Role of Insects and Animals in Maintaining Ecosystem Stability and Functional Diversity: Ecological Mechanisms, Trophic Interactions, and Conservation Implications

Fiona Margaret McKenzie
Department of Zoology, University of Otago, Dunedin, New Zealand

* Corresponding Author: **Fiona Margaret McKenzie**

Article Info

E-ISSN: 3107-6599
Volume: 02
Issue: 02
March-April 2026
Received: 14-01-2026
Accepted: 12-02-2026
Published: 10-03-2026
Page No: 42-49

Abstract
Ecosystem stability and resilience depend fundamentally on the functional diversity of insect and vertebrate communities. This review synthesizes current understanding of how animals sustain ecosystem functioning through pollination, seed dispersal, nutrient cycling, biological control, and trophic regulation. Insects, representing over 80% of animal species, dominate critical functions including decomposition, pollination, and energy flow through food webs. Vertebrates, while less speciose, provide complementary and often irreplaceable roles as ecosystem engineers, apex predators, and mobile links connecting disparate habitats. Functional diversity—the variety of ecological traits within communities—underpins ecosystem stability through three primary mechanisms: functional redundancy buffers against species loss, response diversity enables adaptation to environmental change, and food web complexity regulates population dynamics. Across terrestrial, freshwater, and marine ecosystems, insects and vertebrates contribute distinct but interacting functions: insects excel in micro-scale processing and rapid biomass turnover, whereas vertebrates' mediate landscape-scale processes and exert top-down control. Biodiversity loss threatens ecosystem functioning through trophic cascades, functional homogenization, and service collapse, with over 65% of functional diversity in some regions contributed by threatened species. Conservation must shift from species-centric approaches toward functional trait-based strategies that preserve ecological roles, maintain redundancy, and protect keystone functional groups across interconnected landscapes.

Keywords: Functional Diversity, Ecosystem Stability, Trophic Interactions, Pollination, Nutrient Cycling, Food Webs, Conservation

1. Introduction

The relationship between biodiversity and ecosystem functioning represents a central paradigm of modern ecology. Ecosystem stability—the capacity to maintain functioning despite disturbance—and resilience—the ability to recover after perturbation—depend critically on the diversity of species and the ecological roles they perform [4, 9]. While early biodiversity research focused primarily on species richness, contemporary understanding emphasizes that it is the functional traits of species, rather than their identities alone, that determine ecosystem properties [4].

Insects and vertebrates collectively drive Earth's biogeochemical processes and ecosystem dynamics. Insects comprise an estimated 5.5 million species, representing roughly 80% of all animal species and occupying virtually every terrestrial and freshwater habitat [1, 8]. Their small body sizes, high reproductive rates, and immense biomass position them as primary processors of energy and nutrients. Vertebrates, though numerically fewer, exert disproportionate influence through large body sizes, long life spans, and high trophic positions [3]. The 6,000+ mammal species alone range across eight orders of magnitude in body size, from blue whales to Etruscan shrews, enabling functions impossible for smaller organisms [3].

Research on biodiversity-ecosystem functioning has evolved from grassland plant experiments toward multi-trophic, cross-ecosystem frameworks. Foundational work established that diversity enhances productivity and stability [4], while recent advances incorporate functional trait approaches, network theory, and real-world extinction scenarios [9]. Critical insights include the recognition that functional redundancy provides insurance against species loss, that response diversity determines resilience to environmental change, and that trophic interactions mediate ecosystem-level outcomes [4, 9].

This review examines the ecological roles of insects and vertebrates in sustaining ecosystem stability with five specific objectives: (1) synthesize key functions including pollination, seed dispersal, nutrient cycling, and biological control; (2) analyze how functional diversity components contribute to stability; (3) compare contributions across terrestrial, freshwater, and marine ecosystems; (4) evaluate consequences of biodiversity loss for ecosystem functioning; and (5) assess conservation strategies for preserving functional diversity. By maintaining explicit comparison between insects and vertebrates throughout, this review aims to identify both complementary and irreplaceable roles essential for ecosystem integrity.

2. Ecological Roles of Insects and Vertebrates

2.1. Pollination and Plant Reproduction

Pollination represents one of the most critical ecosystem services, with an estimated 87.5% of flowering plant species requiring animal pollinators [8]. Insects dominate this function numerically: bees (40,000 species), butterflies and moths (19,000+), flies (14,000+), beetles (212,000+), and wasps contribute to global pollination networks [8]. Beetle pollination (cantharophily) represents the most primitive form, associated with ancient angiosperm lineages such as Magnolia, while bees have co-evolved with diverse plant families over millions of years [8].

Vertebrate pollinators, though fewer in number (approximately 1,200 species), provide essential services in specific ecosystems [8]. Bird pollination (ornithophily) involves specialized families including hummingbirds (New World), honeyeaters (Australia/New Zealand), sunbirds (Africa/Asia), and Hawaiian honeycreepers [8]. Bat pollination (chiropterophily) occurs throughout tropics, with both Old-World fruit bats and New World phyllostomid bats serving as primary pollinators [8]. Non-flying mammals including lemurs, honey possums, sugar gliders, and even giraffes contribute to pollination in restricted contexts [8]. These vertebrate pollinators often serve as "mobile links" connecting fragmented plant populations and maintaining gene flow across landscapes [3].

2.2. Seed Dispersal and Vegetation Dynamics

Seed dispersal determines plant population dynamics, community composition, and forest regeneration. Insects, particularly ants (myrmecochory), disperse seeds of thousands of plant species worldwide, moving seeds to nutrient-rich nests and providing protection from predators [3]. Dung beetles secondarily disperse seeds contained in mammal dung, contributing to seed survival and germination.

Vertebrates dominate seed dispersal in most ecosystems. Frugivorous birds, bats, primates, ungulates, and carnivores consume fruits and deposit seeds in new locations, often far from parent plants [3]. Large-bodied frugivores are irreplaceable: species such as elephants, tapirs, and large primates disperse large seeds that smaller dispersers cannot handle [3]. The decline of megafaunal frugivores has cascading effects on tree recruitment and forest carbon storage. Seed-predating rodents and primates also influence plant recruitment through complex interactions that can shift from predation to dispersal depending on context [3].

2.3. Nutrient Cycling and Decomposition

Nutrient cycling underpins ecosystem productivity, with insects playing dominant roles in decomposition and nutrient mineralization. Dung beetles, flies, and termites process vast quantities of organic matter, incorporating nutrients into soils and making them available for primary producers [1, 3]. In agricultural and urban environments, insects demonstrate remarkable capacity to bioconvert low-value organic waste into high-quality protein and lipid biomass, supporting circular economy processes while maintaining ecosystem function [6]. Their nutritional plasticity—the ability to utilize diverse substrates including agro-industrial waste—represents a crucial adaptive mechanism in human-altered landscapes [6].

Termites and ants function as ecosystem engineers, modifying soil structure, creating soil heterogeneity, and influencing water infiltration and nutrient availability [3]. Their bioturbation activities create microsites for plant establishment and maintain soil fertility over evolutionary timescales.

Vertebrates contribute to nutrient cycling through multiple pathways. Large herbivores consume primary production and return nutrients via urine and feces, creating spatial heterogeneity in nutrient availability [3]. Hippopotamuses transfer terrestrial nutrients into aquatic systems, while seabirds and piscivorous birds concentrate marine-derived nutrients in terrestrial environments through guano deposition [3]. Sea otters, through their effects on kelp forest ecosystems, indirectly influence nutrient dynamics and primary productivity [3].

2.4. Biological Control and Trophic Regulation

Predator-prey interactions regulate population dynamics and maintain ecosystem balance. Insects provide essential biological control services: predatory beetles, lacewings, hoverflies, parasitic wasps, and ants suppress herbivore populations in natural and agricultural systems [1]. A single acre of cropland may contain millions of predatory insects whose collective action prevents pest outbreaks.

Vertebrate predators exert top-down control with landscape-scale effects. Wolves, pumas, and sea otters initiate trophic cascades that propagate through entire ecosystems [3]. The reintroduction of wolves to Yellowstone National Park, for example, reduced elk populations, allowed riparian vegetation recovery, and altered channel morphology—demonstrating how apex predators shape ecosystem structure. Bats and birds consume enormous quantities of nocturnal and diurnal insects respectively, providing pest control services valued at billions of dollars annually [3]. Insectivores at intermediate trophic levels—shrews, lizards, frogs, and small mammals—regulate invertebrate populations and link primary production to higher predators. Their collective consumption represents a major energy flow pathway in terrestrial ecosystems.

Table 1: Key Ecological Functions of Insects in Ecosystems

Functional Role	Representative Taxa	Ecosystem Type	Ecological Outcome
Pollination	Bees (40,000 spp.), beetles (212,000+), butterflies/moths, flies	Terrestrial (all vegetated ecosystems)	Plant reproduction; genetic exchange; fruit/seed set
Decomposition	Dung beetles, termites, flies, cockroaches	Terrestrial, freshwater	Nutrient mineralization; soil formation; waste removal
Nutrient cycling	Ants, termites, dung beetles	Terrestrial	Soil bioturbation; enhanced soil fertility; microsite creation
Biological control	Predatory beetles, parasitic wasps, hoverflies, lacewings	Agricultural, forest, grassland	Herbivore suppression; crop protection; population regulation
Seed dispersal	Ants (myrmecochory), dung beetles	Forests, savannas, shrublands	Plant recruitment; vegetation dynamics; genetic connectivity
Aquatic subsidy	Chironomidae, Ephemeroptera, Trichoptera	Freshwater-riparian interfaces	Energy transfer to terrestrial predators; cross-ecosystem linkage

Table 2: Major Ecological Functions of Vertebrates

Functional Role	Representative Groups	Trophic Level	Ecosystem Impact
Pollination	Hummingbirds, sunbirds, honeyeaters, bats, lemurs	Nectarivores	Plant reproduction; genetic connectivity; specialized plant associations
Seed dispersal	Frugivorous birds, primates, bats, elephants, ungulates	Frugivores/herbivores	Forest regeneration; large seed dispersal; vegetation structure
Nutrient cycling	Large herbivores, seabirds, piscivorous birds, hippopotamus	Herbivores/piscivores	Nutrient translocation across ecosystems; soil fertilization; aquatic-terrestrial linkage
Apex predation	Wolves, pumas, sea otters, large sharks	Top predators	Trophic cascades; ecosystem regulation; prey population control
Mesopredation	Insectivorous birds, bats, shrews, lizards, frogs	Intermediate predators	Invertebrate regulation; energy flow to higher trophic levels
Ecosystem engineering	Beavers, elephants, prairie dogs, porcupines	Various	Habitat creation/modification; increased heterogeneity; biodiversity support

3.Functional Diversity and Ecosystem Stability

3.1. Functional Traits and Redundancy

Functional diversity encompasses the range, distribution, and abundance of functional traits within ecological communities [4]. Traits such as body size, diet, foraging strategy, habitat use, and life history determine species' ecological roles. Communities with high functional diversity occupy greater niche space and utilize resources more completely than functionally depauperate communities [4].

Functional redundancy—multiple species performing similar ecological roles—provides critical insurance against biodiversity loss [9]. When multiple species share functional traits, the loss of any single species may be compensated by others. Recent analyses of global bird communities reveal that land-use change systematically reduces functional redundancy, removing the "slack" that buffers ecosystems against perturbation [9]. Even when species richness remains relatively high, declining redundancy leaves ecosystems vulnerable to future environmental shocks [9].

The relationship between species richness and functional diversity is not linear: some species contribute unique functions while others are functionally redundant. Identifying species with high functional uniqueness—those contributing rare or irreplaceable ecological roles—represents a conservation priority [4].

3.2. Food Web Complexity and Network Stability

Food webs describe the network of trophic interactions linking species within ecosystems. Insects dominate these networks numerically: analysis of 95 insect-dominated food webs reveals that insects occupy virtually all trophic levels and functional roles, from primary consumers to top predators [5]. In many habitats, insect taxa function as top predators even after vertebrates are considered [5].

Food web structure influences ecosystem stability through several mechanisms. Connectance—the proportion of possible trophic links realized—affects how perturbations propagate through networks. Omnivory, where species feed at multiple trophic levels, can stabilize or destabilize dynamics depending on context [5]. Long food chains, often supported by insect diversity, create pathways for energy flow from primary production to top predators.

Cross-ecosystem subsidies illustrate the interconnectedness of food webs. Emerging aquatic insects, particularly non-biting midges (Chironomidae), subsidize terrestrial predators including riparian spiders [10]. This aquatic-terrestrial linkage transfers high-quality nutrients across ecosystem boundaries, supporting predator populations far from water sources. Disruption of these subsidies—through pollution, flow alteration, or insecticide application—can propagate through terrestrial food webs [10].

3.3. Response Diversity and Resilience

Response diversity—the variety of responses to environmental change among species performing similar functions—determines ecosystem resilience [4]. When species within a functional group differ in their sensitivity to disturbance, environmental change may eliminate some while others persist, maintaining ecosystem function.

Functional traits mediate response diversity: species with broader environmental tolerances, greater dispersal capacity, and higher phenotypic plasticity exhibit greater resilience to perturbation [6]. Insects demonstrate remarkable nutritional plasticity enabling persistence in human-altered environments, including the capacity to utilize novel food sources such as agricultural and urban waste [6]. This flexibility, often mediated by symbiotic gut microbiota, allows insects to maintain functional roles even as natural habitats transform.

Conversely, specialized species with narrow environmental requirements contribute to response diversity precisely because their sensitivity to different stressors differs from generalists. Preserving response diversity requires maintaining both sensitive specialists and tolerant generalists within functional groups.

Table 3: Functional Diversity Components and Their Contribution to Ecosystem Stability

Functional Component	Definition	Mechanism of Stability	Example Ecosystems	Ecological Significance
Functional richness	Volume of niche space occupied	Resource use complementarity; efficient exploitation	Tropical forests (high), tundra (low)	Complete resource utilization; niche partitioning
Functional redundancy	Multiple species sharing functional traits	Insurance against species loss; compensation after disturbance	Temperate grasslands, coral reefs	Buffering capacity; resilience to extinction
Response diversity	Variation in responses to environmental change among functionally similar species	Differential survival under perturbation; maintained function	Fire-prone shrublands, variable climates	Ecosystem resilience; adaptation capacity
Functional uniqueness	Degree to which species contributes rare functions	Irreplaceable ecological roles; specialized interactions	Islands, ancient lakes, refugia	Conservation priority; functional vulnerability
Functional evenness	Regularity of trait distribution in niche space	Efficient resource use; reduced competition	Undisturbed habitats	Community stability; competitive coexistence
Functional divergence	Extent of trait differentiation	Reduced competition; niche complementarity	Species-rich communities	Enhanced ecosystem functioning

4. Ecosystem-Specific Contributions

4.1. Terrestrial Ecosystems

Terrestrial ecosystems host the majority of described biodiversity and exhibit the highest functional diversity. Insects dominate terrestrial functioning through pollination, decomposition, herbivory, and predation. The estimated 4–6 million insect species in tropical forests alone process the majority of primary production and maintain nutrient cycles [1]. Dung beetles alone, with over 7,000 species worldwide, process mammalian dung across all terrestrial biomes, simultaneously aerating soil, dispersing seeds, and reducing parasite loads [3].

Large mammals provide functions impossible for insects. African elephants modify woodland-savanna boundaries, create water holes used by other species, and disperse seeds over vast distances [3]. American beavers engineer entire watersheds, creating wetland habitats that support diverse communities [3]. Prairie dogs maintain grassland heterogeneity through burrowing and grazing, supporting specialist species that depend on their engineered habitats [3].

Birds connect terrestrial ecosystem functions across scales. Frugivorous and nectarivorous birds maintain genetic connectivity for plants across fragmented landscapes, while insectivorous birds regulate herbivore populations and raptors control vertebrate prey [3, 9]. The loss of bird functional diversity, documented globally, threatens pollination, seed dispersal, and pest control services essential for ecosystem integrity [9].

4.2. Freshwater Systems

Freshwater ecosystems, despite covering <1% of Earth's surface, harbor disproportionate functional diversity. Aquatic insects—mayflies, stoneflies, caddisflies, dragonflies, and true flies—dominate freshwater functioning through algal grazing, leaf litter processing, and predation [1, 10]. Their complex life cycles, with aquatic larvae and terrestrial adults, link freshwater and terrestrial ecosystems.

The emergence of aquatic insects provides critical subsidies to terrestrial predators. Riparian spiders, birds, and bats depend on this seasonal pulse of high-quality prey [10]. Stable isotope analyses demonstrate that terrestrial predators derive substantial nutrition from aquatic sources, and disruption of aquatic insect emergence propagates through terrestrial food webs [10].

Vertebrates in freshwater systems include fish, amphibians, reptiles, and mammals, each contributing unique functions. Fish regulate aquatic food webs through size-selective predation, while beavers create and maintain wetland habitats. Amphibians, with biphasic life cycles, link aquatic and terrestrial nutrient cycles and regulate invertebrate populations in both environments.

4.3. Marine Environments

Marine ecosystems encompass the largest habitable space on Earth and support distinct functional assemblages. Marine vertebrates—sharks, rays, bony fishes, marine mammals, and sea turtles—play dominant functional roles due to large body sizes and high mobility [7].

Recent functional biogeography of Atlantic Ocean reefs reveals that marine vertebrates deliver diverse ecosystem functions including predation, herbivory, nutrient cycling, and habitat modification [7]. Sharks, rays, and bony fishes overlap substantially in functional space (30.94%), suggesting some functional redundancy among these groups. Sea turtles overlap primarily with bony fishes, contributing to seagrass and algal regulation [7].

Importantly, functional richness peaks in the Caribbean—a "functional hotspot"—while functional uniqueness and specialization show different geographical patterns [7]. The loss of mesopredator species, which constitute 20.1% of threatened species, would impact functional diversity more severely than the loss of large-bodied sharks, highlighting the need for nuanced conservation prioritization [7].

Table 4: Comparative Contributions of Insects and Vertebrates Across Ecosystem Types

Ecosystem Type	Insect Contributions	Vertebrate Contributions	Dominant Ecological Processes	Stability Indicators
Terrestrial	Pollination (bees, beetles, flies); decomposition (dung beetles, termites); herbivory; biological control	Seed dispersal (frugivores); herbivory (ungulates); apex predation (carnivores); ecosystem engineering (beavers, elephants)	Primary production regulation; nutrient cycling; vegetation dynamics	Functional redundancy [9]; trophic structure integrity
Freshwater	Leaf litter processing (shredders); algal grazing (scrapers); predation; aquatic-terrestrial subsidy (emergence) [10]	Trophic regulation (fish); habitat creation (beavers); amphibian-mediated nutrient cycling	Organic matter decomposition; energy flow to terrestrial systems; water quality maintenance	Aquatic insect diversity; emergence phenology [10]
Marine	Minor direct roles; zooplankton (crustaceans, not insects) provide analogous functions	Top-down control (sharks); herbivory (parrotfish, surgeonfish); nutrient cycling (marine mammals); habitat modification	Trophic cascades; reef maintenance; nutrient translocation	Functional richness [7]; mesopredator diversity [7]
Riparian interfaces	Aquatic insect emergence subsidizing terrestrial predators [10]; oviposition sites	Piscivorous birds concentrating nutrients; amphibian life cycle completion	Cross-ecosystem energy flow; nutrient transfer	Stable isotope ratios; predator trophic position [10]
Island ecosystems	Endemic pollination syndromes; high specialization	Seabird nutrient concentration; endemic frugivore-plant mutualisms	Unique co-evolutionary relationships; nutrient import from marine systems	Functional uniqueness; network connectance

5. Consequences of Biodiversity Loss

5.1. Collapse of Ecosystem Services

Biodiversity loss directly compromises ecosystem services essential for human well-being. Insect declines averaging 40–50% in abundance threaten pollination, decomposition, and pest control services valued at hundreds of billions of dollars annually [1]. When functionally important species are lost, service provision declines even if total species richness remains relatively stable [4].

Pollination services exemplify this vulnerability. As both insect and vertebrate pollinators decline, plant reproduction faces dual threats: reduced pollen quantity and quality, and disrupted plant-pollinator networks that can unravel through co-extinction cascades. Crops dependent on animal pollination face yield declines with economic consequences for food security.

5.2. Trophic Cascades

Removal of top predators initiates trophic cascades that reorganize entire ecosystems. The loss of apex predators releases mesopredator and herbivore populations, leading to overgrazing, reduced plant regeneration, and altered ecosystem structure [3]. Marine systems demonstrate similar patterns: overfishing of predatory fish releases invertebrate prey, reducing kelp forest extent and associated biodiversity [7].

Mesopredator loss, while less studied, also threatens functional diversity. In Atlantic reefs, mesopredator extinction would cause up to 94% functional loss in vertebrate assemblages, exceeding impacts of large predator loss [7]. These finding challenges assumption that large-bodied species are always functionally irreplaceable.

5.3. Functional Homogenization

As specialized species decline and generalists persist or expand, ecological communities become functionally homogenized [9]. In disturbed habitats, disturbance-tolerant species occupying similar ecological niches dominate, while functionally unique species are lost. This homogenization reduces the range of ecological roles performed, simplifying ecosystem processes and reducing resilience.

Global bird studies reveal that land-use change systematically reduces functional diversity even when species richness remains relatively high [9]. Degraded ecosystems may appear diverse but lack functional depth, leaving them vulnerable to future shocks. This pattern holds across tropical forests, temperate woodlands, and urban landscapes, suggesting a universal response to anthropogenic modification.

5.4. Climate Change Interactions

Climate change interacts synergistically with biodiversity loss, amplifying functional consequences. Species already stressed by habitat loss face additional physiological challenges from warming, drought, and extreme events. Species with narrow thermal tolerances—particularly tropical ectotherms—may lose functional roles before direct extinction if they become too rare to perform ecosystem functions [4].

Functional traits determine climate vulnerability: species with limited dispersal capacity cannot track shifting climate envelopes; those with specialized diets cannot switch resources; those with narrow thermal tolerances cannot acclimate. The loss of response diversity reduces ecosystem capacity to reorganize under climate change, potentially triggering functional collapse [4].

Table 5: Impacts of Biodiversity Loss on Ecosystem Functioning

Type of Biodiversity Loss	Affected Functional Group	Ecosystem Consequences	Geographic Examples	Management Responses
Pollinator declines	Bees, butterflies, birds, bats	Reduced plant reproduction; crop yield declines; altered plant communities	Global, most severe in agricultural landscapes	Pollinator habitat restoration; pesticide reduction; diverse floral resources
Apex predator extirpation	Large carnivores, sharks	Trophic cascades; mesopredator release; herbivore overpopulation	Yellowstone (wolves); marine protected areas	Predator reintroduction; harvest regulation; protected area expansion
Mesopredator loss	Intermediate predators	Functional diversity loss (up to 94% in some assemblages) [7]	Atlantic Ocean reefs [7]; fragmented forests	Functional group protection; connectivity maintenance
Ecosystem engineer decline	Beavers, elephants, prairie dogs	Habitat loss for dependent species; reduced heterogeneity; simplified ecosystems	North American wetlands; African savannas; grasslands	Engineer reintroduction; habitat protection; process-based management
Functional homogenization	Multiple functional groups	Reduced response diversity; decreased resilience; simplified food webs [9]	Global, across all human-modified landscapes [9]	Landscape heterogeneity; functional diversity monitoring
Aquatic subsidy disruption	Emerging aquatic insects [10]	Reduced prey for riparian predators; altered food webs	Freshwater-riparian interfaces globally	Riparian buffer protection; water quality management; flow regime maintenance

6. Conservation and Management Strategies

6.1. Ecosystem-Based Management

Ecosystem-based management recognizes that maintaining functioning requires preserving processes, not just species. Strategies include protecting habitat extent and quality, maintaining natural disturbance regimes, and preserving connectivity that supports functional group interactions. For insects, this means maintaining microhabitat heterogeneity, native vegetation, and reduced pesticide inputs [1].

Marine ecosystem management requires protecting functional groups across trophic levels. The disproportionate impact of mesopredator loss on functional diversity [7] suggests that conservation should target both charismatic large species and functionally critical smaller species.

6.2. Habitat Restoration

Restoration ecology increasingly targets functional recovery, not just species lists. Restoring pollination function requires establishing diverse floral resources and nesting substrates; restoring decomposition requires maintaining detritivore populations and organic inputs; restoring trophic regulation requires rebuilding predator populations and prey bases.

Riparian restoration particularly benefits from considering aquatic-terrestrial linkages. Maintaining vegetation that supports emerging aquatic insects and riparian predators preserves cross-ecosystem subsidies [10]. Buffer strips along watercourses protect both aquatic insect habitat and terrestrial predator foraging areas.

6.3. Landscape Connectivity

Connectivity enables species movement and functional group persistence across fragmented landscapes. For insects, connectivity requires habitat corridors at fine scales—hedgerows, field margins, and vegetated waterways that allow dispersal. For vertebrates, connectivity requires landscape-scale corridors connecting protected areas and allowing seasonal movements [3].

Connectivity planning increasingly incorporates climate considerations, aiming to facilitate range shifts as species track suitable conditions. Corridor design should anticipate future habitat distributions and maintain links across elevational and latitudinal gradients.

6.4. Protection of Keystone and Functional Species

While functional redundancy provides insurance, some species perform unique or irreplaceable roles. Large-bodied frugivores disperse seeds no other species can handle; beavers create wetlands no other species can maintain; apex predators initiate cascades no mesopredator can replicate. Protecting these functionally unique species preserves ecosystem processes that cannot be compensated [3].

Functional distinctiveness—the degree to which a species contributes unique traits—represents a prioritization criterion complementary to traditional endangerment and endemism metrics. Species with high functional uniqueness and high extinction risk deserve urgent conservation attention [4].

6.5. Policy Integration and Biodiversity Governance

International policy frameworks increasingly recognize functional diversity as a conservation target. The Global Biodiversity Framework includes implicit goals for maintaining ecosystem functioning, though explicit functional targets remain underdeveloped. National biodiversity strategies should incorporate functional monitoring alongside species inventories.

Agricultural policy significantly influences functional diversity through land-use decisions. Agri-environment schemes that support diverse farming systems, maintain semi-natural habitats, and reduce chemical inputs preserve insect functional diversity while supporting crop production [1].

6.6. Future Research Directions

Trait-based ecological research represents a priority for understanding functional diversity. Comprehensive trait databases for insects remain incomplete, limiting functional analyses for the most diverse animal group. Expanding trait coverage across understudied taxa and regions would enable global functional assessments comparable to those available for vertebrates [4, 9].

Long-term ecosystem monitoring must incorporate functional metrics alongside species counts. Current monitoring emphasizes species presence/absence, but functional indicators—trophic level distributions, body size spectra, dietary guild composition—provide earlier warning of ecosystem degradation [9]. Standardized protocols for functional monitoring would enable cross-ecosystem comparisons.

Integrating functional metrics into conservation planning requires translating functional importance into prioritization frameworks. While species richness guides many conservation decisions, protecting functional diversity may require different area selections and management approaches. Spatial conservation planning should consider functional complementarity and uniqueness [4].

Cross-ecosystem comparative studies remain rare but essential for understanding general principles. The study of aquatic-terrestrial subsidies [10], marine-vertebrate functional biogeography [7], and global bird functional diversity [9] exemplify the insights gained from broad-scale, multi-system approaches. Expanding such comparisons across taxa and ecosystems would test the generality of functional diversity-stability relationships.

7. Conclusion

Insects and vertebrates together maintain ecosystem stability through complementary and interacting functional roles. Insects dominate micro-scale processes—pollination, decomposition, nutrient cycling, and biological control—processing the majority of energy and materials that flow through ecosystems. Vertebrates exert landscape-scale influences through trophic cascades, seed dispersal, and ecosystem engineering, creating and maintaining habitat heterogeneity that supports biodiversity. Functional diversity—the variety of ecological traits within communities—underpins stability through redundancy (insurance against loss), response diversity (resilience to change), and food web complexity (regulatory feedbacks). Across terrestrial, freshwater, and marine ecosystems, distinct functional assemblages have evolved that reflect environmental constraints and opportunities. Biodiversity loss threatens these systems through service collapse, trophic cascades, functional homogenization, and reduced resilience to climate change. Conservation must evolve from species-centric approaches toward functional strategies that preserve ecological roles, maintain redundancy, protect keystone functional groups, and restore processes across interconnected landscapes. The functional diversity of insects and vertebrates represents not merely an academic interest but the living machinery upon which ecosystem integrity—and ultimately human well-being—depends.

References

1. Farooq M, Khan U, Adnan M, *et al*. Global decline of aquatic and terrestrial insects driven by climate change and anthropogenic impacts: the interaction of multiple stressors and disruption of niche conservatism. Biol Conserv. 2025:111181.
2. Lacher TE, Davidson AD, Fleming TH, *et al*. The functional roles of mammals in ecosystems. J Mammal. 2019;100(3):942-64.
3. González-Maya JF, Vela-Vargas IM, Ceballos G. Ecosystem functional meltdown through biological annihilation in the world's ecoregions. Perspect Ecol Conserv. 2025;23(3):157-64.
4. Weeks TL, Tobias JA, Edwards DP, *et al*. Land-use change undermines the stability of avian functional diversity. Nature. 2025.
5. Waechter LS, Luiz OJ, Leprieur F, *et al*. Functional biogeography of marine vertebrates in Atlantic Ocean reefs. Divers Distrib. 2022;28(8):1680-93.
6. Nabhan GP, Buchmann SL. Services provided by pollinators. In: Daily GC, editor. Nature's services: societal dependence on natural ecosystems. Washington, DC: Island Press; 1997. p. 133-50.
7. Nutritional plasticity, waste bioconversion, and insect detoxification in the Anthropocene. Insects. 2025;16(9):915.
8. Schoenly K, Beaver RA, Heumier TA. On the trophic relations of insects: a food-web approach. Am Nat. 1991;137:597-638.
9. Schowalter TD. Insect ecology: an ecosystem approach. 5th ed. London: Academic Press; 2022.
10. Kolbenschlag S, Brühl CA, Entling MH, *et al*. Impact across ecosystem boundaries – does Bti application change quality and composition of the diet of riparian spiders? Sci Total Environ. 2023:162351.
11. Wilson EO. The diversity of life. Cambridge: Harvard University Press; 1992.
12. Daily GC, editor. Nature's services: societal dependence on natural ecosystems. Washington, DC: Island Press; 1997.
13. Klein AM, Vaissière BE, Cane JH, *et al*. Importance of pollinators in changing landscapes for world crops. Proc R Soc B. 2007;274(1608):303-13.
14. Kremen C. Managing ecosystem services: what do we need to know about their ecology? Ecol Lett. 2005;8(5):468-79.
15. Cardinale BJ, Duffy JE, Gonzalez A, *et al*. Biodiversity loss and its impact on humanity. Nature. 2012;486(7401):59-67.
16. Hooper DU, Chapin FS, Ewel JJ, *et al*. Effects of biodiversity on ecosystem functioning: a consensus of current knowledge. Ecol Monogr. 2005;75(1):3-35.
17. Tilman D, Reich PB, Knops JMH. Biodiversity and ecosystem stability in a decade-long grassland experiment. Nature. 2006;441(7093):629-32.
18. Díaz S, Cabido M. Vive la différence: plant functional diversity matters to ecosystem processes. Trends Ecol Evol. 2001;16(11):646-55.
19. Elmqvist T, Folke C, Nyström M, *et al*. Response diversity, ecosystem change, and resilience. Front Ecol Environ. 2003;1(9):488-94.
20. Petchey OL, Gaston KJ. Functional diversity (FD), species richness and community composition. Ecol Lett. 2002;5(3):402-11.
21. Flynn DFB, Mirotchnick N, Jain M, *et al*. Functional and phylogenetic diversity as predictors of biodiversity–ecosystem-function relationships. Ecology. 2011;92(8):1573-81.
22. Luck GW, Daily GC, Ehrlich PR. Population diversity and ecosystem services. Trends Ecol Evol. 2003;18(7):331-6.
23. Sekercioglu CH. Increasing awareness of avian ecological function. Trends Ecol Evol. 2006;21(8):464-71.
24. Fleming TH, Kress WJ. The ornaments of life: coevolution and conservation in the tropics. Chicago: University of Chicago Press; 2013.
25. Dirzo R, Young HS, Galetti M, *et al*. Defaunation in the Anthropocene. Science. 2014;345(6195):401-6.

26. Estes JA, Terborgh J, Brashares JS, *et al*. Trophic downgrading of planet Earth. Science. 2011;333(6040):301-6.
27. Ripple WJ, Estes JA, Beschta RL, *et al*. Status and ecological effects of the world's largest carnivores. Science. 2014;343(6167):1241484.
28. Nichols E, Spector S, Louzada J, *et al*. Ecological functions and ecosystem services provided by Scarabaeinae dung beetles. Biol Conserv. 2008;141(6):1461-74.
29. Griffiths HM, Louzada J, Bardgett RD, *et al*. Dung beetle communities structure tropical forest regeneration. Ecology. 2016;97(12):3372-83.
30. Howe HF, Smallwood J. Ecology of seed dispersal. Annu Rev Ecol Syst. 1982;13:201-28.
31. Reid JL, Holl KD, Zahawi RA. Seed dispersal limitations shift over time in tropical forest restoration. Ecol Appl. 2015;25(4):1072-82.
32. Lundberg J, Moberg F. Mobile link organisms and ecosystem functioning: implications for ecosystem resilience and management. Ecosystems. 2003;6(1):87-98.
33. Loreau M, Mouquet N, Gonzalez A. Biodiversity as spatial insurance in heterogeneous landscapes. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A. 2003;100(22):12765-70.
34. Isbell F, Craven D, Connolly J, *et al*. Biodiversity increases the resistance of ecosystem productivity to climate extremes. Nature. 2015;526(7574):574-7.
35. Oliver TH, Heard MS, Isaac NJB, *et al*. Biodiversity and resilience of ecosystem functions. Trends Ecol Evol. 2015;30(11):673-84.

How to Cite This Article

McKenzie FM. Role of insects and animals in maintaining ecosystem stability and functional diversity: ecological mechanisms, trophic interactions, and conservation implications. International Journal of Insect and Animal Diversity Research. 2026;2(2):42–49.

Creative Commons (CC) License