

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42



Collaboration for Environmental Evidence

Systematic Review No. 84

WORKING TITLE:

**The relation between biodiversity and land use in the tropics:
a meta-analysis.**

Draft Review Protocol

Lead Reviewer: Marijke van Kuijk

Postal Address: Netherlands Environmental Assessment Agency (PBL)
PO Box 303
3720 AH Bilthoven
the Netherlands

E-mail Address: marijkevankuijk@hotmail.com

Telephone: +31(0)302743298

Fax: +31(0)302744485

43
44

Cover Sheet

Title	The relation between biodiversity and land use in the tropics: a meta-analysis.
Systematic review	N ^o 84
Reviewer(s)	Rob Alkemade, Marijke van Kuijk, Mark van Oorschot, Bart de Knegt and Antoni Tekelenburg
Date draft protocol published on website	07 December 2009
Date final protocol published on website	
Date of most recent amendment	
Date of most recent SUBSTANTIVE amendment	
Details of most recent changes	
Contact address	Netherlands Environmental Assessment Agency (PBL) PO Box 303 3720 AH Bilthoven the Netherlands marijkevankuijk@hotmail.com
Sources of support	Netherlands Environmental Assessment Agency (PBL), Tropenbos International
Conflicts of interest	None known

45

46 **1. Background**

47

48 The current loss of biodiversity at rates significantly exceeding those in the fossil
49 record is a source of concern to many people, conservation organizations and
50 governments (UNEP, 2002a). Recent assessments on global biodiversity show that
51 biodiversity at levels of ecosystems, species and genes decreases rapidly due to
52 several driving forces, including climate change, habitat fragmentation and land use
53 change (MEA, 2005;CBD, 2006). At the species level the process of biodiversity loss
54 is generally characterised by a decrease in the abundance of many species, resulting in
55 an increase in the number of threatened species and in the extinction of others (Pullin,
56 2002).

57

58 Land use and land cover change results in considerable areas of natural habitats being
59 converted into cropland, pasture, urban areas, or are otherwise impacted by human
60 uses such as forestry and hunting. This causes biodiversity loss at a local, regional and
61 global level (Hannah et al., 1994;Chapin et al., 2000;Sala et al., 2000;Sanderson et al.,
62 2002;UNEP, 2002b). Even though it is clear that changes in land use and land cover
63 will cause changes in species composition, the loss of biodiversity due to land use
64 change is not well quantified. In some studies it is either explicitly or implicitly
65 assumed that habitat loss due to conversion of land cover implies extirpation of all
66 species from that habitat (e.g. MEA, 2005). This assumption does not hold for every
67 land use change as shown by Majer and Beeston (1996) and Scholes and Biggs
68 (2005). These studies show that the degree of biodiversity loss depends on the
69 completeness of the conversion and on the intensity of land use after conversion.

70

71 Tropical forests that are relatively undisturbed harbor many floral and faunal species
72 (Singh and Sharma, 2009 and references therein). Due to the conversion or
73 degradation of this primary forest to other types of land use however, many species
74 decline in numbers or disappear from the area (Castelletta et al., 2000;Barthlott et al.,
75 2001;Raman, 2001;Robertson and van Schaik, 2001) which largely influences global
76 biodiversity. In the proposed review we intend to assess the effect on biodiversity of
77 different taxa when relatively undisturbed tropical forest is converted or degraded to
78 other types of land use.

79

80 The data collected during the review will be used to feed the Global Biodiversity
81 Model (GLOBIO3) developed by the Netherlands Environmental Assessment Agency
82 (PBL). The GLOBIO3 model has been developed to assess human-induced changes in
83 biodiversity, in the past, present, and future at regional and global scales. The model
84 is built on simple cause-effect relationships between environmental drivers and
85 biodiversity impacts, based on state-of-the-art knowledge (Alkemade et al., 2009).

86

The proposed review will be executed on behalf of the Netherlands Environmental Assessment Agency (PBL). PBL is the national institute for strategic policy analysis in the field of environment, nature and spatial planning. Among others, it performs assessments on biodiversity to evaluate policy and to explore policy options. For these assessments PBL develops indicators and models to determine the past, current and future state of biodiversity and its causes. The proposed systematic review deals with a topic relevant for an important component of one of PBL's models and will support PBL's efforts to develop policy scenario models of biodiversity responses to human interference.

87

88

89 2. Objective of the Review

90

91 2.1 Primary question

92

93 What is the effect on biodiversity when relatively undisturbed tropical forest is
94 converted or degraded to other types of land use?

95

96 2.2 Secondary questions

97

98 Do different taxonomic groups show different responses when relatively undisturbed
99 tropical forest is converted or degraded to other types of land use?

100

101 How does biodiversity differ between different types of land use?

102

103

104 3. Methods

105

106 3.1 Search strategy

107

108 The search aims to capture a representative sample of the literature published in peer-
109 reviewed journals as well as other sources (grey literature), relevant to the research
110 questions. Different sources of information will be searched in order to maximise
111 coverage, among which will be ISI Web of Knowledge (Web of Science), Scopus and
112 Google Scholar. Search terms such as species, tropics, primary forest, conversion,
113 degradation, land use, habitat type, agro-forestry, secondary forest, plantation,
114 cropland, urban area, diversity, richness and abundance will be used. Variation in
115 spelling of search terms will be checked.

116

117 The World Agroforestry Centre (ICRAF), and in particular Meine van Noordwijk
118 (Global Science Advisor), as well as Douglas Sheil (Center for International Forestry
119 Research) and Francis Putz (University of Florida) will be contacted for advice and
120 provision of any unpublished data that might be relevant to our review study.

121

122 Prior to the review proposed in this protocol, the Netherlands Environmental
123 Assessment Agency (PBL) collected data for a global study on biodiversity related to
124 land use. Those data are recorded in a database and part of it will be used here. Data
125 from the tropics will be selected and supplemented with data from 2007 until 2009
126 under the scope of the review proposed here.

127

128 3.2 Study inclusion criteria

129

- 130 • **Relevant subject(s):** floral and faunal species assemblages
- 131 • **Types of intervention:** conversion or degradation of relatively undisturbed
132 tropical forest* to other types of land use
- 133 • **Types of comparator:** relatively undisturbed tropical forest
- 134 • **Types of outcome:** change in species richness, species abundance and species
135 diversity

136 • **Types of study:** all primary studies that report on the effect on species
137 presence and abundance when undisturbed tropical forest is converted or
138 degraded
139

140 *‘Relatively undisturbed forest’ in our study is defined as primary forest which is
141 either undisturbed for as long as it is known or which was subject to mild disturbance
142 in the past. Mild disturbance could include small scale selective logging or
143 subsistence hunting. Such disturbance should be clearly described in the study. Old
144 growth secondary forests do not count as ‘relatively undisturbed forest’ unless they
145 are more than 100 years old. The study needs to describe the ‘primary’, ‘intact’,
146 ‘mature’ or ‘old growth’ forest which is studied, otherwise the study will not be
147 included in the review.
148

149 **3.3 Potential effect modifiers and reasons for heterogeneity:**

150
151 Variability in data will undoubtedly occur. Reasons for this variability include the
152 type and extension of forest conversion, the temporal and spatial scale of studies,
153 variety in the biodiversity of the reference forest, location of the study and sampling
154 schemes and techniques. Species or taxonomic groups respond differently to
155 conversion.
156

157 Numerous factors other than land use change affect the abundance and spatial
158 distribution of plants and animals, including climate change, background colonisation
159 and extinction patterns, etc.
160

161 **3.4 Study collection**

162
163 A first reviewer will filter the outcome of the searches by selecting those studies with
164 a relevant title and keywords. The abstracts of these articles will be read to further
165 determine the suitability of the study. The studies remaining hereafter, will be read in
166 full to determine which ones are suitable for data extraction. A second reviewer will
167 check the studies of which the suitability is unclear to the first reviewer.
168

169 At the start of the literature selection phase, both reviewers will assess suitability of
170 several studies together to assure consistent use of inclusion criteria.
171

172 **3.5 Study quality assessment**

173
174 Ideally a study includes a undisturbed primary tropical forest as a reference, to which
175 species abundance in other types of land use is compared. A table with individuals
176 counts per species in the undisturbed reference and in other types of land use within
177 the same area would be most suitable to calculate mean species abundance and
178 relative species richness (of original species) (see below for a description of these
179 biodiversity indicators). If such tables are absent, graphs and other figures will be
180 studied to determine if they can provide information to calculate at least one of the
181 biodiversity indicators.
182

183 Studies may differ in the number of species, or taxonomic groups studied and in the
184 spatial and temporal scales that are covered. Sampling design and techniques may also

185 seriously affect the quality of the studies. We will however incorporate all studies if
186 they fulfil the inclusion criteria.

187

188 **3.6 Data extraction strategy**

189

190 Only quantitative data will be extracted from the articles. Two reviewers will assess
191 the suitability of the data in order to proceed with calculations. The data that will be
192 extracted are stored in a database that already exists (it contains data relevant to the
193 topic of the review up to and including 2006). If present in the article or report, tables
194 presenting individuals or species counts in different land use types will be copied to
195 the excel database for further calculations.

196

197 **3.7 Data synthesis and presentation**

198

199 The extracted data will be used to calculate three indicators of biodiversity for each
200 land use type covered in the study. Each study will have to include a reference
201 biodiversity calculated for the undisturbed forest (the comparator). We will apply
202 meta-analytical techniques to combine the results of independent studies in a
203 quantitative way (Arnqvist and Wooster, 1995).

204

205 The first biodiversity indicator is relative species richness (RSR) which is defined as
206 the species richness found in a particular land use type, relative to that of the
207 undisturbed forest. The second is the relative species richness of original species
208 (RSR_{os}) which is the proportion of species in a particular land use type that were also
209 recorded in the undisturbed forest. The third is the mean species abundance (MSA)
210 and is a refinement of RSR_{os} as it not only accounts for the presence or absence of
211 species but also the change in abundance of each species.

212

213 Biodiversity indicators will be presented per land use type and for each taxonomic
214 group separately. The land use types that will be distinguished are: undisturbed forest,
215 lightly used forest, secondary forest, agro-forestry, wood plantation, perennial crops,
216 low-input crops, high-input crops and urban areas.

217

218

219 **4. Potential Conflicts of Interest and Sources of Support**

220

221 Tropenbos International supports this review.

222 There are no known conflicts of interests.

223

224

225 **5. References**

226

227 Alkemade, R., Van Oorschot, M., Miles, L., Nellemann, C., Bakkenes, M. & Ten
228 Brink, B. (2009) *GLOBIO3: A framework to investigate options for reducing*
229 *global terrestrial biodiversity loss. Ecosystems*, **12**, 374-390.

230 Arnqvist, G. & Wooster, D. (1995) *Meta-analysis: synthesizing research findings in*
231 *ecology and evolution. Trends in ecology and evolution*, **10**, 236-240.

232 CBD (2006) *Global Biodiversity Outlook 2. Secretariat of the Convention on*
233 *Biological Diversity, Montreal, 81 pp.*

- 234 CEBC (2008) *Guidelines for systematic review in conservation and environmental*
235 *management. Bangor University, United Kingdom.*
- 236 Chapin, F. S., Zavaleta, E. S., Eviner, V. T., Naylor, R. L., Vitousek, P. M., Reynolds,
237 H. L., Hooper, D. U., Lavorel, S., Sala, O. E., Hobbie, S. E., Mack, M. C. &
238 Diaz, S. (2000) *Consequences of changing biodiversity. Nature, 405*, 234-242.
- 239 Hannah, L., Lohse, D., Hutchinson, C., Carr, J. L. & Lankerani, A. (1994) *A*
240 *preliminary Inventory of Human Disturbance of world ecosystems. AMBIO,*
241 *23*, 246-250.
- 242 Majer, J. D. & Beeston, G. (1996) *The biodiversity Integrity Index: an Illustration*
243 *using ants in Western Australia. Conservation Biology, 10*, 65-73.
- 244 MEA (2005) *Millennium Ecosystem Assessment: Ecosystems and Human Well-being:*
245 *synthesis. Island Press, Washington, DC.*
- 246 Pullin, A. (2002) *Biotic Homogenization: Edited by Lockwood J.L. and McKinney,*
247 *M.L. 2001. Kluwer Academic/Plenum Publishers, New York, 289 pp.*
248 *Biological Conservation, 103*, 376-377.
- 249 Sala, O. E., Chapin, F. S., Armesto, J. J., Berlow, E., Bloomfield, J., Irzo, R., Huber-
250 Samwald, E., Huenneke, K. L. F., Jackson, R. B., Kinzig, A., Leemans, R.,
251 Lodge, D. M., Mooney, H. A., Oesterheld, M., Poff, N. L., Sykes, M. T.,
252 Walker, B. H., Walker, M. & Wall, D. H. (2000) *Global biodiversity scenarios*
253 *for the year 2100. Science, 287*, 1770-1774.
- 254 Sanderson, E. W., Jaiteh, M., Levy, M. A., Redford, K. H., Wannebo, A. V. &
255 Woolmer, G. (2002) *The Human footprint and the last of the wild. BioScience,*
256 *52*, 891-904.
- 257 Scholes, R. J. & Biggs, R. (2005) *A biodiversity intactness index. Nature, 434*, 45-49.
- 258 Singh, S. P. & Sharma, C. M. (2009) *Tropical ecology: an overview. Int Soc Tropical*
259 *Ecology, p7-21.*
- 260 UNEP (2002a) *Decision VI/26: Strategic plan for the Convention on Biological*
261 *Diversity. Seventh Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological*
262 *Diversity, the Hague.*
- 263 UNEP (2002b) *Global Environment Outlook 3. Earthscan Publications Ltd, London.*
264
265