] | James Rosindell[7] | Paulo A. V. Borges[8] | Brent C. Emerson[9] | Rampal S. Etienne[10] | Michael J. Hickerson[5,11] | D. Luke Mahler[12] | Francois Massol[13,14] | Angela McGaughran[15] | Pedro Neves[10] | Christine Parent[16,17] | Jairo Patiño[18] | Megan Ruffley[17] | Catherine E. Wagner[19] | Rosemary Gillespie[20]

[1]School of Biology & Ecology, Mitchell Center for Sustainability Solutions, University of Maine, Orono, Maine, USA

[2]German Centre for Integrative Biodiversity Research (iDiv), Halle-Jena-Leipzig, Leipzig, Germany

[3]Institute of Computer Science, Martin-Luther University Halle-Wittenberg, Halle (Saale), Germany

[4]Department of Biogeography and Global Change, Museo Nacional de Ciencias Naturales (MNCN-CSIC), Madrid, Spain

[5]Graduate Center of the City University of New York, New York, New York, USA

[6]Santa Fe Institute, Santa Fe, New Mexico, USA

[7]Department of Life Sciences, Imperial College London, Ascot, Berkshire, UK

[8]cE3c – Centre for Ecology, Evolution and Environmental Changes/Azorean Biodiversity Group, Faculdade de Ciências Agrárias e do Ambiente, Universidade dos Açores –, Angra do Heroísmo, Terceira, Portugal

[9]Island Ecology and Evolution Research Group, Instituto de Productos Naturales y Agrobiología (IPNA-CSIC), Tenerife, Canary Islands, Spain

[10]Groningen Institute for Evolutionary Life Sciences, University of Groningen, Groningen, The Netherlands

[11]Division of Invertebrate Zoology, American Museum of Natural History, New York, New York, USA

[12]Department of Ecology & Evolutionary Biology, University of Toronto, Toronto, Ontario, Canada

[13]Univ. Lille, CNRS, Inserm, CHU Lille, Institut Pasteur de Lille, U1019 - UMR 8204 - CIIL - Center for Infection and Immunity of Lille, 59000 Lille, France

[14]Univ. Lille, CNRS, UMR 8198 - Evo-Eco-Paleo, SPICI group, 59000 Lille, France

[15]Division of Ecology and Evolution, Research School of Biology, Australian National University, Canberra, Australian Capital Territory, Australia

[16]Institute for Bioinformatics and Evolutionary Studies (IBEST), University of Idaho, Moscow, Idaho, USA

[17]Department of Biological Sciences, University of Idaho, Moscow, Idaho, USA

[18]Department of Botany, Plant Ecology & Physiology, Faculty of Science, Univesity of La Laguna, La Laguna, Tenerife, Spain

[19]Department of Botany, University of Wyoming, Laramie, Wyoming, USA

[20]Department of Environmental Science, Policy, and Management, University of California, Berkeley, California, USA

Correspondence
Brian J. McGill, School of Biology & Ecology, Mitchell Center for Sustainability Solutions, University of Maine, Orono, Maine, USA.
Email: geb@brianmcgill.org

Funding information
USDA Hatch MAFES, Grant/Award Number: 1011538; sDiv, Grant/Award Number: sEcoEvo working group; National Science Foundation, Grant/Award Number: ABI grant #1660000

Editor: Adam Algar

Abstract

The study of biodiversity started as a single unified field that spanned both ecology and evolution and both macro and micro phenomena. But over the 20th century, major trends drove ecology and evolution apart and pushed an emphasis towards the micro perspective in both disciplines. Macroecology and macroevolution re-emerged as self-consciously distinct fields in the 1970s and 1980s, but they remain largely separated from each other. Here, we argue that despite the challenges, it is worth working to combine macroecology and macroevolution. We present 25 fundamental questions about biodiversity that are answerable only with a mixture of the views and tools of both macroecology and macroevolution.

1 | HISTORICAL CONTEXT

In Darwin's "*On the origin of species*" (1859), it is impossible to find a distinction between ecological and evolutionary processes; they are intertwined throughout. Although several of Darwin's chapters are devoted to what we now perceive as purely evolutionary topics, such as transformations of species in the fossil record (Chapters 9 and 10) and hybridism (Chapter 8), other chapters would be assigned to ecology, such as the struggle for existence, which involves reproduction and mortality (Chapters 4 and 5). There are also several chapters addressing topics that are currently recognized as crossing both ecology and evolution (intraspecific variation in Chapters 1 and 2; behaviour in Chapter 7). Equally, Darwin made no distinction between micro and macro scales. He interwove the fossil record with agricultural breeding programmes, and a local entangled bank of interacting species with the biogeographical distribution of organisms. Similar breadth can be seen in the writings of authors who pre-dated Darwin, such as von Humboldt (von Humboldt & Ross, 1852).

In the first half of the 20th century, a wedge began to form between the evolutionary and ecological sides of the field (Figure 1). On the one hand, ecologists became more interested in smaller-scale phenomena, such as population dynamics and species interactions, and could largely ignore evolutionary processes (Clements, Weaver, & Hanson, 1929; Elton, 1927). On the other hand, many evolutionary biologists, spurred on by linkages to genetics (Morgan & Biologiste, 1925) and the development of theoretical population genetics (Provine, 2001), shifted their focus to individual genes rather than the whole phenotype. For example, the development of mathematical models that start with assumptions such as "let the fitness of AA and Aa be 1 and of aa be 1 − *s*" tend to underplay the ecological processes that lead to differences in fitness that Darwin's writings so eloquently merged.

The latter half of the 20th century began to see the re-emergence of a connection. Some early descriptions of this can be seen in chapters of the edited volume "Evolution as a process" (Huxley, Hardy, & Ford, 1954), where evolutionary processes were said to lead to communities of interacting organisms (much like Darwin's entangled bank). Selection in natural environments began to be studied (Ford, 1971; Kettlewell, 1955). Likewise, the emergence of quantitative genetics (Crow & Kimura, 1970) and models of evolution of multivariate phenotypes (Lande, 1979) brought back a complex view of phenotype. From the ecology side, evolutionary ecology emerged as a field, inspired by Hutchinson's metaphor of the "ecological theater and the evolutionary play" (Hutchinson, 1965) and the models by MacArthur and colleagues that looked at the evolution of ecologically relevant traits (MacArthur, 1961, 1962; MacArthur & Levins, 1964; MacArthur & Pianka, 1966).

The 1970s saw this reconnection of ecology and evolution develop more fully as part of the field of "population biology", explaining ecological and evolutionary questions through basic population processes using simple differential equations involving



FIGURE 1 A brief history of how Darwin's integrative vision of organismal biology became split into first two and then four separate fields: microevolution, macroevolution, microecology (traditional population and community ecology) and macroecology. In the bottom right panel, efforts to link microevolution to macroevolution and microecology to macroecology (narrow vertical paths) are ongoing but difficult. Efforts to link microevolution and microecology (horizontal broad connection) have been a major focus for recent decades. Efforts to link macroecology and macroevolution (missing area shown by a question mark) have been, in comparison, much more limited but are needed urgently [Colour figure can be viewed at wileyonlinelibrary.com]

birth, death, immigration and emigration, and speciation (Levins, 1968; MacArthur & Wilson, 1967; Wilson & Bossert, 1971). This population biology framing opened up new fields that combined evolutionary and ecological perspectives spanning a diverse array of questions, including evolutionary ecology (Bulmer, 1994; Fox, Roff, & Fairbairn, 2001), behavioural ecology (Alcock & Rubenstein, 1989) and life-history theory (Roff, 2002; Stearns, 1976). The population biology approach has also seen a resurgence over the last decade under the label of "eco-evolutionary dynamics", which explores the evolutionary dynamics of traits that play out on the same time-scales as ecological processes (Carroll, Hendry, Reznick, & Fox, 2007; Grant & Grant, 1989; Hendry, 2016; McGill & Brown, 2007; McPeek, 2017; Metz, Geritz, Meszena, Jacobs, & Heerwaarden, 1996; Schoener, 2011; Yoshida, Jones, Ellner, Fussmann, & Hairston Jr., 2003).

Although the population biology research programme succeeded in bringing ecology and evolution together in certain ways, it gave primacy to small-scale processes. This is essentially the philosophical notion of reductionism; explaining a system by breaking it into component parts and examining their interactions. This presumes the ability to scale up detailed models of population processes to answer macroevolutionary questions about species diversity and phenotype evolution or macroecological questions about the spatial variation in diversity and the relative abundance of species. Although such scaling up is an active and interesting area of research, progress has been slow owing to specific mathematical obstacles (McGill, 2019; O'Neill, 1979). The result is that embracing the population biology view, while helping to reunite aspects of ecology and evolution, drove a wedge between the micro- and macro-scale aspects of each discipline.

With micro-scale processes predominating in the population biology paradigm, this arguably diminished the importance and relevance of the macro-scale disciplines. As a result, macroevolution and macroecology emerged as distinct, separately named fields (Brown & Maurer, 1989; Stanley, 1975). In evolution, the line is sharp and widely agreed upon; studies of processes within a species are microevolution, whereas macroevolution addresses questions above the species level (phylogenies and comparative evolution). In ecology, the line is more blurred. Microecology (more commonly called ecology) studies small scales, involving physiology, behaviour, populations and communities, whereas macroecology studies large spatial, temporal or taxonomic scales (Brown, 1995; Gaston & Blackburn, 2000; McGill, 2019). Given that both macro fields spent their first decades establishing themselves as independent fields, they have not often looked externally, leading to comparatively few links between macroecology and macroevolution.

To summarize (and admittedly, to oversimplify), the study of organismal biology started as a unified field, became, for most practitioners, split into distinct fields of ecology and evolution, then became split further into four fields, with most practitioners focusing on micro versus macro versions of each field (Figure 1).

2 | RELATIONSHIP OF MACROECOLOGY AND MACROEVOLUTION

Are we on our way to the seamless integration of ecology and evolution practised by Darwin? We would suggest not yet in an important way. The missing linkage in the history as described above is a direct linkage between macroecology and macroevolution (question mark in Figure 1), despite seeming a natural link given their strong match in embracing large scales. Notably, the vertical linkages of the two macro–micro bridges have proved surprisingly resistant to advances (notwithstanding some successes; Avise, 2000), and we suggest that they will ultimately prove to be harder barriers to cross than the ecology–evolution divide (hence the thicker line in Figure 1) for some specific mathematical reasons (McGill, 2019; O'Neill, 1979). Regardless of one's view on the feasibility of spanning the macro–micro divide, the indirect, three-legged route of linking macroevolution to microevolution to microecology to macroecology is hopelessly unwieldy. The main thesis of this paper is that organismal biology is missing (and badly needs) a re-unification directly between macroecology and macroevolution.

A very simple examination of the limited interactions between macroecology and macroevolution can be made using bibliometric analysis, albeit in a necessarily simplistic fashion. In particular, many macroecological and macroevolutionary papers often do not use those keywords (and necessarily could not before the words were coined), meaning that this analysis clearly omits relevant papers, but we believe it to be a sample that is not biased. An analysis of words found in keywords and abstracts using Web of Science was performed in March 2018. A search for derivatives of macroecology ("macroecolog*") found 1,814 papers going back to the coining of the term in 1989 (Brown & Maurer, 1989) and *c*. 150 papers/year in recent years. Derivatives of macroevolution ("macroevolution*") found 2,570 papers going back to Stanely's coining of the term (Stanley, 1975), with *c*. 220 papers/year in recent years. Although, again, by no means does this approach capture all macroecological or macroevolutionary papers, these results suggest that a substantial sample is obtained in searches using these keywords. This analysis supports the notion that both of the macro fields have been growing rapidly since their relatively recent launches. It also supports the notion that macroecology and macroevolution are infrequently practised as overlapping fields. Only 105 papers starting in 2000 (*c*. 10 papers/year) contain both macroecology and macroevolution (macroecolog* and macroevolution*). By this method, only 4%–6% of the papers that are explicitly macroecological or macroevolutionary recognize themselves as interdisciplinary between both fields. This crude analysis suggests that although linkages between macroecology and macroevolution do exist, they are not yet common. In recognition of the existence of some links between macroecology and macroevolution, Box 1 gives some well-known examples of linkages between both disciplines.

Box 1 Examples of prominent existing work linking macroecology and macroevolution

- Biogeography and palaeontology (and palaeoecology) are long-standing fields that integrate ecology and evolution at macro scales. Palaeontology is full of examples, such as the study of how extinction rates depend on body size (e.g., Jablonski & Raup, 1995) or how phenotype changes through time (e.g., Foote, 1997) or ranges shift because of climate (Lyons, 2003) or ecological processes in fossil communities (Blois et al., 2014).
- MacArthur was key in re-introducing evolutionary thinking into ecology (MacArthur, 1961). Examples that are more macro in nature include the idea of limiting similarity (MacArthur & Levins, 1967), his exploration of the causes of the latitudinal gradient in richness (MacArthur, 1969), his work on R versus K selection (MacArthur, 1962) or even his explicit recognition of the importance of evolutionary processes in the theory of island biogeography (Chapter 7 of MacArthur & Wilson, 1967).
- The exploration of adaptive radiations in island-like systems has long necessitated the combination of macroecology and macroevolution (Grant & Grant, 1989; Schluter, 2000). The study of ecological morphotypes and their evolution across many islands is a related example (Gillespie, 2004; Losos, 2011).
- Ecological neutral theory with speciation (Hubbell, 2001) clearly links the two fields. More generally, with growing recognition of the importance of the regional pool of species for ecology (Ricklefs & Schluter, 1993a, 1993b), there has been increased interest in exploring the macroevolution of regional pools of species, which then constrain local community assembly (Mittelbach & Schemske, 2015; Ricklefs, 2015). Also related are studies comparing the assembly of communities through colonization versus speciation (Rummel & Roughgarden, 1985).
- Likewise, phylogenetic community ecology has sought to understand how the macroevolutionary history of the regional pool interacts with ecological and biogeographical processes to produce observed assemblages of co-occurring taxa (Webb et al., 2002; Emerson & Gillespie, 2008; Cavender-Bares, Kozak, Fine, & Kembel, 2009).
- Niche conservatism is explicitly an evolutionary hypothesis about an ecological concept (that niches evolve slowly and thus show conservatism over a phylogeny; Ackerly, 2003; Peterson, Soberón & Sánchez-Cordero, 1999; Wiens & Graham, 2005).
- Ricklef and colleagues have studied taxon cycles on islands (Ricklefs & Cox, 1972) and the role of distinct macroevolution on different continents in species richness (Latham & Ricklefs, 1993), written numerous papers at the interface of niche, community and macroevolution (Cox & Ricklefs, 1977; Ricklefs, 2010, 2011) and made multiple calls for the importance of merging ecological and evolutionary thinking (Ricklefs, 2007; Ricklefs & Schluter, 1993a, 1993b).
- Rosenzweig's examination of competitive speciation (ecological conditions leading to sympatric speciation; Rosenzweig, 1978) and the study of incumbent replacement (increased diversification rates after competitors go extinct; Rosenzweig & McCord, 1991) are also examples.

TABLE 1 Comparison of macroecological versus macroevolutionary views of different variables

Variable	Macroecology	Macroevolution
Diversity	Richness, evenness, abundance (often of polyphyletic groups)	Richness (typically within a monophyletic clade)
Traits	Morphospace; trait volumes and niches across an assemblage; functional diversity	Evolution of morphospace, trait volumes and niches across a phylogeny
Diversification	Phylogenetic diversity indices	Speciation, extinction, diversification rates
Distribution	Range size, habitat preferences	Biogeographical province
Species interactions (e.g., competition, predation, parasitism)	Interaction webs	Co-evolution
Abiotic environment	Climate variation across space; static view of soils/topography	Climate variation across time; geological change in topography

There are good reasons for this disconnect between the two macro fields. As noted, both fields are relatively new, placing an emphasis on self-definition rather than reaching out to other fields. Additionally, the two fields operationalize and measure their variables differently although they discuss the same concepts (Table 1). This is in part because the sources of the data are distinct and in part because the perspectives and priorities are distinct. Macroevolutionists focus on changes through time and thus use either stratified fossils or phylogenies derived from current molecular sequences or both. Macroecologists focus on space and thus use biological inventories in the present day. Clearly, both these perspectives are crucial to understanding diversity in space and time, but integrating these perspectives presents challenges.

The key variable that both fields share is an interest in species richness, although macroevolution initially sees this as an outcome of speciation and extinction through time, whereas macroecology initially sees this as an ecological outcome of dispersal and of past and present climatic conditions (Belyea & Lancaster, 1999) varying across space at one point in time (but as our paper highlights, ecological conditions and diversification are not independent of each other; also see Ricklefs & Schluter, 1993b). Moreover, macroevolution tends to focus on the richness of a monophyletic group of species (e.g., a specific clade of frogs), whereas macroecology tends to focus on the richness of an assemblage (e.g., all trees) that can be polyphyletic.

Such differences extend to other variables of interest. Both areas focus on phenotype. Macroecologists can focus on a complex multivariate set of features but are limited to a point in time. Macroevolutionists bring a temporal perspective but are limited to a simpler view of phenotype owing to the limitations of fossils and phylogenetic methods. Likewise, both fields focus on abundance and distribution. But abundance is not estimatable in phylogenies and is spottily preserved in the fossil record, and distributions can only be approximated from fossil and phylogenetic inference, leading to a very coarse view of historical distribution. Macroecologists can measure these with much more precision at fine-grained spatial scales but fail to see abundance and distribution as dynamic and changing through evolutionary time. Finally, both fields have notions of colonization, but macroevolution looks at rare vicariance or founder events across biogeographical provinces, whereas macroecology looks more at the scale of metapopulation dynamics.

As we have shown, the overlap in concepts of interest to both macroecology and macroevolution hides deeper divides. Methodological challenges exist owing to their disparate data sources. But more fundamentally, there is also a key conceptual difference. Macroevolution tends to focus on temporal processes, whereas macroecology tends to focus on spatial processes. Core questions in macroevolution tend to centre on questions of rates (speciation, extinction and net diversification) and how these rates change through time within and across clades. Core questions in macroecology tend to centre on levels (not rates), such as abundance, richness, range size and traits, and how these levels change across space and across taxa.

3 | REASONS WHY A UNIFICATION IS NEEDED

Scientific inquiry does not divide itself arbitrarily into spatial questions versus temporal questions. Nor does scientific inquiry limit itself to a single source of data at a time. These are barriers created by humans. Although there might have been pragmatic reasons (including social and computational limits) that have slowed the cooperation of macroecology and macroevolution, the conceptual barriers are readily overcome. Indeed, although we have emphasized the differences and challenges thus far, the overlap in topics of interest between macroecology and macroevolution is striking (Table 1). To the degree that large spatial processes play out across long temporal time-scales and vice versa (Levin, 1992; Stommel, 1963; Wiens, 1989), macroecology and macroevolution will also naturally look towards each other rather than towards the "micro" versions of their fields. In fact, we suggest that macroecology and macroevolution urgently need to cooperate, because there are obvious and important questions that combine macroecological and macroevolutionary variables and perspectives.

Figure 2 gives a conceptual framework that suggests many overlapping questions, 25 of which are then listed in more detail



FIGURE 2 The relationships between macroecology and macroevolution. The rows contain possible explanatory variables (labelled and categorized at the left). The columns contain possible dependent variables (labelled and categorized at the top). Some of these variables are ecological (in blue) and some are evolutionary (in red). Diversity and taxonomic group are shared between ecology and evolution (in purple). Abiotic variables are shown in italics, whereas biotic variables are shown in bold. Each intersection or grid cell is a potential question of the form, "How does *X* affect *Y*?". Historically, macroecology focused predominantly on intersections of variables that were ecological, whereas macroevolution focused on variables that were evolutionary, although this division has never been absolute (Box 1). Questions involving ecological variables impacting evolutionary variables and vice versa (light purple regions) represent the emerging synthesis between macroecology and macroevolution, as argued for here. The fact that diversity and the importance of distinct taxonomic groups is shared between macroecology and macroevolution creates a boundary region (dark purple). Note that "diversity" appears as a single factor in the diagram but could refer to taxonomic, functional or phylogenetic diversity and could equally refer to alpha, beta or gamma diversity. Numbers in the grid cells represent questions, which are listed in Table 2. Bold numbers represent case studies, which are expanded upon in this paper, and their superscript letter indicates the case study (A–F) to which they refer. Abiotic variables affecting abiotic variables are earth science questions and not included here. One can place allied fields, such as biogeography, as a stripe spanning the abiotic variables running across the width of the diagram and palaeontology across the bottom row. This placement shows that there is clearly overlap, but these fields do not cover the full range of what we propose here [Colour figure can be viewed at wileyonlinelibrary.com]

TABLE 2 A list of 25 important questions at the interface between macroecology and macroevolution

Ecological factors affecting evolution	
1	**What ecological conditions enable radiations? (Case study A)**
2	**How do diversification rates scale with topography? (Case study B)**
3	How does area and isolation influence relative importance of speciation and colonization?
4	Do diversification rates vary with commonness and rarity?
5	How does dispersal affect diversification?
6	Does spatial sorting lead to speciation of good dispersers more than poor dispersers?
7	How do the environment and environmental change affect diversification rates?
8	Do tightly coupled biotic interactions leading to co-evolution reflect as parallel phylogenies in the interacting taxa?
9	Does evolution into new habitats occur faster or slower than vicariance events between islands?
Evolutionary factors affecting ecology	
10	**How do relative abundance patterns respond to macroevolution? (Case study C)**
11	**Are ecological interactions determined by shared evolutionary history? (Case study D)**
12	How does relative abundance persist or change through geological time and across the tree of life?
13	How does dispersal ability evolve and change?
14	How does diversification affect the number of interactions per species?
15	Are closely related species more likely to be similar in phenotype and niche?
16	Over what time-scales do species interactions remain strong?
17	Are niches and phenotypes static? Or if they change over time, do they change in a directional, random or other systematic fashion?
Cross-cutting questions	
18	**What is the role of evolution in invasion? (Case study E)**
19	**Does diversity saturate in space and/or time? (Case study F)**
20	How do the relative rates of colonization versus speciation influence alpha, beta and gamma taxonomic, functional and phylogenetic diversity?
21	What is the relative importance of environmental heterogeneity and biotic heterogeneity in speciation rates?
22	Does diversity beget diversity?
23	How do the relative rates of colonization versus speciation influence niche packing and filling?
24	Does speciation create niches or does empty niche space drive speciation?
25	What is the interplay between diversification and coexistence mechanisms?

Note: Questions in bold are case studies that are expanded on in the main text. Cross-cutting questions involve diversity, which is the one variable currently shared between macroecology and macroevolution. The sEcoEvo working group generated this list of questions during a working group at sDiv.

in Table 2. All these questions are "big" questions in the sense that they have long been speculated about, in some cases for >100 years. For example, the question, "are closely related species likely to have similar niches and compete more intensely with each other?" (Question 15 in Table 2) was hypothesized by Darwin (1859). All the listed questions remain largely unanswered (but see Box 1), because scientists have not yet bridged the divide between macroecology and macroevolution methodologically. Note that the structure of Figure 2 naturally divides the questions into three categories: where causality flows from ecology to evolution, where causality flows from evolution to ecology, and cross-cutting questions where the flow of causality is bidirectional or complex, and Table 2 is organized accordingly. In the next section, we give some case studies of a subset of the questions to provide more depth.

4 | CASE STUDIES

It is beyond the scope of this paper to review existing literature and highlight the key paths forward for all 25 questions listed in Table 2 (and the countless others that we have not identified, but which are equally important). However, to provide some depth and make our claim of importance for these mostly unanswered questions more concrete, we highlight six of these questions (in bold in Figure 2 and Table 2, also see Figure 3) and briefly address them as case studies.

4.1 | Case study A (Question 1, Figure 3a): What ecological conditions enable radiations?

What ecological conditions promote or inhibit evolutionary diversification? Adaptive radiations occur when a clade rapidly



FIGURE 3 Hypothetical relationships between driver and response variables for six case studies taken from Table 2. The first column represents Case studies A and B, where ecological factors primarily influence evolutionary patterns and processes. The second column represents Case studies C and D, where evolutionary factors primarily influence the ecological process/pattern. The third column represents cross-cutting Case studies E and F, which address ecological and evolutionary processes and feedbacks [Colour figure can be viewed at wileyonlinelibrary.com]

speciates and diversifies into many novel niches, often in response to ecological opportunities (Schluter, 2000). The existence of dramatically species-rich adaptive radiations raises the question, what properties of systems where these radiations occur promote such diversification? Conversely, are systems with low species richness, often in harsh temperate areas and characterized by a few representatives of distantly related clades, limited by dispersal over geological time-scales or is the evolution of novel forms in such low-richness systems limited by some property of these systems?

One long-standing hypothesis for adaptive radiations is that the ecology of insular systems is defined by release of populations from their ancestral predators, parasites and/or competitors (Losos, 2010; Mahler, Revell, Glor, & Losos, 2010; Schluter, 2000; Stroud & Losos, 2016). Conversely, increased diversity in the tropics has been attributed to increased, not decreased, interaction intensity between an increased number of interactors (Gillespie, 2004; Nosil & Crespi, 2006). Clearly, ecological drivers of evolutionary radiation exist, but which direction those drivers point (from increased interaction to diversity, or from decreased interaction to diversity) remains unresolved.

An alternative but complementary perspective posits that ecological stability can either promote or inhibit diversification. If the tropics have maintained stable abiotic conditions, this might facilitate consistent accumulation of species (Jetz & Fine, 2012; Pianka, 1966). By the same argument, temperate areas, with frequent glacial–interglacial disturbance, inhibit diversification. In contrast, it has been hypothesized recently (Rominger et al., 2017) that the non-equilibrium dynamics of ecosystems could provide the opportunity for evolutionary radiations to permit the relaxation of the systems back to ecological equilibrium. If insular systems quickly lose their isolation (e.g., through human introduction of new species), then relaxation could instead be achieved by invasion (Helmus, Mahler, & Losos, 2014). This could help to explain both the incredible adaptive radiations on islands and the dramatic prevalence of invasive species.

4.2 | Case study B (Question 2, Figure 3b): How do diversification rates scale with topography?

Topographic complexity (ruggedness and elevational range) has long been linked to high standing diversity and to processes of speciation. For example, the Andes mountains are home to the highest diversity in South America for both birds (Rahbek & Graves, 2001) and plants (Mutke, Sommer, Kreft, Kier, & Barthlott,), and a lupine clade in the Andes has speciated at rates approaching those of classic island radiations (Hughes & Eastwood, 2006). The geological processes generating oceanic islands likewise create diverse and isolated habitats, long hypothesized to contribute to dramatic radiations (Ricklefs & Cox, 1972; Wilson, 1961), as do isolated continental mountain tops (sky islands; McCormack, Huang, Knowles, Gillespie, & Clague, 2009). What ecological processes interact with topographic complexity to lead ultimately to changed diversification rates?

Topographic complexity interacts with two ecological properties of species (dispersal ability and tolerance or niche breadth) to influence evolutionary processes. Specifically, more topographic complexity and shorter dispersal and narrower tolerances increase the

possibility of local adaptation, genetic isolation and ensuing allopatric speciation processes. The interactions between mountains and changing climate (such as the Plio-Pleistocene glacial–interglacials) can add to the environmental heterogeneity and local adaptation increasing speciation (McCormack, Bowen, & Smith, 2008; Rangel et al., 2018) but simultaneously make it easier to track climate, with short-range dispersal decreasing extinction risk (Colwell, Brehm, Cardelús, Gilman, & Longino, 2008).

4.3 | Case study C (Question 10, Figure 3c): How do relative abundance patterns respond to macroevolution?

Do the diversification processes that produce a set of species influence the relative abundances [species abundance distribution (SAD)] of those species?

There are several developing lines of evidence that suggest high levels of diversification lead to more uneven SADs, with a few hyperdominant species and many very rare species. The highly diverse Amazon rain forest shows extreme hyperdominance: 1.4% of tree species in the Amazon account for half of all individuals, whereas most remaining species are extremely rare (Slik et al., 2015; Ter Steege et al., 2013), and on a 50 ha plot on Barro Colorado Island, 2.9% of species make up approximately half of all individuals.

Species abundance distributions also seem to change shape with greater time available for macroevolution. Proportionately more rare species tend to be in more species-rich genera and families (Harte, Rominger, & Zhang, 2015). The exact processes by which this evolutionary outcome (high standing species diversity) translates to this particular form of SAD is an open question. One possibility is that food-web theory predicts that higher dominance is expected to result in more stable communities (Emmerson & Yearsley, 2004). Conversely, abundance could affect speciation rates (Makarieva & Gorshkov, 2004). But how all these ecological factors cause, or are caused by, the evolutionary processes leading to high diversity remains an open question.

4.4 | Case study D (Question 11, Figure 3d): Are ecological interactions determined by shared evolutionary history?

The relatively high level of specialization observed in host–parasite and plant–herbivore interaction networks begs the following question: at macroecological scales, are ecological interactions constrained primarily by their (co-)evolutionary history or by their ecological distance (i.e., a combination of geographical ranges and preferred environmental conditions)?

Considering host–parasite interactions in particular, on the one hand, there is evidence that differences in parasite communities associated with different host species are driven by environmental dissimilarity and phylogenetic distances among hosts, but not by geographical distance (Krasnov et al., 2010). This finding has been interpreted as evidence of environmental filtering acting on the community of parasites at the "macro" scale (Krasnov et al., 2014). On the other hand, there is evidence that differences in parasite communities across hosts are driven by parasite geographical ranges and not phylogenetic distance, despite a strong apparent signal of phylogenetic conservatism [Calatayud et al., 2016; also see similar results in insect–host associations (Nylin et al., 2018)]. The field of community phylogenetics also touches on interactions between species based on the amount of their shared evolutionary history (Cavender-Bares, Ackerly, Baum, & Bazzaz, 2004; Webb et al., 2002; but see cautions in Mayfield & Levine, 2010).

This case study is a good example of the interrelationships among the questions. Question 11 frames this as evolution driving ecology, but Question 8 is qualitatively the same question, with ecology driving evolution.

4.5 | Case study E (Question 18, Figure 3e): What is the role of evolution in invasion?

Invasive species are a major component of global change (Millenium Ecosystem Assessment, 2005). Invasion is largely perceived as a solely ecological process despite evolutionary studies (Roderick & Navajas, 2003). But there are many ways in which invasion and evolution interact (Pantel et al., 2017; Vermeij, 1996), including, before, during and after the invasion event. Focusing on the evolution of a community before it is invaded, note that invasion and speciation are the primary alternatives for new species to contribute to faunal build-up and assembly. To what degree does having a community primarily derived from invasion differ from a community primarily derived from speciation?

Rummel and Roughgarden (, 1985) suggest that invasion-structured communities are more tightly packed in niche space but less stable and more open to invasion. In contrast, the distinction between invasion and evolution in place has been one of the main arguments in support of the notion that remote islands (with biota assembly primarily driven by speciation) are more susceptible to invasion, although tests of high island invasibility suggest that it might be restricted to tropical islands (Turbelin, Malamud, & Francis, 2017). Looking at the role of evolution during invasion, many have noted that the degree of fit of the invading species into the established morphospace (Moulton & Pimm, 1983), the phylogenetic position of the invader relative to species with which it will interact (Pearse & Altermatt, 2013) and the phylogenetic clade (Binggeli, 1996) can all be predictive of invasion success. There are also interesting questions concerning the evolutionary response of the invader and the invaded community after an invasion event. For example, it has been suggested that invasive species might be freed from their predators and parasites (the 'enemy release' hypothesis; Keane & Crawley, 2002), leading to potential evolutionary opportunities, including the possibility of "evolution of increased competitive ability" or EICA (Blossey & Notzold, 1995), although the evidence is not conclusive (Willis, Memmott, & Forrester, 2000). The act of being invasive might also select for individuals that are successful invaders, including increased dispersal ability (Phillips, Brown, Webb, & Shine, 2006) or the

notion that selection during an invasion may be spatially structured (e.g., different at the invasion front; Shine, Brown, & Phillips, 2011) or admixtures (geographical hybrids; Krehenwinkel & Tautz, 2013). The species in the invaded community may also show an evolutionary response to the invader (Goergen, Leger, & Espeland, 2011) or exploit an invader as a resource (Carroll et al., 2005). Many of these questions are also highly relevant as climate change rearranges species that co-occur and leads to non-analogue communities.

4.6 | Case study F (Question 19, Figure 3f): Does diversity saturate in space and/or time?

Both macroecology and macroevolution ask the question, is there an upper limit to diversity? Macroecologists tend to focus on spatial patterns as an indicator of saturation (Figure 3e). One classical approach has been to ask how the size of the regional species pool influences diversity at local scales (Alroy, 2018; Cornell & Harrison, 2014; Harmon & Harrison, 2015; Mittelbach & Schemske, 2015; Pärtel, Zobel, Zobel, van der Maarel, & Partel, 1996; Ricklefs, 1987). In contrast, macroevolutionary studies tend to focus on saturation of diversity through time (Etienne & Haegeman, 2012; Moen & Morlon, 2014; Phillimore & Price, 2008). In this context, saturation is revealed by a plateau of diversity over long time-scales (Rabosky, 2013; Rabosky & Lovette, 2008; Sepkoski, 1978), although a plateau could also indicate an equilibrium of speciation and extinction rates not caused by saturation (Wagner, Harmon, & Seehausen, 2014). A unified approach to saturation over space and time will require the full integration of both ecological and evolutionary perspectives. Perhaps, for example, local communities can be saturated over short time-scales, but such saturation breaks down over long time-scales, as evolution of novel traits and lifestyles allow coexistence when none was possible before.

We suggest that future studies should consider saturation from both temporal and spatial perspectives, unifying macroecological and macroevolutionary approaches to this crucial question. Two recent papers, a simulation (Herrera-Alsina, van Els, & Etienne, 2018) and an empirical study of the fossil record (Close et al., 2019), suggest that ecological processes at local scales might constrain macroevolutionary processes of diversification and macroecological factors, such as species range sizes, taking place over large spatial and long temporal scales.

5 | CONCLUSIONS

The modern push to reconnect ecology to evolution (Hendry, 2016; McPeek, 2017) is occurring predominantly at micro scales, connecting microevolution (e.g., intraspecific phenotypic evolution) with microecology (e.g., predator–prey species interactions). Darwin would never have attempted to understand one without the other. Yet macroecology and macroevolution have developed largely independently (but see Box 1) since their conceptualization (1975 and 1989, respectively). Given that the roots of the two fields have been so distinct in data and questions (Figure 2; Table 1), the fields have largely functioned independently. However, as we have argued (Figure 3; Table 2), many of the most interesting and important questions span both fields and will require synthesizing the data, tools and perspectives of the two research fields to proceed. We see signs of this happening. The British Ecological Society Special Interest Group on Macroecology openly encourages participation by, and contributions from, both macroecology and macroevolution, as does this journal. We hope this concept piece will provide further encouragement to this much needed unification.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This paper is a joint effort of the working group sEcoEvo, kindly supported by sDiv, the Synthesis Centre of the German Centre for Integrative Biodiversity Research (iDiv), Halle-Jena-Leipzig, funded by the German Research Foundation (FZT 118). Brian McGill acknowledges US Department of Agriculture Hatch grant to Maine Agricultural and Forestry Experimental Station #1011538 and National Science Foundation Advances in Biological Infrastructure grant #1660000.

ORCID

Brian J. McGill https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0850-1913
Jonathan M. Chase https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5580-4303
Brent C. Emerson https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4067-9858
Rampal S. Etienne https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2142-7612

[Correction statement added on 30 Mar 2020 after first online publication: ORCID ID was added to the 9th author and has been updated in this version]

REFERENCES

Ackerly, D. D. (2003). Community assembly, niche conservatism, and adaptive evolution in changing environments. *International Journal of Plant Sciences*, *164*(S3), S165–S184.

Alcock, J., & Rubenstein, D. R. (1989). *Animal behavior*. Sunderland, MA: Sinauer Associates.

Alroy, J. (2018). Limits to species richness in terrestrial communities. *Ecology Letters*, *21*, 1781–1789. https://doi.org/10.1111/ele.13152

Avise, J. C. (2000). *Phylogeography: The history and formation of species*. London, UK: Harvard University Press.

Belyea, L. R., & Lancaster, J. (1999). Assembly rules within a contingent ecology. *Oikos*, 402–416. https://doi.org/10.2307/3546646

Binggeli, P. (1996). A taxonomic, biogeographical and ecological overview of invasive woody plants. *Journal of Vegetation Science*, *7*, 121–124. https://doi.org/10.2307/3236424

Blois, J. L., Gotelli, N. J., Behrensmeyer, A. K., Faith, J. T., Lyons, S. K., Williams, J. W., … Wing, S. (2014). A framework for evaluating the influence of climate, dispersal limitation, and biotic interactions using fossil pollen associations across the late Quaternary. *Ecography*, *37*, 1095–1108. https://doi.org/10.1111/ecog.00779

Blossey, B., & Notzold, R. (1995). Evolution of increased competitive ability in invasive nonindigenous plants: A hypothesis. *Journal of Ecology*, *83*, 887–889. https://doi.org/10.2307/2261425

Brown, J. H. (1995). *Macroecology*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Brown, J. H., & Maurer, B. A. (1989). Macroecology: The division of food and space among species on continents. *Science*, *243*, 1145–1150. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.243.4895.1145

Bulmer, M. (1994). *Theoretical evolutionary ecology*. Sunderland, MA: Sinauer Associates.

Calatayud, J., Hórreo, J. L., Madrigal-González, J., Migeon, A., Rodríguez, M. Á., Magalhães, S., & Hortal, J. (2016). Geography and major host evolutionary transitions shape the resource use of plant parasites. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences USA*, *113*, 9840–9845. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1608381113

Carroll, S. P., Hendry, A. P., Reznick, D. N., & Fox, C. W. (2007). Evolution on ecological time-scales. *Functional Ecology*, *21*, 387–393. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2435.2007.01289.x

Carroll, S. P., Loye, J. E., Dingle, H., Mathieson, M., Famula, T. R., & Zalucki, M. P. (2005). And the beak shall inherit—Evolution in response to invasion. *Ecology Letters*, *8*, 944–951. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1461-0248.2005.00800.x

Cavender-Bares, J., Ackerly, D., Baum, D., & Bazzaz, F. (2004). Phylogenetic overdispersion in Floridian oak communities. *The American Naturalist*, *163*, 823–843. https://doi.org/10.1086/386375

Cavender-Bares, J., Kozak, K. H., Fine, P. V., & Kembel, S. W. (2009). The merging of community ecology and phylogenetic biology. *Ecology Letters*, *12*, 693–715. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1461-0248.2009.01314.x

Clements, F. E., Weaver, J. E., & Hanson, H. C. (1929). *Plant competition: An analysis of community functions*. Washington, DC: Carnegie Institute of Washington.

Close, R. A., Benson, R. B. J., Alroy, J., Behrensmeyer, A. K., Benito, J., Carrano, M. T., … Butler, R. J. (2019). Diversity dynamics of Phanerozoic terrestrial tetrapods at the local-community scale. *Nature Ecology and Evolution*, *3*, 590–597.

Colwell, R. K., Brehm, G., Cardelús, C. L., Gilman, A. C., & Longino, J. T. (2008). Global warming, elevational range shifts, and lowland biotic attrition in the wet tropics. *Science*, *322*, 258–261. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1162547

Cornell, H. V., & Harrison, S. P. (2014). What are species pools and when are they important? *Annual Review of Ecology, Evolution, and Systematics*, *45*, 45–67. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-ecolsys-120213-091759

Cox, G. W., & Ricklefs, R. E. (1977). Species diversity and ecological release in Caribbean land bird faunas. *Oikos*, 113–122. https://doi.org/10.2307/3543330

Crow, J. F., & Kimura, M. (1970). *An introduction to population genetics theory*. New York, NY: Harper & Row.

Darwin, C. (1859). *On the origin of species*. London, UK: Clows and Sons.

Elton, C. (1927). *Animal ecology*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Emerson, B. C., & Gillespie, R. G. (2008). Phylogenetic analysis of community assembly and structure over space and time. *Trends in Ecology and Evolution*, *23*, 619–630. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tree.2008.07.005

Emmerson, M., & Yearsley, J. M. (2004). Weak interactions, omnivory and emergent food-web properties. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, *271*, 397–405.

Etienne, R. S., & Haegeman, B. (2012). A conceptual and statistical framework for adaptive radiations with a key role for diversity dependence. *The American Naturalist*, *180*, E75–E89. https://doi.org/10.1086/667574

Foote, M. (1997). The evolution of morphological diversity. *Annual Review of Ecology and Systematics*, *28*, 129–152. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.ecolsys.28.1.129

Ford, E. (1971). *Ecological genetics and evolution*. Berlin: Springer.

Fox, C. W., Roff, D. A., & Fairbairn, D. J. (2001). *Evolutionary ecology: Concepts and case studies*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Gaston, K. J., & Blackburn, T. M. (2000). *Pattern and process in macroecology*. Oxford: Blackwell Science Ltd.

Gillespie, R. (2004). Community assembly through adaptive radiation in Hawaiian spiders. *Science*, *303*, 356–359. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1091875

Goergen, E. M., Leger, E. A., & Espeland, E. K. (2011). Native perennial grasses show evolutionary response to *Bromus tectorum* (cheatgrass) invasion. *PLoS ONE*, *6*, e18145. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0018145

Grant, B. R., & Grant, P. R. (1989). *Evolutionary dynamics of a natural population: The large cactus finch of the Galápagos*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Harmon, L. J., & Harrison, S. (2015). Species diversity is dynamic and unbounded at local and continental scales. *The American Naturalist*, *185*, 584–593. https://doi.org/10.1086/680859

Harte, J., Rominger, A., & Zhang, W. (2015). Integrating macroecological metrics and community taxonomic structure. *Ecology Letters*, *18*, 1068–1077. https://doi.org/10.1111/ele.12489

Helmus, M. R., Mahler, D. L., & Losos, J. B. (2014). Island biogeography of the Anthropocene. *Nature*, *513*, 543–546. https://doi.org/10.1038/nature13739

Hendry, A. P. (2016). *Eco-evolutionary dynamics*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Herrera-Alsina, L., van Els, P., & Etienne, R. S. (2018). Detecting the dependence of diversification on multiple traits from phylogenetic trees and trait data. *Systematic Biology*, *68*, 317–328. https://doi.org/10.1093/sysbio/syy057

Hubbell, S. P. (2001). *A unified theory of biodiversity and biogeography*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Hughes, C., & Eastwood, R. (2006). Island radiation on a continental scale: Exceptional rates of plant diversification after uplift of the Andes. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences USA*, *103*, 10334–10339. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.0601928103

Hutchinson, G. E. (1965). *The ecological theater and the evolutionary play*. New Haven, CO: Yale University Press.

Huxley, J., Hardy, A. C., & Ford, E. B. (1954). *Evolution as a process*. George Allen & Unwin.

Jablonski, D., & Raup, D. M. (1995). Selectivity of end-Cretaceous marine bivalve extinctions. *Science*, *268*, 389–391. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.11536722

Jetz, W., & Fine, P. V. A. (2012). Global gradients in vertebrate diversity predicted by historical area-productivity dynamics and contemporary environment. *PLoS ONE*, *10*, e1001292. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pbio.1001292

Keane, R. M., & Crawley, M. J. (2002). Exotic plant invasions and the enemy release hypothesis. *Trends in Ecology and Evolution*, *17*, 164–170. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0169-5347(02)02499-0

Kettlewell, H. B. D. (1955). Selection experiments on industrial melanism in the Lepidoptera. *Heredity*, *9*, 323–342. https://doi.org/10.1038/hdy.1955.36

Krasnov, B. R., Mouillot, D., Shenbrot, G. I., Khokhlova, I. S., Vinarski, M. V., Korallo-Vinarskaya, N. P., & Poulin, R. (2010). Similarity in ectoparasite faunas of Palaearctic rodents as a function of host phylogenetic, geographic or environmental distances: Which matters the most? *International Journal for Parasitology*, *40*, 807–817. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijpara.2009.12.002

Krasnov, B. R., Pilosof, S., Stanko, M., Morand, S., Korallo-Vinarskaya, N. P., Vinarski, M. V., & Poulin, R. (2014). Co-occurrence and phylogenetic distance in communities of mammalian ectoparasites: Limiting similarity versus environmental filtering. *Oikos*, *123*, 63–70. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1600-0706.2013.00646.x

Krehenwinkel, H., & Tautz, D. (2013). Northern range expansion of European populations of the wasp spider *Argiope bruennichi* is associated with global warming–correlated genetic admixture and

population-specific temperature adaptations. *Molecular Ecology*, *22*, 2232–2248.

Lande, R. (1979). Quantitative genetic analysis of multivariate evolution applied to brain: Body size allometry. *Evolution*, *33*, 402–416. https://doi.org/10.2307/2407630

Latham, R. E., & Ricklefs, R. E. (1993). Global patterns of tree species richness in moist forests: Energy-diversity theory does not account for variation in species richness. *Oikos*, *67*(2), 325–333. https://doi.org/10.2307/3545479

Levin, S. A. (1992). The problem of pattern and scale in ecology. *Ecology*, *73*, 1943–1967.

Levins, R. (1968). *Evolution in changing environments*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Losos, J. B. (2010). Adaptive radiation, ecological opportunity, and evolutionary determinism: American Society of Naturalists EO Wilson Award address. *The American Naturalist*, *175*, 623–639.

Losos, J. B. (2011). *Lizards in an evolutionary tree: Ecology and adaptive radiation of anoles*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Lyons, S. K. (2003). A quantitative assessment of range shifts of Pleistocene mammals. *Journal of Mammalogy*, *84*, 385–402.

MacArthur, R. H. (1961). Population effects of natural selection. *The American Naturalist*, *95*, 195–199. https://doi.org/10.1086/282175

MacArthur, R. H. (1962). Some generalized theorems of natural selection. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences USA*, *48*, 1893–1897. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.48.11.1893

MacArthur, R. H. (1969). Patterns of communities in the tropics. *Biological Journal of the Linnean Society*, *1*, 19–30. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1095-8312.1969.tb01809.x

MacArthur, R., & Levins, R. (1964). Competion, habitat selection and character displacement in a patchy environment. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences USA*, *51*, 1207–1210.

MacArthur, R., & Levins, R. (1967). The limiting similarity, convergence, and divergence of coexisting species. *The American Naturalist*, *101*, 377–385. https://doi.org/10.1086/282505

MacArthur, R. H., & Pianka, E. R. (1966). On optimal use of a patchy environment. *The American Naturalist*, *100*, 603–609. https://doi.org/10.1086/282454

MacArthur, R. H., & Wilson, E. O. (1967). *The theory of island biogeography*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Mahler, D. L., Revell, L. J., Glor, R. E., & Losos, J. B. (2010). Ecological opportunity and the rate of morphological evolution in the diversification of Greater Antillean anoles. *Evolution*, *64*, 2731–2745. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1558-5646.2010.01026.x

Makarieva, A. M., & Gorshkov, V. G. (2004). On the dependence of speciation rates on species abundance and characteristic population size. *Journal of Biosciences*, *29*, 119–128. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02702569

Mayfield, M. M., & Levine, J. M. (2010). Opposing effects of competitive exclusion on the phylogenetic structure of communities. *Ecology Letters*, *13*, 1085–1093. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1461-0248.2010.01509.x

McCormack, J. E., Bowen, B. S., & Smith, T. B. (2008). Integrating paleoecology and genetics of bird populations in two sky island archipelagos. *BMC Biology*, *6*, 28. https://doi.org/10.1186/1741-7007-6-28

McCormack, J. E., Huang, H., Knowles, L. L., Gillespie, R., & Clague, D. (2009). Sky islands. *Encyclopedia of Islands*, *4*, 841–843.

McCormack, J. E., Huang, H., Knowles, L. L., Gillespie, R., & Clague, D. (2009). Sky islands. In *Encyclopedia of islands* (Vol. 4, pp. 841–843). Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

McGill, B. J. (2019). The what, how and why of doing macroecology. *Global Ecology and Biogeography*, *28*, 6–17. https://doi.org/10.1111/geb.12855

McGill, B. J., & Brown, J. S. (2007). Evolutionary game theory and adaptive dynamics of continuous traits. *Annual Review of Ecology, Evolution, and Systematics*, *38*, 403–435. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.ecolsys.36.091704.175517

McPeek, M. A. (2017). *Evolutionary community ecology*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Metz, J. A. J., Geritz, S. A. H., Meszena, G., Jacobs, F. J. A., & van Heerwaarden, J. (1996). Adaptive dynamics: A geometrical study of the consequences of nearly faithful reproduction. In S. J. Van Strien & S. M. V. Lunel (Eds.), *Stochastic and spatial structures of dynamical systems* (pp. 183–231). Amsterdam, The Netherlands: KNAW Verhandelingen.

Millenium Ecosystem Assessment. (2005) *Ecosystems and human well-being*. Washington DC: World Resources Insitute.

Mittelbach, G. G., & Schemske, D. W. (2015). Ecological and evolutionary perspectives on community assembly. *Trends in Ecology and Evolution*, *30*, 241–247. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tree.2015.02.008

Moen, D., & Morlon, H. (2014). Why does diversification slow down? *Trends in Ecology and Evolution*, *29*, 190–197. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tree.2014.01.010

Morgan, T. H. (1925). *Evolution and genetics*. Princeton: Princeton University.

Moulton, M. P., & Pimm, S. L. (1983). The introduced Hawaiian avifauna: Biogeographic evidence for competition. *The American Naturalist*, *121*, 669–690. https://doi.org/10.1086/284094

Nosil, P., & Crespi, B. J. (2006). Experimental evidence that predation promotes divergence in adaptive radiation. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences USA*, *103*, 9090–9095. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.0601575103

Nylin, S., Agosta, S., Bensch, S., Boeger, W. A., Braga, M. P., Brooks, D. R., … Janz, N. (2018). Embracing colonizations: A new paradigm for species association dynamics. *Trends in Ecology and Evolution*, *33*, 4–14. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tree.2017.10.005

O'Neill, R. V. (1979). Transmutations across hierarchical levels. In G. S. Innis & R. V. O'Neill (Eds.), *Systems analysis of ecosystems* (pp. 59–78). Fairland, Maryland: International Co-operative Publishign House.

Pantel, J. H., Bohan, D., Calcagno, V., David, P., Duyck, P.-F., Kamenova, S., … Thébault, E. (2017). Chapter six - 14 questions for invasion in ecological networks. *Advances in ecological research*, *56*, 293–340.

Pärtel, M., Zobel, M., Zobel, K., van der Maarel, E., & Partel, M. (1996). The species pool and its relation to species richness: Evidence from Estonian plant communities. *Oikos*, *75*(1), 111–117. https://doi.org/10.2307/3546327

Pearse, I. S., & Altermatt, F. (2013). Predicting novel trophic interactions in a non-native world. *Ecology Letters*, *16*, 1088–1094. https://doi.org/10.1111/ele.12143

Peterson, A. T., Soberón, J., & Sánchez-Cordero, V. (1999, August). Conservatism of ecological niches in evolutionary time. *Science*, *285*, 1265–1267.

Phillimore, A. B., & Price, T. D. (2008). Density-dependent cladogenesis in birds. *PLoS Biology*, *6*, e71. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pbio.0060071

Phillips, B. L., Brown, G. P., Webb, J. K., & Shine, R. (2006). Invasion and the evolution of speed in toads. *Nature*, *439*, 803. https://doi.org/10.1038/439803a

Pianka, E. R. (1966). Latitudinal gradients in species diversity: A review of concepts. *The American Naturalist*, *100*, 33–46. https://doi.org/10.1086/282398

Provine, W. B. (2001). *The origins of theoretical population genetics: With a new afterword*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Rabosky, D. L. (2013). Diversity-dependence, ecological speciation, and the role of competition in macroevolution. *Annual Review of Ecology, Evolution, and Systematics*, *44*, 481–502. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-ecolsys-110512-135800

Rabosky, D. L., & Lovette, I. J. (2008). Density-dependent diversification in North American wood warblers. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, *275*, 2363–2371. https://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2008.0630

Rahbek, C., & Graves, G. R. (2001). Multiscale assessment of patterns of avian species richness. *Proceedings of the National Academy of*

Sciences USA, *98*, 4534–4539. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.07103 4898

Rangel, T. F., Edwards, N. R., Holden, P. B., Diniz-Filho, J. A. F., Gosling, W. D., Coelho, M. T. P., … Colwell, R. K. (2018). Modeling the ecology and evolution of biodiversity: Biogeographical cradles, museums, and graves. *Science*, *361*, eaar5452. https://doi.org/10.1126/scien ce.aar5452

Ricklefs, R. E. (1987). Community diversity: Relative roles of local and regional processes. *Science*, *235*, 167–171. https://doi.org/10.1126/ science.235.4785.167

Ricklefs, R. E. (2007). History and diversity: Explorations at the intersection of ecology and evolution. *The American Naturalist*, *170*, S56–S70. https://doi.org/10.1086/519402

Ricklefs, R. E. (2010). Evolutionary diversification, coevolution between populations and their antagonists, and the filling of niche space. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences USA*, *107*, 1265–1272. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.0913626107

Ricklefs, R. E. (2011). Applying a regional community concept to forest birds of eastern North America. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences USA*, *108*, 2300–2305. https://doi.org/10.1073/ pnas.1018642108

Ricklefs, R. E. (2015). Intrinsic dynamics of the regional community. *Ecology Letters*, *18*, 497–503. https://doi.org/10.1111/ele.12431

Ricklefs, R. E., & Cox, G. W. (1972). Taxon cycles in the West Indian avifauna. *The American Naturalist*, *106*, 195–219. https://doi.org/ 10.1086/282762

Ricklefs, R., & Schluter, D. (1993a). *Species diversity in ecological communities: Historical and geographical perspectives*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Ricklefs, R. E., & Schluter, D. (1993b). Species diversity: Regional and historical influences. In R. E. Ricklefs, & D. Schluter (Eds.), *Species diversity in ecological communities: Historical and geographical perspectives*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Roderick, G. K., & Navajas, M. (2003). Genes in new environments: Genetics and evolution in biological control. *Nature Reviews Genetics*, *4*, 889–899. https://doi.org/10.1038/nrg1201

Roff, D. (2002). *Life history evolution*. Sunderland, MA: Sinauer Associates.

Rominger, A., Overcast, I., Krehenwinkel, H., Gillespie, R., Harte, J., & Hickerson, M. (2017) Linking evolutionary and ecological theory illuminates non-equilibrium biodiversity. arXiv preprint arXiv:1705.04725.

Rosenzweig, M. L. (1978). Competitive speciation. *Biological Journal of the Linnean Society*, *10*, 275–289. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1095-8312.1978.tb00016.x

Rosenzweig, M. L., & McCord, R. D. (1991). Incumbent replacement: Evidence for long-term evolutionary progress. *Paleobiology*, *17*, 202–213. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0094837300010563

Rummel, J. D., & Roughgarden, J. (1985). A theory of faunal buildup for commuities. *Evolution*, *39*, 1009–1033.

Schluter, D. (2000). *The ecology of adaptive radiation*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Schoener, T. W. (2011). The newest synthesis: Understanding the interplay of evolutionary and ecological dynamics. *Science*, *331*, 426–429. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1193954

Sepkoski, J. J. (1978). A kinetic model of Phanerozoic taxonomic diversity I. Analysis of marine orders. *Paleobiology*, *4*, 223–251. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0094837300005972

Shine, R., Brown, G. P., & Phillips, B. L. (2011). An evolutionary process that assembles phenotypes through space rather than through time. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences USA*, *108*, 5708–5711. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1018989108

Slik, J. W. F., Arroyo-Rodríguez, V., Aiba, S.-I., Alvarez-Loayza, P., Alves, L. F., Ashton, P., … Venticinque, E. M. (2015). An estimate of the number of tropical tree species. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences USA*, *112*, 7472–7477. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.14231 47112

Stanley, S. M. (1975). A theory of evolution above the species level. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences USA*, *72*, 646–650. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.72.2.646

Stearns, S. C. (1976). Life-history tactics: A review of the ideas. *The Quarterly Review of Biology*, *51*, 3–47. https://doi.org/10.1086/409052

Stommel, H. (1963). Varieties of oceanographic experience. *Science*, *139*, 572–576.

Stroud, J. T., & Losos, J. B. (2016). Ecological opportunity and adaptive radiation. *Annual Review of Ecology, Evolution, and Systematics*, *47*, 507–532.

Ter Steege, H., Pitman, N. C. A., Sabatier, D., Baraloto, C., Salomao, R. P., Guevara, J. E., … Silman, M. R. (2013). Hyperdominance in the Amazonian tree flora. *Science*, *342*, 1243092. https://doi. org/10.1126/science.1243092

Turbelin, A. J., Malamud, B. D., & Francis, R. A. (2017). Mapping the global state of invasive alien species: Patterns of invasion and policy responses. *Global Ecology and Biogeography*, *26*, 78–92. https://doi. org/10.1111/geb.12517

Vermeij, G. J. (1996). An agenda for invasion biology. *Biological Conservation*, *78*, 3–9. https://doi.org/10.1016/0006-3207(96)00013-4

von Humboldt, A., & Ross, T. (1852). *Personal narrative of travels to the equinoctial regions of America, during the years 1799–1804*. London: H. G. Bohn.

Wagner, C. E., Harmon, L. J., & Seehausen, O. (2014). Cichlid species-area relationships are shaped by adaptive radiations that scale with area. *Ecology Letters*, *17*, 583–592. https://doi.org/10.1111/ele.12260

Webb, C. O., Ackerly, D. D., McPeek, M. A., & Donoghue, M. J. (2002). Phylogenies and community ecology. *Annual Review of Ecology and Systematics*, *33*, 475–505.

Wiens, J. A. (1989). Spatial scaling in ecology. *Functional Ecology*, *3*, 385–397. https://doi.org/10.2307/2389612

Wiens, J. J., & Graham, C. H. (2005). Niche conservatism: Integrating evolution, ecology, and conservation biology. *Annual Review of Ecology, Evolution, and Systematics*, *36*, 519–539.

Willis, A., Memmott, J., & Forrester, R. (2000). Is there evidence for the post-invasion evolution of increased size among invasive plant species? *Ecology Letters*, *3*, 275–283. https://doi.org/10.1046/ j.1461-0248.2000.00149.x

Wilson, E. O. (1961). The nature of the taxon cycle in the Melanesian ant fauna. *The American Naturalist*, *95*, 169–193. https://doi. org/10.1086/282174

Wilson, E., & Bossert, W. (1971). *A primer of population biology*. Sunderland, MA: Sinauer Associates.

Yoshida, T., Jones, L. E., Ellner, S. P., Fussmann, G. F., & Hairston, N. G. Jr. (2003). Rapid evolution drives ecological dynamics in a predator–prey system. *Nature*, *424*, 303–306. https://doi.org/10.1038/natur e01767

How to cite this article: McGill BJ, Chase JM, Hortal J, et al. Unifying macroecology and macroevolution to answer fundamental questions about biodiversity. *Global Ecol Biogeogr.* 2019;28:1925–1936. https://doi.org/10.1111/geb.13020