

1 **The nocturnal activity of a commonly housed rodent: How African pygmy dormice (*Graphiurus***  
2 ***murinus*) respond to an enriched environment**

3

4 Gemini P. S. A. Lang <sup>1</sup>, Paul E. Rose <sup>2</sup>, Steve M. Nash <sup>3</sup> and Lisa M. Riley <sup>4\*</sup>

5 <sup>1</sup> University Centre Sparsholt, Sparsholt College Hampshire, Sparsholt, Hampshire, SO21 2NF, UK.

6 <sup>2</sup> Centre for Research in Animal Behavior, College of Life and Environmental Sciences, Washington  
7 Singer Labs, University of Exeter, Perry Road, Exeter, Devon, EX4 4QG, UK.

8 <sup>3</sup> Paignton Zoo Environmental Park, Totnes Road, Paignton, Devon TQ4 7EU, UK.

9 <sup>4</sup> Centre for Animal Welfare, University of Winchester, Sparkford Road, Winchester, Hampshire,  
10 SO22 4NR, UK.

11 \* For correspondence: [Lisa.Riley@winchester.ac.uk](mailto:Lisa.Riley@winchester.ac.uk)

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29 **ABSTRACT**

30 *Exotic rodents are becoming increasingly popular in industry, however, there is limited empirical*  
31 *evidence to guide husbandry practices. African pygmy dormice (*Graphiurus murinus*) are typical in*  
32 *this respect. This research aimed to determine the effect of environmental enrichment on the behavior*  
33 *(including stereotypical scratching at the glass walls of the enclosure) and space use of a group of*  
34 *eight African pygmy dormice at Sparsholt College Hampshire, UK. An apple-wood climbing grid and*  
35 *three raised (at various heights above the substrate) woven-wicker nest boxes were provided.*  
36 *Instantaneous scan sampling was used to record 150 hours of nocturnal behavior (19:00 – 07:00*  
37 *daily) over five experimental phases (Phase 1 baseline; Phase 2 climbing grid provided; Phase 3*  
38 *lower nest box provided; Phase 4 middle nest box provided; Phase 5 higher nest box provided). Space*  
39 *use was determined using the modified Spread of Participation Index. Nest box use was recorded*  
40 *continually. The provision of the climbing grid significantly increased the groups' time spent eating,*  
41 *digging, gnawing and climbing, and significantly decreased stereotypic scratching at glass. It also*  
42 *significantly changed the use of all enclosure zones, with mice utilizing the highest zones as soon as*  
43 *they were accessible. The addition of raised nesting opportunity saw the highest zones of the*  
44 *enclosure become those preferentially used. It also totally diminished stereotypic scratching at glass.*  
45 *The highest nest box was preferentially used and use of terrestrial nest boxes (those placed directly on*  
46 *top of the substrate) reduced significantly when raised alternatives were provided. This study suggests*  
47 *those working with African pygmy dormice should provide an enriched enclosure via 'arboreal'*  
48 *opportunity to increase active behaviors and reduce stereotypy.*

49

50 **Keywords:** Welfare, *Graphiurus murinus*, nest box, behavioral repertoires, space use.

51

52

53 **1. Introduction**

54 African pygmy dormice (*Graphiurus murinus*) (henceforth “dormice”) are now an established captive  
55 species and increasingly form part of zoo animal collections. As is typically for an exotic rodent  
56 species, husbandry guidance for dormice is rare and empirical research lacking. Determining optimal  
57 care guidelines is therefore essential; research on the effects of Environmental Enrichment (EE) on  
58 behavior and space use is particularly needed. Pedal grasping research suggests the potential EE  
59 provided to dormice is not always suitable; some branching provided in captivity fail to allow  
60 adequate grasping or associated postures to be performed by dormice mostly because climbing  
61 substrate diameter is too wide (Youlatos et al., 2015). It is understood that these types of restrictions  
62 lead to a static and overly predictable environment and may result in the expression of abnormal  
63 (including stereotypical) behaviors, or captive coping strategies. The performance of abnormal  
64 behavior may further diminish an individual’s welfare; inability to exploit height variation within  
65 captivity may challenge dormice nesting behavioral repertoire forcing individuals to nest on the  
66 substrate of their enclosure rather than arboreally as was found with edible dormouse (*Glis glis*)  
67 (Marteau and Sara, 2015). Laboratory mice (*Mus musculus*) reared in a barren environment develop a  
68 wide spectrum of abnormal behavior (e.g. Gross et al., 2012) and access to EE throughout and after  
69 rearing can have long-term benefits including a reduction in the expression of abnormal behaviors  
70 (Garner and Mason, 2002).

71 For EE to be effective, the provisions given to any captive animal must afford individuals a chance to  
72 experience positive welfare states (Girbovan and Plamondon, 2013). Mason et al. (2007) suggest EE  
73 will have maximal positive effect when it is used in a targeted way (particular EE provisioned to solve  
74 a specific welfare issue) and when the EE has biological relevance to the species and individual (and  
75 see Rose, 2017; Rose and Riley, *in press*). In the wild, dormice are group living, widely distributed  
76 throughout Africa (Kingdon, 2015), and are classified as Least Concern by the IUCN (Cassola and  
77 Child, 2016). Their arboreal behavior has long been known (Shortridge, 1934; Kingdon, 1974).

78 Dormice exploit many tree species including *Combretum caffrum*, an endemic species commonly  
79 found in moist montane forests and subtropical habitats (Birch, 2000; Salih et al., 2016). This tree  
80 species is favored as the trunk provides hollow spaces ideal for tiny dormice (15g to 200g weight

81 range once adult, Striczky and Pazonyi, 2014) to nest in and avoid ground-dwelling predators (Beyer  
82 and Goldingay, 2006).

83 The behavior displayed by any captive species depends on the type of EE provided (e.g. Newberry,  
84 1995), **thus, it is logical to suggest**, given the behavioral ecology of this species in the wild, that  
85 dormice should be kept in small groups, provided with climbing opportunity and arboreal nesting  
86 **opportunities** to mimic their **wild ecological niche**. In the interests of evidence-based husbandry  
87 (Melfi, 2009) rather than a reliance on anecdotal inference, this logic needs to be empirically tested.  
88 This research aimed to investigate the behavior and space use of a small group of dormice when living  
89 in an enriched enclosure that contained a climbing grid (allowing improved climbing opportunity and  
90 access to all enclosure zones) and sequentially available raised nesting opportunities (suspended from  
91 the climbing grid) compared with a typical exotic rodent enclosure design with limited climbing  
92 opportunity and only terrestrial nesting opportunity.

93

## 94 **2. Materials and Methods**

### 95 *2.1. Study Population*

96 Eight adult, captive-bred dormice (2:6:0) housed at the Animal Management Centre, Sparsholt  
97 College Hampshire, UK were studied. Throughout the study typical handling and husbandry routines  
98 were maintained, as was diet and feeding regime (commercial complete diet with supplementary  
99 nutritional enrichment that promoted variety and gnawing). Food was presented in the same location  
100 daily (directly on top of the substrate in an area later categorized as ‘Zone A’). The group was housed  
101 in a single rectangular glass enclosure 60cm (h) x 45cm (w) x 60cm (d) with front opening doors,  
102 wood shaving substrate (approximately 4cm deep), furnished with three plastic domed nest boxes  
103 presented on the substrate, and a variety of horizontal and vertical sticks randomly presented in the  
104 lower vertical half of the enclosure. The group had been previously established in the enclosure **for**  
105 **approximately three months** before data collection commenced.

106

### 107 *2.2. Apparatus and Environmental Enrichment*

108 A three-dimensional climbing grid was constructed to create three height levels ('higher' tier at 55cm  
109 high, 'middle' tier at 30cm high, 'lower' tier at 15cm high) (Figure 1) and provide enhanced climbing  
110 opportunity to the eight dormice. The grid was made from a lattice of apple twigs (non-toxic,  
111 collected from a local orchard) secured with twine. In addition, one, two and maximally three  
112 commercially available woven wicker bird nest boxes (Gardman Ltd, Huntingdon UK) were  
113 provisioned to provide raised (higher than substrate level) nesting opportunity, one at each of the three  
114 climbing levels (Figure 1) starting at the lower tier and ending with the higher tier. The enclosure,  
115 including existing and new EE, was divided into 10 three-dimensional zones of unequal area (Figure  
116 2) to allow space use to be calculated using the Modified Spread of Participation Index (mSPI)  
117 formula (Plowman, 2003):

$$118 \quad mSPI = \frac{\sum[f_o - f_e]}{2(N - f_e \text{ min})}$$

119  $f_o$  = observed frequency in each zone

120  $f_e$  = expected frequency for each zone

121  $f_e \text{ min}$  = expected frequency in the smallest zone

122 A value of 0.0 is indicative of equal use of all zones whereas a value of 1.0 indicates unequal zone  
123 use. Only data for zones A-J were considered in the mSPI calculations.

124

125 **Figure 1 GOES HERE**

126 **Figure 2 GOES HERE**

127

### 128 *2.3. Experimental Design and Data Collection*

129 Behavior and space (zone) use were recorded between 19:00 – 07:00 from 17<sup>th</sup> January to 17<sup>th</sup>

130 February 2017, via infra-red videography using a Sony night vision indoor HD CCTV™ camera

131 system (Sony Europe B.V., Weybridge, Surrey). Individuals were indistinguishable on the video

132 recording therefore data were grouped for analysis. The entire enclosure was visible on the recording.

133 A five-phase repeated measures experimental design was used with increasingly more enrichment

134 provided in each phase (Table 1). The dormice were observed for 30 hours in each phase. Phase 1  
135 allowed baseline behavior and space use to be observed when climbing opportunity was limited, the  
136 highest zones of the enclosure (I and J) were not accessible and nesting was only possible directly on  
137 top of the substrate. Phase 2 allowed the effects of improved climbing opportunity to be assessed as  
138 the provision of the climbing grid allowed all zones of the enclosure to be accessed. Phases 3, 4, and 5  
139 allowed the effects of adding one, two or three raised nesting opportunities respectively to be  
140 observed.

141 **Table 1 GOES HERE**

142

143 State behaviors (see ethogram - Table 2) were recorded using instantaneous scan sampling with one-  
144 minute intervals. Interactions with nest boxes were recorded continuously, using ad libitum sampling.  
145 The enclosure zone each mouse was observed in was recorded every minute.

146 **Table 2 GOES HERE**

147

#### 148 *2.4 Data Analysis*

149 Data were analyzed using MiniTab<sup>R</sup> 17 Statistical Software. **Differences in the total time the dormice**  
150 **spent (minutes) nesting (rest), and performing each observed active behavior (groom, aggression,**  
151 **climb, walk, gnaw, nest-building, running, eating, scratching at glass, scratching, sit, dig)** between all  
152 of the experimental phases was analyzed using Chi-Square Goodness of Fit test. The same test was  
153 applied to analyze significant differences in nest box use (total count) and significant difference in the  
154 use of a zone between the experimental phases.

155 An alpha level of 0.05 was used for all analysis. As multiple tests were performed on the same data  
156 set for some comparisons, both the Bonferroni Correction Factor and the Benjamini and Hochberg  
157 (1995) correction factor were applied to determine corrected alpha levels.

158

#### 159 *2.5. Ethical Statement*

160 This study was approved by the Ethics Committee, University Centre Sparsholt, UK. The authors  
161 confirm that this research complies with the Elsevier Animal Ethics Policy.

162

163

### 164 **3. Results**

#### 165 *3.1. Nesting (Rest)*

166 Nesting decreased significantly from Phase 1 to Phase 2 and decreased further in Phase 5

167 ( $\chi^2=1697.46$ ,  $df=4$ ,  $P<0.001$ ). During Phase 1 the dormice collectively nested for 84% of the observed  
168 time (Figure 3). Nesting reduced by over 20% when the climbing grid was introduced in Phase 2. As  
169 each raised nesting opportunity was added, nesting time reduced slightly and was least when climbing  
170 and raised nesting opportunity were maximal in the final experimental phase, 36% less compared to  
171 nesting in Phase 1.

#### 172 **Figure 3 GOES HERE**

173

#### 174 *3.2. Active Behavior*

175 The behavioral repertoire of the dormice showed a high degree of consistency across the five  
176 experimental phases. In each phase several locomotor patterns (walk, run, climb) and a range of  
177 behaviors (sit, eating, gnaw, nest building and dig) were observed. The total time the group spent  
178 performing each locomotor pattern and behavior increased significantly (all at  $P<0.001$ , see Table 3)  
179 from Phase 1 to Phase 2 when the climbing grid was introduced and, except for grooming, remained  
180 high compared to baseline when raised nesting opportunity was increased in subsequent phases. In  
181 Phase 5 when raised nesting opportunity and climbing opportunity were maximal, time spent by the  
182 group in walk, gnaw, running, eating, scratching and dig significantly increased further compared to  
183 Phase 1. During Phase 1 scratching at glass and aggression, were observed. In Phase 2 aggression  
184 ceased, while time spent scratching at glass significantly decreased from Phase 1 to Phase 2 (Table 3)  
185 and was not observed after the first raised nesting opportunity was provided in Phase 3. While the  
186 total time spent performing each observed behavior changed significantly once the dormice were

187 living in an enriched enclosure, the percentage of active time spent performing each behavior did not  
188 change significantly for 11 of the 12 observed behaviors (Figure 4). Sit and eating remained  
189 proportionately the most frequently performed behaviors in each experimental phase. However, a  
190 significant reduction in the percentage of time the group spent scratching at glass was observed  
191 between Phase 1 and Phase 2 ( $\chi^2=14.4252$ ,  $df=1$ ,  $P = 0.00015$ ) (Bonferroni corrected alpha  
192  $q^*=0.0045$ ; Benjamini and Hochberg (1995) corrected alpha  $q^* = 0.0045$ ).

193 **Table 3 GOES HERE**

194 **Figure 4 GOES HERE**

195

### 196 *3.3. Nest Box Use*

197 In each phase of the study, the dormice used all available nest boxes. In Phases 1 and 2 terrestrial nest  
198 boxes K, L and M were provided, K was used preferentially (Figure 5). Use of terrestrial nest box K  
199 differed significantly across experimental phases ( $\chi^2=49378.2$ ,  $df=4$ ,  $P<0.001$ ) as did nest box L use  
200 ( $\chi^2=21424.6$ ,  $df=4$ ,  $P<0.001$ ) and nest box M use ( $\chi^2=23410.9$ ,  $df=4$ ,  $P<0.001$ ) (Bonferroni corrected  
201 alpha  $q^*=0.017$ ; Benjamini and Hochberg (1995) corrected alpha  $q^* = 0.05$ ). Use of all terrestrial nest  
202 boxes increased when the climbing grid was added and use of nest box K increased further when  
203 raised nesting opportunity was provided in Phase 3 however nest box N (the raised nest box) was  
204 preferentially used in Phase 3. When multiple raised nest boxes were provided in Phases 4 and 5, the  
205 new, highest nest box was preferentially used while use of all terrestrial nest boxes reduced  
206 significantly.

207 **Figure 5 GOES HERE**

208

### 209 *3.4. Space Use*

210 Space use varied throughout the study; in Phase 1 unequal space use was observed with the dormice  
211 disproportionality using zones A and B, while in all other phases (when additional enrichment was  
212 added) the dormice spread their space use fairly equally across all zones (Table 4). During Phase 1 ten  
213 of sixteen zones were used by the mice; uppermost arboreal zones were not used (zones I and J could



214 not be accessed as they were empty space). In all other conditions (except baseline), the mice used  
215 every zone. Use of the uppermost arboreal zones first occurred once the climbing grid was provided;  
216 once the highest nesting opportunity was added (experimental Phase 5) zones J, I and H were used  
217 extremely often. The middle zones, though the largest in area, were used less often throughout even  
218 when nest boxes were presented in the middle zones. The use of each zone differed significantly  
219 across the experimental phases (Table 4) though this is presumably because total activity increased  
220 across the phases. Zones A, I, J and P were used maximally in Phase 5, while zones C, D, E, F, G, H  
221 and L were used maximally in Phase 2, hence when the dormice could utilize the climbing grid to  
222 access middle zones they did, and once there was nesting opportunity in the highest zones the  
223 mice used the highest zones. The dormice continued to use zone A as this is where food was  
224 consistently presented.

225 **Table 4 GOES HERE**

226

#### 227 **4. Discussion**

228 This study showed that provision of a climbing grid and raised nesting opportunity is enriching for  
229 captive dormice. Provision of the climbing grid caused a significant decrease in nesting behavior, a  
230 significant increase in the time spent performing natural behaviors (dig, eat, gnaw, climb, nest build),  
231 while the percentage expression of natural behaviors were maintained. The climbing grid also  
232 significantly reduced the time the group spent in stereotypic behavior (scratching at glass) and the  
233 percentage of time spent scratching at glass. The addition of raised nesting opportunity amplified  
234 these effects and stereotypy was no longer observed. All nest boxes were used but the dormice used  
235 the highest and newest nest box most frequently.

236 The enriched enclosure was designed with the behavioral ecology of the dormice in mind and to  
237 encourage natural behavioral expression. Small rodents are typically agile runners and climbers of  
238 vertical and horizontal branches (Delany, 1972; Gardner et al., 2007; Madikiza, 2010), and in the wild  
239 this dormouse species is known to be arboreal (e.g. Birch, 2000; Juškaitis, 2000; Avgar et al., 2013;  
240 Hoelzl et al., 2016; Salih et al., 2016). Youlatos et al., (2015) outlined how important it is for this

241 species to express climbing behavior as it allows for expression of a natural physiological repertoire,  
242 otherwise individuals may develop morphological deformities that prevent behavioral expression and  
243 ultimately impact welfare. This study **demonstrates** that, in captivity, dormice will utilize enrichment  
244 with biological relevance and use of a climbing grid causes a significant reduction in the performance  
245 of stereotypy. The provision of climbing opportunity in captivity therefore seems important for good  
246 welfare and vital for suitable husbandry practices. Similarly, the provision of raised nesting  
247 opportunity in this study **indicates** how even small changes in husbandry and enclosure design, adding  
248 a commercially available nest box just above the substrate rather than on the substrate, can provide  
249 relevant opportunity in captivity. Madikiza et al. (2010) provisioned wild-living dormice with nest  
250 boxes, the mice used both the lower nest box placed 1.1m above ground and the higher nest box  
251 placed 2.32m above ground. Thus, captive provisions should provide similar opportunities to the wild  
252 but do not have to directly emulate the wild to beneficially change behavior.

253 Modified SPI analysis in this study **revealed** that enrichment provision can promote ‘fairly equal’  
254 enclosure use where previously unequal zone use was observed. If there is a route provided either  
255 with or without a specific resource associated with it, dormice will explore and utilize that route,  
256 providing greater opportunity for active behaviors to be performed.

257 Throughout the baseline condition, the dormice utilized ‘terrestrial’ zone A and B more than all other  
258 zones and preferentially used zone A. It is thought that the preference of zone A could be a direct  
259 result of all food resources being presented here, showing how radically a husbandry practice can  
260 influence the space use of a species, even in a species who in the wild is known to feed arboreally and  
261 store abundant food in arboreal nests (Hoelzl et al., 2016; Avgar et al., 2013; Trout et al., 2015).

262 Before the introduction of the enrichment grid, subjects were unable to access all zones (I and J were  
263 inaccessible). Zones G and H, the uppermost accessible zones during baseline testing were rarely  
264 used, possibly because they were difficult to get to as the branching provided was not securely fixed  
265 and was highly randomized, whereas the climbing grid was sturdy and secure. Inability to exploit  
266 height variation within captivity challenges *G.murinus* entire nesting behavioral repertoire forcing the  
267 individuals to conflict with their own evolutionary adaptations (Marteau and Sara, 2015) and nest on

268 the substrate. When the enrichment grid was added, the subjects had the ability to access all zones and  
269 took advantage of this, preferring both the most arboreal zones and the terrestrial zones. The use of I  
270 and J zones were relatively static throughout the introduction of the enrichment grid and the first and  
271 second nest box whereas when the third nest box was introduced at the highest level there was a  
272 significant increase in use of zones J and I. The middle zones were used less frequently, these zones  
273 were used to travel to the highest zones demonstrating how important it is to provide multiple vertical  
274 pathways that lead to nest opportunity. Such complex enclosures with a large proportion of usable  
275 space allow for a range of behaviors to be expressed (Sargis, 2001; Youlatos, 2008) and the dormice  
276 in this study did not change the overall proportion of natural, active behaviors but they did perform  
277 more of all behaviors when provided with the EE.

278 Providing nesting opportunity and food provision at substrate level continued to provide opportunity  
279 for the captive dormice in this study who used the resources provided in ‘terrestrial’ zones. Resource  
280 distribution is a known and well-understood influencer on animal behavior, particularly food  
281 distribution. Food was consistently presented in zone A throughout this study and zone A was  
282 consistently one of the most frequently used zones. Here we identify the potential for further study –  
283 the provision of food on the lower, middle and higher tiers of the climbing grid. This may encourage  
284 greater zone use in the mid-enclosure – changing what was observed to be a travel route to a site of  
285 feeding and social interaction and therefore further choice and opportunity.

286 The importance of choice and control to promote animal welfare cannot be understated (Meehan and  
287 Mench, 2007) and the results of this study suggest a secure, rigid climbing grid made from  
288 inexpensive and widely available material provides biologically relevant opportunity and choice to  
289 captive dormice. Husbandry guidance should require the provision of such opportunity for arboreal  
290 dormice in captivity.

291

## 292 **5. Conclusion**

293 Our research **indicates** the provision of a climbing grid and raised nesting opportunity is enriching for  
294 dormice. When provided with an enriched enclosure, dormice utilize all available space, preferentially

295 using the highest spaces provided. They nest most frequently in the newest and highest nest provided.  
296 When enriched, dormice decrease nesting (inactivity) and reduce the percentage of and total time  
297 spent performing stereotypic scratching at glass, while maintaining the proportionate expression of a  
298 range of natural behaviors. African pygmy dormice are an active, arboreal species. In typical  
299 enclosures with limited climbing and terrestrial nesting they can develop stereotypic behavior.  
300 Husbandry guidelines should recommend those who care for dormice ensure each group has climbing  
301 opportunity allowing access to high enclosure zones with nesting opportunity raised off the substrate,  
302 even if the nest is presented directly above the substrate.

303

#### 304 **Acknowledgements**

305 We thank the keepers at the Animal Management Centre at Sparsholt College Hampshire for their  
306 support with this project, especially those who directly cared for the dormice in this study who were  
307 extremely accommodating.

308 This research did not receive any specific grant from funding agencies in the public, commercial, or  
309 not-for-profit sectors.

310

#### 311 **Ethical Statement**

312 This research was given ethical approval by the Ethics Committee, University Centre Sparsholt.

313 Approval was not required under EU Directive 2010/63/EU for animal experiments as this was non-  
314 invasive research.

315

#### 316 **Conflicts of Interest Statement**

317 The authors declare no conflict of interest.

318

#### 319 **Authorship Statement**

320 The idea for the paper was conceived by Lang, Nash and Rose.

321 The experiments were designed by all authors.

322 The experiments were performed by Lang.  
323 The data were analyzed by Lang and Riley.  
324 The paper was written by all authors, led by Riley and Lang.

325

## 326 **References**

327 Avgar, T., Deardon, R., Fryxell, J. M. 2013. An empirically parameterized individual based model of  
328 animal movement, perception, and memory. *Ecological Modelling*. 251, 158-172.

329

330 Avgar, T., Street, G., Fryxell, J. M. 2013. On the adaptive benefits of mammal migration. *Can. J. Zoo*.  
331 92(6), 481-490.

332

333 Benjamini, Y., Hochberg, Y. 1995. Controlling the false discovery rate: a practical and powerful  
334 approach to multiple testing. *J Royal Stat. Soc. Series B (Methodological)*. 57(1), 289-300.

335

336 Beyer, G. L., Goldingay, R. L. 2006. The value of nest boxes in the research and management of  
337 Australian hollow-using arboreal marsupials. *Wild. Res.* 33(3), 161-174.

338

339 Birch, N. V. E. 2000. The vegetation potential of natural rangelands in the Mid-Fish River Valley,  
340 Eastern Cape, South Africa: towards a sustainable and acceptable management system (Doctoral  
341 dissertation, Rhodes University).

342

343 Bright, P. W., Morris, P. A. 1991. Ranging and nesting behavior of the dormouse, *Muscardinus*  
344 *avellanarius*, in diverse low-growing woodland. *J. Zool.* 224(2), 177-190.

345

346 Büchner, S. 2008. Dispersal of common dormice (*Muscardinus avellanarius*) in a habitat mosaic. *Acta*  
347 *Theriologica*. 53(3), 259-262.

348

349 Cassola, F., Child, M.F. 2016. *Graphiurus murinus* (errata version published in 2017). *The IUCN Red*  
350 *List of Threatened Species* 2016: e.T9487A115093727. [http://dx.doi.org/10.2305/IUCN.UK.2016-](http://dx.doi.org/10.2305/IUCN.UK.2016-3.RLTS.T9487A22221270.en)  
351 [3.RLTS.T9487A22221270.en](http://dx.doi.org/10.2305/IUCN.UK.2016-3.RLTS.T9487A22221270.en). Downloaded on 09 June 2019.

352

353 Delany, M. J. 1972. The ecology of small rodents in tropical Africa. *Mammal Rev.* 2(1), 1-42.

354

355 Gardner, T. A., Caro, T. I. M., Fitzherbert, E. B., Banda, T., Lalbhai, P. 2007. Conservation value of  
356 multiple-use areas in East Africa. *Conserv. Bio.* 21(6), 1516-1525.

357

358 Garner, J. P., Mason, G. J. 2002. Evidence for a relationship between cage stereotypies and behavioral  
359 disinhibition in laboratory rodents. *Behav. Brain Res.* 136(1), 83-92.

360

361 Girbovan, C., Plamondon, H. 2013. Environmental enrichment in female rodents: considerations in  
362 the effects on behavior and biochemical markers. *Behav. Brain Res.* 253, 178-190.

363

364 Gross, A. N., Richter, S. H., Engel, A. K. J., Würbel, H. 2012. Cage-induced stereotypies,  
365 perseveration and the effects of environmental enrichment in laboratory mice. *Behav. Brain Res.*  
366 234(1), 61-68.

367

368 Hoelzl, F., Cornils, J. S., Smith, S., Moodley, Y., Ruf, T. 2016. Telomere dynamics in free-living  
369 edible dormice (*Glis glis*): the impact of hibernation and food supply. *J. Exp. Biol.* 219(16), 2469-  
370 2474.

371

372 Juškaitis, R. 2000. Abundance dynamics of common dormouse (*Muscardinus avellanarius*), fat  
373 dormouse (*Glis glis*) and yellow-necked mouse (*Apodemus flavicollis*) derived from nest box  
374 occupation. *Folia Therio. Estonica* 5, 42-50.

375

376 Kingdon, J. 1974. East African mammals. An atlas of evolution in Africa. Vol. II Part B (hares and  
377 rodents). Academic Press, London.  
378  
379 Kingdon, J. 2015. The Kingdon field guide to African mammals. Bloomsbury Publishing. London:  
380 UK.  
381  
382 Madikiza, Z. J. K. 2010. Population biology and aspects of the socio-spatial organisation of the  
383 Woodland dormouse *Graphiurus murinus* (Desmaret, 1822) in the Great fish river Reserve, South  
384 Africa (Doctoral dissertation, University of Fort Hare).  
385  
386 Madikiza, Z. J., Bertolino, S., Baxter, R. M., San, E. D. L. 2010. Nest box use by woodland dormice  
387 (*Graphiurus murinus*): the influence of life cycle and nest box placement. *Eur. J. Wildlife Res.* 56(5),  
388 735-743.  
389  
390 Marteau, M., Sarà, M. 2015. Habitat preferences of edible dormouse, *Glis*: implications for the  
391 management of arboreal mammals in Mediterranean forests. *Folia Zool.* 64(2), 136-150.  
392  
393 Mason, G., Clubb, R., Latham, N., Vickery, S. 2007. Why and how should we use environmental  
394 enrichment to tackle stereotypic behavior? *Appl. Anim. Behav. Sci.* 102(3-4), 163-188.  
395  
396 Meehan, C.L., Mench, J.A. 2007. The challenge of challenge: can problem solving opportunities  
397 enhance animal welfare? *Appl. Anim. Behav. Sci.* 102(3-4), 246-261.  
398  
399 Melfi, V.A. 2009. There are big gaps in our knowledge, and thus approach, to zoo animal welfare: a  
400 case for evidence-based zoo animal management. *Zoo Biol.* 28(6), 574-588.  
401

402 Newberry, R. C. 1995. Environmental enrichment: increasing the biological relevance of captive  
403 environments. *Appl. Anim. Behav. Sci.* 44(2-4), 229-243.  
404

405 Plowman, A.B. 2003. A note on a modification of the spread of participation index allowing for  
406 unequal zones. *Appl. Anim. Beh. Sci.* 83(4), pp.331-336.  
407

408 Salih, E. Y. A., Kanninen, M., Sipi, M., Luukkanen, O., Hiltunen, R., Vuorela, H., Julkunen-Titto, R.,  
409 Fyhrquist, P. 2017. Tannins, flavonoids and stilbenes in extracts of African savanna woodland trees  
410 *Terminalia brownii*, *Terminalia laxiflora* and *Anogeissus leiocarpus* showing promising antibacterial  
411 potential. *S. Afr. J. Bot.* 108, 370-386.  
412

413 Sargis, E. J. 2001. The grasping behavior, locomotion and substrate use of the tree shrews *Tupaia*  
414 *minor* and *T. tana* (Mammalia, Scandentia). *J. Zool.* 253(4), 485-490.  
415

416 Shortridge, C.G. 1934. *Mammals of South West Africa Vol I.* William Heinemann Ltd. London, UK.  
417

418 Striczky, L., Pazonyi, P. 2014. Taxonomic study of the dormice (Gliridae, Mammalia) fauna from the  
419 late Early Pleistocene Somssich Hill 2 locality (Villány Hills, South Hungary) and its  
420 palaeoecological implications. *Fragmenta Palaeontologica Hungarica* 31, 51-81.  
421

422 Trout, R. C., Brooks, S., Morris, P. 2015. Nest box usage by old edible dormice (*Glis glis*) in breeding  
423 and non-breeding years. *Folia Zool.* 64(4), 320-324.  
424

425 Youlatos, D. 2008. Hallucal grasping behavior in *Caluromys* (Didelphimorphia: Didelphidae):  
426 implications for primate pedal grasping. *J. Hum. Evol.* 55(6), 1096-1101.  
427



428 Youlatos, D., Karantanis, N. E., Byron, C. D., Panyutina, A. 2015. Pedal grasping in an arboreal  
429 rodent relates to above-branch behavior on slender substrates. *J. Zool.* 296(4), 239-248.

430

431

432

433

434

435

436

437

438

439

440

441

442

443

444

445

446

447

448

449 **Table 1.** Experimental design. Five experimental phases were implemented, totaling 150 hours of  
450 behavioral recording (30 hours/phase).

<b>Phase 1</b>	<b>Phase 2</b>	<b>Phase 3</b>	<b>Phase 4</b>	<b>Phase 5</b>
Baseline. Original enclosure design. (Zones A-H and nest boxes K-M in Figure 2).	Climbing grid provided. (Zones A – J and nest boxes K-M in Figure 2).	Climbing grid and lower-level woven nest box provided. (Zones A-J and nest	Climbing grid and lower-level plus middle-level woven nest boxes provided. (Zones A-J and nest	Climbing grid and lower-level plus middle-level and higher-level woven nest boxes provided. (Zones

---

boxes K-N in  
Figure 2).

boxes K-O in  
Figure 2).

A-J and nest  
boxes K-P in  
Figure 2).

---

451

452

453

454

455

456

457

458

459

460

461

462

463

464

465

466

467

468

469

470

471 **Table 2.** African pygmy dormice state behavior ethogram.

<b>Category</b>	<b>Behavior</b>	<b>Description</b>
<b>Social</b>	Aggressive interaction	Interaction involves more than one individual directing energy towards another in a confrontational manner. It may be presented with one running at another but will always result in physical interaction in the form of a bite, scratch or wrestle.
<b>Immobile</b>	Sit	The subject will have a small proportion of its hind quarters in contact with a surface within the accommodation. There will be no

		movement during the expression and often it is presented as a resting behavior.
	Dig	The subject will use its front peripheral limbs to repeatedly manipulate an area of substrate within the enclosure.
	Lying	A large proportion of the subject's body will be in contact with a surface within the enclosure, it is possible that the head will be elevated but the majority of the body will be in a relaxed state.
<b>Grooming</b>	Groom	The behavior can be carried out by one or multiple subjects during the investigation. It will involve the subject using their peripheral limbs to manipulate the fur of another individual, the behavior can be directed towards itself and it is common for the mouth components to be used during this exercise.
	Scratching	This behavior will allow for the subject to engage with an area of its own body by using their hind limbs in a repetitive motion to make contact with an area of particular interest.
<b>Locomotive Behaviors</b>	Climb	The subject will be observed to travel in a vertical motion at a point within the enclosure, this will allow for them to reach a higher surface and exercise various muscles.
	Walk	This behavior is carried out by the subject moving their front and hind limbs in a motion that allows for movement from one area to another. It is not carried out at a fast gait and will be expressed in an attempt of the individual moving from one place to another.
	Run	The subject will travel with speed from one place to another, this is carried out much like the walk but expressed using a faster and wider gait.
<b>Abnormal Behaviors</b>	Scratching at the glass	The subject will be identified using their back legs as an anchor point and using their front limbs to repetitively focus on an area of the glass surrounding the accommodation. This behavior will not serve any obvious function.
<b>Consumption</b>	Eating	The subject will be identified to collect a piece of food item and manipulate it with their front periphery limbs before placing it into the mouth or using their teeth to rapidly gnaw away at the food piece.
<b>Other behaviors</b>	Nest building	The subject will be observed moving from one location to another collecting small materials that are suitable for creating an idealistic nesting environment. The materials will be carried in the incisors of the subject and will often be placed in situated nest boxes.
	Gnaw	The subject will be identified to use their front incisors to repetitively chew at a fixture or fitting within the accommodation.
<b>Nesting</b>	Nesting	Subject is inside a nest and is not visible.

472 **Table 3.** Chi-Squared results for changes in state behavior (total time in minutes) between the five  
473 experimental phases. Aggression was only shown in Phase 1. In each comparison df=4 except  
474 scratching at glass when df=1. All comparisons were significant at  $P < 0.0000000001$ . Bonferroni

475 corrected alpha  $q^* = 0.0045$ , Benjamini and Hochberg (1995) corrected alpha  $q^* = 0.05$ . Significant

476 Yes denotes significant at all corrected alpha levels.

<b>Behavior</b>	<b>Phase 1</b>	<b>Phase 2</b>	<b>Phase 3</b>	<b>Phase 4</b>	<b>Phase 5</b>	<b>X<sup>2</sup></b>	<b>Significant</b>
Groom	86	294	129	76	53	295.056	Yes
Aggression	2	0	0	0	0	--	Yes
Climb	141	737	530	445	496	392.573	Yes
Walk	95	660	775	807	925	649.901	Yes
Gnaw	71	522	518	493	545	377.577	Yes
Nest-Building	230	607	582	523	613	203.065	Yes
Running	117	772	514	523	637	460.541	Yes
Eating	496	1010	1010	1370	1652	684.662	Yes
Scratching at Glass	327	12	0	0	0	292.699	Yes
Scratching	29	436	364	393	552	431.710	Yes
Sit	552	986	915	1016	999	169.849	Yes
Dig	39	518	409	492	638	495.207	Yes

477

478

479

480

481

482

483

484

485

486

487

488

489

490

491

492

493 **Table 4.** Space use across the five experimental phases (total count in minutes). mSPI value and  
 494 meaning shown, as is Chi-square value for each zone. df=4 in each comparison. Use of each zone was  
 495 significantly different across experimental phases at P<0.001 for every zone.

Zone Reference	Zone size (%)	Experimental Phase					X <sup>2</sup>
		Phase 1: Baseline	Phase 2: Climbing Grid	Phase 3: Nest Box Lower	Phase 4: Nest Box Middle	Phase 5: Nest Box Higher	
J	3	0	833	789	820	1030	919.863
I	3	0	969	853	1039	1315	1182.38
H	16	1	835	691	952	888	894.293
G	16	0	793	495	536	603	714.283
F	16	24	388	314	211	267	313.965
E	16	2	402	251	231	263	361.614
D	9	50	560	347	278	292	434.549
C	9	96	580	579	489	470	362.509
B	6	936	489	502	520	517	249.411
A	6	1076	978	925	1062	1465	164.136
<b>mSPI value</b>		<b>0.83</b>	<b>0.31</b>	<b>0.38</b>	<b>0.39</b>	<b>0.44</b>	
<b>mSPI meaning</b>		<b>Unequal zone use</b>	<b>Fairly equal zone use</b>	<b>Fairly equal zone use</b>	<b>Fairly equal zone use</b>	<b>Fairly equal zone use</b>	

496  
 497  
 498  
 499  
 500  
 501  
 502  
 503  
 504  
 505  
 506  
 507  
 508

509 **Figure 1.** Climbing Grid enrichment and Woven-wicker bird nests added to enrich existing African  
510 pygmy dormouse enclosure. Bird nests were added sequentially over several days, one-at-a-time  
511 starting at the lower tier, ending at the higher tier.

512

513 **Figure 2.** Enclosure zones to facilitate modified Spread of Participation Index calculations. The  
514 enclosure was divided into 10 zones (A – I). The six nest boxes provided are also shown (K, L, M  
515 existing terrestrial nest boxes, N, O, P woven enrichment nest boxes). Enclosure size 60cm (h) x  
516 45cm (w) x 60cm (d).

517

518 **Figure 3.** Collective time spent nesting (percentage total observation time) of the mouse group (eight  
519 adults) across each of the five experimental phases.

520

521 **Figure 4.** Activity budgets of the African pygmy dormice group during each experimental phase.  
522 Time is expressed as a percentage of the time spent (minutes) active (not nesting). \*\*\* significant  
523 difference  $P < 0.001$ .

524

525 **Figure 5.** Changes in nest box use (total count) across the five experimental phases. Nest box use was  
526 recorded continuously (every mouse, every nest box use counted). Different nest boxes are  
527 represented by different colored/patterned bars. The letter of each nest box relates to the space use  
528 zone it was attributed (see Figure 2). Nest boxes K, L and M were the original terrestrial nest boxes  
529 (available in all experimental phases), nest boxes N, O, P were the novel raised nest boxes (available  
530 in experimental phases 3, 4, or 5).

531

532