

Recent Plant Diversity Changes on Europe's Mountain Summits

Harald Pauli,^{1*} Michael Gottfried,^{2†} Stefan Dullinger,^{2,3*} Otari Abdaladze,⁴ Maia Akhalkatsi,⁴ José Luis Benito Alonso,⁵ Gheorghe Coldea,⁶ Jan Dick,⁷ Brigitta Erschbamer,⁸ Rosa Fernández Calzado,⁹ Dany Ghosn,¹⁰ Jarle I. Holten,¹¹ Robert Kanka,¹² George Kazakis,¹⁰ Jozef Kollár,¹² Per Larsson,¹³ Pavel Moiseev,¹⁴ Dmitry Moiseev,¹⁴ Ulf Molau,¹³ Joaquín Molero Mesa,⁹ Laszlo Nagy,^{15,16} Giovanni Pelino,¹⁷ Mihai Puşcaş,¹⁸ Graziano Rossi,¹⁹ Angela Stanisci,¹⁷ Anne O. Syverhuset,¹¹ Jean-Paul Theurillat,^{20,21} Marcello Tomaselli,²² Peter Unterlugauer,⁸ Luis Villar,⁵ Pascal Vittoz,²³ Georg Grabherr¹

In mountainous regions, climate warming is expected to shift species' ranges to higher altitudes. Evidence for such shifts is still mostly from revisitations of historical sites. We present recent (2001 to 2008) changes in vascular plant species richness observed in a standardized monitoring network across Europe's major mountain ranges. Species have moved upslope on average. However, these shifts had opposite effects on the summit floras' species richness in boreal-temperate mountain regions (+3.9 species on average) and Mediterranean mountain regions (−1.4 species), probably because recent climatic trends have decreased the availability of water in the European south. Because Mediterranean mountains are particularly rich in endemic species, a continuation of these trends might shrink the European mountain flora, despite an average increase in summit species richness across the region.

Biodiversity scenarios for the 21st century consistently forecast the reduction of alpine habitat and, ultimately, the regional loss of many European high-mountain plants (1, 2). This process is supposedly driven by a general upward shift of plant species under a warming climate (3), resulting in a concurrent increase of species numbers at higher altitudes

and local extinctions of those plants that already live near the upper margins of elevation gradients (4, 5). However, empirical evidence on recent plant diversity trends in mountain systems is still scarce and is mostly based on resurveys of historical sites (6–9) [but see (10, 11)].

A worldwide observation network (12, 13) was initiated in the year 2000 as a standardized

system to monitor changes in high-mountain biodiversity. As part of this network, vascular plant species occurrence was recorded first in 2001 on 66 mountain summits distributed across 17 study regions, which span all major mountain systems of Europe (Fig. 1). These summits were resurveyed in 2008. Here we compare the data from all summits from both years of observations to show changes in vascular plant species numbers.

Summits were grouped in a set of four within each region, spanning an altitudinal range from the treeline to the alpine/nival ecotone (13, 14), or to the uppermost peaks on lower mountain ranges. The sampling areas covered the summits from their tops down to the 10-m contour line and were divided into eight sections (fig. S1) (13). For each section, a complete list of vascular plants was collected in 2001 and again in 2008. To avoid drawing conclusions from spurious species turnover caused by observation errors, we filtered the data to remove singleton records and potentially misidentified species from the list before analysis (12). Differences in number of species (i.e., the pooled species richness per summit and per region, respectively, between the two sampling dates) were then compared by means of linear mixed-effects models (12).

Between 2001 and 2008, vascular plant species numbers have increased on 45 mountain summits, decreased on 10 summits, and remained unchanged on 11 summits (Fig. 2A and table S1). Across all 66 summits, the average numbers of

¹Institute of Mountain Research, Austrian Academy of Sciences, c/o University of Vienna, 1030 Wien, Austria. ²Faculty Centre of Biodiversity, University of Vienna, 1030 Wien, Austria. ³Vienna Institute for Nature Conservation and Analyses, 1090 Wien, Austria. ⁴Institute of Ecology, Iliia State University, 0162 Tbilisi, Georgia. ⁵Instituto Pirenaico de Ecología, Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, 22700 Jaca, Spain. ⁶Department of Taxonomy and Plant Ecology, Institute of Biological Research, 400015 Cluj-Napoca, Romania. ⁷Centre for Ecology and Hydrology, EH26 0QB Midlothian, Scotland, UK. ⁸University of Innsbruck, 6020 Innsbruck, Austria. ⁹Department of Botany, Faculty of Pharmacy, University of Granada, 18071 Granada, Spain. ¹⁰Department of Environmental Management, Mediterranean Agronomic Institute of Chania, 73100 Chania, Greece. ¹¹Department of Biology, Norwegian University of Science and Technology, 7491 Trondheim, Norway. ¹²Institute of Landscape Ecology of the Slovak Academy of Sciences, 81499 Bratislava, Slovakia. ¹³Department of Plant and Environmental Sciences, University of Göteborg, 40530 Göteborg, Sweden. ¹⁴Institute of Plant and Animal Ecology, Russian Academy of Sciences, 620144 Ekaterinburg, Russia. ¹⁵EcoScience Scotland, G41 4QP Glasgow, Scotland, UK. ¹⁶Instituto Nacional de Pesquisa da Amazonia, Avenida André Araújo, 2936, Manaus, Brazil. ¹⁷Laboratory of Environmetrics, University of Molise, 86090 Pesche (Isernia), Italy. ¹⁸Alexandru Borza Botanical Garden, Babes-Bolyai University, 400015 Cluj-Napoca, Romania. ¹⁹Department of Earth and Environmental Sciences, University of Pavia, 27100 Pavia, Italy. ²⁰Centre Alpin de Phytogéographie, Fondation J.-M. Aubert, 1938 Champex-Lac, Switzerland. ²¹Section of Biology, University of Geneva, 1292 Chambésy, Switzerland. ²²Department of Evolutionary and Functional Biology, University of Parma, 43100 Parma, Italy. ²³Department of Ecology and Evolution, University of Lausanne, 1015 Lausanne, Switzerland.

*These authors contributed equally to this work.

†To whom correspondence should be addressed. E-mail: michael.gottfried@univie.ac.at




Fig. 1. Vascular plant species numbers in the 17 study regions. Blue circles indicate boreal and temperate, red circles indicate Mediterranean regions. Bars show the number of species found in 2001 (left bar) and 2008 (right bar); the proportion of endemic species is shown in red. Species number (endemic number) per region in 2001/in 2008: LAT (N-Scandes/Sweden, 109(0)/118(0)); PUR (Polar Urals/Russia), 58(0)/60(0); DOV (S-Scandes/Norway), 49(1)/50(1); CAI (Cairngorms/UK), 10(0)/14(0); SUR (S-Urals/Russia), 62(9)/62(7); CTA (High Tatra/Slovakia), 53(5)/60(5); HSW (NE-Alps/Austria), 130(27)/134(27); CRO (E-Carpathians/Romania), 33(2)/40(5); ADO (S-Alps/Italy), 158(14)/170(17); VAL (W-Alps/Switzerland), 96(12)/105(12); NAP (N-Apennines/Italy), 123(7)/126(7); CPY (Central Pyrenees/Spain), 87(12)/101(12); CAK (Central Caucasus/Georgia), 113(35)/140(41); CRI (Corsica/France), 20(7)/19(7); CAM (Central Apennines/Italy), 57(13)/57(13); SNE (Sierra Nevada/Spain), 65(39)/60(35); LEO (Lefka Ori-Crete/Greece), 58(22)/54(19). Blue shaded areas indicate the respective maximum distribution of species defined as endemic (12); most endemics have a far more narrow distribution area.

species per summit increased from 34.9 to 37.7; that is, by ~8%, a change that was significantly different from the null hypothesis of constant species richness ($t = 2.9$, $df = 49$, $P = 0.006$). Changes were, however, strikingly divergent among biomes: Most summits in boreal and temperate regions have gained additional species (43 out of 52; average increase from 38.0 to 41.9, $t = 4.0$, $df = 39$, $P = 0.0004$), and only two have lost one species each. In contrast, from the 14 summits in Mediterranean regions, the majority (8) had lower species counts in 2008 than in 2001, and only 2 have gained additional species (average decrease from 23.6 to 22.2, $t = -2.9$, $df = 10$, $P = 0.018$; Fig. 2A).

At the regional scale, observed changes were congruent with summit-level trends: Species richness increased in 12, decreased in 3, and remained constant in 2 regions (Figs. 1 and 2A). On average, species numbers per region were rising from 75.4 to 80.6 ($t = 2.8$, $df = 16$, $P = 0.013$). All 12 regions with higher species richness in the second survey were located in the boreal or temperate zone (mean increase in species numbers from 83.2 to 90.8, $t = 3.82$, $df = 12$, $P = 0.001$), whereas species counts were decreasing in three out of four Mediterranean regions, although this was not statistically significant because of the low sample size (average decrease from 50.0 to 47.5 species, $t = -2.1$, $df = 3$, $P = 0.12$; Fig. 2A).

To evaluate whether these changes in summit species richness might be related to a possible upward or downward move of species ranges, we calculated an altitudinal index for each species within each region in both 2001 and 2008. To compute this index, we first defined the relative altitude of each summit as the altitude above the lowest summit within the region it belongs to. Next, we weighted these relative altitudes by the species' frequencies on the respective summits in either 2001 or 2008. Finally, we calculated the species' altitudinal index for a particular region and monitoring campaign as the weighted average altitude of its distribution observed in the respective region and year (12). For all species recorded in both years, we then compared these altitudinal indices between 2001 and 2008 using linear mixed-effects models. The results suggest that species were indeed shifting their distributions to higher altitudes, by 2.7 m on average (Table 1). This is in line with a recent related study that found evidence that the more-warm-adapted species increase and the cold-adapted ones decline in European alpine summit vegetation (15). A general upward shift, as indicated in our study, is consistent across the continent's biomes (Table 1). An overall upward move of species hence seems to be compatible with both an average increase and a decrease of summit plant richness.

Parallel relationships between the magnitude of the observed changes and the relative altitude of the summits within one region (that is, its altitudinal difference from the region's lowest summit site) offer a clue for interpreting this

unexpected finding: Both gains (in the boreal-temperate regions) and losses (in the Mediterranean regions) were more pronounced on the lower summits (Fig. 2B). This suggests that upward shifts of plants are mostly driven by leading-edge expansions on boreal-to-temperate mountains, with the higher number of new arrivals on the lower peaks probably resulting from larger nearby pools of potential invaders. In contrast, rear-edge retractions seem to make an important contribution to altitudinal species shifts in the Mediterranean.

We hypothesize that the range expansion in the boreal-to-temperate mountains is a result of warmer conditions, such as previously observed (7, 9, 16), whereas range retractions in the Mediterranean mountain ranges result from a combination of rising summer temperatures and stable-to-decreasing precipitation sums, such as was recently documented for southern Europe for the past decades (17–19). As a corollary, a possible attenuation of low-temperature constraints on Europe's Mediterranean mountains is

probably foiled by rising water stress, and particularly so at the lowest summits, because aridity generally decreases with altitude in the Mediterranean basin (20). In line with this interpretation, Crimmins *et al.* (21) have recently suggested rapid responses of Californian Mediterranean-type mountain plants to changing climatic water balance, although in the opposite direction; i.e., a downward shift of species' optimum elevations through increasing water availability. Yet McCain and Colwell (22) suggested in a global study, albeit on vertebrates, that population extirpation risks in mountain areas due to climate warming would increase 10-fold, on average, when decreases in precipitation were also considered.

Species losses on Mediterranean summits are worrying because southern European mountain floras have high proportions of endemic plants (12, 23) (Fig. 1). Indeed, there were 31% endemics among the species not redetected on those summits where they were recorded in 2001 (17 out of 55 species), but only 13%




Fig. 2. Changes in vascular plant species numbers on 66 European summits between the years 2001 and 2008. **(A)** Summits within 13 boreal-temperate (blue) and 4 Mediterranean (red) mountain regions are arranged from north to south, and from high to low altitude within regions. Triangles represent the increase (solid symbols) or decrease (open symbols) of observed species numbers per summit; horizontal lines represent the changes in species numbers per region. Summits where species numbers did not change are symbolized by open circles. Region-scale changes were calculated after pooling species lists of all the summits surveyed within the respective region; that is, each species was counted only once per region and observation year. For full region names, see Fig. 1. **(B)** Summits are arranged along the x axis according to their relative altitudes within regions, with a value of zero for the lowest summit in the respective region. Lines are drawn based on the fixed-effect coefficients of linear mixed-effects models, regressing the change in species number per summit on this summit's relative altitude. The slope coefficients are significantly different from zero in both cases (boreal-temperate summits: -0.006 , $t = -3.3$, $df = 38$, $P = 0.002$; Mediterranean summits: 0.005 , $t = 2.5$, $df = 9$, $P = 0.034$).

Table 1. Change in the species' altitudinal distribution between 2001 and 2008. Coefficients measure the average shift of the species' altitudinal index between 2001 and 2008 (in meters). SE, df, t , and P are the standard errors of the coefficients, the degrees of freedom, the t values of the coefficient given the specified degrees of freedom, and the associated two-sided P values.

	Coefficient (m)	SE	df	t	P
All summits	2.7	1.10	1246	2.5	0.012
Boreal and temperate and boreal	2.7	1.23	1060	2.2	0.028
Mediterranean	2.5	1.1	185	2.3	0.024

among the species first detected on a particular summit in 2008 (32 out of 239; test on proportional equality: $X^2 = 8.7$, $df = 1$, $P = 0.003$). This does not imply that mountain endemics are intrinsically more threatened by a warming climate, but follows from simultaneous species loss in areas rich in endemics (the Mediterranean) and species gains in areas where endemics are rarer (boreal and temperate mountains). In total, the number of species recorded across all 66 summits increased from 821 to 869 species (by ~6%), whereas the number of endemics increased at a much lower rate, from 201 to 203 species (by ~1%). Overall, the proportion of endemics within our sample of Europe's summit flora decreased from 24.5 to 23.4%. Although this decrease is not significant yet (test on proportional equality: $X^2 = 0.24$, $df = 1$, $P = 0.63$), it would become so after 25 years if average annual rates of species gains remain constant for both endemic plants (~0.25 species/year) and nonendemic plants (~5.75 species/year). In the long run, such a decrease in the share of endemics will tend to homogenize the species composition of mountaintop communities across regions.

Our observations match the general expectation of a climate warming-driven upward shift of species distributions (2, 3, 14, 15, 24). However, they show that these upward shifts do not necessarily result in higher species richness on mountaintops. If rising aridity is actually the driver of observed species loss on many Mediterranean summits, this trend is likely to continue during the coming decades, because climate models predict increasing temperatures, decreasing annual precipitation, and an extension of the dry summer season in southern Europe (25–27). Owing to the high degree of endemism

in these regions, the species pool of the continent's mountain flora might shrink even if local diversity on the majority of boreal and temperate mountaintops increases.

References and Notes

1. W. Thuiller, S. Lavorel, M. B. Araújo, M. T. Sykes, I. C. Prentice, *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.* **102**, 8245 (2005).
2. R. Engler *et al.*, *Glob. Change Biol.* **17**, 2330 (2011).
3. I. C. Chen, J. K. Hill, R. Ohlemüller, D. B. Roy, C. D. Thomas, *Science* **333**, 1024 (2011).
4. J.-P. Theurillat, A. Guisan, *Clim. Change* **50**, 77 (2001).
5. R. K. Colwell, G. Brehm, C. L. Cardelús, A. C. Gilman, J. T. Longino, *Science* **322**, 258 (2008).
6. G. Grabherr, M. Gottfried, H. Pauli, *Nature* **369**, 448 (1994).
7. K. Kländerud, H. J. B. Birks, *Holocene* **13**, 1 (2003).
8. A. E. Kelly, M. L. Goulden, *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.* **105**, 11823 (2008).
9. P. Vittoz, J. Bodin, S. Ungriht, C. Burga, G. R. Walther, *J. Veg. Sci.* **19**, 671 (2008).
10. H. Pauli, M. Gottfried, K. Reiter, C. Klettner, G. Grabherr, *Glob. Change Biol.* **13**, 147 (2007).
11. K. J. Feeley *et al.*, *J. Biogeogr.* **38**, 783 (2011).
12. Materials and methods are available as supplementary materials on Science Online.
13. H. Pauli *et al.*, *The GLORIA Field Manual—Multi-Summit Approach* (Office for Official Publications of the European Communities, Luxembourg, 2004).
14. M. Gottfried *et al.*, *Environ. Res. Lett.* **6**, 014013 (2011).
15. M. Gottfried *et al.*, *Nat. Clim. Change* **2**, 111 (2012).
16. G.-R. Walther, S. Beißner, C. A. Burga, *J. Veg. Sci.* **16**, 541 (2005).
17. A. Mariotti *et al.*, *Environ. Res. Lett.* **3**, 044001 (2008).
18. S. del Río, L. Herrero, R. Fraile, A. Penas, *Int. J. Climatol.* **31**, 656 (2011).
19. A. Toreti, G. Fioravanti, W. Perconti, F. Desiato, *Int. J. Climatol.* **29**, 1976 (2009).
20. H. Walter, S. W. Breckle, *Spezielle Ökologie der Gemäßigten und Arktischen Zonen Ausserhalb Euro-Nordasiens* (Gustav Fischer Verlag, Stuttgart, Germany, 1991).

21. S. M. Crippins, S. Z. Dobrowski, J. A. Greenberg, J. T. Abatzoglou, A. R. Mynsberge, *Science* **331**, 324 (2011).
22. C. M. McCain, R. K. Colwell, *Ecol. Lett.* **14**, 1236 (2011).
23. L. Nagy, G. Grabherr, C. Körner, D. B. A. Thompson, *Alpine Biodiversity in Europe* (Springer, Berlin, 2003), vol. 167.
24. C. M. Van de Ven, S. B. Weiss, W. G. Ernst, *Earth Interact.* **11**, 1 (2007).
25. J. H. Christensen *et al.*, in *Climate Change 2007: The Physical Science Basis. Contribution of Working Group I to the Fourth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change*, S. Solomon *et al.*, Eds. (Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, 2007), pp. 847–940.
26. D. Nogués Bravo, M. B. Araújo, T. Lasanta, J. I. López Moreno, *Ambio* **37**, 280 (2008).
27. B. Benito, J. Lorite, J. Penas, *Clim. Change* **108**, 471 (2011).

Acknowledgments: Baseline data were collected within the European Union FP-5 project GLORIA-Europe (EVK2-CT-2000-0006) and with the support of Switzerland (OFES 00.0184-1). Resurvey was supported by the Swiss MAVA Foundation for Nature Conservation and by a number of national funding agencies, and analysis was supported by the Austrian Federal Ministry of Science and Research; the Austrian Academy of Sciences (Institute of Mountain Research); and the University of Vienna, where data are archived in the central GLORIA database and are available from the authors upon request. We thank the European Topic Centre on Biological Diversity for ambitious discussions in the early stage, C. Klettner for data compilation, S. Laimer for administration assistance, 17 GLORIA-Europe field teams with more than 80 fieldworkers for species recording, and protected-area authorities for logistic support. We also thank three anonymous referees for their valuable comments and suggestions.

Supplementary Materials

www.sciencemag.org/cgi/content/full/336/6079/353/DC1
Materials and Methods
Figs. S1 and S2
Tables S1 to S4
References (28–32)

12 January 2012; accepted 15 March 2012
10.1126/science.1219033

A Yeast Prion, Mod5, Promotes Acquired Drug Resistance and Cell Survival Under Environmental Stress

Genjiro Suzuki, Naoyuki Shimazu, Motomasa Tanaka*

Prion conversion from a soluble protein to an aggregated state may be involved in the cellular adaptation of yeast to the environment. However, it remains unclear whether and how cells actively use prion conversion to acquire a fitness advantage in response to environmental stress. We identified Mod5, a yeast transfer RNA isopentenyltransferase lacking glutamine/asparagine-rich domains, as a yeast prion protein and found that its prion conversion in yeast regulated the sterol biosynthetic pathway for acquired cellular resistance against antifungal agents. Furthermore, selective pressure by antifungal drugs on yeast facilitated the de novo appearance of Mod5 prion states for cell survival. Thus, phenotypic changes caused by active prion conversion under environmental selection may contribute to cellular adaptation in living organisms.

Prion phenomena have been observed in yeast and filamentous fungi (1, 2), and fungal prion proteins share common char-

acteristics with mammalian prion protein. Prion inheritance is caused by the propagation of self-perpetuating and infectious prion particles com-

posed of β sheet-rich fibrillar aggregates called amyloid (3–5). All of the yeast prion proteins identified thus far contain aggregation-prone Gln/Asn-rich domains that are critical for the formation of self-propagating amyloid. A number of Gln/Asn-rich proteins in yeast have the potential to behave as prions (6), implying that yeast might use prion conversion to regulate some cellular functions in vivo. Prion states acquire previously unrecognized genetic traits (7, 8) and affect cellular functions such as transcriptional regulation (3, 9), though they may represent disease states (4). Induction of the prion state [PSI^+] resulting from aggregation of Sup35 may be linked to a survival advantage under the selective pressure of environmental stressors (10), suggesting that prion conversion might help an organism adapt to environmental stress (11).

Laboratory for Protein Conformation Diseases, RIKEN Brain Science Institute, 2-1 Hirosawa, Wako, Saitama 351-0198, Japan.

*To whom correspondence should be addressed. E-mail: motomasa@brain.riken.jp