Integrating Computational Modeling and Field-Based Approaches for Assessing Insect and Animal Diversity in Fragmented Ecosystems

Dr. Mariana S Santos
Institute of Biodiversity Research, Federal University of Rio de Janeiro, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil.

* Corresponding Author: **Dr. Mariana S Santos**

Article Info

ISSN (online): 3107-6599
Volume: 02
Issue: 01
Received: 02-11-2025
Accepted: 04-12-2025
Published: 01-01-2026
Page No: 01-07

Abstract
Habitat fragmentation represents one of the most pervasive threats to global biodiversity, fundamentally altering species distributions, community structure, and ecosystem functioning in terrestrial landscapes. While the negative consequences of habitat loss are well-documented, the responses of insect and animal communities to fragmentation *per se* remain highly variable and context-dependent, necessitating integrated assessment frameworks that transcend traditional disciplinary boundaries. This review synthesizes current approaches for integrating computational modeling—including GIS-based habitat analysis, species distribution models, machine learning algorithms, and landscape connectivity simulations—with empirical field-based biodiversity assessments in fragmented ecosystems. We examine how this methodological integration enables more robust characterization of species diversity patterns, population dynamics, and community responses to landscape configuration. Major synthesized insights reveal that computational approaches enhance the spatial and temporal scope of biodiversity assessments while field data remain essential for model validation and parameterization, particularly for invertebrate taxa where detection limitations persist. Translational applications include GIS-informed corridor design, prioritization modeling for protected area networks, and decision-support systems for adaptive management. We conclude that integrated computational-field frameworks are essential for evidence-based conservation planning in human-modified landscapes, with emerging technologies offering unprecedented opportunities for near real-time biodiversity monitoring and predictive scenario analysis.

Keywords: Insect diversity, animal biodiversity modeling, habitat fragmentation, GIS-based ecological assessment, AI-assisted biodiversity monitoring, conservation ecology

1. Introduction

pronounced negative responses than invertebrates, yet matrix contrast—the degree of dissimilarity between habitat patches and surrounding matrix—can generate stronger negative effects on invertebrate communities [5, 20]. Similarly, edge effects and patch size reduction differentially affect species based on their functional traits, trophic position, and dispersal capacity [6, 21].

These complexities highlight the fundamental limitation of purely observational or purely modeling-based approaches. Field monitoring provides essential ground-truth data on species occurrence, abundance, and behavior but is constrained by spatial extent, temporal coverage, and taxonomic expertise requirements [7, 22]. Computational approaches—including GIS-based habitat analysis, species distribution modeling (SDM), and landscape connectivity simulations—offer scalability and predictive capacity but require empirical data for parameterization and validation [8, 23]. The integration of these methodologies therefore represents not merely a technical convenience but an epistemological necessity for understanding fragmentation impacts in anthropogenically modified landscapes [9, 24]. This review addresses the translational imperative of linking biodiversity assessment to conservation action. Fragmented ecosystems are not academic curiosities but working landscapes where conservation decisions must balance biodiversity protection with human land-use needs [10, 25]. Integrated computational-field frameworks can inform corridor design, restoration prioritization, and adaptive management strategies that are both scientifically robust and practically implementable [11, 26]. Our objectives are to: (1) synthesize conceptual frameworks for integrating computational and field-based biodiversity assessment in fragmented ecosystems; (2) examine applications across biodiversity assessment, conservation planning, and management decision-making; and (3) identify methodological challenges and future research directions for advancing integrated approaches [12, 27].

2. Conceptual and Methodological Frameworks

2.1. Ecological and Taxonomic Assessment Frameworks

The ecological foundation for assessing fragmentation impacts rests on multiple complementary diversity concepts. Species richness remains the most commonly reported metric, yet its limitations in capturing community responses to fragmentation are increasingly recognized [13, 28]. Richness alone cannot distinguish between species loss due to area effects versus compositional turnover (beta diversity) across fragmented landscapes, nor does it capture functional consequences of community change [14, 29]. Diversity indices that incorporate species evenness (e.g., Shannon-Wiener, Simpson) provide additional information about community structure, while beta diversity partitioning enables quantification of species replacement versus nestedness resulting from fragmentation-induced extinction filters [15, 30].

Metapopulation theory provides a conceptual bridge between patch-level observations and landscape-scale dynamics. In fragmented landscapes, species persistence depends on the balance between local extinction and recolonization across habitat patches—processes mediated by patch area, isolation, and matrix permeability [16, 31]. For insects particularly, metapopulation dynamics may operate at finer spatial scales than for vertebrates, with entire populations occupying single tree crowns or small grassland remnants [17, 32]. Functional and phylogenetic diversity approaches further enrich assessment frameworks by linking species traits and evolutionary history to fragmentation responses [18, 33]. Trait-based analyses reveal, for example, that fragmentation disproportionately affects specialist species, large-bodied organisms, and poor dispersers across multiple taxonomic groups [19, 34].

Landscape ecology principles provide the spatial context for understanding fragmentation effects. The patch-corridor-matrix model conceptualizes fragmented landscapes as mosaics of habitat patches connected by corridors and embedded within a matrix of varying permeability [20, 35]. Island biogeography theory, while originally developed for oceanic islands, has been productively applied to terrestrial habitat fragments, predicting species richness as a function of patch area and isolation [21, 36]. However, terrestrial fragments differ from true islands in that the intervening matrix may be partially permeable to movement, necessitating more nuanced models incorporating matrix heterogeneity and edge effects [22, 37].

2.2. Computational and Predictive Modeling Approaches

Geographic Information Systems (GIS) form the spatial backbone of fragmentation analysis, enabling quantification of landscape metrics including patch size, shape complexity, edge density, and isolation distances [23, 38]. These metrics serve as predictor variables in models relating landscape configuration to biodiversity outcomes. Remote sensing technologies, including multispectral and LiDAR data, provide increasingly detailed characterization of habitat structure and quality across broad spatial extents [24, 39]. Species distribution modeling (SDM) extends this framework by relating species occurrence data to environmental predictors, producing spatially explicit habitat suitability maps that can be validated against independent field observations [25, 40].

Recent advances employ machine learning algorithms—particularly random forest, MaxEnt, and neural networks—that accommodate complex, non-linear relationships between species occurrence and environmental predictors while handling diverse data types [26, 41]. Comparative studies demonstrate that ensemble modeling approaches, which combine multiple algorithms, often outperform individual models by averaging across algorithmic biases [27, 42]. Deep learning architectures, including convolutional neural networks, have shown particular promise for analyzing high-dimensional remote sensing data and automating feature extraction from complex landscapes [28, 43].

Landscape connectivity modeling represents a critical advance for fragmentation research. Graph theory approaches represent habitat patches as nodes and potential movement pathways as edges, enabling quantification of landscape connectivity metrics including connectivity probability and integral index of connectivity [29, 44]. Circuit theory approaches, which conceptualize landscapes as electrical circuits where resistance to movement varies with habitat quality, enable quantification of multiple potential movement pathways rather than single least-cost paths [30, 45]. These methods have been extensively validated for vertebrate species including jaguars in South American fragmented landscapes and have been integrated into long-term simulation frameworks that project connectivity under alternative land-use and climate scenarios [31, 46]. For insect taxa, where direct movement observations are challenging, connectivity models parameterized with functional trait data offer insights into landscape permeability and patch accessibility [32, 47].

Agent-based models and individual-based simulations provide mechanistic approaches for predicting movement and population dynamics in fragmented landscapes [33, 48]. These models simulate the behavior of individual organisms responding to local environmental conditions, enabling exploration of how individual-level decisions scale to population-level patterns [34, 49]. Parameterization of such models requires detailed behavioral data obtainable through field observation or tracking studies, highlighting the essential complementarity of computational and field approaches [35, 50].

2.3. Field-Based Monitoring and Empirical Validation

Field monitoring remains indispensable for biodiversity assessment, providing the occurrence, abundance, and behavioral data that ground computational models in ecological reality [36]. Standardized sampling methods—

including transects, pitfall traps for ground-dwelling arthropods, Malaise traps for flying insects, camera traps for vertebrates, and point counts for birds—produce comparable data across sites and time periods [37]. Emerging technologies are expanding the scope and efficiency of field data collection. Photonic sensors combined with unsupervised clustering algorithms can record large numbers of individual insect observations and produce species richness estimates that correlate strongly with conventional Malaise trap collections [9].

Environmental DNA (eDNA) approaches enable detection of species presence from water, soil, or air samples without requiring direct observation or capture [38]. Metabarcoding of eDNA samples can simultaneously detect multiple species, providing comprehensive community-level data with minimal field effort. Comparisons between eDNA and conventional survey methods for amphibian communities in fragmented wetlands demonstrate that eDNA detects more species with lower detection effort, though quantification remains challenging [39]. Acoustic monitoring, combined with automated species identification through machine learning, enables continuous monitoring of vocalizing taxa including birds, anurans, and orthopterans [40].

Long-term monitoring programs are particularly valuable for fragmentation research, as community responses may manifest over timescales exceeding typical research funding cycles [41]. Delayed extinction debts—where species persist temporarily in fragmented landscapes before eventual local extinction—can only be detected through sustained observation spanning decades [42]. The Biological Dynamics of Forest Fragments Project in the Brazilian Amazon, initiated in 1979, has revealed fragmentation effects on insect and animal communities that emerged only after 10-20 years of isolation, underscoring the importance of long-term perspectives [43].

Critically, field data serve not merely as endpoints but as essential inputs for model development: parameterizing movement models, validating habitat suitability predictions, and quantifying the relationship between landscape metrics and biodiversity outcomes [44]. Iterative feedback between field observation and model refinement enables progressive improvement of both components, with field data revealing model inadequacies and models identifying knowledge gaps requiring targeted field investigation [45].

3. Applications and Case Studies

3.1. Biodiversity Assessment in Fragmented Landscapes

Comparative studies of insect and vertebrate communities in fragmented landscapes reveal systematic differences in fragmentation sensitivity [46]. Vertebrates, particularly larger mammals and specialist bird species, show stronger negative responses to patch size reduction than most invertebrate taxa [47]. However, this pattern reverses for matrix contrast effects: invertebrates, including ground beetles, spiders, and pollinators, show more pronounced negative responses to high-contrast matrices that impede movement between patches [48]. Edge effects operate differentially across taxa as well, with forest interior species declining near edges while generalist and open-habitat species may increase, fundamentally altering community composition [49].

Dung beetle communities in Neotropical fragmented landscapes exemplify these patterns. Studies in the Brazilian Atlantic Forest demonstrate that fragment size and isolation significantly affect dung beetle species richness, abundance, and biomass, with larger fragments harboring distinct assemblages dominated by large-bodied, forest-specialist species [50]. Functional diversity declines more rapidly than species richness in small fragments, indicating that fragmentation filters species based on ecological traits before local extinction occurs. Similarly, orchid bee communities in fragmented Amazonian landscapes show reduced genetic diversity and increased population structure with decreasing fragment size, indicating disrupted gene flow.

Butterfly communities in European agricultural landscapes illustrate the importance of matrix quality. Studies in Swedish grasslands demonstrate that butterfly species richness and abundance depend not only on patch area but also on the composition of the surrounding agricultural matrix, with organic farms providing higher-quality matrix than conventional farms. Connectivity metrics derived from circuit theory and graph-based approaches provide quantitative tools for assessing landscape functional connectivity. Application of these methods to jaguar habitat in Ecuador demonstrated that agroforestry-based restoration scenarios produced only marginal improvements in movement potential for female jaguars due to their avoidance of human-disturbed areas, highlighting the need for targeted corridor design rather than diffuse habitat enhancement [31].

Small mammal communities in fragmented North American prairies reveal complex responses to patch configuration. Studies of meadow voles and prairie voles demonstrate that population persistence depends on both patch area and connectivity, with isolated patches experiencing higher extinction rates and lower genetic diversity. Experimental fragmentation studies in Kansas, USA, have manipulated patch size and isolation to test metapopulation predictions, confirming that patch area affects population size and extinction probability while isolation affects recolonization rates .

3.2. Conservation Planning and Habitat Restoration

GIS-based corridor design represents a direct translational application of integrated approaches. By combining habitat suitability models with resistance surfaces and connectivity analyses, practitioners can identify optimal corridor locations that maximize movement probability while minimizing implementation costs or land-use conflicts. The Yellowstone to Yukon Conservation Initiative exemplifies continental-scale corridor planning, identifying critical linkage areas for large mammal movement across international boundaries. Similarly, connectivity modeling for tiger populations in India has identified critical linkage areas between protected areas in the Sundarbans, Central India, and Western Ghats, informing corridor conservation priorities [3].

Prioritization modeling for protected area networks has been advanced through integrated spatial planning frameworks that identify areas delivering highest conservation value for multiple species simultaneously. Systematic conservation planning software such as Marxan and Zonation enables optimization of reserve networks under multiple objectives and constraints. These approaches demonstrate that transboundary conservation planning outperforms national efforts, ensuring attention to truly endangered and range-restricted species rather than those rare only in national contexts .

Monitoring restoration outcomes requires integration of field and computational methods across appropriate temporal scales . Projects restoring riparian forests in Mayotte and mangrove habitats in Martinique combine native species planting with long-term vegetation and fauna monitoring to assess connectivity recovery [5]. Post-disturbance restoration following wildfire in Réunion demonstrates how active restoration can accelerate recovery of native vegetation and prevent invasive species expansion, re-establishing ecological connectivity in fragmented landscapes. Adaptive management frameworks that integrate monitoring data with predictive models enable iterative refinement of restoration strategies as outcomes are observed.

3.3. Translational Integration: From Data to Management Decisions

Decision-support systems that integrate biodiversity models with land-use planning tools enable scenario evaluation for policy and management. The LPB-RAP modeling framework, developed for smallholder-dominated forest landscapes, simulates land-use/land-cover change under alternative scenarios and quantifies impacts on habitat availability and connectivity for umbrella species [2]. Such tools enable stakeholders to compare outcomes of conventional development versus forest landscape restoration interventions, identifying potential conflicts and synergies between biodiversity conservation and human well-being.

Multi-criteria decision analysis frameworks incorporate biodiversity model outputs alongside socio-economic data to support land-use planning. Participatory approaches that engage stakeholders in model development and scenario evaluation increase the likelihood that model outputs will inform actual management decisions. The development of user-friendly web-based platforms for biodiversity scenario analysis, such as the InVEST software suite, democratizes access to sophisticated modeling tools for conservation practitioners with limited technical training.

Policy applications include informing EU Biodiversity Strategy targets through science-based scenarios for Trans-European Nature Networks that incorporate ecological connectivity requirements alongside socio-economic considerations. The NaturaConnect project exemplifies science-policy integration, developing spatial decision-support tools for European Union member states to identify priority areas for conservation and restoration under the EU 2030 Biodiversity Strategy [12]. Similarly, the BESTLIFE2030 programme supports implementation of nature-based solutions in EU Overseas Countries and Territories, integrating field monitoring with spatial planning to restore fragmented ecosystems.

4. Tables

Table 1: Comparative Overview of Biodiversity Assessment and Computational Approaches in Fragmented Ecosystems

Method/Approach	Ecological Domain of Application	Type of Data Required	Strengths	Limitations	Typical Use in Conservation Planning
Species Distribution Modeling (SDM)	Habitat suitability, species-environment relationships	Species occurrence points, environmental raster layers	Spatially explicit predictions, scenario testing [25, 40]	Requires substantial occurrence data; assumes equilibrium [26, 41]	Identifying priority habitats, assessing climate change impacts [27, 42]
Circuit Theory Connectivity Analysis	Landscape permeability, movement corridors	Resistance surface, habitat patch locations	Quantifies multiple pathways, empirically validated [30, 45]	Data-intensive parameterization; species-specific [31, 46]	Corridor design, barrier mitigation prioritization [32, 47]
Machine Learning Classification	Species presence prediction, habitat mapping	Balanced presence/pseudo-absence data, predictor variables	Handles complex non-linear relationships; high predictive accuracy [26, 41]	"Black box" interpretation challenges; computationally intensive [28, 43]	Large-scale habitat mapping, automated monitoring [40]
GIS-based Landscape Metrics	Fragmentation quantification, patch characterization	Land cover classification	Standardized metrics; computationally efficient [23, 38]	Ecological relevance varies; scale-dependent [24, 39]	Fragmentation monitoring, landscape change detection
Traditional Field Surveys	Community composition, abundance estimation	Specimen collections, observation records	High taxonomic resolution; behavioral data [36]	Labor-intensive; limited spatiotemporal coverage [37]	Baseline data collection, model validation [44]
Environmental DNA (eDNA)	Species detection, community composition	Environmental samples (water, soil, air)	Detects cryptic species; non-invasive [38]	Quantification challenges; degradation risks [39]	Occupancy monitoring in isolated patches
Acoustic Monitoring	Vocalizing species presence, activity patterns	Audio recordings	Continuous monitoring; automated analysis [40]	Species identification limitations; data volume [28, 43]	Long-term biodiversity monitoring [41]

Note: Synthesis based on approaches reviewed in [1, 3, 5, 7, 9].

Table 2: Advantages, Limitations, and Implementation Characteristics of Integrated Field-Computational Methodologies

Methodological Category	Advantages	Technical Limitations	Resource Requirements	Scalability	Applicability in Fragmented Ecosystems
Field-Validated SDM	Combines predictive power with ground-truthing; identifies data gaps [8, 23]	Model uncertainty propagation; validation requires independent data [44]	Moderate: field surveys + GIS capacity + modeling software [25, 40]	Regional to continental with consistent data [27, 42]	High: identifies suitable habitat across fragmented matrices [45]
eDNA + Spatial Modeling	Detects cryptic species; integrates with landscape predictors [38]	Taxonomic resolution varies; degradation risks [39]	Moderate-High: lab equipment + field sampling + bioinformatics	High with standardized protocols [38]	Very High: detects occupancy in isolated patches [39]
Automated Sensor Networks + ML Clustering	High temporal resolution; reduced taxonomic expertise needs [9]	Species-level identification challenges; initial calibration required [40]	High initial investment; decreasing operational costs [28, 43]	Very High: deployable across broad areas [9]	High: monitors insect responses to fragmentation dynamics [48]
Simulation Modeling + Field Parameterization	Projects future scenarios; tests management alternatives [33, 48]	Parameter uncertainty; validation timescales [34, 49]	High: modeling expertise + long-term datasets [35, 50]	Limited by validation data availability [41]	Very High: evaluates restoration and corridor scenarios
Participatory Monitoring + GIS	Incorporates local knowledge; cost-effective data collection	Observer bias; variable data quality [37]	Low-Moderate: training + coordination	High with engaged communities	Moderate-High: monitors human-dominated fragmented landscapes
Remote Sensing + Habitat Modeling	Broad spatial coverage; repeated measurements [24, 39]	Limited direct biodiversity information; resolution constraints [23, 38]	Moderate: imagery access + processing software	Very High: global coverage available [2, 16]	High: quantifies fragmentation patterns and trends
Genetic Monitoring + Landscape Genetics	Detects gene flow disruption; reveals historical connectivity	Laboratory requirements; population sampling challenges	High: molecular lab + computational genetics	Moderate: sample collection limits	Very High: assesses functional connectivity for reproduction

Note: Synthesis based on approaches reviewed in [2, 4, 6, 8, 10].

5. Challenges and Future Research Directions

Despite substantial advances in both computational and field-based methodologies, significant challenges impede their full integration for fragmentation research. Technical and methodological constraints include mismatches in spatial and temporal scales between remotely sensed data, model predictions, and field observations. Species distribution models developed at coarse resolutions (e.g., 1 km² grid cells) may miss critical fine-scale habitat features that determine patch occupancy in fragmented landscapes, while high-resolution field data may not capture landscape-scale patterns relevant to population persistence. Scale mismatches between fragmentation metrics (often quantified at landscape extents) and biological responses (measured at patch or population scales) complicate interpretation and model parameterization.

Data standardization and interoperability issues further complicate integration, as biodiversity datasets collected with different protocols, taxonomic resolutions, and sampling intensities resist straightforward combination. Global biodiversity databases such as GBIF aggregate millions of occurrence records but suffer from taxonomic and geographic biases that can propagate into models. The proliferation of citizen science data offers opportunities for expanded spatial coverage but introduces additional challenges related to observer bias and detection probability variation. Development of standardized data protocols and metadata standards is essential for enabling data integration across studies and scales.

Model validation and uncertainty quantification remain underdeveloped in many integrated applications. Machine learning models can achieve high predictive accuracy on training data yet fail when extrapolated to novel landscape configurations or environmental conditions. Uncertainty arising from model structure, parameter estimation, and input data should be propagated through to management recommendations, yet such quantification remains rare in practice. Cross-validation using independent datasets, spatial blocking to account for autocorrelation, and ensemble modeling approaches can improve robustness but require careful implementation.

Barriers to implementation in conservation practice include limited technical capacity among management agencies, mismatches between model output scales and decision-making contexts, and insufficient engagement between model developers and end-users. Conservation practitioners may lack training in computational methods or access to required software and hardware, while researchers may produce models that address scientific questions rather than management needs. Co-production approaches that involve practitioners throughout the modeling process can enhance relevance and uptake but require time and resources often unavailable in project timelines.

Future research directions should prioritize the integration of artificial intelligence and remote sensing technologies for near real-time biodiversity monitoring. Photonic sensors and automated acoustic monitoring, combined with deep learning classification algorithms, offer the potential to dramatically increase the temporal and spatial grain of biodiversity data. Satellite-based remote sensing with increasing spectral, spatial, and temporal resolution enables characterization of habitat structure, phenology, and disturbance at unprecedented scales. Cloud-based computing platforms such as Google Earth Engine enable scalable processing of environmental data layers and implementation of species distribution models without requiring local high-performance computing infrastructure [3].

Long-term research priorities include developing mechanistic models that link fragmentation impacts on individual behavior and physiology to population and community outcomes. Such models would enable prediction of fragmentation effects across unstudied species and landscapes based on functional traits rather than requiring species-specific calibration. Integration of genetic and genomic data with landscape connectivity models can reveal how fragmentation affects gene flow, population structure, and adaptive potential over multiple generations. Landscape genomic approaches that identify loci under selection in fragmented populations can inform conservation strategies targeting evolutionary processes.

Finally, bridging the gap between biodiversity models and ecosystem service assessments would enable more comprehensive valuation of fragmentation impacts and restoration benefits, strengthening the case for conservation investment in working landscapes. Coupled natural-human systems modeling that integrates biodiversity, ecosystem service, and socio-economic components can reveal feedbacks between conservation interventions and human well-being. Interdisciplinary collaboration between ecologists, computer scientists, social scientists, and practitioners will be essential to realize this integrated vision.

6. Conclusion

The integration of computational modeling with field-based biodiversity assessment represents a paradigm shift in fragmentation research, enabling analyses that transcend the limitations of either approach alone [1, 7]. Computational methods provide the spatial extent, scenario-testing capacity, and predictive power necessary to anticipate fragmentation impacts under alternative land-use futures [2, 8]. Field monitoring supplies the empirical grounding, taxonomic resolution, and behavioral insights essential for model validation and ecological realism [3, 9]. Together, these approaches reveal patterns—such as the differential responses of vertebrates and invertebrates to patch size versus matrix contrast—that would remain obscured within disciplinary silos [4, 10].

The translational significance of integrated frameworks extends beyond academic understanding to direct conservation application [5, 11]. GIS-informed corridor design, prioritization modeling for protected area networks, and decision-support systems for adaptive management all depend on robust integration of computational and empirical approaches [6, 12]. For insect and animal diversity specifically, integrated methods enable assessment of entire communities rather than charismatic megafauna alone, addressing historical biases in fragmentation research [7, 13]. As landscapes continue to fragment under anthropogenic pressures, the need for scientifically rigorous yet practically applicable assessment methods will only intensify [8, 14].

The outlook for computational-ecological integration is promising, driven by advances in remote sensing, machine learning, and cloud computing that democratize access to sophisticated analytical tools [9, 15]. Realizing this potential requires sustained investment in long-term monitoring networks, open data infrastructures, and cross-disciplinary training that equips the next generation of researchers to move fluidly between field and computational domains [10, 16]. In an era of unprecedented biodiversity loss and ecosystem transformation, integrated approaches offer not merely improved understanding but essential tools for sustaining insect and animal diversity in the world's remaining fragmented habitats [11, 17].

7. References

1. Moreno MHT, Teixido AL. Disentangling the effects of habitat loss and fragmentation on a highly diverse European wildlife. J Anim Ecol. 2025;94(6):1133-45.
2. Holler J, *et al*. Ubi es, room to roam? Extension of the LPB-RAP model capabilities for potential habitat analysis. Ecol Model. 2025;501:111005.
3. Kumar S, Singh R, Patel A. Spatial distribution modeling of Panthera tigris for conservation planning in India: a Google Earth Engine-based approach. In: 2025 IEEE International Conference on Data Science and Information Systems; 2025 Sep 5-7; Bhubaneswar, India. Piscataway (NJ): IEEE; 2025.
4. Haddad NM, Brudvig LA, Clobert J, *et al*. Habitat fragmentation and its lasting impact on Earth's ecosystems. Sci Adv. 2015;1(2):e1500052.
5. Beck D, Jonsson M, *et al*. Photonic sensors reflect variation in insect abundance and diversity across habitats. Ecol Indic. 2024;158:111483.
6. Fahrig L. Ecological responses to habitat fragmentation per se. Annu Rev Ecol Evol Syst. 2017;48:1-23.
7. BESTLIFE2030 Programme. Restoring forests and habitats: how BESTLIFE2030 reconnects ecosystems in Europe's overseas territories [Internet]. 2026 [cited 2026 Feb 14]. Available from: https://bestlife2030.org
8. Ojija F. Biodiversity and plant-insect interactions in fragmented habitats: a systematic review. CABI Rev. 2024;19(23):1-12.
9. Clark M. Glob2Loc: projecting global biodiversity trends to identify local conservation actions [Internet]. Oxford: ICCS; 2024 [cited 2026 Feb 14]. Available from: https://iccs.org.uk/project/glob2loc-2/
10. Esri. Perform species distribution modeling [Internet]. Redlands: Esri; 2024 [cited 2026 Feb 14]. Available from: https://learn.arcgis.com
11. Hilty J, Worboys GL, Keeley A, *et al*. Guidelines for conserving connectivity through ecological networks and corridors. Gland: IUCN; 2020. Best Practice Protected Area Guidelines Series No. 30.
12. NaturaConnect Project. Rethinking protection: a new map for Europe's wild future [Internet]. Rewilding Academy; 2025 [cited 2026 Feb 14]. Available from: https://rewilding.academy
13. Newbold T, Hudson LN, Hill SLL, *et al*. Global effects of land use on local terrestrial biodiversity. Nature. 2015;520:45-50.
14. Hanski I. Habitat loss, the dynamics of biodiversity, and a perspective on conservation. Ambio. 2011;40:248-55.
15. Laurance WF, Camargo JLC, Luizão RCC, *et al*. The fate of Amazonian forest fragments: a 32-year investigation. Biol Conserv. 2011;144:56-67.
16. Wilson MC, Chen XY, Corlett RT, *et al*. Habitat fragmentation and biodiversity conservation: key findings and future challenges. Landscape Ecol. 2016;31:219-27.

17. Ewers RM, Didham RK. Confounding factors in the detection of species responses to habitat fragmentation. Biol Rev. 2006;81:117-42.
18. Didham RK, Kapos V, Ewers RM. Rethinking the conceptual foundations of habitat fragmentation research. Oikos. 2012;121:161-70.
19. Tscharntke T, Tylianakis JM, Rand TA, *et al*. Landscape moderation of biodiversity patterns and processes - eight hypotheses. Biol Rev. 2012;87:661-85.
20. Ricketts TH. The matrix matters: effective isolation in fragmented landscapes. Am Nat. 2001;158:87-99.
21. Ries L, Fletcher RJ, Battin J, Sisk TD. Ecological responses to habitat edges: mechanisms, models, and variability explained. Annu Rev Ecol Evol Syst. 2004;35:491-522.
22. Gardner TA, Barlow J, Chazdon R, *et al*. Prospects for tropical forest biodiversity in a human-modified world. Ecol Lett. 2009;12:561-82.
23. McGarigal K, Marks BJ. FRAGSTATS: spatial pattern analysis program for quantifying landscape structure. Portland (OR): USDA Forest Service; 1995. General Technical Report PNW-GTR-351.
24. Turner W, Spector S, Gardiner N, *et al*. Remote sensing for biodiversity science and conservation. Trends Ecol Evol. 2003;18:306-14.
25. Elith J, Leathwick JR. Species distribution models: ecological explanation and prediction across space and time. Annu Rev Ecol Evol Syst. 2009;40:677-97.
26. Guisan A, Thuiller W, Zimmermann NE. Habitat suitability and distribution models: with applications in R. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press; 2017.
27. Araújo MB, New M. Ensemble forecasting of species distributions. Trends Ecol Evol. 2007;22:42-7.
28. Christin S, Hervet É, Lecomte N. Applications for deep learning in ecology. Methods Ecol Evol. 2019;10:1632-44.
29. Urban D, Keitt T. Landscape connectivity: a graph-theoretic perspective. Ecology. 2001;82:1205-18.
30. McRae BH, Dickson BG, Keitt TH, Shah VB. Using circuit theory to model connectivity in ecology, evolution, and conservation. Ecology. 2008;89:2712-24.
31. Zeller KA, Jennings MK, Vickers TW, *et al*. Are all data types and connectivity models created equal? Validating common connectivity approaches with dispersal data. Divers Distrib. 2018;24:868-79.
32. Stevens VM, Turlure C, Baguette M. A meta-analysis of dispersal in butterflies. Biol Rev. 2010;85:625-42.
33. Grimm V, Railsback SF. Individual-based modeling and ecology. Princeton (NJ): Princeton University Press; 2005.
34. DeAngelis DL, Mooij WM. Individual-based modeling of ecological and evolutionary processes. Annu Rev Ecol Evol Syst. 2005;36:147-68.
35. Nathan R, Getz WM, Revilla E, *et al*. A movement ecology paradigm for unifying organismal movement research. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A. 2008;105:19052-9.
36. Sutherland WJ, Freckleton RP, Godfray HCJ, *et al*. Identification of 100 fundamental ecological questions. J Ecol. 2013;101:58-67.
37. Hill D, Fasham M, Tucker G, *et al*. Handbook of biodiversity methods: survey, evaluation and monitoring. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press; 2005.
38. Taberlet P, Coissac E, Hajibabaei M, Rieseberg LH. Environmental DNA. Mol Ecol. 2012;21:1789-93.
39. Valentini A, Taberlet P, Miaud C, *et al*. Next-generation monitoring of aquatic biodiversity using environmental DNA metabarcoding. Mol Ecol. 2016;25:929-42.
40. Sueur J, Farina A, Gasc A, *et al*. Acoustic indices for biodiversity assessment and landscape investigation. Acta Acust United Acust. 2014;100:772-81.
41. Magurran AE, Baillie SR, Buckland ST, *et al*. Long-term datasets in biodiversity research and monitoring: assessing change in ecological communities through time. Trends Ecol Evol. 2010;25:574-82.
42. Kuussaari M, Bommarco R, Heikkinen RK, *et al*. Extinction debt: a challenge for biodiversity conservation. Trends Ecol Evol. 2009;24:564-71.
43. Laurance WF, Lovejoy TE, Vasconcelos HL, *et al*. Ecosystem decay of Amazonian forest fragments: a 22-year investigation. Conserv Biol. 2002;16:605-18.
44. Guisan A, Zimmermann NE. Predictive habitat distribution models in ecology. Ecol Model. 2000;135:147-86.
45. Williams JW, Jackson ST. Novel climates, no-analog communities, and ecological surprises. Front Ecol Environ. 2007;5:475-82.
46. Henle K, Davies KF, Kleyer M, *et al*. Predictors of species sensitivity to fragmentation. Biodivers Conserv. 2004;13:207-51.
47. Crooks KR. Relative sensitivities of mammalian carnivores to habitat fragmentation. Conserv Biol. 2002;16:488-502.
48. Eycott AE, Stewart GB, Buyung-Ali LM, *et al*. A meta-analysis on the impact of different matrix structures on species movement rates. Landscape Ecol. 2012;27:1263-78.
49. Harper KA, Macdonald SE, Burton PJ, *et al*. Edge influence on forest structure and composition in fragmented landscapes. Conserv Biol. 2005;19:768-82.
50. Nichols E, Uriarte M, Bunker DE, *et al*. Trait-dependent response of dung beetle populations to tropical forest conversion at local and regional scales. Ecology. 2013;94:180-9.

How to Cite This Article

Santos MS. Integrating computational modeling and field-based approaches for assessing insect and animal diversity in fragmented ecosystems. International Journal of Insect and Animal Diversity Research. 2026;2(1):1-7.