Species Richness and Distribution of Insects and Vertebrates Across Different Ecosystems: Ecological Determinants, Spatial Patterns, and Conservation Implications

Daniel Matthew Clarke
Department of Ecology and Evolutionary Biology, University of Edinburgh, United Kingdom

* Corresponding Author: **Daniel Matthew Clarke**

Article Info

E-ISSN: 3107-6599
Volume: 02
Issue: 02
March-April 2026
Received: 10-01-2026
Accepted: 08-02-2026
Published: 06-03-2026
Page No: 24-32

Abstract
Insects and vertebrates collectively dominate animal biodiversity, yet they exhibit fundamentally different patterns of species richness, distribution, and vulnerability to environmental change. This review synthesizes current knowledge on species richness patterns across terrestrial, freshwater, and marine ecosystems, examining the ecological determinants that shape insect and vertebrate distributions. Tropical forests harbor the highest overall diversity for both groups, but insects dominate species counts in all ecosystems, with estimates suggesting that insects comprise 75-85% of animal species globally while vertebrates represent less than 5%. Latitudinal diversity gradients are pronounced for vertebrates but show greater variability among insect taxa, with some hyperdiverse groups exhibiting weak or even inverse gradients. Altitudinal patterns generally peak at mid-elevations, though insects often show broader elevational ranges than vertebrates. Ecological determinants—climate energy, habitat heterogeneity, productivity, disturbance regimes, and evolutionary history—operate across scales to shape diversity patterns, with insects responding more strongly to microhabitat variation and vertebrates to landscape-scale factors. Comparative analysis reveals that insects' shorter generation times, higher reproductive rates, and greater dispersal ability facilitate rapid responses to environmental change, while their enormous diversity and functional importance demand urgent conservation attention despite persistent data gaps. Anthropogenic pressures including habitat loss, climate change, pollution, and overexploitation threaten both groups, but insects face additional risks from pesticide exposure and light pollution that remain poorly addressed in conservation frameworks. Future research must prioritize understudied tropical and freshwater systems, integrate remote sensing with biodiversity modeling, and leverage community science to address critical knowledge gaps and inform evidence-based conservation strategies.

Keywords: Species Richness Gradients Macroecology Insects Vertebrates Ecosystem Comparison Conservation

1. Introduction

The distribution of life on Earth is characterized by striking spatial variation in species richness, with some ecosystems harboring thousands of species within a single hectare while others support only handfuls across vast expanses. Understanding the patterns and determinants of this variation represents a central goal of ecology and biogeography, with profound implications for conservation in an era of unprecedented anthropogenic change [1]. Insects and vertebrates together comprise the vast majority of described animal species, yet they differ fundamentally in their diversity, ecology, and the scientific attention they receive. Insects, with an estimated 5.5 million species globally, account for more than half of all eukaryotic life, while vertebrates—the focus of most conservation research and public attention—represent fewer than 5% of described animal species [2].

The systematic study of species richness patterns emerged from the exploratory work of naturalists including Alexander von Humboldt and Alfred Russel Wallace, who documented increasing diversity toward the tropics and recognized the role of environmental conditions in shaping biotic communities [3]. Subsequent research has revealed that species richness varies systematically with latitude, elevation, productivity, and habitat structure, generating a suite of macroecological generalizations. However, these generalizations rest predominantly on data from vertebrates and plants, while hyperdiverse insect groups remain dramatically understudied, raising questions about the universality of patterns derived from well-known taxa [4].

This review compares patterns of species richness and distribution between insects and vertebrates across terrestrial, freshwater, and marine ecosystems. Three primary objectives guide this synthesis: first, to document empirical patterns of species richness across major ecosystem types and spatial gradients; second, to evaluate the ecological and evolutionary mechanisms proposed to explain these patterns; and third, to compare the responses of insects and vertebrates to anthropogenic pressures and the implications for conservation. By integrating cross-taxon comparison with ecosystem-specific analysis, this review aims to identify both common principles and critical distinctions that must inform biodiversity research and conservation planning.

2. Patterns of Species Richness Across Ecosystems

2.1. Tropical vs Temperate Systems

The latitudinal diversity gradient—increasing species richness from poles to equator—represents one of the most robust patterns in macroecology, documented for numerous vertebrate and plant taxa across terrestrial and marine environments [5]. Tropical rainforests, covering only 7% of Earth's land surface, harbor an estimated 50% of all species, with particularly high concentrations in the Amazon Basin, Congo Basin, and Southeast Asian archipelagos [6]. For vertebrates, tropical countries host substantially higher species richness than temperate regions: Colombia, with less than 1% of global land area, supports approximately 1,900 bird species—nearly 20% of the world total—while comparable areas in northern Europe support fewer than 200 [7].

For insects, the magnitude of tropical hyperdiversity is even more pronounced but remains poorly quantified. Estimates suggest that tropical forests may harbor 2-3 times more insect species than temperate forests at comparable spatial scales, though sampling biases complicate direct comparison [2]. The most species-rich insect groups—beetles (Coleoptera), butterflies and moths (Lepidoptera), flies (Diptera), and wasps, ants, and bees (Hymenoptera)—all achieve maximum diversity in tropical regions, with many families entirely restricted to low-latitude forests [8].

Temperate ecosystems, while less species-rich overall, support distinct assemblages adapted to seasonal environments and often exhibit high local abundance despite lower richness. Grasslands and temperate forests harbor specialized insect faunas, including many soil-dwelling and root-feeding groups, while temperate freshwater systems support diverse aquatic insect assemblages that drive ecosystem processes [9]. Seasonal resource pulses in temperate regions—such as spring emergence of aquatic insects or autumn mast years—generate dramatic temporal variation in insect abundance that supports migratory bird populations and other vertebrate consumers [10].

2.2. Forest, Grassland, and Desert Ecosystems

Forest ecosystems represent the pinnacle of terrestrial biodiversity for both insects and vertebrates. Tropical forests feature complex vertical stratification, with distinct communities in the canopy, understory, and leaf litter generating exceptional gamma diversity [11]. Canopy arthropods alone may account for a substantial fraction of global species richness, with estimates suggesting that tropical forest canopies harbor 2-3 million arthropod species, many undescribed [12]. Vertebrate diversity in forests reflects similar stratification, with arboreal mammals, canopy-dwelling birds, and terrestrial ungulates partitioning resources across vertical and horizontal dimensions.

Grassland ecosystems support distinctive assemblages adapted to open conditions and frequent disturbance. Insect diversity in grasslands is often dominated by orthopterans (grasshoppers and crickets), hemipterans (true bugs), and coleopterans adapted to herbaceous vegetation [13]. Vertebrate grassland assemblages include grazing ungulates, burrowing mammals, and ground-nesting birds, with many species exhibiting morphological and behavioral adaptations to open habitats. Fire regimes, grazing pressure, and soil conditions interact to shape grassland biodiversity, generating spatial heterogeneity that maintains species coexistence [14].

Desert ecosystems, characterized by water limitation and extreme temperatures, support lower overall species richness but harbor highly specialized endemic taxa. Desert insects exhibit remarkable adaptations to aridity, including nocturnal activity patterns, behavioral thermoregulation, and physiological water conservation [15]. Tenebrionid beetles, ants, and orthopterans dominate many desert insect assemblages, while vertebrate desert specialists include reptiles, small mammals, and birds with adaptations for water conservation and thermal tolerance. Xerophytic vegetation structure creates microhabitats that buffer extreme conditions and support localized biodiversity hotspots within desert landscapes [16].

2.3. Freshwater and Marine Ecosystems

Freshwater ecosystems, covering less than 1% of Earth's surface, support approximately 10% of described species, including substantial fractions of global fish, amphibian, and aquatic insect diversity [17]. Insects dominate freshwater animal diversity, with aquatic and semi-aquatic orders including Ephemeroptera (mayflies), Odonata (dragonflies and damselflies), Plecoptera (stoneflies), Trichoptera (caddisflies), and Diptera (particularly Chironomidae) comprising thousands of species globally [18]. Freshwater vertebrates include diverse fish assemblages, amphibians that depend on aquatic habitats for reproduction, and semi-aquatic reptiles, birds, and mammals.

Marine ecosystems contrast sharply with terrestrial and freshwater systems in their patterns of biodiversity. Insects, so dominant elsewhere, are notably depauperate in marine environments, with only a few hundred truly marine species—mostly water striders (Halobates) and coastal beetles—compared to millions of terrestrial species [19]. Marine biodiversity is instead dominated by crustaceans, mollusks, and vertebrates including fishes, marine mammals, and seabirds. Coral reefs represent the marine analog of tropical rainforests, supporting extraordinary fish and invertebrate diversity in warm, clear, nutrient-poor waters [20].

Table 1: Species Richness of Insects and Vertebrates Across Major Ecosystem Types

Ecosystem Type	Dominant Insect Groups	Dominant Vertebrate Groups	Relative Species Richness	Key Environmental Characteristics
Tropical forest	Coleoptera, Lepidoptera, Hymenoptera, Diptera	Primates, bats, birds, amphibians	Very high (maximum globally)	High year-round productivity, complex vertical structure, climate stability
Temperate forest	Coleoptera, Lepidoptera, Hymenoptera, Hemiptera	Rodents, passerine birds, cervids	Moderate	Seasonal productivity, deciduous/evergreen canopy, distinct strata
Grassland	Orthoptera, Hemiptera, Coleoptera, Hymenoptera	Ungulates, rodents, ground-nesting birds	Moderate to low	Open vegetation, disturbance (fire/grazing), seasonal extremes
Desert	Coleoptera (Tenebrionidae), Hymenoptera (Formicidae), Orthoptera	Reptiles, rodents, small mammals	Low (but high endemism)	Water limitation, temperature extremes, sparse vegetation
Freshwater	Ephemeroptera, Odonata, Plecoptera, Trichoptera, Diptera (Chironomidae)	Fish, amphibians, aquatic reptiles, waterbirds	High relative to area	Patchy distribution, hydrological connectivity, sensitive to water quality
Marine (coastal)	Few (Halobates, coastal Coleoptera)	Fish, marine mammals, seabirds	Moderate to high	Saline environment, three-dimensional habitat, oceanic currents
Marine (open ocean)	Absent	Pelagic fish, cetaceans, seabirds	Low	Low productivity, high connectivity, limited structure

2.4. Island and Mountain Biodiversity

Islands and mountains function as natural laboratories for studying biodiversity patterns, often harboring exceptional concentrations of endemic species. Island biogeography theory predicts that species richness reflects the equilibrium between colonization and extinction, with larger islands and those closer to mainland sources supporting more species [21]. Oceanic islands, despite lower overall richness, often exhibit high endemism: Madagascar, the Galápagos, and Hawai'i each harbor endemic radiations of insects and vertebrates resulting from isolation and adaptive diversification [22].

Mountains compress environmental gradients that span thousands of kilometers latitudinally into just a few vertical kilometers, generating pronounced turnover in species composition with elevation [23]. Species richness typically exhibits hump-shaped relationships with elevation, peaking at mid-elevations where overlapping lowland and high-elevation species pools combine with locally endemic taxa. Tropical mountains, particularly the Andes, East African highlands, and Southeast Asian mountains, represent global biodiversity hotspots with exceptional concentrations of restricted-range vertebrates and insects [24].

Table 2: Latitudinal and Altitudinal Diversity Patterns

Gradient Type	Observed Trend	Insect Response	Vertebrate Response	Proposed Ecological Explanation
Latitudinal	Decreasing richness from tropics to poles	Variable; strong for many taxa, weak for some hyperdiverse groups	Strong and consistent across most taxa	Climate energy, evolutionary time, area, niche conservatism
Altitudinal	Hump-shaped (peak at mid-elevations)	Generally, hump-shaped; broader ranges than vertebrates	Hump-shaped for most groups; narrow ranges for specialists	Area effects, mid-domain effects, temperature-productivity gradients
Depth (marine)	Decreasing richness with depth	N/A (insects absent)	Declining with depth; peaks at continental shelf	Light penetration, productivity, pressure, temperature
Seasonal tropics	Moderate gradient	Pronounced wet-dry seasonality in abundance	Seasonal reproduction and migration	Rainfall seasonality, resource pulses

3. Ecological Determinants of Distribution

3.1. Climate and Energy Availability

The species richness-energy hypothesis posits that available environmental energy limits the number of species that can coexist in a region, operating through both direct physiological effects and indirect effects on ecosystem productivity [25]. Across broad spatial scales, temperature and potential evapotranspiration consistently emerge as strong predictors of vertebrate species richness, particularly for ectothermic groups whose metabolic rates depend directly on ambient thermal conditions [26]. For endotherms, winter temperatures and seasonality strongly constrain distributions, with many bird and mammal species richness declining sharply beyond climatic thresholds.

For insects, the relationship between climate and richness is mediated by their ectothermic physiology and often short generation times. Temperature directly affects development rates, voltinism (number of generations per year), and survival, with many tropical insects unable to tolerate temperate winter conditions [27]. However, some hyperdiverse insect groups—particularly parasitoid wasps and small-bodied Diptera—show weaker latitudinal gradients than vertebrates, suggesting that factors other than climate energy may limit their diversity or that sampling biases obscure true patterns [4].

Water availability represents a critical climate dimension, particularly in arid and semi-arid systems. Precipitation patterns determine primary productivity, host plant availability for herbivorous insects, and free water availability for vertebrates. In the Atlantic Forest biodiversity hotspot, structural equation modeling reveals that climate exerts both direct negative effects on tetrapod species richness and indirect effects mediated through diversification rates, demonstrating that ecological and evolutionary processes jointly determine diversity patterns [28].

3.2. Habitat Heterogeneity and Structural Complexity

Environmental heterogeneity promotes species coexistence by providing diverse niches, allowing spatial partitioning of resources, and maintaining populations through complementary habitat use [29]. At local scales, vegetation structure creates microclimatic variation and diverse foraging substrates that support distinct species assemblages. Tropical forests exemplify this principle: canopy height, foliage density, and tree species diversity all correlate positively with arthropod diversity, with structurally complex forests supporting 2-3 times more insect species than simplified stands [11].

For vertebrates, habitat heterogeneity operates at multiple scales. Landscape-scale topographic variation generates mosaics of habitat types that increase gamma diversity, while local structural complexity—downed wood, rock outcrops, understory vegetation—provides refuge from predators and nesting sites [30]. Freshwater systems similarly show strong heterogeneity-diversity relationships: streams with complex substrates, variable flow regimes, and riparian vegetation support more diverse fish and macroinvertebrate assemblages than simplified channels [31].

The mechanisms linking heterogeneity to diversity include niche partitioning (different species using different microhabitats), refuge effects (complex habitats reducing predation intensity), and resource diversification (different substrates supporting different food resources). Experimental manipulations confirm causal effects: adding structural complexity to simplified habitats increases species richness across taxa and ecosystems.

3.3. Productivity and Trophic Structure

Net primary productivity sets fundamental limits on the energy available to consumer trophic levels, potentially constraining the number and abundance of species an ecosystem can support [32]. The species richness-productivity relationship varies with spatial scale: at local scales, productivity often shows hump-shaped relationships with richness, while at regional scales, positive monotonic relationships predominate. This scale dependence reflects the interplay of local competitive exclusion (which may reduce richness under highly productive conditions) and regional species pool effects (where productivity promotes speciation and reduces extinction).

Trophic interactions—predation, herbivory, parasitism, and mutualism—modulate the effects of productivity on diversity. Predators can maintain prey diversity by preventing competitive exclusion, a mechanism supported by experimental evidence from rocky intertidal zones and grassland ecosystems [33]. For insects, host specialization represents a key diversification mechanism: herbivorous insects that feed on chemically defended plants, parasitoids that attack specific hosts, and pollinators that specialize on particular flower morphologies have all generated exceptional species radiations [34].

Vertebrate trophic structure reflects body size constraints and energetic requirements. Large predators require extensive home ranges and occur at low densities, making them particularly vulnerable to habitat loss and fragmentation. Trophic cascades—where predator removal releases herbivore populations, leading to vegetation overexploitation—have been documented across terrestrial, freshwater, and marine systems, demonstrating the importance of maintaining intact food webs for biodiversity conservation [35].

3.4. Disturbance and Succession

Disturbance regimes shape biodiversity through their effects on resource availability, habitat structure, and species interactions. The intermediate disturbance hypothesis proposes that diversity peaks at intermediate levels of disturbance frequency or intensity, where competitive exclusion is prevented but sufficient time allows colonization and recovery [36]. Fire regimes in savanna and Mediterranean ecosystems, flood regimes in riparian systems, and windthrow in forests all generate mosaic landscapes that maintain species requiring different successional stages.

For insects, disturbance effects vary with life history and habitat requirements. Early successional specialists—including many butterflies, grasshoppers, and bees—depend on open, recently disturbed habitats and decline as succession proceeds. Late successional specialists—including many saproxylic beetles, forest moths, and canopy ants—require mature habitat characteristics and are sensitive to disturbance that removes structural complexity [37].

Vertebrates show similar variation in disturbance responses. Grazing mammals often benefit from fire-induced grass regrowth, while forest interior birds decline with fragmentation and edge effects. Understanding species-specific responses to disturbance regimes is essential for predicting biodiversity outcomes under changing land use and climate.

3.5. Evolutionary and Historical Processes

Contemporary diversity patterns reflect not only current ecological conditions but also the evolutionary history of regional biotas. Regions with high species richness often coincide with areas of elevated speciation rates, long-term climatic stability that allowed lineage accumulation, or both [38]. Phylogenetic approaches now enable researchers to disentangle these processes by reconstructing the timing and geography of diversification.

The concept of "cradles" (areas of recent speciation) and "museums" (areas of lineage persistence) distinguishes regions where lineages originate from those where they accumulate over evolutionary time [39]. Tropical mountains frequently function as both: elevational gradients promote speciation through geographic isolation and ecological divergence, while topographic complexity creates refugia where lineages survive through periods of climate change. In the tropical Andes, recent analysis of hummingbird distributions reveals that young endemic species occur along the treeline where populations become fragmented, while old endemic species cluster in cloud forest refugia at lower elevations, demonstrating spatial segregation of cradle and museum functions [40].

Pleistocene climate oscillations profoundly affected species distributions, particularly in temperate regions where glacial advances repeatedly displaced biotas. Post-glacial colonization routes and refugial populations shape contemporary diversity patterns, with formerly glaciated areas often harboring reduced species richness and distinctive genetic signatures of recent expansion.

Table 3: Ecological Drivers Influencing Species Distribution

Ecological Driver	Mechanism of Influence	Spatial Scale	Representative Ecosystems
Climate (temperature, precipitation)	Physiological constraints, metabolic rates, resource availability	Regional to global	All ecosystems
Habitat heterogeneity	Niche partitioning, refuge availability, speciation through isolation	Local to landscape	Tropical forests, mountains, coral reefs
Productivity (NPP)	Energy available to consumers, population size regulation	Regional	Upwelling zones, tropical forests, grasslands
Disturbance regimes	Patch dynamics, successional niches, competitive release	Local to landscape	Fire-dependent savannas, floodplains
Evolutionary history	Regional species pool determination, lineage accumulation	Regional to global	Biodiversity hotspots, islands

4. Comparative Analysis: Insects vs Vertebrates

4.1. Differences in Dispersal Ability

Dispersal ability fundamentally shapes species distributions, population dynamics, and responses to environmental change. Insects exhibit extraordinary variation in dispersal capacity, from tiny flightless beetles confined to single logs to migratory butterflies that traverse continents. Winged insects generally disperse more readily than most terrestrial vertebrates, facilitating rapid colonization of new habitats and gene flow among populations. However, habitat specialization can offset dispersal ability: many tropical forest insects never venture beyond closed-canopy conditions, while habitat generalists may cross agricultural matrices readily.

Vertebrates show equally varied dispersal abilities. Birds and bats generally disperse farther than terrestrial mammals, facilitating range shifts in response to climate change. Large mammals require extensive habitat corridors to maintain connectivity, while small mammals and amphibians may be unable to cross even narrow barriers. These differences carry conservation implications: insects may track climate change more readily than vertebrates, but habitat degradation that disrupts microhabitat conditions can eliminate specialized species even when dispersal appears possible.

4.2. Reproductive Strategies and Life History Traits

Insect life histories are characterized by short generation times, high fecundity, and flexible development. Many insects’ complete multiple generations annually, allowing rapid population increase and evolutionary response to environmental change. Holometabolous development (complete metamorphosis) separates ecological niches of larvae and adults, reducing intraspecific competition and enabling specialization on different resources. These traits facilitate rapid diversification and adaptation but can also create vulnerabilities: species with narrow larval host ranges are sensitive to host plant loss, while synchronized emergence makes some insects vulnerable to phenological mismatches.

Vertebrates generally exhibit longer generation times, lower fecundity, and greater investment in individual offspring. These traits limit rates of population increase and evolutionary response, making vertebrates particularly vulnerable to rapid environmental change. However, greater mobility and behavioral flexibility can buffer some vertebrate populations against short-term perturbations. K-selected traits—large body size, delayed reproduction, low fecundity—predispose many vertebrates to extinction under anthropogenic pressures, explaining why vertebrate extinctions are better documented than insect extinctions despite insects' greater diversity.

4.3. Sensitivity to Environmental Change

Insects and vertebrates differ in their sensitivity to environmental stressors, reflecting physiological, ecological, and life history differences. Ectothermic insects are directly affected by temperature, with development rates, activity patterns, and survival all temperature-dependent. Climate change is already shifting insect phenology, with spring emergence advancing in many temperate species. However, insects' short generation times may facilitate evolutionary adaptation to changing conditions, at least for species with sufficient genetic variation.

Vertebrates show varied thermal sensitivities. Ectothermic reptiles and amphibians are directly temperature-dependent and may be particularly vulnerable to climate warming, especially in tropical environments where species experience temperatures near their physiological limits. Endothermic birds and mammals buffer environmental temperature through metabolic regulation but face high energy demands that may become unsustainable under extreme conditions or when food resources are disrupted.

Chemical sensitivity also differs. Insects, with their high surface area-to-volume ratios and terrestrial habits, are particularly vulnerable to pesticides and air pollution. Neonicotinoid insecticides have been implicated in pollinator declines and broader insect community changes, with sublethal effects on navigation, reproduction, and foraging behavior. Vertebrates may be more vulnerable to bioaccumulating pollutants that concentrate through food chains, with top predators showing highest contaminant loads.

4.4. Scaling Patterns of Richness

Species-area relationships describe how species richness increases with sampled area, providing insights into biodiversity scaling and extinction vulnerability. Insects generally show shallower species-area slopes than vertebrates, suggesting that insect communities are less sensitive to area reduction per se. This pattern likely reflects insects' smaller body sizes and population requirements: an area that cannot support a viable vertebrate population may still sustain numerous insect species. However, host-specific insects may show area effects indirectly through their host plants, and habitat degradation may affect insect communities even when area remains constant.

Rarefaction analyses consistently show that insects contribute disproportionately to total species richness at all spatial scales. In tropical forests, insect species outnumber vertebrates by approximately 20:1 in local samples, with ratios increasing at regional scales as beta diversity (turnover among sites) accumulates. This pattern underscores the fundamental importance of insects in global biodiversity while highlighting the challenges of monitoring and conserving hyperdiverse groups.

Table 4: Comparative Ecological and Conservation Characteristics of Insects and Vertebrates

Characteristic	Insects	Vertebrates	Ecological Implications	Conservation Considerations
Species richness	Very high (estimated 5.5 million)	Moderate (~70,000 described)	Insects dominate animal diversity; vertebrates better known	Insect conservation hampered by Linnean and Wallacean shortfalls
Generation time	Short (weeks to months typically)	Long (months to decades)	Faster evolutionary potential in insects; slower population recovery in vertebrates	Insects may adapt to change; vertebrates require longer-term protection
Dispersal ability	Highly variable; many strong fliers	Variable; birds/bats mobile, many mammals limited	Insects may track climate change better; vertebrates require corridors	Matrix management critical for vertebrates; habitat quality key for insects
Body size	Small (micrograms to grams)	Medium to large (grams to tonnes)	Insects maintain large populations in small areas; vertebrates need extensive areas	Area-based conservation more effective for vertebrates; insects require habitat quality
Trophic position	Mostly herbivores, detritivores, parasitoids	All trophic levels, including top predators	Insects drive ecosystem processes; vertebrates structure food webs	Both groups essential; insect declines affect vertebrate food supply
Sensitivity to pollution	High (pesticides, air pollution)	Variable (bioaccumulation in predators)	Insects respond rapidly to chemical stressors; vertebrates show cumulative effects	Integrated pest management critical; monitor both direct and food-web effects
Data availability	Poor for most taxa; strong taxonomic biases	Good for many taxa; comprehensive monitoring in some regions	Conservation planning biased toward vertebrates	Urgently need insect monitoring; leverage citizen science and DNA methods

5. Anthropogenic Impacts and Conservation Implications

5.1. Habitat Loss and Fragmentation

Land-use change represents the most pervasive direct driver of biodiversity decline globally, with natural ecosystems reduced by approximately 47% from estimated historical baselines. Conversion to agriculture, urban development, and infrastructure eliminates habitat for native species, while fragmentation of remaining habitats disrupts ecological processes and isolates populations. Tropical deforestation proceeds at approximately 10 million hectares annually, disproportionately affecting the most species-rich ecosystems on Earth.

Habitat loss impacts insects and vertebrates through multiple mechanisms. Area effects directly reduce population sizes, increasing extinction risk for species with large area requirements. Fragmentation disrupts movement among habitat patches, reducing gene flow and preventing recolonization following local extinctions. Edge effects alter microclimate and species composition at habitat boundaries, with tropical forest fragments experiencing increased tree mortality and invasion by disturbance-adapted species.

The consequences of habitat loss differ between insects and vertebrates in ways relevant to conservation prioritization. Large vertebrates with extensive home ranges—including many primates, carnivores, and ungulates—are often the first to disappear from fragmented landscapes, earning them "umbrella species" status in conservation planning. However, insects may show more subtle responses: habitat fragmentation disrupts plant-pollinator networks, reduces parasitoid-host interactions, and alters decomposition processes, with cascading effects on ecosystem functioning that may not be captured by vertebrate-focused monitoring.

5.2. Climate Change

Climate change is increasingly recognized as a major threat to biodiversity, with effects already documented across all ecosystem types. Rising temperatures shift species' geographic ranges toward higher latitudes and elevations, alter phenology, and disrupt ecological interactions. For montane species, upward range shifts may lead to "escalator to extinction" dynamics as populations are pushed toward mountaintops with no further refugia.

Insects show pronounced phenological responses to climate warming, with spring emergence advancing by days to weeks per decade in many temperate species. These shifts can create mismatches with host plant availability or pollinator requirements, potentially reducing reproductive success. However, insects' short generation times and high dispersal capacity may facilitate tracking of suitable climatic conditions, at least for habitat generalists. Range-restricted montane and polar insects face greater risks, as suitable habitat contracts and dispersal barriers prevent colonization of new areas.

Vertebrates show varied responses to climate change. Bird ranges have shifted poleward in both Europe and North America, while tropical montane birds show upward elevational shifts. Amphibians, with their permeable skin and complex life cycles, are particularly vulnerable to combined effects of warming, drying, and disease emergence. Climate change interacts with other stressors: fragmented populations may lack dispersal corridors to track shifting climatic zones, while climate-induced habitat degradation may compound effects of pollution or overexploitation.

5.3. Pollution and Pesticide Exposure

Pollution impacts biodiversity through multiple pathways, with insects particularly vulnerable to pesticides and atmospheric pollutants. Neonicotinoid insecticides, now the most widely used class of insecticides globally, have been implicated in declines of bees, butterflies, and other beneficial insects. Sublethal effects on navigation, foraging behavior, and reproduction may be as important as direct mortality in driving population declines. Agricultural intensification has increased pesticide use dramatically, with consequences for non-target insects in cropped areas and adjacent natural habitats.

Light pollution represents an emerging threat to nocturnal insects, with artificial light at night disrupting navigation, reproduction, and predation risk. Recent analysis of diel activity patterns reveals that approximately one-third of insect species are strictly nocturnal, with many others showing crepuscular activity peaks. Light pollution may therefore affect a substantial fraction of insect diversity, with potential cascading effects on pollination, decomposition, and food webs for nocturnal vertebrates.

Vertebrates are affected by pollution through bioaccumulation of persistent organic pollutants and heavy metals. Top predators—including birds of prey, marine mammals, and large carnivores—show highest contaminant loads, with documented effects on reproduction, immune function, and survival. Eutrophication from agricultural runoff degrades freshwater habitats, reducing oxygen levels and altering food webs for fish and amphibians. Atmospheric nitrogen deposition changes plant community composition, with cascading effects on herbivores and their predators.

5.4. Overexploitation and Wildlife Trade

Overexploitation remains a significant threat for many vertebrate species. Unsustainable hunting for bushmeat has depleted mammal and bird populations across tropical forests, with the empty forest syndrome—forests structurally intact but devoid of large vertebrates—becoming increasingly common. The wildlife trade, both legal and illegal, threatens species from elephants and rhinos to tropical birds, reptiles, and amphibians. For marine species, overfishing has driven population collapses, altered food webs, and degraded ecosystem functioning.

Insects are less directly threatened by overexploitation, though harvesting of commercially valuable species—including butterflies for collections, edible insects, and medicinal species—can impact local populations. More significantly, bycatch from insecticide applications intended for pest control kills vast numbers of non-target insects annually, representing a form of incidental overexploitation rarely quantified in conservation assessments.

5.5. Ecosystem-Based Conservation Strategies

Effective conservation must address the full range of anthropogenic pressures while recognizing the distinct vulnerabilities of insects and vertebrates. Protected area networks remain the cornerstone of conservation, currently covering approximately 17% of terrestrial and 8% of marine areas. However, protected areas alone are insufficient: they must be embedded within landscape-scale strategies that maintain connectivity, allow species movements, and integrate conservation with sustainable land use.

For insects, habitat quality may matter as much as habitat area. Maintaining structural complexity, preserving host plants for specialized herbivores, and reducing pesticide exposure in surrounding matrices are essential for insect conservation. Pollinator-friendly farming practices, integrated pest management, and restoration of native vegetation in agricultural landscapes can support insect diversity while maintaining food production.

For vertebrates, maintaining connectivity among protected areas through corridors and stepping stones enables movement in response to environmental change. Landscape-scale planning must consider the area requirements of wide-ranging species, the effects of barriers on dispersal, and the quality of matrix habitats that species traverse. Community-based conservation that engages local people in stewardship and benefit-sharing can improve outcomes for both biodiversity and human well-being.

6. Future Research Directions

6.1. Data Gaps in Tropical and Freshwater Systems

Despite decades of research, fundamental knowledge gaps limit understanding of biodiversity patterns and our ability to project future changes. Tropical regions, while recognized as biodiversity hotspots, remain dramatically under-sampled for most insect taxa and many vertebrate groups. The Linnean shortfall—the large number of undescribed species—and the Wallacean shortfall—the lack of geographic distribution data—are most severe in tropical forests, where canopy access and taxonomic expertise are limiting [4]. Addressing these gaps requires coordinated international efforts, capacity building in megadiverse countries, and integration of traditional taxonomic approaches with DNA-based methods.

Freshwater ecosystems are disproportionately understudied relative to their biodiversity and vulnerability. Aquatic insects, which drive ecosystem processes and serve as indicators of water quality, remain poorly known in tropical regions, while freshwater fish distributions are incompletely documented in many biodiversity hotspots [17]. Given the intense pressures on freshwater systems from water extraction, pollution, and dam construction, filling these knowledge gaps represents an urgent priority.

6.2. Understudied Insect Taxa

The most critical data gap concerns hyperdiverse "dark taxa"—insect groups comprising thousands of species that remain poorly characterized taxonomically and ecologically. Diptera (flies), Hymenoptera (particularly parasitoid wasps), and Coleoptera (beetles) together account for the majority of insect diversity, yet most species remain undescribed and their ecological roles poorly understood [2]. For these groups, even basic questions about latitudinal gradients, habitat associations, and responses to disturbance cannot be answered with current data.

Targeted inventory efforts, combined with DNA barcoding and metabarcoding, can accelerate documentation of dark taxa. Standardized sampling protocols that enable comparison across sites and through time are essential for detecting population trends and prioritizing conservation efforts. Engaging parataxonomists and citizen scientists in specimen processing can expand capacity while building local expertise and ownership of biodiversity data.

6.3. Integrating Remote Sensing and Biodiversity Modeling

Technological advances are transforming capabilities for biodiversity monitoring at spatial scales relevant to conservation. Remote sensing provides synoptic views of habitat condition, land-use change, and ecosystem productivity, enabling detection of threats and assessment of conservation effectiveness. Satellite imagery tracks deforestation, fire regimes, and habitat fragmentation, while LiDAR and hyperspectral sensors characterize vegetation structure and composition relevant to habitat quality for both insects and vertebrates.

Species distribution models integrate occurrence data with environmental layers to predict current and future species ranges under climate and land-use scenarios. For well-sampled vertebrate taxa, these models inform conservation planning and protected area design. For insects, modeling efforts are constrained by data limitations but can be improved by incorporating host plant distributions, phylogenetic information, and functional traits.

Integrating remote sensing with field validation and biodiversity modeling requires interdisciplinary collaboration and sustained investment in biodiversity infrastructure. The emerging field of macrosystems biology addresses ecological questions at regional to continental scales, providing frameworks for understanding how local processes scale up to generate broad diversity patterns.

6.4. Community Science and Digital Biodiversity Databases

Citizen science initiatives engage volunteers in biodiversity data collection, dramatically expanding monitoring capacity while fostering public engagement with conservation. Programs monitoring butterflies, birds, and pollinators have generated long-term datasets unavailable through professional monitoring alone. iNaturalist, eBird, and other platforms now provide millions of species observations annually, supporting research on phenology, distributions, and responses to environmental change.

However, citizen science data require careful validation and exhibit geographic and taxonomic biases that must be addressed in analysis. Most observations come from temperate regions and accessible areas, with tropical and remote locations underrepresented. Charismatic taxa—butterflies, birds, mammals—receive disproportionate attention, while dark taxa remain neglected. Combining citizen science with targeted professional surveys and statistical modeling can leverage the strengths of each approach while minimizing biases.

Digital biodiversity databases, including the Global Biodiversity Information Facility (GBIF), provide open access to millions of species occurrence records, enabling macroecological analyses at unprecedented scales. Integrating these data with phylogenetic, functional trait, and environmental layers supports comprehensive biodiversity assessments and conservation prioritization. Continued investment in data mobilization, quality control, and analytical tools is essential for realizing the potential of digital biodiversity infrastructure.

7. Conclusion

Insects and vertebrates exhibit both common patterns and fundamental differences in their species richness, distribution, and responses to environmental change. Tropical forests harbor the highest diversity for both groups, but insects dominate species counts in all ecosystems, with estimates suggesting that insects comprise 75-85% of animal species globally while vertebrates represent less than 5%. Latitudinal diversity gradients are pronounced for vertebrates but show greater variability among insect taxa, challenging generalizations derived from well-studied groups. Altitudinal patterns generally peak at mid-elevations, though insects often show broader elevational ranges than vertebrates.

Ecological determinants—climate energy, habitat heterogeneity, productivity, disturbance regimes, and evolutionary history—operate across scales to shape diversity patterns, with insects responding more strongly to microhabitat variation and vertebrates to landscape-scale factors. Comparative analysis reveals that insects' shorter generation times, higher reproductive rates, and greater dispersal ability facilitate rapid responses to environmental change, while their enormous diversity and functional importance demand urgent conservation attention despite persistent data gaps.

Anthropogenic pressures including habitat loss, climate change, pollution, and overexploitation threaten both groups, but insects face additional risks from pesticide exposure and light pollution that remain poorly addressed in conservation frameworks. Effective conservation must integrate protected areas with landscape-scale strategies, maintain habitat quality for specialized insects, and reduce pressures in production landscapes. International policy frameworks, particularly the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework, provide mechanisms for coordinated action, but achieving conservation goals requires addressing data gaps, building monitoring capacity, and engaging diverse stakeholders in biodiversity stewardship.

Future research must prioritize understudied tropical and freshwater systems, accelerate documentation of hyperdiverse insect taxa, and integrate remote sensing with biodiversity modeling to inform evidence-based conservation. Community science and digital biodiversity databases can expand monitoring capacity while fostering public engagement, but sustained investment in biodiversity infrastructure and taxonomic expertise remains essential. The coming decade will determine whether the extraordinary diversity of insects and vertebrates that characterizes our planet can be sustained for future generations.

References

1. Gaston KJ. Global patterns in biodiversity. Nature. 2000;405(6783):220-7.
2. Stork NE. How many species of insects and other terrestrial arthropods are there on Earth? Annu Rev Entomol. 2018;63:31-45.
3. Lomolino MV, Riddle BR, Whittaker RJ, Brown JH. Biogeography. 4th ed. Sunderland: Sinauer Associates; 2010.

4. Santos BF, Srivathsan A, Neves K, Meier R. Weak and inverse latitudinal diversity gradients in the 10 most abundant and diverse flying insect clades. bioRxiv. 2025. doi:10.1101/2025.04.29.651164
5. Hillebrand H. On the generality of the latitudinal diversity gradient. Am Nat. 2004;163(2):192-211.
6. Dirzo R, Raven PH. Global state of biodiversity and loss. Annu Rev Environ Resour. 2003;28(1):137-67.
7. Orme CDL, Davies RG, Burgess M, Eigenbrod F, Pickup N, Olson VA, et al. Global hotspots of species richness are not congruent with endemism or threat. Nature. 2005;436(7053):1016-9.
8. Basset Y, Cizek L, Cuénoud P, Didham RK, Guilhaumon F, Missa O, et al. Arthropod diversity in a tropical forest. Science. 2012;338(6113):1481-4.
9. Dudgeon D. Tropical Asian streams: zoobenthos, ecology and conservation. Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press; 1999.
10. Nakano S, Murakami M. Reciprocal subsidies: dynamic interdependence between terrestrial and aquatic food webs. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A. 2001;98(1):166-70.
11. Tews J, Brose U, Grimm V, Tielbörger K, Wichmann MC, Schwager M, et al. Animal species diversity driven by habitat heterogeneity/diversity: the importance of keystone structures. J Biogeogr. 2004;31(1):79-92.
12. Erwin TL. Tropical forests: their richness in Coleoptera and other arthropod species. Coleopt Bull. 1982;36(1):74-5.
13. Joern A, Laws AN. Ecological mechanisms underlying arthropod species diversity in grasslands. Annu Rev Entomol. 2013;58:19-36.
14. Collins SL, Calabrese LB. Effects of fire, grazing and topographic variation on vegetation structure in tallgrass prairie. J Veg Sci. 2012;23(3):563-75.
15. Cloudsley-Thompson JL. Adaptations of Arthropoda to arid environments. Annu Rev Entomol. 1975;20(1):261-83.
16. Ward D, Seely MK. Adaptation and constraint in the evolution of the physiology and behavior of the Namib desert tenebrionid beetle genus Onymacris. Evolution. 1996;50(3):1231-40.
17. Dudgeon D, Arthington AH, Gessner MO, Kawabata ZI, Knowler DJ, Lévêque C, et al. Freshwater biodiversity: importance, threats, status and conservation challenges. Biol Rev. 2006;81(2):163-82.
18. Dijkstra KDB, Monaghan MT, Pauls SU. Freshwater biodiversity and aquatic insect diversification. Annu Rev Entomol. 2014;59:143-63.
19. Cheng L. Marine insects. In: Resh VH, Cardé RT, editors. Encyclopedia of insects. 2nd ed. Amsterdam: Academic Press; 2009. p. 600-4.
20. Roberts CM, McClean CJ, Veron JEN, Hawkins JP, Allen GR, McAllister DE, et al. Marine biodiversity hotspots and conservation priorities for tropical reefs. Science. 2002;295(5558):1280-4.
21. MacArthur RH, Wilson EO. The theory of island biogeography. Princeton: Princeton University Press; 1967.
22. Paulay G. Biodiversity on oceanic islands: a synthesis. In: Wagner WL, Funk VA, editors. Hawaiian biogeography: evolution on a hot spot archipelago. Washington, DC: Smithsonian Institution Press; 1995. p. 1-15.
23. Rahbek C. The role of spatial scale and the perception of large-scale species-richness patterns. Ecol Lett. 2005;8(2):224-39.
24. Myers N, Mittermeier RA, Mittermeier CG, da Fonseca GAB, Kent J. Biodiversity hotspots for conservation priorities. Nature. 2000;403(6772):853-8.
25. Hawkins BA, Field R, Cornell HV, Currie DJ, Guégan JF, Kaufman DM, et al. Energy, water, and broad-scale geographic patterns of species richness. Ecology. 2003;84(12):3105-17.
26. Buckley LB, Jetz W. Environmental and historical constraints on global patterns of amphibian richness. Proc R Soc B. 2007;274(1614):1167-73.
27. Bale JS, Masters GJ, Hodkinson ID, Awmack C, Bezemer TM, Brown VK, et al. Herbivory in global climate change research: direct effects of rising temperature on insect herbivores. Glob Change Biol. 2002;8(1):1-16.
28. Moroti MT, Skeels A, da Silva FR, Provete DB. Climate interacts with diversification rate in determining species richness and trait diversity of tetrapods in a global hotspot. J Biogeogr. 2024;51(12):2484-97.
29. Stein A, Gerstner K, Kreft H. Environmental heterogeneity as a universal driver of species richness across taxa, biomes and spatial scales. Ecol Lett. 2014;17(7):866-80.
30. MacArthur RH, MacArthur JW. On bird species diversity. Ecology. 1961;42(3):594-8.
31. Vannote RL, Minshall GW, Cummins KW, Sedell JR, Cushing CE. The river continuum concept. Can J Fish Aquat Sci. 1980;37(1):130-7.
32. Waide RB, Willig MR, Steiner CF, Mittelbach G, Gough L, Dodson SI, et al. The relationship between productivity and species richness. Annu Rev Ecol Syst. 1999;30(1):257-300.
33. Paine RT. Food web complexity and species diversity. Am Nat. 1966;100(910):65-75.
34. Forister ML, Novotny V, Panorska AK, Baje L, Basset Y, Butterill PT, et al. The global distribution of diet breadth in insect herbivores. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A. 2015;112(2):442-7.
35. Estes JA, Terborgh J, Brashares JS, Power ME, Berger J, Bond WJ, et al. Trophic downgrading of planet Earth. Science. 2011;333(6040):301-10.
36. Connell JH. Diversity in tropical rain forests and coral reefs. Science. 1978;199(4335):1302-10.
37. Seibold S, Bässler C, Brandl R, Gossner MM, Thorn S, Ulyshen MD, et al. Experimental studies of dead-wood biodiversity—a review identifying global gaps in knowledge. Biol Conserv. 2015;191:139-49.
38. Jetz W, Thomas GH, Joy JB, Hartmann K, Mooers AO. The global diversity of birds in space and time. Nature. 2012;491(7424):444-8.
39. Stebbins GL. Flowering plants: evolution above the species level. Cambridge: Harvard University Press; 1974.
40. Sonne J, Dalsgaard B, Borregaard MK, Kennedy J, Fjeldsa J, Rahbek C. Biodiversity cradles and museums segregating within hotspots of endemism. 2025. https://m2.mtmt.hu/api/publication/33433576

How to Cite This Article

Clarke DM. Species richness and distribution of insects and vertebrates across different ecosystems: ecological determinants, spatial patterns, and conservation implications. International Journal of Insect and Animal Diversity Research. 2026;2(2):24–32.

Creative Commons (CC) License