

1 **A unified framework to identify demographic buffering in natural populations**

2 A manuscript in preparation for submission to ECOLOGY LETTERS

3 Type of article: METHOD

4
5 Gabriel Silva Santos^{1,2*}, Samuel J L Gascoigne^{3*}, André Tavares Corrêa Dias⁴, Maja Kajin
6^{3,5**♦}, Roberto Salguero-Gómez^{3♦}

7
8 1 National Institute of the Atlantic Forest (INMA), 29650-000, Santa Teresa, Espirito Santo,
9 Brazil. ssantos.gabriel@gmail.com

10 2 Department of Ecology, Graduate Program in Ecology and Evolution, Rio de Janeiro
11 State University, 524 São Francisco Xavier street, 20550-900, Maracanã, Rio de Janeiro,
12 Brazil

13 3 Department of Biology, University of Oxford, South Parks Road, OX1 3RB, Oxford, UK.
14 samuel.gascoigne@pmb.ox.ac.uk, rob.salguero@biology.ox.ac.uk,
15 maja.kajin@biology.ox.ac.uk

16 4 Department of Ecology, Institute of Biology, Universidade Federal do Rio de Janeiro,
17 Avenida Carlos Chagas Filho 373, 21941-590 Rio de Janeiro, RJ, Brazil. atcdias@gmail.com

18 5 Department of Biology, Biotechnical Faculty, University of Ljubljana, Večna pot 111, 1000
19 Ljubljana, Slovenia

20
21 *Shared first authorship

22 **Corresponding author

23 ♦Shared senior authorship

24
25 AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS: GSS developed the initial concept, performed the statistical
26 analyses and contributed to the first draft of the manuscript. SJLG developed the initial
27 concept, contributed to the first draft and all other versions of the manuscript and generated
28 final figures. ATCD co-advised the project and contributed significantly to final versions of
29 the manuscript. MK developed and managed the project, contributed to the first draft and all
30 other versions of the manuscript and generated final figures. RSG developed and managed
31 the project and contributed to the first draft and all other versions of the manuscript. All
32 authors made substantial contributions to editing the manuscript and further refining ideas
33 and interpretations.

34
35 RUNNING TITLE: Demographic buffering framework (31/45 words)

36
37 KEYWORDS: COMADRE Animal Matrix Database, elasticity, life-history evolution,
38 natural selection, second-order derivative, sensitivity, stochasticity, variance.

39
40 NUMBER OF WORDS: Abstract – 146/150 words, main text (excluding abstract,
41 acknowledgements, references, table and figure legends) – 5398/5000 words

42
43 NUMBER OF REFERENCES: 64

44
45 NUMBER OF TABLES: 1 (in Supplementary Material)

46
47 NUMBER OF FIGURES: 3

50 **Abstract** (146/150 words)

51 The Demographic Buffering Hypothesis (DBH) predicts that natural selection reduces the
52 temporal fluctuations in demographic processes (such as survival, development, and
53 reproduction), due to their negative impacts on population dynamics. However, a
54 comprehensive approach that allows for the examination of demographic buffering patterns
55 across multiple species is still lacking. Here, we propose a three-step framework aimed at
56 identifying and quantifying demographic buffering. Firstly, we categorize species along a
57 continuum of variance based on their stochastic elasticities. Secondly, we examine the linear
58 selection gradients, followed by the examination of nonlinear selection gradients as the third
59 step. With these three steps, our framework overcomes existing limitations of conventional
60 approaches to identify and quantify demographic buffering, allows for multi-species
61 comparisons, and offers insight into the evolutionary forces that shape demographic
62 buffering. We apply this framework to mammal species and discuss both the advantages and
63 potential of our framework.

64

65

66

67 Environmental stochasticity plays a pivotal role in shaping organisms' life histories (Bonsall
68 & Klug 2011). Nonetheless, how organisms will cope with the increasing variation in
69 environmental conditions expected under climate change (Boyce *et al.* 2006; Morris *et al.* 2008)
70 is one of the most intriguing questions of ecology and evolution (Sutherland *et al.* 2013).
71 Evolutionary demography offers a wide array of explanations for the evolutionary processes
72 that shape the diversity of demographic responses to environmental stochasticity
73 (Charlesworth 1994; Pfister 1998; Tuljapurkar *et al.* 2009; Healy *et al.* 2019; Hilde *et al.* 2020). The
74 Demographic Buffering Hypothesis (*DBH*, hereafter) (Morris & Doak 2004; Pélabon *et al.* 2020)
75 predicts a negative relationship between the contribution of a demographic processes (*e.g.*,
76 survival, development, reproduction) to the population growth rate (λ) and their temporal
77 variance (Pfister 1998). The emerging demographic strategy, demographic buffering,
78 accommodates variance of demographic processes to cope with the otherwise negative effects
79 of stochastic environments on λ (Pfister 1998; Morris & Doak 2004; Hilde *et al.* 2020).

80 A unified approach to unambiguously quantify demographic buffering is still missing.
81 Indeed, identifying demographic buffering remains challenging (Morris & Doak 2004; Doak *et*
82 *al.* 2005) for at least three reasons. First is the different interpretation of results from
83 correlational analyses (*e.g.*, as in Pfister, 1998). Some authors have used the correlation
84 coefficient as an index to order species' life histories in a continuum ranging from buffered
85 (Spearman's correlation $\rho = <0$ between the sensitivity of λ to demographic processes and
86 their temporal variance) to labile ($\rho = >0$, regardless of the "scatterness" around the
87 regression (McDonald *et al.* 2017). In contrast, other researchers interpret the absence of
88 statistical support for demographic buffering as an alternative strategy where variance in
89 demographic process(es) is favoured to track environmental conditions (the so-called
90 Demographic Lability Hypothesis (*DLH*, hereafter; *e.g.*, (Koons *et al.* 2009; Reed & Slade 2012;
91 Jäkäläniemi *et al.* 2013; Hilde *et al.* 2020).

92 The second obstacle to obtain generalisation across species' populations regarding
93 demographic buffering is the hierarchical level at which this phenomenon is typically
94 examined. Some studies base their investigations of demographic buffering on the *whole* life
95 history at the level of species or populations (*interspecific level*, hereafter), focusing on the
96 one demographic process that is the most influential for λ (Reed & Slade 2012; McDonald *et al.*
97 2017). At the interspecific level, a life history is referred to as demographically buffered if the
98 most important demographic process has low temporal variance (Pfister 1998; Morris & Doak
99 2004; Hilde *et al.* 2020; Le Coeur *et al.* 2022). Thus, the associated strategy is commonly
100 decided based on a *single* demographic process (*e.g.*, adult survival), ignoring the selection
101 pressures on the rest of the demographic processes within the life cycle. However, to
102 understand how, why, and where demographic buffering occurs –or not– and how buffering
103 patterns might be modified in response to the environment, it is essential to also consider the
104 features *within* a single species' life cycle (*intraspecific level*, hereafter). Within a single life
105 cycle one demographic process can be buffered against while another can be labile to the
106 environment – supporting the DLH (Koons *et al.* 2009; Jongejans *et al.* 2010; Barraquand &
107 Yoccoz 2013). Thus, for a mechanistic understanding of how environmental stochasticity
108 shapes life histories, both inter- and intra-specific levels need to be addressed.

109 The third reason limiting a holistic understanding of demographic strategies in
110 stochastic environments are the challenges inherent to examining their underlying
111 mechanisms. Evidence for demographic buffering exists across some long-lived organisms
112 with complex life cycles, (Pfister 1998; Gaillard & Yoccoz 2003; Doak *et al.* 2005; Rotella *et al.*
113 2012; McDonald *et al.* 2017), but also in short-lived species (Pfister 1998; Reed & Slade 2012;
114 Ferreira *et al.* 2013). Importantly, these patterns of variation do not inform on how the life
115 histories were shaped by natural selection. To do so, one would need to identify the type
116 (linear or nonlinear) and strength of selection acting on demographic processes. Linear

117 selection acts on changing *the mean* value of a demographic process via a linear function
118 between the fitness and the demographic process. In contrast, nonlinear selection acts on *the*
119 *variance* of demographic processes either increasing it, decreasing it, or
120 increasing/decreasing *the covariance* between two demographic processes (Brodie et al.
121 1995; Carslake et al. 2008).

122 The sign of the self-second derivative of λ determines the type of nonlinear selection
123 acting on a demographic process. For instance, a negative self-second derivative for a given
124 demographic process describes a concave form of selection, commonly referred to as the \cap -
125 shaped selection (Caswell 1996, 2001; Shyu & Caswell 2014). This form of selection reduces the
126 temporal variance in said demographic process, thereby providing support for the DBH.
127 Conversely, a demographic process yielding a positive self-second derivative identifies a
128 convex, or U-shaped selection (Caswell 1996, 2001; Shyu & Caswell 2014). Such a selection
129 mechanism acts upon demographic processes amplifying their temporal variance, thus
130 supporting the DLH (Koons *et al.* 2009; Le Coeur *et al.* 2022). The cross-second derivatives (not
131 discussed here, see Caswell 1996, 2001 for further details) quantify selection pressures acting
132 on the strength of correlation among different demographic processes.

133 The rich variation in demographic strategies across the Tree of Life is a result of
134 evolutionary processes that have shaped variance in demographic processes through time. In
135 this context, setting demographic buffering into the adaptive landscape context of linear and
136 nonlinear selection enables us to identify and quantify the evolutionary processes that
137 generate said demographic patterns. In this way, one will better understand how increased
138 variability of environmental conditions might act on the existing –and shape novel–
139 demographic strategies. However, we still lack a unified approach to quantify DBH.

140 Here, we present a framework that identifies and quantifies demographic buffering.
141 Our framework provides a thorough analysis of temporal variance in demographic processes

142 affected by environmental stochasticity. This framework involves categorizing species or
143 populations along a variance continuum based on the extent to which key demographic
144 processes are buffered by natural selection, thereby limiting their temporal variability. The
145 framework consists of four steps with a mix of well-known methods applied to stage-
146 structured demographic information (*e.g.*, matrix population models [Caswell 2001]; integral
147 projection models [Easterling et al. 2000]). First, we position species or populations on the
148 aforementioned continuum to assess the cumulative effect of the variance on their key
149 demographic processes at the interspecific level (see below). Second, we investigate the
150 presence of linear selection forces operating within the life cycle of each species or
151 population at the intraspecific level (below). Third, we explore the impact of non-linear
152 selection forces acting within the life cycle of each species or population, also at the
153 intraspecific level. The combination of these three steps provides quantitative evidence
154 for/against the DBH, while in step four we describe how to test the DLH.

155 To demonstrate the applicability of our framework, we apply it to 40 populations of
156 34 mammal species sourced from the COMADRE database (Salguero-Gómez *et al.* 2016). We
157 showcase how the framework can provide valuable insights into the patterns of demographic
158 buffering across species. The framework offers novel, detailed insights into the selection
159 pressures that act *within* species' life cycles, thus allowing for a thorough understanding of
160 the evolutionary selection forces that shape the patterns of demographic buffering across
161 species. Beyond providing a quantitative, systematic toolset to test the DBH through three
162 steps, we have also offer an alternative fourth step that briefly outlines how to test for the
163 DLH.

164

165 A unified framework to assess evidence of DBH

166 The evidence for demographic buffering has been mainly assessed using Matrix
167 Population Models (Pfister 1998; Rotella *et al.* 2012). However, Integral Projection Models
168 (IPM; Rodríguez-Caro *et al.* 2020; Wang *et al.* 2023) can be equally applied for identifying
169 the demographic buffering signatures. Both MPMs and IPMs are stage-structured, discrete-
170 time demographic models (Caswell 2001; Ellner *et al.* 2016). For simplicity, here we focus on
171 MPMs, but note that the same approaches are as equally applicable to IPMs (Griffith 2017;
172 Doak *et al.* 2021). Throughout this manuscript, we refer to demographic processes as both
173 matrix entries a_{ij} (*i.e.*, upper-level parameters) and the vital rates that underlie the matrix
174 elements (*i.e.*, lower-level parameters), and note that their conversion is straightforward and
175 described elsewhere (Franco & Silvertown 2004). The framework operates on three steps:

176 The first step of our framework involves acquiring the relative contribution of each
177 demographic process to the stochastic growth rate, λ_s , the so-called stochastic elasticities, E_{ij}^S
178 (Tuljapurkar *et al.* 2003) (Figure 1A). The sum of all stochastic elasticities ($\Sigma E_{a_{ij}}^S$), can be
179 separated into two components to assess how temporal variance and mean values of each
180 demographic process contributes to λ_s . The first component represents the *sum of stochastic*
181 *elasticity of λ_s with respect to the variance* $\Sigma E_{a_{ij}}^{S\sigma}$, and the second represents the *sum of*
182 *stochastic elasticity of λ_s with respect to the mean* $\Sigma E_{a_{ij}}^{S\mu}$, where $\Sigma E_{a_{ij}}^S = \Sigma E_{a_{ij}}^{S\sigma} + \Sigma E_{a_{ij}}^{S\mu}$. Thus,
183 the summation $\Sigma E_{a_{ij}}^{S\sigma}$ quantifies the extent to which the stochastic population growth rate (λ_s)
184 is influenced by changes in the variances of the demographic processes within the population
185 matrix.

186 A higher sum of stochastic elasticity of λ_s with respect to the variance (*i.e.*, higher
187 absolute value; $|\Sigma E_{a_{ij}}^{S\sigma}|$) indicates that small changes in the variance of demographic processes
188 would have a substantial impact on λ_s . In other words, the variance of that demographic

189 process is not constrained by selection, supporting the DLH. On the other hand, a lower
190 (absolute) stochastic elasticity of λ_s with respect to the variance suggests that λ_s is less
191 sensitive to such perturbations, or, that variance of such demographic process is being
192 constrained by natural selection, supporting the DBH (Tuljapurkar *et al.* 2003; Haridas &
193 Tuljapurkar 2005) (Fig. 1A).

194 The first step of the framework thus features the interspecific level and places species
195 or populations alongside a continuum. Species exhibiting unconstrained variance in the most
196 important demographic process (*i.e.*, not buffered/potentially DLH suggesting, Fig. 1A, blue
197 dots) are positioned on the left-hand side of the continuum. In contrast, species with
198 constrained variance in the most important demographic process (*i.e.*, supporting the DBH,
199 Fig. 1A, yellow dots) are positioned on the right-hand side of the continuum. However, the
200 left-hand side of the continuum does not necessarily imply evidence of demographic lability.
201 This is so because demographic lability is defined as an increase in the *mean value* of a
202 demographic process in response to improved environmental conditions (Le Coeur *et al.* 2022).
203 By examining $\Sigma E_{a_{ij}}^{S\sigma}$, we can visualize an increase or decrease in *variance* of demographic
204 processes, while the mean value of a demographic process does not change. The right-hand
205 side (near 0 values for $\Sigma E_{a_{ij}}^{S\sigma}$) supports the DBH, while the opposite end represents the lack
206 of support for the DBH, and potentially support for the DLH. However, to undoubtedly
207 provide support for the DLH, further investigation of demographic parameters is needed, as
208 described below.

209 Step 1 of our framework examines the impacts that environmental variation has on the
210 long-term population growth rate, λ_s (Tuljapurkar *et al.* 2003). This means that the resulting
211 variance continuum in this step of the framework is based on how λ_s was affected by
212 variation in the key demographic parameter across all contiguous time periods.

213 Steps 2 and 3 of the framework are conducted at the intraspecific level. Once species
214 or populations are positioned along the variance continuum regarding the most important
215 demographic process for λ_s , (step 1), one needs to zoom into each life cycle separately,
216 analysing the selection pressures acting on each one of the demographic processes composing
217 the life cycle. In doing so, one can inspect the selection pressures that have generated the
218 patterns found in step 1. Step 2 (Fig. 1B) requires obtaining the partial derivatives of the
219 deterministic population growth rate, λ_t , relative to all matrix elements of the MPM of interest
220 (*i.e.*, elasticities of λ_t w.r.t each demographic process in the MPM). Step 2 therefore informs
221 on the strength of the natural selection on each of the demographic processes.

222 Finally, in step 3, one assesses the pattern of nonlinear selection by using the self-
223 second derivatives of λ_t with respect to each demographic process (Fig. 1C). This final step
224 reveals the potential nonlinear selection pressures on all the demographic processes within a
225 life cycle, rather than only the most important one. This final step is key to understanding the
226 evolutionary processes (*i.e.*, types of nonlinear selection) that the demographic processes are
227 subjected to. Without understanding the evolutionary processes operating on the demographic
228 processes, the pattern observed in step 1 might be artefactual. Moreover, step 1 is founded on
229 the assumption that the importance of a demographic process, as indicated by its elasticity,
230 remains unchanged over time. However, stochastic environments can substantially alter
231 elasticity patterns throughout a life cycle (e.g., Lawler et al. 2009).

232 Steps 2 and 3 of the framework feature selection pressures that have been averaged
233 over the contiguous time periods. This means that the resulting patterns are based on how λ_t
234 (obtained from averaging all sequential MPMs across the duration of the study) would be
235 affected if a demographic process were perturbed. Therefore, steps 2 and 3 are based on a
236 different information than step 1, and can thus complete our understanding of the role of
237 selection pressures on shaping demographic patterns across multiple species.

238 Another important asset of step 3 above includes the notion that the relative
239 importance (elasticity) of demographic processes themselves changes with changing
240 environment (Stearns 1992). In other words, the extent to which λ_t is sensitive to
241 perturbations in a specific demographic process is *dynamic* (Kroon, Hans *et al.* 2000). Thus, the
242 self-second derivatives generate information on how the sensitivity (or elasticity) of λ_t –
243 based on which the entire variance continuum of species is produced in step 1 – might
244 change. If the sensitivity (or elasticity) of λ_t can change, then it is important to know which
245 demographic processes are most prone to trigger such a change. In the example of a
246 hypothetical wolf species (Fig. 1), this means that if the reproduction of the third age-class
247 individuals (matrix element $a_{1,3}$) decreased, the sensitivity of λ_t to $a_{1,3}$ would increase (square
248 with the largest black dot, Fig. 1C). Consequently, with increased environmental variability,
249 the key demographic process used to place this species onto the variance continuum in step 1
250 might change from remaining in the fourth age class (matrix element $a_{4,4}$, Fig. 1B) to
251 reproduction of the third age-class (matrix element $a_{1,3}$, Fig. 1C).

252 Combining the three steps of our framework allows for the clear, quantitative, holistic
253 identification of evidence to support (or reject) the DBH. Steps 2 and 3 offer key insights as
254 to *why* a given species or population is placed on either the buffered or the non-buffered
255 (potentially labile) end of the variance continuum. A clear and unequivocal evidence for
256 support towards the DBH consists of: (1) a species or population being positioned near the 0
257 end of the continuum (the right-hand side) in step 1; (2) this species' or populations' life
258 cycle having one or more demographic processes with highest elasticity values in step 2; and
259 (3) the same demographic process displaying the highest elasticity in step 2 with negative
260 self-second derivative values in step 3. In this sense, Figure 1B shows that, for the chosen
261 population of a hypothetical wolf species, the most important demographic process is
262 remaining in the fourth stage (MPM element $a_{4,4}$), as this demographic process results in

263 highest elasticity value (Fig. 1B yellow square). However, Fig. 1C reveals that $a_{4,4}$ is under
264 little selection pressure for variance reduction. Thus, there is no evidence for DBH from the
265 third step of the framework (*i.e.*, no concave selection forces), therefore, the lack of concave
266 selection forces on the key demographic process within wolf's life cycle explains why this
267 species is placed on the left-hand side of the variance continuum (Fig. 1A).

268 Species placed on the non-buffered end of the continuum is the first but not last step
269 to evidence demographic lability. Indeed, locating a species on the non-buffered end of the
270 variance continuum is a necessary but not sufficient condition for evidence in favour of the
271 DLH. It is key highlighting here that demographic buffering and lability do not represent two
272 extremes of the same continuum. The variance continuum allocates the species or populations
273 from strongly buffered to non-buffered, but to test the DLH, a further step is needed.

274 Although not our primary goal here, we briefly introduce said step 4. To establish
275 compelling evidence for or against the DLH, it is essential to fulfil several criteria. First,
276 sufficient data across various environments (over time or space) are required to construct
277 reaction norms that depict how a demographic process responds to environmental changes
278 (Morris et al., 2008; Koons et al., 2009). Second, non-linear relationships between
279 demographic processes and the environment must be established based on these reaction
280 norms. Lastly, to identify demographic processes where an increase in the mean value has a
281 stronger positive impact on population growth rate than the detrimental effect of increased
282 variance. This latter condition is only achieved when the vital rate-environment reaction
283 norm is convex (U-shaped; Morris et al. 2008; Koons et al. 2009). Importantly, we note that
284 more likely than previously thought (*e.g.*, Pfister 1998), species do not exist as purely
285 buffering or labile, but that within species, some vital rates may be buffered, other labile, and
286 others insensitive to the environment (*e.g.*, Doak et al. 2005). Deciphering generality in this
287 likely complex pattern should attract much research attention going forward, in our opinion.

288

289 **Demographic buffering in mammals: a case study using the unified framework**

290 We demonstrate the performance of our framework using 44 MPMs from 34 mammal
291 species. Mammals are of special interest here for two reasons: (1) mammalian life histories
292 have been well studied (Gillespie 1977; Stearns 1983; Bielby *et al.* 2007; Jones 2011); and (2)
293 some of their populations have already been assessed in terms of buffering, particularly for
294 primates (Morris *et al.* 2008, 2011; Reed & Slade 2012; Rotella *et al.* 2012; Campos *et al.* 2017).
295 Together, the well-studied life histories and previous information about the occurrence of
296 buffering in mammals provide the necessary information to make accurate predictions and
297 validate the performance of the proposed framework.

298 We used Matrix Population Models from 40 out of 139 studies with mammals
299 available in the COMADRE database v.3.0.0 (Salguero-Gómez *et al.* 2016). These 40
300 populations encompass 34 species from eight taxonomic orders. We included these MPMs in
301 our analyses because they provide values of demographic processes (a_{ij}) for three or more
302 contiguous time periods, thus allowing us to obtain the stochastic elasticity of each a_{ij} .
303 Although we are aware that not all possible temporal variation in demographic processes may
304 have been expressed within this period, we assumed three or more transitions are enough to
305 provide sufficient variation for population comparison. At least three contiguous time periods
306 - a common selection criteria in comparative studies of stochastic demography (Compagnoni
307 *et al.* 2023) - also allowed to test and showcase our framework. Fortunately, several long-lived
308 species, characterized by low variation in their demographic processes, were studied for a
309 long time (*e.g.*, some primates in our dataset have been studied for over 20 years – Morris *et*
310 *al.* 2011). We removed the populations where either only survival or only reproduction rates
311 were reported, because of the impossibility to calculate the stochastic growth rate. A detailed
312 description of the analysed data and their original sources are available in supplementary
313 material (Supplementary Material, Table S1).

314 *Homo sapiens* was included in our analyses because it is the only mammalian species
315 in which second-order derivatives have been applied (Caswell 1996). Therefore, *Homo*
316 *sapiens* provides an ideal basis for comparisons among species. The data for *Homo sapiens*
317 were gathered from 26 modern populations located in various cities, allowing us to construct
318 a spatiotemporal variance. It is important to note that in this case, we are not working with
319 true temporal variance but rather a variance that encompasses both spatial and temporal
320 aspects.

321 For steps 2 and 3 of our framework, we utilized a subset of 16 populations (including
322 *Homo sapiens*) whose population projection matrices (MPMs) were organized by age. We
323 specifically selected these populations because their life cycles can be summarized by two
324 main demographic processes: survival and contribution to recruitment of new individuals.
325 The contribution to recruitment can be interpreted as either the mean reproductive output for
326 each age class or an approximation thereof, depending on how the matrices are structured
327 (Ebert 1999). One advantage of using such matrices is that they encompass only two types of
328 demographic processes, namely survival and recruitment, eliminating the need to account for
329 multiple transitions between different life stages.

330 To perform the step 1 of our framework and obtain the $\Sigma E_{a_{ij}}^{S\sigma}$ (and $\Sigma E_{a_{ij}}^{S\mu}$), we followed
331 Tuljapurkar *et al.* (2003). To perform step 2 of our framework, we calculated the
332 deterministic elasticities of each demographic process extracted using the *popbio* package.
333 All analyses were performed using R version 3.5.1 (R Core team, 2018). Finally, to perform
334 the step 3 of our framework the self-second derivatives were adapted from *demogR* (Jones
335 2007) following Caswell 1996 and applied for the mean MPM.

336 *Results*

337 We ranked 40 populations from the 34 identified mammal species according to the
 338 cumulative impact of variation in demographic processes on λ_s using the step 1 of our
 339 framework (Fig. 2). Additional information is provided in the supplementary material (Table
 340 S1). Most of the analysed orders were placed on the low-variance end of the variance
 341 continuum (Fig. 2). The smallest contributions of variation in demographic processes (*i.e.*,
 342 maximum value of $\Sigma E_{a_{ij}}^{S\sigma}$, note that $\Sigma E_{a_{ij}}^{S\sigma}$ ranges from 0 to -1), suggesting more buffered
 343 populations, were assigned to Primates: northern muriqui (*Brachyteles hyphoxantus*, $\Sigma E_{a_{ij}}^{S\sigma} = -$
 344 $0.09 \times 10^{-4} \pm 0.12 \times 10^{-4}$) (mean \pm standard deviation) (Fig. 2 silhouette a), mountain gorilla
 345 (*Gorilla beringhei*, $\Sigma E_{a_{ij}}^{S\sigma} = -0.24 \times 10^{-4} \pm 0.08 \times 10^{-4}$) (Fig. 2 silhouette b), followed by the
 346 blue monkey (*Cercopithecus mitis*, $\Sigma E_{a_{ij}}^{S\sigma} = -0.63 \times 10^{-4} \pm 0.06 \times 10^{-4}$) (Fig. 2 silhouette c).
 347 The first non-primate species placed near the low-variance end of the continuum was the
 348 Columbian ground squirrel (*Urocitellus columbianus*, Rodentia, $\Sigma E_{a_{ij}}^{S\sigma} = -0.003 \pm 0.002$) (Fig.
 349 2 silhouette d). The species with the highest contribution of variation in demographic
 350 processes placed at the high-variance end of the continuum was the stoat (*Mustela erminea*,
 351 Carnivora, $\Sigma E_{a_{ij}}^{S\sigma} = -0.35 \pm 0.02$) (Fig. 2 silhouette e). All the 14 primate populations
 352 supported the DBH, occupying the right-hand side of the variance continuum, with exception
 353 of the Patas monkey (*Erythrocebus patas*, Primates, $\Sigma E_{a_{ij}}^{S\sigma} = -0.05 \pm 0.03$) (Fig. 2 silhouette
 354 f). The snowshoe hare (*Lepus americanus*, Lagomorpha, $\Sigma E_{a_{ij}}^{S\sigma} = -0.29 \pm 0.16$) (Fig. 2
 355 silhouette g) and the Bush rat (*Rattus fuscipes*, Rodentia, $\Sigma E_{a_{ij}}^{S\sigma} = -0.25 \pm 0.03$) (Fig. 2
 356 silhouette h) appear on the high-variance end of the continuum.

357 As predicted for the steps 2 and 3, we could not observe a clear pattern in support of
 358 the DBH. This finding means that the demographic processes with the highest elasticity
 359 values failed to display strongly negative self-second derivatives (Fig. 3). Particularly for

360 majority of primates - with the lack or minor temporal variation in demographic processes -
361 demographic processes with high elasticities had positive values for the self-second
362 derivatives (indicated by yellow squares with white dots in Fig. 3). Examples of primate
363 species exhibiting high elasticities and positive values for the self-second derivatives and
364 include northern muriqui (*Brachyteles hypoxanthus*), mountain gorilla (*Gorilla beringei*),
365 white-faced capuchin monkey (*Cebus capucinus*), rhesus monkey (*Macaca mulatta*), blue
366 monkey (*Cercopithecus mitis*), Verreaux's sifaka (*Propithecus verreauxi*) and olive baboon
367 (*Papio cynocephalus*) (Fig. 3). This implies that the key demographic processes influencing
368 λ_t are not subject to selective pressure for reducing their temporal variability. However, even
369 though the primates were positioned closer to the low-variance end of the continuum in step
370 1, the evidence from steps 2 and 3 does not support DBH.

371 The killer whale showed similar controversy between step 1 and steps 2-3 results as
372 most primates. In step 1, the killer whale was positioned at the buffered end of the variance
373 continuum (*Orcinus orca*, Cetacea, $\Sigma E_{a_{ij}}^{S\sigma} = -0.70 \times 10^{-4} \pm 1.04 \times 10^{-5}$) (Fig. 2 silhouette not
374 shown). However, steps 2 and 3 show that the three demographic processes in killer whale
375 life cycle with highest elasticity values (matrix elements $a_{2,2}$, $a_{3,3}$ and $a_{4,4}$) are not under
376 selection pressures for reducing their temporal variance, but the opposite (depicted by yellow
377 and green squares with white dots, Fig. 3).

378 The only primate species exhibiting DBH evidence in steps 2 and 3 was human. In
379 human, demographic parameters representing survival from first to second age class (matrix
380 element $a_{2,1}$) displayed high elasticities and negative self-second derivatives (depicted as
381 yellow squares with black dots in Fig. 3). Evidence supporting the DBH was also found in
382 the Columbian ground squirrel (*Urocitellus columbianus*), where, similar to humans, survival
383 from the first to the second age class (matrix element $a_{2,1}$) showed indications of selection
384 acting to reduce its variance. Accordingly, the Columbian ground squirrel was positioned

385 close to the buffered end of the variance continuum in step 1. Hence, the Columbian ground
386 squirrel was the sole species with consistent DBH support across all three steps of the
387 framework.

388 The Soay sheep (*Ovis aries*) was the species furthest from the buffered end of the
389 variance continuum that enabled to perform steps 2 and 3. For the Soay sheep, remaining in
390 the third age class (matrix element $a_{3,3}$) has the major influence on λ_t and is under selection
391 pressure to have its variance increased. The latter characteristics reveal conditions for the
392 DLH support even though the species is placed closer to the buffered end of the variance
393 continuum.

394 Steps 2 and 3 illustrate the importance of examining DBH evidence on the
395 intraspecific level. These two steps of the framework identify the simultaneous acting of
396 concave and convex selection on different demographic processes but within a single life
397 cycle. In polar bear (*Ursus maritimus*), the key demographic process (matrix element $a_{4,4}$) is
398 under convex selection, as depicted by a yellow square with a white dot in Fig. 3. However,
399 the demographic process with the second highest elasticity value (matrix element $a_{5,4}$) is
400 under strong concave selection (depicted by a light green square with a black dot in Fig. 3).

401 By adding step 3 to the framework, another important information was added. The
402 high absolute values of self-second derivatives (large dots, either black or white, Fig. 3)
403 indicate where the sensitivity of λ_t to demographic parameters is itself prone to environmental
404 changes. For instance, if the value of $a_{5,4}$ for polar bear increased, the sensitivity of λ_t to $a_{5,4}$
405 would decrease because the self-second derivative of $a_{5,4}$ is highly negative (depicted by the
406 largest black dot in polar bear MPM). Vice versa holds for the $a_{4,4}$ demographic process,
407 where an increase in the value of $a_{4,4}$ would increase λ_t 's sensitivity to $a_{4,4}$, because the self-
408 second derivative of $a_{5,4}$ is highly positive (depicted by the largest white dot in polar bear

409 MPM). Thus, sensitivities (or equally elasticities) of demographic processes with high
410 absolute values for self-second derivatives can easily change - potentially changing the key
411 demographic process used for allocating species into the variance continuum in step 1 of the
412 framework.

413 **Discussion**

414 In the Anthropocene, identifying and quantifying mechanisms of species responses to
415 stochastic environments holds crucial importance. This importance is particularly tangible in
416 the context of the unprecedented environmental changes and uncertainties that impact the
417 dynamics and persistence of natural populations (Boyce *et al.* 2006). Correlational
418 demographic analysis, whereby the importance of demographic processes and their temporal
419 variability is examined (e.g., Pfister 1998), has attempted to identify how species may buffer
420 against the negative effects of environmental stochasticity. However, these widely used
421 approaches have important limitations (see Introduction and Hilde *et al.* 2020). Our novel
422 framework overcomes said limitations by providing a rigorous approach to test the
423 demographic buffering hypothesis (DBH; Pfister 1998; Hilde *et al.* 2020).

424 Evidencing demographic buffering is not straightforward. Indeed, through the
425 analysis of stochastic population growth rate (λ_s) in our application of the framework to 44
426 populations of 34 species, we identify the highest density of natural populations near the
427 buffered end of the variance continuum (step 1), indicating possible support for the DBH.
428 However, we show that the same species then fail to exhibit signs of concave (\cap -shaped)
429 selection on the key demographic parameters when further analyses are performed averaging
430 the variation across the duration of each study (steps 2 and 3). This finding confirms that
431 placing the species near the buffered end of the variance continuum is *necessary* but not
432 *sufficient* to test the DBH. Indeed, buffering occurs when concave selection forces act on the
433 key demographic parameter (Caswell 1996, 2001; Shyu & Caswell 2014).

434 Combining the three steps into a unified framework is of utmost importance. In steps
435 2 and 3 of the framework, we find relatively limited overall support for the DBH in the
436 examination of our 16 (out of 34 in step 1) studied animal species. Step 3 of our framework
437 reveals that the role of natural selection shaping temporal variation in demographic processes
438 is more complex than expected by the DBH alone. Indeed, demographic processes within our
439 study populations are often under a mix of convex and concave selection. This mix of
440 selection patterns was already suggested by Doak *et al.* (2005). Here, only two out of 16
441 mammal species revealed concave selection acting on the key demographic processes
442 (Columbian ground squirrel [*Urocitellus columbianus*], and humans, [*Homo sapiens*
443 *sapiens*]). These two species were also placed near the buffered end of the variance
444 continuum, therefore meeting all the necessary conditions to diagnose clear support in favour
445 of DBH. However, finding 12.5% (two out of 16) species that meet the criteria for
446 demographic buffering is not in concordance with previous studies. Support for the DBH has
447 been reported across 22 ungulate species (Gaillard & Yoccoz 2003). In the one ungulate we
448 examined, the moose (*Alces alces*), we find only partial support for DBH in adult survival,
449 since this species is placed near the buffered end of the variance continuum in step 1 but does
450 not show concave selection pressures on adult survival in step 2/3, as predicted by the DBH.

451 Our overall findings reveal varying levels of support for the notion that adult survival
452 in long-lived species tends to be buffered. Indeed, Gaillard *et al.* (1998) found that adult
453 female survival varied considerably less than juvenile survival in large herbivores. This
454 finding was also supported by further studies in ungulates (Gaillard & Yoccoz 2003), turtles
455 (Heppell 1998), vertebrates and plants (Pfister 1998), and more recently across nine (out of
456 73) species of plants (McDonald *et al.* 2017).

457 When placing our study species along a variance continuum (step 1), primates tend to
458 be located on the buffered end. However, most primates displayed convex –instead of the

459 expected concave– selection on adult survival. Similar results, where the key demographic
460 process failed to display constrained temporal variability, have been reported for long-lived
461 seabirds (Doherty *et al.* 2004). One explanation for the unexpected convex selection on adult
462 survival involves trade-offs, as suggested by Doak *et al.* (2005). When two demographic
463 parameters are negatively correlated, the variance of population growth rate (λ) can be
464 increased or decreased (Evans & Holsinger 2012; Compagnoni *et al.* 2016). The well-established
465 trade-off between survival and fecundity (e.g., Stearns 1992; Roff & Fairbairn 2007) might
466 explain the observed concave selection signatures on late fecundity and convex selection on
467 adult survival. Because variation in primate recruitment is already constrained by
468 physiological limitations (Campos *et al.* 2017), when adult survival and recruitment are
469 engaged in a trade-off, this trade-off might lead to our unexpected result. Here, future studies
470 may benefit from deeper insights via cross-second derivatives (Caswell 1996, 2001) to
471 investigate correlations among demographic processes.

472 Examining the drivers of demographic buffering has become an important piece of the
473 ecological and evolutionary puzzle of demography. As such, testing the DBH can help us
474 better predict population responses to environmental variability, climate change, and direct
475 anthropogenic disturbances (Pfister 1998; Boyce *et al.* 2006; McDonald *et al.* 2017; Vázquez *et al.*
476 2017). By setting the DBH into a broader and integrated framework, we hope to enhance
477 comprehension and prediction of the implications of heightened environmental stochasticity
478 on the evolution of life history traits. This understanding is crucial in mitigating the risk of
479 extinction for the most vulnerable species.

480

481 **Acknowledgements**

482 This study was financed in part by the *Coordenação de Aperfeiçoamento de Pessoal de Nível*
483 *Superior* - Brasil (CAPES) - Finance Code 001. GSS was supported by CAPES and CNPq

484 (301343/2023-3). RS-G was supported by a NERC Independent Research Fellowship
485 (NE/M018458/1). MK was supported by the European Commission through the Marie
486 Skłodowska-Curie fellowship (MSCA MaxPersist #101032484) hosted by RSG.

487

488 **Data availability**

489 The demographic data used in this paper are open-access and available in the COMPADRE
490 Plant Matrix Database (v. 5.0.1; <https://compadre-db.org/Data/Compadre>). A list of the
491 studies and species used here is available in Supplementary Material (Table S1). If the
492 manuscript is accepted, the data and code supporting the results will be archived on Zenodo.
493 The data and code specific DOI will then be included in our “Data availability” statement.

494

495 **References**

- 496 Barraquand, F. & Yoccoz, N.G. (2013). When can environmental variability benefit population
497 growth? Counterintuitive effects of nonlinearities in vital rates. *Theor Popul Biol*, 89, 1–11.
- 498 Bielby, J., Mace, G.M., Bininda-Emonds, O.R.P., Cardillo, M., Gittleman, J.L., Jones, K.E., *et al.*
499 (2007). The Fast-Slow Continuum in Mammalian Life History: An Empirical Reevaluation. *Am*
500 *Nat*, 169, 748–757.
- 501 Bonsall, M.B. & Klug, H. (2011). The evolution of parental care in stochastic environments. *J Evol*
502 *Biol*, 24, 645–655.
- 503 Boyce, M.S., Haridas, C. V., Lee, C.T., Boggs, C.L., Bruna, E.M., Coulson, T., *et al.* (2006).
504 Demography in an increasingly variable world. *Trends Ecol Evol*, 21, 141–148.
- 505 Brodie, E.I., Moore, A. & Janzen, F. (1995). Visualizing and quantifying natural selection. *Trends*
506 *Ecol Evol*, 10, 313–318.
- 507 Campos, F.A., Morris, W.F., Alberts, S.C., Altmann, J., Brockman, D.K., Cords, M., *et al.* (2017).
508 Does climate variability influence the demography of wild primates? Evidence from long-term
509 life-history data in seven species. *Glob Chang Biol*, 23, 4907–4921.
- 510 Carslake, D., Townley, S. & Hodgson, D.J. (2008). Nonlinearity in eigenvalue-perturbation curves of
511 simulated population projection matrices. *Theor Popul Biol*, 73, 498–505.
- 512 Caswell, H. (1996). Second Derivatives of Population Growth Rate: Calculation and Applications.
513 *Ecology*, 77, 870–879.
- 514 Caswell, H. (2001). *Matrix Population Models: Construction, Analysis, and Interpretation*. Sinauer
515 Associates Inc. Publishers, Sunderland, Massachusetts, USA.

- 516 Charlesworth, B. (1994). *Evolution in age-structured populations*. second edi. Cambridge University
517 Press.
- 518 Le Coeur, C., Yoccoz, N.G., Salguero-Gómez, R. & Vindenes, Y. (2022). Life history adaptations to
519 fluctuating environments: Combined effects of demographic buffering and lability. *Ecol Lett*, 1–
520 13.
- 521 Compagnoni, A., Bibian, A.J., Ochocki, B.M., Rogers, H.S., Schultz, E.L., Sneek, M.E., *et al.* (2016).
522 The effect of demographic correlations on the stochastic population dynamics of perennial
523 plants. *Ecol Monogr*, 86, 480–494.
- 524 Compagnoni, A., Evers, S. & Knight, T. (2023). Spatial replication can best advance our
525 understanding of population responses to climate. *bioRxiv*,
526 <https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.06.24.497542>.
- 527 Doak, D.F., Morris, W.F., Pfister, C., Kendall, B.E. & Bruna, E.M. (2005). Correctly Estimating How
528 Environmental Stochasticity Influences Fitness and Population Growth. *Am Nat*, 166, E14–E21.
- 529 Doak, D.F., Waddle, E., Langendorf, R.E., Louthan, A.M., Isabelle Chardon, N., Dibner, R.R., *et al.*
530 (2021). A critical comparison of integral projection and matrix projection models for
531 demographic analysis. *Ecol Monogr*, 91, e01447.
- 532 Doherty, P.F., Schreiber, E.A., Nichols, J.D., Hines, J.E., Link, W.A., Schenk, G.A., *et al.* (2004).
533 Testing life history predictions in a long-lived seabird: A population matrix approach with
534 improved parameter estimation. *Oikos*, 105, 606–618.
- 535 Easterling, M.R., Ellner, S.P. & Dixon, P.M. (2000). Size-Specific Sensitivity: Applying a New
536 Structured Population Model. *Ecology*, 81, 694–708.
- 537 Ellner, S.P., Childs, D.Z. & Rees, M. (2016). Data-driven Modelling of Structured Populations.
- 538 Evans, M.E.K. & Holsinger, K.E. (2012). Estimating covariation between vital rates : A simulation
539 study of connected vs . separate generalized linear mixed models (GLMMs). *Theor Popul Biol*,
540 82, 299–306.
- 541 Ferreira, M., Kajin, M., Vieira, M., Zangrandi, P., Cerqueira, R. & Gentile, R. (2013). Life history of
542 a neotropical marsupial: Evaluating potential contributions of survival and reproduction to
543 population growth rate. *Mamm Biol*, 78, 406–411.
- 544 Franco, M. & Silvertown, J. (2004). A comparative demography of plants based upon elasticities of
545 vital rates. *Ecology*, 85, 531–538.
- 546 Gaillard, J.-M. & Yoccoz, N. (2003). Temporal Variation in Survival of Mammals: a Case of
547 Environmental Canalization? *Ecology*, 84, 3294–3306.
- 548 Gillespie, J.H. (1977). Natural Selection for Variances in Offspring Numbers: A New Evolutionary
549 Principle. *Am Nat*, 111, 1010–1014.
- 550 Griffith, A.B. (2017). Perturbation approaches for integral projection models. *Oikos*, 126, 1675–1686.
- 551 Haridas, C.V. & Tuljapurkar, S. (2005). Elasticities in Variable Environments: Properties and
552 Implications. *Am Nat*, 166, 481–495.
- 553 Healy, K., Ezard, T.H.G., Jones, O.R., Salguero-Gómez, R. & Buckley, Y.M. (2019). Animal life
554 history is shaped by the pace of life and the distribution of age-specific mortality and
555 reproduction. *Nat Ecol Evol*, 3, 1217–1224.

- 556 Heppell, S.S. (1998). Application of Life-History Theory and Population Model Analysis to Turtle
557 Conservation. *Copeia*, 1998, 367.
- 558 Hilde, C.H., Gamelon, M., Sæther, B.-E., Gaillard, J.-M., Yoccoz, N.G. & Pélabon, C. (2020). The
559 Demographic Buffering Hypothesis: Evidence and Challenges. *Trends Ecol Evol*, 35, 523–538.
- 560 Jäkäläniemi, A., Ramula, S. & Tuomi, J. (2013). Variability of important vital rates challenges the
561 demographic buffering hypothesis. *Evol Ecol*, 27, 533–545.
- 562 Jones, J.H. (2007). *Journal of Statistical Software*, 22.
- 563 Jones, J.H. (2011). Primates and the evolution of long, slow life histories. *Current Biology*, 21, R708–
564 R717.
- 565 Jongejans, E., De Kroon, H., Tuljapurkar, S. & Shea, K. (2010). Plant populations track rather than
566 buffer climate fluctuations. *Ecol Lett*, 13, 736–743.
- 567 Koons, D.N., Pavard, S., Baudisch, A. & Jessica E. Metcalf, C. (2009). Is life-history buffering or
568 lability adaptive in stochastic environments? *Oikos*, 118, 972–980.
- 569 Kroon, Hans, D., van Groenendael, J. & Ehrlén, J. (2000). Elasticities: A review of methods and
570 model limitations.
- 571 Lawler, R.R., Caswell, H., Richard, A.F., Ratsirarson, J., Dewar, R.E. & Schwartz, M. (2009).
572 Demography of Verreaux’s sifaka in a stochastic rainfall environment. *Oecologia*, 161, 491–
573 504.
- 574 McDonald, J.L., Franco, M., Townley, S., Ezard, T.H.G., Jelbert, K. & Hodgson, D.J. (2017).
575 Divergent demographic strategies of plants in variable environments. *Nat Ecol Evol*, 1, 0029.
- 576 Morris, W.F., Altmann, J., Brockman, D.K., Cords, M., Fedigan, L.M., Pusey, A.E., *et al.* (2011).
577 Low Demographic Variability in Wild Primate Populations: Fitness Impacts of Variation,
578 Covariation, and Serial Correlation in Vital Rates. *Am Nat*, 177, E14–E28.
- 579 Morris, W.F. & Doak, D.F. (2004). Buffering of Life Histories against Environmental Stochasticity:
580 Accounting for a Spurious Correlation between the Variabilities of Vital Rates and Their
581 Contributions to Fitness. *Am Nat*, 163, 579–590.
- 582 Morris, W.F., Pfister, C.A., Tuljapurkar, S., Haridas, C. V., Boggs, C.L., Boyce, M.S., *et al.* (2008).
583 Longevity can buffer plant and animal populations against changing climatic variability.
584 *Ecology*, 89, 19–25.
- 585 Pélabon, C., Hilde, C.H., Einum, S. & Gamelon, M. (2020). On the use of the coefficient of variation
586 to quantify and compare trait variation. *Evol Lett*, 4, 180–188.
- 587 Pfister, C. (1998). Patterns of variance in stage-structured populations: Evolutionary predictions and
588 ecological implications. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 95, 213–218.
- 589 Reed, A.W. & Slade, N.A. (2012). Buffering and plasticity in vital rates of oldfield rodents. *Journal*
590 *of Animal Ecology*, 81, 953–959.
- 591 Rodríguez-Caro, R.C., Capdevila, P., Graciá, E., Barbosa, J.M., Giménez, A. & Salguero-Gómez, R.
592 (2020). The demographic buffering strategy has a threshold of effectiveness to increases in
593 environmental stochasticity. *bioRxiv*, 1–41.
- 594 Roff, D.A. & Fairbairn, D.J. (2007). The evolution of trade-offs: Where are we? *J Evol Biol*, 20, 433–
595 447.

596 Rotella, J.J., Link, W.A., Chambert, T., Stauffer, G.E. & Garrott, R.A. (2012). Evaluating the
597 demographic buffering hypothesis with vital rates estimated for Weddell seals from 30 years of
598 mark – recapture data, 162–173.

599 Salguero-Gómez, R., Jones, O.R., Archer, C.R., Bein, C., de Buhr, H., Farack, C., *et al.* (2016).
600 COMADRE: A global data base of animal demography. *Journal of Animal Ecology*, 85, 371–
601 384.

602 Shyu, E. & Caswell, H. (2014). Calculating second derivatives of population growth rates for ecology
603 and evolution. *Methods Ecol Evol*, 5, 473–482.

604 Stearns, S. (1992). *The Evolution of Life Histories*. Oxford University Press, New York, USA.

605 Stearns, S.C. (1983). The Influence of Size and Phylogeny on Patterns of Covariation among Life-
606 History Traits in the Mammals. *Oikos*, 41, 173.

607 Sutherland, W.J., Freckleton, R.P., Godfray, H.C.J., Beissinger, S.R., Benton, T., Cameron, D.D., *et*
608 *al.* (2013). Identification of 100 fundamental ecological questions. *Journal of Ecology*, 101, 58–
609 67.

610 Tuljapurkar, S., Gaillard, J.-M. & Coulson, T. (2009). From stochastic environments to life histories
611 and back. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, 364, 1499–
612 1509.


613 Tuljapurkar, S., Horvitz, C.C. & Pascarella, J.B. (2003). The Many Growth Rates and Elasticities of
614 Populations in Random Environments. *Am Nat*, 162, 489–502.

615 Vázquez, D.P., Gianoli, E., Morris, W.F. & Bozinovic, F. (2017). Ecological and evolutionary
616 impacts of changing climatic variability. *Biological Reviews*, 92, 22–42.


617 Wang, J., Yang, X., Silva Santos, G., Ning, H., Li, T., Zhao, W., *et al.* (2023). Flexible demographic
618 strategies promote the population persistence of a pioneer conifer tree (*Pinus massoniana*) in
619 ecological restoration. *For Ecol Manage*, 529, 120727.

620


621



624 **Figure 2**



627 **Figure 3**



628

629

630

631 **Figure legends**

632

633 **Figure 1.** A three-step framework proposed to: Step 1 - allocate species and/or populations
634 on a variance continuum (plot A, dots representing 50 hypothetical species). The variance
635 continuum operates at the interspecific level (see text) and is represented by partitioning the
636 sum of all the stochastic elasticities ($\Sigma E_{a_{ij}}^S$) into two compounds: i) sums of stochastic
637 elasticities with respect to the variance ($\Sigma E_{a_{ij}}^{S\sigma}$), and ii) sums of stochastic elasticities with
638 respect to the mean ($\Sigma E_{a_{ij}}^{S\mu}$). The first step of our framework shows the variance compound of
639 the sums of stochastic elasticities forming a continuum where the right-hand side of the plot
640 represents species (or populations) where a perturbation of variance of the most important
641 demographic process results in weak or no impact on λ_s (yellow dots). The yellow-dotted
642 species (or populations) can be classified as having *buffered life-cycles (supporting the DBH)*
643 – based on the most important demographic process for the λ_s . The left-hand side of the graph
644 represents species (or populations) where a perturbation of the variance of the most important
645 demographic process results in strong impact on λ_s (blue dots). Thus, the blue-dotted species
646 (or populations) can be classified as having *unbuffered life cycles (potentially supporting*
647 *DLH, see text)* – based on the most important demographic process for the λ_s . The jitter
648 applied on the y-axis has no biological meaning. Step 2 - Access the linear selection
649 pressures for individual species or populations at intraspecific level (see text) (plot B). Step 2
650 displays the elasticities of the deterministic population growth rate (λ_i) for a hypothetical
651 population of wolf and reveals the linear selection gradients. Step 3 - Access the nonlinear
652 selection pressures at the intraspecific level (see text) (plot C). In the third step self-second
653 derivatives for the corresponding demographic processes from step 2 are displayed.

654

655 **Figure 2.** Results for step 1 of our framework showing the sum of stochastic elasticities with
656 respect to the variance $\Sigma E_{aij}^{S\sigma}$ increase caused by a perturbation in the most relevant
657 demographic process. The 40 populations from 34 species of mammals from the COMADRE
658 database are ranked into the variance continuum from strongly buffered (right-hand side,
659 supporting the DBH) to more variable, less buffered (left-hand side, potentially supporting
660 the DLH, see text). Colors represent different taxonomic orders with Primates occupying the
661 right-hand side. Silhouettes: a) *Brachyteles hypoxantus*, b) *Gorilla beringhei*, c)
662 *Cercopithecus mitis*, d) *Uroditellus columbianus*, e) *Mustela erminea*, f) *Erythrocebus patas*,
663 g) *Lepus americanus*, h) *Rattus fuscipes*, i) *Ovis aries*, j) *Homo sapiens*, k) *Macropus eugenii*,
664 and l) *Felis catus*. The jitter applied on the y-axis has no biological meaning.

665
666 **Figure 3:** Results from steps 2 and 3 of the proposed framework (see Fig. 2B, C). The 16
667 plots represent populations where the MPMs built by ages were available in the COMADRE
668 database (see text). The color scale represents elasticity values for each of the demographic
669 processes in the MPM, where yellow represents high and blue low elasticity values. No color
670 means elasticity=0. Because the aim of step 2 is to identify the most important demographic
671 process within each species' life cycle (the intraspecific level, see text) - not to compare the
672 elasticity values among species - each plot has its own scale (see end of legend). The black
673 dots represent negative self-second derivatives of λ_t - thus concave selection - and the white
674 dots represent positive self-second derivatives of λ_t - thus convex selection. The dot sizes are
675 scaled by the absolute value of self-second derivatives, where the smaller the dot, the closer a
676 self-second derivative is to 0, indicating weak or no selection. Large dots indicate strong
677 selection forces. Scales ($E_{\min-\max}$ =elasticity minimum and maximum value, $SSD_{\min-\max}$ =self-
678 second derivative minimum and maximum value): Blue monkey $E_{\min-\max}=0.00-0.52$, $SSD_{\min-$
679 $\max}=-1.25-1.27$; Columbian ground squirrel: $E_{\min-\max}=0.00-0.23$, $SSD_{\min-\max}=-1.48-0.01$;

680 Eastern chimpanzee: $E_{\min-\max}=0.00-0.60$, $SSD_{\min-\max}=-4.39-2.59$; Human: $E_{\min-\max}=0.00-0.18$,
681 $SSD_{\min-\max}=-0.15-0.08$; Killer whale: $E_{\min-\max}=0.00-0.55$, $SSD_{\min-\max}=-5.72-3.43$; Moose:
682 $E_{\min-\max}=0.00-0.55$, $SSD_{\min-\max}=-0.66-0.36$; Mountain gorilla: $E_{\min-\max}=0.00-0.81$, $SSD_{\min-}$
683 $\max=-1.46-0.28$; Northern muriqui: $E_{\min-\max}=0.00-0.72$, $SSD_{\min-\max}=-1.17-0.35$; Olive baboon:
684 $E_{\min-\max}=0.00-0.54$, $SSD_{\min-\max}=-0.57-1.13$; Polar bear: $E_{\min-\max}=0.00-0.26$, $SSD_{\min-\max}=-$
685 $0.73-0.54$; Rhesus macaque: $E_{\min-\max}=0.00-0.51$, $SSD_{\min-\max}=-0.54-0.71$; Root vole: $E_{\min-}$
686 $\max=0.00-0.86$, $SSD_{\min-\max}=-2.54-0.22$; Soay sheep: $E_{\min-\max}=0.00-0.56$, $SSD_{\min-\max}=-0.22-$
687 0.40 ; Tammar wallaby: $E_{\min-\max}=0.00-0.55$, $SSD_{\min-\max}=-0.64-0.34$; White faced capuchin
688 monkey: $E_{\min-\max}=0.00-0.66$, $SSD_{\min-\max}=-2.66-1.21$.

689

690 **Supplementary material – Data available in COMADRE Version 2.0.1 and results from Step 1 of the framework**

691 **Table S1.** The metadata used in step 1 of our framework and the respective results presented in the main text. The first four columns represent
692 the information from where Matrix Populations Models (MPMs) were extract precisely as presented in COMADRE 2.0.1. Column titles differ
693 from the database as “SpeciesAuthorComadre” is equivalent to “SpeciesAuthor” and “SpeciesName” is equivalent to “SpeciesAccepted” in
694 COMADRE 2.0.1. The remaining columns present the results of step 1, where we present the raw values of $\Sigma E_{a_{ij}}^{S^{\mu}}$ and $\Sigma E_{a_{ij}}^{S^{\sigma}}$, their respective
695 standard deviation, the stochastic population growth rate λ_s , and the number of available matrices (# matrices). For ByAge, “TRUE” was
696 assigned for MPMs built by age or “FALSE” if otherwise.

SpeciesAuthorComadre	SpeciesName	CommonName	Order	$\Sigma E_{a_{ij}}^{S^{\mu}}$	$\Sigma E_{a_{ij}}^{S^{\mu}}$ (sd)	$\Sigma E_{a_{ij}}^{S^{\sigma}}$	$\Sigma E_{a_{ij}}^{S^{\sigma}}$ (sd)	# matrices	λ
Homo_sapiens_subsp_sapiens	<i>Homo sapiens sapiens</i>	Human	Primates	1.003	0.003	1.003	0.004	13	1.064
Alces_alces	<i>Alces alces</i>	Moose	Artiodactyla	1.001	0.001	1.001	0.001	13	1.205
Antechinus_agilis	<i>Antechinus agilis</i>	Agile antechinus	Dasyuromorphia	1.111	0.111	1.111	0.011	2	0.931
Brachyteles_hypoxanthus	<i>Brachyteles hypoxanthus</i>	Northern muriqui	Primates	1.000	0.000	1.000	0.000	12	1.051
Callospermophilus_lateralis	<i>Callospermophilus lateralis</i>	Golden-mantled ground squirrel	Rodentia	1.054	0.054	1.054	0.055	9	2.052
Cebus_capucinus	<i>Cebus capucinus</i>	White faced capuchin monkey	Primates	1.000	0.000	1.000	0.000	11	1.021
Cercopithecus_mitis	<i>Cercopithecus mitis</i>	Blue monkey	Primates	1.000	0.000	1.000	0.000	14	1.036
Eumetopias_jubatus	<i>Eumetopias jubatus</i>	Northern sea lion; Steller sea lion	Carnivora	1.005	0.005	1.005	0.002	2	0.904
Felis_catus	<i>Felis catus</i>	Feral cat	Carnivora	1.136	0.136	1.136	0.012	1	1.948
Gorilla_beringei	<i>Gorilla beringei</i>	Mountain gorilla	Primates	1.000	0.000	1.000	0.000	21	1.027
Hippocamelus_bisulcus	<i>Hippocamelus bisulcus</i>	Huemul deer	Artiodactyla	1.002	0.002	1.002	0.001	1	0.996
Lepus_americanus	<i>Lepus americanus</i>	Snowshoe hare	Lagomorpha	1.294	0.294	1.294	0.165	2	0.812
Lycaon_pictus	<i>Lycaon pictus</i>	African wild dog	Carnivora	1.100	0.100	1.100	0.008	1	1.500
Macaca_mulatta_3	<i>Macaca mulatta</i>	Rhesus macaque	Primates	1.000	0.000	1.000	0.001	12	1.127
Macropus_eugenii	<i>Macropus eugenii</i>	Tammar wallaby	Diprotodontia	1.013	0.013	1.013	0.012	7	0.981

Marmota_flaviventris_2	<i>Marmota flaviventris</i>	Yellow-bellied marmot	Rodentia	1.007	0.007	1.007	0.006	4	0.890
Marmota_flaviventris_3	<i>Marmota flaviventris</i>	Yellow-bellied marmot	Rodentia	1.008	0.008	1.008	0.005	4	0.921
Microtus_oeconomus	<i>Microtus oeconomus</i>	Root vole	Rodentia	1.000	0.000	1.000	0.001	14	1.028
Mustela_erminea	<i>Mustela erminea</i>	Stoat	Carnivora	1.334	0.334	1.334	0.117	2	1.258
Orcinus_orca_2	<i>Orcinus orca</i>	Killer whale	Cetacea	1.001	0.001	1.001	0.001	24	0.999
Ovis_aries_2	<i>Ovis aries</i>	Soay sheep	Artiodactyla	1.033	0.033	1.033	0.020	3	1.099
Pan_troglodytes_subsp._schweinfurthii	<i>Pan troglodytes</i>	Eastern chimpanzee	Primates	1.000	0.000	1.000	0.001	22	0.982
Papio_cynocephalus	<i>Papio cynocephalus</i>	Olive baboon	Primates	1.000	0.000	1.000	0.000	19	1.054
Peromyscus_maniculatus_2	<i>Peromyscus maniculatus</i>	Deer mouse	Rodentia	1.010	0.010	1.010	0.005	2	1.107
Phocarcetos_hookeri	<i>Phocarcetos hookeri</i>	New Zealand sea lion	Carnivora	1.005	0.005	1.005	0.003	8	1.023
Propithecus_verreauxi	<i>Propithecus verreauxi</i>	Verreaux's sifaka	Primates	1.000	0.000	1.000	0.000	12	0.986
Puma_concolor_8	<i>Puma concolor</i>	Cougar	Carnivora	NA	NA	NA	NA	10	1.115
Rattus_fuscipes	<i>Rattus fuscipes</i>	Bush rat	Rodentia	1.246	0.246	1.246	0.029	2	1.305
Spermophilus_armatus	<i>Urocitellus armatus</i>	Uinta ground squirrel	Rodentia	1.016	0.016	1.016	0.011	4	1.125
Spermophilus_armatus_2	<i>Urocitellus armatus</i>	Uinta ground squirrel	Rodentia	1.017	0.017	1.017	0.010	3	1.095
Spermophilus_columbianus	<i>Urocitellus columbianus</i>	Columbian ground squirrel	Rodentia	1.036	0.036	1.036	0.025	3	1.009
Spermophilus_columbianus_3	<i>Urocitellus columbianus</i>	Columbian ground squirrel	Rodentia	1.003	0.003	1.003	0.006	3	1.200
Ursus_americanus_subsp._floridanus	<i>Ursus americanus</i>	Florida black bear	Carnivora	1.003	0.003	1.003	0.003	2	1.020
Ursus_arctos_subsp._horribilis_5	<i>Ursus arctos</i>	Grizzly bear	Carnivora	1.001	0.001	1.001	0.001	4	1.026
Ursus_maritimus_2	<i>Ursus maritimus</i>	Polar bear	Carnivora	1.019	0.019	1.019	0.007	2	0.941
Brachyteles_hypoxanthus_2	<i>Brachyteles hypoxanthus</i>	Northern muriqui	Primates	1.000	0.000	1.000	0.000	12	1.111
Cebus_capucinus_2	<i>Cebus capucinus</i>	WhiteNAfaced capuchin monkey	Primates	1.000	0.000	1.000	0.000	11	1.059
Chlorocebus_aethiops_2	<i>Chlorocebus aethiops</i>	Vervet	Primates	1.075	0.075	1.075	0.087	5	1.187
Erythrocebus_patas	<i>Erythrocebus patas</i>	Patas monkey	Primates	1.051	0.051	1.051	0.038	5	1.128
Gorilla_beringei_subsp._beringei	<i>Gorilla beringei</i>	Mountain gorilla	Primates	1.000	0.000	1.000	0.000	21	1.053

697

698