



Once you have Acrobat Reader open on your computer, click on the [Comment](#) tab at the right of the toolbar:



This will open up a panel down the right side of the document. The majority of tools you will use for annotating your proof will be in the [Annotations](#) section, pictured opposite. We've picked out some of these tools below:



### 1. Replace (Ins) Tool – for replacing text.




Strikes a line through text and opens up a text box where replacement text can be entered.

#### How to use it

- Highlight a word or sentence.
- Click on the [Replace \(Ins\)](#) icon in the Annotations section.
- Type the replacement text into the blue box that appears.

standard framework for the analysis of microeconomic activity. Nevertheless, it also led to the development of a number of strategic approaches. The number of competitors in an industry is that the structure of the industry is a main component. At the industry level, are externalities important? (M henceforth) we open the 'black b



### 2. Strikethrough (Del) Tool – for deleting text.



Strikes a red line through text that is to be deleted.

#### How to use it

- Highlight a word or sentence.
- Click on the [Strikethrough \(Del\)](#) icon in the Annotations section.

there is no room for extra profits as mark-ups are zero and the number of firms (net) values are not determined by market clearing. Blanchard ~~and Kiyotaki~~ (1987), perfect competition in general equilibrium. The effects of aggregate demand and supply shocks in a classical framework assuming monopolistic competition and an exogenous number of firms

### 3. Add note to text Tool – for highlighting a section to be changed to bold or italic.



Highlights text in yellow and opens up a text box where comments can be entered.

#### How to use it

- Highlight the relevant section of text.
- Click on the [Add note to text](#) icon in the Annotations section.
- Type instruction on what should be changed regarding the text into the yellow box that appears.

dynamic responses of mark-ups consistent with the VAR evidence

sation by Markov processes. The number of competitors and the impact on the structure of the sector is that the structure of the sector



### 4. Add sticky note Tool – for making notes at specific points in the text.




Marks a point in the proof where a comment needs to be highlighted.

#### How to use it

- Click on the [Add sticky note](#) icon in the Annotations section.
- Click at the point in the proof where the comment should be inserted.
- Type the comment into the yellow box that appears.

and supply shocks. Most of the time, the number of competitors and the impact on the structure of the sector is that the structure of the sector




**5. Attach File Tool – for inserting large amounts of text or replacement figures.**



Inserts an icon linking to the attached file in the appropriate place in the text.

**How to use it**

- Click on the **Attach File** icon in the Annotations section.
- Click on the proof to where you'd like the attached file to be linked.
- Select the file to be attached from your computer or network.
- Select the colour and type of icon that will appear in the proof. Click OK.




**6. Drawing Markups Tools – for drawing shapes, lines and freeform annotations on proofs and commenting on these marks.**

Allows shapes, lines and freeform annotations to be drawn on proofs and for comment to be made on these marks.



**How to use it**

- Click on one of the shapes in the Drawing Markups section.
- Click on the proof at the relevant point and draw the selected shape with the cursor.
- To add a comment to the drawn shape, move the cursor over the shape until an arrowhead appears.
- Double click on the shape and type any text in the red box that appears.



# Natural regeneration and biodiversity: a global meta-analysis and implications for spatial planning

Agnieszka E. Latawiec<sup>1,2,3,4,10</sup>, Renato Crouzeilles<sup>1,2</sup>, Pedro H.S. Brancalion<sup>5</sup>, Ricardo R. Rodrigues<sup>6</sup>, Jerônimo B. Sansevero<sup>1,7</sup>, Juliana Silveira dos Santos<sup>1</sup>, Morena Mills<sup>8</sup>, André Gustavo Nave<sup>9</sup>, and Bernardo B. Strassburg<sup>1,4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> International Institute for Sustainability, Estrada Dona Castorina 124, 22460-320, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil

<sup>2</sup> Rio Conservation and Sustainability Science Centre, Department of Geography and the Environment, Pontifícia Universidade Católica, 22453900, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil

<sup>3</sup> Institute of Agricultural Engineering and Informatics, Faculty of Production and Power Engineering, University of Agriculture in Krakow, Balicka 116B, 30-149, Krakow, Poland

<sup>4</sup> School of Environmental Science, University of East Anglia, Norwich, NR4 7TJ, UK

<sup>5</sup> Department of Forest Sciences, 'Luiz de Queiroz' College of Agriculture, University of São Paulo, 13418-900, Av. Pádua Dias, 11, Piracicaba, São Paulo, Brazil

<sup>6</sup> Department of Biology, 'Luiz de Queiroz' College of Agriculture, University of São Paulo, 13418-900, Av. Pádua Dias, 11, Piracicaba, São Paulo, Brazil

<sup>7</sup> Departamento de Ciências Ambientais (DCA), Instituto de Floresta (IF), Universidade Federal Rural do Rio de Janeiro (UFRRJ), BR 465, Km 07, 23890-000, Seropédica, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil

<sup>8</sup> Centre of Excellence for Environmental Decisions, University of Queensland, Qld, Australia

<sup>9</sup> Bioflora, Rod. Piracicaba – Tupi, Km 18, 13420-280, Piracicaba, São Paulo, Brazil

## ABSTRACT

Natural regeneration offers a cheaper alternative to active reforestation and has the potential to become the predominant way of restoring degraded tropical landscapes at large-scale. We conducted a meta-analysis for tropical regions and quantified the relationships between both ecological and socioeconomic factors and biodiversity responses in naturally regenerating areas. Biogeographic realms, past disturbance, and the human development index (HDI) were used as explanatory variables for biodiversity responses. In addition, we present a case study of large-scale natural regeneration in the Brazilian Atlantic Forest and identify areas where different forms of restoration would be most suitable. Using our dataset for tropical regions, we showed that natural regeneration was predominantly reported within: the Neotropical realm; areas that were intensively disturbed; and countries with medium HDI. We also found that biodiversity in regenerating forests was more similar to the values found in old growth forests in: countries with either low, high, or very high HDI; less biodiverse realms; and areas of less intensive past disturbance. Our case study from Brazil showed that the level of forest gain resulting from environmental legislation, in particular the Brazilian Forest Code, has been reduced, but remains substantial. Complementary market incentives and financial mechanisms to promote large-scale natural regeneration in human-modified agricultural landscapes are also needed. Our analysis provides insights into the factors that promote or limit the recovery of biodiversity in naturally regenerating areas, and aids to identify areas with higher potential for natural regeneration.

Abstract in Portuguese is available with online material.

*Key words:* Atlantic Forest; ecological restoration; environmental Kuznets curve; Forest Code; landscape restoration.

ECOLOGICAL RESTORATION IS CRITICAL TO REVERSE BIODIVERSITY DECLINE, restore ecological processes, and supply ecosystem services in disturbed or degraded lands throughout the world (Lamb *et al.* 2005, Chazdon & Guariguata 2016, Crouzeilles *et al.* 2016a,b). International and local momenta have stimulated, initiatives in different parts of the world to restore native systems. For example, The Aichi Targets 14 and 15 of the United Nations

Convention on Biological Diversity (Janishevski *et al.* 2015) aim to restore the ecosystems that provide essential services and restore at least 15 percent of degraded ecosystems, respectively. The Bonn Challenge, a global restoration initiative, set a goal of restoring 150 million hectares of deforested and degraded forests by 2020 (WRI, 2012). Other examples are the result of the 2014 New York Climate Summit—the New York Declaration on Forests—that promotes restoration of 350 million hectares globally by 2030, and the recent Initiative 20 × 20 to restore 20 million hectares of forests by 2020 in some Latin American and

Received 22 December 2015; revision accepted 3 September 2016.

Agnieszka E. Latawiec and Renato Crouzeilles contributed equally to this article.

<sup>10</sup>Corresponding author; e-mail: a.latawiec@iis-rio.org

Dispatch: 27.9.16	CE: Shanthi M
No. of pages: 12	PE: Krishnaveni A
WILEY	
12386	Manuscript No.
B T P	Journal Code
	

1 Caribbean countries, launched at the COP 20 in Peru. Examples  
 2 can also be found at the country and biome level. At the country  
 3 level: the Green Belt Movement in Kenya (de Aquino *et al.* 2011)  
 4 restored over 51 million trees in watersheds of major mountain  
 5 ecosystems since 1977 (Greenbelt Movement, 2016). At a biome  
 6 level, the Brazilian Atlantic Forest Restoration Pact, gathers more  
 7 than 250 members, including environmental organizations,  
 8 research institutes, private companies, and government agencies,  
 9 and aims to restore 15 million hectares of forest by 2050 (Melo  
 10 *et al.* 2013).

11 Although a myriad of restoration methods is available,  
 12 restoration has normally been grouped into two main approaches:  
 13 passive (leaving areas for natural regeneration) and active restora-  
 14 tion (human intervention in order to accelerate and influence the  
 15 successional trajectories) (Holl & Aide 2011). Many studies in dif-  
 16 ferent tropical regions have explored the factors and mechanisms  
 17 facilitating natural regeneration in abandoned agricultural areas or  
 18 in areas of low agricultural productivity at a local scale (Cramer  
 19 *et al.* 2008). Natural regeneration has been shown to depend on:  
 20 isolation from source forests (Pereira *et al.* 2013, Curran *et al.*  
 21 2014, Crouzeilles & Curran 2016); frequency of recurrent fire  
 22 (Hooper *et al.* 2004); type of soil seed bank (*e.g.*, composed by  
 23 native species; Lamb *et al.* 2005); intensity of land degradation  
 24 (Guariguata & Ostertag 2001); time since deforestation started  
 25 (years vs. decades; Lamb *et al.* 2001, Crouzeilles *et al.* 2016c); and  
 26 climate (Vieira *et al.* 2006, Poorter *et al.* 2016). Although socio-  
 27 economic factors have often been overlooked in restoration stud-  
 28 ies (Wortley *et al.* 2013), ultimately the success of natural  
 29 regeneration (*i.e.*, return to a reference condition) depends on  
 30 socioeconomic attributes, and direct and indirect benefits to land-  
 31 holders and local communities (Cairns & Heckman 1996, Sayer  
 32 *et al.* 2004, Lamb *et al.* 2005, Chazdon & Guariguata 2016). Cost  
 33 is an important factor when considering restoration, and natural  
 34 regeneration has been shown to be the most cost-effective  
 35 restoration approach for increasing native vegetation cover at  
 36 large-scale (Chazdon 2014, Chazdon & Guariguata 2016). Rural-  
 37 urban migration can result in the abandonment of poor quality  
 38 agricultural land, leading to an increased quantity of land available  
 39 for restoration (García-Barrios *et al.* 2009, Aide *et al.* 2013, De  
 40 Rezende *et al.* 2015). Within rural properties that are not aban-  
 41 doned, financial incentives can encourage restoration, especially  
 42 within areas that are not currently used for agriculture or that  
 43 have low productivity (Wunder 2006, Brancalion *et al.* 2012).  
 44 Recent international market mechanisms or policies (*e.g.*, certifica-  
 45 tion systems, Kyoto Protocol) can instigate restoration by govern-  
 46 ment (Wuethrich 2007) or private landholders.

47 Despite research effort, both ecological/biophysical and  
 48 socioeconomic factors that influence the likelihood of abandoned  
 49 lands to regenerate are complex and not entirely understood  
 50 (Aide *et al.* 2013). As a consequence, it is still being debated  
 51 where large-scale natural regeneration should occur. Some studies  
 52 suggest that land for natural regeneration can be made available  
 53 through the coupling of sustainable intensification of agricultural  
 54 production with land sparing for forest restoration (Phalan *et al.*  
 55 2016). Sustainable intensification, in a nutshell, means producing

more from current agricultural lands that are being used below  
 their potential, while respecting biophysical constraints to avoid  
 adverse impacts from over intensification (Foresight 2011). Phalan  
*et al.* (2016) presents mechanisms that harness the potential  
 of yield increases to make space for nature at large-scales. Strass-  
 burg *et al.* (2014) shows that the current productivity of Brazilian  
 pasturelands is only about 30 percent of its sustainable potential.  
 Increasing productivity to 70 percent of its sustainable potential,  
 could accommodate agricultural production of main products  
 (meat, soybean, sugarcane, and maize; including for exports) and  
 release 36 million hectares for restoration of natural systems  
 (Strassburg *et al.* 2014). The same could be true for other places  
 worldwide (Strassburg *et al.* 2014), and not only for pasture but  
 also for other types of agricultural land uses (Królczyk *et al.*  
 2014, Królczyk & Latawiec 2015). Nevertheless, even if within  
 the same landscape matrix, some areas could be used for sustain-  
 able intensive agriculture and other for natural regeneration, a  
 successful land-sparing approach depends on relevant legislation  
 and its enforcement and is limited by landowners preferences.

In this paper we address two key questions: (1) how do dif-  
 ferent ecological, biophysical, and socioeconomic factors correlate  
 with the success of natural regeneration for biodiversity? And (2)  
 where and how can we find potential areas for natural regenera-  
 tion at large-scale? These questions explore the driving factors of  
 regeneration success for biodiversity in tropical regions, focused  
 in areas where forest gain now exceeds forest loss over recent  
 time periods. To these ends, we first conducted a meta-analysis  
 for tropical regions to quantify the effects of socioeconomic, bio-  
 geographic, and ecological factors on biodiversity responses in  
 natural regenerating areas. Although measuring the success of  
 natural regeneration is not always straight forward or simple  
 (Wortley *et al.* 2013, Brancalion & Holl 2016), three ecosystem  
 attributes can be used to measure it: biodiversity, vegetation  
 structure, and ecosystem processes (Ruiz-Jaen & Aide 2005, San-  
 severo & Garbin 2015). In this study, we used ecological metrics  
 as abundance, richness, diversity, and similarity as biodiversity  
 response and the human development index (HDI), biogeo-  
 graphic realms (according to Olson *et al.* 2001), and past distur-  
 bance as the measured explanatory variables affecting biodiversity.  
 Second, we present a case study of large-scale natural regenera-  
 tion in the Brazilian Atlantic Forest and identify areas where dif-  
 ferent forms of restoration would be most suitable. The case  
 study sheds light onto the role of restoration regulations on the  
 expansion of natural regeneration in agricultural regions, where  
 most of native vegetation loss has been observed and its antici-  
 pated future gain. We hypothesized that the farm size is positively  
 associated with the proportion of its area that has to be manda-  
 torily restored, as a consequence of the mechanisms established  
 by the Brazilian Forest Code to reduce the allocation of land to  
 restoration in small- and medium-sized farms (Soares-Filho *et al.*  
 2014). This paper contributes to current knowledge on the  
 impacts of natural regeneration within different socioeconomic  
 and ecological/biophysical contexts, and provides insight to the  
 factors that promote or limit natural regeneration of tropical for-  
 ests. To our knowledge, this is the first study that presents a

meta-analysis of how different socioeconomic, ecological, and biophysical factors affect biodiversity in naturally regenerated areas of tropical regions.

## METHODS

LITERATURE REVIEW AND META-ANALYSIS.—We conducted an extensive analysis of all recorded studies in the data base used by Crouzeilles and Curran (2016) and Crouzeilles *et al.* (2016a,b), which investigated the scale of effect of forest cover on restoration success and the main ecological drivers of forest restoration success, respectively, both for biodiversity and vegetation structure at the global scale. This data base is the most comprehensive gathered to date on restoration success (*i.e.*, return to a reference condition; Crouzeilles & Curran 2016, Crouzeilles *et al.* 2016a). It was constructed based on seven key reviews on either biodiversity responses or ecological succession of forest structures in degraded and/or restored ecosystems (Dunn 2004, Ruiz-Jaen & Aide 2005, Bowen *et al.* 2007, Rey Benayas *et al.* 2009, Gibson *et al.* 2011, Wortley *et al.* 2013, Curran *et al.* 2014). The inclusion criteria used in Crouzeilles and Curran (2016) and Crouzeilles *et al.* (2016a) selected studies that were carried out in forested ecosystems and had multiple sampling sites (replicates) to measure biodiversity (mammals, birds, invertebrates, herpetofauna, and plants) and/or vegetation structure (cover, density, height, biomass, and litter) in both reference (old growth forests) and degraded or restored systems. We used a subset of this data base by considering only studies that had comparison of reference forests (old growth or less disturbed forests) versus naturally regenerated forests (*i.e.*, data on degraded and active restoration systems were excluded); were conducted in tropical regions; had information on past disturbance for each natural regenerated forest; and had comparison for biodiversity (*i.e.*, data on vegetation structure were excluded).

We also gathered information on socioeconomic, biogeographic, and ecological factors for each selected study. Socioeconomic factors were represented by Human Development Index (HDI), which aims to assess the development of country and takes into account indicators of life expectancy, education and income per capita (UNDP 2014). We gathered this information for the exact location and year in which the selected study was conducted. When this information was unavailable, we considered the HDI value for the country in which the study was carried out and/or the nearest study's year. For example, if there was no HDI value for 1979 and 1970, and the value for 1980 was the closest one, we used this HDI value in the analysis. The HDI values were obtained from either the United Nations Development Programme or the Human Development Report. They contain HDI values ranging from 1980 to 2013 and 2000 to 2013, respectively, with different intervals of years between the released data. We classified the HDI values in four classes according to the United Nations Development Programme criteria: very high (values  $\geq 0.8$ ); high ( $\geq 0.7$  and  $< 0.8$ ); medium ( $\geq 0.55$  and  $< 0.7$ ); and low ( $< 0.55$ ).

Biogeographic factors were represented by the biogeographic realms proposed by Olson *et al.* (2001). This is the broadest

biogeographic division in the Earth's land surface, clustering ecoregions that may contain several habitat types, but have strong biogeographic patterns, such as climate conditions (temperature and precipitation) and distribution of terrestrial organisms (*e.g.*, higher taxonomic levels). Such taxonomic diversity occurs as organisms evolved relatively isolated over long term due to natural barriers, such as large mountains and oceans. Despite this broad division, the next classification level encompasses more than 80 different ecoregions, which would preclude our analysis. Thus, here we used studies across the four biogeographic realms included in the tropical region: Indo-Malay, Afrotropic, Australasia, and Neotropic. The coordinate systems of each study landscape and either the HDI values or the biogeographic realms were overlapped using the software ArcGis 9.3 (ESRI 2008).

Land classes indicating the type and intensity of disturbance prior to the forest recovery in a given area can be used to understand the ecological effects of the past disturbance on restoration success (Dent & Wright 2009, Curran *et al.* 2014). We gathered information on land classes from the studies included in the original data base used by Crouzeilles and Curran (2016) and Crouzeilles *et al.* (2016a,b). When there was different past disturbance types for each natural regenerating area, these were considered as different treatments. We classified the past disturbance in four classes according to Dent and Wright (2009): Extensive transformation – areas that were little transformed and remained under occupation for a short term (*e.g.*, not completely cleared forests); Extensive occupation—areas that were little transformed and remained under occupation for long-term (*e.g.*, agroforestry and shaded plantations); Intensive transformation—areas that were heavily transformed and remained under occupation for short-term (*e.g.*, clear-cut and burning); and Intensive occupation—areas that were heavily transformed and remained under occupation for long-term (*e.g.*, plantation, pasture, and agriculture).

In order to quantify the effects of socioeconomic, biogeographic, and ecological factors on biodiversity measures (see below), we used a meta-analysis metric called response ratio (Hedges *et al.* 1999). It measures the standardized mean effect size of each comparison of biodiversity between reference forests and natural regenerated forests within the same assessment. The response ratio is measured as  $\ln(x \text{ natural regenerating forest} / x \text{ reference forest})$ , where  $x$  is the mean value for a quantified measure of biodiversity within all sampling sites (replicates) in a study landscape. Response ratio ranges from negative to positive values, with values around zero considered as the desired outcome of restoration (*i.e.*, success in bringing biodiversity in natural regenerated forest back to the reference forest). Negative values mean that biodiversity is lower in natural regenerated forests compared with reference forests, while the opposite holds for positive values.

Biodiversity data can represent different taxonomic groups (plants, birds, mammals, herpetofauna, and invertebrates). These biodiversity data included different ecological metrics, abundance, richness, diversity, and similarity: abundance was represented by number, proportion, frequency and density of individuals, equitability; richness by observed, estimated, rarefied richness,

species density; diversity by Shannon index, Simpson index, Margalef index, Fisher alpha, evenness; and species similarity by Sorenson index, Morisita–Horn index, ANOSIM, PCA, MDS, Mantel, Jaccard index, Bray–Curtis, and Euclidean distances.

There can be more than one comparison of biodiversity between reference forests and natural regenerated forests (*i.e.*, many response ratios) for the same study landscape, if for example, there was more than one: study in the same study landscape, taxonomic group studied, and/or ecological metric (*e.g.*, abundance, richness, diversity, and similarity) measured. To avoid spatial pseudo-replication, we resampled any given biodiversity dataset with replacement (10,000 bootstraps) and used only one comparison per study landscape to generate the median effect size and 95 percent confident intervals (*e.g.*, Gibson *et al.* 2011, Curran *et al.* 2014, Crouzeilles *et al.* 2016a). Thus, we quantified the effects of socioeconomic, biogeographic, and ecological factors on biodiversity via a bootstrapped meta-analysis for a pooled dataset that includes response ratio of different taxonomic groups and ecological metrics (*e.g.*, Rey Benayas *et al.* 2009). Consideration of different taxonomic groups facilitates a deeper understanding of biodiversity responses to restoration. Lack of data for each taxonomic group and ecological metric precluded individual analysis. Nonetheless, different taxonomic groups and ecological metrics can be pooled in the same meta-analysis as the response ratio is calculated as log natural of a ratio ( $\ln(\text{natural regenerating forests}/\text{reference forests})$ ), that is, the differences are standardized. Outliers were removed to assure normally distributed residuals, which were checked by plotting residuals (Crawley 2007). Difference among classes of a factor (HDI, biogeographic realm or past disturbance) may be driven by the time since natural regeneration started. So we tested it performing one-way ANOVA, which we ran 10,000 times for each factor, with one comparison per study landscape to avoid spatial-replication. We presented the results in terms of percentage of time which there was difference among the classes of a factor (*i.e.*,  $P\text{-value} \leq 0.05$ ). This dataset was smaller than those used in the meta-analysis as not all selected studies provided information on the time since natural regeneration started, thus, we preferred to perform meta-analysis only for the same ‘full’ dataset. Meta-analysis and ANOVA were conducted in R 2.12 (R Development Core Team 2010).

CASE STUDY: THE ROLE OF BRAZIL’S FOREST CODE TO CATALYZE NATURAL REGENERATION AT LARGE-SCALE IN THE ATLANTIC FOREST.—The new version of the Brazilian Forest Code (established in 2012) provides a comprehensive example of how legislation may foster forest gain in agricultural regions. Compliance with this law may result in the restoration of 21 million hectares of native vegetation in private farms during the next 20 yr (Soares-Filho *et al.* 2014). Restoration should occur in Areas of Permanent Preservation (APPs—pre-determined areas where land use is restricted and native vegetation has to be conserved or restored; for example, riparian buffers, mountain tops, and steep slopes), and Legal Reserves (LRs—percentage of the farm area that must be covered by native vegetation, without a

pre-determined location and depending on the farm size and in which biome the farm is located—for example, 20 percent and 80 percent in the Atlantic Forest and Amazon, respectively) (for further details, see Garcia *et al.* 2013). In addition, farmers are obliged to include their landholdings in the on-line federal Environmental Registry System (CAR, the acronym in Portuguese), in which they have to delineate areas that will be protected or restored to ensure environmental compliance. The new Forest Code established mechanisms to favor legal compliance of farms driving a historical deficit of native vegetation, and these mechanisms focus on small- to medium-sized landholdings and affected 90 percent of all farms in Brazil (Soares-Filho *et al.* 2014). Examples of these mechanisms are the reduction in the width of riparian buffers to be restored and the permission to farm within APPs, where native vegetation was already converted (restoration amnesty in APP), the removal of restoration requirements of LRs in small- and medium-sized farms (restoration amnesty in RLs), and amnesty of fines for those who engage in a restoration plan.

We assessed the restoration planning of 284 medium- to large-sized farms ( $214 \pm 183$  ha each), totaling 63,338 hectares, in eight municipalities (Alcobaça, Caravelas, Ibirapuã, Mucuri, Nova Viçosa, Porto Seguro, Prado, Teixeira de Freitas, and Vereda) of Bahia state, in the Atlantic Forest region of northeast Brazil (Fig. 1). The landscape is predominantly composed by commercial Eucalyptus plantations and cattle ranching, and remaining native forest cover is low ( $< 10\%$ ). Although the states from Northeast Brazil have lower income and social development compared to south and southeastern states, the specific region where the assessment was made has higher revenues from land use as a consequence of the large-scale, industrial production of *Eucalyptus*, reflecting the socioeconomic and ecological context of Northern Espírito Santo and Southern Bahia states. This region may represent the overall context in which large-scale restoration programs will be implemented in Brazil and in other tropical countries where new legal instruments and market regulations have fostered land-use reorganization and policies to protect and restore native ecosystems within farms (Rodrigues *et al.* 2011, Nepstad *et al.* 2014).

Although varying economic activities are developed in these farms, all of them produce *Eucalyptus* in partnership with two large Brazilian pulp companies, which provide technical assistance and resources for the establishment, maintenance, and harvesting of *Eucalyptus* plantations, while farmers sell the timber according to pre-determined contractual conditions. Since these companies need forest certification for exports and must comply with environmental laws, they support restoration planning and implementation with partnering farmers. In particular, the 301 farms included in this study were part of a large compliance agreement established between these two pulp companies and the state environmental legislators. All of the farms included in the compliance agreement were evaluated in this work. The environmental diagnosis was performed as part of a consultancy project developed by the Laboratory of Forest Ecology and Restoration (LERF), of the University of São Paulo, Brazil, following the legal frameworks of the Environmental Registry System and Project for the




FIGURE 1. Distribution of the farms used for the case study.

Recovery of Degraded and Altered Lands, as part of the new Forest Code.

We assessed the proportion of different restoration methods prescribed for APPs and LRs in each of the 301 farms we studied. Restoration methods consisted of: active restoration—seedling plantation or direct seeding in the entire restoration area; and passive restoration—isolating the sites from further human-mediated disturbances; assisting spontaneously regenerating seedlings by controlling invasive grasses around them and, when necessary, planting new seedlings or sowing seeds in the patches not covered by regenerating seedlings. We first evaluated the total restoration area established by legislation for all farms included in our dataset and explored how the recent changes in the law would affect restoration area. Then, we used linear regressions to analyze the influence of farm size on: the percentage of farm area to be restored; the proportion of active restoration in APPs; and the proportion of active restoration in LRs. Based on previous observations of restoration planning in Southeastern Brazil, in which large farms producing sugarcane were distributed in more fertile soils and flat terrain, thus with more intense historical land use (Rodrigues *et al.* 2011), we hypothesized that the proportion of active restoration in APPs and LRs will increase with farm area.

## RESULTS

**META-ANALYSIS: BIODIVERSITY RESPONSES TO NATURAL REGENERATION.**—During the literature review, we selected 123 studies including 1389 quantitative comparisons of biodiversity between reference and natural regenerated forests across 117 study landscapes. These studies were spread across the four

biogeographic realms (Indo-Malay, Afrotropic, Australasia, Neotropical) found in the tropical regions (Fig. 2A). Data in these studies were collected in the field between 1984 and 2008. The time since natural regeneration began ranged from 0.5 to more than 200 yr. In general, these studies were widely spread across all the classes of biogeographic realms and HDI (Fig. 2). The predominant type of area selected given the criteria described here was: areas characterized with the medium HDI (36%,  $N = 44$ ; Fig. 3A) in the Neotropical realm ( $N = 63$ , 51%; Fig. 3B), and with intensive occupation as the past disturbance (51%,  $N = 63$ ; Fig. 3C).

Biodiversity response ratios in naturally regenerated forests were lower than in reference forests for all classes of socioeconomic, biogeographic, and ecological factors, that is, the biodiversity is more depleted in naturally regenerated forests when compared with reference forests (Fig. 4). Biodiversity response ratio in naturally regenerated forests were more similar to reference forests in countries with either low, high, or very high HDIs (median effect size of  $-0.14$ ,  $-0.16$ ,  $-0.19$ , respectively; Fig. 4A). Countries with medium HDI were characterized with lower biodiversity response ratios in regenerating forests (median effect size of  $-0.23$ ) (Fig. 4A). Biodiversity responses in naturally regenerated forests were more similar to reference forests in Australasia realm ( $-0.12$ ), while they were more distinct for Neotropical and Indo-Malay realms ( $-0.18$  and  $-0.19$ , respectively) (Fig. 4B). Areas with extensive occupation as the past disturbance (represented by agroforestry and shaded-plantation) showed higher biodiversity responses in naturally regenerated forests than in reference forests (0.19) (Fig. 4C). For every other class of past disturbance, biodiversity responses in regenerated forests were lower than in reference forests (Fig. 4C) with biodiversity




FIGURE 2. Study landscapes ( $N = 119$ ) spread across tropical biogeographic realms as proposed by Olson *et al.* (2001) (A) and HDI ranking for these areas (B).


response more similar to reference area in extensively transformed areas ( $-0.1$ ), while response ratios in intensively occupied areas were lower ( $-0.23$ ) (Fig. 4C). These differences in biodiversity responses among classes of HDI, biogeographic realms, and past disturbance were not influenced (or at least were only slightly influenced) by the time since natural regeneration started as only in 0.06, 0.002, and 0.35 percent of the 10,000 bootstraps the ANOVA was significant (*i.e.*,  $P$ -value  $\leq 0.05$ ), respectively. Analyzing intensive occupation separately, our results show that Afrotropic realm presents higher biodiversity response ratios in naturally regenerated forests than in other geographic realms (Fig. S1A). In addition, biodiversity response ratio in areas of intensive occupation was highest in countries with low HDI (Fig. S1B).

**CASE STUDY: THE ROLE OF BRAZIL'S FOREST CODE TO CATALYZE NATURAL REGENERATION AT LARGE-SCALE IN THE ATLANTIC FOREST.**—A total of 1990 hectares ( $3.1 \pm 2.7\%$  of total area of farms, mean  $\pm$  SD, ranging from 0 to 20.8% of total farm area) were allocated for restoration according to the diagnosis of the 284 farms in the south of Bahia. Overall, larger farms would be required to restore a higher proportion of their area to comply with the law (linear regression:  $P$ -value  $< 0.0001$ ;  $r^2 = 0.09$ ). Total restoration area included 876 hectares of restoration in

APPs ( $1.5 \pm 1.0\%$  of total area of farms) and 1114 hectares ( $5.4 \pm 4.4\%$  of total area of farms obliged to restore LRs) in LRs. The APP area where agricultural activities and infrastructure could be maintained indefinitely (1537 ha), thus eligible for restoration amnesty, was almost double the area required for restoration (876 ha). The proportion of APP area eligible for restoration amnesty decreased with farm size ( $P$ -value = 0.005;  $r^2 = 0.02$ ). Only 20 percent of farms would be legally obligated to restore LRs, and 10 percent of farms would have to restore more than 10 hectares ( $9.1 \pm 17.7$  ha, mean  $\pm$  SD; 0.03–140.60 ha) to fulfill the legal mandate of the Forest Code. Farm size did not influence the proportion of land allocated to active restoration in APPs ( $P$ -value = 0.14;  $r^2 = 0.004$ ) or LRs ( $P$ -value = 0.11;  $r^2 = 0.02$ ). Overall, the proportion of active restoration required was similar between APPs ( $59 \pm 32\%$ , mean  $\pm$  SD) and LRs ( $48 \pm 38\%$ ).

## DISCUSSION

Our literature review for tropical regions shows that studies of natural regeneration are more abundant in areas in the Neotropic realm, with medium HDI values, and with intensive occupation as the past disturbance. In addition, our meta-analysis reveals for



31 FIGURE 3. Number of selected studies according to HDI class (A), biogeographic realm (B) and past disturbance (C).

the first time overall patterns of biodiversity responses in natural regenerating areas across socioeconomic, biophysical, and ecological factors. We found that biodiversity in naturally regenerating forests will be more similar to those in old growth forests in countries with either low, high, or very high HDI; in less biodiverse realms; and in areas of short-term and low-intensity land use. Finally, our case study shows an empirical example of how the Brazilian legislation currently shapes restoration pathways in the south of Bahia.

We found that the greater biodiversity benefits were obtained from natural regeneration within countries with low and high or very high levels of development, potentially reflecting the environmental degradation of forest as predicted by the environmental Kuznets curve (Mather 1992, Bhattarai & Hammig 2001, Dinda 2004, Meyfroidt & Lambim 2011). Countries with lower HDI values tend to have less intensive previous land use, more recent deforestation, and overall more highly forested landscapes; all of these factors facilitate natural regeneration (Chazdon *et al.* 2007), and consequently have a greater potential for biodiversity persistence and/or recovery (Chazdon & Guariguata 2016). As HDI increases to medium HDIs, previous land-use intensity increases, forest cover decreases, and other environmental impacts increase (*e.g.*, high levels of hunting, pollution) that can influence the recovery of biodiversity. As HDI increases further, environmental degradation decreases due to higher sensitivity of the population to care for the environment and programs focused on recovery of degraded land increase, again facilitating natural regeneration. Additionally, the ‘economic development path’ may also help to explain this pattern of forest recovery as increasing urbanization and economic development can promote

a rural–urban migration, thus, promoting natural regeneration in agricultural abandoned lands (Aide & Grau 2004, Rudel *et al.* 2005, Grau & Aide 2008, Meyfroidt *et al.* 2010). While these forest gains are not intentional but rather they were a consequence of demographic and economic changes, marginal agricultural land presents a potential opportunity for making space for natural regeneration that minimizes competition for land.

Contrasts between biogeographic realms also represent differences in terms of species richness of these tropical forests (Leigh *et al.* 2004, Slik *et al.* 2015). Indo-Pacific and Neotropics region shows high tree species richness compared to continental tropical Africa (Slik *et al.* 2015). Therefore, initial high species richness could be one of the reasons for slow biodiversity recovery in Indo-Pacific and Neotropics. Previous studies demonstrated that vegetation structure in the Neotropics can be recovered in a few decades (Guariguata & Ostertag 2001). On the other hand, recovery of species richness and composition can take centuries (Liebsch *et al.* 2008) and past land-use intensity as well as the distance to propagule sources represent important barriers to natural regeneration (Guariguata & Ostertag 2001, Crouzeilles & Curran 2016). Moreover, former land use plays an important role in the net change in local richness in the Neotropics and Indo-Malay region (see Newbold *et al.* 2015).

Our results, showing that areas that had suffered intensive transformation tend to have most impoverished biodiversity during natural regeneration than those that had suffered extensive transformation (Fig. 4C) also corroborate with that of other authors (Lamb *et al.* 2005, Chazdon *et al.* 2007). Natural regeneration within areas of extensive transformation provided a higher biodiversity response as compared with the reference systems




FIGURE 4. Bootstrapped response ratios for biodiversity according to HDI class (A), geographic realm (B), and past disturbance (C). Zero (vertical dashed line) means no difference as compared with the reference system (old growth forest). Therefore, values closer to zero mean biodiversity in regenerated forest is similar to undisturbed forest. A negative response ratio represents more biodiversity in reference areas than restores areas, while positive response means that restored areas is characterized with more biodiversity than reference area. Lines in the box plots represent the median, first and third quartile values for 10,000 bootstraps.  $N$  = sample size, site = number of study landscapes.

(Fig. 4C). Areas with extensive occupation as the past disturbance (represented by agroforestry and shaded-plantation) showed higher biodiversity responses in natural regenerated forests than in reference forests (Fig. 4C). This pattern can be explained by higher resource availability for species in these areas (Tscharnkte *et al.* 2008) and tend to support a land-sharing approach to biodiversity conservation (Badgley & Perfecto 2007, Perfecto &

Vandermeer 2010). Badgley and Perfecto (2007), using a global dataset of 293 yield ratios for plant and animal production, argue that agroecological production systems that are based on organic agriculture principles could suffice to provide enough food to global population. Green manures derived from nitrogen-fixing legumes can provide enough biologically fixed nitrogen to replace synthetic nitrogen fertilizer (Badgley & Perfecto 2007). Other authors claim that where large-scale intensive farming is not viable due to unfavorable biophysical conditions, agroforestry and other nature-friendly types of farming can contribute to increased tree cover (Fischer *et al.* 2008), which will be beneficial for some objectives (*e.g.*, protection from erosion, carbon storage) but less effective for others (*e.g.*, conservation of species dependent on relatively undisturbed forest).

Analyzing intensive occupation separately, our results show that Afrotropic realm presents higher biodiversity response ratio in naturally regenerating forests as compared to others realms (Fig. S1A). The history of disturbance in Africa has been mentioned as a main mechanism to explain this pattern (see Cole *et al.* 2014). This result has important implications to increase forest cover in Africa through passive restoration, especially considering economic barriers to the implementation of restoration projects. Natural regeneration is the cheapest way to achieve large-scale restoration (Rodrigues *et al.* 2009, Holl & Aide 2011, Brancalion *et al.* 2012, Chazdon & Guariguata 2016). Furthermore, paleoecological studies show that forest regeneration is significantly faster in African forests compared with those in South America and Asia (Cole *et al.* 2014) and may present an attractive alternative both for biodiversity recovery and provision of ecosystem services locally as well as globally.

Our study explored for the first time correlations between biodiversity, ecological, and socioeconomic factors in natural regeneration areas within a meta-analysis for tropical regions. Nonetheless, other factors may affect natural regeneration, such as time since restoration started (Crouzeilles *et al.* 2016a) and the landscape context (amount of forest cover, proximity to other forest fragments or matrix permeability; for example, Crouzeilles & Curran 2016). In addition, the biodiversity response to natural regeneration reflected the pattern produced by ecological metrics of richness and abundance, which composed most of our dataset. The recovery of species similarity and diversity is likely to take orders of magnitude longer than abundance and richness (Dunn 2004, Curran *et al.* 2014, Crouzeilles *et al.* 2016a). Therefore, future studies should also focus on other ecological and socioeconomic factors, especially by relating them to more sensitive ecological metrics such as similarity of species composition.

Regarding the case study considered here, the new Forest Code mandated a low fraction of the available space for large-scale restoration in private farms, thus forest cover may not increase to minimum levels to support biodiversity persistence in Atlantic Forest landscapes as a result of this policy (Banks-Leite *et al.* 2014). This outcome is a direct consequence of the environmental setbacks of the new law, which authorized the maintenance of agricultural land uses and infrastructure in portions of APPs and reduced their restoration requirements, used native

1 vegetation of APPs to reduce LR deficit (thus, reducing restora-  
 2 tion requirements of LRs), and removed the obligation to restore  
 3 LRs in small- and medium-sized farms (Garcia *et al.* 2013). In  
 4 addition, part of the deficit of LR can be compensated by hiring  
 5 or buying the LR surplus of other farms (*i.e.*, native forest cover  
 6 exceeding the 20% required), which may further reduce restora-  
 7 tion area.

8 Following expectations, the Forest Code revision, which  
 9 reduced restoration requirements of small- and medium-sized  
 10 farms to avoid losses of agricultural production and minimize  
 11 investments in restoration, the percentage of the farm area that  
 12 must be restored increased with farm size, that is, larger farms  
 13 required a higher restoration effort than smaller farms. Given the  
 14 old and intense land use of the region, active restoration predom-  
 15 inated, a similar result obtained in regions dominated by sugar-  
 16 cane plantation in southeastern Brazil (Rodrigues *et al.* 2011,  
 17 Brancalion *et al.* 2016a,b). Given the higher proportion of flat  
 18 and productive lands in large farms, where historical land-use  
 19 intensification compromised the use of passive or mixed restora-  
 20 tion, and concentration of marginal agricultural lands in smaller  
 21 farms, we anticipated that the proportion of active restoration  
 22 would increase with farm size. However, contrary to our hypoth-  
 23 esis, the proportion of active restoration was not influenced by  
 24 farm area both in APPs and LRs, probably because concessions  
 25 of the new Forest Code to reduce restoration requirements 'bene-  
 26 fitted' larger farms, and even marginal agricultural lands were  
 27 intensively used by small farmers to compensate the reduced size  
 28 of their property.

29 Programs and policies that promote a sustainable increase in  
 30 agricultural productivity while freeing marginal lands for forest  
 31 re-growth can actively favor natural regeneration (Latawiec *et al.*  
 32 2015). In Brazil, it has been shown that land sparing for large-  
 33 scale reforestation of Atlantic Forest can come from extensive  
 34 cattle-ranching farms (Latawiec *et al.* 2015). Strassburg *et al.*  
 35 (2014) shows that most of Brazilian pasturelands are character-  
 36 ized by relatively low current levels of cattle ranching productivity  
 37 but with considerable potential for growth (about two-thirds)  
 38 which corroborates that increasing cattle productivity in these  
 39 areas is a viable option to spare other areas for restoration. Our  
 40 results show that the new law drastically reduced restoration  
 41 requirements of individual farms, thus reducing the potential of  
 42 this legislation to drive large-scale natural regeneration (Brancalion  
 43 *et al.* 2016a). On one hand, the previous version of the  
 44 Forest Code required more restoration, but compliance levels  
 45 were very low and restricted to some few agricultural sectors  
 46 more pressured by environmental sustainability standards of the  
 47 market. On the other hand, the new Forest Code weakened  
 48 restoration requirements, but created more effective mechanisms  
 49 to support legal compliance. For instance, the Environmental  
 50 Registry System establishes that every farm of Brazil has to  
 51 declare, in a web-based, geospatial system, its deficit of native  
 52 vegetation in APP in LR, in order to better plan financial incen-  
 53 tives and technical support to foster restoration, and legal  
 54 enforcement activities. Up until 31 January 2016, ~2.3 million  
 55 farms, which encompass an area of 263 million hectares (66% of

the total land that must be registered), had already been incorpo-  
 rated in CAR (SFB 2015). Such positive outcomes may foster a  
 massive involvement of farmers in restoration in the coming  
 years, using CAR as the platform for implementing a national-  
 wide restoration plan, mostly in tropical forests. Thus, in spite of  
 the reduced area to be restored in each farm, the massive  
 involvement of farms may ultimately result in a very large area to  
 be restored in the whole country. To illustrate, if the same  
 restoration diagnosis obtained for the 63,338 hectares of farms  
 evaluated in this work are directly applied to the state of Bahia  
 (6.63% of Brazil area), which has 29,581,747 hectares that must  
 be registered in CAR, an area of almost 1 million hectares would  
 have to be restored. If extrapolated to the whole of Brazil, it  
 would yield an area to be restored equal to 13.5 million hectares.  
 Interestingly, this area is very similar to the 12.5 million hectares  
 expected by the National Plan for the Recovery of Native Vegeta-  
 tion (PLANAVEG, in the Portuguese acronym).

## CONCLUSIONS

Factors influencing natural regeneration are heterogeneous and  
 they depend on a range of biophysical, ecological, and socioeco-  
 nomic factors. On one hand, marginal lands (with low agricultural  
 potential and hence low opportunity costs) offer options for nat-  
 ural regeneration. But because these marginal lands are highly  
 degraded and bring low value for agriculture that their degrada-  
 tion can also hamper natural regeneration and biodiversity recov-  
 ery (Chazdon & Guariguata 2016). Our results for tropical  
 regions suggest that greater recovery of biodiversity in natural  
 regenerating forests is likely to occur predominantly in countries  
 with either low, high HDI, or very high HDI, in areas with less  
 intensive past disturbance, and in less biodiverse realms. Reconcil-  
 ing food production and best approaches for biodiversity recov-  
 ery during forest restoration may sometimes be socially or  
 politically unacceptable. Planning for natural regeneration must  
 also take into account a range of factors: maximizing biodiversity  
 benefits, provision of ecosystem services, and landscape connec-  
 tivity (*e.g.*, Crouzeilles *et al.* 2015). Prioritization of areas for nat-  
 ural regeneration should also always clearly define the goals to be  
 achieved in a landscape, including the objectives of different  
 groups of people (Chazdon & Guariguata 2016). Agricultural  
 (sustainable) intensification may aid in creating a space for nat-  
 ural regeneration, but it needs to be combined with policies to control  
 uncontrolled expansion of intensified, more efficient agricultural  
 production (*e.g.*, by certification, land-use zoning). Natural regen-  
 eration is a promising way to restore degraded lands and it  
 should always be considered as an alternative for landscape  
 restoration. Establishing legal instruments have been considered a  
 key strategy to foster large-scale restoration in private agricultural  
 lands, and our case study showed that the level of forest gain  
 potentially resulting from this strategy is still substantial, despite  
 being compromised by the recent revision of the law. Comple-  
 mentary land-sparing approaches, market incentives, and financial  
 mechanisms are also needed to promote large-scale natural regen-  
 eration in human-modified landscapes. These implications can

provide general guidelines to help policymakers and restoration practitioners regarding natural regeneration efforts in tropical forests.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Norwegian Agency for Development Cooperation (Norad) is gratefully acknowledged for funding. We thank Ana Castro for her invaluable help with formatting. Ben Phalan is gratefully acknowledged for interesting comments on biodiversity and land sparing. PHSB thanks the National Council for Scientific and Technological Development (CNPq) for a productivity grant (#304817/2015-5) and Daniella Schweizer for support in statistical analysis.

## SUPPORTING INFORMATION

Additional Supporting Information may be found online in the supporting information tab for this article:

FIGURE S1. Biodiversity response in areas of natural regeneration that occurred in previously disturbed areas characterized as intensive occupation classified according to geographic realm and HDI.

## LITERATURE CITED

- AIDE, T. M., M. L. CLARK, H. R. GRAU, D. LÓPEZ-CARR, M. A. LEVY, D. REDO, M. BONILLA-MOHENO, G. RINER, M. J. ANDRADE-NUÑES, AND M. MUÑIZ. 2013. Deforestation and reforestation of Latin America and the Caribbean (2001–2010). *Biotropica* 45: 262–271.
- AIDE, T., AND H. GRAU. 2004. Globalization, migration and Latin American ecosystems. *Science* 305: 1915–1916.
- de AQUINO, A. R., A. AASRUD, AND L. GUIMARÃES. 2011. Can forest carbon finance influence land tenure security in project areas? Preliminary lessons from projects in Niger and Kenya. In B. M. Kumar, and P. K. R. Nair (Eds.). *Carbon sequestration potential of agroforestry systems. Opportunities and challenges. Advances in Agroforestry*. Springer, New York, NY. Human Development Report. [http://www.pnud.org.br/HDR/Relatorios-Desenvolvimento-Humano-Globais.aspx?indiceAccordion=2&li=li\\_RDHGlobais#2000](http://www.pnud.org.br/HDR/Relatorios-Desenvolvimento-Humano-Globais.aspx?indiceAccordion=2&li=li_RDHGlobais#2000).
- BADGLEY, C., AND I. PERFECTO. 2007. Can organic agriculture feed the world? *Renew. Agric. Food Syst.* 22: 80–86.
- BANKS-LEITE, C., R. PARDINI, L. R. TAMBOSI, W. D. PEARSE, A. A. BUENO, R. T. BRUSCAGIN, T. H. CONDEZ, M. DIXO, A. T. IGARI, A. C. MARTENSEN, AND J. P. METZGER. 2014. Using ecological thresholds to evaluate the costs and benefits of set-asides in a biodiversity hotspot. *Science* 345: 1041–1045.
- BHATTARAI, M., AND M. HAMMIG. 2001. Institutions and the environmental Kuznets curve for deforestation: A cross-country analysis for Latin America, Africa and Asia. *World Dev.* 29: 995–2010.
- BOWEN, M. E., C. A. McALPINE, A. P. N. HOUSE, AND G. C. SMITH. 2007. Regrowth forests on abandoned agricultural land: A review of their habitat values for recovering forest fauna. *Biol. Conserv.* 140: 273–296.
- BRANCALION, P. H., L. C. GARCIA, R. LOYOLA, R. R. RODRIGUES, V. D. PILLAR, AND T. M. LEWINSOHN. 2016a. A critical analysis of the Native Vegetation Protection Law of Brazil (2012): Updates and ongoing initiatives. *Natureza Conservação* 14: 1–15.
- BRANCALION, P. H., AND K. D. HOLL. 2016. Functional composition trajectory: A resolution to the debate between Suganuma, Durigan, and Reid. *Restor. Ecol.* 24: 1–3.
- BRANCALION, P., D. SCHWEIZER, U. GAUDARE, J. MANGUEIRA, F. LAMONATO, F. FARAH, A. NAVE, AND R. RODRIGUES. 2016b. Balancing economic costs and ecological outcomes of passive and active restoration in agricultural landscapes: The case of Brazil. *Biotropica* 48: ???–???.
- BRANCALION, P. H. S., R. A. G. VIANI, AND B. B. N. ??????. 2012. Strassburg: Finding the money for tropical forest restoration. *Unasylva* 239: 25–34.
- CAIRNS, JR., J., AND J. R. HECKMAN. 1996. Restoration ecology: The state of an emerging field. *Annu. Rev. Ecol. Syst.* 21: 167–189.
- CHAZDON, R. L. 2014. *Second growth: The promise of tropical forest regeneration in an age of deforestation*. University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 472 p.
- CHAZDON, R. L., P. H. S. BRANCALION, D. LAMB, L. LAESTADIUS, M. CALMON, AND C. KUMAR. A policy-driven knowledge agenda for global forest and landscape restoration. *Cons. Lett.* ?????–????? In press.
- CHAZDON, R. L., AND M. R. GUARIGUATA. 2016. Natural regeneration as a tool for large-scale forest restoration in the tropics: Prospects and challenges. *Biotropica* 48: ?????–?????.
- CHAZDON, R. L., S. G. LETCHER, M. VAN BREUGEL, M. MARTÍNEZ-RAMOS, F. BONGERS, AND B. FINEGAN. 2007. Rates of change in tree communities of secondary Neotropical forests following major disturbances. *Philos. Trans. Royal Soc. B-Biol. Sci.* 362: 273–289.
- COLE, L. E. S., S. A. BHAGWAT, AND K. J. WILLIS. 2014. Recovery and resilience of tropical forests after disturbance. *Nat. Commun.* 5: 3906.
- CRAMER, V. A., R. J. HOBBS, AND R. J. STANDISH. 2008. What's new about old fields? Land abandonment and ecosystem assembly. *Trends Ecol. Evol.* 23: 104–112.
- CRAWLEY, M. J. 2007. *The R book*. Wiley, UK.
- CROUZELLES, R., H. L. BEYER, M. MILLS, C. E. V. GREILE, AND H. P. POSSINGHAM. 2015. Incorporating habitat availability into systematic planning for restoration: A species-specific approach for Atlantic Forest mammals. *Diver. Distrib.* 21: 1027–1037.
- CROUZELLES, R., AND M. CURRAN. 2016. Which landscape size best predicts the influence of forest cover on restoration success? A global meta-analysis on the scale of effect. *J. App. Ecol.* 53: 440–448.
- CROUZELLES, R., M. CURRAN, M. S. FERREIRA, D. B. LINDENMAYER, C. E. GREILE, AND J. M. R. BENAYAS. 2016a. A global meta-analysis on the ecological drivers of forest restoration success. *Nat. Commun.* 7: ???–?????.
- CROUZELLES, R., M. S. FERREIRA, AND M. CURRAN. 2016b. Forest restoration: A global dataset for biodiversity and vegetation structure. *Ecology*. doi: 10.1002/ecy.1474.
- CROUZELLES, R., M. S. FERREIRA, AND M. CURRAN. 2016c. Forest restoration: A global dataset for biodiversity and vegetation structure. *Ecology* ?????–????? (in press).
- CURRAN, M., S. HELLWEG, AND J. BECK. 2014. Is there any empirical support for biodiversity offset policy? *Ecol. Appl.* 24: 617–632.
- DE REZENDE, C. L., F. SCARANO, AND D. ARAUJO. 2015. Atlantic Forest spontaneous regeneration at landscape scale. *Biodivers. Conserv.* 24: 2255–2272.
- DENT, D. H., AND S. J. WRIGHT. 2009. The future of tropical species in secondary forests: A quantitative review. *Biol. Conserv.* 142: 2833–2843.
- DINDA, S. 2004. Environmental Kuznets curve hypothesis: A survey. *Ecol. Econ.* 49: 431–455.
- DUNN, R. R. 2004. Recovery of faunal communities during tropical forest regeneration. *Conserv. Biol.* 18: 302–309.
- Environmental Systems Research Institute. 2008.
- FISCHER, J., B. BROST, G. C. DAILY, P. R. EHLRICH, R. GOLDMAN, J. GOLDSTEIN, D. B. LINDENMAYER, A. D. MANNING, H. A. MOONEY, L. PEJCHAR, J. RANGANATHAN, AND H. TALLIS. 2008. Should agricultural policies encourage land sparing or wildlife-friendly farming? *Front. Ecol. Environ.* 6: 380–385.

- Foresight. 2011. The future of food and farming: Challenges and choices for global sustainability. Final project report. The Government Office for Science, London, U.K.
- GARCIA, L. C., J. S. SANTOS, M. MATSUMOTO, T. S. F. SILVA, A. PADOVEZI, G. SPAROVEK, AND R. J. HOBBS. 2013. Restoration challenges and opportunities for increasing landscape connectivity under the new Brazilian Forest Act. *Natureza e Conservação* 11: 181–185.
- GARCÍA-BARRIOS, L., Y. M. GALVÁN-MIYOSHI, I. A. VALDIVIESO-PÉREZ, O. R. MASERA, G. BOCCO, AND J. VANDERMEER. 2009. Neotropical forest conservation, agricultural intensification, and rural out-migration: The Mexican experience. *Bioscience* 59: 863–873.
- GIBSON, L., T. M. LEE, L. P. KOH, B. W. BROOK, T. A. GARDNER, J. BARLOW, C. A. PERES, C. J. A. BRADSHAW, W. F. LAURANCE, T. E. LOVEJOY, AND N. S. SODHI. 2011. Primary forests are irreplaceable for sustaining tropical biodiversity. *Nature* 478: 378–381.
- GRAU, H. R., AND M. AIDE. 2008. Globalization and land-use transitions in Latin America. *Ecol. Soc.* 13: 16.
- Greenbelt Movement 2016; <http://www.greenbeltmovement.org/what-we-do/tree-planting-for-watersheds>; accessed 3 August, 2016.
- GUARIGUATA, M. R., AND R. OSTERTAG. 2001. Neotropical secondary forest succession: Changes in structural and functional characteristics. *For. Ecol. Manage.* 148: 185–206.
- HEDGES, L. V., J. GUREVITCH, AND P. S. CURTIS. 1999. The meta-analysis of response ratios in experimental ecology. *Ecology* 80: 1150–1156.
- HOLL, K. D., AND T. M. AIDE. 2011. When and where to actively restore ecosystems? *For. Ecol. Manage.* 261: 1558–1563.
- HOOPER, E., P. LEGENDRE, AND R. CONDIT. 2004. Factors affecting community composition of forest regeneration in deforested, abandoned land in Panama. *Ecology* 85: 3313–3326.
- JANISHEVSKI, L., C. SANTAMARIA, S. B. GIDDA, H. D. COOPER, AND P. H. S. BRANCALION. 2015. Ecosystem restoration, protected areas and biodiversity conservation. *Unasylva* 245: 19–28.
- KRÓLCZYK, J. B., AND A. E. LATAWIEC. 2015. Sustainability Indicators For Agriculture In The European Union. In A. E. Latawiec, and D. Agol (Ed.) *Sustainability indicators in practice*, deGruyter Open, Berlin/Warsaw. ISBN (Online): 9783110450507
- KRÓLCZYK, J. B., A. E. LATAWIEC, AND M. KUBON. 2014. Sustainable agriculture – The potential to increase wheat and rapeseed yields in Poland. *J. Environment. Stud.* 23: 663–672.
- LAMB, D., P. D. ERSKINE, AND J. A. PARROTTA. 2005. Restoration of degraded tropical forest landscapes. *Science* 310: 1628–1632.
- LAMB, D., R. KEENAN, AND K. GOULD. 2001. Historical background to plantation development in the tropics: A North Queensland case study. In H. S. Harrison, and J. Herbohn (Eds.), *Sustainable farm forestry in the tropics: Social and economic analysis and policy*, pp. 21–34. ??????, ??????.
- LATAWIEC, A. E., B. B. N. STRASSBURG, P. H. S. BRANCALION, R. R. RODRIGUES, AND T. A. GARDNER. 2015. Creating space for large-scale restoration in tropical agricultural landscapes. *Front. Ecol. Environ.* 13: 211–218.
- LEIGH, E., P. DAVIDAR, AND C. DICK. 2004. Why do some tropical forests have so many species of trees? *Biotropica* 36: 447–473.
- de LEITE, M. S., L. R. TAMBOSI, I. ROMITELLI, AND J. P. METZGER. 2013. Landscape ecology perspective in restoration projects for biodiversity conservation: A review. *Nat. Conserv.* 11: 108–118.
- LIEBSCH, D., M. C. M. MARQUES, AND R. GOLDENBERG. 2008. How long does the Atlantic Rain Forest take to recover after a disturbance? Changes in species composition and ecological features during secondary succession. *Biol. Conserv.* 141: 1717–1725.
- MATHER, A. S. 1992. The forest transition. *Area* 24: 367–379.
- MELO, F. P. L., S. R. R. PINTO, P. H. S. BRANCALION, S. C. CASTRO, R. R. RODRIGUES, J. ARONSON, AND M. TABARELLI. 2013. Priority settings for scaling-up tropical forest restoration projects: Early lessons from the Atlantic Forest Restoration Pact. *Environ. Sci. Policy* 33: 395–404.
- MEYFROIDT, P., T. K. RUDEL, AND E. F. LAMBIM. 2010. Forest transitions, trade, and the global displacement of land use. *Proc. Natl Acad. Sci. USA* 107: 20917–20922.
- MEYFROIDT, P., AND E. F. LAMBIM. 2011. Global forest transition: Prospects for an end to deforestation. *Annu. Rev. Environ. Resour.* 36: 343–371.
- NEPSTAD, D., D. McGRATH, C. STICKLER, A. ALENCAR, A. AZEVEDO, B. SWETTE, T. BEZERRA, M. DIGIANO, J. SHIMADA, R. S. MOTTA, E. ARMJO, L. CASTELLO, P. BRANDO, M. C. HANSEN, M. McGRATH-HORN, O. CARVALHO, AND L. HESS. 2014. Slowing Amazon deforestation through public policy and interventions in beef and soy supply chains. *Science* 344: 1118–1123.
- NEWBOLD, T., L. N. HUDSON, S. L. HILL, S. CONTU, I. LYSENKO, R. A. SENIOR, L. BORGER, D. J. BENNETT, A. CHOIMES, B. COLLEN, J. DAY, A. De PALMA, S. DIAZ, S. ECHEVERRIA-LONDOÑO, M. J. EDGAR, A. FELDMAN, M. GARON, M. L. HARRISON, T. ALHUSSEINI, D. J. INGRAM, Y. ITESCU, J. KATTGE, V. KEMP, L. KIRKPATRICK, M. KLEYER, D. L. CORREIA, C. D. MARTIN, S. MEIRI, M. NOVOSOLOV, Y. PAN, H. R. PHILLIPS, D. W. PURVES, A. ROBINSON, J. SIMPSON, S. L. TUCK, E. WEIHER, H. J. WHITE, R. M. EWERS, G. M. MACE, J. P. W. SCHARLEMANN, AND A. PURVIS. 2015. Global effects of land use on local terrestrial biodiversity. *Nature* 520: 45–50.
- OLSON, D. M., E. DINERSTEIN, E. D. WIKRAMANAYAKE, N. D. BURGESS, G. V. N. POWELL, E. C. UNDERWOOD, J. A. D'AMICO, I. ITOUA, H. E. STRAND, J. C. MORRISON, C. J. LOUCKS, F. A. ALLNUTT, T. H. RICKETS, Y. KURA, J. F. LAMOREUX, W. W. WETTENGEL, P. HEDAO, AND K. R. KASSEM. 2001. Terrestrial ecoregions of the world: A new map of life on earth. *Bioscience* 51: 933–938.
- PEREIRA, L., C. DE OLIVEIRA, AND J. TOREZAN. 2013. Woody species regeneration in Atlantic Forest restoration sites depends on surrounding landscape. *Nat. Conserv.* 11: 138–144.
- PERFECTO, I., AND J. VANDERMEER. 2010. The agroecological matrix as alternative to the land-sparing/agriculture intensification model. *Proc. Natl Acad. Sci. USA* 107: 5786–5791.
- PHALAN, B., R. E. GREEN, L. V. DICKS, G. DOTTA, C. FENIUK, A. LAMB, B. B. N. STRASSBURG, D. R. WILLIAMS, AND E. K. H. J. ZU ERMGASSEN. 2016. Harness high-yield agriculture to help make space for nature. *Science* 351: 450–451.
- POORTER, L., F. BONGERS, T. M. AIDE, A. M. A. ZAMBRANO, P. BALVANERA, J. M. BECKNELL, V. BOUKILI, P. H. S. BRANCALION, E. N. BROADBENT, R. L. CHAZDON, D. CRAVEN, J. S. ALMEIDA-CORTEZ, G. A. L. CABRAL, B. H. J. de JONG, J. S. DENSLOW, D. H. DENT, S. J. DeWALT, J. M. DUPUY, S. M. DURÁN, M. M. ESPÍRITO-SANTO, M. C. FANDINO, R. G. CÉSAR, J. S. HALL, J. L. HERNANDEZ-STEFANONI, C. C. JAKOVAC, A. B. JUNQUEIRA, D. KENNARD, S. G. LETCHER, J. C. LICONA, M. LOHBECK, E. MARÍN-SPIOTTA, M. MARTÍNEZ-RAMOS, P. MASSOJA, J. A. MEAVE, R. MESQUITA, F. MORA, R. MUÑOZ, R. MUSCARELLA, Y. R. F. NUNES, S. OCHOAGAONA, A. A. OLIVEIRA, E. ORIHUELA-BELMONTE, M. PEÑA-CLAROS, E. A. PÉREZ-GARCÍA, D. PIOTTO, J. S. POWERS, J. RODRÍGUEZ-VELÁZQUEZ, E. ROMERO-PÉREZ, J. RUÍZ, J. G. SALLARRIAGA, A. SANCHEZ-AZOFEIFA, N. B. SCHWARTZ, M. B. K. STEININGER, N. G. SWENSON, M. TOLEDO, M. URIARTE, M. VAN BRUGEL, H. van der WAL, M. D. M. VELOSO, H. F. M. VESTER, A. VICENTINI, I. C. G. VIEIRA, T. V. BENTOS, G. B. WILLIAMSON, AND D. M. A. ROZENDAAL. 2016. Biomass resilience of neotropical secondary forests. *Nature* 530: 211–214.
- R Development Core Team. 2010. R: A language and environment for statistical computing. R Development Core Team, ??????.
- REY BENAYAS, J. M., A. C. NEWTON, A. DIAZ, AND J. M. BULLOCK. 2009. Enhancement of biodiversity and ecosystems services by ecological restoration: A meta-analysis. *Science* 325: 1121–1124.
- RODRIGUES, R. R., S. GANDOLFI, A. G. NAVE, J. ARONSON, T. E. BARRETO, C. Y. VIDAL, AND P. H. S. BRANCALION. 2011. Large-scale ecological restoration of high-diversity tropical forests in SE Brazil. *Forest. Ecol. Manag.* 261: 1605–1613.
- RODRIGUES, R. R., R. A. F. LIMA, S. GANDOLFI, AND A. G. NAVE. 2009. On the restoration of high diversity forests: 30 years of experiences in the Brazilian Atlantic Forest. *Biol. Conserv.* 142: 1242–1251.
- RUDEL, T. K., O. T. COOMES, E. F. MORAN, F. ACHARD, A. ANGELSEN, J. XU, AND E. LAMBIM. 2005. Forest transitions: Towards a global understanding of the land use change. *Glob. Environ. Change* 15: 23–31.

- 1 RUIZ-JAEN, A., AND T. M. AIDE. 2005. Restorations success: How is it being  
2 measured? *Restor. Ecol.* 13: 569–577.
- 3 SANSEVERO, J. B. B., AND M. L. GARBIN. 2015. Restoration Success of Tropical  
4 Forests: The Search For Indicators. In A. E. Latawiec, and D. Ágol  
5 (Eds.), *Sustainability indicators in practice*, deGruyter Open, Berlin/  
6 Warsaw. ISBN (Online): 9783110450507, DOI (Book): 10.1515/  
7 9783110450507.
- 8 SAYER, J., U. CHOKKALINGAM, AND J. POULSEN. 2004. The restoration of forest  
9 biodiversity and ecological values. *For. Ecol. Manage.* 201: 3–11.
- 10 SFB. 2015. Serviço Florestal Brasileiro – 2016. Available in: <http://www.florestal.gov.br/cadastro-ambiental-rural/numeros-do-cadastro-ambiental-rural>.
- 11 SLIK, J. W. F., V. ARROYO-RODRIGUES, S.-I. AIBA, P. ALVAREZ-LOAYZA, L. F.  
12 ALVES, P. ASHTON, P. BALVABERA, M. L. BASTIAN, P. J. BELLINGHAM, E.  
13 van den BERG, L. BERNACCI, P. C. BISPO, L. BLANC, K. BOHNING-  
14 GAESE, P. BOECK, F. BONGERS, B. BOYLE, M. BRADFORD, AND F. Q.  
15 BREARLEY. 2015. An estimate of the number of tropical tree species.  
16 *Proc. Natl Acad. Sci. USA* 112: 7472–7477.
- 17 SOARES-FILHO, B., R. RAJÃO, M. MACEDO, A. CARNEIRO, W. COSTA, M. COE, H.  
18 RODRIGUES, AND A. ALENCAR. 2014. Cracking Brazil's Forest Code.  
19 *Science* 344: 363–364.
- 20 STRASSBURG, B. B. N., A. E. LATAWIEC, L. G. BARIONI, C. A. NOBRE, V. P. da  
21 SILVA, J. F. VALENTIM, M. VIANNA, AND E. D. ASSAD. 2014. When  
22 enough should be enough: Improving the use of current agricultural  
23 lands could meet production demands and spare natural habitants in  
24 Brazil. *Glob. Environ. Change* 28: 84–97.
- 25 TSCHARNKTE, T., C. SEKERCIOLU, AND T. DIESTSCH. 2008. Landscape con-  
26 straints on functional diversity of birds and insects in tropical agro-  
27 ecosystems. *Ecology* 89: 944–951.
- 28 United Nations Development Programme – Human Development Reports.  
29 2014. Human development index trends. <http://hdr.undp.org/en/data>.
- 30 VIEIRA, D., A. SCARIOT, A. SAMPAIO, AND K. HOLL. 2006. Tropical dry-forest  
31 regeneration from root suckers in Central Brazil. *J. Trop. Ecol.* 22:  
32 353–357.
- 33 WORTLEY, L., J. M. HERO, AND M. HOWES. 2013. Evaluating ecological restora-  
34 tion success: A review of the literature. *Restor. Ecol.* 21: 537–543.
- 35 WRI. 2012. First global commitment to forest restoration launched. World  
36 Resources Institute, New York.
- 37 WUETHRICH, B. 2007. Biodiversity: Reconstructing Brazil's Atlantic rainforest.  
38 *Science* 315: 1070–1072.
- 39 WUNDER, S. 2006. The efficiency of payments for environmental services in  
40 tropical conservation. *Conserv. Biol.* 21: 48–58.

# Author Query Form

Journal: BTP

Article: 12386

Dear Author,

During the copy-editing of your paper, the following queries arose. Please respond to these by marking up your proofs with the necessary changes/additions. Please write your answers on the query sheet if there is insufficient space on the page proofs. Please write clearly and follow the conventions shown on the attached corrections sheet. If returning the proof by fax do not write too close to the paper's edge. Please remember that illegible mark-ups may delay publication.

Many thanks for your assistance.

Query reference	Query	Remarks
1	<b>AUTHOR:</b> Please confirm that given names (red) and surnames/family names (green) have been identified correctly.	
2	<b>AUTHOR:</b> Please provide city name for eighth affiliation.	
3	<b>AUTHOR:</b> Crouzeilles et al. 2016 has been changed to Crouzeilles et al. 2016a, b so that this citation matches the Reference List. Please confirm that this is correct.	
4	<b>AUTHOR:</b> Please check the usage of the term “momenta”.	
5	<b>AUTHOR:</b> Crouzeilles et al. in press has been changed to Crouzeilles et al. 2016d so that this citation matches the Reference List. Please confirm that this is correct.	
6	<b>AUTHOR:</b> García-Barrios et al. 2009 has been changed to García-Barrios et al. 2009 so that this citation matches the Reference List. Please confirm that this is correct.	
7	<b>AUTHOR:</b> Rezende et al. 2015 has been changed to De Rezende et al. 2015 so that this citation matches the Reference List. Please confirm that this is correct.	
8	<b>AUTHOR:</b> Krolczyk et al. 2014 has been changed to Królczyk et al. 2014 so that this citation matches the Reference List. Please confirm that this is correct.	
9	<b>AUTHOR:</b> Krolczyk & Latawiec 2015 has been changed to Królczyk and Latawiec 2015 so that this citation matches the Reference List. Please confirm that this is correct.	
10	<b>AUTHOR:</b> Benayas et al. 2009 has been changed to Rey Benayas et al. 2009 so that this citation matches the Reference List. Please confirm that this is correct.	
11	<b>AUTHOR:</b> Meyfroidt & Lambin 2011 has been changed to Meyfroidt & Lambim 2011 so that this citation matches the Reference List. Please confirm that this is correct.	
12	<b>AUTHOR:</b> Meyfroidt et al. 2010 has been changed to Meyfrodtd et al. 2010 so that this citation matches the Reference List. Please confirm that this is correct.	

13	AUTHOR: Tscharntke et al. 2008 has been changed to Tscharnkte et al. 2008 so that this citation matches the Reference List. Please confirm that this is correct.	
14	AUTHOR: Brancalion et al. 2016 has been changed to Brancalion et al. 2016a,b so that this citation matches the Reference List. Please confirm that this is correct.	
15	AUTHOR: SFB 2016 has been changed to SFB 2015 so that this citation matches the Reference List. Please confirm that this is correct.	
16	AUTHOR: Please provide the page range for reference Brancalion et al. (2016a).	
17	AUTHOR: Please provide the family name for the author B. B. N. for reference Brancalion et al. (2012).	
18	AUTHOR: Please provide the volume number, page range for reference Chazdon et al..	
19	AUTHOR: Chazdon et al. has not been cited in the text. Please indicate where it should be cited; or delete from the Reference List.	
20	AUTHOR: Please provide the page range for reference Chazdon and Guariguata (2016).	
21	AUTHOR: Please provide the page range for reference Crouzeilles et al. (2016a).	
22	AUTHOR: Reference ‘Crouzeilles, R., M. Curran, M. S. Ferreira, D. B. Lindenmayer, C. E. Grelle, and J. M. R. Benayas (2016)’ has been repeated twice. Hence one of the reference has been deleted. Please check.	
23	AUTHOR: Please provide volume number and page range for reference Crouzeilles 2016b.	
24	AUTHOR: Please provide the volume number, page range for reference Crouzeilles et al. (2016c).	
25	AUTHOR: Please provide more details for reference Environmental Systems Research Institute 2008.	
26	AUTHOR: Please provide the publisher name, publisher location for reference Lamb et al. (2001).	
27	AUTHOR: Leite et al. (2013) has not been cited in the text. Please indicate where it should be cited; or delete from the Reference List.	
28	AUTHOR: Please provide the publisher location for reference R Development Core Team (2010).	
29	AUTHOR: Year 2015 has been inserted from the text for reference Sansevero. Please check.	
30	AUTHOR: Year 2014 has been inserted from the text for reference Soares-Filho et al.	
31	AUTHOR: Figure 3 has been saved at a low resolution of 152 dpi. Please resupply at 600 dpi. Check required artwork specifications at <a href="http://authorservices.wiley.com/bauthor/illustration.asp">http://authorservices.wiley.com/bauthor/illustration.asp</a>	