

 Open access • Journal Article • DOI:10.1111/J.1365-2486.2011.02593.X

Interactions between climate and habitat loss effects on biodiversity: a systematic review and meta-analysis — [Source link](#)

[Chrystal Mantyka-Pringle](#), [Chrystal Mantyka-Pringle](#), [Tara G. Martin](#), [Tara G. Martin](#) ...+1 more authors

Institutions: [University of Queensland](#), [Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation](#)

Published on: 01 Apr 2012 - [Global Change Biology](#) (John Wiley & Sons, Ltd)

Topics: [Habitat fragmentation](#), [Habitat destruction](#) and [Climate change](#)

Related papers:

- [Synergies among extinction drivers under global change.](#)
- [Impacts of climate change on the future of biodiversity.](#)
- [Extinction risk from climate change](#)
- [Very high resolution interpolated climate surfaces for global land areas.](#)
- [Projected impacts of climate and land-use change on the global diversity of birds.](#)

Share this paper:    

View more about this paper here: <https://typeset.io/papers/interactions-between-climate-and-habitat-loss-effects-on-4xm4icwj6>

Interactions between climate and habitat loss effects on biodiversity: a systematic review and meta-analysis

Running Title: Climate and Habitat Loss Interactions

CHRYSTAL S. MANTYKA-PRINGLE^{1,2,3*}, TARA G. MARTIN^{2,3}, and JONATHAN R. RHODES^{1,2}

¹*The University of Queensland, Centre for Spatial Environmental Research, School of Geography, Planning and Environmental Management, Brisbane, Qld 4072, Australia;*
²*Australian Research Council Centre of Excellence for Environmental Decisions, The University of Queensland, Brisbane, Qld 4072, Australia;* ³*Climate Adaptation Flagship, CSIRO Ecosystem Sciences, GPO Box 2583, Brisbane, Qld 4102, Australia*

**Address for correspondence:*

Tel: +61 733 654370

Fax: +61 733 656899

Email: c.mantypaprangle@uq.edu.au

Key words: Meta-analysis, habitat loss, habitat fragmentation, climate change, interactions, mixed-effects logistic regression

Abstract

Climate change and habitat loss are both key threatening processes driving the global loss in biodiversity. Yet little is known about their synergistic effects on biological populations due to the complexity underlying both processes. If the combined effects of habitat loss and climate change are greater than the effects of each threat individually, current conservation management strategies may be inefficient and at worst ineffective. Therefore, there is a pressing need to identify whether interacting effects between climate change and habitat loss exist and, if so, quantify the magnitude of their impact. In this paper, we present a meta-analysis of studies that quantify the effect of habitat loss on biological populations and examine whether the magnitude of these effects depends on current climatic conditions and historical rates of climate change. We examined 1,319 papers on habitat loss and fragmentation, identified from the past 20 years, representing a range of taxa, landscapes, land-uses, geographic locations and climatic conditions. We find that current climate and climate change are important factors determining the negative effects of habitat loss on species density and/or diversity. The most important determinant of habitat loss and fragmentation effects, averaged across species and geographic regions, was current maximum temperature, with mean precipitation change over the last 100 years of secondary importance. Habitat loss and fragmentation effects were greatest in areas with high maximum temperatures. Conversely, they were lowest in areas where average rainfall has increased over time. To our knowledge, this is the first study to conduct a global terrestrial analysis of existing data to quantify and test for interacting effects between current climate, climatic change and habitat loss on biological populations. Understanding the synergistic effects between climate change and other threatening processes has critical implications for our ability to support and incorporate climate change adaptation measures into policy development and management response.

48 **Introduction**

49 One of the most pressing questions of the twenty-first century in ecology and conservation is
50 how do multiple stressors interact and cumulatively impact ecosystems and their biodiversity
51 (Vinebrooke *et al.* 2004; Brook *et al.* 2008; Crain *et al.* 2008)? Climate change, habitat loss,
52 invasive species, disease, pollution, and overexploitation are typically studied and managed
53 in isolation, although it is becoming increasingly clear that a single-stressor perspective is
54 inadequate when ecosystems and species are threatened by multiple, co-occurring stressors
55 (Sala *et al.* 2000; Darling *et al.* 2010).

56 Processes of climatic change and habitat loss happening concurrently are an important
57 example where synergistic effects may occur. Yet most studies reporting effects of climate
58 change (e.g. Williams *et al.* 2003; Miles *et al.* 2004; Parmesan 2006) or habitat loss and
59 fragmentation on biodiversity (e.g. Brooks *et al.* 2002; Fahrig 2003; Cushman 2006) have
60 examined each in isolation. If the potential combined effects of these processes are greater
61 than those estimated individually, then current estimates of habitat loss and fragmentation
62 effects may be misleading (de Chazal & Rounsevell 2009). Nevertheless, substantial changes
63 in terrestrial species' populations and distributions have already been detected world-wide in
64 response to both of these impacts. For landscapes undergoing habitat loss and fragmentation,
65 the effect of losing habitat is obvious: when habitat is lost, dependent species are also likely
66 to be lost and, populations decline (e.g. Andrén 1994; Fahrig 1997, 2001; Bender *et al.* 1998).
67 Habitat fragmentation creates small populations with increased spatial isolation, which also
68 increases the risk of extinction (Opdam 1991; Ellstrand & Elam 1993; Young *et al.* 1996). On
69 the other hand, the presence of scattered vegetation in a landscape may facilitate migration
70 and gene flow among tree populations in response to climate change by providing
71 connectivity across the landscape (Breed *et al.* 2011).

For landscapes undergoing climate change, the effects are less clear. In terms of potential risks to biodiversity, species responses to climate change vary considerably, depending on which species are studied, whether there are any interactions between drivers, whether there are any species interactions, and the spatial and temporal scale considered (de Chazal & Rounsevell 2009). On a global scale, many species have been or are expected to shift their ranges to higher latitudes: from the tropics to the poles (Hickling *et al.* 2005, 2006; Wilson *et al.* 2005). Others will retract and potentially face extinction (Pounds *et al.* 2006; Thomas *et al.* 2006; Sekercioglu *et al.* 2008). The evidence for these changes, however, comes mostly from the documented shifts in the distributions of a few well-studied taxonomic groups (e.g. birds, butterflies and vascular plants) (e.g. Hickling *et al.* 2005, 2006; Sekercioglu *et al.* 2008).

In the few cases where studies examine both the importance of climate change and habitat loss, it is difficult to determine which stressor is the more important driver of long-term trends (e.g. Travis 2003; Opdam & Wascher 2004; Pimm 2008). In general, most studies indicate that, at present, habitat loss and fragmentation outweigh the responses of climate warming on species and ecosystems (Sala *et al.* 2000; Warren *et al.* 2001; Franco *et al.* 2006; Jetz *et al.* 2007), but the impact of climate change is predicted to increase over time and eventually overtake land-use modification in determining population trends (Lemoine *et al.* 2007).

There is growing evidence to suggest that climate change will negatively interact with habitat loss and habitat fragmentation and synergistically contribute to the degradation of biological diversity at the species, genetic and/or habitat level (Schindler 2001; McLaughlin *et al.* 2002; Opdam & Wascher 2004; Pyke 2004; Brook *et al.* 2008). Populations in fragmented landscapes are more vulnerable to environmental drivers such as climate change than those in continuous landscapes (Travis 2003; Opdam & Wascher 2004). For example,

forest clearance and fragmentation can cause localised drying and regional rainfall shifts, enhancing fire risk and restraining the capacity of species to move in response to shifting bioclimatic conditions (Brook *et al.* 2008). A rapid population decline of the green salamander (*Aneides aeneus*) within a highly fragmented habitat in the southern Appalachians, U.S.A. has also been linked with an increase in temperatures since the early 1960s (Corser 2001). Similar findings have also been reported for butterflies in the U.S.A (McLaughlin *et al.* 2002) and in the Mediterranean (Stefanescu *et al.* 2004). Habitat fragmentation and overharvesting, combined with environmental warming in rotifer zooplankton resulted in populations declining up to 50 times faster when all three threats acted together (Mora *et al.* 2007). Jetz *et al.* (2007) showed similar findings for land bird species; 950–1,800 of the world's 8,750 species of land birds could be imperilled by climate change and land conversion by the year 2100. Furthermore, Carroll (2007) modelled the potential impacts of climate change and logging on mammals in south-eastern Canada and the north-eastern United States; interactions between the two stressors increased overall vulnerability of both marten (*Martes americana*) and lynx (*Lynx canadensis*) populations. In contrast, there are very few studies that suggest climate change will positively interact with other impacts such as habitat loss and fragmentation on species. Those reported suggest increasing periods of thermal stress and drought may cause species to rapidly adapt, and these changes, in turn, can potentially help species counter other stressful conditions such as habitat destruction, or realize ecological opportunities arising from climate change (Cormont *et al.* 2011; Hoffmann & Sgrò 2011).

Clearly, the consequences of interactions between landscape change and climate change for biodiversity have the potential to be quite significant. Most climate change impact studies on species have been based on data collected in the temperate zone, where climate change is predicted to be most pronounced, and to date, there have been no global analyses of the

synergistic effects of climate change and habitat loss on biological populations. We address this important issue using a global systematic review and meta-analytic techniques to estimate how current climatic conditions, climate change and habitat loss interact and synergistically impact on terrestrial biological systems. In doing so, we test hypotheses about the generality of interactions between habitat loss, climate change and current climate on biodiversity. More specifically, three hypotheses are tested:

1. The effect of habitat loss on biological populations depends on current climatic conditions and historical rates of climate change.
2. The interaction between habitat loss and climate varies with the type of habitat (i.e. vegetation type) in which a species occurs.
3. The interaction between habitat loss and climate varies with taxonomic group.

Meta-analysis is a quantitative method for synthesizing existing data from multiple studies to test specific hypotheses (Schulze 2004). By systematically combining studies, one attempts to overcome limits of size or scope in individual studies to obtain more reliable and general information about treatment effects (Berman & Parker 2002). There has been some controversy about its validity (LeLorier *et al.* 1997; Garg *et al.* 2008; Stewart 2010), but even knowing its limitations, meta-analysis is considered an ideal framework within which to assess the accumulation of scientific evidence (Berman & Parker 2002; Garg *et al.* 2008) in ecology (Gurevitch *et al.* 2001; Leimu & Koricheva 2004; Luiselli 2008) and in conservation biology (Ojeda-Martinez *et al.* 2007; Aronson *et al.* 2010; Marczak *et al.* 2010). Given the high volume of studies and lines of evidence concerning climate change and habitat loss to date, we believe undertaking a meta-analysis is warranted and timely, and is the best way to test for the generality of such interactions at a global scale.

Materials and methods

To test for interactions between climate change, current climate and habitat loss, we created a database of existing data on habitat loss effects using a systematic review of the literature and then identified relationships between the patterns of habitat loss effects and climate data using mixed-effects logistic regression models.

Criteria for publication selection and data extraction

The first goal of the study was to quantitatively review the results of published studies that statistically analysed the effects of habitat loss (i.e. loss of native habitat) on population density and diversity. Figure 1 shows the process of study identification, study selection and data extraction. A list of research articles published between 1989 and 2009 were generated using the key-words “(habitat loss OR habitat fragmentation) AND (species abundance OR species distribution) AND (impact)” under TOPIC in the database of ISI Web of Science, revealing 1,098 studies. The use of these key-words allowed for the identification of a broad inclusive set of studies on the effects of habitat loss and associated habitat fragmentation on biological populations.

From the list of 1,098 articles, we examined each title and abstract to determine whether they met the criteria for inclusion in the meta-analysis. Inclusion criteria comprised impacts on species abundances, density, diversity and/or richness due to habitat loss. The impact of habitat loss caused by anthropogenic pressures was the only effect measure considered. However, it was not always clear whether a study looked at the impact of habitat loss, habitat fragmentation, patch size effect, isolation or a combination of these, since they are almost always correlated (Fahrig 2003). Thus, if a study measured habitat fragmentation and/or

habitat loss it was included in our analysis. Because our focus was on empirical evidence, theoretical studies and review papers were excluded during this first filter. However, the reference lists in these papers were scrutinized for further studies. Additional studies identified in the course of reading were also included. At each stage of the review the numbers and identities of articles retrieved, accepted, and rejected were recorded (Fig. 1). Remaining articles were then reviewed in full to determine whether they contained relevant and usable data (second filter). The estimated habitat loss effects on species (positive, negative or null relationships) were extracted from the final set of studies (see Appendix 1). If a study reported individual species effects, the effect on each species was recorded. If a study reported only an overall effect for a group of species, a single effect on that group of species was recorded. If the results were not statistically tested then the study was excluded or only those results that were statistically tested were included in the database. The total size of the study area for each study and the proportion of the landscape area covered by suitable habitat were also recorded. For any studies that did not measure the proportion of area covered by suitable habitat, it was sometimes possible to calculate or access the data by other means (see Appendix 1). For 31 studies, this was calculated from the text, tables or graphs, or estimated from their study map. In 27 cases, the primary authors were contacted for unpublished data and in 3 cases we were able to obtain the missing information from another paper that studied the same study region. The study location, study coordinates (if not reported in the paper, Google Earth was used to identify the coordinates), year that the study was completed (if no study year was reported, the year that the paper was published was recorded), response variable measured (density, richness, diversity or probability of occurrence), type of habitat/vegetation type (forest, rainforest, woodland, wetland, savanna/grassland, shrubland/heathland or other) and land-use (agriculture, grazing, urban, natural fragmentation or other) were also tabulated. Finally, each species was classified into one of six taxonomic

groups: birds, plants, arthropods, mammals, amphibians or reptiles. After the second filter we went back and performed another search using the same key-words and time span as above, but substituted the word “impact” for 30 individual countries or regions (Russia, Siberia, China, Turkey, Kazakhstan, Mongolia, Iran, Saudi Arabia, Korea, Egypt, Libya, Pakistan, Algeria, North Africa, Ethiopia, Somalia, Chad, Niger, Mali, Nigeria, Ghana, Guinea, Angola, Congo, Madagascar, Greenland, Denmark, Venezuela, Peru and Alaska) to target geographical areas that were not well represented ($n = 221$). Of these 221 papers, 23 were identified suitable for the meta-analysis using the same criteria as previously.

Climate data

To test for the interaction effect between habitat loss, climate change and current climate we spatially mapped the location of each study site and overlaid the locations on high-resolution global climate data (Fig. 2). For current climatic conditions, we used four bioclimatic variables (1 km² resolution grid) from the WorldClim database (1950-2000 averaged values) (Hijmans *et al.* 2005) without modifications: maximum temperature of warmest month, precipitation of driest month, temperature seasonality and precipitation seasonality. For climatic change, we used two variables: monthly average daily maximum temperature and average monthly precipitation (0.5 km² resolution grid), from the Climatic Research Unit (CRU) at the University of East Anglia (1901-2006) (Mitchell & Jones 2005). From the original CRU climate data variables we calculated the change in temperature and precipitation over time as the difference in mean values between the periods 1977-2006 and 1901-1930 (1977-2006 minus 1901-1930). The two time periods were chosen based on availability of data: using the latest and earliest available years from the CRU data at the time

of analysis (2010). Thirty year time periods were also chosen as a period long enough to eliminate year-to-year variations.

Logistic Regression Models

Mixed-effects logistic regression models were used to model the relationship between the habitat loss effects and the climatic variables, while accounting for variation among studies, taxonomic groups, habitats and land-uses. Mixed-effect models are preferable in ecological data synthesis because their assumption of variance heterogeneity is more likely to be satisfied (Gurevitch *et al.* 2001). In this case, the climatic variables and habitat amount were used as the explanatory variables and a binomial habitat loss effect (negative vs non-negative) was used as the dependent variable. Prior to analysis, correlations among variables were calculated using Pearson's correlation coefficient to test for collinearity among the climatic variables and habitat amount. Habitat amount was not significantly correlated with any of the climatic variables ($r < 0.5$, $p > 0.05$). However, temperature seasonality and precipitation seasonality were identified as being correlated ($r > 0.5$, $p < 0.05$) with maximum temperature of warmest month or precipitation of driest month. Temperature seasonality and precipitation seasonality were therefore removed from the models to reduce the effect of collinearity (Graham 2003). The remaining bioclimatic variables (maximum temperature of warmest month, precipitation of driest month, annual temperature difference and annual precipitation difference) and habitat amount were standardized to have a mean of zero and standard deviation of one prior to running the meta-analysis.

We used a step-wise forward selection analysis to test the significance of random-effects before including them in the logistic regression analyses (Beale *et al.* 1967). Initially all climatic predictors and habitat amount were incorporated as fixed effects and study response

type (i.e. response variable measured in each study: density, richness, diversity, probability of occurrence) was incorporated as a random intercept effect. Random-effects were then sequentially added and tested for statistical significance with likelihood ratio tests using the lme4 package in R 2.11.1 (Team 2010).

Once the significant random effects had been identified, an information theoretic approach using Akaike's Information Criteria (AIC) (Burnham & Anderson 2002) was then used to rank competing models with all combinations of predictors. Model-averaged logistic regression coefficients were then calculated with unconditional standard errors to identify the magnitude of important relationships (Burnham & Anderson 2002). Finally, for each variable, its relative importance was quantified through an index constructed by summing the Akaike weights for all models containing the variable (Burnham & Anderson 2002). To assess the fit of the most parsimonious model, we visually inspected a goodness-of-fit quantile-quantile (Q-Q) plot developed by Landwehr *et al.* (1984) with simulations replicated 1,000 times. Logistic regression Q-Q plots are useful for assessing whether the error distribution of the data is modelled correctly and to detect more general departures from model assumptions (Landwehr *et al.* 1984; Rhodes *et al.* 2009).

Results

Summary of the effects of habitat loss on biodiversity

Out of the 1,319 papers that we reviewed, a total of 168 studies were identified as suitable for our meta-analysis. Many studies, however, reported habitat loss or fragmentation effects on multiple species and/or on several taxa, and so from the 168 studies we had 1,779 data points for our analyses (Appendix 1). The number of publications that cited significantly positive or

no habitat loss/fragmentation effects on single species or a group of species ($n = 1132$; 312 positive & 820 null) exceeded the number that reported significantly negative effects ($n = 647$). Although the number of negatives ($n = 647$) exceeded the number of positives ($n = 312$), their combined total ($n = 959$), opposed to the number of no effects ($n = 820$) was not driven by a sample size effect (logistic regression, $\chi^2 = 406.51$, $df = 1$, $p = 0.434$). Out of the 1,779 effect sizes included, 1,017 (57%) referred to birds, 389 (22%) arthropods, 166 (9%) mammals, 126 (7%) plants, 52 (3%) reptiles, and 29 (2%) amphibians (Appendix 1). Approximately 59% ($n = 1,057$) referred to forest habitats, 12% ($n = 207$) woodland, 10% ($n = 183$) shrubland or heathland, 8% ($n = 140$) rainforest, 5% ($n = 93$) savanna or grassland, 2% ($n = 27$) wetlands, and 4% ($n = 72$) described other various habitats such as farmland, pasture, salt marsh, meadows, coastal sage scrub and coastal dunes (Appendix 1). Papers primarily examined changes in species density (83%, $n = 266$) or species richness (11%, $n = 36$), with only 6% reporting changes in the probability of occurrence ($n = 13$) or species diversity ($n = 6$) (Appendix 1). Figure 2 shows an overview of the geographical spread of studies included in our analyses. It can be seen that most studies were conducted in North America and in Europe; however areas throughout South America, Africa, Asia and Australia are also represented.

The studies we reviewed reported habitat cover (proportion of the area covered by suitable habitat) (Appendix 1) at various spatial scales. Of the 168 studies included, 83 reported habitat cover at the landscape scale, 39 reported habitat cover at the site or treatment scale, and 26 reported treatment effects, but we were only able to obtain habitat cover data at the landscape scale. For 20 of the 168 studies (11.9%) we were unable to obtain the proportion of suitable habitat remaining for either the study landscape or study sites.

The influence of climatic factors on habitat loss and fragmentation effects

The climate data used in the models varied substantially across the study areas. Maximum temperature of warmest month ranged from -1.7 to 41.9 °C, minimum precipitation of driest month from 0 to 202 mm, mean precipitation change from -311.1 to 247.38 mm and mean temperature change from -1.14 to 1.8 °C. Tests of significance indicated that random slopes for study response type and land-use, and random intercepts for taxonomic group, habitat type, and land-use were not significant ($p > 0.05$), and therefore were excluded from the logistic-regression models. Random slopes for taxonomic group and habitat type and a random intercept for study response type were significant ($p < 0.05$) and therefore were included (Table 1).

The most parsimonious model according to AIC was a model containing maximum temperature, mean precipitation change and mean temperature change (AIC = 629.2; Table 2). This model had a comparably high Akaike weight ($W_i = 0.68$) indicating that the combined effects of these three climate variables have good support from the data relative to other models. A model containing maximum temperature and mean precipitation change was the second best model (AIC = 632.1, $\Delta AIC = 2.9$, $W_i = 0.16$), but according to Burnham and Anderson (2002) only models with AIC differences between 0 and 2 have substantial support. The goodness-of-fit Q-Q plot for the best model showed a slight lack of fit at the lower and upper quantiles (Appendix 2). This appears to be due to an inability of the model to account for some of the variation in the tails of distribution of the residuals, rather than a misspecified functional form for the model. Overall, the most important variable was maximum temperature ($w_i = 0.999$), followed by precipitation change ($w_i = 0.857$), and temperature change ($w_i = 0.825$). We found little evidence for the importance of minimum precipitation ($w_i = 0.147$) and habitat amount ($w_i = 0.011$; Table 2).

The model-averaged coefficients revealed that maximum temperature was positively related to habitat loss/fragmentation impacts and had the strongest effect compared to the other climatic factors (Fig. 3). The positive relationship indicates that, as maximum temperature increases, the probability of negative habitat loss/fragmentation impacts also increases. On the other hand, effect sizes for minimum precipitation and precipitation change were negative. The negative relationships indicate that as minimum precipitation increases, the probability of negative habitat loss/fragmentation impact declines. Similarly, the probability of a negative habitat loss/fragmentation effect is lowest where rainfall has increased most over time. Coefficients for temperature change and habitat amount were small in magnitude.

Taxonomic group and habitat type variation

There were very few differences in the habitat loss/fragmentation effect sizes among taxa (Fig. 4). Apart from arthropods, habitat loss/fragmentation effects on species were large and positive for maximum temperature (Fig. 4a). This indicates that, in general, as temperature increases, the chance of a species being negatively affected by habitat loss/fragmentation also increases, especially for reptiles, which had the largest coefficient of 23.026. For arthropods, the effect size was still relatively large but, as temperature increases, the chance of a species being negatively affected by habitat loss/fragmentation declines. On average, all taxonomic groups (excluding plants) had relatively large negative coefficients for precipitation change; in general, habitat loss/fragmentation effects declined in areas where rainfall has increased most over time (Fig. 4c). Plants, on the other hand, displayed no response to precipitation change. For minimum precipitation, negative coefficients were observed for all taxa except birds, which showed no response (Fig. 4b), indicating that as current precipitation increases,

habitat loss/fragmentation effects decline. Effect sizes varied considerably for habitat amount (Fig. 4e). Amphibians and mammals displayed larger positive coefficients, whereas plants and reptiles displayed smaller negative coefficients. This indicates that, as habitat amount increases, the chance of a plant or reptile species being negatively affected by habitat loss/fragmentation declines. In contrast, as habitat amount increases, the chance of an amphibian or mammal species being negatively affected by habitat loss/fragmentation increases. The coefficients for birds and arthropods in relation to habitat amount, and all taxa in relation to temperature change were small (Fig. 4d, e).

Effect sizes for different habitat types showed several distinct differences (Fig. 5). First, the coefficients were more variable than for taxonomic groups, indicating that habitat type probably drives most of the variation in the dataset. Coefficients for forest, savanna/grassland, rainforest and wetland habitats were large and positive for maximum temperature, indicating that as current temperature increases the chance of a species being negatively affected by habitat loss/fragmentation in these habitats also increases (Fig. 5a). Coefficients for woodland, shrubland/heathland and other habitats were negative, but smaller in magnitude, suggesting that the effects of temperature on habitat loss/fragmentation effects in these habitats were relatively minor. For precipitation change, the majority of coefficients (excluding wetlands and other habitats) were negative; habitat loss/fragmentation effects in these habitats were lowest in areas where rainfall has increased most over time (Fig. 5c). The wetland coefficient was small, but for other habitats positive, indicating that habitat loss/fragmentation effects in other habitats were highest in areas where rainfall has increased most over time. Apart from shrubland/heathland, the coefficients for minimum precipitation were relatively small (Fig. 5b). For shrubland/heathland, the chance of a species being negatively affected by habitat loss/fragmentation declines as precipitation increases. Effect sizes varied considerably for temperature change (Fig. 5d). Woodland, shrubland/heathland

and rainforest displayed negative coefficients; habitat loss/fragmentation effects were lowest in areas where temperature has increased most over time. In contrast, habitat loss/fragmentation effects on species in wetlands and other habitats were highest in areas where temperature has increased most. Forest and shrubland/heathland coefficients were small. For habitat amount, the shrubland/heathland, savanna/grassland and wetland coefficients were positive, indicating that as habitat amount increases, the chance of a species in these habitats being negatively affected by habitat loss/fragmentation also increases. All other coefficients were small, except for rainforest; suggesting that the chance of a rainforest species being negatively affected by habitat loss/fragmentation declines as habitat amount increases.

Discussion

We have presented here the first empirical synthesis to quantify and test for interacting effects among current climate, climatic change and habitat loss on terrestrial biological populations at a global scale. Our empirical approach demonstrates that habitat loss and fragmentation effects were greatest where maximum temperature of warmest month was highest (i.e. effects were greatest in areas with high temperatures). Conversely, habitat loss and fragmentation effects were lowest in areas where precipitation has increased most (i.e. smaller effects occurred in areas where average rainfall has increased over time than in areas where rainfall has decreased). These were the two most important variables, with mean temperature change as the third. Therefore both current climate (i.e. maximum temperature) and climate change (i.e. precipitation change) appear to be key determinants of habitat loss and fragmentation effects on terrestrial biodiversity.

Model interpretation

Our results suggest that areas with high current temperatures and where average rainfall has decreased over time exacerbate the negative effects of habitat loss and fragmentation on species density and/or diversity. Over the last 10-15 years, key findings on the ecological effects of high temperatures and extended droughts in terrestrial ecosystems have accumulated (e.g. Davis & Shaw 2001; Walther *et al.* 2002; Parmesan & Yohe 2003; Root *et al.* 2003; Thomas *et al.* 2004; Bates *et al.* 2005; Parmesan 2006; Allen *et al.* 2010). Evidence suggests that stressful conditions appear to drive local population dynamics; however, the responses of both flora and fauna to drought, heat and rain, can vary (Parmesan 2006; Pearson 2006). Species react differently to climate change depending on their life-history characteristics, individual thresholds and many environmental factors (Walther *et al.* 2002). It is also important to recognize that the threshold of climate change below which species extinction occurs or populations severely decline is likely to be determined by the pattern of habitat loss (Opdam & Wascher 2004; Keith *et al.* 2008). For instance, Travis (2003) used a lattice model to investigate the combined impacts of climate change and habitat loss on a hypothetical species and showed that during climatic change, the habitat loss threshold occurs sooner. Habitat loss and fragmentation may increase species susceptibility to climate change by limiting their ability to track climate variations across space (Thomas *et al.* 2004). In contrast, species within high temperature and lower precipitation regions may be more susceptible to fragmentation and habitat destruction because they are unable to adapt rapidly enough to their environmental conditions.

We hypothesized that different taxonomic groups might show different interactions between habitat loss and climate change depending on their functional niche and habitat requirements. In spite of the diverse number of taxonomic groups and species included in the meta-analysis, arthropods were the only group to show little interaction between current

temperature and habitat loss effects compared with other taxa. Studies of this taxa do not appear to be outliers, but rather indicate that differences among taxa may reflect the choice of species sampled. For example, previous studies of insects have reported that single drought years and manipulated water availability cause drastic crashes in some species while leading to population booms in others (Mattson & Haack 1987; Schowalter *et al.* 1999). The arthropods included in our meta-analysis varied greatly from ants, termites, dung beetles, moths, flies, bees, scorpions, amphipods, spiders, cockroaches to butterflies, and included a wide range of specialists, generalists, opportunists, and even hot climate specialists. The range of plants, mammals, reptiles and amphibians, on the other hand, were much more limited. Thus, it is possible that diverse animal groups are more resistant or resilient on average because they are more likely to include various heat-tolerant and drought-resistant species. Specialist species are more prone to extinction during climate change because they tend to have low colonization ability and limited dispersal, whereas generalist species with relatively wider ranges tend to be more resilient (Travis 2003; Thomas *et al.* 2004). Consequently, in order to thoroughly understand how the combined effects of current climate, climate change and habitat loss vary between animal groups, further investigations into specific taxa, functional groups and ecological traits are required. It seems clear, however, at least at the broad taxonomic level that higher order species on average are being more adversely affected by habitat loss and climate interactions.

The variation in effects among habitats were far more complex than among taxonomic groups. Species of the same taxa are often similar in both morphology and ecology, yet they can respond differently in different habitats or distributions depending on the local conditions (Schlichting 1986). For example, it has been well documented that species can change physiologically and morphologically to adapt to their environment (e.g. Davis & Shaw 2001; Losos & Ricklefs 2009; Berg *et al.* 2010; Hofmann & Todgham 2010; Hill *et al.* 2011). This

ability is particularly important in plants, whose sessile life-history requires them to deal with ambient conditions (Wilson *et al.* 1980; Dudley 1996; Aiba *et al.* 2004; Puijalon *et al.* 2005). Other species have adapted to unpredictable habitat availability in space and time by developing high mobility, and consequently are less susceptible to human-induced fragmentation, for example, species from coastal habitats and early succession stages of ecosystems (Opdam & Wascher 2004). In contrast, species in systems with less natural variability, like forests, heathlands and wetlands, have evolved under fairly predictable conditions. Species in those habitats that were found not to be negatively impacted by habitat loss and climate interactions, may therefore be caused by the adaptability or phenotypic plasticity of the species in each habitat, the natural variability of the ecosystem, or both, rather than the type of habitat alone.

Another theory for species not being negatively impacted by habitat loss and climate interactions, within specific habitats, is the notion that the amount of habitat in the landscape and the spatial distribution of remaining habitat may influence the degree to which climate interacts with habitat loss (Opdam & Wascher 2004; Pyke 2004). It has been hypothesized that fragmentation effects should be most pronounced at low levels of habitat cover (Andrén 1994; Bascompte & Solé 1996; Fahrig 1997; Swift & Hannon 2010). Forests, grasslands and wetlands often become highly fragmented with habitat loss, while shrublands, heathlands and other ecosystems such as farmland and pastures are regarded as less vulnerable. Species in highly fragmented ecosystems, when responding to climate change, may therefore be limited by the amount and spatial configuration of habitat (Opdam & Wascher 2004; Pyke 2004). This concept may help to explain some of the variation found among the habitat types in this study, especially in relation to maximum temperature effects. Differences in how authors classify habitats across the globe, and the relatively small number of wetland ($n = 27$) and

savanna or grassland ($n = 93$) samples included in our meta-analysis may also explain some of the variation.

Model limitations

An assumption of meta-analyses is that the studies examined have collected data in a sufficiently similar manner that they can be pooled to identify meaningful patterns. Although habitat cover (proportion of the area covered by suitable habitat) was shown to have little importance in explaining habitat loss/fragmentation effects in our model, the resolution of the habitat amount data was variable and could not be improved, because of inconsistencies in the spatial scales reported among studies and missing data (Appendix 1). Therefore, it's possible that the logistic regression models may have underestimated the impact of habitat cover as a predictor. Despite this limitation, we believe that our results are valid and the lack of a habitat amount effect does not affect our conclusions about the climate effects, which is the main focus of the study. Furthermore, there is a slight lack of fit at the lower and upper quantiles of our model (Appendix 2). This is primarily due to the model failing to capture all of the variation among studies and not a result of a miss-specified functional form. However, because the main aim of the model was to understand how the effects of current climate, climate change and habitat loss interact and synergistically impact on biological systems rather than as a general predictive model we do not believe this affects our overall conclusions. As discussed earlier, the relationships among habitats that may explain the unexplained variation are complex and should be explored in more detail in future work.

Implications for conservation

The results of this study have important implications for conservation of biodiversity under climate change. A plethora of modelling studies have already shown the potential impacts of climate change on the distributions and abundances of species (e.g. Easterling *et al.* 2000; Berry *et al.* 2002; Midgley *et al.* 2003; Thomas *et al.* 2004; Thuiller 2004; Harrison *et al.* 2006; Márquez *et al.* 2010). While many studies have postulated about the potential for synergetic effects between climate change and other stressors (e.g. Harvell *et al.* 2002; Pyke 2004, 2005; Christensen *et al.* 2006; Brook *et al.* 2008) few studies have examined these interactions explicitly. The analysis conducted in this study provides an empirical test using direct examples to inform conservation biologists of what responses we can expect to see more of in the coming decades.

Integrated assessments, such as this one, on how species and ecosystems respond to climate and habitat loss can help to identify appropriate actions for biodiversity conservation and assist in preparing for future conservation challenges. The overall breakthrough that emerges from this paper is the discovery that areas with high temperatures where average rainfall has decreased over time augment the negative effects of habitat loss on species density and/or diversity. The question now is whether existing management strategies for conserving biodiversity are still appropriate under predicted climatic conditions? Management strategies should focus towards areas with warmer climates, especially those that are more susceptible to precipitation change. In the case where biodiversity is threatened by interactions among climate change and other stressors, there are essentially two main approaches to minimising loss. Where climate change interactions are expected to be relatively small and knowledge and capacity high, the best feasible option might be to continue what we are already doing. That is, building resilience in a system to climate change, for example, through habitat restoration, and continued management of other stressors such as pest management, and fire and grazing management. Existing measures

against drought such as protecting and creating migration corridors (Anderson & Jenkins 2006) should also be intensified, to reduce the negative interaction between habitat loss and climate change, especially in fragmented landscapes. However, in areas where the effects of climate change and interactions are expected to be severe, our current suite of management actions may be ineffective. It may be appropriate in these cases to use a mixture of more proactive management strategies instead; such as species translocation (McDonald-Madden *et al.* 2011), engineering habitat to reduce impact of interactions (Brook *et al.* 2008), and even abandoning effort on saving species in one area in favour of other areas (Botrill *et al.* 2008). Monitoring that informs management is thus essential here to pre-emptively identify populations that may suffer decline, and to assess cost-effective and feasible management actions (Field *et al.* 2004; Carwardine *et al.* 2011).

Acknowledgements

We thank the study authors, in particular those who responded to our emails and provided additional data and/or information regarding their study area. Special thanks to L. Cattarino (Centre for Spatial Environmental Research, University of Queensland) for his statistical support and for modifying the goodness-of-fit R code. We are also grateful for the comments and inputs from C. McAlpine (Centre of Excellence for Environmental Decisions, University of Queensland), R. McAllister (CSIRO Ecosystem Sciences), A. Kythreotis (Global Change Institute, University of Queensland) and the reviewers of this manuscript whom helped to improve the manuscript considerably. Research was funded in part by a University of Queensland Early Career Researcher Grant (JRR), a Queensland Government Smart Futures PhD Scholarship (CMP), an Australian Government Postgraduate Award (CMP), and a Julius

Career Award (TGM). Finally, this research was also conducted with the support of funding from the Australian Research Council's Center of Excellence for Environmental Decisions.

References

Aiba S, Kitayama K, Takyu M (2004) Habitat associations with topography and canopy structure of tree species in a tropical montane forest on Mount Kinabalu, Borneo. *Plant Ecology*, **174**, 147-161.

Allen CD, Macalady AK, Chenchouni H *et al.* (2010) A global overview of drought and heat-induced tree mortality reveals emerging climate change risks for forests. *Forest Ecology and Management*, **259**, 660-684. Anderson AB, Jenkins CN (2006) *Applying Nature's Design: Corridors as a Strategy for Biodiversity Conservation*, Columbia University Press, New York.

Andrén H (1994) Effects of habitat fragmentation on birds and mammals in landscapes with different proportions of suitable habitat: A review. *Oikos*, **71**, 355-366.

Aronson J, Blignaut JN, Milton SJ *et al.* (2010) Are socioeconomic benefits of restoration adequately quantified? A meta-analysis of recent papers (2000-2008) in restoration ecology and 12 other scientific journals. *Restoration Ecology*, **18**, 143-154.

Bascompte J, Solé RV (1996) Habitat fragmentation and extinction thresholds in spatially explicit models. *Journal of Animal Ecology*, **65**, 465-473.

Bates JW, Thompson K, Grime JP (2005) Effects of simulated long-term climatic change on the bryophytes of a limestone grassland community. *Global Change Biology*, **11**, 757-769.

Beale EML, Kendall MG, Mann DW (1967) The discarding of variables in multivariate analysis. *Biometrika*, **54**, 357-366.

554 Bender DJ, Contreras TA, Fahrig L (1998) Habitat loss and population decline: A meta-
555 analysis of the patch size effect. *Ecology*, **79**, 517-533.

556 Berg MP, Kiers ET, Driessen G *et al.* (2010) Adapt or disperse: understanding species
557 persistence in a changing world. *Global Change Biology*, **16**, 587-598.

558 Berman NG, Parker RA (2002) Meta-analysis: neither quick nor easy. *BMC Medical*
559 *Research Methodology*, **2**, 10.

560 Berry PM, Dawson TP, Harrison PA, Pearson RG (2002) Modelling potential impacts of
561 climate change on the bioclimatic envelope of species in Britain and Ireland. *Global*
562 *Ecology and Biogeography*, **11**, 453-462.

563 Bottrill MC, Joseph LN, Carwardine J *et al.* (2008) Is conservation triage just smart decision
564 making? *Trends in Ecology & Evolution*, **23**, 649-654.

565 Breed MF, Ottewell KM, Gardner MG, Lowe AJ (2011) Clarifying climate change
566 adaptation responses for scattered trees in modified landscapes. *Journal of Applied*
567 *Ecology*, **48**, 637-641.

568 Brook BW, Sodhi NS, Bradshaw CJA (2008) Synergies among extinction drivers under
569 global change. *Trends in Ecology & Evolution*, **23**, 453-460. Brook BW, Sodhi NS,
570 Bradshaw CJA (2008) Synergies among extinction drivers under global change.
571 *Trends in Ecology & Evolution*, **23**, 453-460.

572 Brooks TM, Mittermeier RA, Mittermeier CG *et al.* (2002) Habitat loss and extinction in the
573 hotspots of biodiversity. *Conservation Biology*, **16**, 909-923.

574 Burnham KP, Anderson DR (2002) *Model selection and multimodel inference: A practical*
575 *information-theoretic approach*, Springer-Verlag, New York.

576 Carroll C (2007) Interacting effects of climate change, landscape conversion, and harvest on
577 carnivore populations at the range margin: marten and lynx in the northern
578 Appalachians. *Conservation Biology*, **21**, 1092-1104.

579 Carwardine J, O'Connor T, Legge S, Mackey B, Possingham HP, Martin TG (2011) *Priority*
580 *threat management to protect Kimberley wildlife*, CSIRO Ecosystem Sciences,
581 Brisbane.

582 Christensen MR, Graham MD, Vinebrooke RD, Findlay DL, Paterson MJ, Turner MA (2006)
583 Multiple anthropogenic stressors cause ecological surprises in boreal lakes. *Global*
584 *Change Biology*, **12**, 2316-2322.

585 Cormont A, Malinowska A, Kostenko O, Radchuk V, Hemerik L, WallisDeVries M,
586 Verboom J (2011) Effect of local weather on butterfly flight behaviour, movement,
587 and colonization: Significance for dispersal under climate change. *Biodiversity and*
588 *Conservation*, **20**, 483-503.

589 Corser JD (2001) Decline of disjunct green salamander (*Aneides aeneus*) populations in the
590 southern Appalachians. *Biological Conservation*, **97**, 119-126.

591 Crain CM, Kroeker K, Halpern BS (2008) Interactive and cumulative effects of multiple
592 human stressors in marine systems. *Ecology Letters*, **11**, 1304-1315.

593 Cushman SA (2006) Effects of habitat loss and fragmentation on amphibians: a review and
594 prospectus. *Biological Conservation*, **128**, 231-240.

595 Darling ES, McClanahan TR, Côté IM (2010) Combined effects of two stressors on Kenyan
596 coral reefs are additive or antagonistic, not synergistic. *Conservation Letters*, **3**, 122-
597 130.

598 Davis MB, Shaw RG (2001) Range shifts and adaptive responses to Quaternary climate
599 change. *Science*, **292**, 673-679.

600 de Chazal J, Rounsevell MDA (2009) Land-use and climate change within assessments of
601 biodiversity change: A review. *Global Environmental Change-Human and Policy*
602 *Dimensions*, **19**, 306-315.

603 Dudley SA (1996) The response to differing selection on plant physiological traits: evidence
604 for local adaptation. *Evolution*, **50**, 103-110.

605 Easterling DR, Meehl GA, Parmesan C, Changnon SA, Karl TR, Mearns LO (2000) Climate
606 extremes: observations, modeling, and impacts. *Science*, **289**, 2068-2074.

607 Ellstrand NC, Elam DR (1993) Population genetic consequences of small population size:
608 Implications for plant conservation. *Annual Review of Ecology and Systematics*, **24**,
609 217-242.

610 Fahrig L (1997) Relative effects of habitat loss and fragmentation on population extinction.
611 *The Journal of Wildlife Management*, **61**, 603-610.

612 Fahrig L (2001) How much habitat is enough? *Biological Conservation*, **100**, 65-74.

613 Fahrig L (2003) Effects of habitat fragmentation on biodiversity. *Annual Review of Ecology*,
614 *Evolution, and Systematics*, **34**, 487-515.

615 Field SA, Tyre AJ, Jonzen N, Rhodes JR, Possingham HP (2004) Minimizing the cost of
616 environmental management decisions by optimizing statistical thresholds. *Ecology*
617 *Letters*, **7**, 669-675.

618 Franco AMA, Hill JK, Kitchke C *et al.* (2006) Impacts of climate warming and habitat loss
619 on extinctions at species' low-latitude range boundaries. *Global Change Biology*, **12**,
620 1545-1553.

621 Garg AX, Hackam D, Tonelli M (2008) Systematic review and meta-analysis: When one
622 study is just not enough. *Clinical Journal of the American Society of Nephrology*, **3**,
623 253-260.

624 Graham MH (2003) Confronting multicollinearity in ecological multiple regression. *Ecology*,
625 **84**, 2809-2815.

626 Gurevitch J, Curtis PS, Jones MH (2001) Meta-analysis in ecology. *Advances in Ecological*
627 *Research*, **32**, 199-247.

628 Harrison PA, Berry PM, Butt N, New M (2006) Modelling climate change impacts on
629 species' distributions at the European scale: implications for conservation policy.
630 *Environmental Science & Policy*, **9**, 116-128.

631 Harvell CD, Mitchell CE, Ward JR, Altizer S, Dobson AP, Ostfeld RS, Samuel MD (2002)
632 Climate warming and disease risks for terrestrial and marine biota. *Science*, **296**,
633 2158-2162.

634 Hickling R, Roy DB, Hill JK, Fox R, Thomas CD (2006) The distributions of a wide range of
635 taxonomic groups are expanding polewards. *Global Change Biology*, **12**, 450-455.

636 Hickling R, Roy DB, Hill JK, Thomas CD (2005) A northward shift of range margins in
637 British Odonata. *Global Change Biology*, **11**, 502-506.

638 Hijmans RJ, Cameron SE, Parra JL, Jones PG, Jarvis A (2005) Very high resolution
639 interpolated climate surfaces for global land areas. *International Journal of*
640 *Climatology*, **25**, 1965-1978.

641 Hill JK, Griffiths HM, Thomas CD (2011) Climate change and evolutionary adaptations at
642 species' range margins. *Annual Review of Entomology*, **56**, 143-159.

643 Hoffmann AA, Sgrò CM (2011) Climate change and evolutionary adaptation. *Nature*, **470**,
644 479-485.

645 Hofmann GE, Todgham AE (2010) Living in the now: Physiological mechanisms to tolerate
646 a rapidly changing environment. *Annual Review of Physiology*, **72**, 127-145.

647 Jetz W, Wilcove DS, Dobson AP (2007) Projected impacts of climate and land-use change on
648 the global diversity of birds. *PLoS Biology*, **5**, 1211-1219.

649 Keith DA, Akçakaya HR, Thuiller W *et al.* (2008) Predicting extinction risks under climate
650 change: coupling stochastic population models with dynamic bioclimatic habitat
651 models. *Biology Letters*, **4**, 560-563.

652 Landwehr JM, Pregibon D, Shoemaker AC (1984) Graphical methods for assessing logistic
653 regression models. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, **79**, 61-71.

654 Leimu R, Koricheva J (2004) Cumulative meta-analysis: A new tool for detection of temporal
655 trends and publication bias in ecology. *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London
656 Series B-Biological Sciences*, **271**, 1961-1966.

657 LeLorier J, Gregoire G, Benhaddad A, Lapierre J, Derderian F (1997) Discrepancies between
658 meta-analyses and subsequent large randomized, controlled trials. *New England
659 Journal of Medicine*, **337**, 536-542.

660 Lemoine N, Bauer HG, Peintinger M, Bohning-Gaese K (2007) Effects of climate and land-
661 use change on species abundance in a central European bird community.
662 *Conservation Biology*, **21**, 495-503.

663 Losos JB, Ricklefs RE (2009) Adaptation and diversification on islands. *Nature*, **457**, 830-
664 836.

665 Luiselli L (2008) Community ecology of African reptiles: historical perspective and a meta-
666 analysis using null models. *African Journal of Ecology*, **46**, 384-394.

667 Marczak LB, Sakamaki T, Turvey SL, Deguise I, Wood SLR, Richardson JS (2010) Are
668 forested buffers an effective conservation strategy for riparian fauna? An assessment
669 using meta-analysis. *Ecological Applications*, **20**, 126-134.

670 Márquez A, Real R, Olivero J, Estrada A (2010) Combining climate with other influential
671 factors for modelling the impact of climate change on species distribution. *Climatic
672 Change*, **108**, 1-23.

673 Mattson WJ, Haack RA (1987) The role of drought in outbreaks of plant-eating insects.
674 *Bioscience*, **37**, 110-118.

675 McDonald-Madden E, Runge MC, Possingham HP, Martin TG (2011) Optimal timing for
676 managed relocation of species faced with climate change. *Nature Climate Change*, **1**,
677 261-265.

678 McLaughlin JF, Hellmann JJ, Boggs CL, Ehrlich PR (2002) Climate change hastens
679 population extinctions. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the*
680 *United States of America*, **99**, 6070-6074.

681 Midgley GF, Hannah L, Millar D, Thuiller W, Booth A (2003) Developing regional and
682 species-level assessments of climate change impacts on biodiversity in the Cape
683 Floristic Region. *Biological Conservation*, **112**, 87-97.

684 Miles L, Grainger A, Phillips O (2004) The impact of global climate change on tropical forest
685 biodiversity in Amazonia. *Global Ecology and Biogeography*, **13**, 553-565.

686 Mitchell TD, Jones PD (2005) An improved method of constructing a database of monthly
687 climate observations and associated high-resolution grids. *International Journal of*
688 *Climatology*, **25**, 693-712.

689 Mora C, Metzger R, Rollo A, Myers RA (2007) Experimental simulations about the effects of
690 overexploitation and habitat fragmentation on populations facing environmental
691 warming. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, **274**, 1023-1028.

692 Ojeda-Martinez C, Bayle-Sempere JT, Sanchez-Jerez P, Forcada A, Valle C (2007) Detecting
693 conservation benefits in spatially protected fish populations with meta-analysis of
694 long-term monitoring data. *Marine Biology*, **151**, 1153-1161.

695 Opdam P (1991) Metapopulation theory and habitat fragmentation: A review of holarctic
696 breeding bird studies. *Landscape Ecology*, **5**, 93-106.

697 Opdam P, Wascher D (2004) Climate change meets habitat fragmentation: Linking landscape
698 and biogeographical scale levels in research and conservation. *Biological*
699 *Conservation*, **117**, 285-297.

700 Parmesan C (2006) Ecological and evolutionary responses to recent climate change. *Annual*
701 *Review of Ecology Evolution and Systematics*, **37**, 637-669.

702 Parmesan C, Yohe G (2003) A globally coherent fingerprint of climate change impacts across
703 natural systems. *Nature*, **421**, 37-42.

704 Pearson RG (2006) Climate change and the migration capacity of species. *Trends in Ecology*
705 *& Evolution*, **21**, 111-113.

706 Pimm SL (2008) Biodiversity: Climate change or habitat loss - which will kill more species?
707 *Current Biology*, **18**, R117-R119.

708 Pounds JA, Bustamante MR, Coloma LA *et al.* (2006) Widespread amphibian extinctions
709 from epidemic disease driven by global warming. *Nature*, **439**, 161-167.

710 Puijalon S, Bornette G, Sagnes P (2005) Adaptations to increasing hydraulic stress:
711 Morphology, hydrodynamics and fitness of two higher aquatic plant species. *Journal*
712 *of Experimental Botany*, **56**, 777-786.

713 Pyke CR (2004) Habitat loss confounds climate change impacts. *Frontiers in Ecology and the*
714 *Environment*, **2**, 178-182.

715 Pyke CR (2005) Interactions between habitat loss and climate change: Implications for fairy
716 shrimp in the central valley ecoregion of California, USA. *Climatic Change*, **68**, 199-
717 218.

718 R Development Core Team (2010) *R: A language and environment for statistical computing*.
719 R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna

720 Rhodes JR, McAlpine CA, Zuur AF, Smith GM, Ieno EN (2009) Glmm applied on the spatial
721 distribution of koalas in a fragmented landscape. In: *Mixed effects models and*
722 *extensions in ecology with R* (eds Zuur AF, Ieno EN, Walker N, Saveliev AA, Smith
723 GM), pp 469-492. Springer, New York.

724 Root TL, Price JT, Hall KR, Schneider SH, Rosenzweig C, Pounds JA (2003) Fingerprints of
725 global warming on wild animals and plants. *Nature*, **421**, 57-60.

726 Sala OE, Chapin FS, Armesto JJ *et al.* (2000) Biodiversity - global biodiversity scenarios for
727 the year 2100. *Science*, **287**, 1770-1774.

728 Schindler DW (2001) The cumulative effects of climate warming and other human stresses
729 on Canadian freshwaters in the new millennium. *Canadian Journal of Fisheries and*
730 *Aquatic Sciences*, **58**, 18-29.

731 Schlichting CD (1986) The evolution of phenotypic plasticity in plants. *Annual Review of*
732 *Ecology and Systematics*, **17**, 667-693.

733 Schowalter TD, Lightfoot DC, Whitford WG (1999) Diversity of arthropod responses to host-
734 plant water stress in a desert ecosystem in southern New Mexico. *American Midland*
735 *Naturalist*, **142**, 281-290.

736 Schulze R (2004) *Meta-analysis : A comparison of approaches*, Hogrefe & Huber, Toronto.

737 Sekercioglu CH, Schneider SH, Fay JP, Loarie SR (2008) Climate change, elevational range
738 shifts, and bird extinctions. *Conservation Biology*, **22**, 140-150.

739 Stefanescu C, Herrando S, Paramo F (2004) Butterfly species richness in the north-west
740 Mediterranean Basin: the role of natural and human-induced factors. *Journal of*
741 *Biogeography*, **31**, 905-915.

742 Stewart G (2010) Meta-analysis in applied ecology. *Biology Letters*, **6**, 78-81.

743 Swift TL, Hannon SJ (2010) Critical thresholds associated with habitat loss: a review of the
744 concepts, evidence, and applications. *Biological Reviews*, **85**, 35-53.

745 Thomas CD, Cameron A, Green RE *et al.* (2004) Extinction risk from climate change.
746 *Nature*, **427**, 145-148.

747 Thomas CD, Franco AMA, Hill JK (2006) Range retractions and extinction in the face of
748 climate warming. *Trends in Ecology & Evolution*, **21**, 415-416.

- Thuiller W (2004) Patterns and uncertainties of species' range shifts under climate change. *Global Change Biology*, **10**, 2020-2027.
- Travis JMJ (2003) Climate change and habitat destruction: a deadly anthropogenic cocktail. *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London Series B-Biological Sciences*, **270**, 467-473.
- Vinebrooke RD, Cottingham KL, Norberg J, Scheffer M, Dodson SI, Maberly SC, Sommer U (2004) Impacts of multiple stressors on biodiversity and ecosystem functioning: The role of species co-tolerance. *Oikos*, **104**, 451-457.
- Walther GR, Post E, Convey P *et al.* (2002) Ecological responses to recent climate change. *Nature*, **416**, 389-395.
- Warren MS, Hill JK, Thomas JA *et al.* (2001) Rapid responses of British butterflies to opposing forces of climate and habitat change. *Nature*, **414**, 65-69.
- Williams SE, Bolitho EE, Fox S (2003) Climate change in Australian tropical rainforests: an impending environmental catastrophe. *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London. Series B: Biological Sciences*, **270**, 1887-1892.
- Wilson J, Ludlow M, Fisher M, Schulze E (1980) Adaptation to water stress of the leaf water relations of four tropical forage species. *Functional Plant Biology*, **7**, 207-220.
- Wilson K, Pressey RL, Newton A, Burgman M, Possingham H, Weston C (2005) Measuring and incorporating vulnerability into conservation planning. *Environmental Management*, **35**, 527-543.
- Young A, Boyle T, Brown T (1996) The population genetic consequences of habitat fragmentation for plants. *Trends in Ecology & Evolution*, **11**, 413-418.

Appendix 1

773 Abensperg-Traun M, Smith GT, Arnold GW, Steven DE (1996) The effects of habitat
774 fragmentation and livestock-grazing on animal communities in remnants of gimlet
775 *Eucalyptus salubris* woodland in the Western Australian wheatbelt: 1. Arthropods.
776 *Journal of Applied Ecology*, **33**, 1281-1301.

777 Aerts R, Lerouge F, November E, Lens L, Hermy M, Muys B (2008) Land rehabilitation and
778 the conservation of birds in a degraded Afromontane landscape in northern Ethiopia.
779 *Biodiversity and Conservation*, **17**, 53-69.

780 Amuno JB, Massa R, Dranzoa C (2007) Abundance, movements and habitat use by African
781 Grey Parrots (*Psittacus erithacus*) in Budongo and Mabira forest reserves, Uganda.
782 *Ostrich*, **78**, 225-231.

783 Anderson J, Cowlshaw G, Rowcliffe JM (2007) Effects of forest fragmentation on the
784 abundance of *Colobus angolensis palliatus* in Kenya's coastal forests. *International*
785 *Journal of Primatology*, **28**, 637-655.

786 Andrén H (1992) Corvid density and nest predation in relation to forest fragmentation - a
787 landscape perspective. *Ecology*, **73**, 794-804.

788 Arroyo-Rodríguez V, Aguirre A, Benítez-Malvido J, Mandujano S (2007) Impact of rain
789 forest fragmentation on the population size of a structurally important palm species:
790 *Astrocaryum mexicanum* at Los Tuxtlas, Mexico. *Biological Conservation*, **138**, 198-
791 206.

792 Arroyo-Rodríguez V, Mandujano S (2006) The importance of tropical rain forest fragments
793 to the conservation of plant species diversity in Los Tuxtlas, Mexico. *Biodiversity and*
794 *Conservation*, **15**, 4159-4179.

795 Avendaño-Mendoza C, Morón-Ríos A, Cano E, León-Cortés J (2005) Dung beetle
796 community (Coleoptera : Scarabaeidae : Scarabaeinae) in a tropical landscape at the
797 Lachua Region, Guatemala. *Biodiversity and Conservation*, **14**, 801-822.

798 Baker MD, Lacki MJ (1997) Short-term changes in bird communities in response to
 799 silvicultural prescriptions. *Forest Ecology and Management*, **96**, 27-36.

800 Bayne EM, Hobson KA (1998) The effects of habitat fragmentation by forestry and
 801 agriculture on the abundance of small mammals in the southern boreal mixedwood
 802 forest. *Canadian Journal of Zoology*, **76**, 62-69.

803 Baz A, Garcia-Boyero A (1995) The effects of forest fragmentation on butterfly communities
 804 in central Spain. *Journal of Biogeography*, **22**, 129-140.

805 Beale EML, Kendall MG, Mann DW (1967) The discarding of variables in multivariate
 806 analysis. *Biometrika*, **54**, 357-366.

807 Bellamy PE, Hinsley SA, Newton I (1996) Factors influencing bird species numbers in small
 808 woods in south-east England. *Journal of Applied Ecology*, **33**, 249-262.

809 Bentley JM, Catterall CP (1997) The use of bushland, corridors, and linear remnants by birds
 810 in southeastern Queensland, Australia. *Conservation Biology*, **11**, 1173-1189.

811 Berg A (1997) Diversity and abundance of birds in relation to forest fragmentation, habitat
 812 quality and heterogeneity. *Bird Study*, **44**, 355-366.

813 Bernarde PS, Macedo LC (2008) The impact of deforestation and pastures on the leaf-litter
 814 frog community in Rondônia, Brazil. *Iheringia Serie Zoologia*, **98**, 454-459.

815 Blaum N, Rossmanith E, Jeltsch F (2007a) Land use affects rodent communities in Kalahari
 816 savannah rangelands. *African Journal of Ecology*, **45**, 189-195.

817 Blaum N, Rossmanith E, Popp A, Jeltsch F (2007b) Shrub encroachment affects mammalian
 818 carnivore abundance and species richness in semiarid rangelands. *Acta Oecologica*,
 819 **31**, 86-92.

820 Bolger DT, Alberts AC, Sauvajot RM *et al.* (1997a) Response of rodents to habitat
 821 fragmentation in coastal southern California. *Ecological Applications*, **7**, 552-563.

- 822 Bolger DT, Scott TA, Rotenberry JT (1997b) Breeding bird abundance in an urbanizing
823 landscape in coastal southern California. *Conservation Biology*, **11**, 406-421.
- 824 Bruna EM, Vasconcelos HL, Heredia S (2005) The effect of habitat fragmentation on
825 communities of mutualists: Amazonian ants and their host plants. *Biological*
826 *Conservation*, **124**, 209-216.
- 827 Burke D, Goulet H (1998) Landscape and area effects on beetle assemblages in Ontario.
828 *Ecography*, **21**, 472-479.
- 829 Cadotte MW, Franck R, Reza L, Lovett-Doust J (2002) Tree and shrub diversity and
830 abundance in fragmented littoral forest of southeastern Madagascar. *Biodiversity and*
831 *Conservation*, **11**, 1417-1436.
- 832 Canaday C (1996) Loss of insectivorous birds along a gradient of human impact in
833 Amazonia. *Biological Conservation*, **77**, 63-77.
- 834 Carrascal LM, Palomino D, Seoane J, Alonso CL (2008) Habitat use and population density
835 of the houbara bustard *Chlamydotis undulata* in Fuerteventura (Canary Islands).
836 *African Journal of Ecology*, **46**, 291-302.
- 837 Catterall CP, Kingston MB, Park K, Sewell S (1998) Deforestation, urbanisation and
838 seasonality: Interacting effects on a regional bird assemblage. *Biological*
839 *Conservation*, **84**, 65-81.
- 840 Cozzi G, Muller CB, Krauss J (2008) How do local habitat management and landscape
841 structure at different spatial scales affect fritillary butterfly distribution on fragmented
842 wetlands? *Landscape Ecology*, **23**, 269-283.
- 843 Cresswell W, Wilson JM, Vickery J, Jones P, Holt S (2007) Changes in densities of Sahelian
844 bird species in response to recent habitat degradation. *Ostrich*, **78**, 247-253.
- 845 Darveau M, Beauchesne P, Belanger L, Huot J, Larue P (1995) Riparian forest strips as
846 habitat for breeding birds in boreal forest. *Journal of Wildlife Management*, **59**, 67-78.

847 Davies KF, Margules CR (1998) Effects of habitat fragmentation on carabid beetles:
848 Experimental evidence. *Journal of Animal Ecology*, **67**, 460-471.

849 Davis ALV (1993) Biogeographical groups in a southern African, winter rainfall, dung beetle
850 assemblage (Coleoptera, Scarabaeidae) - consequences of climatic history and habitat
851 fragmentation. *African Journal of Ecology*, **31**, 306-327.

852 Davis ALV (1994) Habitat fragmentation in southern Africa and distributional response
853 patterns in 5 specialist or generalist dung beetle families (Coleoptera). *African*
854 *Journal of Ecology*, **32**, 192-207.

855 Delis PR, Mushinsky HR, McCoy ED (1996) Decline of some west-central Florida anuran
856 populations in response to habitat degradation. *Biodiversity and Conservation*, **5**,
857 1579-1595.

858 Desouza OFF, Brown VK (1994) Effects of habitat fragmentation on Amazonian termite
859 communities. *Journal of Tropical Ecology*, **10**, 197-206.

860 Didham RK, Lawton JH, Hammond PM, Eggleton P (1998) Trophic structure stability and
861 extinction dynamics of beetles (Coleoptera) in tropical forest fragments.
862 *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B-Biological Sciences*, **353**, 437-451.

863 Downes SJ, Handasyde KA, Elgar MA (1997) The use of corridors by mammals in
864 fragmented Australian eucalypt forests. *Conservation Biology*, **11**, 718-726.

865 Drapeau P, Leduc A, Giroux JF, Savard JPL, Bergeron Y, Vickery WL (2000) Landscape-
866 scale disturbances and changes in bird communities of boreal mixed-wood forests.
867 *Ecological Monographs*, **70**, 423-444.

868 Driscoll DA (2004) Extinction and outbreaks accompany fragmentation of a reptile
869 community. *Ecological Applications*, **14**, 220-240.

870 Drolet B, Desrochers A, Fortin MJ (1999) Effects of landscape structure on nesting songbird
871 distribution in a harvested boreal forest. *Condor*, **101**, 699-704.

872 Dubbert M, Tschardt T, Vidal S (1998) Stem-boring insects of fragmented Calamagrostis
 873 habitats: herbivore-parasitoid community structure and the unpredictability of grass
 874 shoot abundance. *Ecological Entomology*, **23**, 271-280.

875 Dunford W, Freemark K (2005) Matrix matters: Effects of surrounding land uses on forest
 876 birds near Ottawa, Canada. *Landscape Ecology*, **20**, 497-511.

877 Dunstan CE, Fox BJ (1996) The effects of fragmentation and disturbance of rainforest on
 878 ground-dwelling small mammals on the Robertson Plateau, New South Wales,
 879 Australia. *Journal of Biogeography*, **23**, 187-201.

880 Echeverría C, Newton AC, Lara A, Benayas JMR, Coomes DA (2007) Impacts of forest
 881 fragmentation on species composition and forest structure in the temperate landscape
 882 of southern Chile. *Global Ecology and Biogeography*, **16**, 426-439.

883 Edenius L, Elmberg J (1996) Landscape level effects of modern forestry on bird communities
 884 in north Swedish boreal forests. *Landscape Ecology*, **11**, 325-338.

885 Edenius L, Sjöberg K (1997) Distribution of birds in natural landscape mosaics of old-growth
 886 forests in northern Sweden: relations to habitat area and landscape context.
 887 *Ecography*, **20**, 425-431.

888 Escobar F, Halfpeter G, Solis A, Halfpeter V, Navarrete D (2008) Temporal shifts in dung beetle
 889 community structure within a protected area of tropical wet forest: a 35-year study
 890 and its implications for long-term conservation. *Journal of Applied Ecology*, **45**,
 891 1584-1592.

892 Fahrig L, Jonsen I (1998) Effect of habitat patch characteristics on abundance and diversity
 893 of insects in an agricultural landscape. *Ecosystems*, **1**, 197-205.

894 Fahrig L (2001) How much habitat is enough? *Biological Conservation*, **100**, 65-74.

895 Fairbanks DHK (2002) Regional land-use impacts affecting avian richness patterns in
896 southern Africa-insights from historical avian atlas data. In: *98th Annual Meeting of*
897 *the Association-of-American-Geographers*, pp 268-288. Los Angeles, California.

898 Fenton MB, Cumming DHM, Rautenbach IL *et al.* (1998) Bats and the loss of tree canopy in
899 African woodlands. *Conservation Biology*, **12**, 399-407.

900 Fitzgibbon CD (1993) The distribution of gray squirrel dreys in farm woodland - the
901 influence of wood area, isolation and management. *Journal of Applied Ecology*, **30**,
902 736-742.

903 Fitzgibbon CD (1994) The distribution and abundance of the golden-rumped elephant-shrew
904 *Rhynchocyon chrysopygus* in Kenyan coastal forests. *Biological Conservation*, **67**,
905 153-160.

906 Fitzgibbon CD (1997) Small mammals in farm woodlands: the effects of habitat, isolation
907 and surrounding land-use patterns. *Journal of Applied Ecology*, **34**, 530-539.

908 Flather CH, Sauer JR (1996) Using landscape ecology to test hypotheses about large-scale
909 abundance patterns in migratory birds. *Ecology*, **77**, 28-35.

910 Fortin D, Arnold GW (1997) The influence of road verges on the use of nearby small
911 shrubland remnants by birds in the central wheatbelt of Western Australia. *Wildlife*
912 *Research*, **24**, 679-689.

913 Frankie GW, Vinson SB, Rizzardi MA, Griswold TL, O'Keefe S, Snelling RR (1997)
914 Diversity and abundance of bees visiting a mass flowering tree species in disturbed
915 seasonal dry forest, Costa Rica. *Journal of the Kansas Entomological Society*, **70**,
916 281-296.

917 Friesen LE, Eagles PFJ, MacKay RJ (1995) Effects of residential development on forest
918 dwelling neotropical migrant songbirds. *Conservation Biology*, **9**, 1408-1414.

919 Gardner TA, Ribeiro-Junior MA, Barlow J, Cristina T, Avila-Pires S, Hoogmoed MS, Peres
 920 CA (2007) The value of primary, secondary, and plantation forests for a neotropical
 921 herpetofauna. *Conservation Biology*, **21**, 775-787.

922 Gibbs JP, Stanton EJ (2001) Habitat fragmentation and arthropod community change: carrion
 923 beetles, phoretic mites, and flies. *Ecological Applications*, **11**, 79-85.

924 Graham MH (2003) Confronting multicollinearity in ecological multiple regression. *Ecology*,
 925 **84**, 2809-2815.

926 Hagan JM, McKinley PS, Meehan AL, Grove SL (1997) Diversity and abundance of
 927 landbirds in a northeastern industrial forest. *Journal of Wildlife Management*, **61**, 718-
 928 735.

929 Hamel PB, Smith WP, Wahl JW (1993) Wintering bird populations of fragmented forest
 930 habitat in the central basin, Tennessee. *Biological Conservation*, **66**, 107-115.

931 Hanowski JM, Niemi GJ, Christian DC (1997) Influence of within-plantation heterogeneity
 932 and surrounding landscape composition on avian communities in hybrid poplar
 933 plantations. *Conservation Biology*, **11**, 936-944.

934 Hanski I, Pakkala T, Kuussaari M, Lei GC (1995) Metapopulation persistence of an
 935 endangered butterfly in a fragmented landscape. *Oikos*, **72**, 21-28.

936 Herkert JR (1994) The effects of habitat fragmentation on midwestern grassland bird
 937 communities. *Ecological Applications*, **4**, 461-471.

938 Hillers A, Veith M, Rodelt MO (2008) Effects of forest fragmentation and habitat
 939 degradation on west African leaf-litter frogs. *Conservation Biology*, **22**, 762-772.

940 Hinsley SA, Bellamy PE, Newton I, Sparks TH (1996) Influences of population size and
 941 woodland area on bird species distributions in small woods. *Oecologia*, **105**, 100-106.

942 Hobson KA, Bayne E (2000) Effects of forest fragmentation by agriculture on avian
 943 communities in the southern boreal mixed woods of western Canada. *Wilson Bulletin*,
 944 **112**, 373-387.

945 Hoffmann BD (2000) Changes in ant species composition and community organisation along
 946 grazing gradients in semi-arid rangelands of the Northern Territory. *Rangeland*
 947 *Journal*, **22**, 171-189.

948 Honnay O, Hermy M, Coppin P (1999) Effects of area, age and diversity of forest patches in
 949 Belgium on plant species richness, and implications for conservation and
 950 reforestation. *Biological Conservation*, **87**, 73-84.

951 Jennings VH, Tallamy DW (2006) Composition and abundance of ground-dwelling
 952 Coleoptera in a fragmented and continuous forest. *Environmental Entomology*, **35**,
 953 1550-1560.

954 Johns BW (1993) The influence of grove size on bird species richness in Aspen parklands.
 955 *Wilson Bulletin*, **105**, 256-264.

956 Jones DT, Susilo FX, Bignell DE, Hardiwinoto S, Gillison AN, Eggleton P (2003) Termite
 957 assemblage collapse along a land-use intensification gradient in lowland central
 958 Sumatra, Indonesia. *Journal of Applied Ecology*, **40**, 380-391.

959 Jullien M, Thiollay JM (1996) Effects of rain forest disturbance and fragmentation:
 960 comparative changes of the raptor community along natural and human-made
 961 gradients in French Guiana. *Journal of Biogeography*, **23**, 7-25.

962 Keith LB, Bloomer SEM, Willebrand T (1993) Dynamics of a snowshoe hare population in
 963 fragmented habitat. *Canadian Journal of Zoology*, **71**, 1385-1392.

964 Keller ME, Anderson SH (1992) Avian use of habitat configurations created by forest cutting
 965 in southeastern Wyoming. *Condor*, **94**, 55-65.

966 Kissling ML, Garton EO (2008) Forested buffer strips and breeding bird communities in
 967 southeast Alaska. *Journal of Wildlife Management*, **72**, 674-681.

968 Kiviniemi K, Eriksson O (2002) Size-related deterioration of semi-natural grassland
 969 fragments in Sweden. *Diversity and Distributions*, **8**, 21-29.

970 Kossenko SM, Kaygorodova EY (2007) Reproduction of the middle spotted woodpecker
 971 *Dendrocopos medius* in the Nerussa-Desna woodland, SW Russia, with particular
 972 reference to habitat fragmentation, weather conditions and food supply. *Ardea*, **95**,
 973 177-189.

974 Kozlov MV (1996) Patterns of forest insect distribution within a large city: Microlepidoptera
 975 in St Petersburg, Russia. *Journal of Biogeography*, **23**, 95-103.

976 Krauss J, Steffan-Dewenter I, Tschardt T (2004) Landscape occupancy and local
 977 population size depends on host plant distribution in the butterfly *Cupido minimus*.
 978 *Biological Conservation*, **120**, 355-361.

979 Krishnamurthy SV (2003) Amphibian assemblages in undisturbed and disturbed areas of
 980 Kudremukh National Park, central western Ghats, India. *Environmental Conservation*,
 981 **30**, 274-282.

982 Kurki S, Nikula A, Helle P, Linden H (1998) Abundances of red fox and pine marten in
 983 relation to the composition of boreal forest landscapes. *Journal of Animal Ecology*,
 984 **67**, 874-886.

985 Laakkonen J, Fisher RN, Case TJ (2001) Effect of land cover, habitat fragmentation and ant
 986 colonies on the distribution and abundance of shrews in southern California. *Journal*
 987 *of Animal Ecology*, **70**, 776-788.

988 Landwehr JM, Pregibon D, Shoemaker AC (1984) Graphical methods for assessing logistic
 989 regression models. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, **79**, 61-71.

990 Larsen TH, Lopera A, Forsyth A (2008) Understanding trait-dependent community
 991 disassembly: Dung beetles, density functions, and forest fragmentation. *Conservation*
 992 *Biology*, **22**, 1288-1298.

993 Laurance WF (1991) Ecological correlates of extinction proneness in Australian tropical rain-
 994 forest mammals. *Conservation Biology*, **5**, 79-89.

995 Laurance WF (1994) Rainforest fragmentation and the structure of small mammal
 996 communities in tropical Queensland. *Biological Conservation*, **69**, 23-32.

997 Lehouck V, Spanhove T, Colson L, Adringa-Davis A, Cordeiro NJ, Lens L (2009) Habitat
 998 disturbance reduces seed dispersal of a forest interior tree in a fragmented African
 999 cloud forest. *Oikos*, **118**, 1023-1034.

1000 Lindenmayer DB, Cunningham RB, Pope ML (1999a) A large-scale "experiment" to
 1001 examine the effects of landscape context and habitat fragmentation on mammals.
 1002 *Biological Conservation*, **88**, 387-403.

1003 Lindenmayer DB, Cunningham RB, Pope ML, Donnelly CF (1999b) The response of
 1004 arboreal marsupials to landscape context: a large-scale fragmentation study.
 1005 *Ecological Applications*, **9**, 594-611.

1006 Lloyd H (2008) Abundance and patterns of rarity of *Polylepis* birds in the Cordillera
 1007 Vilcanota, southern Perú: implications for habitat management strategies. *Bird*
 1008 *Conservation International*, **18**, 164-180.

1009 Luiselli L, Capizzi D (1997) Influences of area, isolation and habitat features on distribution
 1010 of snakes in Mediterranean fragmented woodlands. *Biodiversity and Conservation*, **6**,
 1011 1339-1351.

1012 Lumaret R, Guillermin JL, Maillet J, Verlaque R (1997) Plant species diversity and polyploidy
 1013 in islands of natural vegetation isolated in extensive cultivated lands. *Biodiversity and*
 1014 *Conservation*, **6**, 591-613.

- 1015 Lumsden LF, Bennett AF (2005) Scattered trees in rural landscapes: foraging habitat for
1016 insectivorous bats in south-eastern Australia. *Biological Conservation*, **122**, 205-222.
- 1017 Mac Nally R, Bennett AF, Horrocks G (2000) Forecasting the impacts of habitat
1018 fragmentation. Evaluation of species-specific predictions of the impact of habitat
1019 fragmentation on birds in the box-ironbark forests of central Victoria, Australia.
1020 *Biological Conservation*, **95**, 7-29.
- 1021 Mac Nally R, Brown GW (2001) Reptiles and habitat fragmentation in the box-ironbark
1022 forests of central Victoria, Australia: predictions, compositional change and faunal
1023 nestedness. *Oecologia*, **128**, 116-125.
- 1024 MacHunter J, Wright W, Loyn R, Rayment P (2006) Bird declines over 22 years in forest
1025 remnants in southeastern Australia: evidence of faunal relaxation? *Canadian Journal*
1026 *of Forest Research*, **36**, 2756-2768.
- 1027 Margules CR, Milkovits GA, Smith GT (1994) Contrasting effects of habitat fragmentation
1028 on the scorpion *Cercophonius squama* and an amphipod. *Ecology*, **75**, 2033-2042.
- 1029 Marsh DM, Pearman PB (1997) Effects of habitat fragmentation on the abundance of two
1030 species of Leptodactylid frogs in an Andean montane forest. *Conservation Biology*,
1031 **11**, 1323-1328.
- 1032 Martin JL, Gaston AJ, Hitier S (1995) The effect of island size and isolation on old-growth
1033 forest habitat and bird diversity in Gwaii-Haanas (Queen-Charlotte-Islands, Canada).
1034 *Oikos*, **72**, 115-131.
- 1035 Martin JL, Lepart J (1989) Impoverishment in the bird community of a Finnish archipelago -
1036 the role of island size, isolation and vegetation structure. *Journal of Biogeography*,
1037 **16**, 159-172.
- 1038 Martin TG, Catterall CP (2001) Do fragmented coastal heathlands have habitat value to birds
1039 in eastern Australia? *Wildlife Research*, **28**, 17-31.

1040 Martin TG, McIntye S (2007) Impacts of livestock grazing and tree clearing on birds of
 1041 woodland and riparian habitats. *Conservation Biology*, **21**, 504-514.
 1042 Masis A, Marquis RJ (2009) Effects of even-aged and uneven-aged timber management on
 1043 dung beetle community attributes in a Missouri Ozark forest. *Forest Ecology and*
 1044 *Management*, **257**, 536-545.
 1045 May R, Landa A, van Dijk J, Linnell JDC, Andersen R (2006) Impact of infrastructure on
 1046 habitat selection of wolverines *Gulo gulo*. *Wildlife Biology*, **12**, 285-295.
 1047 Mazerolle MJ, Drolet B, Desrochers A (2001) Small-mammal responses to peat mining of
 1048 southeastern Canadian bogs. *Canadian Journal of Zoology*, **79**, 296-302.
 1049 McCollin D (1993) Avian distribution patterns in a fragmented wooded landscape (North-
 1050 Humberside, UK) - the role of between-patch and within-patch structure. *Global*
 1051 *Ecology and Biogeography Letters*, **3**, 48-62.
 1052 McGarigal K, McComb WC (1995) Relationships between landscape structure and breeding
 1053 birds in the Oregon coast range. *Ecological Monographs*, **65**, 235-260.
 1054 Meulebrouck K, Ameloot E, Verheyen K, Hermy M (2007) Local and regional factors
 1055 affecting the distribution of the endangered holoparasite *Cuscuta epithymum* in
 1056 heathlands. *Biological Conservation*, **140**, 8-18.
 1057 Milden M, Cousins SAO, Eriksson O (2007) The distribution of four grassland plant species
 1058 in relation to landscape history in a Swedish rural area. *Annales Botanici Fennici*, **44**,
 1059 416-426.
 1060 Moreau G, Eveleigh ES, Lucarotti CJ, Quiring DT (2006) Stage-specific responses to
 1061 ecosystem alteration in an eruptive herbivorous insect. *Journal of Applied Ecology*,
 1062 **43**, 28-34.

- 1063 Nakagawa M, Miguchi H, Nakashizuka T (2006) The effects of various forest uses on small
1064 mammal communities in Sarawak, Malaysia. *Forest Ecology and Management*, **231**,
1065 55-62.
- 1066 Negro M, Casale A, Migliore L, Palestini C, Rolando A (2007) The effect of local
1067 anthropogenic habitat heterogeneity on assemblages of carabids (Coleoptera,
1068 Caraboidea) endemic to the Alps. *Biodiversity and Conservation*, **16**, 3919-3932.
- 1069 Nicolas V, Barriere P, Tapiero A, Colyn M (2009) Shrew species diversity and abundance in
1070 Ziama Biosphere Reserve, Guinea: comparison among primary forest, degraded forest
1071 and restoration plots. *Biodiversity and Conservation*, **18**, 2043-2061.
- 1072 Norton DA, Hobbs RJ, Atkins L (1995) Fragmentation, disturbance, and plant-distribution:
1073 mistletoes in woodland remnants in the Western Australian wheatbelt. *Conservation*
1074 *Biology*, **9**, 426-438.
- 1075 Nowicki P, Pepkowska A, Kudlek J, Skorka P, Witek M, Settele J, Woyciechowski M (2007)
1076 From metapopulation theory to conservation recommendations: lessons from spatial
1077 occurrence and abundance patterns of Maculinea butterflies. *Biological Conservation*,
1078 **140**, 119-129.
- 1079 O'Farrell PJ, Donaldson JS, Hoffman MT, Mader AD (2008) Small mammal diversity and
1080 density on the Bokkeveld escarpment, South Africa - implications for conservation
1081 and livestock predation. *African Zoology*, **43**, 117-124.
- 1082 Paciencia MLB, Prado J (2005) Effects of forest fragmentation on pteridophyte diversity in a
1083 tropical rain forest in Brazil. *Plant Ecology*, **180**, 87-104.
- 1084 Paracuellos M (2008) Effects of long-term habitat fragmentation on a wetland bird
1085 community. *Revue d'écologie*, **63**, 227-238.

- 1086 Paritsis J, Aizen MA (2008) Effects of exotic conifer plantations on the biodiversity of
1087 understory plants, epigeal beetles and birds in *Nothofagus dombeyi* forests. *Forest*
1088 *Ecology and Management*, **255**, 1575-1583.
- 1089 Patterson MP, Best LB (1996) Bird abundance and nesting success in Iowa CRP fields: The
1090 importance of vegetation structure and composition. *American Midland Naturalist*,
1091 **135**, 153-167.
- 1092 Peters MK, Likare S, Kraemer M (2008) Effects of habitat fragmentation and degradation on
1093 flocks of African ant-following birds. *Ecological Applications*, **18**, 847-858.
- 1094 Pimm SL (2008) Biodiversity: Climate change or habitat loss - which will kill more species?
1095 *Current Biology*, **18**, R117-R119.
- 1096 Potvin F, Courtois R (2006) Incidence of spruce grouse in residual forest strips within large
1097 clear-cut boreal forest landscapes. *Northeastern Naturalist*, **13**, 507-520.
- 1098 Presley SJ, Willig MR, Castro-Arellano I, Weaver SC (2009) Effects of habitat conversion on
1099 temporal activity patterns of Phyllostomid bats in lowland Amazonian rain forest.
1100 *Journal of Mammalogy*, **90**, 210-221.
- 1101 Raghu S, Clarke AR, Drew RAI, Hulsman K (2000) Impact of habitat modification on the
1102 distribution and abundance of fruit flies (Diptera : Tephritidae) in southeast
1103 Queensland. *Population Ecology*, **42**, 153-160.
- 1104 Reif J, Voříšek P, Št'astný K, Koschová M, Bejček V (2008) The impact of climate change
1105 on long-term population trends of birds in a central European country. *Animal*
1106 *Conservation*, **11**, 412-421.
- 1107 Renjifo LM (1999) Composition changes in a subandean avifauna after long-term forest
1108 fragmentation. *Conservation Biology*, **13**, 1124-1139.

- 1109 Rhim SJ, Lee WS (2007) Influence of forest fragmentation on the winter abundance of
 1110 mammals in Mt. Chirisan National Park, South Korea. *Journal of Wildlife*
 1111 *Management*, **71**, 1404-1408.
- 1112 Roberge JM, Angelstam P, Villard MA (2008) Specialised woodpeckers and naturalness in
 1113 hemiboreal forests - deriving quantitative targets for conservation planning.
 1114 *Biological Conservation*, **141**, 997-1012.
- 1115 Rolstad J, Wegge P, Sivkov AV, Hjeljord O, Storaunet KO (2009) Size and spacing of grouse
 1116 leks: Comparing capercaillie (*Tetrao urogallus*) and black grouse (*Tetrao tetrix*) in
 1117 two contrasting Eurasian boreal forest landscapes. *Canadian Journal of Zoology*, **87**,
 1118 1032-1043.
- 1119 Romey WL, Ascher JS, Powell DA, Yanek M (2007) Impacts of logging on midsummer
 1120 diversity of native bees (Apoidea) in a northern hardwood forest. *Journal of the*
 1121 *Kansas Entomological Society*, **80**, 327-338.
- 1122 Rosenberg KV, Lowe JD, Dhondt AA (1999) Effects of forest fragmentation on breeding
 1123 tanagers: a continental perspective. *Conservation Biology*, **13**, 568-583.
- 1124 Roth DS, Perfecto I, Rathcke B (1994) The effects of management-systems on ground-
 1125 foraging ant diversity in Costa-Rica. *Ecological Applications*, **4**, 423-436.
- 1126 Rukke BA (2000) Effects of habitat fragmentation: increased isolation and reduced habitat
 1127 size reduces the incidence of dead wood fungi beetles in a fragmented forest
 1128 landscape. *Ecography*, **23**, 492-502.
- 1129 Saavedra B, Simonetti JA (2005) Small mammals of Maulino forest remnants, a vanishing
 1130 ecosystem of south-central Chile. *Mammalia*, **69**, 337-348.
- 1131 Sanchez-Zapata JA, Carrete M, Grailov A, Sklyarenko S, Ceballos O, Donazar JA, Hiraldo
 1132 F (2003) Land use changes and raptor conservation in steppe habitats of eastern
 1133 Kazakhstan. *Biological Conservation*, **111**, 71-77.

- 1134 Scheffler PY (2005) Dung beetle (Coleoptera : Scarabaeidae) diversity and community
 1135 structure across three disturbance regimes in eastern Amazonia. *Journal of Tropical*
 1136 *Ecology*, **21**, 9-19.
- 1137 Schieck J, Lertzman K, Nyberg B, Page R (1995) Effects of patch size on birds in old-growth
 1138 montane forests. *Conservation Biology*, **9**, 1072-1084.
- 1139 Scott DM, Brown D, Mahood S, Denton B, Silburn A, Rakotondraparany F (2006) The
 1140 impacts of forest clearance on lizard, small mammal and bird communities in the arid
 1141 spiny forest, southern Madagascar. *Biological Conservation*, **127**, 72-87.
- 1142 Sewell SR, Catterall CP (1998) Bushland modification and styles of urban development: their
 1143 effects on birds in south-east Queensland. *Wildlife Research*, **25**, 41-63.
- 1144 Shahabuddin G, Terborgh JW (1999) Frugivorous butterflies in Venezuelan forest fragments:
 1145 abundance, diversity and the effects of isolation. *Journal of Tropical Ecology*, **15**,
 1146 703-722.
- 1147 Shanker K, Sukumar R (1998) Community structure and demography of small-mammal
 1148 populations in insular montane forests in southern India. *Oecologia*, **116**, 243-251.
- 1149 Shriver WG, Hodgman TP, Gibbs JP, Vickery PD (2004) Landscape context influences salt
 1150 marsh bird diversity and area requirements in New England. *Biological Conservation*,
 1151 **119**, 545-553.
- 1152 Sitompul AF, Kinnaird MF, O'Brien TG (2004) Size matters: the effects of forest
 1153 fragmentation and resource availability on the endemic Sumba hornbill *Aceros*
 1154 *everetti*. *Bird Conservation International*, **14**, S23-S37.
- 1155 Smith CM, Wachob DG (2006) Trends associated with residential development in riparian
 1156 breeding bird habitat along the Snake River in Jackson Hole, WY, USA: implications
 1157 for conservation planning. *Biological Conservation*, **128**, 431-446.

1158 Smith GT, Arnold GW, Sarre S, Abensperg-Traun M, Steven DE (1996) The effects of
 1159 habitat fragmentation and livestock-grazing on animal communities in remnants of
 1160 gimlet *Eucalyptus salubris* woodland in the Western Australian wheatbelt. 2. Lizards.
 1161 *Journal of Applied Ecology*, **33**, 1302-1310.

1162 Suarez AV, Bolger DT, Case TJ (1998) Effects of fragmentation and invasion on native ant
 1163 communities in coastal southern California. *Ecology*, **79**, 2041-2056.

1164 Suárez F, Martínez C, Herranz J, Yanes M (1997) Conservation status and farmland
 1165 requirements of pin-tailed sandgrouse *Pterocles alchata* and black-bellied sandgrouse
 1166 *Pterocles orientalis* in Spain. *Biological Conservation*, **82**, 73-80.

1167 Suaz-Ortuno I, Alvarado-Diaz J, Martinez-Ramos M (2008) Effects of conversion of dry
 1168 tropical forest to agricultural mosaic on herpetofaunal assemblages. *Conservation*
 1169 *Biology*, **22**, 362-374.

1170 Telleria JL, Santos T (1995) Effects of forest fragmentation on a guild of wintering
 1171 passerines - the role of habitat selection. *Biological Conservation*, **71**, 61-67.

1172 Thiollay JM (1993) Response of a raptor community to shrinking area and degradation of
 1173 tropical rain-forest in the south western Ghâts (India). *Ecography*, **16**, 97-110.

1174 Thiollay JM (1997) Distribution and abundance patterns of bird community and raptor
 1175 populations in the Andaman archipelago. *Ecography*, **20**, 67-82.

1176 Thiollay JM (2006) Large bird declines with increasing human pressure in savanna
 1177 woodlands (Burkina Faso). *Biodiversity and Conservation*, **15**, 2085-2108.

1178 Trainor CR (2007) Changes in bird species composition on a remote and well-forested
 1179 Wallacean Island, South-East Asia. *Biological Conservation*, **140**, 373-385.

1180 Trzcinski MK, Fahrig L, Merriam G (1999) Independent effects of forest cover and
 1181 fragmentation on the distribution of forest breeding birds. *Ecological Applications*, **9**,
 1182 586-593.

- 1183 Tschardt T, Steffan-Dewenter I, Kruess A, Thies C (2002) Contribution of small habitat
1184 fragments to conservation of insect communities of grassland-cropland landscapes.
1185 *Ecological Applications*, **12**, 354-363.
- 1186 Tubelis DP, Lindenmayer DB, Cowling A (2007) Bird populations in native forest patches in
1187 south-eastern Australia: the roles of patch width, matrix type (age) and matrix use.
1188 *Landscape Ecology*, **22**, 1045-1058.
- 1189 Vallan D (2000) Influence of forest fragmentation on amphibian diversity in the nature
1190 reserve of Ambohitantely, highland Madagascar. *Biological Conservation*, **96**, 31-43.
- 1191 Vanapeldoorn RC, Celada C, Nieuwenhuizen W (1994) Distribution and dynamics of the red
1192 squirrel (*Sciurus-vulgaris* L.) in a landscape with fragmented habitat. *Landscape*
1193 *Ecology*, **9**, 227-235.
- 1194 Vanapeldoorn RC, Oostenbrink WT, Vanwinden A, Vanderzee FF (1992) Effects of habitat
1195 fragmentation on the bank vole, *Clethrionomys glareolus*, in an agricultural
1196 landscape. *Oikos*, **65**, 265-274.
- 1197 Vanderpoorten A, Engels P, Sotiaux A (2004) Trends in diversity and abundance of obligate
1198 epiphytic bryophytes in a highly managed landscape. *Ecography*, **27**, 567-576.
- 1199 Vega LE, Bellagamba PJ, Fitzgerald LA (2000) Long-term effects of anthropogenic habitat
1200 disturbance on a lizard assemblage inhabiting coastal dunes in Argentina. *Canadian*
1201 *Journal of Zoology*, **78**, 1653-1660.
- 1202 Vickery JA, Tallowin JR, Feber RE, Asteraki EJ, Atkinson PW, Fuller RJ, Brown VK (2001)
1203 The management of lowland neutral grasslands in Britain: effects of agricultural
1204 practices on birds and their food resources. *Journal of Applied Ecology*, **38**, 647-664.
- 1205 Villard MA, Trzcinski MK, Merriam G (1999) Fragmentation effects on forest birds: relative
1206 influence of woodland cover and configuration on landscape occupancy.
1207 *Conservation Biology*, **13**, 774-783.

1208 Wada N, Narita K, Kumar S, Furukawa A (1995) Impact of overgrazing on seed predation by
1209 rodents in the Thar Desert, northwestern India. *Ecological Research*, **10**, 217-221.

1210 Watson JEM, Whittaker RJ, Dawson TP (2004) Avifaunal responses to habitat fragmentation
1211 in the threatened littoral forests of south-eastern Madagascar. *Journal of*
1212 *Biogeography*, **31**, 1791-1807.

1213 Williams SE, Pearson RG (1997) Historical rainforest contractions, localized extinctions and
1214 patterns of vertebrate endemism in the rainforests of Australia's wet tropics.
1215 *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London Series B-Biological Sciences*, **264**, 709-
1216 716.

1217 Willig MR, Presley SJ, Bloch CP *et al.* (2007) Phyllostomid bats of lowland Amazonia:
1218 effects of habitat alteration on abundance. *Biotropica*, **39**, 737-746.

1219 Wolff A, Dieuleveut T, Martin JL, Bretagnolle V (2002) Landscape context and little bustard
1220 abundance in a fragmented steppe: implications for reserve management in mosaic
1221 landscapes. *Biological Conservation*, **107**, 211-220.

1222 Woodford JE, Meyer MW (2003) Impact of lakeshore development on green frog abundance.
1223 *Biological Conservation*, **110**, 277-284.

1224 Zabel J, Tschardt T (1998) Does fragmentation of *Urtica* habitats affect phytophagous and
1225 predatory insects differentially? *Oecologia*, **116**, 419-425.

1226 Zartman CE (2003) Habitat fragmentation impacts on epiphyllous bryophyte communities in
1227 central Amazonia. *Ecology*, **84**, 948-954.

1228

1229

1230

1231

1232

Tables

Table 1 List of parameters included in the logistic-regression analyses to test whether study habitat loss/fragmentation effect sizes are related to current climate and/or climatic change

Parameter	Description	Type of variance/effect
Taxa	taxonomic group	random slope effect
Habitat	type of habitat	random slope effect
Study response	response variable measured	random intercept effect
Habitat amount	proportion of the area covered by suitable habitat	fixed effect
Max temperature	maximum temperature of warmest month (1950-2000)	fixed effect
Min precipitation	precipitation of driest month (1950-2000)	fixed effect
Mean precipitation change	annual average precipitation difference ((1977-2006) - (1901-1930))	fixed effect
Mean temperature change	annual average temperature difference ((1977-2006) - (1901-1930))	fixed effect

Table 2 Logistic-regression models with habitat loss/fragmentation effects as the dependent variable and climatic parameters and habitat amount as independent variables. Random-effect variables coding for study (intercept), taxonomic group (slope) and habitat type (slope) were included in all models. The table indicates the fixed-effect variables included in each model, the Akaike's information criterion scores (AIC), the difference between the AIC for a given model and the best fitting model (Δ AIC), AIC weights (W_i) and the individual variable weights (w_i)

Model	Variables	AIC	Δ AIC	Model weights (W_i)
XIX	mtwm + precdiff + tmxdiff	629.2	0.0	0.68
VII	mtwm + precdiff	632.1	2.9	0.16
XVII	mtwm + podm + tmxdiff	632.4	3.2	0.14
XX	mtwm + precdiff + habper	637.7	8.5	0.01
VI	mtwm + podm	639.4	10.2	0.00
XXVI	mtwm + podm + precdiff + tmxdiff	639.4	10.2	0.00
VIII	mtwm + tmxdiff	641.7	12.5	0.00
XVI	mtwm + podm + precdiff	642.4	13.2	0.00
XXIX	mtwm + precdiff + tmxdiff + habper	643.7	14.5	0.00
IX	mtwm + habper	645.7	16.5	0.00
XXVIII	mtwm + podm + tmxdiff + habper	646.5	17.3	0.00
I	mtwm	648.8	19.6	0.00
XVIII	mtwm + podm + habper	649.9	20.7	0.00
XXI	mtwm + tmxdiff + habper	650.0	20.8	0.00
XXV	precdiff + tmxdiff + habper	652.8	23.6	0.00
XXVII	mtwm + podm + precdiff + habper	654.9	25.7	0.00
XXXI	mtwm + podm + precdiff + tmxdiff + habper	659.3	30.1	0.00
XXII	podm + precdiff + tmxdiff	660.6	31.4	0.00
XXIV	podm + tmxdiff + habper	665.6	36.4	0.00
XXX	podm + precdiff + tmxdiff + habper	665.7	36.5	0.00

XIV	precdiff + habper			669.1	39.9	0.00
XI	podm + tmxdiff			669.3	40.1	0.00
XIII	precdiff + tmxdiff			670.0	40.8	0.00
XXIII	podm + precdiff + habper			678.6	49.4	0.00
XV	tmxdiff + habper			680.8	51.6	0.00
V	habper			693.0	63.8	0.00
III	precdiff			695.1	65.9	0.00
XII	podm + habper			695.3	66.1	0.00
X	podm + precdiff			695.5	66.3	0.00
IV	tmxdiff			698.2	69.0	0.00
II	podm			703.9	74.7	0.00
N	Null			716.8	87.6	0.00
Individual variable weights (w_i)		mtwm	precdiff	tmxdiff	podm	habper
		0.999	0.857	0.825	0.147	0.011

Models are ranked by ΔAIC values; bold indicates lowest AIC value in model set.

mtwm = maximum temperature of warmest month; podm = precipitation of driest month; precdiff = annual average precipitation difference; tmxdiff = annual average temperature difference; habper = proportion of the area covered by suitable habitat.

Figure legends

Fig. 1. Flow chart detailing the process of study identification, selection and data extraction for studies included in the meta-analysis.

Fig. 2. Location of studies and maximum temperature of warmest month, WorldClim 1950-2000 (Hijmans *et al.* 2005) ($n = 168$).

Fig. 3. Coefficient averages from the logistic regression models in Table 2 explaining the variation in habitat loss and fragmentation effects on biological populations as influenced by current climate, climatic change and amount of habitat. max temperature = maximum temperature of warmest month; min precipitation = precipitation of driest month; mean precipitation change = annual average precipitation difference; mean temperature change = annual average temperature difference; habitat amount = proportion of the area covered by suitable habitat.

Fig. 4. Logistic regression coefficients for each taxonomic group averaged across all models and combined with the fixed-effect model-averaged coefficients. Positive associations exist between habitat loss/fragmentation effects and (a) maximum temperature of warmest month, (b) minimum precipitation of driest month, (c) mean annual precipitation difference, (d) mean annual temperature difference, or (e) habitat amount for taxonomic groups with coefficients greater than zero. Negative associations exist for those taxonomic groups with coefficients less than zero.

Fig. 5. Logistic regression coefficients for each habitat type averaged across all models and combined with the fixed-effect model-averaged coefficients. Positive associations exist between habitat loss/fragmentation effects and (a) maximum temperature of warmest month, (b) minimum precipitation of driest month, (c) mean annual precipitation difference, (d) mean

annual temperature difference, or (e) habitat amount for habitats with coefficients greater than zero. Negative associations exist for those habitats with coefficients less than zero.