Biological Conservation 144 (2011) 56–67

Contents lists available at ScienceDirect

Biological Conservation

journal homepage: www.elsevier.com/locate/biocon

Review

The fate of Amazonian forest fragments: A 32-year investigation

William F. Laurance [a,b,*], José L.C. Camargo [a], Regina C.C. Luizão [a,c], Susan G. Laurance [a,b], Stuart L. Pimm [d], Emilio M. Bruna [e], Philip C. Stouffer [f], G. Bruce Williamson [g], Julieta Benítez-Malvido [h], Heraldo L. Vasconcelos [i], Kyle S. Van Houtan [d,j], Charles E. Zartman [k], Sarah A. Boyle [l], Raphael K. Didham [m,n], Ana Andrade [a], Thomas E. Lovejoy [o,p,*]

[a] Biological Dynamics of Forest Fragments Project, National Institute for Amazonian Research (INPA) and Smithsonian Tropical Research Institute, C.P. 478, Manaus, AM 69011-970, Brazil
[b] School of Marine and Tropical Biology, James Cook University, Cairns, Queensland 4870, Australia
[c] Department of Ecology, National Institute for Amazonian Research (INPA), C.P. 478, Manaus, AM 69011-970, Brazil
[d] Nicholas School of the Environment, Duke University, Durham, NC 27708, USA
[e] Center for Latin American Studies and Department of Wildlife Ecology and Conservation, University of Florida, Gainesville, FL 32611, USA
[f] School of Renewable Natural Resources and LSU AgCenter, Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge, LA 70803, USA
[g] Department of Biological Sciences, Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge, LA 70803, USA
[h] Center for Ecosystem Research, National Autonomous University of Mexico (UNAM), Morelia, Michoacán, Mexico
[i] Institute of Biology, Federal University of Uberlândia (UFU), C.P. 593, Uberlândia, MG 38400-902, Brazil
[j] Marine Turtle Assessment Program, NOAA Fisheries, Honolulu, HI 96822, USA
[k] Department of Botany, National Institute for Amazonian Research (INPA), C.P. 478, Manaus, AM 69011-970, Brazil
[l] Department of Biology, Rhodes College, Memphis, TN 38112, USA
[m] School of Animal Biology, University of Western Australia, Crawley, WA 6009, Australia
[n] CSIRO Ecosystem Sciences, Centre for Environment and Life Sciences, Floreat, WA 6014, Australia
[o] The Heinz Center, 900 17th Street, NW, Suite 700, Washington, DC 20006, USA
[p] Department of Environmental Science and Policy, George Mason University, Fairfax, VA 22030, USA

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:
Received 11 September 2010
Received in revised form 18 September 2010
Accepted 19 September 2010
Available online 18 October 2010

Keywords:
Amazon
Community dynamics
Ecosystem processes
Edge effects
Habitat fragmentation
Long-term research
Matrix effects
Species extinctions
Tropical forests

ABSTRACT

We synthesize findings to date from the world's largest and longest-running experimental study of habitat fragmentation, located in central Amazonia. Over the past 32 years, Amazonian forest fragments ranging from 1 to 100 ha have experienced a wide array of ecological changes. Edge effects have been a dominant driver of fragment dynamics, strongly affecting forest microclimate, tree mortality, carbon storage, fauna, and other aspects of fragment ecology. However, edge-effect intensity varies markedly in space and time, and is influenced by factors such as edge age, the number of nearby edges, and the adjoining matrix of modified vegetation surrounding fragments. In our study area, the matrix has changed markedly over the course of the study (evolving from large cattle pastures to mosaics of abandoned pasture and regrowth forest) and this in turn has strongly influenced fragment dynamics and faunal persistence. Rare weather events, especially windstorms and droughts, have further altered fragment ecology. In general, populations and communities of species in fragments are hyperdynamic relative to nearby intact forest. Some edge and fragment-isolation effects have declined with a partial recovery of secondary forests around fragments, but other changes, such as altered patterns of tree recruitment, are ongoing. Fragments are highly sensitive to external vicissitudes, and even small changes in local land-management practices may drive fragmented ecosystems in markedly different directions. The effects of fragmentation are likely to interact synergistically with other anthropogenic threats such as logging, hunting, and especially fire, creating an even greater peril for the Amazonian biota.

---

* Corresponding authors. Addresses: School of Marine and Tropical Biology, James Cook University, Cairns, Queensland 4870, Australia. Tel.: +61 7 4042 1819; fax: +61 7 4042 1319 (W.F. Laurance). Department of Environmental Science and Policy, George Mason University, Fairfax, VA 22030, USA. Tel.: +1 202 737 6307; fax: +1 202 737 6410 (T.E. Lovejoy).

E-mail addresses: bill.laurance@jcu.edu.au (W.F. Laurance), lovejoy@heinzctr.org (T.E. Lovejoy).

0006-3207/$ - see front matter Crown Copyright © 2010 Published by Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved.
doi:10.1016/j.biocon.2010.09.021

Contents

1. Introduction

The rapid loss and fragmentation of old-growth forests are among the greatest threats to tropical biodiversity (Lovejoy et al., 1986; Sodhi et al., 2004; Laurance and Peres, 2006). More than half of all surviving tropical forest occurs in the Amazon Basin, which is being seriously altered by large-scale agriculture (Fearnside, 2001; Gibbs et al., 2010), industrial logging (Asner et al., 2005), proliferating roads (Laurance et al., 2001a; Killeen, 2007), and oil and gas developments (Finer et al., 2008).

The exploitation of Amazonia is driving forest fragmentation on a vast spatial scale. By the early 1990s, the area of Amazonian forest that was fragmented (<100 km^2) or vulnerable to edge effects (<1 km from edge) was over 150% greater than the area that had been deforested (Skole and Tucker, 1993). From 1999 to 2002, deforestation and logging in Brazilian Amazonia respectively created ~32,000 and ~38,000 km of new forest edge annually (Broadbent et al., 2008). Prevailing land uses in Amazonia, such as cattle ranching and small-scale farming, produce landscapes dominated by small (<400 ha) and irregularly shaped forest fragments (Cochrane and Laurance, 2002; Broadbent et al., 2008). Such fragments are highly vulnerable to edge effects, fires, and other deleterious consequences of forest fragmentation (Laurance et al., 2002; Barlow et al., 2006; Cochrane and Laurance, 2008).

Starting in 1979, the Biological Dynamics of Forest Fragments Project (BDFFP) has been assessing the impacts of fragmentation on the Amazon rainforest and biota (Lovejoy et al., 1986; Bierregaard et al., 1992; Pimm, 1998; Laurance et al., 2002). Today, 32 years later, it is the world's largest and longest-running experimental study of habitat fragmentation, as well as one of the most highly cited ecological investigations ever conducted (Gardner et al., 2009; Peres et al., 2010). As of October 2010, BDFFP researchers had produced 562 publications and 143 completed graduate theses (http://pdbff.inpa.gov.br), focusing on the responses of a wide array of animal and plant taxa to fragmentation as well as research on secondary forests, global-change phenomena, and basic forest ecology.

The last general review of forest fragmentation research at the BDFFP was nearly a decade ago (Laurance et al., 2002), and we present here an updated synthesis. We highlight several key conclusions from our last review but emphasize new findings and their implications for forest conservation, including recent works by BDFFP investigators that encompass large expanses of the Amazon basin.

2. Project background

The BDFFP is located 80 km north of Manaus, Brazil and spans ~1000 km^2 (Fig. 1). The topography is relatively flat (80–160 m elevation) but dissected by numerous stream gullies. The heavily weathered, nutrient-poor soils of the study area are typical of large expanses of the Amazon Basin. Rainfall ranges from 1900 to 3500 mm annually with a moderately strong dry season from June to October. The forest canopy is 30–37 m tall, with emergents to 55 m. Species richness of trees ($\geqslant$10 cm diameter-at-breast-height) often exceeds 280 species ha^{-1} (Oliveira and Mori, 1999; Laurance et al., 2010) with a comparably high level of diversity also evident in many other plant and animal taxa.

The study area includes three large cattle ranges (~5000 ha each) containing 11 forest fragments (five of 1 ha, four of 10 ha,



Fig. 1. Map of the BDFFP study area in central Amazonia. Unshaded areas are mostly intact forest.

and two of 100 ha), and expanses of nearby continuous forest that serve as experimental controls. In the early 1980s, the fragments were isolated from nearby intact forest by distances of 80–650 m by clearing and burning the surrounding forest. A key feature was that pre-fragmentation censuses were conducted for many animal and plant groups (e.g. trees, understory birds, small mammals, primates, frogs, many invertebrate taxa), thereby allowing long-term changes in these groups to be assessed far more confidently than in most other fragmentation studies.

Because of poor soils and low productivity, the ranches surrounding the BDFFP fragments were largely abandoned. Secondary forests (initially dominated by *Vismia* spp. in areas that were cleared and burned, or by *Cecropia* spp. in areas that were cleared without fire) proliferated in many formerly cleared areas (Mesquita et al., 2001). Some of the regenerating areas initially dominated by *Cecropia* spp. later developed into quite mature (>20 m tall), species-rich secondary forests. *Vismia*-dominated regrowth, which is relatively species poor, is changing far more slowly (Norden et al., 2010). To help maintain isolation of the experimental fragments, 100 m-wide strips of regrowth were cleared and burned around each fragment on 3–4 occasions, most recently between 1999 and 2001. Additional human disturbances that harm many fragmented landscapes in the Amazon, such as major fires and logging, are largely prevented at the BDFFP. Hunting pressure has been very limited until recently. Laurance and Bierregaard (1997) and Bierregaard et al. (2001) provide detailed descriptions of the study area and design.

3. Sample and area effects

3.1. Sample effects are important in Amazonia

Many species in Amazonian forests are rare or patchily distributed. This phenomenon is especially pronounced in the large expanses of the basin that overlay heavily weathered, nutrient-poor soils (e.g. Radtke et al., 2008), where resources such as fruits, flowers, and nectar are scarce and plants are heavily defended against herbivore attack (Laurance, 2001). This has a key implication for understanding forest fragmentation: given their rarity, many species may be absent from fragments not because their populations have vanished, but because they were simply not present at the time of fragment creation—a phenomenon termed the 'sample effect' (Wilcox and Murphy, 1985). Such sample effects are the hypothesized explanation for the absence of many rare understory bird species from fragments (Ferraz et al., 2007). In addition, many beetles (Didham et al., 1998a), bats (Sampaio et al., 2003), ant-defended plants (Bruna et al., 2005), and trees (Bohlman et al., 2008; S. Laurance et al., 2010) at the BDFFP exhibit high levels of habitat specialization or patchiness. In a region where rarity and patchy distributions of species are the norm, sample effects appear to play a major role in structuring fragmented communities. Given these sample effects, nature reserves will have to be especially large to sustain viable populations of rare species (Lovejoy and Oren, 1981; Laurance, 2005; Peres, 2005; Radtke et al., 2008).

3.2. Fragment size is vital

Although fragments range from just 1–100 ha in the BDFFP study area, understanding fragment-area effects has long been a central goal of the project (Lovejoy and Oren, 1981; Lovejoy et al., 1984, 1986). The species richness of many organisms declines with fragment area (e.g. Fig. 2), even with constant sampling effort across all fragments. Such declines are evident in leaf bryophytes (Zartman, 2003), tree seedlings (Benítez-Malvido and Martinez-Ramos, 2003a), palms (Scariot, 1999), understory insectivorous birds (Stratford and Stouffer, 1999; Ferraz et al., 2007), primates (Gilbert and Setz, 2001; Boyle and Smith, 2010a), and larger herbivorous mammals (Timo, 2003), among others. For these groups, smaller fragments are often unable to support viable populations and deleterious edge effects—ecological changes associated with the abrupt, artificial edges of forest fragments—can also rise sharply in intensity (Didham et al., 1998a). A few groups, such as ant-defended plants and their ant mutualists, show no significant decline in diversity with fragment area (Bruna et al., 2005).

Fragment size also influences the rate of species losses, with smaller fragments losing species more quickly (Lovejoy et al., 1986; Stouffer et al., 2008). Assuming the surrounding matrix is hostile to bird movements and precludes colonization, Ferraz et al. (2003) estimated that a 1000-fold increase in fragment area would be needed to slow the rate of local species extinctions by 10-fold. Even a fragment of 10,000 ha in area would be expected to lose a substantial part of its bird fauna within one century (Ferraz et al., 2003). Similarly, mark-recapture data suggest that very



Fig. 2. Fragment-size dependent extinction of understory birds. Shown are the mean, minimum, and maximum proportion of bird species captured in each fragment in 1992 that were locally extinct in the same fragment in 2001 (after Stouffer et al., 2008).

large fragments will be needed to maintain fully intact assemblages of some faunal groups, such as ant-following birds, which forage over large areas of forest (Van Houtan et al., 2007).

4. Edge effects

4.1. Forest hydrology is disrupted

The hydrological regimes of fragmented landscapes differ markedly from those of intact forest (Kapos, 1989). Pastures or crops surrounding fragments have much lower rates of evapotranspiration than do forests because they have far lower leaf area and thus less rooting depth. Additionally, such clearings are hotter and drier than forests. Field observations and heat-flux simulations suggest that desiccating conditions can penetrate up to 100–200 m into fragments from adjoining clearings (Malcolm, 1998; Didham and Lawton, 1999). Further, streams in fragmented landscapes experience greater temporal variation in flows than do those in forests, because clearings surrounding fragments have less evapotranspiration and rainfall interception by vegetation (Trancoso, 2008). This promotes localized flooding in the wet season and stream failure in the dry season, with potentially important impacts on aquatic invertebrates (Nessimian et al., 2008) and other organisms.

Forest fragmentation also can alter low-level atmospheric circulation, which in turn affects local cloudiness and rainfall (Fig. 3). The warm, dry air over clearings tends to rise, creating zones of low air pressure. The relatively cool, moist air over forests is drawn into this vacuum (Avissar and Schmidt, 1998). As it warms it also rises and forms convectional clouds over the clearing, which can lead to localized thunderstorms (Avissar and Liu, 1996). In this way, clearings of a few hundred hectares or more can draw moisture away from nearby forests (Laurance, 2004; Cochrane and Laurance, 2008). In eastern Amazonia, satellite observations of canopy-water content suggest such desiccating effects typically penetrate 1.0–2.7 km into fragmented forests (Briant et al., 2010). This moisture-robbing function of clearings, in concert with frequent burning in adjoining pastures, could help explain why fragmented forests are so vulnerable to destructive, edge-related fires (Cochrane and Laurance, 2002, 2008).

4.2. Edge effects often dominate fragment dynamics

Edge effects are among the most important drivers of ecological change in the BDFFP fragments. The distance to which different edge effects penetrate into fragments varies widely, ranging from ~10 to 300 m at the BDFFP (Laurance et al., 2002) and considerably further (at least 2–3 km) in areas of the Amazon where edge-related fires are common (Cochrane and Laurance, 2002, 2008; Briant et al., 2010).

Edge phenomena are remarkably diverse. They include increased desiccation stress, windshear, and wind turbulence that sharply elevate rates of tree mortality and damage (Laurance et al., 1997, 1998a). These in turn cause wide-ranging alterations in the community composition of trees (Laurance et al., 2000, 2006a, 2006b) and lianas (Laurance et al., 2001b). Such stresses may also reduce germination (Bruna, 1999) and establishment (Uriarte et al., 2010) of shade-tolerant plant species in fragments, leading to dramatic changes in the composition and abundance of tree seedlings (Benítez-Malvido, 1998; Benítez-Malvido and Martinez-Ramos, 2003a).

Many animal groups, such as numerous bees, wasps, flies (Fowler et al., 1993), beetles (Didham et al., 1998a, 1998b), ants (Carvalho and Vasconcelos, 1999), butterflies (Brown and Hutchings, 1997), and understory birds (Quintela, 1985; S. Laurance, 2004), decline in abundance near fragment edges. Negative edge effects are apparent even along forest roads (20–30 m width) in large forest tracts. Among understory birds, for example, five of eight foraging guilds



Fig. 3. In fragmented tropical landscapes, clearings can create localized atmospheric circulations that rob nearby forests of moisture (after Laurance and Peres, 2006).

declined significantly in abundance within 70 m of roads, whereas tree mortality increased and canopy cover declined (S. Laurance, 2004).

Some groups of organisms remain stable or even increase in abundance near edges. Leaf bryophytes (Zartman and Nascimento, 2006), wandering spiders (*Ctenus* spp.; Rego et al., 2007; Mestre and Gasnier, 2008), and many frogs (Gascon, 1993) show no significant response to edges. Species that favor forest ecotones or disturbances, such as many gap-favoring and frugivorous bird species (S. Laurance, 2004), hummingbirds (Stouffer and Bierregaard, 1995a), light-loving butterflies (Leidner et al., 2010), and fast-growing lianas (Laurance et al., 2001b), increase in abundance near edges, sometimes dramatically.

4.3. Edge effects are cumulative

BDFFP research provides strong support for the idea that two or more nearby edges create more severe edge effects than does just one (Fig. 4). This conclusion is supported by studies of edge-related changes in forest microclimate (Kapos, 1989; Malcolm, 1998), vegetation structure (Malcolm, 1994), tree mortality (Laurance et al., 2006a), abundance and species richness of tree seedlings (Benítez-Malvido, 1998; Benítez-Malvido and Martinez-Ramos, 2003a), liana abundance (Laurance et al., 2001b), and the density and diversity of disturbance-loving pioneer trees (Laurance et al., 2006a, 2006b, 2007). The additive effects of nearby edges could help to explain why small (<10 ha) or irregularly shaped forest remnants are often so severely altered by forest fragmentation (Zartman, 2003; Laurance et al., 2006a).

4.4. Edge age, structure, and adjoining vegetation influence edge effects

When a forest edge is newly created it is open to fluxes of wind, heat, and light, creating sharp edge-interior gradients in forest microclimate that stress or kill many rainforest trees (Lovejoy et al., 1986; Sizer and Tanner, 1999). As the edge ages, however, proliferating vines and lateral branch growth tend to 'seal' the edge, making it less permeable to microclimatic changes (Camargo and Kapos, 1995; Didham and Lawton, 1999). Tree death from microclimatic stress is likely to decline over the first few years after edge creation (D'Angelo et al., 2004) because the edge becomes less permeable, because many drought-sensitive individuals die immediately, and because surviving trees may acclimate to drier, hotter conditions near the edge (Laurance et al., 2006a). Tree mortality from wind turbulence, however, probably increases as the edge ages and becomes more closed. This is because, as suggested by wind-tunnel models, downwind turbulence increases when edges are less permeable (Laurance, 2004).

Regrowth forest adjoining fragment edges can also lessen edge-effect intensity. Microclimatic alterations (Didham and Lawton, 1999), tree mortality (Mesquita et al., 1999), and edge avoidance by understory birds (Develey and Stouffer, 2001; S. Laurance, 2004; S. Laurance et al., 2004) are all reduced substantially when forest edges are buffered by adjoining regrowth forest, relative to edges adjoined by cattle pastures.

5. Isolation and matrix effects

5.1. Matrix structure and composition affect fragments

Secondary forests have gradually overtaken most pastures in the BDFFP landscape. This lessens the effects of fragmentation for some taxa as the matrix becomes less hostile to faunal use and movements. Several species of insectivorous birds that had formerly disappeared have recolonized fragments as the surrounding secondary forest grew back (Stouffer and Bierregaard, 1995b). The rate of bird extinction has also declined (Stouffer et al., 2008). A number of other species, including certain forest spiders (Mestre and Gasnier, 2008), dung beetles (Quintero and Roslin, 2005), euglossine bees (Becker et al., 1991), and monkeys such as red howlers, bearded sakis, and brown capuchins (Boyle and Smith, 2010a) have recolonized some fragments.



Fig. 4. Forest plots affected by two or more nearby edges (plot centre <100 m from edge) suffer greater tree mortality (A) and have a higher density (B) and species richness (C) of disturbance-loving pioneer trees than do plots with just one nearby edge. Values shown are the mean ± SD (after Laurance et al., 2006a).

The surrounding matrix also has a strong effect on plant communities in fragments by mediating certain edge effects (see above), influencing the movements of pollinators (Dick, 2001; Dick et al., 2003) and seed dispersers (Jorge, 2008; Bobrowiec and Gribel, 2009; Boyle and Smith, 2010a), and strongly affecting the seed rain that arrives in fragments. For instance, pioneer trees regenerating in fragments differed strikingly in composition between fragments surrounded by *Cecropia*-dominated regrowth and those encircled by *Vismia*-dominated regrowth (Nascimento et al., 2006). In this way plant and animal communities in fragments could come to mirror to some extent the composition of the surrounding matrix (Laurance et al., 2006a, 2006b), a phenomenon observed elsewhere in the tropics (e.g. Janzen, 1983; Diamond et al., 1987).

5.2. Even narrow clearings are harmful

Many Amazonian species avoid clearings, and even a forest road can be an insurmountable barrier for some. A number of understory insectivorous birds exhibit depressed abundances (S. Laurance, 2004) near forest roads (20–40 m width) and strongly inhibited movements across those roads (S. Laurance et al., 2004). Experimental translocations of resident adult birds reveal such bird species will cross a highway (50–75 m width) but not a small pasture (250 m width) to return to their territory (S. Laurance and Gomez, 2005). Individuals of other vulnerable species, however, have traversed clearings to escape from small fragments to larger forest areas (Harper, 1989; Van Houtan et al., 2007). Captures of understory birds declined dramatically in fragments when a 100 m-wide swath of regrowth forest was cleared around them, suggesting that species willing to traverse regrowth would not cross clearings (Stouffer et al., 2006).

Aside from birds, clearings of just 100–200 m width can evidently reduce or halt the movements of many forest-dependent organisms (Laurance et al., 2009b), ranging from herbivorous insects (Fáveri et al., 2008), euglossine bees (Powell and Powell, 1987), and dung beetles (Klein, 1989) to the spores of epiphyllous lichens (Zartman and Nascimento, 2006; Zartman and Shaw, 2006). Narrow clearings can also provide invasion corridors into forests for exotic and nonforest species (Gascon et al., 1999; Laurance et al., 2009b).

6. Landscape dynamics

6.1. Rare disturbances can leave lasting legacies

Rare events such as windstorms and droughts have strongly influenced the ecology of fragments. Rates of tree mortality rose abruptly in fragmented (Laurance et al., 2001c) and intact (Williamson et al., 2000; S. Laurance et al., 2009a) forests in the year after the intense 1997 El Niño drought. Such pulses of tree death help drive changes in the floristic composition and carbon storage of fragments (Laurance et al., 2007). Leaf-shedding by drought-stressed trees also increases markedly during droughts, especially within ~60 m of forest edges (Laurance and Williamson, 2001). This increases the susceptibility of fragments to destructive surface fires (Cochrane and Laurance, 2002, 2008).

Intense wind blasts from convectional thunderstorms have occasionally strafed parts of the BDFFP landscape and caused intense forest damage and tree mortality, especially in the fragments. Fragments in the easternmost cattle ranch at the BDFFP have had substantially lower rates of tree mortality than did those in the other two ranches, because the former have so far escaped windstorms (Laurance et al., 2007). These differences have strongly influenced the rate and trajectory of change in tree-community composition in fragments (Laurance et al., 2006b). Hence, by altering forest dynamics, composition, structure, and carbon storage, rare disturbances have left an enduring imprint on the ecology of fragmented forests.

6.2. Fragments are hyperdynamic

The BDFFP fragments experience exceptionally large variability in population and community dynamics, relative to intact forest, despite being largely protected from ancillary human threats such as fires, logging, and overhunting. Being a small resource base, a habitat fragment is inherently vulnerable to stochastic effects and external vicissitudes. Species abundances can fluctuate dramatically in small communities, especially when immigration is low and disturbances are frequent (Hubbell, 2001). Edge effects, reduced dispersal, external disturbances, and changing herbivore or predation pressure can all elevate the dynamics of plant and animal populations in fragments (Laurance, 2002, 2008).

Many examples of hyperdynamism have been observed in the BDFFP fragments. Some butterfly species have experienced dramatic population irruptions in response to a proliferation of their favored host plants along fragment margins (Brown and Hutchings, 1997), and butterfly communities in general are hyperdynamic in fragments (Fig. 5) (Leidner et al., 2010). Streamflows are far more variable in fragmented than forested watersheds (Trancoso, 2008). Rates of tree mortality and recruitment are chronically elevated in fragments (Laurance et al., 1998a, b), with major pulses associated with rare disturbances (see above). Further, tree species disappear and turn over far more rapidly in fragments than intact forest, especially within ~100 m of forest margins (Laurance et al., 2006b). These and many other instabilities plague small, dwindling populations in the BDFFP fragments.

6.3. Fragments in different landscapes diverge

An important insight is that different fragmented landscapes—even those as alike as the three large cattle ranches in the BDFFP, which have very similar forests, soils, climate, fragment ages, and land-use histories—can diverge to a surprising degree in species composition and dynamics. Although spanning just a few dozen kilometers (Fig. 1), the three ranches are following unexpectedly different trajectories of change.

At the outset, small initial differences among the ranches multiplied into much bigger differences. Parts of the western and eastern ranches were cleared in 1983, when an early wet season prevented burning of the felled forest. Tall, floristically diverse *Cecropia*-dominated regrowth quickly developed in these areas, whereas areas cleared in the years just before or after became cattle pastures or, eventually, scrubby *Vismia*-dominated regrowth (Williamson and Mesquita, 2001). As discussed above, the differing matrix



Fig. 5. Elevated temporal variation in butterfly species richness in fragmented forests. Shown is an index of variability in species richness for fragmented and intact sites sampled in consecutive years (adapted from Leidner et al., 2010).



Fig. 6. Increasing divergence of tree-community composition in three fragmented Amazonian landscapes. Tree communities in forest-edge plots (<100 m from the nearest edge) are shown before forest fragmentation and 13–18 years after fragmentation, based on a single ordination of all plots and censuses in the study area. The ordination used importance values for all 267 tree genera found in the plots (after Laurance et al., 2007).

vegetation strongly affected the dynamics of plant and animal communities in the nearby fragments. These differences were magnified by subsequent windstorms, which heavily damaged most fragments in the central and western ranches, yet left fragments in the eastern ranch unscathed. Even identically sized fragments in the three ranches have had remarkably different dynamics and vectors of compositional change (Laurance et al., 2007).

The apparently acute sensitivity of fragments to local landscape and weather dynamics—even within a study area as initially homogeneous as ours—prompted us to propose a ‘landscape-divergence hypothesis’ (Laurance et al., 2007). We argue that fragments within the same landscape tend to have similar dynamics and trajectories of change in species composition, which will often differ from those in other landscapes. Over time, this process will tend to homogenize fragments in the same landscape, and promote ecological divergence among fragments in different landscapes. Evidence for this hypothesis is provided by tree communities in our fragments (Fig. 6), which appear to be diverging in composition among the three cattle ranches. Pioneer and weedy trees are increasing in all fragments, but the composition of these generalist plants and their rate of increase differ markedly among the three ranches (Scariot, 2001; Laurance et al., 2006a, 2007; Nascimento et al., 2006).

7. Broader consequences of fragmentation

7.1. Ecological distortions are common

Many ecological interactions are altered in fragmented forests. Fragmented communities can pass through unstable transitional states that may not otherwise occur in nature (Terborgh et al., 2001). Moreover, species at higher trophic levels, such as predators and parasites, are often more vulnerable to fragmentation than are herbivores, thereby altering the structure and functioning of food webs (Didham et al., 1998b; Terborgh et al., 2001).



Fig. 7. In Amazonia, leaf herbivory appears to be depressed in forest fragments relative to intact forest (after Fáveri et al., 2008).

BDFFP findings suggest that even unhunted forest fragments have reduced densities of key mammalian seed dispersers. As a result, seed dispersal for an endemic, mammal-dispersed tree (*Duckeodendron cestroides*) was far lower in fragments, with just ~5% of the number of seeds being dispersed >10 m away from parent trees than in intact forest (Cramer et al., 2007a). Leaf herbivory appears reduced in fragments (Fig. 7), possibly because of lower immigration of insect herbivores (Fáveri et al., 2008). Dung beetles exhibit changes in biomass and guild structure in fragments (Radtke et al., 2008) that could alter rates of forest nutrient cycling and secondary seed dispersal (Klein, 1989; Andresen, 2003). Exotic Africanized honeybees, a generalist pollinator, are abundant in matrix and edge habitats and can alter pollination distances and gene flow for some tree species (Dick, 2001; Dick et al., 2003). A bewildering variety of ecological distortions can pervade fragmented habitats, and a challenge for conservation biologists is to identify those of greatest importance and generality.

7.2. Fragmentation affects much more than biodiversity

Habitat fragmentation affects far more than biodiversity and interactions among species; many ecosystem functions, including hydrology (see above) and biochemical cycling, are also being altered. Among the most important of these are fundamental changes in forest biomass and carbon storage.

Carbon storage in fragmented forests is affected by a suite of interrelated changes. Many trees die near forest edges (Laurance et al., 1997, 1998a), including an alarmingly high proportion of large (⩾60 cm dbh) canopy and emergent trees that store much forest carbon (Laurance et al., 2000). Fast-growing pioneer trees and lianas that proliferate in fragments are smaller and have lower wood density, and thereby sequester much less carbon, than do the mature-phase trees they replace (Laurance et al., 2001b, 2006a). Based on current rates of forest fragmentation, the edge-related loss of forest carbon storage might produce up to 150 million tons of atmospheric carbon emissions annually, above and beyond that from tropical deforestation per se (Laurance et al., 1998c). This would exceed the yearly carbon emissions of the entire United Kingdom.

In addition, biomass is being redistributed in fragmented forests. Less biomass is stored in large, densely wooded old-growth trees and more in fast-growing pioneer trees, disturbance-loving lianas, woody debris, and leaf litter (Sizer et al., 2000; Nascimento and Laurance, 2004; Vasconcelos and Luizão, 2004). Finally, carbon cycling accelerates. The large, mature-phase trees that predominate in intact forests can live for many centuries or even millennia (Chambers et al., 1998; Laurance et al., 2004), sequestering carbon for long periods of time. However, the residence time of carbon in early successional trees, vines, and necromass (wood debris, litter), which proliferate in fragments, is far shorter (Nascimento and Laurance, 2004). Other biochemical cycles, such as those affecting key nutrients like phosphorus (Sizer et al., 2000) and calcium (Vasconcelos and Luizão, 2004), may also be altered in fragmented forests, given the striking changes in biomass dynamics, hydrology, and thermal regimes they experience.

8. Predicting species responses to fragmentation

8.1. Species losses are highly nonrandom

Species extinctions in the BDFFP fragments have occurred in a largely predictable sequence, with certain species being consistently more vulnerable than others. Among birds, a number of understory insectivores, including army ant-followers, solitary species, terrestrial foragers, and obligate mixed-flock members, are most susceptible to fragmentation. Others, including edge/gap species, insectivores that use mixed flocks facultatively, hummingbirds, and many frugivores, are far less vulnerable (Antongiovanni and Metzger, 2005; Stouffer et al., 2006, 2008). Primates exhibit similarly predictable patterns of species loss, with wide-ranging frugivores, especially the black spider-monkey, being most vulnerable (Boyle and Smith, 2010a). Local extinctions in fragments follow a foreseeable pattern, with species assemblages in smaller fragments rapidly forming a nested subset of those in larger fragments (Stouffer et al., 2008). Random demographic and genetic processes may help to drive tiny populations into oblivion, but the species that reach this precarious threshold are far from random.

8.2. Fragmented communities are not neutral

An important corollary of nonrandom species loss is that fragmented forests are not neutral. Neutral theory (Hubbell, 2001) assumes that species in diverse, space-limited communities, such as tropical trees, are competitively equivalent in order to make predictions about phenomena such as species-area curves, the relative abundances of species in communities, and the rate of species turnover in space. Hubbell (2001) emphasizes the potential relevance of neutral theory for predicting community responses to habitat fragmentation: for isolated communities, locally abundant species should be least extinction prone, with rare species being lost more frequently from random demographic processes. Over time, fragments should become dominated by initially abundant species, with rare species gradually vanishing; other ecological traits of species are considered unimportant.

Gilbert et al. (2006) tested the efficacy of neutral theory for predicting changes in tree communities at the BDFFP. Neutral theory effectively predicted the rate of species extinction from plots in fragmented and intact forest as a function of the local diversity and mortality rate of trees. However, in most fragments, the observed rate of change in species composition was 2–6 times faster than predicted by the theory. Moreover, the theory was wildly erroneous in predicting which species are most prone to extinction. Rather than becoming increasingly dominated by initially common species, fragments in the BDFFP landscape have experienced striking increases in disturbance-loving pioneer species (Laurance et al., 2006a), which were initially rare when the fragments were created. As a model for predicting community responses to habitat fragmentation, neutral theory clearly failed, demonstrating that ecological differences among species strongly influence their responses to fragmentation.



Fig. 8. Highly mobile species tend to disappear from forest fragments. Shown are the movement rates — the proportion of captures that involve between-plot movements. For extinction-prone species, which are normally highly mobile, movements decrease by 67% after fragment isolation. Species that persist in fragments, which normally move less, show no difference (adapted from Van Houtan et al., 2007).

8.3. Matrix use and area needs determine animal vulnerability

The responses of animal species to fragmentation appear largely governed by two key sets of traits. The first is their spatial requirements for forest habitat. In birds (Fig. 8) (Van Houtan et al., 2007) and mammals (Timo, 2003), wide-ranging forest species are more vulnerable than are those with localized ranges and movements. Species with limited spatial needs, such as many small mammals (Malcolm, 1997), hummingbirds (Stouffer et al., 2008), frogs (Tocher et al., 1997), and ants (Carvalho and Vasconcelos, 1999), are generally less susceptible to fragmentation.

The second key trait for fauna is their tolerance of matrix habitats (Gascon et al., 1999), which comprises cattle pastures and regrowth forest in the BDFFP landscape. Populations of species that avoid the matrix will be entirely isolated in fragments, and therefore vulnerable to local extinction, whereas those that tolerate or exploit the matrix often persist (Laurance, 1991; Malcolm, 1997; Antongiovanni and Metzger, 2005; Ferraz et al., 2007). At least among terrestrial vertebrates, matrix use is positively associated with tolerance of edge habitats (S. Laurance, 2004), an ability to traverse small clearings (S. Laurance et al., 2004; S. Laurance and Gomez, 2005), and behavioral flexibility (Neckel-Oliveira and Gascon, 2006; Stouffer et al., 2006; Van Houtan et al., 2006; Boyle and Smith, 2010b). Within particular guilds of species, such as beetles or small mammals, traits such as body size and natural abundance are poor or inconsistent predictors of vulnerability (Laurance, 1991; Didham et al., 1998a; Jorge, 2008; Boyle and Smith, 2010a).

8.4. Disturbance tolerance and mutualisms affect plant vulnerability

Among plants, a different suite of factors is associated with vulnerability to fragmentation. Because fragments suffer chronically elevated tree mortality, faster-growing pioneer trees and lianas that favor treefall gaps are favored at the expense of slower-growing mature-phase trees (Laurance et al., 2006a, b). Pioneer species often flourish in the matrix and produce abundant small fruits that are carried into fragments by frugivorous birds and bats that move between the matrix and nearby fragments (Sampaio, 2000; Nascimento et al., 2006). Especially vulnerable in fragments are the diverse assemblages of smaller subcanopy trees that are physiologically specialized for growing and reproducing in dark, humid, forest-interior conditions (Laurance et al., 2006b). Tree species that have obligate outbreeding systems, rely on animal seed dispersers, or have relatively large, mammal-dispersed seeds also appear vulnerable (Laurance et al., 2006b; Cramer et al., 2007b).

These combinations of traits suggest that plant communities in fragmented forests are structured primarily by chronic disturbances and microclimatic stresses and possibly also by alterations in animal pollinator and seed-disperser communities. For long-lived plants such as *Heliconia* species and many mature-phase trees, demographic models suggest that factors that reduce adult survival and growth—such as recurring wind disturbance and edge-related microclimatic stresses—exert a strong influence on population growth (Bruna, 2003; Bruna and Oli, 2005).

9. Broad perspectives

9.1. Long-term research is crucial

Many insights from the BDFFP would have been impossible in a shorter-term study. The exceptional vulnerability of large trees to fragmentation (Laurance et al., 2000) only became apparent after two decades of fragment isolation. Likewise, the importance of ephemeral events such as El Niño droughts (Williamson et al., 2000; Laurance et al., 2001c) and major windstorms (Laurance et al., 2007) would not have been captured in a less-enduring project. Many other key phenomena, such as the kinetics of species loss in fragments (Ferraz et al., 2003), the strong effects of matrix dynamics on fragmented communities (Antongiovanni and Metzger, 2005; Stouffer et al., 2006), the divergence of fragments in different landscapes (Laurance et al., 2007), and the effects of fragmentation on rare or long-lived species (Benítez-Malvido and Martinez-Ramos, 2003b; Ferraz et al., 2007), are only becoming understood after decades of effort.

Far more remains to be learned. For example, forest-simulation models parameterized with BDFFP data suggest that even small ($\leqslant$10 ha) fragments will require a century or more to stabilize in floristic composition and carbon storage (Groeneveld et al., 2009), given the long-lived nature of many tropical trees. Eventually, these fragments might experience a fundamental reorganization of their plant communities, given striking shifts in the composition of their tree, palm, liana, and herb seedlings (Scariot, 2001; Benítez-Malvido and Martinez-Ramos, 2003a; Brum et al., 2008). If these newly recruited plants represent the future of the forest, then the BDFFP fragments will eventually experience dramatic changes in floristic composition—comparable to those observed in some other long-fragmented ecosystems (e.g. da Silva and Tabarelli, 2000; Girão et al., 2007; Santos et al., 2010).

9.2. The BDFFP is a best-case scenario

Although forest fragments in the BDFFP are experiencing a wide array of ecological changes, it is important to emphasize that it is a controlled experiment. The fragments are square, not irregular, in shape. They are isolated by distances of just 80–650 m from large tracts of surrounding mature forest. They are embedded in a relatively benign matrix increasingly dominated by regrowth forest. And they lack many of the ancillary threats, such as selective logging, wildfires, and overhunting, that plague many fragmented landscapes and wildlife elsewhere in the tropics. Such threats can interact additively or synergistically with fragmentation, creating even greater perils for the rainforest biota (Laurance and Cochrane, 2001; Michalski and Peres, 2005; Brook et al., 2008). For these reasons, results from the BDFFP are almost certainly optimistic relative to many human-dominated landscapes elsewhere in the tropics.

10. Conservation lessons from the BDFFP

10.1. Amazonian reserves should be large and numerous

A key conclusion from BDFFP research is that nature reserves in Amazonia should ideally be very large—on the order of thousands to tens of thousands of square kilometers (Laurance, 2005; Peres, 2005). Only at this size will they be likely to maintain natural ecological processes and sustain viable populations of the many rare and patchily distributed species in the region (Ferraz et al., 2007; Radtke et al., 2008); provide resilience from rare calamities such as droughts and intense storms (Laurance et al., 2007); facilitate persistence of terrestrial and aquatic animals that migrate seasonally (Bührnheim and Fernandes, 2003); buffer the reserve from large-scale edge effects including fires, forest desiccation, and human encroachment (Cochrane and Laurance, 2002; Briant et al., 2010); maximize forest carbon storage (Laurance et al., 1997, 1998c); and provide resilience from future climatic and atmospheric changes—the effects of which are difficult to predict for Amazonia (Laurance and Useche, 2009).

Nature reserves in Amazonia should also be numerous and stratified across major river basins and climatic and edaphic gradients, in order to preserve locally endemic species (Bierregaard et al., 2001; Laurance, 2007). Further, the core areas of reserves should ideally be free of roads, which can promote human encroachment and hunting, internally fragment wildlife populations, and facilitate invasions of exotic species (Laurance et al., 2009b).

10.2. Protect and reconnect fragments

Few landscapes are as intact as those in the Amazon. Biodiversity hotspots, which sustain the majority of species at risk of extinction, have, by definition, lost over 80% of their natural vegetation and what remains is typically in small fragments (Myers et al., 2000). The BDFFP makes recommendations here, too. Reconnecting isolated fragments by forest restoration will be an effective way of creating areas large enough to slow the rate of species extinctions (Lima and Gascon, 1999; Pimm and Jenkins, 2005).

In such heavily fragmented landscapes, protecting remaining forest remnants is highly desirable, as they are likely to be key sources of plant propagules and animal seed dispersers and pollinators (Mesquita et al., 2001; Chazdon et al., 2008). They may also act as stepping stones for animal movements (Laurance and

Bierregaard, 1997; Dick et al., 2003). In regions where forest loss is severe, forest fragments could also sustain the last surviving populations of locally endemic species, thereby underscoring their potential value for nature conservation (Arroyo-Rodríguez et al., 2009).

10.3. Fragmented landscapes can recover

A further lesson is that fragmented landscapes, if protected from fires and other major disturbances, can begin to recover in just a decade or two. Forest edges tend to 'seal' themselves, reducing the intensity of deleterious edge effects (Didham and Lawton, 1999; Mesquita et al., 1999). Secondary forests can develop quickly in the surrounding matrix (Mesquita et al., 2001), especially if soils and seedbanks are not depleted by overgrazing or repeated burning (Ribeiro et al., 2009; Norden et al., 2010). Secondary forests facilitate movements of many animal species (Gascon et al., 1999), allowing them to recolonize fragments from which they had formerly disappeared (Becker et al., 1991; Quintero and Roslin, 2005; Stouffer et al., 2008; Boyle and Smith, 2010a). Species clinging to survival in fragments can also be rescued from local extinction via the genetic and demographic contributions of immigrants (Zartman and Nascimento, 2006; Stouffer et al., 2008).

11. The future of the BDFFP

The BDFFP is one of the most enduring and influential ecological research projects in existence today (Gardner et al., 2009; Peres et al., 2010). From the prism of understanding habitat fragmentation, there are vital justifications for continuing it. The project, moreover, is engaged in far more than fragmentation research: it plays a leading role in training Amazonian scientists and decision-makers, and sustains long-term research on global-change phenomena, forest regeneration, and basic ecological studies.

In its 32-year history, the BDFFP has faced myriad challenges. These include, among others, the continuing weakness the US dollar, challenges in obtaining research visas for foreign students and scientists, inadequate core funding from its US and Brazilian sponsors, and the vagaries of finding soft money for long-term research. Yet today the BDFFP faces a far more direct threat: encroachment from colonists and hunters. Since the late 1990s, the paving of the 1100-km-long Manaus–Venezuela highway has greatly accelerated forest colonization and logging north of the city. SUFRAMA, a Brazilian federal agency that controls an expanse of land north of Manaus that includes the BDFFP, has begun settling families in farming plots around the immediate periphery of the study area. At least six colonization projects involving 180 families are planned for the near future (Laurance and Luizão, 2007). This could be the beginning of a dramatic influx into the area, especially if a proposed highway between Manaus and Rondônia, a major deforestation hotspot in southern Amazonia, is completed as planned (Fearnside and Graça, 2006).

To date, BDFFP staff and supporters have managed to stave off most of the colonization projects—which also threaten to bisect the Central Amazonian Conservation Corridor, a budding network of protected and indigenous lands that is one of the most important conservation areas in the entire Amazon basin (Laurance and Luizão, 2007). Yet it is an uphill battle against a government bureaucracy that appears myopically determined to push ahead with colonization at any cost—despite the fact that colonists can barely eke out a living on the region's infamously poor soils. That such a globally important research project and conservation area could be lost seems unthinkable. That it could be lost for such a limited gain seems tragic.

Acknowledgements

We thank Gonçalo Ferraz, Robert Ewers, Reuben Clements, Will Edwards, and four anonymous referees for helpful comments on the manuscript. The National Institute for Amazonian Research (INPA), Smithsonian Institution, US National Science Foundation, Brazilian Science Foundation (CNPq), NASA-LBA program, US-AID, Mellon Foundation, Blue Moon Fund, Marisla Foundation, and other organizations generously supported the BDFFP. This is publication number 562 in the BDFFP technical series.

References

Andresen, E., 2003. Effect of forest fragmentation on dung beetle communities and functional consequences for plant regeneration. Ecography 26, 87–97.

Antongiovanni, M., Metzger, J.P., 2005. Influence of matrix habitats on the occurrence of insectivorous bird species in Amazonian forest fragments. Biol. Conserv. 122, 441–451.

Arroyo-Rodríguez, V., Pineda, E., Escobar, F., Benítez-Malvido, J., 2009. Conservation value of small patches to plant species diversity in highly fragmented landscapes. Conserv. Biol. 23, 729–739.

Asner, G.P., Knapp, D., Broadbent, E., Oliveira, P., Keller, M., Silva, J., 2005. Selective logging in the Brazilian Amazon. Science 310, 480–482.

Avissar, R., Liu, Y., 1996. A three-dimensional numerical study of shallow convective clouds and precipitation induced by land-surface forcing. J. Geophys. Res. 101, 7499–7518.

Avissar, R., Schmidt, T., 1998. An evaluation of the scale at which ground-surface heat flux patchiness affects the convective boundary layer using a large-eddy simulation model. J. Atmos. Sci. 55, 2666–2689.

Barlow, J., Peres, C.A., Henriques, L., Stouffer, P.C., Wunderle, J., 2006. The responses of understorey birds to forest fragmentation, logging and wildfires: an Amazonian synthesis. Biol. Conserv. 128, 182–192.

Becker, P., Moure, J.B., Peralta, F., 1991. More about euglossine bees in Amazonian forest fragments. Biotropica 23, 586–591.

Benítez-Malvido, J., 1998. Impact of forest fragmentation on seedling abundance in a tropical rain forest. Conserv. Biol. 12, 380–389.

Benítez-Malvido, J., Martinez-Ramos, M., 2003a. Influence of edge exposure on tree seedling species recruitment in tropical rain forest fragments. Biotropica 35, 530–541.

Benítez-Malvido, J., Martinez-Ramos, M., 2003b. Impact of forest fragmentation on understory plant species richness in Amazonia. Conserv. Biol. 17, 389–400.

Bierregaard, R.O., Lovejoy, T.E., Kapos, V., dos Santos, A.A., Hutchings, R.W., 1992. The biological dynamics of tropical rainforest fragments. Bioscience 42, 859–866.

Bierregaard, R.O., Gascon, C., Lovejoy, T.E., Mesquita, R. (Eds.), 2001. Lessons from Amazonia: Ecology and Conservation of a Fragmented Forest. Yale University Press, New Haven, Connecticut.

Bobrowiec, P.E.D., Gribel, R., 2009. Effects of different secondary vegetation types on bat community composition in Central Amazonia, Brazil. Anim. Conserv. 13, 204–216.

Bohlman, S., Laurance, W.F., Laurance, S.G., Nascimento, H., Fearnside, P.M., Andrade, A., 2008. Effects of soils, topography, and geographic distance in structuring central Amazonian tree communities. J. Veg. Sci. 19, 863–874.

Boyle, S.A., Smith, A.T., 2010a. Can landscape and species characteristics predict primate presence in forest fragments in the Brazilian Amazon? Biol. Conserv. 143, 1134–1143.

Boyle, S.A., Smith, A.T., 2010b. Behavioral modifications in northern bearded saki monkeys (*Chiropotes satanas chiropotes*) in forest fragments of central Amazonia. Primates 51, 43–51.

Briant, G., Gond, V., Laurance, S.G., 2010. Habitat fragmentation and the desiccation of forest canopies: a case study from eastern Amazonia. Biol. Conserv. 143, 2763–2769.

Broadbent, E., Asner, G.P., Keller, M., Knapp, D., Oliveira, P., Silva, J., 2008. Forest fragmentation and edge effects from deforestation and selective logging in the Brazilian Amazon. Biol. Conserv. 140, 142–155.

Brook, B.W., Sodhi, N.S., Bradshaw, C.J.A., 2008. Synergisms among extinction drivers under global change. Trends Ecol. Evol. 23, 453–460.

Brown, K.S., Hutchings, R.W., 1997. Disturbance, fragmentation, and the dynamics of diversity in Amazonian forest butterflies. In: Laurance, W.F., Bierregaard, R.O. (Eds.), Tropical Forest Remnants: Ecology, Management, and Conservation of Fragmented Communities. University of Chicago Press, Chicago, pp. 91–110.

Brum, H.D., Nascimento, H., Laurance, W.F., Andrade, A., Laurance, S.G., Luizão, R., 2008. Rainforest fragmentation and the demography of the economically important palm *Oenocarpus bacaba* in central Amazonia. Plant Ecol. 199, 209–215.

Bruna, E.M., 1999. Seed germination in rainforest fragments. Nature 402, 139.

Bruna, E.M., 2003. Are plant populations in fragmented habitats recruitment limited? Tests with an Amazonian herb. Ecology 84, 932–947.

Bruna, E., Oli, M., 2005. Demographic consequences of habitat fragmentation for an Amazonian understory plant: analysis of life-table response experiments. Ecology 86, 1816–1824.

Bruna, E.M., Vasconcelos, H.L., Heredia, S., 2005. The effect of habitat fragmentation on communities of mutualists: a test with Amazonian ants and their host plants. Biol. Conserv. 124, 209–216.

Bührnheim, C.M., Fernandes, C.C., 2003. Structure of fish assemblages in Amazonian rainforest streams: effects of habitats and locality. Copeia 2003, 255–262.

Camargo, J.L.C., Kapos, V., 1995. Complex edge effects on soil moisture and microclimate in central Amazonian forest. J. Trop. Ecol. 11, 205–211.

Carvalho, K.S., Vasconcelos, H.L., 1999. Forest fragmentation in central Amazonia and its effects on litter-dwelling ants. Biol. Conserv. 91, 151–158.

Chambers, J.Q., Higuchi, N., Schimel, J.P., 1998. Ancient trees in Amazonia. Nature 391, 135–136.

Chazdon, R.L., Harvey, C.A., Komar, O., Griffith, D.M., Ferguson, B.G., Martinez-Ramos, M., Morales, H., Nigh, R., Soto-Pinto, L., van Breugel, M., Philpott, S.M., 2008. Beyond reserves: a research agenda for conserving biodiversity in human-modified tropical landscapes. Biotropica 41, 142–153.

Cochrane, M.A., Laurance, W.F., 2002. Fire as a large-scale edge effect in Amazonian forests. J. Trop. Ecol. 18, 311–325.

Cochrane, M.A., Laurance, W.F., 2008. Synergisms among fire, land use, and climate change in the Amazon. Ambio 37, 522–527.

Cramer, J.M., Mesquita, R., Bentos, T., Moser, B., Williamson, G.B., 2007a. Forest fragmentation reduces seed dispersal of *Duckeodendron cestroides*, a Central Amazon endemic. Biotropica 39, 709–718.

Cramer, J.M., Mesquita, R., Williamson, G.B., 2007b. Forest fragmentation differentially affects seed dispersal of large and small-seeded tropical trees. Biol. Conserv. 137, 415–423.

D'Angelo, S., Andrade, A., Laurance, S.G., Laurance, W.F., Mesquita, R., 2004. Inferred causes of tree mortality in fragmented and intact Amazonian forests. J. Trop. Ecol. 20, 243–246.

da Silva, J.M.C., Tabarelli, M., 2000. Tree species impoverishment and the future flora of the Atlantic forest of northeast Brazil. Nature 404, 72–74.

Develey, P., Stouffer, P.C., 2001. Roads affect movements by understory mixed-species flocks in central Amazonian Brazil. Conserv. Biol. 15, 1416–1422.

Diamond, J.M., Bishop, K.D., Balen, S.V., 1987. Bird survival in an isolated Javan woodland: island or mirror? Conserv. Biol. 1, 132–142.

Dick, C.W., 2001. Genetic rescue of remnant tropical trees by an alien pollinator. Proc. Roy. Soc. B 268, 2391–2396.

Dick, C.W., Etchelecu, G., Austerlitz, F., 2003. Pollen dispersal of tropical trees (*Dinizia excelsa*: Fabaceae) by native insects and African honeybees in pristine and fragmented Amazonian rainforest. Mol. Ecol. 12, 753–764.

Didham, R.K., Hammond, P.M., Lawton, J.H., Eggleton, P., Stork, N.E., 1998a. Beetle species responses to tropical forest fragmentation. Ecol. Monogr. 68, 295–303.

Didham, R.K., Lawton, J.H., 1999. Edge structure determines the magnitude of changes in microclimate and vegetation structure in tropical forest fragments. Biotropica 31, 17–30.

Didham, R.K., Lawton, J.H., Hammond, P.M., Eggleton, P., 1998b. Trophic structure stability and extinction dynamics of beetles (Coleoptera) in tropical forest fragments. Proc. Roy. Soc. B 353, 437–451.

Fáveri, S.B., Vasconcelos, H.L., Dirzo, R., 2008. Effects of Amazonian forest fragmentation on the interaction between plants, insect herbivores, and their natural enemies. J. Trop. Ecol. 24, 57–64.

Fearnside, P.M., 2001. Soybean cultivation as a threat to the environment in Brazil. Environ. Conserv. 28, 23–38.

Fearnside, P.M., Graça, P.M.L.A., 2006. BR-319: Brazil's Manaus–Porto Velho highway and the potential impact of linking the arc of deforestation to central Amazonia. Environ. Manage. 38, 705–716.

Ferraz, G., Nichols, J.D., Hines, J., Stouffer, P.C., Bierregaard, R.O., Lovejoy, T.E., 2007. A large-scale deforestation experiment: effects of patch area and isolation on Amazon birds. Science 315, 238–241.

Ferraz, G., Russell, G.J., Stouffer, P.C., Bierregaard, R.O., Pimm, S.L., Lovejoy, T.E., 2003. Rates of species loss from Amazonian forest fragments. Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci. USA 100, 14069–14073.

Finer, M., Jenkins, C., Pimm, S.L., Keane, B., Ross, C., 2008. Oil and gas projects in the western Amazon: threats to wilderness, biodiversity, and indigenous peoples. PLoS ONE 3, e2932.

Fowler, H.G., Silva, C.A., Ventincinque, E., 1993. Size, taxonomic and biomass distributions of flying insects in central Amazonia: forest edge vs. Understory. Rev. Biol. Trop. 41, 755–760.

Gardner, T.A., Barlow, J., Chazdon, R., Ewers, R., Harvey, C., Peres, C.A., Sodhi, N.S., 2009. Prospects for tropical forest biodiversity in a human-modified world. Ecol. Lett. 12, 561–582.

Gascon, C., 1993. Breeding habitat use by Amazonian primary-forest frog species at the forest edge. Biodiv. Conserv. 2, 438–444.

Gascon, C., Lovejoy, T.E., Bierregaard, R.O., Malcolm, J.R., Stouffer, P.C., Vasconcelos, H., Laurance, W.F., Zimmerman, B., Tocher, M., Borges, S., 1999. Matrix habitat and species persistence in tropical forest remnants. Biol. Conserv. 91, 223–229.

Gibbs, H.K., Reusch, A.S., Achard, F., Clayton, M.K., Holmgren, P., Ramankutty, N., Foley, J.A., 2010. Tropical forests were the primary sources of new agricultural lands in the 1980s and 1990s. Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci. USA 107, 16732–16737.

Gilbert, B., Laurance, W.F., Leigh, E.G., Nascimento, H., 2006. Can neutral theory predict the responses of Amazonian tree communities to forest fragmentation? Am. Nat. 168, 304–317.

Gilbert, K.A., Setz, E.Z.F., 2001. Primates in a fragmented landscape: six species in central Amazonia. In: Laurance, W.F., Bierregaard, R.O. (Eds.), Tropical Forest Remnants: Ecology, Management and Conservation of Fragmented Communities. University of Chicago Press, Chicago, pp. 207–221.

Girão, L.C., Lopes, A.V., Tabarelli, M., Bruna, E.M., 2007. Changes in tree reproductive traits reduce functional diversity in a fragmented Atlantic forest landscape. PLoS ONE 2, e908. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0000908.

Groeneveld, J., Alves, L., Bernacci, L., Catharino, E., Knogge, C., Metzger, J., Pütz, S., Huth, A., 2009. The impact of fragmentation and density regulation on forest succession in the Atlantic rain forest. Ecol. Model. 220, 2450–2459.

Harper, L.H., 1989. The persistence of ant-following birds in small Amazonian forest fragments. Acta Amazonica 19, 249–263.

Hubbell, S.P., 2001. The Neutral Theory of Biodiversity and Biogeography. Princeton University Press, Princeton, New Jersey.

Janzen, D.H., 1983. No park is an island: Increase in interference from outside as park size increases. Oikos 41, 402–410.

Jorge, M.L., 2008. Effects of forest fragmentation on two sister genera of Amazonian rodents (*Myoprocta acouchy* and *Dasyprocta leporina*). Biol. Conserv. 141, 617–623.

Kapos, V., 1989. Effects of isolation on the water status of forest patches in the Brazilian Amazon. J. Trop. Ecol. 5, 173–185.

Killeen, T.J., 2007. A Perfect Storm in the Amazon Wilderness: Development and Conservation in the Context of the Initiative for the Integration of the Regional Infrastructure of South America (IIRSA). Conservation International, Washington, DC.

Klein, B.C., 1989. Effects of forest fragmentation on dung and carrion beetle communities in central Amazonia. Ecology 70, 1715–1725.

Laurance, S.G., 2004. Responses of understory rain forest birds to road edges in central Amazonia. Ecol. Appl. 14, 1344–1357.

Laurance, S.G., Gomez, M.S., 2005. Clearing width and movements of understory rainforest birds. Biotropica 37, 149–152.

Laurance, S.G., Laurance, W.F., Andrade, A., Fearnside, P.M., Harms, K., Luizão, R., 2010. Influence of soils and topography on Amazonian tree diversity: a landscape-scale study. J. Veg. Sci. 21, 96–106.

Laurance, S.G., Laurance, W.F., Nascimento, H., Andrade, A., Fearnside, P.M., Rebello, E., Condit, R., 2009a. Long-term variation in Amazon forest dynamics. J. Veg. Sci. 20, 323–333.

Laurance, S.G., Stouffer, P.C., Laurance, W.F., 2004. Effects of road clearings on movement patterns of understory rainforest birds in central Amazonia. Conserv. Biol. 18, 1099–1109.

Laurance, W.F., 1991. Ecological correlates of extinction proneness in Australian tropical rainforest mammals. Conserv. Biol. 5, 79–89.

Laurance, W.F., 2001. The hyper-diverse flora of the central Amazon: an overview. In: Bierregaard, R.O., Gascon, C., Lovejoy, T.E., Mesquita, R. (Eds.), Lessons from Amazonia: Ecology and Conservation of a Fragmented Forest. Yale University Press, New Haven, Connecticut, pp. 47–53.

Laurance, W.F., 2002. Hyperdynamism in fragmented habitats. J. Veg. Sci. 13, 595–602.

Laurance, W.F., 2004. Forest–climate interactions in fragmented tropical landscapes. Phil. Trans. Roy. Soc. B 359, 345–352.

Laurance, W.F., 2005. When bigger is better: the need for Amazonian megareserves. Trends Ecol. Evol. 20, 645–648.

Laurance, W.F., 2007. Have we overstated the tropical biodiversity crisis? Trends Ecol. Evol. 22, 65–70.

Laurance, W.F., 2008. Theory meets reality: how habitat fragmentation research has transcended island biogeographic theory. Biol. Conserv. 141, 1731–1744.

Laurance, W.F., Bierregaard, R.O. (Eds.), 1997. Tropical Forest Remnants: Ecology, Management, and Conservation of Fragmented Communities. University of Chicago Press, Chicago.

Laurance, W.F., Cochrane, M.A., 2001. Synergistic effects in fragmented landscapes. Conserv. Biol. 15, 1488–1489.

Laurance, W.F., Cochrane, M., Bergen, S., Fearnside, P.M., Delamonica, P., Barber, C., D'Angelo, S., Fernandes, T., 2001a. The future of the Brazilian Amazon. Science 291, 438–439.

Laurance, W.F., Delamonica, P., Laurance, S.G., Vasconcelos, H.L., Lovejoy, T.E., 2000. Rainforest fragmentation kills big trees. Nature 404, 836.

Laurance, W.F., Ferreira, L.V., Rankin-de Merona, J.M., Laurance, S.G., 1998a. Rain forest fragmentation and the dynamics of Amazonian tree communities. Ecology 79, 2032–2040.

Laurance, W.F., Ferreira, L.V., Rankin-de Merona, J.M., Laurance, S.G., Hutchings, R., Lovejoy, T.E., 1998b. Effects of forest fragmentation on recruitment patterns in Amazonian tree communities. Conserv. Biol. 12, 460–464.

Laurance, W.F., Goosem, M., Laurance, S.G., 2009b. Impacts of roads and linear clearings on tropical forests. Trends Ecol. Evol. 24, 659–669.

Laurance, W.F., Laurance, S.G., Delamonica, P., 1998c. Tropical forest fragmentation and greenhouse gas emissions. For. Ecol. Manage. 110, 173–180.

Laurance, W.F., Laurance, S.G., Ferreira, L.V., Rankin-de Merona, J., Gascon, C., Lovejoy, T.E., 1997. Biomass collapse in Amazonian forest fragments. Science 278, 1117–1118.

Laurance, W.F., Lovejoy, T.E., Vasconcelos, H., Bruna, E., Didham, R., Stouffer, P., Gascon, C., Bierregaard, R., Laurance, S.G., Sampaio, E., 2002. Ecosystem decay of Amazonian forest fragments: a 22-year investigation. Conserv. Biol. 16, 605–618.

Laurance, W.F., Luizão, R.C.C., 2007. Driving a wedge into the Amazon. Nature 448, 409–410.

Laurance, W.F., Nascimento, H., Laurance, S.G., Andrade, A., Ewers, R., Harms, K., Luizão, R., Ribeiro, J., 2007. Habitat fragmentation, variable edge effects, and the landscape-divergence hypothesis. PLoS ONE 2, e1017. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0001017.

Laurance, W.F., Nascimento, H., Laurance, S.G., Andrade, A., Fearnside, P.M., Ribeiro, J., 2006a. Rain forest fragmentation and the proliferation of successional trees. Ecology 87, 469–482.

Laurance, W.F., Nascimento, H., Laurance, S.G., Andrade, A., Ribeiro, J., Giraldo, J.P., Lovejoy, T.E., Condit, R., Chave, J., D'Angelo, S., 2006b. Rapid decay of tree-community composition in Amazonian forest fragments. Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci. USA 103, 19010–19014.

Laurance, W.F., Nascimento, H., Laurance, S.G., Condit, R., D'Angelo, S., Andrade, A., 2004. Inferred longevity of Amazonian rainforest trees based on a long-term demographic study. For. Ecol. Manage. 190, 131–143.

Laurance, W.F., Peres, C.A. (Eds.), 2006. Emerging Threats to Tropical Forests. University of Chicago Press, Chicago.

Laurance, W.F., Perez-Salicrup, D., Delamonica, P., Fearnside, P.M., D'Angelo, S., Jerozolinski, A., Pohl, L., Lovejoy, T.E., 2001b. Rain forest fragmentation and the structure of Amazonian liana communities. Ecology 82, 105–116.

Laurance, W.F., Useche, D.C., 2009. Environmental synergisms and extinctions of tropical species. Conserv. Biol. 23, 1427–1437.

Laurance, W.F., Williamson, G.B., 2001. Positive feedbacks among forest fragmentation, drought, and climate change in the Amazon. Conserv. Biol. 15, 1529–1535.

Laurance, W.F., Williamson, G.B., Delamonica, P., Olivera, A., Gascon, C., Lovejoy, T.E., Pohl, L., 2001c. Effects of a strong drought on Amazonian forest fragments and edges. J. Trop. Ecol. 17, 771–785.

Leidner, A.K., Haddad, N.M., Lovejoy, T.E., 2010. Does tropical forest fragmentation increase long-term variability of butterfly communities? PLoS ONE 5, e9534. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0009534.

Lima, M., Gascon, C., 1999. The conservation value of linear forest remnants in central Amazonia. Biol. Conserv. 91, 241–247.

Lovejoy, T.E., Bierregaard, R.O., Rylands, A.B., Malcolm, J.R., Quintela, C., Harper, L., Brown, K., Powell, A., Powell, G., Schubart, H., Hays, M., 1986. Edge and other effects of isolation on Amazon forest fragments. In: Soulé, M.E. (Ed.), Conservation Biology: The Science of Scarcity and Diversity. Sinauer, Sunderland, Massachusetts, pp. 257–285.

Lovejoy, T.E., Oren, D.C., 1981. Minimum critical size of ecosystems. In: Burgess, R.L., Sharp, D.M. (Eds.), Forest Island Dynamics in Man-dominated Landscapes. Springer-Verlag, New York, pp. 7–12.

Lovejoy, T.E., Rankin, J.M., Bierregaard, R.O., Brown, K.S., Emmons, L.H., Van der Voort, M.E., 1984. Ecosystem decay of Amazon forest fragments. In: Nitecki, M.H. (Ed.), Extinctions. University of Chicago Press, Chicago, pp. 295–325.

Malcolm, J.R., 1994. Edge effects in central Amazonian forest fragments. Ecology 75, 2438–2445.

Malcolm, J.R., 1997. Biomass and diversity of small mammals in Amazonian forest fragments. In: Laurance, W.F., Bierregaard, R.O. (Eds.), Tropical Forest Remnants: Ecology, Management, and Conservation of Fragmented Communities. University of Chicago Press, Chicago, pp. 207–221.

Malcolm, J.R., 1998. A model of conductive heat flow in forest edges and fragmented landscapes. Clim. Change 39, 487–502.

Mesquita, R., Delamônica, P., Laurance, W.F., 1999. Effects of surrounding vegetation on edge-related tree mortality in Amazonian forest fragments. Biol. Conserv. 91, 129–134.

Mesquita, R., Ickes, K., Ganade, G., Williamson, G.B., 2001. Alternative successional pathways in the Amazon basin. J. Ecol. 89, 528–537.

Mestre, L.A.M., Gasnier, T.R., 2008. Populações de aranhas errantes do gênero *Ctenus* em fragmentos florestais na Amazônia Central. Acta Amazonica 38, 159–164.

Michalski, F., Peres, C.A., 2005. Anthropogenic determinants of primate and carnivore local extinctions in a fragmented forest landscape of Southern Amazonia. Biol. Conserv. 124, 383–396.

Myers, N., Mittermeier, R.A., Mittermeier, C.G., Fonseca, G.A.B., Kent, J., 2000. Biodiversity hotspots for conservation priorities. Nature 403, 853–858.

Nascimento, H., Andrade, A., Camargo, J., Laurance, W.F., Laurance, S.G., Ribeiro, J., 2006. Effects of the surrounding matrix on tree recruitment in Amazonian forest fragments. Conserv. Biol. 20, 853–860.

Nascimento, H., Laurance, W.F., 2004. Biomass dynamics in Amazonian forest fragments. Ecol. Appl. 14, S127–S138.

Neckel-Oliveira, S., Gascon, C., 2006. Abundance, body size and movement patterns of a tropical treefrog in continuous and fragmented forests of the Brazilian Amazon. Biol. Conserv. 128, 308–315.

Nessimian, J.L., Venticinque, E.M., Zuanon, J., De Marco, P., Gordo, M., Fidelis, L., Batista, J., Juen, L., 2008. Land use, habitat integrity, and aquatic insect assemblages in central Amazonian streams. Hydrobiologia 614, 117–131.

Norden, N., Mesquita, R., Bentos, T., Chazdon, R., Williamson, G.B., 2010. Contrasting community compensatory trends in alternative successional pathways in central Amazonia. Oikos. doi:10.1111/j.1600-0706.2010.18335.x.

Oliveira de, A.A., Mori, S.A., 1999. A central Amazonian terra firme forest. I. High tree species richness on poor soils. Biodiv. Conserv. 8, 1219–1244.

Peres, C.A., 2005. Why we need megareserves in Amazonia. Conserv. Biol. 19, 728–733.

Peres, C.A., Gardner, T.A., Barlow, J., Zuanon, J., Michalski, F., Lees, A., Vieira, I., Moreira, F., Feeley, K.J., 2010. Biodiversity conservation in human-modified Amazonian forest landscapes. Biol. Conserv. 143, 2314–2327.

Pimm, S.L., 1998. The forest fragment classic. Nature 393, 23–24.

Pimm, S.L., Jenkins, C., 2005. Sustaining the variety of life. Sci. Am. September, 66–73.

Powell, A.H., Powell, G.V.N., 1987. Population dynamics of male euglossine bees in Amazonian forest fragments. Biotropica 19, 176–179.

Quintela, C.E., 1985. Forest Fragmentation and Differential Use of Natural and Man-made Edges by Understory Birds in Central Amazonia. M.Sc. Thesis, University of Illinois, Chicago.

Quintero, I., Roslin, T., 2005. Rapid recovery of dung beetle communities following habitat fragmentation in Central Amazonia. Ecology 86, 3303–3311.

Radtke, M.G., da Fonseca, C., Williamson, G.B., 2008. Forest fragment size effects on dung beetle communities. Biol. Conserv. 141, 613–614.

Rego, F., Venticinque, E.M., Brescovit, A., 2007. Effects of forest fragmentation on four *Ctenus* spider populations (Araneae, Ctenidae) in central Amazonia, Brazil. Stud. Neotrop. Fauna Environ. 42, 137–144.

Ribeiro, M.B.N., Bruna, E.M., Mantovani, W., 2009. Influence of post-clearing treatment on the recovery of herbaceous plant communities in Amazonian secondary forests. Restor. Ecol. 18, 50–58.

Sampaio, E.M., 2000. Effects of Forest Fragmentation on the Diversity and Abundance Patterns of Central Amazonian Bats. Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Tübingen, Berlin, Germany.

Sampaio, E.M., Kalko, E., Bernard, E., Rodriguez-Herrera, B., Handley, C., 2003. A biodiversity assessment of bats (Chiroptera) in a tropical lowland forest of central Amazonia, including methodological and conservation considerations. Stud. Neotrop. Fauna Environ. 28, 17–31.

Santos, B.A., Arroyo-Rodríguez, V., Moreno, C.E., Tabarelli, M., 2010. Edge-related loss of tree phylogenetic diversity in the severely fragmented Brazilian Atlantic forest. PLoS ONE 5, e12625. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0012625.

Scariot, A., 1999. Forest fragmentation effects on diversity of the palm community in central Amazonia. J. Ecol. 87, 66–76.

Scariot, A., 2001. Weedy and secondary palm species in central Amazonian forest fragments. Rev. Bot. Brasil. 15, 271–280.

Sizer, N., Tanner, E.V.J., 1999. Responses of woody plant seedlings to edge formation in a lowland tropical rainforest. Amazonia. Biol. Conserv. 91, 135–142.

Sizer, N., Tanner, E.V.J., Kossman-Ferraz, I., 2000. Edge effects on litterfall mass and nutrient concentrations in forest fragments in central Amazonia. J. Trop. Ecol. 16, 853–863.

Skole, D.S., Tucker, C.J., 1993. Tropical deforestation and habitat fragmentation in the Amazon: satellite data from 1978 to 1988. Science 260, 1905–1910.

Sodhi, N.S., Koh, L.P., Brook, B.W., Ng, P., 2004. Southeast Asian biodiversity: an impending disaster. Trends Ecol. Evol. 19, 654–660.

Stouffer, P.C., Bierregaard, R.O., 1995a. Effects of forest fragmentation on understory hummingbirds in Amazonian Brazil. Conserv. Biol. 9, 1085–1094.

Stouffer, P.C., Bierregaard, R.O., 1995b. Use of Amazonian forest fragments by understory insectivorous birds. Ecology 76, 2429–2445.

Stouffer, P.C., Bierregaard, R.O., Strong, C., Lovejoy, T.E., 2006. Long-term landscape change and bird abundance in Amazonian rainforest fragments. Conserv. Biol. 20, 1212–1223.

Stouffer, P.C., Strong, C., Naka, L.N., 2008. Twenty years of understory bird extinctions from Amazonian rain forest fragments: consistent trends and landscape-mediated dynamics. Divers. Distrib. 15, 88–97.

Stratford, J.A., Stouffer, P.C., 1999. Local extinctions of terrestrial insectivorous birds in Amazonian forest fragments. Conserv. Biol. 13, 1416–1423.

Terborgh, J., Lopez, L., Nuñez, V.P., Rao, M., Shahabuddin, G., Orihuela, G., Riveros, M., Ascanio, R., Adler, G., Lambert, T., Balbas, L., 2001. Ecological meltdown in predator-free forest fragments. Science 294, 1923–1926.

Timo, T.P.C., 2003. Influência de fragmentação e matriz sobre a comunidade de mamíferos de médio e grande porte em uma floresta de terra firme na Amazônia central. M.Sc. Thesis, National Institute for Amazonian Research (INPA), Manaus, Brazil.

Tocher, M., Gascon, C., Zimmerman, B.L., 1997. Fragmentation effects on a central Amazonian frog community: a ten-year study. In: Laurance, W.F., Bierregaard, R.O. (Eds.), Tropical Forest Remnants: Ecology, Management, and Conservation of Fragmented Communities. University of Chicago Press, Chicago, pp. 124–137.

Trancoso, R., 2008. Hydrological Impacts of Deforestation in Small Catchments in Brazilian Amazonia. M.Sc. Thesis, National Institute for Amazonian Research (INPA), Manaus, Brazil.

Uriarte, M., Bruna, E.M., Rubim, P., Anciães, M., Jonckheere, I., 2010. Effects of forest fragmentation on the seedling recruitment of a tropical herb: assessing seed vs. safe-site limitation. Ecology 91, 1317–1328.

Van Houtan, K.S., Pimm, S.L., Bierregaard, R.O., Lovejoy, T.E., Stouffer, P.C., 2006. Local extinctions in Amazonian forest fragments. Evol. Ecol. Res. 8, 129–148.

Van Houtan, K.S., Pimm, S.L., Halley, J., Bierregaard, R.O., Lovejoy, T.E., 2007. Dispersal of Amazonian birds in continuous and fragmented forest. Ecol. Lett. 10, 219–229.

Vasconcelos, H.L., Luizão, F.J., 2004. Litter production and litter nutrient concentrations in a fragmented Amazonian landscape: edge and soil effects. Ecol. Appl. 14, 884–892.

Wilcox, B.A., Murphy, D.D., 1985. Conservation strategy: the effects of fragmentation on extinction. Am. Nat. 125, 879–887.

Williamson, G.B., Laurance, W.F., Oliveira, A.A., Delamonica, P., Gascon, C., Lovejoy, T.E., Pohl, L., 2000. Amazonian wet forest resistance to the 1997–98 El Niño drought. Conserv. Biol. 14, 1538–1542.

Williamson, G.B., Mesquita, R., 2001. Effects of fire on rain forest regeneration in the Amazon Basin. In: Laurance, W.F., Bierregaard, R.O. (Eds.), Tropical Forest Remnants: Ecology, Management, and Conservation of Fragmented Communities. University of Chicago Press, Chicago, pp. 325–334.

Zartman, C.E., 2003. Forest fragmentation effects on epiphyllous bryophyte communities in central Amazonia. Ecology 84, 948–954.

Zartman, C.E., Nascimento, H.E.M., 2006. Are patch-tracking metacommunities dispersal limited? Inferences from abundance-occupancy patterns of epiphylls in Amazonian forest fragments. Biol. Conserv. 127, 46–54.

Zartman, C.E., Shaw, A.J., 2006. Metapopulation extinction thresholds in rainforest remnants. Am. Nat. 167, 177–189.