

# **Effects of conservation interventions on bats: a protocol for subject-wide evidence synthesis**

**Authors: Anna Berthinussen<sup>1</sup>, Olivia C Richardson<sup>2</sup>, John D Altringham<sup>3</sup>, and Rebecca K Smith<sup>4</sup>**

1. Conservation First, York, YO62 4DB, United Kingdom.
2. PhD student, University of Sheffield, S10 2TN, United Kingdom.
3. Emeritus Professor of Animal Ecology and Conservation in the School of Biology, University of Leeds, LS2 9JT, United Kingdom.
4. Conservation Evidence, Department of Zoology, University of Cambridge, The David Attenborough Building, Cambridge, CB2 3QZ, United Kingdom.

## **Reviewed by the following Advisory Board:**

Fabio Bontadina	SWILD – Urban Ecology and Wildlife Research	Switzerland
Katherine Boughey & colleagues	Bat Conservation Trust	United Kingdom
Rachel Cooper- Bohannon	Bats Without Borders	Zambia
Jasja Dekker	Jasja Dekker Dierecologie	Netherlands
Brock Fenton	University of Western Ontario	Canada
Winifred Frick & colleagues	Bat Conservation International	USA
Anita Glover	Vincent Wildlife Trust	United Kingdom
Alice Hughes	Chinese Academy of Sciences	China
Johnny de Jong	Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences	Sweden
Tigga Kingston	Texas Tech University	USA & SE Asia
Júlia Luz	Federal University of Rio de Janeiro	Brazil
Kirsty Park	University of Stirling	United Kingdom
Paul Racey	University of Exeter	United Kingdom
Orly Razgour	University of Southampton	United Kingdom
Guido Reiter	Austrian Coordination Centre for Bat Conservation and Research	Austria
Luísa Rodrigues	Institute for Nature Conservation and Forests	Portugal
Danilo Russo	University of Naples Frederico II	Italy
Emma Stone	African Bat Conservation	United Kingdom & Malawi
Paul Webala	Maasai Mara University	Kenya

## Abstract

Bats are under pressure from multiple threats, including habitat loss and modification, disease, hunting, persecution and climate change, and many species are declining in number. There is therefore an increasing need for evidence-based conservation of bat populations. Reviewing the evidence can be 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. In 2014, we used a subject-wide evidence synthesis approach to produce the Bat Conservation Synopsis, which summarised the available evidence for the effectiveness of the wide range of conservation interventions for bats. We updated the synopsis in early 2019 to incorporate new research, and aim to publish a second update in early 2020 to ensure that decision-makers have access to the most recent evidence. This protocol outlines the methods that will be used to synthesize evidence for this update.

**Key Words:** subject-wide evidence synthesis, bats, conservation, intervention, management

## Background

Bats represent approximately one fifth of all mammal species with over 1,400 bat species currently known to science (Simmons & Cirranello 2019). They are also the most widely distributed order of terrestrial mammals occupying all areas of the world except the Arctic and Antarctica, although the greatest bat diversity is found in the tropics. Bats provide vital ecosystem services with ecological and economic benefits, such as pest suppression, pollination and seed dispersal (e.g. Boyles et al. 2011, Kunz et al. 2011). However, the life history of bats (typically low fecundity) makes them particularly vulnerable to extinction, and widespread population declines have been documented over the last few decades (e.g. Frick et al. 2019). Many bat species are threatened, particularly by anthropogenic impacts such as logging and deforestation, agriculture, urban and industrial development, pollution, hunting and persecution (e.g. see Voigt & Kingston 2016, Frick et al. 2019). Climate change and extreme weather events, such as heat waves and tropical storms, are also a threat to bats (e.g. Sherwin et al. 2013).

Five bat species are listed as extinct by the International Union of Conservation for Nature (IUCN) and almost one-fifth of bat species (18%) assessed by the IUCN are considered threatened (Frick et al. 2019). However, the actual number may be far greater given that insufficient data are available to assess the conservation status for a further 15% of bat species listed by the IUCN and many newly discovered species are not yet classified or included on the IUCN red list. Conservation efforts have been successful in reversing population declines for some species, and even preventing species extinctions. For example,

the lesser long-nosed bat was recently removed from endangered species lists in both the USA and Mexico after populations recovered following bat-friendly farming initiatives, education programs and roost protection (US Fish & Wildlife Service 2016).

Evidence-based knowledge is key for planning successful conservation strategies and for the cost-effective allocation of scarce conservation resources. Targeted reviews may be carried out to collate evidence on the effects of a particular conservation intervention, but this approach is labour-intensive, expensive and ill-suited for areas where the data are scarce and patchy. There is a paucity of evidence within the literature for the effectiveness of conservation interventions aimed at bats. As a result, very few targeted reviews exist, and those that do exist are inconclusive or limited in scope.

In 2014, we published the Bat Conservation Synopsis to collate evidence for bat conservation on a global scale (Berthinussen et al. 2014). We used a subject-wide evidence synthesis approach (Sutherland et al. 2019, Sutherland & Wordley 2018) to simultaneously summarize the evidence for the wide range of interventions dedicated to the conservation of bats. By simultaneously targeting all potential interventions for bats, we were able to review the evidence for each intervention cost-effectively and efficiently. The synopsis is freely available at [www.conservationevidence.com](http://www.conservationevidence.com) and, alongside the *Conservation Evidence* online database, provides a valuable asset to the toolkit of practitioners and policy makers seeking sound information to support bat conservation. We aim to periodically update the synopsis to incorporate new research. An update was published in early 2019 (Berthinussen et al. 2019), and a second update is planned for early 2020 to ensure that more recent evidence is made available to decision-makers. This protocol outlines the methods that will be used to update the existing Bat Conservation Synopsis.

## Scope of the review

### 1. Review subject

This synthesis focuses on updating the evidence for the effectiveness of global interventions for the conservation of bats. New evidence will be added to the existing Bat Conservation Synopsis (Berthinussen et al. 2019), which was produced using a subject-wide evidence synthesis approach. 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. 2019).

This synthesis covers evidence for the effects of conservation interventions for wild bats (i.e. not in captivity). We will not include evidence from the literature on husbandry of commercially reared bats 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. For this synthesis, conservation interventions will include management measures that aim to conserve wild bat populations and ameliorate the deleterious effects of threats. The output of the project will be an authoritative, freely accessible evidence-base that will support bat conservation objectives with the latest evidence and help to achieve conservation outcomes.

## **2. Advisory board**

An advisory board made up of international conservationists and academics with expertise in bat conservation has been formed. These experts will input into the synopsis update at three key stages: a) reviewing the protocol including identifying key sources of evidence, b) updating the comprehensive list of conservation interventions for review, and c) reviewing the updated draft evidence synthesis. The advisory board is listed above, although additional experts may be added during the production of the synopsis update. 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**

For the existing Bat Conservation Synopsis (Berthinussen et al. 2019), a comprehensive list of interventions was developed by searching the literature and in partnership with the advisory board. The list was also checked by Conservation Evidence to ensure that it followed the standard structure. This list will be reviewed for the synopsis update, and edited or additional interventions added if relevant. The aim is to include all interventions that have been carried out or advised to support populations or communities of wild bats, whether evidence for the effectiveness of an intervention is available or not. During the update process further interventions may also be discovered, which will be integrated into the synopsis structure. The list of interventions will be organized into categories based on the 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>).

# **Methods**

Any new evidence found during the synopsis update will be summarised and added to the existing Bat Conservation Synopsis (Berthinussen et al. 2019). Methods for this update will follow those used for the existing Bat Conservation Synopsis (Berthinussen et al. 2019) as described below.

## **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 (all titles and abstracts) and report series ('grey literature'); relevant publications describing studies of conservation interventions for all species groups and habitats are saved from each and are added to the database.

**a) *Global evidence***

Evidence from all around the world will be included.

**b) *Languages included***

The following non-English journals published in Spanish and Portuguese were searched for the existing Bat Conservation Synopsis (Berthinussen et al. 2019) and relevant papers extracted. Due to project constraints, update searches of these journals will not be carried out on this occasion. However, we will aim to update them periodically in the future.

- *Therya* Vol. 1, Issue 1 (2010) – Vol. 8, Issue 3 (2017)
- *Gamelys* Vol. 1 (2011) – Vol. 7 (2017)
- *Boletim da Sociedade Brasileira de Mastozoologia* Vol. 66 (2013) – Vol. 78 (2017)
- *Mastozoologia Neotropical* Vol. 1, Issue 1 (1994) – Vol. 24, Issue 1 (2017)
- *Chiroptera Neotropical* Vol. 1, Issue 1 (1995) – Vol. 21, Issue 2 (2015)
- *Mammalogy Notes* Vol. 1, Issue 1 (2014) – Vol. 4, Issue 1 (2017)
- *Revista Mexicana de Mastozoología* Vol. 1 (1995) – Vol. 7, Issue 2 (2017)

All other journals searched are published in English (see below). 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 (Amano et al. 2016). While searching only a small number of non-English language journals may therefore potentially introduce some bias to the review process, project resources and time constraints determine the number of journals that can be searched within the project timeframe.

**c) *Journals searched***

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. Those published up until the end of 2017 were included in the existing Bat Conservation Synopsis (Berthinussen et al. 2019), more recent relevant papers will be included in this update. 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 have previously been or will be summarised.

For this update, additional searches up to the end of 2018 will be undertaken for journals likely to yield studies for bats (marked with an asterisk in Appendix 1). No new journal searches will be undertaken as the specialist journals most likely to yield studies relevant to bat conservation are already included.

**d) Reports from specialist websites searched**

**i) From Conservation Evidence discipline-wide literature database**

All report series (and years) below have already been searched for the Conservation Evidence project and relevant studies were included in the existing Bat Conservation Synopsis (Berthinussen et al. 2019). 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 have been summarised. For this update, additional searches up to the end of 2018 will be carried out for the reports most likely to yield studies for bats (marked with an asterisk).

- |  |           |                 |
|--|-----------|-----------------|
| • 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) Specific searches for the Bat Conservation Synopsis**

The following specialist reports/websites relevant to bat conservation have already been searched for the existing Bat Conservation Synopsis (Berthinussen et al. 2019). Searches were carried out either by searching every report title and abstract or summary within each report series or relevant category, or using key words, and any relevant reports were added to the project database. For this update, all specialist reports/websites listed below will be searched up to the end of 2018.

- Bat Conservation International ([www.batcon.org](http://www.batcon.org), resources searched)
- Bat Conservation Trust, UK ([www.bats.org.uk](http://www.bats.org.uk), resources searched)
- Rufford Foundation, UK ([www.rufford.org](http://www.rufford.org), report titles searched for category 'Bats')
- The Vincent Wildlife Trust, UK ([www.vwt.org.uk](http://www.vwt.org.uk), report titles searched for category 'Bats')
- Scottish Natural Heritage, UK ([www.nature.scot/information-library-data-and-research/information-library](http://www.nature.scot/information-library-data-and-research/information-library), database of report titles searched using key word 'bat\*')
- Natural England, UK ([publications.naturalengland.org.uk](http://publications.naturalengland.org.uk), database of report titles searched for category 'Species – Mammals – Bats')
- Department for Food, Environment and Rural Affairs (Defra) Science and Research projects, UK ([sciencesearch.defra.gov.uk](http://sciencesearch.defra.gov.uk), database of report titles searched using key word 'bats')

**e) Other literature searches**

The online database ([www.conservationevidence.com](http://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 ( $\geq 20$  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 update. 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 ([www.conservationevidence.com/journalsearcher/synopsis](http://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 updated 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 have 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 intervention that might be done to conserve biodiversity**

1. Does this study measure the effect of an intervention 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 intervention 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 intervention 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 interventions that have a measured outcome on human behaviour only.

1. b. Intervention must be carried out by people: excludes impacts from natural processes (e.g. tree falls, natural fires), impacts from background variation (e.g. soil type, vegetation, climate change), correlations with habitat types, where there is no test of a specific intervention by humans, or pure ecology (e.g. movement, distribution of species).

2. Study must test an intervention that could be put in place for conservation. This excludes assessing impacts of threats (interventions which remove threats would be included), unless the threat acts as an appropriate control for an intervention. For example, a woodland that has been cut down/degraded could be compared with woodland that has been left intact to test the

intervention 'Retain native woodland'. The test may involve comparisons between sites/factors not originally put in place or modified for conservation but which could be (e.g. mown vs unmown field margins, fenced vs unfenced cave entrances – where the mowing/fencing 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 intervention was under human control, the intervention could be applied by a conservationist/decision maker or whether there are data quantifying the outcome, then the study will be included. If the article has no abstract, but the title is suggestive, then a study will be included.

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

The outcome for wild taxa/habitats can be negative, neutral or positive, does not have to be statistically significant but must be quantified (if hard to judge from abstract, then it will be included for closer inspection by the synopsis authors). 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, artificial fertilization success, mating success, birth rate, pup condition/survival, 'overall recruitment'.
- Genetics: genetic diversity, genetic suitability (e.g. adaptation to local conditions, use of flyways for migratory species etc.).
- Life history: age/size at maturity, survival, mortality.
- Population measures: number, abundance, density, presence/absence, biomass, movement, cover, 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), area covered (e.g. by different habitat types), physical habitat structure (e.g. rugosity, height, basal area).

**Interventions** within the scope of Conservation Evidence include:

- Clear management interventions, e.g. closing a cave to tourism, prescribed burning, mowing, controlling invasive species, creating or restoring habitats

- International or national policies
- Reintroductions or management of wild species in captivity
- Interventions that reduce human-wildlife conflict
- Interventions that change human behaviour, resulting in an impact on wild taxa or habitats

See <https://www.conservationevidence.com/data/index> for more examples of interventions.

Note on study types:

Literature reviews, systematic reviews, meta-analyses or short notes that review studies that fulfil these criteria will be included.

Theoretical modelling studies will be excluded, as no intervention has been taken. However, studies that use models to analyse real-world data, or compare models to real-world situations will be included (if they otherwise fulfil these criteria).

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

1. Does this study measure the effect of an intervention 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 intervention 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 school attendance in villages under a community based conservation program)

1. c. Intervention must be under human control: excludes impacts from climatic or other natural events.

2. Study must test an intervention that could be put in place for conservation: excludes studies with no intervention, 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 it will be included). 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). Interventions include, but are not limited to the following:

- Change in adverse behaviours (which directly threaten biodiversity), e.g. unsustainable hunting, burning, grazing, 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 any of the above.

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

- Enforcement: hunting restrictions, market inspections, increase number of rangers, patrols or frequency of patrols in, around or within protected areas, improve fencing/physical barriers, improve signage.
- 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, 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 into 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).

### ***c) Relevant subject***

Studies relevant to the synopsis subject will include those focused on the conservation of wild, native bats.

### ***d) Relevant types of intervention***

An intervention has to be one that could be put in place by a manager, conservationist, policy maker, advisor or consultant to protect, manage, restore or reduce the impacts of threats to wild, native bats. Alternatively, interventions may aim to change human behaviour (actual or intentional), which is likely to protect, manage, restore or reduce threats to bat 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.

### ***e) 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 bat species before and after woodland is restored, or the reduction in bat mortality at wind turbines with different rotor designs.

Exceptions, which may not have a control but will still be included, are for example the effectiveness of captive breeding or rehabilitation programmes.

### ***f) 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
- Population response
  - Abundance: bat activity, number, density, presence/absence, biomass, movement, age-structure, sex ratio
  - Reproductive success: egg/sperm production, artificial fertilization success, mating success, birth rate, pup condition, overall recruitment, age/size at maturity
  - Survival: survival, mortality

- Condition: growth, size, weight, condition factors, biochemical ratios, stress, disease levels or immune function
- Behaviour
  - Uptake
  - Use
  - Behaviour change: movement, use of natural/artificial habitat/structure, range, predatory or nuisance behaviour that could lead to retaliatory action by humans
  - Change in human behaviour
- Other
  - Impact on roost sites

***g) 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

<b>Term</b>	<b>Meaning</b>
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: <a href="http://www.environmentalevidence.org/index.htm">www.environmentalevidence.org/index.htm</a>
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 protected area; reduction in mortality after operational changes to wind turbines) 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 searched and the total number of publications included following data extraction will be published in the updated synopsis using the diagram in Appendix 2.

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 study in 1999–2004 in a wetland on an island in Catalonia, Spain (1) found that all 69 bat boxes of two different designs were used by soprano pipistrelles *Pipistrellus pygmaeus* with an average occupancy rate of 71%. During at least one of the four breeding seasons recorded, 96% of boxes were occupied and occupation rates by females with pups increased from 15% in 2000 to 53% in 2003. Bat box preferences were detected in the breeding season only, with higher abundance in east-facing bat boxes (average 22 bats/box) compared to west-facing boxes (12 bats/box), boxes with double compartments (average 25 bats/box) compared to single compartments (12 bats/box) and boxes placed on posts (average 18 bats/box) and houses (average 12 bats/box). Abundance was low in bat boxes on trees (average 2 bats/box). A total of 69 wooden bat boxes (10 cm deep x 19 cm wide x 20 cm high) of two types (44 single and 25 double compartment) were placed on three supports (10 trees, 29 buildings and 30 electricity posts) facing east and west. From July 2000 to February 2004, the boxes were checked on 16 occasions. Bats were counted in boxes or upon emergence when numbers were too numerous to count within the box.

(1) Flaquer C., Torre I. & Ruiz-Jarillo R. (2006) The value of bat-boxes in the conservation of *Pipistrellus pygmaeus* in wetland rice paddies. *Biological Conservation*, 128, 223–230.

A replicated, randomized, controlled, before-and-after study in 1993–1999 of five harvested hardwood forests in Virginia, USA (2) 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 m<sup>2</sup>). Abundance was significantly lower compared to unharvested plots (6/30 m<sup>2</sup>). 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.

- (2) 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 ( $\geq 20$  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 for which evidence is found 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]<sup>1,2</sup> and Z studies were in [LOCATION 2]<sup>3,4</sup>. *Locations will usually be countries, ordered based on chronological order of studies rather than alphabetically, i.e. USA<sup>1</sup>, Australia<sup>2</sup> not Australia<sup>2</sup>, USA<sup>1</sup>. 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):**

#### **BEHAVIOUR (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):**

If no evidence is found for an intervention, the following text will be added in place of the key messages above:

- We found no studies that evaluated the effects of [INTERVENTION] on [TARGET POPULATION].

*'We found no studies' means that we have not yet found any studies that have directly evaluated this intervention during our systematic journal and report searches. Therefore we have no evidence to indicate whether or not the intervention has any desirable or harmful effects.*

## **6. Dissemination/communication of evidence synthesis**

The information from this synopsis update will be available in three ways:

- An updated synopsis pdf, downloadable from [www.conservationevidence.com](http://www.conservationevidence.com), will contain the study summaries, key messages and background information on each intervention.
- The searchable database at [www.conservationevidence.com](http://www.conservationevidence.com) will contain all the summarized information from the synopsis update, along with expert assessment scores.
- A chapter in *What Works in Conservation*, available as a pdf to download and a book from [www.conservationevidence.com/content/page/79](http://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 Professor William Sutherland, Dr Claire Wordley and Dr Ricardo Rocha for their help and advice.

## **Funding**

The Bat Conservation Synopsis and subsequent updates have been prepared with funding from Natural England and Pettersson Elektronik (Uppsala Science Park, Dag Hammarskjolds v. 34A, S-751 83, UPPSALA, SWEDEN, [www.batsound.com](http://www.batsound.com)) (first edition, 2014); MAVVA, Fondation pour la Nature (2019 edition); and Arcadia (2020 edition).

## References

- Amano, T., González-Varo, J. P., & Sutherland, W. J. (2016). Languages are still a major barrier to global science. *PLoS Biology*, 14, e2000933.
- Berthinussen, A., Richardson O.C. and Altringham J.D. (2014) *Bat Conservation: Global Evidence for the Effects of Interventions*. Synopses of Conservation Evidence Series. University of Cambridge, Cambridge, UK. Available at: <https://www.conservationevidence.com/synopsis/download/22>
- Berthinussen, A., Richardson O.C. and Altringham J.D. (2019) *Bat Conservation: Global Evidence for the Effects of Interventions*. Synopses of Conservation Evidence Series. University of Cambridge, Cambridge, UK. Available at: <https://www.conservationevidence.com/synopsis/download/8>
- Cohen, J. (1960) A coefficient of agreement for nominal scales. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 20, 37–46.
- Frick, W.F., Kingston, T. & Flanders, J. (2019) A review of the major threats and challenges to global bat conservation. *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences*, 2019, 1-21.
- Kunz, T. H., de Torrez, E. B., Bauer, D., Lobo, T., and Fleming, T. H. (2011). Ecosystem services provided by bats. *Ann. N.Y. Acad. Sci.* 1223, 1–38.
- Sherwin H.A., Montgomery W.I. & Lundy M.G. (2013) The impact and implications of climate change for bats. *Mammal Review*, 43, 171–182.
- Simmons, N.B. and A.L. Cirranello. 2019. *Bat Species of the World: A taxonomic and geographic database*. Accessed on 08/08/2019. [www.batnames.org](http://www.batnames.org)
- 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. (2019) Building a tool to overcome barriers in the research-implementation space: the Conservation Evidence database. *Biological Conservation*, 238, 108199.
- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (2016) *Species status assessment for the lesser long-nosed bat*. December 2016. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Southwest Region, Albuquerque, NM. 96 pp.
- Voigt, C.C. & T. Kingston (2016) *Bats in the Anthropocene: Conservation of Bats in a Changing World*. Springer International Publishing.

## APPENDIX 1. Journals (and years) searched

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	2006-2016	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	1990-2016	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*	1998-2018	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	1999-2017	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*	1987-2017	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	2006-2016	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	1910-2016	All biodiversity
Cunninghamia	1981-2016	All biodiversity
Current Herpetology	1964-2016	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*	2000-2017	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
Fisheries Management and Ecology	1994-2018	All biodiversity
Fisheries Research	1990-2018	All biodiversity
Folia Primatologica	1963-2014	All biodiversity
Folia Zoologica	1959-2013	All biodiversity
Forest Ecology and Management*	1976-2013	All biodiversity
Freshwater Biology	1975-2017	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*	1986-2017	All biodiversity
Ibis	1980-2016	All biodiversity
ICES Journal of Marine Science	1990-2018	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	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 Bat Conservation and Research*	2000-2017	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 Experimental Marine Biology & Ecology	1980-2016	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	2004-2017	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 Ecological Progress Series	2000-2018	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	1993-2014	All biodiversity
New Journal of Botany	2011-2013	All biodiversity
New Zealand Journal of Zoology*	1974-2017	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
PLOS*	1980-2018	Key word: bat*
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*	2004-2017	All biodiversity
The Condor	1980-2016	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	2000-2016	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*	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	1982-2016	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 Bat Conservation Synopsis

The diagram below (from Berthinussen et al. 2019) will be updated and included in the synopsis document to show the numbers of journals and report series searched for the updated synopsis, the total number of publications searched (title and abstract) within those, and the number of publications that were summarized from each source of literature.

