

**Phylogeny is a stronger predictor of activity than allometry in an African mammal community**

Herbert Kasozi, Department of Fisheries and Wildlife. Michigan State University, 14 Natural Resources, 480 Wilson Road. East Lansing MI 48824, USA. [kasozihe@msu.edu](mailto:kasozihe@msu.edu)

Remington J. Moll, Department of Natural Resources and the Environment, 56 College Road, University of New Hampshire, Durham, NH 03824, USA. [Remington.Moll@unh.edu](mailto:Remington.Moll@unh.edu)

Robert M. Kityo, Department of Zoology, Entomology and Fisheries Sciences. Makerere University, P. O. Box 7062. Kampala, Uganda. [kityrob@gmail.com](mailto:kityrob@gmail.com)

Robert A. Montgomery, Wildlife Conservation Research Unit, Department of Zoology, University of Oxford, Abingdon Road, Tubney, Oxfordshire. OX13 5QL, UK. [robert.montgomery@zoo.ox.ac.uk](mailto:robert.montgomery@zoo.ox.ac.uk)

Running title: Phylogeny predicts mammal activity

Correspondence: Herbert Kasozi, 14 Natural Resources 480 Wilson Road, East Lansing MI 48824, USA. [kasozihe@msu.edu](mailto:kasozihe@msu.edu)

Statement of authorship: RMK designed the study; HK and RMK collected data; HK performed data analysis and interpretation, and led the writing of the manuscript. RAM and RJM contributed substantially to development of the ideas presented in the manuscript. All authors contributed critically to the drafts and gave final approval for publication.

Data availability: All data supporting the results will be provided upon reasonable request.

Acknowledgements: We are grateful to G. Guenard, D. Kramer and four anonymous reviewers for valuable insights and comments that improved the manuscript. Japan International Corporation Agency funded data collection through Air Water and Earth Engineers, Uganda. Uganda Wildlife Authority provided logistical support during data collection. HK was supported by a WWF Education for Nature Fellowship, Wildlife Conservation Network scholarship, and a Dissertation Completion Fellowship from the Graduate School at Michigan State University. The authors have no conflict of interest.

## 28    **ABSTRACT**

29    In promoting coexistence, sympatric species often partition shared resources along  
30    spatiotemporal domains. Similarly-sized and phylogenetically-close species, for instance,  
31    partition the times of day in which they are active to limit interference competition. Given that  
32    variation in species body mass has evolutionary underpinnings, species activity levels (time  
33    spent active in a 24-hour daily cycle) within animal communities might be structured by  
34    phylogeny. However, few studies have tested this hypothesis across animal communities, and  
35    none among medium to large mammals. We quantified the relative contributions of phylogeny  
36    and body mass in predicting activity levels in a community of 22 sympatric mammal species in  
37    Murchison Falls National Park, Uganda. We show that phylogeny is a stronger predictor of  
38    species activity levels than body mass. Our findings provide empirical evidence for the  
39    phylogenetic structuring of mammal activity in diverse communities. More broadly, our results  
40    suggest that evolutionary relationships mask allometry in predicting species traits in diverse  
41    animal communities.

42    **Keywords:** Activity level, body mass, co-existence, mammals, phylogeny, temporal niche  
43    partitioning

## INTRODUCTION

Species coexistence in animal communities is often facilitated by niche partitioning across spatio-temporal domains (Schoener, 1974; Amarasekare, 2003; Laporta & Sallum, 2014). Spatially, animals often partition habitats, or reduce competition via movements including dispersal and migration (Jeltsch et al., 2013). When spatial partitioning is not possible, animals may partition time by altering their activity schedules (Schoener, 1974; Walter, 1991; Richards, 2002; Bennie et al., 2014). Such temporal niche partitioning can minimize interference competition among similarly-sized and phylogenetically-close sympatric species (Kronfeld-Schor et al., 2001; Kronfeld-Schor & Dayan, 2003). Similarly, many prey species have evolved to be active when their predators are not, to minimize predation risk (Schoener, 1974; Kronfeld-Schor & Dayan, 2003). Further, increased nocturnality has been detected among several animal species and interpreted as a strategy to avoid anthropogenic disturbance (Carter et al., 2012; Gaynor et al., 2018; Patten et al., 2019). Thus, competition, predation, and anthropogenic disturbance are forces that drive temporal variation in species activity (Schoener, 1974; Kronfeld-Schor & Dayan, 2003).

Through their life history, animals structure their activity schedules with both active and passive behaviors (Halle & Stenseth, 2000). Active behavioral states include foraging, reproduction, care for young, or predator avoidance, whereas passive states include resting and sleeping (Halle & Stenseth, 2000). In deciding when to be active, animals navigate potentially fitness-compromising trade-offs that partly reflect adaptability to environmental variability over time (Enright, 1970; Halle, 2000; Vazquez et al., 2020). For example, foraging activity is required for animal sustenance and survival (Moermond, 1990) but also carries potential costs incurred from risks of inter- and intra-species interactions such as competition and predation

(Halle & Stenseth, 2000; Downes, 2001). Animals routinely make such trade-offs within ecological communities that are allometrically and phylogenetically diverse. The proportion of time an animal spends active in a day (cf. activity level; Rowcliffe et al., 2014) has been adopted as a critical metric for examining the tradeoffs within species activity schedules (Rowcliffe et al., 2014).

Body mass has been identified as a predominant factor determining species activity levels (Peters, 1983; West et al., 1997; Brown et al., 2004). The active behavioral states that constitute an animal's activity level and underlying schedule are constrained by body mass, which partly determines the rate at which animals acquire, process, and transform energy (Smith & Lyons, 2011). For example, dietary needs and home range scale allometrically across mammal taxonomic groups such as carnivores and herbivores (Peters, 1983; Swihart et al., 1988). As such, larger mammals spend more time foraging over wider areas than smaller mammals (Peters, 1983; Calder, 1984). Thus, a mammal's body size has a critical bearing on time spent active. Additionally, species differences in body mass are related to their evolutionary relationships as revealed by phylogeny (Smith & Lyons, 2011). The fact that variation in species body mass has evolutionary underpinnings suggests that temporal partitioning of activity within communities might in turn be structured by species phylogenies. However, few studies have formally evaluated the hypothesis that phylogeny predicts species activity (Webb et al., 2002). Communities of medium to large mammals present an opportunity for pursuit of this line of inquiry. Phylogeny reflects evolutionary differences among species, which may be related to ecological processes and dynamics (Felsenstein, 1985; Harvey & Pagel, 1991; Faith, 1992). Therefore an understanding of the mechanisms generating species differences in the timing of their activity must be inclusive of the evolutionary components of species divergence (Webb et

al., 2002; Narwani et al., 2015). Thus, an investigation of the relative contributions of body mass and phylogeny to patterns of variation among animal species activity levels may reveal the ecological and evolutionary processes underlying animal coexistence and community assembly.

Mammals are a diverse taxonomic group with approximately 6,399 described extant species (Burgin et al., 2018). Species in the Class Mammalia span eight orders of magnitude in body mass (Baker et al., 2015) and exhibit a variety of activity levels and schedules (Halle & Stenseth, 2000). Using sympatric mammals as research subjects, we explored; *i*) the relative contributions of phylogeny and body mass in predicting variation in mammal activity levels and *ii*) whether evident differences in mammal activity levels are phylogenetically structured. We examined these questions in a diverse mammal community in Murchison Falls National Park, Uganda. The species included in our analysis varied broadly in taxonomy, body mass, and activity. We investigated pairwise overlap among activity schedules of species within the same taxonomic orders to assess temporal niche partitioning. Our results provide insights into the role of phylogeny and body mass in structuring mammal activity within communities, with implications for temporal niche partitioning and species coexistence.

## **MATERIALS AND METHODS**

### ***Study area***

We conducted our study in Murchison Falls National Park (MFNP), located in northwestern Uganda (Figure 1). Covering an estimated land area of approximately 3,898 km<sup>2</sup>, MFNP is the largest national park in Uganda. A section of the River Nile (i.e. Victoria Nile) flowing from the east to west bisects MFNP into northern and southern sections. The vegetation of the southern section comprises dense woodlands, wooded grassland savannahs, riverine forest,

and tropical high forest. The northern section, on the other hand, comprises open grasslands, acacia woodland, and borassus woodland as the dominant vegetation types (Figure 1). Murchison Falls National Park has a hot and dry tropical climate characterized by wet (April to May, and September to November) and dry seasons (December to February, and June to August). It also supports a diversity of mammals including approximately 76 species (Mudumba et al., 2020).

### ***Mammal surveys***

We deployed camera traps at 144 sites between May 2012 and August 2013 to obtain records of medium to large mammal species activity (Figure 1). We placed cameras systematically on a grid of 1.5 km x 1.5 km resolution (Figure 1). We also placed cameras at some opportunistic locations considered important landscape features for mammals (such as water pools, river, trails, salt licks). Via this strategy, we ensured broad coverage of all habitat types in the study area (Figure 1). We mounted the camera traps on tree trunks, at most one meter off the ground to capture species of varied sizes, and to avoid destruction of the cameras, particularly by spotted hyenas (*Crocuta crocuta* Erxleben, 1777). Given this height, we slightly tilted the traps downwards to enable detection of a range of mammal species (Majelantle et al., 2020). Additionally, we avoided facing cameras directly at vegetation to minimize false triggers from vegetation movement in windy conditions. We programmed the cameras to take three photos per trigger with a one-minute lapse between triggers (Lepard et al., 2018). We conducted this survey in a backcountry area of MFNP where recreational human activity and park staff residence were absent. We set the traps unbaited and left them to run for the entire 16 month survey period.

### *Estimating mammal activity levels*

We assumed independence in species detections by enforcing a 30-minute temporal window between intraspecific detection events at each camera location, unless individuals of the same species were distinguishable (Kelly & Holub, 2008; Davis et al., 2011; Monterroso et al., 2013). We [used the function “fitact” in the activity R package \(version 1.3.; Rowcliffe, 2019\) to](#) estimate activity levels for species with >30 independent detections across the survey period (cf. Cid et al., 2020). We fit circular von Mises kernels to the time of day associated with each independent animal detection event and generated activity levels (A) for 22 species. We defined activity levels as the portion of the 24-hour daily cycle the mammals spent active (cf. Rowcliffe et al., 2014). Activity levels corresponded to the area under the kernel density curve for each species, estimated with 95% confidence limits generated with 1000 bootstraps (Rowcliffe et al., 2014).

### *Phylogenetic signal in species activity levels and body mass*

We [used the function “phylosig” in the phytools R package \(version 0.7.80.; Revell, 2012\) to](#) calculate phylogenetic signal in species activity levels and body mass using Blomberg’s K (Blomberg et al., 2003). We defined phylogenetic signal as the extent to which trait values of closely related species tend to be more similar compared to those of other species drawn at random from the phylogenetic tree (Münkemüller et al., 2012).  $K = 0$  indicates no phylogenetic signal (i.e. the trait variation is random with respect to the phylogeny),  $K = 1$  indicates that a trait perfectly fits a Brownian motion model of evolution, and  $K > 1$  indicates that trait values are more similar than expected under Brownian motion. We used 1000 randomizations to generate P values associated with K.

## Modelling

We used Phylogenetic Eigenvector Maps (PEM; Guenard et al., 2013), linear regression, and phylogenetic generalized least squares to model relationships between species activity levels, body mass, and phylogeny. We used eigenvectors generated via PEM as predictors representing phylogeny in modelling species activity levels. The PEM procedure involves decomposing the topology of a phylogeny into a binary influence matrix representing evolutionary relationships between ancestors and their descendants. We rescaled the binary influence matrix based on the amount of phylogenetic signal in species activity levels by multiplying all values off the main diagonal by  $K$  (Molina-Venegas et al., 2018). We then transformed the influence matrix, assuming an evolutionary model and taking into account the quantified species trait values, to represent trait change patterns along the branches of the phylogeny. PEM uses edge weighting to represent information on trait evolutionary dynamics across branches of the phylogenetic tree. An edge (branch) is assigned a weight  $w_{a,\psi}$  proportional to the extent of the change that is expected to occur along that edge based on the following monotonic function;

$$w_{a,\psi}(\Phi_j) = \begin{cases} \psi \Phi_j^{\frac{1-a}{2}} & \Phi_j > 0 \\ 0 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

where  $a$  ( $0 \leq a \leq 1$ ) is the steepness parameter quantifying abrupt evolutionary changes along branches after each split, whereas  $\psi$  ( $0 < \psi < \infty$ ) indicates the relative evolutionary rate of species activity levels, and  $\Phi_j$  is the length of edge/branch  $j$ . The steepness parameter  $a$  is related to Pagel's (1999)  $\kappa$  (i.e.  $a = 1 - \kappa$ ). We assumed neutral trait evolution under Brownian motion throughout the rescaled phylogeny, and assigned a single pair of values for  $a$  and  $\psi$ . Under Brownian motion,  $a = 0$ , and the expected changes are proportional to the square root of the branch lengths (Guenard et al., 2013). A trait evolving neutrally under Brownian motion changes



gradually along the branches. Conversely, when  $a = 1$ , evolutionary changes occur at a fixed rate  $\psi$  whenever species diverge irrespective of branch length. We set  $\psi = 1$ , the default state suggested by Guenard et al. (2013). Evolutionary rate,  $\psi$ , has no effect when assumed to be constant across the phylogeny.

Via weighting and centering the influence matrix, PEM returns  $n - 1$  eigenvectors, (where  $n$  is the number of species analyzed), some of which are not useful in explaining trait variation. Each eigenvector describes a pattern of phylogenetic variation stemming from the structure of the phylogenetic tree, and that is orthogonal (linearly independent) with respect to the other eigenvectors in the set. We selected a subset of significant eigenvectors which explained majority of the variation in species activity levels using a forward stepwise procedure based on Akaike Information Criterion corrected for small samples (AICc; Hurvich & Tsai, 1993). We then regressed activity levels against the selected subset of significant eigenvectors (i.e. *Activity level*  $\sim$  *eigenvectors* +  $\varepsilon$ ) and activity levels against eigenvectors and body mass (i.e. *Activity level*  $\sim$  *eigenvectors* + *body mass* +  $\varepsilon$ ). [We implemented PEM using functions in the R package MPSEM \(version 0.3-6.; Guenard & Legendre, 2019\).](#)

We modeled the influence of body mass on species activity levels (i.e., *Activity level*  $\sim$  *body mass* +  $\varepsilon$ ) using a generalized least squares model. Within this framework, we simultaneously fit a regression model and estimated Pagel's  $\lambda$  (Pagel, 1999), which represents the phylogenetic signal in the residuals. Pagel's  $\lambda$  transforms the phylogeny to ensure the best fit of trait data to a Brownian motion model (Münkemüller et al., 2012). Lambda values range from 0 to 1. A  $\lambda$  value of 0 indicates that model residuals are completely independent of the phylogeny, resulting in a model that is equivalent to a standard linear model. A  $\lambda$  value of 1 indicates that the model's residuals perfectly follow a Brownian motion model of evolution.

## *Variation partitioning*

We used variation partitioning analysis (Borcard et al., 1992) to investigate the relative contributions of body mass and phylogeny in explaining the variation in species activity levels. We partitioned the variation of species activity levels into four proportions namely *i*) a part strictly due to body mass (A), *ii*) a part strictly due to phylogeny (C), *iii*) shared variation explained by both phylogeny and body mass (B), and *iv*) a part unexplained by either phylogeny or body mass (i.e., residual variation, D; Figure 2). We obtained values of the different activity level variation proportions (A – D) either directly via adjusted  $R^2$  statistics from the phylogenetic linear regressions or arithmetically (Table 1).

## *Estimating overlap [in species activity schedules](#)*

We estimated overlap [in activity schedules](#) among species within the same taxonomic orders using the coefficient of overlap ( $\Delta$ ; Ridout & Linkie, 2009). The  $\Delta$  value ranges from 0 (for completely dissimilar curves) to 1 (for identical curves). We generated 95% confidence limits for each overlap estimate using 10,000 smoothed bootstraps. We performed a Watson's two-sample test of homogeneity using the  $\alpha \leq 0.05$  level to test for statistical significance in differences between species activity schedules. [We implemented the overlap analysis in the R package overlap \(version 0.3.3.; Ridout & Linkie, 2009\).](#)

We omitted the effect of weather and season in our analysis because we observed no differences in species activity schedules across the dry and rainy seasons (Figure S1). We conducted analyses using log transformed body mass and activity level data to reduce skew and to linearize the relationship between the two variables (Desdevises et al., 2003). We adopted the phylogeny used in this analysis from the super tree of Fritz et al. (2009) and obtained body mass data from

Faurby et al. (2019). Phylogeny included topology and branch lengths. We conducted analyses on an informative ultrametric phylogenetic tree, where distance from the root to all tips is constant for all tips/species. We conducted all analyses using the [RStudio version 1.3.1073](#) [running R version](#) 4.0. (R Core Team, 2020).

## RESULTS

Our analysis included 22 species from eight taxonomic orders and 15 families (Figure 3) detected across 23,753 independent camera trap observations. The most commonly-detected species were Uganda kob (*Kobus kob* Erxleben, 1777;  $n = 4,833$  detections) followed by hippopotamus (*Hippopotamus amphibius* Linnaeus, 1758;  $n = 4,166$  detections, Table S1). The least detected species included ground pangolin (*Manis temminckii* Smuts, 1832;  $n = 31$  detections) and banded mongoose (*Mungos mungo* Gmelin, 1788;  $n = 38$  detections).

Activity level estimates varied across species, both within and across taxonomic orders. Among carnivores, the banded mongoose (*Mungos mungo* Gmelin, 1788) were the most active, with approximately 17 hours of activity in a day ( $A = 0.71$ , 95% CI 0.42–0.81; Figure 4). The remaining carnivores spent approximately 11 hours active per day (Table S1, Figure S2). Among the Cetartiodactyls, the hartebeest (*Alcelaphus buselaphus* Pallas, 1766) was the most active species, spending approximately 18 hours active per day ( $A = 0.76$ , 95% CI 0.65–0.85; Figure 4). The least active species within the order Cetartiodactyla was the bush duiker (*Sylvicapra grimmia* Linnaeus, 1758) spending approximately 9 hours active ( $A = 0.38$ , 95% CI 0.28–0.57). The elephant (*Loxodonta africana* Blumenbach, 1797) was equally active as the hartebeest, whereas the armadillo (*Orycteropus afer* Pallas, 1766) was the least active among all species ( $A = 0.35$ , 95% CI 0.31–0.44, approximately 8 hours active; Table S1, Figure 4).

We found activity levels to have moderate phylogenetic signal ( $K = 0.5$ ,  $P > 0.01$ ), and body mass to have high phylogenetic signal ( $K = 0.8$ ,  $P < 0.01$ ). We obtained a total of 21 phylogenetic eigenvectors from the tree of 22 species. Four eigenvectors were chosen to represent phylogeny in subsequent regression analyses. Body mass with an embedded part of phylogeny (component AB; Table 1) explained a small proportion (5%) of the variation of species activity levels ( $R^2_{\text{adj}} = 0.05$ ,  $P > 0.01$ ). While, body mass only (component A; Table 1) explained 1%. Both phylogeny and body mass (component ABC; Table 1) explained 61.5% of the variation in species activity levels ( $R^2_{\text{adj}} = 0.62$ ,  $P < 0.01$ ). Phylogeny and body mass explained a shared variation (component B; Figure 2) of 4%. Phylogeny with an embedded component of body mass (component BC; Figure 2) explained 61% of the variation in species activity levels ( $R^2_{\text{adj}} = 0.61$ ,  $P < 0.01$ ). While phylogeny only (component C; Figure 2) explained 56%. The component of variation in species activity levels unexplained by either of the two factors (component D; Table 1) was 39%. There was a no phylogenetic signal in the residuals of the regression of activity levels against body mass ( $\lambda = 0.00$ , 95% CI -1.13, 0.27).

Across all taxonomic orders, we detected considerable pairwise overlap among species activity schedules (Figure 5, Table S2; Figure S3). Species pairs with highly overlapping activity schedules included olive baboon (*Papio anubis* Lesson, 1827) and vervet monkey (*Cercopithecus pygerythrus* Lesson, 1827), Uganda kob and waterbuck (*Kobus ellipsiprymnus* Ogilby, 1833), Uganda kob and hartebeest, and waterbuck and hartebeest which all had overlap coefficients of at least 0.90 (Range 0.90–0.91; Table S2; Figure 5). On the other hand, species pairs with the least overlapping activity schedules included hippopotamus and warthog (*Phacochoerus africanus* Gmelin, 1788), giraffe (*Giraffa camelopardalis rothschildi* Lydekker, 1903) and hippopotamus, bush duiker and hippopotamus, all with overlap coefficients of less

than 0.4 (Range 0.33–0.35; Table S2; Figure 5). Despite the high overlap among activity schedules across several species, the Watson’s test indicated significant differences in the majority of pairwise species activity schedule comparisons ( $P < 0.05$ , Table S2).

## DISCUSSION

Our analysis highlights varied activity levels in a community of 22 mammal species inhabiting MFNP, Uganda. Activity levels of phylogenetically-close species tended to be similar, indicative of a strong influence of phylogeny in structuring the variation in species activity levels. Comparatively, there was less of an influence of body mass in explaining variation in species activity levels. This was exemplified by the general lack of a trend between body mass and activity levels among species across the phylogeny. Exploring such phylogenetically-explicit relationships among species traits is important (Desdevises et al., 2003), given that species have shared ancestry (Burgin et al., 2018). Within this context, the residual variation represents independent evolution of the trait within each species (Diniz-Filho et al., 1998; Desdevises et al., 2003). Our analysis is illustrative of the broad applicability and relevance of multispecies phylogenetically-explicit modelling in exploring patterns of species traits. Such methods could be employed to examine the multiple factors that facilitate species assembly and coexistence as they relate to phylogenetic structure within communities across other taxonomic groups.

Our phylogenetically-explicit models detected a significant influence of phylogeny on mammal activity levels, highlighted by phylogenetic eigenvectors explaining over 60% of the variation. Additionally, our results highlight that the amount of phylogenetic signal in species activity levels corresponds to the percentage of variation explained by phylogeny without an embedded component of body mass. Additional research is necessary to examine the relationship between level of phylogenetic signal in species trait data and the amount of trait variation

[explained by phylogeny](#). On the other hand, we did not detect a significant influence of body mass on mammal activity levels. We interpret this result to be indicative of phylogenetically-distant species showing no clear patterns between body mass and activity levels. Body mass may have an effect if modelled across a range of phylogenetically-close species, say within one taxonomic order in which species have widely different body masses and activity levels. This may reduce the correlation between body mass and phylogeny, and thus allow detection of an effect of body mass. Additionally, recent studies have detected strong relationships between body mass and mammal activity levels when phylogeny is not included among the predictors (e.g., Rowcliffe et al., 2014; Ramesh et al., 2015). Our results build upon the initial work on rodents to reveal the importance of phylogeny in structuring activity in mammal communities (Roll et al., 2006). Analyses of the allometry of species activity levels tend to be conducted among species of specific dietary guilds such as carnivores or herbivores (e.g. Rowcliffe et al. 2014; Cid et al. 2020) or taxonomic hierarchies (e.g., Roll et al. 2006). While our research is limited in the number of species assessed, we extend the analyses to include species from a diverse range of dietary guilds and taxonomic hierarchies. Additional research including more species could further highlight the role of species body mass and their evolutionary relationships in the generation and maintenance of differences in species activity, temporal niche partitioning, and species coexistence.

We found that the elephant and hartebeest had the highest activity levels of all species (Figure 4a,b). Among the carnivores, our results showed the banded mongoose to have higher activity levels than the larger genet (*Genetta genetta* Linnaeus, 1758), hyena, and leopard (*Panthera pardus* Linnaeus, 1758) (Table S1, Figure S2). Collectively, these results highlighted no consistent patterns between species body mass and activity levels across the phylogeny. [These](#)

[results align with recent analyses suggesting no scaling of diel activity with body mass from a mammal community of Lake Manyara National Park, Tanzania, \(Clauss et al., 2021\).](#) This explains our observation that body mass explained a small proportion in species activity levels across the phylogeny. A critical difference we observed among carnivore activity is that the banded mongoose is cathemeral, exhibiting its peak activity during day light hours. Whereas the genet, hyena, and leopard are strictly nocturnal species (Figure S2). This temporal partitioning of activity among the carnivores aligns with their differences in foraging strategies, and has been suggested to promote their coexistence (Hayward & Slotow, 2009). The mongoose is predominantly insectivorous, but could become prey for the larger nocturnal carnivores, hence their need to maintain low activity during the night. The species with the lowest estimated activity levels were all obligate nocturnal species (i.e., aardvark, crested porcupine (*Hystrix cristata* Linnaeus, 1758), and ground pangolin (*Manis temminckii* Smuts, 1832; Figure 4d, e, f). These animals are shy and elusive burrowing species, which spend majority of the day in the underground tunnels (Felicoli et al., 1997; Nowak, 1999; Taylor & Skinner, 2003; Tabruce et al., 2008). Consequently, their activity estimates may therefore be interpreted as nocturnal given their biased detection above ground.

Despite the high overlaps, differences between activity schedules of majority of phylogenetically-close species were statistically significant (e.g. Figure 5a, b, c). A close examination of activity curves for these species revealed considerable variations in their peak activity times (Figure 5, Figure S3). Such variation suggests that temporal niche partitioning among phylogenetically-close species is only possible within specific times of day, perhaps highlighted as times of peak activity. Given that phylogenetically-close sympatric species use similar resources (Daan, 1981; Roll & Dayan, 2002), it is necessary for them to maximize their

resource consumption in times when their relatives' activity is low (Kronfeld-Schor & Dayan, 2003). The variation in species times of peak activity is critical in minimizing interspecific encounters and interference competition, and thus can facilitate coexistence (Schoener, 1974; Daan, 1981; Roll & Dayan, 2002). Our results show that the hippopotamus had the least activity overlap with several species, including warthog, giraffe and bush duiker ( $\Delta < 0.5$ ; Figure 5d, e, f; Table S2; Figure S3). We attribute this result to the fact that hippopotamus predominantly inhabit aquatic environments during the day, but forage on land at night (Eltringham, 1999). The nocturnal terrestrial activity of the hippopotamus therefore minimizes potential for activity overlap with diurnal phylogenetically-close relatives. Additionally, hippopotamus are obligate grazers, exhibiting dietary niche overlap avoidance with giraffe and duikers which are obligate browsers.

To conclude, we provide empirical evidence for the phylogenetic structuring of species activity levels within a diverse mammal community. In this regard, our findings suggest that evolutionary relationships are more important in structuring mammal activity than allometry within diverse communities. These results further highlight the need to consider evolutionary relatedness when exploring interspecific variation in species traits (Pignata & Diniz-Filho, 1996; Diniz-Filho & Torres, 2006). More broadly, our findings suggest that evolutionary relatedness can be a useful pathway to reveal mechanisms underlying the structuring of activity, coexistence as well as patterns of assembly in animal communities. In an applied context, insights from this research may be useful when identifying conservation and management priorities based on the phylogenetic comparison of species activity.

**Data availability:** All data supporting the results will be provided upon reasonable request.



## REFERENCES

- Amarasekare P. 2003. Competitive coexistence in spatially structured environments: a synthesis. *Ecology Letters* 6: 1109–1122.
- Baker J, Meade A, Pagel M, Venditti, C. 2015. Adaptive evolution toward larger size in mammals. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 112 (16): 5093–5098.
- Bennie JJ, Duffy JP, Inger R, Gaston KJ. 2014. Biogeography of time partitioning in mammals. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 111 (38): 13727–13732.
- Borcard D, Legendre P, Drapeau, P. 1992. Partialling out the spatial component of ecological variation. *Ecology* 73 (3): 1045–1055.
- Brown JH, Gillooly JF, Allen AP, Savage VM, West GB. 2004. Toward a metabolic theory of ecology. *Ecology* 85: 1771–1789.
- Blomberg SP, Garland T, Ives AR. 2003. Testing for phylogenetic signal in comparative data: behavioral traits are more labile. *Evolution* 57: 717–745.
- Burgin CJ, Colella JP, Kahn PL, Upham NS. 2018. How many mammal species are there? *Journal of Mammalogy* 99 (1): 1–14.
- Calder, WA. 1984. Size, function, and life history. Harvard University Press, Cambridge, pp 448.
- Carter NH, Shrestha BK, Karki JB, Pradhan NMB, Liu J. 2012. Coexistence between wildlife and humans at fine spatial scales. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 109 (38): 15360–15365.
- Cid B, Carbone C, Farnandez FAS, Jansen PA, Rowcliffe JM. et al. 2020. On the scaling of activity in tropical forest mammals. *Oikos* 129: 668–676.

381 [Clauss M, Scriba M, Kioko J, Ganzhorn JU, Kiffner C. 2021. Camera-trap data do not indicate](#)  
382 [scaling of diel activity and cathemerality with body mass in an East African mammal](#)  
383 [assemblage. \*Ecology and Evolution\* 11: 13846–13861.](#)

384 Daan S. 1981. Adaptive daily strategies in behavior. In: Aschoff J (ed) Handbook of behavioral  
385 neurobiology: Vol. 4: Biological Rhythms. Plenum press, New York and London, pp  
386 275–298.

387 Davis ML, Kelly MJ, Stauffer DF. 2011. Carnivore co-existence and habitat use in the Mountain  
388 Pine Ridge Forest Reserve, Belize. *Animal Conservation* 14: 56–65.

389 Desdevises Y, Legendre P, Azouzi L, Morand S. 2003. Quantifying Phylogenetically Structured  
390 Environmental Variation. *Evolution* 57 (11): 2647–2652.

391 Diniz-Filho JAF, De Sant’Ana CER, Bini LM. 1998. An eigenvector method for estimating  
392 phylogenetic inertia. *Evolution* 52 (5): 1247–1262.

393 Diniz-Filho JAF, Torres NM. 2006. Phylogenetic autocorrelation and evolutionary interpretation  
394 of the higher-taxon approach for biodiversity analyses. *Brazilian Journal of Biology* 66  
395 (3): 873–881.

396 Downes S. 2001. Trading heat and food for safety: costs of predator avoidance in a lizard.  
397 *Ecology* 82: 2870–2881.

398 Eltringham SK. 1999. The Hippos. Poyser Natural History Series. Academic Press.

399 Enright IT. 1970. Ecological aspects of endogenous rhythmicity. *Annual Review of Ecology,*  
400 *Evolution, and Systematics* 1: 221–238.

401 Faith DP. 1992. Conservation evaluation and phylogenetic diversity. *Biological Conservation*  
402 61: 1–10.

403 Faurby S, Davis M, Pedersen RØ, Schowaneck SD, Antonelli A, Svenning JC. 2019. Data from:  
404 PHYLACINE 1.2: The Phylogenetic Atlas of Mammal Macroecology, Dryad, Dataset,  
405 <https://doi.org/10.5061/dryad.bp26v20>.

406 Felicioli A, Grazzini A, Santini L. 1997. The mounting behaviour of a pair of crested porcupine  
407 *Hystrix cristata* L. *Mammalia* 61 (1): 119–123.

408 Felsenstein J. 1985. Phylogenies and the comparative method. *American Naturalist* 125: 1–15.

409 Freckleton RP, Harvey PH, Pagel M. 2002. Phylogenetic analysis and comparative data: a test  
410 and review of evidence. *American Naturalist* 160: 712–726.

411 Fritz SA, Bininda-Emonds ORP, Purvis A. 2009. Geographic variation in predictors of  
412 mammalian extinction risk: big is bad, but only in the tropics. *Ecology Letters* 12 (6):  
413 538–549.

414 Guenard G, Legendre P, Peres-Neto P. 2013. Phylogenetic eigenvector maps: a framework to  
415 model and predict species traits. *Methods in Ecology and Evolution* 4: 1120–1131.

416 Guenard G, Legendre P. 2019. MPSEM: Modeling Phylogenetic Signals using Eigenvector  
417 Maps. R package version 0.3-6. <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=MPSEM>.

418 Gaynor KM, Hohnowski CE, Carter NH, Brashares JS. 2018. The influence of human  
419 disturbance on wildlife nocturnality. *Science* 360 (6394): 1232–1235.

420 Jeltsch F, Bonte D, Pe'er G, Reineking B, Leimgruber P. et al. 2013. Integrating movement  
 421 ecology with biodiversity research – exploring new avenues to address spatiotemporal  
 422 biodiversity dynamics. *Movement Ecology* 2013: 1–6.

423 Halle S. 2000. Ecological relevance of daily activity patterns. In: Halle, S. & Stenseth, N. C.  
 424 (eds). *Activity Patterns in Small Mammals: An Ecological Approach*. Springer, New  
 425 York, pp. 67–90.

426 Halle S, Stenseth NC. Eds. 2000. *Activity Patterns in Small Mammals. An Ecological Approach*.  
 427 Springer, New York.

428 Harvey PH, Pagel M. 1991. *The Comparative Method in Evolutionary Biology*. Oxford  
 429 University Press, Oxford.

430 Hayward MW, Slotow R. 2009. Temporal Partitioning of Activity in Large African Carnivores:  
 431 Tests of Multiple Hypotheses. *African Journal of Wildlife Research* 39 (2): 109–125.

432 Hurvich CM, Tsai C-L. 1993. A corrected Akaike Information Criterion for vector  
 433 autoregressive model selection. *Journal of Time Series Analysis* 14 (3): 271–279.

434 Kelly MJ, Holub EL. 2008. Camera trapping of carnivores: trap success among camera types and  
 435 across species, and habitat selection by species, on Salt Pond Mountain, Giles County,  
 436 Virginia. *Northeastern Naturalist* 15: 249–262.

437 Kronfeld-Schor N, Dayan T. 2003. Partitioning of time as an ecological resource. *Annual Review*  
 438 *of Ecology, Evolution, and Systematics* 34: 153–181.

439 Kronfeld-Schor N, Dayan T, Elvert R, Haim A, Zisapel N, Heldmaier G. 2001. On the Use of the  
 440 Time Axis for Ecological Separation: Diel Rhythms as an Evolutionary Constraint.  
 441 *American Naturalist* 158: 451–457.

442 Laporta GZ, Sallum MAM. 2014. Coexistence mechanisms at multiple scales in mosquito  
 443 assemblages. *BMC Ecology* 14 (30): 1472–6785.

444 Lepard CC, Moll RJ, Cepek JD, Lorch PD, Dennis PM, Robinson T, Montgomery RA. 2018.  
 445 The influence of the delay-period setting on camera-trap data storage, wildlife detections  
 446 and occupancy models. *Wildlife Research* 46 (1): 37–53.

447 Majelantle TL, Ganswindt A, Jordaan RK, Slip DJ, Harcourt R, McIntyre T. 2020. Increased  
 448 population density and behavioral flexibility of African clawless otters (*Aonyx capensis*)  
 449 in specific anthropogenic environments. *Urban Ecosystems* 24: 691–699.

450 Moermond TC. 1990. A functional approach to foraging: morphology, behavior, and the capacity  
 451 to exploit. In: Morrison ML, Ralph CJ, Verner J, Jehl JR. (eds) Avian foraging: theory,  
 452 methodology, and applications. Studies in avian biology number, vol 13. Allen,  
 453 Martinstown, pp 427–430.

454 [Molina-Venegas R, Moreno-Saiz JC, Parga IS, Davies TJ, Peres-Neto PR, Rodriguez MA. 2018.](#)  
 455 [Assessing among-lineage variability in phylogenetic imputation of functional trait](#)  
 456 [datasets. \*Ecography\* 41: 1–10.](#)

457 Monterroso P, Alves PC, Ferreras P. 2013. Catch me if you can: Diel activity patterns of  
 458 mammalian prey and predators. *Ethology* 199: 1044–1056.

459 Mudumba T, Jingo S, Heit D, Montgomery RA. 2020. The landscape configuration and lethality  
 460 of snare poaching of sympatric guilds of large carnivores and ungulates. *African Journal*  
 461 *of Ecology* 59: 51–62.

462 Münkemüller T, Lavergne S, Bzeznik B, Dray S, Jombart T, Schiffrers K, Thuiller W. 2012. How  
 463 to measure and test phylogenetic signal. *Methods in Ecology and Evolution* 3: 743–756.

464 Narwani A, Mathews B, Fox J, Venail P. 2015. Using phylogenetics in community assembly and  
 465 ecosystem functioning research. *Functional Ecology* 29: 589–591.

466 Nowak R. 1999. Walker's Mammals of the World. Baltimore, Maryland: The John Hopkins  
 467 University Press.

468 Pagel M. 1999. Inferring the historical patterns of biological evolution. *Nature* 401: 877–884.

469 Patten MA, Burger JC, Mitrovich, M. 2019. The Intersection of Human Disturbance and Diel  
 470 Activity, with Potential Consequences on Trophic Interactions. *PLoS ONE* 14 (12):  
 471 e0226418.

472 Peters RH. 1983. The ecological implications of body size. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge  
 473 University Press.

474 Pignata MIB, Diniz-Filho JAF. 1996. Phylogenetic autocorrelation and evolutionary constraints  
 475 in worker body size of some neotropical stingless bees (Hymenoptera: Apidae). *Heredity*  
 476 76: 222–228.

477 R Core Team. 2020. R: A language and environment for statistical computing. R Foundation for  
 478 Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria. URL <https://www.R-project.org/>.

479 Ramesh T, Kalle R, Sankar K, Qureshi Q. 2015. Role of body size in activity budgets of  
480 mammals in the Western Ghats of India. *Journal of Tropical Ecology* 31: 315–323.

481 Revell LJ. 2012. phytools: An R package for phylogenetic comparative biology (and other  
482 things). *Methods in Ecology and Evolution* 3: 217–223.

483 Richards SA. 2002. Temporal partitioning and aggression among foragers: modeling the effects  
484 of stochasticity and individual state. *Behavioral Ecology* 13(3): 427–438.

485 Ridout M, Linkie M. 2009. Estimating overlap of daily activity patterns from camera trap data.  
486 *Journal of Agricultural, Biological and Environmental Statistics* 14(3): 322–337.

487 Roll U, Dayan T. 2002. Family ties and activity time in the order Rodentia. *Israel Journal of*  
488 *Zoology* 48(2): 177–178.

489 Roll U, Dayan T, Kronfeld-Schor N. 2006. On the role of phylogeny in determining activity  
490 patterns of rodents. *Evolutionary Ecology* 20: 479–490.

491 Rowcliffe JM, Kays R, Kranstauber B, Carbone C, Jansen PA. 2014. Quantifying levels of  
492 animal activity using camera trap data. *Methods in Ecology and Evolution* 5: 1170–1179.

493 Rowcliffe M. 2019. activity: Animal Activity Statistics. R package version 1.3. [https://CRAN.R-](https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=activity)  
494 [project.org/package=activity](https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=activity).

495 Schoener TW. 1974. Resource Partitioning in Ecological Communities. *Science* 185(4145): 27–  
496 39.

497 Smith FA, Lyons SK. 2011. How big should a mammal be? A macroecological look at  
498 mammalian body size over space and time. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal*  
499 *Society B* 366: 2364–2378.

500 Swihart RK, Slade NA, Bergstrom BJ. 1988. Relating body size to the rate of home range use in  
501 mammals. *Ecology* 69: 393–399.

502 Tabruce R, Asher R, Lehmann T. 2008. Afrotherian mammals: a review of current data.  
503 *Mammalia* 72 (1): 2–14.

504 Taylor W, Skinner J. 2003. Activity patterns, home ranges and burrow use of aardvarks  
505 (*Orycteropus after*) in Karoo. *Journal of Zoology* 261: 291–297.

506 Vazquez C, Rowcliffe JM, Spoelstra K, Jansen PA. 2020. Comparing diel activity patterns of  
507 wildlife across latitudes and seasons: Time transformations using day length. *Methods in*  
508 *Ecology and Evolution* 10: 2057–2066.

509 Walter GH. 1991. What is Resource Partitioning? *Journal of Theoretical Biology* 150: 137–143.

510 Webb CO, Ackerly DD, McPeck MA, Donogue MJ. 2002. Phylogenies and community ecology.  
511 *Annual Review of Ecology, Evolution, and Systematics* 33: 475–505.

512 West GB, Brown JH, Enquist BJ. 1997. A general model for the origin of allometric scaling laws  
513 in biology. *Science* 276: 122–126.

514



# **TABLES**

Table 1: Calculation of components of variation in activity levels (proportion of the 24-hour day spent active) from a community of 22 mammal species inhabiting Murchison Falls National Park, Uganda. Variation explained by the first three components is derived directly from adjusted  $R^2$  values of their respective regression equations. The remaining components were derived arithmetically.

Variance component due to;	Formula
Phylogeny and body mass (ABC)	Activity level ~ Phylogeny + Body mass
Body mass (AB)	Activity level ~ Body mass
Phylogeny (BC)	Activity level ~ Phylogeny
Body mass only (A)	$ABC - BC$
Common influence of phylogeny and body mass (B)	$AB + BC - ABC$
Phylogeny only (C)	$ABC - AB$
Unexplained variance (D)	$1 - (ABC)$

## FIGURE LEGENDS

Figure 1. Layout of camera traps used to study mammal activity in Murchison Falls National Park (MFNP), Uganda between May 2012 and August 2013. Inset, location of MFNP in Uganda, the grey dot signifies the extent of the study area covered by the survey.

Figure 2: Partitioning protocol for variation of species activity levels (time spent active in 24-hours) as explained by body mass and phylogeny.

Figure 3. Phylogeny of the 22 mammal species observed in Murchison Falls National Park, Uganda from a camera trapping survey conducted between May 2012 and August 2013. The tree is adapted from Fritz et al. (2009) after removing species that were not observed in the current surveys.

Figure 4. Activity schedules of mammal species with the highest (a, b, c) and lowest (d, e, f) activity levels (A) in Murchison Falls National Park, Uganda, estimated using camera trap temporal records. The activity curves are fitted circular von Mises kernel density curves showing patterns of species activity across a 24-hour daily cycle.

Figure 5. Pairwise overlap of activity schedules between selected mammal species in Murchison Falls National Park, Uganda, as estimated using camera trap temporal records. The highest activity overlap was between a) waterbuck (*Kobus ellipsiprymnus* Ogilby, 1833) and hartebeest (*Alcelaphus buselaphus* Pallas, 1766), b) kob (*Kobus kob* Erxleben, 1777) and hartebeest, and c) kob and water buck all with overlap coefficients of 0.9 (95% CI 0.87–0.94, Table S5). The least activity overlap was between d) hippopotamus (*Hippopotamus amphibius* Linnaeus, 1758) and warthog (*Phacochoerus africanus* Gmelin, 1788), e) hippopotamus and giraffe (*Giraffa*

544 *camelopardalis rothschildi* Lydekker, 1903), and f) hippopotamus and bush duiker (*Sylvicapra*  
545 *grimmia* Linnaeus, 1758) all with overlap coefficients of 0.3 (95% CI 0.24–0.46, Table S3).