

1 **What is an urban bird? Trait-based predictions of urban tolerance for the**  
2 **world's birds are modulated by latitude and human population density**

3 Montague H. C. Neate-Clegg\*<sup>1</sup>, Benjamin A. Tonelli<sup>1</sup>, Casey Youngflesh<sup>1,2</sup>, Joanna X. Wu<sup>1</sup>, Graham A.  
4 Montgomery<sup>1</sup>, Çağan H. Şekercioğlu<sup>3,4</sup>, and Morgan W. Tingley<sup>1</sup>

5

6 <sup>1</sup>Ecology and Evolutionary Biology, University of California, Los Angeles, CA 90095, USA

7 <sup>2</sup>Ecology, Evolution, and Behavior Program, Michigan State University, East Lansing, MI 48824, USA

8 <sup>3</sup>School of Biological Sciences, University of Utah, Salt Lake City, UT 84112, USA

9 <sup>4</sup>Faculty of Sciences, Koç University, Rumelifeneri, Istanbul, Sarıyer, Turkey

10

11 \*Corresponding author: [monteneateclegg@gmail.com](mailto:monteneateclegg@gmail.com)

12

13 Word count: main text – 6302; excluding methods – 3485

14 Number of figures: 5

15 Number of tables: 1

16 Number of references: 88

17

18 **Keywords:** body mass, citizen science, clutch size, diet breadth, dispersal ability, eBird, habitat breadth,

19 longevity, NDVI, nest type

**20 Abstract**

21 As human density increases, biodiversity must increasingly co-exist with urbanization or face local  
22 extinction. Tolerance of urban areas has been linked to numerous functional traits, yet few globally-  
23 consistent patterns have emerged to explain variation in urban tolerance, which stymies attempts at a  
24 generalizable predictive framework. Here, we calculate an Urban Association Index (UAI) for 3768 bird  
25 species in 137 cities across all permanently inhabited continents. We then assess how UAI varies as a  
26 function of ten species-specific traits and further test whether the strength of trait relationships vary as  
27 a function of three city-specific variables. Of the ten species traits, nine were significantly associated  
28 with urban tolerance. Urban-associated species tend to be smaller, less territorial, have greater dispersal  
29 ability, broader dietary and habitat niches, larger clutch sizes, greater longevity, and have lower  
30 elevational limits. Only bill shape showed no global association with urban tolerance. Additionally, the  
31 strength of several trait relationships varied across cities as a function of latitude and/or human  
32 population density. For example, the effects of body mass and diet breadth are more pronounced at  
33 higher latitudes, while the effects of territoriality and longevity were reduced in cities with higher  
34 population density. Thus, the importance of trait filters in birds varies predictably across cities,  
35 indicating biogeographic variation in selection for urban tolerance that could explain prior challenges in  
36 the search for global patterns. A globally-informed framework that predicts urban tolerance will be  
37 integral to conservation as increasing proportions of the world's biodiversity are impacted by  
38 urbanization.

## 39 Introduction

40 Urbanization is one of the greatest threats to biodiversity (McDonald *et al.* 2008; McKinney 2008;  
41 McDonald *et al.* 2020). By 2030, an expected 5.2 billion people will live in urban areas alone (United  
42 Nations 2018) and urban land cover is predicted to exceed 1.2 million km<sup>2</sup> globally (Seto *et al.* 2012).  
43 Urbanization is accompanied by a consistent loss of biodiversity (Aronson *et al.* 2014; Evans *et al.* 2018;  
44 de Camargo Barbosa *et al.* 2020), including reduced phylogenetic (Morelli *et al.* 2016; Sol *et al.* 2017)  
45 and functional diversity (Lizée *et al.* 2011; Evans *et al.* 2018; Palacio *et al.* 2018), resulting in more  
46 homogenized wildlife communities. Despite these overall losses, cities can still harbor substantial  
47 biodiversity (Spotswood *et al.* 2021), including threatened species (Ives *et al.* 2016), with several factors  
48 contributing to an increase in species richness within urban areas. For example, biodiversity can be  
49 bolstered by green space (Beninde *et al.* 2015; Callaghan *et al.* 2018; Fidino *et al.* 2021), greater habitat  
50 heterogeneity (Oliveira Hagen *et al.* 2017; Souza *et al.* 2019), higher tree cover (Threlfall *et al.* 2016; De  
51 Castro Pena *et al.* 2017; Planillo *et al.* 2021), or reduced housing density (Fontana *et al.* 2011; Fidino *et*  
52 *al.* 2021). Within these species pools, some species – often termed urban adapters, urban exploiters, or  
53 urban-tolerant species – generally succeed in cities where others do not (Spotswood *et al.* 2021). The  
54 relative tolerance of species to urbanization can result from shared evolutionary history (Iglesias-  
55 Carrasco *et al.* 2022) and is often linked to functional traits. For example, in Australian birds, urban  
56 adapters show diet generalization, bigger brains and larger clutch sizes (Callaghan *et al.* 2019). Although  
57 many such traits have been suggested or regionally evaluated, what remains untested is whether the  
58 traits that confer urban tolerance in species differ across the cities and biogeographic contexts of the  
59 world. With recently-available global data on occurrence (Sullivan *et al.* 2009) and species trait (e.g.,  
60 AVONET, Tobias *et al.* 2022), birds are an ideal system to explore this question.

61 Several ecological traits have been linked with urban association in birds (McClure 1989; Sol *et*  
62 *al.* 2014; Callaghan *et al.* 2019). For example, urban tolerance is often positively associated with niche

63 breadth (Bonier *et al.* 2007; Evans *et al.* 2011), including dietary (Crocì *et al.* 2008; Lizée *et al.* 2011;  
64 Morelli *et al.* 2016) and habitat breadth (Ducatez *et al.* 2018; Callaghan *et al.* 2019; Sayol *et al.* 2020).  
65 The degree of sociality also plays a role, with urban-tolerant species tending to be more social (Kark *et*  
66 *al.* 2007; Crocì *et al.* 2008; Sol *et al.* 2014). In addition, nest placement is important, with ground nesters  
67 often avoiding urban areas (Conole & Kirkpatrick 2011; Evans *et al.* 2011; Sol *et al.* 2014; Dale *et al.*  
68 2015; Guetté *et al.* 2017) while tree nesters tend to persist in cities (Conole & Kirkpatrick 2011; Dale *et*  
69 *al.* 2015). Yet, despite some general trends, the importance of certain traits often varies between  
70 studies. For example, although urban-associated species tend to have larger clutch sizes (Møller 2009;  
71 Lizée *et al.* 2011; Callaghan *et al.* 2019), this pattern is not always supported (Crocì *et al.* 2008;  
72 Chamberlain *et al.* 2009), and may be mediated by other life-history traits (Sayol *et al.* 2020). Similarly,  
73 the role of body size has also received mixed support, with urban tolerance positively associated with  
74 body mass in Australia (Callaghan *et al.* 2019), but showing no relationship globally (Sol *et al.* 2017).  
75 Longevity or lifespan has seldom received strong support in models (Crocì *et al.* 2008; Guetté *et al.*  
76 2017), while cavity nesters show mixed responses to urban areas (Conole & Kirkpatrick 2011; Lizée *et al.*  
77 2011; Dale *et al.* 2015; Jokimäki *et al.* 2016; Evans *et al.* 2018). Finally, although dispersal ability has  
78 been linked to urban tolerance (Møller 2009), migratory strategy is rarely associated with urban  
79 tolerance (Evans *et al.* 2011, 2018; Dale *et al.* 2015; Jokimäki *et al.* 2016; Guetté *et al.* 2017; Callaghan *et*  
80 *al.* 2019; Sayol *et al.* 2020).

81         The lack of generality in previous work may arise for multiple reasons. Many studies sample only  
82 a subset of biogeographic regions and/or species. Variation in the importance of traits may be driven by  
83 differences in species pools or by context-dependent differences in filters between different landscapes  
84 (Aronson *et al.* 2016; Oliveira Hagen *et al.* 2017). It thus seems likely that results should differ between  
85 biomes due to differences in climate and biogeographic history (Morelli *et al.* 2016; Leveau *et al.* 2017;  
86 Filloy *et al.* 2019). Yet, even studies that have taken a global perspective have been biased in their

87 sampling towards North America, Europe, and Australia, with a distinct lack of data from the tropics  
88 (Magle *et al.* 2012; Sol *et al.* 2014; Sayol *et al.* 2020). Moreover, the number of species in global trait  
89 studies has also been limited, with the largest sample size (629 species by Sayol *et al.* 2020))  
90 representing only ~6% of bird species found globally. Previous studies have been restricted by the lack  
91 of bird occurrence data across urbanization gradients, particularly in the tropics (Magle *et al.* 2012), but  
92 also by access to global trait datasets that have only recently become available.

93         Here, we combine global data on occurrence (>125 million records) from the citizen science  
94 project eBird (Sullivan *et al.* 2009) with a continuous measure of urbanization (night-time lights) to  
95 calculate an Urban Association Index (UAI) for 3768 bird species (~35% of extant bird species) in 137  
96 cities across six continents and 11 biomes. We chose ten species-specific functional traits with globally  
97 available data and hypothesized links to urban tolerance, and modeled UAI values as a function of these  
98 traits. We further chose three city-specific landscape variables that we predicted would influence the  
99 importance of our traits for urban tolerance (Oliveira Hagen *et al.* 2017), assessing whether the effects  
100 of each trait varied as a function of latitude, human population density, and landscape greenness. We  
101 present the first evidence that the importance of different traits for urban tolerance varies predictably  
102 across the planet.

103

## 104 **Methods**

### 105 *Data filtering*

106 We downloaded the global eBird basic dataset (Sullivan *et al.* 2009) including all records up until  
107 February, 2022 (v1.14). We restricted the dataset to the years 2002–2021 – the 20 complete years  
108 before present. We then limited eBird protocol types to “traveling”, “stationary”, and “area” and  
109 removed incomplete checklists. Following eBird best practices (Johnston *et al.* 2021), we removed

110 checklists with >10 observers, with durations >5 hr, with distances >5 km (for “traveling” protocol), and  
111 with areas >500 ha (for “area” protocol). For group checklists involving duplicate records, we randomly  
112 retained one checklist per group. Finally, we removed records that were not identified to species level,  
113 including all hybrids, intergrades, “slashes” (e.g., “Greater/Lesser Yellowlegs”), indefinite species (e.g.,  
114 “hummingbird sp.”), and domestics. Although many of the species in our dataset are introduced in some  
115 cities, they are native in others, so we did not remove or classify species based on being exotic (e.g.,  
116 *Passer domesticus*, *Sturnus vulgaris*). We made a single exception to these exclusions, retaining the  
117 widespread and ubiquitous Feral (Rock) Pigeon (*Columba livia*) despite having been domesticated as it is  
118 a key avian species in many cities. Initially we considered including all species found in cities but  
119 restricted our dataset to exclude water birds (~15% of the species set) since they have substantially  
120 different natural histories and traits compared to land birds, following Callaghan et al. (2019).

#### 121 *City selection*

122 From the data repository OpenDataSoft, we downloaded the dataset “Geonames – All Cities with a  
123 population > 1000” (OpenDataSoft 2022), and reduced the dataset down to cities with a population  
124 >100,000, yielding 4643 cities. We chose this relatively low population cut-off to include smaller, remote  
125 cities in ecologically distinct regions – including Darwin (Australia), Port Louis (Mauritius), and Reykjavík  
126 (Iceland). We then calculated the pairwise distance between every city using the package *geodist*  
127 (Padgham & Sumner 2019). Starting with the cities with the largest populations, we sequentially  
128 removed all smaller cities within 500 km of the larger city in order to produce a set of non-overlapping,  
129 spatially-independent cities. This algorithm retained 289 cities separated by at least 500 km (Fig. S1).  
130 After identification of these target urban areas around the world, we filtered the eBird dataset to  
131 checklists within a 100 km radius of each city center. This radius was chosen to include the whole  
132 metropolitan area as well as surrounding habitats that might supplement the species pool. For each city  
133 dataset (hereafter “city”), we removed species with <100 records, as well as species that comprised

134 <0.01% of all occurrences per city. The first filter ensured a minimum data requirement while the second  
135 filter was a threshold intended to filter out vagrant species while retaining scarce but expected species.  
136 As some cities lacked 100 records for even one species, we removed any city with <50 species remaining  
137 after restricting species to  $\geq 100$  records, such that all remaining cities had  $\geq 5000$  bird records. This 50-  
138 species threshold was chosen in order to remove cities that contained only a handful of species that  
139 would tend to be more urban associated (high UAIs), but to retain cities in environments with low  
140 species richness (e.g., boreal regions) that would have been removed if the threshold was 100 species.  
141 Our final dataset contained 16,455 UAI estimates representing 127,046,578 eBird occurrence records of  
142 3768 species across 137 cities (Fig. 1a).

#### 143 *Urbanization association index (UAI)*

144 To quantify species' relationships with urban areas we aimed to create a continuous metric of urban  
145 association that would avoid the assumptions of using arbitrary thresholds to categorize species based  
146 on urban tolerance (Callaghan *et al.* 2019; Fanelli *et al.* 2022). Following Callaghan *et al.* (2019), we  
147 downloaded the VIIRS night-time lights imagery (Annual VNL V1; Elvidge *et al.* 2017), a composite global  
148 image of night-time lights for the year 2016. Although 2016 is not the mid-point of the eBird data  
149 (2012), the number of eBird records has increased exponentially so 2016 is close to the mean year of all  
150 checklists (2017). We chose light radiance as a proxy for urbanization because it is available as a  
151 continuous measure across the world, it is a close proxy for human population density (Elvidge *et al.*  
152 2017), and, when combined with eBird data, it is correlated with other measures of urban tolerance in  
153 birds (Callaghan *et al.* 2021). From this imagery, we extracted the radiance value for every eBird  
154 checklist locality. As these radiance values start at 0 (total darkness) and increase exponentially, we  
155 added 1 then log-transformed all radiance values to reduce the leverage of extremely bright buildings.  
156 Then, for every species within each city, we calculated the mean radiance value of all occurrence  
157 records. We chose to use the mean instead of the median because we found that many species had a

158 median radiance of 0, as they occurred predominantly in non-urban areas. Moreover, the distribution of  
159 mean radiance values was fairly normal (Fig. S2), while the distribution of median radiance values was  
160 heavily right skewed. We also tested our chosen metric for sensitivity to mismatches in scale between  
161 the spatial resolution of VIIRS and checklists (Supporting Information) but decided to retain the metric  
162 as described. Thus, our Urban Association Index (UAI) for each species is the mean of the transformed  
163 radiance values across eBird records where the radiance value of each record is taken from a single pixel  
164 of night-time lights.

### 165 *Species traits*

166 We chose species-specific functional traits that have been linked to urban tolerance in the past and/or  
167 traits that we hypothesized would predict urban tolerance that have not been tested globally. We chose  
168 traits that were available for the entire species set and, where possible, we chose numerical (rather than  
169 categorical) traits in order to reduce the number of parameters estimated. We therefore did not use  
170 traits such as residual brain size where data does not exist for all species (Sayol *et al.* 2020) and excluded  
171 categorical traits with many levels, such as primary diet. Traits for every species were then extracted  
172 from several datasets, as follows (Table 1).

173 From the publicly available AVONET (Tobias *et al.* 2022) we extracted body mass, four bill  
174 measurements (length from culmen, length from nares, width, and depth), and hand-wing index (HWI).  
175 These data were complete for all species. To reduce the four bill measurements down to a single axis,  
176 we conducted a PCA on the variables and extracted the second principal component, ignoring the first  
177 principal component, which is highly correlated with body size (Pigot *et al.* 2020). This second principal  
178 component – which we refer to as “bill shape” – represents a spectrum from long, thin, pointy bills (e.g.,  
179 *Ensifera ensifera*) to short, thick bills (e.g., *Callocephalon fimbriatum*), a spectrum associated with  
180 foraging specializations (Pigot *et al.* 2020). As a measure of dispersal ability, HWI has not been tested as



181 a global predictor of urban tolerance but is highly correlated with several ecological factors, including  
182 primary diet and habitat type (Sheard *et al.* 2020).

183 From the dataset BirdBase (Şekercioğlu *et al.* 2004; Buechley *et al.* 2019) we extracted diet  
184 breadth, habitat breadth, lower elevational limit, clutch size, and nest shape/substrate. Diet breadth is  
185 the number of major food groups (1–9) that a species eats (e.g., invertebrates, fruit, seeds) while habitat  
186 breadth (1–11) is the number of major habitats where a species is found (e.g., forest, grasslands,  
187 desert). Lower elevational limit was included because we hypothesized that cities – which tend to be  
188 found non-randomly at lower elevations (Luck 2007) – would favor species that occur at lower  
189 elevations. Nest shape and nest substrate were originally sourced as two separate data columns, but we  
190 collapsed these into one. As there was no way to define these nests numerically by shape and substrate,  
191 we instead defined four categories: ground (nests of any form located on the ground), cavity (nests  
192 above ground in cavities or crevices), open (nests above ground with open tops such as cups, saucers,  
193 and platforms), and enclosed (nests above ground with entrance holes such as spheres, pendants, and  
194 domes). Clutch size data were augmented with data from an existing published dataset (Myhrvold *et al.*  
195 2015), while further gaps in BirdBase variables were filled using the online database Birds of the World  
196 (Billerman *et al.* 2020). Where information was lacking for a species, missing values were inferred from  
197 close extant relatives with complete data. Finally, longevity (a measure of lifespan) and territoriality (a  
198 scale from 1 to 3 where 3 is more territorial) were extracted from published datasets (Tobias *et al.* 2016;  
199 Bird *et al.* 2020). Once assembled, we had complete data for ten functional traits (Table 1).

200 Trait variables were transformed, as necessary, prior to analysis. Given expected non-linear  
201 relationships, we took the log of body mass, longevity, and clutch size. We then scaled and centered all  
202 numerical traits to have a mean of 0 and a standard deviation of 1.

203 *City variables*

204 For each 100 km-radius city circle we gathered data on three covariates that we hypothesized would  
205 alter the importance of traits: latitude, greenness, and population density. We chose numerical  
206 covariates in order to reduce the number of parameters, as each new city covariate adds nine  
207 parameters (one for each numerical trait) to the model. However, combined, latitude and greenness  
208 cover much of the variation among biomes (Fig. 1b).

209 Many factors vary with latitude including climate, species richness, and human development, so  
210 there are many possible avenues through which latitude could affect urban tolerance. For example, the  
211 stability of tropical climate and ecosystems (Janzen 1967) may mean stronger filters in urban areas  
212 against ecological specialists in the tropics compared to temperate regions (Newbold *et al.* 2013). We  
213 extracted the latitude of each city from the same Geonames dataset as the city populations.

214 The amount of greenness in a city – whether tree cover or vegetation diversity – is an important  
215 predictor of bird diversity in cities (Beninde *et al.* 2015; Threlfall *et al.* 2016; De Castro Pena *et al.* 2017;  
216 Callaghan *et al.* 2018; Souza *et al.* 2019; Planillo *et al.* 2021). Moreover, overall greenness of the  
217 landscape depends on the primary habitat. For example, desert cities such as Phoenix (USA) and Dubai  
218 (UAE) are greener than the surrounding landscape while forest cities such as Iquitos (Peru) and Nashville  
219 (USA) are less green than the surroundings. We thus hypothesized that the amount of greenery would  
220 also alter trait filters (Oliveira Hagen *et al.* 2017). For example, less green landscapes with fewer  
221 resources may select for habitat generalists or more mobile species. We used NDVI as a measure of the  
222 greenness of each city, derived from the MOD13A3 product (Didan 2021). This product provides 1km  
223 monthly NDVI values globally, excluding water bodies. We calculated the mean NDVI values within the  
224 100 km buffer of each city for each month for the year 2021, and retained the maximum NDVI value. We  
225 used the maximum NDVI value as each city has a different seasonal cycle over which greenness is likely  
226 to vary (i.e., greenness peaks in some cities in August, while in January in others).

227 Human population density has been linked to taxonomic and functional diversity in cities  
 228 (Fontana *et al.* 2011; Oliveira Hagen *et al.* 2017). We hypothesized that cities with higher population  
 229 densities may present strong selection pressures against species that are, for example, larger with  
 230 narrower diets. To obtain population density (number of people/cell), we downloaded Gridded  
 231 Population of the World data from the Center for International Earth Science Information Network  
 232 (CIESIN 2018). The data are available on 5-year intervals between 2000–2020. We used 30 arc-second  
 233 resolution population size for the year 2015 as the year closest to the VIIRS imagery and the mean year  
 234 of eBird records. We buffered city midpoints by 100 km and extracted the mean value of the gridded  
 235 density data within each buffer.

236 For the models, we calculated the absolute value of latitude and the log of population density.  
 237 All three city covariates were then scaled and centered.

### 238 *Modeling*

239 We modeled UAI values as a function of traits and city variables in a Bayesian hierarchical framework  
 240 that accounted for the random effects of city and species. We modeled the effect of the ten species  
 241 traits on UAI with the following structure:

$$242 \quad y_{ij} \sim \text{Gamma}(\zeta_j, \frac{\zeta_j}{e^{\mu_{ij}}})$$

$$243 \quad \mu_{ij} = \alpha_{ij} + \delta_1 \cdot \text{enclosed} + \delta_2 \cdot \text{cavity} + \delta_3 \cdot \text{ground} +$$

$$244 \quad \beta_{1,j} \cdot \text{mass} + \beta_{2,j} \cdot \text{beak} + \beta_{3,j} \cdot \text{HWI} + \beta_{4,j} \cdot \text{DB} + \beta_{5,j} \cdot \text{HB} +$$

$$245 \quad \beta_{6,j} \cdot \text{elevation} + \beta_{7,j} \cdot \text{territory} + \beta_{8,j} \cdot \text{longevity} + \beta_{9,j} \cdot \text{clutch},$$

246 where the estimated mean UAI,  $y_{ij}$ , for species  $i$  in city  $j$  was modeled as a gamma-distributed random  
 247 variable with a city-specific shape parameter  $\zeta_j$  and a rate parameter equal to  $\frac{\zeta_j}{e^{\mu_{ij}}}$ . We chose a gamma

248 distribution to reflect the fact that our response variable was bounded by 0 on the lower end and right  
 249 skewed. The shape of the distribution was allowed to vary among cities to accommodate variation in the  
 250 data. In turn,  $\mu_{ij}$  was modeled as a linear combination of an intercept for open nesters,  $\alpha_{ij}$ , three  
 251 differences in intercepts ( $\delta_1$  to  $\delta_3$ ) and nine covariates with corresponding parameters ( $\beta_{1,j}$  to  $\beta_{9,j}$ ). The  
 252 parameters  $\delta_1$  to  $\delta_3$  represent the difference in UAI for three dummy variables (*enclosed*, *cavity*, and  
 253 *ground*) that together encode the three other nest types, where all three covariates are binary (1 =  
 254 species' nest type, 0 = otherwise) and mutually exclusive. The parameters  $\beta_{1,j}$  to  $\beta_{9,j}$  represent the  
 255 slopes of the effects of nine numerical traits on  $\mu_{ij}$ .

256 The intercept  $\alpha_{ij}$  can be further decomposed,

$$257 \quad \alpha_{ij} = \gamma + \eta_i + \omega_j,$$

258 into a global intercept,  $\gamma$ , and the random effects of species,  $\eta_i$ , and city,  $\omega_j$ . The random effect of  
 259 species accounts for species being represented across multiple cities. The random effect of city allows  
 260 species in different cities to have different average UAIs based on unmodeled factors such as differences  
 261 in brightness, development, and birdwatching effort. The random effects of species,

$$262 \quad \eta_i \sim t(0, \sigma_\eta, \kappa),$$

263 were drawn from a t-distribution with a mean 0, standard deviation  $\sigma_\eta$ , and degrees of freedom  $\kappa$   
 264 (which controls the degree to which the distribution resembles a normal, as  $\kappa$  approaches infinity, or a  
 265 Cauchy, as  $\kappa$  approaches 1). The choice of t-distribution allowed for fatter tails in the distribution of  
 266 intercepts across species. The random effects of city,

$$267 \quad \omega_j \sim \text{Normal}(0, \sigma_\omega),$$

268 were drawn from normal distributions with mean 0 and standard deviation and  $\sigma_\omega$ .

269 In order to integrate the city covariates with the functional traits, every  $\beta_j$  parameter for trait  $k$   
 270 was drawn from a normal distribution

$$271 \quad \beta_{kj} \sim \text{Normal}(v_{kj}, \sigma_{\beta_k}),$$

272 with a mean  $v_{kj}$  and a standard deviation  $\sigma_{\beta_k}$  such that each  $\beta_{kj}$  had its own process error, to  
 273 accommodate variation in the data. The mean was then modeled as a linear combination of city  
 274 covariates

$$275 \quad v_{kj} = \varphi_k + \theta_{1,k} \cdot \textit{latitude} + \theta_{2,k} \cdot \textit{density} + \theta_{3,k} \cdot \textit{greenness},$$

276 such that the effect of each numerical trait on UAI varied as a function of the city-level covariates.  
 277 Importantly, this allowed urban tolerance to be predicted differently by different traits in different  
 278 geographical contexts.

279 We ran this Bayesian model using the program JAGS (Plummer 2003) via the R package *R2jags*  
 280 (Su & Yajima 2021). We used vague priors (mean of 0, standard deviation of 100) and we ran three  
 281 chains, each with 40,000 iterations, beginning with a burn-in of 10,000 followed by a thinning of 30,  
 282 retaining 1000 posteriors per chain. We verified that the model had successfully converged (Rhat  $\leq$  1.01  
 283 and n.eff  $>$  400). We performed posterior predictive checks to ensure that data generated by the model  
 284 were similar to data used to fit the model (Gelman *et al.* 2000). We found that 49.4% of the means of  
 285 the posteriors were less than the observed mean UAI, indicating that our model could successfully  
 286 reproduce the mean UAI. From the parameter posteriors we calculated the means and 95% credible  
 287 intervals for each parameter. Due to Bayesian shrinkage within the random effects framework, *post hoc*  
 288 testing indicated that the model was less able to estimate suitable species-specific intercepts,  $\eta_i$ , for  
 289 species with only a few data points – i.e., those species present in only one or a few cities. We therefore  
 290 fit a second, identically-structured model using a dataset where species represented in  $<$ 5 cities were

291 excluded, and checked for consistency of model results (i.e.,  $\beta$ s) as compared to the original, full dataset  
292 model.

### 293 *Phylogenetic structure*

294 In order to test for phylogenetic signal in UAI values, we aligned the eBird (Clements) taxonomy with the  
295 taxonomy of BirdTree.org (Jetz *et al.* 2012) and downloaded 100 phylogenetic trees with the Hackett  
296 backbone. We averaged UAI values across the tips of the phylogeny. For each tree, we calculated Pagel's  
297  $\lambda$  as a measure of phylogenetic signal using the package *phytools* (Revell 2012). We then calculated the  
298 mean  $\lambda$  across trees, with associated 95% quantiles. Directly incorporating these phylogenies into our  
299 Bayesian model was not practical due to the extensive computational time required for an analysis that  
300 includes so many species (over a year). Rather, we tested whether model residuals, averaged at the  
301 species level, contained phylogenetic signal (Revell 2010). This test would tell us whether there was  
302 unexplained variation in the model associated with phylogeny. We also tested for signal in the residuals  
303 of the model with the reduced species set.

304

## 305 **Results**

306 Our analysis included 16,455 UAI estimates representing data from >125 million eBird records across  
307 137 cities (Fig. 1a). This list comprised cities from 62 countries including 39 in North America, 28 in South  
308 America, 27 in Asia, 22 in Europe, 10 in Africa, and 10 in Australasia. Together, these cities span 11 of  
309 the world's 14 terrestrial biomes (Olson & Dinerstein 1998). The number of avian species meeting the  
310 inclusion criteria in each city ranged from 56 in Naha (Japan) to 533 in Bogotá (Colombia).

311           Of the 3768 species for which we calculated UAI, the five species present in the most urban  
312 areas (see Fig. S4 for top 30) were Feral (Rock) Pigeon (*Columba livia*), House Sparrow (*Passer*

313 *domesticus*), Barn Swallow (*Hirundo rustica*), Osprey (*Pandion haliaetus*), and Peregrine Falcon (*Falco*  
314 *peregrinus*). Across species, UAI values ranged from 0 (for 46 species) to 3.97 (Yellow-crested Cockatoo –  
315 *Cacatua sulphurea* – a species introduced to Hong Kong) with a mean of 1.14. Of species present in at  
316 least ten cities, the top-five species with the highest UAI (see Fig. S5 for top 30) were Monk Parakeet  
317 (*Myiopsitta monachus*), Rose-ringed Parakeet (*Psittacula krameri*), Yellow-chevroned Parakeet  
318 (*Brotogeris chiriri*), Feral Pigeon, and Sayaca Tanager (*Thraupis sayaca*).

319         There was considerable phylogenetic signal in UAI across species (Fig. 2;  $\lambda = 0.61$ , CI = 0.56–  
320 0.65). Notable families with high average UAI values, indicating broad urban associations, included  
321 Sturnidae (starlings;  $1.75 \pm 0.13$  SE,  $n_{\text{cities}} = 40$ ), Apodidae (swifts;  $1.61 \pm 0.12$ ,  $n_{\text{cities}} = 44$ ), Hirundinidae  
322 (swallows;  $1.55 \pm 0.09$ ,  $n_{\text{cities}} = 52$ ), Psittacidae (parrots;  $1.55 \pm 0.11$ ,  $n_{\text{cities}} = 86$ ), and Icteridae (New World  
323 orioles and blackbirds;  $1.47 \pm 0.08$ ,  $n_{\text{cities}} = 80$ ). Notable families with low average UAI included Pipridae  
324 (manakins;  $0.33 \pm 0.07$ ,  $n_{\text{cities}} = 21$ ), Petroicidae (Australasian robins;  $0.38 \pm 0.09$ ,  $n_{\text{cities}} = 20$ ), Trogonidae  
325 (trogons;  $0.45 \pm 0.07$ ,  $n_{\text{cities}} = 24$ ), Thamnophilidae (antbirds;  $0.55 \pm 0.06$ ,  $n_{\text{cities}} = 72$ ), and Tinamidae  
326 (tinamous;  $0.58 \pm 0.09$ ,  $n_{\text{cities}} = 22$ ).

327         Of the ten species-specific traits considered, all except bill shape were significantly associated  
328 with UAI (Figs. 3,4). Body mass (Fig. 3a), lower elevational limit (Fig. 3e), territoriality (Fig. 3f), and  
329 ground nesting (Fig. 3i) were negatively associated with UAI, while hand-wing index (HWI; Fig. 3b), diet  
330 breadth (Fig. 3c), habitat breadth (Fig. 3d), longevity (Fig. 3g), and clutch size (Fig. 3h) were positively  
331 associated with UAI. In other words, more urban-tolerant species are smaller, tree- or building-nesting  
332 species with higher dispersal ability, wider diet and habitat breadth, lower elevational limits, lower  
333 territoriality, longer lifespan, and greater clutch size.

334         Seven of the traits varied significantly as a function of city-level covariates (Fig. 4,5). In terms of  
335 latitude (Fig. 4b), the negative effect of body mass on UAI (Fig. 5a) and the positive effects of diet

336 breadth (Fig. 5b) and longevity (Fig. 5d) became more pronounced in cities at higher latitudes.  
337 Contrastingly, the positive effect of habitat breadth (Fig. 5e) and the negative effect of lower elevational  
338 range limit (Fig. 5g) on UAI became more pronounced in tropical cities. The effect of bill shape on UAI –  
339 which showed no globally consistent relationship – varied with latitude (Fig. 5h) such that species with  
340 longer, pointier bills were more urban tolerant at higher latitudes while species with shorter, thicker bills  
341 were more urban tolerant at lower latitudes. In terms of population density (Fig. 4d), the negative effect  
342 of territoriality (Fig. 5c) and the positive effects of diet breadth (Fig. 5f) and longevity (Fig. 5i) became  
343 more pronounced in cities with lower population density. Finally, none of the nine numerical traits  
344 varied significantly in effect as a function of landscape greenness (Fig. 4c).

345 Model residuals contained relatively low phylogenetic signal ( $\lambda = 0.37$ , CI = 0.33–0.43). Most of  
346 this signal resulted from species with few data points – i.e., those represented in 1–4 cities – as the  
347 model was less able to estimate suitable species-specific intercepts due to the shrinkage of intercept  
348 parameters towards the cross-species mean. Removing these 2848 species (76% of the species set) and  
349 re-running the model produced qualitatively similar trait coefficients (Fig. S6) and greatly reduced the  
350 phylogenetic signal in the residuals ( $\lambda = 0.15$ , CI = 0.09–0.22). Thus, we are confident that our estimates  
351 of the effect of traits on UAI are robust to potential phylogenetic or sample-based biases.

352

## 353 Discussion

354 Many studies have linked species-specific functional traits to urban tolerance (Møller 2009; Sol *et al.*  
355 2014; Callaghan *et al.* 2019; Sayol *et al.* 2020) but none have tested for interactions between traits and  
356 geographic factors, especially not at the global taxonomic and spatial scale we employ here. For 35% of  
357 the world's bird species across 137 cities and 11 biomes – including regions of the world  
358 underrepresented in ecological studies (i.e., Asia, Africa, South America; Magle *et al.* 2012; Estes *et al.*



2018) – we find that nine different functional traits are related to urban association. Furthermore, we find that two geographic variables – latitude and human population density – significantly modulate the effects of seven of these traits, meaning that the strength of trait-based filters in urban environments varies systematically across the planet (Aronson *et al.* 2016; Oliveira Hagen *et al.* 2017). Our study is the first at a global scale to demonstrate the effects of body size, hand-wing index (HWI), diet breadth, lower elevational limit, territoriality, longevity, and clutch size on urban association, and confirms the positive association of habitat breadth and the negative association of ground nesting (Sol *et al.* 2014; Ducatez *et al.* 2018).

Urban associated species tended to have wider diet and habitat breadths (Fig. 3c,d), confirming the role of ecological generalism in urban tolerance (Bonier *et al.* 2007; Ducatez *et al.* 2018; Callaghan *et al.* 2019; Fidino *et al.* 2022). As cities erase or erode most native habitats (McDonald *et al.* 2020), ecological specialists are less able to survive while more versatile species persist. However, we found that the importance of diet and habitat breadth had opposing patterns across latitude (Fig. 5b,d). Habitat breadth was more important in tropical urban areas, possibly because most tropical land birds have high forest dependency (Tobias *et al.* 2013), and thus are more likely to experience a stronger filter in urban areas (Newbold *et al.* 2013). But, with fewer habitats to specialize on towards the poles, habitat breadth becomes less important at higher latitudes. By contrast, diet breadth was more important in temperate areas. Many urban-associated tropical birds are dietary specialists, particularly nectarivores and frugivores, where they take advantage of plentiful year-round fruiting and flowering ornamental trees (Lim & Sodhi 2004). Temperate cities, with seasonal resource pulses and troughs, favor omnivores that can make use of a wide variety of food sources (Crocì *et al.* 2008; Lizée *et al.* 2011; Jokimäki *et al.* 2016; Evans *et al.* 2018).

Related to diet, the effect of beak shape on urban associations changed sign with latitude (Fig. 5f). In the tropics, species with short, thick bills were favored in urban areas, a result that may be

383 explained by the abundance of specialist frugivores in fruit-plentiful tropical cities, exemplified by urban-  
384 tolerant parrots (Cacatuidae, Psittaculidae, Psittacidae). At more temperate latitudes, species with  
385 short, stubby bills tend to be granivores and also tend to avoid urban areas where grasses are cut short.  
386 While the occasional short, stubby bill does well in temperate urban environments (e.g., House  
387 Sparrow or House Finch, *Haemorhous mexicanus*), many temperate granivores such as game birds  
388 (Phasianidae), longspurs (Calcariidae), and grassland sparrows (Passerellidae) require suitable habitat far  
389 from development (Crocchi *et al.* 2008; Callaghan *et al.* 2019). Meanwhile, the hummingbirds (Trochilidae)  
390 – long-billed species with high data leverage – present an interesting outlier. In the Neotropics, where  
391 their diversity peaks, only a fraction of species are found in urban areas (Maruyama *et al.* 2019) such as  
392 Panama City, while in North America, most hummingbird species frequent urban feeders (Greig *et al.*  
393 2017; Miller *et al.* 2017). Variation in the importance of bill shape is clearly complex, underscoring the  
394 diverse responses of different feeding guilds to urbanization (Kark *et al.* 2007; Jokimäki *et al.* 2016;  
395 Evans *et al.* 2018; Callaghan *et al.* 2019).

396 Previous studies have suggested that migratory strategy was not associated with urban  
397 tolerance (Dale *et al.* 2015; Jokimäki *et al.* 2016; Guetté *et al.* 2017; Evans *et al.* 2018; Callaghan *et al.*  
398 2019; Sayol *et al.* 2020), while only one study has found dispersal ability *per se* to be related to urban  
399 associations (Møller 2009). We, however, found that species with higher HWI, i.e., longer, more pointed  
400 wings associated with greater dispersal ability (Sheard *et al.* 2020), have higher UAI values (Fig. 3b).  
401 Although dispersal ability is positively associated with migratory capacity (Sheard *et al.* 2020), previous  
402 studies focusing on temperate cities may not have found a role for migratory capacity as migrants tend  
403 to broaden their habitat use to include cities on their wintering grounds in the tropics. Additionally, this  
404 pattern could be driven by a number of factors, including the sensitivity of low-dispersal species to  
405 anthropogenic change (Claramunt *et al.* 2022), and the association between HWI and specific foraging  
406 modes such as flycatching, aerial insectivory, frugivory, and nectarivory (as opposed to gleaning,

407 terrestrial insectivory etc.) that would be favored in urban environments (Lees & Peres 2009; Sheard *et*  
408 *al.* 2020).

409         The role of body size in urban tolerance has mixed support, including a positive association in  
410 Australia (Callaghan *et al.* 2019) but no effect globally across 358 species (Sol *et al.* 2014). Here, we  
411 found urban-tolerant species are significantly smaller, an effect (Fig. 3a) that strengthens towards the  
412 poles (Fig. 5a). Many families of large species, such as bustards (Otididae), tinamous, and pheasants,  
413 appear to be urban avoidant (Fig 2). These species tend also to be cursorial, which could put them at  
414 elevated risk of urban-associated predators (e.g., domestic cats; Loss *et al.* 2013) and nest predators  
415 (e.g., rats; Smith *et al.* 2016). In the tropics, these families of large species might be balanced out by  
416 urban-tolerant arboreal-nesting large hornbills (Bucerotidae), turacos (Musophagidae), parrots, and  
417 cockatoos (Conole & Kirkpatrick 2011). In temperate regions, game birds are likely selected against in  
418 urban areas due to habitat requirements, the history of hunting, or pressure from meso-predators  
419 (Crooks & Soule 1999).

420         Body size can be associated with other life-history traits that predict urban tolerance – although  
421 we found little correlation between body mass, longevity, and clutch size in this study. Supporting  
422 results from other studies (Møller 2009; Lizée *et al.* 2011; Callaghan *et al.* 2019), we found that species  
423 with larger clutches were more urban tolerant (Fig. 3h). Species with larger clutch sizes tend to live at  
424 the faster end of the life-history continuum and may be able to adapt faster to novel environments  
425 (Møller 2009). Conversely, however, we found that species with longer lifespans were also more urban  
426 tolerant (Fig. 3g), corroborating the finding that urban-tolerant species also have higher annual survival  
427 rates (Møller 2009). One possibility is that long-lived species are also more intelligent species (Smeele *et*  
428 *al.* 2022). The role of brain size in urban tolerance appears linked to other life-history strategies, with big  
429 brains important for species with high brood value (i.e., fewer broods over a lifetime) and small brains  
430 important for species with low brood value (Sayol *et al.* 2020). While we lacked the data to test this

431 hypothesis globally across our full species set, our results suggest a similar trade-off, that it helps to  
432 either have large clutch sizes, or live longer in order to learn to exploit urban environments. The  
433 importance of longevity also increases in temperate cities (Fig. 5c), suggesting that living longer and,  
434 perhaps, being smarter are more beneficial closer to the poles.

435         Certain aspects of breeding biology were also tied to urban tolerance. While we did not test  
436 sociality *per se* (a trait which is not available broadly), we did find a significant negative effect of  
437 territoriality (Fig. 3f). Urban-tolerant species tend to be more social or gregarious (Kark et al. 2007; Croci  
438 et al. 2008; Sol et al. 2014) and therefore less territorial. Being strongly territorial year-round (level 3 on  
439 the scale) is usually tied to defense of resources (Tobias *et al.* 2016) and in resource-poor cities it makes  
440 less sense to be territorial and more sense to follow resources more plastically. Where species nest also  
441 matters, and we confirm the results of others that ground-nesting species tend to be less urban-tolerant  
442 (Conole & Kirkpatrick 2011; Evans *et al.* 2011; Sol *et al.* 2014; Dale *et al.* 2015; Guetté *et al.* 2017).  
443 Species that nest above the ground with open or enclosed nests had the highest urban tolerance (Fig.  
444 3i), probably due to safety from predators (Jokimaki & Huhta 2000; Chace & Walsh 2006). Some studies  
445 have suggested that cavity nesters would have higher urban tolerance (Chace & Walsh 2006; Croci *et al.*  
446 2008; Conole & Kirkpatrick 2011) while others have suggested the opposite (Evans *et al.* 2018). We  
447 found intermediate UAI values for cavity nesters, perhaps reflecting the contrast of relative success of  
448 cavity nesters with lower availability of nest cavities in urban areas (Blewett & Marzluff 2005).

449         The effects of territoriality, diet breadth, and longevity were all reduced in cities with higher  
450 population density (Fig. 5g–i). As population density is calculated across the whole 100 km radius circle,  
451 it is possible that the most densely populated cities are more homogenous with less non-urban habitat  
452 for urban avoiders. For example, Anchorage (USA) and Reykjavík (Iceland) are small cities surrounded by  
453 wilderness where habitats strongly differ between urban and non-urban areas. In contrast, cities like  
454 Bangkok (Thailand) and İstanbul (Turkey) are vast sprawling metropolises with abundant feral predators

455 where there is little room for specialized, long-lived, territorial urban avoiders. Finally, we did not find  
456 that any trait effects varied as a function of landscape greenness, indicating that ecological filters in  
457 urban areas are similar for cities at the same latitude that differ in greenness, a measure driven in large  
458 part by habitat (Fig. 1b).

459         In summary, we found that numerous species-specific functional traits (smaller body size, lower  
460 territoriality, greater dispersal ability, broader dietary and habitat niches, larger clutch sizes, greater  
461 longevity) predict urban tolerance across the planet. However, many of these trait effects are  
462 modulated by landscape-level properties, most notably latitude. Where previous studies have  
463 demonstrated the importance of certain traits in certain parts of the world, we demonstrate the  
464 importance of geography in determining trait-based urbanization filters (Ferenc *et al.* 2014; Aronson *et*  
465 *al.* 2016; Leveau *et al.* 2017; Filloy *et al.* 2019) at an unprecedented taxonomic and spatial scale.  
466 Moreover, much of the region-specific variation in previous trait-seeking studies could be due to  
467 predictable geographic variation in trait strength that varies with latitude and human population  
468 density. Studying how traits filter diversity across the globe moves us toward a more predictable  
469 framework that will better allow us to understand future biodiversity loss – and how we might mitigate  
470 it – given the expected future expansion of urban areas.

471

472 **Acknowledgments:** We thank Ellie Diamant for her insights at the conception of the study. JXW was  
473 supported by the National Science Foundation Graduate Research Fellowship DGE-2034835.

474 **References**

- 475 Aronson, M.F.J., Nilon, C.H., Lepczyk, C.A., Parker, T.S., Warren, P.S., Cilliers, S.S., *et al.* (2016).  
476 Hierarchical filters determine community assembly of urban species pools. *Ecology*, 97, 2952–  
477 2963.
- 478 Aronson, M.F.J., La Sorte, F.A., Nilon, C.H., Katti, M., Goddard, M.A., Lepczyk, C.A., *et al.* (2014). A global  
479 analysis of the impacts of urbanization on bird and plant diversity reveals key anthropogenic  
480 drivers. *Proc. R. Soc. B Biol. Sci.*, 281.
- 481 Beninde, J., Veith, M. & Hochkirch, A. (2015). Biodiversity in cities needs space: A meta-analysis of  
482 factors determining intra-urban biodiversity variation. *Ecol. Lett.*, 18, 581–592.
- 483 Billerman, S.M., Keeney, B.K., Rodewald, P.G. & Schulenberg, T.S. (2020). *Birds of the World*. Cornell  
484 Laboratory of Ornithology, Ithaca.
- 485 Bird, J.P., Martin, R., Akçakaya, H.R., Gilroy, J., Burfield, I.J., Garnett, S.T., *et al.* (2020). Generation  
486 lengths of the world's birds and their implications for extinction risk. *Conserv. Biol.*, 34, 1252–1261.
- 487 Blewett, C.M. & Marzluff, J.M. (2005). Effects of urban sprawl on snags and the abundance and  
488 productivity of cavity-nesting birds. *Condor*, 107, 678–693.
- 489 Bonier, F., Martin, P.R. & Wingfield, J.C. (2007). Urban birds have broader environmental tolerance. *Biol.*  
490 *Lett.*, 3, 670–673.
- 491 Buechley, E.R., Santangeli, A., Girardello, M., Neate-Clegg, M.H.C., Oleyar, D., McClure, C.J.W., *et al.*  
492 (2019). Global raptor research and conservation priorities: Tropical raptors fall prey to knowledge  
493 gaps. *Divers. Distrib.*, 25, 856–869.
- 494 Callaghan, C.T., Major, R.E., Lyons, M.B., Martin, J.M. & Kingsford, R.T. (2018). The effects of local and

- 495 landscape habitat attributes on bird diversity in urban greenspaces. *Ecosphere*, 9.
- 496 Callaghan, C.T., Major, R.E., Wilshire, J.H., Martin, J.M., Kingsford, R.T. & Cornwell, W.K. (2019).
- 497 Generalists are the most urban-tolerant of birds: a phylogenetically controlled analysis of
- 498 ecological and life history traits using a novel continuous measure of bird responses to
- 499 urbanization. *Oikos*, 128, 845–858.
- 500 Callaghan, C.T., Sayol, F., Benedetti, Y., Morelli, F. & Sol, D. (2021). Validation of a globally-applicable
- 501 method to measure urban tolerance of birds using citizen science data. *Ecol. Indic.*, 120.
- 502 de Camargo Barbosa, K.V., Rodewald, A.D., Ribeiro, M.C. & Jahn, A.E. (2020). Noise level and water
- 503 distance drive resident and migratory bird species richness within a Neotropical megacity. *Landsc.*
- 504 *Urban Plan.*, 197, 103769.
- 505 De Castro Pena, J.C., Martello, F., Ribeiro, M.C., Armitage, R.A., Young, R.J. & Rodrigues, M. (2017).
- 506 Street trees reduce the negative effects of urbanization on birds. *PLoS One*, 12.
- 507 Chace, J.F. & Walsh, J.J. (2006). Urban effects on native avifauna: A review. *Landsc. Urban Plan.*, 74, 46–
- 508 69.
- 509 Chamberlain, D.E., Cannon, A.R., Toms, M.P., Leech, D.I., Hatchwell, B.J. & Gaston, K.J. (2009). Avian
- 510 productivity in urban landscapes: a review and meta-analysis. *Ibis*, 151, 1–18.
- 511 CIESIN. (2018). Gridded Population of the World.
- 512 Claramunt, S., Hong, M. & Bravo, A. (2022). The effect of flight efficiency on gap-crossing ability in
- 513 Amazonian forest birds. *Biotropica*.
- 514 Conole, L.E. & Kirkpatrick, J.B. (2011). Functional and spatial differentiation of urban bird assemblages at
- 515 the landscape scale. *Landsc. Urban Plan.*, 100, 11–23.

- 516 Croci, S., Butet, A. & Clergeau, P. (2008). Does urbanization filter birds on the basis of their biological  
517 traits? *Condor*, 110, 223–240.
- 518 Crooks, K.. & Soule, M.. (1999). Mesopredator release and avifaunal extinctions in a fragmented system.  
519 *Nature*, 400, 563–566.
- 520 Dale, S., Lifjeld, J.T. & Rowe, M. (2015). Commonness and ecology, but not bigger brains, predict urban  
521 living in birds. *BMC Ecol.*, 15.
- 522 Didan, K. (2021). MODIS/Terra Vegetation Indices Monthly L3 Global 1km SIN Grid V061.
- 523 Ducatez, S., Sayol, F., Sol, D. & Lefebvre, L. (2018). Are urban vertebrates city specialists, artificial habitat  
524 exploiters, or environmental generalists? *Integr. Comp. Biol.*, 58, 929–938.
- 525 Elvidge, C.D., Baugh, K., Zhizhin, M., Hsu, F.C. & Ghosh, T. (2017). VIIRS night-time lights. *Int. J. Remote*  
526 *Sens.*, 38, 5860–5879.
- 527 Estes, L., Elsen, P.R., Treuer, T., Ahmed, L., Caylor, K., Chang, J., *et al.* (2018). The spatial and temporal  
528 domains of modern ecology. *Nat. Ecol. Evol.*, 2.
- 529 Evans, B.S., Reitsma, R., Hurlbert, A.H. & Marra, P.P. (2018). Environmental filtering of avian  
530 communities along a rural-to-urban gradient in Greater Washington, D.C., USA. *Ecosphere*, 9.
- 531 Evans, K.L., Chamberlain, D.E., Hatchwell, B.J., Gregory, R.D. & Gaston, K.J. (2011). What makes an urban  
532 bird? *Glob. Chang. Biol.*, 17, 32–44.
- 533 Fanelli, R.E., Martin, P.R., Robinson, O.J. & Bonier, F. (2022). Estimates of species-level tolerance of  
534 urban habitat in North American birds. *Ecology*.
- 535 Ferenc, M., Sedláček, O., Fuchs, R., Dinetti, M., Fraissinet, M. & Storch, D. (2014). Are cities different?  
536 Patterns of species richness and beta diversity of urban bird communities and regional species



- 537 assemblages in Europe. *Glob. Ecol. Biogeogr.*, 23, 479–489.
- 538 Fidino, M., Gallo, T., Lehrer, E.W., Murray, M.H., Kay, C.A.M., Sander, H.A., *et al.* (2021). Landscape-scale  
539 differences among cities alter common species' responses to urbanization. *Ecol. Appl.*, 31.
- 540 Fidino, M., Limbrick, K., Bender, J., Gallo, T. & Magle, S.B. (2022). Strolling through a Century: Replicating  
541 Historical Bird Surveys to Explore 100 Years of Change in an Urban Bird Community. *Am. Nat.*, 199,  
542 159.
- 543 Filloy, J., Zurita, G.A. & Bellocq, M.I. (2019). Bird diversity in urban ecosystems: The role of the biome  
544 and land use along urbanization gradients. *Ecosystems*, 22, 213–227.
- 545 Fontana, S., Sattler, T., Bontadina, F. & Moretti, M. (2011). How to manage the urban green to improve  
546 bird diversity and community structure. *Landsc. Urban Plan.*, 101, 278–285.
- 547 Gelman, A., Goegebeur, Y., Tuerlinckx, F. & Van Mechelen, I. (2000). Diagnostic checks for discrete data  
548 regression models using posterior predictive simulations. *J. R. Stat. Soc. Ser. C Appl. Stat.*, 49, 247–  
549 268.
- 550 Greig, E.I., Wood, E.M. & Bonter, D.N. (2017). Winter range expansion of a hummingbird is associated  
551 with urbanization and supplementary feeding. *Proc. R. Soc. B Biol. Sci.*, 284.
- 552 Guetté, A., Gaüzère, P., Devictor, V., Jiguet, F. & Godet, L. (2017). Measuring the synanthropy of species  
553 and communities to monitor the effects of urbanization on biodiversity. *Ecol. Indic.*, 79, 139–154.
- 554 Iglesias-Carrasco, M., Tobias, J.A. & Duchêne, D.A. (2022). Bird lineages colonizing urban habitats have  
555 diversified at high rates across deep time. *Glob. Ecol. Biogeogr.*, 31, 1784–1793.
- 556 Ives, C.D., Lentini, P.E., Threlfall, C.G., Ikin, K., Shanahan, D.F., Garrard, G.E., *et al.* (2016). Cities are  
557 hotspots for threatened species. *Glob. Ecol. Biogeogr.*, 25, 117–126.

- 558 Janzen, D.H. (1967). Why mountain passes are higher in the tropics. *Am. Nat.*, 101, 233–249.
- 559 Jetz, W., Thomas, G.H., Joy, J.B., Hartmann, K. & Mooers, A.O. (2012). The global diversity of birds in  
560 space and time. *Nature*, 491, 444–448.
- 561 Johnston, A., Hochachka, W.M., Strimas-Mackey, M.E., Ruiz Gutierrez, V., Robinson, O.J., Miller, E.T., et  
562 al. (2021). Analytical guidelines to increase the value of community science data: An example using  
563 eBird data to estimate species distributions. *Divers. Distrib.*, 27, 1265–1277.
- 564 Jokimaki, J. & Huhta, E. (2000). Artificial nest predation and abundance of birds along an urban gradient.  
565 *Condor*, 102, 838–847.
- 566 Jokimäki, J., Suhonen, J., Jokimäki-Kaisanlahti, M. & Carbó-Ramírez, P. (2016). Effects of urbanization  
567 on breeding birds in European towns: Impacts of species traits. *Urban Ecosyst.*, 19, 1565–1577.
- 568 Kark, S., Iwaniuk, A., Schalimtzeck, A. & Banker, E. (2007). Living in the city: Can anyone become an  
569 “urban exploiter”? *J. Biogeogr.*, 34, 638–651.
- 570 Lees, A.C. & Peres, C.A. (2009). Gap-crossing movements predict species occupancy in Amazonian forest  
571 fragments. *Oikos*, 118, 280–290.
- 572 Leveau, L.M., Jokimäki, J. & Kaisanlahti-Jokimäki, M.L. (2017). Scale dependence of biotic  
573 homogenisation by urbanisation: A comparison of urban bird communities between central  
574 argentina and northern Finland. *Eur. J. Ecol.*, 3, 1–18.
- 575 Lim, H.C. & Sodhi, N.S. (2004). Responses of avian guilds to urbanisation in a tropical city. *Landsc. Urban  
576 Plan.*, 66, 199–215.
- 577 Lizée, M.H., Mauffrey, J.F., Tatoni, T. & Deschamps-Cottin, M. (2011). Monitoring urban environments  
578 on the basis of biological traits. *Ecol. Indic.*, 11, 353–361.

- 579 Loss, S.R., Will, T. & Marra, P.P. (2013). The impact of free-ranging domestic cats on wildlife of the  
580 United States. *Nat. Commun.*, 4.
- 581 Luck, G.W. (2007). A review of the relationships between human population density and biodiversity.  
582 *Biol. Rev.*, 82, 607–645.
- 583 Magle, S.B., Hunt, V.M., Vernon, M. & Crooks, K.R. (2012). Urban wildlife research: Past, present, and  
584 future. *Biol. Conserv.*, 155, 23–32.
- 585 Maruyama, P.K., Bonizário, C., Marcon, A.P., D’Angelo, G., da Silva, M.M., da Silva Neto, E.N., *et al.*  
586 (2019). Plant-hummingbird interaction networks in urban areas: Generalization and the  
587 importance of trees with specialized flowers as a nectar resource for pollinator conservation. *Biol.*  
588 *Conserv.*, 230, 187–194.
- 589 McClure, H.E. (1989). What characterizes an urban bird? *J. Yamashina Inst. Ornithol.*, 21, 178–192.
- 590 McDonald, R.I., Kareiva, P. & Forman, R.T.T. (2008). The implications of current and future urbanization  
591 for global protected areas and biodiversity conservation. *Biol. Conserv.*, 141, 1695–1703.
- 592 McDonald, R.I., Mansur, A. V, Ascensão, F., Colbert, M., Crossman, K., Elmqvist, T., *et al.* (2020).  
593 Research gaps in knowledge of the impact of urban growth on biodiversity. *Nat. Sustain.*, 3, 16–24.
- 594 McKinney, M.L. (2008). Effects of urbanization on species richness: A review of plants and animals.  
595 *Urban Ecosyst.*, 11, 161–176.
- 596 Miller, E.T., Bonter, D.N., Eldermire, C., Freeman, B.G., Greig, E.I., Harmon, L.J., *et al.* (2017). Fighting  
597 over food unites the birds of North America in a continental dominance hierarchy. *Behav. Ecol.*, 28,  
598 1454–1463.
- 599 Møller, A.P. (2009). Successful city dwellers: A comparative study of the ecological characteristics of

- 600 urban birds in the Western Palearctic. *Oecologia*, 159, 849–858.
- 601 Morelli, F., Benedetti, Y., Ibáñez-Álamo, J.D., Jokimäki, J., Mänd, R., Tryjanowski, P., *et al.* (2016).  
602 Evidence of evolutionary homogenization of bird communities in urban environments across  
603 Europe. *Glob. Ecol. Biogeogr.*, 25, 1284–1293.
- 604 Myhrvold, N.P., Baldrige, E., Chan, B., Sivam, D., Freeman, D.L. & Ernest, S.K.M. (2015). An amniote life-  
605 history database to perform comparative analyses with birds, mammals, and reptiles. *Ecology*, 96,  
606 3109–000.
- 607 Newbold, T., Scharlemann, J.P.W., Butchart, S.H.M., Şekercioğlu, Ç.H., Alkemade, R., Booth, H., *et al.*  
608 (2013). Ecological traits affect the response of tropical forest bird species to land-use intensity.  
609 *Proc. R. Soc. B Biol. Sci.*, 280, 1–8.
- 610 Oliveira Hagen, E., Hagen, O., Ibáñez-álamo, J.D., Petchey, O.L. & Evans, K.L. (2017). Impacts of urban  
611 areas and their characteristics on avian functional diversity. *Front. Ecol. Evol.*, 5, 1–15.
- 612 Olson, D.M. & Dinerstein, E. (1998). The global 200: A representation approach to conserving the earth's  
613 most biologically valuable ecoregions. *Conserv. Biol.*, 12, 502–515.
- 614 OpenDataSoft. (2022). *Geonames - All Cities with a population > 1000*. Available at:  
615 [https://public.opendatasoft.com/explore/dataset/geonames-all-cities-with-a-population-](https://public.opendatasoft.com/explore/dataset/geonames-all-cities-with-a-population-1000/table/?disjunctive.cou_name_en&sort=name)  
616 [1000/table/?disjunctive.cou\\_name\\_en&sort=name](https://public.opendatasoft.com/explore/dataset/geonames-all-cities-with-a-population-1000/table/?disjunctive.cou_name_en&sort=name). Last accessed .
- 617 Padgham, M. & Sumner, M.D. (2019). geodist: fast, dependency-free geodesic distance calculations.
- 618 Palacio, F.X., Ibañez, L.M., Maragliano, R.E. & Montalti, D. (2018). Urbanization as a driver of taxonomic,  
619 functional, and phylogenetic diversity losses in bird communities. *Can. J. Zool.*, 96, 1114–1121.
- 620 Pigot, A.L., Sheard, C., Miller, E.T., Bregman, T.P., Freeman, B.G., Roll, U., *et al.* (2020).

- 621           Macroevolutionary convergence connects morphological form to ecological function in birds. *Nat.*  
622           *Ecol. Evol.*
- 623   Planillo, A., Kramer-Schadt, S., Buchholz, S., Gras, P., von der Lippe, M. & Radchuk, V. (2021). Arthropod  
624           abundance modulates bird community responses to urbanization. *Divers. Distrib.*, 27, 34–49.
- 625   Plummer, M. (2003). JAGS: a program for analysis of Bayesian graphical models using Gibbs sampling.  
626           *Proc. 3rd Int. Work. Distrib. Stat. Comput. (DSC 2003), March 20-22, Vienna, Austria.*
- 627   Revell, L.J. (2010). Phylogenetic signal and linear regression on species data. *Methods Ecol. Evol.*, 1, 319–  
628           329.
- 629   Revell, L.J. (2012). phytools: An R package for phylogenetic comparative biology (and other things).  
630           *Methods Ecol. Evol.*, 3, 217–223.
- 631   Sayol, F., Sol, D. & Pigot, A.L. (2020). Brain size and life history interact to predict urban tolerance in  
632           birds. *Front. Ecol. Evol.*, 8, 1–9.
- 633   Şekercioğlu, Ç.H., Daily, G.C. & Ehrlich, P.R. (2004). Ecosystem consequences of bird declines. *Proc. Natl.*  
634           *Acad. Sci. U. S. A.*, 101, 18042–18047.
- 635   Seto, K.C., Güneralp, B. & Hutyra, L.R. (2012). Global forecasts of urban expansion to 2030 and direct  
636           impacts on biodiversity and carbon pools. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.*, 109, 16083–16088.
- 637   Sheard, C., Neate-Clegg, M.H.C., Alioravainen, N., Jones, S.E.I., Vincent, C., Macgregor, H.E.A., *et al.*  
638           (2020). Ecological drivers of global gradients in avian dispersal inferred from wing morphology.  
639           *Nat. Commun.*, 11, 2463.
- 640   Smeele, S.Q., Conde, D.A., Baudisch, A., Bruslund, S., Iwaniuk, A., Staerk, J., *et al.* (2022). Coevolution of  
641           relative brain size and life expectancy in parrots. *Proc. R. Soc. B Biol. Sci.*, 289.


- 642 Smith, H.M., Dickman, C.R. & Banks, P.B. (2016). Nest predation by commensal rodents in urban  
643 bushland remnants. *PLoS One*, 11.
- 644 Sol, D., Bartomeus, I., González-Lagos, C. & Pavoine, S. (2017). Urbanisation and the loss of phylogenetic  
645 diversity in birds. *Ecol. Lett.*, 20, 721–729.
- 646 Sol, D., González-Lagos, C., Moreira, D., Maspons, J. & Lapiedra, O. (2014). Urbanisation tolerance and  
647 the loss of avian diversity. *Ecol. Lett.*, 17, 942–950.
- 648 Souza, F.L., Valente-Neto, F., Severo-Neto, F., Bueno, B., Ochoa-Quintero, J.M., Laps, R.R., *et al.* (2019).  
649 Impervious surface and heterogeneity are opposite drivers to maintain bird richness in a Cerrado  
650 city. *Landsc. Urban Plan.*, 192, 103643.
- 651 Spotswood, E.N., Beller, E.E., Grossinger, R., Grenier, J.L., Heller, N.E. & Aronson, M.F.J. (2021). The  
652 biological deserts fallacy: Cities in their landscapes contribute more than we think to regional  
653 biodiversity. *Bioscience*, 71, 148–160.
- 654 Su, Y.-S. & Yajima, M. (2021). R2jags: Using R to Run “JAGS.”
- 655 Sullivan, B.L., Wood, C.L., Iliff, R.E., Bonney, D.F. & Kelling, S. (2009). eBird: a citizen-based bird  
656 observation network in the biological sciences. *Biol. Conserv.*, 142, 2282–2292.
- 657 Threlfall, C.G., Williams, N.S.G., Hahs, A.K. & Livesley, S.J. (2016). Approaches to urban vegetation  
658 management and the impacts on urban bird and bat assemblages. *Landsc. Urban Plan.*, 153, 28–  
659 39.
- 660 Tobias, J.A., Şekercioğlu, Ç.H. & Vargas, F.H. (2013). Bird conservation in tropical ecosystems: challenges  
661 and opportunities. In: *Key Topics in Conservation Biology 2* (eds. Macdonald, D.W. & Willis, K.J.).  
662 John Wiley & Sons, New York, pp. 258–276.

- 663 Tobias, J.A., Sheard, C., Pigot, A.L., Devenish, A.J.M., Yang, J., Neate-Clegg, M.H.C., *et al.* (2022). AVONET:  
664 morphological, ecological and geographical data for all birds. *Ecol. Lett.*, 25, 581–597.
- 665 Tobias, J.A., Sheard, C., Seddon, N., Meade, A., Cotton, A.J. & Nakagawa, S. (2016). Territoriality, social  
666 bonds, and the evolution of communal signaling in birds. *Front. Ecol. Evol.*, 4, 1–15.
- 667 United Nations. (2018). *World Urbanization Prospects: The 2018 Revision*. United Nations Population  
668 Division.
- 669


**Table 1. Ten functional traits included in the analysis.**

Trait	Description	Primary sources
Body mass	Log-transformed	AVONET
Bill shape	Second PC from a PCA of four bill measurements	AVONET
Hand-wing index	The ratio of Kipp's distance to wing length	AVONET
Diet breadth	Number of major food groups, 1–9	BirdBase, Birds of the World
Habitat breadth	Number of major habitats, 1–11	BirdBase, Birds of the World
Lower elevational limit	Lower limit of elevational range reported in the literature	BirdBase, Birds of the World
Territoriality	A scale from 1 (low) to 3 (high)	Tobias et al. 2016
Longevity	Log-transformed	Bird et al. 2020
Clutch size	Log-transformed	BirdBase, Myhrvold et al. 2015, Birds of the World
Nest type	Categorical: ground, cavity, open, and enclosed	BirdBase, Birds of the World







**Figure 1. Geographical coverage of 137 cities included in the analysis.** Cities were distributed (a) across 62 countries, including 39 in North America, 28 in South America, 27 in Asia, 22 in Europe, 10 in Africa, and 10 in Australasia. Each of these cities was initially selected to have a population of  $\geq 100,000$  people and be  $\geq 500$  km apart. Cities were then retained that had  $\geq 50$  species each with  $\geq 100$  eBird records within a 100 km radius circles over 20 years (2002–2021). Cities are colored by the (log) number of species that met the criteria from 56 (dark purple) to 533 (yellow). Cities were representative (b) of 11 of the world’s biomes (Olson & Dinerstein 1998). Biomes are ordered by the mean absolute latitude of the cities included, and cities are colored by the NDVI of the greenest month, from the greenest city (lime green) to the least green city (dark brown).




**Figure 2. The phylogeny of Urban Association Index (UAI) across 3768 species by family.** For visualization, UAI values were averaged across species and then across taxonomic families. The height of the bar indicates the UAI, with taller bars indicating higher urban tolerance. The color indicates the (log) number of species in the family from 1 (dark purple) to 231 (Tyrannidae, yellow).



**Figure 3. The global mean effects of nine species traits on the Urban Association Index (UAI) of 3768 bird species across 137 cities.** There was a significant relationship between UAI and (a) body mass, (b) hand-wing index, (c) diet breadth, (d) habitat breadth, (e) lower elevational limit, (f) territoriality, (g) longevity, (h) clutch size, and (i) nest type. Gray points show the partial residuals of each data point. Trend lines for numerical traits are shown along with the 95% credible intervals. Territoriality is treated as numerical in the model but here we summarize the data for the three levels of territoriality (low, medium, high). Nest type is treated as categorical in the model (open, enclosed, cavity, or ground). For territoriality and nest type, black points show the mean and bars show the 95% credible intervals.




**Figure 4. The relationship between Urban Association Index (UAI), species traits, and city variables for 3768 birds species across 137 cities.** Covariate coefficients ( $\beta$ ) show how UAI varies as a function of nine numerical trait covariates (a). In turn, these trait coefficients vary across cities as a function of three city-level variables with corresponding coefficients ( $\theta$ ): (b) latitude, (c) NDVI, and (d) human population density. Points show the covariate coefficient estimates with corresponding interquartile range (thick lines) and 95% credible intervals (thin lines). Points are open when the interquartile range overlaps 0. Points and lines are gray when the 95% credible intervals overlap 0 and black when they do not.




**Figure 5. The effect of latitude and human population density on the city-level trait coefficients for Urban Association Index.** Latitude had a significant effect on the city-level trait coefficients for (a) body mass, (b) diet breadth, (d) longevity, (e) habitat breadth, (g) lower elevational limit, and (h) bill shape. Human population density had a significant effect on the city-level trait coefficients for (c) territoriality, (f) diet breadth, and (i) longevity. Points represent the model-estimated trait coefficients for each city ( $n = 137$ ). Trend lines and 95% credible intervals show how these coefficients vary as a function of the city-level covariates.

### Supporting Information


We tested for the effects of the difference in spatial scale between VIIRS and eBird checklists. The VIIRS night-time lights imagery has a spatial resolution of ~500 m, much smaller than the 5 km filter applied to eBird checklists, and so a single point value may not be representative of the landscape sampled during a specific checklist. In order to check whether this affected our index, we experimented on six example cities, one from each continent (Los Angeles, Buenos Aires, London, Nairobi, Mumbai, Sydney). For every checklist locality within each city, we sampled 100 points from a bivariate normal distribution of latitude and longitude centered on the checklist locality, with a standard deviation of 1 km, truncating values >5 km from the locality. This sampling approach created a scatter of points around the locality, from which a mean radiance value can be calculated. From these mean estimates, we then calculated the mean radiance values for each species across localities. We found that these species-level estimates based on sampled points were highly correlated to the estimates based on single radiance values per locality ( $r = 0.97\text{--}0.98$ ; Fig. S3). Thus, our Urban Association Index (UAI) for each species is the mean radiance value across records where the radiance value of each record is taken from a single pixel of radiance.



**Figure S1.** A map of 289 cities spaced  $\geq 500$  km apart with populations  $\geq 100,000$ . Points are colored from least (purple) to most (yellow) populous.



**Figure S2.** Histograms showing the distribution of Urban Association Indices (UAI) for six example cities. The top row shows UAI estimates based on the mean of radiance values while the bottom row shows UAI estimates based on the median of radiance values.



**Figure S3. A comparison of two Urban Association Indices (UAI) for six example cities.** UAI (point) estimates are based on radiance values from a single pixel of night time lights for each locality. UAI (sample) estimates are based on the mean of 100 points sampled randomly from around each locality. Each point represents the UAI of a species. The dashed line shows 1:1 correspondence, the red line shows the trend between the two indices, and the Pearson's correlation coefficient is given in the top-right corner.






Figure S4. The 50 species represented in the most city circles.





Figure S5. The 30 species with the highest Urban Association Index (UAI). For each species the mean and standard error of their UAI is shown, along with the sample size (i.e., number of cities). Only species present across  $\geq 10$  city circles are shown.



**Figure S6. The relationship between Urban Association Index (UAI), species traits, and city covariates**

**for the 920 birds species each represented in at least five cities.** This figure is comparable with the

results for the full species set in Fig. 4. Covariate coefficients ( $\beta$ ) show how UAI varies as a function of

nine numerical trait covariates (a). In turn, these trait coefficients vary across cities as a function of three

city-level variables with corresponding coefficients ( $\theta$ ): (b) latitude, (c) NDVI, and (d) human population

density. Points show the covariate coefficient estimates with corresponding interquartile range (thick

lines) and 95% credible intervals (thin lines). Points are open when the interquartile range overlaps 0.

Points and lines are gray when the 95% credible intervals overlap 0 and black when they do not.