

Multi-species count transformation models

Lukas Graz*
Universität Zürich

Luisa Barbanti*
Universität Zürich

Roland Brandl
Universität Marburg

Torsten Hothorn
Universität Zürich

Abstract

Joint Species Distribution Models are essential for understanding how ecological drivers shape species communities. However, most existing approaches are limited by rigid parametric distributions for count data and the inability to model how interspecific interactions change in response to those drivers. We introduce multi-species count transformation models, a novel framework designed to overcome these limitations. Our approach combines flexible, distribution-free marginal species count transformation models for each species' count abundance, with a driver-dependent latent Gaussian copula modelling interspecific correlations, interpretable as Spearman's rank correlation on the scale of the counts. All model parameters are estimated efficiently via joint maximum likelihood estimation, implemented in the R package **cotram**.

We apply this framework to model the joint abundance of three fish-eating bird species, using seasonality as the primary driver. Our model successfully captured the complex, species-specific seasonal abundance patterns, including periods of high zero-counts and seasonal shifts in variance. Furthermore, the model revealed strong, seasonally-varying correlations between the species. These findings are consistent with an empirical approach and similar to those from the computationally expensive parametric Bayesian Hierarchical Modelling of Species Communities (HMSC) framework.

Keywords: community modeling; copulas; count data; abundance data; Gaussian copula; joint species distribution models; multi-species distribution models; species covariance; species distribution models; species interaction; transformation models; Covariate-Dependent gaussian copula; Distribution-free models; Hierarchical Modelling of Species Communities; HMSC; Species co-occurrence; Interspecific interactions; Interspecific competition; Copula models; .

1. Introduction

Ecology studies how individual species and species community interactions—spanning from mutualism and commensalism to predation and competition—are governed by a range of drivers, such as physical habitat, meteorological conditions, and the broader spatiotemporal context. Species distribution models (SDMs) have become popular tools for describing the impact of these drivers on the distribution of a species' the occurrence or abundance. Predictions from SDMs are valuable not only in basic ecology but also in applied ecology, especially for the conservation of endangered species and the management of invasive ones. Binary regression models and classification machine learning methods are often used to predict the presence or absence of a species in a given habitat (e.g., [Elith et al. 2008](#); [Hothorn et al. 2011](#); [Cowans et al. 2025](#)). Models describing species abundance rely on count data instead of presence/absence information and thus yield more detailed insights into a

* Co-First Authors

species' distribution. However, despite early work in this direction (De'ath 2002), most contemporary SDMs ignore the interspecific relationships within an ecological community. Consequently, more elaborate models that integrate both community and environmental aspects have been proposed over the past decade. Kissling *et al.* (2012) reviewed several ad hoc approaches, such as including the presence or absence of one species as a predictor variable in the SDM for another. Ingram *et al.* (2020) categorized more sophisticated model-based approaches into multi-species distribution models (MSDMs) and joint species distribution models (JSDMs). MSDMs are used to jointly estimate multiple individual SDMs by assuming that the impact of the environment on the species distribution is similar for similar species. Ovaskainen and Soininen (2011) proposed a binary regression model, and Ingram *et al.* (2020) a more flexible Gaussian process model for presence/absence data in this context. Norberg *et al.* (2019) provides an empirical comparison of 33 models for presence/absence data.

JSDMs typically consider relationships between species as a priori unstructured correlations expressed in a residual term. Ovaskainen *et al.* (2010) proposed a logistic model for presence/absence data, Pollock *et al.* (2014) a probit model, and Warton *et al.* (2015) reviewed how multivariate generalized linear mixed models (MGLMMs) and latent variable models are used to model the abundance of multiple species. Similar models with a priori structured correlations have also been introduced, especially in phylogenetic generalized linear mixed models (Ives and Helmus 2011). The modeling approaches implemented by MSDMs and JSDMs are largely mutually exclusive: MSDMs estimate marginal models for each species but lack an explicit assessment of their relationships, whereas JSDMs allow the identification of species relationships without providing interpretable marginal models.

The development of multi-species count transformation models (MSCTMs) and their interpretation as SDMs for multiple target species is illustrated by a model for the joint abundance of three bird species—Great Cormorant (*Phalacrocorax carbo*), Great Crested Grebe (*Podiceps cristatus*) and Goosander (*Mergus merganser*)—monitored at Seehamer See (Upper Bavaria, Germany) from 2002 to 2016 (Kinshofer *et al.* 2018). All three piscivorous bird species feed on fish of a similar size within the same habitat. In Europe, these birds can play a major role in controlling the abundance of their prey fish species and thus potentially influence their own abundances in turn. The interactions between the three bird species would presumably change according to seasonal variations in the abundances of the bird species (for seasonal variation of competition see e.g., Wignall *et al.* 2020; Cecala *et al.* 2020); hence, we will refer to the day of the year as the driver of interest. To motivate the main idea, we first explored these dynamics descriptively. For each day of the year, we computed the rank correlation coefficient Spearman's ρ for each pair of species using all observations across all years within a ± 10 day window, in order to get a smoother estimate. Figure 1 shows the resulting correlation curves suggesting higher probabilities of co-occurrences in the cold months and uncorrelated species counts in the warm months. This descriptive approach, however, leads to erratic estimates. The primary objective of our work is therefore to develop a model-based approach to estimate how such dependency structures vary as a function of our drivers. Additionally, we aim to assess the uncertainty of the driver-dependent dependency structure.

The desire to estimate driver-dependent correlation structures is not new. In econometrics, time-varying copulas are used to estimate in an autoregressive manner the correlation of different asset values depending on time (Patton 2006). A key problem is that they are designed for continuous time series, limiting their applicability to drivers other than time and count data. Within ecology, studies such as Petren and Case (1998) or Bakker *et al.* (2006) have shown that competition/correlation patterns may also change in response to changes in environmental conditions. However, most modern JSDMs are MGLMMs or generalized linear latent variable models (GLLVMs), such as those introduced by Niku *et al.* (2019) and McGillicuddy *et al.* (2025). Neither MGLMMs nor GLLVMs allow for




Figure 1: Empirical trajectories of pairwise Spearman's rank correlations ρ across species over the course of a year using all observations within a ± 10 day window across all years.

driver-dependent correlations. [Hui *et al.* \(2023\)](#) extended MGLMMs by adding a spatiotemporal (spline-based) random effect, where correlation is spatially (and potentially temporally) structured. [Han and De Oliveira \(2020\)](#) introduced Gaussian copula models for geostatistical count data; and [Anderson *et al.* \(2019\)](#) and [Popovic *et al.* \(2018\)](#) modeled multivariate correlated counts via a latent Gaussian copula, but none of these approaches allow for driver-dependent correlations. Neither do the mentioned copula-based approaches estimate all parameters jointly but rather employ a two-step approach, first estimating the marginals and only in a second step estimating the static copula parameters, yielding incorrect standard errors. Conditional graphical LASSO ([Augugliaro *et al.* \(2023\)](#)) estimates the copula and marginals jointly, but is limited to static correlations and does not cover count data.

A relevant extension to MGLMMs was developed by [Tikhonov *et al.* \(2017\)](#) within the Hierarchical Modeling of Species Communities (HMSC) framework, which does allow for driver-dependent correlations, making it a candidate method for our data. This model class was identified as the best-performing approach in a large-scale benchmark comparison of 33 JSdMs ([Norberg *et al.* \(2019\)](#)), making it the state-of-the-art competitor for our method. However, the HMSC implementation is restricted to (log-)Poisson distributed counts and comes with the usual caveats of Bayesian MCMC estimation, such as long computation times and potential convergence issues.

In the following, we present MSCTMs, a novel and flexible JSdM framework designed to overcome these limitations by estimating the marginal distributions and driver-dependent correlations in a data-driven, distribution-free manner. Our approach is built upon marginal SDMs and a copula connecting the SDMs. The SDMs describe the marginal distributions for each target species as a function of our drivers and are modeled distribution-free, as in [Siegfried and Hothorn \(2020\)](#), but extended to the class of location-scale transformation models introduced in [Siegfried *et al.* \(2023\)](#). The structure of the MSCTM emerges from multivariate conditional transformation models ([Klein *et al.* \(2022\)](#)), in which the correlation structure is described by a driver-dependent latent Gaussian copula. From this MSCTM, we can extract pairwise rank correlations between the species abundances (conditional on drivers), yielding a model-based result similar to the empirical approach in Figure 1. Joint maximum likelihood estimation and inference for all parameters is performed using the appropriate count likelihood and its gradient from [Hothorn \(2024, 2025a\)](#) implemented in [Hothorn \(2025b\)](#).

Marginal SDMs are not easily available in commonly applied JSdMs (i.e., MGLMMs and GLLVMs), as numerically integrating over species destroys the simple structure of the conditional JSdM (Lee and Nelder 2004; Muff *et al.* 2016). For MSCTMs, however, marginal SDMs are directly available as a by-product of the model fitting procedure.

MSCTMs are introduced in Section 2.1. Details on the aquatic bird competition scenario and the application of an MSCTM and HMSC are provided in Section 2.2. The resulting model-based correlation curves and marginal distributions (i.e., SDMs) are presented in Section 3 and discussed in Section 4, along with potential directions for future work.

2. Methods

2.1. Multi-species count transformation models (MSCTMs)

We developed MSCTMs to address the aquatic bird competition problem, a joint regression model for multivariate count data. Our approach extends Multivariate Conditional Transformation Models, originally proposed by Klein *et al.* (2022), to count responses. MSCTMs model the joint distribution of J species count variables $\mathbf{Y} = (Y_1, \dots, Y_J) \in \mathbb{N}_0^J$ conditional on a set of drivers \mathbf{x} . Hereafter, the subscript j refers to any of the $j = 1, \dots, J$ species.

General model structure

We combine the individual SDMs introduced in Section 2.1.2 into a JSdM leveraging a latent Gaussian copula $\Phi_{\mathbf{0}, \Sigma(\mathbf{x})}$, that is, using the cumulative distribution function of a multivariate normal distribution with a zero mean vector and a driver-dependent correlation matrix $\Sigma(\mathbf{x})$ (i.e., constraining $\Sigma(\mathbf{x})_{jj} = 1$ in Section 2.1.3). The MSCTM is defined by the joint cumulative distribution of \mathbf{Y} conditional on $\mathbf{X} = \mathbf{x}$ as

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathbf{Y} \leq \mathbf{y} \mid \mathbf{X} = \mathbf{x}) = \Phi_{\mathbf{0}, \Sigma(\mathbf{x})}(\mathbf{h}(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{x})), \quad (1)$$

where we call $\mathbf{h}(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{x}) = (h_1(y_1|\mathbf{x}), \dots, h_J(y_J|\mathbf{x}))^\top$ a conditional transformation function. In order to yield a valid discrete multivariate distribution for count data, $h_j(\cdot|\mathbf{x})$ needs to be monotonically increasing (for all \mathbf{x}) and constant on the interval $[k-1, k)$ for any integer $k \in \mathbb{N}$ to ensure that the model assigns probabilities only to integer counts. Furthermore, the transformation of y_j may depend on drivers \mathbf{x} , enabling driver-dependent shifts, scaling, and stratification of the response distribution.

Marginal species distribution models

A key feature of the Gaussian copula framework is that the joint model in Equation 1 decomposes into separate marginal distributions, which serve as the individual SDMs for each species:

$$\mathbb{P}(Y_j \leq y_j \mid \mathbf{X} = \mathbf{x}) = \Phi_{0,1}(h_j(y_j|\mathbf{x})). \quad (2)$$

The conditional probability mass function for an observed count $y_j \in \mathbb{N}_0$ of species j is then

$$p_{Y_j|\mathbf{X}=\mathbf{x}}(y_j) = \begin{cases} \Phi_{0,1}(h_j(y_j|\mathbf{x})) - \Phi_{0,1}(h_j(y_j-1|\mathbf{x})), & \text{if } y_j = 1, 2, \dots \\ \Phi_{0,1}(h_j(y_j|\mathbf{x})), & \text{if } y_j = 0 \end{cases}.$$

Following the location-scale framework of Siegfried *et al.* (2023), we write each conditional transformation function $h_j(y_j|\mathbf{x})$ in terms of its own baseline transformation $h_j(y_j)$, a driver-dependent shift term $\beta_j(\mathbf{x})$, and a driver-dependent scale term $\gamma_j(\mathbf{x})$:

$$h_j(y_j|\mathbf{x}) = h_j(y_j)\sqrt{\exp(\boldsymbol{\gamma}_j(\mathbf{x}))} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_j(\mathbf{x}). \quad (3)$$

Here, $\boldsymbol{\gamma}_j(\mathbf{x})$ and $\boldsymbol{\beta}_j(\mathbf{x})$ are modeled as linear predictors $\mathbf{x}^\top \boldsymbol{\gamma}_j$ and $\mathbf{x}^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}_j$. The baseline transformation function $h_j(y_j)$ generalizes commonly used response transformations such as log- or square-root transformations, by estimating the transformation from the data, similar to but more flexible than Box-Cox transformations (Box and Cox 1964). Following Siegfried and Hothorn (2020), we parameterize them as a polynomial in Bernstein form $\mathbf{a}(\lfloor y_j \rfloor)^\top \boldsymbol{\vartheta}_j$, where $\lfloor y_j \rfloor$ is the integer part of y_j . Monotonicity is ensured using linear constraints on the parameter vector $\boldsymbol{\vartheta}_j$ as described in Hothorn *et al.* (2018). Note that $\boldsymbol{\beta}_j(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbb{E}(h_j(y_j)\sqrt{\exp(\boldsymbol{\gamma}_j(\mathbf{x}))} \mid X = \mathbf{x})$ represents the conditional mean of the scaled-transformed counts.

Driver-dependent correlation

The driver-dependent correlation matrix $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}(\mathbf{x})$ is the central component for modeling interspecific interactions. To ensure that $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}(\mathbf{x})$ is always a valid correlation matrix during estimation, we parameterize it with its scaled inverse Cholesky factor

$$\boldsymbol{\Lambda}(\mathbf{x}) = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & & & 0 \\ \lambda_{21}(\mathbf{x}) & 1 & & \\ \vdots & \ddots & \ddots & \\ \lambda_{J1}(\mathbf{x}) & \dots & \lambda_{J,J-1}(\mathbf{x}) & 1 \end{pmatrix},$$

where each lower off-diagonal element $\lambda_{jj}(\mathbf{x})$ (for $j > j$) is expressed as a linear predictor $\mathbf{x}^\top \boldsymbol{\xi}_{jj}$. The correlation matrix $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}(\mathbf{x})$ is then computed via:

$$\boldsymbol{\Sigma}(\mathbf{x}) = \text{diag}(\boldsymbol{\Lambda}(\mathbf{x})^{-1} \boldsymbol{\Lambda}(\mathbf{x})^{-\top})^{-1/2} \boldsymbol{\Lambda}(\mathbf{x})^{-1} \boldsymbol{\Lambda}(\mathbf{x})^{-\top} \text{diag}(\boldsymbol{\Lambda}(\mathbf{x})^{-1} \boldsymbol{\Lambda}(\mathbf{x})^{-\top})^{-1/2},$$

where $\text{diag}(A)^{-1/2}$ denotes the diagonal matrix with the reciprocal inverse square roots of the diagonal elements of a matrix A . This scaling ensures the diagonal elements of $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}(\mathbf{x})$ are always equal to one, yielding a valid correlation matrix. A detailed discussion of this parameterization and scaling can be found in Hothorn (2024).

While the parameters $\lambda_{jj}(\mathbf{x})$ have a direct interpretation (Pourahmadi 2007), we focus on the resulting correlations $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}(\mathbf{x})_{jj}$ as they quantify the strength of association between species j and j on the latent transformed scale. To make the interpretation of those correlations agnostic of the monotone transformation $\mathbf{h}(\cdot|\mathbf{x})$, we can convert them to Spearman's rank correlation coefficient ρ or Kendall's τ (Fang *et al.* 2002):

$$\begin{aligned} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{(\rho)}(\mathbf{x})_{jj} &= \frac{6}{\pi} \arcsin \left(\frac{1}{2} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}(\mathbf{x})_{jj} \right) \\ \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{(\tau)}(\mathbf{x})_{jj} &= \frac{2}{\pi} \arcsin (\boldsymbol{\Sigma}(\mathbf{x})_{jj}) \end{aligned}$$

Likelihood inference

Count data $\mathbf{y}_i \in \mathbb{N}^J$ can be viewed as interval-censored information (Siegfried and Hothorn 2020). Instead of observing an exact continuous multivariate observation $\mathbf{y}_i \in \mathbb{R}^J$, the multidimensional

interval $(y_i - 1, y_i]$ is observed. Thus, for N observations $\mathbf{y}_i, i = 1, \dots, N$ of a multidimensional count variable $\mathbf{Y} = (Y_1, \dots, Y_J)^\top$ the exact log-likelihood in this framework is given by

$$\ell(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \sum_{i=1}^N \log \left(\int_{\mathbf{h}(\mathbf{y}_i - \mathbf{1} | \mathbf{x}_i)}^{\mathbf{h}(\mathbf{y}_i | \mathbf{x}_i)} \phi_{\boldsymbol{\theta}, \boldsymbol{\Sigma}(\mathbf{x}_i)}(\mathbf{z}) d\mathbf{z} \right) \quad (4)$$

where $\phi_{\boldsymbol{\theta}, \boldsymbol{\Sigma}(\mathbf{x})}$ is the density of $\Phi_{\boldsymbol{\theta}, \boldsymbol{\Sigma}(\mathbf{x})}$ and $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ contains all J marginal model parameters $(\boldsymbol{\gamma}_j, \boldsymbol{\beta}_j, \boldsymbol{\vartheta}_j)$ and all covariance parameters of $\boldsymbol{\Lambda}(\mathbf{x})$ (i.e., $\boldsymbol{\xi}_{jj}$). To correctly handle zero counts, we define $\mathbf{h}(\mathbf{y} | \mathbf{x}_i) = -\infty$ for $y < 0$. Additionally, we handle missing values in the j -th dimension of \mathbf{y}_i by setting the integration limits for that dimension in Equation 4 to $(-\infty, \infty)$.

Maximization of the exact log-likelihood $\ell(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ requires fast numerical procedures for the evaluation of multivariate normal integrals over hypercubes in the presence of observation-specific, unstructured covariance matrices $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}(\mathbf{x}_i)$. A novel implementation of Genz' algorithm (Genz 1992) in the **mvtnorm** R add-on package (Hothorn 2025a) provides functionality for the evaluation of $\ell(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ and the corresponding gradient when $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}(\mathbf{x}_i)$ is parameterized in terms of its Cholesky factor $\text{diag}(\boldsymbol{\Lambda}(\mathbf{x}_i)^{-1} \boldsymbol{\Lambda}(\mathbf{x}_i)^{-\top})^{-1/2} \boldsymbol{\Lambda}(\mathbf{x}_i)^{-1}$ (which is simple to derive from the lower triangular matrix $\boldsymbol{\Lambda}(\mathbf{x}_i)$). As estimating a zero-mean driver-dependent Gaussian copula is a convex optimization problem (Barratt and Boyd 2023), this allows the application of standard solvers to the underlying optimization problem (see Hothorn 2024, for technical details).

The variance-covariance matrix of all model parameters can be obtained from the numerically evaluated Hessian, allowing for Wald-type confidence intervals. Because we estimate all model parameters jointly—rather than employing a two-step procedure that estimates marginals prior to copula parameters—standard asymptotic theory applies, yielding asymptotically correct standard errors. Uncertainty in the estimated correlation matrix $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}(\mathbf{x})$ can be estimated via a Wald-type parametric bootstrap, where the parameters of $\boldsymbol{\Lambda}(\mathbf{x})$ are sampled from their asymptotic distribution.

2.2. Competitive interactions in fish-eating aquatic birds

We applied our novel JSMD to a species community of three piscivorous birds whose abundances vary with the season: Great Cormorant, Great Crested Grebe and Goosander.

Data and Study Area

The analysis is based on daily counts of the three piscivorous bird species sampled at lake Seehamer See (Figure 2), which is located in the foothills of the Alps in southern Bavaria, about 40 km southeast of Munich. It has an area of 1.47 km², with an average depth of 3.8 m (maximum 12 m). Thus, the entire water body is accessible to the three bird species. A local ornithologist, Gerhard Kinshofer, counted the three species daily between May 1, 2002 and November 13, 2016 from various locations around the lake using a spotting scope. He was therefore able to spot most, if not all, birds on the lake. As the sampling design was identical across all years, it can be safely assumed that any sampling error was consistent over time. The observation period comprised 5,311 days. Data were missing for 0.34% of the days for some bird species and for 6.31% of the days for all bird species. These few missing values occurred either because data were not collected on that day due to adverse meteorological conditions or because one of the bird species was not spotted but the ornithologist was unsure whether it was truly absent. Missing values were handled appropriately in the likelihood (see Section 2.1.4).

Competition hypothesis and research questions

In the study area, the abundances of all three species in winter increased during the second half of the 20th century such that carrying capacity was reached in the 1990s (Suter 1995). A possible explanation for the logistic growth of the winter populations is that the food resources for these piscivores were limited. All three species forage on fish of almost the same size (10-20 cm) by diving to a depth of 5 m. Thus, the three species exhibit considerable overlap in their feeding niches. Accordingly, if common resources are limiting, interspecific competition would be expected. Hence, in the absence of experimental intervention data, our aim was to answer the following questions: (1) How does the abundance of each species vary over the course of a year? (2) How do competitive interactions between the species vary over the course of a year? That is, what are the Spearman rank correlations between the marginal species abundances, conditional on the day of the year?

Modeling bird abundances and interactions using MSCTMs

To answer the research questions above, we used the MSCTMs introduced in Section 2.1. Therefore, we analyzed the joint conditional distribution of the trivariate bird-count response $\mathbf{Y} = (Y_1, Y_2, Y_3)^\top \in \mathbb{N}_0^3$ (1 = Great Crested Grebe, 2 = Great Cormorant, 3 = Goosander), given the day of the year. Question (1) is addressed by the marginal SDMs (Section 2.1.2), and question (2) is addressed by the driver-dependent correlations (Section 2.1.3).

We specified the model components $h_j(y_j)$, $\boldsymbol{\gamma}_j(\mathbf{x})$, $\boldsymbol{\beta}_j(\mathbf{x})$, and $\lambda_{jj}(\mathbf{x})$ as follows. The transformation function $h_j(y_j)$ was parameterized using a polynomial in Bernstein form of order 6 as used for count data by Siegfried and Hothorn (2020), to significantly reduce the number of parameters while allowing substantial flexibility in the marginal models. To account for seasonal patterns in abundance and interactions, we used a periodic 4th order Fourier basis of the day-of-the-year as the linear predictor for the shift term $\boldsymbol{\beta}_j(\mathbf{x})$, the scale term $\boldsymbol{\gamma}_j(\mathbf{x})$, and each correlation parameter $\lambda_{jj}(\mathbf{x})$.

Comparison with Hierarchical Modeling of Species Communities (HMSC)

Furthermore, we compared MSCTMs to HMSC (Ovaskainen *et al.* 2017), a state-of-the-art framework for analyzing community data (Norberg *et al.* 2019). The key conceptual difference is that HMSC is a fully parametric approach that assumes a specific count distribution (e.g., Poisson) for the species abundances:

$$Y_j \sim \text{Poisson}(\exp(\mathbf{x}^\top \tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_j + \varepsilon_j)),$$

where species associations are captured by the covariance of a multivariate latent random effect, $(\varepsilon_1, \dots, \varepsilon_J)^\top \sim \mathbf{N}_J(\mathbf{0}, \tilde{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}(\mathbf{x}))$. An extension allows these associations to depend on drivers (Tikhonov *et al.* 2017). While the shift term $\mathbf{x}^\top \tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_j$ and the driver-dependent covariance $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}(\mathbf{x})$ are conceptually similar to the MSCTM's components, HMSC models only the means of conditional (given random effects) Poisson distributions. In contrast, MSCTMs learn the shape of the entire conditional distribution from the data, avoiding strong distributional assumptions.

3. Results

The raw time series data (Figure 2) reveal clear seasonal patterns for all three species, albeit with noticeable year-to-year variation in counts. All three species showed lower counts during the summer months. This pattern was particularly pronounced for the Goosander, with only 13 out of 1,308 observations in June, July, and August being non-zero. Conversely, the Great Crested Grebe and




Figure 2: Observed count time series for the three aquatic bird species at lake Seehamer See (Germany).

Great Cormorant exhibited consistent peaks in counts around November. The rate of decline after this peak differed noticeably between years, leading to high variation in the subsequent winter months (December through March). These complex distributional features—seasonal means, high zero-counts, and seasonally-driven variance—are what our marginal SDMs are designed to capture.

Figure 3 displays the estimated marginal distributions as quantiles conditional on day from our individual SDMs (Equation 2), addressing our first research question. The models successfully captured the observed seasonal patterns. Notably, the inclusion of the driver-dependent scale term ($\gamma_j(\mathbf{x})$) allowed the model to account for the higher variability in Great Crested Grebe and Great Cormorant counts observed after the November peak. For the Goosander, the flexible baseline transformation $h_j(y_j)$ accurately modeled the high frequency of zero counts during summer while still providing a good fit to the non-zero counts observed in other seasons.

The main motivation for MSCTMs was identifying driver-dependent interspecies dependencies, addressing our second research question. The estimated time-dependent Spearman’s rank correlations from our model are presented in Figure 4(b). Our smooth, model-based correlation curves closely resembled the patterns from the motivating empirical correlation curves in Figure 1 (repeated in Figure 4(1) for side-to-side comparison). In particular, the model confirmed the high positive correlations between all three bird species during the winter months. We also observed periods of moderate negative correlation, such as between the Great Crested Grebe and Great Cormorant in June, and between the Great Cormorant and Goosander in November. As we observed relevant autocorrelation in the model residuals (not shown), the parametric bootstrap confidence intervals are likely too narrow. However, we expect them to still give a qualitative impression of the relative uncertainty in the estimates. And indeed, the uncertainty was highest for correlations involving the Goosander during the summer months, a direct consequence of the sparse non-zero counts in that period. Consequently, we interpreted the correlation estimates in these high-uncertainty regions with caution.

For comparison, we fitted HMSC with driver-dependent correlations. The resulting correlation curves shown in Figure 4(c) were qualitatively similar to those from our MSCTM (Figure 4(b)). An exact match is not expected, given the conceptual differences: HMSC models latent residual correlations based on a strict (log-)Poisson assumption for the counts, whereas our model estimates the rank correlation from flexibly learned, distribution-free marginals. The HMSC model was fitted using Bayesian MCMC estimation (Tikhonov *et al.* 2025) and required 5 hours to generate 2,500 MCMC samples (including 500 burn-in) per chain, running 8 chains in parallel on 8 cores. In contrast, our maximum likelihood approach converged in 10 minutes on a single core. The main computational effort for our method lies in the evaluation of the exact log-likelihood (Equation 4) and its gradient during optimization.

4. Discussion

MSCTMs provide a new perspective on joint models for species distributions, utilizing flexible distribution-free marginal SDMs combined with a driver-dependent copula, in a unified maximum likelihood framework for count data. In this application, we focused on seasonality as the only driver of interest influencing both marginal abundances and pairwise correlations. However, in general, the framework can be extended to include other drivers \mathbf{x} , such as environmental factors, physical habitat variables, meteorological conditions, and spatiotemporal dynamics.

In contrast to common MSDMs and JSDMs (mostly MGLMMs and GLLVMs), MSCTMs do not make any assumptions about a parametric distribution of the counts. Instead, the distribution is estimated




Figure 3: Estimated marginal distributions conditional on time of the year for the three bird species through our MSCTM. Distribution is visualized via quantile curves with observed counts for all years visible as a reference.




Figure 4: Pariwise correlation trajectories across species over one year. (a) shows Figure 1 again, i.e., empirically derived Spearman's rank correlations ρ using all observations within a ± 10 day window across all years; (b) shows MSCTM-based Spearman's rank correlations with 95% confidence intervals derived via parametric bootstrap; (c) shows HMSC-based latent residual correlations with 95% confidence intervals derived from the posterior distribution.

in a semi-parametric way. This, in particular, avoids the need to separately consider overdispersion or high zero-counts and extends the modeling to situations where common parametric distributions like the Poisson or Negative Binomial are not justified. Additionally, MSCTMs represent the community aspect (i.e., measures of dependence) not by a multivariate random residual term but rather by pairwise Pearson's correlations on a latent scale, which can be understood as Spearman's rank correlations between species on the original scale of the counts as motivated in Figure 1. Common MSDMs and JSDMs do not provide such rank-based measures of dependence, but come with Pearson's correlations of random effects on the scale of the link function with no intuitive interpretation. Moreover, when interpreting fixed effects, MSCTMs do not require conditioning on random effects, as it is the case when the commonly fixed-/random effects dichotomy is applied. Consequently, MSCTMs allow us to answer a broader class of research questions that simultaneously involve marginal SDMs and the relationship between different species depending on drivers \mathbf{x} . Furthermore, modeling correlations dependent on drivers accommodates driver-inflicted variations in species interactions in addition to possible driver-driven trends in marginal abundances.

In the relatively simple models for aquatic bird competition presented herein, the marginal abundances of the three fish-eating bird species were shown to vary systematically over the course of a year (hypothesis 1, reflecting different habitat requirements particularly during the breeding period in summer), with moderate positive correlations determined in winter and early spring, and small and highly variable correlations during the rest of the year (hypothesis 2). Thus, the results indicate that competition is not a driving factor regulating the abundance of these bird species in the study area. Unlike the seasonal variation, which is clearly represented in the time series plots of the observations, correlations cannot be inferred from the raw data in the absence of a suitable model.

MSCTMs are currently limited in several ways. With driver-dependent inverse Cholesky factor $\Lambda(\mathbf{x})$, the model is not as lean on assumptions as a model with constant correlations, i.e., constant parameters in Λ . Concretely, the parameter estimates resulting from the joint model might depend on the order in which the marginal models are specified (Barratt and Boyd 2023). This effect can be counterbalanced by accounting for sufficient flexibility in the marginal models. Models with driver-dependent correlations $\Sigma(\mathbf{x})$ should be estimated for different permutations of the species in a sensitivity analysis. In general, a strong dependence of the parameter estimates on the order of species indicates a severe lack of model fit.

Alternative interpretations of $\beta_j(\mathbf{x})$, such as odds ratios and hazard ratios, are discussed in Hothorn *et al.* (2018) and require adapting Equation 1 according to Section 2.6 in Klein *et al.* (2022). Model estimation is implemented in **tram** for a range of alternatives. Stratification can be achieved by estimating the baseline transformation function h_{Y_j} in Equation 3 for each stratum separately. This and more complex interactions between \mathbf{x} and y_j are further discussed in Siegfried *et al.* (2023). Complex models can be specified for the marginal shift terms $\beta_j(\mathbf{x})$ and for components of the Cholesky factor $\Lambda(\mathbf{x})$, for example by including either nonlinear or lagging effects of explanatory environmental variables or terms capturing spatiotemporal trends for correlated observations. However, in such cases the likelihood approach proposed here requires supplementation with appropriate smoothness constraints. A mixed version of univariate transformation models that is also applicable to univariate count transformation models was recently proposed (Tamási 2025) and can handle spatially or otherwise correlated data. However, the technical challenges associated with mixed transformation models on the one hand and MSCTMs on the other clearly demonstrate that significant improvements in this direction will require substantial research efforts. With respect to nonlinear habitat effects, a pragmatic approach might be to estimate marginal SDMs separately for each species, thus allowing a nonlinear impact of environmental variables. The joint models could then be fitted with the same functional form as that

of the marginal shift terms $\beta_j(\mathbf{x})$. If the goal is proper statistical inference of model parameters, one should check for conditional independence, for example, by inspecting spatiotemporal residual autocorrelation. The presence of such autocorrelation would indicate that the assumption is violated and reinforces the need to extend the model to a mixed-effects version, as discussed previously.

While computationally challenging, joint maximum-likelihood estimation for Equation 4 is now feasible for low-dimensional problems (three species in our case) and moderate sample sizes ($N = 4,955$) due to the availability of the corresponding score function (see [Hothorn 2025a](#), for computational details).

MSCTMs are potentially complex and cannot be viewed as extensions of established JSDMs or MSDMs. Model interpretation requires an understanding of latent, transformed scales, especially on the marginal scale. Nevertheless, we demonstrated that interesting insights into the interplay between species can be obtained from a simple MSCTM.

Computational details

All computations were performed using R version 4.5.2 ([R Core Team 2025](#)). Multi-species count transformation models are implemented in the **tram** add-on package ([Hothorn et al. 2025](#)). All models and figures can be reproduced with the **cotram** package ([Siegfried et al. 2025](#)) using the code below.

```
library("cotram")
demo("aquabirds", package = "cotram")
```

The competitor model HMSC was fitted with the package **Hmsc** ([Tikhonov et al. 2025](#)).

Acknowledgments

LG, LB and TH acknowledge financial support by Schweizerischer Nationalfonds (grant numbers 200021_184603 and 200021_219384). The authors thank Wendy Ran for improving the language. We thank the maintainer of the **Hmsc** package for support in applying the package to the aquatic bird problem.

Author Contributions

LG, LB and TH developed the models and maximum likelihood estimation procedures. RB contributed the aquatic bird model system. All authors analyzed and interpreted this data, drafted, and finally revised the manuscript.

Conflict of Interest Statement

The authors declare no conflicts of interest.

References

- Anderson MJ, de Valpine P, Punnett A, Miller AE (2019). “A Pathway for Multivariate Analysis of Ecological Communities Using Copulas.” *Ecology and Evolution*, **9**(6), 3276–3294. doi: 10.1002/ece3.4948.
- Augugliaro L, Sottile G, Wit EC, Vinciotti V (2023). “**cglasso**: An R Package for Conditional Graphical LASSO Inference with Censored and Missing Values.” *Journal of Statistical Software*, **105**, 1–58. doi: 10.18637/jss.v105.i01.
- Bakker ES, Ritchie ME, Olff H, Milchunas DG, Knops JMH (2006). “Herbivore Impact on Grassland Plant Diversity Depends on Habitat Productivity and Herbivore Size.” *Ecology Letters*, **9**(7), 780–788. doi: 10.1111/j.1461-0248.2006.00925.x.
- Barratt S, Boyd S (2023). “Covariance Prediction via Convex Optimization.” *Optimization and Engineering*, **24**(3), 2045–2078. doi: 10.1007/s11081-022-09765-w.
- Box GEP, Cox DR (1964). “An Analysis of Transformations.” *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society. Series B (Methodological)*, **26**(2), 211–252.
- Cecala KK, Walker EH, Ennen JR, Fix SM, Davenport JM (2020). “Seasonal Variation in the Strength of Interference Competition Among Headwater Stream Predators.” *Freshwater Biology*, **65**(8), 1440–1449. doi: 10.1111/fwb.13511.
- Cowans A, Bigatà AB, Sutherland C (2025). “Sample Size Considerations for Species Co-Occurrence Models.” *Ecology*, **106**(8), e70175. doi: 10.1002/ecy.70175.
- De’ath G (2002). “Multivariate Regression Trees: A New Technique for Modelling Species-Environment Relationships.” *Ecology*, **83**(4), 1105–1117. doi: 10.1890/0012-9658(2002)083[1105:MRTANT]2.0.CO;2.
- Elith J, Leathwick JR, Hastie T (2008). “A Working Guide to Boosted Regression Trees.” *Journal of Animal Ecology*, **77**(4), 802–813. doi: 10.1111/j.1365-2656.2008.01390.x.
- Fang HB, Fang KT, Kotz S (2002). “The Meta-Elliptical Distributions with Given Marginals.” *Journal of Multivariate Analysis*, **82**(1), 1–16. doi: 10.1006/jmva.2001.2017.
- Genz A (1992). “Numerical Computation of Multivariate Normal Probabilities.” *Journal of Computational and Graphical Statistics*, **1**(2). doi: 10.1080/10618600.1992.10477010.
- Han Z, De Oliveira V (2020). “Maximum Likelihood Estimation of Gaussian Copula Models for Geostatistical Count Data.” *Communications in Statistics - Simulation and Computation*, **49**(8), 1957–1981. doi: 10.1080/03610918.2018.1508705.
- Hothorn T (2024). “On Nonparanormal Likelihoods.” (arXiv:2408.17346). doi: 10.48550/arXiv.2408.17346.
- Hothorn T (2025a). “Multivariate Normal Log-likelihoods in the **mvtnorm** Package.” doi: 10.32614/CRAN.package.mvtnorm. R package vignette version 1.3-3.
- Hothorn T (2025b). “**mlt**: Most Likely Transformations.” doi: 10.32614/CRAN.package.mlt. R package version 1.7-2.
- Hothorn T, Möst L, Bühlmann P (2018). “Most Likely Transformations.” *Scandinavian Journal of Statistics*, **45**(1), 110–134. doi: 10.1111/sjos.12291.

- Hothorn T, Müller J, Schröder B, Kneib T, Brandl R (2011). “Decomposing Environmental, Spatial, and Spatiotemporal Components of Species Distributions.” *Ecological Monographs*, **81**(2), 329–347. doi: 10.1890/10-0602.1.
- Hothorn T, Siegfried S, Kook L (2025). “**tram**: Transformation Models.” doi: 10.32614/CRAN.package.tram. R package version 1.3-0.
- Hui FKC, Warton DI, Foster SD, Haak CR (2023). “Spatiotemporal Joint Species Distribution Modelling: A Basis Function Approach.” *Methods in Ecology and Evolution*, **14**(8), 2150–2164. doi: 10.1111/2041-210X.14184.
- Ingram M, Vukcevic D, Golding N (2020). “Multi-Output Gaussian Processes for Species Distribution Modelling.” *Methods in Ecology and Evolution*, **11**(12), 1587–1598. doi: 10.1111/2041-210X.13496.
- Ives AR, Helmus MR (2011). “Generalized Linear Mixed Models for Phylogenetic Analyses of Community Structure.” *Ecological Monographs*, **81**(3), 511–525. doi: 10.1890/10-1264.1.
- Kinshofer G, Brandl R, Pfeifer R (2018). “Keine Hinweise auf Konkurrenz zwischen Kormoran *Phalacrocorax carbo*, Haubentaucher *Podiceps cristatus* und Gänsesäger *Mergus merganser*.” *Ornithologischer Anzeiger*, **56**, 132–143.
- Kissling WD, Dormann CF, Groeneveld J, Hickler T, Kühn I, McInerny GJ, Montoya JM, Römermann C, Schiffrers K, Schurr FM, Singer A, Svenning JC, Zimmermann NE, O’Hara RB (2012). “Towards Novel Approaches to Modelling Biotic Interactions in Multispecies Assemblages at Large Spatial Extents.” *Journal of Biogeography*, **39**(12), 2163–2178. doi: 10.1111/j.1365-2699.2011.02663.x.
- Klein N, Hothorn T, Barbanti L, Kneib T (2022). “Multivariate Conditional Transformation Models.” *Scandinavian Journal of Statistics*, **49**(1), 116–142. doi: 10.1111/sjos.12501.
- Lee Y, Nelder JA (2004). “Conditional and Marginal Models: Another View.” *Statistical Science*, **19**(2), 219–238. doi: 10.1214/088342304000000305.
- McGillcuddy M, Popovic G, Bolker BM, Warton DI (2025). “Parsimoniously Fitting Large Multivariate Random Effects in **glmmTMB**.” *Journal of Statistical Software*, **112**, 1–19. doi: 10.18637/jss.v112.i01.
- Muff S, Held L, Keller LF (2016). “Marginal or Conditional Regression Models for Correlated Non-Normal Data?” *Methods in Ecology and Evolution*, **7**(12), 1514–1524. doi: 10.1111/2041-210X.12623.
- Niku J, Brooks W, Herliansyah R, Hui FKC, Taskinen S, Warton DI (2019). “Efficient Estimation of Generalized Linear Latent Variable Models.” *PLOS ONE*, **14**(5), e0216129. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0216129.
- Norberg A, Abrego N, Blanchet FG, Adler FR, Anderson BJ, Anttila J, Araújo MB, Dallas T, Dunson D, Elith J, Foster SD, Fox R, Franklin J, Godsoe W, Guisan A, O’Hara B, Hill NA, Holt RD, Hui FKC, Husby M, Kålås JA, Lehtikoinen A, Luoto M, Mod HK, Newell G, Renner I, Roslin T, Soininen J, Thuiller W, Vanhatalo J, Warton D, White M, Zimmermann NE, Gravel D, Ovaskainen O (2019). “A Comprehensive Evaluation of Predictive Performance of 33 Species Distribution Models at Species and Community Levels.” *Ecological Monographs*, **89**(3). doi: 10.1002/ecm.1370.

- Ovaskainen O, Hottola J, Siitonen J (2010). “Modeling Species Co-occurrence by Multivariate Logistic Regression Generates New Hypotheses on Fungal Interactions.” *Ecology*, **91**(9), 2514–2521. doi: 10.1890/10-0173.1.
- Ovaskainen O, Soininen J (2011). “Making More Out of Sparse Data: Hierarchical Modeling of Species Communities.” *Ecology*, **92**(2), 289–295. doi: 10.1890/10-1251.1.
- Ovaskainen O, Tikhonov G, Norberg A, Guillaume Blanchet F, Duan L, Dunson D, Roslin T, Abrego N (2017). “How to Make More Out of Community Data? A Conceptual Framework and Its Implementation as Models and Software.” *Ecology Letters*, **20**(5), 561–576. doi: 10.1111/ele.12757.
- Patton AJ (2006). “Modelling Asymmetric Exchange Rate Dependence.” *International Economic Review*, **47**(2), 527–556. doi: 10.1111/j.1468-2354.2006.00387.x.
- Petren K, Case TJ (1998). “Habitat Structure Determines Competition Intensity and Invasion Success in Gecko Lizards.” *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, **95**(20), 11739–11744. doi: 10.1073/pnas.95.20.11739.
- Pollock LJ, Tingley R, Morris WK, Golding N, O’Hara RB, Parris KM, Vesik PA, McCarthy MA (2014). “Understanding Co-occurrence by Modelling Species Simultaneously with a Joint Species Distribution Model (JSDM).” *Methods in Ecology and Evolution*, **5**(5), 397–406. doi: 10.1111/2041-210X.12180.
- Popovic GC, Hui FKC, Warton DI (2018). “A General Algorithm for Covariance Modeling of Discrete Data.” *Journal of Multivariate Analysis*, **165**, 86–100. doi: 10.1016/j.jmva.2017.12.002.
- Pourahmadi M (2007). “Cholesky Decompositions and Estimation of a Covariance Matrix: Orthogonality of Variance-Correlation Parameters.” *Biometrika*, **94**(4), 1006–1013. doi: 10.1093/biomet/asm073.
- R Core Team (2025). *R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing*. R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria. URL <https://www.R-project.org/>.
- Siegfried S, Barbanti L, Hothorn T (2025). “**cotram**: Count Transformation Models.” doi: 10.32614/CRAN.package.cotram. R package version 0.6-0.
- Siegfried S, Hothorn T (2020). “Count Transformation Models.” *Methods in Ecology and Evolution*, **11**(7), 818–827. doi: 10.1111/2041-210X.13383.
- Siegfried S, Kook L, Hothorn T (2023). “Distribution-Free Location-Scale Regression.” *The American Statistician*, **77**(4), 345–356. doi: 10.1080/00031305.2023.2203177.
- Suter W (1995). “Are Cormorants *Phalacrocorax carbo* Wintering in Switzerland Approaching Carrying Capacity? An Analysis of Increase Patterns and Habitat Choice.” *Ardea*, **83**(1), 255–266.
- Tamási B (2025). “Mixed-Effects Additive Transformation Models with the R Package **tramME**.” *Journal of Statistical Software*, **114**(11), 1–40. doi: 10.18637/jss.v114.i11.
- Tikhonov G, Abrego N, Dunson D, Ovaskainen O (2017). “Using Joint Species Distribution Models for Evaluating How Species-to-Species Associations Depend on the Environmental Context.” *Methods in Ecology and Evolution*, **8**(4), 443–452. doi: 10.1111/2041-210X.12723.

- Tikhonov G, Ovaskainen O, Oksanen J, de Jonge M, Opedal O, Dallas T (2025). “**Hmsc**: Hierarchical Model of Species Communities.” doi: [10.32614/CRAN.package.Hmsc](https://doi.org/10.32614/CRAN.package.Hmsc). R package version 3.3-7.
- Warton DI, Blanchet FG, O’Hara RB, Ovaskainen O, Taskinen S, Walker SC, Hui FK (2015). “So Many Variables: Joint Modeling in Community Ecology.” *Trends in Ecology & Evolution*, **30**(12), 766–779. doi: [10.1016/j.tree.2015.09.007](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tree.2015.09.007).
- Wignall VR, Harry IC, Davies NL, Kenny SD, McMinn JK, Ratnieks FL (2020). “Seasonal Variation in Exploitative Competition Between Honeybees and Bumblebees.” *Oecologia*, **192**(2), 351–361. doi: [10.1007/s00442-019-04576-w](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00442-019-04576-w).

Affiliation:

Lukas Graz, Luisa Barabanti, Torsten Hothorn
Universität Zürich
Hirschengraben 84
CH-8001 Zürich
Switzerland
Roland Brandl
Philipps-Universität Marburg
Karl-von-Frisch-Straße 8
DE-35032 Marburg
Germany