

Effects of conservation interventions on marine fish: a protocol for subject-wide evidence synthesis

**Authors: Leo J Clarke¹ and Natasha Taylor², Rosslyn McIntyre², Chris Barrett²,
Khatija Alliji², Rebecca K Smith³**

1. School of Ocean Sciences, Bangor University, Menai Bridge, LL59 5AB, United Kingdom.
2. Centre for Environment, Aquaculture and Fisheries Science, Pakefield Road, Lowestoft, Suffolk, NR33 0HT, United Kingdom.
3. Conservation Evidence, Department of Zoology, University of Cambridge, The David Attenborough Building, Cambridge, CB2 3QZ, United Kingdom.

Reviewed by the following Advisory Board:

Colin Bannister	Alumnus of the Centre for Environment, Fisheries and Aquaculture Science	United Kingdom
Rabea Diekmann	Thünen Institut	Germany
Matt Doggett	Freelance Marine Ecologist	United Kingdom
Euan Dunn	Royal Society for the Protection of Birds	United Kingdom
Matt Dunn	National Institute of Water and Atmospheric Research	New Zealand
Clive Fox	Scottish Association for Marine Science	United Kingdom
Michel Kaiser	Marine Stewardship Council	United Kingdom
Cristina Mangano	University of Palermo (DiStEM)	Italy
Tara Marshall	University of Aberdeen	United Kingdom
Tim McClanahan	Wildlife Conservation Society	United States of America
Tessa Mazor	University of Queensland	Australia
Ana Parma	Centro Nacional Patagónico-CONICET	Argentina
Mike Quigley	Natural England	United Kingdom
Kirsten Ramsay	Natural Resources Wales	United Kingdom
Dave Reid	Marine Institute Ireland	Ireland
Anna Rindorf	Technical University Denmark Aqua	Denmark
Beatriz Roel	Alumnus of the Centre for Environment, Fisheries and Aquaculture Science	United Kingdom
Marija Sciberras	Mediterranean Institute for Advanced Studies	Spain
Jean-Luc Solandt	Marine Conservation Society	United Kingdom
Selina Stead	Marine Management Organisation	United Kingdom
Mark Tasker	Emeritus Principal Advisor, JNCC	United Kingdom

Abstract

Fishing is one of the most widespread sources of human disturbance in marine and aquatic environments, and many ecosystems and fish populations have been dramatically altered as a result of fishing activities. There is therefore an increasing need for evidence-based management of fish populations and their conservation. Reviewing the evidence is a time-consuming and costly exercise. In general, the assessment of the evidence-base is approached on a case-by-case basis and different stakeholders independently conduct evidence reviews relative to their specific application or enquiry. This approach is counter to the philosophy of 'produce once and use many times over' and is a highly inefficient use of resources. The methods outlined in this protocol are designed to identify and synthesise the available evidence for the effectiveness of conservation interventions for marine fish, including management measures for the sustainable use of fisheries resources (i.e. conservation of stocks). This first protocol uses wording that we expect to become the standard for a subject-wide Conservation Evidence synthesis, except where there was deviation from the standard methods, including improvements.

Key Words: subject-wide evidence synthesis, marine fish, conservation, intervention, fisheries, management

Background

There is increasing need for policy makers and managers to assess the impact of human pressures on the marine environment and to recommend and implement measures that restrain, reduce or eliminate these pressures. These activities are undertaken by multi-disciplinary organisations, including international, government and regulatory agencies, devolved governments, local authorities, non-governmental organisations and science advisors. When assessing potential pressures on the marine environment, each of these bodies employs staff to scrutinise the available scientific evidence-base for guidance on best practice to reduce impacts.

Reviewing the evidence to inform marine management decisions is a time-consuming and costly exercise. In general, the assessment of the evidence-base is approached on a case-by-case basis. It is recognised that many stakeholders, intergovernmental bodies and advisory groups strive for a standardised approach to data collection with respect to, for example, terminology and methods for assessing fish populations and, that these standards differ with the amount of data available for a given fish resource. However, often, different stakeholders independently conduct evidence reviews relative to their specific application or enquiry. This approach is counter to the philosophy of 'produce once and use many times over' and is a highly inefficient use of resources. This means that evidence is assessed and interpreted many times over, but with the risk that evidence included in different reviews, and the way that it is assessed, will be inconsistent, draws on different expert opinion, and replicates effort

that has been spent on previous reviews. This lack of consistency can lead to informal reviews that vary in their quality and potential bias due to differences in objectivity and comprehensiveness (see Woodcock et al. 2017). The inefficiency in this process is obvious, but may result in a lack of repeatability and accuracy if methods are not clearly explained; one review may draw different conclusions based on similar evidence, and has the potential to lead to different management recommendations from different agencies or stakeholders. One serious consequence of divergent interpretation is that decisions and the evidence-assessment process are then more open to challenge, which may require further investigation to resolve conflicts, slowing down the process and using more resources.

Fishing is one of the most widespread sources of human disturbance in marine and aquatic environments, and many ecosystems and fish populations have been dramatically altered as a result of fishing activities. Effective management is complicated by conflicting interests of multiple stakeholders and there is an increasing need for evidence-based management and conservation of fish populations and communities (Cooke et al. 2017). While a large amount of evidence exists, it is often not collated and summarised in an easily accessible format. This project will summarise and evaluate the available global scientific evidence on the effectiveness of conservation interventions in marine and transitional aquatic environments and incorporate this information into an online free to use searchable database (www.ConservationEvidence.com). In doing so, the output of our proposed project will contribute to the maintenance and enhancement of the quality of the marine environment.

Scope of the review

1. Review subject

This synthesis focuses on evidence for the effectiveness of global interventions for the conservation of marine fish. This subject has not yet been covered using subject-wide evidence synthesis. This is defined as a systematic method of evidence synthesis that covers entire subjects at once, including all closed review topics within that subject at a fine scale and analysing results through study summary and expert assessment, or through meta-analysis; the term can also refer to any product arising from this process (Sutherland et al. submitted). The topic is therefore a priority for the discipline-wide Conservation Evidence database.

This synthesis covers evidence for the effects of conservation interventions for wild marine fish (i.e. not in captivity). We will not include evidence from the substantial literature on husbandry of commercially reared cultured marine fish or those kept in zoos. However, where these interventions are relevant to the conservation of wild declining or threatened species, they will be included, e.g. captive breeding for the purpose of reintroductions or gene banking (for future release). For this synthesis, conservation interventions will include fisheries management measures that aim to conserve fish stocks and ameliorate the deleterious effects of fishing activity. The output of the project will be an authoritative, freely accessible evidence-base that will support marine management objectives and help to achieve conservation outcomes and more sustainable use of marine biological resources.

The global synthesis will collate evidence for the effects of conservation actions for all marine ecosystems, habitat types and all wild marine fish species. Evidence for the effectiveness of interventions targeting conservation of diadromous species (those that spend a part of their life cycle in freshwater habitats and part in marine habitats) will be summarised only for studies that have been carried out in marine and estuarine aquatic habitats. Interventions relating to the conservation of these species that have been carried out in freshwater habitats will be collated separately to be retained for any future synopsis covering this theme.

2. Advisory board

An advisory board made up of international conservationists and academics with expertise in fisheries and marine fish conservation has been formed. These experts will input into the evidence synthesis at three key stages: a) reviewing the protocol including identifying key sources of evidence, b) developing a comprehensive list of conservation interventions for review and c) reviewing the draft evidence synthesis. The advisory board is listed above, although additional experts may be added during the production of the synopsis. The final list will be published in the synopsis document and online (<https://www.conservationevidence.com/site/page?view=methods>).

3. Creating the list of interventions

At the start of the project, a comprehensive list of interventions will be developed by scanning the literature and in partnership with the advisory board. The list will also be checked by Conservation Evidence to ensure that it follows the standard structure. The aim is to include all actions that have been carried out or advised to support populations or communities of wild marine fish, whether evidence for the effectiveness of an action is available or not. During the synthesis process further interventions may be discovered, which will be integrated into the synopsis structure.

The list of interventions will be organized into categories based on the International Union for the Conservation of Nature (IUCN) classifications of direct threats (<http://www.iucnredlist.org/technical-documents/classification-schemes/threats-classification-scheme>) and conservation actions (<http://www.iucnredlist.org/technical-documents/classification-schemes/conservation-actions-classification-scheme-ver2>).

Depending on the amount of available evidence, it may not be possible to summarise the evidence for all interventions within the time frame of this project. Under those circumstances once the comprehensive list of interventions has been produced, we will ask the advisory board to prioritise specific interventions. We will then summarise the evidence starting with that for the highest priority intervention/group of interventions, and then work down the priority list.

Methods

1. Literature searches

Literature will be obtained from the Conservation Evidence discipline-wide literature database, and from searches of additional subject specific literature sources. The Conservation Evidence discipline-wide literature database is compiled using systematic searches of journals; relevant publications describing studies of conservation interventions for all species groups and habitats are saved from each journal and are added to the database.

a) Global evidence

Evidence from all around the world will be included.

b) Languages included

Only English language journals will be included. A recent study on the topic of language barriers in global science indicates that approximately 35% of conservation studies may be in non-English languages. While searching only English language journals may therefore potentially introduce some bias to the review process, project resources and time constraints determine the journals that can be searched within the project timeframe.

c) Journals searched

i) From Conservation Evidence discipline-wide literature database

All of the journals (and years) listed in Appendix 1 have already been searched and relevant papers have been added to the Conservation Evidence discipline-wide literature database. An asterisk indicates the journals most relevant to this synopsis. Others are less likely to have included papers relevant to this synopsis, but if they did, they will be summarised.

ii) Update searches

No additional searches of any of the journals listed in Appendix 1 will be undertaken, as journal searches prioritised for this synopsis will aim at specialist journals that are likely to yield studies that focus on marine fisheries management and conservation.

iii) New searches

Additional, focused searches of journals most relevant to the conservation of marine fish populations listed below will be undertaken. These journals were identified through expert judgement by the project researchers and the advisory board and ranked in order of relevance, to prioritise searches that were considered likely to yield higher numbers of relevant studies. These journals will not be searched from the first year of publication; rather searches will be undertaken backwards from the end of 2018, either to the earliest published volume or for 30 years for long-running journals.

- Fish and Fisheries
- Fisheries
- Fisheries Management & Ecology
- Fisheries Oceanography
- Fisheries Research
- ICES Journal of Marine Science
- Journal of Coastal Research
- Journal of Experimental Marine Biology and Ecology
- Journal of Fish Biology
- Marine Ecology Progress Series
- New Zealand Journal of Marine & Freshwater Research

d) Reports from specialist websites searched

i) From Conservation Evidence discipline-wide literature database

All of the report series (and years) below have already been searched for the Conservation Evidence project. An asterisk indicates the report series most relevant to this synopsis. Others are less likely to have included reports relevant to this synopsis, but if they did they will be summarised.

- | | | |
|--|-----------|-----------------|
| • Amphibian Survival Alliance | 1994-2012 | Vol 9 - Vol 104 |
| • British Trust for Ornithology | 1981-2016 | Report 1-687 |
| • IUCN Invasive Species Specialist Group | 1995-2013 | Vol 1 - Vol 33 |
| • Scottish Natural Heritage* | 2004-2015 | Reports 1-945 |

ii) Update searches

Updates to reports already searched as part of the wider Conservation Evidence project will not be undertaken for this synopsis, which will prioritise fisheries-focused reports.

iii) New searches

Following consultation with the project advisory board, searches will target specialist reports produced by the International Council for the Exploration of the Sea (ICES) Expert Groups and workshops relevant to marine fish and fisheries. ICES has almost 150 expert groups and workshops that address a range of issues across marine ecosystems, and searches will therefore target relevant reports by systematically searching through ICES' web directory of the reports of Expert Groups that are relevant to the review subject (i.e. marine fish and fisheries) (<https://www.ices.dk/community/groups/Pages/default.aspx>). Such expert groups include, for example, the Working Group on Comparative Analyses between European Atlantic and Mediterranean marine ecosystems to move towards an Ecosystem-based Approach to Fisheries and the Working Group on Fisheries Benthic Impact and Trade-offs. These searches will scan every report title and abstract or summary within each report series and add any relevant report to the project database.

e) Other literature searches

The online database www.conservationevidence.com will be searched for relevant publications that have already been summarised.

Where a systematic review is found for an intervention, if the intervention has a small literature (<20 papers), all publications including the systematic review will be summarised. If the intervention has a large literature (≥ 20 papers), then only the systematic review and any publications published since the review will be summarised. Where a non-systematic review (or editorial, synthesis, preface, introduction etc.) is found for an intervention, all relevant publications referenced within it will be included, but the review itself will not be summarised. However, if the review also provides new/collective data, then the review itself will also be included/summarised (indicating which other summarized publications it includes). Relevant publications cited in other publications summarised for the synopsis will not be included (due to time restrictions).

f) Supplementary literature identified by advisory board or relevant stakeholders

Additional journal or specialist website searches, and relevant papers or reports suggested by the advisory board or relevant stakeholders will also be included, where time permits.

Additional searches may be added during the production of the synopsis. The final list of evidence sources searched for this synopsis will be published in the synopsis document (including a summary using Appendix 2), and the full list of journals and report series searched published online (<https://www.conservationevidence.com/journalsearcher/synopsis>).

g) Search record database

A database will be created of all relevant publications found during searches. Reasons for exclusion will be recorded for all those included during screening that are not summarised for the synopsis.

2. Publication screening and inclusion criteria

A summary of the total number of evidence sources and papers/reports screened will be published in the synopsis using the diagram in Appendix 2.

a) Screening

To ensure consistency/accuracy when screening publications for inclusion in the literature database, an initial test using the Conservation Evidence inclusion criteria (provided below) and a consistent set of references was carried out by authors, compared with the decisions of the experienced core Conservation Evidence team. Results were analysed using Cohen's Kappa test (Cohen 1960). Where initial results did not show 'substantial' ($K=0.61-0.8$) or 'almost perfect' agreement ($K=0.81-1.0$), authors were given further training. A second Kappa test will be used to assess the consistency/accuracy of article screening for the first

two years of the first journal searched by each author. Again, where results do not show 'substantial' ($K=0.61-0.8$) or 'almost perfect' agreement ($K= 0.81-1.0$), authors will receive further training before carrying out further searches.

Authors of other synopses who have searched journals and added relevant publications to the Conservation Evidence literature database since 2018, and all other searchers since 2017 have undertaken the initial paper inclusion test described above; searchers prior to that have not. Kappa tests of the first two years searched has been carried out for all new searchers who have contributed to the Conservation Evidence literature database since July 2018.

We acknowledge that the literature search and screening method used by Conservation Evidence, as with any method, will result in gaps in the evidence. The Conservation Evidence literature database currently includes relevant papers from over 270 English language journals as well as over 150 non-English journals. Additional journals are frequently added to those searched, and years searched are often updated. It is possible that searchers will have missed relevant papers from those journals searched. Publication bias will not be taken into account, and it is likely that additional biases will result from the evidence that is available, for example there are often geographic biases in study locations.

b) Inclusion criteria

The following Conservation Evidence inclusion criteria will be used.

Criteria A: Conservation Evidence includes studies that measure the effect of an action that might be done to conserve biodiversity

1. Does this study measure the effect of an action that is or was under the control of humans, on wild taxa (including captives), habitats, or invasive/problem taxa? If yes, go to 3. If no, go to 2.
2. Does this study measure the effect of an action that is or was under the control of humans, on human behaviour that is relevant to conserving biodiversity? If yes, go to Criteria B. If no, the study will be excluded.
3. Could the action be put in place by a conservationist/decision maker to protect, manage, restore or reduce impacts of threats to wild taxa or habitats, or control or mitigate the impact of the invasive/problem taxon on wild taxa or habitats? If yes, the study will be included. If no, the study will be excluded.

Explanation:

1.a. Study must have a measured outcome on wild taxa, habitats or invasive species: excludes studies on domestic/agricultural species, theoretical modelling or opinion pieces. See Criteria B for actions that have a measured outcome on human behaviour only.

b. Action must be carried out by people: excludes impacts from natural processes (e.g. wave action, natural storms), impacts from background variation (e.g. sediment type, climate change), correlations with habitat types, where there is no test of a specific action by humans,

or pure ecology (e.g. movement, distribution of species).

2. Study must test an action that could be put in place for conservation. This excludes assessing impacts of threats (but actions which remove threats would be included). The test may involve comparisons between sites/factors not originally put in place or modified for conservation but which could be (e.g. fished vs unfished sites, dredged vs undredged sites – where the removal of fishing/dredging is as you would do for conservation, even if that was not the original intention in the study).

If the title and/or abstract are suggestive of fulfilling our criteria, but there is not sufficient information to judge whether the action was under human control, whether the action could be applied by a conservationist/decision maker or whether there are data quantifying the outcome, then include. If the article has no abstract, but the title is suggestive, then a study will be included.

We sort articles into folders by the taxon/habitat for which they have an outcome. If the title/abstract does not specify which species/taxa/habitats are impacted, then the full article will be scanned and then assigned to folders accordingly.

The outcome for wild taxa/habitats can be negative, neutral or positive, and does not have to be statistically significant but must be quantified (if hard to judge from abstract, then it will be included). It could be any outcome that has implications for the health of individuals, populations, species, communities or habitats, including, but not limited to the following:

Individual health, condition or behaviour, including in captivity: e.g. growth, size, weight, stress, disease levels or immune function, movement, use of natural/artificial habitat/structure, range, predatory or nuisance behaviour that could lead to retaliatory action by humans.

Breeding: egg/sperm production, sperm motility/viability after freezing (e.g. for captive breeding), artificial fertilization success, mating success, hatching success, egg/larvae quality/condition, 'overall recruitment'

Genetics: genetic diversity, genetic suitability (e.g. adaptation to local conditions, use of correct flyways for migratory species, etc.)

Life history: growth, age/size at maturity, survival, mortality

Population measures: number, abundance, density, presence/absence, biomass, movement, age-structure, species distributions (only in response to a human action), disease prevalence, sex ratio

Community/habitat measures: species richness, diversity measures (including trait/functional diversity), community composition, community structure (e.g. trophic structure), distribution

area (e.g. by different habitat types), physical habitat structure (e.g. rugosity, height, basal area)

Actions within the scope of Conservation Evidence include:

- clear management actions: closing an area to fishing, modifying fishing gear to improve selectivity and reduce bycatch, controlling invasive species, creating or restoring habitats.
- International or national policies
- reintroductions or management of wild species in captivity,
- actions that reduce human-wildlife conflict
- actions that change human behaviour, resulting in an impact on wild taxa or habitats
- See <https://www.conservationevidence.com/data/index> for more examples of actions.

Note on study types:

Include any literature reviews, systematic reviews, meta-analyses or short notes that review studies that fulfil these criteria.

Exclude theoretical modelling studies, as no action has been taken. However, studies that use models to analyse real-world data, or compare models to real-world situations are included (if they otherwise fulfil these criteria).

Criteria B: Conservation Evidence includes studies that measure the effect of an action that might be done to change human behaviour for the benefit of biodiversity

1. Does this study measure the effect of an action that is or was under human control on human behaviour (actual or intentional) which is likely to protect, manage, restore or reduce threats to wild taxa or habitats? If yes, go to 2. If no, the study will be excluded.
2. Could the action be put in place by a conservationist, manager or decision maker to change human behaviour? If yes, the study will be included. If no, the study will be excluded.

Explanation:

1. a. Study must have a measured outcome on actual or intentional human behaviour including self-reported behaviours: excludes outcomes on human psychology (tolerance, knowledge, awareness, attitude, perceptions or beliefs)

1. b. change in human behaviour must be linked to outcomes for wild taxa and habitats, excludes changes in behaviour linked to outcomes for human benefit, even if these occurred under a conservation program (e.g. we would exclude a study demonstrating increased economic benefits from fishing for small coastal communities generated by temporary closures of their fishing grounds)

1. c. Action must be under human control: this excludes impacts from climatic or other

natural events.

2. Study must test an action that could be put in place for conservation: this excludes studies with no action e.g. correlating human personality traits with likelihood of conservation-related behaviours.

The human behaviour outcome of the study can be negative, neutral or positive, does not have to be statistically significant but must be quantified (if hard to judge from abstract, then include). It could be any behaviour that is likely to have an outcome on wild taxa and habitats (including mitigating the impact of invasive/problem taxon on wild taxa or habitats). Actions include, but are not limited to the following:

Change in adverse behaviours (which directly threaten biodiversity) e.g. unsustainable fishing (industrial, artisanal, recreational), urban encroachment, creating noise, entering sensitive areas, polluting or dumping waste, clearing or habitat destruction, introducing invasive species.

Change in positive behaviours e.g. uptake of alternative/sustainable livelihoods, number of households adopting sustainable practices, donations

Change in policy or conservation methods e.g. placement of protected areas, protection of key habitats/species

Change in consumer or market behaviour e.g. purchasing, consuming, buying, willingness to pay, selling, illegal trading, advertising, consumer fraud.

Behavioural intentions to do with any of the above

Actions which are particularly likely to have a behaviour change as the outcome include, but are not limited to the following:

- **Enforcement:** closed seasons, size limits, fishing gear restrictions, auditable/traceable reporting requirements, market inspections, increased number of rangers, patrols or frequency of patrols in, around or within protected areas, improved fencing/physical barriers, improved signage, improved equipment/technology used by guards, use of UAVs/drones for rapid response, DNA analysis, GPS tracking.
- **Behaviour Change:** promote alternative/sustainable livelihoods, payment for ecosystem services, ecotourism, poverty reduction, increased appreciation or knowledge, debunking misinformation, altering or re-enforcing local taboos, financial incentives.
- **Governance:** Protect or reward whistle-blowers, increase government transparency, ensure independence of judiciary, provide legal aid
- **Market Regulation:** trade bans, taxation, supply chain transparency laws
- **Consumer Demand Reduction:** Increase awareness or knowledge, fear appeals (negative association with undesirable product), benefit appeal (positive association with

desirable behaviour), worldview framing, moral framing, employing decision defaults, providing decision support tools, simplifying advice to consumers, promoting desirable social norms, legislative prohibition.

- Sustainable Alternatives: Certification schemes, captive bred or artificial alternatives, sustainable alternatives.
- New policies for conservation/protection

We allocate studies to folders by their outcome. All studies under Criteria B go in the 'Behaviour change' folder. They are additionally duplicated in to a taxon/habitat folder if there is a specific intended final outcome of the behaviour change (if none mentioned, they will be filed only in Behaviour change)

Relevant subject

Studies relevant to the synopsis subject will include those focused on the conservation of wild, native marine fish and carried out in marine and estuarine habitats.

Relevant types of intervention

An intervention has to be one that could be put in place by a fisheries manager, conservationist or policy maker to protect, manage, restore or reduce the impacts of threats to wild native marine fish, or control or mitigate the impact of an invasive/problem taxon on marine fish. Alternatively, interventions may aim to change human behaviour (actual or intentional), which is likely to protect, manage, restore or reduce threats to marine fish populations. See inclusion criteria above for further details.

If the following two criteria are met, a combined intervention will be created within the synopsis, rather than repeating evidence under all the separate interventions: a) there are five or more publications that use the same well-defined combination of interventions, with very clear description of what they were, without separating the effects of each individual intervention, and b) the combined set of interventions is a commonly used conservation strategy.

Relevant types of comparator

To determine the effectiveness of interventions, studies must include a comparison, i.e. monitoring change over time (typically before and after the intervention was implemented), or for example at treatment and control sites. Alternatively, a study could compare one specific intervention (or implementation method) against another. For example, this could be comparing the abundance of a species before and after the closure of an area to fishing activities, or the species selectivity or bycatch reduction of two different mesh sizes used in fishing gear.

Exceptions, which may not have a control but will still be included, are for example investigating mortality levels following implementation of catch and release policies, or the effectiveness of restocking or captive breeding programmes.

Relevant types of outcome

Below we provide a list of anticipated metrics; others will be included if reported within relevant studies.

- Community response
 - Community composition
 - Richness/diversity
- Other
 - Stock status
 - Bycatch reduction
 - Increased gear selectivity
 - Gear-habitat interactions
- Population response
 - Abundance: number, density, presence/absence, biomass, movement, age-structure, sex ratio
 - Reproductive success: egg/sperm production, artificial fertilization success, mating success, hatching rate, egg/larvae quality/ condition, overall recruitment, age/size at maturity
 - Survival: survival, mortality
 - Condition: growth, size, weight, condition factors, biochemical ratios, stress, disease levels or immune function
- Usage:
 - Uptake
 - Use
 - Behaviour change: movement, use of natural/artificial habitat/structure, range, predatory or nuisance behaviour that could lead to retaliatory action by humans

Relevant types of study design

The table below lists the study designs included. The strongest evidence comes from randomized, replicated, controlled trials with paired-sites and before and after monitoring.

Table 1. Study designs

Term	Meaning
Replicated	The intervention was repeated on more than one individual or site. In conservation and ecology, the number of replicates is much smaller than it would be for medical trials (when thousands of individuals are often tested). If the replicates are sites, pragmatism dictates that between five and ten replicates is a reasonable amount of replication, although more would be preferable. We provide the number of replicates wherever possible. Replicates should reflect the number of times an intervention has been independently carried out, from the perspective of the study subject. For example, 10 plots

	within a mown field might be independent replicates from the perspective of plants with limited dispersal, but not independent replicates for larger motile animals such as birds. In the case of translocations/release of captive bred animals, replicates should be sites, not individuals.
Randomized	The intervention was allocated randomly to individuals or sites. This means that the initial condition of those given the intervention is less likely to bias the outcome.
Paired sites	Sites are considered in pairs, within which one was treated with the intervention and the other was not. Pairs, or blocks, of sites are selected with similar environmental conditions, such as soil type or surrounding landscape. This approach aims to reduce environmental variation and make it easier to detect a true effect of the intervention.
Controlled*	Individuals or sites treated with the intervention are compared with control individuals or sites not treated with the intervention. (The treatment is usually allocated by the investigators (randomly or not), such that the treatment or control groups/sites could have received the treatment).
Before-and-after	Monitoring of effects was carried out before and after the intervention was imposed.
Site comparison*	A study that considers the effects of interventions by comparing sites that historically had different interventions (e.g. intervention vs no intervention) or levels of intervention. Unlike controlled studies, it is not clear how the interventions were allocated to sites (i.e. the investigators did not allocate the treatment to some of the sites).
Review	A conventional review of literature. Generally, these have not used an agreed search protocol or quantitative assessments of the evidence.
Systematic review	A systematic review follows an agreed set of methods for identifying studies and carrying out a formal 'meta-analysis'. It will weight or evaluate studies according to the strength of evidence they offer, based on the size of each study and the rigour of its design. All environmental systematic reviews are available at: www.environmentalevidence.org/index.htm
Study	If none of the above apply, for example a study looking at the number of people that were engaged in an awareness raising project. Or a study measuring change over time in only one site and only after an intervention.

* Note that "controlled" is mutually exclusive from "site comparison". A comparison cannot be both controlled and a site comparison. However, one study might contain both controlled and site comparison aspects e.g. study of fertilized grassland, compared to unfertilized plots (controlled) and natural, target grassland (site comparison).

3. Study quality assessment & critical appraisal

We will not quantitatively assess the evidence from each publication or weight it according to quality. However, to allow interpretation of the evidence, we make the size and design of each study we report clear.

We will critically appraise each potentially relevant study and will exclude those that do not provide data for a comparison to the treatment, do not statistically analyse the results (or if included this will be stated in the summary paragraph) or have obvious errors in their design or analysis. A record of the reason for excluding any of the publications included during screening will be kept within the synopsis database.

4. Data extraction

Data on the effectiveness of the relevant intervention (e.g. mean species abundance inside or outside a closed area; reduction in bycatch after installation of a bycatch reduction device) will be extracted from, and summarised for, publications that include the relevant subject, types of intervention, comparator and outcomes outlined above. A summary of the total number of evidence sources and papers/reports scanned and the total number of publications included following data extraction will be published in the synopsis using the diagram in Appendix 2.

In addition to ensuring consistency/accuracy when screening publications for inclusion in the discipline-wide literature database (see above), for a set of publications, relevant data will be extracted by a member of the core Conservation Evidence team as well as the author to ensure agreement for inclusion in the synopsis. In addition, at the start of each month, authors will swap three summaries with another author to ensure that the correct type of data has been extracted and that the summary follows the Conservation Evidence standard format.

5. Evidence synthesis

a) Summary protocol

Each publication will usually have just one paragraph for each intervention it tests describing the study in (usually) no more than 150 words using plain English. Each summary will be in the following format:

A [TYPE OF STUDY] in [YEARS X-Y] in [HOW MANY SITES] in/of [HABITAT] in [REGION and COUNTRY] [REFERENCE] found that [INTERVENTION] [SUMMARY OF ALL KEY RESULTS] for [SPECIES/HABITAT TYPE]. [DETAILS OF KEY RESULTS, INCLUDING DATA]. In addition, [EXTRA RESULTS, IMPLEMENTATION OPTIONS, CONFLICTING RESULTS]. The [DETAILS OF EXPERIMENTAL DESIGN, INTERVENTION METHODS and KEY DETAILS OF SITE CONTEXT]. Data was collected in [DETAILS OF SAMPLING METHODS].

Type of study - use terms and order in Table 1.

Site context - for the sake of brevity, only nuances essential to the interpretation of the results are included. The reader is always encouraged to read the original source to get a full understanding of the study site (e.g. history of management, physical conditions).

For example:

A replicated, paired, site comparison study in 2002 of two coastal coral reefs in the Philippines (1) found that establishing a marine reserve closed to fishing resulted in higher density and biomass of species of fish taken by local fishers within the reserve compared to a fished area in one of two cases. For species taken by fishers, density and biomass inside reserve one was higher (density: 68 fish/500 m²; biomass: 89 kg) than outside (27/500 m²; 25 kg), but not significantly different inside and outside reserve two (density inside and outside: 41/500 m²; no biomass data provided). For fish species not subject to fishing, density was higher inside both reserves compared to outside, however statistical tests showed this was mainly due to habitat variation not protection status (reserve one: 146 fish/250 m² inside, 113/250 m² outside; reserve two: 93/250 m² inside, 32/250 m² outside). No-take reserves approximately 450 m long (protected for 20 years) and 650 m long (protected for 15 years) off two islands were each compared to fished areas approximately 500 m away. Fish were surveyed in November and December 2002. Divers surveyed fish at six (reserve one) and eight (reserve two) coral reef slope sites inside and outside each reserve. Counts were along 50 x 10 m transects for fish taken by fishers and 50 x 5 m transects for fish not fished. Transects were surveyed twice.

- (1) Abesamis R.A., Russ G.A., Alcala A.C. (2006) Gradients of abundance of fish across no-take marine reserve boundaries: Evidence from Philippine coral reefs. *Aquatic Conservation: Marine and Freshwater Ecosystems*, 16, 349-371.

A replicated, randomized, controlled, before-and-after study in 1993–1999 of five harvested hardwood forests in Virginia, USA (1) found that harvesting trees in groups did not result in higher salamander abundances than clearcutting. Abundance was similar between treatments (group cut: 3; clearcut: 1/30 m²). Abundance was significantly lower compared to unharvested plots (6/30 m²). Species composition differed before and three years after harvest. There were five sites with 2 ha plots with each treatment: group harvesting (2–3 small area group harvests with selective harvesting between), clearcutting and an unharvested control. Salamanders were monitored on 9–15 transects (2 x 15 m)/plot at night in April–October. One or two years of pre-harvest and 1–4 years of post-harvest data were collected.

- (1) Knapp S.M., Haas C.A., Harpole D.N. & Kirkpatrick R.L. (2003) Initial effects of clearcutting and alternative silvicultural practices on terrestrial salamander abundance. *Conservation Biology*, 17, 752–762.

b) Terminology used to describe the evidence

Unless specifically stated otherwise, results will reflect statistical tests performed on the data i.e. we will only state that there was a difference if it was a significant difference or will state that there was no difference if it was not significant.

Table 1 above defines the terms used to describe the study designs.

c) Dealing with multiple interventions within a publication

When separate results are provided for the effects of each of the different interventions tested, separate summaries will be written under each intervention heading. However, when several

interventions were carried out at the same time and only the combined effect reported, the result will be described with a similar paragraph under all relevant interventions. The first sentence will make it clear that there was a combination of interventions carried out, i.e. ‘.....(REF) found that [x intervention], along with [y] and [z interventions] resulted in [describe effects]’. Within the results section we will also add a sentence such as: ‘It is not clear whether these effects were a direct result of [x], [y] or [z] interventions’, or ‘The study does not distinguish between the effects of [x], and other interventions carried out at the same time: [y] and [z].’

d) Dealing with multiple publications reporting the same results and reviews

If two publications describe results from the same intervention implemented in the same space and at the same time, we will only include the most stringently peer-reviewed publication (i.e. journal of the highest impact factor). If one includes initial results (e.g. after year one) of another (e.g. after 1-3 years), we will only include the publication covering the longest time span. If two publications describe at least partially different results, we will include both but make clear they are from the same project in the paragraph, e.g. ‘A controlled study..... (Gallagher et al. 1999; same experimental set-up as Oasis et al. 2001).....’.

Basic (i.e. not systematic) reviews will only be summarised if they provide new/collective data; the individual publications will also be summarised to provide full details of each study. Publications identified in all other basic reviews will be obtained and summarised individually (where time allows). Where there is a systematic review of an intervention with a large associated literature (≥ 20 papers), the systematic review will be summarised along with any papers/reports published since the systematic review. If the intervention has a small literature (<20 papers), all publications including the systematic review will be summarised.

e) Taxonomy

Taxonomy will not be updated but will follow that used in the original publication. Where possible, common names and Latin names will both be given the first time each species is mentioned within each summary.

f) Key messages

Each intervention will have a set of concise, bulleted key messages at the top, written once all the literature has been summarised. These will include information such as the number, design and location of studies included.

The first bullet point will describe the total number of studies that tested the intervention and the locations of the studies, followed by key information on the relevant metrics presented under the headings and sub-headings shown below (with number of relevant studies in parentheses for each).

- **X studies** examined the effects of [INTERVENTION] on [TARGET POPULATION]. Y studies were in [LOCATION 1]^{1,2} and Z studies were in [LOCATION 2]^{3,4}. *Locations will usually be countries, ordered based on chronological order of studies rather than alphabetically, i.e. USA¹, Australia² not Australi², USA¹. However, when more than 4-5 separate countries, they may be grouped into regions to make it clearer e.g. Europe, North America. The distribution of studies amongst habitat types may also be added here if relevant.*

COMMUNITY RESPONSE (x STUDIES)

- **Community composition (x studies):**
- **Richness/diversity (x studies):**

POPULATION RESPONSE (x STUDIES)

- **Abundance (x studies):**
- **Reproductive success (x studies):**
- **Survival (x studies):**
- **Condition (x studies):**

USAGE (x STUDIES)

- **Uptake (x studies):**
- **Use (x studies):**
- **Behaviour change (x studies):**

OTHER (x STUDIES) (*Included only for interventions/chapters where relevant*)

- **[Sub-heading(s) for the metric(s) reported will be created] (x studies):**

6. Dissemination/communication of evidence synthesis

The information from this evidence synthesis will be available in three ways:

- A synopsis pdf, downloadable from www.conservationevidence.com, will contain the study summaries, key messages and background information on each intervention.
- The searchable database at www.conservationevidence.com will contain all the summarized information from the synopsis, along with expert assessment scores.
- A chapter in *What Works in Conservation*, available as a pdf to download and a book from [<https://www.conservationevidence.com/content/page/79>], will contain the key messages from the synopsis as well as expert assessment scores on the effectiveness and certainty of the synopsis, with links to the online database.

Acknowledgements

Our thanks to David Righton (Cefas) and Jan Geert Hiddink (Bangor University) for making the project happen and for their continued support and encouragement. Thanks also to Laura Pettit and Anaëlle Lemasson (Joint Nature Conservation Committee) for their willingness to share knowledge and finally to the team at Conservation Evidence, Cambridge, for their expert advice and guidance.

Funding

This project is jointly funded by the European Maritime and Fisheries Fund (EMFF) and the Centre for Environment, Fisheries and Aquaculture Science (Cefas), through funding from Defra.

References

Amano, T., González-Varo, J. P., & Sutherland, W. J. (2016). Languages are still a major barrier to global science. *PLoS Biology*, 14, e2000933.

Cooke, S. J., Wesch, S., Donaldson, L. A., Wilson, A. D., & Haddaway, N. R. (2017). A Call for Evidence-Based Conservation and Management of Fisheries and Aquatic Resources. *Fisheries*, 42, 143-149.

Sutherland, W.J., Taylor, N.G., MacFarlane, D., Amano, T., Christie, A.P., Dicks, L.V., Lemasson, A.J., Littlewood, N.A., Martin, P.A., Ockendon, N., Petrovan, S.O., Robertson, R.J., Rocha, R., Shackelford, G.E., Smith, R.K., Tyler, E.H.M., & Wordley, C.F.R. Building a tool to overcome barriers in the research-implementation space: the Conservation Evidence database. Submitted *Biological Conservation*.

Woodcock, P., O'Leary, B. C., Kaiser, M. J., & Pullin, A. S. (2017). Your evidence or mine? Systematic evaluation of reviews of marine protected area effectiveness. *Fish and Fisheries*, 18, 668-681.

APPENDIX 1. Journals (and years) searched and for which relevant papers have been added to the Conservation Evidence discipline-wide literature database. An asterisk indicates the journals most relevant to this synopsis.

Journal	Years Searched	Topic
Acta Chiropterologica	1999-2017	All biodiversity
Acta Herpetologica	2006-2012	All biodiversity
Acta Oecologica-International Journal of Ecology	1990-2017	All biodiversity
Acta Theriologica	1977-2014	All biodiversity
Acta Theriologica Sinica	1981-2017	All biodiversity
African Bird Club Bulletin	1994-2017	All biodiversity
African Journal of Ecology	1963-2016	All biodiversity
African Journal of Herpetology	1990-2012	All biodiversity
African Journal of Marine Science	1983-2017	All biodiversity
African Primates	1995-2012	All biodiversity
African Zoology	1979-2013	All biodiversity
Agriculture, Ecosystems and Environment	1983-2017	All biodiversity
Ambio	1972-2011	All biodiversity
American Journal of Primatology	1981-2014	All biodiversity
American Naturalist	1867-2017	All biodiversity
Amphibia-Reptilia	1980-2012	All biodiversity
Amphibian and Reptile Conservation	1996-2012	All biodiversity
Animal Biology	2003-2013	All biodiversity
Animal Conservation*	1998-2017	All biodiversity
Annales Zoologici Fennici	1964-2013	All biodiversity
Annales Zoologici Societatis Zoologicae Botanicae Fennicae Vanamo	1932-1963	All biodiversity
Annual Review Ecology and Systematics	1970-2017	All biodiversity
Anthrozoos	1987-2013	All biodiversity
Apidologie	1958-2009	All biodiversity
Applied Animal Behaviour Science	1998-2014	All biodiversity
Applied Herpetology	2003-2009	All biodiversity
Applied Vegetation Science	1998-2017	All biodiversity
Aquaculture Research	1972-2008	All biodiversity
Aquatic Botany	1975-2017	All biodiversity
Aquatic Conservation: Marine and Freshwater Ecosystems*	1991-2017	All biodiversity
Aquatic Ecology*	1968-2016	All biodiversity
Aquatic Ecosystem Health & Management	1998-2016	All biodiversity
Aquatic Invasions*	2006-2016	All biodiversity
Aquatic Living Resources*	1988-2016	All biodiversity
Aquatic Mammals	1972-2017	All biodiversity
Arid Land Research and Management	1987-2013	All biodiversity
Asian Primates	2008-2012	All biodiversity
Auk	1980-2016	All biodiversity
Austral Ecology	1977-2017	All biodiversity
Australasian Journal of Herpetology	2009-2012	All biodiversity
Australian Mammalogy	2000-2017	All biodiversity
Avian Conservation and Ecology	2005-2016	All biodiversity

Basic and Applied Ecology	2000-2017	All biodiversity
Behavior	1948-2013	All biodiversity
Behavior Ecology	1990-2013	All biodiversity
Bibliotheca Herpetologica	1999-2012	All biodiversity
Biocontrol	1956-2016	All biodiversity
Biocontrol Science and Technology	1991-1996	All biodiversity
Biodiversity and Conservation*	1994-2017	All biodiversity
Biological Conservation	1981-2017	All biodiversity
Biological Control	1991-2017	All biodiversity
Biological Invasions	1999-2017	All biodiversity
Biology and Environment: Proceedings of the Royal Irish Academy	1993-2017	All biodiversity
Biology Letters	2005-2017	All biodiversity
Biotropica	1990-2017	All biodiversity
Bird Conservation International	1991-2016	All biodiversity
Bird Study	1980-2016	All biodiversity
Boreal Environment Research	1996-2014	All biodiversity
Bulletin of the Herpetological Society of Japan	1999-2008	All biodiversity
Canadian Field Naturalist	2013-2017	All biodiversity
Canadian Field-Naturalist	1987-2013	All biodiversity
Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences*	1901-2017	All biodiversity
Canadian Journal of Forest Research	1971-2013	All biodiversity
Caribbean Journal of Science	1961-2013	All biodiversity
Chelonian Conservation and Biology	2006-2013	All biodiversity
Collinsorum	2012-2014	All biodiversity
Community Ecology	2000-2012	All biodiversity
Conservation Biology*	1987-2017	All biodiversity
Conservation Evidence*	2004-2018	All biodiversity
Conservation Genetics	2000-2013	All biodiversity
Conservation Letters	2008-2017	All biodiversity
Contemporary Herpetology	1998-2009	All biodiversity
Contributions to Primatology	1974-1991 (final published volume)	All biodiversity
Copeia	1910-2003	All biodiversity
Cunninghamia	1981-2016	All biodiversity
Current Herpetology	1964-2012	All biodiversity
Dodo	1977-2001	All biodiversity
Ecological and Environmental Anthropology	2005-2008	All biodiversity
Ecological Applications	1991-2017	All biodiversity
Ecological Indicators	2001-2007	All biodiversity
Ecological Management & Restoration	2000-2016	All biodiversity
Ecological Management and Restoration	2017	All biodiversity
Ecological Restoration	1981-2016	All biodiversity
Ecology*	1936-2017	All biodiversity
Ecology Letters	1998-2013	All biodiversity
Ecoscience	1994-2013	All biodiversity
Ecosystems	1998-2013	All biodiversity
Emu	1980-2016	All biodiversity
Endangered Species Bulletin	1966-2003	All biodiversity

Endangered Species Research	2004-2017	All biodiversity
Environmental Conservation*	1974-2017	All biodiversity
Environmental Evidence	2012-2017	All biodiversity
Environmental Management	1977-2017	All biodiversity
Environmentalist	1981-1988	All biodiversity
Ethology Ecology and Evolution	1989-2014	All biodiversity
European Journal of Soil Science	1950-2012	Soil Fertility
European Journal of Wildlife Research	1955-2017	All biodiversity
Evolutionary Anthropology	1992-2014	All biodiversity
Evolutionary Ecology	1987-2014	All biodiversity
Evolutionary Ecology Research	1999-2014	All biodiversity
Fire Ecology	2005-2016	All biodiversity
Folia Primatologica	1963-2014	All biodiversity
Folia Zoologica	1959-2013	All biodiversity
Forest Ecology and Management	1976-2013	All biodiversity
Freshwater Biology	1975-2016	All biodiversity
Freshwater Science	1982-2017	All biodiversity
Functional Ecology	1987-2013	All biodiversity
Genetics and Molecular Research	2002-2013	All biodiversity
Geoderma	1967-2012	Soil Fertility
Gibbon Journal	2005-2011	All biodiversity
Global Change Biology	1995-2017	All biodiversity
Global Ecology and Biogeography	1991-2014	All biodiversity
Grass and Forage Science	1980-2017	All biodiversity
Herpetofauna	2003-2007	All biodiversity
Herpetologica	1936-2012	All biodiversity
Herpetological Bulletin	2000-2013	All biodiversity
Herpetological Conservation and Biology	2006-2012	All biodiversity
Herpetological Journal	2005-2012	All biodiversity
Herpetological Monographs	1982-2012	All biodiversity
Herpetological Review	1967-2014	All biodiversity
Herpetology Notes	2008-2014	All biodiversity
Human Wildlife Interactions	2007-2017	All biodiversity
Hydrobiologia*	2000-2017	All biodiversity
Hystrix, the Italian Journal of Mammalogy	1986-2016	All biodiversity
Ibis	1980-2016	All biodiversity
iForest	2008-2016	All biodiversity
Integrative Zoology	2006-2013	All biodiversity
International Journal of Pest Management (formerly PANS Pest Articles & News Summaries 1969 - 1975, PANS 1976-1979 & Tropical Pest Management 1980-1992)	1969-1979	All biodiversity
International Journal of the Commons	2007-2016	All biodiversity
International Journal of Wildland Fire	1991-2016	All biodiversity
International Wader Studies	1970-1972	All biodiversity
International Zoo Yearbook	1960-2015	Primate Conservation
International Zoo Yearbook	1960-2015	Management of Captive Animals
Invasive Plant Science and Management	2008-2016	All biodiversity

Israel Journal of Ecology & Evolution	1963-2013	All biodiversity
Italian Journal of Zoology	1978-2013	All biodiversity
Journal for Nature Conservation*	2002-2017	All biodiversity
Journal of Animal Ecology*	1932-2017	All biodiversity
Journal of Apicultural Research	1962-2009	All biodiversity
Journal of Applied Ecology	1964-2017	All biodiversity
Journal of Aquatic Plant Management	1962-2016	All biodiversity
Journal of Arid Environments	1993-2017	All biodiversity
Journal of Avian Biology	1980-2016	All biodiversity
Journal of Cetacean Research and Management	1999-2012	All biodiversity
Journal of Ecology*	1933-2017	All biodiversity
Journal of Environmental Management	1973-2017	All biodiversity
Journal of Field Ornithology	1980-2016	All biodiversity
Journal of Forest Research	1996-2017	All biodiversity
Journal of Great Lakes Research	1975-2017	All biodiversity
Journal of Herpetological Medicine and Surgery	2009-2013	All biodiversity
Journal of Herpetology	1968-2015	All biodiversity
Journal of Kansas Herpetology	2002-2011	All biodiversity
Journal of Mammalian Evolution	1993-2014	All biodiversity
Journal of Mammalogy	1919-2017	All biodiversity
Journal of Mountain Science	2004-2016	All biodiversity
Journal of Negative Results: Ecology & Evolutionary Biology	2004-2016	All biodiversity
Journal of Ornithology	2004-2018	All biodiversity
Journal of Primatology	2012-2013	All biodiversity
Journal of Raptor Research	1966-2016	All biodiversity
Journal of Sea Research*	1961-2017	All biodiversity
Journal of the Japanese Institute of Landscape Architecture	1934-2017	All biodiversity
Journal of the Marine Biological Association of the United Kingdom*	1887-2006	All biodiversity
Journal of Tropical Ecology	1986-2017	All biodiversity
Journal of Vegetation Science	1990-2017	All biodiversity
Journal of Wetlands Ecology	2008-2012	All biodiversity
Journal of Wetlands Environmental Management	2012-2016	All biodiversity
Journal of Wildlife Diseases	1965-2012	All biodiversity
Journal of Wildlife Management	1945-2017	All biodiversity
Journal of Zoo and Aquarium Research	2013-2016	All biodiversity
Journal of Zoology	1966-2017	All biodiversity
Jurnal Primatologi Indonesia	2009	All biodiversity
Kansas Herpetological Society Newsletter	1977-2001	All biodiversity
Lake and Reservoir Management	1984 -2016	All biodiversity
Land Degradation and Development	1989-2016	All biodiversity
Land Use Policy	1984-2012	Soil Fertility
Latin American Journal of Aquatic Mammals	2002-2016	All biodiversity
Lemur News	1993-2012	All biodiversity
Limnologica - Ecology and Management of Inland Waters	1999-2017	All biodiversity
Mammal Research	2001-2017	All biodiversity
Mammal Review	1970-2017	All biodiversity
Mammal Study	2005-2017	All biodiversity

Mammalia	1937-2017	All biodiversity
Mammalian Biology	2002-2017	All biodiversity
Mammalian Genome	1991-2013	All biodiversity
Management of Biological Invasions	2010-2016	All biodiversity
Mangroves and Salt Marshes	1996-1999	All biodiversity
Marine Environmental Research*	1978-2017	All biodiversity
Marine Mammal Science	1985-2017	All biodiversity
Marine Pollution Bulletin*	2010-2017	All biodiversity
Mires and Peat	2006-2016	All biodiversity
Natural Areas Journal	1992-2017	All biodiversity
Neobiota	2011-2017	All biodiversity
Neotropical Primates	1993-2012	All biodiversity
New Journal of Botany	2011-2013	All biodiversity
New Zealand Journal of Zoology	1974-2016	All biodiversity
New Zealand Plant Protection	2000-2016	All biodiversity
Northwest Science	2007-2016	All biodiversity
Oecologia	1969-2017	All biodiversity
Oikos	1949-2017	All biodiversity
Ornitologia Neotropical	1990-2018	All biodiversity
Oryx	1950-2017	All biodiversity
Ostrich	1980-2016	All biodiversity
Pacific Conservation Biology*	1993-2017	All biodiversity
Pakistan Journal of Zoology	2004-2013	All biodiversity
Plant Ecology	1948-2007	All biodiversity
Plant Protection Quarterly	2008-2016	All biodiversity
Polish Journal of Ecology	2002-2013	All biodiversity
Population Ecology	1952-2013	All biodiversity
Preslia	1973-2017	All biodiversity
Primate Conservation	1981-2014	All biodiversity
Primates	1957-2013	All biodiversity
Rangeland Ecology & Management (previously Journal of Range Management 1948-2004)	1948-2016	All biodiversity
Rangeland Journal	1976-2016	All biodiversity
Raptors Conservation	2005-2016	All biodiversity
Regional Studies in Marine Science	2015-2017	All biodiversity
Restoration Ecology	1993-2017	All biodiversity
Revista Chilena de Historia Natural	2000-2016	All biodiversity
Revista de Biología Tropical	1976-2013	All biodiversity
River Research and Applications	1987-2016	All biodiversity
Russian Journal of Herpetology	1994-2000	All biodiversity
Slovak Raptor Journal	2007-2016	All biodiversity
Small Ruminant Research	1988-2017	All biodiversity
Soil Biology & Biochemistry	1969-2012	Soil Fertility
South African Journal of Botany	1982-2016	All biodiversity
South African Journal of Wildlife Research	1971-2014	All biodiversity
South American Journal of Herpetology	2006-2012	All biodiversity
Southern Forests: a journal of Forest Science	2008-2013	All biodiversity
Southwestern Naturalist	1956-2013	All biodiversity

Strix	1982-2017	All biodiversity
Systematic Reviews Centre for Evidence-Based Conservation	2004-2016	All biodiversity
The Condor	1980-2009	All biodiversity
The Open Ornithology Journal,	2008-2016	All biodiversity
The Rangeland Journal	1976-2016	All biodiversity
Trends in Ecology and Evolution	1986-2017	All biodiversity
Tropical Conservation Science	2008-2014	All biodiversity
Tropical Ecology	1960-2014	All biodiversity
Tropical Grasslands	1967-2010	All biodiversity
Tropical Zoology	1988-2013	All biodiversity
Turkish Journal of Zoology	1996-2014	All biodiversity
Vietnamese Journal of Primatology	2007-2009	All biodiversity
Wader Study Group Bulletin	1970-1977	All biodiversity
Waterbirds	1983-2016	All biodiversity
Weed Biology and Management	2001-2016	All biodiversity
Weed Research	1961-2017	All biodiversity
West African Journal of Applied Ecology	2000-2016	All biodiversity
Western North American Naturalist	2000-2017	All biodiversity
Wetlands	1981-2016	All biodiversity
Wetlands Ecology and Management	1989-2016	All biodiversity
Wildfowl	1948-2016	All biodiversity
Wildlife Biology	1995-2013	All biodiversity
Wildlife Monographs	1958-2013	All biodiversity
Wildlife Research	1956-2012	Bat Conservation
Wildlife Research	1974-2017	All biodiversity
Wildlife Society Bulletin	1973-2017	All biodiversity
Wilson Journal of Ornithology	1980-2016	All biodiversity
Zhurnal Obshchei Biologii	1972-2013	All biodiversity
Zoo Biology	1982-2013	All biodiversity
ZooKeys	2008-2013	All biodiversity
Zoologica Scripta	1971-2014	All biodiversity
Zoological Journal of the Linnean Society	1856-2013	All biodiversity
Zootaxa	2004-2014	All biodiversity

APPENDIX 2. Literature reviewed for the [NAME] Synopsis

The diagram below should be completed and included in your synopsis document to show the numbers of journals and report series searched for your synopsis (by you and CE), the total number of publications scanned within those, and the number of publications that were summarized from each source of literature.

