

# 1 Irreplaceable socioeconomic value of wild meat extraction to local food 2 security in rural Amazonia

3

4 André Valle Nunes<sup>a,\*</sup>, Carlos A. Peres<sup>b,c</sup>, Pedro de Araújo Lima Constantino<sup>d</sup>, Bráulio  
5 A. Santos<sup>c</sup>, Erich Fischer<sup>a</sup>

6

7 <sup>a</sup> Programa de Pós-Graduação em Ecologia e Conservação, Instituto de Biociências,  
8 Universidade Federal de Mato Grosso do Sul, 79070-900 Campo Grande, Mato Grosso  
9 do Sul, Brazil

10

11 <sup>b</sup> School of Environmental Sciences, University of East Anglia, Norwich NR4 7TJ  
12 Norfolk, United Kingdom

13

14 <sup>c</sup> Departamento de Sistemática e Ecologia, Universidade Federal da Paraíba, 58051-900  
15 João Pessoa, Paraíba, Brazil

16

17 <sup>d</sup> REDEFAUNA – Rede de pesquisa em diversidade, conservação e uso da fauna da  
18 Amazônia, SQN 416, Bloco G, 203, 70.879-070 Brasília, Brazil

19

20 \* **Corresponding author:** André Valle Nunes

21 Programa de Pós-Graduação em Ecologia e Conservação, Universidade Federal de  
22 Mato Grosso do Sul, 79070-900 Campo Grande, Mato Grosso do Sul, Brasil

23 Phone numbers: 55-67-33457338 or 55-67-33457342

24 E-mail: [tataupas@gmail.com](mailto:tataupas@gmail.com)

25

26 **Abstract.** Wild vertebrates play a decisive role in the subsistence economy of human  
27 populations worldwide. The food security value of wild-meat extracted from natural  
28 ecosystems remains poorly quantified. Here, we provide an economic valuation of the  
29 nutritional and monetary benefits of year-round wild-meat hunting across a large  
30 trinational region of southwestern Amazonia using data from indigenous and non-  
31 indigenous settlements from 30 sites. We then build scenarios to explore whether three  
32 ubiquitous sources of regional-scale household income (i.e. wage labour, horticultural  
33 revenues from manioc flour production and the harvest of Brazil-nuts) could match the  
34 purchase costs of alternative meat demand to meet domestic consumption of animal  
35 protein should game stocks collapse for any reason. We also considered a fourth  
36 valuation scenario in terms of game meat substitution with bovine beef. We  
37 conservatively estimate a total annual consumption of ~1431.8 tons of undressed animal  
38 carcasses, equivalent to a mean per-capita meat consumption of 54.75 kg person<sup>-1</sup> yr<sup>-1</sup>,  
39 or ~10.9 kg of animal protein person<sup>-1</sup> yr<sup>-1</sup>. This overall consumption of terrestrial

40 wildlife meat provides US\$7.875 million yr<sup>-1</sup> across the study region. However,  
41 household income levels were too low to enable transitions into domestic livestock  
42 consumption indicating low adaptation capacity to alternative animal protein;  
43 replacement purchases of domestic meat would amount to 90% of aggregate annual  
44 wages, 194% of overall income from manioc flour, and 67% of all Brazil-nuts collected.  
45 Complete beef replacement by the population in this 16,541-km<sup>2</sup> region would require  
46 further inputs of US\$2.658 million yr<sup>-1</sup> and the conversion of 4,310 ha of Amazonian  
47 forests into pasture. Our results emphasize the extraordinarily valuable and irreplaceable  
48 role of wild meat in the food security of tropical forest dwellers. Proposing consumption  
49 of alternative sources of animal protein for monetarily deprived forest dwellers is  
50 clearly an unrealistic, if not environmentally-damaging, strategy. Conservation  
51 scientists, wildlife biologists and policy makers should therefore prioritize adding value  
52 to standing forests by managing sustainable wild-meat offtake from natural ecosystems.

53 **Keywords:** bushmeat harvest, ecosystem services, household income, protein  
54 consumption, rainforest, wildlife conservation

55

56 **1. Introduction**

57 Despite advances towards reducing world hunger over the past two decades,  
58 about 11% of the world's population (~805 million people) still live in a chronic state of  
59 malnutrition (FAO, 2014). A large part of this population inhabits economically  
60 marginal tropical regions and depends on daily offtake of terrestrial vertebrates or local  
61 fisheries to supplement their diets as they cannot afford to purchase alternative protein,  
62 including meat, eggs and dairy (Milner-Gulland et al., 2003; Robinson and Bennett,  
63 2002). Consumption of wild vertebrate protein is mandatory for rural, forest-dependent  
64 families with annual incomes lower than US\$1,041 (Wilkie and Godoy, 2001). About  
65 two thirds of their indirect income comes from subsistence harvest of forest products,  
66 agricultural crops, and bushmeat (Angelsen et al., 2014; Crookes et al., 2007; Nielsen et  
67 al., 2018). While subsistence overhunting by tropical forest dwellers is one of the  
68 drivers of wildlife population declines (Peres, 2001; Peres and Lake, 2003; Ripple et al.,  
69 2016), both the socioeconomic benefits of wild meat and the environmental costs of  
70 enabling transitions from wild to domestic meat consumption have rarely been  
71 estimated.

72 With the world population projected to reach ~9.7 billion people by 2050, the  
73 production of animal protein will have to increase by more than 200 million tons per  
74 year to meet burgeoning consumption demand (FAO, 2009). Such increased production  
75 will drive the conversion of additional natural habitats, accelerate land-use change,  
76 threaten native biodiversity, reduce the provision of several ecosystem services and  
77 increase poverty or social vulnerability (Alves and van Vliet, 2018; Barlow et al., 2018;  
78 Chaves et al., 2017; Costanza et al., 2017; Green et al., 2005; Laurance et al., 2012;  
79 Peres et al., 2010). For residents of (semi)natural ecosystems, whether traditional or  
80 otherwise, this may generate food insecurity by impairing subsistence hunting and  
81 favouring severe nutritional deficiencies of iron, zinc, vitamins A and B<sub>12</sub>, and many  
82 fatty acids (Golden et al., 2011; Sarti et al., 2015).

83 Although the effects of unsustainable hunting have been historically more  
84 damaging in the Asian and African tropics compared to the Amazon (Fa and Peres,  
85 2001), it is unclear to what degree the domestic economy of Amazonian populations can  
86 realistically afford the acquisition of alternative sources of animal protein. To address  
87 this gap in the literature, we assessed the prey harvest profile and the annual  
88 consumption of wildlife meat and animal protein by indigenous and non-indigenous  
89 populations in the southwest Amazon. We specifically assessed the economic benefits  
90 of wild-caught meat consumption and examined whether local household incomes can  
91 finance realistic substitution values of domestic meat consumption under scenarios of  
92 either chronic game depletion or banned subsistence hunting.

93 We examined the purchasing power of households in buying domestic meat  
94 based on three sources of income: (a) annualized expected household-scale wages, (b)  
95 revenues from manioc flour production, and (c) monetary yields from Brazil-nut  
96 harvesting, the dominant extractive trade across the study region. In addition, we  
97 estimate how much forest area would need to be converted and how many head of cattle  
98 would be required to replace consumption of wild-meat with bovine beef. If household  
99 economies are sufficient to ensure such replacement, and little additional forest  
100 conversion is required, management actions could be more restrictive and limit  
101 subsistence hunting. However, if household economies cannot meet baseline costs of  
102 beef acquisition, rendering the full transition into a market economy unaffordable,  
103 managing game hunting by rural Amazonians should be more flexible, and take into  
104 account the demography of game species and their subsistence value to humans.

105

106 **2. Methods**


107 *2.1 Study region and data compilation*

108 We used data on game vertebrate extraction in a 16,541-km<sup>2</sup> study region of  
109 Southwest Amazonia, including parts of Brazil, Peru and Bolivia, based on a review of  
110 hunting studies ranging from 14 days to seven years of sampling at 30 sites (mean  $\pm$  SD  
111 = 379  $\pm$  545 days). We conducted a comprehensive literature search using secondary  
112 data from peer-reviewed papers, technical reports and theses available on the World  
113 Wide Web. These documents were compiled from an initial survey using the Google  
114 and Google Scholar search platforms with the terms ‘hunting’, ‘forest’, and ‘Amazon’  
115 (in Portuguese, Spanish and English). Bibliographic references of these articles also led  
116 to others with secondary hunting data in the study region. Most of this information was,  
117 however, extracted from non-indexed journals. One of us (AVN) also carried out a  
118 supplementary study yielding primary game harvest data over a 12-month period from  
119 15 riverine communities within the 340,000-ha Riozinho da Liberdade Extractive  
120 Reserve in the Brazilian state of Acre (for further details, see Nunes et al., 2019).

121 The species-specific number of animals killed at each site was obtained from 30  
122 studies conducted between 1966 and 2016 in the state of Acre, Brazil, the Peruvian  
123 departments of Ucayali, Huánuco, Pasco and Madre de Dios, and the Bolivian Amazon  
124 department of Pando (Fig. 1). Forests across the study region are defined as open  
125 ombrophilous forest, alluvial ombrophilous dense forest, and lowland ombrophilous  
126 dense forest sustained by soils with variable nutrient loads, which may affect large-scale  
127 forest productivity (Moulatlet et al., 2017). Sampling sites are located along four main  
128 watersheds: Juruá and Purus in Brazil, and the Ucayali, Purus and Madre de Dios in  
129 Peru and Bolivia (see Table 1 for a brief description of study sites).

130 We searched for studies whose results included a list of hunted species with their  
131 respective numerical offtakes. We excluded papers that estimated hunting of only a  
132 single species or a specific taxonomic group (e.g. hunting of either mammals or birds)  
133 because they fail to represent the total game meat consumption at each site. Households  
134 identified in these studies encompass indigenous, riverine and neocolonist settlements.  
135 Although we believe that wild meat trade occurs across all sites, at least as small  
136 fractions of the total offtake, these data were not available. Hunting studies recorded all  
137 species comprising the most important game vertebrates, including cracids, primates,  
138 ungulates, caviomorph rodents, reptiles and species contributing with smaller offtakes,  
139 such as carnivores. Hence, these samples can be considered representative of the overall  
140 game biomass consumed by rural populations in the southwest Amazon.

141



142  
 143 **Fig. 1.** Location of sites sampled across a ~16,541-km<sup>2</sup> trinational region of  
 144 southwestern Amazonia, including administrative provinces or states in Brazil [(1)  
 145 Acre]; Peru [(2) Ucayali; (3) Huánuco; (4) Pasco; (5) Madre de Dios], and Bolivia [(6)  
 146 Pando]. Background colour-coding represents deforestation and elevation (asl).  
 147

148 **Table 1.** Region and human population (number of residents) of the 30 study sites in the  
 149 southwestern Amazon where game offtake data were obtained to estimate wild-meat  
 150 consumption and the cost of bovine beef substitution.

Country (State)	Site	Population	Source	
Brazil (Acre)	Alto Juruá Extractive Reserve	850	Ramos, 2005	
	Alto Tarauacá e Extractive Reserve	250	Moura, 2013	
	Cazumbá-Iracema Extractive Reserve	280	Oliveira, 2012	
	Chico Mendes Extractive Reserve	1794	Medeiros and Garcia, 2016	
	Riozinho da Liberdade Extractive Reserve	1200	A.V. Nunes (unpubl. data)	
	Chico Mendes settlement	390	Rosas and Drumond, 2007	
	São Salvador settlement	800	Fragoso et al. 2000	
	Settlement along the Iaco river	405	Martins, 1993	
	Antimary State Forest	383	Calouro, 1995	
	Kaxinawá do Baixo Jordão Indigenous Land	172	Constantino, 2008	
	Kaxinawá do Rio Jordão Indigenous Land	1470	Constantino, 2008	
Kaxinawá Praia do Carapanã Indigenous Land	571	Constantino, 2012		
Peru (Huánuco)	Indigenous Campa of the Pichis river	6600	Guedes, 1981	
	Native Community Amahuaca de Laureano	32	Arco, 2013	
	Native Community Gasta Bala	178	Sheppard, 2007	
	Native Community Santa Rey	72	Navarro, 2004; ProPurús, 2011	
	Native Community Balta	541	Navarro, 2004; ProPurús, 2011	
	Peru (Ucayali)	Native Community Triunfo	20	Navarro, 2004
		Native Community Columbia	34	Navarro, 2004
		Native Community Nueva Esperanza	49	Navarro, 2004
		Alto Purús Reserved Zone	3150	Amanzo, 2002
		Native Community Monterey	32	ProPurús, 2011
Native Community Bufo, Pikiniki and Nuevo Belén	622	Pacheco and Amanzo, 2000; Sherpad, 2007		
Peru (Madre de Dios)	Tambopata-Candamo Reserve	3200	Ascorra, 1999	
	Native Community Yomibato y Tayacome	322	Ohl-Schacherer et al. 2007	
	Communities in the Madre de Dios river	100	Loja-Alemán and Ascorra, 2004	
Peru (Pasco)	Native Community Infierno	480	Loja-Alemán and Ascorra, 2004	
	Communal Reserve Yanesha	34	Gonzales, 2003	
Peru (Pasco)	Pachieta River	950	Pierret and Dourojeanni, 1966	
	Bolivia (Pando)	Provincia Iturrealde	884	Rumiz and Maglianesi, 2012

## 2.2 People and socioeconomic profiles

Our study region has been occupied by indigenous populations, mostly belonging to the Pano and Arawak linguistic families, since at least the first European expeditions into South America. Twelve out of 30 settlements were, however, occupied by non-indigenous former rubber-tappers and *colono* populations. Immigration into southwest Amazonia began in the late 19<sup>th</sup> century as new settlers established natural rubber estates to extract rubber tree latex (*Hevea brasiliensis* L.), culminating with the arrival of 55,000 northeastern Brazilians into the state of Acre alone (Wilkinson, 2013). Following the collapse of the rubber boom (1942-1945), there was significant rural exodus into large cities, and those who remained in native rubber stands continued to practice a subsistence economy in which hunting, wild animal skin trade and manioc cultivation (*Manioc esculenta* Crantz) became the most traditional livelihood modes (Dean, 1987; Nunes et al., 2019).

The Peruvian Amazon region examined here is inhabited by some 60 indigenous groups, including 15 that remain in voluntary isolation (INDEPA, 2009). Occupation of this region occurred 300 A.D, especially along the Ucayali River and its tributaries (Myers, 1974). Between 1880 and 1920 there was a natural rubber extractive industry boom, which was later replaced by timber, gold, animal skins, and currently palm oil extraction (Aparicio and Bodmer, 2009). During the rubber boom, many indigenous communities in the Madre de Dios region were enslaved; and more accessible areas along major waterways were only recolonized in the last 35 years (Vallve, 2010).

Rubber was also the main colonization driver of northern Bolivia (Heath, 2012), including extractive labour demand for both indigenous peoples and war prisoners, especially in remote areas (Vallori, 2012). Following the collapse of the rubber boom, several ethnic groups either disappeared or became severely depleted (Vallve, 2010). In sum, human populations of the southwest Amazon can be characterized by extreme rural poverty. In Brazil, household income is usually below US\$7.88 day<sup>-1</sup> (IBGE 2010). In southwest Peru, the rural subsistence economy is based on manioc, horticulture, hunting and fishing. However, per capita income is approximately US\$4.5 day<sup>-1</sup> (INEI-ENAHO 2014) and lower than that in neighbouring Brazil. Similarly, average income in northern Bolivia's Department of Pando, where populations rely heavily on the seasonal harvest of Brazil-nuts (*Bertholletia excelsa*) (Stoian, 2000), is about US\$4.3 day<sup>-1</sup> (INE 2016).

185

### 2.3 Protein calculations and bushmeat consumption

We calculated the undressed carcass yield for all species hunted by multiplying the adult body mass of each species by a factor of 0.6 (Rushton et al., 2005). This represents the total weight of fresh edible meat excluding skeletal parts, viscera and skin. We assumed that the amount of protein in wild-meat equates to 20% of overall undressed carcasses (Ojasti, 1996). To estimate body mass values of slaughtered game species, we used data for the same species from studies elsewhere in the Amazon (Parry et al., 2009; Peres, 2001; Terborgh et al., 1990). We estimated per-capita mean meat consumption as follows (Eq. 1; Redford and Robinson, 1987):

$$\text{Mean per capita consumption} = \frac{\text{total undressed carcasses}}{\text{no. consumers} \times \text{study duration}} \quad (1)$$

When the number of consumers was unavailable in the study, we consulted databases from the Brazilian Institute of Geography and Statistics (IBGE), Instituto Socioambiental (ISA) (<https://terrasindigenas.org.br/pt-br/brasil>; <https://uc.socioambiental.org/uc/pesquisa>), and Instituto del Bien Común (IBC) (<http://www.ibcperu.org/mapas/sicna/>). In Brazilian rural villages, for instance, we assumed an average of six persons per household following IBGE census data. To estimate wild-meat consumption at each site, we multiplied the per capita consumption by the total population at that site.

### 2.4 Replacement cost of wild-meat consumption

We quantified annual household economic benefit from wild meat (AHE) consumption as follows (Eq. 2):

$$\text{AHE} = (\text{household consumption} \times \text{price of bovine meat kg}) - \text{income}^{a,b,c} \quad (2)$$

We considered three income scenarios: (a) average annual net household wages of US\$2,001 (IBGE 2010, INEI-ENAH0 2014, INE 2016); (b) revenues from sales of manioc flour production of US\$931.26 per yr, equivalent to 60-80 sacks of 50 kg produced per hectare; (c) and monetary yields from seasonal Brazil-nut harvesting of US\$2,660, based on the average price of US\$0.43 per kg and an annual production of 6,187 kg per household (Duchelle et al. 2011). We aggregated the replacement value of wild meat with bovine beef because this is the main source of domesticated red meat consumed by Amazonian communities (Nardoto et al., 2011). This is also the main agricultural activity contributing to historical deforestation rates in the Amazon (Simon and Garagorry, 2005). We therefore assumed a mean value of US\$5.50 per kg of bovine beef. This represents the average price (US\$/kg) of bovine meat purchased at the nearest towns from the study communities. In addition, we estimated the total protein content from bovine beef biomass required to substitute animal protein from wild game meat from all available sources. We considered a mean body mass of 418 kg per head of cattle (~251 kg per undressed carcass), and 25% of protein per 100 g of beef (Wilson et al., 1979). In this context, we quantified how many head of cattle would be required to replace game meat, and the monetary cost of this replacement. We also included the basic costs of livestock husbandry, which involves the process of pasture creation (6 kg of *Brachiaria humidicola* per hectare; Embrapa, 1980; ~US\$270.50), essential veterinary care (e.g. brucellosis vaccination; ~US\$13.53), and the market value of each calf (~US\$332.59). Moreover, we assumed a mean stocking density of one animal unit per hectare, which is an approximate estimate for SW Amazonia (Barbosa et al., 2015).



235 All values were recorded in Brazilian, Peruvian and Bolivian currencies [reais  
(R\$), nuevo sol (PEN) and boliviano (Bs)] and subsequently converted into US dollars  
(US\$). As a conversion rate, we used the US\$ value at the time of the last study in our  
database. Monetary quotes were based on the year 2016 (1 US\$ = R\$ 3.25; PEN 3.35  
and Bs 6.93). We aimed to be deliberately conservative in our estimates in this study, as  
240 we did not include costs of livestock transportation between rural villages and urban  
centres and other livestock rearing costs, including labour inputs.

### 3. Results

#### 3.1 Wild meat and protein consumption

245 We recorded 28,349 terrestrial vertebrates representing 58 species harvested at  
the 30 sites, amounting to 157,941 tons of undressed carcasses and 31,588 tons of  
protein harvested (Table 2). This harvest volume corresponds to an annual consumption  
of 1431.8 tons of wild meat and 286.4 tons of protein for the 25,865 people inhabiting  
those 30 localities. This is equivalent to an average intake of 150 g of meat person<sup>-1</sup>  
250 day<sup>-1</sup>, which represents a per capita annual consumption of 54.75 kg of meat and 10.9  
kg of protein.


**Table 2.** Biomass of undressed carcasses and protein content of game vertebrate (total kg hunted per species) consumed by indigenous and non-indigenous forest dwellers inhabiting 30 study sites across the southwestern Amazon.

Latin name	English name	Undressed meat biomass (kg)	Protein (kg)
<b>Birds</b>			
<i>Ramphastos</i> spp.	Toucan	79.2	15.84
<i>Pteroglossus</i> spp.	Araçari	0.975	0.19
<i>Ortalis guttata</i>	Speckled chachalaca	154	30.73
<i>Opisthocomus hoazin</i>	Hoatzin	2.70	0.54
Accipitriformes †	Kite	9.0	1.8
<i>Psophia leucoptera</i>	White-winged trumpeter	199	39.84
<i>Penelope jacquacu</i>	Spix's guan	785	157
<i>Aburria aburri</i>	Wattled guan	99	19.80
Columbidae †	Dove	370.25	74.05
<i>Aburria</i> spp.	Cujubi	4.26	0.85
<i>Ara macao</i>	Scarlet macaw	64.8	12.96
<i>Ara</i> spp.	Chestnut-fronted macaw	6.46	1.29
<i>Amazona</i> spp.	Parrot	27	5.39
<i>Mitu tuberosum</i>	Razor-billed curassow	646	129.24
Tinamidae †	Small tinamous	1114	222.81
<i>Tinamus tao</i>	Large tinamous	109.8	21.96
Anatidae †	Duck	90	18
Rallidae †	Common gallinule	5	1.02
<i>Tigrisoma lineatum</i>	Rufescent tiger-heron	8.36	1.67
Odontophoridae †	Wood quail	49.79	10
<b>Reptiles</b>			
<i>Chelonoidis denticulata</i>	Yellow-footed Tortoise	2076	415
<i>Caiman crocodilus</i>	Spectacled caiman	921	184
<i>Podocnemis</i> spp.	Turtle	78	15.6
<b>Marsupialia</b>			
<i>Didelphis marsupialis</i>	Common opossum	576	115.2
<b>Carnivores</b>			
<i>Leopardus pardalis</i>	Ocelot	96	19.2
<i>Eira barbara</i>	Tayra	12	2.4
<i>Potos flavus</i>	Kinkajou	196.2	39.24
<i>Panthera onca</i>	Jaguar	432	86.4
<i>Puma concolor</i>	Puma	254	50.88
<i>Nasua nasua</i>	Coati	1075	215
<b>Rodents</b>			
<i>Cuniculus paca</i>	Paca	17758	3552
<i>Dinomys branickii</i>	Pacarana	144	28.8
<i>Hydrochaeris hydrochaeris</i>	Capybara	6435	1287
<i>Dasyprocta fuliginosa</i>	Agouti	6655	1331
<i>Myoprocta pratii</i>	Acouchi	333.6	66.72

<i>Coendu</i> spp.	Porcupine	213	42.60
<i>Urosciurus</i> spp.	Squirrel	371.49	74.30
<b>Primates</b>			
<i>Saimiri boliviensis</i>	Squirrel monkey	34.21	6.84
<i>Pithecia</i> spp.	Saki monkey	135.6	27.12
<i>Sapajus macrocephalus</i>	Large-headed capuchin	469.5	94
<i>Ateles chamek</i>	Black spider monkey	1892	378.42
<i>Callicebus</i> spp.	Titi monkey	34.32	6.86
<i>Lagothrix cana</i>	Gray woolly monkey	861.3	172.26
<i>Saguinus imperator</i>	Emperor tamarin	3	0.6
<i>Alouatta</i> spp.	Howler monkey	4653	930.52
<i>Cebus albifrons</i>	White-fronted capuchin	252	50.40
<i>Aotus nigriceps</i>	Night monkey	84	16.8
<i>Leontocebus weddelli melanoleucus</i>	White saddleback tamarin	4.09	0.82
<b>Ungulates</b>			
<i>Tapirus terrestris</i>	Lowland tapir	11250	2250
<i>Pecari tajacu</i>	Collared peccary	29990	5998
<i>Tayassu pecari</i>	White-lipped peccary	31046	6209
<i>Mazama americana</i>	Red brocket deer	28770	5754
<i>Mazama nemorivaga</i>	Brown brocket deer	1208	242
<b>Xenarthra</b>			
<i>Priodontes maximus</i>	Giant armadillo	435.6	87.12
<i>Dasybus kappleri</i>	Long-nosed armadillo	117	23.40
<i>Dasybus</i> spp.	Armadillo	5195	1039
<i>Tamandua tetradactyla</i>	Southern tamandua	18	3.6
<i>Bradypus variegatus</i>	Brown-throated sloth	15.12	3.02

† Taxa containing more than one species of uncertain identification.

260 Medium-sized prey such as tortoise (*Chelonoidis denticulata*; 15%), paca  
 (265 *Cuniculus paca*; 12%), and agouti (*Dasyprocta* spp.; 9%) were the most abundant  
 species in the game harvest profiles. The abundance of hunted species differed  
 considerably across vertebrate orders. Ungulates dominated hunted undressed carcasses  
 by more than 59% (> 80 tons) and consequently the profile of protein intake ( $452 \pm$   
 $1,130$  kg protein), followed by rodents (19%;  $339 \pm 911$  kg protein) and birds 6 (6%;  
 $120 \pm 193$  kg protein) (Fig. 2). Only 15% of all individuals were threatened but  
 provided 31% of all meat consumed (IUCN, 2018). Among the threatened species, tapir  
 (265 *Tapirus terrestris*) and white-lipped peccary (*Tayassu pecari*) were the most  
 consumed, accounting for 7% and 18% of the harvest across all sites, respectively.



270 **Fig. 2.** Contribution of each taxonomic group of game species in terms of wild meat to the extractive subsistence economy of rural populations at 30 sites in southwestern Amazonia. Substitution values are based on the average price (US\$5.5 per kg) of the most frequently purchased beef in local markets. Values are calculated as the number of hunted individuals times the mean weight of an average undressed carcass, times the beef substitution price.

275 *3.2 Economic value of replacement of subsistence hunting*

Considering the mean market price of bovine beef (US\$5.50 per kg) and an overall annual consumption of 1431.8 tons of wild meat reported here, the total terrestrial wildlife consumption value amounted to US\$7.875 million per year across the study region (average rents of US\$262,502  $\pm$  5,283 yr<sup>-1</sup> per locality). The average consumption of wild meat per unit area was US\$3.5  $\pm$  6.0 ha<sup>-1</sup> yr<sup>-1</sup>. When we considered the value of bovine beef across the region, each person would require an annual cash value of US\$301 just to maintain his/her current rates of protein consumption sourced from wild meat. Each household, with an average size of six persons, would therefore require US\$1,806 yr<sup>-1</sup> to satisfy its protein demands. Our estimates indicate that annual household wages throughout the study region is US\$2,001, indicating that purchasing bovine meat to replace wild vertebrate meat would require 90% of the annual per capita income. This would therefore leave only 10% of income (US\$195  $\approx$  US\$162 per month) to cover all other essential living costs including external food supplies (e.g., rice, oil, and sugar) as well as fuel to make regular trips to local markets to purchase chilled beef and other manufactured goods (Fig. 3; Scenario A). In Scenario B, all annual income obtained from manioc flour production (US\$931.26 yr<sup>-1</sup>) would be required to purchase substitution beef. Beef purchases alone would therefore account for 194% of the overall per capita income, leaving households with an annual monetary deficit of US\$875. Therefore, this would require an additional labour investment of 2 ha of manioc cropland per household to ensure the profit required for the consumption of animal protein. This is, however, a conservative estimate because it does not take into account potential price elasticities in saturating local markets, thereby both reducing the price of manioc and increasing beef prices. Considering that approximately 4,310 households inhabit our study communities, the total manioc crop production required to supply domestic protein demand, in the collapse of wild meat, would amount to approximately 9,000 ha. Under Scenario C, a Brazil-nut harvest of 4,200 tons would be required to supply the meat acquisition from domesticated livestock. In other words, 67% of the Brazil-nut extraction value would be used to purchase bovine beef. Among the total biomass consumed per mammalian order, ungulates contributed most to the economic profile of wild-meat consumption, totalling US\$509,222; followed by rodents (US\$170,711). At the opposite extreme, marsupials accounted for the least consumed order (US\$1,732).

310


315

320

325

330

335



ld  
;  
old;  
ed

340 To match observed intakes of wild meat protein, each household would therefore  
be required to accommodate exotic pasture areas to graze at least one head of cattle.  
Given that the carcass of an average head of cattle provides 62 kg of protein, the  
expected per capita annual protein consumption is 10.9 kg, and each household requires  
345 65.4 kg of protein yr<sup>-1</sup>, we estimated that replacing wildlife meat consumption with  
livestock across our study region would require 4,310 head of cattle annually. The total  
cost involved in expanding a regional-scale livestock sector to replace wild meat would  
be US\$2.658 million annually. This includes the process of creating and maintaining  
pastures (US\$1.166 million), essential veterinary care (US\$58.314 thousand) and  
350 purchase of calves (US\$1.433 million). These livestock husbandry costs could easily  
reach US\$616.62 for each household. Additionally, ~4,310 ha of unflooded forest  
habitat would have to be converted into cattle pastures to graze this additional protein  
demand.

#### 4. Discussion

355 This study highlights that wild meat extracted from tropical forests is, in  
practice, economically irreplaceable and an extremely important food source for the  
local subsistence and household economy of native and non-native Amazonian forest  
dwellers. We provide evidence that aggregate household revenues are insufficient to  
meet the substitution costs of alternative sources of farmed meat. An eventual collapse  
360 in wildlife harvesting through either chronic game depletion or a government ban on  
subsistence hunting would result in severe long-term problems in terms of the food  
security and economics of semi-extractive households. Although our scenarios —  
created to understand the importance of hunting for food security — comprise only  
some of several possible outcomes, they clearly illustrate that wild game meat is  
365 irreplaceable in safeguarding against the nutritional deficiency of animal protein, which  
is typically the most expensive component of human diets (Fa et al. 2015a). Next, we  
discuss how much this game meat is worth, and the value contributed by forest  
ecosystems to safeguard the food security of low-income Amazonians.

We documented very high rates of game meat consumption (54.75 kg per person  
370 yr<sup>-1</sup>) by both indigenous and non-tribal local communities spread across the study  
region. This far exceeds the per capita consumption recommended by FAO (20 g of  
animal protein per person per day or 7.3 kg yr<sup>-1</sup>) to preclude human malnutrition and  
under-nourishment. In global terms, this exceeded the average per capita consumption  
of animal protein (42.9 kg yr<sup>-1</sup>; FAO 2014) by 78%. In addition, our observed rate of  
375 game meat offtake also exceeded the mean per capita consumption of bovine meat and  
poultry across all seven South American countries that officially record annual meat  
consumption, including Brazil and Peru, both of which are near the top ranking meat  
consuming nations (EOCD 2018). However, the general assessment provided in this  
study contradicts patterns of meat consumption observed in other tropical forest studies.  
380 For example, rural and indigenous populations in Afrotropical forests usually consume  
only 14.6 and 18.3 kg per person yr<sup>-1</sup>, respectively. These low wild meat intake rates  
may result from either communities that partly rely on other sources of animal protein  
or a general pattern of wild-meat depletion in the aftermath of a long history of  
overhunting (Brashares et al., 2004; De Merode et al., 2004; Milner-Gulland et al.,  
385 2003). Our results suggest that, even following a long history of industrial-scale hunting  
in the 19<sup>th</sup> century in Southwestern Amazonia to supply the export skin trade (Antunes  
et al., 2016), wild meat harvesting in our study region can still ensure adequate nutrition  
for a large number of rural households, including high-value fats, protein and minerals.

In all meat substitution scenarios examined here, replacing wild-meat consumption with domesticated livestock would require a prohibitive reorganization of the household economy, and also lead to markedly elevated deforestation rates at either a local or regional scale and all associated consequences (O'Neill et al., 2018). These interventions can affect game vertebrate consumption in four different ways. First, elevated livestock and manioc flour production would increase local deforestation rates near settlements, impacting forest game populations due to habitat loss, which is regionally more severe than the impacts of hunting per se (Constantino, 2016; Sirén and Parvinen, 2015). Second, a possible reduction in game offtake would increase rural-urban migration as people seek new economic opportunities to ensure greater purchase power, partly to meet animal protein demands (Parry et al., 2010). Third, socioeconomic changes, such as urban wage labour, would also fuel the consumption of alternative food sources, possibly altering the search radius of urban hunters, thereby aggravating pressures on wildlife even in remote areas (Godoy et al., 2010). In other words, monetary income may exert a stronger influence on levels of wildlife mortality and consumption, as urban hunters acquire goods that enhance harvesting efficiency such as outboard motors, fuel, firearms and ammunition (Peres and Lake 2003). Fourth, elevated Brazil-nut harvesting to generate cash for commercial meat can exert further pressure on the demographic sustainability of Brazil-nut tree (*Bertholletia excelsa*) populations and other non-timber forest resources (Peres et al. 2003). Our realistic scenarios considered alternative food production to replace protein demand from hunted meat, which ultimately implies a tradeoff between food security and biodiversity conservation. Therefore, maintaining consumption of wild meat from forest vertebrates at sustainable levels remains the best possible scenario under which to continue a 'win-win' paradigm in systems characterized by socioecological dynamics (Fischer et al., 2017).

In our study, the value of forest ecosystem services provided by wildlife was much larger than the direct annual income of a household, providing a good indicator of the economic importance of provisioning services. Indeed, our estimates of the hidden economic value of hunted meat consumption largely exceeds the cost of converting forests into cattle pasture for bovine beef production. Our estimated value of wild meat in southwestern Amazonia is extremely high, and greater than that observed in northeastern Madagascar (US\$0.42 ha<sup>-1</sup> yr<sup>-1</sup>; Golden et al., 2014), and higher than the market revenue estimated for non-timber forest products (e.g. fruits, seeds and latex) in a typical hectare of forest in the northern Peruvian Amazon (Peters et al., 1989). However, comparisons of the provisioning value of ecosystem services requires caution because of methodological differences between studies and differences in productivity across sites (Naidoo and Ricketts 2006). This scenario further reinforces the extremely high value of wild-meat consumption as an ecosystem service in the southwest Amazon.

From the perspective of the rural poor facing extreme social vulnerability, sources of protein are highly valuable (Golden et al. 2016). Therefore, if wild game meat is both essential and effectively irreplaceable for rural Amazonian populations, the consumption benefits of these non-timber forest resources become indisputably invaluable. This strongly suggests that environmental goods and services, which are rarely tallied in country-level statistics, should be considered priorities in national to global political arenas. Wild meat extraction should therefore be managed appropriately, in light of robust game management science (Campos-Silva et al. 2017), rather than banned indiscriminately, thereby further constraining the livelihoods of the rural poor (McShane 2003).



In summary, subsistence hunting in Amazonian hinterlands is critical for both food and economic security of rural people. Our study provides a broad geographic perspective for Amazonian populations, in which game animals can still sustain local livelihoods and provide clear provisioning benefits. Replacing wild-meat extraction with alternative sources of animal protein across the study region, for any reason, would likely lead to more predatory land-use practices, because this would incentivize deforestation to support grazelands for ruminant livestock. For rural Amazonians, wild animals are a valuable food resource that cannot be easily replaced without inducing significant environmental damage and social inequalities. Proposing dietary shifts to relatively expensive alternative sources of animal protein to a group of economically vulnerable consumers is clearly not the best strategy. Therefore, conservation scientists should take proper account of the value of wildlife in conservation planning to manage sustainable wild-meat offtake from natural ecosystems, considering the complex links between wildlife conservation and rural poverty (Brockington and Wilkie 2015). We therefore argue that wild meat is essential for rural populations in southwestern Amazonia, but game stocks will need to be managed satisfactorily to prevent wholesale resource collapse.

## References

- Angelsen, A., Jagger, P., Babigumira, R., Belcher, B., Hogarth, N.J., Bauch, S., Börner, J., Smith-Hall, C., Wunder, S., 2014. Environmental income and rural livelihoods: a global-comparative analysis. *World Dev.* 64, S12–S28.  
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.worlddev.2014.03.006>
- Antunes, A.P., Fewster, R.M., Venticinque, E.M., Peres, C.A., Levi, T., Rohe, F., Shepard, G.H., 2016. Empty forest or empty rivers? A century of commercial hunting in Amazonia. *Sci. Adv.* 10, 1–14. <https://doi.org/10.1126/sciadv.1600936>
- Aparicio, P.M., Bodmer, R., 2009. Pueblos indígenas de la amazonía peruana. p. 339.
- Arco, A.P.O.D., 2013. Cacería de subsistencia y etnoecología asociada en una Comunidad Nativa Amahuaca de la Provincia de Purús-Ucayali, Perú. Thesis Universidad Nacional Agraria La Molina.
- Ascorra, C., 1999. Cazadores amazónicos y conservación de la fauna silvestre. SEPIA, VII. ITDG-Perú.
- Barbosa, F.A., Soares-Filho, B.S., Merry, F.D., Azevedo, H.O., Costa, W., Coe, M.T., Batista, E.L.S., 2015. Cenários para a pecuária de corte na Amazônia. Editora IGC/UFGM.
- Barlow, J., França, F., Gardner, T., Hicks, C., Lennox, G., Berenguer, E., Castello, L., Economo, E., Ferreira, J., Guénard, B., Leal, C., Isaac, V., Lees, A., Paar, C., Wilson, S., Young, P., Graham, N., 2018. The future of hyperdiverse tropical ecosystems. *Nature* 559, 517–526. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-018-0301-1>
- Brashares, J.S., Arcese, P., Sam, M.K., Coppolillo, P.B., Sinclair, A.R.E., Balmford, A., 2004. Bushmeat hunting, wildlife declines, and fish supply in west Africa. *Science* 306, 1180–1183. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1102425>
- Brockington, D., Wilkie, D., 2015. Protected areas and poverty. *Philos. Trans. R. Soc. Lond. B Biol. Sci.* 370, 2–6. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rstb.2014.0271>
- Calouro, M.A., 1995. Caça de subsistência: sustentabilidade e padrões de uso entre seringueiros ribeirinhos e não-ribeirinhos do estado do Acre. Dissertation Universidade de Brasília.

- 485 Campos-Silva, J.V., Peres, C.A., Antunes, A.P., Valsecchi, J., Pezzuti, J., 2017. Community-based population recovery of overexploited Amazonian wildlife. *Perspect. Ecol. Conserv.* 15, 266–270. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pecon.2017.08.004>
- 490 Chaves, W.A., Wilkie, D.S., Monroe, M.C., Sieving, K.E., 2017. Market access and wild meat consumption in the central Amazon, Brazil. *Biol. Conserv.* 212, 240–248. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biocon.2017.06.013>
- Constantino, P.A.L., 2016. Deforestation and hunting effects on wildlife across amazonian indigenous lands. *Ecol. Soc.* 21, 3. <https://doi.org/10.5751/ES-08323-210203>
- 495 Constantino, P.A.L., Tavares, R.A., Kaxinawa, J.L., Macario, F.M., Kaxinawa, E., Kaxinawa, A.S., 2012. Mapeamento e monitoramento participativo da caça na Kaxinawá da Praia do Carapanã Indigenous Land, Acre, Amazônia Brasileira. in: Paese, A., Uezu, A., Lorini, M.L., Cunha, A. (Eds.), *Sistema de informações geográficas e a conservação da biodiversidade*. Oficina do Texto, São Paulo, Brasil.
- 500 Constantino, P.A.L., Fortini, L.B., Kaxinawa, F.R.S., Kaxinawa, A.M., Kaxinawa, E.S., Kaxinawa, A.P., Kaxinawa, L.S., Kaxinawa, J.M., Kaxinawa, J.P., 2008. Indigenous collaborative research for wildlife management in Amazonia: the case of the Kaxinawá, Acre, Brazil. *Biol. Conserv.* 11, 2718–2729. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biocon.2008.08.008>
- 505 Costanza, R., de Groot, R., Braat, L., Kubiszewski, I., Fioramonti, L., Sutton, P., Farber, S., Grasso, M., 2017. Twenty years of ecosystem services: How far have we come and how far do we still need to go? *Ecosyst. Serv.* 28, 1–16. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecoser.2017.09.008>
- 510 Crookes, D.J., Humphreys, D., Masroh, F., Tarchie, B., Milner-Gulland, E., 2007. The role of hunting in village livelihoods in the Ashanti region, Ghana. *South African Journal of Economic and Management Science* 10, 457–469. <https://doi.org/10.4102/sajems.v10i4.1059>
- Dean, W., 1987. *Brazil and the struggle for rubber*. Cambridge University Press.
- 515 De Merode, E., Homewood, K., Cowlshaw, G., 2004. The value of bushmeat and other wild foods to rural households living in extreme poverty in Democratic Republic of Congo. *Biol. Conserv.* 118, 573–581. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biocon.2003.10.005>
- Duchelle, A.E., Cronkleton, P., Kainer, K.A., Guanacoma, G., Gezan, S., 2011. Resource theft in tropical forest communities: Implications for non-timber management, livelihoods, and conservation. *Ecol. Soc.* 16, 4. <https://doi.org/10.5751/ES-03806-160104>
- 520 EOOD, 2018. Meat consumption (indicator). [WWW Document]. URL. (Accessed 11 June 18). <https://data.eood.org/ag/output/meat-consumption.html>
- 525 Fa, J.E., Olivero, J., Real, R., Farfán, M.A., Márquez, A.L., Vargas, J.M., Ziegler, S., Wegmann, M., Brown, D., Margetts, B., Nasi, R., 2015. Disentangling the relative effects of bushmeat availability on human nutrition in central Africa. *Sci. Rep.* 5, 8168. <https://doi.org/10.1038/srep08168>
- 530 Fa, J.E., Peres, C.A., 2001. Game vertebrate extraction in African and Neotropical forests: an intercontinental comparison. in: Reynolds, J.D., Mace, G.M., Redford, K.H., Robinson, J.G. (Eds.), *Conservation of Exploited Species*. Cambridge University Press, UK.
- FAO, 2014. Meat consumption. <https://fao.org/ag/againfo/themes/en/meat/background.html> (accessed 20 October 2018).
- FAO, 2009. *The state of food insecurity in the world*. Rome, Italy: FAO.

- 535 Fischer, J., Abson, D.J., Bergsten, A., French Collier, N., Dorresteijn, I., Hanspach, J.,  
Hylander, K., Schultner, J., Senbeta, F., 2017. Reframing the food-biodiversity  
challenge. *Trends Ecol. Evol.* 32, 335–345.  
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tree.2017.02.009>
- 540 Fragoso, J.M.V., Santos, M.C., 2000. Wildlife and hunting practices of seringueiros in  
Seringal São Salvador. Technical Report, Pesacre.
- Godoy, R., Undurraga, E.A., Wilkie, D., Reyes-García, V., Huanca, T., Leonard, W.R.,  
McDade, T., Tanner, S., Vadez, V., 2010. The effect of wealth and real income on  
wildlife consumption among native Amazonians in Bolivia: Estimates of annual  
trends with longitudinal household data (2002–2006). *Anim. Conserv.* 13, 265–274.  
545 <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1469-1795.2009.00330.x>
- Golden, C.D., Gupta, A.C., Vaitla, B., Myers, S.S., 2016. Ecosystem services and food  
security: assessing inequality at community, household and individual scales.  
*Environ. Conserv.* 4, 381–388. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0376892916000163>
- 550 Golden, C.D., Bonds, M.H., Brashares, J.S., Rodolph Rasolofoniaina, B.J., Kremen, C.,  
2014. Economic valuation of subsistence harvest of wildlife in Madagascar. *Conserv.*  
*Biol.* 28, 234–243. <https://doi.org/10.1111/cobi.12174>
- Golden, C.D., Fernald, L.C.H., Brashares, J.S., Rodolph Rasolofoniaina, B.J., Kremen,  
C., 2011. Benefits of wildlife consumption to child nutrition in a biodiversity  
hotspot. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.* 108, 19653–19656.  
555 <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1112586108>
- Gonzales, J.A., 2003. Patrones generales de caza y pesca em comunidades nativas y  
asentamientos de colonos aledaños a la Reserva Comunal Yanasha, Pasco, Perú.  
CITES. Cartagena.
- 560 Green, R.E., Cornell, S.J., Scharlemann, J.P.W., Balmford, A., 2005. Farming and the  
fate of wild nature. *Science.* 307, 550–555. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1106049>
- Guedes, A.G., 1981. La fauna silvestre y su aprovechamiento por las comunidades  
campa del Rio Pichis. *Revista Forestal del Peru* 10, 1–12.
- Heath, E.R., 2012. A exploração do rio Beni 1880–1881. *Revista Veredas Amazônia*, 2,  
1–67.
- 565 IBGE, 2010. Censo 2010: unidades da federação e terras indígenas.  
[http://ibge.gov.br/home/estatistica/populacao/censo2010/default\\_resultados\\_universo.shtm](http://ibge.gov.br/home/estatistica/populacao/censo2010/default_resultados_universo.shtm)  
(accessed 5 July 2018).
- INE, 2016. Anuario estadístico 2016.
- INEI-ENAH0, 2014. Encuesta nacional de hogares sobre condiciones de vida y pobreza  
570 2014.
- IUCN, 2018. The IUCN Red List of Threatened Species. Version 2018-2.  
<https://www.iucnredlist.org> (accessed 20 July 2018).
- IWGIA-IPES, 2012. Pueblos indígenas en aislamiento voluntario y contacto inicial.
- 575 Laurance, W.F., Carolina Useche, D., Rendeiro, J., Kalka, M., Bradshaw, C.J.A., Sloan,  
S.P., Laurance, S.G., Campbell, M., Abernethy, K., Alvarez, P., Arroyo-Rodriguez,  
V., Ashton, P., Benítez-Malvido, J., Blom, A., Bobo, K.S., Cannon, C.H., Cao, M.,  
Carroll, R., Chapman, C., Coates, R., Cords, M., Danielsen, F., De Dijn, B.,  
Dinerstein, E., Donnelly, M.A., Edwards, D., Edwards, F., Farwig, N., Fashing, P.,  
Forget, P.M., Foster, M., Gale, G., Harris, D., Harrison, R., Hart, J., Karpanty, S.,  
580 John Kress, W., Krishnaswamy, J., Logsdon, W., Lovett, J., Magnusson, W.,  
Maisels, F., Marshall, A.R., McClearn, D., Mudappa, D., Nielsen, M.R., Pearson, R.,  
Pitman, N., Van Der Ploeg, J., Plumptre, A., Poulsen, J., Quesada, M., Rainey, H.,  
Robinson, D., Roetgers, C., Rovero, F., Scatena, F., Schulze, C., Sheil, D.,  
Struhsaker, T., Terborgh, J., Thomas, D., Timm, R., Nicolas Urbina-Cardona, J.,

- 585 Vasudevan, K., Joseph Wright, S., Carlos Arias-G., J., Arroyo, L., Ashton, M.,  
 Auzel, P., Babaasa, D., Babweteera, F., Baker, P., Banki, O., Bass, M., Bila-Isia, I.,  
 Blake, S., Brockelman, W., Brokaw, N., Brühl, C.A., Bunyavejchewin, S., Chao,  
 J.T., Chave, J., Chellam, R., Clark, C.J., Clavijo, J., Congdon, R., Corlett, R.,  
 Dattaraja, H.S., Dave, C., Davies, G., De Mello Beisiegel, B., De Nazaré Paes Da  
 590 Silva, R., Di Fiore, A., Diesmos, A., Dirzo, R., Doran-Sheehy, D., Eaton, M.,  
 Emmons, L., Estrada, A., Ewango, C., Fedigan, L., Feer, F., Fruth, B., Giacalone  
 Willis, J., Goodale, U., Goodman, S., Guix, J.C., Guthiga, P., Haber, W., Hamer, K.,  
 Herbing, I., Hill, J., Huang, Z., Fang Sun, I., Ickes, K., Itoh, A., Ivanauskas, N.,  
 Jackes, B., Janovec, J., Janzen, D., Jiangming, M., Jin, C., Jones, T., Justiniano, H.,  
 595 Kalko, E., Kasangaki, A., Killeen, T., King, H.B., Klop, E., Knott, C., Koné, I.,  
 Kudavidanage, E., Lahoz Da Silva Ribeiro, J., Lattke, J., Laval, R., Lawton, R., Leal,  
 M., Leighton, M., Lentino, M., Leonel, C., Lindsell, J., Ling-Ling, L., Eduard  
 Linsenmair, K., Losos, E., Lugo, A., Lwanga, J., MacK, A.L., Martins, M., Scott  
 McGraw, W., McNab, R., Montag, L., Myers Thompson, J., Nabe-Nielsen, J.,  
 600 Nakagawa, M., Nepal, S., Norconk, M., Novotny, V., O'Donnell, S., Opiang, M.,  
 Ouboter, P., Parker, K., Parthasarathy, N., Pisciotta, K., Prawiradilaga, D., Pringle,  
 C., Rajathurai, S., Reichard, U., Reinartz, G., Renton, K., Reynolds, G., Reynolds,  
 V., Riley, E., Rödel, M.O., Rothman, J., Round, P., Sakai, S., Sanaiotti, T., Savini,  
 T., Schaab, G., Seidensticker, J., Siaka, A., Silman, M.R., Smith, T.B., De Almeida,  
 605 S.S., Sodhi, N., Stanford, C., Stewart, K., Stokes, E., Stoner, K.E., Sukumar, R.,  
 Surbeck, M., Tobler, M., Tscharrntke, T., Turkalo, A., Umapathy, G., Van Weerd,  
 M., Vega Rivera, J., Venkataraman, M., Venn, L., Vereza, C., Volkmer De Castilho,  
 C., Waltert, M., Wang, B., Watts, D., Weber, W., West, P., Whitacre, D., Whitney,  
 K., Wilkie, D., Williams, S., Wright, D.D., Wright, P., Xiankai, L., Yonzon, P.,  
 610 Zamzani, F., 2012. Averting biodiversity collapse in tropical forest protected areas.  
 Nature 489, 290–293. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nature11318>  
 Loja-Alemán, J., Ascorra, C., 2004. Implementación y monitoreo de planes de manejo  
 de fauna silvestre em Tambopata. Memorias: Manejo de Fauna Silvestre em  
 Amazonia y Latinoamérica 1, 442–453.
- 615 Martins, E., 1993. A caça de subsistência de extrativistas na Amazônia:  
 sustentabilidade, biodiversidade e extinção de espécies. Dissertation Universidade de  
 Brasília.
- McShane, T.O., 2003. The devil in the detail of biodiversity conservation. *Conserv.  
 Biol.* 1, 1-3. <https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1523-1739.2003.01717.x>
- 620 Medeiros, T.S.F.M., Garcia, L., 2006. O consumo e as estratégias de caça utilizadas  
 pelas populações tradicionais da Reserva Extrativista Chico Mendes. *Revista  
 Internacional de Desenvolvimento Local* 12, 121–134.
- Milner-Gulland, E.J., Bennett, E.L., the SCB 2002 Annual Meeting Wild Meat Group.,  
 2003. Wild meat: The bigger picture. *Trends Ecol. Evol.* 18, 351–357.  
 625 [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0169-5347\(03\)00123-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0169-5347(03)00123-X)
- Moulatlet, G.M., Zuquim, G., Figueiredo, F.O.G., Lehtonen, S., Emilio, T.,  
 Ruokolainen, K., Tuomisto, H., 2017. Using digital soil maps to infer edaphic  
 affinities of plant species in Amazonia: problems and prospects. *Ecol. Evol.* 7, 8463–  
 8477. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ece3.3242>
- 630 Moura, A.L.B., 2013. Caça de subsistência e os mamíferos da RESEX do Alto  
 Tarauacá, Acre. Dissertation Universidade Federal do Acre.
- Myers, T.P., 1974. Spanish contacts and social change on the Ucayali River.  
*Ethnohistory* 21, 135–157. <https://doi.org/10.2307/480948>

- 635 Nardoto, G. B., Murrieta, R.S.S., Prates, L.E.G., Adams, C., Garavello, M.E.P.E.,  
Schor, T., de Moraes, A., Rinaldi, F.D., Gragnani, J.G., Moura, E.A.F., Duarte-Neto,  
P.J., Martinelli, L.A., 2011. Frozen chicken for wild fish: nutritional transition in the  
Brazilian Amazon region determined by carbon and nitrogen stable isotope ratios in  
fingernails. *Am. J. Hum. Biol.* 23, 642–650. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ajhb.21192>
- 640 Navarro, J.G.G., 2004. Aprovechamiento de la fauna silvestre em comunidades  
Cashinahua del río Curanja y Purús. Informe técnico I.
- Nielsen, M.R., Meilby, H., Smith-Hall, C., Pouliot, M., Treue, T., 2018. The importance  
of wild meat in the global south. *Ecol. Econ.* 146, 696–705.  
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolecon.2017.12.018>
- 645 Nunes, A.V., Guariento, R.D., Santos, B.A., Fischer, E. 2019. Wild meat sharing among  
non-indigenous people in the southwestern Amazon. *Behav. Ecol. Sociobiol.* 73, 26.  
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s00265-018-2628-x>
- 650 Ohl-Schacherer, J., Shepard, G.H., Kaplan, H., Peres, C.A., Levi, T., Yu, D.W., 2007.  
The sustainability of subsistence hunting by Matsigenka native communities in Manu  
National Park, Peru. *Conserv. Biol.* 21, 1174–1185. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1523-1739.2007.00759.x>
- Ojasti, J., 1996. Wildlife utilization in Latin America: current situation and prospects for  
sustainable management. Food and Agriculture Organization, Rome.  
<http://www.fao.org/docrep/T0750E/T0750E00.html>
- 655 Oliveira, M.A., 2012. Efeitos da caça de subsistência sobre a comunidade de mamíferos  
de uma reserva extrativista na Amazônia sul-ocidental. Dissertation Universidade  
Federal do Acre.
- O'Neill, D.W., Fanning, A.L., Lamb, W.F., Steinberger, J.K., 2018. A good life for all  
within planetary boundaries. *Nat. Sustain.* 1, 88–95. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41893-018-0021-4>
- 660 Pacheco, V., Amazon, J., 2000. Análisis de datos de cacería en las comunidades nativas  
de Pikiniki y Nuevo Belén, Rio Alto Purús. in: Pitman, R.L., Pitman, N., Álvarez, P.  
(Eds.), Alto Purus: biodiversidad, conservación y manejo. Impreso Gráfica S.A.  
Lima, Perú.
- 665 Parry, L., Barlow, J., Peres, C.A., 2009. Allocation of hunting effort by Amazonian  
smallholders: Implications for conserving wildlife in mixed-use landscapes. *Biol.  
Conserv.* 142, 1777–1786. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biocon.2009.03.018>
- Parry, L., Peres, C.A., Day, B., Amaral, S., 2010. Rural-urban migration brings  
conservation threats and opportunities to Amazonian watersheds. *Conserv. Lett.* 3,  
251–259. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1755-263X.2010.00106.x>
- 670 Peres, C.A., 2001. Synergistic effects on Amazonian forest vertebrates fragmentation.  
*Conserv. Biol.* 15, 1490–1505. <https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1523-1739.2001.01089.x>
- Peres, C.A., Lake, I.R., 2003. Extent of nontimber resource extraction in tropical  
forests: accessibility to game vertebrates by hunters in the Amazon basin. *Conserv.  
Biol.* 17, 521–535. <https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1523-1739.2003.01413.x>
- 675 Peres, C.A., Baider, C., Zuidema, P.A., Wadt, L.H., Kainer, K.A., Gomes-Silva, D.A.,  
Salomão, R.P., Simões, L.L., Franciosi, E.R., Valverde, F.C., Gribel, R., 2003.  
Demographic threats to the sustainability of Brazil nut exploitation. *Science* 302,  
2112–2114. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1091698>
- 680 Peres, C.A., Gardner, T.A., Barlow, J., Zuanon, J., Michalski, F., Lees, A.C., Vieira,  
I.C.G., Moreira, F.M.S., Feeley, K.J., 2010. Biodiversity conservation in human-  
modified Amazonian forest landscapes. *Biol. Conserv.* 143, 2314–2327.  
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biocon.2010.01.021>

- Peters, C.M., Gentry, A.H., Mendelsohn, R.O., 1989. Valuation of an Amazonian rainforest. *Nature* 339, 655–656. <https://doi.org/10.1038/339655a0>
- 685 Pierret, P.V., Dourojeanni, M.J., 1966. Importancia de la caza para alimentación humana en el curso inferior del Río Ucayali, Perú. *Revista Forestal del Perú* 2, 1–14.
- ProPurús, 2011. Evaluación del uso de los recursos naturales en cuatro comunidades nativas de la provincia de Purús - Ucayali, 2009-2011. Purús, Ucayali, Peru: UAC/ProPurús.
- 690 Ramos, R., 2005. Estrategia de caça e uso de fauna na reserva extrativista no Alto Juruá – AC. Thesis Universidade de São Paulo.
- Redford, K.H., Robinson, J.G., 1987. The game of choice: patterns of indian and colonist hunting in the Neotropics. *Am. Anthropol.* 89, 650–667. <https://doi.org/10.1525/aa.1987.89.3.02a00070>
- 695 Ripple, W.J., Abernethy, K., Betts, M.G., Chapron, G., Dirzo, R., Galetti, M., Levi, T., Lindsey, P.A., Macdonald, D.W., Machovina, B., Newsome, T.M., Peres, C.A., Wallach, A.D., Wolf, C., Young, H., 2016. Bushmeat hunting and extinction risk to the world’s mammals. *Open Sci.* 3, 160498. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rsos.160498>
- Robinson, J.G., Bennett, E.L., 2002. Will alleviating poverty solve the bushmeat crisis? *Oryx.* 36, 332. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S00306053020000662>
- 700 Rosas, G.K.C., Drumond, P.M., 2007. Caracterização da caça de subsistência em dois seringais localizados no estado do Acre, Amazônia. *Embrapa Documentos* 109, 1-31.
- Rumiz, D.I., Maglianesi, M.A., 2012. Hunting impacts associated with Brazil nut harvesting in the Bolivian Amazon. *Vida Silvestre* 1/2, 19–29.
- 705 Rushton, J., Viscarra, R., Viscarra, C., Basset, F., Baptista, R., Brown, D., 2005. How important is bushmeat consumption in South America: now and in the future? *Odi Wildl. Policy Brief.* 11, 1–4.
- Sarti, F.M., Adams, C., Morsello, C., van Vliet, N., Schor, T., Yagüe, B., Tellez, L., 710 Quiceno-Mesa, M.P., Cruz, D., 2015. Beyond protein intake: Bushmeat as source of micronutrients in the Amazon. *Ecol. Soc.* 20, 22. <https://doi.org/10.5751/ES-07934-200422>
- Sheppard, S.N., 2007. Evaluación y monitoreo del aprovechamiento de los recursos hidrobiológicos y de fauna terrestre en comunidades indígenas de la cuenca del Purús – Ucayali, Perú. Informe técnico II, WWF.
- 715 Simon, M.F., Garagorry F.L., 2005. The expansion of agriculture in the Brazilian Amazon. *Environ. Conserv.* 32, 203–212. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0376892905002201>
- Sirén, A., Parvinen, K., 2015. A spatial bioeconomic model of the harvest of wild plants and animals. *Ecol. Econ.* 116, 201–210. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolecon.2015.04.015>
- 720 Stoian, D., 2000. Shifts in forest product extraction: the post-rubber era in the Bolivian Amazon. *International Tree Crops Journal* 10, 277–297. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01435698.2000.9753016>
- 725 Terborgh, J., Robinson, S.K., Iii, T.A.P., Munn, C.A., 1990. Structure and organization of an Amazonian forest bird community. *Ecol. Monogr.* 60, 213–238. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1943045>
- Vallori, F.V., 2012. La barraca gomera boliviana: Etnicidad, mano de obra y aculturación (1880-1920). *Boletín Americanista* 65, 61-83.
- 730 Vallve, F., 2010. The Impact of the rubber boom on the indigenous peoples of the Bolivian lowlands (1850-1920). Dissertation Georgetown University.

Wilkie, D.S., Godoy, R.A., 2001. Income and price elasticities of bushmeat demand in lowland Amerindian Societies. *Conserv. Biol.* 15, 761–769.  
<https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO981107415324.004>

735 Wilkinson, X.V., 2013. Tapping the Amazon for victory: Brazil's "Battle for rubber" of world war II. Thesis Georgetown University.

Wilson, E.D., Fisher, K.H., Garcia, P.A., 1979. *Principles of nutrition*. John Wiley & Sons, New York, USA.