## 1 Appendix S1: Additional figures and tables



4 Figure S1.1. Spatial positions of the 10 randomly placed hypothetical 'town centres' across the simulation study

5 area for each of the 10 simulation repetitions.





10 Figure S1.2. Evaluation of model predictions of abundance (based on D = 'deviation from the best model') for 11 three hypothetical organisms (one with randomly simulated occurrences = random species, and two with 12 occurrences simulated based on biological preferences = altitude species or altitude\_randomised species (here 13 termed altitude\_2 species)). Mean D ( $\pm$  SE and data range) is shown for each sampling strategy (random or 14 biased) across 10 different sets of hypothetical 'town centres' for each model. There are four non-zero-inflated 15 generalised linear models, and six zero-inflated (ZI) models. For explanations of the structure of each model, see 16 Tab. 3. Two types of prediction were evaluated: the count abundance predictions from the count component of 17 the ZI models and the sampling abundance predictions from the whole of the ZI models or from the GLMs. Note 18 the different scales on the vertical axes for the two types of predictions.



Figure S1.3. Model coefficients estimating the effects of a biological predictor (altitude or altitude\_randomised (here termed altitude\_2)) and a sampling bias predictor (distance to nearest hypothetical town) on the abundance of a hypothetical organism from a non-zero-inflated generalised linear model containing both the bias and biological predictor (GLM4), and two zero-inflated models which either exclude (ZI2) or include (ZI6) the bias predictor in the zero component. Zero-inflated (ZI) models include components which model both the count (C)of organisms per grid cell, and excess zeros (Z) caused by zero-inflation. For explanations of the structure of each model, see Tab. 3. Median model coefficients and range are shown for models fitted with data simulated using two different sampling strategies: random sampling and biased sampling. Results highlighted in red boxes indicate where the model is including the bias variable as a predictor of abundance where it should not. Black boxes are results that are correctly predicted.



36 Figure S1.4. Example maps of abundance for a hypothetical species ('altitude randomised species') whose 37 occurrence is positively influenced by a randomised altitude layer, produced from two generalised linear models 38 (GLMs) and two Zero-Inflated (ZI) models. Models were built with either data collected by randomly sampling 39 grid cells (random) or with sampling bias (biased). Abundance maps from GLM3 (including the biological 40 predictor only) and GLM4 (including both the biological and bias predictor) are produced using sampling 41 abundance predictions (i.e. from the whole model). Both count abundance and sampling abundance predictions 42 can be produced from the ZI models along with a map of the probability a cell is an excess zeros (zero). Both ZI 43 models include a biological predictor (altitude) of both abundance and excess zeros, and bias predictor (distance 44 from the nearest town) of abundance. ZI6 also includes 'distance from the nearest town' as a predictor of excess 45 zeros. Individual cells are colour-coded based on abundance for the abundance predictions or on probability of 46 being an excess zero for the zero predictions (high = red, low = blue).

## Altitude species

			Sa	mpling:	Rando	om								
Predictor	Model	True abundance		Sampling abundance/ occurrence		Zero predictions		Tri abuna	ue lance	Samp abuna occur	oling lance/ rence	Zero predictions		
		r	se	r	se	r	se	r	se	r	se	r	se	
	GLM3			0.999	0.000					0.999	0.000			
1100 1	GLM4			0.992	0.003					0.603	0.052			
Altitude	ZI2	0.979	0.007	0.993	0.003	0.183	0.254	0.738	0.029	0.623	0.050	0.822	0.082	
	ZI6	0.944	0.013	0.993	0.003	0.071	0.198	0.960	0.012	0.607	0.053	0.187	0.072	
	GLM3			-0.037	0.071					-0.037	0.070			
Distance	GLM4			-0.046	0.082					-0.781	0.019			
from town	ZI2	-0.054	0.081	-0.042	0.080	0.016	0.060	-0.648	0.039	-0.765	0.020	0.002	0.054	
	ZI6	0.069	0.091	-0.044	0.081	0.262	0.152	0.069	0.086	-0.769	0.021	0.958	0.009	

## Altitude\_2 species

			Sa	mpling:	Rando	om			ed					
Predictor	Model	True abundance		Sampling abundance/ occurrence		Zero predictions		Tri abuna	ue lance	Samp abuna occur	oling lance/ rence	Zero predictions		
		r	se	r	r se r se			r	se	r	se	r	se	
	GLM3			0.999	0.000					0.999	0.000			
(little de	GLM4			0.985	0.007					0.576	0.020			
Aittitude	ZI2	0.980	0.005	0.986	0.007	0.497	0.194	0.565	0.042	0.593	0.021	-0.289	0.238	
	ZI6	0.944	0.011	0.986	0.007	0.414	0.159	0.957	0.013	0.584	0.022	0.045	0.046	
	GLM3			-0.002	0.003					-0.003	0.003			
Distance	GLM4			-0.057	0.043					- <b>0</b> .787	0.017			
from town	ZI2	-0.044	0.035	-0.053	0.043	0.002	0.004	-0.781	0.032	-0.773	0.018	0.002	0.004	
	ZI6	-0.025	0.085	-0.052	0.042	0.012	0.188	0.056	0.072	-0.774	0.020	0.980	0.006	

## 47

<sup>48</sup> Figure S1.5. Spearman's Rank correlation coefficients (r<sub>s</sub>) between the model predictors (altitude/ 49 altitude\_randomised (here termed altitude\_2) and distance from nearest town) and model predictions under two 50 sampling strategies (random and biased). The top panel represents results for altitude species, whereas the bottom 51 panel represents results for altitude\_randomised species. These predictions are either abundance predictions 52 from the whole model (shown for the generalised linear models (GLMs), sampling abundance predictions from 53 the zero-inflated (ZI) models, count abundance predictions of true abundance (shown for the ZI models) and 54 predictions of the probability an observation is an excess zero (shown for the ZI models). GLM3 and the zero 55 component of ZI2 do not include the bias predictor, whereas GLM4 and the zero component of ZI6 do contain the 56 bias predictor. Values represent the mean coefficients (including standard error (se)) across the 10 simulated sets 57 of 'town centres' Coefficients are colour-coded based on strength: the darker the colour, the stronger the 58 correlation. Red values represent positive correlations, whereas blue represent negative correlations. 59

Rand	lom		Altitude Threshold																							
-			D	iffere	encel	betwo	een G	LM4	and 2	16	Ð	iffere	ence l	betwe	een G	LM4	and 2	Z12	- IX	Differe	ence	betw	een	ZI2 a	nd Zl	6
rid			R	0	50	100	125	150	175	200	R	0	50	100	125	150	175	200	R	0	50	100	125	150	175	200
6		1000	0.00	0.00	-0.02	-0.11	-0.21	-0.36	-0.73	-1.73	0.00	0.00	-0.02	-0.11	-0.22	-0.36	-0.75	-1.88	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.02	0.15
lec		2000	0.00	0.00	-0.01	-0.09	-0.17	-0.31	-0.61	-1.49	0.00	0.00	-0.01	-0.09	-0.17	-0.31	-0.61	-1.53	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.04
8	es	3000	0.00	0.00	-0.02	-0.08	-0.17	-0.32	-0.60	-1.49	0.00	0.00	-0.01	-0.08	-0.17	-0.32	-0.60	-1.52	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.03
an	an	4000	0.00	0.00	-0.05	-0.09	-0.19	-0.34	-0.63	-1.51	0.00	0.00	-0.05	-0.09	-0.19	-0.34	-0.63	-1.52	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.02
fs	5	5000	0.00	0.00	-0.06	-0.25	-0.21	-0.38	-0.68	-1.59	0.00	0.00	-0.06	-0.25	-0.21	-0.38	-0.68	-1.61	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.02
ž	ŝ	6000	0.00	-0.01	-0.06	-0.26	-0.25	-0.42	-0.74	-1.74	0.00	-0.01	-0.06	-0.26	-0.25	-0.42	-0.74	-1.75	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.01
be		7000	0.00	-0.01	-0.06	-0.26	-0.42	-0.48	-0.81	-1.87	0.00	-0.01	-0.06	-0.26	-0.42	-0.48	-0.81	-1.87	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
E		8000	0.00	-0.01	-0.06	-0.26	-0.42	-0.61	-0.88	-2.00	0.00	-0.01	-0.06	-0.26	-0.42	-0.61	-0.88	-2.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
ž		9000	0.00	-0.01	-0.06	-0.26	-0.42	-0.63	-0.94	-2.08	0.00	-0.01	-0.06	-0.26	-0.42	-0.63	-0.94	-2.08	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
		10000	0.00	-0.01	-0.06	-0.26	-0.42	-0.63	-1.02	-2.19	0.00	-0.01	-0.06	-0.26	-0.42	-0.63	-1.02	-2.19	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Bias	ed											A	titude	e Thre	eshol	d										
			D	iffere	encel	betwo	een G	LM4	and 2	216	D	iffere	ence l	betwe	een G	LM4	and 2	/12		Differe	ence	betw	een	ZI2 a	nd Z	16
E E			R	0	50	100	125	150	175	200	R	0	50	100	125	150	175	200	R	0	50	100	125	150	175	200
6		1000	0.00	0.00	-0.01	-0.08	-0.15	-0.26	-0.49	-1.35	0.00	0.00	-0.01	-0.09	-0.27	-0.36	-0.68	-1.77	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.02	0.06	0.10	0.16	0.36
led		2000	0.00	0.00	-0.01	-0.09	-0.18	-0.32	-0.62	-1.56	0.00	0.00	-0.01	-0.11	-0.23	-0.42	-0.78	-1.92	0.0	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.10	0.16	0.36
đ	S	3000	0.00	0.01	-0.01	-0.09	-0.18	-0.33	-0.61	-1.46	0.00	0.00	-0.03	-0.10	-0.22	-0.41	-0.74	-1.82	0.0	0.01	0.01	0.02	0.04	0.08	0.14	0.37
an	ar	4000	0.01	0.01	-0.03	-0.10	-0.20	-0.36	-0.65	-1.55	0.00	0.00	-0.05	-0.16	-0.24	-0.42	-0.77	-1.90	0.0	0.01	0.02	0.06	0.04	0.06	0.12	0.35
fs	9	5000	0.01	0.01	-0.05	-0.26	-0.39	-0.39	-0.70	-1.66	0.00	-0.01	-0.06	-0.26	-0.25	-0.45	-0.80	-1.88	0.0	0.02	0.02	0.04	0.03	0.06	0.09	0.22
2	ŝ	6000	0.01	0.01	-0.05	-0.26	-0.30	-0.43	-0.76	-1.74	0.00	-0.01	-0.06	-0.26	-0.38	-0.48	-0.86	-2.00	0.0	0.02	0.01	0.00	0.08	0.06	0.09	0.26
be		7000	0.01	0.01	-0.06	-0.26	-0.42	-0.48	-0.82	-1.88	0.00	-0.01	-0.06	-0.26	-0.42	-0.52	-0.86	-1.99	0.0	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.04	0.05	0.11
E		8000	0.01	0.00	-0.06	-0.26	-0.42	-0.59	-0.88	-2.00	0.00	-0.01	-0.06	-0.26	-0.42	-0.62	-0.92	-2.08	0.0	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.03	0.04	0.08
ž		9000	0.01	0.00	-0.06	-0.26	-0.42	-0.63	-0.98	-2.10	0.00	-0.01	-0.06	-0.26	-0.42	-0.63	-1.00	-2.15	0.0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.02	0.04
	_	10000	0.00	-0.01	-0.06	-0.26	-0.42	-0.63	-1.02	-2.19	0.00	-0.01	-0.06	-0.26	-0.42	-0.63	-1.02	-2.19	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
						_	2.5	2	4	0.5	0	0.5		2	25	_		_	0	0.00	0.4	0.2	0	0.0	0.4	26



62 Figure S1.6. Comparisons of model predictive power of sampling abundance (from the whole model) between a 63 generalised linear model (GLM) and two zero-inflated (ZI) models across varying levels of biological and 64 sampling bias zero-inflation. Values represent the mean difference in D ('deviation from the best model') between 65 GLM4 (containing both biological and bias predictor), ZI2 (excludes the bias predictor from the zero component) 66 and ZI6 (includes the bias predictor in the zero component). Biological zero-inflation was increased by 67 introducing a minimum altitude threshold below which the species cannot survive and therefore reducing its 68 environmental niche. Sampling-related zero-inflation was increased by increasing the number of grid cells 69 sampled across the study area in increments of 10%. Negative (red) values show scenarios where the ZI model 70 performs better than the GLM (left and middle panels) or where ZI6 performs better than ZI2 (right panel), 71 whereas positive (blue) values show scenarios where GLM4 outperforms the ZI models or ZI2 outperforms ZI6. 72 'R' represents the values for the random species whose occurrence is not related to altitude.

Tı	rue species ab	undance	Distance from n	earest town	Altitude					
Scale	Sampling	BinomialGLM1	MaxEnt1	BinomialGLM 2	MaxEnt2	Z16				
1-km		en en				(and				
2-km	Biased	<u>E</u>		Ċ,	4					
5-km			1	Ľ.	2.0.	6				
1-km		1. Ser.		and the second						
2-km	Random									
5-km			(*		£.,					

75 Figure S1.7. Example distribution maps for a hypothetical species whose occurrence is positively influenced by 76 altitude (altitude species) from two binomial generalised linear models (GLMs) and two Maximum Entropy 77 (MaxEnt) models. Maps are compared to maps of predicted abundance produced using the count abundance 78 predictions (from the count component only) from a zero-inflated (ZI) model (ZI6) which inclues the bias in 79 predictor in both components of the model. BinomialGLM1 and MaxEnt1 include only the biological predictor of 80 altitude, whereas BinomialGLM2 and MaxEnt2 also include the bias predictor of distance from the nearest town. 81 Unlike the zero-inflated (ZI) model, only one prediction can be obtained from the whole model and therefore will 82 contain influences of sampling bias if present. Models were built with either data collected by random or biased

- 83 sampling. Individual cells are colour coded based on abundance for the ZI abundance predictions or on
- 84 probability of presence for the binomial GLM and MaxEnt predictions (high = red, low = blue).

85



88 Figure S1.8. Evaluation of MaxEnt, generalised linear model (GLM) and zero-inflated (ZI) model predictions of 89 altitude species presence-absence across the study area based on mean Area under the Curve (AUC) across three 90 scales of data aggregation: 1-km, 2-km and 5-km. Mean AUC values ( $\pm$  SE and data range) for each sampling 91 strategy (random or biased) across the 10 model repetitions are shown for two MaxEnt models and two binomial 92 generalised linear models (GLMs): MaxEnt1 and Binomial-GLM1 which includes only altitude as a predictor, 93 and MaxEnt2 and Binomial-GLM2 which includes altitude and distance from town as predictors. Abundance 94 predictions were converted into binary presence-absence predictions for two non-zero-inflated generalised linear 95 models (GLM3 including only the biological predictor and GLM4 including the biological and bias predictor) 96 and two zero-inflated (ZI) models (ZI2 which does not account for bias in the zero component and ZI6 which does 97 account for bias in the zero component) based on a threshold equal to the mean predicted abundance per model 98 type (see Methods for more information). 99

**100** Table S1.1. Number of grid cells (at 1km<sup>2</sup> resolution) across the study area above each altitude threshold (m)

*used for Simulation 2.* 

Threshold (m)	Number of cells above threshold						
0	10,000						
50	9,068						
100	5,329						
125	3,364						
150	1,993						
175	1,036						
200	396						