Are Protected Areas Effective In the Conservation of Priority Areas for Freshwater Insects In Brazil?

Karina Dias-Silva

Federal University of Para

Thiago Vieira (✉ vieiratb@ufpa.br)

Federal University of Para

Felipe Ferraz Figueiredo Moreira

Oswaldo Cruz Foundation

Leandro Juen

Federal University of Para

Neusa Hamada

National Institute of Amazonian Research

Research Article

Keywords:

Posted Date: July 15th, 2021

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.21203/rs.3.rs-700484/v1>

License: © ⓘ This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.

[Read Full License](#)

Abstract

Biodiversity conservation has faced many challenges, especially the conversion of natural areas that compete with use for agriculture, energy production and mineral extraction. This problem is further aggravated by lack of knowledge of the biodiversity that exists and the geographical distribution of different groups. The objectives of our study were to examine the distributional pattern of Gerromorpha diversity in Brazil, create a map of conservation priority areas, measure the importance level of the current network of protected areas, and identify the size thresholds in geographical distributions that would allow species to be protected. We used species occurrences from the Water Bugs Distributional Database, and we used 19 bioclimatic variables to build models of the potential distributions of species using the MaxEnt program. Using the potential model results, we calculated diversity metrics and overlapped them with the current state and federal “conservation units” (protected areas for biodiversity) in Brazil. Total beta diversity and turnover portions were separated into two faunistic groups, one in northern and the other in southern Brazil. The Amazon has higher beta diversity than what was predicted by the null models. We detected a positive relationship between species distribution area and occurrence in conservation units. Conservation units with less than 250 km² do not protect Gerromorpha species. We reinforce the necessity of formulating new conservation strategies for this group, contemplating species with both restricted and ample distributions, because rare and specialist species are the most harmed by habitat reduction, given that they are more sensitive to environmental disturbance.

Introduction

Biodiversity conservation has faced many challenges in the past few years, especially because of the speed with which natural areas have been converted to areas for agriculture, energy production, mineral extraction and real-estate development ¹. This challenge is even bigger when areas of economic interest overlap with areas that are important for biological conservation ^{2,3}, creating socio-economic conflicts. In addition, the definition of areas for conservation is intended for flag species, synergistic species or species with a social appeal ^{4,5}, leaving aquatic and terrestrial insects out of this planning ⁶. One way of diminishing this problem is by creating and implementing conservation units to conciliate nature conservation with sustainable resource use, making a human presence in protected areas compatible with biodiversity conservation. In Brazil there are 12 types of “conservation units” (CUs) (*Unidades de Conservação* in Portuguese), or protected areas for biodiversity ⁷. The different types of CUs differ in the level of access permitted; some are similar to ecological sanctuaries and have effective protection, being restricted to scientific research. Some unit types are less restricted and allow use for recreation (e.g., National Parks) and even for resource exploitation (Extractive Reserves). Generally, each protected area has rules regarding its use. These areas shelter a high diversity of species, ecosystem services and traditions. CUs provide biodiversity maintenance, and (in some cases) biodiversity recovery ⁷. However, not all protection measures are complete, sometimes being inefficient because the areas tend to be selected arbitrarily based either on the empirical knowledge of researchers or by being placed in areas with difficult access, which limits competing interests for agriculture or for real-estate development.

Selection may be done considering only the specific characteristics of a restricted biological group, usually only accounting for terrestrial biodiversity⁸. Brazil's current CU network is insufficient and does not adequately protect biodiversity^{6,9}.

The selection of priority areas for conservation must consider an area's representativeness, irreplaceability, flexibility, complementarity and persistence¹⁰. Area selection is based on biogeographical and ecologically georeferenced information, so as to permit analyses and interpretation at different scales¹¹. However, it is often impossible to fully protect these components due to the lack of biogeographical information on species^{3,12}. In the Neotropical region the lack of knowledge is acute regarding real species distribution (the "Wallacean shortfall")¹². For instance, in Brazil, biogeographical information on species is scarce, even for biodiversity hotspots. Lack of information, together with the lack of financial resources and the overlapping interests between agricultural development and conservation are the main challenges in defining priority areas for conservation^{6,13}. In addition, we do not know whether the current reserve network is sufficient to protect all the taxonomic groups. A study carried out with bats in the Cerrado showed that species with restricted distributions tend not to be covered by conservation units¹⁴. This result leads us to question the effectiveness of conservation units, especially for key species in ecosystems (such as aquatic insects, which are not charismatic).

Inefficiency of reserve networks may be related to non-protection of rare species⁶ or to choosing areas that are marginally adequate for species distributions¹⁵. One way of reducing inefficiency is by using other criteria for area selection, e.g., species richness, beta diversity, fauna complementarity and the number of endemic species^{3,16}. These parameters, along with use of species-distribution models (SDMs) could reduce the problem of lack of knowledge about distributions that leads to protection of marginally adequate areas. This knowledge would allow selection of areas having high probability of occurrence of a species and that provide favorable environmental conditions for its ecological niche may be selected. Although this approach has been robust for conservation, the criteria used are generally based on a few groups of vertebrates and plants, which reduces the effectiveness of protected areas for conserving the biodiversity of all groups. Consequently, several biodiversity components, such as aquatic invertebrates, might not be included in the protected areas^{6,9}.

In aquatic ecosystems, macroinvertebrates stand out from other groups because of their sensitivity to environmental impact^{17,18} and their role in nutrient cycling and energy transfer in food chains. Insects in the suborder Heteroptera are predators, are at the top of food chains, can respond to changes happening in lower trophic levels, and are considered to be good models for evaluating environmental impact¹⁹. Heteroptera occupy an ample variety of habitats, including waterbodies that are either lotic or lentic and either perennial or temporary; these insects have an important role in biological control in waterbodies^{20–23}. Heteroptera is composed of three infraorders: Nepomorpha (truly aquatic), Gerromorpha and Lepdomorpha (both semi-aquatic). The suborder Gerromorpha is divided into 20 families, 325 genera, and approximately 4700 species inhabiting freshwater ecosystems: 28% of these species are in the

Neotropics²⁴. Most Gerromorpha species live over the water column, either on floating plants or between plant roots on the edges of bodies of fresh water²⁵. Thus, they are affected by forest removal and increased waterflow in streams^{22,26}. Approximately 2100 species have been described for Gerromorpha, which currently has eight families and about 160 genera²⁴, of which 206 species and subspecies occur in Brazil²⁷. This group was chosen because it occupies various types of aquatic ecosystems, has an ample geographical distribution, and perhaps acts as an umbrella or surrogate group encompassing additional aquatic species that inhabit the same sites^{28,29}.

Due to the speed with which natural areas have been modified by anthropogenic activities and the lack of knowledge about the state of conservation of aquatic insects, our objectives are to: (i) describe distributional patterns of Gerromorpha diversity (Richness and Beta Diversity) among Brazilian biomes; (ii) create a map of conservation priority areas for this group; (iii) assess the importance of the current network of conservation units and (iv) identify the threshold in geographical distribution size needed to protect species under the current Brazilian system of conservation units.

Materials And Methods

Species occurrence data

Species occurrences (Fig. 1) were obtained from the Water Bugs Distributional Database (available at <https://sites.google.com/site/distributionaldatabase/>). This database represents an extensive research effort to obtain information from the literature. The database contains occurrence information for all Gerromorpha species known in Brazil together with the sources from which the information was obtained. More information about the database is available Dias-Silva et al³⁰,

Environmental Variables

Initially, species-occurrence data were transformed into decimal degrees (in datum SAD 69), using the SpeciesLink website. In order to avoid any bias caused by geographically imprecise data, we eliminated occurrences where the distance between point coordinates and the seat of the municipality was less than 2 km^{31,32}.

We used 19 bioclimatic variables to build the models; the values were obtained from monthly data on temperature and precipitation available on the WorldClim platform (Hijmans et al., 2005). The climatic variables have a resolution of approximately 9 km (≈ 0.083 decimal degrees) and are highly colinear. In order to solve or reduce the multicollinearity problem, we performed a principal component analysis (PCA)³³, from which we extracted seven axes that explained, in total, 95% of the variation in the original dataset. These axes were used as predictive environmental variables in the potential species distribution model (SDM). We tried therefore to reduce the multicollinearity problem of the original variables, making it possible to model species distributions with a small dataset on occurrence³⁴.

Distribution models and model evaluation

Potential species distributions were estimated using the MaxEnt (Maximum Entropy Modeling) program version 3.3.3³⁵. To analyze the performance of the potential species distribution model, we used two techniques: AUC (area under the curve) and TSS (true skilled statistics). The AUC measure, which is the area under the ROC (receiver operating characteristic) curve, has scores varying between 0 and 1, where values ≤ 0.5 represent similar predictive models obtained randomly and values ≥ 0.7 are considered acceptable^{36,37}. True skilled statistics (TSS) was also used to evaluate model quality, this measure varies from -1 to 1, where scores close to zero and negative scores are no better than random scores, and scores close to 1 have a perfect adjustment between the observed distribution and the predicted distribution³⁸. Values ≥ 0.5 indicate acceptable models. To convert predicted species distributions into presence/absence maps, we used threshold values^{39,40} that were derived from the ROC curve. Use of the maximum threshold value maximizes the specificity and sensitivity of models and tends to produce more-restricted distributions. Additionally, we performed a Monte Carlo simulation test to evaluate the dependency of AUC on the number of occurrences⁶ (Table 1). Thus, we divided the data into five classes (with an interval of 15 locations between the classes) and considered the first class (4–15 locations) to be the control, using the mean AUC as a critical value. For AUC value simulations we maintained the species number inside the classes equal and calculated the mean AUC of random species. This procedure was repeated 10,000 times and the simulated AUC values greater than or equal to the values for the control class were considered to be scores obtained at random. This procedure was repeated for all classes, and the result was not significant. This means that there is no relationship between the number of sites and AUC values, indicating that the models are reliable⁴¹.

Table 1
Values of Monte Carlo tests performed to identify the relationship between the numbers of occurrences and the observed AUC values

Number of Occurrences	Number of Species	AUC mean	p
4 to 15	76	0.915	
16 to 30	18	0.954	0.63
31 to 45	10	0.951	0.82
46 to 60	2	0.918	0.52
61 to 75	4	0.902	0.96
AUC = area under the curve			

Data Analysis

To identify the spatial distribution of Gerromorpha diversity in Brazil, we used a grid with a resolution of 0.083° (the same resolution as the SDM) and extracted information on species presence and absence from potential distribution maps. Therefore, each row represents a grid cell and each column represents a

species, and the spreadsheet cells represent species presence or absence. Using this table, we calculated the total species richness of each cell based on the sum of lines and beta diversity, using the procedure described by Baselga et al.⁴², in which diversity is partitioned into portions for nestedness and turnover, and the sum of these portions represents total beta diversity. For the spatialization of beta diversity (the total of the nested and turnover portions), we performed a principal coordinate analysis (PCoA)³³ with each diversity matrix, and the first PCoA axis was used as a synthesis of diversity per cell. Thus, we obtained values for richness, total beta diversity, nested beta diversity and turnover beta diversity for each grid cell. This allowed us to spatialize diversity values by categorizing the cells into color gradients. This procedure was performed for each of the diversity measures.

We used a Monte Carlo randomization procedure with 10,000 randomizations to evaluate diversity distribution among Brazilian biomes. For this procedure we developed a routine in the R environment that classifies grid cells according to the biome to which cells belong and calculates the mean and standard deviation of the diversity metrics for each biome. We chose cells randomly for the significance test (always controlling the number of observed cells in the biome) and calculated the mean random diversity. To calculate the significance value, we identified the number of random values higher than the observed values and divided them by 10,001. This procedure was performed for richness and total beta diversity.

To determine priority areas for conservation of aquatic species in Brazil, we used the Zonation algorithm⁴³, along with data on the potential distribution of an indicator organism (Gerromorpha). Zonation is a quantitative method that prioritizes conservation areas, aiming for long-term biodiversity persistence⁴⁴. Evaluation is done by randomly removing cells. This analysis can be performed using three algorithms: Core-area Zonation, Additive benefit function and Target-based planning. For this study, we used the additive-benefit function because it is best suited for a high number of species. This analysis initiates with the complete landscape, where sites are classified based on biological value (complementarity and irreplaceability), and the less-valuable cells are removed one (or more) at a time, producing a sequence of landscape structures with more resources for biodiversity⁴⁵.

To evaluate the difference in importance between protected and unprotected cells, we used a second routine in the R environment⁴⁶ based on the Monte Carlo randomization test with 10,000 randomizations. Cells were classified into those that were “protected” (if they were totally or at least 50% within a conservation unit) and those that were “unprotected,” and the mean importance of protected cells was estimated. The same number of unprotected cells was selected randomly, and we estimated the mean importance. The estimate of the random importance value was calculated 10,000 times, thus creating the expected distribution of the importance values. This procedure was performed for the reserve network of Brazil as a whole and for the reserve network inside each biome. The significance value was obtained by dividing the number of values that were greater than or equal to the observed values by 10,001⁴⁷. The reserve network considered for the analyses was the official map of conservation units in the “full protection” category, which is available on the Brazilian Ministry of Environment (MMA) website

(<http://mapas.mma.gov.br/i3geo/datadownload.htm>). The official biome borders (also available on the MMA website) were considered to represent the historical distribution of the biological biomes.

To evaluate if there is a minimum size for a species to be protected by a conservation unit, we performed a logistic regression between species distributions and their presence/absence inside the units. Species distribution area was estimated using the sum of cell numbers in which the species occurs, and the cells are classified as being inside (1) or outside (0) of conservation units. A non-linear logistic regression model was performed^{41,48}, where presence/absence was considered to be the dependent variable.

Results

Of 208 Gerromorpha species recorded in Brazil, we found 3541 occurrences and modeled 111 species (only species with three or more occurrences are suitable for this procedure) (Table S1). Significant portions of the species-occurrence sites were in the Southeastern Region of Brazil, in the Atlantic Forest biome, and in the Northern Region (Amazon) (Fig. 1). The areas with the highest richness are the northern portion of the Amazon, eastern and western Cerrado, and a small coastal portion in the northern Atlantic Forest (Fig. 2a). The Atlantic Forest and the Amazon have higher richness than predicted (Table 2); the northern portions of the Cerrado biome, the Caatinga biome and the central portion of the Amazon biome had the lowest expected richness (Fig. 2a), and these values did not differ from what was predicted. When evaluating total beta diversity, the highest values were found for the Northern Region of Brazil (Fig. 2b), and the Amazon biome had higher beta diversity than predicted (Table 2). However, when evaluating the components of beta diversity, the turnover portion (Fig. 2d) was greatest in the Southern Region of Brazil (Fig. 2c). On the other hand, in the nested portion we found the areas with the lowest species richness values (the northern Cerrado and Caatinga, as well as the central Amazon); these are the areas with the highest nestedness values for Gerromorpha (Fig. 2d).

Table 2

Random and observed mean (M) and standard deviation (SD) values of Gerromorpha richness and total beta diversity in Brazilian biomes. N – number of observed cells in each biome; p – significance value according to the Monte Carlo randomization test

Biome	N	Richness			Beta Diversity		
		Observed (M ± SD)	Random (M ± SD)	p	Observed (M ± SD)	Random (M ± SD)	p
Amazon	998	36 ± 12	32 ± 1	< 0.001	0.159 ± 0.177	< 0.001 ± 0.005	< 0.001
Caatinga	231	17 ± 8	32 ± 2	0.984	0.030 ± 0.181	< 0.001 ± 0.150	0.024
Cerrado	468	29 ± 14	32 ± 1	0.893	(-)0.185 ± 0.211	< 0.001 ± 0.010	0.074
Atlantic Forest	194	38 ± 11	32 ± 1	< 0.001	(-)0.317 ± 0.143	< 0.001 ± 0.017	0.872
Pampas	57	22 ± 5	32 ± 2	0.072	(-)0.220 ± 0.170	< 0.001 ± 0.033	0.032
Pantanal	21	30 ± 3	32 ± 4	0.771	(-)0.273 ± 0.137	< 0.001 ± 0.056	0.023

The map of cell importance for conservation (Fig. 3) shows that cells in the northern Amazon, the eastern and western Cerrado and in the coastal portion of the Atlantic Forest are important to Gerromorpha conservation, and many locations that are considered priority areas are outside of conservation units. In general, the biomes did not differ in terms of importance for the conservation of Gerromorpha (Table 3), and we observed for both the general model (evaluating conservation units in Brazil as a whole) and the regional models (evaluating the CUs in each biome) that conservation units do not protect either more or less areas that are considered to be important for Gerromorpha than what was randomly expected (Table 3). Lastly, we observed a positive relationship between species distribution areas and species occurrences in conservation units ($\chi^2_{(1)} = 36.144$ $p < 0.001$). The minimum occurrence for a species to be present within a conservation unit is approximately five cells, i.e., 250 km² (Fig. 4).

Table 3

Random and observed mean (M) and standard deviation (SD) of importance values for the conservation of Gerromorpha in Brazil (Total) and for each biome. N – number of observed cells in each biome; NUC – number of protected cells in each biome; p – significance value according to the Monte Carlo randomization test

Biome	N	Conservation Unit				Biome		
		NUC	Observed (M ± SD)	Random (M ± SD)	p	Observed (M ± SD)	Random (M ± SD)	p
Total	1969	262	0.462 ± 0.097	0.503 ± 0.066	0.811			
Amazon	998	188	0.509 ± 0.082	0.502 ± 0.019	0.344	0.502 ± 0.081	0.502 ± 0.000	0.965
Caatinga	231	16	0.208 ± 0.053	0.174 ± 0.043	0.210	0.174 ± 0.032	0.174 ± 0.002	0.986
Cerrado	468	34	0.361 ± 0.085	0.455 ± 0.051	0.966	0.455 ± 0.096	0.455 ± 0.003	0.586
Atlantic Forest	194	19	0.492 ± 0.202	0.624 ± 0.062	0.977	0.623 ± 0.082	0.624 ± 0.004	0.987
Pampas	57	4	0.118 ± 0.056	0.294 ± 0.119	0.916	0.294 ± 0.060	0.294 ± 0.014	0.978
Pantanal	21	1	0.549	0.498 ± 0.259	0.985	0.501 ± 0.070	0.498 ± 0.067	0.264

Discussion

Cells protected by conservation units (CUs) have a lower degree of importance than expected. This low importance, determined according to Gerromorpha biodiversity, may be related to the fact CUs have been created arbitrarily, probably based on economic interest or to protect specific taxonomic groups³ that are not aquatic⁹. These results indicate that the current network of CUs does little to protect Gerromorpha species, especially those with restricted distributions, and especially species with distributions smaller than 250 km². CUs may be protecting sites with marginal environmental suitability for the occurrence of these species (e.g., Nóbrega and de Marco 2011; Sánchez-Fernández et al. 2013; Silva et al. 2018), thereby making these species more susceptible to environmental change, such as anthropogenic activities and climate change. These results support the conclusion that conservation strategies should be based on conservation policies and not only on the productive value of the areas (which are generally areas with low agricultural interest), or for reasons that are often political⁴⁹. When decisions on protected areas are based solely on economic and political interests they reduce the possibility of including species with restricted distributions or that occur in areas with high economic value for agricultural production

Creating new conservation units is a slow process because creating them depends on financial resources to buy land, provide area maintenance and pay teams working in the unit, besides the various impediments imposed by the conflicts-of-interest mentioned earlier. Thus, an economically viable possibility would be to maintain existing forest fragments and encourage farmers to maintain legal reserves and riparian vegetation. Forest remnants and legal-reserve areas would act as steppingstones for biodiversity, helping maintain connectivity among CUs. In addition, riparian vegetation maintenance keeps catchments fully preserved, further enhancing connectivity among remnants, legal reserves and CUs. Finally, we emphasize that, although the maintenance of riparian forests is considered to be sufficient for maintaining the Gerromorpha stream community, we must include other areas besides the riparian strip. This maintenance should be done in strategic areas, such as the ones presented in this paper, in order to avoid the risk of preserving only species with wide occurrence ranges and leaving rare and restricted species outside the network of CUs.

In terms of species richness, we found that the Atlantic Forest and the Amazon biomes shelter the highest number of Gerromorpha species per unit area, and the richness in these biomes is higher than expected, suggesting that the habitats of these biomes are more heterogeneous than in the other Brazilian biomes. This idea is supported by the results on total beta diversity, suggesting that the Gerromorpha composition in these biomes results from conspicuous environmental gradients. On the other hand, we observed the Pampas biome to have fewer species than expected, suggesting that these areas have low heterogeneity for the group.

Regarding priority areas for Gerromorpha sampling, we observed that all biomes have sampling deficits. Some examples are the “arc of deforestation” in the southern portion of the Amazon biome, large parts of the Pantanal and Caatinga biomes, and part of the Atlantic Forest biome. In general, we observed that most sampling is concentrated near institutions that have a researcher interested in aquatic insects, such as sites near the city of Manaus where the National Institute of Research in Amazonia (INPA) is located and where an aquatic-insect research group is coordinated by Dr. Neusa Hamada, sites in the state of Mato Grosso, where the Mato Grosso State University (UNEMAT) is located, along with the aquatic-insect research group coordinated by Dr. Helena Soares Ramos Cabette, in the Southeastern Region, where the Federal University of Minas Gerais is located, with studies on aquatic and semi-aquatic Heteroptera coordinated by Dr. Alan Lane de Melo, along with the Federal University of Rio de Janeiro (UFRJ) with both the research group coordinated by Dr. Jorge Luiz Nessimian and studies by Dr. Felipe F.F. Moreira, most of the time at sites that are close to roads and easily accessible.

If we consider Brazil's vast river network we can conclude that the number of records we have is small, providing an example of the “Wallacean shortfall”⁵⁴, where information about species distributions is still insufficient. Additional sampling is needed so that information on species distributions can be expanded and more occurrence sites can be identified, enabling the discovery of new species and the generation of information on species distributions to assist in choosing conservation areas⁵¹. We also emphasize the importance of evaluating the extreme northern portion of the Amazon and the southeastern Cerrado, which are very relevant for conservation and have high species richness but are not

well studied. Furthermore, the southeastern portion of the Cerrado stands out for its large turnover component, suggesting a strong environmental filter, possibly due to the existence of small fragments of vegetation. The northern portion of the Cerrado and the Caatinga stand out for their nesting components, suggesting that dispersion is easily observed in these areas. This result has already been observed for bats in the Cerrado, and the nesting component was justified by the existence of large preserved areas in the northern portion of the biome, which is facilitated the mobility of bats ¹⁴. The turnover component was justified by the local extinction of some species because the southern and southwestern portions of the Cerrado are highly fragmented, which hampers dispersal and may cause local extinctions of species. The high diversity of Gerromorpha in these regions is also congruent with other biological groups, e.g., birds, reptiles, amphibians and non-flying mammals ^{55,56}. Hence, by preserving the diversity of Gerromorpha, we are also preserving the diversity of other groups, and ensuring that ecosystems can sustain themselves and recover from stochastic events or even climate-change events. We therefore stress that CUs defined with little or no planning have low importance for Gerromorpha conservation and do not contemplate species with restricted distributions (less than 250 km² for Gerromorpha). New strategies for the conservation of this group are necessary, especially strategies that conserve both species with restricted ranges and those with ample distributions ⁶ because rare and specialist species are the most affected by habitat reduction and are the most sensitive to environmental disturbance.

Declarations

Acknowledgments

KDS is thankful to the Conselho Nacional de Desenvolvimento Científico e Tecnológico (CNPq) for granting her a postdoctoral scholarship (Process N ° 150288/2015-8). LJ and NH received continuous research support from CNPq productivity grants (Processes 304710/2019-9 and 308970/ 2019-5). TBV received a scholarship from Coordenação de Aperfeiçoamento de Pessoal de Nível Superior - Brasil (CAPES). This study was financed in part by CAPES (Finance Code 001). We thank Philip Fearnside for the English correction.

Author contribution statement

Karina Dias da Silva – Write original draft; Conceptualization

Thiago Bernardi Vieira – Data analyses; Review and editing draft

Felipe Ferraz Figueiredo Moreira – Data Curation; Review and editing draft

Leandro Juen - Review and editing draft

Neusa Hamada – Supervision; Conceptualization; Review and editing draft

Funding information

Conselho Nacional de Desenvolvimento Científico e Tecnológico (CNPq) - Process N ° 150288/2015-8, 304710/2019-9 and 308970/ 2019-5.

Coordenação de Aperfeiçoamento de Pessoal de Nível Superior - Brasil (CAPES) - Finance Code 001.

Ethical statements

Not applicable

Consent to participate

Not applicable

Consent to publish

Not applicable

Competing interest statements

There is no conflict of interest.

Data availability statements

All occurrences data are available in Water Bugs Distributional Database (<https://sites.google.com/site/distributionaldatabase/>)

References

1. Brooks, T. M. *et al.* Global biodiversity conservation priorities. *Science* (80-.), **313**, 58–61 (2006).
2. Camacho-Sandoval, J. & Duque, H. Indicators for biodiversity assessment in Costa Rica. *Agric. Ecosyst. Environ*, **87**, 141–150 (2001).
3. Diniz-Filho, J. A. F. *et al.* Ensemble forecasting shifts in climatically suitable areas for *Tropidacris cristata* (Orthoptera: Acridoidea: Romaleidae). *Insect Conserv. Divers*, <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1752-4598.2010.00090.x> (2010).
4. Morse-Jones, S. *et al.* Stated preferences for tropical wildlife conservation amongst distant beneficiaries: Charisma, endemism, scope and substitution effects. *Ecol. Econ.* **78**, (2012).
5. Verissimo, D., MacMillan, D. C. & Smith, R. J. Toward a systematic approach for identifying conservation flagships. *Conservation Letters* vol. 4 (2011).
6. Nóbrega, C. C. & De Marco, P. Unprotecting the rare species: a niche-based gap analysis for odonates in a core Cerrado area. *Divers. Distrib*, **17**, 491–505 (2011).
7. SNUC, (Sistema Nacional de Unidades de Conservação da Natureza). Lei nº 9.985, de 18 de julho de 2000. *Mma/Sbf* (2000) doi:10.1017/CBO9781107415324.004.

8. Abell, R., Allan, J. D. & Lehner, B. Unlocking the potential of protected areas for freshwaters. *Biol. Conserv*, **134**, 48–63 (2007).
9. Monteiro, C. S., Esposito, M. C. & Juen, L. Are the adult odonate species found in a protected area different from those present in the surrounding zone? A case study from eastern Amazonia. *J. Insect Conserv*, **20**, 643–652 (2016).
10. Margules, C. R. & Pressey, R. L. Systematic conservation planning. *Nature*, **405**, 243–253 (2000).
11. Whittaker, R. J. *et al.* Conservation Biogeography: assessment and prospect. *Divers. Distrib*, **11**, 3–23 (2005).
12. Bini, L. M., Diniz-Filho, J. A. F., Rangel, T. F. L. V. B., Bastos, R. P. & Pinto, M. P. Challenging Wallacean and Linnean shortfalls: Knowledge gradients and conservation planning in a biodiversity hotspot. *Divers. Distrib*, <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1366-9516.2006.00286.x> (2006).
13. Rodrigues, A. S. L. & Gaston, K. J. Maximising phylogenetic diversity in the selection of networks of conservation areas. *Biol. Conserv*, [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0006-3207\(01\)00208-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0006-3207(01)00208-7) (2002).
14. Silva, D. C., Vieira, T. B., da Silva, J. M. & de Cassia Faria, K. Biogeography and priority areas for the conservation of bats in the Brazilian Cerrado. *Biodivers. Conserv*, **27**, 815–828 (2018).
15. Salkeld, D. J., Padgett, K. A. & Jones, J. H. A meta-analysis suggesting that the relationship between biodiversity and risk of zoonotic pathogen transmission is idiosyncratic. *Ecol. Lett*, **16**, 679–686 (2013).
16. Juen, L. & de Marco, P. Dragonfly endemism in the Brazilian Amazon: Competing hypotheses for biogeographical patterns. *Biodivers. Conserv*, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10531-012-0377-0> (2012).
17. Doughty, C. R. Freshwater biomonitoring and benthic macroinvertebrates, edited by D. M. Rosenberg and V. H. Resh, Chapman and Hall, New York 1993. ix + 488pp. Price: £39.95. ISBN 0412 02251 6. *Aquat. Conserv. Mar. Freshw. Ecosyst.* **4**, 92–92 (1994).
18. Harper, D. M., Rosenberg, D. A. & Resh, V. H. Freshwater Biomonitoring and Benthic Macroinvertebrates. *J. Appl. Ecol*, **31**, 790 (1994).
19. Cunha, E. J. & Juen, L. Impacts of oil palm plantations on changes in environmental heterogeneity and Heteroptera (Gerromorpha and Nepomorpha) diversity. *J. Insect Conserv*, **21**, 111–119 (2017).
20. Schuh, R. T. & Slater, J. A. *True bugs of the World (Hemiptera: Heteroptera). Classification and Natural History* (Cornell University press, 1995).
21. Giehl, N. F., Dias-Silva, S., Juen, K., Batista, L. & Cabette, H. S. R. da,, , J. D. & Taxonomic and Numerical Resolutions of Nepomorpha (Insecta: Heteroptera) in Cerrado Streams. *PLoS One* **9**, e103623(2014).
22. Dias-Silva, K., Cabette, H. S. R., Juen, L. & Jr, P. D. M. The influence of habitat integrity and physical-chemical water variables on the structure of aquatic and semi-aquatic Heteroptera. *Zool*, **27**, 918–930 (2010).
23. Panizzi, A. R. & Grazia, J. *True Bugs (Heteroptera) of the Neotropics. True Bugs (Heteroptera) of the Neotropics* vol. 2 (Springer Netherlands, 2015).

24. Polhemus, J. T. & Polhemus, D. A. Global diversity of true bugs (Heteroptera; Insecta) in freshwater., <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10750-007-9033-1> (2008).
25. Nieser, N. & Melo, A. L. *Os Heterópteros Aquáticos de Minas Gerais* (UFMG, Belo Horizonte, 1997).
26. Cunha, E. J., de Assis Montag, L. F. & Juen, L. Oil palm crops effects on environmental integrity of Amazonian streams and Heteropteran (Hemiptera) species diversity. *Ecol. Indic*, **52**, 422–429 (2015).
27. *Biodivers. Data J.* **3**, e4913 (2015).
28. Rodrigues, A. S. L. & Brooks, T. M. Shortcuts for Biodiversity Conservation Planning: The Effectiveness of Surrogates. *Annu. Rev. Ecol. Evol. Syst*, **38**, 713–737 (2007).
29. Andelman, S. J. & Fagan, W. F. Umbrellas and flagships: Efficient conservation surrogates or expensive mistakes? *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.* **97**, 5954–5959(2000).
30. Dias-Silva, K. *et al.* (Hemiptera: Heteroptera) of eastern Mato Grosso State, Brazil: Checklist, new records, and species distribution modeling. *Zootaxa*, <https://doi.org/10.11646/zootaxa.3736.3.1> (2013).
31. Ferraz, K. M. P. M., de Ferraz, B., de Paula, S. F., de Beisiegel, R. C., Breitenmoser, C. & B. & Species Distribution Modeling for Conservation Purposes. *Nat. Conserv*, **10**, 214–220 (2012).
32. Marco-Júnior, P. & Siqueira, M. F. Como determinar a distribuição potencial de espécies sob uma abordagem conservacionista? *Megadiversidade*(2009).
33. Borcard, D., Gillet, F. & Legendre, P. Numerical Ecology with R. Numerical Ecology with R(Springer New York, 2011). doi:10.1007/978-1-4419-7976-6.
34. Serra, B. D. V., De Marco, P. J., Nóbrega, C. C. & Campos, L. A. D. O. Modeling Potential Geographical Distribution of the Wild Nests of *Melipona capixaba* Moure & Camargo, 1994 (Hymenoptera, Apidae): Conserving Isolated Populations in Mountain Habitats. *Nat. e Conserv*, **10**, 199–206 (2012).
35. Phillips, S. J., Anderson, R. P. & Schapire, R. E. Maximum entropy modeling of species geographic distributions. *Ecol. Modell*, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolmodel.2005.03.026> (2006).
36. Swets, J. Measuring the accuracy of diagnostic systems. *Science (80-.)*, **240**, 1285–1293 (1988).
37. Girardello, M., Griggio, M., Whittingham, M. J. & Rushton, S. P. Identifying important areas for butterfly conservation in Italy. *Anim. Conserv*, <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1469-1795.2008.00216.x> (2009).
38. Allouche, O., Tsoar, A. & Kadmon, R. Assessing the accuracy of species distribution models: prevalence, kappa and the true skill statistic (TSS). *J. Appl. Ecol*, **43**, 1223–1232 (2006).
39. Elith, J. *et al.* Novel methods improve prediction of species' distributions from occurrence data. *Ecography (Cop.)*, <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2006.0906-7590.04596.x> (2006).
40. Pearson, R. G., Raxworthy, C. J. & Nakamura, M. & Townsend Peterson, A. Predicting species distributions from small numbers of occurrence records: a test case using cryptic geckos in Madagascar. *J. Biogeogr*, **34**, 102–117 (2006).
41. Fielding, A. H. & Bell, J. F. A review of methods for the assessment of prediction errors in conservation presence/absence models. *Environ. Conserv*, **24**, 38–49 (1997).

42. Baselga, A. Partitioning the turnover and nestedness components of beta diversity. *Glob. Ecol. Biogeogr*, <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1466-8238.2009.00490.x> (2010).
43. Moilanen, A. *et al.* Prioritizing multiple-use landscapes for conservation: methods for large multi-species planning problems. *Proc. R. Soc.* 272, 1885–1891(2005).
44. Moilanen, A. *et al.* Zonation spatial conservation planning framework and software v. 3.1, User manual(2012).
45. Moilanen, A. Landscape Zonation, benefit functions and target-based planning: Unifying reserve selection strategies. *Biol. Conserv*, **134**, 571–579 (2007).
46. R Core Team. R: A language and environment for statistical computing. *R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria*. URL <http://www.R-project.org/>. (2019).
47. Carvalho, A. R. de. Método de Monte Carlo e Aplicações. *Repositório Inst. da Univ. Fed. Flum.*84(2017).
48. Feinleib, M. & Zar, J. H. Biostatistical Analysis. *J. Am. Stat. Assoc*, <https://doi.org/10.2307/2285423> (1975).
49. Fearnside, P. M. Conservation Policy in Brazilian Amazonia: Understanding the Dilemmas. *World Dev*, **31**, 757–779 (2003).
50. dos Santos, A. J., Vieira, T. B. & de Faria, K. C. Effects of vegetation structure on the diversity of bats in remnants of Brazilian Cerrado savanna. *Basic Appl. Ecol*, **17**, 720–730 (2016).
51. Groves, C. R. *et al.* Planning for Biodiversity Conservation: Putting Conservation Science into Practice., [https://doi.org/10.1641/0006-3568\(2002\)052](https://doi.org/10.1641/0006-3568(2002)052) (2002).
52. Fearnside, P. M. & Ferraz, J. A. Conservation Gap Analysis of Brazil's Amazonian Vegetation. *Conserv. Biol*, **9**, 1134–1147 (1995).
53. Fearnside, P. M. Introduction: Strategies for Social and Environmental Conservation in Conservation Units. in *The Amazon Várzea*233–238(Springer Netherlands, 2011). doi:10.1007/978-94-007-0146-5_16.
54. Cardoso, P., Erwin, T. L., Borges, P. A. V. & New, T. R. The seven impediments in invertebrate conservation and how to overcome them. *Biol. Conserv*, **144**, 2647–2655 (2011).
55. Marini, M. Ã. & Garcia, F. I. Bird conservation in Brazil. *Conserv. Biol*, <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1523-1739.2005.00706.x> (2005).
56. Young, B. E. *et al.* Population Declines and Priorities for Amphibian Conservation in Latin America. *Conserv. Biol*, **15**, 1213–1223 (2001).

Figures

Figure 1

Gerromorpha species occurrences used in the species distribution models (SDM)

Figure 2

Predicted spatial distributions of a) richness, b) total beta diversity, c) turnover and d) nestedness of Gerromorpha in Brazil

Figure 3

Priority areas for Gerromorpha conservation in Brazil, according to the Zonation algorithm. Values indicate the importance of each cell; the higher the value, the higher the importance

Figure 4

Logistic relationship between Gerromorpha occurrence and presence of these species in CUs. Four species are located outside the protected area of the biome, where zero (0) means location outside a CU and one (1) means presence in a CU

Supplementary Files

This is a list of supplementary files associated with this preprint. Click to download.

- [S120102020.xls](#)