



HOKKAIDO UNIVERSITY

Title	How much abandoned farmland is required to harbor comparable species richness and abundance of bird communities in wetland? Hierarchical community model suggests the importance of habitat structure and landscape context
Author(s)	Hanioka, Masashi; Yamaura, Yuichi; Yamanaka, Satoshi et al.
Citation	Biodiversity and conservation, 27(8), 1831-1848 https://doi.org/10.1007/s10531-018-1510-5
Issue Date	2018-07
Doc URL	https://hdl.handle.net/2115/74839
Rights	© Springer Science+Business Media B.V., part of Springer Nature 2018, The final publication is available at https://doi.org/10.1007/s10531-018-1510-5
Type	journal article
File Information	hanioka revised ms - 2017-11-29 clean ver.pdf



How much abandoned farmland is required to harbor comparable species richness and abundance of bird communities in wetland? Hierarchical community model suggests the importance of habitat structure and landscape context

Masashi Hanioka¹, Yuichi Yamaura^{2,3,*}, Satoshi Yamanaka^{1,4}, Masayuki Senzaki^{1,5}, Kazuhiro Kawamura¹, Akira Terui^{1,6}, Futoshi Nakamura¹

¹Graduate School of Agriculture, Hokkaido University, Kita 9, Nishi 9, Kita-ku, Sapporo, Hokkaido, 060-8589, Japan

²Department of Forest Vegetation, Forestry and Forest Products Research Institute, 1 Matsunosato, Tsukuba, Ibaraki, 305-8587, Japan

³Fenner School of Environment and Society, Australian National University, Canberra, ACT, 2601, Australia

⁴Hokkaido Research Center, Forestry and Forest Products Research Institute, Hitsujigaoka 7, Sapporo 062-8516, Japan

⁵Center for Environmental Biology and Ecosystem Studies, National Institute for Environmental Studies, Onogawa 16-2, Tsukuba City, Ibaraki 305-8506, Japan

⁶Department of Ecology, Evolution, and Behavior, University of Minnesota, 1479 Gortner Avenue, St Paul, MN 55108, USA

21

22 *Author for correspondence: yamaura@ffpri.affrc.go.jp

23 Tel: +81-29-829-8224; Fax: +81-29-873-1542

24

25

27 While wetlands have been converted into farmlands, large amounts of farmlands are now
28 being abandoned, and this novel habitat is expected to be inhabited by species which depend
29 on wetlands. Here we examined the effects of habitat and landscape variables on the densities
30 of wetland bird species in abandoned farmlands. We surveyed birds in abandoned farmlands
31 with varied patch area, habitat, and landscape variables in Kushiro district, eastern Hokkaido,
32 northern Japan. We also surveyed birds in 15 ha of the remaining wetlands as a reference
33 habitat. We used abundance-based hierarchical community model (HCM) to estimate
34 patch-level estimates of abundance of each species based on sampling plots data that only
35 partially covered the studied patches. We observed 14 wetland species and analyzed them
36 with HCM. Abandoned farmland patch areas had significant positive effects on the densities
37 of two species. Tree densities and shrub coverage exerted positive and negative effects on
38 some species. Amounts of surrounding wetland/grassland had positive effects on many
39 species. Ensemble of species-level models suggested that 24.7 ha and 10.6 ha of abandoned
40 farmlands would be needed to harbor a comparable total abundance and species richness in
41 15-ha wetlands, respectively. These required amounts can be increased/decreased depending
42 on the covariates. The use of HCM allows us to predict species- and community-level
43 responses under varied conditions based on incomplete sampling data. A quantity of 1.6 times
44 larger areas of abandoned farmlands may be required to restore wetland bird communities in
45 eastern Hokkaido.

46

47 Keywords: hierarchical community model; incomplete spatial coverage; multispecies

48 abundance model; pasture; patch area; wetland

49

1. Introduction

Wetlands are one of the endangered ecosystems that have been converted into agricultural and industrial areas (Finlayson and Spiers 1999). By reviewing 189 reports of the changes in wetland area, Davidson (2014) suggested that 87% of the world's wetlands may have been lost since 1700s, and that wetland conversion rate during the past 100 years can be 3.7 times faster than before. Japan has also been experiencing a great decrease of wetland areas. Large amounts of these areas which existed at the early 20th century (approximately 2,110 km²) are now reduced to less than half (821 km²), indicating that more than 60% of wetlands have been lost during the past 100 years in Japan (GSI 2000). This reduction caused the immense decrease of wetland species (ME 2005).

On the other hand, since 1800s, especially 1900s, farmlands have been abandoned over the world (Ramankutty and Foley 1999; Ellis et al. 2010). Farmland abandonment has ramifying effects on biodiversity. For example, in eastern North America, forest development at the abandoned farmlands caused the substantial decrease in early-successional species (Litvaitis 1993; Askins 2001). In Japan, abandoned farmland increased from 130,000 ha in the late 1980s to 400,000 ha in 2011 (MAFF 2011). They are likely to increase because of the decrease and aging of farmers in Japan. Although abandoned farmland can provide habitats for varied organisms, their values differ among regions (Queiroz et al. 2014), and are likely to depend on the prior farmland management (Cramer et al. 2008). We therefore expected that abandoned farmlands originally converted from wetlands may also serve as habitat for

70 wetland species.

71 Studies in wetlands and grasslands show that bird species densities can change
72 according to various factors, including vegetation composition, structure, patch area, and
73 landscape structure (Wiens and Rotenberry 1981; Fairbairn and Dinsmore 2001; Davis 2004).
74 It can be noted that species richness and abundance are known to show contrasted responses
75 to the patch/habitat area: abundance may linearly increase with the area while species richness
76 nonlinearly increases with the area (Connor and McCoy 1979; James and Wamer 1982;
77 Connor et al. 2000; Yamaura et al. 2016a). These suggest that possible conservation values of
78 abandoned farmlands would depend on the local habitat structure, surrounding landscape
79 structure, farmland area, and conservation targets (in this study, species richness and
80 abundance).

81 Here we examined the effects of environmental covariates (local habitat structure,
82 habitat area, and landscape context) on densities of individual bird species using
83 abundance-based hierarchical community models (HCMs: Yamaura et al. 2016a; 2016b).
84 Using HCMs, we inferred the relationships between community-level properties (total
85 abundance and species richness) and patch area based on incomplete sampling data (i.e., focal
86 patches were only partially covered by the field survey). This is important since we cannot
87 usually cover studied patches entirely by the field survey, and many species and individuals
88 are expected to remain undetected during the survey (Cam et al. 2002). Nevertheless,
89 individual patches are usually the management units in the habitat and landscape management

(Urban and Keitt 2001), and we therefore need to estimate patch-level and community-level properties based on the incomplete sampling data, which can be done by the recently developed HCMs (Yamaura et al. 2016a). We then considered the effects of habitat structure and landscape context on patch-level and community-level properties by including these environmental covariates into species-level models. We finally obtained required amounts of abandoned farmlands to harbor comparable bird species richness and abundance in the 15-ha wetlands under the varied environmental conditions.

2. Material and methods

2.1. Study area

Our study area was located in the Kushiro District, eastern Hokkaido, northern Japan (43°01-17'N, 144°08-34'E). The area is covered by forests, farmlands, and Kushiro wetland (the largest wetland in Japan). We defined abandoned farmland as former wetlands transformed into uncultivated farmlands. We treated abandoned farmland patches, with an edge-to-edge distance of 50 m, as a single patch, because 50-m gaps restrict bird movements (Matthysen et al. 1995; Desrochers and Hannon 1997).

Major plant species dominating the abandoned farmlands included common reed (*Phragmites australis*), reed canary grass (*Phalaris arundinacea*), *Carex* spp., and a dwarf tree species (*Spiraea salicifolia*). Abandoned farmlands can be surrounded by shelter-woods

or forest remnants; we treated fens dominated by above-grass species and *Calamagrostis canadensis* without land-use histories as wetlands (reference habitat).

2.2. Bird survey

We identified abandoned farmlands through aerial photographs and preliminary field survey. Then, we created a land use map composed of forest, abandoned farmland, wetland, grassland, urban, open water, dwarf bamboo and other land uses, based on the vegetation map (scale: 1:25,000 and resolution: 25 m) provided by the Natural Conservation Bureau, Ministry of Environment (<http://www.biodic.go.jp>). We generated 300-m buffers from the edges of abandoned farmland patches, and measured the wetlands (including abandoned farmland) and grasslands proportions. We used this wetland/grassland proportion as a single landscape variable (landscape context) in this study (see below). Preliminary analysis showed that this landscape variable was the most strongly associated with bird abundance than variables with other habitat classifications and spatial scales. We then used 23 survey patches (mean $\pm$ SD: 42.4 ± 57.8 ha, range: 1.2–210.2 ha) controlling for the correlations among the patch area and the above mentioned landscape variable (Fig. 1). We also selected three reference sites in the Kushiro wetland. We conducted these procedures using ArcMap version 10.0 (ESRI Inc., Redlands, CA).

We surveyed birds in 23 abandoned farmland patches and three reference wetland sites during the morning period (4:00–10:00 a.m.) throughout June, 2014. All migratory

130 wetland/grassland species arrived at the study area before the initiation of the survey. Every
131 site was surveyed three times, and the bias of survey time was avoided by visiting each site in
132 three different times: (i) 4:00–6:00, (ii) 6:00–8:00, and (iii) 8:00–10:00. We established the
133 transect lines in the patches (100 m width) and recorded the observed individuals in the maps
134 (territory mapping: Bibby et al. 2000). Locations of transect lines were determined to
135 represent the vegetation types of the entire patches (Fig. 2). Sampling plots (transect length $\times$
136 100 m width) covered the total area of patches < 2 ha; plot area was 2 ha for 2–20-ha patches,
137 and 10% of 20–50-ha patches. We established 5-ha plots for patches > 50 ha. The edge-to-edge
138 distances of the plots were 500 m to make sampling plots independent from each other (Ralph
139 et al. 1993).

140 The single surveyor (M.H.) and an attendant, who slowly walked through transects,
141 recorded the species, sex, and location of individuals in the plots. Our focal species were
142 considered as wetland species because: (i) their original habitats were previously lost because
143 of the farmlands expansion, (ii) and current farmland abandonment can be an opportunity for
144 their restoration. We classified wetland species according to published references (e.g.,
145 Takagawa et al. 2011), and drew the territories of individual species in map based on their
146 known territory sizes (Nakamura et al. 1968; Higuchi et al. 1997) and field records (e.g.,
147 locations, aggressive behavior, and sex) via three visits (Bibby et al. 2000). The territories
148 which had > 0.5 areas in the plots were treated as one territories (see Appendix A for the
149 detailed procedure); otherwise we assigned 0.5 (Bibby et al. 2000). We summed and rounded

these quantities and obtained the number of territories (integer) within the sampling plots.

Although bird individuals are only imperfectly detected by the single survey, open-land

songbirds have relatively high detection probability (~ 0.6 ; Yamaura et al. 2016a). We

considered that each individual inhabiting the sampling plots was detected in at least one of

the survey visits.

2.3.Plant survey

We established the sampling points at every 10 m along the transect lines. We placed the measuring pole (2 m height) at each point and measured the maximum height at which the grass touched the pole as the vegetation height by 10 cm increments (cf. Rotenberry and Wiens 1980). But we did not use this data concerning the plant height in the analysis since our preliminary analysis suggested its weak association with bird abundance. We also counted the number of trees (>3 m height) and visually estimated the shrubs coverage (*Salicifolia* sp.) by 5% increments in the bird sampling plots.

2.4.Statistical analysis

We conducted the analyses according to what Yamaura et al. (2016b) developed for abundance-based HCMs. In this model, communities are treated as ensembles of models of individual species comprising communities. Patch-level species abundance and community-level properties (total abundance/species richness) are inferred by accounting for

the incomplete spatial coverage of patches by the sampling plots. Specifically, we estimated the abundance of individual species in the entire patches as function of environmental covariates (including patch area) using the number of detected individuals and the proportion of spatial coverage by the sampling plots (see below for the formulations). We then inferred the relationships between community-level properties and patch area by considering the effects of covariates.

We first assumed that patch-level abundance of species i in patch j (z_{ij}) follows a Poisson distribution ($z_{ij} \sim \text{Poisson}[\lambda_{ij}]$). We then assumed that the expected abundance of species i at patch j (λ_{ij}) is a function of patch area (A_j : ha) and three covariates (x_{2-4} : tree density [/ha], shrub cover [%], and wetland/grassland proportion in the surroundings [%]):

$$\log(\lambda_{ij}) = \beta_{0i} + \beta_{1i} \times \log(A_j) + \beta_{2i} \times x_{2j} + \beta_{3i} \times x_{3j} + \beta_{4i} \times x_{4j} \quad \text{eqn 1}$$

where β_{0i} is the logarithmically transformed expected abundance when area is 1 ($\lambda_{ij} = \exp[\beta_{0i}]$). This model means that the expected abundance is a power function of the area with the exponent of β_{1i} : $\lambda_{ij} = \exp(\beta_{0i}) \times (A_j)^{\beta_{1i}}$ (Connor et al. 1997), and density is $\lambda_{ij}/A_j = \exp(\beta_{0i}) \times (A_j)^{(\beta_{1i}-1)}$. When β_{1i} is equal to 1, density is constant in relation to the patch area; $\beta_{1i} > 1$, indicates that population density increases with the area (density decreases when $\beta_{1i} < 1$). The other three coefficients (β_{2i} , β_{3i} , and β_{4i}) are the effects of covariates. Our preliminary analysis showed that these three covariates were the most important ones.

Our bird survey only partially covered the total area of most patches; we then assumed that detected individuals during the survey (y_{ij} : obtained from the territory mapping

through three visits) depended on the plots coverage over the patches (ϕ):

$$y_{ij} \sim \text{Binomial}(z_{ij}, \phi). \quad \text{eqn 2}$$

where ϕ was obtained by dividing the plot area by the patch area. This means that only 10% of individuals would be detected when 10% of the patch was covered by the plot.

Species-level parameters β_i follow the community-level normal distribution with hyper-parameters, e.g., $\beta_{i0} \sim \text{Normal}(\mu_{\beta_0}, \sigma_{\beta_0}^2)$. This parameterization can allow us to model rare species by borrowing the information from common species (Kéry and Royle 2016).

Based on the median estimates of species-level parameters, we modeled the expected community-level (total) abundance as a function of patch area and covariates (i.e., summation of λ_{ij} across the species). We similarly modeled the expected species richness, which was defined as the number of species with at least one individual (i.e., $z_{ij} \geq 1$). We summed the probability of at least one individual occurs in the area (occupancy probability) across species (Yamaura et al. 2016a):

$$E[\text{species richness}_j] = \sum_{i=1}^R [1 - \exp(-\lambda_{ij})] \quad \text{eqn 3}$$

where R is the species pool size (number of species possibly occurring in the studied patches).

We believe that all possible species were detected in the field survey (Hanioka and Senzaki,

pers. observ.), and R was the number of detected wetland species (= 14). We derived the

predicted responses of total abundance and species richness to patch area and covariates by

changing the values of covariates in the species-level models (eqn 1). We standardized

environmental covariates other than patch area before the analysis. We conducted the analysis

using R version 3.1.2 (R Core Team 2015), JAGS version 3.4.0 (Plummer 2013), and R2jags version 0.5-7 (Su and Yajima 2013). We obtained the parameter estimates using Markov Chain Monte Carlo (MCMC) with three chains, 50,000 burn-in, no-thinning, and 100,000 post iterations. We decided that chain convergence was achieved when the Gelman-Rubin statistic of species- and community-level parameters was < 1.1 ; otherwise, we ran additional 100,000 iterations until we achieved chain convergence using the ‘autojags’ function.

We finally determined the patch area harboring the comparable total abundance and species richness in 15-ha wetland under the varied values of covariates. We obtained the total abundance and species richness of wetland bird communities per 15 ha from the three 5-ha sampling plots in the wetland. We numerically searched for these values using the ‘uniroot’ R function.

3. Results

3.1. Bird survey

We observed 29 bird species during the survey; among them, 14 species were classified as wetland species and were therefore analyzed (Appendix B). Red-crowned crane (*Grus japonensis*) and mallard (*Anas platyrhynchos*) were excluded from the analyses because their territory sizes were very large compared with our plot area. For both of the abandoned farmlands and wetlands, black-browed reed warbler (*Acrocephalus bistrigiceps*)

and Middendorff's grasshopper warbler (*Locustella ochotensis*) were the dominant species (Appendix C).

3.2. Species responses to environmental covariates

Only two species showed significant deviations from the constant densities in relation to patch area (Fig. 3b, Appendix D-E). Densities of two dominant species (black-browed reed warbler and Middendorff's grasshopper warbler) increased with the patch area increase. For tree density, three species showed positive responses (black-faced bunting *Emberiza spodocephala*, Siberian rubythroat *Luscinia calliope*, and lanceolated grasshopper warbler *Locustella lanceolata*) and one showed negative responses (Middendorff's grasshopper warbler) (Fig. 3c). Shrub cover significantly decreased two species (black-browed reed warbler and Middendorff's grasshopper warbler), while many other species showed marginally positive responses (Fig. 3d). For wetland/grassland proportion, two species (common reed bunting *Emberiza schoeniclus* and lanceolated grasshopper warbler), as well as the community-mean, showed positive responses (Fig. 3e).

3.3. Community responses to environmental covariates

Based on the species-level estimates, we obtained the predicted responses of total abundance and species richness to patch area and three environmental covariates. Effects of tree density and shrub coverage on total abundance was concave (Fig. 4a, b), meaning that

total abundance was minimized at the intermediate values of tree density and shrub coverage. There were species that showed both positive and negative responses to these two covariates, and such species increased the dominance and total abundance at the marginal values of the covariates. On the other hand, no species showed negative responses to the wetland/grassland proportion, and total abundance monotonically increased with wetland/grassland proportion increase (Fig. 4c).

Species richness greatly increased in areas below 40 ha (Fig. 4d–f). Occupancy (or incidence) probabilities of rare species (e.g., Latham's snipe) were sensitive to the area, and contributed to the increasing species richness in relation to the area. In contrast to the total abundance, tree density hardly affected species richness, and shrub coverage increased species richness (Fig. 4d, e). This occurred because rare species densities can be insensitive and sensitive to tree density and shrub coverage, respectively. Wetland/grassland proportion increased not only total abundance but also species richness (Fig. 4f).

3.4. Comparison to wetland communities

Under the mean values of covariates, 24.7 ha of abandoned farmlands were required to harbor 244 bird individuals of 15-ha wetlands. For all the three covariates, their specific values can decrease the required amounts to ~ 20 ha (Fig. 5a–c). An area of 10.6 ha of abandoned farmlands with average covariates was required to harbor 10 species of 15-ha wetlands (Fig. 5d–f); it was suggested that covariates would also affect the required amount of

abandoned farmlands.

4. Discussion

4.1. Species responses to environmental covariates

Only two dominant species (black-browed reed warbler and Middendorff's grasshopper warbler) showed significant deviation of constant densities in relation to patch area. This indicates that the dominance of these species increased with the increase of abandoned farmland patch areas. These positive effects of patch area on population densities were also reported in other grassland and forest habitats (e.g., Davis 2004; Yamaura et al. 2008b). It is suggested that large abandoned farmland patches would have higher conservation values per area and highly contribute to regional abundance and population persistence for at least these wetland species compared with small abandoned farmland patches (sensu Connor et al. 2000).

Effects of tree densities and shrub coverage varied among species. There were species showing positive and negative responses, while densities of other species were insensitive to these covariates. Species with positive responses (particularly black-faced bunting and Siberian rubythroat) inhabit not only wetlands but also forest edges and/or shrub-lands (Toyoshima et al. 2013; Yamaura et al. 2016a). They use trees and shrubs in abandoned farmlands as song posts (Hanioka and Senzaki, pers. observ.). On the other hand,

species showing negative responses to tree density and shrub cover are wetland or grassland specialists (e.g., black-browed reed warbler and Middendorff's grasshopper warbler), which is also consistent with previous evidence that tree or shrub development decrease the densities of grassland species (Grant et al. 2004; Sirami et al. 2009). Succession of abandoned farmlands would lead to the succession of the bird communities, specifically, decreased abundance in these wetland/grassland specialist species.

The existence of wetland/grassland in the surroundings increased the densities of many species, which was also shown by other studies (Fairbairn and Dinsmore 2001). These surrounding habitats would supplement the food resources and allow wetland birds to occupy the abandoned farmlands (cf. Dunning et al. 1992). It was noted that none of the species showed negative responses to this covariate, suggesting the general importance of habitat availability to the wetland bird conservation in abandoned farmlands. As Crouzeilles and Curran (2016) suggested concerning forest restoration, improvement of local habitat quality, such as tree removal (e.g., Thompson et al. 2016), would yield great returns (increases in abundance of wetland species) on the locations with abundant habitats in the surroundings (i.e., not surrounded by forests or urban areas).

4.2. Community responses to environmental covariates

Since our model treats communities as ensembles of species-level models, it can provide the mechanistic understanding how communities are organized by the species-level

underlying processes. Effects of tree densities and shrub coverage on the community-level total abundance were concave. Responses to these covariates were species-specific; different species dominated the community and increased the total abundance depending on the values of covariates. At the intermediate values of covariates, communities had the lowest total abundance, but the total abundance was equally distributed among the species (i.e., high evenness). In other words, even if the total abundance was similar, communities with high and low values of these covariates had quite different community structures.

In contrast to the total abundance, species richness greatly depends on the abundance of rare species rather than common species. This is because species richness was treated as the summation of occupancy probabilities (probability that at least one individual occurs) across the species (eqn 3). Occupancy probabilities of common species quickly reached nearly 1 within the small range of the patch area, and what is important is those of rare species (see also Yamaura et al. 2016a). Therefore, it can be said that changes in species richness along with the covariates, including patch area, depend on the effects of covariates on rare species abundance. HCMs can deal with rare species by borrowing the strength of common species, and this is the advantage of our approach to model species richness. Our simultaneous modeling of species richness and total abundance also showed that they differently responded to tree density and shrub cover (Fig. 4).

The roles of habitat and landscape variables for species occupancy, abundance, and species richness have been actively examined during the past 20 years (Mazerolle and Villard

1999; Yamaura et al. 2008a; Ruffell and Didham 2016). Studies surveyed organisms within the sampling plots with equal areas, and examined the effects of environmental covariates on the plot-level (per area) abundance or species richness. On the other hand, although habitat (patch) area is long known to play a crucial role in determining abundance and species richness (Connor and McCoy 1979; Triantis et al. 2012), the role of patch area on patch-level species richness/total abundance has not been actively compared with those of other habitat and landscape variables. Williams et al. (2009) analyzed the number of plant species in the British islands, and showed the importance of considering covariates (e.g., latitude, elevation) as well as area to model species richness. Combined analysis of the habitat/patch area, habitat- and landscape variables can provide an important basis of conservation recommendations (Huth and Possingham 2011). Our modeling framework provides one approach to this issue by modeling abundance of individual species comprising communities. However, our approach entails model complexity and detailed data, i.e., we need the information about how sampling plots cover the area of interest, and abundance of individual species in the plots (Taki et al. in press).

4.3.Comparison with wetland communities

Our results suggested that habitat and landscape variable have important roles in the conservation problems. For example, to harbor comparable total abundance of wetland species in 15-ha wetlands, increasing habitat quality would lower the required amounts of

abandoned farmlands from 25 ha to 20 ha. Although < 10 ha of abandoned farmlands are likely to harbor comparable species richness in 15-ha wetlands; this would be because the existence of trees and shrubs increases densities of species that prefer these habitat structures. However, wetland specialists (e.g., black-browed reed warbler and Middendorff's grasshopper warbler) had lower densities in the abandoned farmlands (Appendix C), suggesting that wetlands have irreplaceable conservation values for them, and cannot be completely substituted by the abandoned farmlands.

4.4.Conclusion

Results of our field survey and the analysis showed that abandoned farmland originally converted from wetlands can serve as habitats for wetland bird species. This habitat provision function depends on the local habitat structure, patch area of abandoned farmland, and landscape context. Our model provides the framework to evaluate the relative effects of these relevant factors based on the empirical data accounting for the sampling incompleteness. Of course, abandoned farmland cannot completely substitute the wetland, and larger areas would be required to harbor comparable birds in wetlands. Nevertheless, ongoing farmland abandonment in the world can be an opportunity to restore and conserve declining wetland biodiversity.

370 Acknowledgement

371 We thank J. Morimoto and K. Yabe for useful comments for this study. We also thank the
372 members of the Nature Protection Office of Kushiro District, owners of the study site and the
373 members of the Laboratory of Forest Ecosystem Management of Hokkaido University for
374 their assistance in our field survey. This study was supported by the Environmental Research
375 and Technology Development Fund (4-1504) of the Ministry of the Environment of Japan. Y.
376 Yamaura was supported by JSPS KAKENHI Grant Number JP26292074 and JP16KK0176.

377

378

379 References

- 380 Askins RA (2001) Sustaining biological diversity in early successional communities: the
381 challenge of managing unpopular habitats. *Wildl Soc Bull* 29:407-412
- 382 Bibby CJ, Burgess ND, Hill DA, Mustoe SH (2000) Bird census techniques. Second edn.
383 Academic Press, San Diego
- 384 Cam E, Nichols JD, Hines JE, Sauer JR, Alpizar-Jara R, Flather CH (2002) Disentangling
385 sampling and ecological explanations underlying species–area relationships. *Ecology*
386 83:1118-1130
- 387 Connor EF, Courtney AC, Yoder JM (2000) Individuals-area relationships: the relationship
388 between animal population density and area. *Ecology* 81:734-748
- 389 Connor EF, Hosfield E, Meeter DA, Niu X (1997) Tests for aggregation and size-based

sample-unit selection when sample units vary in size. *Ecology* 78:1238-1249

Connor EF, McCoy ED (1979) The statistics and biology of the species-area relationships. *Am Nat* 113:791-833

Cramer VA, Hobbs RJ, Standish RJ (2008) What's new about old fields? Land abandonment and ecosystem assembly. *Trends Ecol Evol* 23:104-112

Crouzeilles R, Curran M (2016) Which landscape size best predicts the influence of forest cover on restoration success? A global meta-analysis on the scale of effect. *J Appl Ecol* 53:440-448

Davidson NC (2014) How much wetland has the world lost? Long-term and recent trends in global wetland area. *Marine Freshw Res* 65:934-941

Davis SK (2004) Area sensitivity in grassland passerines: effects of patch size, patch shape, and vegetation structure on bird abundance and occurrence in southern Saskatchewan. *Auk* 121:1130-1145

Desrochers A, Hannon SJ (1997) Gap crossing decisions by forest songbirds during the post-fledging period. *Conserv Biol* 11:1204-1210

Dunning JB, Danielson BJ, Pulliam HR (1992) Ecological processes that affect populations in complex landscapes. *Oikos* 65:169-175

Ellis EC, Goldewijk KK, Siebert S, Lightman D, Ramankutty N (2010) Anthropogenic transformation of the biomes, 1700 to 2000. *Global Ecol Biogeogr* 19:589-606

Fairbairn SE, Dinsmore JJ (2001) Local and landscape-level influences on wetland bird

410 communities of the prairie pothole region of Iowa, USA. *Wetlands* 21:41-47

411 Finlayson CM, Spiers AG (1999) Global review of wetland resources and priorities for
 412 wetland inventory. *Wetlands International* 53, Supervising Scientist, Canberra

413 Grant TA, Madden E, Berkey GB (2004) Tree and shrub invasion in northern mixed-grass
 414 prairie: implications for breeding grassland birds. *Wildl Soc Bull* 32:807-818

415 GSI (2000) National survey of lakes and wetlands. Geospatial Information Authority of Japan
 416 (GSI), <http://www.gsi.go.jp/kankyochiri/gsilake.html> (in Japanese),

417 Higuchi H, Morioka H, Yamagishi S (1997) The encyclopedia of animals in Japan. Vol. 4.
 418 Birds II. Heibonsha, Tokyo, Japan (in Japanese)

419 Huth N, Possingham HP (2011) Basic ecological theory can inform habitat restoration for
 420 woodland birds. *J Appl Ecol* 48:293-300

421 James FC, Wamer NO (1982) Relationships between temperate forest bird communities and
 422 vegetation structure. *Ecology* 63:159-171

423 Kéry M, Royle JA (2016) Applied hierarchical modeling in ecology: analysis of distribution,
 424 abundance and species richness using R and BUGS. Volume 1. Prelude and static
 425 models. Academic Press, San Diego

426 Litvaitis JA (1993) Response of early successional vertebrates to historic changes in land use.
 427 *Conserv Biol* 7:866-873

428 MAFF (2011) On the current status of abandoned cropland. Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry
 429 and Fisheries (MAFF), Tokyo.

430 <http://www.maff.go.jp/j/nousin/tikei/houkiti/pdf/genjou1103.pdf> (in Japanese)

431 Matthysen E, Adriaensen F, Dhondt AA (1995) Dispersal distances of nuthatches, *Sitta*

432 *europaea*, in a highly fragmented forest habitat. *Oikos* 72:375-381

433 Mazerolle MJ, Villard M-A (1999) Patch characteristics and landscape context as predictors

434 of species presence and abundance: a review. *Ecoscience* 6:117-124

435 ME (2005) Ecosystems and human well-being: synthesis. Millennium Ecosystem Assessment

436 (ME), Island Press, Washington D. C.

437 Nakamura T, Yamaguchi S, Iijima K, Kagawa T (1968) A comparative study on the habitat

438 preference and home range of four species of the Genus *Emberiza* on peat grassland. *J*

439 *Yamashina Inst Ornith* 5:313-336 (in Japanese)

440 Plummer M (2013) JAGS: Just Another Gibbs Sampler. <http://mcmc-jags.sourceforge.net/>

441 Queiroz C, Beilin R, Folke C, Lindborg R (2014) Farmland abandonment: threat or

442 opportunity for biodiversity conservation? A global review. *Front Ecol Environ*

443 12:288-296

444 R Core Team (2015) R: a language and environment for statistical computing. R Foundation

445 for Statistical Computing Vienna, Austria

446 Ralph CJ, Geupel GR, Pyle P, Martin TE, DeSante DF (1993) Handbook of field methods for

447 monitoring landbirds vol 0. USDA For. Serv. Gen. Tech. Rep. PSW-GTR-144,

448 Ramankutty N, Foley JA (1999) Estimating historical changes in global land cover: croplands

449 from 1700 to 1992. *Global Biogeochem Cy* 13:997-1027

450 Rotenberry JT, Wiens JA (1980) Habitat structure, patchiness, and avian communities in north
 451 american steppe vegetation: a multivariate analysis. *Ecology* 61:1228-1250
 452 Ruffell J, Didham RK (2016) Towards a better mechanistic understanding of edge effects.
 453 *Landsc Ecol* 31:2205-2213
 454 Sirami C, Seymour C, Midgley G, Barnard P (2009) The impact of shrub encroachment on
 455 savanna bird diversity from local to regional scale. *Divers Distrib* 15:948-957
 456 Su Y-S, Yajima M (2013) R2jags: a package for running jags from
 457 R.<http://CRAN.R-project.org/package=R2jags>
 458 Takagawa S et al. (2011) JAVIAN Database: a species-level database of life history, ecology
 459 and morphology of bird species in Japan. *Bird Res* 7:R9-R12 (in Japanese)
 460 Taki H, Murao R, Mitai K, Yamaura Y (in press) The species/abundance–area relationships of
 461 bees in early successional tree plantation. *Basic Appl Ecol*
 462 Thompson SJ, Arnold TW, Fieberg J, Granfors DA, Vacek S, Palaia N (2016) Grassland birds
 463 demonstrate delayed response to large-scale tree removal in central North America. *J*
 464 *Appl Ecol* 53:284-294
 465 Toyoshima Y, Yamaura Y, Mitsuda Y, Yabuhara Y, Nakamura F (2013) Reconciling wood
 466 production with bird conservation: a regional analysis using bird distribution models
 467 and forestry scenarios in Tokachi district, northern Japan. *For Ecol Manage* 307:54-62
 468 Triantis KA, Guilhaumon F, Whittaker RJ (2012) The island species–area relationship:
 469 biology and statistics. *J Biogeogr* 39:215-231

470 Urban D, Keitt T (2001) Landscape connectivity: a graph-theoretic perspective. *Ecology*
 471 82:1205-1218
 472 Wiens JA, Rotenberry JT (1981) Habitat associations and community structure of birds in
 473 shrubsteppe environments. *Ecol Monogr* 51:21-41
 474 Williams MR, Lamont BB, Henstridge JD (2009) Species–area functions revisited. *J Biogeogr*
 475 36:1994-2004
 476 Yamaura Y, Connor EF, Royle JA, Itoh K, Sato K, Taki H, Mishima Y (2016a) Estimating
 477 species – area relationships by modeling abundance and frequency subject to
 478 incomplete sampling. *Ecol Evol* 6:4836-4848
 479 Yamaura Y, Kéry M, Royle JA (2016b) Study of biological communities subject to imperfect
 480 detection: bias and precision of community *N*-mixture abundance models in
 481 small-sample situations. *Ecol Res* 31:289-305
 482 Yamaura Y, Katoh K, Takahashi T (2008a) Effects of stand, landscape, and spatial variables
 483 on bird communities in larch plantations and deciduous forests in central Japan. *Can J*
 484 *For Res* 38:1223-1243
 485 Yamaura Y, Kawahara T, Iida S, Ozaki K (2008b) Relative importance of the area and shape
 486 of patches to the diversity of multiple taxa. *Conserv Biol* 22:1513-1522
 487
 488




Fig. 1. Study area.

We established sampling plots in 23 abandoned farmland patches and three wetland sites.

White area indicates land-uses other than wetland/grassland and abandoned farmland, e.g., forests, urban, and open waters.

Abandoned farmland patch




Fig. 2. Schematic illustration of establishment of bird sampling plots.

We first examined the distributions of dominant vegetation types in the studied patches, and established the rectangular plots (100-m width $\times$ length) to represent the vegetation types. Plant survey was conducted along the center lines of the bird sampling plots (i.e., transect lines: see main text).




Fig. 3. Parameter estimates of individual species and communities.

Median estimates and 95% credible intervals are shown. Dots indicate median values, and

bars indicate intervals between 95% lower and upper limits. Species ID are shown in

Appendix B, and COM indicates community-level hyper parameters (community-means). For

β_{1-4} , statistical significance at 5% level is indicated by *. (a) β_{0i} was logarithmically

transformed when expected abundance when area was 1 ha. (b) Effect of patch area. (c-e) β_{2i} ,

β_{3i} , and β_{4i} are the effects of tree density [/ha], shrub cover [%], and wetland/grassland

proportion in the surroundings [%], respectively.




Fig. 4. Total abundance and species richness as function of patch areas and covariates.

Vertical axes indicate (a, d) tree density [./ha], (b, e) shrub cover [%], and (c, f) wetland/grassland proportion in the surroundings [%]. Solid lines indicate estimates of (a–c) abundance and (d–f) species richness. In each figure, the other covariates are fixed to mean values.




Fig. 5. Abundance-area and species-area relationships in relation to wetland communities in 15-ha wetlands. Horizontal broken lines indicate total abundance of wetland communities in 15-ha wetlands. (a–c) Abundance-area relationships. (d–f) Species-area relationships. In each figure, three curves indicate the cases in the covariates for minimum (dotted), mean (solid), and maximum (broken) values of (a, d) tree densities, (b, e) shrub cover, and (c, f) wetland/grassland proportions in the surroundings. In each figure, the other covariates are fixed to mean values.