

1 **Do functional traits offset the effects of fragmentation? The case of large-bodied diurnal**  
2 **lemur species**

3

4 Timothy M. Eppley<sup>1,2,\*</sup>, Luca Santini<sup>3</sup>, Jen C. Tinsman<sup>4,5</sup>, Giuseppe Donati<sup>6</sup>

5

6 <sup>1</sup> Institute for Conservation Research, San Diego Zoo Global, PO Box 120551, San Diego,  
7 CA 92112, USA

8

9 <sup>2</sup> Department of Anthropology, Portland State University, PO Box 751, Portland, OR 97297,  
10 USA

11

12 <sup>3</sup> Department of Environmental Science, Institute for Wetland and Water Research, Faculty of  
13 Science, Radboud University, PO Box 9010, NL-6500GL, Nijmegen, The Netherlands

14

15 <sup>4</sup> Institute of the Environment and Sustainability, University of California, Los Angeles, Los  
16 Angeles, CA 90024, USA

17

18 <sup>5</sup> Department of Ecology, Evolution and Environmental Biology Columbia University, New  
19 York, NY 10027, USA

20

21 <sup>6</sup> Department of Social Sciences, Oxford Brookes University, Oxford, OX3 0BP, UK

22

23

24 \*Correspondence:

25 Timothy M. Eppley

26 Institute for Conservation Research

27 San Diego Zoo Global

28 PO Box 120551

29 San Diego, CA 92112

30 USA

31 E-mail: TEppley@sandiegozoo.org

32

33 **Abstract**

34 Primates worldwide are faced with increasing threats making them more vulnerable to  
35 extinction. Anthropogenic disturbances, such as habitat degradation and fragmentation, are  
36 among the main concerns, and in Madagascar, these issues have become widespread. As this  
37 situation continues to worsen, we sought to understand how fragmentation affects primate  
38 distribution throughout the island. Further, because species may exhibit different sensitivity  
39 to fragmentation, we also aimed to estimate the role of functional traits in mitigating their  
40 response. We collated data from 32 large-bodied lemur species ranges, consisting of species  
41 from the families Lemuridae (5 genera) and Indriidae (2 genera). We fitted Generalized  
42 Linear Models to determine the role of habitat fragmentation characteristics, e.g., forest  
43 cover, patch size, edge density, and landscape configuration, as well as the protected area  
44 network, on the species relative probability of presence. We then assessed how the influence  
45 of functional traits (dietary guild, home range size) mitigate the response of species to these  
46 habitat metrics. Habitat area had a strong positive effect for many species, and there were  
47 significantly negative effects of fragmentation on the distribution of many lemur species. In  
48 addition, there was a positive influence of protected areas on many lemur species'  
49 distribution. Functional trait classifications showed that lemurs of all dietary guilds are  
50 negatively affected by fragmentation; however, folivore-frugivores show greater  
51 flexibility/variability in terms of habitat area and landscape complexity compared to nearly  
52 exclusive folivores and frugivores. Furthermore, species of all home range sizes showed a  
53 significantly negative response to fragmentation, while habitat area had an increasingly  
54 positive effect as home range increased in size. Overall, the general trends for the majority of  
55 lemur species are dire and point to the need for immediate actions on a multitude of fronts,  
56 most importantly landscape-level reforestation efforts.

57

58 **Keywords**

59 habitat fragmentation, species distribution, anthropogenic disturbance, Lemuridae, Indriidae,  
60 Madagascar

61

62 **Introduction**

63 Tropical forests hold the majority of global biodiversity, yet these habitats are  
64 experiencing dramatic faunal declines due to continued threats from humans, a process now  
65 termed as “defaunation” (Gibson et al., 2013; Dirzo et al., 2014; Galetti et al., 2017). Among  
66 these primary anthropogenic disturbances are habitat degradation and fragmentation, which  
67 can ultimately lead to local and widespread species extinctions via isolating small populations  
68 (Asner, Rudel, Aide, Defries, & Emerson, 2009; Gibson et al., 2011, 2013; Laurance et al.,  
69 2011; Dirzo et al., 2014; Tilman et al., 2017). Furthermore, fragments remaining within these  
70 human-modified landscapes are often considered unsuitable habitat for the majority of forest  
71 species (Laurance, Goosem, & Laurance, 2009). In fact, fragmentation results in extended  
72 edge habitats, which compared to normal forest interiors can be considered entirely distinct  
73 ecosystems (Laurance, Delamônica, Laurance, Vasconcelos, & Lovejoy, 2000; Pfeifer et al.,  
74 2017). Finally, forest fragmentation increases human accessibility to interior habitat,  
75 therefore increasing the risk of illegal hunting (Benítez-López, Santini, Schipper, Busana, &  
76 Huijbregts, 2019). Taken together, increasingly anthropogenic landscapes have significant  
77 consequences on fauna populations (Dirzo et al., 2014; Ceballos, Ehrlich, & Dirzo, 2017).

78 Considering all primate species, more than half (approximately 60%) are threatened  
79 with extinction, with roughly 75% of all primate species experiencing declining population  
80 trends likely due to unsustainable human activities (Estrada et al., 2017). Within Madagascar,  
81 which is considered to be a biodiversity hotspot due to its many endemic species listed as  
82 Endangered or Critically Endangered by the IUCN (Myers, Mittermeier, Mittermeier, Da

83 Fonseca, & Kent, 2000), ninety-four percent of the 113 currently described lemur species are  
84 threatened with extinction, making them the most threatened vertebrate taxon (Schwitzer et  
85 al. 2013, 2014). The issues surrounding the decline of lemurs are myriad, with the reduction  
86 of lemur species richness primarily due to habitat loss through cultivation and timber  
87 harvesting (Harper, Steininger, Tucker, Juhn, & Hawkins, 2007; Hannah et al., 2008;  
88 Ganzhorn, Lowry, Schatz, & Sommer, 2001; Ganzhorn, Wilmé, & Mercier, 2014; Irwin et  
89 al., 2010; Schwitzer et al., 2014). Specifically, Madagascar's exponential population growth  
90 (UNFPA, 2017; World Bank, 2018) paired with a majority of the population living in  
91 extreme poverty in rural areas (World Bank, 2018), has increased pressure on the forests via  
92 human encroachment (Estrada et al., 2018).

93 Data from 2007 indicated that more than 80% of forested area in Madagascar falls  
94 within 1 km of the forest edge (Harper et al., 2007), while data from 2014 showed that the  
95 mean distance to forest edge on the island was approximately 300 meters (Vielledent et al.,  
96 2018). This trend will likely worsen as the human population of Madagascar continues to  
97 surge (UNFPA, 2017; World Bank, 2018). Fragmentation not only isolates populations by  
98 impeding animal dispersal and potential rescue effects on declining population and gene  
99 flow, but also worsens a number of additional threats (Fahrig, 2002). For example, increasing  
100 contact zones between anthropogenic and natural habitats contributes to increased zoonotic  
101 pathogen transmissions (Chapman, Gillespie, & Goldberg, 2005; Gortazar et al., 2014) and  
102 bushmeat hunting for subsistence (Razafimanahaka et al., 2012; Golden, Bonds, Brashares,  
103 Rasolofoniaina, & Kremen, 2014). The hunting of lemurs is illegal, but consumption of  
104 bushmeat in Madagascar is widespread, with poor rural households often targeting large  
105 diurnal lemur species (Golden, 2009; Jenkins et al., 2011, Borgerson, McKean, Sutherland, &  
106 Godfrey, 2016). Additionally, the illegal pet trade has also been suggested to play a  
107 significant role in the reduction of wild populations (Reuter, Gilles, Wills, & Sewall, 2016),

108 especially for some species, e.g., *Lemur catta* (Gould & Sauther, 2016; LaFleur, Clarke,  
109 Reuter, & Schaefer, 2019).

110 Previous studies predicted that a majority of lemur species will experience massive  
111 range shifts, contracting the amount of habitat available to them (Brown and Yoder, 2015).  
112 Given that nearly all primate populations are declining due to anthropogenic disturbances  
113 (Estrada et al., 2017; Galán-Acedo, Arroyo-Rodríguez, Cudney-Valenzuela, & Fahrig,  
114 2019a), it is imperative to understand specifically how lemurs are currently responding to  
115 habitat degradation, fragmentation and forest loss. Patch-level approaches have been  
116 commonly applied to understand primate species' responses to habitat loss and fragmentation  
117 (Ganzhorn & Eisenbeiß, 2001; Bodin & Norberg, 2007; Boyle & Smith, 2010; da Silva,  
118 Ribeiro, Hasui, da Costa, da Cunha, 2015; Schüßler, Radespiel, Ratsimbazafy, & Mantilla-  
119 Contreras, 2018; Steffens & Lehman, 2018), however, anthropogenic effects often occur at a  
120 landscape-level (Arroyo-Rodríguez et al., 2013; Arroyo-Rodríguez & Fahrig, 2014; Galán-  
121 Acedo et al., 2019a; Galán-Acedo, Arroyo-Rodríguez, Estrada, & Ramos-Fernández, 2019b).  
122 Due to the need for a landscape-level approach, we sought to determine how a number of  
123 habitat metrics influence the presence of all large-bodied diurnal/cathemeral primate species  
124 throughout Madagascar. We did not include nocturnal lemurs because (1) the taxonomy and  
125 distribution of nocturnal lemur species is poorly understood, with many species only known  
126 from a single location (e.g., see Hotaling et al., 2016; Lei et al., 2016), and (2), it has been  
127 shown that relatively smaller-bodied lemurs exhibit a greater tolerance to habitat  
128 fragmentation and disturbance compared to the larger-bodied diurnal/cathemeral species  
129 (Godfrey & Irwin, 2007). In fact, it has been shown that mammals of larger body mass are  
130 more sensitive to fragmentation and edge effects (Pfeifer et al., 2017). For these reasons, we  
131 modelled the role of various habitat characteristics on large-bodied diurnal/cathemeral  
132 species presence to understand how certain populations may be able to persist in the current

133 landscape, including forest fragments, edges and complex matrices. Given the critical state of  
134 human pressure on the remaining natural habitats of Madagascar, we predicted that all the  
135 lemurs considered will be negatively affected by anthropogenic disturbance.

136         It has been shown that species' responses to gradual and stochastic changes to  
137 environments may be mitigated by the species' functional traits (e.g., activity pattern, body  
138 size, dietary guild, home range size), and such an ability to expand niche breadth is vital to  
139 withstanding anthropogenic risks (Lee, 2003; Wieczkowski, 2003; Isaac & Cowlishaw, 2004;  
140 Boyle & Smith, 2010; Nowak & Lee, 2013; Donati et al., 2016; Eppley et al., 2017). Unlike  
141 previous lemur-fragmentation studies that have only focused on site-specific or regional  
142 scales (e.g., Irwin et al., 2010; Kamilar & Tecot, 2016; Steffens & Lehman, 2018), we  
143 modelled the role of several species functional traits (i.e., dietary guild, home range size) in  
144 determining sensitivity to fragmentation throughout Madagascar for all 32 large-bodied  
145 diurnal/cathemeral lemur species. As habitats disappear, it has been postulated that dietary /  
146 habitat specialists will be affected more than dietary / habitat generalists, as high dietary  
147 diversity may buffer against extinction (Nowak & Lee, 2013). Frugivores are faced with a  
148 scattered spatial and temporal resource distribution, typically requiring extensive home  
149 ranges, potentially limiting their ability to cope within altered landscapes (Estrada & Coates-  
150 Estrada, 1996; Rode, Chapman, McDowell, & Stickler, 2006; Boyle & Smith, 2010; Donati  
151 et al., 2011; Campera et al., 2014). By comparison, folivores may be less affected by habitat  
152 degradation as leaves in secondary growth are often of higher dietary quality compared to  
153 those leaves available in mature forests (Plumptre & Reynolds 1994; Ganzhorn 1995;  
154 Chapman, Chapman, Bjorndal, & Onderdonk, 2002; Eppley, Donati, & Ganzhorn, 2016),  
155 though folivorous primates can be highly selective and potentially require equally large home  
156 ranges (Snaith & Chapman, 2005). Considering the large-bodied lemurs, we expect genera  
157 such as *Varecia* and most *Eulemur* to be severely affected by habitat availability and

158 fragmentation due to their high reliance on fruit resources and need for larger home ranges.  
159 By comparison, generalist folivores, e.g., *Hapalemur*, *Prolemur*, *Indri* and some *Propithecus*,  
160 especially those with smaller home ranges, are expected to be the least affected. We expect  
161 that lemurs with folivore-frugivore diets (e.g., *Lemur catta*, some *Eulemur* and some  
162 *Propithecus*) will display intermediate effects due to fragmentation.

163

## 164 **Methods**

165

### 166 *Data collection*

167

168 We obtained occurrence points for all diurnal and cathemeral lemur species, totaling  
169 32 taxa, from the dataset collated by Tinsman (2019). These include the genera *Eulemur* (12  
170 species), *Lemur catta*, *Hapalemur* (4 species), *Prolemur simus*, and *Varecia* (2 species / 3  
171 subspecies) from the family Lemuridae, and *Propithecus* (9 species) and *Indri indri* from the  
172 family Indriidae. We considered the three *Varecia variegata* subspecies as separate taxa  
173 within our analyses as they are geographically isolated from one another and inhabit regions  
174 with differing degrees of pressure on the remaining forest habitat. The only species from  
175 these genera to be excluded was *Hapalemur alaotrensis* as it is only known from the area  
176 immediate area surrounding Lac Alaotra (Rendigs et al., 2015), thus we did not have enough  
177 distribution points to allow for comprehensive modelling. Three types of sources were  
178 utilized: 1) points collected in the field by co-authors, 2) online databases including the  
179 Global Biodiversity Information Facility (GBIF), Mammal Networked Information System  
180 (MaNIS), VertNet, Madagascar Lemurs Portal, and Réseau de la Biodiversité de Madagascar  
181 (ReBioMa), and 3) peer-reviewed published sources. For this last source, we searched all  
182 articles published in *Lemur News*, *Madagascar Conservation and Development*, and *Primate*

183 *Conservation* for GPS coordinates, in addition to several Google Scholar searches using a  
184 combination of various key terms. This yielded a total of 6,503 occurrence points across all  
185 forest types of various degrees of fragmentation in both protected and unprotected sites.  
186 Occurrence points were then vetted in which localities >50 km outside the species' IUCN  
187 occurrence area, as well as undated localities for species that have since been taxonomically  
188 split, were considered suspect and thus removed from the dataset. Further, we only retained 1  
189 occurrence point per 1-km cell. We were left with a remainder of 3,006 reliable and unique  
190 occurrence points (Figure S1).

191 We obtained a 30-m resolution forest density map for 2010 from Vielledent et al.  
192 (2018) and binarized it at 75% of canopy coverage ( $\geq 75\% = 1$ ;  $< 75\% = 0$ ) consistently with  
193 what done in Vielledent et al., 2018. Most of our occurrence data come from protected areas  
194 which are expected to be, on average, less fragmented and degraded; therefore in order to  
195 avoid potential biases due to more frequent sampling in protected areas, we also downloaded  
196 a spatial layer of the Madagascar Protected Area Network, hereafter referred to as Protected  
197 Areas (PA), from the online database Réseau de la Biodiversité de Madagascar (ReBioMa)  
198 (Fig. S2). Nearly all forests in Madagascar exhibit some relative degree of fragmentation  
199 (Vielledent et al., 2018), thus PAs include both fragmented and less fragmented forests.

200

#### 201 *Data preparation and fragmentation analysis*

202

203 We used the binary forest maps (0 = non-forest; 1 = forest) to estimate the level of  
204 forest fragmentation at 1-km resolution. Many fragmentation metrics exist, partly because  
205 they measure different components of fragmentation, and partly because they measure these  
206 components using different approximations. Here we considered 11 different metrics (Table  
207 S1) and then used a principal component analysis (hereafter PCA) to reduce the factors



208 considered within our model analysis. We used varimax rotation to improve interpretation of  
209 the PCA axes, and extracted the first 3 axes covering 95% of the total variance (Table S2).  
210 The first axis mostly accounted for the available habitat area (e.g. Mean patch area, Total  
211 core area, Mean patch core area and Proportion of canopy cover); the second axis mostly  
212 accounted for the actual fragmentation of the habitat (e.g., Edge density, Patch density, and  
213 Perimeter area fractal dimension); and the third axis mostly accounted for landscape  
214 complexity (e.g., Mean shape index, Landscape shape index), i.e., measuring the physical  
215 shape of the habitat (Table 1; Table S1). The first two axes, ‘habitat area’ and  
216 ‘fragmentation’, can be interpreted as the amount of habitat area per cell and the density of  
217 patches/edges per unit area, respectively. ‘Landscape complexity’ can be interpreted as a  
218 measure of the overall geometric complexity of the landscape or of a focal class, in our case,  
219 forest. These indices are based on the ratio between perimeter and area, and measure if patch  
220 shape tends to be simple and compact, or irregular and convoluted. It can also be interpreted  
221 as a measure of landscape disaggregation, where higher values indicate more dispersed  
222 patches in the landscape (McGarigal & Marks, 1995).

223 To test the influence of functional traits on species distribution, we assigned species  
224 according to their dietary guild. Previous authors have defined *frugivore* as an animal whose  
225 diet is composed of  $\geq 50\%$  fruits (Fleming, Breitwisch, & Whitesides, 1987; Donati et al.,  
226 2017), and while this approach offers an easy solution, it overlooks the flexibility of some  
227 species that greatly shift their diet seasonally. Thus, we identified *folivore-frugivores* as  
228 species consuming between  $\geq 35\%$  to  $\leq 65\%$  fruit in their diet, with *frugivores* defined as  $>$   
229  $65\%$  fruit and *folivores* as  $< 35\%$  fruit. This classification, though also crude, allows us to  
230 make meaningful comparisons between the three dietary guilds (Kappeler & Heymann,  
231 1996). The diets of all lemur species were determined from a comprehensive literature survey  
232 using the All The World’s Primates’ (ATWP) database (Rowe & Myers, 2017). In the case of

233 multiple behavioral and feeding ecology studies on a species, we calculated the mean percent  
234 of fruit consumed so as to have a single value. Of the lemurs included in the analyses, 11  
235 species are considered folivores (*Hapalemur* spp. / *Prolemur simus*, some *Propithecus* spp.,  
236 and *Indri indri*), seven species are folivore-frugivores (some *Eulemur* spp., some *Propithecus*  
237 spp., and *Lemur catta*), while *Varecia* ssp. (four taxa) and most *Eulemur* spp. (nine taxa)  
238 maintain a frugivorous diet (Table S3). Additionally, we determined mean home range size  
239 (ha), hereafter referred to as ‘home range size’, for each species following the same  
240 comprehensive literature survey via ATWP (Table S3; Rowe & Myers, 2017).

241

## 242 *Modelling*

243

244 We tested for the effect of fragmentation on the species probability of presence using  
245 a species distribution modelling approach. For each species, we sampled a number of  
246 background (i.e., pseudo-absence) data points equal to 10 times the number of presences  
247 (Barbet-Massin, Jiguet, Albert, & Thuiller, 2012). Background points are used to contrast the  
248 available habitat with the habitat where the species have been observed. When background  
249 points are used instead of real absences (i.e. presence-only models), the model estimates a  
250 relative probability of presence (Guillera-Arroita et al., 2015). Background points are  
251 commonly sampled randomly in areas potentially accessible to the species, often based on  
252 estimates of dispersal distance from occurrence points (e.g. Thuiller, Lafourcade, Engler, &  
253 Araújo, 2009; Brown & Yoder, 2015). Therefore, we limited the sampling of the randomly  
254 distributed background points within a buffer whose radius corresponded to the estimated  
255 dispersal distance of each species. Dispersal distance was estimated from home range areas  
256 using the allometric relationships in Santini et al. (2013). This ensured that we sampled  
257 background points only in areas potentially accessible to the species (Araújo et al., 2019).

258 Background points falling in non-forested areas within the buffer were assigned the highest  
259 fragmentation values in the landscape. To control for the spatial bias and pseudo-replication  
260 of presence points, we only retained one presence point per 1-km, which exceeds the radius  
261 of home range area of all species in our sample (range = 0.06 - 0.65 km). To compare the  
262 strength of the relationship of different predictors, we standardized all predictor variables to a  
263 mean of 0 and a standard deviation of 1. Then, for each species we fitted a generalized linear  
264 model (GLM) with a binomial family, using the presences (1s) and background points (0s) as  
265 response variables, and the three fragmentation and the protected area variables as predictors  
266 (Table 1). Including protected areas separately from the fragmentation axes allowed us to  
267 estimate the relative contribution of fragmentation to the relative probability of presence of  
268 species while controlling for the confounding effect of protected areas. We ran a model  
269 selection for each of the models using AICc (Akaike Information Criterion corrected for  
270 small samples) and retained models with the lowest AICc value. Here we present both the full  
271 models and the selected models.

272 To test the effect of species traits on species sensitivity to fragmentation, we ran a  
273 generalized linear mixed effect model (GLMM) including all species. We used the same  
274 predictors used in the single species GLM (F1, F2, F3, and protected areas) and the  
275 interaction between the three habitat metrics and the  $\log_{10}$ -transformed values of species  
276 average home range size and species dietary guild. We treated species as a random effect. We  
277 checked whether there was phylogenetic autocorrelation in the residuals and determined it  
278 was not necessary to control for phylogeny (Pagel Lambda = 0.300,  $P = 0.103$ ). We present  
279 both the full models and the selected models, and in the latter case we opted for selecting the  
280 best fit model with the lowest number of parameters (Arnold et al., 2010).

281 All analyses were computed using R statistical software (R Core Team, 2017). We  
282 used the R package “psych” (Revelle, 2018) for the principal component analysis. We used

283 the package “raster” (Hijman & van Etten, 2014) for all raster operations and the package  
284 “sf”(Pebesma, 2018) for vector operations. We used “SDMTools” package (VanDerWal,  
285 Falconi, Januchowski, Shoo, & Storlie, 2014) to compute the fragmentation metrics, and  
286 “GIStools” (Brundson & Chen, 2014) to estimate the density kernel.

287

## 288 **Results**

289

290 In general, all habitat variables tested were important for most of the species (Figure  
291 1; Table S4), though five species, i.e., *E. mongoz*, *E. macaco*, *P. deckenii*, *P. coronatus*, and  
292 *P. perrieri*, were not included in the selected models. The first habitat component (F1)  
293 accounting for habitat availability and mean patch area was significant in explaining the  
294 distribution of 10 taxa (31.3% of lemurs modelled). This F1 component had a positive effect  
295 on the distribution of these ten species, mostly *Eulemur* and *Propithecus*. The second  
296 component (F2) accounting for habitat fragmentation was significant in 14 taxa (43.8% of  
297 lemurs modelled), always showing a negative effect, therefore indicating that for most  
298 species the probability of presence is lower when the habitat is fragmented. These results  
299 equally affected at least some species of all genera, though *I. indri* was not included in this  
300 selected model. The third component (F3) accounting for landscape complexity was  
301 significant in 2 taxa (6.3% of lemurs modelled), negatively affecting the distribution of *H.*  
302 *occidentalis* and *V. v. subcincta* (Figure 1; Table S4). Protected areas showed a positive effect  
303 in 37.5% of taxa modelled (Figure 1; Table S4). Among species for which variables were not  
304 retained during model selection (i.e., the only-intercept model was the best model), there is  
305 also a pattern of consistent negative effect of fragmentation (see Figure S3; Table S5 for full  
306 model results).

307 Using the data from the selected models, the effect of traits on the fragmentation  
308 metrics was limited. Habitat area (F1) had a positive effect on lemur species and a positive  
309 interaction with home range area, suggesting that habitat area is especially important for  
310 species with large home ranges (Figure 2; Tables S5, S6). For fragmentation (F2), there was  
311 negative effect for all species, regardless of home range size (Figure 3; Tables S5, S6).

312 Considering the full model for the trait-specific analysis, the effect of dietary guild on  
313 F1, all species regardless of diets were more likely to be present in areas with greater habitat  
314 availability and mean patch area (Figure 4a; Table S7). Regarding F2, all dietary guilds, i.e.,  
315 folivores, frugivores, and folivore-frugivores, were negatively affected by patch and edge  
316 density (Figure 4b; Table S7). The negative effect of F2 became more strongly negative with  
317 increased home ranges of lemur species (Figure 5b; Table S7). Landscape complexity (F3)  
318 negatively affected both folivores and frugivores, while having a strongly positive affect on  
319 folivore-frugivores (Figure 4c; Table S7). Finally, landscape complexity negatively affected  
320 species of both small and medium home range sizes, though positively affected species with  
321 large home range sizes (Figure 5c; Table S7).

322

## 323 **Discussion**

324

325 Among the three habitat variables considered (F1, F2, and F3), the one accounting for  
326 habitat fragmentation (F2; highly correlated with habitat patch and edge density) had the  
327 strongest overall negative effect on species distribution, while both F1 (habitat area) and PAs  
328 had strong positive effects on many species (Figure 1). Lastly, landscape complexity does not  
329 appear to play a large role effecting species distribution. Furthermore, as expected, species  
330 with larger home range areas were more negatively affected by habitat availability, but did  
331 not exhibit a higher sensitivity to fragmentation than species with small home range areas.

332 Considering general trends, all dietary guilds were positively affected by F1 (habitat area)  
333 and negatively affected by F2 (fragmentation).

334

335 *True lemurs: Eulemur spp.*

336

337 Our analyses seem to mirror previously reported effects on the diverse *Eulemur* clade  
338 (Bayart & Simmen, 2005; Schwitzer, Randriatahina, Kaumanns, Hoffmeister, & Schwitzer,  
339 2007; Donati et al., 2011; Brenneman et al., 2012; Tecot, 2013; Balestri et al., 2014; Campera  
340 et al., 2014), with the distribution of many brown lemur species trending or significantly  
341 influenced by ‘habitat area’ (F1) and ‘fragmentation’ (F2). Habitat area positively affected  
342 the distribution of four, mostly rainforest inhabitant *Eulemur* spp., including *E. albifrons*, *E.*  
343 *fulvus*, and *E. rubriventer*. All three have large species ranges, though *E. sanfordi* has a  
344 significantly smaller species range with less habitat available to it. Concerning F2, habitat  
345 fragmentation negatively or strongly negatively affected the distribution of five, dry forest  
346 species, while landscape complexity (F3) provided no effects on *Eulemur* spp. distribution. In  
347 general terms, it appears that *Eulemur* species inhabiting larger, continuous humid forest tend  
348 to be more vulnerable to variations in canopy cover while species coping with more  
349 discontinuous and open dry forest habitat respond more to strict fragmentation and edge  
350 density. PAs showed a positive effect on the distribution of seven *Eulemur* spp., yet neither  
351 black lemurs (*E. macaco*) nor mongoose lemurs (*E. mongoz*) showed any effects to protected  
352 areas or the fragmentation metrics.

353 Overall, *Eulemur* taxa occur across all habitat types in Madagascar (Mittermeier et al.,  
354 2010). This genus consists of both frugivores and folivore-frugivores, and in addition to a  
355 relatively large dietary flexibility (but see Sato et al., 2016), they exhibit a wide variation in  
356 activity patterns (i.e., cathemerality), ranging pattern, and social organization (e.g., pair-living

357 and multi-male multi-female social groups), and as such, many species within are considered  
358 ecologically flexible primates (Overdorff, 1993a, 1993b; Donati, Bollen, Borgognini-Tarli, &  
359 Ganzhorn, 2007; Donati et al., 2011, 2016; Ossi & Kamilar 2006; Kappeler & Fichtel, 2016;  
360 Sato et al., 2016). Western species that occur within the seasonal, deciduous forest seem to be  
361 more vulnerable to fragmentation and edge area (Kamilar & Tecot, 2016; Sato et al., 2016).  
362 Smaller home-range requirements in western species compared to eastern species (Overdorff,  
363 1993a; Curtis & Zaramody, 1998; Donati, Lunardini, & Kappeler, 1999; Schwitzer et al.,  
364 2007; Donati et al., 2011; Sato et al., 2016) and perhaps better abilities to cross the matrix  
365 between the forest fragments (Steffens & Lehman, 2018) may allow them to persist despite  
366 the smaller available habitat and the reduced canopy cover. However, highly fragmented  
367 areas with significant edge effects still cause a negative response on the probability of  
368 occurrence of dry forest *Eulemur* suggesting a threshold of habitat pulverization beyond which  
369 these flexible species disappear. In support of these negative effects of fragmentation, some  
370 *Eulemur* species living in relatively degraded habitats show clear signs of increased levels of  
371 stress (Tecot, 2013; Balestri et al., 2014).

372

373 *Ring-tailed lemurs: Lemur catta*

374

375         Similar to some of the dry forest brown lemurs, our analysis revealed that ring-tailed  
376 lemurs (*L. catta*) was significantly affected by fragmentation and protected areas.  
377 Considering the behavioral ecology of *L. catta*, it is not altogether surprising that the habitat  
378 and landscape complexity variables were not significant predictors. This geographically  
379 widespread species maintains a frugivorous-folivorous diet and is considered the most  
380 ecologically flexible lemur (Sauther, Sussman, & Gould, 1999; Goodman, Rakotoarisoa, &  
381 Wilmé, 2006; Gould, 2006; Jolly, Koyama, & Rasamimanana, 2006; LaFleur & Gould, 2009;

382 Axel & Maurer, 2011; Kelley, 2011; Cameron & Gould, 2013; Donati et al., 2013; Gabriel,  
383 2013). They are also semiterrestrial and known to exploit anthropogenic landscapes (Sauther  
384 et al., 2006; LaFleur & Gould, 2009; Gabriel 2013), yet it is suggested that this species is  
385 sensitive to moderate habitat disturbance as populations occurring in poor quality habitats  
386 have lower densities (Sussman, Green, Porton, Andrianasolondraibe, & Ratsirarson, 2003;  
387 Kelley, 2011; Gabriel, 2013). Thus, their flexibility in being able to exploit areas outside of  
388 strict forest habitat at least may allow this species to sustain populations within fragmented  
389 landscapes (Anderson, Rowcliffe, & Cowlshaw, 2007; Gabriel, 2013). Contrary to many  
390 recent publications (Sussman et al., 2003; Axel & Maurer, 2011; Cameron & Gould, 2013),  
391 however, our findings show that similar to most lemur species, PAs represent a widespread  
392 positive effect on the distribution of *L. catta*. Either way, it is difficult to be optimistic about  
393 lemur persistence in increasingly fragmented and further isolated landscapes, which may lead  
394 to future genetic health bottlenecks (Parga, Sauther, Cuzzo, Jacky, & Lawler, 2012).

395

396 *Bamboo lemurs: Hapalemur spp. and Prolemur simus*

397

398 Fragmentation (F2) was more important than habitat availability (F1) and landscape  
399 complexity (F3) in determining the probability of presence of *Hapalemur* species / *Prolemur*  
400 *simus*. Bamboo lemurs are folivorous, and their ecological flexibility may allow bamboo  
401 lemurs to persist in heavily altered environments, allowing them utilize edge habitat (Grassi,  
402 2006; Eppley et al., 2015, 2016, 2017). Not all bamboo lemurs, however, are able to cope  
403 with habitat fragmentation. The greater bamboo lemur (*P. simus*) used to be one of the most  
404 widespread lemur species (Godfrey, Jungers, Simons, Chatrath, & Rakotosamimanana,  
405 1999), but is now restricted to a handful of sites within the eastern humid forests (Wright et  
406 al., 2008; Ravaloharimanitra et al., 2011). A recent study showed that its dwindling range



407 was essentially the result of climate change altering botanical diversity within dry deciduous  
408 habitats, and causing the lemur's main food resource (giant bamboos) to go extinct locally  
409 (Eronen et al., 2017). Contrary to other genera, PAs were not an important predictor of  
410 *Hapalemur* spp. presence. Furthermore, PAs did not show a positive effect on the distribution  
411 of the greater bamboo lemur (*P. simus*), and this may be due to it only being known from a  
412 small number of recently discovered sites (Wright et al., 2008; Ravaloharimanitra et al.,  
413 2011). For the most part, these areas are not yet formally protected by the government, but  
414 are being actively protected by both conservation research NGOs and local communities as  
415 they present an economic benefit to the surrounding area. In addition to these formally  
416 unprotected sites, the species is known to occur in Ranomafana NP, while feeding remains  
417 have been observed in both Zahamena NP to the north, and Midongy du Sud NP in the south  
418 (Rakotonirina et al., 2011).

419

420 *Ruffed lemurs: Varecia rubra and Varecia variegata ssp.*

421

422 The various habitat metrics provided similar results across ruffed lemur taxa. Habitat  
423 area (F1) had a positive effect on *Varecia rubra* presence which inhabits the largest  
424 continuous humid forest remaining in Madagascar (Masoala-Makira) whereas fragmentation  
425 (F2) had a strongly negative effect on both *V. variegata editorum* and *V. v. variegata*. Taking  
426 into account the uneven distribution of this genus throughout its range, these findings are  
427 expected. Members of this genus are characterized by utilizing the largest relative food trees  
428 and maintaining large home ranges (Rigamonti, 1993; Vasey, 2000; Ratsimbazafy, 2006), to  
429 a degree that species densities are significantly lower and/or absent in anthropogenically  
430 impacted habitats leading to the perception that they are sensitive to habitat disturbance  
431 (White, Overdorff, Balko, & Wright, 1995; Balko & Underwood, 2005; Herrera, Wright,

432 Lauterbur, Ratavonjanahary, & Taylor, 2011). Though generally true, *V. v. editorum* is  
433 known to inhabit less than ideal habitat, e.g., shifting cultivation and secondary forest  
434 (Hekkala, Rakotondratsima, & Vasey, 2007), forest restoration zones (Martinez &  
435 Razafindratsima, 2014; de Winter et al., 2018), and even in degraded fragments intermixed  
436 with coffee plantations (Holmes et al., 2013), thus providing an explanation as to why this  
437 taxon differs from the other ruffed lemurs. To build on this, however, it has been shown that  
438 patch size may influence how fast genetic diversity is lost after patch isolation (Holmes et al.,  
439 2013), with signs of genetic bottleneck occurring in degraded habitats (Razakamaharavo,  
440 McGuire, Vasey, Louis, & Brenneman, 2010). With the current distribution occurring at low  
441 densities across fragmented populations (Vasey, 2004; Louis et al., 2005; Holmes et al.,  
442 2013; Baden et al., 2014), this threat may become even more dire following severe  
443 environmental disturbances, whether natural or anthropogenic. In fact, over a 10-year period  
444 (1991 – 2001), *V. variegata editorum* within the small fragmented PA of Manombo Special  
445 Reserve failed to successfully reproduce (Ratsimbazafy, 2002), yet populations occurring at  
446 other sites were successful, thus the geographic coastal locale led to speculation that  
447 stochastic weather events resulted in low dietary quality foods (Louis et al., 2005; Dunham,  
448 Erhart, & Wright, 2010).

449

450 *Sifaka and indri: Propithecus spp. / Indri indri*

451

452           Similar to bamboo lemurs, both habitat availability (F1) and fragmentation (F2) were  
453 important in determining the probability of presence of *Propithecus* spp. and *Indri indri*.  
454 Sifaka (*Propithecus* spp.) are relatively widespread throughout most Madagascar habitats,  
455 i.e., eastern humid, dry/humid deciduous, and spiny desert (Mittermeier et al., 2010). For  
456 example, fragmentation had a strongly negative effect on the distribution of golden-crowned

457 sifaka (*P. tattersalli*), a species endemic to the Daraina region of northern Madagascar.  
458 According to Quéméré, Amelot, Pierson, Crouau-Roy, & Chikhi (2012), however, the small  
459 remaining population of golden-crowned sifaka had contracted prior to human arrival.  
460 Interestingly, the distribution of Perrier's sifaka (*P. perrieri*) a little further north showed no  
461 effects from any of the fragmentation metrics despite its current species range being quite  
462 fragmented. It is noted, however, that this species was able to disperse over large distances of  
463 open habitat within the recent past (Salmona et al., 2015). Habitat area (F1) positively  
464 affected both *P. coquereli* and *P. candidus*. The main difference is that the former inhabits an  
465 extremely fragmented western deciduous forest, while the latter is found in a few large,  
466 humid eastern forest blocks (Pichon et al., 2010; Salmona et al., 2014). Despite these habitat  
467 differences, all *Propithecus* spp. are threatened by habitat loss from charcoal production and  
468 shifting cultivation (Schwitzer et al. 2013; Kun-Rodrigues et al., 2014).

469         Considering all nine sifaka species, both *P. diadema* and *P. verreauxi* inhabit the  
470 largest geographic areas, the central-northeastern humid forest and the dry deciduous / spiny  
471 desert of the southwest, respectively (Mittermeier et al., 2010). Despite their widespread  
472 distribution, fragmentation (F2) negatively affected *P. diadema*, while habitat area (F1)  
473 positively affected *P. verreauxi*. These results are similar to other congeners which inhabit  
474 distinctly different biomes, and is likely due to *P. verreauxi* inhabiting more seasonal and  
475 heavily fragmented forests in western and southwestern Madagascar (Axel & Maurer, 2011).  
476 It should be noted that while *P. diadema* inhabit some fragmented forests, the long-term  
477 viability of these populations is unknown as previous research has suggested that smaller  
478 habitats can lead to morphometric signals of population decline (Irwin et al., 2019).

479         Habitat area (F1) had a significant effect on the largest extant lemur, indri  
480 (Mittermeier et al., 2010; Junge, Barrett, & Yoder, 2011). This species is restricted to the  
481 central-eastern humid forests (Mittermeier et al., 2010), yet despite their overall population

482 sizes being reduced by habitat degradation, they display an ecological plasticity allowing  
483 them to live in various sized forest fragments (Glessner & Britt, 2005; Nunziata et al., 2016).  
484 However, this may be partially due to the significantly positive affect of PA on indri  
485 presence.

486

#### 487 *Trait-specific sensitivity to fragmentation*

488

489 Overall, lemurs' functional traits appear to be affected by habitat availability,  
490 fragmentation and configuration as expected. Our results showed that species with larger  
491 home range were more positively affected by habitat availability (Figure 2), indicating that  
492 species with small home range areas are more tolerant to habitat loss than species with large  
493 home range areas. We also detected a negative effect of fragmentation across species, but no  
494 interaction with home range size (Figure 3). These results are mirrored our full model trait-  
495 specific models (Figure 5).

496 Our full models showed that greater habitat availability had a similar positive effect  
497 on both folivores and frugivores, thus species with these more specialized dietary preferences  
498 were more often distributed within larger habitat areas. While it is suggested that frugivores  
499 often have larger home ranges in order to cope with the scattered spatial and temporal  
500 distribution of fruiting resources (Estrada & Coates-Estrada, 1996), folivores can be similarly  
501 highly selective of the leaves they consume and thus require larger habitat area (Snaith &  
502 Chapman, 2005). Considering folivore-frugivores, habitat area (F1) also had a positive effect  
503 though there appeared to be increased variability. It is possible that their flexible diet allows  
504 these species, e.g., *E. rufus*, *L. catta*, and *P. tattersalli* among others, to disproportionately  
505 inhabit smaller habitat patches and/or more open forests. It is important to note that the diet  
506 of *Propithecus* is diverse and species are classified as either folivores or folivore-frugivores

507 (Hemingway, 1998; Powzyk & Mowry, 2003; Norscia, Carrai, & Borgognini-Tarli, 2006;  
508 Irwin, 2008; Sato et al. 2016; Koch, Ganzhorn, Rothman, Chapman, & Fichtel, 2017), thus  
509 the folivore models may be more strongly influenced by other ecologically-specialized  
510 lemurs, e.g., bamboo lemurs and indri. Considering the mean sizes of home ranges, the effect  
511 of habitat area transitioned from negative to strongly positive as lemur home ranges  
512 increased, indicating that lemurs with small home ranges may prefer smaller habitat patches  
513 whereas species with large home range prefer large intact habitat areas.

514         The fragmentation metric (F2) had negative affect on species of all dietary guilds.  
515 This result was expected for frugivores which require larger habitat areas to meet their dietary  
516 demands, but it was unexpected for both folivore-frugivores and folivores which typically  
517 display a level of ecological flexibility allowing them to cope well within fragmented areas.  
518 In general, previous site-specific research has shown folivores to be less vulnerable to habitat  
519 disturbance and edge effects (Ganzhorn, 1995; Lehman, Rajaonson, & Day, 2006; Eppley et  
520 al., 2015, 2017), while frugivorous lemurs have been shown to be adversely affected by  
521 anthropogenic, degraded habitat (White et al., 1995; Balko & Underwood, 2005; Herrera et  
522 al., 2011). As frugivorous lemurs are important seed dispersers, they are essential for the  
523 maintenance of forest diversity and play a fundamental role in habitat regeneration  
524 (Ganzhorn, Fietz, Rakotavao, Schwab, & Zinner, 1999; Wright et al., 2011; Razafindratsima  
525 & Dunham, 2014; Federman et al., 2016). Folivore-frugivores, on the other hand, have  
526 previously showed mixed responses to edge habitats, possibly due to their wide dietary  
527 breadth across seasons, allowing some species to persist in degraded and fragmented  
528 landscapes (Lehman et al., 2006; Sato et al., 2016; de Winter et al., 2018). Yet, our overall  
529 results, however, show that each of these dietary guilds are near equally affected by  
530 fragmentation (F2). When considering lemur home range size, the effect of fragmentation  
531 became more strongly negative as home range size increased, as would be expected. Thus,

532 species with smaller home ranges (e.g., *E. sanfordi*, *H. occidentalis*) are able to better cope  
533 with fragmentation compared to lemurs requiring large home ranges (e.g., *Varecia* spp.).

534 For the third habitat metric, landscape complexity (F3) showed a similar somewhat  
535 neutral effect on both folivores and frugivores. This is an unexpected result for lemurs with a  
536 folivorous diet, which often cope well within more fragmented habitat matrices (Boyle &  
537 Smith, 2010; Eppley et al., 2015). It should be noted that as exceptions, *H. occidentalis* (a  
538 folivore) and *V. v. subcincta* (a frugivore) showed significantly negative effects of landscape  
539 complexity. On the other hand, F3 displayed a strongly positive effect on folivore-frugivores  
540 meaning that their presence increased with landscape complexity. Similar to previous  
541 explanations for lemur folivore-frugivores, their flexible dietary ability potentially allows for  
542 them to locate resources in these habitats. Regardless of dietary guild, this habitat metric had  
543 a negative effect on lemurs across small and medium home range sizes, though a slightly  
544 positive effect on lemurs with large home ranges

545

#### 546 *Potential caveats*

547

548 In this study we made a number of assumptions in order to estimate the effect of  
549 habitat availability, fragmentation and complexity on the probability of species' presence.  
550 First, in order to apply fragmentation metrics, we had to binarize forest coverage, and used a  
551 threshold of 75% of canopy cover. While this seemed to be a reasonable threshold for most  
552 species (Vielledent et al., 2018), it may be too high for species selecting more open forest  
553 habitats such as ring-tailed lemurs. Second, we assumed species' presence to be an indication  
554 of habitat quality (intended as amount of habitat and its level of fragmentation), however this  
555 is a simplification as species may persist for a certain amount of time in a fragmented habitat  
556 (Chapman, Lawes, Naughton-Treves, & Gillespie, 2003; Araújo & Guisan, 2006). Therefore

557 it is possible that the effects that we detected are diluted and thus, under-estimated. Third, we  
558 contrasted species' occurrence points with background points drawn randomly from the  
559 surrounding -potentially accessible- areas. If occurrence points were preferentially collected  
560 in more accessible areas (less dense and more fragmented forests) compared to more intact  
561 forest areas, our models may have estimated an inverse effect, as indicated with several  
562 *Eulemur* and *Hapalemur* species within the full model (Table S5, Figure S3). Fourth, it is  
563 possible that the positive effect of PAs is a genuine effect suggesting that species in have a  
564 higher probability of occurrence in PAs than in surrounding areas, however, this may simply  
565 reflect the fact that most presence points are collected in protected areas. Finally, it is  
566 important to remember that while these models provide us with an interpretation for the  
567 current distribution of large-bodied lemurs throughout Madagascar, these data do not take  
568 into account exogenous factors (e.g., additional anthropogenic pressures, climate, etc.) that  
569 may be further impacting certain species and habitats. All in all, our results meet most of the  
570 expectations and show a consistent negative effect of fragmentation on species presence that  
571 is unlikely to arise from any of the above assumptions.

572

### 573 *Implications for Conservation*

574

575 The general trends for the majority of lemur species are dire and point to the need for  
576 immediate actions on a multitude of fronts. These would require widespread implementation  
577 throughout Madagascar by actors at all levels if we hope to curtail the impending extinction  
578 of many lemur species. Among these actions are increasing landscape-level reforestation  
579 efforts. Implementing efforts to reduce deforestation rates while increasing reforestation  
580 efforts would help to prevent impending extinctions (Wearn, Reuman, & Ewers, 2012).  
581 Intrinsically, it is imperative to understand the responses of flora and fauna to natural and

582 anthropogenic disturbance if we are to create effective restoration programs that increase  
583 forest buffer zones and corridors (Hannah et al., 2008; Kremen et al. 2008; Irwin et al. 2010;  
584 Campera et al. 2014; Eppley et al. 2015, 2017), and so more ground-level lemur population  
585 research is needed. Effectively, increasing fragment size may improve corridor connectivity  
586 potential within landscapes, and ultimately assist in species dispersal from source populations  
587 (Steffens & Lehman, 2018), thus increasing genetic diversity.

588         Also, maintaining permanent presence at field sites may reduce local anthropogenic  
589 pressures (e.g., hunting, timber harvesting) on species' populations as a consequence of  
590 providing consistent employment / direct benefits to local communities (Wrangham & Ross,  
591 2008; Wright et al., 2012; Campera et al., 2017). As PAs were shown to be the best predictor  
592 of species occurrence, a greater effort is needed to maintain park boundaries. Unfortunately,  
593 many park borders are being pushed farther back due to human encroachment from illegal  
594 timber harvesting and shifting cultivation practices (Barrett, Brown, Morikawa, Labat, Yoder,  
595 2010; Allnutt, Asner, Golden, & Powell, 2013). Even just considering Madagascar forests in  
596 general, the mean distance to edge has been estimated at 300m, a number that is continuing to  
597 exponentially decrease (Vielledent et al., 2018).

598         While our results did show diverse responses by these lemur species to various habitat  
599 fragmentation metrics, this variance was likely dependent on species-specific ecological  
600 traits. Overall, our results support the critical need for further studies on dietary and habitat  
601 preferences, as well as life histories to further our understanding of how lemur species may  
602 respond to climatic and anthropogenic effects, especially forest loss and fragmentation.

603

## 604 **Acknowledgments**

605



606 We would like to thank Lisa Gould for the invitation to present this work at the IPS  
607 symposium. Many thanks to Stephen Nash for providing us with silhouettes of his lemur  
608 artwork.

609

## 610 **References**

611

612 Allnutt, T. F., Asner, G. P., Golden, C. D., & Powell, G. V. (2013). Mapping recent  
613 deforestation and forest disturbance in northeastern Madagascar. *Tropical Conservation*  
614 *Science*, 6, 1–15.

615

616 Anderson, J., Rowcliffe, J. M., & Cowlshaw, G. (2007). Does the matrix matter? A forest  
617 primate in a complex agricultural landscape. *Biological Conservation*, 135, 212–222.

618

619 Araújo, M. B., Anderson, R. P., Barbosa, A. M., Beale, C. M., Dormann, C. F., Early, R., ...  
620 Rahbek, C. (2019). Standards for distribution models in biodiversity assessments. *Science*  
621 *Advances*, 5, eaat4858.

622

623 Araújo, M. B., & Guisan, A. (2006). Five (or so) challenges for species distribution  
624 modelling. *Journal of Biogeography*, 33, 1677–1688.

625

626 Arnold, T.W. (2010). Uninformative parameters and model selection using Akaike's  
627 Information Criterion. *Journal of Wildlife Management*, 74, 1175–1178.

628

629 Arroyo-Rodríguez, V., Cuesta-del Moral, E., Mandujano, S., Chapman, C. A., Reyna-  
630 Hurtado, R., & Fahrig, L. (2013). Assessing habitat fragmentation effects on primates: the

631 importance of evaluating questions at the correct scale. In L. Marsh & C. A. Chapman (Eds.),  
632 *Primates in fragments: Complexity and resilience* (pp. 13-28). New York: Springer.  
633

634 Arroyo-Rodríguez, V., & Fahrig, L. (2014). Why is a landscape perspective important in  
635 studies of primates? *American Journal of Primatology*, 76, 901–909.  
636

637 Asner, G. P., Rudel, T. K., Aide, T. M., Defries, R., & Emerson, R. (2009). A contemporary  
638 assessment of change in humid tropical forests. *Conservation Biology*, 23, 1386–1395.  
639

640 Axel, A.C. & Maurer, B.A. (2011) Lemurs in a complex landscape: mapping species density  
641 in subtropical dry forests of southwestern Madagascar using data at multiple levels. *American*  
642 *Journal of Primatology*, 73, 38–52.  
643

644 Baden, A. L., Holmes, S. M., Johnson, S. E., Engberg, S. E., Louis Jr, E. E., & Bradley, B. J.  
645 (2014). Species-level view of population structure and gene flow for a critically endangered  
646 primate (*Varecia variegata*). *Ecology and Evolution*, 4, 2675–2692.  
647

648 Balestri, M., Barresi, M., Campera, M., Serra, V., Ramanamanjato, J. B., Heistermann, M., &  
649 Donati, G. (2014). Habitat degradation and seasonality affect physiological stress levels of  
650 *Eulemur collaris* in littoral forest fragments. *PLoS ONE*, 9, e107698.  
651

652 Balko, E. A., & Underwood, H. B. (2005). Effects of forest structure and composition on  
653 food availability for *Varecia variegata* at Ranomafana National Park, Madagascar. *American*  
654 *Journal of Primatology*, 66, 45–70.  
655

656 Barbet-Massin, M., Jiguet, F., Albert, C. H., & Thuiller, W. (2012). Selecting pseudo-  
657 absences for species distribution models: how, where and how many? *Methods in Ecology*  
658 *and Evolution*, 3, 327–338.

659

660 Barrett, M. A., Brown, J. L., Morikawa, M. K., Labat, J-N., Yoder, A. D. (2010). CITES  
661 designation for endangered rosewood in Madagascar. *Science*, 328, 1109–1110.

662

663 Bayart, F., & Simmen, B. (2005). Demography, range use, and behavior in black lemurs  
664 (*Eulemur macaco macaco*) at Ampasikely, northwest Madagascar. *American Journal of*  
665 *Primatology*, 67, 299–312.

666

667 Benítez-López, A., Santini, L., Schipper, A. M., Busana, M., Huijbregts, M. A. J. (2019).  
668 Intact but empty forests? Patterns of hunting-induced mammal defaunation in the tropics.  
669 *PLoS Biology*, 17, e300024.

670

671 Bodin, Ö., & Norberg, J. (2007). A network approach for analyzing spatially structured  
672 populations in fragmented landscape. *Landscape Ecology*, 22, 31–44.

673

674 Borgerson, C., McKean, M. A., Sutherland, M. R., & Godfrey, L. R. (2016). Who hunts  
675 lemurs and why they hunt them. *Biological Conservation*, 197, 124–130.

676

677 Boyle, S. A., & Smith, A. T. (2010). Can landscape and species characteristics predict  
678 primate presence in forest fragments in the Brazilian Amazon? *Biological Conservation*, 143,  
679 1134–1143.

680

681 Brenneman, R. A., Johnson, S. E., Bailey, C. A., Ingraldi, C., Delmore, K. E., Wyman, T. M.,  
682 ... Louis, E. E. (2012). Population genetics and abundance of the Endangered grey-headed  
683 lemur *Eulemur cinereiceps* in south-east Madagascar: assessing risks for fragmented and  
684 continuous populations. *Oryx*, 46, 298–307.

685

686 Brown, J. L., & Yoder, A. D. (2015). Shifting ranges and conservation challenges for lemurs  
687 in the face of climate change. *Ecology and Evolution*, 5, 1131–1142.

688

689 Brundson, C., & Chen, H. (2014). GISTools: Some further GIS capabilities for R. R package  
690 version 0.7-4. Retrieved from: <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=GISTools>.

691

692 Cameron, A., & Gould, L. (2013). Fragment adaptive behavioural strategies and inter-site  
693 variation in the ring-tailed lemur (*Lemur catta*) at Anja Special Reserve and the Tsaranoro  
694 Valley, southcentral Madagascar. In L. Marsh & C. A. Chapman (Eds.), *Primates in*  
695 *fragments: Complexity and resilience* (pp. 227–243). New York: Springer.

696

697 Campera, M., Serra, V., Balestri, M., Barresi, M., Ravaolahy, M., Randriatafika, F., &  
698 Donati, G. (2014). Effects of habitat quality and seasonality on ranging patterns of collared  
699 brown lemur (*Eulemur collaris*) in littoral forest fragments. *International Journal of*  
700 *Primateology*, 35, 957–975.

701

702 Campera, M., Phelps, M., Besnard, F., Balestri, M., Eppley, T. M., Nijman, V., & Donati, G.  
703 (2017). Forest management and researchers' presence reduced hunting and forest exploitation  
704 by local communities in Tsitongambarika, Madagascar. *Oryx*. doi:  
705 10.1017/S0030605317001211

706

707 Ceballos, G., Ehrlich, P. R., & Dirzo, R. (2017). Biological annihilation via the ongoing sixth  
708 mass extinction signaled by vertebrate population losses and declines. *Proceedings of the*  
709 *National Academy of Sciences*, 114, E6089–E6096.

710

711 Chapman, C. A., Chapman, L. J., Bjorndal, K., & Onderdonk, D. A. (2002). Application of  
712 protein to fiber ratios to predict colobine abundance on different spatial scales. *International*  
713 *Journal of Primatology*, 23, 283–310.

714

715 Chapman, C. A., Lawes, M. J., Naughton-Treves, L., & Gillespie, T. (2003). Primate survival  
716 in community-owned forest fragments: are metapopulation models useful amidst intensive  
717 use? In: Marsh, L. K. (Ed.) *Primates in fragments: ecology and conservation*. New York:  
718 Kluwer Academic/Plenum Publishers. p 63–78.

719

720 Chapman, C. A., Gillespie, T. R., & Goldberg, T. L. (2005). Primates and the ecology of their  
721 infectious diseases: how will anthropogenic change affect host-parasite interactions?  
722 *Evolutionary Anthropology*, 14, 134–144.

723

724 Curtis, D. J., & Zaramody, A. (1998). Group size, home range use, and seasonal variation in  
725 the ecology of *Eulemur mongoz*. *International Journal of Primatology*, 19, 811–835.

726

727 da Silva, L. G., Ribeiro, M. C., Hasui, E., da Costa, C. A., da Cunha, R. G. T. (2015). Patch  
728 size, functional isolation, visibility and matrix permeability influences Neotropical primate  
729 occurrence within highly fragmented landscapes. *PLoS ONE*, 10, e0114025.

730

731 de Winter, I., van der Hoek, S., Schütt, J., Heitkönig, I. M., Van Hooft, P., Gort, G., ... &  
732 Sterck, F. (2018). Anthropogenic disturbance effects remain visible in forest structure, but not  
733 in lemur abundances. *Biological Conservation*, 225, 106–116.

734

735 Dirzo, R., Young, H. S., Galetti, M., Ceballos, G., Isaac, N. J., & Collen, B. (2014).  
736 Defaunation in the Anthropocene. *Science*, 345, 401–406.

737

738 Donati, G., Lunardini, A., & Kappeler, P. M. (1999). Cathemeral activity of red-fronted  
739 brown lemurs (*Eulemur fulvus rufus*) in the Kirindy Forest/CFPF. In B. Rakotosamimanana,  
740 H. Rasamimanana, J. U. Ganzhorn, & S. M. Goodman (Eds.), *New directions in lemur*  
741 *studies* (pp. 119–137). Boston: Springer.

742

743 Donati, G., Bollen, A., Borgognini-Tarli, S. M., & Ganzhorn, J. U. (2007). Feeding over the  
744 24-h cycle: Dietary flexibility of cathemeral collared lemurs (*Eulemur collaris*). *Behavioral*  
745 *Ecology and Sociobiology*, 61, 1237–1251.

746

747 Donati, G., Kesch, K., Ndremifidy, K., Schmidt, S. L., Ramanamanjato, J. B., Borgognini-  
748 Tarli, S. M., & Ganzhorn, J. U. (2011). Better few than hungry: Flexible feeding ecology of  
749 collared lemurs *Eulemur collaris* in littoral forest fragments. *PLoS ONE*, 6, e19807.

750

751 Donati, G., Santini, L., Razafindramanana, J., Boitani, L., & Borgognini-Tarli, S. (2013).  
752 (Un-) expected nocturnal activity in “Diurnal” *Lemur catta* supports cathemerality as one of  
753 the key adaptations of the lemurid radiation. *American Journal of Physical Anthropology*,  
754 150, 99–106.

755

756 Donati, G., Campera, M., Balestri, M., Serra, V., Barresi, M., Schwitzer, C., ... & Santini, L.  
757 (2016). Ecological and anthropogenic correlates of activity patterns in *Eulemur*. *International*  
758 *Journal of Primatology*, 37, 29-46.

759

760 Donati, G., Santini, L., Eppley, T. M., Arrigo-Nelson, S. J., Balestri, M., Boinski, S., ...  
761 Ganzhorn JU (2017) Low levels of fruit nitrogen as drivers for the evolution of Madagascar's  
762 primate communities. *Scientific Reports*, 7, 14406.

763

764 Dunham, A. E., Erhart, E. M., & Wright, P. C. (2010). Global climate cycles and cyclones:  
765 consequences for rainfall patterns and lemur reproduction in southeastern Madagascar.  
766 *Global Change Biology*, 17, 219–227.

767

768 Eppley, T. M., Donati, G., Ramanamanjato, J.-B., Randriatafika, F., Andriamandimbiarisoa,  
769 L. N., Ravelomanantsoa, R., & Ganzhorn, J. U. (2015). The use of an invasive species habitat  
770 by a small folivorous primate: Implications for conservation. *PLoS ONE*, 10, e0140981.

771

772 Eppley, T. M., Donati, G., & Ganzhorn, J. U. (2016). Determinants of terrestrial feeding in an  
773 arboreal primate: The case of the southern bamboo lemur (*Hapalemur meridionalis*).  
774 *American Journal of Physical Anthropology*, 161, 328–342.

775

776 Eppley, T. M., Balestri, M., Campera, M., Rabenantoandro, J., Ramanamanjato, J. B.,  
777 Randriatafika, F., ... Donati, G. (2017). Ecological flexibility as measured by the use of  
778 pioneer and exotic plants by two lemurids: *Eulemur collaris* and *Hapalemur meridionalis*.  
779 *International Journal of Primatology*, 38, 338–357.

780

781 Eronen, J. T., Zohdy, S., Evans, A. R., Tecot, S. R., Wright, P. C., & Jernvall, J. (2017).  
782 Feeding ecology and morphology make a bamboo specialist vulnerable to climate change.  
783 *Current Biology*, 27, 3384–3389.

784

785 Estrada, A., & Coates-Estrada, R. (1996). Tropical rain forest fragmentation and wild  
786 populations of primates at Los Tuxtlas. *International Journal of Primatology*, 5, 759–783.

787

788 Estrada, A., Garber, P. A., Rylands, A. B., Roos, C., Fernandez-Duque, E., Di Fiore, A., ...  
789 Rovero, F. (2017). Impending extinction crisis of the world's primates: Why primates  
790 matter. *Science Advances*, 3, e1600946.

791

792 Estrada, A., Garber, P. A., Mittermeier, R. A., Wich, S., Gouveia, S., Dobrovolski, R., ...  
793 Williamson, E. A. (2018). Primates in peril: the significance of Brazil, Madagascar, Indonesia  
794 and the Democratic Republic of the Congo for global primate conservation. *PeerJ*, 6, e4869.

795

796 Fahrig, L. (2002). Effect of habitat fragmentation on the extinction threshold: a synthesis.  
797 *Ecological Applications*, 12, 346–353.

798

799 Federman, S., Dornburg, A., Daly, D. C., Downie, A., Perry, G. H., Yoder, A. D., ... Baden,  
800 A. L. (2016). Implications of lemuriform extinctions for the Malagasy flora. *Proceedings of*  
801 *the National Academy of Sciences*, 113, 5041–5046.

802

803 Fleming, T. H., Breitwisch, R. & Whitesides, G. H. (1987). Patterns of tropical vertebrate  
804 frugivore diversity. *Annual Review of Ecology, Evolution, and Systematics*, 18, 91–109.

805



806 Gabriel, D. N. (2013). Habitat use and activity patterns as an indication of fragment quality in  
807 a strepsirrhine primate. *International Journal of Primatology* 34: 388–406.  
808

809 Galán-Acedo, C., Arroyo-Rodríguez, V., Cudney-Valenzuela, S. J., & Fahrig, L. (2019a). A  
810 global assessment of primate responses to landscape structure. *Biological Reviews*, 94, 1605–  
811 1618.  
812

813 Galán-Acedo, C., Arroyo-Rodríguez, V., Estrada, A., & Ramos-Fernández, G. (2019b).  
814 Forest cover and matrix functionality drive the abundance and reproductive success of an  
815 endangered primate in two fragmented rainforests. *Landscape Ecology*, 34, 147–158.  
816

817 Galetti, M., Brocardo, C. R., Begotti, R. A., Hortenci, L., Rocha-Mendes, F., Bernardo, C. S.  
818 S., ... Meirelles, F. (2017). Defaunation and biomass collapse of mammals in the largest  
819 Atlantic forest remnant. *Animal Conservation*, 20, 270-281.  
820

821 Ganzhorn, J. U. (1995). Low-level forest disturbance effects on primary production, leaf  
822 chemistry, and lemur populations. *Ecology*, 76, 2084–2096.  
823

824 Ganzhorn, J. U., Fietz, J., Rakotovao, E., Schwab, D., & Zinner, D. (1999). Lemurs and the  
825 regeneration of dry deciduous forest in Madagascar. *Conservation Biology*, 13, 794–804.  
826

827 Ganzhorn, J. U., & Eisenbeiß, B. (2001). The the concept of nested species assemblages and  
828 its utility for understanding effects of habitat fragmentation. *Basic and Applied Ecology*, 2,  
829 87–99.  
830

831 Ganzhorn, J. U., Lowry, P. P., Schatz, G. E., & Sommer, S. (2001). The biodiversity of  
832 Madagascar: one of the world's hottest hotspots on its way out. *Oryx*, 35, 346–348.  
833

834 Ganzhorn, J. U., Wilmé, L., & Mercier, J.-L. (2014). Explaining Madagascar's biodiversity.  
835 In I. R. Scales (Ed.), *Conservation and environmental management in Madagascar* (pp. 17–  
836 43). New York: Routledge.  
837

838 Gibson, L., Lee, T. M., Koh, L. P., Brook, B. W., Gardner, T. A., Barlow, J., ... Sodhi, N. S.  
839 (2011). Primary forests are irreplaceable for sustaining tropical biodiversity. *Nature*, 478,  
840 378–381.  
841

842 Gibson, L., Lynam, A. J., Bradshaw, C. J., He, F., Bickford, D. P., Woodruff, D. S., ...  
843 Laurance, W. F. (2013). Near-complete extinction of native small mammal fauna 25 years  
844 after forest fragmentation. *Science*, 341, 1508–1510.  
845

846 Glessner, K. D., & Britt, A. (2005). Population density and home range size of *Indri indri* in a  
847 protected low altitude rain forest. *International Journal of Primatology*, 26, 855–872.  
848

849 Godfrey, L. R., & Irwin, M. T. (2007). The evolution of extinction risk: past and present  
850 anthropogenic impacts on the primate communities of Madagascar. *Folia Primatologica*, 78,  
851 405–419.  
852

853 Godfrey, L. R., Jungers, W. L., Simons, E. L., Chatrath, P. S., & Rakotosamimanana, B.  
854 (1999). Past and present distributions of lemurs in Madagascar. In B. Rakotosamimanana, H.

855 Rasamimanana, J. U. Ganzhorn, & S. M. Goodman (Eds.), *New directions in lemur studies*  
856 (pp. 19–53). Boston: Springer.

857

858 Golden, C. D. (2009). Bushmeat hunting and use in the Makira Forest, north-eastern  
859 Madagascar: a conservation and livelihoods issue. *Oryx*, 43, 386–392.

860

861 Golden, C. D., Bonds, M. H., Brashares, J. S., Rasolofoniaina, B. J. R., & Kremen, C. (2014).  
862 Economic valuation of subsistence harvest of wildlife in Madagascar. *Conservation Biology*,  
863 28, 234–243.

864

865 Goodman, S. M., Rakotoarisoa, S. V., & Wilmé, L. (2006). The distribution and  
866 biogeography of the ring-tailed lemur (*Lemur catta*) in Madagascar. In A. Jolly, R. W.  
867 Sussman, N. Koyama, & H. Rasamimanana (Eds.), *Ringtailed Lemur Biology* (pp. 3-15).  
868 New York: Springer.

869

870 Gortazar, C., Reperant, L. A., Kuiken, T., de la Fuente, J., Boadella, M., Martínez-Lopez, B.,  
871 ... Medley, G. (2014). Crossing the interspecies barrier: opening the door to zoonotic  
872 pathogens. *PLoS Pathogens*, 10, e1004129.

873

874 Gould, L. (2006). *Lemur catta* ecology: what we know and what we need to know. In L.  
875 Gould & M. L. Sauther (Eds.), *Lemurs: Ecology and Adaptation* (pp. 255-274). New York:  
876 Springer.

877

878 Gould, L., & Sauther, M. L. (2016). Going, going, gone... Is the iconic ring-tailed lemur  
879 (*Lemur catta*) headed for imminent extirpation. *Primate Conservation*, 30, 89–101.

880

881 Grassi, C. (2006). Variability in habitat, diet, and social structure of *Hapalemur griseus* in  
882 Ranomafana National Park, Madagascar. *American Journal of Physical Anthropology*, 131,  
883 50–63.

884

885 Guillera-Arroita, G., Lahoz-Monfort, J. J., Elith, J., Gordon, A., Kujala, H., Lentini, P. E., ...  
886 & Wintle, B. A. (2015). Is my species distribution model fit for purpose? Matching data and  
887 models to applications. *Global Ecology and Biogeography*, 24, 276–292.

888

889 Hannah, L., Dave, R., Lowry, P. P., II, Andelman, S., Andrianarisata, M., Andriamaro, L., ...  
890 & Wilmé, L. (2008). Climate change adaptation for conservation in Madagascar. *Biology*  
891 *Letters*, 4, 590–594.

892

893 Harper, G. J., Steininger, M. K., Tucker, C. J., Juhn, D., & Hawkins, F. (2007). Fifty years of  
894 deforestation and forest fragmentation in Madagascar. *Environmental Conservation*, 34, 1–9.

895

896 Hekkala, E. R., Rakotondratsima, M., & Vasey, N. (2007). Habitat and distribution of the  
897 ruffed lemur, *Varecia*, north of the Bay of Antongil in northeastern Madagascar. *Primate*  
898 *Conservation*, 22, 88–95.

899

900 Hemingway, C. A. (1998). Selectivity and variability in the diet of Milne-Edwards' sifakas  
901 (*Propithecus diadema edwardsi*): Implications for folivory and seed-eating. *International*  
902 *Journal of Primatology*, 19, 355–377.

903

904 Herrera, J. P., Wright, P. C., Lauterbur, E., Ratavonjanahary, L., & Taylor, L. L. (2011). The  
905 effects of habitat disturbance on lemurs at Ranomafana National Park. *International Journal*  
906 *of Primatology*, 32, 1091–1108.

907

908 Hijmans, R. J., & van Etten, J. (2014). raster: Geographic data analysis and modeling. *R*  
909 *package version*, 2(8). Retrieved from: <http://cran.r2056 project.org/package=raster>.

910

911 Holmes, S. M., Baden, A. L., Brenneman, R. A., Engberg, S. E., Louis, E. E., & Johnson, S.  
912 E. (2013). Patch size and isolation influence genetic patterns in black-and-white ruffed lemur  
913 (*Varecia variegata*) populations. *Conservation Genetics*, 14, 615–624.

914

915 Hotaling, S., Foley, M. E., Lawrence, N. M., Bocanegra, J., Blanco, M. B., Rasoloarison, R.,  
916 ... & Weisrock, D. W. (2016). Species discovery and validation in a cryptic radiation of  
917 endangered primates: coalescent-based species delimitation in Madagascar's mouse  
918 lemurs. *Molecular Ecology*, 25, 2029–2045.

919

920 Irwin, M. T. (2008). Feeding ecology of *Propithecus diadema* in forest fragments and  
921 continuous forest. *International Journal of Primatology*, 29, 95–115.

922

923 Irwin, M. T., Wright, P. C., Birkinshaw, C., Fisher, B. L., Gardner, C. J., Glos, J., ... &  
924 Ganzhorn, J. U. (2010). Patterns of species change in anthropogenically disturbed forests of  
925 Madagascar. *Biological Conservation*, 143, 2351–2362.

926

927 Irwin, M. T., Samonds, K. E., Raharison, J. L., Junge, R. E., Mahefarisoa, K. L.,  
928 Rasambainarivo, F., ... & Glander, K. E. (2019). Morphometric signals of population decline

929 in diademed sifakas occupying degraded rainforest habitat in Madagascar. *Scientific*  
930 *Reports*, 9, 8776.

931

932 Isaac, N. J., & Cowlshaw, G. (2004). How species respond to multiple extinction threats.  
933 *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London B: Biological Sciences*, 271, 1135–1141.

934

935 Jenkins, R. K. B., Keane, A., Rakotoarivelo, A. R., Rakotomboavonjy, V.,  
936 Randrianandrianina, F. H., Razafimanahaka, H. J., ... & Jones, J. P. G. (2011) Analysis of  
937 patterns of bushmeat consumption reveals extensive exploitation of protected species in  
938 eastern Madagascar. *PLoS ONE*, 6, e27570.

939

940 Jolly, A., Koyama, N., & Rasamimanana, H. (2006). *Ringtailed lemur biology*. New York:  
941 Springer.

942

943 Junge, R. E., Barrett, M. A., & Yoder, A. D. (2011). Effects of anthropogenic disturbance on  
944 indri (*Indri indri*) health in Madagascar. *American Journal of Primatology*, 73, 632–642.

945

946 Kamilar, J. M., & Tecot, S. R. (2016). Anthropogenic and climatic effects on the distribution  
947 of *Eulemur* species: an ecological niche modeling approach. *International Journal of*  
948 *Primatology*, 37, 47–68.

949

950 Kappeler, P. M., & Fichtel, C. (2016). The evolution of *Eulemur* social organization.  
951 *International Journal of Primatology*, 37, 10–28.

952

953 Kappeler, P. M., & Heymann, E. W. (1996). Nonconvergence in the evolution of primate life  
954 history and socio-ecology. *Biological Journal of the Linnean Society*, 59, 297–326.  
955

956 Kelley, E. A. (2011). *Lemur catta* in the region of Cap Sainte-Marie, Madagascar: Introduced  
957 cacti, xerophytic Didiereaceae-Euphorbia bush, and tombs. Washington University, St. Louis  
958 (unpublished doctoral dissertation).  
959

960 Koch, F., Ganzhorn, J. U., Rothman, J. M., Chapman, C. A., & Fichtel, C. (2017). Sex and  
961 seasonal differences in diet and nutrient intake in Verreaux's sifakas (*Propithecus verreauxi*).  
962 *American Journal of Primatology*, 79, 1–10.  
963

964 Kremen, C., Cameron, A., Moilanen, A., Phillips, S. J., Thomas, C. D., Beentje, H., ... &  
965 Zjhra, M. L. (2008). Aligning conservation priorities across taxa in Madagascar with high-  
966 resolution planning tools. *Science*, 320, 222–226.  
967

968 Kun-Rodrigues, C., Salmons, J., Besolo, A., Rasolondraibe, E., Rabarivola, C., Marques, T.  
969 A., ... & Chikhi, L. (2014). New density estimates of a threatened sifaka species  
970 (*Propithecus coquereli*) in Ankarafantsika National Park. *American Journal of*  
971 *Primatology*, 76, 515–528.  
972

973 LaFleur, M., Clarke, T. A., Reuter, K. E., & Schaefer, M. S. (2019). Illegal trade of wild-  
974 captured *Lemur catta* within Madagascar. *Folia Primatologica*, 90, 199–214.  
975

976 LaFleur, M., & Gould, L. (2009). Feeding outside the forest: The importance of crop raiding  
977 and an invasive weed in the diet of gallery forest ring-tailed lemurs (*Lemur catta*) following a

978 cyclone at the Beza Mahafaly Special Reserve, Madagascar. *Folia Primatologica*, 80, 233–  
979 246.

980

981 Laurance, W. F., Delamônica, P., Laurance, S. G., Vasconcelos, H. L., & Lovejoy, T. E.  
982 (2000). Conservation: rainforest fragmentation kills big trees. *Nature*, 404, 836–836.

983

984 Laurance, W. F., Goosem, M., & Laurance, S. G. (2009). Impacts of roads and linear  
985 clearings on tropical forests. *Trends in Ecology & Evolution*, 24, 659–669.

986

987 Laurance, W. F., Camargo, J. L., Luizão, R. C., Laurance, S. G., Pimm, S. L., Bruna, E. M.,  
988 ... & Lovejoy, T. E. (2011). The fate of Amazonian forest fragments: A 32-year  
989 investigation. *Biological Conservation*, 144, 56–67.

990

991 Lee, P. C. (2003). Innovation as a behavioural response to environmental challenges: A cost  
992 and benefit approach. In S. M. Reader (Ed.), *Animal innovation* (pp. 261–276). Oxford:  
993 Oxford University Press.

994

995 Lehman, S. M., Rajaonson, A., & Day, S. (2006). Edge effects and their influence on lemur  
996 density and distribution in southeast Madagascar. *American Journal of Physical*  
997 *Anthropology*, 129, 232–241.

998

999 Lei, R., Frasier, C. L., Hawkins, M. T., Engberg, S. E., Bailey, C. A., Johnson, S. E., ... &  
1000 Mittermeier, R. A. (2016). Phylogenomic reconstruction of sportive lemurs (genus  
1001 *Lepilemur*) recovered from mitogenomes with inferences for Madagascar biogeography.  
1002 *Journal of Heredity*, 108, 107–119.



1003

1004 Louis, E. E., Ratsimbazafy, J. H., Razakamaharauo, V. R., Pierson, D. J., Barber, R. C., &  
1005 Brenneman, R. A. (2005). Conservation genetics of black and white ruffed lemurs, *Varecia*  
1006 *variegata*, from Southeastern Madagascar. *Animal Conservation*, 8, 105–111.

1007

1008 Martinez, B. T., Razafindratsima, O. H. (2014). Frugivory and seed dispersal patterns of the  
1009 red-ruffed lemur, *Varecia rubra*, at a forest restoration site in Masoala National Park,  
1010 Madagascar. *Folia Primatologica*, 85, 228–243.

1011

1012 McGarigal, K., & Marks, B. J. (1995). FRAGSTATS: spatial pattern analysis program for  
1013 quantifying landscape structure. Gen. Tech. Rep. PNW-GTR-351. Portland, OR: US  
1014 Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Pacific Northwest Research Station. 122 p, 351.

1015

1016 Mittermeier, R. A., Louis Jr, E. E., Richardson, M., Schwitzer, C., Langrand, O., Rylands, A.  
1017 B., ... Mackinnon, J. (2010). *Lemurs of Madagascar* (3<sup>rd</sup> ed.). Washington, D.C.:  
1018 Conservation International.

1019

1020 Myers, N., Mittermeier, R. A., Mittermeier, C. G., Da Fonseca, G. A. B., & Kent, J. (2000).  
1021 Biodiversity hotspots for conservation priorities. *Nature*, 403, 853–858.

1022

1023 Norscia, I., Carrai, V., & Borgognini-Tarli, S. M. (2006). Influence of dry season and food  
1024 quality and quantity on behavior and feeding strategy of *Propithecus verreauxi* in Kirindy,  
1025 Madagascar. *International Journal of Primatology*, 27, 1001–1022.

1026

1027 Nowak, K., & Lee, P. C. (2013). “Specialist” primates can be flexible in response to habitat  
1028 alteration. In L. K. Marsh & C. A. Chapman (Eds.), *Primates in fragments: Complexity and*  
1029 *resilience* (pp. 199–211). *Developments in Primatology: Progress and Prospects*. New York:  
1030 Springer Science+Business Media.

1031

1032 Nunziata, S. O., Wallenhorst, P., Barrett, M. A., Junge, R. E., Yoder, A. D., & Weisrock, D.  
1033 W. (2016). Population and conservation genetics in an Endangered lemur, *Indri indri*, across  
1034 three forest reserves in Madagascar. *International Journal of Primatology*, 37, 688–702.

1035

1036 Ossi, K. M., & Kamilar, J. M. (2006). Environmental and phylogenetic correlates of *Eulemur*  
1037 behavior and ecology (Primates: Lemuridae). *Behavioral Ecology and Sociobiology*, 61, 53–  
1038 64.

1039

1040 Overdorff, D. J. (1993a). Ecological and reproductive correlates to range use in red-bellied  
1041 lemurs (*Eulemur rubriventer*) and rufous lemurs (*Eulemur fulvus rufus*). In P. M. Kappeler &  
1042 J. U. Ganzhorn (Eds.), *Lemur social systems and their ecological basis* (pp. 167–178).  
1043 Boston: Springer.

1044

1045 Overdorff, D. J. (1993b). Similarities, differences, and seasonal patterns in the diets of  
1046 *Eulemur rubriventer* and *Eulemur fulvus rufus* in the Ranomafana National Park,  
1047 Madagascar. *International Journal of Primatology*, 14, 721–753.

1048

1049 Parga, J. A., Sauther, M. L., Cuzzo, F. P., Jacky, I. A. Y., & Lawler, R. R. (2012).  
1050 Evaluating ring-tailed lemurs (*Lemur catta*) from southwestern Madagascar for a genetic  
1051 population bottleneck. *American Journal of Physical Anthropology*, 147, 21-29.

1052

1053 Pebesma, E. (2018). Simple features for R: Standardized support for spatial vector data. *The*  
1054 *R Journal*, 10, 439–446.

1055

1056 Pfeifer, M., Lefebvre, V., Peres, C. A., Banks-Leite, C., Wearn, O. R., Marsh, C. J., ... Ewers,  
1057 R. M. (2017). Creation of forest edges has a global impact on forest vertebrates. *Nature*, 551,  
1058 187.

1059

1060 Pichon, C., Tarnaud, L., Bayart, F., Hladik, A., Hladik, C. M., & Simmen, B. (2010). Feeding  
1061 ecology of the crowned sifaka (*Propithecus coronatus*) in a coastal dry forest in northwest  
1062 Madagascar (SFUM, Antrema). *Lemur News*, 15, 43–47.

1063

1064 Plumptre, A. J., & Reynolds, V. (1994). The effect of selective logging on the primate  
1065 populations in the Budongo Forest Reserve, Uganda. *Journal of Applied Ecology*, 31, 631–  
1066 641.

1067

1068 Powzyk, J. A., & Mowry, C. B. (2003). Dietary and feeding differences between sympatric  
1069 *Propithecus diadema diadema* and *Indri indri*. *International Journal of Primatology*, 24,  
1070 1143–1162.

1071

1072 Quéméré, E., Amelot, X., Pierson, J., Crouau-Roy, B., & Chikhi, L. (2012). Genetic data  
1073 suggest a natural prehuman origin of open habitats in northern Madagascar and question the  
1074 deforestation narrative in this region. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 109,  
1075 13028–13033.

1076

1077 R Core Team. (2017). R: A language and environment for statistical computing. Vienna,  
1078 Austria: R Foundation for Statistical Computing. Retrieved from: [http://www.Rproject.](http://www.Rproject.org)  
1079 [org](http://www.Rproject.org).  
1080  
1081 Rakotonirina, L., Rajaonson, A., Ratolojanahary, T., Rafalimandimby, J., Fanomezantsoa, P.,  
1082 Ramahefasoa, B., ... & King, T. (2011). New distributional records and conservation  
1083 implications for the critically endangered greater bamboo lemur *Prolemur simus*. *Folia*  
1084 *Primatologica*, 82, 118–129.  
1085  
1086 Rakotonirina, L. H. F., Randriantsara, F., Rakotoarisoa, A. H., Rakotondrabe, R.,  
1087 Razafindramanana, J., Ratsimbazafy, J., & King, T. (2014). A preliminary assessment of  
1088 sifaka (*Propithecus*) distribution, chromatic variation and conservation in western central  
1089 Madagascar. *Primate Conservation*, 28, 43–54.  
1090  
1091 Ratsimbazafy, H. J. (2002). On the brink of extinction and the process of recovery: responses  
1092 of black-and-white ruffed lemurs (*Varecia variegata variegata*) to disturbance in Manombo  
1093 forest, Madagascar. SUNY-Stony Brook (unpublished doctoral dissertation).  
1094  
1095 Ratsimbazafy, J. (2006). Diet composition, foraging, and feeding behavior in relation to  
1096 habitat disturbance: Implications for the adaptability of ruffed lemurs (*Varecia variegata*) in  
1097 Manombo Forest. In L. Gould & M. L. Sauther (Eds.), *Lemurs: Ecology and adaptation* (pp.  
1098 403–422). New York: Springer.  
1099  
1100 Ravaloharimanitra, M., Ratolojanahary, T., Rafalimandimby, J., Rajaonson, A., Rakotonirina,  
1101 L., Rasolofoharivelo, T., ... & Rakotoarisoa, J. C. (2011). Gathering local knowledge in

1102 Madagascar results in a major increase in the known range and number of sites for critically  
1103 endangered greater bamboo lemurs (*Prolemur simus*). *International Journal of Primatology*,  
1104 32, 776–792.

1105

1106 Razafimanahaka, J. H., Jenkins, R. K. B., Andriafidison, D., Randrianandrianina, F.,  
1107 Rakotomboavonjy, V., Keane, A. & Jones, J. P. G. (2012). Novel approach for quantifying  
1108 illegal bushmeat consumption reveals high consumption of protected species in Madagascar.  
1109 *Oryx*, 46, 584–592.

1110

1111 Razafindratsima, O. H., & Dunham, A. E. (2014). Assessing the impacts of nonrandom seed  
1112 dispersal by multiple frugivore partners on plant recruitment. *Ecology*, 96, 24–30.

1113

1114 Razakamaharavo, V. R., McGuire, S. M., Vasey, N., Louis, E. E., & Brenneman, R. A.  
1115 (2010). Genetic architecture of two red ruffed lemur (*Varecia rubra*) populations of Masoala  
1116 National Park. *Primates*, 51, 53–61.

1117

1118 Rendigs, A., Reibelt, L. M., Ralainasolo, F. B., Ratsimbazafy, J. H., & Waeber, P. O. (2015).  
1119 Ten years into the marshes—*Hapalemur alaotrensis* conservation, one step forward and two  
1120 steps back? *Madagascar Conservation & Development*, 10, 13–20.

1121

1122 Reuter, K. E., Gilles, H., Wills, A. R., & Sewall, B. J. (2016). Live capture and ownership of  
1123 lemurs in Madagascar: extent and conservation implications. *Oryx*, 50, 344–354.

1124

1125 Revelle, W. (2018). Psych: Procedures for personality and psychological research,  
1126 Northwestern University, Evanston. R package version 1.8.12. Retrieved from:  
1127 <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=psych>.  
1128  
1129 Rigamonti, M. M. (1993). Home range and diet in red ruffed lemurs (*Varecia variegata*  
1130 *rubra*) on the Masoala Peninsula, Madagascar. In P. M. Kappeler & J. U. Ganzhorn (Eds.),  
1131 *Lemur social systems and their ecological basis* (pp. 25–39). Boston: Plenum Press  
1132  
1133 Rode, K. D., Chapman, C. A., McDowell, L. R., & Stickler, C. (2006). Nutritional correlates  
1134 of population density across habitats and logging intensities in redbellied monkeys  
1135 (*Cercopithecus ascanius*). *Biotropica*, 38, 625–634.  
1136  
1137 Rowe, N. & Myers, M. (2017). *All the World's Primates*. Charlestown, RI: Primate  
1138 Conservation, Inc. Retrieved from <http://www.alltheworldsprimates.org>.  
1139  
1140 Salmona, J., Jan, F., Rasolondraibe, E., Besolo, A., Oussen, D. S., Beck, A., ... & Chikhi, L.  
1141 (2014). Extensive survey of the Endangered Coquerel's sifaka *Propithecus coquereli*.  
1142 *Endangered Species Research*, 25, 175–183.  
1143  
1144 Salmona, J., Teixeira, H., Rasolondraibe, E., Aleixo-Pais, I., Kun-Rodrigues, C.,  
1145 Rakotonanahary, A. N., ... & Chikhi, L. (2015). Genetic diversity, population size, and  
1146 conservation of the Critically Endangered Perrier's sifaka (*Propithecus perrieri*).  
1147 *International Journal of Primatology*, 36, 1132–1153.  
1148

1149 Santini, L., Di Marco, M., Visconti, P., Baisero, D., Boitani, L., & Rondinini, C. (2013).  
1150 Ecological correlates of dispersal distance in terrestrial mammals. *Hystrix*, 24, 181–186.  
1151

1152 Sato, H., Santini, L., Patel, E. R., Campera, M., Yamashita, N., Colquhoun, I. C., & Donati,  
1153 G. (2016). Dietary flexibility and feeding strategies of *Eulemur*: A comparison with  
1154 *Propithecus*. *International Journal of Primatology*, 37, 109–129.  
1155

1156 Sauther, M. L., Sussman, R. W., & Gould, L. (1999). The socioecology of the ringtailed  
1157 lemur: Thirty-five years of research. *Evolutionary Anthropology: Issues, News, and Reviews*,  
1158 8, 120–132.  
1159

1160 Sauther, M. L., Fish, K. D., Cuzzo, F. P., Miller, D. S., Hunter-Ishikawa, M., & Culbertson,  
1161 H. (2006). Patterns of health, disease, and behavior among wild ringtailed lemurs, *Lemur*  
1162 *catta*: Effects of habitat and sex. In A. Jolly, R. W. Sussman, N. Koyama, & H.  
1163 Rasamimanana (Eds.), *Ringtailed lemur biology: Lemur catta in Madagascar* (pp. 313–331).  
1164 New York: Springer.  
1165

1166 Schüßler, D., Radespiel, U., Ratsimbazafy, J. H., & Mantilla-Contreras, J. (2018). Lemurs in  
1167 a dying forest: Factors influencing lemur diversity and distribution in forest remnants of  
1168 north-eastern Madagascar. *Biological Conservation*, 228, 17–26.  
1169

1170 Schwitzer C, Mittermeier RA, Davies N, Johnson S, Ratsimbazafy J, Razafindramanana J,  
1171 Louis EE Jr, Rajaobelina S. (2013) Lemurs of Madagascar: A strategy for their conservation  
1172 2013-2016. Bristol, UK: IUCN SSC Primate Specialist Group, Bristol Conservation and  
1173 Science Foundation, and Conservation International.

1174

1175 Schwitzer, C., Mittermeier, R. A., Johnson, S. E., Donati, G., Irwin, M., Peacock, H., ...

1176 Wright, P. C. (2014). Averting lemur extinctions amid Madagascar's political crisis. *Science*,

1177 343, 842–843.

1178

1179 Schwitzer, N., Randriatahina, G. H., Kaumanns, W., Hoffmeister, D., & Schwitzer, C.

1180 (2007). Habitat utilization of blue-eyed black lemurs, *Eulemur macaco flavifrons* (Gray,

1181 1867), in primary and altered forest fragments. *Primate Conservation*, 22, 79–87.

1182

1183 Snaith, T. V., & Chapman, C. A. (2005). Towards an ecological solution to the folivore

1184 paradox: patch depletion as an indicator of within-group scramble competition in red colobus

1185 monkeys (*Ptilocolobus tephrosceles*). *Behavioral Ecology and Sociobiology*, 59, 185–190.

1186

1187 Steffens, T. S., & Lehman, S. M. (2018). Lemur species-specific metapopulation responses to

1188 habitat loss and fragmentation. *PLoS ONE*, 13, e0195791.

1189

1190 Sussman, R. W., Green, G., Porton, I., Andrianasolondraibe, O. L., & Ratsirarson, J. (2003).

1191 A survey of the habitat of *Lemur catta* in southwestern and southern Madagascar. *Primate*

1192 *Conservation*, 19, 32–52.

1193

1194 Tecot, S. (2013). Variable energetic strategies in disturbed and undisturbed rain forest

1195 habitats: fecal cortisol levels in southeastern Madagascar. In J. Masters, M. Gamba, F. Génin,

1196 & R. Tuttle (Eds.), *Leaping ahead: Advances in prosimian biology* (pp. 185–195). New York:

1197 Springer.

1198



1199 Thuiller, W., Lafourcade, B., Engler, R., & Araújo, M. B. (2009). BIOMOD—a platform for  
1200 ensemble forecasting of species distributions. *Ecography*, 32, 369–373.  
1201

1202 Tilman, D., Clark, M., Williams, D. R., Kimmel, K., Polasky, S., & Packer, C. (2017). Future  
1203 threats to biodiversity and pathways to their prevention. *Nature*, 546, 73–81.  
1204

1205 Tinsman, J. C. (2019). Geospatial and genomic tools for conserving the Critically  
1206 Endangered blue-eyed black lemur (*Eulemur flavifrons*) and the sportive lemurs (genus  
1207 *Lepilemur*). Columbia University (unpublished doctoral dissertation).  
1208

1209 UNFPA. (2017). The State of World Population 2017: Worlds Apart - Reproductive Health  
1210 and Rights in an Age of Inequality, New York.  
1211

1212 VanDerWal, J., Falconi, L., Januchowski, S., Shoo, L., & Storlie, C. (2014). SDMTools:  
1213 Species distribution modelling tools: Tools for processing data associated with species  
1214 distribution modelling exercises. R package version 1, 1-221. Retrieved from: [http://cran.r-](http://cran.r-project.org/package=SDMTools)  
1215 [project.org/package=SDMTools](http://cran.r-project.org/package=SDMTools).  
1216

1217 Vasey, N. (2000). Niche separation in *Varecia variegata rubra* and *Eulemur fulvus albifrons*:  
1218 I. Interspecific patterns. *American Journal of Physical Anthropology*, 112, 411–431.  
1219

1220 Vasey, N. (2004). *Varecia*, ruffed lemurs. In S. M. Goodman & J. P. Benstead (Eds.), *The*  
1221 *natural history of Madagascar* (pp. 1332–1336). Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.  
1222

1223 Vielledent, G., Grinand, C., Rakotomalala, F. A., Ranaivosoa, R., Rakotoarijaona, J. R.,  
1224 Allnutt, T. F., & Achard, F. (2018). Combining global tree cover loss data with historical  
1225 national forest cover maps to look at six decades of deforestation and forest fragmentation in  
1226 Madagascar. *Biological Conservation*, 222, 189–197.

1227

1228 Wearn, O. R., Reuman, D. C., & Ewers, R. M. (2012) Extinction debt and windows of  
1229 conservation opportunity in the Brazilian Amazon. *Science*, 337, 228–232

1230

1231 White, F. J., Overdorff, D. J., Balko, E. A., & Wright, P. C. (1995). Distribution of ruffed  
1232 lemurs (*Varecia variegata*) in Ranomafana National Park, Madagascar. *Folia Primatologica*  
1233 64, 124–131.

1234

1235 Wieczkowski, J. A. (2003). Aspects of the ecological flexibility of the Tana River mangabey  
1236 (*Cercocebus galeritus*) in its fragmented habitat, Tana River, Kenya. University of Georgia  
1237 (unpublished doctoral dissertation).

1238

1239 World Bank. (2018). Poverty and shared prosperity 2018: Piecing together the poverty  
1240 puzzle. Washington, DC: World Bank.

1241

1242 Wrangham, R. & Ross, E. (2008). Science and conservation in African forests: The benefit of  
1243 long-term research. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK.

1244

1245 Wright, P. C., Johnson, S. E., Irwin, M. T., Jacobs, R., Schlichting, P., Lehman, S., ... &  
1246 Razafindratsita, V. (2008). The crisis of the critically endangered greater bamboo lemur  
1247 (*Prolemur simus*). *Primate Conservation*, 23, 5–18.

1248  
1249  
1250  
1251  
1252  
1253  
1254  
1255  
1256  
1257  
1258  
1259  
1260  
1261  
1262  
1263  
1264  
1265  
1266  
1267  
1268  
1269  
1270  
1271  
1272  
1273  
1274

Wright, P. C., Tecot, S. R., Erhart, E. M., Baden, A. L., King, S. J., & Grassi, C. (2011).  
Frugivory in four sympatric lemurs: Implications for the future of Madagascar's forests.  
*American Journal of Primatology*, 73, 585–602.

Wright, P. C., Erhart, E. M., Tecot, S., Baden, A. L., Arrigo-Nelson, S. J., Herrera, J., ...  
Zohdy, S. (2012). Long-term lemur research at Centre Valbio, Ranomafana National Park,  
Madagascar. In P.M. Kappeler & D. P. Watts (Eds.), Long-term field studies of primates (pp.  
67–100). Berlin Heidelberg: Springer.

1275 **Table**

1276

1277 **Table 1.** Predictor variables included in the analyses.

			Interpretation	Description
<i>Habitat metrics</i>				
	F1	Habitat area	Amount of habitat area per cell.	Positively related with the Proportion of Forest, patch Aggregation and mean Patch Area
	F2	Fragmentation	Density of patches or edges per unit area.	Positively related to Patch density and Edge density
	F3	Landscape complexity	Overall geometric complexity of the landscape. It measures if the shapes of patches tend to be simple and compact, or irregular and convoluted.	Positively related to Landscape shape index and Mean shape index
<i>Protected Areas</i>				
	PA		Used to control for the unbalanced sample of occurrence points inside and outside protected areas which may bias the estimated effect of fragmentation (generally higher outside protected areas)	Protected Area network (1 = inside protected area; 0 = outside protected area)

1278

1279

1280

1281

1282

1283

1284

1285

1286

1287

1288

1289 **Figure legends**

1290

1291 **Figure 1.** Heatmap showing the directional influence of various habitat metrics (F1: habitat area; F2:  
1292 fragmentation; F3: landscape complexity) and protected area (PA) metrics on the occurrence of  
1293 diurnal and cathemeral lemur species belonging to the families Lemuridae and Indriidae. Empty boxes  
1294 indicate variables that have been excluded after model selection. Species with no box are species for  
1295 which the only-intercept model scored best.

1296

1297 **Figure 2.** Partial responses by dietary guild of the three habitat variables on the probability of  
1298 lemur species occurrence. a) F1: habitat area; b) F2: fragmentation; c) F3: landscape  
1299 complexity).

1300

1301 **Figure 3.** Partial response of the three habitat variables on the probability of lemur species  
1302 occurrence and their interaction with species average home range size. a) F1: habitat area; b)  
1303 F2: fragmentation; c) F3: landscape complexity.