Global Patterns of Insect and Animal Diversity: Ecological Drivers, Biogeographical Mechanisms, and Contemporary Conservation Challenges

Joseph Mwangi Kamau [1]*, **Carlos Alberto Silva Santos** [2]
[1] Department of Entomology, Kenyatta University, Nairobi, Kenya
[2] Departamento de Zoologia, Universidade de São Paulo, São Paulo, Brazil

* Corresponding Author: **Joseph Mwangi Kamau**

Article Info

E-ISSN: 3107-6599
Volume: 02
Issue: 02
March-April 2026
Received: 12-01-2026
Accepted: 10-02-2026
Published: 08-03-2026
Page No: 33-41

Abstract

Understanding the distribution of life on Earth remains a central challenge in biodiversity science, with implications for conservation in an era of rapid global change. This review synthesizes current knowledge on global patterns of insect and animal diversity, examining the ecological drivers, biogeographical mechanisms, and conservation challenges shaping contemporary biodiversity distributions. The latitudinal diversity gradient—increasing species richness toward the tropics—represents a pervasive macroecological pattern, although emerging evidence suggests that small-bodied invertebrate taxa may exhibit weaker or even inverse gradients, challenging long-held generalizations. Topographic heterogeneity and climatic stability interact to generate pronounced altitudinal gradients and concentrations of endemism, particularly in tropical montane systems that function as both biodiversity cradles and museums. Ecological drivers including climate energy, productivity, habitat heterogeneity, and disturbance regimes operate across scales to regulate species richness, while evolutionary processes—speciation, extinction, and dispersal—determine the biogeographic imprint visible today. Anthropogenic pressures, particularly land-use change, climate change, invasive species, and pollution, are driving unprecedented biodiversity loss, with insects experiencing substantial but poorly documented declines. International policy frameworks, including the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework, provide mechanisms for coordinated conservation action, yet transformative change in biodiversity governance remains urgently needed. This review identifies critical knowledge gaps, particularly regarding insect diversity in tropical systems, and emphasizes the need for integrated approaches combining remote sensing, biodiversity modeling, and community-based monitoring to inform effective conservation strategies.

Keywords: Latitudinal Diversity Gradient Biodiversity Hotspots Macroecology Conservation Policy Insects Anthropogenic Drivers

1. Introduction

The distribution of species across Earth's surface is neither uniform nor random. From the species-rich rainforests of the Amazon and Congo basins to the relatively depauperate expanses of boreal forests and polar deserts, biodiversity exhibits striking spatial patterns that have fascinated naturalists for centuries [1]. Insects, comprising more than half of all described eukaryotic species and representing an estimated 5.5 million species globally, dominate terrestrial and freshwater animal diversity, yet remain dramatically understudied relative to vertebrates and plants [2]. Understanding the processes that generate and maintain these patterns represents a foundational goal of ecology and evolutionary biology, with urgent practical implications as anthropogenic pressures drive species declines and extinctions at unprecedented rates [3]. The systematic study of biodiversity patterns emerged from the exploratory expeditions of Alexander von Humboldt and Alfred Russel Wallace, who documented latitudinal gradients in species richness and recognized the role of environmental conditions in shaping biotic communities [4]. Subsequent decades of research have revealed that species richness varies systematically with latitude, altitude, productivity, and habitat structure, giving rise to a suite of macroecological generalizations. However, these generalizations rest disproportionately on data from well-studied vertebrate and plant taxa, while hyperdiverse invertebrate groups—particularly small-bodied insects—remain conspicuously absent from global syntheses [5].

This review synthesizes current understanding of global insect and animal diversity patterns, with three primary objectives: first, to examine the empirical evidence for latitudinal, altitudinal, and habitat-based diversity gradients across major taxonomic groups; second, to evaluate the ecological and evolutionary mechanisms proposed to explain these patterns; and third, to assess contemporary anthropogenic threats and the policy frameworks developed to address them. By integrating macroecological theory with applied conservation science, this review aims to identify both foundational knowledge and critical uncertainties that must be addressed to safeguard biodiversity in the coming decades.

2. Global Patterns of Insect and Animal Diversity

2.1. Latitudinal Diversity Gradients

The latitudinal diversity gradient—the increase in species richness from polar to tropical regions—stands among the most robust empirical generalizations in macroecology [6]. For terrestrial vertebrates, flowering plants, and many marine taxa, tropical regions harbor substantially more species than temperate or polar zones at comparable spatial scales. Meta-analyses confirm that this pattern holds across terrestrial and marine environments, although its magnitude varies among taxonomic groups and geographic regions [7].

However, recent evidence challenges the universality of this pattern, particularly for hyperdiverse invertebrate taxa. Analysis of DNA barcode data from 1.35 million flying insect specimens collected at 101 sites across six continents reveals that the ten most abundant and diverse insect families—comprising mostly small-bodied species—exhibit weak, non-significant, or even inverse latitudinal gradients [1]. Among these dominant taxa, five families showed no significant latitudinal trend in species richness, while ichneumonid wasps displayed a pronounced inverse gradient, with highest diversity at mid-to-high latitudes. These findings suggest that the canonical latitudinal gradient may not apply uniformly to the most species-rich components of animal diversity, highlighting the critical importance of addressing taxonomic and body-size biases in biodiversity research [1].

Complementing these taxonomic patterns, recent work has revealed that the diel partitioning of species richness also varies with latitude. Analysis of 60 insect communities globally demonstrates that the proportion of diurnal and nocturnal species peaks in tropical communities and declines poleward, while cathemeral species—active both day and night—comprise over half of all species at high latitudes [8]. This gradient likely reflects latitudinal variation in environmental factors including temperature regimes, photoperiod, and predation pressure, and carries implications for understanding ecosystem functioning and vulnerability to anthropogenic disturbances across latitudes [8].

2.2. Altitudinal and Habitat-Based Variation

Mountainous regions harbor disproportionate shares of global biodiversity, with elevational gradients often compressing the ecological and climatic variation that spans thousands of kilometers latitudinally into just a few vertical kilometers [9]. Species richness typically exhibits a hump-shaped relationship with elevation, peaking at mid-elevations where overlapping lowland and high-elevation species pools combine with locally endemic taxa [10]. This pattern reflects the interplay of area effects, climatic conditions, and historical biogeography.

Topographic complexity emerges as a primary predictor of endemic species richness across mountain systems. In Turkey, centers of vascular plant endemism are concentrated in high mountain ranges, with elevational amplitude explaining 31-38% of variation in endemic richness [11]. These patterns extend to animal taxa: tropical montane regions including the tropical Andes, the Atlantic Forest, and East African mountains harbor exceptional concentrations of range-restricted vertebrate and invertebrate species [12]. The mechanisms underlying montane endemism involve both ecological isolation—where topographic barriers limit dispersal—and climatic stability, which allows lineages to persist through Pleistocene climate oscillations [13].

Recent high-resolution analysis of Andean hummingbird distributions reveals that biodiversity hotspots in tropical mountains result from distinct processes operating at different elevations [2]. Young endemic species, representing recent speciation events, exhibit scattered non-overlapping distributions along the Andean treeline—a long, narrow habitat where populations become fragmented. In contrast, old endemic species show aggregated distributions within cloud forest pockets at lower elevations, reflecting long-term persistence in climatically stable refugia [2]. This spatial segregation of "cradles" (areas of recent speciation) and "museums" (areas of lineage persistence) challenges the traditional view that these functions overlap within single valley systems, instead implicating large-scale climate complexity and habitat connectivity in generating montane biodiversity hotspots.

2.3. Marine-Terrestrial Contrasts and Biodiversity Hotspots

Marine and terrestrial systems differ fundamentally in environmental structure, connectivity, and the nature of barriers to dispersal, yet both exhibit pronounced spatial variation in species richness. Marine biodiversity peaks in the Indo-Australian Archipelago—the "Coral Triangle"—where reef-associated fishes, mollusks, and crustaceans achieve maximum diversity [14]. This pattern reflects the confluence of historical factors (the region served as a center of origin and accumulation during sea-level fluctuations) and ecological factors (high habitat heterogeneity, stable warm temperatures, and high primary productivity).

Globally, 36 biodiversity hotspots have been designated for conservation priority based on exceptional concentrations of endemic plant species coupled with high habitat loss [15]. These hotspots, while originally defined for terrestrial vascular plants, also harbor extraordinary animal diversity: the Tropical Andes hotspot contains approximately one-sixth of all bird species, the Indo-Burma hotspot supports high primate and freshwater turtle endemism, and the

Mediterranean Basin hosts numerous reptile and amphibian radiations [15]. Insects, however, remain inadequately represented in hotspot delineation due to incomplete taxonomic and distributional data, despite constituting the majority of animal species in these regions.

Table 1: Global Biodiversity Patterns Across Biogeographical Realms

Biogeographical Realm	Dominant Taxa	Species Richness Trends	Endemism Level	Key Environmental Drivers
Afrotropical	Mammals (ungulates, primates), butterflies, dung beetles	High in tropical forests and savannas; lower in arid regions	High in montane "sky islands" and Madagascar	Climate seasonality, productivity, topographic complexity
Australasian	Marsupials, passerine birds, myrtaceae-associated insects	Moderate overall; highest in rainforests	Very high (continental isolation)	Historic isolation, soil nutrients, fire regimes
Indo-Malayan	Primates, birds, butterflies, ants	Very high in Sundaland and Wallacea	High in island systems and mountains	Pleistocene sea-level changes, productivity, habitat heterogeneity
Madagascan	Lemurs, chameleons, tenrecs, endemic insect radiations	Moderate but highly endemic	Extremely high (>80% for many taxa)	Long isolation, varied topography, cyclonic disturbance
Neotropical	Primates, bats, hummingbirds, butterflies, scarab beetles	Highest globally in Amazon and Andes	Very high, especially in montane regions	Climate stability, productivity, topographic and habitat heterogeneity
Nearctic	Rodents, carnivores, bees, butterflies	Moderate; highest in southwestern mountains	Moderate; high in isolated mountain ranges	Latitudinal temperature gradient, Pleistocene glaciation history
Palearctic	Ungulates, carnivores, bumblebees, syrphid flies	Moderate; highest in Mediterranean and East Asian mountains	Moderate; locally high in islands and mountains	Seasonal climate variability, topographic complexity, historic glaciation

3. Ecological and Evolutionary Drivers

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 [16]. Across broad spatial scales, temperature and potential evapotranspiration consistently emerge as strong predictors of species richness for ectothermic organisms—including insects, reptiles, and amphibians—whose metabolic rates and activity periods depend directly on ambient thermal conditions [17].

For endothermic vertebrates, the relationship between climate and richness is mediated by energy requirements and resource availability. Winter temperatures and seasonality strongly constrain the distributions of birds and mammals, with many groups showing sharp declines in species richness beyond certain climatic thresholds [18]. Water availability assumes particular importance in arid and semi-arid systems, where precipitation patterns determine primary productivity and the availability of free water for drinking [19].

Recent work in the Atlantic Forest biodiversity hotspot demonstrates that climate interacts with diversification history to determine contemporary richness patterns [3]. Using spatially explicit structural equation models, researchers found that climate exerted both direct negative effects on tetrapod species richness and indirect effects mediated through its influence on diversification rates. This finding supports integrated models in which ecological and evolutionary processes jointly determine diversity patterns, rather than operating as mutually exclusive alternatives [3].

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 [20]. At local scales, vegetation structure creates microclimatic variation and diverse foraging substrates that support distinct species assemblages. At landscape scales, topographic variation generates mosaics of habitat types that increase gamma diversity and promote speciation through population isolation.

The relationship between heterogeneity and diversity holds across taxonomic groups and ecosystems. In tropical forests, tree species diversity creates vertical stratification that supports distinct arthropod communities in the canopy, understory, and leaf litter [21]. In aquatic systems, habitat complexity provided by submerged vegetation, woody debris, or coral structure increases fish and macroinvertebrate diversity by providing refuge from predation and colonization surfaces [22]. Experimental manipulations confirm that adding structural complexity to simplified habitats increases species richness, demonstrating causal effects that complement correlative evidence.

3.3. Productivity and Trophic Interactions

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 [23]. 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 [24]. 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 both terrestrial and aquatic systems [25]. Herbivores similarly influence plant diversity by suppressing dominant species and creating colonization opportunities for subordinates. For hyperdiverse insect groups, 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 [26].

3.4. Evolutionary History and Speciation Rates

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 [27]. Phylogenetic approaches now enable researchers to disentangle these processes by reconstructing the timing and geography of diversification.

The concept of "cradles" and "museums" captures the distinction between regions where lineages originate and regions where they persist [28]. 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 [2]. The Atlantic Forest, for example, exhibits strong correlations between contemporary species richness and historical diversification rates, suggesting that speciation processes remain active in generating diversity [3].

Conversely, some species-rich regions function primarily as museums—areas where low extinction rates allowed lineages to accumulate over evolutionary time. Deep-sea habitats, tropical deep-time stable landscapes such as the Amazonian terra firme forests, and some Mediterranean-climate regions harbor relictual lineages that persisted while related groups went extinct elsewhere [29]. Distinguishing between cradle and museum dynamics has important conservation implications, as regions dominated by recent radiations may recover from disturbance differently than those harboring ancient, dispersal-limited lineages.

Table 2: Major Ecological Drivers of Insect and Animal Diversity

Ecological Driver	Mechanism of Influence	Spatial Scale	Representative Examples
Climate (temperature, water availability)	Physiological constraints on activity and survival; metabolic theory; productivity limitation	Regional to global	Reduced bee diversity in cold temperate regions; amphibian richness correlated with warm, wet conditions
Productivity (NPP, energy)	Resource base supporting consumer trophic levels; population size regulation	Regional	Positive productivity-richness relationships in birds and mammals; hump-shaped relationships in some plant communities
Habitat heterogeneity	Niche partitioning; refuge availability; isolation promoting speciation	Local to landscape	Increased arthropod diversity in structurally complex vegetation; topographic complexity predicting endemism
Disturbance regimes	Intermediate disturbance maintaining coexistence; patch dynamics	Local to landscape	Fire-maintained savanna biodiversity; flood regimes structuring riparian communities
Evolutionary history (speciation, extinction)	Regional species pool determination; lineage accumulation over time	Regional to global	High tropical diversity from both speciation and low extinction; montane "cradles and museums"

4. Anthropogenic Pressures and Conservation Challenges

4.1. Habitat Loss and Fragmentation

Land-use change represents the most pervasive direct driver of biodiversity decline globally [30]. Conversion of natural ecosystems to agriculture, urban areas, and infrastructure eliminates habitat for native species, while fragmentation of remaining habitats disrupts ecological processes, isolates populations, and increases edge effects. The 2019 IPBES Global Assessment documented that natural ecosystems have declined by 47% on average from estimated historical baselines, with particularly severe losses in tropical and subtropical grasslands, forests, and wetlands [30].

Tropical mountains exemplify the pressures facing biodiversity hotspots. On Mount Kilimanjaro, analysis of historical maps and satellite imagery combined with 1600 vegetation plots reveals that land-use change driven by population growth has been the primary direct driver of biodiversity loss between 1911 and 2022, with 75% of natural species per km² disappearing from the lower slopes [4]. Urban areas experienced faster population growth than rural areas, and land-cover changes were more pronounced in the lowlands than in the highlands, where protected areas and traditional agroforestry systems provided some mitigation [4].

The biological consequences of habitat loss extend beyond simple area effects. Fragmentation reduces population connectivity, limiting gene flow and increasing extinction risk for small, isolated populations [31]. Edge effects alter microclimate and species composition at habitat boundaries, with tropical forest fragments experiencing increased tree mortality, invasion by disturbance-adapted species, and declines of forest-interior specialists [32]. Time lags between habitat loss and species extinctions—"extinction debt"—mean that current species richness may overestimate the long-term persistence of populations in fragmented landscapes.

4.2. Climate Change

Climate change is increasingly recognized as a major threat to biodiversity, with effects already documented across terrestrial, freshwater, and marine systems [33]. Rising temperatures shift species' geographic ranges toward higher latitudes and elevations, alter phenology (timing of life-history events), 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 [34].

However, the relative importance of climate change compared to other drivers varies regionally and taxonomically. On Mount Kilimanjaro, climate change showed no apparent influence on observed biodiversity trends over the past century, in contrast to the dominant effects of land-use change [4]. This finding underscores the need for context-specific assessments rather than assuming climate change is universally the primary threat. In marine systems, ocean warming and acidification pose severe risks to coral reef ecosystems, with mass bleaching events increasing in frequency and intensity [35].

Species responses to climate change depend on their physiological tolerances, dispersal abilities, and the availability of suitable habitat in future climates. Interactions between climate change and habitat loss compound threats: fragmented populations may lack dispersal corridors to track shifting climatic zones, while climate-induced habitat degradation may interact with other stressors such as pollution or overexploitation [36].

4.3. Invasive Species, Pollution, and Overexploitation

Biological invasions alter community composition, disrupt ecological networks, and drive native species declines [37]. Invasive predators, competitors, and pathogens have contributed to numerous extinctions, particularly on islands and in freshwater systems where native species evolved in isolation. The rate of introductions has accelerated with globalization, and climate change may facilitate the establishment of invasive species in previously unsuitable regions [38].

Pollution impacts biodiversity through multiple pathways. Pesticides, particularly neonicotinoids and other systemic insecticides, have been implicated in declines of beneficial insects including pollinators and natural enemies of crop pests [39]. Agricultural runoff containing nutrients and sediments degrades freshwater habitats, while atmospheric nitrogen deposition alters plant community composition and favors nitrophilous species at the expense of native diversity [40]. Light pollution disrupts nocturnal insect behavior, with potential consequences for reproduction, navigation, and predation risk [8].

Overexploitation remains a significant threat for many vertebrate species. Unsustainable hunting for bushmeat has depleted mammal and bird populations across tropical forests, while the wildlife trade—both legal and illegal—threatens species from elephants and rhinos to tropical birds and reptiles [41]. For marine species, overfishing has driven population collapses, altered food webs, and degraded ecosystem functioning. The indirect effects of overexploitation can cascade through ecosystems: removal of large predators may release mesopredator populations, with consequent effects on their prey.

4.4. The Insect Decline Crisis

Mounting evidence indicates that insect populations are declining dramatically in many regions, with potentially severe consequences for ecosystem functioning [42]. Insects pollinate crops and wild plants, decompose organic matter, regulate pest populations, and provide food for insectivorous vertebrates. The loss of insect abundance and diversity thus threatens both ecosystem integrity and human well-being.

Documenting insect declines remains challenging due to limited baseline data, particularly for hyperdiverse "dark taxa" for which most species remain undescribed [1]. Long-term monitoring programs in Europe and North America have documented declines in butterfly, moth, and beetle abundance, but comparable data from tropical regions are sparse [43]. The drivers of insect decline likely include habitat loss, agricultural intensification, pesticide use, climate change, and light pollution, acting synergistically rather than in isolation.

The consequences of insect declines extend across trophic levels. Declines in aerial insect abundance correlate with population declines of insectivorous birds, while reduced insect pollination threatens plant reproduction and crop yields [44]. Because insects mediate critical ecosystem processes, their decline may trigger feedback loops that further degrade habitat quality and reduce ecosystem resilience.

Table 3: Conservation Threats and Strategic Responses

Threat Category	Affected Taxa	Geographic Hotspots	Conservation Strategies	Policy Instruments
Habitat loss and fragmentation	All taxa, particularly forest-dependent species, large vertebrates	Tropical deforestation fronts, biodiversity hotspots	Protected area expansion, corridor establishment, land-use planning, restoration	CBD, national forest policies, land-use regulations, REDD+
Climate change	Montane species, coral reefs, polar specialists, range-restricted endemics	Mountains, coral reefs, Arctic, Mediterranean-type ecosystems	Climate-smart conservation, assisted colonization, resilience enhancement	UNFCCC, Paris Agreement, national adaptation plans
Invasive species	Island endemics, freshwater species, insular biotas	Islands, freshwater systems, port cities	Biosecurity, early detection and rapid response, biological control	Convention on Biological Diversity, International Plant Protection Convention
Pollution (pesticides, nutrients, light)	Insects, aquatic organisms, pollinators	Agricultural regions, urban areas, freshwater systems	Integrated pest management, buffer zones, dark-sky reserves	Stockholm Convention, national pesticide regulations
Overexploitation and wildlife trade	Large mammals, birds, reptiles, marine fishes, timber species	Tropical forests, marine coastal zones, high-value species ranges	Community-based management, law enforcement, certification	CITES, fisheries management agreements, CBD sustainable use provisions

5. Integrated Conservation Frameworks and Policy Responses

5.1. Protected Areas and Area-Based Conservation

Protected areas remain the cornerstone of biodiversity conservation, currently covering approximately 17% of terrestrial and 8% of marine areas [45]. The Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework (GBF), adopted in 2022, sets an ambitious target—Target 3—to effectively conserve and manage at least 30% of terrestrial, inland water, and coastal and marine areas by 2030 through "protected areas and other effective area-based conservation measures" (OECMs) [5].

The recognition of OECMs alongside traditional protected areas expands the toolkit for area-based conservation. OECMs include territories governed by Indigenous peoples and local communities, privately protected areas, and areas managed for other purposes that deliver long-term biodiversity conservation [46]. Implementing OECMs requires robust legal and policy frameworks that ensure governance integrity, monitoring, and alignment with CBD criteria. Countries are adopting diverse approaches—binding ministerial instruments, national guidelines, administrative procedures, and sector-based recognition—reflecting existing legal traditions and governance arrangements [5].

However, expanding protected area coverage alone is insufficient. Protected areas must be effectively managed, adequately resourced, and located in areas of high biodiversity importance. Current protected area networks disproportionately represent remote, low-productivity lands while underrepresenting species-rich tropical lowlands and freshwater systems [47]. Furthermore, protected areas face increasing pressures from climate change, invasive species, and edge effects, requiring active management rather than passive protection.

5.2. Landscape-Scale and Ecosystem-Based Approaches

Conservation planning increasingly recognizes that protected areas cannot function in isolation. Landscape-scale approaches maintain connectivity, allow species movements in response to environmental change, and integrate conservation with sustainable land use in matrix habitats [48]. Ecological networks that link protected areas through corridors, stepping stones, and matrix management provide functional connectivity while supporting compatible human activities.

Ecosystem-based management extends this thinking to entire ecosystems, considering cumulative impacts, maintaining ecosystem processes, and adapting to change. In marine systems, ecosystem-based fisheries management accounts for species interactions, habitat requirements, and environmental variability rather than managing target species in isolation [49]. In terrestrial systems, ecosystem-based approaches maintain natural disturbance regimes, restore degraded habitats, and promote resilience to climate change.

The ecosystem approach, as articulated by the CBD, emphasizes adaptive management, decentralization to appropriate levels, and consideration of both ecological integrity and human well-being. This integrated perspective recognizes that biodiversity conservation cannot succeed without addressing the social and economic systems that drive habitat loss and resource exploitation.

5.3. International Biodiversity Governance

The Convention on Biological Diversity provides the primary international framework for biodiversity conservation, with near-universal membership spanning 195 countries and the European Union [6]. The Kunming-Montreal GBF represents the third strategic plan under the CBD, following the 2002-2010 Strategic Plan and the 2011-2020 Aichi Biodiversity Targets, both of which achieved limited success in implementation.

A notable innovation of the GBF is the inclusion of 18 "Considerations" that articulate principles guiding implementation [6]. These Considerations introduce ecocentric concepts including recognition of the Rights of Mother Earth and the Rights of Nature, challenging dominant anthropocentric perspectives that prioritize utilitarian views of nature. They also emphasize full and far-reaching participation, recognition of diverse worldviews and knowledge systems, and acknowledgment of rights, empowerment, and justice [6]. While previous biodiversity governance has been shaped by Western industrial norms, these Considerations open space for integrating Indigenous cosmologies and alternative value systems into conservation practice.

However, tensions remain between transformative aspirations and operational realities. Considerations focused on development practicalities maintain links to market-oriented approaches, while streamlining with existing agreements may limit transformative potential if overshadowed by mainstream policies [6]. Realizing the transformative potential of the GBF requires dedicated processes to advance its more innovative elements and genuine engagement with diverse knowledge systems.

5.4. Technological Tools in Biodiversity Monitoring

Effective conservation requires reliable data on biodiversity status and trends. Technological advances are transforming monitoring capabilities, addressing some of the knowledge gaps that have historically limited conservation planning [50]. DNA barcoding and metabarcoding enable rapid species identification from bulk samples, including the "dark taxa" that dominate insect diversity but remain poorly characterized taxonomically [1]. Environmental DNA (eDNA) from water, soil, or air samples allows detection of species presence without direct observation.

Remote sensing provides synoptic views of habitat condition, land-use change, and ecosystem productivity at spatial scales relevant to conservation planning. Satellite imagery tracks deforestation, fire regimes, and habitat fragmentation, while LiDAR and hyperspectral sensors characterize vegetation structure and composition. Integrating remote sensing with species distribution models enables prediction of climate change impacts and identification of priority areas for conservation.

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. However, citizen science data require careful validation and may exhibit geographic and taxonomic biases that must be addressed in analysis.

6. Future Research Directions

Despite centuries of study, fundamental knowledge gaps limit understanding of global biodiversity patterns and our ability to project future changes. Addressing these gaps represents a research priority with direct implications for conservation.

6.1. Data Gaps in Insect Diversity

The most critical data gap concerns hyperdiverse insect groups. The Linnean shortfall—the large number of undescribed species—and the Wallacean shortfall—the lack of geographic distribution data—are most severe for "dark taxa" comprising small-bodied species that dominate insect diversity [1]. These shortfalls are self-reinforcing: taxonomic neglect limits inclusion in biodiversity studies, while lack of data reinforces neglect [1]. Addressing these gaps requires integrated approaches combining standardized sampling, DNA barcoding, and taxonomic revision.

The finding that dominant insect families may not follow canonical latitudinal gradients [1] underscores the danger of extrapolating from well-studied taxa to hyperdiverse groups. If small-bodied insects exhibit different diversity patterns than vertebrates and plants, our understanding of global biodiversity—and the conservation priorities derived from it—may be substantially biased. Expanding sampling across geographic regions and taxonomic groups, with particular attention to tropical systems, represents an urgent priority.

6.2. Understudied Systems and Scales

Tropical freshwater systems, soil communities, and canopy arthropods remain dramatically understudied relative to their diversity and functional importance. Freshwater ecosystems support disproportionate biodiversity relative to their area but face intense pressures from water extraction, pollution, and habitat modification. Soil biota—including microarthropods, nematodes, and microbes—drive nutrient cycling and decomposition but remain poorly characterized taxonomically and functionally.

Spatial scale also matters. Most biodiversity studies operate at local or regional scales, yet the processes maintaining diversity operate across scales from local interactions to biogeographic history. Scaling up from plot-level measurements to continental-scale patterns, and scaling down global models to local conservation decisions, requires integrated approaches that bridge disciplines and methodologies.

6.3. Integrating Approaches and Engaging Communities

Future progress depends on integrating remote sensing, biodiversity modeling, and field validation. Remote sensing provides broad coverage but limited taxonomic resolution; field sampling provides detailed taxonomic data but limited spatial extent. Combining these approaches through stratified sampling designs and statistical modeling can leverage the strengths of each.

Community-based monitoring and participatory research engage local knowledge holders in biodiversity documentation while building capacity and fostering stewardship. Indigenous and local communities often possess detailed knowledge of species distributions, ecological interactions, and environmental change that complements scientific data. Integrating diverse knowledge systems requires respectful partnerships, recognition of intellectual property rights, and commitment to equitable benefit-sharing.

7. Conclusion

Global patterns of insect and animal diversity reflect the interplay of ecological and evolutionary processes operating across spatial and temporal scales. The latitudinal diversity gradient, while robust for many taxa, may not apply uniformly to hyperdiverse insect groups, challenging long-standing generalizations and highlighting critical knowledge gaps. Topographic complexity and climatic stability generate concentrations of endemism in tropical mountains, where distinct processes of speciation and persistence create "cradles and museums" that together account for exceptional biodiversity. Ecological drivers—climate, productivity, habitat heterogeneity, and disturbance—regulate species richness through effects on energy availability, niche partitioning, and coexistence, while evolutionary history determines the regional species pools upon which ecological processes act.

Anthropogenic pressures are driving rapid biodiversity loss, with land-use change representing the most pervasive threat, particularly in tropical regions where species richness is highest and endemism concentrated. Climate change, invasive species, pollution, and overexploitation compound these pressures, with insects experiencing substantial but poorly documented declines that threaten ecosystem functioning. International policy frameworks, particularly the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework, provide mechanisms for coordinated conservation action, but achieving transformative change requires addressing the social and economic drivers of biodiversity loss while respecting diverse worldviews and knowledge systems.

Addressing critical knowledge gaps—particularly concerning insect diversity in tropical systems, freshwater habitats, and soil communities—represents a research priority with direct conservation implications. Integrating technological advances in remote sensing and DNA-based monitoring with community-based approaches can expand monitoring capacity while fostering engagement and stewardship. The coming decade will determine whether the ambitious goals of the Global Biodiversity Framework can be realized, and whether the extraordinary diversity of insects and animals that characterizes our planet can be sustained for future generations.

8. References

1. 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
2. Sonne J, Dalsgaard B, Borregaard MK, Kennedy J, Fjeldsa J, Rahbek C. Biodiversity cradles and museums segregating within hotspots of endemism. 2025. Available from: https://m2.mtmt.hu/api/publication/33433576
3. 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.
4. Hemp A, Miyazawa Y, Hemp C. Gain and loss: human and environmental wellbeing – drivers of Kilimanjaro’s decreasing biodiversity. PLoS One. 2025;20(10):e0334184.
5. Biodiversity Law and Governance Initiative. Global lessons for policy and practice: advancing legal and policy frameworks for other effective area-based conservation measures (OECMs). 2026. Available from: https://www.biodiversitylawgovernance.org
6. Turnhout E, Purvis A. Pathways for transforming biodiversity governance: an examination of the Global Biodiversity Framework's considerations. Ambio. 2025. doi:10.1007/s13280-025-02215-8
7. Hillebrand H. On the generality of the latitudinal diversity gradient. Am Nat. 2004;163(2):192-211.

8. Wong MKL. A latitudinal gradient in the diel partitioning of species richness? bioRxiv. 2024. doi:10.1101/2024.05.20.594953
9. Rahbek C. The role of spatial scale and the perception of large-scale species-richness patterns. Ecol Lett. 2005;8(2):224-39.
10. McCain CM. Elevational gradients in diversity of small mammals. Ecology. 2005;86(2):366-72.
11. Noroozi J, Talebi A, Doostmohammadi M, Rumpf SB, Linder HP, Pirani O. Centers of endemism and areas of endemism in the Turkish flora. Front Ecol Evol. 2019;7:159.
12. Myers N, Mittermeier RA, Mittermeier CG, da Fonseca GAB, Kent J. Biodiversity hotspots for conservation priorities. Nature. 2000;403(6772):853-8.
13. Fjeldsa J, Lovett JC. Geographical patterns of old and young species in African forest biota: the significance of specific montane areas as evolutionary centres. Biodivers Conserv. 1997;6(3):325-46.
14. Briggs JC. The marine East Indies: centre of origin? Global Ecol Biogeogr. 2005;14(1):5-12.
15. Mittermeier RA, Turner WR, Larsen FW, Brooks TM, Gascon C. Global biodiversity conservation: the critical role of hotspots. In: Zachos FE, Habel JC, editors. Biodiversity hotspots. Berlin: Springer; 2011. p. 3-22.
16. 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.
17. Buckley LB, Jetz W. Environmental and historical constraints on global patterns of amphibian richness. Proc R Soc B. 2007;274(1614):1167-73.
18. Currie DJ. Energy and large-scale patterns of animal- and plant-species richness. Am Nat. 1991;137(1):27-49.
19. O'Brien EM. Water-energy dynamics, climate, and prediction of woody plant species richness: an interim general model. J Biogeogr. 1998;25(2):379-98.
20. 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.
21. 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.
22. Kovalenko KE, Thomaz SM, Warfe DM. Habitat complexity: approaches and future directions. Hydrobiologia. 2012;685(1):1-17.
23. 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.
24. Mittelbach GG, Steiner CF, Scheiner SM, Gross KL, Reynolds HL, Waide RB, *et al*. What is the observed relationship between species richness and productivity? Ecology. 2001;82(9):2381-96.
25. Paine RT. Food web complexity and species diversity. Am Nat. 1966;100(910):65-75.
26. 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.
27. W, Thomas GH, Joy JB, Hartmann K, Mooers AO. The global diversity of birds in space and time. Nature. 2012;491(7424):444-8.
28. Stebbins GL. Flowering plants: evolution above the species level. Cambridge: Harvard University Press; 1974.
29. Haffer J. Speciation in Amazonian forest birds. Science. 1969;165(3889):131-7.
30. Diaz SM, Settele J, Brondízio ES, Ngo HT, Guèze M, Agard J, *et al*. Pervasive human-driven decline of life on Earth points to the need for transformative change. Science. 2019;366(6471):eaax3100.
31. Hanski I. Habitat fragmentation and species extinction. In: Tilman D, Kareiva P, editors. Spatial ecology. Princeton: Princeton University Press; 1997. p. 101-21.
32. Laurance WF, Camargo JLC, Fearnside PM, Lovejoy TE, Williamson GB, Mesquita RCG, *et al*. The fate of Amazonian forest fragments: a 32-year investigation. Biol Conserv. 2011;144(1):56-67.
33. Parmesan C, Yohe G. A globally coherent fingerprint of climate change impacts across natural systems. Nature. 2003;421(6918):37-42.
34. Freeman BG, Class Freeman AM. Rapid upslope shifts in New Guinean birds illustrate strong distributional responses of tropical montane species to global warming. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A. 2014;111(12):4490-4.
35. Hughes TP, Anderson KD, Connolly SR, Heron SF, Kerry JT, Lough JM, *et al*. Spatial and temporal patterns of mass bleaching of corals in the Anthropocene. Science. 2018;359(6371):80-3.
36. Travis JMJ. Climate change and habitat destruction: a deadly anthropogenic cocktail. Proc R Soc B. 2003;270(1514):467-73.
37. Simberloff D, Martin JL, Genovesi P, Maris V, Wardle DA, Aronson J, *et al*. Impacts of biological invasions: what's what and the way forward. Trends Ecol Evol. 2013;28(1):58-66.
38. Bellard C, Genovesi P, Jeschke JM. Global patterns in threats to vertebrates by biological invasions. Proc R Soc B. 2016;283(1823):20152454.
39. Hallmann CA, Foppen RPB, van Turnhout CAM, de Kroon H, Jongejans E. Declines in insectivorous birds are associated with high neonicotinoid concentrations. Nature. 2014;511(7509):341-3.
40. Bobbink R, Hicks K, Galloway J, Spranger T, Alkemade R, Ashmore M, *et al*. Global assessment of nitrogen deposition effects on terrestrial plant diversity: a synthesis. Ecol Appl. 2010;20(1):30-59.
41. Maxwell SL, Fuller RA, Brooks TM, Watson JEM. The ravages of guns, nets and bulldozers. Nature. 2016;536(7615):143-5.
42. Hallmann CA, Sorg M, Jongejans E, Siepel H, Hofland N, Schwan H, *et al*. More than 75 percent decline over 27 years in total flying insect biomass in protected areas. PLoS One. 2017;12(10):e0185809.
43. Thomas JA, Telfer MG, Roy DB, Preston CD, Greenwood JJD, Asher J, *et al*. Comparative losses of British butterflies, birds, and plants and the global extinction crisis. Science. 2004;303(5665):1879-81.
44. Biesmeijer JC, Roberts SPM, Reemer M, Ohlemüller R, Edwards M, Peeters T, *et al*. Parallel declines in pollinators and insect-pollinated plants in Britain and the Netherlands. Science. 2006;313(5785):351-4.
45. UNEP-WCMC, IUCN. Protected Planet Report 2020. Cambridge: UNEP-WCMC and IUCN; 2021.

46. Convention on Biological Diversity. Decision 14/8. Protected areas and other effective area-based conservation measures. Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity; 2018.
47. Joppa LN, Pfaff A. High and far: biases in the location of protected areas. PLoS One. 2009;4(12):e8273.
48. Bennett G, Wit P. The development and application of ecological networks: a review of proposals, plans and programmes. Amsterdam: AIDEnvironment; 2001.
49. Pikitch EK, Santora C, Babcock EA, Bakun A, Bonfil R, Conover DO, *et al*. Ecosystem-based fishery management. Science. 2004;305(5682):346-7.
50. Bush A, Sollmann R, Wilting A, Bohmann K, Cole B, Balzter H, *et al*. Connecting Earth observation to high-throughput biodiversity data. Nat Ecol Evol. 2017;1(7):017.

How to Cite This Article

Kamau JM, Santos CAS. Global patterns of insect and animal diversity: ecological drivers, biogeographical mechanisms, and contemporary conservation challenges. International Journal of Insect and Animal Diversity Research. 2026;2(2):33–41.