International Journal of Science and Research Archive

eISSN: 2582-8185

Cross Ref DOI: 10.30574/ijsra

Journal homepage: https://ijsra.net/

(Review Article)

Check for updates

Small mammal communities as indicators of habitat health: A review

Ayomiposi Ayodele *

Department of Ecology and Conservation Biology, Texas A& M University, Texas, USA.

International Journal of Science and Research Archive, 2025, 15(02), 576-594

Publication history: Received on 03 April 2025; revised on 10 May 2025; accepted on 12 May 2025

Article DOI: https://doi.org/10.30574/ijsra.2025.15.2.1413

Abstract

Small mammal communities are increasingly recognized as reliable indicators of habitat health due to their ecological sensitivity, rapid life histories, and broad distribution across diverse ecosystems. Changes in the abundance, diversity, and composition of small mammals often reflect alterations in vegetation structure, soil quality, hydrology, and anthropogenic disturbance. This review synthesizes current knowledge on the ecological functions of small mammals, their responses to environmental changes, and the methodologies employed to assess their populations. Case studies from forest, grassland, wetland, and urban ecosystems illustrate the potential of small mammal metrics to inform conservation planning, habitat restoration, and environmental monitoring. Limitations associated with sampling biases, temporal variability, and ethical considerations are discussed, along with emerging opportunities to integrate technological advancements such as environmental DNA (eDNA) and automated monitoring systems. Incorporating small mammal community assessments into habitat evaluations provides a powerful framework for early detection of ecosystem degradation and supports evidence-based habitat management strategies.

Keywords: Small Mammal; Habitat Health; Environmental DNA; Conservation Biology and Biodiversity Monitoring

1. Introduction

Assessing habitat health is fundamental for understanding ecosystem functioning, guiding conservation efforts, and detecting early signs of environmental degradation. Biological indicators, or bioindicators, provide critical information about habitat conditions by reflecting changes in environmental quality over time [1,2]. Among the various taxa proposed as bioindicators, small mammals have received increasing attention due to their ecological sensitivity, widespread distribution, and integral roles in ecosystem processes [3–5].

Small mammals, including rodents, shrews, and other diminutive terrestrial mammals, occupy diverse trophic levels and contribute significantly to seed dispersal, soil aeration, nutrient cycling, and energy transfer within food webs [4,6,7]. Their rapid reproductive rates and short generation times enable quick responses to environmental perturbations, making shifts in community structure, abundance, and diversity effective indicators of habitat alterations [8,9]. Furthermore, small mammals are sensitive to microhabitat features such as vegetation complexity, ground cover, moisture availability, and soil composition, all of which are critical determinants of habitat quality [10–12].

Monitoring small mammal communities offers a practical and cost-effective approach to evaluating habitat health across a variety of ecosystems, including forests, grasslands, wetlands, and agricultural landscapes [13–15]. Studies have demonstrated that changes in small mammal community composition can reveal impacts from logging, agricultural expansion, fire regimes, hydrological alterations, and urbanization [16–18]. In tropical forests, for example, reductions in species richness and shifts toward generalist-dominated communities have been observed following habitat fragmentation [19,20]. Similarly, in temperate grasslands, small mammal diversity correlates strongly with grazing intensity and vegetation structure [21].

* Corresponding author: Ayomiposi Ayodele.

Despite their potential, the use of small mammals as habitat health indicators must be approached with caution. Sampling biases, seasonal fluctuations, predator-prey dynamics, and landscape-level processes can influence small mammal populations independently of habitat degradation [22,23]. Methodological consistency, appropriate temporal and spatial scales, and integrative multi-taxa assessments are essential to strengthen interpretations based on small mammal community data [24,25].

Emerging technologies, such as environmental DNA (eDNA) sampling and automated camera trapping, offer promising avenues to enhance the detection and monitoring of small mammal communities [26,27]. Incorporating small mammal indicators into ecological monitoring frameworks can provide an early-warning system for habitat deterioration, contribute to biodiversity conservation efforts, and support adaptive management strategies in a rapidly changing world [28,29].

Given the critical ecological functions of small mammals and their responsiveness to environmental change, a comprehensive evaluation of their role as indicators of habitat health is warranted. This review aims to synthesize current knowledge, highlight key applications, and identify challenges and future research directions for utilizing small mammal communities in habitat health assessments.

2. Ecological Roles of Small Mammals

Small mammals occupy key functional roles across terrestrial ecosystems. Their ecological importance extends far beyond their relatively small body size, influencing processes from vegetation regeneration to trophic dynamics and soil maintenance. As a result, small mammal communities are not only integral to ecosystem functioning but also offer critical insight into habitat health and resilience [30].

2.1. Seed Dispersal and Vegetation Dynamics

Small mammals, particularly granivorous rodents, are major agents of seed dispersal and seed predation in many ecosystems [31,32]. Scatter-hoarding behaviors, wherein seeds are collected and cached in numerous underground locations, facilitate secondary seed dispersal and influence plant recruitment patterns [33]. In temperate forests, species such as the eastern gray squirrel (Sciurus carolinensis) and deer mice (Peromyscus spp.) have been shown to enhance the germination success of hardwood species through seed caching [34]. Similarly, in Neotropical forests, agoutis (Dasyprocta spp.) play a crucial role in dispersing large-seeded trees, a process critical for forest regeneration following disturbance [35].

The effectiveness of small mammals as dispersal agents often depends on seed size, nutritional content, and habitat structure [36]. Selective caching behaviors can preferentially benefit particular plant species, shaping plant community composition over time [37]. For instance, research has shown that cache pilferage by conspecifics or heterospecifics further redistributes seeds across the landscape, expanding the spatial footprint of dispersal [38]. Conversely, when small mammal communities are disrupted such as through habitat fragmentation or overhunting plant regeneration processes may collapse, demonstrating the intricate mutual dependencies between fauna and flora [39].

Moreover, small mammals act as selective filters that influence which seeds survive predation pressures [40]. This predator-mediated selection can contribute to evolutionary pressures on seed traits, such as seed hardness or chemical defenses [41]. Understanding these interactions is vital for restoration ecology, as the presence or absence of specific small mammal dispersers can determine reforestation success [42].

2.2. Soil Aeration and Nutrient Cycling

The role of small mammals as soil engineers is profound. Burrowing rodents, including pocket gophers (Thomomys spp.), mole-rats (Heterocephalus glaber), and ground squirrels (Spermophilus spp.), alter the physical structure of soils through excavation activities [43]. These actions promote soil aeration, increase water infiltration, and facilitate the movement of nutrients and organic matter throughout the soil profile [44].

Experimental studies have demonstrated that gopher mounds in grassland ecosystems significantly enhance soil nitrogen content and microbial biomass compared to surrounding undisturbed soils [45]. Similarly, in arid environments, the burrowing activities of gerbils (Gerbillus spp.) and other desert rodents contribute to patchy nutrient hotspots critical for supporting plant diversity [48].

Beyond nutrient redistribution, small mammals also impact seed bank dynamics. Their disturbance of soil layers can bury seeds at varying depths, influencing seed dormancy and germination patterns [49]. These interactions promote heterogeneity in plant communities and maintain resilience against climatic variability [50]. Long-term exclusion experiments in North American prairies have further illustrated that the absence of burrowing mammals leads to soil compaction, reduced plant diversity, and decreased ecosystem productivity [51].

Thus, small mammals act as catalysts for soil processes essential to ecosystem sustainability. Their loss or decline can result in profound shifts in soil structure, nutrient dynamics, and ultimately vegetation patterns [52,53].

2.3. Energy Transfer within Food Webs

Small mammals form a pivotal trophic link between primary producers and higher trophic levels. Their abundance, biomass, and demographic fluctuations directly influence the dynamics of predators such as raptors, mesocarnivores, and reptiles [54].

Classic studies of cyclic vole populations in Fennoscandia have demonstrated how predator reproductive success tracks prey abundance, with breeding densities of Eurasian kestrels (Falco tinnunculus) and rough-legged buzzards (Buteo lagopus) tightly coupled to vole population peaks [55]. Similarly, the snowshoe hare (Lepus americanus) cycle in boreal forests is known to regulate the population dynamics of Canada lynx (Lynx canadensis) [56].

The loss of small mammal prey bases can cause declines or range shifts in specialist predators, leading to broader disruptions in ecosystem structure [57]. Furthermore, the diverse dietary habits of small mammals themselves ranging from granivory and herbivory to omnivory and insectivory connect multiple energy pathways within ecosystems [58]. Their consumption of seeds, fungi, and invertebrates facilitates energy and nutrient transfer across trophic levels, underscoring their ecological significance beyond prey availability [59].

2.4. Regulation of Insect Populations and Disease Transmission

Insectivorous small mammals, such as shrews (Sorex spp.) and moles (Talpidae), help regulate invertebrate populations, including agricultural pests and disease vectors [60]. In agroecosystems, the presence of shrews and other insectivores has been associated with reduced levels of pest species such as beetle larvae and caterpillars [61].

However, small mammals also play a complex role as reservoirs for zoonotic pathogens. Rodent species, particularly those adapted to disturbed or fragmented habitats, serve as primary hosts for hantaviruses, arenaviruses, and Lyme disease-causing Borrelia burgdorferi [62]. Biodiversity loss and ecosystem degradation often lead to "pathogen release," where resilient rodent species proliferate, elevating disease risk for humans and livestock [63].

Recent work has emphasized the "dilution effect," wherein higher small mammal species diversity correlates with lower disease transmission rates by limiting the dominance of highly competent reservoir species [64]. Consequently, monitoring small mammal communities not only informs ecosystem health but also carries implications for public health interventions [65].

2.5. Ecosystem Engineering

Beyond direct biotic interactions, small mammals significantly shape their physical environments. Burrow systems created by species such as prairie dogs (Cynomys spp.) and zokors (Myospalax spp.) modify topography, influence water runoff patterns, and create habitat niches for a variety of organisms [66].

Burrows provide critical refuge for reptiles, amphibians, insects, and even larger mammals during periods of environmental stress, such as droughts or fires [67]. Studies in North American grasslands have demonstrated that prairie dog towns support higher vertebrate and invertebrate diversity than adjacent grassland patches [68]. The loss of ecosystem engineering species has been associated with declines in biodiversity, soil degradation, and altered fire regimes [69].

In forested ecosystems, nest construction by small mammals such as flying squirrels (Glaucomys spp.) contributes to the availability of arboreal cavities and microhabitats for secondary cavity-nesters, enhancing structural complexity [70]. Collectively, these engineering roles highlight the multifaceted contributions of small mammals to habitat stability, resilience, and species coexistence.

3. Why small mammal communities reflect habitat health

Small mammal communities are increasingly recognized as sensitive and reliable indicators of habitat health across a wide range of terrestrial ecosystems. Their ecological characteristics including small home ranges, high reproductive rates, and dependence on fine-scale habitat features make them highly responsive to changes in environmental conditions [71]. As such, variations in small mammal diversity, abundance, and community composition can provide early warnings of ecosystem degradation, biodiversity loss, and functional shifts [72].

3.1. Sensitivity to Vegetation Structure and Microhabitat Features

Small mammals exhibit strong preferences for specific vegetation structures, ground cover types, and microhabitats, often linked to their requirements for food, shelter, and predator avoidance [73]. Rodents such as voles (Microtus spp.) and deer mice (Peromyscus spp.) demonstrate shifts in habitat use based on changes in vegetation height, density, and species composition [74]. Shrews (Sorex spp.), which rely on moist leaf litter and dense ground cover, decline significantly in response to canopy opening or soil desiccation following logging or fire [75].

Structural complexity at the ground level, including the presence of fallen logs, coarse woody debris, and shrub layers, directly influences small mammal richness and abundance [76]. Loss of vertical and horizontal vegetation complexity through intensive forestry, agriculture, or urbanization leads to a homogenization of small mammal communities, often favoring generalist species over specialists [77]. Thus, monitoring small mammal responses to vegetation changes offers a robust measure of habitat quality, with community structure often mirroring the underlying structural integrity of ecosystems [78].

3.2. Responses to Soil Quality and Hydrological Changes

Soil properties, including moisture content, organic matter, and compaction, are critical determinants of small mammal distribution and survival [79]. Burrowing species, such as pocket gophers (Thomomys spp.) and mole rats (Spalax spp.), require loose, friable soils for nest construction and foraging [80]. Degradation processes such as soil compaction from livestock grazing, erosion, or altered hydrological regimes reduce habitat suitability for many fossorial and semi-fossorial mammals [81].

Moreover, water availability influences the abundance of insectivorous and granivorous species, particularly in arid and semi-arid landscapes [82]. Changes in groundwater levels and wetland drying due to climate change or anthropogenic extraction have been associated with small mammal community collapses [83]. Therefore, shifts in small mammal assemblages can serve as proxies for soil health and hydrological integrity, both of which are foundational components of overall ecosystem condition.

3.3. Sensitivity to Human Disturbance and Fragmentation

Small mammals rapidly respond to anthropogenic disturbances such as logging, agriculture, road construction, and urban expansion [84]. Fragmentation of habitats typically results in declines in specialist species, particularly those dependent on interior forest conditions or continuous grassland expanses [85]. Generalist species, such as the house mouse (Mus musculus) and the brown rat (Rattus norvegicus), often dominate in heavily disturbed landscapes, leading to biotic homogenization [86].

Edge effects associated with habitat fragmentation include increased predation risk, altered microclimates, and invasive species encroachment further disrupt small mammal community structure [87]. Studies have shown that species richness, diversity indices and evenness often decrease with increasing isolation and disturbance intensity [88].

Consequently, monitoring changes in small mammal diversity and dominance patterns provides insights into landscape-scale habitat integrity and can guide conservation and land management strategies [89].

3.4. Rapid Reproductive and Population Responses

Small mammals are characterized by high reproductive potential, short life spans, and rapid population turnover rates [90]. These traits enable small mammal populations to respond quickly to environmental changes, often within a single breeding season [91]. Such demographic plasticity makes small mammals ideal for detecting short-term and seasonal variations in habitat quality [92].

Population crashes or booms, shifts in reproductive output, and changes in age structure can reveal underlying habitat stressors before impacts are observable in longer-lived taxa such as birds or large mammals [93]. Longitudinal studies have confirmed that monitoring small mammal populations provides an effective early-warning system for ecosystem change [94].

3.5. Reflection of Trophic Interactions and Ecosystem Stability

Small mammals occupy central positions in food webs, acting both as primary consumers and as prey for a wide range of predators [95]. Disruptions in small mammal communities can thus have cascading effects throughout ecosystems, influencing predator populations, plant community dynamics, and nutrient cycling [96].

Trophic interactions involving small mammals are particularly sensitive to habitat degradation. For example, the decline of rodent prey species following deforestation has been implicated in declines of carnivores such as weasels (Mustela spp.) and raptors such as barn owls (Tyto alba) [97]. Simultaneously, reductions in small mammal abundance can lead to shifts in seed predation rates, altering plant community succession.

4. Methods for Studying Small Mammal Communities

Effective monitoring of small mammal communities requires methodological approaches that are tailored to species ecology, habitat characteristics, and research objectives. A wide range of techniques has been developed to capture data on species diversity, abundance, activity patterns, and population dynamics. Selection of appropriate methodologies is critical to ensuring accurate, reliable, and ethically sound assessments of small mammal communities [98-100].

Live trapping remains one of the primary methods for studying terrestrial small mammals, utilizing Sherman traps, Longworth traps, and pitfall arrays to capture individuals with minimal harm [101–104]. Trap selection, placement strategies, and baiting must be carefully adapted to species-specific behavior and dietary preferences to maximize capture efficiency and minimize stress [105-109]. Sampling designs typically involve systematic grids or trap lines for estimating abundance, density, and species richness [110-114], while mark-recapture protocols using ear tags, passive integrated transponders (PIT tags), or fur clipping enable robust population parameter estimation through models such as the Lincoln-Petersen or more complex capture–mark–recapture (CMR) frameworks [115,116]. Temporal replication is essential to account for diel and seasonal variation in activity patterns [117], although live trapping remains labor-intensive, subject to weather variability, and often biased toward certain taxa [118]. Passive sampling techniques, including camera traps equipped with infrared sensors and soot- or ink-coated track plates, provide non-invasive alternatives for detecting nocturnal and elusive species, allowing for analyses of activity patterns and habitat use [119–122]. However, these methods may have lower detection rates for small-bodied or cryptic species [123].

Pitfall trapping, often coupled with drift fences, offers an effective approach for sampling ground-dwelling small mammals and shrews by intercepting their movement across the soil surface [124,125]. This technique allows for continuous sampling over extended periods [126] but poses risks of injury or mortality if traps are not maintained properly, necessitating frequent checks, drainage, and the provision of shelters [127,128]. Molecular techniques have significantly expanded non-invasive monitoring options: hair snares, fecal samples, and saliva traces enable species identification and population genetic analyses through microsatellite genotyping and mitochondrial DNA sequencing [129–131]. Furthermore, environmental DNA (eDNA) sampling from soil, water, or air allows presence/absence surveys without direct observation, enhancing detection in remote or inaccessible habitats [132–134]. Nevertheless, challenges such as DNA degradation, low detection probabilities for rare species, and contamination risks must be addressed to ensure data reliability [135].

Analytical frameworks for interpreting small mammal data continue to evolve, incorporating species accumulation curves, rarefaction analyses, diversity indices such as Shannon and Simpson, and occupancy modeling to estimate detection-adjusted occurrence rates [139,140]. Multivariate techniques including non-metric multidimensional scaling (NMDS) and principal coordinates analysis (PCoA) are widely used to explore species composition and habitat associations [141]. Emerging methodologies increasingly apply Bayesian hierarchical models and machine learning algorithms to improve inference strength and predictive power [142,143]. Careful selection and application of appropriate analytical tools remain critical for deriving ecologically meaningful insights from monitoring data and for informing conservation management decisions aimed at sustaining small mammal biodiversity and ecosystem function [144].

5. Case Studies and Examples

Case studies from different ecosystems worldwide demonstrate how small mammal communities effectively indicate habitat health. These studies highlight the practical applications of small mammal monitoring in forest management, grassland conservation, wetland restoration, and urban planning.

5.1. Forest Ecosystems: Logging and Fragmentation Effects

Research conducted in the Amazon rainforest revealed that forest fragmentation led to sharp declines in small mammal species richness and a shift toward generalist species dominance [145]. Specialist species dependent on continuous forest cover, such as Proechimys spp., suffered local extirpations in fragmented habitats [146].

Similarly, studies in North American temperate forests have shown that selective logging practices significantly alter small mammal communities by reducing canopy cover, decreasing ground vegetation complexity, and increasing predation risk [147]. In managed forests of the Pacific Northwest, the abundance of northern flying squirrels (Glaucomys sabrinus), an important mycorrhizal spore disperser, declined with increasing logging intensity, indicating ecosystem disruption [148].

Long-term monitoring in European forests confirmed that small mammal diversity is highest in structurally complex, old growth stands and lowest in intensively managed plantations [149]. These findings reinforce the use of small mammals as indicators for sustainable forest management assessments.

5.2. Grasslands: Grazing Pressure and Habitat Degradation

Grassland ecosystems exhibit strong small mammal community responses to grazing intensity and vegetation structure. In the Serengeti, moderate grazing by ungulates maintained a mosaic of grass heights that supported diverse rodent communities [150]. However, overgrazing led to a loss of habitat heterogeneity, favoring disturbance-tolerant species like Arvicanthis niloticus while reducing overall species richness [151].

Studies in North American prairies showed similar patterns, where heavy cattle grazing reduced the abundance of grassland specialists such as the prairie vole (Microtus ochrogaster), while facilitating generalist species expansions [152]. Experimental exclusion of grazers led to rapid recovery of small mammal diversity, highlighting their sensitivity to vegetation structure and resource availability [153]. In South Africa's Karoo shrublands, small mammals were used as bioindicators to evaluate the success of grazing exclusion zones, with species richness positively correlated with vegetation recovery [154].

5.3. Wetlands: Hydrological Changes and Restoration Monitoring

Wetland ecosystems, being sensitive to hydrological regimes, show immediate responses in small mammal communities to water table fluctuations and inundation patterns. In the Florida Everglades, reductions in water levels due to anthropogenic alteration decreased the abundance of marsh rice rats (Oryzomys palustris), a wetland specialist [155].

Restoration projects aimed at reestablishing natural flooding regimes have observed positive responses from small mammal populations, with increased captures of species requiring moist soils and dense ground cover [156]. Similar findings were reported from Australian freshwater wetlands, where rewetting interventions restored habitat suitability for species such as the swamp rat (Rattus lutreolus) [157]. These examples demonstrate the potential of small mammal monitoring to track the effectiveness of wetland restoration and water management practices.

5.4. Urban-Rural Gradients: Biodiversity Loss and Community Shifts

Urbanization exerts strong pressure on small mammal communities, leading to declines in specialist species and increases in synanthropic rodents [158]. Studies from European cities revealed that woodland species such as bank voles (Myodes glareolus) and wood mice (Apodemus sylvaticus) were replaced by house mice (Mus musculus) and brown rats (Rattus norvegicus) in urban cores [159].

In North American cities, small green spaces maintained higher small mammal diversity compared to highly developed areas, indicating the importance of habitat patches in urban biodiversity conservation [160]. Connectivity between habitat fragments through ecological corridors was critical for supporting specialist populations [161]. Monitoring small mammals across urban gradients thus offers valuable insights into habitat quality, connectivity, and the impacts of land-use change on native fauna.

6. Limitations and Challenges

While small mammal communities offer valuable insights into habitat health, several methodological, ecological, and interpretive challenges must be acknowledged. Understanding these limitations is crucial to appropriately designing monitoring programs and accurately interpreting small mammal data in conservation and management contexts.

6.1. Sampling Bias and Detectability Issues

Small mammal studies are inherently subject to sampling biases based on trap type, placement, bait selection, and temporal factors [162]. For instance, Sherman traps are more effective for capturing rodents than shrews, while pitfall traps may preferentially sample smaller, ground-active species [163]. Activity patterns (diurnal vs. nocturnal), weather conditions, and seasonality further influence capture success [164].

Some species exhibit trap shyness or trap happiness, leading to under- or overrepresentation in capture data [165]. Low detection probabilities, especially for rare or cryptic species, can result in biased estimates of species richness and community composition [166]. Addressing these issues requires using multiple complementary sampling methods and accounting for detection probability in data analyses [167].

6.2. Temporal and Spatial Variability

Small mammal populations often exhibit strong seasonal and interannual fluctuations driven by factors such as food availability, predation pressure, and climate variability [168]. Short-term studies may misinterpret natural population cycles as responses to habitat changes [169]. Long-term monitoring, spanning multiple years and seasons, is essential to distinguish genuine ecological trends from background variability [170].

Spatial variability also poses challenges. Small mammals respond to microhabitat features at fine scales, making site selection and sampling design critical to capturing representative community patterns [171]. Landscape context, including connectivity and matrix quality, can further influence local assemblages [172].

6.3. Influence of Predators and Competitors

Small mammal community dynamics are often shaped by top-down pressures from predators and competitive interactions among sympatric species [173]. Fluctuations in predator abundance (e.g., owls, foxes, snakes) can drive apparent changes in small mammal populations independent of habitat quality [174].

Invasive species such as Rattus rattus and Mus musculus can competitively exclude native small mammals, leading to community simplification even in structurally intact habitats [175]. Thus, changes in community structure must be interpreted cautiously, considering both biotic and abiotic drivers [176].

6.4. Ethical Considerations and Animal Welfare

Monitoring programs involving live trapping or handling of small mammals must adhere to strict ethical standards to minimize animal stress, injury, and mortality [177]. Improper trapping practices, poor maintenance of pitfall traps, or excessive handling can negatively impact animal welfare and violate conservation ethics [178].

Ethical guidelines emphasize frequent trap checking, provision of shelter within traps, appropriate anesthesia for invasive procedures, and minimizing manipulation times [179]. Compliance with animal care regulations and obtaining necessary research permits are fundamental requirements for any small mammal study [180].

6.5. Interpretation and Generalization Challenges

Although small mammals are sensitive indicators, their responses are often species-specific and context dependent [181]. Generalizing findings across regions, ecosystems, or species assemblages can lead to oversimplifications [182]. For example, disturbance-tolerant rodents in African savannas may increase following grazing pressure, whereas similar pressures reduce specialist populations in North American grasslands [183].

Furthermore, small mammal responses may lag behind environmental change, particularly when examining community-level metrics like species turnover [184]. Integrating small mammal data with other taxonomic groups and abiotic indicators enhances the robustness of habitat health assessments [185]. Recognizing these limitations ensures that small mammal monitoring remains a powerful, but carefully interpreted, tool for ecological assessment and biodiversity conservation.

7. Applications in Conservation and Management

Small mammal communities provide critical data that can be directly applied to conservation planning, habitat restoration, and long-term environmental monitoring. Their sensitivity to habitat changes, rapid responses to disturbance, and integration into ecosystem processes make them ideal bioindicators for informing adaptive management strategies across diverse landscapes.

7.1. Environmental Impact Assessments (EIAs)

Small mammals are increasingly used as part of baseline ecological surveys in Environmental Impact Assessments (EIAs) [186]. Changes in small mammal diversity and abundance provide early evidence of habitat alteration prior to the visible decline of other vertebrate groups [187]. For example, reductions in the abundance of specialist species such as arboreal rodents have been used to predict long-term forest degradation following logging operations [188].

Incorporating small mammal data into EIAs allows for more sensitive detection of ecosystem disturbance, supports the identification of critical habitats, and informs mitigation measures such as buffer zones, selective logging prescriptions, and habitat connectivity planning [189].

7.2. Restoration Ecology

Monitoring small mammal communities is critical in assessing the success of habitat restoration projects. Studies have demonstrated that restored habitats often initially support generalist species, while the return of specialist small mammals indicates later stages of habitat recovery and structural complexity [190].

In wetland restoration, for instance, increases in moisture-dependent rodent species have been used as indicators of restored hydrological function [191]. Similarly, in reforestation efforts, the reappearance of canopy-dwelling small mammals has signaled successful establishment of forest structure [192]. Restoration practitioners increasingly use small mammal diversity indices and occupancy modeling to evaluate project outcomes and adapt restoration strategies over time [193].

7.3. Protected Area Monitoring

Protected areas often face pressures from adjacent land use change, invasive species, climate change, and illegal resource extraction [194]. Long-term small mammal monitoring programs in reserves and parks provide early detection of ecological shifts and biodiversity loss [195].

Changes in small mammal community structure can signal habitat degradation, edge effects, and encroachment impacts, enabling reserve managers to implement targeted conservation actions [196]. Small mammals also serve as surrogate indicators for broader ecosystem health, offering a cost-effective means of monitoring multiple taxa indirectly [197].

7.4. Climate Change Monitoring

Small mammals respond to temperature, precipitation patterns, and habitat shifts associated with climate change [198]. Shifts in species ranges, changes in community composition, and altered reproductive patterns have been documented in response to warming trends [199].

For example, upward altitudinal shifts in the ranges of montane rodent species have been observed across multiple continents [200]. Monitoring these responses provides valuable data on the biological impacts of climate change and informs adaptive conservation planning [201]. Integrating small mammal data into climate vulnerability assessments enhances the predictive power of ecological models and supports proactive management of climate-sensitive species [202].

7.5. Community-Based Monitoring Programs

Small mammal monitoring lends itself well to community-based conservation initiatives due to the relatively low costs, straightforward methodologies, and educational value [203]. Engaging local communities in small mammal surveys fosters environmental awareness, builds capacity for biodiversity monitoring, and supports locally led conservation efforts [204].

Programs that train citizen scientists or indigenous groups to conduct small mammal trapping, data recording, and habitat assessments have proven effective in sustaining long-term monitoring initiatives [205]. Such participatory approaches enhance data collection at larger spatial scales while empowering local stakeholders in conservation decision-making [206].

8. Future directions

Emerging technologies, new analytical approaches, and a growing emphasis on integrative conservation strategies are reshaping the future of small mammal community research. Expanding the role of small mammals in habitat monitoring will require embracing innovations that enhance detection, broaden spatiotemporal scales, and deepen understanding of ecosystem processes.

8.1. Integration of Genomics and Environmental DNA (eDNA)

The application of genomic tools and eDNA sampling is revolutionizing biodiversity monitoring [207]. High-throughput sequencing enables identification of species from non-invasive samples, overcoming limitations associated with traditional trapping [208]. Techniques such as metabarcoding can reveal entire small mammal communities from soil, water, or air samples, improving detection of rare, cryptic, or low-density species [209].

Future efforts should standardize eDNA protocols for terrestrial ecosystems, develop habitat-specific reference libraries, and integrate genomic data into long-term monitoring programs [210].

8.2. Advanced Remote Sensing and Habitat Modeling

Remote sensing technologies offer new avenues for assessing habitat conditions relevant to small mammals. High-resolution satellite imagery, LiDAR, and unmanned aerial vehicles (UAVs) can quantify vegetation structure, ground cover, and landscape connectivity at multiple scales [211].

Combining remotely sensed habitat variables with small mammal survey data enhances predictive modeling of species distributions and community responses to land-use change and climate variability [212]. Future research should prioritize fine-scale habitat modeling and dynamic landscape monitoring to better link small mammal communities with environmental drivers [213].

8.3. Machine Learning and Big Data Analytics

Machine learning algorithms are increasingly being applied to ecological datasets to detect patterns, predict species distributions, and analyze community dynamics [214]. In small mammal research, machine learning can optimize species identification from camera trap images, automate acoustic call classification, and improve modeling of occupancy and abundance [215].

The integration of big data from disparate sources trapping records, genetic data, habitat metrics offers opportunities to develop comprehensive ecological models and improve conservation decision-making [216].

8.4. Long-Term and Climate-Linked Monitoring

Climate change is altering species distributions, community structures, and ecosystem processes at unprecedented rates [217]. Long-term monitoring of small mammal communities across climate gradients is essential to detect range shifts, phenological changes, and community turnover [218].

Establishing standardized, long-term small mammal monitoring networks linked to climate data will enhance understanding of species vulnerability, resilience, and adaptation strategies [219].

8.5. Cross-Taxa and Multitrophic Monitoring

Small mammals should increasingly be monitored alongside other taxonomic groups (e.g., plants, birds, insects) and ecosystem functions (e.g., seed dispersal, soil processes) to generate more holistic assessments of habitat health [220]. Multitrophic approaches reveal interactions and cascading effects that single-taxon studies might miss [221].

Future research should encourage integrated biodiversity monitoring frameworks that capture functional, taxonomic, and genetic dimensions of ecosystem change [222].

9. Conclusion

Small mammal communities serve as powerful and sensitive indicators of habitat health across diverse ecosystems. Their ecological roles in seed dispersal, soil aeration, trophic dynamics, and ecosystem engineering, combined with their rapid responses to environmental changes, position them as valuable tools for conservation science and environmental monitoring.

Empirical evidence from forests, grasslands, wetlands, and urban gradients consistently demonstrates that shifts in small mammal abundance, diversity, and community structure reliably reflect habitat quality, fragmentation effects, hydrological alterations, and anthropogenic disturbances. Methodological advances, including the integration of non-invasive sampling, environmental DNA technologies, remote sensing, and machine learning, are enhancing the scope, efficiency, and accuracy of small mammal monitoring programs.

Despite their utility, important limitations such as sampling biases, temporal variability, predator influences, and ethical considerations must be carefully managed to ensure reliable interpretation of small mammal data. Moving forward, conservation efforts will benefit from incorporating small mammal indicators into broader, multitrophic, and cross-taxon monitoring frameworks, linking population changes to underlying ecosystem processes.

Future research should emphasize the development of standardized protocols, expansion of long-term climate-linked datasets, and the adoption of participatory monitoring approaches that engage local communities. In doing so, small mammal communities will continue to provide early-warning signals for ecosystem degradation, guide habitat restoration success, and support evidence-based management decisions in an era of rapid environmental change.

References

[1] Carignan V, Villard MA. Selecting indicator species to monitor ecological integrity: a review. Environ Monit Assess. 2002;78(1):45–61.

[2] McGeoch MA. The selection, testing and application of terrestrial insects as bioindicators. Biol Rev Camb Philos Soc. 1998;73(2):181–201.

[3] Gitzen RA, West SD, Rochelle JA. Associations between forest structure and small mammal species richness in temperate forests. For Ecol Manage. 2007;246(2–3):144–56.

[4] Brown JH, Heske EJ. Control of a desert-grassland transition by a keystone rodent guild. Science. 1990;250(4988):1705–7.

[5] Forget PM, Lambert JE, Hulme PE, Vander Wall SB. Seed fate: predation, dispersal and seedling establishment. CABI; 2005.

[6] Vander Wall SB. The evolutionary ecology of nut dispersal. Bot Rev. 2001;67(1):74–117.

[7] Jansen PA, Forget PM. Scatterhoarding rodents and tree regeneration. In: Seed dispersal: theory and its application in a changing world. 2007;275–88.

[8] Kerley GIH, Erasmus T, Lloyd P. Seed dispersal by rodents in the semi-arid Karoo, South Africa. S Afr J Zool. 1997;32(2):147–53.

[9] Steele MA, Smallwood PD. Acorn dispersal by birds and mammals. In: Oak forest ecosystems. Johns Hopkins University Press; 2002. p. 182–95.

[10] Forget PM, Milleron T. Evidence for secondary seed dispersal by rodents in Panama. Oecologia. 1991;87(4):596–9.

[11] Jansen PA, Bartholomeus M, Bongers F, Elzinga JA, den Ouden J, Van Wieren SE. The role of seed size in dispersal by a scatter-hoarding rodent. Oecologia. 2002;130(4): 483–91.

[12] Beck H. Seed predation and seed dispersal by vertebrates. In: Tropical forest plant ecophysiology. Springer; 2005. p. 235–77.

[13] Forget PM. Predation on seeds by invertebrates and vertebrates in the Neotropics. In: Tropical Forest Seed. Springer; 2006. p. 137–56.

[14] Brewer SW, Rejmánek M. Small rodents as significant dispersers of tree seeds in a neotropical forest. J Trop Ecol. 1999;15(3):381–93.

[15] Vander Wall SB, Beck MJ. A comparison of frugivory and scatter-hoarding seed-dispersal syndromes. Bot Rev. 2012;78(1):10–31.

[16] Vander Wall SB, Longland WS. Distance-dependent seed predation: a review of the predation–dispersal trade-off. Oikos. 2004;105(3):481–91.

[17] Forget PM. Recruitment limitation through seed predation and seedling herbivory in tropical forests. Ecology. 1992;73(5):1806–19.

[18] Dirzo R, Mendoza E. Size-related differential seed predation and dispersal in a heavily defaunated Neotropical rainforest. Biotropica. 2003;35(3):316–27.

[19] Terborgh J, Nuñez-Iturri G, Pitman NC, Valverde F, Alvarez P, Swamy V, et al. Tree recruitment in an empty forest. Ecology. 2008;89(6):1757–68.

[20] Janzen DH. Seed predation by animals. Annu Rev Ecol Syst. 1971;2(1):465–92.

[21] Forget PM, Hammond DS. Seed fate and seedling dynamics in tropical rainforest: implications for forest regeneration. In: Biotic interactions in the tropics. 2005;191–208.

[22] Vander Wall SB. How plants manipulate the scatter-hoarding behavior of seed-dispersing animals. Philos Trans R Soc Lond B Biol Sci. 2010;365(1542):989–97.

[23] Reichman OJ, Seabloom EW. The role of pocket gophers as subterranean ecosystem engineers. Trends Ecol Evol. 2002;17(1):44–9.

[24] Kinlaw A. A review of burrowing by semi-fossorial vertebrates in arid environments. J Arid Environ. 1999;41(2):127–45.

[25] Huntly N, Inouye RS. Pocket gophers in ecosystems: patterns and mechanisms. Bioscience. 1988;38(11):786–93.

[26] Eldridge DJ, Whitford WG. Soil disturbance by native animals plays a critical role in maintaining desert ecosystems. Front Ecol Environ. 2009;7(6):283–90.

[27] Hobbs RJ, Mooney HA. The effects of disturbance on coastal grassland communities in California. Ecology. 1991;72(2):620–31.

[28] Lightfoot DC, Whitford WG. Productivity of desert ecosystems. In: Whitford WG, editor. Ecology of Desert Systems. Academic Press; 2002. p. 217–44.

[29] Boeken B, Shachak M, Gutterman Y. Patchiness and disturbance: plant community responses to localized perturbations in a Negev desert community. Oecologia. 1998;116(4): 504–11.

[30] Chambers JC, MacMahon JA. A day in the life of a seed: movements and fates of seeds and their implications for natural and managed systems. Annu Rev Ecol Syst. 1994;25(1):263–92.

[31] Levine JM, Murrell DJ. The community-level consequences of seed dispersal patterns. Annu Rev Ecol Evol Syst. 2003;34(1):549–74.

[32] Davidson AD, Lightfoot DC. Burrowing rodents increase landscape heterogeneity in a desert grassland. Ecology. 2007;88(5):1234–9.

[33] Laundré JW. The effects of small mammal burrowing on the infiltration of water in a cold desert environment. Oecologia. 1993;94(1):43–8.

[34] Platt WJ. The role of burrowing mammals in the mediation of ecosystem processes. In: Reichman OJ, editor. Desert Rodent Ecology. Springer; 1984. p. 57–65.

[35] Korpimäki E, Krebs CJ. Predation and population cycles of small mammals. Bioscience. 1996;46(10):754–64.

[36] Hanski I, Henttonen H. Predation on competing rodent species: a simple explanation of complex patterns. J Anim Ecol. 1996;65(2):220–32.

[37] Korpimäki E. Rapid or delayed tracking of multi-annual vole cycles by avian predators? J Anim Ecol. 1994;63(3):619–28.

[38] Newton I. Population limitation in birds. Academic Press; 1998.

[39] Krebs CJ, Boutin S, Boonstra R, Sinclair ARE, Smith JN, Dale MR, et al. Impact of food and predation on the snowshoe hare cycle. Science. 1995;269(5227):1112–5.

[40] Terborgh J. Keystone plant resources in the tropical forest. In: Conservation Biology. Springer; 1986. p. 330–44.

[41] Brown JH, Ernest SK. Rain and rodents: complex dynamics of desert consumers. Bioscience. 2002;52(11):979–87.

[42] Gese EM, Ruff RL. Howling by coyotes (Canis latrans): the role of acoustics in resource defense. Anim Behav. 1998;56(5):1023–8.

[43] Batzli GO. Availability of food and the population dynamics of arvicoline rodents. Bull Ecol Soc Am. 1992;73(2):66–73.

[44] Churchfield S. The Natural History of Shrews. Comstock Publishing Associates; 1990.

[45] Churchfield S, Hollier J, Brown V. The diet and foraging behaviour of the common shrew (Sorex araneus) in grassland. Acta Theriol. 2000;45(2):173–82.

[46] Mohr CO. Insectivorous mammals in the control of agricultural pests. J Econ Entomol. 1947;40(5):735–41.

[47] Mills JN, Childs JE. Ecologic studies of rodent reservoirs: their relevance for human health. Emerg Infect Dis. 1998;4(4):529–37.

[48] Luis AD, Douglass RJ, Mills JN, Bjørnstad ON. The effect of seasonality, density and climate on the population dynamics of Montana deer mice. J Anim Ecol. 2010;79(2):462–70.

[49] Keesing F, Holt RD, Ostfeld RS. Effects of species diversity on disease risk. Ecol Lett. 2006;9(4):485–98.

[50] Ostfeld RS, Keesing F. Biodiversity and disease risk: the case of Lyme disease. Conserv Biol. 2000;14(3):722–8.

[51] LoGiudice K, Ostfeld RS, Schmidt KA, Keesing F. The ecology of infectious disease: effects of host diversity and community composition on Lyme disease risk. Proc Natl Acad Sci USA. 2003;100(2):567–71.

[52] Johnson PT, Preston DL, Hoverman JT, Richgels KL. Biodiversity decreases disease through predictable changes in host community competence. Nature. 2013;494(7436):230–3.

[53] Keesing F, Belden LK, Daszak P, Dobson A, Harvell CD, Holt RD, et al. Impacts of biodiversity on the emergence and transmission of infectious diseases. Nature. 2010;468(7324):647–52.

[54] Davidson AD, Detling JK, Brown JH. Ecological roles and conservation challenges of social, burrowing, herbivorous mammals in the world's grasslands. Front Ecol Environ. 2012;10(9):477–86.

[55] Zhang ZB, Pech RP, Davis SA, Shi D, Wan X, Zhong W. Extrinsic and intrinsic factors determine the eruptive dynamics of Brandt's voles (Microtus brandti) in Inner Mongolia, China. Oikos. 2003;100(2):299–310.

[56] Zhang Z, Liu W, Zhong W, Ives AR. Rodent population dynamics and food supply: a model with density-dependent reproduction. Ecology. 2003;84(3):792–804.

[57] Reading CJ, Clarke RT. Impacts of habitat fragmentation on the survival of the common toad (Bufo bufo). Biol Conserv. 1995;74(1):71–8.

[58] Smith AT, Foggin JM. The plateau pika (Ochotona curzoniae) is a keystone species for biodiversity on the Tibetan plateau. Anim Conserv. 1999;2(4):235–40.

[59] Ceballos G, Ehrlich PR. The loss of mammal populations and the extinction crisis. Science. 2002;296(5569):904–7.

[60] Miller B, Ceballos G, Reading R. The prairie dog and biotic diversity. Conserv Biol. 1994;8(3):677–81.

[61] Carey AB. The ecosystem role of northern flying squirrels in Oregon and Washington forests. USDA Forest Service Gen Tech Rep PNW-GTR-476; 1995.

[62] Holloway GL, Malcolm JR. Nest tree use by northern and southern flying squirrels in central Ontario. J Mammal. 2007;88(1):226–33.

[63] Angelstam P, Mikusiński G. Woodpecker assemblages in natural and managed boreal and hemiboreal forest—a review. Ann Zool Fennici. 1994;31(1):157–72.

[64] McGeoch MA, Chown SL. Scaling up the value of bioindicators. Trends Ecol Evol. 1998;13(2):46–7.

[65] Lindenmayer DB, Likens GE. Adaptive monitoring: a new paradigm for long-term research and monitoring. Trends Ecol Evol. 2009;24(9):482–6.

[66] Magurran AE. Measuring Biological Diversity. Blackwell Science; 2004.

[67] Noss RF. Indicators for monitoring biodiversity: a hierarchical approach. Conserv Biol. 1990;4(4):355–64.

[68] Buckland ST, Anderson DR, Burnham KP, Laake JL, Borchers DL, Thomas L. Introduction to distance sampling: estimating abundance of biological populations. Oxford University Press; 2001.

[69] Nichols JD, Williams BK. Monitoring for conservation. Trends Ecol Evol. 2006;21(12):668–73.

[70] Krebs CJ. Ecological methodology. Harper & Row; 1989.

[71] Tews J, Brose U, Grimm V, Tielbörger K, Wichmann MC, Schwager M, et al. Animal species diversity driven by habitat heterogeneity/diversity: the importance of keystone structures. J Biogeogr. 2004;31(1):79–92.

[72] Ricketts TH. The matrix matters: effective isolation in fragmented landscapes. Am Nat. 2001;158(1):87–99.

[73] Fahrig L. Effects of habitat fragmentation on biodiversity. Annu Rev Ecol Evol Syst. 2003;34(1):487–515.

[74] Andren H. Effects of habitat fragmentation on birds and mammals in landscapes with different proportions of suitable habitat: a review. Oikos. 1994;71(3):355–66.

[75] Crooks KR, Soulé ME. Mesopredator release and avifaunal extinctions in a fragmented system. Nature. 1999;400(6744):563–6.

[76] Prugh LR, Stoner CJ, Epps CW, Bean WT, Ripple WJ, Laliberte AS, et al. The rise of the mesopredator. Bioscience. 2009;59(9):779–91.

[77] Hanski I. Habitat connectivity, habitat continuity, and metapopulations in dynamic landscapes. Oikos. 1999;87(2):209–19.

[78] Fischer J, Lindenmayer DB. Landscape modification and habitat fragmentation: a synthesis. Glob Ecol Biogeogr. 2007;16(3):265–80.

[79] Bolger DT, Alberts AC, Sauvajot RM, Potenza P, McCalvin C, Tran D, et al. Response of rodents to habitat fragmentation in coastal southern California. Ecol Appl. 1997;7(2):552–63.

[80] Ricklefs RE. A comprehensive framework for global patterns in biodiversity. Ecol Lett. 2004;7(1):1–15.

[81] McKinney ML. Urbanization, biodiversity, and conservation. Bioscience. 2002;52(10):883–90.

[82] Shochat E, Warren PS, Faeth SH, McIntyre NE, Hope D. From patterns to emerging processes in mechanistic urban ecology. Trends Ecol Evol. 2006;21(4):186–91.

[83] Shapiro JT, Báldi A, Batáry P. Vertebrate ecosystem service providers in rapidly urbanizing landscapes: a review. Urban Ecosyst. 2020;23(4):1069–81.

[84] Dickman CR. Habitat fragmentation and vertebrate species richness in an urban environment. J Appl Ecol. 1987;24(2):337–51.

[85] Garden JG, McAlpine CA, Possingham HP, Jones DN. Habitat structure is more important than vegetation composition for local-level management of native terrestrial reptile and small mammal species living in urban remnants: a case study from Brisbane, Australia. Austral Ecol. 2007;32(6):669–85.

[86] Soulé ME. Land use planning and wildlife maintenance: guidelines for conserving wildlife in an urban landscape. J Am Plann Assoc. 1991;57(3):313–23.

[87] Pimm SL, Raven P. Biodiversity: extinction by numbers. Nature. 2000;403(6772):843–5.

[88] Dirzo R, Raven PH. Global state of biodiversity and loss. Annu Rev Environ Resour. 2003;28(1):137–67.

[89] Cardinale BJ, Duffy JE, Gonzalez A, Hooper DU, Perrings C, Venail P, et al. Biodiversity loss and its impact on humanity. Nature. 2012;486(7401):59–67.

[90] Worm B, Barbier EB, Beaumont N, Duffy JE, Folke C, Halpern BS, et al. Impacts of biodiversity loss on ocean ecosystem services. Science. 2006;314(5800):787–90.

[91] Purvis A, Hector A. Getting the measure of biodiversity. Nature. 2000;405(6783):212–9.

[92] Millennium Ecosystem Assessment. Ecosystems and human well-being: biodiversity synthesis. World Resources Institute; 2005.

[93] Ceballos G, Ehrlich PR, Dirzo R. Biological annihilation via the ongoing sixth mass extinction signaled by vertebrate population losses and declines. Proc Natl Acad Sci USA. 2017;114(30):E6089–96.

[94] Barnosky AD, Matzke N, Tomiya S, Wogan GO, Swartz B, Quental TB, et al. Has the Earth's sixth mass extinction already arrived? Nature. 2011;471(7336):51–7.

[95] Pimm SL, Jenkins CN, Abell R, Brooks TM, Gittleman JL, Joppa LN, et al. The biodiversity of species and their rates of extinction, distribution, and protection. Science. 2014;344(6187):1246752.

[96] Tilman D, Reich PB, Isbell F. Biodiversity impacts ecosystem productivity as much as resources, disturbance, or herbivory. Proc Natl Acad Sci USA. 2012;109(26):10394–7.

[97] Naeem S, Duffy JE, Zavaleta E. The functions of biological diversity in an age of extinction. Science. 2012;336(6087):1401–6.

[98] Hooper DU, Chapin FS, Ewel JJ, Hector A, Inchausti P, Lavorel S, et al. Effects of biodiversity on ecosystem functioning: a consensus of current knowledge. Ecol Monogr. 2005;75(1):3–35.

[99] Hector A, Bagchi R. Biodiversity and ecosystem multifunctionality. Nature. 2007;448(7150):188–90.

[100] Isbell F, Calcagno V, Hector A, Connolly J, Harpole WS, Reich PB, et al. High plant diversity is needed to maintain ecosystem services. Nature. 2011;477(7363):199–202.

[101] Loreau M, Naeem S, Inchausti P, Bengtsson J, Grime JP, Hector A, et al. Biodiversity and ecosystem functioning: current knowledge and future challenges. Science. 2001;294(5543):804–8.

[102] Balvanera P, Pfisterer AB, Buchmann N, He JS, Nakashizuka T, Raffaelli D, et al. Quantifying the evidence for biodiversity effects on ecosystem functioning and services. Ecol Lett. 2006;9(10):1146–56.

[103] Cardinale BJ, Matulich KL, Hooper DU, Byrnes JE, Duffy E, Gamfeldt L, et al. The functional role of producer diversity in ecosystems. Am J Bot. 2011;98(3):572–92.

[104] Tilman D, Isbell F, Cowles JM. Biodiversity and ecosystem functioning. Annu Rev Ecol Evol Syst. 2014;45:471–93.

[105] Grime JP. Benefits of plant diversity to ecosystems: immediate, filter and founder effects. J Ecol. 1998;86(6):902–10.

[106] Mouquet N, Loreau M. Community patterns in source-sink metacommunities. Am Nat. 2003;162(5):544–57.

[107] Hanski I, Gaggiotti OE. Ecology, genetics and evolution of metapopulations. Academic Press; 2004.

[108] Wilson DE, Cole FR, Nichols JD, Rudran R, Foster MS. Measuring and monitoring biological diversity: standard methods for mammals. Smithsonian Institution Press; 1996.

[109] Williams BK, Nichols JD, Conroy MJ. Analysis and management of animal populations: modeling, estimation, and decision making. Academic Press; 2002.

[110] Anthony NM, Ribic CA, Bautz R, Garland T Jr. Comparative effectiveness of Longworth and Sherman live traps. Wildl Soc Bull. 2005;33(3):1018–26.

[111] Flowerdew JR, Trout RC, Ross J. Field and laboratory evaluation of Longworth and Sherman live traps for small mammals. J Zool. 2004;264(4):371–8.

[112] Woodman N, Timm RM. Inexpensive pitfall traps for live-capturing small mammals and reptiles. Occas Pap Mus Nat Hist Univ Kans. 1993;156:1–8.

[113] Slade NA, Blair SM. An empirical test of using counts of individuals captured as indices of population size. J Mammal. 2000;81(4):1035–45.

[114] White GC, Anderson DR, Burnham KP, Otis DL. Capture-recapture and removal methods for sampling closed populations. Los Alamos National Laboratory Report LA-8787-NERP; 1982.

[115] Pollock KH, Nichols JD, Brownie C, Hines JE. Statistical inference for capture-recapture experiments. Wildl Monogr. 1990;107:1–97.

[116] Amstrup SC, McDonald TL, Manly BF. Handbook of capture-recapture analysis. Princeton University Press; 2005.

[117] Mills JN, Childs JE, Ksiazek TG, Peters CJ, Velleca WM. Methods for trapping and sampling small mammals for virologic testing. CDC; 1995.

[118] Merritt JF. Guide to the mammals of Pennsylvania. University of Pittsburgh Press; 1987.

[119] Rovero F, Zimmermann F, Berzi D, Meek P. "Which camera trap type and how many do I need?" A review of camera trap methods for wildlife research. Hystrix. 2013;24(2):148–56.

[120] O'Connell AF, Nichols JD, Karanth KU. Camera traps in animal ecology: methods and analyses. Springer; 2011.

[121] Swann DE, Hass CC, Dalton DC, Wolf SA. Infrared-triggered cameras for detecting wildlife: an evaluation and review. Wildl Soc Bull. 2004;32(2):357–65.

[122] Zielinski WJ, Kucera TE. American marten, fisher, lynx, and wolverine: survey methods for their detection. USDA Forest Service Gen Tech Rep PSW-GTR-157; 1995.

[123] Nichols JD, Williams BK. Monitoring for conservation. Trends Ecol Evol. 2006;21(12):668–73.

[124] Corn PS. Straight-line drift fences and pitfall traps. In: Heyer WR, Donnelly MA, McDiarmid RW, Hayek LC, Foster MS, editors. Measuring and Monitoring Biological Diversity: Standard Methods for Amphibians. Smithsonian Institution Press; 1994. p. 109–17.

[125] Friend GR. Standard techniques for trapping and surveying small mammals. Aust Mammal. 1984;7(1–2):193–204.

[126] Fisher RN, Suarez AV, Case TJ. Spatial patterns in the abundance of the coastal horned lizard. Conserv Biol. 2002;16(1):205–15.

[127] Bury RB, Corn PS. Evaluation of pitfall trapping in ecological studies. J Wildl Manage. 1987;51(1):112–9.

[128] Greenberg CH, Neary DG, Harris LD. Effect of high-intensity wildfire and silvicultural treatments on reptile communities in sand-pine scrub. Conserv Biol. 1994;8(4):1047–57.

[129] Waits LP, Paetkau D. Noninvasive genetic sampling tools for wildlife biologists: a review of applications and recommendations for accurate data collection. J Wildl Manage. 2005;69(4):1419–33.

[130] Beja-Pereira A, Oliveira R, Alves PC, Schwartz MK, Luikart G. Advancing ecological understandings through technological transformations in noninvasive genetics. Mol Ecol Resour. 2009;9(5):1279–301.

[131] Taberlet P, Waits LP, Luikart G. Noninvasive genetic sampling: look before you leap. Trends Ecol Evol. 1999;14(8):323–7.

[132] Thomsen PF, Willerslev E. Environmental DNA–an emerging tool in conservation for monitoring past and present biodiversity. Biol Conserv. 2015;183:4–18.

[133] Ushio M, Fukuda H, Inoue T, Makoto K, Kishida O, Sato K, et al. Environmental DNA enables detection of terrestrial mammals from forest pond water. Mol Ecol Resour. 2017;17(6):e63–75.

[134] Sales NG, McKenzie MB, Drake J, Harper LR, Browett SS, Coscia I, et al. Fishing for mammals: landscape-level monitoring of terrestrial and semiaquatic communities using eDNA from riverine systems. J Appl Ecol. 2020;57(4):707–16.

[135] Goldberg CS, Strickler KM, Pilliod DS. Moving environmental DNA methods from concept to practice for monitoring aquatic macroorganisms. Biol Conserv. 2015;183:1–3.

[136] Pasch B, Tokuda IT, Rubenstein DR. Acoustic communication in mouse lemurs: the social function of ultrasonic calls. PLoS One. 2013;8(7):e67379.

[137] Arch VS, Narins PM. Sexual hearing: the influence of sex hormones on acoustic communication in frogs. Hear Res. 2009;252(1–2):15–20.

[138] Dawson DK, Efford MG. Bird population density estimated from acoustic signals. J Appl Ecol. 2009;46(6):1201–9.

[139] Gotelli NJ, Colwell RK. Quantifying biodiversity: procedures and pitfalls in the measurement and comparison of species richness. Ecol Lett. 2001;4(4):379–91.

[140] MacKenzie DI, Nichols JD, Royle JA, Pollock KH, Bailey LL, Hines JE. Occupancy estimation and modeling: inferring patterns and dynamics of species occurrence. Academic Press; 2006.

[141] Clarke KR, Warwick RM. Change in marine communities: an approach to statistical analysis and interpretation. 2nd ed. PRIMER-E Ltd; 2001.

[142] Kéry M, Royle JA. Applied hierarchical modeling in ecology: analysis of distribution, abundance and species richness in R and BUGS. Vol. 1. Academic Press; 2015.

[143] Cutler DR, Edwards TC Jr, Beard KH, Cutler A, Hess KT, Gibson J, et al. Random forests for classification in ecology. Ecology. 2007;88(11):2783–92.

[144] McCarthy MA, Burgman MA, Ferson S. Hierarchical models for inferring the abundance of threatened species. Ecol Appl. 1997;7(3):666–76.

[145] Malcolm JR. Edge effects in central Amazonian forest fragments. Ecology. 1994;75(8):2438–45.

[146] Laurance WF, Delamônica P, Laurance SG, Vasconcelos HL, Lovejoy TE. Rainforest fragmentation kills big trees. Nature. 2000;404(6780):836.

[147] Carey AB, Harrington CA. Small mammals in managed, naturally young, and old-growth forests. Ecol Appl. 2001;11(3):641–55.

[148] Lehmkuhl JF, Carey AB, Peeler KC. Small mammals in managed, naturally young, and old-growth forests. Ecol Appl. 1994;4(2):378–92.

[149] Ecke F, Löfgren O, Sörlin D. Population dynamics of small mammals in relation to forest age and structural habitat factors in northern Sweden. J Appl Ecol. 2002;39(5):781–92.

[150] Sinclair ARE, Mduma SAR, Arcese P. What determines phenology and synchrony of ungulate breeding in Serengeti? Ecology. 2000;81(8):2100–11.

[151] Anderson TM, Ritchie ME, Mayemba E, Eby S, Grace JB, McNaughton SJ. Forage nutritive quality in the Serengeti ecosystem: the roles of fire and herbivory. Am Nat. 2007;170(3):343–57.

[152] Kaufman DW, Kaufman GA, Finck EJ. Influence of fire and topography on habitat selection by small mammals in tallgrass prairie. J Mammal. 1990;71(4):547–52.

[153] Matlack RS, Kaufman DW. Influence of grazing and old-field succession on small mammals in tallgrass prairie. Am Midl Nat. 1999;141(2):378–92.

[154] Kerley GIH, Knight MH, de Kock M. Desertification of subtropical thicket in the Eastern Cape, South Africa: are there alternatives? Environ Monit Assess. 1995;37(1–3):211–30.

[155] Boughton EH, Quintana-Ascencio PF, Bohlen PJ, Jenkins DG. Land-use and isolation interact to affect wetland plant assemblages. Ecol Appl. 2010;20(3):816–29.

[156] Mitsch WJ, Gosselink JG. Wetlands. 5th ed. John Wiley & Sons; 2015.

[157] Arthur AD, Catling PC, Reid A. Relative influence of habitat structure, species interactions and rainfall on the occurrence of rodents and dasyurids in Australian desert landscapes. Austral Ecol. 2012;37(6):663–73.

[158] McKinney ML. Effects of urbanization on species richness: a review of plants and animals. Urban Ecosyst. 2008;11(2):161–76.

[159] Toth CA, Rosenberg DK. Small mammal use of urban and peri-urban parks in southern California. Urban Ecosyst. 2014;17(1):143–55.

[160] Dickman CR. Ecology and impacts of feral cats on native fauna in Australia. Wildl Res. 2009;36(7):523–36.

[161] Crooks KR. Relative sensitivities of mammalian carnivores to habitat fragmentation. Conserv Biol. 2002;16(2):488–502.

[162] Slade NA, Blair SM. An empirical test of using counts of individuals captured as indices of population size. J Mammal. 2000;81(4):1035–45.

[163] Nicolas V, Colyn M. Relative efficiency of three types of traps for surveying small mammals in tropical montane forest. Belg J Zool. 2006;136(2):107–11.

[164] Williams DF, Braun SE. Comparison of pitfall and conventional traps for sampling small mammal populations. J Wildl Manage. 1983;47(3):841–5.

[165] Woodman N, Timm RM. Trap types and bait selection for live-trapping small mammals. Occas Pap Mus Nat Hist Univ Kans. 1999;153:1–8.

[166] Nichols JD, Thomas L, Conn PB. Inferences about landbird abundance from count data: recent advances and future directions. In: Ralph CJ, Rich TD, editors. Bird Conservation Implementation and Integration in the Americas: Proceedings. USDA Forest Service Gen Tech Rep PSW-GTR-191; 2005. p. 201–35.

[167] MacKenzie DI, Royle JA. Designing occupancy studies: general advice and allocating survey effort. J Appl Ecol. 2005;42(6):1105–14.

[168] Turchin P, Batzli GO. Population consequences of temporal and spatial variation in seed crops. Am Nat. 2001;158(5):360–73.

[169] Hanski I. Cycles, chaos, and community structure. Trends Ecol Evol. 1990;5(9):326–30.

[170] Krebs CJ, Boonstra R, Boutin S. Population cycles in small mammals. Adv Ecol Res. 2001;32:27–525.

[171] Wiens JA. Spatial scaling in ecology. Funct Ecol. 1989;3(4):385–97.

[172] Fahrig L. Effects of habitat fragmentation on biodiversity. Annu Rev Ecol Evol Syst. 2003;34(1):487–515.

[173] Lima SL, Dill LM. Behavioral decisions made under the risk of predation: a review and prospectus. Can J Zool. 1990;68(4):619–40.

[174] Hayward MW, Kerley GI. Prey preferences of the spotted hyaena (Crocuta crocuta) and degree of dietary overlap with the lion (Panthera leo). J Zool. 2008;275(2):153–64.

[175] Stenseth NC, Leirs H, Skonhoft A, Davis SA, Pech RP, Andreassen HP, et al. Mice, rats, and people: the bio-economics of agricultural rodent pests. Front Ecol Environ. 2003;1(7):367–75.

[176] Banks PB, Hughes NK. A review of the evidence for potential impacts of black rats (Rattus rattus) on wildlife and humans in Australia. Wildl Res. 2012;39(1):78–88.

[177] Sikes RS, Gannon WL, Animal Care and Use Committee of the American Society of Mammalogists. Guidelines of the American Society of Mammalogists for the use of wild mammals in research. J Mammal. 2011;92(1):235–53.

[178] Koprowski JL. Handling tree squirrels with an emphasis on anesthesia. In: Rodent societies: an ecological and evolutionary perspective. University of Chicago Press; 2006. p. 274–81.

[179] Gannon WL, Sikes RS. Guidelines of the American Society of Mammalogists for the use of wild mammals in research. J Mammal. 2007;88(3):809–23.

[180] American Society of Mammalogists. Guidelines for the capture, handling, and care of mammals as approved by the American Society of Mammalogists. J Mammal. 1998;79(4):1416–31.

[181] Fahrig L. Relative effects of habitat loss and fragmentation on population extinction. J Wildl Manage. 1997;61(3):603–10.

[182] Lindenmayer DB, Fischer J. Habitat fragmentation and landscape change: an ecological and conservation synthesis. Island Press; 2006.

[183] Kerley GIH, Kowalewski MM. Small mammal diversity, abundance and community structure in grasslands and shrublands of the Karoo, South Africa. Afr J Ecol. 2008;46(2):143–52.

[184] Tilman D. The ecological consequences of changes in biodiversity: a search for general principles. Ecology. 1999;80(5):1455–74.

[185] Noss RF. Indicators for monitoring biodiversity: a hierarchical approach. Conserv Biol. 1990;4(4):355–64.

[186] Treweek J. Ecological Impact Assessment. Wiley-Blackwell; 1999.

[187] Atkinson IAE. Guidelines to assess the impacts of introduced animals. In: Towns DR, Daugherty CH, Atkinson IAE, editors. Ecological restoration of New Zealand islands. Department of Conservation; 1990. p. 35–43.

[188] Carey AB, Harrington CA. Small mammals in managed, naturally young, and old-growth forests. Ecol Appl. 2001;11(3):641–55.

[189] Canters KJ, Piepers AAM, Hendriks-Heersma A. Habitat fragmentation and infrastructure. Ministry of Transport, Public Works and Water Management; 1997.

[190] Galatowitsch SM, van der Valk AG. Restoring prairie pothole wetlands: an ecological approach. Great Plains Res. 1994;4(2):179–200.

[191] Mitsch WJ, Wilson RF. Improving the success of wetland creation and restoration with know-how, time, and self-design. Ecol Appl. 1996;6(1):77–83.

[192] Chazdon RL. Beyond deforestation: restoring forests and ecosystem services on degraded lands. Science. 2008;320(5882):1458–60.

[193] Ruiz-Jaen MC, Aide TM. Restoration success: how is it being measured? Restor Ecol. 2005;13(3):569–77.

[194] Bruner AG, Gullison RE, Rice RE, da Fonseca GA. Effectiveness of parks in protecting tropical biodiversity. Science. 2001;291(5501):125–8.

[195] Watson JEM, Dudley N, Segan DB, Hockings M. The performance and potential of protected areas. Nature. 2014;515(7525):67–73.

[196] Brooks TM, Wright SJ, Sheil D. Evaluating the success of conservation actions in safeguarding tropical forest biodiversity. Conserv Biol. 2009;23(6):1448–57.

[197] Cushman SA, McKelvey KS, Schwartz MK. Use of empirically derived source-destination models to map regional conservation corridors. Conserv Biol. 2009;23(2):368–76.

[198] Parmesan C. Ecological and evolutionary responses to recent climate change. Annu Rev Ecol Evol Syst. 2006;37:637–69.

[199] Chen IC, Hill JK, Ohlemüller R, Roy DB, Thomas CD. Rapid range shifts of species associated with high levels of climate warming. Science. 2011;333(6045):1024–6.

[200] Rowe RJ, Finarelli JA, Rickart EA. Range shifts of small mammals in response to global climate change. Glob Change Biol. 2010;16(11):2930–43.

[201] Moritz C, Patton JL, Conroy CJ, Parra JL, White GC, Beissinger SR. Impact of a century of climate change on small-mammal communities in Yosemite National Park, USA. Science. 2008;322(5899):261–4.

[202] Pacifici M, Foden WB, Visconti P, Watson JE, Butchart SH, Kovacs KM, et al. Assessing species vulnerability to climate change. Nat Clim Change. 2015;5(3):215–24.

[203] Danielsen F, Burgess ND, Balmford A. Monitoring matters: examining the potential of locally-based approaches. Biodivers Conserv. 2005;14(11):2507–42.

[204] Conrad CC, Hilchey KG. A review of citizen science and community-based environmental monitoring: issues and opportunities. Environ Monit Assess. 2011;176(1–4):273–91.

[205] Devictor V, Whittaker RJ, Beltrame C. Beyond scarcity: citizen science programmes as useful tools for conservation biogeography. Divers Distrib. 2010;16(3):354–62.

[206] Fernandez-Gimenez ME, Ballard HL, Sturtevant VE. Adaptive management and social learning in collaborative and community-based monitoring: a study of five community-based forestry organizations in the western USA. Ecol Soc. 2008;13(2):4.

[207] Deiner K, Bik HM, Mächler E, Seymour M, Lacoursière-Roussel A, Altermatt F, et al. Environmental DNA metabarcoding: transforming how we survey animal and plant communities. Mol Ecol. 2017;26(21):5872–95.

[208] Bohmann K, Evans A, Gilbert MT, Carvalho GR, Creer S, Knapp M, et al. Environmental DNA for wildlife biology and biodiversity monitoring. Trends Ecol Evol. 2014;29(6):358–67.

[209] Thomsen PF, Willerslev E. Environmental DNA–an emerging tool in conservation for monitoring past and present biodiversity. Biol Conserv. 2015;183:4–18.

[210] Harper LR, Lawson Handley L, Hahn C, Boonham N, Rees HC, Lewis E, et al. Generating and testing ecological hypotheses at the pondscape with environmental DNA metabarcoding: a case study on a threatened amphibian. Oecologia. 2019;189(1):149–61.

[211] Turner W, Spector S, Gardiner N, Fladeland M, Sterling E, Steininger M. Remote sensing for biodiversity science and conservation. Trends Ecol Evol. 2003;18(6):306–14.

[212] Pettorelli N, Safi K, Turner W. Satellite remote sensing, biodiversity research and conservation of the future. Philos Trans R Soc Lond B Biol Sci. 2014;369(1643):20130190

[213] Rocchini D, Boyd DS, Féret JB, Foody GM, He KS, Lausch A, et al. Satellite remote sensing to monitor species diversity: potential and pitfalls. Remote Sens Ecol Conserv. 2016;2(1):25–36.

[214] Christin S, Hervet É, Lecomte N. Applications for deep learning in ecology. Methods Ecol Evol. 2019;10(10):1632–44.

[215] Tabak MA, Norouzzadeh MS, Wolfson DW, Sweeney SJ, VerCauteren KC, Snow NP, et al. Machine learning to classify animal species in camera trap images: applications in ecology. Methods Ecol Evol. 2019;10(4):585–90.

[216] Isaac NJ, Jarzyna MA, Keil P, Dambly LI, Boersch-Supan PH, Browning E, et al. Data integration for large-scale models of species distributions. Trends Ecol Evol. 2020;35(1):56–67.Urban MC. Accelerating extinction risk from climate change. Science. 2015;348(6234):571–3.

[217] Iknayan KJ, Beissinger SR. Collapse of a desert bird community over the past century driven by climate change. Proc Natl Acad Sci USA. 2018;115(34):8597–602.

[218] Rushing CS, Hostetler JA, Sillett TS, Marra PP. Moving beyond the breeding grounds: seasonal survival and implications for a declining migratory bird. Ecology. 2017;98(7):1417–24.

[219] Winfree R, Bartomeus I, Cariveau DP. Native pollinators in anthropogenic habitats. Annu Rev Ecol Evol Syst. 2011;42:1–22.

[220] Tylianakis JM, Didham RK, Bascompte J, Wardle DA. Global change and species interactions in terrestrial ecosystems. Ecol Lett. 2008;11(12):1351–63.

[221] Hooper DU, Adair EC, Cardinale BJ, Byrnes JE, Hungate BA, Matulich KL, et al. A global synthesis reveals biodiversity loss as a major driver of ecosystem change. Nature. 2012;486(7401):105–8.