

## **Termite activity and decomposition are influenced by digging mammal reintroductions along an aridity gradient**

Coggan, Nicole V.; Hayward, Matthew; Gibb, Heloise

### **Journal of Arid Environments**

DOI:

[10.1016/j.jaridenv.2016.06.005](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jaridenv.2016.06.005)

Published: 01/10/2016

Peer reviewed version

[Cyswllt i'r cyhoeddiad / Link to publication](#)

*Dyfyniad o'r fersiwn a gyhoeddwyd / Citation for published version (APA):*

Coggan, N. V., Hayward, M., & Gibb, H. (2016). Termite activity and decomposition are influenced by digging mammal reintroductions along an aridity gradient. *Journal of Arid Environments*, 133(October), 85-93. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jaridenv.2016.06.005>

#### **Hawliau Cyffredinol / General rights**

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the public portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal ?

#### **Take down policy**

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

1 **Termite activity and decomposition are influenced by digging mammal**  
2 **reintroductions**

3  
4 Nicole V. Coggan <sup>1\*</sup>, Matthew W. Hayward <sup>2</sup>, Heloise Gibb <sup>1</sup>

5 <sup>1</sup>Department of Zoology, School of Life Sciences, La Trobe University, Melbourne, Vic., 3086,  
6 Australia.

7 <sup>2</sup>Australian Wildlife Conservancy, PO Box 8070, Subiaco East, W.A., 6008, Australia.

8 <sup>2</sup>Current address: School of the Environment, Bangor University, LL572UW, United Kingdom.

9  
10 \*Corresponding author: Email: n.coggan@latrobe.edu.au  
11

## 12 Abstract

13 ~~The decline of species~~ Species declines can have ~~broader~~ impacts on ecosystems, particularly when  
14 those species act as ecosystem engineers. Ecosystem engineers modify habitats and therefore indirectly  
15 shape plant and animal communities. However, environmental attributes, such as aridity, may influence  
16 the direct effect of engineers on habitat properties, indirectly affecting other species and the functions  
17 they perform. We used three sites where endangered digging mammals had been reintroduced to test the  
18 hypotheses that: 1. digging mammal reintroductions affect resource consumption and abandonment by  
19 termites, and 2. locality attributes, such as aridity, influences termite interactions with reintroduced  
20 mammals. We performed two manipulative experiments to test these hypotheses. First, we tested the  
21 effects of burial resource depth on termite consumption of resources (toilet rolls). ~~Here, resource depth~~  
22 ~~was a proxy for disturbance intensity by reintroduced mammals, with shallow rolls expected to~~  
23 ~~experience more disturbance.~~ Second, we tested resource abandonment by termites in response to  
24 simulated disturbances by determining the proportion of termites remaining at disturbed resources  
25 relative to undisturbed controls over time. Both experiments were conducted at all three ~~aridity~~  
26 ~~levels~~ sites, inside and outside exotic predator and exotic digging mammal-free reserves. We discovered  
27 that: 1. resource consumption was ~25% lower, and resource abandonment ~50% higher where digging  
28 mammals were reintroduced; and 2. termite responses to ~~reintroduced digging mammals~~ mammal  
29 reintroduction became less pronounced potentially as aridity increased. ~~We thus showed that the~~ The  
30 near-extinction of digging mammals from much of Australia is likely to have significantly altered  
31 termite ~~behaviour and termite driven~~ activity and decomposition, but that impacts ~~may potentially~~  
32 depend on aridity. Our work should also be considered in the context of reserve carrying capacities as it  
33 suggests, counterintuitively, that ecosystem impacts of reintroductions may be lower in resource-poor  
34 sites.

Commented [MH1]: Broader than what? I'd use 'widespread'.



35 **Keywords:** Climatic gradient, Critical weight range mammal, Decomposition, Ecosystem engineer,  
36 Interactions, Termite

## 37 1. Introduction

38 Recent declines in biodiversity have been dramatic (e.g. Colwell et al., 2012; Dunn et al., 2009),  
39 resulting in significant changes to ecosystem functioning and species assemblages (Boyer and Jetz,  
40 2014; Brodie et al., 2014; Feer and Boissier, 2015; Silvey et al., 2015). Australia has the fourth- highest  
41 record of species loss (IUCN 2015) and the highest rate of terrestrial mammal extinctions worldwide.  
42 Thirty terrestrial mammal species have been declared extinct since European settlement (from 1788) ~~and~~  
43 and a further 21 native mammals are threatened with extinction (Fleming et al., 2014; Woinarski et al.,  
44 2015). Non-native predators are amongst the leading contributors to Australia's mammal extinction  
45 record (Woinarski et al., 2015). Some of the greatest impacts have occurred in arid and semi-arid  
46 habitats, where species of intermediate body size (35 g – 5500 g, referred to as 'Critical Weight Range'  
47 species), (McKenzie et al., 2007), and greater mass (up to 10 kg, i.e. Hanna and Cardillo, 2014), have  
48 been more susceptible to regional extinctions or declines. The scale of these species losses has been  
49 mitigated through mammal reintroductions into fenced reserves, from which exotic predators and other  
50 non-native species have been removed (e.g. Hayward and Kerley, 2009; Short and Turner, 2000).  
51 Digging mammals in the critical weight range were almost completely extirpated from Australia's  
52 mainland, where arid and semi-arid habitats comprise up to 70 % of the total terrestrial landscape (James  
53 et al., 1995). Desertification is increasing globally (Reynolds et al., 2007), ergo, the cover of arid and  
54 semi-arid habitats is likely to increase in the near future. Australia's native digging mammals are  
55 thought to have functioned as ecosystem engineers (sensu Jones et al., 1996). Engineering impacts are  
56 generally expected to benefit biotic communities as abiotic stressors increase by providing physiological

**Commented [MH2]:** Hayward, M. W., Moseby, K. E.,  
Read, J. L. (2014). The role of predator exclosures in the  
conservation of Australian fauna. In *Carnivores of  
Australia*: pp 363-379. Glen, A. S., Dickman, C. R. (Eds.).  
Heidelberg, Melbourne, Australia: CSIRO Publishing.

**Formatted:** Font: Italic

57 ~~or physical refuge~~ (Crain and Bertness, 2006). ~~Engineering effects~~ ~~However, their inputs~~ are not  
58 adversity. The magnitude of an engineer species' impacts can be context-dependent upon factors  
59 including aridity or productivity (hence, resource availability), both of which are important features of  
60 arid environments (Fischer and Turner, 1978; Hadley and Szarek, 1981).  
61 Prior to their declines from arid habitats, burrowing bettongs (*Bettongia lesueur*) and greater bilbies  
62 (*Macrotis lagotis*) were native digging mammals that made prolific contributions to soil turnover,  
63 moving between one to six tonnes of soil per hectare every year (Eldridge and James, 2009). The  
64 survival record of these species on the Australian mainland since 1788 is mixed. Bilbies persist in  
65 isolated populations in north-western Australia and north-central Queensland (e.g. Southgate and  
66 Carthew, 2006) but were lost from their central, south and south-eastern Australian range from the  
67 1910s to the 1930s (Pavey, 2006). In contrast, bettongs became regionally extinct from mainland  
68 habitats by the 1960s (e.g. Short and Turner, 2000). Critical weight range mammal declines (especially  
69 of digging mammals) represent a broad-scale loss of ecosystem function, with quantified impacts upon  
70 the current structure of arid habitats and the biota within them (Fleming et al., 2014; Manning et al.,  
71 2015). These include impacts upon multiple aspects of soil (Clarke et al., 2015; Eldridge et al., 2015),  
72 invertebrate (Davidson and Lightfoot, 2007; Read et al., 2008; Silvey et al., 2015), ~~and plant~~  
73 assemblages (e.g. Chapman, 2016; Fleming et al., 2014; Verdon et al. in review) ~~and fire regimes~~  Re-  
74 establishing native mammal assemblages is anticipated to restore impacted natural ecological processes  
75 (James and Eldridge, 2007; James et al., 2009; Manning et al., 2015). Digging mammals have been  
76 successfully established inside sanctuaries in arid and semi-arid habitats  but the scarcity of accurate  
77 historical data needed for these types of conservation projects means that little is known of their  
78 potential interactions with, nor their impacts upon pre-existing ecological assemblages (e.g. Nogués-  
79 Bravo et al., 2016).

**Commented [MH3]:** Hayward, M. W., Ward-Fear, G., L'Hotellier, F., Herman, K., Kabat, X. (2016). Could biodiversity loss have increased Australia's bushfire threat? *Animal Conservation* **In press**.

**Commented [MH4]:** Hayward, M. W., Moseby, K. E., Read, J. L. (2014). The role of predator exclosures in the conservation of Australian fauna. In *Carnivores of Australia*: pp 363-379. Glen, A. S., Dickman, C. R. (Eds.). Heidelberg, Melbourne, Australia: CSIRO Publishing.

80 [Termites are the dominant invertebrate soil engineers and detritivores in Australian arid systems](#)  
81 (Morton et al., 2011), and are vitally important to soil health wherever they occur (de Bruyn and  
82 Conacher, 1990). [Prior to European colonisation, native digging mammals were likely to have been](#)  
83 [important disturbance agents and predators of subterranean termites and other ground-dwelling](#)  
84 [invertebrates](#) (Gibb, 2012a; Silvey et al., 2015). [Termite activity is sensitive to disturbances](#) ~~which that~~  
85 [affect the availability and suitability of their resources](#) (e.g. Jones et al., 2003). They are therefore likely  
86 to respond indirectly [to soil disturbance when mammals are foraging or burrowing](#) (Gibb, 2012a). This  
87 may [have cascading influences on factors such as habitat productivity, given their input into the](#)  
88 [functioning of arid systems](#). In addition to their functional significance, [termites are](#) consumed by a  
89 variety of fauna (e.g. Colli et al., 2006; Morton and James, 1988; Sheppe, 1970). They are [directly](#)  
90 [relevant to reintroduced digging mammals as one of their primary food sources](#), as a [number of these](#)  
91 [and other threatened critical weight range species are opportunistic dietary generalists and/or](#)  
92 [insectivores](#) (e.g. Bice and Moseby, 2008).

93 [Understanding the responses of ecological assemblages to the reintroduction of regionally extinct](#)  
94 [species is a developing field in ecology. New evidence indicates that critical weight range mammal](#)  
95 [reintroductions \(digging mammals included\) have had significant influences on the community](#)  
96 [assembly of arthropods by initiating trophic cascades](#) (Silvey et al., 2015), [and on soil microbes through](#)  
97 [digging and defecation](#) (Clarke et al., 2015). [However, no previous studies have investigated the effects](#)  
98 [of digging mammals on invertebrate activity and its implication for functions such as detritivory.](#)  
99 [Understanding the impacts of mammal reintroduction on termite activity is important because of the](#)  
100 [significant contribution of termites to food webs and ecological processes](#) (i.e. Bice and Moseby, 2008;  
101 Colli et al., 2006; Matthews, 1976; Morton et al., 2011; Morton and James, 1988; Sheppe, 1970),  
102 [particularly in arid habitats](#) (Whitford and Kay, 1999).

We used replicated comparisons of three reintroduction sanctuaries located in arid/semi-arid southern  
Australia. Our aim was to quantify the responses of subterranean termite activity inside sanctuaries  
where native digging mammals have been reintroduced, against controls outside the sanctuaries; where  
native digging mammals are regionally extinct. We did this by comparing the proportion of a) resources  
eaten by termites at different depths, and b) termites remaining at experimentally-disturbed resources  
buried at both reintroduction and control habitats. We hypothesised that soil disturbances generated by  
reintroduced digging mammals would reduce termite activity, resulting in lower proportions of buried  
resources consumed, and higher proportions of resource abandonment by termites. Because aridity was  
one of the major abiotic variables to increase across the sanctuaries, and also because engineering  
impacts tend to be context-dependent (Crain and Bertness, 2006; McAfee et al., 2015), we also  
considered whether different aridity levels at each sanctuary could affect the magnitude of termite  
responses when digging mammals were present. We hypothesised that the effect of digging mammals on  
termite foraging would be influenced by the level of aridity experienced at each sanctuary.

117 **2. Methods**

118 **2.1. Study sites**

119 We compared termite responses to soil disturbance by reintroduced digging mammals at three  
120 conservation sanctuaries. These were Arid Recovery (~~30°33'55.38''S, 136°55'3.85''E~~, South  
121 Australia), Scotia (~~33°8'9.00''S, 145°11'33.00''E~~, New South Wales), and Yookamurra sanctuaries (~~34°31'19.38''S, 139°28'31.91''E~~, South Australia) (Table 1, Fig. 1a). Scotia and Yookamurra  
122 sanctuaries were administered by the Australian Wildlife Conservancy, and Arid Recovery by BHP  
123 Billiton. Aridity varied across sanctuaries. The three sanctuaries were located along a gradient of aridity  
124 (Table 1). Temperature, precipitation, gross primary production (GPP) and the enhanced vegetation  
125 index (EVI) co-varied with aridity. We used aridity indices for each site that were provided by the  
126 Australian Virtual Herbarium (Australian Virtual Herbarium 2015). We placed the aridity index value  
127 for each sanctuary relative to the others according to the United Nations Food and Agriculture  
128 Organization's (FAO) aridity index scale. Aridity indices are calculated as the annual mean ratio of  
129 precipitation/potential evapotranspiration (Chiew, Wang, McConachy, James, Wright and deHoedt  
130 2002, Tabari and Aghajanjloo 2013). 'High' aridity indices closer to 1 are less arid than 'low' indices  
131 closer to 0. Thus, Hyper-arid zones have indices <0.05, Arid zones are <0.05 - <0.20, and Semi-arid  
132 zones are <0.20 - <0.50 (FAO 2015). Arid Recovery was the most arid sanctuary and Yookamurra  
133 sanctuary was the least arid. Aridity indices, annual precipitation, GPP and EVI increased by an average  
134 interval of 34.11%, and the mean daily maximum temperature decreased by an interval of 7.25% from  
135 Arid Recovery to Yookamurra sanctuary (Table 1). Note: Aridity indices are calculated as the annual  
136 mean ratio of precipitation/potential evapotranspiration (Chiew et al., 2002; Tabari and Aghajanjloo,  
137 2013). 'High' aridity indices closer to 1 are less arid than 'low' indices closer to 0. Thus, Hyper-arid  
138 zones have indices <0.05, Arid zones are <0.05- <0.20, and Semi-arid zones are <0.20 - <0.50 (FAO,  
139 2015).

**Commented [MH5]:** Do you need to include the minus if you then stipulate these are all degrees south?

**Field Code Changed**



140 2015). ~~Previous research suggests that effects of (invertebrate) ecosystem engineers on vegetation~~  
141 ~~communities increase with precipitation , and resource scarcity promotes fidelity for termites (Lenz,~~  
142 ~~Kard, Evans, Mauldin, Etheridge and Abbey 2009).~~ We therefore hypothesised that termite responses to  
143 ~~reintroduced mammal disturbance would increase with decreasing aridity.~~

144 The dominant vegetation class for Scotia and Yookamurra sanctuaries was remnant Mallee woodland  
145 and shrublands, with climate at Yookamurra classified as ‘Mediterranean’, while that at Scotia was  
146 ‘Semi-arid’. Dominant ground cover at Scotia included spinifex (*Triodia spp.*) and chenopod species,  
147 and *Westringia rigida* at Yookamurra sanctuary. The dominant trees in Mallee woodlands and  
148 shrublands are *Eucalyptus* species, including *E. dumosa* and *E. gracilis*. Arid ~~recovery~~ Recovery was  
149 classified as Acacia shrubland with a ‘Desert’ climate. Dominant ground cover at Arid Recovery varied  
150 with season: at the time of data collection, the Poached-egg daisy (*Polycalymma stuartii*) and Desert  
151 Rattle-pod (*Crotalaria eremaea*) were abundant. Sandhill wattle (*Acacia ligulata*) was the dominant  
152 shrub species at Arid Recovery. Scotia and Yookamurra sanctuaries supported cryptogamic crust which  
153 bound the soil surface at those sanctuaries, whereas Arid Recovery did not.

154

### 155 2.1.2. Sampling design

156 All sanctuaries included large (up to ~86000 ha) enclosures free of introduced predators and protected  
157 by predator-proof fencing. Reconstruction of native mammal assemblages commenced at Scotia  
158 Sanctuary circa 2004 (Finlayson et al., 2008), at Arid Recovery circa 2000 (Moseby et al., 2003), and at  
159 Yookamurra Sanctuary circa 1999 (Vieira et al., 2007). All sanctuaries functioned as pastoral land for  
160 livestock (sheep and/or cattle) after European settlement and prior to their conversion into sanctuary  
161 habitats (Grolleau and Peterson, 2012). All reintroduced mammal species were considered regionally

**Commented [MH6]:** I'm not sure of journal requirements, but these aren't proper nouns so shouldn't be capitalised.

**Commented [MH7]:** Hayward, M. W., Moseby, K. E., Read, J. L. (2014). The role of predator exclosures in the conservation of Australian fauna. In *Carnivores of Australia*: pp 363-379. Glen, A. S., Dickman, C. R. (Eds.). Heidelberg, Melbourne, Australia: CSIRO Publishing.

**Commented [MH8]:** Hayward, M. W., Moseby, K. E., Read, J. L. (2014). The role of predator exclosures in the conservation of Australian fauna. In *Carnivores of Australia*: pp 363-379. Glen, A. S., Dickman, C. R. (Eds.). Heidelberg, Melbourne, Australia: CSIRO Publishing.

**Commented [MH9]:** Hayward, M. W., Moseby, K. E., Read, J. L. (2014). The role of predator exclosures in the conservation of Australian fauna. In *Carnivores of Australia*: pp 363-379. Glen, A. S., Dickman, C. R. (Eds.). Heidelberg, Melbourne, Australia: CSIRO Publishing.

extinct from both reintroduction and control areas prior to the establishment of these sanctuaries (Table 1). -Rabbits were present at control habitats, but had been eliminated from inside reintroduction enclosures. The population densities of exotic species in control habitats (e.g. cats, foxes and rabbits) are routinely controlled by sanctuary management using poison baiting, trapping and shooting.


To test the effects of native digging mammals on termite ~~foraging along the climatic gradient~~activity, we performed experiments inside (reintroduced ~~mammalian engineers~~digging mammals present: ‘Reintroduction’) and outside the reintroduction enclosure (controls with no native ~~mammalian engineers~~digging mammals: ‘Control’) at each sanctuary (Fig. 1b). We paired sampling sites (n = 6) inside and outside the reintroduction enclosure at each sanctuary. Sites were paired to minimise the influence of spatial autocorrelation of biotic and abiotic characteristics on our response variables. Sampling sites were placed at least 150 m from the fence line (i.e., paired sites were at least 300 m apart) and, where possible, the distance between sites was 1 km (Fig. 1b).

### 2.1.3. Reintroduced ~~mammalian engineer species~~mammals and presence of reintroduced ~~termitivores~~

We focused on soil disturbances caused by two reintroduced digging mammal species, burrowing bettongs, *Bettongia lesueur*, and greater bilbies, *Macrotis lagotis* (Table 1). These species were important ecosystem engineers prior to their regional extinction from the Australian mainland (James and Eldridge 2007). Bettongs and bilbies are omnivorous and include termites in their diet, although bettongs tend to consume more plant material, while bilbies are more insectivorous (Gibson, 2001; Navnith et al., 2009; Robley et al., 2001). Both species move substantial amounts of soil, within the range of 1.27-5.99 t.ha<sup>-1</sup> per year (Eldridge and James, 2009), suggesting that termites experience markedly greater levels of soil disturbance inside sanctuaries. Numbats (*Myrmecobius fasciatus*) were

184 also reintroduced at Scotia and Yookamurra sanctuaries (Vieira et al., 2007). ~~Although this species is not~~  
185 ~~considered an ecosystem engineer, it is exclusively termitivorous~~ Numbats are exclusively  
186 termitivorous (Calaby, 1960), but are not digging mammals and do not function as ecosystem engineers  
187 (Table 1). Interactions with numbats were not included in our hypotheses, but were acknowledged as a  
188 potential influence on termite behaviour.

189



190

191 Fig.1 a) Map showing location of study sanctuaries [relative to the precipitation gradient](#); b) Simplified diagram of sampling sites at each  
 192 sanctuary. Dashed line represents the fence dividing habitats. Comparisons of termite responses [to reintroduced to engineers-digging mammals](#)  
 193 were made between habitats where digging mammals were reintroduced (Reintroduction: closed circles), or regionally extinct (Control: open  
 194 circles); c) Resource (toilet roll) layout for Experiment 1 showing resource depth [\(disturbance level\)](#); d), Resource layout for Experiment 2,  
 195 showing 'disturbed' (black) and 'control' (white) resources and layout of blocks by observation time (shaded rectangles). AR: Arid Recovery,  
 196 SS: Scotia Sanctuary, YS: Yookamurra Sanctuary.

#### 2.1.4. Vegetation Surveys

We performed vegetation surveys in September 2011, prior to commencing experiments. We established twelve 5 m x 5 m quadrats at each of the six paired sites in each sanctuary. In every quadrat, we estimated the percentage cover of four habitat characteristics: bare ground, ground cover, leaf litter and canopy. We also calculated the average volume of logs (lying dead wood) with a diameter  $\geq 5$  cm in every quadrat (c.f. Gibb and Cunningham, 2010). Standing stems were not measured. Log volume was estimated as the volume of a cylinder in cubic centimetres, using log length and diameter measured at the mid-point of the log. Vegetation cover was predicted to decrease with increasing aridity because precipitation restricts resource availability (Oksanen et al., 1981). It was also expected to decrease where ~~ecosystem engineers~~ digging mammals were present, because persistent soil disturbance limits opportunities of for plants to establish (e.g. Gurney et al., 2015). Climate was expected to regulate the impact of digging mammals on vegetation cover in more-arid habitats by limiting the amount of vegetation available for manipulation ~~by engineers~~.

#### 2.2. Termite responses

##### 2.2.1. Experiment 1: Resource consumption ~~under increasing soil disturbance intensity~~.

We performed an experiment ~~using resources buried at three depths~~ to test the effect of soil disturbance by reintroduced ~~ecosystem engineers~~ digging mammals on termite ~~foraging across the climatic gradient~~ activity. ~~We used resource depth as a surrogate for disturbance intensity.~~ A longitudinal study of soil disturbance indicated that the average foraging pit constructed by bilbies and bettongs is 10-20 cm (Travers, 2013). We therefore expected that resource consumption by termites would be affected most by ~~reintroduced ecosystem engineers~~ soil

[disturbance](#) at depths less than 10 cm, moderately affected at depths less than 20 cm and not affected at depths greater than 20 cm.

In February 2012, we buried nine unscented toilet paper rolls ('resources') in a 3 m x 3 m grid at each of the 6 paired sampling sites in each sanctuary (Fig. 1a-c). We used toilet rolls as resources because they were attractive to common soil and wood-feeding termite genera (*Coptotermes*, and *Heterotermes*), whose ranges intersected all of our study sites (French and Robinson, 1981; Watson and Abbey, 1993). A row of three resources was buried at each of the three depths, ~~where depth was a surrogate for disturbance~~. Treatments were: 1) intensely disturbed resources ('High disturbance'), 1-5 cm below ground (these represented the zone of highest resource exposure to soil disturbance); moderately disturbed resources ('Moderate disturbance'), 10-15 cm below ground (these were close to the average maximum depth of ~~engineer~~ [digging](#)s); and least disturbed resources ('Low disturbance'), 30-50 cm below ground, where the majority of ~~engineer-disturbance~~ [digging](#)s should be avoided (Fig. 1c). In August/September 2012, we unearthed the resources and visually estimated the proportion of each resource that termites had consumed: 0% consumption indicated that the resource remained intact, and 100% consumption indicated that the resource was completely consumed.

### **2.2.2. Experiment 2. ~~Effect of intense soil disturbance on resource abandonment by termites~~ [Resource abandonment](#).**

We hypothesised that disturbance would ~~increase the rate of~~ [affect](#) resource abandonment ~~by termites~~. Disturbance caused by reintroduced digging mammals was expected to expose termite foragers to threats such as desiccation or [to](#) attack by termite predators, which also include the reintroduced mammals themselves (Table 1). We tested the effects of disturbance ~~on termites~~ [by](#)

comparing [termite](#) abundances on experimentally disturbed resources with those on controls (undisturbed resources) over 24 hours (Fig. 1d).

In February 2012, we buried nine resources in pairs within a 3 [m](#) x 3 [m](#) grid at each of the six paired sites at each sanctuary (Fig. 1d). Resources were buried approximately 5 cm below ground, within the range of highest soil disturbance intensity by reintroduced mammals (see Experiment 1). Resource pairs were separated by 5-10 cm and rows were 1 -2 m apart ([Fig. 1d](#)). Termites were allowed to colonize resources until August/September 2012, when we applied our disturbance treatment. For each pair, we disturbed one resource by unearthing it and leaving it unburied in its hole, and one resource, the ‘control’, undisturbed. The purpose of the control resource was to estimate the number of termites using undisturbed resources. We disturbed termite resources between 0900h-1000h to standardize temporal conditions at our sampling sites. Resource abandonment in response to our disturbance was measured by comparing the number of termites in the ‘disturbed’ and ‘control’ resources. We examined each row separately at 15 minutes, 3 hours and 24 hours after our initial disturbance treatment. Each replicate resource was examined only once, i.e. termites inside resources from row 1 were collected and counted after 15 minutes, from row 2 after 3 hours, and from row 3 after 24 hours following resource disturbance. For each pair, we counted the number of termites remaining in the disturbed resource and its control. For tests of the effect of digging mammals ~~and climate~~ on resource abandonment, we standardised each response by the total number of termites at the pair (Control-Disturbed)/(Control+Disturbed). We identified termite species whenever soldiers were found (soldiers were required for identification). We also noted predation by ants on termites, i.e., ants carrying termites away (~~Fig. 1d~~), at the disturbed resources. Finally, we calculated the proportion of disturbed resources that were attended by ants and photographed ants for later identification to genus.

### 265 2.3. Data Analysis

266 We used a generalized linear model (GLM) and Tukey's post-hoc tests with Bonferroni  
267 corrections to test the effect of ~~ecosystem engineer~~[digging mammal](#) reintroduction on vegetation  
268 cover. We also used GLMs to compare termite and ant responses to soil disturbance in habitats  
269 with and without reintroduced digging mammals. We used the Gaussian response distribution **for**  
270 termite activity in both experiments. In experiment 2, note that we used the binomial distribution  
271 for ant data, [as these described either the presence or absence of ants](#). Tukey's post-hoc tests with  
272 Bonferroni corrections were used to determine differences among interacting factors. All  
273 analyses were conducted using **R** (R Core Team, 2015).

**Commented [MH10]:** Do you need to mention the link function?

**Commented [MH11]:** Do you need to mention the models used and cite the coders for them?

274



### 275 3. Results

#### 276 3.1. General

##### 277 3.1.1. Habitat Surveys

278 Habitat cover differed among sanctuaries, with habitat structure decreasing [with aridity from](#)  
279 [Yookamurra to Arid Recovery, and Scotia intermediate between the two](#) (Table 2). Yookamurra  
280 had the greatest volume of logs,  $\text{m}^{-2}$ , the densest canopy, and the least bare ground (Table 2 Post-  
281 hoc). At the opposite end of the scale, Arid Recovery consistently had the lowest percentage  
282 cover of all recorded habitat types, and had very few logs with a diameter >5 cm, with wood  
283 resources concentrated at patches of dead Sandhill wattle (Table 2, Post-hoc). Scotia was similar  
284 to Arid Recovery in terms of bare ground and canopy cover, but closer to Yookamurra in terms  
285 of ground cover. Leaf litter and logs at Scotia were intermediate between Arid Recovery and  
286 Yookamurra sanctuaries (Table 2).

287

Commented [MH12]: Global change required

Commented [MH13]: Is this necessary?

### 288 3.1.2. Termites

289 Species of *Heterotermes* comprised the overwhelming majority of termites collected in both  
290 experiments; *Coptotermes* were collected in very small numbers. [Trench surveys from a related](#)  
291 [experiment estimated the average density of \*Heterotermes\* and of \*Coptotermes\* as follows:](#)  
292 [Heterotermes: Arid Recovery \(AR\)  \$87 \pm 22\$  termites.m<sup>-2</sup>, Scotia \(SS\)  \$137 \pm 21\$  termites.m<sup>-2</sup>,](#)  
293 [Yookamurra \(YS\)  \$112 \pm 19\$  termites.m<sup>-2</sup>. \*Coptotermes\*: AR  \$63 \pm 42\$  termites.m<sup>-2</sup>, SS  \$120 \pm 47\$](#)   
294 [termites.m<sup>-2</sup>, YS  \$36 \pm 34\$  termites.m<sup>-2</sup>.](#)

### 295 3.2. Experiment 1: Resource ~~consumption under increasing soil disturbance intensity and~~ 296 ~~increasing aridity~~[consumption.](#)

297 Average resource decomposition by termites was ~~53.25-3~~  $\pm 2.09-1$  % ~~upon observation~~ after 6  
298 months' burial. We found a significant three-way interaction between the presence of digging  
299 mammals, depth and [aridity sanctuary location](#) (Table 3). There was no difference in resource  
300 consumption with resource depth (~~disturbance intensity~~) where ~~engineers-digging mammals~~ were  
301 excluded (Fig. 3, post-hoc:  $P > 0.05$ ). However, when reintroduced ~~engineers-digging mammals~~  
302 were present, resource consumption at the low disturbance treatment (1-5 cm) was greater than at  
303 the high disturbance treatment (30-50 cm) (Fig. 3).

304 At 1-5 cm depths, the effect of reintroductions of digging mammals on resource consumption by  
305 termites (i.e., the difference inside and outside the sanctuary) increased with decreasing aridity  
306 (Fig. 3a-c, post-hoc:  $P < 0.0001$ ).

307




Fig. 3: Mean  $\pm$  SE proportion of resources consumed by termites exposed to increasing levels of soil disturbance in Experiment I. Graphs for each sanctuary are presented in order of aridity, from least arid (a, Yookamurra), to most arid (c, Arid Recovery).

313

314 **3.3. Experiment 2: Resource abandonment**~~following soil disturbance.~~

315 ~~Soil disturbance~~Experimentally- disturbing buried resources significantly increased ~~rates of~~  
316 resource abandonment by termites over time, ~~and rates of Resource~~ abandonment ~~were was~~  
317 higher when digging mammals were present (Table 4, Termites; Fig. 4a-c). ~~Aridity~~The location  
318 ~~of sanctuaries~~ did not affect resource abandonment by termites (Table 4, Termites). The number  
319 of termites remaining on resources declined with time since disturbance at Yookamurra and  
320 Scotia Sanctuaries (Fig. 4a-b) (effect size contrast: 15 mins > 3 hrs > 24 hrs ( $p < 0.05$ ). The  
321 number of termites remaining after disturbance at Arid Recovery fluctuated between the 3 hr and  
322 24 hr observation times (Fig. 4c).

323 Ants were observed carrying termites away from disturbed resources and we used ant attendance  
324 at resources as a surrogate for ant predation on termites. Time since disturbance, engineer status  
325 and ~~aridity-sanctuary~~ interacted to affect ant attendance at resources. Control and reintroduction  
326 sites differed after 3 hrs and 24 hrs, but only at Scotia and Yookamurra sanctuaries. At 24 hrs,  
327 the effect size (difference between control and reintroduction) decreased ~~with increasing~~  
328 ~~aridity~~from Yookamurra sanctuary to Arid Recovery, which was the most arid sanctuary (Figs.  
329 4d-f). *Iridomyrmex purpureus* was the most frequently observed ant species preying on termites.

330

331




Fig. 4, Mean  $\pm$  SE resource abandonment by termites (a-c) and termite predation by ants (d-f) following soil disturbance. Graphs are presented in order of the aridity at each sanctuary, from least arid (a & d, Yookamurra), to most arid (c & f, Arid Recovery).

#### 339 4. Discussion

340 Previous studies have shown that digging mammals alter invertebrate community assemblages  
341 through ecosystem engineering (Davidson and Lightfoot, 2007; Read et al., 2008). Their effects  
342 are associated with changes to habitat structure and/or complexity, such that assemblages that  
343 take advantage of engineered habitats (for example, burrows), are distinct from surrounding  
344 habitats that have not been engineered (e.g. Bravo et al., 2009). Invertebrate ~~and invertebrate~~  
345 assemblages may be further altered through predation by reintroduced digging mammals and  
346 resulting trophic cascades (Silvey et al., 2015). ~~This is the first study to~~ We show that  
347 ~~interactions with digging mammals~~ reintroduced digging mammals also negatively affect  
348 ~~ecosystem functions performed by invertebrates~~ termite activity, an impact that has not been  
349 previously examined in the context of reintroducing regionally-extinct species. Termite activity  
350 was approximately 25% lower and resource abandonment about 50% higher than controls when  
351 digging mammals were reintroduced. We also observed a decrease in the effect magnitude of  
352 termite responses from Yookamurra sanctuary to Arid Recovery. These may be attributed to  
353 greater aridity levels and resource availability at Arid Recovery versus the other sanctuaries,  
354 which we will discuss.

355 Digging mammals such as the greater bilby and burrowing bettong move a significant volume of  
356 soil each year (Eldridge and James, 2009). Termites were expected to alter their resource  
357 consumption to avoid soil disturbances (Brown et al., 1999), resulting in ~~a decreased~~ decreases  
358 ~~rate~~ of termite activity that could ultimately influence decomposition, one of their primary  
359 ecological functions. Data from Experiment I supported this prediction: shallow resources that  
360 were exposed to the most intense levels of soil disturbance (~~those at shallow depths~~) were  
361 consumed less by termites when engineers ~~digging mammals~~ were present. In contrast, resource  
362 consumption was independent of resource ~~disturbance intensity (resource depth)~~ disturbance

Field Code Changed

363 when [engineers digging mammals](#) were absent. This shift in resource consumption suggests that  
364 termites were either actively avoiding, or were less successful at consuming resources ~~where soil~~  
365 ~~disturbance was greater when digging mammals were present~~. Termite populations decline  
366 following habitat disturbances that disrupt their food supplies, for example, shortly following  
367 fires, or when habitats shift towards lower plant diversity (e.g. in plantations) (Dosso et al.,  
368 2013). It is therefore possible that this change in function resulted from a change in population  
369 density of termites. However, preliminary data suggest that this is not the case (Coggan & Gibb  
370 in prep), so changes in resource consumption may be the result of changes in termite behaviour,  
371 considered in Experiment 2.

372 We showed a clear ~~(aridity dependent)~~ diminution in termite activity in the upper layers of soil  
373 in the presence of digging mammals, [although this was greater at Yookamurra and Scotia](#)  
374 [sanctuaries](#). While previous studies have focussed on the biodiversity impacts of the loss of  
375 ecosystem engineers (Romero et al., 2015), few studies have examined the ecological cascades  
376 or functional changes resulting from changes in behaviour or population densities of species with  
377 which ecosystem engineers such as digging mammals interact. ~~-Termites are the dominant~~  
378 ~~detritivores in arid Australia (Morton et al. 2011), and the change in activity resulting in lower~~  
379 ~~levels of resource consumption in the presence of digging mammals may translate into decreased~~  
380 ~~decomposition (in the manner that functioning decreases along disturbance intensity gradients,~~  
381 ~~i.e. McDonnell et al., 1997).~~ Any such changes in termite-driven decomposition may  
382 significantly alter soil nutrient cycling, with potential cascades through to habitat productivity.  
383 Our study suggests that reintroduction of [digging mammals that function as](#) ecosystem engineers  
384 might lead to decreases in decomposition rates, at least in the upper soil layer where foraging  
385 disturbance is most intense. Although it is possible that termite-driven decomposition has  
386 increased following the loss of digging mammals from the Australian arid zone, the outcome of

**Commented [MH14]:** I'd use an easier word – simplify your writing so people will understand your message (esp those who don't have English as their first language, but still write papers and so may cite your work).

Field Code Changed

Field Code Changed

387 reintroductions for nutrient cycling are likely to be complex, with further studies required to  
388 better elucidate the full complexity of interactions.

389 Reintroductions of digging mammals were associated with ~~increased-greater~~ resource  
390 abandonment by termites, suggesting a behavioural response to disturbance might be the  
391 mechanism determining reduced resource consumption. Several species of native mammals  
392 (digging and non-digging) reintroduced to our study sites prey on invertebrates, which may result  
393 in cascading effects on invertebrate assemblages. For example, Silvey et al. (2015) documented  
394 mesopredator release in arachnid assemblages, where mammal predation reduced the abundance  
395 of the dominant scorpion species, triggering a trophic cascade in scorpion and ground-dwelling  
396 spider communities (Silvey et al., 2015). Previous studies have also reported that some species  
397 display behavioural responses to predators that minimise predation risk, but which also reduce  
398 foraging success (i.e. the 'landscape of fear', Lima and Dill, 1990), although ~~extreme~~ hunger will  
399 ~~reverse-alter~~ the priorities of risk in order to avoid certain death by starvation over uncertain  
400 death by potential predators (Lima, 1998). Differences in resource abandonment ~~rates~~ between  
401 control and reintroduction sites ~~for similarly disturbed resources~~ suggest that termites may  
402 experience a landscape of fear effect in the presence of digging mammals. Laboratory  
403 experiments show that resource abandonment by termites depends on the level of danger that  
404 termites perceive (Gautam and Henderson, 2012). Increased ~~rates of resource~~ abandonment in  
405 reintroductions might therefore be a result of perceived threats of predation by reintroduced  
406 native mammals (including digging species) ~~digging mammals~~ or other organisms affected by  
407 the reintroductions.

408 Disturbed resources were attended by ants within minutes of ~~exposure when engineers were~~  
409 ~~present~~ exposure, and their attendance was greater at disturbed resources when digging mammals  
410 were present. Although effects of digging mammals on ant assemblages have not been reported,

Field Code Changed

Field Code Changed

**Commented [MH15]:** And we found this here: Hayward, M. W., Ortmann, S., Kowalczyk, R. (2015). Risk perception by endangered European bison *Bison bonasus* is context (condition) dependent. *Landscape Ecol* **30**, 2079-2093.

Field Code Changed

Field Code Changed

Field Code Changed

Field Code Changed



411 habitat disturbance alters invertebrate assemblages, favouring aggressive ant genera such as  
412 *Iridomyrmex* (Gibb and Hochuli, 2003). Ant attendance at resources was greater in  
413 reintroduction than control sites, suggesting ant predation rates on termites may be higher when  
414 termites are exposed to disturbance when digging mammals are present. Declines in numbers of  
415 termites at resources in the presence of digging mammals may therefore have resulted from both  
416 the direct process of predation by ants or digging mammals, and the indirect process of predation  
417 or disturbance avoidance.

Field Code Changed

Field Code Changed

418 Changes in termite activity in the presence of digging mammals tended to be greatest at  
419 Yookamurra sanctuary, moderate at Scotia sanctuary, and not different from controls at Arid  
420 Recovery. We suggest that the differences in effect magnitude were associated with habitat  
421 (resource) availability, which differed at each sanctuary, for example, where vegetation resources  
422 covered more area at Yookamurra and Scotia than at Arid Recovery, which had more bare  
423 ground. The historical use of sanctuary land to run non-native livestock (cattle and/or sheep)  
424 before they were re-purposed for conservation is one factor that could strongly affect habitat  
425 availability. The presence of livestock in arid lands has lasting impacts on habitat structure.  
426 These include changes in the proportions of bare ground and low vegetation to taller plant types  
427 (e.g. shrubs), and the long-term impact on habitat cover can be observed when livestock is  
428 absent as those taller plant classes return (e.g. Eldridge et al., 2011). Persistent soil disturbance in  
429 addition to different mammal densities (where digging is an engineering function) also limits  
430 opportunities for plants to establish (e.g. Gurney et al., 2015; McAfee et al., 2015). Both of these  
431 factors are likely to contribute to the habitat cover observed at each sanctuary, in addition to  
432 aridity, which was lower at Yookamurra and Scotia than at Arid Recovery. The influence of  
433 rainfall (aridity) over productivity is one of the defining aspects of arid habitats (Fischer and  
434 Turner, 1978; Hadley and Szarek, 1981; Rodríguez-Castañeda, 2013), with less vegetation

Field Code Changed

Field Code Changed

Field Code Changed

Field Code Changed

Field Code Changed

Field Code Changed

Field Code Changed

Field Code Changed

Field Code Changed

435 [expected in more arid habitats \(Oksanen et al., 1981\). Results from the first experiment indicated](#)  
436 [that avoiding disturbance was important for termites in less-arid sanctuaries, where resources](#)  
437 [such as wood and leaf litter were more available. The cost of leaving a resource would be higher](#)  
438 [in more arid environments where fewer alternative resources were available. Resource scarcity,](#)  
439 [such as the low wood availability observed at Arid Recovery, might thus encourage higher](#)  
440 [fidelity to resources by termites. Different responses to resource-use based on the relative value](#)  
441 [of scarce resources have previously been observed in termites, for example, \*Reticulitermes\*](#)  
442 [flavipes consumed resources more slowly when resources were scarce \(Lenz et al., 2009\).](#)  
443 [Productivity might also affect ant predation: more productive environments might support larger](#)  
444 [densities of ants, such that the chance of discovery of termite prey would be higher. Further](#)  
445 [investigation is required to test this hypothesis.](#)

Field Code Changed

Field Code Changed

Field Code Changed

Field Code Changed

## 446 5. Conclusions

447 [We observed clear effects of digging mammal reintroductions on termite activity, which were](#)  
448 [significantly reduced when those mammals were present. An additional pattern suggested that](#)  
449 [termite responses were influenced by resource availability, which could be affected by factors](#)  
450 [such as aridity and land-use history.](#) Our explicit test of termite responses to soil disturbance by  
451 mammals adds to our growing empirical understanding of interactions between digging  
452 mammals and ground-dwelling invertebrates. Our results suggest that Australian arid ecosystems  
453 may have been substantially different prior to the ecological extinction of digging mammalian  
454 engineers. They also highlight the complexity of species interactions, with mammal disturbance  
455 also altering termite interactions with invertebrate predators (ants). Termites are important food  
456 resources for other species, key detritivores in the decomposition process, and ecosystem  
457 engineers that affect soil processes and vegetation patterns, especially in arid environments  
458 [\(Evans et al., 2011; Gibb, 2012b; Mora et al., 2005\). The lessening of termite activity when](#)

Field Code Changed

Field Code Changed

Field Code Changed

Field Code Changed

459 [digging mammals were present is an interesting point to consider, as it could indicate a shift in](#)  
460 [the location of resource decomposition into deeper, less-disturbed soil. The relevance of](#)  
461 [sanctuary-specific background factors including aridity land-use history \(among others\) still](#)  
462 [require empirical exploration beyond what we uncovered using only three sites. The trends that](#)  
463 [we observed agree with the context-dependency of engineering impacts](#) (McAfee et al., 2015),  
464 [but run counterpoint to theories that engineering ought to benefit interacting organisms with](#)  
465 [increasing environmental adversity](#) (Crain and Bertness, 2006). –This novel finding suggests that  
466 it may be more difficult to generalise about the effects of digging mammals on ecosystems than  
467 anticipated, and that higher carrying capacities of less arid environments may also be linked with  
468 greater ecosystem sensitivity. This study adds to the small, but growing, volume of research  
469 showing that the decline of digging mammals has had broad-reaching effects on invertebrates  
470 (e.g. Davidson and Lightfoot, 2007; Silvey et al., 2015), and makes substantial advances in our  
471 understanding of impacts on invertebrate-driven decomposition, a critical ecosystem function.

Field Code Changed

Field Code Changed

Field Code Changed

Field Code Changed

Field Code Changed

Field Code Changed

Field Code Changed

472

## 473 6. Acknowledgements

474 We thank D. Eldridge, M. Van de Wetering, S. Avitabile, J. Grubb, S. Watson and anonymous  
475 reviewers for their valuable assistance in preparing this manuscript. We are grateful to the  
476 volunteers who assisted with fieldwork and also to the ANZ Holsworth Wildlife Research  
477 Endowment, Australian Wildlife Conservancy, Arid Recovery and the Australia and Pacific  
478 Science Foundation for their financial and logistical support. NVC was supported by an  
479 Australian Postgraduate Award, HG was supported by a Future Fellowship (FT130100821).

### 480 6.1. Conflict of interest disclaimer

481 We confirm no conflicts of interest on behalf of the authors associated with this manuscript.

483 **7. References**

- 484 1. Bice, J., Moseby, K., 2008. Diets of the re-introduced greater bilby (*Macrotis lagotis*) and  
485 burrowing bettong (*Bettongia lesueur*) in the Arid Recovery Reserve, Northern South Australia.  
486 Australian Mammalogy 30, 1-12.
- 487 2. Boyer, A.G., Jetz, W., 2014. Extinctions and the loss of ecological function in island bird  
488 communities. Global Ecology and Biogeography 23, 679-688.
- 489 3. Bravo, L.G., Belliure, J., Rebollo, S., 2009. European rabbits as ecosystem engineers: warrens  
490 increase lizard density and diversity. Biodiversity and Conservation 18, 869-885.
- 491 4. Brodie, J.F., Aslan, C.E., Rogers, H.S., Redford, K.H., Maron, J.L., Bronstein, J.L., Groves, C.R.,  
492 2014. Secondary extinctions of biodiversity. Trends in Ecology and Evolution 29, 664-672.
- 493 5. Brown, J.S., Laundré, J.W., Gurung, M., 1999. The ecology of fear: optimal foraging, game  
494 theory, and trophic interactions. Journal of Mammalogy 80, 385-399.
- 495 6. Calaby, J., 1960. Observations on the banded ant-eater *Myrmecobius fasciatus* Waterhouse  
496 (Marsupialia), with particular reference to its food habits. Proceedings of the Zoological Society  
497 of London 135, 183-207.
- 498 7. Chapman, T.F., 2016. Comparison of soils and plants on the active and relic parts of a  
499 recolonised burrowing bettong (*Bettongia lesueur*) warren. Pacific Conservation Biology 21, 298-  
500 306.
- 501 8. Chiew, F., Wang, Q., McConachy, F., James, R., Wright, W., deHoedt, G., 2002.  
502 Evapotranspiration Maps for Australia [online]. Institution of Engineers, Barton, A.C.T.
- 503 9. Clarke, L.J., Weyrich, L.S., Cooper, A., 2015. Reintroduction of locally extinct vertebrates impacts  
504 arid soil fungal communities. Molecular Ecology.
- 505 10. Colli, G.R., Constantino, R., Costa, G.C., 2006. Lizards and termites revisited. Austral Ecology 31,  
506 417-424.
- 507 11. Colwell, R.K., Dunn, R.R., Harris, N.C., 2012. Coextinction and persistence of dependent species  
508 in a changing world. Annual Review of Ecology, Evolution, and Systematics 43, 183-203.
- 509 12. Crain, C.M., Bertness, M.D., 2006. Ecosystem engineering across environmental gradients:  
510 implications for conservation and management. Bioscience 56, 211-218.
- 511 13. Davidson, A.D., Lightfoot, D.C., 2007. Interactive effects of keystone rodents on the structure of  
512 desert grassland arthropod communities. Ecography 30, 515-525.
- 513 14. de Bruyn, L., Conacher, A., 1990. The role of termites and ants in soil modification - a review. Soil  
514 Research 28, 55-93.
- 515 15. Dosso, K., Deligne, J., Yéo, K., Konaté, S., Linsenmair, K., 2013. Changes in the termite  
516 assemblage across a sequence of land-use systems in the rural area around Lamto Reserve in  
517 central Côte d'Ivoire. Journal of Insect Conservation 17, 1047-1057.
- 518 16. Dunn, R.R., Harris, N.C., Colwell, R.K., Koh, L.P., Sodhi, N.S., 2009. The sixth mass coextinction:  
519 are most endangered species parasites and mutualists? Proceedings of the Royal Society of  
520 London B: Biological Sciences 276, 3037-3045.
- 521 17. Eldridge, D.J., Bowker, M.A., Maestre, F.T., Roger, E., Reynolds, J.F., Whitford, W.G., 2011.  
522 Impacts of shrub encroachment on ecosystem structure and functioning: towards a global  
523 synthesis. Ecology Letters 14, 709-722.
- 524 18. Eldridge, D.J., James, A.I., 2009. Soil-disturbance by native animals plays a critical role in  
525 maintaining healthy Australian landscapes. Ecological Management & Restoration 10, S27-S34.
- 526 19. Eldridge, D.J., Woodhouse, J.N., Curlevski, N.J.A., Hayward, M., Brown, M.V., Neilan, B.A., 2015.  
527 Soil-foraging animals alter the composition and co-occurrence of microbial communities in a  
528 desert shrubland. ISME J 9, 2671-2681.

20. Evans, T.A., Dawes, T.Z., Ward, P.R., Lo, N., 2011. Ants and termites increase crop yield in a dry climate. *Nature Communications* 2, 262.
21. FAO, 2015. FAO GEONETWORK, Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations. FAO, Rome, Italy.
22. Feer, F., Boissier, O., 2015. Variations in dung beetle assemblages across a gradient of hunting in a tropical forest. *Ecological Indicators* 57, 164-170.
23. Finlayson, G.R., Vieira, E.M., Priddel, D., Wheeler, R., Bentley, J., Dickman, C.R., 2008. Multi-scale patterns of habitat use by re-introduced mammals: A case study using medium-sized marsupials. *Biological Conservation* 141, 320-331.
24. Fischer, R., Turner, N.C., 1978. Plant productivity in the arid and semiarid zones. *Annual Review of Plant Physiology* 29, 277-317.
25. Fleming, P.A., Anderson, H., Prendergast, A.S., Bretz, M.R., Valentine, L.E., Hardy, G.E., 2014. Is the loss of Australian digging mammals contributing to a deterioration in ecosystem function? *Mammal Review* 44, 94-108.
26. French, J., Robinson, P., 1981. Baits for aggregating large numbers of subterranean termites. *Australian Journal of Entomology* 20, 75-76.
27. Gautam, B.K., Henderson, G., 2012. Escape behavior of the Formosan subterranean termite (Isoptera: Rhinotermitidae) in response to disturbance. *Journal of Insect Behavior* 25, 70-79.
28. Gibb, H., 2012a. How might terrestrial arthropod assemblages have changed after the dramatic decline of critical weight range (CWR) mammals in Australia? Using reintroductions at Scotia Sanctuary as a model for pre-European ecosystems, *Proceedings of the Linnean Society of New South Wales*.
29. Gibb, H., 2012b. How might terrestrial arthropod assemblages have changed after the dramatic decline of critical weight range (CWR) mammals in Australia? Using reintroductions at Scotia Sanctuary as a model for pre-European ecosystems. *Proceedings of the Linnean Society of New South Wales* 134.
30. Gibb, H., Cunningham, S., 2010. Revegetation of farmland restores function and composition of epigeic beetle assemblages. *Biological Conservation* 143, 677-687.
31. Gibb, H., Hochuli, D.F., 2003. Colonisation by a dominant ant facilitated by anthropogenic disturbance: effects on ant assemblage composition, biomass and resource use. *Oikos* 103, 469-478.
32. Gibson, L.A., 2001. Seasonal changes in the diet, food availability and food preference of the greater bilby (*Macrotis lagotis*) in south-western Queensland. *Wildlife Research* 28, 121-134.
33. Grolleau, G., Peterson, D., 2012. Biodiversity conservation through private initiative: the case of Earth Sanctuaries Ltd. *European Journal of Law and Economics* 40, 293-312.
34. Gurney, C.M., Prugh, L.R., Brashares, J.S., 2015. Restoration of native plants is reduced by rodent-caused soil disturbance and seed removal. *Rangeland Ecology & Management* 68, 359-366.
35. Hadley, N.F., Szarek, S.R., 1981. Productivity of Desert Ecosystems. *BioScience* 31, 747-753.
36. Hanna, E., Cardillo, M., 2014. Predation selectively culls medium-sized species from island mammal faunas. *Biology Letters* 10, 20131066.
37. Hayward, M.W., Kerley, G.I., 2009. Fencing for conservation: Restriction of evolutionary potential or a riposte to threatening processes? *Biological Conservation* 142, 1-13.
38. James, A.I., Eldridge, D.J., 2007. Reintroduction of fossorial native mammals and potential impacts on ecosystem processes in an Australian desert landscape. *Biological Conservation* 138, 351-359.
39. James, A.I., Eldridge, D.J., Hill, B.M., 2009. Foraging animals create fertile patches in an Australian desert shrubland. *Ecography* 32, 723-732.
40. James, C.D., Landsberg, J., Morton, S.R., 1995. Ecological functioning in arid Australia and research to assist conservation of biodiversity. *Pacific Conservation Biology* 2, 126-142.

Formatted: Font color: Red

41. Jones, C., Lawton, J., Shachak, M., 1996. Organisms as Ecosystem Engineers, *Ecosystem Management*. Springer New York, pp. 130-147.
42. Jones, D., Susilo, F., Bignell, D., Hardiwinoto, S., Gillison, A., Eggleton, P., 2003. Termite assemblage collapse along a land-use intensification gradient in lowland central Sumatra, Indonesia. *Journal of Applied Ecology* 40, 380-391.
43. Lenz, M., Kard, B., Evans, T.A., Mauldin, J.K., Etheridge, J.L., Abbey, H.M., 2009. Differential use of identical food resources by *Reticulitermes flavipes* (Isoptera: Rhinotermitidae) in two types of habitats. *Environmental Entomology* 38, 35-42.
44. Lima, S.L., 1998. Nonlethal effects in the ecology of predator-prey interactions. *BioScience* 48, 25-34.
45. Lima, S.L., Dill, L.M., 1990. Behavioral decisions made under the risk of predation: a review and prospectus. *Canadian Journal of Zoology* 68, 619-640.
46. Manning, A.D., Eldridge, D.J., Jones, C.G., 2015. Policy implications of ecosystem engineering for multiple ecosystem benefits, in: Armstrong, D., Hayward, M., Moro, D., Seddon, P. (Eds.), *Advances in Reintroduction Biology of Australian and New Zealand Fauna*. CSIRO Publishing, Australia.
47. Matthews, E.G., 1976. *Insect ecology*. University of Queensland Press, St. Lucia, Queensland, Australia.
48. McAfee, D., Cole, V.J., Bishop, M.J., 2015. Latitudinal gradients in ecosystem engineering by oysters vary across habitats. *Ecology*.
49. McDonnell, M.J., Pickett, S.T.A., Groffman, P., Bohlen, P., Pouyat, R.V., Zipperer, W.C., Parmelee, R.W., Carreiro, M.M., Medley, K., 1997. Ecosystem processes along an urban-to-rural gradient. *Urban Ecosystems* 1, 21-36.
50. McKenzie, N., Burbidge, A., Baynes, A., Brereton, R., Dickman, C., Gordon, G., Gibson, L., Menkhorst, P., Robinson, A., Williams, M., 2007. Analysis of factors implicated in the recent decline of Australia's mammal fauna. *Journal of Biogeography* 34, 597-611.
51. Mora, P., Miambi, E., Jiménez, J., Decaëns, T., Rouland, C., 2005. Functional complement of biogenic structures produced by earthworms, termites and ants in the neotropical savannas. *Soil Biology and Biochemistry* 37, 1043-1048.
52. Morton, S., Smith, D.S., Dickman, C., Dunkerley, D., Friedel, M., McAllister, R., Reid, J., Roshier, D., Smith, M., Walsh, F., 2011. A fresh framework for the ecology of arid Australia. *Journal of Arid Environments* 75, 313-329.
53. Morton, S.R., James, C.D., 1988. The diversity and abundance of lizards in arid Australia: a new hypothesis. *American Naturalist*, 237-256.
54. Moseby, K.E., #39, Donnell, E., 2003. Reintroduction of the greater bilby, *Macrotis lagotis* (Reid) (Marsupialia : Thylacomyidae), to northern South Australia: survival, ecology and notes on reintroduction protocols. *Wildlife Research* 30, 15-27.
55. Navnith, M., Finlayson, G., Crowther, M., Dickman, C., 2009. The diet of the re-introduced greater bilby *Macrotis lagotis* in the mallee woodlands of western New South Wales. *Australian Zoologist* 35, 90-95.
56. Nogués-Bravo, D., Simberloff, D., Rahbek, C., Sanders, N.J., 2016. Rewilding is the new Pandora's box in conservation. *Current Biology* 26, R87-R91.
57. Oksanen, L., Fretwell, S.D., Arruda, J., Niemela, P., 1981. Exploitation ecosystems in gradients of primary productivity. *American Naturalist*, 240-261.
58. Pavey, C., 2006. National Recovery Plan for the Greater Bilby. *Macrotis lagotis*.
59. R Core Team, 2015. R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing. R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria.
60. Read, J., Carter, J., Moseby, K., Greenville, A., 2008. Ecological roles of rabbit, bettong and bilby warrens in arid Australia. *Journal of Arid Environments* 72, 2124-2130.

Formatted: Font color: Red

61. Reynolds, J.F., Smith, D.M., Lambin, E.F., Turner, B.L., Mortimore, M., 2007. Global desertification: building a science for dryland development. *Science* 316, 847-851.
62. Robley, A.J., Short, J., Bradley, S., 2001. Dietary overlap between the burrowing bettong (*Bettongia lesueur*) and the European rabbit (*Oryctolagus cuniculus*) in semi-arid coastal Western Australia. *Wildlife Research* 28, 341-349.
63. Rodríguez-Castañeda, G., 2013. The world and its shades of green: a meta-analysis on trophic cascades across temperature and precipitation gradients. *Global Ecology and Biogeography* 22, 118-130.
64. Romero, G.Q., Gonçalves-Souza, T., Vieira, C., Koricheva, J., 2015. Ecosystem engineering effects on species diversity across ecosystems: a meta-analysis. *Biological Reviews* 90, 877-890.
65. Sheppe, W., 1970. Invertebrate predation on termites of the African Savanna. *Insectes Sociaux* 17, 205-218.
66. Short, J., Turner, B., 2000. Reintroduction of the burrowing bettong *Bettongia lesueur* (Marsupialia: Potoroidae) to mainland Australia. *Biological Conservation* 96, 185-196.
67. Silvey, C.J., Hayward, M.W., Gibb, H., 2015. Effects of reconstruction of a pre-European vertebrate assemblage on ground-dwelling arachnids in arid Australia. *Oecologia* 178, 497-509.
68. Southgate, R., Carthew, S.M., 2006. Diet of the bilby (*Macrotis lagotis*) in relation to substrate, fire and rainfall characteristics in the Tanami Desert. *Wildlife Research* 33, 507-519.
69. Tabari, H., Aghajanloo, M.-B., 2013. Temporal pattern of aridity index in Iran with considering precipitation and evapotranspiration trends. *International Journal of Climatology* 33, 396-409.
70. Travers, S.K., 2013. Aspects of litter dynamics in semi-arid environments in eastern Australia, Science. The University of New South Wales, Australia, p. 251.
71. Vieira, E.M., Finlayson, G.R., Dickman, C.R., 2007. Habitat use and density of numbats (*Myrmecobius fasciatus*) reintroduced in an area of mallee vegetation, New South Wales. *Australian Mammalogy* 29, 17-24.
72. Watson, J.A.L., Abbey, H.M., 1993. Atlas of Australian termites. CSIRO PUBLISHING.
73. Whitford, W.G., Kay, F.R., 1999. Bioperturbation by mammals in deserts: a review. *Journal of Arid Environments* 41, 203-230.
74. Woinarski, J.C., Burbidge, A.A., Harrison, P.L., 2015. Ongoing unraveling of a continental fauna: Decline and extinction of Australian mammals since European settlement. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 112, 4531-4540.

Formatted: Font color: Red

Formatted: Font color: Red