

# Metadata of the article that will be visualized in OnlineFirst

|                      |   |  |
|----------------------|---|--|
| ArticleTitle         | Carabids (Coleoptera:Carabidae) in a forest patchwork: a connectivity analysis of the Bereg Plain landscape graph |  |
| Article Sub-Title    |   |  |
| Journal Name         | Landscape Ecology   |  |
| Corresponding Author | Family Name   | <b>Jordán</b>  |
|                      | Particle  |  |
|                      | Given Name  | <b>Ferenc</b>  |
|                      | Suffix  |  |
|                      | Division  | Collegium Budapest   |
|                      | Organization  | Institute for Advanced Study   |
|                      | Address   | Szentháromság u. 2, 1014, Budapest, Hungary                            |
|                      | Division  |  |
|                      | Organization  | Animal Ecology Research Group of HAS, Hungarian Natural History Museum |
|                      | Address   | Budapest, Hungary  |
|                      | Email   | jordan.ferenc@gmail.com  |
| Author               | Family Name   | <b>Magura</b>  |
|                      | Particle  |  |
|                      | Given Name  | <b>Tibor</b>   |
|                      | Suffix  |  |
|                      | Division  |  |
|                      | Organization  | Hortobágy National Park Directorate                                    |
|                      | Address   | Debrecen, Hungary  |
| Author               | Family Name   | <b>Tóthmérés</b>   |
|                      | Particle  |  |
|                      | Given Name  | <b>Béla</b>  |
|                      | Suffix  |  |
|                      | Division  |  |
|                      | Organization  | Ecological Institute of Debrecen University                            |
|                      | Address   | Budapest, Hungary  |
| Author               | Family Name   | <b>Vasas</b>   |
|                      | Particle  |  |
|                      | Given Name  | <b>Vera</b>  |
|                      | Suffix  |  |
|                      | Division  | Department of Plant Taxonomy and Ecology                               |
|                      | Organization  | Eötvös University  |
|                      | Address   | Budapest, Hungary  |
| Author               | Family Name   | <b>Ködöböcz</b>  |
|                      | Particle  |  |
|                      | Given Name  | <b>Viktor</b>  |

Suffix  
Division  
Organization Hortobágy National Park Directorate  
Address Debrecen, Hungary  
Email

|                             |   |               |
|-----------------------------|---|---------------|
| Schedule                    | Received  | 7 August 2006 |
|                             | Revised   |               |
|                             | Accepted  | 9 August 2007 |
| Abstract                    | <p>For many species, one important key to persistence is maintaining connectivity among local populations that allow for dispersal and gene flow. This is probably true for carabid species (Coleoptera:Carabidae) living in the fragmented forests of the Bereg Plain (NE Hungary and W Ukraine). Based on field data, we have drafted a landscape graph of the area representing the habitat network of these species. Graph nodes and links represented two kinds of landscape elements: habitat (forest) patches and corridors, respectively. The quality of habitat patches and corridors were ranked (from low (1) to high (4)), reflecting local population sizes in the case of patches and estimated permeability in the case of corridors. We analysed (1) the positional importance of landscape elements in maintaining the connectivity of the intact network, (2) the effect of inserting hypothetical corridors into the network, (3) the effects of improving the quality of the existing corridors, and (4) how to connect every patch in a cost-effective way. Our results set quantitative priorities for conservation practice by identifying important corridors: what to protect, what to build and what to improve. Several network analytical techniques were used to account for the directed (source-sink) and highly fragmented nature of the landscape graph. We provide conservation priority ranks for the landscape elements and discuss the conditions for the use of particular network indices. Our study could be of extreme relevance, since a new highway is being planned through the area.</p> |               |
| Keywords (separated by '-') | Landscape graph - Reachability - Isolation - Connectivity - Carabidae - Bereg Plain - Hungary   |               |
| Footnote Information        |   |               |

# Carabids (Coleoptera:Carabidae) in a forest patchwork: a connectivity analysis of the Bereg Plain landscape graph

Ferenc Jordán · Tibor Magura · Béla Tóthmérész ·  
Vera Vasas · Viktor Ködöböcz

Received: 7 August 2006 / Accepted: 9 August 2007  
© Springer Science+Business Media B.V. 2007

**Abstract** For many species, one important key to persistence is maintaining connectivity among local populations that allow for dispersal and gene flow. This is probably true for carabid species (Coleoptera: Carabidae) living in the fragmented forests of the Bereg Plain (NE Hungary and W Ukraine). Based on field data, we have drafted a landscape graph of the area representing the habitat network of these species. Graph nodes and links represented two kinds of landscape elements: habitat (forest) patches and corridors, respectively. The quality of habitat patches and corridors were ranked (from low (1) to high (4)), reflecting local population sizes in the case of patches and estimated permeability in the case of corridors. We analysed (1)

the positional importance of landscape elements in maintaining the connectivity of the intact network, (2) the effect of inserting hypothetical corridors into the network, (3) the effects of improving the quality of the existing corridors, and (4) how to connect every patch in a cost-effective way. Our results set quantitative priorities for conservation practice by identifying important corridors: what to protect, what to build and what to improve. Several network analytical techniques were used to account for the directed (source-sink) and highly fragmented nature of the landscape graph. We provide conservation priority ranks for the landscape elements and discuss the conditions for the use of particular network indices. Our study could be of extreme relevance, since a new highway is being planned through the area.

**Keywords** Landscape graph · Reachability · Isolation · Connectivity · Carabidae · Bereg Plain · Hungary

## Introduction

The loss of natural habitats and the fragmentation of those remaining raise important concerns in conservation biology and practice. If individuals cannot disperse between fragmented habitat patches, local populations become isolated and various mechanisms (including random fluctuations, inbreeding and demographical problems, see e.g., Keller and Largiadér

F. Jordán (✉)  
Collegium Budapest, Institute for Advanced Study,  
Szentháromság u. 2, 1014 Budapest, Hungary  
e-mail: jordan.ferenc@gmail.com

F. Jordán  
Animal Ecology Research Group of HAS, Hungarian  
Natural History Museum, Budapest, Hungary

T. Magura · V. Ködöböcz  
Hortobágy National Park Directorate, Debrecen, Hungary

B. Tóthmérész  
Ecological Institute of Debrecen University, Budapest,  
Hungary

V. Vasas  
Department of Plant Taxonomy and Ecology, Eötvös  
University, Budapest, Hungary

2003) may cause local extinctions. For many species, the most important key to persistence is maintaining connectivity among habitat patches that can provide the possibility of gene flow among local populations (e.g., Baudry et al. 2003).

A number of principles have recently been proposed to describe how species characteristics and habitat fragmentation interact to determine extinction probability (e.g., Kruess and Tscharntke 1994; Davies et al. 2000). The differential sensitivity of particular species may lead to a disruption of the structure of local communities and their ecological processes. One example is the local extinction of large, mobile, higher predators and the subsequent loss of top-down control on mesopredators and primary consumers (Crooks and Soulé 1999; Kondoh 2003). Interspecific interactions may also be sensitive to fragmentation (Tewksbury et al. 2002) and this potentially leads to significant changes to ecosystem processes.

The effect of fragmentation on population processes is not always immediately clear. Extinction debt (Brooks et al. 1999) or source-sink metapopulation dynamics (Spiller and Schoener 1998) may mask an extinction process in the short run. Moreover, many species live in patchy habitats under natural conditions, so a patchy spatial pattern is not necessarily a result of fragmentation. Despite these difficulties, it is very interesting and important to monitor how landscape ecological processes influence high-level predators, as cascading community ecological processes may project single-species problems to community-wide crises (Crooks and Soulé 1999).

The focus of this study is to examine the habitat network of a set of carabid species (Coleoptera: Carabidae) that inhabit hill and mountain forest patches (hereinafter: “forest specialist carabids”) in the Bereg Plain, NE Hungary and W Ukraine. Carabids are excellent study species for landscape ecology, because their habitat structure is relatively easy to describe (compared to many other organisms, e.g., birds); the ecology of the group is well known and adults can easily be used for experiments. Moreover, many carabids are higher predators and sensitive to fragmentation, potentially participating in trophic cascades. The conservation value of ground beetles is also high (Lövei and Sunderland 1996).

Our study site, the Bereg Plain is located at the foot of the Carpathians and spreads over an area of 6,000 km<sup>2</sup>, belonging to Hungary and the Ukraine.

The Bereg Plain was covered by continuous woodlands of deciduous trees up to the 18th–19th centuries. Because of the clear-felling of forests and agricultural activity, the former near-continuous forested areas are reduced to small isolated forest fragments separated by agricultural areas and open semi-natural habitats. When the Bereg Plain was covered by continuous forest, species living in closed canopy deciduous forests were able to disperse from the Carpathians to lowland forests. For these species, the Carpathians were a potential colonization source. Even today, a special feature of the carabid fauna in these patches is the occurrence of species characteristic of closed-canopy deciduous forests of hills and mountains. Such species do not usually occur in Hungarian lowlands (Magura et al. 2001b; Ködöböcz and Magura 2005). The local populations in at least some of these fragments are relatively stable, but the entire metapopulation (sensu Pickett and Cadenasso 1995) probably depends on the dispersal of individuals from the source areas in the Carpathians. The fragmentation of the formerly contiguous forests in the Bereg Plain raises the question of whether forest specialist carabids can persist in these patches and whether their persistence can be helped by conservation efforts (e.g., building corridors or protecting the most critical patches and corridors).

In order to explicitly study the source-sink nature of the studied patches, we analysed them as a directed network with a single source and many sinks. A directed network contains links where a link from A to B is not equivalent to a link from B to A (contrary to an undirected network, where no difference exists between a link from A to B and from B to A).

In this study we provide a network analysis of the landscape graph (from a “ground beetle perspective”) to determine: (1) the positional importance of existing landscape elements (patches and corridors) in maintaining connectivity; (2) the advantages of various hypothetical landscape management solutions (creating corridors in different positions); (3) the effects of improving the quality of existing corridors; and (4) the most efficient solution for connecting all patches. Our approach is mostly based on a structural analysis of the landscape graph, and we provide solutions for setting preferences in landscape management. Our study is of immediate and applied interest, because a new highway is planned to be built across the studied area and carabids (as mobile

148 predators) may be among those organisms that are the  
149 most sensitive to this kind of disturbance.

150 **Methods**

151 **Species**

152 The focal species of our study were forest specialist  
153 carabids inhabiting closed deciduous forests of hills and  
154 mountains. We have disregarded habitat generalists,  
155 because fragmentation is probably less problematic for  
156 them (Magura et al. 2001b; Lövei et al. 2006), and a  
157 landscape graph analysis may not be sensitive to the  
158 distribution of generalist carabids. The reason is that  
159 these species inhabit less definitive landscape elements.  
160 Typically, there are a variety of factors influencing the  
161 distribution of carabids, but vegetation structure seems  
162 to be of high importance (Brose 2003a, 2003b; de la  
163 Pena et al. 2003). Grazing of herbivores (Suominen  
164 et al. 2003) and human activity (Niemelä et al. 2002;  
165 Ishitani et al. 2003; Kotze et al. 2003; Magura et al.  
166 2004) may also exert a large, indirect influence on their  
167 distribution. The forest specialist carabids analysed here  
168 were *Carabus intricatus* (Linnaeus 1761), *Cychrus*  
169 *caraboides* (Linnaeus 1758), *Leistus piceus* (Frölich  
170 1799), *Abax parallelus* (Duftschmid 1812), *Cymindis*  
171 *cingulata* (Dejean 1825), *Carabus arcensis carpathus*  
172 (Born 1902), *Pterostichus melas* (Creutzer 1799) and  
173 *Molops piceus* (Panzer 1793). These specialist species  
174 only occur in old-growth deciduous forest patches,  
175 because they require special environmental conditions  
176 (cool and wet microclimate, dead and decaying trees,  
177 cover of leaf litter and herbs etc.). We have analysed the  
178 composite habitat network for all of these species, since  
179 they inhabit areas of very similar habitat structure.  
180 Lumping species-specific data served for the building of  
181 a more robust database at the expense of losing  
182 information on interspecific differences. Habitat choice  
183 and landscape use by these species are very similar  
184 across species (Ködöböcz and Magura 2005).

185 **Collection methods**

186 Carabids were collected between 1995 and 1999.  
187 Beetles were sampled using unbaited pitfall traps,  
188 consisting of plastic cups (diameter 100 mm, volume  
189 500 ml) filled with 70% ethylene glycol as a killing

and preserving solution. Within individual forest  
patches, there were 9 to 18 traps located at least 10 m  
from each other and scattered randomly. Each pitfall  
trap was located at least 50 m from the nearest forest  
edge, in order to avoid edge effects (Magura et al.  
2000). Traps were checked monthly between April  
and October in each year from 1995 to 1999 (Magura  
et al. 2001b). Unequal trapping effort did not influ-  
ence the number and abundance of forest specialist  
species (Lövei et al. 2006). Further, as we sampled  
over the whole activity season, trap density is  
unlikely to affect our results.

The study area and the construction of the habitat  
network model

The Bereg Plain in NE Hungary and W Ukraine is  
confined by the Tisza River and the Carpathians  
(Fig. 1). The analysed old-growth deciduous forest  
patches, dominated by oak (*Quercus robur*) and  
populated by varying densities of *Fraxinus angusti-*  
*folia* spp. *pannonica* and hornbeam (*Carpinus*  
*betulus*), are located in an area dominated by agricul-  
tural fields, roads and creeks. These deciduous forests  
are declining and the local populations of specialist  
carabids living in the forests fragments either become  
isolated or may disperse between small forest patches,  
depending on the distance between patches, the  
properties of the matrix (Baudry and Burel 2004;



**Fig. 1** Topographical map of the studied area. Black areas are forests and thin lines mark country borders. The studied forest patches are numbered with the codes displayed in the Tables. For spatial scaling, note that the distance of patch N1 from the largest patch N16 is 40 km and its area totals 1250 ha

Baum et al. 2004) and the presence of corridor-like landscape elements.


We assumed a typical dispersal range of 1 km for the studied flightless specialist species (Thiele 1977). We identified 16 forest patches (15 small ones and the Carpathians as a practically continuous forest patch, coded N1–N16), as well as 9 forest corridors (coded L1–L9; Fig. 2a). We analysed this landscape graph and created modified versions by inserting 18 hypothetical green corridors (coded L10–L27; Fig. 2b). Building

these corridors would entail establishing a series of forest patches with a size of 50\*50 m and distances from one another of not more than 1 km; so that these could serve as stepping-stones between habitat patches. We used the recommended patch size in order to have core zones: edge effects have been found to negatively influence forest specialist carabids staying within 10–30 m of the matrix (Magura et al. 2000, 2001a). We did not analyse an additional 93 hypothetical corridors, because those were either topographically impossible (e.g., a corridor between N8 and N12; Fig. 2a), or apparently meaningless (for example, building a green corridor between N1 and N3 would not substantially increase connectivity; Fig. 2a).

However, certain possibilities of the latter were also tested, although only in combinations with others (L28–L37, see Table 2). The quality of both patches and corridors (including the hypothetical ones) were weighted (respectively, from 1 (low) to 4 (high)) reflecting local population sizes for patches and permeability for corridors.

Local population size was the annual average combined number of individuals trapped for the eight studied species: patch values of 1, 2, 3 and 4 correspond to 0–10, 11–100, 101–1000 and >1001 individuals, respectively (these are qualitative weights on graph nodes). Local population size as an indicator of habitat quality is problematic because of source-sink network effects. In this case, however, it seems to be less problematic, because every patch (except N16) is also likely to be a sink (this is why we also studied a directed network, beyond the more general analysis of the undirected landscape graph). Thus, differences in local population size reflected differences in quality of the given patches.

The width of links corresponded to the estimated permeability of corridors (here, we provided a “semi-quantitative” weight on graph links, based on field data). We assumed the existence of a corridor between two patches if their distance did not exceed 1,000 m and there was no unpenetrable barrier between them. This critical distance was chosen because even poor colonist forest specialists can cover this distance through inhospitable habitats. The highest permeability score (4) was given to corridors of length up to 100 m with no barrier (e.g., corridor L1 between N2 and N4), a value of 3 was given to 300–500 m long corridors with no barriers (e.g., L4



**Fig. 2** Topology of landscape elements. Nodes and links represent habitat patches and corridors, respectively. Numbers correspond to patch codes given in Table 1 (i.e., “5” corresponds to node “N5”, for simplicity, while corridor L1 connects “2” to “4”, see Table 1). Quality values are illustrated by node size and link width, according to the top left insets in (a). The hypothetical corridors, whose insertion effects have been studied, are also presented by dashed lines in (b)



between N14 and N15), a value of 2 was given for corridors that were longer but <1000 m or relatively easily penetrable barriers, like a road (e.g., L5 between N13 and N14), and, finally, the lowest score (1) was given to corridors with hardly penetrable barriers, like a small creek (e.g., L2 between N7 and N9). In summary, distance between patches and matrix properties determined corridor quality.

We also analysed the modified network where the quality of individual corridors was improved one by one to attain maximum permeability (L1\*–L9\*; Tables 1 and 2). For reasons of simplicity, we did not take into account the area of patches (but see Pascual-Hortal and Saura 2006).

We note that the usefulness of corridors for several species is questionable (Collinge 2000; Haddad et al. 2003). Depending on the properties and the quality of corridors, they may facilitate the movement of some species (Beier and Noss 1998; Berggren et al. 2002), while hinder others (Selonen and Hanski 2003; Henein and Merriam 1990; Tischendorf and Wissel 1997; Tischendorf et al. 1998). Corridors are generally beneficial to carabid dispersal (Burel 1989, 1992). The evaluation of corridors and the role of the matrix are important. Corridors that are not used by animals should not be defined as such (Selonen and Hanski 2003). Similarly, matrix areas that are frequently and easily used are not matrix areas and should be defined as part of a preferred patch (cf. Baum et al. 2004). In spite of these difficulties, we believe that the habitat network we constructed is a good model for the studied organisms.

## Methods of network analysis

Landscape graphs are characterised by a wide array of techniques (Cantwell and Forman 1993; Schumaker 1996; O'Neill et al. 1998; Tischendorf and Fahrig 2000a, b; Urban and Keitt 2001; Turner et al. 2001), many of which are supported by graph theory (e.g., Shimazaki et al. 2004). Landscape graphs are mathematical representations of habitat structure, where nodes (representing patches) are linked ("links" stand for corridors) to one another providing information on habitat topology (e.g., whether habitat arrangement is spider-, chain- or loop-like, Pickett and Cadenasso 1995). For studying a special problem, techniques most adequate for the properties of

**Table 1** The code and identity of habitat patches and corridors in the intact landscape graph

| Intact graph           |             |         |
|------------------------|-------------|---------|
| <i>Habitat patches</i> |             |         |
| Code                   | Name        | Quality |
| N1                     | Bockerek    | 2       |
| N2                     | Déda H      | 2       |
| N3                     | Lónya       | 3       |
| N4                     | Déda U      | 2       |
| N5                     | Dobrony     | 4       |
| N6                     | Peres       | 1       |
| N7                     | Rafajna     | 3       |
| N8                     | Téglás      | 1       |
| N9                     | Gút         | 2       |
| N10                    | Alsóremete  | 2       |
| N11                    | Beregújfalu | 3       |
| N12                    | Puskino     | 1       |
| N13                    | Munkács     | 3       |
| N14                    | Alsókerepec | 3       |
| N15                    | Gát         | 3       |
| N16                    | Carpathians | 4       |
| <i>Corridors</i>       |             |         |
| Code                   | Position    | Quality |
| L1                     | N2/N4       | 4       |
| L2                     | N7/N9       | 1       |
| L3                     | N7/N15      | 1       |
| L4                     | N14/N15     | 3       |
| L5                     | N13/N14     | 2       |
| L6                     | N13/N16     | 1       |
| L7                     | N11/N16     | 3       |
| L8                     | N10/N11     | 3       |
| L9                     | N10/N12     | 1       |

Quality is estimated based on field data and expert (from 1 to 4) reflecting local population size for patches and permeability for corridors. See the details in Methods section

the landscape graph (e.g., data quality) need to be selected.

We analysed our landscape graph with structural indices that enabled us to weight nodes (characterising habitat patch quality) and links (characterising the permeability of corridors). Carabids in this system are regarded as a source-sink metapopulation, where continuous immigration is needed for sink patches (the forest fragments) from the source area (the Carpathians). It is unknown whether the local

**Table 2** The code and identity of designed corridors

| designed corridors |          |        |
|--------------------|----------|--------|
| code               | position | length |
| L10                | N3/N5    | 13     |
| L11                | N3/N7    | 11     |
| L12                | N4/N7    | 4      |
| L13                | N4/N9    | 5      |
| L14                | N5/N7    | 8      |
| L15                | N5/N14   | 10     |
| L16                | N5/N15   | 13     |
| L17                | N5/N16   | 7      |
| L18                | N6/N8    | 1      |
| L19                | N9/N10   | 9      |
| L20                | N9/N11   | 9      |
| L21                | N10/N13  | 13     |
| L22                | N10/N14  | 14     |
| L23                | N10/N15  | 12     |
| L24                | N11/N13  | 9      |
| L25                | N11/N15  | 10     |
| L26                | N12/N16  | 4      |
| L27                | N14/N16  | 2      |
| L28                | N1/N2    | 3      |
| L29                | N1/N3    | 6      |
| L30                | N1/N7    | 7      |
| L31                | N2/N3    | 8      |
| L32                | N2/N7    | 4      |
| L33                | N3/N6    | 16     |
| L34                | N3/N8    | 17     |
| L35                | N5/ N6   | 2      |
| L36                | N6/N16   | 8      |
| L37                | N8/N16   | 14     |

Length gives the number of established stepping-stones when opening a new corridor. Designed corridors are always of quality 1 except for L18 which is of quality 2

populations are self-sustainable, because the habitat network of the analysed carabids is poorly connected. The graph is unconnected (individuals cannot disperse between every pair of patches) and several network indices are sensitive to infinite distance values. We used several network indices in order to characterize different aspects of this fragmented source-sink habitat network.

These indices were used to answer the four major questions stated at the end of Introduction. First, we quantified (1) the effects of removing nodes (marked by N1–N16) and links (marked by L1–L9) from the

intact network (Fig. 2a). Subsequently, we calculated (2) the effects of adding single links according to Fig. 2b (L10–L27), and (3) the effects of improving the quality of existing links (L1\*–L9\*). Finally, we determined (4) the best solution for connecting every patch by adding combinations of links (L10–L37).

## Network parameters

We quantified our landscape graph with several network indices that are described in the following paragraphs: (1) the degree of network nodes (i.e., the number of neighbour patches directly connected to patch  $i$ ;  $D_i$ ); (2) topological distance ( $d$ ) and topographical distance ( $d_{igr}$ , reflecting corridor quality: the length and width of corridors); and (3) metapopulation size ( $MPS$ , reflecting patch quality). Using these variables, we constructed a combined importance index ( $I^*$ ). This technique reflects the quality and basic structural properties of the habitat network, increasing the reality of the graph model. Since this metapopulation system is typically of sink-source nature, we quantified the maximum population size connected to the source habitat ( $C_{source}$ ) and the distance-based maximum reachability of patches from the source (reachability,  $R_{16}^{D:igr}$ ).

## Degree

The position of node  $i$  was characterised by its degree ( $D_i$ ) value giving the number of neighbouring patches directly connected to  $i$  (Wassermann and Faust 1994). Generally, a habitat patch with high  $D_i$  will tend to have a high  $I^*$ . A  $D_i$  value was also calculated for corridors, where the value was calculated as the average degrees of the joint nodes.

## Topological distance and topographical distance

The  $d_{ij}$  topological distance of two nodes,  $i$  and  $j$ , is the minimum number of links forming a path through which  $i$  is reachable from  $j$  in a network (Wassermann and Faust 1994). The topographical distance ( $d_{igr}$ ) is a more realistical corridor index that incorporates both the number of links between two nodes and the permeability of the corridors by summing





link values along pathways (high permeability meaning low topographical distance). The connectedness of graph node  $i$  was calculated as the average of the  $d_{igr,ij}$  distance values,  $d_{avtgr,i}$ . Small distance values represent more central nodes in a network (a habitat patch with low  $d_{avtgr,i}$  is more important in maintaining connectivity than one with a higher  $d_{avtgr,i}$ ). The distance of nodes  $i$  and  $j$  is infinite if they belong to different graph components (there is no path between them); therefore, we calculated the  $d_{igr,ij}$  (and consequently  $I^*$ ) only for nodes belonging to the largest component of the network.

### Metapopulation size

Patch quality was characterized by the estimated local population size (estimated by  $LPS_i = \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$  for patch  $i$ ). The sum of  $LPS_i$  values of all patches connected to the major component of the landscape graph gives the metapopulation size ( $MPS$ , assuming that unconnected local populations do not belong to the metapopulation, Urban and Keitt 2001). If a node or a link is removed from the landscape graph, then, in some cases, it becomes more fragmented (Keitt et al. 1997 and Urban and Keitt 2001). The maximally connected-local-population size ( $MPS$ ) is the largest sum of the local population size values of connected patches (metapopulation size). In the intact network,  $MPS$  equals 24 (i.e., the sum of  $LPS_i$  values). If node or link  $i$  is deleted from the graph, the resulting  $MPS$  value of the new graph will be  $MPS_i$ , thus, a relative value of a landscape element is related to its effect on the  $MPS$ .

### Importance index

The importance index ( $I^*$ ) was calculated for the elements (nodes and links) of the intact landscape graph (Fig. 2a). This was a modified version of a similar index (Jordán et al. 2003), by ignoring the clustering coefficient, because of the very low connectivity of this network. Thus,  $I^*$  was calculated as

$$I_i^* = D_i / (d_{avtgr,i} + MPS_i).$$

This index is a combined index reflecting the pure topological properties of the network ( $D$ ), as well as the quality of both habitat patches ( $MPS$ ) and corridors ( $d$ ).

$C_{source}$ : metapopulation size connected to the source habitat

The metapopulation size connected to the source habitat ( $C_{source}$ ) is equal to the  $MPS$  that includes patch N16 (the Carpathians). The analysis of  $C_{source}$  differs from preceding indices in that it assumes that dispersal is not limited by distance and is particularly relevant if the metapopulation is sensitive to the loss of genetic variability. If a species is on the brink of extinction, the total number of individuals participating in gene flow is more important than the conditions and speed of dispersal events.

Reachability from the source habitat

Finally, the calculation of the reachability index assumes that dispersal depends on topographic distance and that the contiguity with the source habitat (N16) is critical for persistence. We employed a distance-weighted reachability measure ( $R_{igr,16}^d$ ), where the weighting is the combination of topological distance values from N16 and estimated link weights (reflecting corridor permeability). This is modified from Borgatti (2003) and only briefly discussed here. Reachability is calculated as:

$$R_{16}^{D,igr} = \sum_i \frac{LPS_i}{d_{igr,16,i}} / 4n$$

where the local population size in patch  $i$  ( $LPS_i$ ) was weighted by its topographical distance from the Carpathians ( $d_{igr,N16,i}$ ), and was normalized with the size of the network ( $n$ , the number of nodes) and the possible maximum for  $LPS_i$ , (which equals 4 in this case).

Combined effects of corridors

In addition to estimating the importance of existing landscape elements, we proposed a plan for connecting all habitat patches by newly established corridors (and stepping-stones if necessary). Here the combined effect of the corridors needs to be calculated: if we establish three corridors, the best solution is not necessarily the insertion of the best three based on their individual effects (Borgatti 2003). If we assume



that the habitat network is a source-sink system, and we do not consider dispersal as a limiting factor, our priorities could be the following: (1) connect all patches to the Carpathians (maximize the size of the core,  $C_{source}$ ), (2) solve this problem with the fewest corridors and stepping-stones possible, and (3) all patches need to be as close to the Carpathians as possible (maximize reachability,  $R_{16}^{D:igr}$ ). Obviously, priorities could change and, accordingly, the best solution would be different. Based on these priorities, a computer programme was developed to identify the optimal combination of  $k = 1, 2, \dots, 11$  inserted corridors (based on the calculated index values). The programme provided the 100 best combinations

of corridors, where ranking followed first (a) the maximum values of  $C_{source}$ , When  $C_{source}$  was equal, ranking considered (b) the minimum number of stepping-stones, and in cases where both were equal, the ranking was by (c)  $R_{16}^{D:igr}$  values. From these  $11 \times 100$  combinations, for each number of stepping-stones, the one with the highest  $C_{source}$  value was chosen.

## Results

First we analysed the structural importance of existing landscape elements in the intact network.

**Table 3** The importance ranks of different landscape elements in the intact network (based on their loss quantified by  $I^*$  importance index,  $C_{source}$  core index and  $R_{16}^{D:igr}$  reachability


| $I^*$ |        |          | $C_{source}$ —loss |          | $C_{source}$ —insertion |          | $R_{16}^{D:igr}$ —loss |          | $R_{16}^{D:igr}$ —insertion, improvement |  |
|-------|--------|----------|--------------------|----------|-------------------------|----------|------------------------|----------|--|--|
| N13   | 0.1081 | N16      | X                  | L12      | 28                      | N16      | X                      | L6*      | 0.1690                                   |  |
| L5    | 0.0967 | N13      | 10                 | L13      | 28                      | L7       | 0.0916                 | L7*      | 0.1511                                   |  |
| N14   | 0.0958 | L6       | 10                 | L14      | 28                      | L6       | 0.0957                 | L17      | 0.1404                                   |  |
| L6    | 0.0920 | N14      | 13                 | L15      | 28                      | N11      | 0.0977                 | L27      | 0.1339                                   |  |
| N16   | 0.0909 | L5       | 13                 | L16      | 28                      | N13      | 0.1021                 | L15      | 0.1305                                   |  |
| L4    | 0.0825 | N15      | 16                 | L17      | 28                      | L5       | 0.1074                 | L5*      | 0.1298                                   |  |
| N15   | 0.0812 | L4       | 16                 | L11      | 27                      | L4       | 0.1141                 | L16      | 0.1296                                   |  |
| L7    | 0.0758 | N11      | 18                 | L18      | 24                      | N14      | 0.1146                 | L20      | 0.1292                                   |  |
| N11   | 0.0748 | L7       | 18                 | L19      | 24                      | L8       | 0.1150                 | L25      | 0.1289                                   |  |
| L3    | 0.0693 | N7       | 19                 | L20      | 24                      | L3       | 0.1193                 | L14      | 0.1284                                   |  |
| N7    | 0.0664 | L3       | 19                 | L21      | 24                      | N15      | 0.1217                 | L12      | 0.1283                                   |  |
| L8    | 0.0658 | N10      | 21                 | L22      | 24                      | N10      | 0.1227                 | L13      | 0.1277                                   |  |
| N10   | 0.0645 | L8       | 21                 | L23      | 24                      | L9       | 0.1228                 | L8*      | 0.1277                                   |  |
| L9    | 0.0432 | N9       | 22                 | L24      | 24                      | L2       | 0.1229                 | L11      | 0.1275                                   |  |
| L2    | 0.0430 | L2       | 22                 | L25      | 24                      | original | 0.1248                 | L19      | 0.1271                                   |  |
| N12   | 0.0274 | N12      | 23                 | L26      | 24                      | L1       | 0.1248                 | L26      | 0.1267                                   |  |
| N9    | 0.0273 | L9       | 23                 | L27      | 24                      | N7       | 0.1273                 | L3*      | 0.1262                                   |  |
|       |        | N1       | 24                 | L10      | 24                      | N12      | 0.1310                 | L9*      | 0.1259                                   |  |
|       |        | N2       | 24                 | original | 24                      | N9       | 0.1311                 | L23      | 0.1258                                   |  |
|       |        | N3       | 24                 |          |                         | N1       | 0.1331                 | L4*      | 0.1258                                   |  |
|       |        | N4       | 24                 |          |                         | N2       | 0.1331                 | L2*      | 0.1252                                   |  |
|       |        | N5       | 24                 |          |                         | N3       | 0.1331                 | L1*      | 0.1248                                   |  |
|       |        | N6       | 24                 |          |                         | N4       | 0.1331                 | L10      | 0.1248                                   |  |
|       |        | N8       | 24                 |          |                         | N5       | 0.1331                 | L18      | 0.1248                                   |  |
|       |        | L1       | 24                 |          |                         | N6       | 0.1331                 | L21      | 0.1248                                   |  |
|       |        | original | 24                 |          |                         | N8       | 0.1331                 | L22      | 0.1248                                   |  |
|       |        |          |                    |          |                         |          |                        | L24      | 0.1248                                   |  |
|       |        |          |                    |          |                         |          |                        | original | 0.1248                                   |  |



Here we did not take the direction of graph links into account (we did not regard the habitat as a source-sink system). Under this scenario, the loss of the Munkács forest patch (N13) resulted in the greatest loss of connectivity of the landscape graph compared to the loss of any other single patch (based on the  $I^*$  index, Table 3). The loss of the Gút (N9) and Puskindo forests (N12) caused the least reduction in connectivity, since these patches are at the periphery of the largest component of the graph. Among the corridors, the most important one (based on  $I^*$ ), coded L5, connects the Munkács forest (N13) to the Alsókerepec forest (N14). Patches and corridors not connected to the Carpathians (N16) were not considered for the calculation of this index, (for both realistic and technical reasons). This index is useful if we are interested in a two-way dispersal of individuals (i.e.,

if the source-sink nature of the carabid metapopulation seems to be unimportant).  
Second, we compared the effects of newly established corridors to the effect of losing existing ones (Table 3). In the intact network, the sum of estimated local population values connected to the Carpathians (including the latter) was 24. The removal of the corridor from the Carpathians to the Munkács forest (L6), or losing the Munkács forest itself (N13), would cause the largest loss of connectivity in the network (based on the  $C_{source}$  index). In both cases several patches with large local populations would be separated from the source. Losing unconnected patches and corridors had no effect on this property, and a number of insertions did not influence  $C_{source}$ . Six different corridor insertions lead to equally good solutions, because these connected either the Deda

**Fig. 3** The reliability of the reachability ( $R_{16}^{Digr}$ ) index illustrated by the ranks of different landscape management solutions: (a) the loss of patches and corridors; (b) the insertion of new corridors; (c) improving existing corridors. The value of the intact landscape graph is the dark bar and displayed in each case for comparison. Improvement and insertion are either neutral or positive, while losses may be both negative and positive (i.e., the measure is not consistent for the analysis of the latter)




forest (N2 and N4) or the Dobrony forest (N5) to the main component. The difference between these solutions is related to distance values only expressed by the next index.

Third, we also considered how to improve the quality of the existing corridors. The reachability index ( $R_{16}^{D:igr}$ ) considers a directed network and compares the effects of corridor deletions, insertions and improvements. This approach focused on the topographical distance-based reachability of nodes measured from the Carpathians (N16). Note that the highest increase of the original value (0.1248) was reached by improving the quality of corridors

connecting the Carpathians to the Munkács (L6) or the Beregújfalu (L7) forests, followed by inserting a new corridor, L17 (Table 3). This index was not suitable for estimating the effect of losing patches, since it is normalized with the network size; therefore, the loss of an unconnected patch indirectly increases the reachability of the remaining ones. This index was useful to compare the insertion of new corridors with the improvement of existing ones. However, this was misleading in a few cases: insertions and improvements are neutral or improve the network, but node deletions had both positive and negative effects (Fig. 3).

**Table 4** The effects of the insertion of multiple corridors in different combinations on the values of different connectivity indices. “# of insertions” means the number of established corridors, “corridors” identifies the identity of corridors in the network, while “length” gives the number of established stepping-stones required. The maximum of  $C_{source}$  core index equals to 39; this is the case when all patches are connected

| # of insertions | Corridors                      | $C_{source}$ | $R_{16}^{D:igr}$ | Length |
|-----------------|--------------------------------|--------------|------------------|--------|
| 0               | -                              | 24           | 0.124771         | 0      |
| 1               | 18                             | 24           | 0.124771         | 1      |
|                 | 27                             | 24           | 0.133873         | 2      |
|                 | 28                             | 24           | 0.124771         | 3      |
|                 | 12                             | 28           | 0.128345         | 4      |
|                 | 32                             | 28           | 0.128345         | 4      |
| 2               | 12, 18                         | 28           | 0.128345         | 5      |
|                 | 18, 32                         | 28           | 0.128345         | 5      |
|                 | 12, 27                         | 28           | 0.138188         | 6      |
|                 | 27, 32                         | 28           | 0.138188         | 6      |
|                 | 28, 32                         | 30           | 0.129833         | 7      |
|                 | 13, 28                         | 30           | 0.128881         | 8      |
|                 | 17, 35                         | 29           | 0.142349         | 9      |
|                 | 28, 30                         | 30           | 0.129517         | 10     |
|                 | 12, 17                         | 32           | 0.14397          | 11     |
|                 | 17, 32                         | 32           | 0.14397          | 11     |
| 3               | 12, 17, 35                     | 33           | 0.145923         | 13     |
|                 | 17, 32, 35                     | 33           | 0.145923         | 13     |
|                 | 17, 28, 32                     | 34           | 0.145458         | 14     |
|                 | 13, 17, 28                     | 34           | 0.144506         | 15     |
|                 | 13, 14, 28                     | 34           | 0.132558         | 16     |
|                 | 17, 28, 30                     | 34           | 0.145142         | 17     |
|                 | 12, 17, 30                     | 34           | 0.145808         | 18     |
|                 | 17, 30, 32                     | 34           | 0.145808         | 18     |
|                 | 17, 31, 32                     | 35           | 0.146202         | 19     |
| 4               | 17, 28, 29, 32                 | 37           | 0.147333         | 20     |
|                 | 13, 17, 28, 29                 | 37           | 0.146069         | 21     |
| 5               | 17, 28, 29, 32, 35             | 38           | 0.149286         | 22     |
| 6               | 17, 18, 28, 29, 32, 35         | 39           | 0.150707         | 23     |
| 7               | 17, 18, 27, 28, 29, 32, 35     | 39           | 0.161054         | 25     |
| 8               | 17, 18, 26, 27, 28, 29, 32, 35 | 39           | 0.163007         | 29     |



**Fig. 4** The effect of the length of inserted corridors on the value of the connectivity index  $C_{source}$ . Note that, depending on topology, inserting shorter corridors may result in similar or higher connectivity

Finally, we proposed a plan for connecting all patches to the Carpathians in an efficient way, where “efficient” was defined as the minimum number of stepping-stones needed to establish certain combinations of corridors and “effect” was measured by the  $C_{source}$  index, or (if it does not change) by reachability. At least six corridors with 23 stepping-stones must be inserted to connect all patches. Nevertheless, with the addition of another corridor with only two stepping-stones, the distance-based reachability of the network ( $R_{16}^{D:tr}$ ) was increased (Table 4 and Fig. 4). If resources are limited and only few stepping-stones can be established, our analysis suggested that 4, 7, 11, 14 or 20 stepping-stones (see Fig. 4), established in the positions listed in Table 4, were the ones that gave the most cost-effective solution. These results only provide an illustrative example, since the optimal solution heavily depends on the priorities set (cf. also Urban and Keitt 2001 for the minimum spanning tree analysis of landscape graphs).

## Discussion

The conservation of different species living in different habitats requires different landscape management strategies. In the case of forest specialist carabids inhabiting the forest patches of the Bereg Plain, the problematic task is to increase the connectivity of a highly fragmented, source-sink system, where persistence requires continuous recolonisation

from the Carpathians. We applied several network analytical indices for characterising the landscape graph of the habitat of the studied species. Based on topological properties and the estimated qualities of both corridors and patches, we evaluated the relative positional importance of landscape elements (patches and corridors) in maintaining the connectivity of the habitat, and consequently in enabling dispersal and gene flow. The habitat network was constructed based on field data and information on the dispersal properties of the species involved.

Given our assumptions on carabid dispersal and land use, the results suggest that relatively simple manipulations could increase the connectivity of the network. Several indices unequivocally indicated the importance of the Munkács forest (N13), the corridors adjacent to it (L5, L6) and the corridor between the Beregújfaló forest and the Carpathians (L7). Attention should focus primarily on these landscape elements. Improving the quality of certain corridors (the ones coming from the Carpathians, L6 and L7) provides the best solution. Other improvements (e.g., L5) are less effective than establishing new corridors in certain arrangements (e.g., L17, between the Dobrony forest and the Carpathians). The network that we analysed in this study was very simple. Still, our study is of high practical relevance considering that (1) the construction of a new highway crossing this area is in the planning phase, and (2) the studied specialist carabids are highly sensitive to fragmentation and are important predators that influence top-down trophic control.

We suggest that the main directions of future research in this area should be (1) improving these methods in order to study more species and their interactions (metacommunities) and (2) considering financial aspects in optimising solutions in a more detailed way. Since habitat network connectivity analysis has recently become a key issue in setting conservation priorities (Briers 2002), landscape engineering and management require new quantitative methods for finding optimal solutions (Jordán 2000; Étienne 2004). This includes studying the relative positional importance of landscape elements in habitat networks (Verboom et al. 2001; Jordán et al. 2003).

**Acknowledgements** We are grateful for Zoltán Peresztegi-Nagy for developing a computer programme for one part of the



analysis, András Báldi and Gábor Lövei for useful discussions and three anonymous reviewers for their comments on the manuscript. We thank K. Csepi and G. Lövei for linguistic revision. FJ and TM were supported by grants from the Hungarian Scientific Research Fund (OTKA T 37726 and F 61651, respectively). FJ was also supported by Society in Science: the Branco Weiss Fellowship from ETH Zürich, Switzerland.

## References

- Baum KA, Haynes KJ, Dilleuth FP, Cronin RT (2004) The matrix enhances the effectiveness of corridors and stepping stones. *Ecology* 85:2671–2676
- Baudry J, Burel F, Aviron S, Martin M, Ouin A, Pain G, Thenail C (2003) Temporal variability of connectivity in agricultural landscapes: do farming activities help? *Landscape Ecol* 18:303–314
- Baudry J, Burel F (2004) Trophic flows and spatial heterogeneity in agricultural landscapes. In: Polis GA, Power ME, Huxel GR (eds) *Food webs at the landscape level*. University of Chicago Press, Chicago, pp 317–332
- Beier P, Noss RF (1998) Do habitat corridors provide connectivity? *Conserv Biol* 12:1241–1252
- Berggren A, Birath B, Kindvall O (2002) Effect of corridors and habitat edges on dispersal behavior, movement rates, and movement angles in Roesel's bush-cricket (*Metrioptera roeseli*). *Conserv Biol* 16:1562–1569
- Borgatti SP (2003) The key player problem. In: Breiger R, Carley K, Pattison P (eds) *Dynamic Social Network Modeling and Analysis: Workshop Summary and Papers*, Committee on Human Factors, National Research Council, pp 241–252
- Briers RA (2002) Incorporating connectivity into reserve selection procedures. *Biol Conserv* 103:77–83
- Brooks TM, Pimm SL, Oyugi JO (1999) Time lag between deforestation and bird extinction in tropical forest fragments. *Conserv Biol* 13:1140–1150
- Brose U (2003a) Island biogeography of temporary wetland carabid beetle communities. *J Biogeogr* 30:879–889
- Brose U (2003b) Bottom-up control of carabid beetle communities in early successional wetlands: mediated by vegetation structure or plant diversity? *Oecologia* 135:407–413
- Burel F (1989) Landscape structure effects on carabid beetles spatial patterns in western France. *Landscape Ecol* 4:215–226
- Burel F (1992) Effect of landscape structure and dynamics on species diversity in hedgerow networks. *Landscape Ecol* 6:161–174
- Cantwell MD, Forman RTT (1993) Landscape graphs: ecological modelling with graph theory to detect configurations common to diverse landscapes. *Landscape Ecol* 8:239–255
- Collinge SK (2000) Effects of grassland fragmentation on insect species loss, colonization, and movement patterns. *Ecology* 81:2211–2226
- Crooks KR, Soulé ME (1999) Mesopredator release and avifaunal extinctions in a fragmented system. *Nature* 400:563–566
- Davies KF, Margules CR, Lawrence JF (2000) Which traits of species predict population declines in experimental forest fragments? *Ecology* 81:1450–1461
- de la Pena NM, Butet A, Dlettire Y, Morant P, Burel F (2003) Landscape context and carabid beetles (Coleoptera:Carabidae) communities of hedgerows in western France. *Agric Ecosyst Environ* 94:59–72
- Étienne RS (2004) On optimal choices in increase of patch area and reduction of interpatch distance for metapopulation persistence. *Ecol Modell* 179:77–90
- Haddad NM, Browne DR, Cunningham A, Danielson BJ, Levey DJ, Sargent S, Spira T (2003) Corridor use by diverse taxa. *Ecology* 84:609–615
- Henein K, Merriam G (1990) The elements of connectivity where corridor quality is variable. *Landscape Ecol* 4:157–170
- Ishitani M, Kotze DJ, Niemelä J (2003) Changes in carabid beetle assemblages across an urban-rural gradient in Japan. *Ecography* 26:481–489
- Jordán F (2000) A reliability-theory approach to corridor design. *Ecol Modell* 128:211–220
- Jordán F, Báldi A, Orci KM, Rácz I, Varga Z (2003) Characterizing the importance of habitat patches and corridors in maintaining the landscape connectivity of a *Pholidoptera transsylvanica* (Orthoptera) metapopulation. *Landscape Ecol* 18:83–92
- Keitt TH, Urban DL, Milne BT (1997) Detecting critical scales in fragmented landscapes. *Conserv Ecol* 1(1):4
- Keller I, Lurgiader CR (2003) Recent habitat fragmentation caused by major roads leads to reduction of gene flow and loss of genetic variability in ground beetles. *Proc Roy Soc Lond, Ser B* 270:417–423
- Kondoh M (2003) Habitat fragmentation resulting in overgrazing by herbivores. *J Theor Biol* 225:453–460
- Kotze DJ, Niemelä J, O'Hara RB, Turin H (2003) Testing abundance-range size relationships in European carabid beetles (Coleoptera, Carabidae). *Ecography* 26:553–566
- Ködöböcz V, Magura T (2005) Forests of the Bereg-plain as refuges based on their carabid fauna (Coleoptera:Carabidae). *Acta Phytopathologica et Entomologica Hungarica* 40:367–382
- Kruess A, Tschamtker T (1994) Habitat fragmentation, species loss, and biological control. *Science* 264:1581–1584
- Lövei GL, Sunderland KD (1996) Ecology and behavior of ground beetles (Coleoptera:Carabidae). *Annu Rev Entomol* 41: 231–256
- Lövei GL, Magura T, Tóthmérész B, Ködöböcz V (2006) The influence of matrix and edges on species richness patterns of ground beetles (Coleoptera, Carabidae) in habitat islands. *Glob Ecol Biogeogr* 15: 283–289
- Magura T, Tóthmérész B, Molnár T (2000) Spatial distribution of carabid species along a grass-forest transects. *Acta Zoologica Academiae Scientiarum Hungariae* 46:1–17
- Magura T, Tóthmérész B, Molnár T (2001a) Forest edge and diversity: carabids along forest-grassland transects. *Biodiv Conserv* 10:287–300
- Magura T, Ködöböcz V, Tóthmérész B (2001b) Effects of habitat fragmentation on carabids in forest patches. *J Biogeogr* 28:129–138
- Magura T, Tóthmérész B, Molnár T (2004) Changes in carabid beetle assemblages along an urbanisation gradient in the city of Debrecen, Hungary. *Landscape Ecol* 19:747–759





- 747 Niemelä J, Kotze DJ, Venn S, Penev L, Stoyanov I, Hartley D, 776  
 748 Montes de Oca E (2002) Carabid beetle assemblages 777  
 749 (Coleoptera, Carabidae) across urban-rural gradients: an 778  
 750 international comparison. *Landsc Ecol* 17:387–401 779  
 751 O'Neill RV, Krummel JR, Gardner RH, Sugihara G, Jackson 780  
 752 B, DeAngelis DL, Milne BT, Turner MG, Zygmunt B, 781  
 753 Christensen SW, Dale VH, Graham RL (1998) Indices of 782  
 754 landscape pattern. *Landsc Ecol* 1:153–162 783  
 755 Pascual-Hortal L, Saura S (2006) Comparison and develop- 784  
 756 ment of new graph-based landscape connectivity indices: 785  
 757 towards the prioritization of habitat patches for conser- 786  
 758 vation. *Landsc Ecol* 21: 959–967 787  
 759 Pickett STA, Cadenasso ML (1995) Landscape ecology: spatial 788  
 760 heterogeneity in ecological systems. *Science* 269:331–334 789  
 761 Schumaker NH (1996) Using landscape indices to predict 790  
 762 habitat connectivity. *Ecology* 77:1210–1225 791  
 763 Selonen V, Hanski IK (2003) Movements of the flying squirrel 792  
 764 *Pteromys volans* in corridors and in matrix habitat. 793  
 765 *Ecography* 26:641–651 794  
 766 Shimazaki H, Tamura M, Darman Y, Andronov V, Parilov MP, 795  
 767 Nagendran M, Higuchi H (2004) Network analysis of 796  
 768 potential migration routes for oriental white storks (*Ci- 797*  
 769 *conia boyciana*). *Ecol Res* 19:683–698 798  
 770 Spiller DA, Schoener TW (1998) Lizards reduce spider species 799  
 771 richness by excluding rare species. *Ecology* 79:503–516 800  
 772 Suominen O, Niemelä J, Martikainen P, Niemelä P, Kojola I 801  
 773 (2003) Impact of reindeer grazing on ground-dwelling 802  
 774 Carabidae and Curculionidae assemblages in Lapland. 803  
 775 *Ecography* 26:503–513 804
- Tewksbury JJ, Levey DJ, Haddad NM, Sargent S, Orrock JL, 776  
 Weldon A, Danielson BJ, Brinkerhoff J, Damschen EI, 777  
 Townsend P (2002) Corridors affect plants, animals, and 778  
 their interactions in fragmented landscapes. *Proc Nat* 779  
*Acad Sci, USA* 99:12923–12926 780  
 Thiele HU (1977) Carabid beetles in their environments. 781  
 Springer Verlag, New York 782  
 Tischendorf L, Wissel C (1997) Corridors as conduits for small 783  
 animals: attainable distances depending on movement 784  
 pattern, boundary reaction and corridor width. *Oikos* 785  
 79:603–611 786  
 Tischendorf L, Irmeler U, Hingst R (1998) A simulation 787  
 experiment on the potential of hedgerows as movement 788  
 corridors for forest carabids. *Ecol Modell* 106:107–118 789  
 Tischendorf L, Fahrig L (2000a). On the usage and measure- 790  
 ment of landscape connectivity. *Oikos* 90:7–19 791  
 Tischendorf L, Fahrig L (2000b) How should we measure 792  
 landscape connectivity? *Landsc Ecol* 15:633–641 793  
 Turner MG, Gardner RH, O'Neill RV (2001) Landscape 794  
 ecology. Springer Verlag, Berlin 795  
 Urban D, Keitt T (2001) Landscape connectivity: a graph- 796  
 theoretic perspective. *Ecology* 82:1205–1218 797  
 Verboom J, Foppen R, Chardon P, Opdam P, Luttikhuisen P 798  
 (2001) Introducing the key patch approach for habitat 799  
 networks with persistent populations: an example for 800  
 marshland birds. *Biol Conserv* 100:89–101 801  
 Wassermann S, Faust K (1994) Social network analysis. 802  
 Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 803  
 804