

# Supplementary Information for

Historical reconstruction unveils the risk of mass mortality and ecosystem collapse during pan-continental megadrought

Robert C. Godfree, Nunzio Knerr, Denise Godfree, John Busby, Bruce Robertson and Francisco Encinas-Viso

Robert C. Godfree Email: Robert.Godfree@csiro.au

# **This PDF file includes:**

Supplementary text Figs. S1 to S7 Tables S1 to S5

# **Supplementary Information Text**

**Materials and Methods.** Further details on information sources, database development and data analyses.

### **Database development**

The primary source of data consisted of digitised newspaper articles contained in the National Library of Australia's Trove platform (www.trove.nla.gov.au). Trove contains a very large, searchable repository of online historical digital resources that includes newspapers, journals, photographs and other material. We conducted a series of searches of Trove's digitised newspaper collection that contained the terms *drought*, *dead* OR *dying*, followed by one of 296 terms or phrases relating to geographic locations or features ( $n = 273$ ) or broad vegetation groups or plant genera  $(n = 23)$ . Geographic search terms were selected from 90 different meteorological forecast districts (see Australian Bureau of Meteorology, www.bom.gov.au) in all six Australian states and two territories. Terms include towns, rivers, major geographic regions (e.g., 'Darling Downs', 'Kimberley', 'Goldfields'), or isolated telegraph or private stations (e.g., 'Avon Downs', 'Tennant Creek'). Searches based on regional population centres were particularly important because many observations at the time were reported by local correspondents. Vegetation terms were selected to represent major vegetation groups present in Australia (*Acacia, Callitris, Eucalyptus, forest*, *grassland, heath, mallee, rainforest, shrub, tussock and woodland*) or a range of colloquial or more general terms used at the time [*alpine, brigalow* (= *Acacia harpophylla*), *gum, mulga* (= *Acacia aneura* sens. lat.), *river red gum* (= *Eucalyptus camaldulensis*), *savannah, scrub, spinifex* (= *Triodia* sens. lat.), *timber, tree, vegetation* and *wetland*].

For each search we reviewed up to the first 2000 (drought  $+$  dead OR dying search;  $n =$ 1), 400 (vegetation searches) or 100 (geographic searches) newspaper articles, for a total of >35,000 potentially relevant articles. In virtually all searches this exhausted the number of articles relevant for use in our study, and the great majority of newspaper reports that documented either an impact of drought on plants or non-domestic animals (hereafter referred to as biotic impact records; BIRs) were identified in multiple searches. Thus, our approach provided a nearcomprehensive screening of all digitised newspaper articles potentially relevant to our work. We also identified a small number of explorer journals and other sources based on references in newspaper articles and also reviewed these for relevant information. We retained all sources that documented either an impact of drought on biota (BIRs) or an especially significant event or attribute of drought-affected areas, such as dust storms, livestock death, or social impacts (drought impact record; DIR). We excluded sources with impacts that were attributable to nondrought factors (e.g., poison, bounties). A total of 556 BIRs (541 with geolocations) and 1748 DIRs were identified.

For DIRs we then simply estimated the geolocations of observations of 1) dust storms, sand storms and drift, 2) livestock death, 3) hydrological impacts (low water levels in rivers, lakes, etc.), 4) bare understory, and 5) general drought conditions. This allowed us to determine the geographic extent of perceived drought and the locations of more severe impacts associated with agriculture or "dust bowl" conditions. For BIRs we extracted information for the following data fields (e.g., *SI Appendix*, Fig. S6): 1) estimated observation date (as opposed to the

publication date), 2) broad morpho-taxonomic group (8 animal and 6 plant groups, see *SI Appendix*, Table S2), 3) taxonomic identity (family, genus or species), 4) impact type (mortality, stress or absence, which includes any evidence of rapid population decline or disappearance), 5) estimated geolocation (latitude, longitude), 6) estimated extent of impact, 7) IBRA bioregion, 8) ecosystem type, 9) presence of livestock-related factors, 10) location relative to area of severe rabbit infestation in 1891, and 11) evidence of population collapse or mass mortality.

The estimated observation date was determined as precisely as possible to the last full calendar month prior to the date of the relevant report, or earlier based on textual evidence if available. This allowed for the typical several days to three weeks that occurred between an observation being made and its subsequent reporting in newspapers. These dates were used in subsequent data analyses (see below). Animal and plant morpho-taxonomic groups were as follows: Actinopterygii (fish), Amphibia (frogs), Aves (birds), Eutheria (i.e., European rabbit, *Oryctolagus cuniculus* and hare, *Lepus timidus*), Insecta (insects), Malacostraca (shrimp), Marsupialia (marsupials), Reptilia (reptiles), woody trees  $(>7m)$ , tall shrubs  $(3-7m)$ , low shrubs (<3m), herbaceous – graminoid (Poaceae), herbaceous – other (i.e., Asteraceae) and succulents (i.e., *Opuntia stricta*). Taxonomic identity was determined to the lowest level possible.

It was possible to estimate indicative geolocations for 541 BIRs based on textual evidence. We estimated the area of impact  $(A_T)$  based on a circle of radius r (the estimated extent of impact) centred on each indicative geocoded location, classified according to  $r = 0.5, 1, 5, 10$ , 25, 50, 100, 150, 200, 250…..km unless specific information was provided in the text. The IBRA bioregion was determined based on Thackway & Cresswell (1995). Ecosystem types were defined using the following general categories based on textual evidence and location: aquatic (marine, lake or river/creek), terrestrial [dry, wet (floodplain, ephemeral wetland), arboreal, mixed], mixed (aquatic + terrestrial), and other.

We also determined whether livestock-related factors (e.g., overgrazing, trampling) were stated by the observer as a contributing factor to each BIR. BIRs referring only to mortality or stress associated with overgrazing or heat and not drought were therefore excluded from the database. BIRs were also classified into occurring inside or outside the main area of rabbit infestation. The geographic extent of this area (RIA) was determined based on textual evidence of hyperabundant populations of rabbits at the beginning of the study period (1891) and on distribution maps provided in Stodart & Parer (1988). This excluded some areas where rabbits were present but only in latter stages of the study period, or where there was little or no evidence of hyperabundance, and in particular starvation associated with overpopulation. Non-terrestrial BIRs were also excluded. The RIA identified is shown in Fig. 3 and the *SI Appendix*, Fig. S5A.

We also assessed each BIR for evidence of population collapse or mass mortality. We first classified each relevant BIR into one of four categories: 1) extirpation of population (E), with evidence of total disappearance and lack of subsequent recovery, 2) near-extirpation (NE), with evidence of population decline to extreme scarcity, 3) mass mortality based on area (Ma), with evidence of mortality affecting a large proportion of a particular population or assemblage over a given area, and 4) mass mortality based on numerical estimate (Mn). We classified categories 1-3 into local (patchy impact on scale of hundreds of m to < 10km radius), district (impact on scale of 10 - <100 km radius, usually the district around a town, area between two towns, or a large agricultural station, or regional (scale >100 km radius, multiple districts or large stations). We classified the Mn category into 1) hundreds to thousands  $(10^2-10^3)$ , 2) tens to hundreds of thousands ( $10^4$ - $10^5$ ), and 3) millions or more ( $10^6$ +). BIRs were allocated to categories based on interpretation of textual evidence, the stated magnitude and/or area of impact, and the geographic context of the report.

#### **Rainfall data and association with BIRs**

Rainfall data were obtained from the public SILO enhanced climate database (daily rainfall since 1889) hosted by the Science Delivery Division of the Department of Science, Information

Technology and Innovation (DSITI) found at https://legacy.longpaddock.qld.gov.au/silo/. We determined, for Australia, 1) mean annual precipitation  $(P_{AV}; 1889{\text -}2015)$ , 2) total annual precipitation *P* (all years 1890-1903), 3) percentile annual *P* (all years 1890-1903, Nov 1901-Oct 1902), 4) total *P* as a percentage of the mean (all years 1890-1903; 1891-94, 1895-1902 and Nov 1901-Oct 1902), and 5) lowest annual *P* as total and as percentage of  $P_{AV}$ . These data were used to construct rainfall total, deviation and decile maps for relevant time periods (see Fig.1 and *SI Appendix* Fig. S2).

We investigated evidence of an increase in BIRs during dry years by comparing the number of BIRS across "wet" years and "other" years. This was performed in three continental regions: 1) western (W; west of E 131 $^{\circ}$ ), north-eastern (NE; east of E 131 $^{\circ}$  and north of S 26 $^{\circ}$ ) and south-eastern (SE; east of E 131° and south of S 26°) (*SI Appendix*, Fig S4A). Wet years were defined as: W = 1890, 1893, 1896; NE = 1890-1891, 1894, 1896; SE = 1890-91, 1893-94. During "wet" years the total rainfall across the majority of each region exceeded  $P_{AV}$ . For each region we compared the frequency of BIRs in "wet" and "other" years using simple  $\chi^2$ contingency analyses with the expected frequency of counts proportional to the number of years in each category. To avoid dependency among data points we included only BIRs with unique spatial coordinates and observation dates in these analyses.

We used analysis of cumulative sum of monthly rainfall residuals (*R*) to quantify the depth and magnitude of drought for each geocoded BIR (*n* = 541) prior to the last full calendar month before each estimated observation date  $(T_0)$ . *R* was extended back to Jan 1889 (the start of the SILO record). We then determined three measures of drought duration, 1) the number of consecutive months of negative monthly rainfall residuals prior to  $T_0$  ( $D_{CDM}$ ), 2) the duration of continuous drought in months ( $D_{\text{CON}}$ ) prior to  $T_0$  (no prior unbroken period of 12 months or more of above average rainfall), and 3) the duration of semicontinuous drought in months  $(D<sub>SCO</sub>)$  prior to  $T_0$  (no prior unbroken period of 24 months or more of above average rainfall). Drought magnitude after the period of continuous drought was defined as the total cumulative rainfall residual over the period  $(R_{CON})$ , expressed as a percentage of mean annual rainfall (which allows for comparison across sites with different mean precipitation). A worked example is provided in *SI Appendix* Fig. S7. Subsequent analyses included only rainfall data with terminal  $D_{CDM}$ ,  $D_{CON}$  or D<sub>SCO</sub> dates; for a small subset of data this excluded records with insufficient rainfall history (i.e., pre-1889) to determine terminal values for these metrics.

We developed a percentile-based index,  $(PR_R)$ , to determine the strength of association between the magnitude of preceding cumulative 12-month rainfall  $(R_{12}$ , expressed as percentage deviation relative to the 1889-2015 average) and the estimated timing (observation date) of a given biotic impact record. We determined  $PR_R$  according to  $PR_R = ((f_b + 0.5f_w)/N) \times 100$  where *f*<sup>b</sup> is the frequency of *R*<sup>12</sup> values below the observed *R*<sup>12</sup> value at the estimated observation date of a given BIR,  $f_w$  is the number of  $R_{12}$  values with the same value, and N is the total number of all cumulative 12-month rainfall intervals.  $R_{12}$  values were calculated for all 12-month intervals beginning in Jan-Dec 1890 and ending in Jan-Dec 1903 ( $n = 157$ ). We then determined  $PR<sub>R</sub>$  for all BIRs with unique spatial coordinates ( $n = 326$ ) and compared the mean  $PR_R$  of BIRs both within and outside the primary rabbit infested area (RIA) using generalised least squares linear model analysis. Spatial autocorrelation was accounted for by incorporating an exponential correlation structure which had the lowest Akaike information criterion (AIC) among tested structures (see below).

We also tested whether the mean  $R_{12}$  across all BIRs differed from a statistical null model. This was constructed by randomly selecting, for each BIR, one  $R_{12}$  value from among the 157 values between Dec 1890 and Dec 1903. This process was repeated 1,000 times, and the mean and standard deviation of sample means determined (according to the central limit theorem, the sample means are normally distributed). The difference between mean of the observations (*n*  $= 541$ ) and the null distribution was then assessed using standard z statistic.

Finally, we determined whether the frequency of spatially and temporally unique BIRs citing livestock impact differed between rabbit-infested and other areas, and whether BIR frequency differed from equal expectation across winter (J,J,A), spring (S,O,N), summer (D,J,F) and autumn (M,A,M) seasons in RIAs as well as other northern (-16 to -26°S) and southern (-26 to -42°S) regions using simple  $\chi^2$  contingency analyses.

## **Density and network analyses, spatial interpolation, and statistical modelling**

Kernel density analysis was performed on geocoded mortality records (for this and most subsequent analyses this combined the absence and mortality classes of impact type) for birds, marsupials, fish, rabbits (*Oryctolagus cuniculus*), trees, tall shrubs, low shrubs and grasses using the R package GISTools (v. 0.7-4) with a bandwidth (H) of 5 which minimised data overfitting. Modularity network analysis of the network based on spatial co-occurrence of broad impacted plant and animal groups was conducted based on stochastic simulated annealing algorithm using the package netcarto (see Guimera & Amaral 2005 for details of the SA modularity method). We also tested the significance of the observed modularity using a randomisation test with  $N=1000$ replicates implemented in the netcarto command line program

(https://bitbucket.org/amarallab/network-cartography). Spatial interpolation of  $D_{\text{CON}}$  and  $R_{\text{CON}}$ was performed using variogram fitting and ordinary kriging approaches described in Bivand *et al*.  $(2013)$  and Brundson & Comber  $(2015)(84, 85)$  and relevant functions in R packages gstat v. 1.1-6, sp v. 1.2-4 and raster v. 2.5-8.

We determined mean values of  $D_{\text{CS}}$ ,  $D_{\text{CON}}$ ,  $R_{\text{CON}}$  and  $D_{\text{SCO}}$  based on mortality records for native animals, native plants, major taxonomic or morphological groups (marsupials, birds, fish, *Oryctolagus cuniculus*, trees, tall shrubs, low shrubs and grasses) across all BIRs and both within (native animals, native plants, *Oryctolagus cuniculus*), and outside the rabbit-infested region (native animals, native plants). We then modelled each parameter using linear model analysis with generalised least squares and with broad biotic group (native terrestrial animals vs. native plants; Tgroup), occurrence inside or outside rabbit-infested areas of central and western NSW (RIA), and mean site precipitation ( $P_{AV}$ ) as predictor variables. The two-way RIA  $\times$  Tgroup interaction was also tested in each model and removed due to non-significance. Three model types were tested for each dependent variable: 1) model including all observations (full, nonspatial; FNS), 2) models using all observations [with very small random deviations (average  $\approx$ 1km) added to spatial coordinates] but incorporating spatial autocorrelation (full, spatial; FS), and 3) model using only BIRs with unique spatial locations (restricted, non-spatial; RNS). For FS models we tested five autocorrelation structures (exponential, Gaussian, linear spatial, rational quadratic and spherical) and selected the model with the lowest Akaike information criterion (AIC). In most models the rational quadratic structure provided the best fit, and autocorrelation in FS and RNS models was greatly reduced compared to FNS models. Dependent variables were transformed where necessary to conform to model assumptions. Model parameters including adjusted means and tests of main effects were constructed and extracted using R packages stats v. 3.4.2 and nlme v. 3.1-139.

### **References for Materials and Methods**

- Bivand RS, Pebesma E, Gómez-Rubio V (2013) Applied spatial data analysis with R. Springer, New York, NY. 405p.
- Brundston C, Comber L (2015) An introduction to R for spatial analysis and mapping. Sage Publications Ltd. London. 343p.
- [Guimera G, Amaral LAN \(2005\) Functional cartography of complex metabolic networks.](http://amaral-lab.org/publications/functional-cartography-of-complex-metabolic-networks/) *Nature* [433: 895-900.](http://amaral-lab.org/publications/functional-cartography-of-complex-metabolic-networks/)
- Stodart E, Parer I (1988) Colonisation of Australia by the rabbit *Oryctolagus cuniculus* (L.). Canberra, Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation.

Thackway R, Cresswell ID (1995) An Interim Biogeographic Regionalisation for Australia: a framework for setting priorities in the national reserves system cooperative program. Australian Nature Conservancy Agency, Canberra, ACT.



**Fig. S1.** Annual continental rainfall anomalies and significant eastern Australia droughts 1890- 2015. The data show increasing mean continental rainfall since approximately 1972 with particularly wet periods in the 1970s, 1990s and 2010s. Major decade-scale droughts that affected part or all of eastern Australia include the (1892-) 1895-1903 Federation Drought (FD), World War II (1935-) 1937-1945 drought (WWII) and the (1997-) 2001-2009 Millennium Drought (MD; numbers in brackets are sometimes used). Other severe droughts occurred during 1912-15, 1920s, 1964-67, 1979-82 and 1991-94 (mainly affecting eastern Qld and NE NSW). The 1891- 1903 study period (Federation Drought Period, FDP) is shown in green; the period 1895-1945 is known as the eastern Australian "Dust Bowl". The orange line is the cumulative residual rainfall curve for the continent as a whole. Regional rainfall trends can be obtained at the Australian Bureau of Meteorology home page (www.bom.gov.au).



# Annual precipitation across Australia, 1890-1903







Most extreme year of the Federation Drought, with exceptionally low rainfall and severe drought extending across virtually all of the eastern half of the continent. Very low to record low rainfall extending to coastal areas of QLD and NSW. Devastating stock losses, especially in inland areas of Qld, NSW and SA. Re-emergence of drought in far southwestern WA.





**Fig. S2.** Total annual rainfall (left panels) and quantiles (right panels) for 1890-1903. A brief description of the pattern of drought in each year is provided. Quantile maps contain geolocations of drought records recorded in that year (black dots). States and abbreviations are shown in the first panel. Also shown for the period November 1901 – October 1902 are total rainfall (% of normal) and associated quantiles.



**Fig. S3.** Secondary indicators of drought extracted from historical sources, 1890-1903. (*A*) Locations of reported livestock mortality and vegetation denudation (bare). (*B*) Carcasses of cattle at drying waterhole on Bowra Station, north of Cunnamulla, Queensland, ca. 1900-1902. (*C*) Locations of reported dust storms, sandstorms and soil drift (wind erosion). (*D*) Severe dust storm at Narrandera, central NSW, on Monday Feb 2, 1903 [photo: Carl T. Dugdale (d. 1939); courtesy National Library of Australia]. Recoloured from the original. Gray shading in *A* and *C* represents the approximate extent of areas unexplored by Europeans in 1896 reproduced from Hill JG (1905) The Calvert scientific exploring expedition. F. Philip & Son, Ltd., London, 44p.



**Fig. S4.** Timing of biotic impact records across Australia and association with rainfall deficiencies and overgrazing. (*A*) Biotic impact records by year (x axis). (*B*) *PR*<sup>R</sup> index for all BIR locations. *PRR* is the percentile rank of the rainfall deficiency observed in the 12 months prior to a given BIR relative to all 12 month intervals 1890-1903. High values indicate that the BIR occurred in a relatively wet period while low values indicate a drier period. For example, a *PR*R value of 10 indicates that the BIR observation was made during the lowest decile or 10% of 12 month rainfall totals. (*C*) Locations of BIR sites at which overgrazing was cited as a contributing factor to biotic mortality or stress. All figures were constructed using unique records (removing site-level duplications).



**Fig. S5.** Estimated total area of impact across BIRs (*A*T) and mortality hotspots for animals (A; kernel density estimate maps for marsupials, birds, fish and rabbits shown below) and plants (B; kernel density estimate maps for trees, tall shrubs, low shrubs and grasses shown below) during 1891-1903. The combined  $A_T$  of all animal and plant records is 2.76 x 10<sup>6</sup> km<sup>2</sup>.



**Fig. S6.** Example of biotic impact records extracted from a newspaper article published in the Brisbane Courier, May 15 1902.



**Fig. S7.** Method for determining drought depth and duration prior to the time of impact based on analysis of the cumulative sum of monthly rainfall residuals (*R*). For each geocoded BIR we determined the estimated observation date  $(T_0)$  and extended  $R$  backwards by sequentially adding monthly rainfall residuals (determined as  $P_{AV} - P_M$  where  $P_{AV}$  is the mean monthly rainfall and  $P_M$  is the observed monthly rainfall) back to Jan 1889. We then determined 1) the number of consecutive months of negative monthly rainfall residuals prior to  $T_0$  ( $D_{CDM}$ ), 2) the duration of continuous drought ( $D_{CON}$ ) prior to  $T_0$ , defined as duration of cumulated monthly rainfall residuals working backwards from the observation date with no unbroken period of 12 months or more of declining *R* (i.e., no  $R_{(t+n)} \sim R_{(t+1)} < R_{(t)}$  such that  $n \geq 12$ ), and 3) duration of semi-continuous drought ( $D_{SCO}$ ) prior to  $T_0$ , defined as the duration of cumulative monthly rainfall residuals with no unbroken period of 24 months or more of declining *R* (i.e., no  $R_{(t+1)}...R_{(t+1)} < R_{(t)}$  such that n  $\geq$ 24). In the diagram above, prior to the observation (OBS) at t=0, there were 11 consecutive months of below average monthly rainfall  $(D_{CDM} = 11)$  and 24 months of continuous drought  $(D<sub>CON</sub> = 24)$  with a total accumulated rainfall deficiency of 950 mm which is 95% of the mean annual precipitation of 1000 mm ( $R_{\text{CON}} = 95$ ). Prior to this there were two intervals (*x* and *y*) of between 12 and 24 months of declining *R*, but no period exceeding 24 months (note *x* and *y* are separated by  $R_A$  where  $R_A > R_{\text{CON}}$ . Prior to  $R_{\text{SCO}}$  there were at least 24 months of declining *R* (i.e, two years with a positive rainfall residual overall; interval *z*) and so the period of semicontinuous drought  $(D<sub>SCO</sub>)$  is terminated at 91 months prior to the observation.

**Table S1.** Selected accounts describing drought impacts during the study period. 1-4: livestock death, 5: hydrological; 6-9: waterway contamination; 10-14: dust storms, wind erosion; 15-18: social and economic; 19-28: birds, 29-35: native mammals, 36-38: rabbits (*Oryctolagus cuniculus*), 39-42: fish and eels, 43-44: reptiles, 45-62: vegetation, 63-73: use of livestock and carcasses by predatory and scavenging animals, 74-80: evidence of persistent drought impacts on biota.

























**Table S2.** Biotic impact record counts of plant and animal taxa during the 1891-1903 study period. \*exotic species

Note: some taxa vary in size from tall shrubs to trees depending on location



**Table S3**. Accounts of population collapse (extirpation and near-extirpation) and mass mortality (by area and number) across major taxonomic groups and major families. Categories for E, NE and Ma are:  $1$  < 10km, 2) 10 - < 100 km and 3) > 100 km). Categories for the Mn category are 1)  $10^2 - 10^3$ , 2)  $10^4 - 10^5$ , and 3)  $10^6 +$ .

		Extirpation (E) Near-Extirpation (NE)		Mass mortality (area) (Ma)			Mass mortality (number)(Mn)	<b>Total</b>				
		$\overline{2}$	3	$\mathbf{1}$	2	з	$\mathbf{1}$	$\overline{2}$	3	$\mathbf{1}$	3 2	
Actinopterygii							11	$\mathbf{1}$	$\overline{2}$	$\overline{4}$		18
	Anguillidae						$\overline{2}$	$\mathbf 1$		$\mathbf 1$		4
Aves		$\overline{2}$	$\mathbf{1}$	$\mathbf{1}$	5	8	4	$\overline{6}$	3	11		41
	Alcedinidae			$\mathbf 1$	3	$\mathbf 1$		1		$\mathbf 1$		7
	Casuariidae					$\mathbf{1}$	$\mathbf{1}$	$\overline{2}$		$\mathbf 1$		5
	Psittacidae	$\mathbf 1$				$\mathbf{1}$				$\mathbf 1$		3
Eutheria												
	Leporidae			$\mathbf{1}$	10	3	$\overline{2}$	5	4	12	7 $\mathbf{1}$	45
Marsupialia		$\mathbf{1}$	$\overline{7}$		$\mathbf{1}$	$\overline{6}$	$\mathbf{1}$	3	5	5		29
	Macropodidae		$\mathbf{1}$		$\mathbf{1}$	2	$\mathbf{1}$	$\mathbf 1$		$\mathbf 1$		7
	Peramelidae		$\mathbf{1}$						$1\,$	1		3
	Phalangeridae					$\overline{2}$		$1\,$		$1\,$		4
	Phascolarctidae	$1\,$						$1\,$		$\mathbf 1$		3
	Potoroidae		$1\,$						4	$\mathbf 1$		6
Forbs								$\mathbf{1}$				$\mathbf{1}$
Insecta					$\mathbf 1$	$\mathbf 1$						$\overline{2}$
Reptilia						$\overline{2}$		$\mathbf 1$	$\overline{2}$			5
Grasses												
	Poaceae				1			10	4			15
Short shrubs					$\overline{3}$	5		14	$\overline{3}$			25
	Chenopodiaceae				$\overline{2}$	4		9	3			18
<b>Tall Shrubs</b>					$\mathbf{1}$		4	$\overline{7}$	5	$\overline{2}$		19
	Fabaceae				$\mathbf{1}$		3	7	$\overline{4}$	$\overline{2}$		17
<b>Trees</b>				$\overline{2}$	$\mathbf{1}$	$\mathbf{1}$	9	21	11	$\overline{4}$		49
	Casuarinaceae						$\mathbf 1$	$\mathbf{1}$	$\overline{2}$			4
	Cupres saceae			$1\,$			$\overline{2}$	$\mathbf{1}$		$\mathbf{1}$		5
	Fabaceae						$\mathbf 1$	$\overline{2}$	3			6
	Myrtaceae			$\mathbf{1}$			4	8	$\mathbf{1}$			14
Mixed animals					5	$\overline{5}$	$\mathbf{1}$					11
Mixed animals and plants								$\mathbf{1}$				$\mathbf{1}$
<b>Mixed plants</b>								$\overline{4}$				4
	Mixed woody plants			$\mathbf{1}$	$\mathbf{1}$		$\mathbf{1}$	$\overline{6}$	$\mathbf{1}$			10
<b>Grand Total</b>		3	8	5	29	31	33	80	40	38	$\mathbf{1}$ 7	275

**Table S4**. Results of generalised least squares linear model analysis of relationships between magnitude or duration of drought ( $D_{CDM}$ ,  $D_{CON}$ ,  $R_{CON}$  and  $D_{SCO}$ ; defined in *SI Appendix* Fig. S7) and mean annual impact site rainfall  $(P_{AV}, mm)$ , location relative to areas infested by the European rabbit (*Oryctolagus cuniculus*) (RIA) and native terrestrial animal or plant group (Tgroup). F values (with residual degrees of freedom, rdf) for each predictor variable (DV) and predicted means (standard error) are provided; for  $P_{AV}$  means were evaluated at 130, 430, 740, 1000 and 1400 mm. Means are in the transformed scale where appropriate ( $D_{CDM}$ ,  $D_{CON}$ ,  $R_{CON}$ ) = square root transformed;  $D_{SCO} =$  untransformed). Three model types were used: FNS = all BIRs, non spatial; FS = all BIRs, spatial; RNS = only spatially unique BIRs, non-spatial; for details see *SI Appendix* SI Text. M*P*< 0.10, \**P*< 0.05, \*\**P*< 0.01, \*\*\**P*<0.001.

	Model			Effect			<b>RIA</b>		Tgroup		$P_{AV}$			
DV	Type	rdf	$P_{AV}$	TGroup	<b>RIA</b>	Inside	Outside	Plant	Animal	130	430	740		1000 1400
D <sub>CDM</sub>	<b>FNS</b>	295	41.67***	0.01	8.03	2.25(0.13)	2.65(0.05)	2.58(0.07)	2.59(0.07)	2.18	2.54	2.91	3.22	3.70
	FS	295	$4.16*$	0.13	1.24	2.44(0.20)	2.55(0.09)	2.56(0.09)	2.51(0.10)	2.30	2.51	2.72	2.91	3.19
	<b>RNS</b>	151	$5.31*$	0.01	0.01	2.50(0.17)	2.52(0.08)	2.52(0.09)	2.51(0.12)	2.31	2.51	2.72	2.90	3.18
D <sub>CON</sub>	<b>FNS</b>	289	$3.34^{M}$	$6.29*$	$13.87***$	5.06(0.24)	6.14(0.10)	6.19(0.13)	5.71(0.14)	6.33	6.00	5.66	5.38	4.94
	FS	289	1.73	0.04	0.19	5.72 (0.40)	6.03(0.20)	5.98 (0.20)	5.97 (0.20)	6.30	6.01	5.72	5.47	5.08
	<b>RNS</b>	147	2.93 <sup>M</sup>	1.57	$4.19*$	5.34(0.35)	6.18(0.16)	6.17(0.18)	5.79 (0.24)	6.46	6.05	5.62	5.27	4.72
Rcon	<b>FNS</b>	289	$10.94**$	$5.34*$	$21.24***$	8.83(0.43)	11.17(0.18)	11.16(0.23)	10.36(0.24)	11.91	10.91	9.89	9.02	7.70
	FS	289	$8.02**$	0.84	0.47	10.08 (0.66)	10.94 (0.35)	10.82 (0.34)	10.77 (0.34)	11.98	10.94	9.86	8.96	7.57
	<b>RNS</b>	147	$14.02***$	0.96	$8.14**$	9.38(0.59)	11.32 (0.27)	11.15(0.30)	10.65(0.41)	12.43	11.01	9.56	8.34	6.45
Dsco	FNS	275	$4.14*$	2.37	0.03	50.53 (3.9)	52.41 (1.71)	54.46 (2.17)	49.55 (2.24)	56.53	52.75	48.86	45.59	40.56
	<b>RNS</b>	136	0.97	0.08	0.54		48.39 (5.50) 52.80 (2.57)	51.47 (2.84)	52.84 (3.89)	56.14	52.30	48.33	45.01	39.89

Table S5. Mean (standard error) of magnitude and duration of drought ( $D_{CDM}$ ,  $D_{CON}$ ,  $R_{CON}$  and *D*<sub>SCO</sub>; defined in *SI Appendix* Fig. S7) prior to mortality for native plants, animals, and the European rabbit (*Oryctolagus cuniculus*) across all BIRs (all areas) and both inside and outside of rabbit-infested areas (RIA).

		$D_{CDM}$	$D_{CON}$	$R_{\text{COM}}$	$D_{SCO}$
All areas	Native animal	7.23(0.40)	34.54 (1.79)	111.46 (5.83)	51.72 (2.66)
	Actinopterygii	5.45(0.96)	32.30 (6.10)	86.98 (16.79)	50.80 (6.79)
	Aves	8.07 (0.69)	30.07 (2.92)	119.26 (9.85)	49.64 (4.19)
	Marsupialia	6.86(0.75)	30.90 (2.66)	99.60 (8.27)	54.31 (5.34)
	Native plant	6.93(4.32)	40.86 (1.97)	136.25 (6.32)	56.93 (2.66)
	Grasses	6.44(1.15)	36.75 (5.40)	135.97 (19.97)	57.31 (7.62)
	Low shrubs	6.44(0.96)	38.35 (5.38)	128.50 (17.23)	48.39 (6.64)
	Tall shrubs	6.09(0.79)	44.30 (4.56)	154.68 (16.21)	63.09 (6.48)
	<b>Trees</b>	8.09(0.58)	39.87 (2.93)	126.88 (8.56)	57.26 (4.02)
	Oryctolagus cuniculus	4.13(0.36)	25.43 (2.92)	68.70 (7.04)	35.87 (4.24)
Outside RIA	Native animal	7.51(0.43)	34.33 (1.70)	112.30 (5.79)	53.23 (2.74)
	Native plant	7.20(0.41)	42.30 (2.21)	142.19 (7.09)	57.74 (3.06)
Inside RIA	Native animal	4.58(0.53)	36.42 (9.68)	103.71 (27.40)	37.75 (9.53)
	Native plant	5.89(0.87)	35.39 (4.27)	113.77 (13.40)	53.86 (5.28)
	Oryctolagus cuniculus	3.85(0.33)	21.30 (2.54)	58.18 (5.54)	30.24 (4.09)