

Climate change going deep: The effects of global climatic alterations on cave ecosystems

Stefano Mammola, Elena Piano, Pedro Cardoso, Philippe Vernon, David Domínguez-Villar, David Culver, Tanja Pipan, Marco Isaia

To cite this version:

Stefano Mammola, Elena Piano, Pedro Cardoso, Philippe Vernon, David Domínguez-Villar, et al.. Climate change going deep: The effects of global climatic alterations on cave ecosystems. Anthropocene Review, 2019, 6 (1-2), pp.98-116. 10.1177/2053019619851594. hal-02284202

HAL Id: hal-02284202 <https://univ-rennes.hal.science/hal-02284202v1>

Submitted on 12 Sep 2019

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

- **(3) Potential implications of subterranean warming on abiotic features**
- **(4) Shallow subterranean habitats**
- **III. BIOTIC FEATURES**
- **(1) Subterranean organisms**
- **(2) Potential species sensitivity to climate change**
- **(3) Eco-evolutionary response to climate change**
- **(4) Inter-connection with other systems**
-
- **IV. FUTURE DIRECTIONS**
- **V. CONCLUSIONS**

ABSTRACT

 Scientists of different disciplines have recognised the valuable role of terrestrial caves as ideal natural laboratories in which to study multiple eco-evolutionary processes, from genes to ecosystems. Because caves and other subterranean habitats are semi-closed systems characterised by a remarkable thermal stability, they should also represent insightful systems for understanding the effects of climate change on biodiversity *in situ.* Whilst a number of recent advances have demonstrated how promising this fast moving field of research could be, a lack of synthesis is possibly holding back the adoption of caves as standard models for the study of the recent climatic alteration. By linking literature focusing on physics, geology, biology, and ecology, we illustrate the rationale supporting the use of subterranean habitats as laboratories for studies of global change biology. We initially discuss the direct relationship between external and internal temperature, the stability of the subterranean climate and the dynamics of its alteration in an anthropogenic climate change perspective. Due to their evolution in a stable environment, subterranean species are expected to exhibit low tolerance to climatic perturbations and could theoretically cope with such changes only by shifting their distributional range or by adapting to the new environmental conditions. However, they should have more obstacles to overcome than surface species in such shifts, and therefore could be more prone to local extinction. In the face of rapid climate change, subterranean habitats can be seen as refugia for some surface species, but at the same time they may turn into dead-end traps for some of their current obligate inhabitants. Together with other species living in confined habitats, we argue that subterranean species are particularly sensitive to climate change, and we stress the urgent need for future research, monitoring programs and conservation measures.

I. INTRODUCTION

 Climate change is considered to be one of the most challenging concerns for humanity (Walther et al., 2002; Parmesan and Yohe, 2003; Scholze et al., 2006; Williams et al. 2015). The complexity of the global climate issue stretches far beyond the currently observed pattern of global temperature increase (Santer et al., 2003), as it involves a variety of multifaceted ecological responses to climatic variations, such as shifts in species distribution ranges (Chen et al., 2011), phenological displacements (Parmesan and Yohe, 2003; Root et al., 2003), complex interactions among previously isolated species (Williams and Jackson, 2007; Krosby et al., 2015), extinctions (Thomas et al., 2004; Cahill et al., 2013) and other unpredictable cascading effects on different ecosystem components (Walther et al., 2002).

89 In order to minimize confounding effects, scientists have often used isolated ecosystems—and specific organisms within them—as models to unravel ecological responses to recent climate alterations, upscaling results and conclusions to a wider range of systems and organisms. Under this perspective, mountain summits, oceanic islands, lakes and other confined habitats have offered insightful models for determining the effects of climate change on biodiversity *in situ* (Hortal et al., 2014; Warren et al., 2015; Whittaker et al., 2017; Itescu, 2018; Mammola, 2018). Even if the potential of subterranean habitats as ideal biological laboratories has been long ago foreseen (Barr, 1968; Poulson and White, 1969; Culver, 1982), little has been written about the specific contribution of cave- based studies to the understanding of patterns and processes in global change biology (Mammola, 2018; Sánchez-Fernández et al., 2018). As a direct consequence, most syntheses focusing on the effect of climate change on ecosystems did not feature terrestrial caves in the potential study systems (e.g. Walther et al., 2002; Parmesan and Yohe, 2003; Scholze et al., 2006). However, there exists an emerging trend in

 environmental, physical, and ecological studies alike to use caves and other subterranean habitats as models for unraveling current climate change dynamics. Recent relevant studies focused on the role of climatic alterations on the geophysical components of the cave environment (Domínguez-Villar et al., 2015; Colucci et al., 2016; Pipan et al. 2018), the potential of caves as methane-sinks (Fernandez-Cortes et al., 2015) and the general effects of global temperature increase on different subterranean animals (Colson-Proch et al., 2010, Lencioni et al., 2010; Brandmayr et al., 2013; Mermillod-Blondin et al., 2013; Rizzo et al., 2015; Sánchez-Fernández et al., 2016; Mammola and Isaia, 2017; Di Lorenzo and Galassi, 2017; Mammola et al., 2018), and microorganisms (Brielmann et al., 2009, 2011; Gribler et al., 2016).

 We hypothesize here that caves represent one of the most informative systems for the study of climate change across its biotic and abiotic components, for multiple reasons:

 i) they are semi-closed systems that are extensively replicated across the Earth (Culver and Pipan, 2009);

 ii) they are buffered from external variations and generally characterised by a remarkable thermal stability, especially in temperate areas (Badino, 2004, 2010);

 iii) temperature inside caves highly correlate with mean annual temperatures on the surface (Moore and Nicholas, 1964), at least in temperate areas (Sánchez-Fernández et al., 2018); and

 iv) subterranean organisms have evolved a suite of morphological and physiological adaptations to thrive under the peculiar environmental conditions found in caves, which are often convergent even across phylogenetically distant groups (Culver and Pipan, 2009; Juan et al., 2010; Protas and Jeffrey, 2012).

 However, a lack of synthesis on this topic is possibly holding back the establishment of caves as standard models for the study of the effects of climate change in the field. By bringing together literature focusing on cave biology, ecology, and physics that were previously disconnected, we illustrate the rationale supporting the use of subterranean habitats as ideal model for studies of global change biology. We describe the potential effects of the anthropogenic climate alterations on the abiotic and the biotic components of the cave ecosystem, giving special reference to the cave climate, subterranean organisms and the interconnection between caves and other ecosystems (surface and soil). We focused here mostly on terrestrial subterranean habitats and only partly on groundwater systems (see Green et al., 2011; Taylor et al., 2013 for more arguments on groundwaters). We did not considered marine caves. A definition of the jargon used in the text is presented in Box 1. Throughout the text, the term "cave" is used to refer to the extended network of fissures and cracks that permeate most substrates, even if their size is not commensurable to the human-scale (Romero, 2012).

II. ABIOTIC FEATURES

(1) Subterranean climate

 A wealth of literature documents the ecological peculiarity of the subterranean realm, and how distinct it is from surface habitats. Whilst the absence of solar radiation is possibly the most crucial factor conditioning the ecology of subsurface habitats (Culver and Pipan, 2015), the most important feature that corroborates the idea that caves are ideal laboratories for the study of climate change in natural environment is their unique climatic stability. Indeed, deep subterranean habitats have, in most cases, an almost constant temperature over the year and a relative humidity often close to saturation (Cigna, 2002; Badino, 2010).

 The cave temperature is coupled with surface atmosphere temperature. The surface ground thermal signal is transferred by conduction through the bedrock, eventually reaching the depth of the cave (Domínguez-Villar et al., 2013). External air penetrating caves rapidly reaches a nearly constant temperature along the entrance sectors due to the buffering effect associated to the increase of relative humidity, and the progressive equilibration with the temperature of the rock (Wigley and Brown, 1971; Wigley and Brown, 1976). As a result of this process, mean air temperature in cave interiors correspond almost exactly to the average annual value of the outside temperature (Moore, 1964, Moore and Nicholas, 1964; Figure 1).

161 It is worth noting that, depending on the geophysical characteristics of the ground layers above the cave, thermal differences between the cave and the external mean annual temperature may occur. The main factor affecting diversion of cave temperature from the mean annual atmosphere one in temperate climates is related to the type of vegetation cover of the area above the cave, since different levels of shading may affect ground temperature (Domínguez-Villar et al., 2013). In addition, variations in solar radiation, the presence of long lasting snow cover and the evaporative cooling in soils caused by evaporation, are other factors which may contribute to explain small thermal disequilibria between cave and mean annual atmosphere temperatures (Beltrami and Kellman, 2003; Yzaki et al., 2013). Finally, strong air circulation or significant water streams can impact the cave temperature by the advection or radiation of heat from the fluids (De Freitas and Littlejohn, 1987; Covington et al., 2011), although in those cases the internal temperature is also linked to the external one (Smithson, 1991; Kranjc and Opara, 2002).

 One may argue about the possible effect of the geothermal gradient, as temperature below the surface slowly increases with the vertical distance under the

177 surface (ca. 30 °C/km away from tectonic plates). However, the geothermal gradient is generally so small that tens to hundreds of meters are required to notice a shift in the thermal equilibrium between the external air temperature and the cave one (Luetscher and Jeannin, 2004). Moreover, in karst regions the geothermal gradient is further buffered by the advection of groundwater (Bögli, 1980), limiting the sources of heat variability affecting caves (Badino, 2010).

 In light of the intimate relationship of cave temperature with the surface atmosphere temperature, it is no surprise that changes in surface atmosphere temperature results in shifts in the temperature recorded underground (Perrier et al., 2005; Figure 1).

(2) Climate change and the thermal inertia of caves

 Theoretical models have predicted that climate warming will impact temperature in caves (Badino, 2004; Covington and Perne, 2015), and model-data comparisons have confirmed such scenario (Domínguez-Villar et al., 2015; Šebela et al., 2015; Pipan et al., 2018), indicating that anthropogenic climate alterations are currently modifying the subterranean microclimate. Most caves show fairly stable air temperature in their interiors, as a result of the slow mechanism conveying underground the outer thermal signals by conduction. Consequently, there is lag-time between the air temperature increase recorded at the surface and its record in cave interiors. The delay depends on the cave depth (that is, the thickness of the rock above the cave) and on the duration of the anomaly (Domínguez- Villar, 2012). In the pioneer synthesis of Moore and Nicholas (1964), the authors speculated with delay times in the order of hundreds to thousands of years for climate anomalies at the surface to reach the deeper sectors of karst massifs. In a study set in a Slovenian cave located 37 m under the surface, the signal of the onset of global warming

 was recorded 20 years later (Domínguez-Villar et al., 2015). However, it should be noticed that at the same site, cave conduits located closer to the surface were expected to record thermal anomalies earlier, whereas cave conduits located deeper into the karst massif are unlikely to have registered the thermal impact of climate warming yet.

(3) Potential implications of subterranean warming on abiotic features

 In the past, caves have suffered climate changes that affected their temperature. Those changes were recorded in cave deposits (e.g., Mangini et al., 2005, Fairchild and Frisia, 2014), although during last millennia they had limited impact on the geophysical environment of most caves. An increase in cave temperature is associated to a higher relative content of water vapour required to reach saturation (i.e., 100% relative humidity). However, in most cases this has no environmental implication, since dripping water provides enough moisture to reach saturation.

 Concentration of CO² in caves is a major control on the dissolution and precipitation 215 of carbonates. However, at the inter-annual timescale, the $CO₂$ concentration does not 216 depend on the cave temperature but on the soil $CO₂$ production and cave ventilation (Fairchild and Baker, 2012). Therefore, subtle changes in cave temperature are not expected to produce large geophysical changes.

 However, the warming rate during the last decades is unusually large compared to changes recorded during previous millennia (Moberg et al., 2005), affecting the magnitude of thermal change per unit of time. Due to the required time to transfer the external thermal signal to caves, a thermal decoupling exists between the external temperature and the cave interior temperature during a climate change period. This decoupling affects the seasonal air flow in caves that, in most cases, is driven by gradients in air density, depending, in turn, from temperature differences between external

 atmosphere and the cave interior. Thus, in most caves, enhanced ventilation occurs when the external temperature is below the cave temperature, whereas limited ventilation is recorded during the rest of the year (e.g., Kowalczk and Froelich, 2010). Under a scenario of thermal decoupling, the thermal difference between the external and the cave atmosphere increases during winters, and decreases during summers. This large thermal decoupling may be affecting the duration of air flow regime in caves, causing longer periods of enhanced ventilation and reducing the periods with limited ventilation. Despite their potential implication for cave environments and their importance in determining 234 seasonal concentrations of CO₂ and other cave environmental parameters, changes in the duration of seasonal air flows have not been studied in detail yet.

(4) Shallow Subterranean Habitats

 Besides caves and the associated networks of fissures, superficial subterranean habitats (SSHs; Box 1) stand out as a group of subterranean habitats which are likely to be affected 240 by the global temperature increase. As the name suggests, these habitats are restricted to areas close to the surface and, compared with caves, have higher energy inputs and higher intrinsic variability, including significant microclimatic variations (Gers, 1998; Pipan et al., 2011; Mammola et al., 2016).

 The increased flux of energy from the atmosphere to the subterranean environment induced by climate change is expected to be primarily in the SSHs—see physical models in Mammola et al. (2016)—as well as in the most superficial sectors of caves (Badino, 2004). It is therefore expected that the temperature increase in these habitats will parallel the external one almost synchronically. Compared to the deep subterranean sectors, effects on the SSH fauna are expected to be more immediate.

III. BIOTIC FEATURES

(1) Subterranean organisms

 The adaptive morphology of subterranean animals has attracted the attention of evolutionary biologists since the discovery of life in caves. Subterranean obligate species, either terrestrial (troglobionts) or aquatic (stygobionts), have indeed often evolved behavioral, physiological and/or morphological traits to survive the peculiar conditions of the subterranean habitat (Box 1). Morphologically, they often lack eyes and pigmentation, and evolved elongated appendages and an assortment of sensory organs to perceive the environment by senses other than vision. Given the general low energy availability of the subterranean environment, they often exhibit low metabolic rates with consequent slow growth rates, high fasting performances, delayed maturation, and extended longevity when compared to their surface relatives (Hervant and Renault, 2002; Mezec et al., 2010; Voituron et al., 2011; Fišer et al., 2013). A charismatic example is offered by the first cave species ever described, the olm *Proteus anguinus* Laurenti. This aquatic cave salamander reaches sexual maturity at 16 years, lays eggs every 12 years, has an adult average lifespan of nearly 70 years and a predicted maximum lifespan of over 100 years (Voituron et al., 2011).

(2) Potential species sensitivity to climate change

 While much attention has been given to the effects of global climate change on surface organisms, communities and ecosystems, studies about the influence of temperature increase on subterranean biota are still at their infancy (Table 1). The contrasting response obtained on different animal groups indicate that the sensitivity of subterranean species to altered climatic conditions is likely to depend on phylogeny, evolutionary history and by the degree of subterranean adaptations or other functional traits.

 The most important, yet heterogeneous, evidence about the sensitivity of 277 subterranean species to the ongoing climate change derives from physiological tests. As a direct result of a long evolutionary history in a thermally stable environment, it is theoretically expected that most subterranean species should exhibit a stenothermal profile (*sensu* Huey and Kingsolver, 1989), which maximises their physiological performance over a narrow temperature range. However, in a climate change perspective, adaptation to narrow ranges of temperature turns out to be a strong limitation. Indeed, while most invertebrates living in the vicinity of the surface have the capacity to withstand temperature variations, most deep subterranean species lack such thermoregulatory mechanisms (Novak et al., 2014; Raschmanová et al., 2018). In certain species, even a positive or negative variation of 2°C in respect to their habitat temperature proved to be fatal (Mermillod-Blondin et al., 2013). However, the figure remains rather crude, as most studies conducted so far focused on single model taxa and thus lacked a wider phylogenetic perspective (but see Pallarés et al., 2019). For instance, tests carried on subterranean beetles are divergent, pointing out a wide thermal niche for numerous species of Cholevidae (Rizzo et al., 2015; Sánchez-Fernández et al., 2016)**.** In addition, it has been shown that two cold stenothermal cave-dwelling beetles in the genus *Neobathyscia* (Coleoptera: Catopidae) have the ability to synthesise heat shock proteins, which provide resistance to heat exposure (Bernabò et al., 2011). The same kind of pattern (inducible HSP70 heat shock response) has been observed in subterranean amphipods in the genus *Niphargus* (Crustacea: Amphipoda) (Colson-Proch et al., 2010).

 Also, contrasting results were obtained by different authors focusing on survival and performance patterns in stygobiont crustaceans living in thermally buffered subterranean aquatic habitats. Physiological tests suggested that certain species have lost the mechanisms for withstanding thermal variation, while certain others have not (Mathieu,

 1968; Issartel et al., 2005; Colson-Proch et al., 2010; Mermillod-Blondin et al., 2013). Moreover, an intra-specific variability in the thermal performance across different populations of *Niphargus rhenorhodanensis* Schellenberg was demonstrated (Colson- Proch et al., 2009). Some of this variability may be the result of different cave habitats. For example, epikarst (an SSH) inhabitants face a wider range of temperatures than do deep cave inhabitants (see Pipan et al., 2011). One would expect species facing this increased range of temperatures to have an increased thermal tolerance, but there are no data to directly bear on this point. It seems clear that thermal tolerance is necessarily species- specific, and the resulting bioindicator potential should be evaluated on a case-by-case basis.

 Apart from thermal tolerance, it is worth noting that air moisture content (i.e. humidity) is one of the most important limiting factors for terrestrial cave obligate species (Howarth, 1980, 1983; Simões et al., 2015). For example, Howarth (1980) tested in laboratory the longevity of spiderlings of *Lycosa howarthi* Gertsch (Araneae: Lycosidae) at three distinct values of relative humidity (100%, 95%, and 90%). At 90% the longevity dropped to one- fourth of the mean value at 100% (15.4±0.9 versus 61.8±1.3 days), pointing toward a pronounced sensitivity to saturation deficit. Accordingly, the maintenance of high humidity levels appears to be essential for the survival of different troglobionts. This is generally explained by the high cuticular permeability of many species, associated with a low resistance to desiccation (Howarth, 1980, 1983; Hadley et al., 1981). As previously explained, in caves from regions with limited water infiltration, relative humidity of cave environments may be reduced as a consequence of the cave temperature increase. However, the impacts associated to the alteration of relative humidity due to increased temperature is rather limited when compared to role of infiltrating water in karst (Eraso, 1962). Nevertheless, in many regions of the planet, such as the Mediterranean, it adds on

 top of the decrease in precipitation (Xoplaki et al., 2004) that is reducing infiltration of water in karst, pushing caves towards lower relative humidity scenarios. Consequently, drops in the relative humidity in some regions of the planet are likely to play a critical role in the species response of subterranean species to climate change (Shu et al., 2013).

(3) Eco-evolutionary response to climate change

 Despite the predicted and observed extinction of different taxa across terrestrial and aquatic biomes (Thomas et al., 2004, Cahill et al., 2013), Bellard et al. (2012) underlined how species can respond to climate change by shifting their climatic niche along three non-exclusive axes: time (e.g. phenology), space (e.g. range) and self (e.g. physiology). However, studies observing eco-evolutionary responses mostly concern surface organisms, while subterranean species may not be able to adapt in the same way. As a rule of thumb, subterranean species can theoretically couple with climatic alterations only by shifting their distributional range (i.e. spatial information) or by adapting to the new environmental conditions (i.e. physiological information). It must be added that it is difficult to integrate temporal information as phenology in caves is not directly linked to climatic factors (e.g. light, temperature; Figure 2).

 If the dispersal capacity is enough to accompany the spatial change in temperatures, one of the most common response of surface organisms to climate change is the altitudinal and/or latitudinal shift of distribution ranges (Parmesan and Yohe, 2003; Chen et al., 2011). However, most subterranean systems are geographically isolated, acting as islands for many species (e.g., Cardoso, 2012; Niemiller et al., 2013; Fattorini et al., 2016; Rizzo et al., 2017). This ecological feature, together with physiological constraints, caused an extreme reduction in the dispersal potential of most troglobionts (Bohonak, 1999). Indeed, as discussed in Juan et al. (2010), a breadth of studies

 uncovered pronounced genetic structuring and low gene flow between populations inhabiting different caves. Thus, long range dispersal events in troglobionts are extremely unlikely and, in fact, available future projections point at reductions in troglobiont ranges rather than range expansions or shifts (Sánchez-Fernández et al., 2016; Mammola et al., 2018). In this respect, due to the same kind of barriers inhibiting local migrations, altitudinal shifts may be equally unlikely. However, it is worth noting that isolation between caves should be theoretically higher for troglobionts than for stygobionts, as subterranean waters present broader connections than subterranean terrestrial habitats (Christman and Culver, 2001), often resulting in aquatic subterranean species having wider ranges then terrestrial ones (Lamoreaux, 2004). Also, it has been recently shown that adaptation to subterranean habitats is not always a one-way evolutionary path, with subterranean species being occasionally able to recolonise and widely disperse in surface habitats (Prendini et al., 2009, Copilas-Ciocianu et al., 2018).

 At a smaller scale, in response to climate change cave species could theoretically change their spatial distribution inside the cave system itself (Fejér and Moldovan, 2013; Mammola et al., 2015, 2017; Lunghi et al., 2017). Evidence suggests that a number of subterranean species are indeed able to seasonally migrate toward greater depths and vice versa (e.g., Juberthie, 1969; Crouau-Roy et al., 1992; Tobin et al., 2013). However, a permanent shift in the species spatial niche toward greater depths may be less likely, because this would affect the general energetic needs, as the energy input far from the surface is generally scarcer especially in temperate oligotrophic caves (Gers, 1998; Souza-Silva et al., 2011; Venarsky et al., 2014). Moreover, most of specialised subterranean arthropods are confined in caves lacking climatic heterogeneity to be exploited (Figure 2).

 If enough genetic variability is encompassed by a population, allowing for a change of dominant traits over time, adaptive evolution of physiology may be the best response to climate warming (Bradshaw and Holzapfel, 2006; Visser, 2008; Williams et al., 2008). In particular, physiological adaptation to increasing temperatures has been reported in surface organisms, resulting in increased metabolic rate and faster growth (Hughes, 2000). Although physiological modifications are hard to be measured or predicted, previous studies suggest that subterranean organisms exhibit decreased metabolic plasticity, i.e., show far less elevation of metabolism than their close surface relatives in response to higher temperatures (Dresco-Derouet, 1959; Vandel, 1965; Hervant and Mathieu, 1997). Indeed, habitat specialists often present low functional variability due to specialisation (but see Faille et al., 2010; Juan et al., 2010; Ribera et al., 2010). This in turn limits the evolutionary potential even within large populations (Kellermann et al., 2006). With a relatively stable habitat and restricted distribution, genetic variability of cave populations is in fact often very low (Juan et al., 2010; but see Cieslak et al., 2014; Stern et al., 2017). In addition, cave species typically have low reproductive rates, slow growing/maturing and long life-span (Voituron et al., 2011). These characteristics generally constrain rapid evolutionary change (McKinney, 1997).

(4) Inter-connection with other systems

 The arguments presented in the previous section illustrate the potential eco-evolutionary responses of cave species to climate change within the subterranean domain. However, it is worth noting that most subterranean habitats are semi-closed systems, thus interconnected and strongly dependent of other environments, especially surface habitats.

 Being light deficient, the subterranean ecosystem is strongly dependent from the outside ecosystems providing the fundamental energy inputs for its maintenance (Gibert

 and Deharveng, 2002)—although chemolithotrophic organisms may account for primary production within caves (Northup and Lavoie, 2001). Trophic inputs mainly consist of organic materials passively transported underground, as well as by active migration of animals within some caves. Consequently, energy flow in a typical subterranean habitat is strongly influenced by seasonal fluctuations (Culver and Pipan, 2009) and the supply of organic matter might also increase with current surface land-use changes (Wilhelm et al., 2006). Phenological shifts—the advancement or postponing of annual phenomena—in relation to global change have been extensively documented in surface species (Peñuelas and Filella, 2001), especially in plants (Cleland et al., 2007; Wolkovich et al., 2012). It is thus theoretically expected that the amount and timing of allochtonous energy inputs in caves will change accordingly, with direct effects on the subterranean biota.

 It is also well documented how climate changes will enhance invasion processes, causing the introduction and spread of alien species (Bellard et al., 2013), which are expected to affect cave biology (Wynne et al., 2014). Accordingly, several studies have documented the potential recent spread of pathogen fungi in terrestrial subterranean habitats (Escobar et al., 2014) or of alien species in marine caves (Gerovasileiou et al., 2016). Furthermore, dramatic modification of surface habitats (e.g., aridification and deforestation), may also induce changes in the hydrological regimes of caves, with consequent further degradation of the cave ecosystem (Trajano et al., 2009, Bichuette and Trajano, 2010).

 From a slightly different perspective, it is likely that some soil and surface organisms may exploit subterranean environments, especially cave entrances and SSHs, as refugial area in a climate change scenario. Indeed, it can be argued that the critical difference between caves or other subterranean habitats and surface habitats is that temperature extremes are buffered. If these extremes are what constitute a physiological

 challenge, then these habitats may serve as a refuge. For instance, different soil arthropods (e.g. springtails, woodlouse) may find more favourable conditions (e.g. lower desiccation level, lower predation level) in the subterranean habitats that in surface habitats (Fernandes et al., 2016; Mammola et al., 2016). Similarly, arthropods adapted to cold environments may find safer places for survival in some subterranean habitats as in karst areas (Raschmanova et al., 2015).

 These examples do not intend to be exhaustive, but we rather aim to highlight the importance of considering the deep relation between caves and other ecosystems, and thus to consider the reciprocal interaction between the underground and the above-ground world. However, in lack of specific studies involving the collaboration of cave-based scientists and ecologists operating in other research fields, most of these interactions are still difficult to disclose and predict.

IV. FUTURE DIRECTIONS

 We have discussed that caves represent remarkable examples of natural laboratories in which the climatic conditions are as homogeneous as the one that could be obtained in a laboratory. Thus, in contrast with fluctuating surface temperatures, temperature measurements in caves allow researchers to readily detect temperature variations related to climate warming (see, e.g., Fejér and Moldovan, 2013; Šebela et al., 2015; Domínguez- Villar et al., 2015). Currently monitoring programs in caves mostly involves the analysis of speleothems, which requires a single visit to obtain a sample (Pipan et al. 2018). Indeed, the sheltered environment in which speleothems grow, and their capacity to preserve even sub-annual climatic events, offers a certain potential for their use as climatic archives of the Anthropocene (Fairchild and Frisia, 2014; Fairchild, 2017; Waters et al., 2017). On the other hand, long-term monitoring programs within karst settings are currently very rare

 (Brookfield et al., 2016; Pipan et al., 2018); we thus point out that monitoring programs should be established for relevant abiotic and biotic variables—see, e.g., the notable case of Postojna cave (Šebela and Turk, 2011; Šebela et al., 2015; Pipan et al., 2018).

 With small distribution ranges (due to the isolation among subterranean systems), small population size (due to low energy availability), and restricted habitat (by definition), cave organisms often fulfil all forms of rarity (Rabinowitz, 1981; Gaston, 1994). Species with small range and abundance are expected to have low adaptive potential in the face of environmental change (Williams et al., 2008). Subterranean species are in fact prevalent on conservation priority lists (Martín et al., 2010; Cardoso et al., 2011; IUCN, 2017). We have shown that a significant number of subterranean species cannot accommodate to changing conditions by dispersal or microhabitat use, and the only possibility to cope with climate change will be to persist *in situ*. However, if natural populations cannot adapt to environmental change by means of adaptive shifts, they should be more prone to local extinction due to the direct effects of climate change than their surface counterparts. We therefore advocate the need for long-term monitoring programs for cave species, namely those with high threat status.

 Nevertheless, it is worth noting that not all subterranean species are likely to become extinct in light of a warming climate. Depending on the organisms under consideration and its degree of subterranean adaptation, a variety of possible responses to an altered climate has to be expected. Whilst a great deal of attention is paid to troglobionts, there are high-dispersal subterranean species which may, on the contrary, be able to respond with dispersal to climatic alterations (e.g., Mammola and Isaia, 2017). We have also discussed that movements of faunas from surface to subterranean habitats, and vi*ce versa*, can be expected. The confrontation of these opposite displacements, even if they are currently rare, might become a research priority in the next future, because of the rapid

 changes observed in surface habitats and the loss of climatic stability of subterranean ones. In that context, analytical approaches typically used in landscape and island ecology—e.g. source-sink and metapopulations dynamics (Pipan et al., 2010; Moldovan et al., 2012; Fattorini et al., 2016; Trajano and de Carvalho, 2017)—will become helpful to document the amplitude of these reciprocal movements.

 A general caveat to consider in discussing this topic is that studies conducted so far have been mostly correlative, meaning that a causal attribution of recent biological trends to climate change in subterranean species is currently lacking. Although it is difficult to overcome this impediment, it is likely that advances can be done both by studying multiple subterranean systems and by combining multiple lines of evidence (Mammola and Leroy, 2018; Pipan et al., 2018). For instance, the simultaneous use of physiological data, genetic evidence and forecast derived from statistical projections has a great deal of potential. There is little doubt that this integrated approach would greatly benefit the study of climate change dynamics in deep subterranean habitats, prompting a fast and significant advance in knowledge.

V. CONCLUSIONS

 (1) Due to their intrinsic environmental stability, subterranean ecosystems are unique models for the study of global change biology. However, monitoring programs of caves abiotic conditions are rare and we still have a limited understanding of the mechanisms that underlie survival of the most adapted species to climatic and environmental alterations, even more so in tropical regions.

 (2) Most subterranean species are expected to have fine-tuned their thermal physiology to the narrow and stable condition of their habitats, and should have low adaptive potential in

 the face of environmental change. The contrasting response obtained on different animal groups suggest that the sensitivity of subterranean species to temperature variations is likely to significantly differ depending on phylogeny, evolutionary history and degree of subterranean adaptation.

 (3) Subterranean communities are relatively depauperate, with less redundancy in ecological roles among species. Disruption of trophic webs and species interactions is therefore much likely in such communities.

 (4) Some external organisms may be able to exploit subterranean environments as refugia in a climate change scenario. However, if caves can be seen as shelters for preadapted surface and soil species in the face of rapid climate change, they may become dead-end traps for their current inhabitants, being characterised by a poor dispersal ability a low adaptation potential.

 (5) When thinking about the ecology of subterranean ecosystems, it is crucial to consider their interconnections with other environments, especially surface habitats. Studies involving the collaboration of cave-based scientists with ecologists operating in other research fields are likely to produce a more realistic picture of the effects of climate change in the underground world.

 (6) We encourage renewed effort to better characterise the dynamic processes and challenges associated with global climate change in deep subterranean habitats. Evidence arising from such studies would not exclusively be important for the conservation of the subterranean fauna, but more generally they would contribute to increase our

 Brielmann H, Lueders T, Schreglmann K et al. (2011) Shallow geothermal energy usage and its potential impacts on groundwater ecosystems. *Grundwasser* 16: 77–91. Beltrami H and Kellman L (2003). An examination of short-and long-term air–ground temperature coupling. *Global and planetary change* 38(3–4): 291–303. doi:10.1016/S0921-8181(03)00112-7 Bernabò P, Latella L, Jousson O et al. (2011) Cold stenothermal cave-dwelling beetles do have an HSP70 heat shock response. *Journal of Thermal Biology* 36(3): 206–208. doi:10.1016/j.jtherbio.2011.03.002 Bichuette ME and Trajano E (2010) Conservation of Subterranean Fishes. In: Trajano E, Bichuette ME and Kapoor BC *Biology of subterranean fishes*. CRC Press. Bögli A (1980) *Karst hydrology and physical speleolology*. Berlin: Springer Verlag. Bohonak AJ (1999) Dispersal, gene flow and population structure. The Quarterly Review of Biology 74(1): 21–45. Bradshaw WE and Holzapfel CM (2006) Evolutionary response to rapid climate change. *Science 312:* 1477–1478. doi:10.1126/science.1127000 Brandmayr P, Giorgi F, Casale A et al. (2013) Hypogean carabid beetles as indicators of global warming?. *Environmental Research Letters 8*(4): 044047. doi:10.1088/1748- 9326/8/4/044047 Cahill AE, Aiello-Lammens ME, Fisher-Reid MC et al. (2012) How does climate change cause extinction?. *Proceeding of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences* 280: 20121890. doi:10.1098/rspb.2012.1890

 Cardoso P (2012) Diversity and community assembly patterns of epigean vs. troglobiont spiders in the Iberian Peninsula. *International Journal of Speleology* 41(1): 83–94. doi:10.5038/1827-806X.41.1.9

 Cardoso P, Borges PA, Triantis KA et al. (2011) Adapting the IUCN Red List criteria for invertebrates. *Biological conservation* 144(10): 2432–2440.

doi:10.1016/j.biocon.2011.06.020

Chen IC, Hill JK, Ohlemüller R et al. (2011) Rapid range shifts of species associated with

high levels of climate warming. *Science* 333(6045): 1024–1026.

doi:10.1126/science.1206432

 Chevaldonné P and Lejeusne C (2003) Regional warming‐ induced species shift in north‐ west Mediterranean marine caves. *Ecology Letters* 6(4): 371–379. doi:10.1046/j.1461-0248.2003.00439

 Christiansen KA (2012) Morphological adaptations. In: White WB and Culver DC *Encyclopedia of caves*. Amsterdam: Elsevier.

 Christman MC and Culver DC (2001) The relationship between cave biodiversity and available habitat. *Journal of Biogeography* 28: 367–380. doi:10.1046/j.1365- 2699.2001.00549

 Cieslak A, Fresneda J and Ribera I (2014) Life-history specialization was not an evolutionary dead-end in Pyrenean cave beetles. *Proceeding of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences* 281(1781): 20132978. doi:10.1098/rspb.2013.2978

 Cigna AA (2002) Modern trend(s) in cave monitoring. *Acta Carsologica* 31: 35–54. doi:10.3986/ac.v31i1.402

- Cleland EE, Chuine I, Menzel A et al. (2007) Shifting plant phenology in response to global change. *Trends in Ecology and Evolution* 22(7): 357–365. doi:10.1016/j.tree.2007.04.003
- Colson-Proch C, Morales A, Hervant F et al. (2010) First cellular approach of the effects of global warming on groundwater organisms: a study of the HSP70 gene expression. *Cell*
- *Stress and Chaperones* 15(3): 259–270. doi:10.1007/s12192-009-0139-4
-
- Colson-Proch C, Renault D, Gravot A et al. (2009) Do current environmental conditions explain physiological and metabolic responses of subterranean crustaceans to cold?. *Journal of Experimental Biology* 212(12): 1859–1868. doi:10.1242/jeb.027987
-
- Colucci RR, Fontana D, Forte E et al. (2016). Response of ice caves to weather extremes
- in the southeastern Alps, Europe. *Geomorphology* 261: 1–11.
- doi:10.1016/j.geomorph.2016.02.017
-
- Copilaş-Ciocianu D, Fišer C, Borza P et al. (2018) Is subterranean lifestyle reversible? Independent and recent large-scale dispersal into surface waters by two species of the groundwater amphipod genus Niphargus. *Molecular phylogenetics and evolution* 119: 37– 49. doi:10.1016/j.ympev.2017.10.023
-
- Covington MD and Perne M (2015) Consider a cylindrical cave: a physicist's view of cave and karst science. *Acta Carsologica* 44: 363–380. doi:10.3986/ac.v44i3.1925

- Covington MD, Luhmann AJ, Gabrovsek F et al. (2011) Mechanisms of heat exchange
- between water and rock in karst conduits. *Water Resources Research* 47*:* W10514.
- doi:10.1029/2011WR010683

- Crouau‐ Roy B, Crouau Y and Ferre C (1992) Dynamic and temporal structure of the troglobitic beetle Speonomus hydrophilus (Coleoptera: Bathyscimae). *Ecography* 15(1): 12–18. doi:10.1111/j.1600-0587.1992.tb00002
-

 Domínguez-Villar D, Fairchild IJ, Baker A et al. (2013) Reconstruction of cave air temperature based on surface atmosphere temperature and vegetation changes: implications for speleothem palaeoclimate records. *Earth and Planetary Science Letters* 369–370: 158–168. doi:10.1016/j.epsl.2013.03.017 Dresco-Derouet L (1959) Contribution a l'étude de la biologie de deux Crustacés aquatiques cavernicoles: *Caecosphaeroma burgundum* D. et *Niphargus virei* Ch. *Vie et Milieu* 10: 321–346. Eraso A (1962) Ideas sobre la climática subterránea. *Estudios del grupo Espeleológico Alavés* 21-41. Escobar LE, Lira-Noriega A, Medina-Vogel G et al. (2014) Potential for spread of the white-nose fungus (*Pseudogymnoascus destructans*) in the Americas: use of Maxent and NicheA to assure strict model transference. *Geospatial health* 9(1): 221–229. Faille A, Ribera I, Deharveng L et al. (2010) A molecular phylogeny shows the single origin of the Pyrenean subterranean Trechini ground beetles (Coleoptera: Carabidae). *Molecular Phylogenetics and Evolution* 54: 97–106. doi:10.1016/j.ympev.2009.10.008 Fairchild IJ (2017) Geochemical records in Speleothems. In: DellaSala D and Goldstein M *Encyclopedia of the Anthropocene.* Elsevier Reference Modules. Fairchild IJ and Baker A (2012) *Speleothem science: from processes to past environments.* Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell. Fairchild IJ and Frisia S (2014) Definition of the Anthropocene: a view from the underworld. In: Waters C, Zalasiewicz J, Williams JM et al. *A Stratigraphical Basis for the Anthropocene.* Geological Society Special Publication 395.

 Fattorini S, Borges PA, Fiasca B et al. (2016) Trapped in the web of water: Groundwater‐ fed springs are island‐ like ecosystems for the meiofauna. *Ecology and evolution* 6(23): 8389–8401. doi:10.1002/ece3.2535

 Fejér A and Moldovan OT (2013) Population size and dispersal patterns for a *Drimeotus* (Coleoptera, Leiodidae, Leptodirini) cave population. *Subterranean Biology* 11: 31–44. doi:10.3897/subtbiol.11.4974

 Fernandes CS, Batalha MA and Bichuette ME (2016) Does the cave environment reduce functional diversity?. *PloS ONE* 11(3): e0151958. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0151958

 Fernandez-Cortes A, Cuezva S, Alvarez-Gallego M et al. (2015) Subterranean atmospheres may act as daily methane sinks. *Nature communications* 6: 7003. doi:10.1038/ncomms8003

 Fišer C, Zagmajster M, and Zakšek V. 2013. Coevolution of life history traits and morphology in female subterranean amphipods. *Oikos* 122: 770–778. doi:10.1111/j.1600- 0706.2012.20644.x

Gaston KJ (1994) *Rarity.* Dordrecht: Springer.

Gerovasileiou V, Voultsiadou E, Issaris Y et al. (2016) Alien biodiversity in Mediterranean

marine caves. *Marine Ecology* 37(2): 239–256. doi:10.1111/maec.12268

Gers C (1998) Diversity of energy fluxes and interactions between arthropod communities:

from soil to cave. *Acta Oecologica* 19(3): 205–213. doi:10.1016/S1146-609X(98)80025-8

 Hortal J, Nabout JC, Calatayud J et al. (2014) Perspectives on the use of lakes and ponds as model systems for macroecological research. *Journal of limnology* 73(1): 46–60. doi:10.4081/jlimnol.2014.887

 Howarth FG (1983) Ecology of cave arthropods. *Annual review of entomology* 28(1): 365- 389. doi:10.1146/annurev.en.28.010183.002053

 Howarth FG (1980) The Zoogeography of specialized cave animals: a bioclimatic model. *Evolution* 34*:* 394–406. doi:10.1111/j.1558-5646.1980.tb04827

 Huey RB and Kingsolver JG (1989) Evolution of thermal sensitivity of ectotherm performance. *Trends in Ecology and Evolution* 4(5): 131–135. doi:10.1016/0169- 5347(89)90211-5

 Issartel J, Hervant F, Voituron Y et al. (2005) Behavioural, ventilatory and respiratory responses of epigean and hypogean crustaceans to different temperatures. *Comparative Biochemistry and Physiology Part A: Molecular and Integrative Physiology* 141(1): 1–7.

 Itescu Y (2018) Are island‐ like systems biologically similar to islands? A review of the evidence. *Ecography*, early view. doi:10.1111/ecog.03951

 Juan C, Guzik MT, Jaume D et al. (2010) Evolution in caves: Darwin's 'wrecks of ancient life' in the molecular era. *Molecular Ecology* 19(18): 3865–3880. doi:10.1111/j.1365- 294X.2010.04759

 Mammola S, Piano E, Giachino PM et al. (2015) Seasonal dynamics and micro-climatic preference of two Alpine endemic hypogean beetles. *International Journal of Speleology* 44(3): 239–249. doi:10.5038/1827-806X.44.3.3

 Mammola S, Piano E, Giachino PM et al. (2017) An ecological survey of the invertebrate community at the epigean/hypogean interface. *Subterranean Biology* 24: 27–52. doi:10.3897/subtbiol.24.21585

 Mangini A, Spötl C and Vedes P (2005) Reconstruction of temperature in the Central Alps 855 during the past 2000 yr from a δ¹⁸O stalagmite record. *Earth and Planetary Science Letters* 235: 741–751. doi:10.1016/j.epsl.2005.05.010

 Mathieu J (1968) Temperatures letales et acclimatation thermique chez *Niphargus longicaudatus* (Amphipode, Gammaride). *Bulletin de la Société Zoologique de France* 93: 595–603.

 McKinney ML (1997) Extinction vulnerability and selectivity: combining ecological and paleontological views. *Annual Review of Ecology and Systematics* 28(1): 495–516. doi:10.1146/annurev.ecolsys.28.1.495

 Mermillod-Blondin F, Lefour C, Lalouette L et al. (2013) Thermal tolerance breadths among groundwater crustaceans living in a thermally constant environment. *Journal of Experimental Biology* 216(9): 1683–1694. doi:10.1242/jeb.081232

 Mezek T, Simčič T, Arts MT et al. (2010) Effect of fasting on hypogean (*Niphargus stygius*) and epigean (*Gammarus fossarum*) amphipods: a laboratory study. *Aquatic ecology*, 44(2): 397–408. doi:10.1007/s10452-009-9299-7

 Moberg A, Sonechkin DM, Holmgren K et al. (2005) Highly variable Northern Hemisphere temperatures reconstructed from low- and high-resolution proxy data. *Nature* 433: 613– 617. doi:10.1038/nature03265 Moldovan OT, Meleg IN and Persoiu A (2012) Habitat fragmentation and its effects on groundwater populations. *Ecohydrology* 5: 445–452. doi:10.1002/eco.237 Moore GW (1964) Cave temperature. *National Speleological Society News* 22: 57–60. Moore GW and Nicholas G (1964) Out of phase seasonal temperature fluctuations in Cathedral Cave, Kentucky. *Geological Society of America Special Paper* 76: 313. Niemiller ML, McCandless JR, Reynolds RG et al. (2013) Effects of climatic and geological processes during the Pleistocene on the evolutionary history of the northern cavefish, *Amblyopsis spelaea* (Teleostei: Amblyopsidae). *Evolution* 67(4): 1011–1025. doi:10.1111/evo.12017 Northup DE and Lavoie KH (2001) Geomicrobiology of caves: a review. *Geomicrobiology journal* 18(3): 199–222. doi:10.1080/01490450152467750 Novak T, Šajna N, Antolinc E et al. (2014) Cold tolerance in terrestrial invertebrates inhabiting subterranean habitats. *International Journal of Speleology* 43(3): 265–272 (2014). doi:10.5038/1827-806X.43.3.3 Pallarés S, Colado R, Pérez-Fernández T et al. (2019) Heat tolerance and acclimation capacity in unrelated subterranean arthropods living under common and stable thermal conditions. *BioRxiv*: 598458. doi:10.1101/598458 Peñuelas J and Filella I (2001) Responses to a warming world. *Science* 294(5543): 793– 795. doi:10.1126/science.1066860

 Parmesan C and Yohe G (2003) A globally coherent fingerprint of climate change impacts across natural systems. *Nature* 421: 37–42. doi:10.1038/nature01286

 Perrier F, Le Mouël JL, Poirier, JP et al. (2005) Long-term climate change and surface versus underground temperature measurements in Paris. *International Journal of Climatology* 25: 1619–1631. doi:10.1002/joc.1211

 Pipan T, Holt N and Culver DC (2010) How to protect a diverse, poorly known, inaccessible fauna: identification of source and sink habitats in the epikarst. *Aquatic Conservation Marine and Freshwater Ecosystems* 20: 748–755. doi:10.1002/aqc.1148

 Pipan T, López H, Oromí P et al. (2011) Temperature variation and the presence of troglobionts in terrestrial shallow subterranean habitats. J*ournal of Natural History* 45(3–4): 253–273. doi:10.1080/00222933.2010.523797

 Pipan T, Petrič M, Šebela S et al. (2018) Analyzing climate change and surface-subsurface interactions using the Postojna Planina Cave System (Slovenia) as a model system. *Regional Environmental Change* doi:10.1007/s10113-018-1349-z

Poulson TL and White WB (1969) The cave environment. *Science* 165: 971–981.

doi:10.1126/science.165.3897.971

 Prendini L, Francke OF and Vignoli V (2009) Troglomorphism, trichobothriotaxy and typhlochactid phylogeny (Scorpiones, Chactoidea): more evidence that troglobitism is not an evolutionary dead end. *Cladistics* 25: 1–24. doi:10.1111/j.1096-0031.2009.00277.x

 Protas M and Jeffery WR (2012) Evolution and development in cave animals: from fish to crustaceans. *Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviews: Developmental Biology* 1(6): 823–845. doi:10.1002/wdev.61

 Raschmanová N, Miklisová D, Kováč L et al. (2015). Community composition and cold tolerance of soil Collembola in a collapse karst doline with strong microclimate inversion. *Biologia* 70(6): 802–811. doi:10.1515/biolog-2015-0095

939 Raschmanová N, Šustr V, Kováč L et al. (2018) Testing the climatic variability hypothesis in edaphic and subterranean Collembola (Hexapoda). *Journal of Thermal Biology* 78: 391– 400. doi:10.1016/j.jtherbio.2018.11.004

 Rabinowitz D (1981) Seven forms of rarity. In: Synge H *Aspects of rare plant conservation*. New York: Wiley.

 Ribera I, Fresneda J, Bucur R et al. (2010). Ancient origin of a Western Mediterranean radiation of subterranean beetles. *BMC Evolutionary Biology* 10*:* 29. doi:10.1186/1471- 2148-10-29

 Rizzo V, Sánchez-Fernández D, Fresneda J et al. (2015) Lack of evolutionary adjustment to ambient temperature in highly specialized cave beetles. *BMC evolutionary biology* 15(1): 10. doi:10.1186/s12862-015-0288-2

 Rizzo V, Sánchez‐ Fernández D, Alonso R et al. (2017) Substratum karstificability, dispersal and genetic structure in a strictly subterranean beetle. *Journal of Biogeography* 44(11): 2527–2538. doi:10.1111/jbi.13074

Romero A (2012) Caves as biological space. *Polymath* 2(3): 1–15.

 Root TL, Price JT, Hall KR et al. (2003) Fingerprints of global warming on wild animals and plants. *Nature* 421(6918): 57–60. doi:10.1038/nature01333

 Sánchez-Fernández D, Rizzo V, Bourdeau C et al. (2018) The deep subterranean environment as a model system in ecological, biogeographical and evolutionary research. *Subterranean Biology* 25: 1–7. doi:10.3897/subtbiol.25.23530

 Sánchez-Fernández D, Rizzo V, Cieslak A et al. (2016) Thermal niche estimators and the capability of poor dispersal species to cope with climate change. *Scientific Reports* 6: 23381. doi:10.1038/srep23381

 Santer BD, Wehner MF, Wigley TML et al. (2003) Contributions of anthropogenic and natural forcing to recent tropopause height changes. *Science* 301(5632): 479–483. doi:10.1126/science.1084123

Scholze M, Knorr W, Arnell NW et al. (2006) A climate-change risk analysis for world

ecosystems. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 103(35): 13116–3120.

doi:10.1073/pnas.0601816103

 Šebela S and Turk J (2011) Local characteristics of Postojna Cave climate, air temperature, and pressure monitoring. *Theoretical and Applied Climatology* 105: 371–386. doi:10.1007/s00704-011-0397-9

 Šebela S, Turk J and Pipan T (2015) Cave micro-climate and tourism: towards 200 years (1819–2015) at Postojnska jama (Slovenia). *Cave and Karst Science* 42(2): 78–85.

 Shu SS, Jiang WS, Whitten T et al. (2013) Drought and China's cave species. *Science* 340(6130); 272. doi:10.1126/science.340.6130.272-a

 Simões MH, Souza-Silva M and Ferreira RL (2015) Cave physical attributes influencing the structure of terrestrial invertebrate communities in Neotropics. *Subterranean Biology* 16*:* 103–121. doi:10.3897/subtbiol.16.5470

 Smithson PA (1991) Inter-relationships between cave and outside air temperatures. *Theoretical and Applied Climatology* 44(1): 65–73.

-
- Souza-Silva M, Parentoni MR and Ferreira LR (2011) Trophic dynamics in a neotropical limestone cave. *Subterranean Biology* 9: 127–138. doi:10.3897/subtbiol.9.2515 Stern DB, Breinholt J, Pedraza‐ Lara C et al. (2017) Phylogenetic evidence from freshwater crayfishes that cave adaptation is not an evolutionary dead-end. *Evolution* 71(10): 2522–2532. doi:10.1111/evo.13326 Taylor RG, Scanlon B, Döll P et al. 2013. Ground water and climate change. *Nature Climate Change* 3: 322–329. doi:10.1038/nclimate1744 Thomas CD, Cameron A, Green RE et al. (2004) Extinction risk from climate change. *Nature* 427(6970): 145–148. doi:10.1038/nature02121 Tobin BW, Hutchins BT and Schwartz BF (2013) Spatial and temporal changes in invertebrate assemblage structure from the entrance to deep-cave zone of a temperate marble cave. *International Journal of Speleology* 42(3): 203–214. doi:10.5038/1827- 806X.42.3.4 Trajano E and Carvalho MR de (2017) Towards a biologically meaningful classification of subterranean organisms: a critical analysis of the Schiner-Racovitza system from a
- historical perspective, difficulties of its application and implications for conservation. *Subterranean Biology* 22: 1–26. doi:10.3897/subtbiol.22.9759
-

 Trajano E, Secutti S and Bichuette ME (2009) Population decline in a Brazilian cave catfish, *Trichomycterus itacarambiensis* Trajano and Pinna, 1986 (Siluriformes): reduced flashflood as a probable cause. *Speleobiology Notes* 1: 24–27. doi:10.1590/1982-0224- 20170057

 Vandel A (1965) *Biospeleology. The biology of cavernicolous animals*. Oxford: Pergamon Press.

 Venarsky MP, Huntsman BM, Huryn AD et al. (2014) Quantitative food web analysis supports the energy-limitation hypothesis in cave stream ecosystems. *Oecologia* 176(3): 859–869. doi:10.1007/s00442-014-3042-3

- Visser ME (2008) Keeping up with a warming world; assessing the rate of adaptation to climate change. *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London B: Biological Sciences*, 275(1635): 649–659. doi:10.1098/rspb.2004.2770
-

 Voituron Y, De Fraipont M, Issartel J et al. (2010) Extreme lifespan of the human fish (Proteus anguinus): a challenge for ageing mechanisms. *Biology letters* 7: 105–107. doi:10.1098/rsbl.2010.0539

 Walther GR, Post E, Convey P et al. (2002) Ecological responses to recent climate change. *Nature* 416(6879): 389–395. doi:10.1038/416389a

 Warren BH, Simberloff D, Ricklefs RE et al. (2015) Islands as model systems in ecology and evolution: prospects fifty years after MacArthur‐ Wilson. *Ecology Letters* 18(2): 200- 217. doi:10.1111/ele.12398

 Waters CN, Zalasiewicz J, Summerhayes C et al. (2017) Global Boundary Stratotype Section and Point (GSSP) for the Anthropocene Series: Where and how to look for potential candidates. *Earth-Science Reviews* 178:379–429. doi:10.1016/j.earscirev.2017.12.016

 Whittaker RJ, Fernández-Palacios JM, Matthews TJ et al. (2017) Island biogeography: Taking the long view of nature's laboratories. *Science* 357(6354): eaam8326.. doi:10.1126/science.aam8326

 Wigley TML and Brown MC (1971) Geophysical applications of heat and mass transfer in turbulent pipe flow. *Boundary-Layer Meteorology* 1: 300–320.

 Wigley TML and Brown MC (1976) The physics of Caves. In: Ford TD and Cullingford CHD *The Science of Speleology*. London: Academic Press. London.

 Wilhelm FM, Taylor SJ and Adams GL (2006) Comparison of routine metabolic rates of the stygobite, *Gammarus acherondytes* (Amphipoda: Gammaridae) and the stygophile, *Gammarus troglophilus*. *Freshwater Biology* 51(6): 1162–1174. doi:10.1111/j.1365- 2427.2006.01564.x

 Williams JW and Jackson ST (2007) Novel climates, no‐ analog communities, and ecological surprises. *Frontiers in Ecology and the Environment* 5(9): 475–482. doi:10.1890/070037

 Williams M, Zalasiewicz J, Haff PK et al. (2015) The anthropocene biosphere. *The Anthropocene Review* 2(3): 196–219. doi:10.1177/2053019615591020

 Williams SE, Shoo LP, Isaac JL et al. (2008) Towards an integrated framework for assessing the vulnerability of species to climate change. *PLoS biology* 6(12): e325. doi:10.1371/journal.pbio.0060325

 Wolkovich EM, Cook BI, Allen JM et al. (2012). Warming experiments underpredict plant phenological responses to climate change. *Nature* 485(7399): 494–497. doi:10.1038/nature11014

 Wynne JJ, Bernard EC, Howarth FG et al. (2014) Disturbance relicts in a rapidly changing world: the Rapa Nui (Easter Island) factor. *BioScience* 64(8): 711–718. doi:10.1093/biosci/biu090

 Xoplaki E, González-Rouco JF, Luterbacher J et al. (2004) Wet season Mediterranean precipitation variability: influence of large-scale dynamics and trends. *Climate Dynamics* 23: 63–78. doi:10.1007/s00382-004-0422-0

 Yazaki T, Iwata Y, Hirota T et al. (2013) Influences of winter climatic conditions on the relation between annual mean soil and air temperatures from central to northern Japan. *Cold Regions Science and Technology* 85: 217–224. doi:10.1016/j.coldregions.2012.09.009

TABLES & BOXES

Box 1. Glossary

 Shallow Subterranean Habitats (acronym SSH). The aphotic subterranean habitats close to the surface, harbouring species showing subterranean adaptations. These include small emerging drainages (hypotelminorheic habitats), small cavities in the uppermost karst layers (epikarst), lava tubes, deep soil and litter strata, talus slopes, surface cracks and fissures (*Milieu Souterrain Superficiel*; MSS) (Culver & Pipan, 2014).

 Subterranean habitats. All the aphotic subterranean spaces harbouring species showing adaptation to subterranean life (troglomorphic traits). These include human-accessible natural subterranean spaces (i.e. "proper caves" *sensu* Curl, 1964), network of fissures with sizes smaller than the human-scale and artificial subterranean habitats (mines, blockhouses, cellars, etc.) (Culver & Pipan, 2009).

 Troglobiont/Stygobiont. A terrestrial (troglo-) or aquatic (stygo-) species having its source population in the subterranean habitat (Trajano & Carvalho, 2017). Usually shows pronounced adaptation to the subterranean conditions.

 Troglophile/Stygophile. A terrestrial (troglo-) or aquatic (stygo-) species forming source populations both in subterranean and surface habitats (Trajano & Carvalho, 2017).

 Troglomorphism. The suite of morphological, physiological and behavioral adaptations to the subterranean habitat (Christiansen, 2012). Examples of troglomorphic traits include pigment loss, eye regression and parallel increase in the development of other receptors and sensory organs, reduction in metabolic rate, increase in life span.

-
-
-
-

1118 **Table 1**. A selection of recent experimental studies investigating the response of 1119 subterranean organisms to global climate change. Only articles written in English are 1120 reported.

FIGURE LEGENDS

 Figure 1. The (theoretical) sinusoidal conduction dominating the thermal signal of a cave. Lines show the theoretical annual trend of mean daily temperatures deep inside the cave (filled black line), in the vicinity of the cave entrance (filled grey line) and outside the cave (dotted line). Note the reduction of the signal amplitude with increasing depths (i.e. buffering effect), the delay of the signal (i.e. thermal inertia), and the strict correspondence between the inner temperature and the mean annual temperature outside (highlighted in the y-axis).

 Figure 2. Eco-evolutionary response to climate change. Potential shifts in the thermal niche of a hypothetical troglobiont and stygobiont along three non-exclusive axes r e p r e s e n t i

n