ARTICLE IN PRESS

Available online at [www.sciencedirect.com](http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/journal/aip/22145745)

ScienceDirect

1 The role of tolerance variation in vulnerability

forecasting of insects

Sarah E Diamond and Aaron R Yilmaz

- 5 Quantifying the amount of climatic change organisms can
- 6 withstand before exceeding their physiological tolerance is a
- 7 cornerstone of vulnerability forecasting. Yet most work in this
- 8 area treats tolerance as a fixed trait. We review recent work that
- 9 quantifies variation in high temperature tolerance across
- 10 bioclimatic gradients, and we explore the implications for
- 11 vulnerability to climate change. For some sources of variation,
- 12 including differences in the evolutionary potential of heat
- 13 tolerance across latitude, the typical biogeographic pattern of
- 14 high vulnerability in the tropics is exacerbated. For other
- 15 sources of variation, including certain types of plastic variation
- 16 in heat tolerance, the biogeographic pattern of high tropical
- 17 vulnerability is diminished. As a consequence, thermal
- 18 tolerance variation should not be ignored in vulnerability
- 19 forecasting.

Address

20 Department of Biology, Case Western Reserve University, Cleveland, 21 OH 44106, USA

Corresponding author: Diamond, Sarah E [\(sarah.diamond@case.edu\)](mailto:sarah.diamond@case.edu)

- 22 Current Opinion in Insect Science 2019, 29:xx–yy
- 23 This review comes from a themed issue on Global change biology
- 24 Edited by Oswald Schmitz and Adam Rosenblatt

25 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cois.2018.07.009>

26 2214-5745/ã 2018 Published by Elsevier Inc.

27 Forecasting vulnerabilities to climate change ²⁸ with tolerance traits

²⁹ Insects provide critical ecosystem services that support ³⁰ biodiversity and human well-being [\[1](#page--1-0)]. However, several

³¹ recent studies point to an alarming rate of decline in ³² insect populations over the last several decades [[2\]](#page--1-0). In

- ³³ some cases, these declines have occurred even within
- ³⁴ protected areas and are not a direct consequence of
- ³⁵ habitat loss [\[3](#page--1-0)], but rather point to the effects of recent ³⁶ climate change. As humans continue to modify the envi-
- ³⁷ ronment, insect declines are likely to increase in the
- ³⁸ future [\[4](#page--1-0)]. The ability to forecast insect declines, with
- ³⁹ respect to species identity and geographic location, is
- ⁴⁰ therefore of paramount importance, as this information
- ⁴¹ that can be used by conservation plannersto help mitigate

insect declines [[5,6](#page--1-0)]. How best to forecast insect ⁴² responses to global change remains an area of active ⁴³ research and debate [[7\]](#page--1-0).

Trait-based approaches have met with considerable suc- ⁴⁵ cess, especially those which examine the relationship ⁴⁶ between temperature change — a hallmark of global 47 change —and thermal physiological traits [[8\]](#page--1-0). However, ⁴⁸ a major shortcoming of these approaches is that they treat 49 the tolerance traits as fixed, when in reality, trait values 50 can shift as individuals remodel their physiology under 51 different environmental conditions within a generation 52 (phenotypic plasticity) or as populations exhibit changes 53 in their mean tolerance across generations (evolutionary 54 change) [9[°]]. Here we review current [biogeographic](#page--1-0) patterns of thermal tolerance in insects, and explore the ⁵⁶ implications of these patterns with respect to insect 57 vulnerability to global climate change. We further con- ⁵⁸ sider how plastic and evolved variation in thermal toler-
59 ance might influence forecasts of vulnerability to global 60 change. 61

Thermal physiology-based measures of $\qquad \qquad \text{{\tiny 62}}$ vulnerability: metrics and patterns $\frac{63}{63}$

Ectothermic species tend to exhibit stereotypical perfor- ⁶⁴ mance responses to temperature, where performance 65 rises from some lower threshold temperature up to a ⁶⁶ thermal optimum, at which performance is greatest, ⁶⁷ before declining sharply until the upper threshold is 68 reached [\[10](#page--1-0)]. The difference between measures of heat 69 tolerance (such as the lethal thermal limit or the critical τ_0 thermal maximum, CT_{max} , which defines the loss of 71 coordinated movement) and environmental temperature 72 are broadly termed 'warming tolerance' and have been 73 used extensively to assess the vulnerability of insects (and 74 closely related arthropods) to global climate change. ⁷⁵ Relatedly, the difference between environmental tem- ⁷⁶ perature and the thermal optimum is called the 'thermal π safety margin' and has been used in a similar manner to $\frac{78}{6}$ estimate how much of a thermal buffer an organism has 79 before becoming vulnerable to climate change 80 $[11, 12, 13, 14, 15$ $[11, 12, 13, 14, 15$ $[11, 12, 13, 14, 15$ ^{**}[,16](#page--1-0)] [\(Figure](#page-1-0) 1, [Box](#page-1-0) 1, [Table](#page--1-0) 1).

The emerging biogeographic picture from the current 82 research is one of increased vulnerability of tropical ⁸³ insects $[16]$ $[16]$. This pattern appears to be driven by species 84 at low latitudes exhibiting narrow thermal tolerance ⁸⁵ breadths (the range between cold and heat tolerance), 86 which places them very close to their thermal optimum 87 and heat tolerance relative to the environmental se

www.sciencedirect.com **Current Opinion in Insect Science** 2018, 29:1–8

COIS 493 1–8

2 Global change biology

Thermal performance curve, indicating cold tolerance (as assessed by the minimum critical temperature for performance, CT_{min}); heat tolerance (as assessed by the maximum critical temperature for performance, CT_{max}); thermal optimum (T_{out} , the temperature at which performance is greatest). Environmental temperature is shown in the dashed line, and vulnerability indices are presented relative to $T_{environment}$: thermal safety margin is the difference between T_{opt} and $T_{environment}$, and warming tolerance is the difference between CT_{max} and Tenvironment.

 temperatures that they currently experience and will experience in the future [[13\]](#page--1-0). Despite the smaller antici- pated magnitude of climate warming at lower compared with higher latitudes, the negative consequences of nar- row thermal tolerance breadths at lower latitudes is suffi- cient to overwhelm the effects of diminished warming [\[11](#page--1-0)]. Higher latitude species are generally less vulnerable to climate change because they have broader ranges of thermal tolerance and are much farther from their thermal optimum and upper thermal tolerance. Yet while these forecasts of vulnerability allow environmental tempera- ture to shift (e.g. by comparing warming tolerance under current and future climates), the tolerance traits are treated as fixed. Below we consider the sources of varia- tion in insect thermal tolerance and how this variation might alter vulnerability assessments. Specifically, we consider intraspecific sources of variation in tolerance including plastic and evolved differences in tolerance across space and time, and then summarize the patterns across different insect species and biogeographic regions, as these are the levels at which warming tolerance anal- yses are typically performed. Of particular interest is whether the consideration of tolerance variation quanti- tatively, or perhaps even qualitatively, alters assessments of vulnerability to climate change as compared with

Box 1 Glossary of terms.

Descriptors of thermal performance and vulnerability

Thermal tolerance – the upper or lower endpoint of performance across a range of environmental temperatures, and a key trait in vulnerability forecasting with organismal physiology

 CT_{max} – the critical thermal maximum, often defined by the (upper) temperature at which coordinated activity is lost; a commonly used measure of heat tolerance, and which forms the basis for many assessments of warming tolerance

 CT_{min} - the critical thermal minimum, often defined by the (lower) temperature at which coordinated activity is lost

 T_{opt} – the optimal temperature at which performance is maximized for a given response, and which forms the basis for assessment of the thermal safety margin

Thermal safety margin — the difference between the thermal optimum and environmental temperature

Warming tolerance — the difference between a measure of heat tolerance and environmental temperature

Microclimate— the climatic conditions nearer to those that organisms inhabit rather than air temperature at a height of 2 m in the shade as is the basis for most warming tolerance assessments, for example, from climatic databases such as WorldClim

Mechanisms underlying variation in thermal tolerance

Plasticity — remodeling of an organism's thermal tolerance within a generation; for example, exposure to a warmer temperature environment which increases the expressed heat tolerance trait value

Evolutionary change — shifts in tolerance trait values across generations; here, we are specifically interested in allele frequency changes over generations, as contrasted with, for example, maternal effects which also manifest across generations

Evolutionary potential — a general term that describes the potential for a trait to evolve based on the amount of additive genetic variation; for example, narrow-sense heritability (the amount of additive genetic variation divided by the total phenotypic variation) is a common measure of evolutionary potential

Genetic accommodation— a process by which unexpressed genetic variation is revealed under novel environments and selection then acting on this variation; an example of the potential interaction between plastic and evolutionary mechanisms that generate variation in tolerance traits under climate change

assessments derived from mean trait values. In the case ¹¹⁴ of such alterations, global to local-scale patterns of vul- ¹¹⁵ nerability based on trait means could be inaccurate, with 116 downstream consequences for conservation planning and 117 management. 118

Ecological and evolutionary sources of 119 variation in tolerance traits **120** 120

The critical importance of variation in tolerance has come 121 into sharper focus over the past several years. A striking 122 example comes from Bush and colleagues $[17]$ $[17]$ —using a 123 species distribution modeling approach which incorpo- ¹²⁴ rated empirical estimates of variability heat tolerance, 125 they found qualitatively different forecasts of vulnerabil- ¹²⁶ ity to climate change compared with models that ¹²⁷ excluded this variation. Specifically, for several of the 128

Current Opinion in Insect Science 2018, 29:1–8 www.sciencedirect.com

Please cite this article in press as: Diamond SE, Yilmaz AR: The role of tolerance variation in vulnerability forecasting of insects, Curr Opin Insect Sci (2018), [https://doi.org/10.1016/j.](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cois.2018.07.009) [cois.2018.07.009](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cois.2018.07.009)

Download English Version:

<https://daneshyari.com/en/article/8878403>

Download Persian Version:

<https://daneshyari.com/article/8878403>

[Daneshyari.com](https://daneshyari.com/)