



Role of Habitat Fragmentation in Shaping Insect and Animal Diversity Patterns

Rahul Sharma ^{1*}, Priya Nair ², Ankit Verma ³, Sunita Rao ⁴

¹ Department of Ecology and Environmental Sciences, University of Delhi, India

² Centre for Biodiversity Research, Bengaluru, India

³ Wildlife Institute of India, Dehradun, India

* Corresponding Author: **Rahul Sharma**

Article Info

ISSN (online): 3107-6599

Volume: 01

Issue: 06

November - December 2025

Received: 12-10-2025

Accepted: 10-11-2025

Published: 08-12-2025

Page No: 23-26

Abstract

Background: Habitat fragmentation is among the foremost drivers of global biodiversity loss, disrupting ecological networks and isolating populations across terrestrial and aquatic landscapes.

Objective: This study investigates the mechanistic relationships between habitat fragmentation and diversity patterns in insects and vertebrate animals, evaluating connectivity metrics and population trends across fragmented and intact landscapes in central India.

Methods: Field surveys were conducted across 14 study sites (seven fragmented, seven connected) using standardized transect sampling, pitfall trapping, and mark-recapture protocols. Landscape metrics were quantified using GIS-based patch analysis and remote sensing imagery. Shannon diversity indices (H'), species richness (S), habitat connectivity indices, and mean patch area were computed for comparative analysis.

Results: Fragmented habitats exhibited significantly lower Shannon diversity indices (mean $H' = 1.1 \pm 0.3$) compared to connected habitats ($H' = 2.8 \pm 0.4$). Species richness declined by 48–67% in patches smaller than 20 ha. Insect abundance showed the steepest reductions (up to 72%), followed by small mammals (54%) and reptiles (41%). Connectivity indices below 0.35 were consistently associated with negative population trends.

Conclusion: Habitat fragmentation profoundly restructures biodiversity at landscape scales. Strategic corridor establishment, edge mitigation, and minimum viable area thresholds are critical conservation levers requiring urgent policy integration.

Keywords: Biodiversity loss, ecological connectivity, landscape fragmentation, species richness, conservation corridors, edge effects, island biogeography

1. Introduction

Habitat fragmentation — the process by which large, continuous habitats are divided into smaller, isolated patches — represents one of the most pervasive threats to global biodiversity ^[1]. Driven largely by agricultural expansion, urban sprawl, road construction, and industrial development, fragmentation has dramatically altered landscape structure across all biomes ^[2]. The consequences extend far beyond simple habitat loss; fragmentation introduces a suite of ecological stressors including edge effects, reduced patch size, increased isolation, and disruption of gene flow ^[3].

Insects and animals are particularly sensitive to fragmentation because they require adequate habitat area for foraging, reproduction, and thermoregulation ^[4]. Insects, which constitute the majority of terrestrial animal biomass and provide essential ecosystem services such as pollination, decomposition, and food web support, have experienced precipitous global declines correlated with landscape simplification ^[5]. Similarly, vertebrate populations in fragmented landscapes exhibit elevated

extinction debts — a temporal lag between habitat loss and actual species disappearance [6].

India, home to four global biodiversity hotspots, offers a compelling study system given its rapid land-use transformation over the past four decades [7]. The Western Ghats, Northeastern forests, and Deccan Plateau represent landscapes where fragmentation effects can be rigorously evaluated. This study addresses a critical knowledge gap by quantifying diversity patterns across a fragmentation gradient, linking landscape-level metrics to species-level outcomes for insects and vertebrates simultaneously [8].

2. Related Work

MacArthur and Wilson's Theory of Island Biogeography established foundational predictions about the relationship between habitat area and species richness [9]. Subsequent empirical work has refined these predictions for terrestrial habitat islands. Fahrig [10] conducted a landmark meta-analysis demonstrating that while habitat loss drives most biodiversity decline, fragmentation per se exerts additional, independent negative effects — particularly on area-sensitive and dispersal-limited species.

Research on tropical forest fragments in the Amazon (the Biological Dynamics of Forest Fragments Project) documented cascading ecological effects over decades, including altered microclimates, increased tree mortality near edges, and collapse of vertebrate communities [11]. Parallel studies in European agricultural landscapes showed that landscape connectivity maintained by hedgerows and field margins was critical for sustaining carabid beetle and butterfly metapopulations [12].

Insect decline literature has increasingly implicated fragmentation alongside pesticides and climate change [13]. Hallmann *et al.* [14] documented a 75% reduction in flying insect biomass over 27 years in protected German habitats surrounded by fragmented agricultural matrices, highlighting that even nominally protected areas are not immune. For mammals, Cushman *et al.* [15] demonstrated that connectivity modeling effectively predicts gene flow barriers created by fragmented corridors.

Despite extensive literature, comparative studies simultaneously measuring insect and vertebrate responses to fragmentation across a standardized connectivity gradient in South Asian biodiversity hotspots remain scarce, motivating the present investigation [16].

3. Habitat Fragmentation Framework

3.1. Conceptual Foundations

Habitat fragmentation encompasses four interrelated processes: habitat loss (reduction in total habitat quantity), habitat subdivision (division of remaining habitat), isolation (increased inter-patch distances), and edge creation (increase in habitat boundary relative to interior). Each process operates at different spatial and temporal scales, producing complex, nonlinear effects on biodiversity.

3.2. Mechanisms of Biodiversity Loss

Three principal mechanisms drive diversity loss in fragmented landscapes. First, small patch effects operate through demographic stochasticity and Allee effects — isolated populations fall below minimum viable sizes and experience disproportionately high extinction rates. Second, edge effects alter abiotic conditions (temperature, humidity, wind exposure) and biotic interactions (predation rates, nest

parasitism) within 50–200 m of patch boundaries, effectively reducing usable interior habitat. Third, dispersal limitation prevents recolonization following local extinctions, severing the rescue effect that sustains metapopulations in naturally patchy systems [17].

3.3. Ecological Connectivity

Connectivity encompasses structural connectivity (physical landscape configuration) and functional connectivity (realized movement of organisms). Both dimensions interact to determine whether fragmentation translates into population isolation. Corridors — linear strips of suitable habitat linking fragments — are widely promoted as conservation tools, though their effectiveness depends on organism-specific movement behaviors, corridor width, and matrix permeability.

4. Materials and Methods

4.1. Study Sites

Fourteen sites were selected across the Satpura landscape, Madhya Pradesh, India (21.5°–23.2°N, 77.8°–80.4°E), spanning a fragmentation gradient from continuous forest to heavily fragmented agricultural-forest mosaics. Seven sites were classified as connected (connectivity index > 0.65; mean patch area > 150 ha) and seven as fragmented (connectivity index < 0.35; mean patch area < 20 ha). Sites were matched for biogeographic region, altitude (400–750 m asl), and dominant vegetation type (dry deciduous forest).

4.2. Biological Surveys

Insect sampling used pitfall traps ($n = 20$ per site), malaise traps ($n = 5$ per site), and 50 m point-count transects, all standardized across three seasons (post-monsoon, winter, summer) over 2022–2024. Vertebrate surveys combined camera trapping (30-night sessions per site), line transects (4 km per site per season), and incidental records. All surveys followed IUCN protocols and received institutional biosafety clearance.

4.3. Landscape and Statistical Analysis

Patch metrics including area, perimeter-area ratio, connectivity index, and edge density were computed using FRAGSTATS v4.6 applied to LISS-IV satellite imagery (5.8 m resolution). Diversity was quantified using Shannon-Wiener index, Margalef richness, and Pielou's evenness. Comparisons between fragmented and connected sites used Welch's t-tests and non-parametric Mann-Whitney U tests; effect sizes were reported as Cohen's d . Generalized linear mixed models (GLMMs) evaluated species richness as a function of patch area, connectivity, and edge density, with site as a random effect. All analyses used R v4.3.1 (packages: *vegan*, *lme4*, *ggplot2*).

5. Results and Comparative Analysis

5.1. Diversity Indices

Shannon diversity was significantly higher at connected sites (mean $H' = 2.8 \pm 0.4$, range 2.1–3.6) than fragmented sites (mean $H' = 1.1 \pm 0.3$, range 0.8–1.4; $t = 9.72$, $p < 0.001$, $d = 4.38$). A total of 847 insect morphospecies and 112 vertebrate species were recorded across all sites. Fragmented sites harbored 48–67% fewer species, with the steepest losses observed in ground beetles (Carabidae; –72%), diurnal Lepidoptera (–68%), small mammals (–54%), and lizards (–41%).

5.2. Fragmentation and Population Trends

GLMM results indicated patch area ($\beta = 0.42$, $SE = 0.07$, $p < 0.001$) and connectivity index ($\beta = 0.61$, $SE = 0.09$, $p < 0.001$) were the strongest positive predictors of species richness. Edge density showed a significant negative effect ($\beta = -0.28$, $SE = 0.06$, $p < 0.01$). Population trend data from long-term monitoring revealed mean annual declines of 3.2–8.1% at fragmented sites versus stable or slightly increasing trends

(+0.5 to +2.4%/yr) at connected sites (Table 2).

The fragmentation-diversity relationship was non-linear: species richness declined sharply below patch areas of 20 ha and connectivity indices below 0.35. Insect communities showed greater sensitivity to fragmentation than vertebrates across all models, consistent with their limited dispersal capacities and specialized habitat requirements.

Table 1: Summary of Habitat Fragmentation Impacts on Biodiversity Across Land-Use Types

Fragmentation Type	Patch Size Effect	Edge Effect	Species Loss (%)	Primary Taxa Affected
Deforestation	Severe reduction	High (>60%)	30–55%	Mammals, amphibians
Agricultural Expansion	Moderate reduction	Moderate (30–60%)	20–40%	Ground beetles, birds
Urban Development	Extreme reduction	Very high (>70%)	40–65%	Insects, reptiles
Road Construction	Barrier creation	Low–moderate	10–25%	Large mammals, herps
Wetland Drainage	High reduction	High (50–70%)	25–50%	Aquatic insects, birds

Note: Species loss percentages represent reductions relative to comparable intact habitat benchmarks, averaged across surveyed taxa. Edge effect represents proportion of patch area influenced by edge conditions.

Table 2: Diversity Pattern Indicators Comparing Fragmented and Connected Habitats

Metric	Fragmented Habitat	Connected Habitat	Method of Measurement	Conservation Relevance
Shannon Diversity Index (H')	0.8 – 1.4	2.1 – 3.6	Quadrat sampling	High — baseline monitoring
Species Richness (S)	12 – 24	45 – 90	Mark-recapture, transects	High — threat assessment
Habitat Connectivity Index	0.12 – 0.30	0.65 – 0.92	Remote sensing / GIS	Very high — corridor design
Population Trend (%/yr)	-3.2 to -8.1	+0.5 to +2.4	Long-term census data	Critical — extinction risk
Mean Patch Area (ha)	5 – 18	120 – 800+	GIS patch analysis	High — minimum viable area
Edge-to-Interior Ratio	High (>0.8)	Low (<0.25)	Landscape morphology	Moderate — microclimate

Note: All values represent means \pm SE computed from seven sites per habitat type. Connectivity index scaled 0–1 (0 = complete isolation; 1 = fully connected). Population trend expressed as mean annual percentage change over 2019–2024.

6. Discussion

Our findings confirm and extend prior evidence that habitat fragmentation exerts strong, independent negative effects on biodiversity beyond those attributable to habitat quantity alone. The magnitude of species loss observed — particularly among insect functional groups — corroborates widespread concerns about insect declines at a regional scale. Notably, the threshold responses identified here (critical patch area ~20 ha; connectivity index ~0.35) provide actionable targets for landscape planning in the Satpura system.

Edge effects emerged as a critical intermediary mechanism. In patches smaller than 20 ha, virtually the entire area falls within edge-influenced zones, exposing interior-specialist species to adverse microclimatic conditions and elevated predation. This effectively renders many small fragments ecologically non-functional for sensitive taxa despite their nominal existence in land-cover maps. Conservation strategies that count total habitat area without accounting for functional interior habitat will systematically overestimate biodiversity capacity.

The disproportionate sensitivity of insects relative to vertebrates has important food web implications. Insects constitute a foundational trophic link; their decline cascades upward to insectivorous birds, reptiles, and mammals, amplifying vertebrate losses beyond those attributable to direct fragmentation effects. This trophic amplification may partly explain why vertebrate diversity indices at fragmented sites exceeded predictions based solely on area-species relationships. Conservation frameworks must explicitly incorporate insect diversity targets rather than relying on vertebrate surrogates alone.

Ecological corridors represent a high-priority intervention where restoration of connecting habitat strips could restore connectivity indices above critical thresholds. Our data indicate that even modest corridor width (30–50 m of native vegetation) linking fragments above 20 ha would shift multiple sites from subcritical to viable connectivity categories. Policy integration of these thresholds into Environmental Impact Assessments and State Biodiversity Action Plans represents a near-term opportunity for substantive impact.

7. Conclusion

This study demonstrates that habitat fragmentation profoundly restructures insect and animal diversity patterns in central Indian landscapes, with non-linear thresholds at patch areas of approximately 20 ha and connectivity indices around 0.35. Insects are disproportionately affected, with cascading consequences for vertebrate communities through trophic linkages. Three conservation priorities emerge from these findings: (i) maintaining and restoring ecological corridors that exceed functional connectivity thresholds; (ii) protecting existing patches above minimum viable area thresholds from further reduction; and (iii) managing edge habitats through buffer zone vegetation to reduce edge-to-interior ratios. Integration of fragmentation metrics — connectivity indices, mean patch area, and edge density — into national biodiversity monitoring frameworks and spatial planning instruments is urgently needed. Future research should examine genetic diversity consequences of isolation, assess corridor effectiveness through movement ecology studies, and extend monitoring to aquatic insect communities, which remain underrepresented in fragmentation literature.

References

1. Haddad NM, Brudvig LA, Clobert J, Davies KF, Gonzalez A, Holt RD, *et al.* Habitat fragmentation and its lasting impact on Earth's ecosystems. *Sci Adv.* 2015;1(2):e1500052.
2. Fahrig L. Effects of habitat fragmentation on biodiversity. *Annu Rev Ecol Evol Syst.* 2003;34:487–515.
3. Fischer J, Lindenmayer DB. Landscape modification and habitat fragmentation: a synthesis. *Glob Ecol Biogeogr.* 2007;16(3):265–80.
4. Tschamntke T, Tylianakis JM, Rand TA, Didham RK, Fahrig L, Batáry P, *et al.* Landscape moderation of biodiversity patterns and processes—eight hypotheses. *Biol Rev.* 2012;87(3):661–85.
5. Sánchez-Bayo F, Wyckhuys KAG. Worldwide decline of the entomofauna: a review of its drivers. *Biol Conserv.* 2019;232:8–27.
6. Tilman D, May RM, Lehman CL, Nowak MA. Habitat destruction and the extinction debt. *Nature.* 1994;371:65–66.
7. Mittermeier RA, Robles Gil P, Hoffmann M, Pilgrim J, Brooks T, Mittermeier CG, *et al.* Hotspots revisited: Earth's biologically richest and most endangered ecoregions. Mexico City: CEMEX; 2004.
8. Turner MG. Landscape ecology: the effect of pattern on process. *Annu Rev Ecol Syst.* 1989;20:171–97.
9. MacArthur RH, Wilson EO. The theory of island biogeography. Princeton (NJ): Princeton University Press; 1967.
10. Fahrig L. Ecological responses to habitat fragmentation per se. *Annu Rev Ecol Evol Syst.* 2017;48:1–23.
11. Laurance WF, Camargo JLC, Luizão RCC, Laurance SG, Pimm SL, Bruna EM, *et al.* The fate of Amazonian forest fragments: a 32-year investigation. *Biol Conserv.* 2011;144(1):56–67.
12. Benton TG, Vickery JA, Wilson JD. Farmland biodiversity: is habitat heterogeneity the key? *Trends Ecol Evol.* 2003;18(4):182–88.
13. Wagner DL. Insect declines in the Anthropocene. *Annu Rev Entomol.* 2020;65:457–80.
14. 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.
15. Cushman SA, McKelvey KS, Schwartz MK. Use of empirically derived source-destination models to map regional conservation corridors. *Conserv Biol.* 2009;23(2):368–76.
16. Dutta T, Sharma S, McRae BH, Roy PS, DeFries R. Connecting the dots: landscape connectivity for tigers in central India. *Reg Environ Change.* 2016;16(1):53–67.
17. Hanski I. Metapopulation dynamics. *Nature.* 1998;396:41–49.

How to Cite This Article

Sharma R, Nair P, Verma A, Rao S. Role of habitat fragmentation in shaping insect and animal diversity patterns. *Int J Insect Anim Divers Res.* 2025;1(6):23-26.

Creative Commons (CC) License

This is an open access journal, and articles are distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution NonCommercial-ShareAlike 4.0 International (CC BY-NC-SA 4.0) License, which allows others to remix, tweak, and build upon the work non-commercially, as long as appropriate credit is given and the new creations are licensed under the identical terms.