

Effect of landscape heterogeneity on diurnal raptor community richness and diversity in Jammu *Shiwaliks*, Jammu and Kashmir

Sudesh Kumar¹, Asha Sohil², Muzaffar Ahmed³, Neeraj Sharma^{2*}

¹Department of Environmental Sciences, MAM College, Jammu

²Institute of Mountain Environment, University of Jammu

³Department of Environmental Sciences, Govt. Degree College, Banihal

* nirazsharma@gmail.com

Abstract

In this study, we examined the richness and diversity of diurnal raptors along with their foraging guilds across different land uses in a sub-tropical landscape during December 2016 to November 2018. A total of 80 vantage points, 19 line transects and 36 road transects were sampled in 33 sites in six different habitat types in the study area where we recorded 3409 individuals of 29 diurnal raptors in 2 orders and 3 families. Significant variation in bird abundance was observed among different habitat types, farmlands being more specious followed by pure forests, water bodies and forest-farmland interfaces. Among the seasons, summers recorded higher abundance followed by winter, monsoon and post-monsoon. A low diversity value ($H'=2.22$) however was observed for the whole study area with mean monthly highest recorded during February ($H'=2.44$) and least during June ($H'=1.85$). Most of the raptors observed for their food types and foraging were predators ($n=22$) and rest were carrion feeders ($n=22$). Fourteen among all observed diurnal raptors were winter visitors and 13 residents with 9 reported globally threatened. A moderately high richness of diurnal raptors substantiate high conservation value of these habitats especially the forest patches and farmlands and thus calls for effective management strategies for the conservation and proliferation of raptors in sub-tropical areas of Jammu region.

Introduction

Raptors are among the most dynamic avian species [1] characterized by unique morphological characteristics including strong talons, hooked beaks adaptation to tearing and/or piercing flesh etc. [2]. Because of their life history traits, relatively low population densities; large home ranges [3-5] and high trophic level, raptors are more sensitive to human disturbances [6-7], environmental contamination [3] and extinction [8] than other bird species. Raptors being the top-order predators, are considered excellent indicators of habitat quality [9] and play a potent role in structuring biological communities [10-11], besides, their population dynamics provide useful information of ecosystem status they inhabit [12-15].

High habitat heterogeneity and prey diversity promotes species richness and abundance among raptor communities [16]. Low population densities, slow turnover rates [8,17-18] and their more susceptibility to anthropogenic threats [6-7] leads to huge population decline [19]. Threats to raptors include habitat alteration [20-25], killings [26-27], poisoning [28-34], electrocution [35-38], collisions with human made structures and vehicles [17,39-40], road killing [41], human consumption [42-43], climate change [44-49] and many more. Most of the raptors are seriously threatened all over the globe like Europe [50-51], Asia, Middle East and Africa [1,52-53]. The vultures across the Indian sub-continent have witnessed a catastrophic decline in their population following the introduction of diclofenac as a veterinary drug in the 1990s [28]. Despite their charisma and immense ecological significance, there is currently no systematic global synthesis of status, threats, or conservation for all raptors [54]. Raptors being the top predators are key taxa in conservation planning [55], regular monitoring of their population status is essential for proper management of natural ecosystems [56]. It thus becomes extremely essential to understand the status and distribution of raptors in different countries and regions [57].

Diurnal birds of prey are the predominant avian predators for natural ecosystems and are amongst the most susceptible species to the impacts of habitat transformations and perturbations [17]. Asia is home to 127 diurnal raptors (accipitriformes and falconiformes) contributing 40% of the total 317 diurnal raptors found all around the globe [58]. Heterogeneous geography, varied topography and great climatic variability makes northwestern Himalayas biodiversity rich region [59]. At the micro scale, 15 species of raptors were recorded from Baltistan, Pakistan occupied Jammu and Kashmir [60], 25 from south-eastern part of Jammu and Kashmir [61] and 13 species from the plains of Jammu city [62]. At regional level, [63] reported 47 species of raptors in three families, Accipitridae (39 species), Falconidae (7) and Pandionidae (1) from the erstwhile state of Jammu and Kashmir (which includes Jammu, Kashmir and Ladakh division). Forty three among these have been reported from Jammu division only. Despite high raptor diversity and species of conservation interest, the information on distribution and diversity of diurnal raptor communities is scanty and equivocal for the sub-tropical forests in the region. Forming one of the largest groups among the birds in the region [63], the raptors have not attracted the attention of bird ecologists from this part of the region, except for a breeding record by [64]. The current work aims to document diversity, richness, abundance, habitat guild and threat status of raptor communities in the Shiwalik region of UT of Jammu and Kashmir.

Material and Methodology

Study area

Organized surveys were carried out in six different habitats in a subtropical region of Jammu Shiwaliks lying at 32°27' and 33°50' N and 74°19' and 75°20' E between 317m to 1010m asl elevation and an area coverage of c.5000 Km² (Fig 1) during December 2016 to November 2018. The study area comprises of heterogeneous landscapes including southern alluvial plains, fallow lands, agricultural areas, urban built-up areas and the pine clad slopes near the Nandani

Wildlife Sanctuary extending eastwards to Kathua region of Jammu division (Table 1, Fig 1). The vegetation comprises of subtropical scrub, broad-leaved associates interspersed with patches of Chirpine at higher elevations. The climate is generally dry sub-humid type and the whole year is divisible into four distinct seasons *i.e.*, spring (February, March - mid-April), summer (mid-April-June), rainy (July-mid-September), and winter (October-January). The maximum summer temperatures range between 36°C and 42°C while the area receives the average annual precipitation of ~ 1000 mm. The surveys were conducted in 33 sampling sites among six distinct ecosystems intended to cover a range of diverse habitats with varied degree of disturbances. The sampling sites have been categorized as pure forests, forest-farmland interfaces, farmlands, urban built-up, greenbelt parks and urban avenues and water bodies (Table 1).

Data Collection

The selection of sampling sites and sampling intensity was based on 15 days reconnaissance surveys conducted in the possible raptor occupancy sites in Jammu Shiwaliks. Transect method involving road transect of 25-60 km length [65], line transect (2-3 kms) and point count methods were used for counting the birds. For each transect, we recorded the number of species and individuals seen, activities observed and habitat occupied. To avoid the double count, transects were placed at 15 kms and 250 meters apart for road and line transects, respectively. The vantage points were fixed at the elevated areas for counting soaring raptors within circumference of 2-3 kms. A total of 80 vantage points, 19 line transects and 36 road transects were sampled in six different habitat types in the study area (Table 1).

Transects were walked / travelled during morning (2 hrs after sunrise) and evening hours (before dusk). Sampling was avoided during inclement weather conditions like storm, rain or fog. A few opportunistic sightings recorded close to the predefined sampling locations have also been included for the analysis. Field excursions were carried out with the aid of 10x50

binocular and Canon Eos 7D Mark II DSLR with 100*400 mm telephoto lens. Species identification was done by using standard field guide [66-68] and online bird identification platforms like J&K Birdlife, Indian Birds, Ask id's of Indian Birds. For the systematic list of birds, the work of [69] was followed.

Habitat Characterization and Foraging Behaviour

Based on their food composition and foraging behaviour, the raptors have been categorized as predators (hunt the prey, kill and consume) and carrion eaters (feed on dead animal matter) following [70]. Habitat affinities of raptors were also noted for six habitat types during the surveys. The species were classified in different threat categories following IUCN Red List of threatened species [71].




Fig 1: Map showing the location of sampling sites in the study area

Data Analysis

Richness and diversity attributes

Species diversity was considered the pooled number and summed abundance of each species across all months, seasons, study sites and entire study area. It was calculated using Shannon-Weiner [72] and [73] Simpson's indices while species richness, taken as the number of species per unit area [74] was obtained by [75] and [76] index. Evenness was calculated following [77] and [78]. The statistical analysis was performed in PAST software package ver. 3.06 [79]. The Relative abundance (RA) of the birds was calculated by using the following formula;

$$\mathbf{RA} = \text{No. of individuals of one species} / \text{Total no. of individual of all species} \times 100$$

Significant differences in the species abundance among the four seasons *i.e.*, Winter, Summer, Monsoon and Post-monsoon was compared using one-way ANOVA followed by Tukey's multiple comparison tests [80]. Since the data was not normal (Shapiro Wilk $W = 0.46$, $df = 116$, $p < 0.05$), it was transformed to a logarithmic scale (\log_{10}) before the analysis. Similarly, Kruskal-Wallis test and Mann-Whitney U-test were applied to species abundance and richness values among the habitat types which appeared non-normal. The statistical tests were performed using SPSS (version 25) software packages with significance tested at $p = 0.05$.

164 **Table 1: Characteristic features of the sampling sites with details on geo-features, transects and the level of disturbance**

Study Site	Transect type/ No	Sampling sites	Geo-Coordinates	Elev. (in m)	Habitat types	Disturbance
Pure forest	Road=13 Line=5	Kalidhar	33.0500N, 74.6500E	845	Dominated by Chirpine-broadleaved mixed forests	Low
		Billawar	32.6480N, 75.5880E	1176	Sub-tropical broadleaved forests dominated with Chirpine at hill tops	Moderate
	Point=42	Galak	32.5850N, 75.3520E	610	Rocky outcrops interspersed with open grassy slopes and Chirpine forests.	Moderate
		Nandini Wildlife Sanctuary	32.8510N, 74.9560E	610	A protected area characterized with sub-tropical deciduous forests interspersed with Chirpine.	Low
		Jasrota Wildlife Sanctuary	32.4840N, 75.3990E	560	Sub-tropical dry deciduous forest interspersed with thick bamboo stands	Low
		Sarain	32.6220N, 75.0970E	475	Sub-tropical dry open scub	High
		Bhed devta	32.7930N, 74.9770E	447	River bed and riparian forest	Moderate
		Badgah (Surinsar)	32.7810N, 75.0110E	632	Lake, agriculture and human habitations	Low
		Buttal (Mansar)	32.7170N, 75.1260E	674	Lake, agriculture and commercial setups	Low
		Kumbi	32.7120N, 75.1080E	772	Plateau with sparse Chirpine stands overlooking deep ravines and gorges	Moderate
Forest-farmland Interfaces	Road=2	Ujh Barrage	32.4750N, 75.4260E	386	A lacustrine ecosystem surrounded with plantations, farmlands and habitations.	Moderate
	Line=1	Nagrota	32.7930N, 74.8860E	430	Undulating valleys with flat sub-tropical hills	High
	Point=5	Samba	32.5740N, 75.1010E	354	Subtropical dry scrub and vast agriculture landscapes southwards	High
Farmlands	Road=8	Jourian	32.8160N, 74.5850E	268	Vast cultivable farmlands	Low
	Line=4	Pargwal	32.7990N, 75.5950E	263	Waterlogged fields and fallows	Low
	Point=11	Kokerian	32.7120N, 74.7520E	265	A wide and shallow channel of river Tawi	High
		Khakryal	32.3520N, 75.4560E	289	Vast arable agriculture landscapes	Low
		Phallian Mandal	32.6950N, 74.7920E	275	Low lying farmlands and fallow lands	High
		Koulpur	32.4930N, 74.9990E	303	Vast open rice fields	Low
		Gharana cultivation fields	32.5410N, 74.6900E	263	agriculture landscapes dotted with habitations around Gharana wetland conservation reserve	Moderate
Urban built-up	Road=4	Nikki Tawi	32.7160N, 74.8260E	289	A natural off shoot of river Tawi southwards of Jammu City, with moderate pollution load	Very high
	Line=1	Bari Brahmana	32.6460N, 74.9130E	332	Industrial area surrounded by vast wastelands and fallows	High
	Point=4	Udhampur	32.9500N, 75.1560E	800	Subtropical deciduous forests and valleys in middle Shiwaliks	High
		Vijaypur	32.5630N, 75.0400E	340	Sub-urban area along the right bank of seasonal Devak stream	High
Greenbelt parks and urban avenues	Road=3	Raika	32.7290N, 74.9100E	515	A raised forest with a mix of native and introduced trees. Understory comprises of native shrubs	Moderate
	Line=5	Mahamaya	32.7300N, 74.8870E	402	A natural remnant of forest, a designated protected area	Low

Water bodies	Point=2	Manda	32.7700N, 74.8690E	551	Urban patch bordering Ramnagar Wildlife Sanctuary northwards of Jammu city.	Low
		Jammu University	32.7200N, 74.8670E	317	A green residential campus sprawled in 118 acres on mid of Jammu city along the left banks of river Tawi	Low
	Road=6	Daya chak	32.4620N, 75.3120E	362	Vast landmass dotted with water bodies	High
	Line=3	Basantar	32.5140N, 75.0380E	313	A perennial medium stream with sandy bed drains Samba and adjoining villages	Moderate
	Point=16	Jourian	32.8160N, 74.5850E	268	Vast landmass of irrigated agricultural land	Low
		Gharana Wetland	32.5410N, 74.6900E	263	A designated protected wetland and important Bird Area, a heaven for winter migrants.	Moderate
		Purthu (Basohli)	32.4800N, 75.7750E	525	South-western part of vast Ranjit Sagar Reservoir in district Kathua	Low

165

166

167

168

169

170


171

Results

Species abundance

The study reported a total of 3409 individuals of 29 diurnal raptors in 2 orders and 3 families with 27 species belonging to family Accipitridae and one each to Pandionidae and Falconidae, respectively (Table 3). Most of the species have been observed in the farmlands (26 species) followed by pure forests (25 species), water bodies (22 species) and forest-farmland interfaces (16 species). The less specious habitats included urban built-up (11 species), green belt parks and urban avenues (9 species), each. Urban built-up recorded the highest mean population of 34.68 ± 21.44 raptors followed by pure forests (27.68 ± 9.71), farmlands (18 ± 4.81), forest-farmlands interfaces (13.58 ± 6.24), Green belt parks and urban avenues (11.48 ± 7.69 , each) and water bodies (12 ± 3.44). Kruskal-Wallis test revealed a significant variation in bird abundance among the habitat types ($H = 29.60$; $df = 5$; $p < 0.05$) (Fig 2). The highest relative abundance was observed for *Milvus migrans lineatus* (RA=36.53) followed by *Neophron percnopterus* (RA=13.59) and *Aquila nipalensis* (RA=10.83). *Aquila fasciata* and *Aquila rapax* observed only twice during the entire survey period, showed the least relative abundance of 0.06, each (Table 3, Fig 3). When compared season wise, the highest species abundance was recorded during summer (40.93 ± 16.52) followed by winter (32.21 ± 11.19), monsoon (30.28 ± 13.58) and post-monsoon (14.13 ± 5.15). The seasons however did not play any significant role in governing the abundance of the species (ANOVA, $F = 1.20$, $df = 3$, $p = 0.312$) (Fig 4), the habitats exhibited, though. Pure forests showed a significant variation in raptor abundance when compared with forest-farmland interface ($z = -2.10$, $n = 58$, $p = 0.035$), urban built-up ($z = -3.43$, $n = 58$, $p = 0.001$) and green belt parks and urban avenues ($z = -3.63$, $n = 58$, $p = 0.000$); water bodies in relation to urban built-ups ($z = -2.89$, $n = 57$, $p = 0.004$); green belt parks and urban avenues ($z = -3.16$, $n = 57$, $p = 0.002$); farmlands with forest-farmland interfaces ($z = -2.39$, $n = 58$, $p = 0.017$), urban build-

195 ups ($z = -3.62$, $n = 58$, $p = 0.000$) and green belt parks and urban avenues ($z = -3.83$, $n = 58$, $p = 0.000$).
 196 No-significant variation was however observed for the raptor abundance between water bodies and
 197 pure forests ($z = -0.56$, $n = 57$, $p = 0.575$), farmlands ($z = -1.47$, $n = 57$, $p = 0.141$) and forest-farmland
 198 interfaces ($z = -0.74$, $n = 57$, $p = 0.456$); urban built up with forest-farmland interfaces ($z = -1.39$, n
 199 $= 58$, $p = 0.16$) and green belt parks and urban avenues ($z = -0.431$, $n = 58$, $p = 0.666$).
 200



201

202 Fig 2. Bird species abundance among different habitats

203

204


205

206

207

208

209



211

212

213

214

215

216

217

218

219

220

221

222

223

224

225


226

227

228

229

Fig 3: Mean abundance of each species MML: *Milvus migrans lineatus*; NP: *Neophron percnopterus*; AN: *Aquila nipalensis*, MM: *Milvus migrans*, GF: *Gyps fulvus*; GH: *Gyps himalayensis*; EC: *Elanus caeruleus*; AB: *Accipiter badius*; FT: *Falco tinnunculus*; CA: *Circus aeruginosus*; BR: *Buteo rufinus*; BT: *Butastur teesa*; PP: *Pernis ptilorhynchus*; CG: *Circaetus gallicus*; CH: *Clanga hastata*; GB: *Gyps bengalensis*; HP: *Hieraaetus pennatus*; SC: *Spilornis cheela*; AM: *Aegypius monachus*; BB: *Buteo buteo*; AH: *Aquila heliacal*; CC: *Circus cyaneus*; FS: *Falco subbuteo*; AN: *Accipiter nisus*; PH: *Pandion haliaetus*; ANI: *Accipiter nisus*; CCL: *Clanga clanga*; AF: *Aquila fasciata*; AR: *Aquila rapax*



231

232 Fig 4: Bird species abundance among seasons

233

234 **Species richness and diversity**

235 The richness and diversity attributes showed interesting results for different habitats. Maximum value
236 for Menhinick's and Margalef richness indices were recorded during November ($D_{Mn}= 1.69$), and
237 December ($D_{Mg}= 4.60$), respectively (Table 2). When compared for the seasons, post-monsoon
238 revealed maximum species richness ($D_{Mn}= 1.33$; $D_{Mg}= 4.32$) followed by winters ($D_{Mn}= 0.95$; $D_{Mg}=$
239 4.09), summers ($D_{Mn}= 0.78$; $D_{Mg}= 3.67$) while monsoon showed the least ($D_{Mn}= 0.74$; $D_{Mg}= 3.1$)
240 (Table 2). Kruskal-Wallis test revealed a significant variation in bird species richness among the
241 different habitats ($H = 21.9$; $df = 5$; $p = 0.001$). Post doc Mann-Whitney U-test showed variations in
242 species richness for pure forests when compared with forest-farmland interfaces, urban build-ups,
243 green belt parks and urban avenues ($P < 0.05$). *Neophron percnopterus*, *Milvus migrans* and *Accipiter*

244 *badius* found in all the habitat types, were considered generalists. *Pandion haliaetus*, *Aquila rapax*,
245 *Clanga clanga*, *Circus cyaneus*, *Aquila heliaca*, *Buteo buteo*, *Spilornis cheela*, *Circaetus gallicus*,
246 *Butastur teesa*, *Circus aeruginosus*, *Neophron percnopterus* were mostly observed around the water
247 bodies, dry riverbeds, sand beds and agricultural fields. The forest specialists included *Aquila*
248 *nipalensis*, *Milvus migrans*, *Gyps fulvus*, *Gyps himalayensis*, *Falco tinnunculus*, *Buteo rufinus*,
249 *Butastur teesa*, *Pernis ptilorhynchus*, *Gyps bengalensis*, *Falco subbuteo*, *Accipiter nisus* and *Aquila*
250 *fasciata*. *Milvus migrans lineatus*, *Neophron percnopterus*, *Milvus migrans*, *Accipiter badius*, *Falco*
251 *peregrines* dominated the urban landscapes. *Milvus migrans*, *Elanus caeruleus*, *Accipiter badius*,
252 *Pernis ptilorhynchus*, *Hieraaetus pennatus* have been recorded around Green belt parks and urban
253 avenues. Interestingly, the endangered *Neophron percnopterus* and *Aquila nipalensis* revealed the
254 high relative abundance in the study area.

255
256 The diurnal raptor communities showed a moderate diversity with the Shannon Weiner and Simpson's
257 diversity index values as 2.22 and 0.8, respectively. Mean monthly highest diversity ($H' = 2.44$ and
258 $1-D = 0.87$), was observed during February (Table 2) and the least during June ($H' = 1.85$; $1-D = 0.71$).
259 Among the seasons, winter recorded the highest diversity ($H' = 2.41$ and $1-D = 0.85$) and monsoon the
260 least ($H' = 2.02$; $1-D = 0.77$) (Table 2). The species were observed evenly distributed during the winters
261 with highest evenness index ($J = 0.77$) observed for February (Table 2). Among all, *Milvus migrans*
262 *lineatus* and *Elanus caeruleus* showed the highest diversity ($H' = 2.44$, $1-D = 0.90$) whereas *Aquila*
263 *fasciata* and *Aquila rapax* were least diverse ($H' = 0.69$) each.

264

265

266

267 **Whittaker curves and Correspondence analysis ordination**

268 The species diversity among different habitat types is well reflected by Whittaker curves (Fig 5) where
269 urban built-ups and green-belt parks and urban avenues are ranked high with high raptor abundance
270 followed by pure forests and forest-farmland interfaces whereas the farmlands and water bodies ranked
271 low. Pure forests, water bodies, farmlands and forest-farmland interfaces with slanting curves reveal
272 high species richness and evenness whereas the urban built-up and green belt parks and urban avenues
273 behave vice-versa.

274 Correspondence analysis ordination plot reveals the bird community composition among the habitat
275 types (Fig 6). Most of the species have their distribution restricted to pure forests, water-bodies and
276 farmlands. The pure forests supported the habitats of Crested Serpent eagle (*Spilornis cheela*),
277 Eurasian Hobby (*Falco subbuteo*), Himalayan Vulture (*Gyps himalayensis*), Griffon vulture (*Gyps*
278 *fulvus*), Eurasian Sparrowhawk (*Accipiter nisus*) and Cinereous vulture (*Aegypius monachus*) whereas
279 farmlands harbored Peregrine Falcon (*Falco peregrines*), Oriental honey Buzzard (*Pernis*
280 *ptilorhynchus*), Booted Eagle (*Hieraaetus pennatus*), Bonelli's Eagle (*Aquila fasciata*), Steppe eagle
281 (*Aquila nipalensis*), Shikra (*Accipiter badius*), White-rumped vulture (*Gyps bengalensis*), Indian
282 spotted Eagle (*Clanga hastata*), Greater Spotted Eagle (*Aquila rapax*) and Black shouldered Kite
283 (*Elanus caeruleus*). Forest-farmlands and water bodies shared Kites, Eagles, Buzzards and Harriers
284 whereas Kestrels, Osprey, Eastern Imperial Eagle (*Aquila heliaca*), Short-toed Snake Eagle
285 (*Circaetus gallicus*) were found scattered around water bodies. The generalists like Egyptian vulture
286 (*Neophron percnopterus*), Black kite (*Milvus migrans*) and Black-eared kite (*Milvus migrans lineatus*)
287 occupied Urban built up and Green belt parks and avenues.

288

289

290

291

292 Table 2: Observed richness and diversity attributes of raptors across months and seasons


Month wise	Dec	Jan	Feb	W	Mar	Apr	May	S	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	M	Oct	Nov	PM
Taxa (S)	27	25	24	29	25	22	19	27	16	18	16	21	22	21	25	27
Individuals (N)	282	323	329	934	474	392	321	1187	244	231	219	184	878	193	217	410
Diversity Index																
Simpson (1-D)	0.80	0.82	0.87	0.85	0.85	0.78	0.74	0.81	0.71	0.80	0.78	0.75	0.77	0.83	0.82	0.83
Shannon (H')	2.24	2.28	2.44	2.41	2.25	2.01	1.87	2.11	1.85	2.09	2.01	1.94	2.02	2.23	2.29	2.31
Richness Index																
Menhinick (DMn)	1.60	1.39	1.32	0.95	1.14	1.11	1.06	0.78	1.02	1.18	1.08	1.54	0.74	1.51	1.69	1.33
Margalef (DMg)	4.60	4.15	3.96	4.09	3.89	3.51	3.11	3.67	2.72	3.12	2.78	3.83	3.1	3.8	4.46	4.32
Species Estimate																
Equitability (J)	0.68	0.70	0.77	0.71	0.70	0.65	0.63	0.64	0.67	0.72	0.72	0.63	0.65	0.73	0.71	0.70

293 Where, **W**–Winter; **S**–Summer; **M**–Monsoons; **PM**–Post-monsoon

294


295

296



297

298 Fig 5: Diversity of species among the habitat types.



299

300

301 Fig 6: Correspondence analysis ordination between different habitats

302

303

304

305

Feeding, migratory and conservation status

Our observation on food type and feeding behavior revealed that most of the raptors were predators (n= 22) and rest were carrion feeders (n= 7) (Table 3). Fourteen among the total species observed were winter visitors and these included *Aquila nipalensis*, *Gyps fulvus*, *Gyps himalayensis*, *Circus aeruginosus*, *Buteo rufinus*, *Clanga hastata*, *Gyps bengalensis*, *Aegypius monachus*, *Buteo buteo*, *Aquila heliaca*, *Circus cyaneus*, *Clanga clanga*, *Aquila rapax* and *Pandion haliaetus*. *Pernis ptilorhynchus* and *Falco subbuteo* were summer visitors whereas the remaining 13 were all residents (Table 3). Nine among the total species so observed were classified as globally threatened (IUCN, 2020). These included *Gyps bengalensis* (critically endangered); *Neophron percnopterus* and *Aquila nipalensis* (endangered), *Clanga hastata*, *Aquila heliaca*, *Clanga clanga* and *Aquila rapax* (vulnerable); *Gyps himalayensis* and *Aegypius monachus* (near threatened). Twenty species belonged to the least concern category (Table 3).

Table 3: List of raptor species recorded in the study area along with their status, guilds and abundance

S. No.	Common name	Binomial name	Relative Abundance				RA (%)	MS	Feeding Behaviour	Habitat Guild	IUCN
			Winter (Dec-Feb)	Summer (Mar-May)	Monsoon (Jun-Sep)	Post monsoon (Oct-Nov)					
ORDER: ACCIPITRIFORMES											
Family: Accipitridae											
1	Black-eared kite	<i>Milvus migrans lineatus</i>	0.32	0.36	0.43	0.31	36.53	R	Carrion eater	UB,FFI,FL, GPUA,WB	LC
2	Egyptian Vulture	<i>Neophron percnopterus</i>	0.10	0.14	0.14	0.15	13.59	R	Carrion eater	UB,FFI,FL, GPUA,WB, PF,	EN
3	Steppe Eagle	<i>Aquila nipalensis</i>	0.13	0.13	0.06	0.05	10.83	W	Predator	PF,FL,WB	EN
4	Black Kite	<i>Milvus migrans</i>	0.09	0.08	0.08	0.16	9.68	R	Carrion eater	PF,FFI,FL, UB,GPUA, WB	LC
5	Griffon Vulture	<i>Gyps fulvus</i>	0.04	0.05	0.05	0.05	5.16	W	Carrion eater	PF,FFI	LC
6	Himalayan Vulture	<i>Gyps himalayensis</i>	0.06	0.06	0.03	0.01	5.10	W	Carrion eater	PF,FFI	NT
7	Black-shouldered Kite	<i>Elanus caeruleus</i>	0.04	0.02	0.04	0.04	3.99	R	Predator	FFI,FL,WB, GPUA,	LC
8	Shikra	<i>Accipiter badius</i>	0.03	0.02	0.02	0.02	2.79	R	Predator	PF,FFI,FL,UB, GPUA,WB	LC
9	Common Kestrel	<i>Falco tinnunculus</i>	0.02	0.02	0.03	0.02	2.52	R	Predator	PF,FFI,FL,WB	LC
10	Eurasian Marsh Harrier	<i>Circus aeruginosus</i>	0.01	0.013	0.007	0.01	1.29	W	predator	WB,FL,	LC
11	Long-legged Buzzard	<i>Buteo rufinus</i>	0.01	0.008	0.009	0.009	1.17	W	Predator	PF,FL,WB, FFI,	LC
12	White-eyed Buzzard	<i>Butastur teesa</i>	0.01	0.008	0.013	0.014	1.09	R	Predator	PF,WB	LC
13	Oriental honey-buzzard	<i>Pernis ptilorhynchus</i>	0.006	0.006	0.013	0.014	0.88	S	Predator	PF,FFI, GPUA,	LC

14	Short-toed Snake eagle	<i>Circaetus gallicus</i>	0.01	0.003	0.008	0.012	0.79	R	Predator	FL, WB, PF,	LC
15	Indian Spotted Eagle	<i>Clanga hastata</i>	0.01	0.003	0.002	0.007	0.67	W	Predator	FM, WB	VU
16	White-rumped Vulture	<i>Gyps bengalensis</i>	0.005	0.006	0.006	0.007	0.59	W	Carrion eater	WB, PF	CE
17	Booted Eagle	<i>Hieraaetus pennatus</i>	0.009	0.005	0.001	0.009	0.56	R	Predator	UB, FFI, GPU, WB	LC
18	Crested Serpent Eagle	<i>Spilornis cheela</i>	0.001	0.005	0.002	0.014	0.44	R	Predator	PF, WB	LC
19	Cinereous vulture	<i>Aegypius monachus</i>	0.009	0.002	0	0.009	0.41	W	Carrion eater	PF,	NT
20	Common Buzzard	<i>Buteo buteo</i>	0.009	0.002	0.001	0.002	0.35	W	Predator	FL, FFI, WB	LC
21	Eastern Imperial Eagle	<i>Aquila heliaca</i>	0.006	0.003	0	0.002	0.29	W	Predator	FL, FFI, WB	VU
22	Hen Harrier	<i>Circus cyaneus</i>	0.005	0.002	0	0.004	0.26	W	Predator	WB, FL	LC
23	Eurasian Hobby	<i>Falco subbuteo</i>	0.001	0.0008	0.003	0.002	0.18	S	Predator	PF, FL	LC
24	Eurasian Sparrowhawk	<i>Accipiter nisus</i>	0.002	0.0008	0.001	0.002	0.15	R	Predator	PF, FL,	LC
25	Tawny Eagle	<i>Clanga clanga</i>	0.004	0	0	0	0.12	W	Predator	FL, WB	VU
26	Bonelli's Eagle	<i>Aquila fasciata</i>	0.001	0.0008	0	0	0.06	R	Predator	PF, FL	LC
27	Greater Spotted Eagle	<i>Aquila rapax</i>	0.001	0	0	0.002	0.06	W	Predator	FL, WB	VU
Family : Pandionidae											
28	Osprey	<i>Pandion haliaetus</i>	0.004	0.0008	0	0.002	0.18	W	Predator	FL, WB	LC
ORDER: FALCONIFORMES											
Family: Falconidae											
29	Peregrine Falcon	<i>Falco peregrinus</i>	0.005	0.0008	0.003	0.002	0.29	R	Predator	UB, FFI, PF	LC

Discussion

Richness and Abundance

South and southeast Asia is home to high raptor diversity with 219 species recorded so far and of these 102 are found in India [58]. The present study reports 29 species accounting for 42% of the total diurnal raptors in India. This may be attributed to the heterogeneity of landscapes supporting an array of habitats comprising of intact forest patches, protected areas (Jasrota, Nandini, and Surinsar-Mansar Wildlife sanctuaries), rocky ridges, vast fallows and agricultural fields, water bodies (rivers, streams, and ponds), floodplains and urban habitats infused with green belt parks, urban forests and green corridors that provide favorable space for nesting, breeding, perching and roosting and thus high raptor richness and abundance [3,81-84]. Landscape attributes play an important role in determining avian richness and abundance [85-86] which is high in mosaic lands [87-89] limited by suitable breeding habitat and specific nest-site requirements [1,3]. Raptors which have large home ranges encompass a wide range of habitats [90]. Statistical analysis showed a contrasting deviation in species richness among different habitat types. The raptor abundance varied significantly for pure forest, farmlands and water bodies. Variation in bird species abundance could be due to their migratory behavior, food availability, habitat condition, and breeding season of the species [91-92]. Human disturbance is another important factor affecting the abundance and richness of birds [93]. The mean monthly highest values of Menhinick and Margalef richness indices observed for November and December may be attributed to the winter migration. This leads to the overall population inflation and thus the increased diversity as well during the winters.

Presence of raptors in urban areas can be related to stable or abundant prey bases, novel environments, reduced competition, and additional nesting structures [94]. Same holds good with two most abundant raptors observed in the urban environment which included *Milvus*

migrans lineatus and *Neophron percnopterus*. These generalist species exploit buildings, other human structures and ornamental plantations for shelter, nesting, and food sources (including human-subsidized foods) reaching highest densities in urban areas [95]. Perching sites close to roads (power lines and telephone poles) and road kills increase attractiveness of raptors to urban areas [96]. Urbanization increases biological homogenization and consequently urban adaptable species become increasingly widespread and locally abundant [97]. The green belt parks, avenues, urban forests and green corridors in the present study area act as an ecotonal zone and have been quite successful in providing refuge to the raptor species like *Milvus migrans lineatus*, *Neophron percnopterus*, *Milvus migrans*, *Elanus caeruleus*, *Accipiter badius*, *Pernis ptilorhynchus* and *Hieraaetus pennatus*. Rich plant diversity, availability of perching sites (trees, electricity poles, and telephonic poles) and food resources could be the reason for good species number of raptor in green belt parks and urban avenues.

Urban avoiders like eagles, hawks, and falcons [98] with specific habitat requirements [95] are more abundant in less-disturbed and natural habitats [95,99-100] that provide safe refuge, hostile environment and the prey species [90]. It comprises the species adapted to live in the interior of forests, migrants, nesting birds sensitive to human presence. The forest dwellers observed during this study included *Accipiter badius*, *Falco subbuteo*, *Accipiter nisus* and *Falco peregrines*, *Gyps fulvus*, *Gyps himalayensis*, *Buteo rufinus*, *Butastur teesa*, *Pernis ptilorhynchus*, *Circaetus gallicus*, *Spilornis cheela* and *Aegypius monachus*. Agricultural fields and large open spaces provide breeding and foraging habitats for many open space foragers such as the Eurasian buzzards (*Buteo buteo*), harrier species (*Circus* ssp.), etc [101-104]. Besides providing new habitats, irrigated crops provide higher food availability to birds of prey in the form of small mammals, voles and rodents which are ideal foods for western marsh-harrier [105-106], black kites [107-108], black-winged kites and some migrant raptors like

booted eagle and steppe eagle [13,109-110]. High raptor abundance in the farmlands and forest farmland interfaces in the study area is attributed to the availability of perching sites (more artificial in the form of poles and high tension / mobile towers) and diverse food options.

Feeding, Migratory and Conservation status

Food supply is an important factor governing the raptor density [3] as birds and mammals form the main food for raptors [90] besides reptiles, amphibians, fish and arthropods [111]. Pertinently the number of the carrion feeders among the total appeared low but three among seven carrion feeders, *Milvus migrans lineatus*, *Neophron percnopterus* and *Milvus migrans* were among the top four highly abundant species recorded during the study. Most of them were reported mainly from urban habitats along the road side, near the water bodies and at perches either eating or roosting. Remaining four carrion feeders i.e., *Gyps fulvus*, *Gyps himalayensis*, *Gyps bengalensis* and *Aegypius monachus* were reported from forests and/or forest farmlands interfaces feeding on cattle that die naturally attracting the large numbers of vultures. Carcass of large animals; deer, hares in forest are the potential source of carrion forming a potent food base for raptors in forests [90,112]. Unlike scavenging raptors, predatory raptors search for their prey visually and hunt those [113]. The observed richness of predatory raptors was quite high than the scavenging ones. This may be attributed to the availability of diverse food availability in mosaic habitats in the study area. [114] reported that food availability is the most important criteria for selecting suitable stopover sites for migratory species and large concentrations of raptors are common in wintering grounds with abundant prey [115] that holds good with the current study. Predatory winter migrants and resident raptors, *Aquila nipalensis*, *Elanus caeruleus*, *Circus aeruginosus*, *Buteo rufinus*, *Butastur teesa*, *Circaetus gallicus*, *Clanga hastata*, *Hieraaetus pennatus*, *Spilornis cheela*, *Accipiter badius*, *Buteo buteo* *Aquila heliaca*,

Clanga clanga, *Aquila rapax*, *Pandion haliaetus* observed in the mosaic habitats, were commonly observed feeding on lizards, rodents, insects, birds, etc.

The migratory behaviour of different raptor species in the study area may be due to seasonal movement patterns, local and regional habitat changes, large-scale population changes, and climatic conditions [116-118]. Most of the winter migrants during the study were reported from paddy fields and other farmlands situated close to wetlands or open areas near streams or floodplains and few of them were recorded from forest areas during winters. Migratory species often use paddy fields in winter as foraging sites [119-120]. The forest also serve as alternative habitat for the migratory species which could use the area for resting, foraging till the return of favorable condition [121-122]. The occurrence of 16 migratory species of raptors supports the fact that study area is an important conservation priority area especially for the winter migrants. Out of 26 globally threatened raptor species in India [58] (Bird life international, 2017) nine were observed during the current surveys. *Neophron percnopterus* is resident to the study area and is second most abundant species recorded from the study area whereas *Aquila nipalensis*, *Gyps himalayensis*, *Clanga hastata*, *Gyps bengalensis*, *Aegypius monachus*, *Aquila heliaca*, *Clanga clanga* and *Aquila rapax* are winter migrant to the region.

Conclusions

Our study highlights the importance of urban and suburban areas, forests, streams, floodplains and farmlands for raptor conservation. Combination of natural, semi natural, and urban habitats, are becoming hot spots of landscape diversity that allow a high number of species with contrasting habitat needs. The farmlands and forests harbored the highest species of raptors. Water bodies like streams, rivers and adjoining floodplains too attracted unique raptor species. The conservation value of these mosaic habitat types is not only related to the number of raptor species but also due to inclusion of raptors that need special conservation measures. Indeed,

several threatened birds of prey reported from these habitats are rare or even absent in the adjacent protected areas of Jammu Shiwaliks. Holistic actions are needed to implement focusing on ecosystems and habitats essential for maintaining biological diversity, preventing species extinction and increasing the ecological scope for recovery of endangered species. This research work has great implication for combined effort in conservation of raptors in future especially from Himalayan region.

Acknowledgments

The authors gratefully acknowledge Department of Wildlife Protection, Govt. of Union Territory of Jammu and Kashmir for granting necessary permits and providing logistic support during the surveys Rector, Bhaderwah Campus, University of Jammu is also thanked for providing the administrative support during this study. The help rendered by Mr. Dinesh Singh, Anil Thakar and Ajaz Quereshi, in conducted field surveys is highly appreciated and duly acknowledged

References

1. Ferguson-Lees J, Christie DA. Raptors of the World. London: Christopher Helm; 2001. p. 320.
2. Brown L. Birds of Prey: their biology and ecology. London: Hamlyn; 1976.
3. Newton I. Population ecology of raptors. South Dakota: Buteo Books; 1979.
4. Real J, Mañosa S. Demography and conservation of western European Bonelli's eagle *Hieraaetus fasciatus* populations. Biol. Conserv. 1997; 79:59–66.
5. Hall JC, Chhangani AK, Warner TA. Spatial characteristics of nest sites of critically endangered Indian vultures (*Gyps indicus*) in Rajasthan, India. Indian For. 2015; 141:1–5.

6. Owens IPF, Bennett PM. Ecological basis of extinction risk in birds: Habitat loss versus human persecution and introduced predators. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.* 2000; 97:12144–12148.
7. Sergio F, Caro T, Brown D, Clucas B, Hunter J, Ketchum J, McHugh K, Hiraldo F. Top predators as conservation tools: ecological rationale, assumptions, and efficacy. *Annu. Rev. Ecol. Evol. Syst.* 2008; 39:1–19.
8. Bennett PM, Owens IPF. Variation in extinction risk among birds: chance or evolutionary predisposition? *Proc. R. Soc. B Biol. Sci.* 1997; 264:401–408. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.1997.0057>
9. Chambers SA. Birds as environmental indicators: review of literature. Parks Victoria Technical Series No. 55. Parks Victoria, Melbourne; 2008.
10. Bogliani G, Sergio F, Tavecchia G. Woodpigeons nesting in association with hobby falcons: advantages and choice rules. *Anim. Behav.* 1999; 57:125–131.
11. Sergio F, Marchesi L, Pedrini P, Penteriani V. Coexistence of a generalist owl with its intra guild predator: distance-sensitive or habitat-mediated avoidance? *Anim. Behav.* 2007; 74:1607–1616.
12. Thiollay JM. The decline of raptors in West Africa: long-term assessment, human pressure and role of protected areas. *Ibis.* 2006; 48:240–254. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1474-919X.2006.00531.x>
13. Herremans M, Herremans-Tonnoeyr D. Land use and the conservation status of raptors in Botswana. *Biol. Conserv.* 2000; 94:31–41. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0006-3207\(99\)00166-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0006-3207(99)00166-4)
14. Greene HW. Species richness in tropical predators. In: Almeda F, Pringle C, editors. *Tropical rainforests: diversity and conservation*. San Francisco: California Academy of Science; 1988. p. 259–274.

15. Terborgh J. Maintenance of diversity in tropical forests. *Biotropica*. 1992; 24:283–292.
16. White CM. Current problems and techniques in raptor management and conservation. *Transactions of the thirty-ninth North American Wildlife Conference*. Washington: Wildlife Management Institute; 1974. p. 301–312.
17. Donázar JA, Cortés-Avizanda A, Fargallo JA, Margalida A, Moleón M, Morales-Reyes Z, Moreno-Opo R, Pérez-García JM, Sánchez-Zapata JA, Zuberogoitia I, Serrano D. Roles of raptors in a changing world: from flagships to providers of key ecosystem services. *Ardeola*. 2016; 63:181–234. <https://doi.org/10.13157/arla.63.1.2016.rp8>
18. Dirzo R, Raven PH. Global state of biodiversity and loss. *Annu. Rev. Environ. Resour.* 2003; 28:137–167.
19. Ceballos G, Ehrlich PR, Dirzo R. Biological annihilation via the ongoing sixth mass extinction signaled by vertebrate population losses and declines. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.* 2017; 114:201704949.
20. Thiollay JM. *Falconiformes of Tropical Rainforests: A Review*. ICBP Tech Publishing; 1985. p. 155–165.
21. Thiollay JM. Current status and conservation of falconiformes in tropical Asia. *J. Raptor Res.* 1998; 32:40–55.
22. Virani M, Watson RT. Raptors in the East African tropics and Western Indian Ocean islands: state of ecological knowledge and conservation status. *J. Raptor Res.* 1998; 32:28–39.
23. Thiollay JM, Rahman Z. The raptor community of central Sulawesi: habitat selection and conservation status. *Conserv. Biol.* 2002; 3:128–137.
24. Bildstein KL. *Migrating Raptors of the World: Their Ecology and Conservation*. New York: Cornell University Press; 2006.

25. Goriup P, Tucker G. Assessment of the merits of a CMS instrument covering migratory raptors in Africa and Eurasia. London: Department for environment, food and rural affairs, wildlife species conservation division; 2007.
26. Whitfield DP, David RA, McLeod DRA, Watson J, Fielding AH, Haworth PF. The association of grouse moor in Scotland with the illegal use of poisons to control predators. *Biol. Conserv.* 2003; 114(2):157–163.
27. Brochet AL, Vav Den Bossche W, Jones VR, Arnardottir H, Damoc D, Demko M, Driessens G, Flensted K, Gerber M, Ghasabyan M, Gradinarov D, Hansen J, Horvath M, Karlonas M, Krogulec J, Kuzmenko T, Lachman L, Lehtiniemi T, Lorge P, Lotberg U, Lusby J, Ottens G, Paquet JY, Rukhaia A, Schmidt M, Shimmings P, Stipnieks A, Sultanov E, Vermouzek Z, Vintchevski A, Volke V, Willi G, Butchart SHM. Illegal killing and taking of birds in Europe outside the Mediterranean: assessing the scope and scale of a complex issue. *Bird Conserv. Int.* 2017; 26:1–31.
28. Oaks JL, Gilbert M, Virani MZ, Watson RT, Meteyer CU, Rideout B, Shivaprasad HL, Ahmed S, Chaudhry MJI, Arshad M, Mahmood S, Ali A, Khan AA. Diclofenac residues as the cause of vulture population decline in Pakistan. *Nature.* 2004a; 427: 630–633.
29. Murn C, Khan U, Farid F. Vulture populations in Pakistan and the Gyps vulture restoration project. *Vulture News.* 2008; 58:35–43.
30. Ogada D, Shaw P, Beyers RL, Buij R, Murn C, Thiollay JM, Beale CM, Holdo RM, Pomeroy D, Baker N, Krüger SC, Botha A, Virani MZ, Monadjem A, Sinclair ARE. Another continental vulture crisis: Africa's vultures collapsing toward extinction. *Conserv. Lett.* 2016; 9:89–97.
31. Garbett R, Maude G, Hancock P, Kenny D, Reading R, Amar A. Association between hunting and elevated blood lead levels in the critically endangered African white-backed vulture *Gyps Africanus*. *Sci. Total Environ.* 2018b; 630:1654–1665.

32. Vogler BR, Hoop R, Sinniger M, Albin S. Intentional methomyl-poisoning of peregrine falcons (*Falco peregrinus*) in Switzerland. Eur. J Wildl. Res. 2015; 61(4):611–615.
33. Botha A. 65 endangered vultures killed in poisoning incident. African Geographic. Available online on <http://africageographic.com/blog/65-endangered-vultures-killed-in-poisoning-incident>; 2015.
34. Galligan TH, Amano T, Prakash VM, Kulkarni M, Shringarpure R, Prakash N, Ranade S, Green RE, Cuthbert RJ. Have population declines in Egyptian vulture and red-headed vulture in India slowed since the 2006 ban on veterinary diclofenac? Bird Conserv. Int. 2014; 24:272–281.
35. Lehman RN. Raptor electrocution on power lines: current issues and outlook. Wildl. Soc. Bull. 2001; 29:804–813.
36. Kagan RA. Electrocution of raptors on power lines: a review of necropsy methods and findings. Vet Pathol. 2016; 53(5):1030–1036. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0300985816646431>.
37. Angelov I, Hashim I, Oppel S. Persistent electrocution mortality of Egyptian vultures *Neophron percnopterus* over 28 years in East Africa. Bird Conserv. Int. 2013; 23:1–6. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0959270912000123>
38. Mojica EK, Dwyer JF, Harness RE, Williams GE, Woodbridge B. Review and synthesis of research investigating golden eagle electrocutions. J. Wildl. Manag. 2018; 82:495–506.
39. Maceda JJ, Sarasola JH, Emilio M, Pessino M. Presas consumidas por el Águila Coronada (*Harpyhaliaetus coronatus*) en el límite sur de su rango de distribución en Argentina. Ornitol. Neotrop. 2003; 14:419–422.

40. Cusa M, Jackson DA, Mesure M. Window collisions by migratory bird species: urban geographical patterns and habitat associations. *Urban Ecosys.* 2015; 18:1427–1446.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s11252-015-0459-3>
41. Klippel AH, Oliveira PV, Britto KB, Freire BF, Moreno MR, Dos Santos AR, Banhos A, Paneto GG. Using DNA barcodes to identify road-killed animals in two Atlantic forest nature reserves Brazil. *PLoS One.* 2015; 10:1–15.
<https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0134877>
42. Symes CT. Amur falcon *Falco amurensis* slaughter in Nagaland India. *Gabar.* 2012; 23: 69–73.
43. Dalvi S, Haralu B. Doyang reservoir: a potential IBA in Nagaland. *Mistnet.* 2014; 15:24–28.
44. Watson J. The golden eagle. London; 2010.
45. Monadjem A, Virani MZ, Jackson C, Reside A. Rapid decline and shift in the future distribution predicted for the endangered Sokoke Scops Owl *Otus ireneae* due to climate change. *Bird Conserv. Int.* 2013; 23:247–258.
46. Martin RO, Sebele L, Koeslag A, Curtis O, Abadi F, Amar A. Phenological shifts assist colonisation of a novel environment in a range-expanding raptor. *Oikos.* 2014b; 123:1457–1468.
47. Garcia-Heras M-S, Arroyo B, Mougeot F, Amar A, Simmons RE. Does timing of breeding matter less where the grass is greener? Seasonal declines in breeding performance differ between regions in an endangered endemic raptor. *Nat. Conserv.* 2016; 15:23–45.
48. Franke A. Priorities for Gyrfalcon research: food weather and phenology in a changing climate. In: Anderson DL, McClure CJW, Franke A, editors. *Applied Raptor Ecology:*

Essentials from Gyrfalcon Research. USA: The Peregrine Fund Boise Idaho; 2017. p. 11–33.

49. Iknayan KJ, Beissinger SR. Collapse of a desert bird community over the past century driven by climate change. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.* 2018; 201805123.

50. Tucker GM, Heath MF. Birds in Europe: their conservation status. UK: Birdlife International Cambridge; 1994.

51. BirdLife International. Birds in the European Union: a status assessment. Netherlands: BirdLife International; 2004.

52. Cramp S. The complete birds of the Western Palearctic. Oxford University Press; 1998.

53. Mebs T, Schmidt D. Die Greifvögel Europas Nordafrikas und Vorderasiens Biologie Kennzeichen Bestände. Franckh-Kosmos Verlags Stuttgart 495; 2006.

54. McClure CJW, Westrip JRS, Johnson JA, Schulwitz SE, Virani MZ, Davies R, Symes A, Wheatley H, Thorstrom R, Amar A, Buij R, Jones VR, Williams NP, Buechley ER, Butchart SHM. State of the world's raptors: Distributions threats and conservation recommendations. *Biol. Conserv.* 2018; 227:390–402.

55. Simberloff D. Flagships umbrellas and keystones: is single-species management pass´e in the landscape era? *Biol. Conserv.* 1998; 83:247–257.

56. Witmer GW. Wildlife population monitoring: some practical considerations. *Wildl. Res.* 2005; 32:259–263.

57. Karakas R. Current status and distribution of diurnal raptor species in the south-eastern Anatolia Region Turkey. *Raptor J.* 2015; 9(1):105–113.<https://doi.org/10.1515/srj-2015-0008>

58. BirdLife International. IUCN red list for birds. Downloaded from <http://www.birdlife.org> on 20/12/2020; 2017.

59. Kumar A. Avifauna of North West Himalaya. In: Sivaperuman C, Venkataraman K, editors. Indian Hotspots. Singapore: Springer publishing; 2018. p. 151–194. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-10-6605-4_8
60. Scully L. A contribution to the ornithology of Gilgit. Ibis. 1881; 23:415–453.
61. Sharma N, Rana SK, Raina P, Amir R, Kichloo MA. An annotated checklist of the birds of upper Chenab catchment Jammu and Kashmir India. JoTT. 2018; 10:11869–11894.
62. Sohail A, Sharma N. Bird diversity and distribution in mosaic landscapes around Jammu, Jammu & Kashmir. Acta. Eco.l Sin. 2020; 40(4):323–338. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chnaes.2020.02.005>
63. Suhail I, Ahmad R, Ahmad K. Avifaunal diversity in Jammu and Kashmir State. In: Dar GH, Khuroo AA, editors. Biodiversity of the Himalaya: Jammu and Kashmir state: Topics in Biodiversity and Conservation; 2020. p. 897–931. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-32-9174-4_35
64. Kichloo MA, Kumar S, Sharma N. Breeding site records of three sympatric vultures in a mountainous cliff in Kahara-Thathri Jammu & Kashmir India. J. Threat. Taxa. 2020; 12(09):16166–16169. <https://doi.org/10.11609/jott.5537.12.9.16166-16169>
65. Fuller MR, Mosher JA. Methods of detecting and counting raptors: a review. In: Ralph CJ, Scott JM, editors. Estimating the numbers of terrestrial birds. San Francisco: Cooper Ornithological Society; 1981.p. 235–246.
66. Grimmett R, Inskipp C, Inskipp T. Birds of the Indian Subcontinent: India Pakistan Sri Lanka Nepal Bhutan Bangladesh and the Maldives. Bloomsbury Publishing; 2013. p. 528.
67. Naoroji R. Birds of Prey of the Indian subcontinent. New Delhi: Om Books International publishing; 2011. p. 692.

68. Grewal B, Sen S, Singh S, Devasar N, Bhatia G. A pictorial field guide to birds of India Pakistan Nepal Bhutan Sri Lanka and Bangladesh. New Delhi: Om Books International publishing; 2016.
69. Praveen J, Jayapal R, Pittie A. A Checklist of the birds of India. Indian BIRDS. 2016; 11(5–6):113–172.
70. De Graaf RM, Tilghman NG, Anderson SH. Foraging guilds of North American birds. Environ. Manag. 1985; 9:493–536.
71. IUCN. The IUCN Red List of Threatened Species version 2020-3. <https://www.iucnredlist.org>; 2021; Accessed date: 10 December 2020.
72. Shannon CE, Weaver W. The Mathematical theory of communication. Urbana: University of Illinois Press; 1949.
73. Simpson EH. Measurement of Diversity. Nature. 1949; 163:688.
74. Whittaker RH. Evolution and measurement of species diversity. Taxon. 1972; 21:213–51.
75. Margalef DR. Information theory in ecology. Genet. syst. 1968; 3:36–71.
76. Menhinick EF. A comparison of some species diversity indices applied to samples of field insects. Ecol. 1964; 45:858–862.
77. Peet R. The measurement of species diversity. Annu. Rev. Ecol. Evol. Syst. 1974; 5:285–307.
78. Magurran AE. Measuring biological diversity. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing; 2004. p. 256.
79. Hammer O, Harper DAT, Ryan PD. PAST: Paleontological statistics software package for education and data analysis. Palaeontol. Electronica. 2001; 4(1):1–9.
80. Zar JH. Biostatistical analysis. Prentice-Hall Englewood Cliffs; 1984. p. 718.

81. Pendleton BA, Millsap BA, Cline KW. Habitat management. In: Pendleton BA, Millsap BA, Cline KW, Bird DA, editors. Raptor management techniques manual. Science Technical Series No. 10. Washington: National Wildlife Federation; 1987. p. 215–237.
82. Craighead JJ, Craighead FC. Hawks owls and wildlife. New York: Stackpole Company and Wildlife Management Institute; 1956.
83. Janes SW. Habitat selection in raptorial birds. In: Cody M, editor. Habitat selection in birds. New York: Academic Press; 1985. p. 159–188.
84. Tapia L, Zuberogoitia I. Breeding and nesting biology in Raptors. In: Sarasola JH, Grande JM, Negro JJ, editors. Birds of Prey. Switzerland: Springer Publishing; 2018. p. 63–94. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-73745-4>
85. Miller JN, Brooks RP, Croonquist MJ. Effects of landscape patterns on biotic communities. *Landscape Ecol.* 1997; 12:137–153.
86. Pino J, Rodà F, Ribas J, Pons X. Landscape structure and bird species richness: implications for conservation in rural areas between natural parks. *Landsc. Urban Plan.* 2000; 49:35–48.
87. Katayama N, Osawa T, Amano T, Kusumoto Y. Are both agricultural intensification and farmland abandonment threats to biodiversity? A test with bird communities in paddy-dominated landscapes. *Agric. Ecosyst. Environ.* 2014; 214:21–30.
88. Hamada A, Fukui W, Mizushima M. The study of the relationship between connectivity of rural land use and urban fringe area Kyoto city. *J Jap. Soc. Reveget. Tech.* 2015; 41: 145–150.
89. Norfolk O, Jung M, Platts PJ, Malaki P, Odeny D, Marchant R. Birds in the matrix: the role of agriculture in avian conservation in the Taita Hills Kenya. *Afr. J. Ecol.* 2017; 55: 530–540.

90. Petty SJ. Ecology and Conservation of Raptors in Forests. London: Forestry Commission Bulletin 118; 1998.
91. Mengesha G, Bekele A. Diversity and relative abundance of birds of Alatish National Park. *Int. J. Environ. Sci.* 2008; 34(2):15–22.
92. Tilahun C, Travi Y, Valles V. Mechanism of degradation of the quality of natural water in the Lakes region of the Ethiopian Rift Valley. *Water Resour.* 2001; 35:2819–2832.
93. Zhang Y, Fox AD, Cao L, Jia Q, Lu C, Prins HHT, De-Boer WF. Effects of ecological and anthropogenic factors on waterbird abundance at a Ramsar Site in the Yangtze River Floodplain. *Ambio.* 2019; 48(3):293–303.
94. Cooke R, Hogan F, Isaac B, Weaving M, White JG. Urbanization and Raptors: Trends and Research Approaches. In: Boal CW, Dykstra CR, editors. *Urban Raptors*. Washington: Island Press; 2018.
95. Solaro C. Costs and benefits of urban living in raptors. In: Sarasola JH, Grande JM, Negro JJ, editors. *Birds of Prey*. Springer publishing; 2018. p. 177–196.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-73745-4>
96. Meunier FD, Verheyden C, Jouventin P. Use of roadsides by diurnal raptors in agricultural landscapes. *Biol. Conserv.* 2000; 92:291–298.
97. Pennington DN, Blair RB. Using gradient analysis to uncover pattern and process in urban bird communities. In: Lepczyk CA, Warren PS, editors. *Urban bird ecology and conservation: studies in avian biology*. Berkeley: University of California Press; 2012. p. 9–32.
98. Berry M, Bock C, Haire S. Abundance of diurnal raptors on open space grasslands in an urbanized landscape. *Condor.* 1998; 100: 601–608.
<http://hairelab.com/files/Berryetal1998>

99. Bellocq M, Filloy J, Garaffa P. Influence of agricultural intensity and urbanization on the abundance of the raptor chimango caracara (*Milvago chimango*) in the Pampean region of Argentina. Ann. Zool. Fenn. 2008; 45:128–134.
100. Carrete M, Tella J. Individual consistency in flight initiation distances in burrowing owls: a new hypothesis on disturbance-induced habitat selection. Biol. Lett. 2010; 6:167–170. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rsbl.2009.0739>
101. Pedrini P, Sergio F. Golden eagle *Aquila chrysaetos* density and productivity in relation to land abandonment and forest expansion in the alps. Bird Study. 2001; 48:194–199.
102. Watson RT, Cade TJ, Hunt G, Fuller M, Potapov E. Gyrfalcons and Ptarmigan in a Changing World. vol. I and II. The Peregrine Fund Boise; 2011.
103. Thiollay JM. Family Accipitridae (hawks and eagles). In: del Hoyo J, Elliott A, Sargatal J, editors. Handbook of the birds of the world volume 2. New world vultures to guineafowl. Spain: Lynx Editions; 1994. p. 52–105.
104. Garcia JT, Alda F, Terraube J, Mougeot F, Sternalski A, Bretagnolle V, Arroyo B. Demographic history genetic structure and gene flow in a steppe-associated raptor species. BMC Evol. Biol. 2011; 11:333.
105. Molina B, Martínez F. El Aguilucho Lagunero en España. Población en 2006 y métodos de censo. Madrid: Seo/BirdLife; 2008.
106. Cardador L, Carrete M, Manosa S. Can intensive agricultural landscapes favour some raptor species? The marsh-harrier in North-Eastern Spain. Anim. Conserv. 2011; 14:382–390.
107. Mougeot F, Garcia JT, Viñuela J. Breeding biology behaviour diet and conservation of the red kite (*Milvus milvus*) with particular emphasis on Mediterranean populations. In: Zuberogoitia I, Martínez JE, editors. Ecology and conservation of European dwelling forest raptors and owls; 2011.p. 190–204.

108. Paz A, Jareño D, Arroyo L, Viñuela J, Arroyo B, Mougeot F, Luque-Larena JJ, Fargallo JA. Avian predators as a biological control system of common vole (*Microtus arvalis*) populations in North-Western Spain: experimental set-up and preliminary results. Pest Manag. Sci. 2013; 69:444–450.
109. Virani MZ, Harper DM. Factors influencing the breeding performance of the Augur Buzzard *Buteo augur* in southern Lake Naivasha Rift Valley Kenya. Ostrich. 2009; 80:9–17.
110. Buij R, Croes BM, Gort G, Komdeur J. The role of breeding range diet mobility and body size in associations of raptor communities and land-use in a west African savanna. Biol. Conserv. 2013; 166:231–246.
111. Gamauf A, Preleuthner M, Winkler H. Philippine birds of prey: Interrelations among habitat morphology and behavior: The Auk. 1998; 115(3):713–726.
112. Fisher IJ, Pain DJ, Thomas VG. A review of lead poisoning from ammunition sources in terrestrial birds. Biol. Conserv. 2006; 131(3):421–432.
113. Jones MP; Pierce KE; Ward D. Avian vision: a review of form and function with special consideration to birds of prey. J. Exotic Pet Med. 2007; 16:69–87.
114. Smith SB, McPherson KH, Backer JM, Pierce BJ, Podlesak DW, McWilliams SR. Fruit quality and consumption by songbirds during autumn migration. Wilson J. Ornithol. 2007; 119:419–428.
115. Sarasola JH, Negro JJ. Hunting success of wintering Swainson’s Hawks: environmental effects on timing and choice of foraging method. Can. J. Zool. 2005; 83:1353–1359.
116. Aynalem S, Bekele A. Species composition relative abundance and distribution of bird fauna of riverine and wetland habitats of Infranz and Yiganda at southern tip of Lake Tana Ethiopia. Trop. Ecol. 2008; 49:199–209.

117. Ericia V, Den B, Tom Y, Meire P. Water bird communities in the Lower Zeeschelde:
Long-term changes near an expanding harbour. *Hydrobiology*. 2005; 540:237–258.
118. Gaston KJ, Blackburn TM, Greenwood JD, Greroryx RD, Rachel MQ, Lawton JH.
Abundance-occupancy relationships. *J Appl. Ecol*. 2000; 37:39–59.
119. Maeda T, Yoshida H. Responses of birds in rice fields to winter flooding. *Jap. J.*
Ornithol. 2009; 58:55–64.
120. Katayama N, Amano T, Naoe S, Yamakita T, Komatsu I, Takagawa SI, Sato N, Ueta
M, Miyashita T. Landscape Heterogeneity biodiversity relationship: Effect of range
size. *PLoS ONE*. 2014; 9(3):e93359. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0093359>
121. Manu SA. Effects of habitat fragmentation on the distribution of forest birds in south
western Nigeria with particular reference to the Ibadan Malimbe and other malimbess.
Ph.D Thesis. University of Oxford; 2000.
122. Girma Z, Mamo Y, Mengesha G, Verma A, Asfaw T. Seasonal abundance and habitat
use of bird species in and around Wondo Genet Forest south-central Ethiopia. *Ecol Evol*.
2017; 7:3397–3405. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ece3.2926>