



The response of bats to dispersed retention of broad-leaved trees in harvested conifer plantations in Hokkaido, northern Japan

Nanoka Teshima^{a,1}, Kazuhiro Kawamura^{a,b,1}, Takumi Akasaka^{c,*}, Satoshi Yamanaka^d, Futoshi Nakamura^a

^a Department of Forest Science, Graduate School of Agriculture, Hokkaido University, Kitaku Kita 9 Nishi 9, Sapporo, Hokkaido 060-8589, Japan

^b Department of Wildlife Biology, Forestry and Forest Products Research Institute, Matsunosato 1, Tsukuba, Ibaraki 305-8687, Japan

^c Laboratory of Conservation Ecology, Obihiro University of Agriculture and Veterinary Medicine, Nishi 2-sen 11, Inadacho, Obihiro, Hokkaido 080-8555, Japan

^d Hokkaido Research Center, Forestry and Forest Products Research Institute, Hitsujigaoka 7, Sapporo, Hokkaido 062-8516, Japan

ARTICLE INFO

Keywords:

Variable retention
Green-tree retention
Silvicultural treatment
Clear-felling
Chiroptera
Sakhalin fir

ABSTRACT

The area of tree plantations has been expanding globally. While plantations generally support less biodiversity than natural forests, the habitat function of plantations can be enhanced by management. Retention forestry is a promising method to mitigate the negative impacts of harvesting on forest-dependent species through retaining some vital habitat structures for organisms. Bats are highly dependent on forests and have an important pest-control function; however, their response to retention forestry remains unknown. We surveyed bat activity at clear-cut sites, sites with dispersed broad-leaved tree retention (medium-level retention: 50 trees/ha, high-level retention: 100 trees/ha), and unharvested Todo fir (*Abies sachalinensis*) plantations in Hokkaido, northern Japan. We analyzed the effects of these treatments on genus richness and the activity of three groups preferring different degrees of habitat openness (cluttered-space species, open-space species, and edge species). Genus richness and the activity of cluttered-space species were higher at retention sites than at clear-cut sites. Similarly, the activity of edge species was higher at high-level retention sites than at clear-cut sites and comparable to that at unharvested plantations. Unexpectedly, the pattern of open-space species was similar to that of edge species. The increase in bat activity due to high-level retention was predicted to be 3.4 and 6.1 times that of medium-level retention for cluttered-space and edge species, respectively. Our results imply that dispersed broad-leaved tree retention in conifer plantations mitigates the negative impacts of harvesting on cluttered-space and edge species, and high-level retention is more effective. Thus, retaining large numbers of trees in a few harvested compartments and clear-cutting in others can be more effective for conserving bat activity than retaining a smaller number of trees in each of many compartments. For biodiversity conservation in plantation landscapes, it would be worthwhile to consider not only the common strategy of low retention in each of many harvested compartments but also a management strategy that retains many trees in a few compartments.

1. Introduction

Planted forests have been expanding worldwide and account for 7% of the global forest area (FAO, 2020). Planted forests dominate many landscapes; for example, the proportion of planted forest among the total forest area is 36% in East Asia and 30% in Europe, excluding the Russian Federation (FAO, 2020). Planted forests that are intensively managed (composed of one or two species, even age class, and regular spacing of trees) are defined as tree plantations (FAO, 2020). Planted

forests, especially plantations, generally support less biodiversity than natural forests because the forest composition and structure are less diverse (Brocknerhoff et al., 2008; Chaudhary et al., 2016). Conversely, abundance or species richness for a range of taxa in planted forests can be enhanced by management activities, such as the tree species selection, stand maturation, or maintenance of native trees within stands (Hartley, 2002; Castaño-Villa et al., 2019; López-Bedoya et al., 2021). In landscapes dominated by plantations, the conservation of forest-dependent species in plantations can be an important means to

* Corresponding author.

E-mail address: mail2taq@gmail.com (T. Akasaka).

¹ These two authors contributed equally.

maintain or enhance regional biodiversity, and specific management methods have recently been proposed to achieve this aim (Yamaura et al., 2012; Demarais et al., 2017; McFadden and Dirzo, 2018).

One of the main purposes of plantations is timber production (FAO, 2020). In 2012, planted forests, almost half of which were plantations, produced 46.3% of global industrial round wood despite their small area (Payn et al., 2015). Conserving biodiversity in plantations requires management methods that are compatible with timber production (Yamaura et al., 2012; Demarais et al., 2017). Clear-cutting is a common timber-harvesting technique, but results in a huge decline of forest-dependent species following tree removal (Paillet et al., 2010; Chaudhary et al., 2016). Retention forestry has been proposed to mitigate the negative impact of harvesting (Franklin et al., 1997). In this silvicultural system, some important components for organisms and ecosystems are retained in harvested areas (Gustafsson et al., 2012; Lindenmayer et al., 2012). Retention forestry has been used mainly in natural forests or naturally regenerated forests in many parts of the world (Pastur et al., 2020). Its effectiveness for biodiversity conservation has been demonstrated in several meta-analyses (Rosenvald and Löhmus, 2008; Fedrowitz et al., 2014; Mori and Kitagawa, 2014).

Retention forestry also likely contributes to biodiversity conservation in plantations (Demarais et al., 2017; McFadden and Dirzo, 2018), but this benefit has not been investigated (Gustafsson et al., 2012; Lindenmayer et al., 2012; Yamaura et al., 2018). In conifer plantations, which are common in boreal and temperate zones (FAO, 2006), mixed broad-leaved trees are essential for many species as prey resources or roosting/nesting sites, e.g., for insects (Ohsawa, 2007) and birds (Lindbladh et al., 2017). Broad-leaved tree retention is therefore considered a promising approach for conserving biodiversity in conifer plantations (Yamaura et al., 2018, 2019). Its effectiveness for ground beetles was demonstrated in a large-scale experiment in Japan (Yamanaka et al., 2021). However, the effects of retention forestry are likely to vary across taxa (Rosenvald and Löhmus, 2008; Fedrowitz et al., 2014; Mori and Kitagawa, 2014), and the responses of various taxa need to be evaluated before retention forestry can be promoted in plantations.

Most bats in temperate forests are nocturnal insectivores and have important roles in controlling pest populations in plantations (Charbonnier et al., 2014). Many studies have revealed that forest harvesting profoundly affects bat communities, although the effects differ among species. Intensive harvesting (i.e., removing most trees from stands) decreases the activity of species that prefer the forest interior or edges (cluttered-space species and edge species, respectively), but increases the activity of species preferring open habitats (open-space species) (Law et al., 2016; Węgiel et al., 2019; Loeb, 2020). In contrast, mature conifer plantations with flying spaces under the canopies can be suitable habitats for cluttered-space and edge species (Starbuck et al., 2015; Law et al., 2016), and mixed broad-leaved trees likely support their activity (Charbonnier et al., 2016). Thus, retaining broad-leaved trees in harvested conifer plantations may mitigate the impact of harvesting on cluttered-space and edge species. However, few studies have focused on the effects of retention forestry on bats (but see Hogberg et al., 2002; Law and Law, 2011), and none have been conducted in planted forests.

In Japan, plantations account for 41% of the total forest area, and are principally monocultures of conifer trees (Yamaura et al., 2012; Forestry Agency, 2017a). Plantations largely replaced natural forests after clear-cutting from the 1950s to 1980s, and they have matured and remain unharvested because of the decline of forestry over the subsequent decades (Yamaura et al., 2012). Recently clear-cutting of mature plantations has occurred across Japan to increase the domestic wood supply; however, the Forestry Agency has also stressed the need to improve biodiversity and the provision of ecosystem services in plantations as a measure to achieve sustainable development (Kakizawa et al., 2018; Forestry Agency, 2020). Two recent meta-analyses in Japan revealed that Pinaceae plantations are important as habitats for various taxa, with mature stands supporting a higher abundance and richness of birds and woody plants than younger ones (Spake et al., 2019; Kawamura et al.,

2021). Yoshikura et al. (2011) compared bat communities and forest structures between Pinaceae plantations and old-growth natural forests and stressed the importance of restoring the features of old-growth forests (e.g., large or dead trees) in plantations for supporting forest-dependent bat species. It is therefore crucial for the conservation of forest biodiversity, including bats, to evaluate the effects of retention forestry in Pinaceae plantations in Japan.

The aim of this study was to evaluate the responses of bats to broad-leaved tree retention in harvested Pinaceae plantations in Hokkaido, northern Japan. Specifically, we recorded the echolocation calls of bats at different harvested sites, including clear-cutting and two levels of tree retention (medium and high), as well as unharvested Todo fir *Abies sachalinensis* plantations. We compared bat activity and the genus richness among treatments. Considering the differences in harvesting effects on bats according to habitat preference, we categorized each genus or species into one of three groups (cluttered-space, edge, and open-space species) based on wing morphologies and echolocation call characteristics. Separate analyses were then conducted for each group.

2. Materials and methods

2.1. Study region and sites

The study was conducted in 2019 using sites from the Retention Experiment for Plantation Forestry in Sorachi, Hokkaido (REFRESH project) (43°34'37"–39°26"N, 142°05'27"–09°33"E). In Hokkaido, Pinaceae plantations have replaced broad-leaved natural forests, particularly those of native Todo fir, which constitute more than half of the plantation area (Forestry Agency, 2017b; Yamaura et al., 2018). The study sites were in forested landscapes dominated by Todo fir plantations, and the remaining natural forests were composed mainly of broad-leaved trees (Yamaura et al., 2018).

Among the REFRESH sites, we selected plantation harvesting sites that had received three different treatments (clear-cut [CC], medium-level retention [MR] and high-level retention [HR]), and an unharvested Todo fir plantation [UP] as a control (hereafter, the term treatment is used to describe all four types of sites; Fig. 1). At the MR and HR sites, dispersed 50 and 100 broad-leaved trees/ha were retained, respectively, mainly birch (*Betula platyphylla*, *B. ermanii*, and *B. maximowicziana*), linden (*Tilia japonica*), and Mongolian oak (*Quercus crispula*). The proportion of broad-leaved trees retained among all trees before harvesting was as follows: MR (number basis: 7.3–10.8%, basal area basis: 5.7–12.9%, volume basis: 4.1–11.9%) and HR (number basis: 15.0–18.1%, basal area basis: 18.6–26.5%, volume basis: 16.7–26.5%). Broad-leaved trees were mixed at the UP sites, accounting for 18.2–27.5% of all trees based on the number of trees, and 8.1–10% based on the basal area, based on the results of a survey of seven 20 × 20-m plots at each site (Akashi et al., 2017). Each treatment had three replicates (i.e., 12 sites were surveyed in total) that were not spatially clustered (Appendix S1). The distance between sites was greater than 360 m. Within a 1-km radius from the center of each site, forest accounted for 86–100% of the area. The percentages of broad-leaved natural forests in the same radius for the three replicates at each site were as follows: CC, 21%, 23%, and 27%; MR, 15%, 16%, and 34%; HR, 11%, 18%, and 20%; and UP, 17%, 18%, and 26%. The area of each site was 5.87–7.94 ha (Akashi et al., 2017). The stand ages of the three UPs were 52, 52, and 55 years when the surveys were conducted, and the other sites were studied at 3–5 years post-harvesting (Akashi et al., 2017; Yamaura et al., 2018). Todo fir seedlings had been planted at the harvested sites, and weeding had been conducted once or twice annually (Akashi et al., 2017; Yamaura et al., 2018). The details of this experiment were described in Yamaura et al. (2018).

2.2. Bat survey

We recorded the echolocation calls of bats to evaluate bat activity




Fig. 1. Photographs of representative sites for each treatment: (a) clear-cut (CC), (b) unharvested conifer plantation (UP), and (c) medium-level dispersed broad-leaved tree retention (50 trees/ha) (MR) (number basis: 7.3–10.8%, basal area basis: 5.7–12.9%, volume basis: 4.1–11.9%), (d) high-level dispersed broad-leaved tree retention (100 trees/ha) (HR) (number basis: 15.0–18.1%, basal area basis: 18.6–26.5%, volume basis: 16.7–26.5%).

using bat detectors (Song Meter SM4BAT FS, Wildlife Acoustics, Inc., USA). We placed bat detectors connected to microphones (SMM-U2, Wildlife Acoustics, Inc.) at three sampling points at each site. Each sampling point was at least 50 m from the next-nearest sampling point. Bat activity was likely to be high near the edges between harvested and unharvested areas, potentially because cluttered- and open-space species avoid open spaces and the forest interior, respectively, or because there are abundant prey resources (Morris et al., 2010; Law and Law, 2011). We selected sampling points near the center of sites for a harvesting treatment (at least 40 m from the edges between harvested and unharvested forests) to reduce the edge effects and assess the differences in bat activity among treatments. We placed microphones 1.2 m above the ground to reduce the recording of natural noise near the ground (e.g., the sound of grass swaying in the wind) and prevent microphone damage by small animals. The microphones were directed toward the sky to record bat calls from all directions.

The surveys were conducted from June 13 to October 2, 2019. To consider the lifecycle of bats in Hokkaido, the surveys at each site were conducted twice across the breeding and dispersal seasons. The first period was from the evening of June 13 to the early morning of July 31, 2019, and the second was from the evening of July 31 to the early morning of October 2, 2019 (Ohdachi et al., 2009). The bat detectors were activated automatically from 30 min before sunset to 30 min after sunrise. We obtained data derived from 4 to 12 nights without rain in each survey period at each site. In this study, the bat detectors recorded a sequence of sounds for 15 s once they detected a high-frequency sound and then saved it as a single observation; any sounds that continued for longer than 15 s were recorded as multiple observations. The average temperature, precipitation, and average wind velocity during the survey period (June to October) were 17.24 °C, 113.2 mm, and 1.82 m/s, respectively, which did not differ from those in the previous 10 years (17.25 ± 1.11 °C, 135.69 ± 55.68 mm, and 1.98 ± 0.21 m/s, respectively).

Temperature can affect bat activity because the activity of their insect prey is likely reduced during periods with low temperatures (Rydell

et al., 1996). Following Fukui et al. (2011), who conducted a study in the same region, we examined whether there were any days with a temperature < 10 °C at sunset (1900 h) at Ashibetsu, a nearby observation station of the Japanese Meteorological Agency (<https://www.data.jma.go.jp/gmd/risk/obsdl/index.php>; accessed on September 1, 2021). There were no such days during the first period, and there were only 2 days during the second period. Of these 2 days, a single datum from September 19 was excluded from the analyses because the temperature was low for a long time, even at noon before the survey (maximum: 11.8 °C), and no bat calls were recorded. We therefore used all the data except for that collected on September 19. Finally, we considered the total calls recorded at each sampling point in each survey period as the analysis unit and obtained 72 samples (12 sites × three sampling points × two periods).

2.3. Sound analysis and bat grouping

The recorded sound data were displayed as sonograms using Kaleidoscope analysis software (Wildlife Acoustics, Inc.). Following Fukui et al. (2004) and Ohdachi et al. (2009), each call was visually identified to each genus and two different activity types (commuting pass or feeding buzz; hereafter, pass and buzz, respectively). Eight genera were identified at the study sites, and for three of them (*Plecotus*, *Barbastella*, and *Eptesicus*) only one species occurs in the region (Ohdachi et al., 2009). Therefore, we treated them as the following species: Japanese long-eared bat (*Plecotus sacrimontis*), Japanese barbastelle (*Barbastella pacifica*), and Northern bat (*Eptesicus nilssonii*). Ultimately, we counted the numbers of sound data points consisting of passes or buzzes for each genus/species and used them as an index of bat activity. Differences in the numbers of survey nights were considered when constructing models, as outlined in Section 2.4.

We categorized each genus/species into the following three groups according to their wing morphologies and echolocation call characteristics: cluttered-space species with wide, short, and rounded wings and high-frequency calls, adapted to flying slowly in cluttered spaces

(*P. sacrimontis*, *B. pacifica*, *Murina* spp., and *Rhinolophus* spp.); open-space species with narrow, long, and pointed wings and low-frequency calls, adapted for fast flight in open environments (*Nyctalus* spp., *E. nilssonii*, and *Vespertilio* spp.); and edge species with intermediate morphologies between cluttered- and open-space species, which prefer to use the edge space between forests and open habitats (*Myotis* spp.) (Norberg and Rayner, 1987; Fukui et al., 2011). There is little information available regarding the ecology of *B. pacifica* (Kruskop et al., 2019), but in many studies this species has been captured mainly within continuous mixed conifer and broad-leaved forests (e.g., Sato et al., 2008; Sugai et al., 2011), especially in cluttered spaces (Akasaka et al., 2004). Akasaka et al. (2004) captured seven individuals on an abandoned (almost vanished) forest road, but did not find them on four other active forest roads. Thus, we categorized *B. pacifica* as a cluttered-space species. Among the *Myotis* genus, Ikonnikov's bat (*M. ikonnikovi*), Fraternal myotis (*M. frater*), and Japanese large-footed bat (*M. macrodactylus*) were present in the study area (Ohdachi et al., 2009). Of these species, *M. ikonnikovi* and *M. macrodactylus* are considered to be edge species in Japan (Fukui et al., 2004). Although the ecology of *M. frater* is poorly understood, the sound structure of its echolocation call is similar to that of other *Myotis* species that are considered to be edge species (Masuda et al., 2017). This species has been observed in linear open spaces in Japan (Endo, 1967) and five individuals were caught at the intersection of scrub-covered hills and cedar forest, primary oak forest, and forest edges in India (Chakravarty et al., 2020). Therefore, we collectively categorized *Myotis* as edge species.

Although each sampling point was arranged to be spatially independent, multiple bat detectors at the same site may have recorded the same call (i.e., duplicate recordings). This was a particular issue for open-space species because these species make low-frequency calls, which can easily travel long distances. After sorting the data, we found that echolocation calls were recorded at multiple sampling points at the same time (2 s before and after) only for *Nyctalus* spp., which accounted for less than 2% of the total calls for the open-space species. The percentages were 15%, 25%, and 32% for the periods 10, 20, and 30 s before and after, respectively, which implied that duplicate recordings were rare.

2.4. Statistical analysis

We analyzed the treatment effects on bat communities using a generalized linear mixed model (family = Poisson, link function = log). The response variables were genus richness and the number of passes (i.e., activity) of each group or genus/species in each survey period at each sampling point. We considered each treatment (CC, MR, HR, and UP) as four categorical explanatory variables. The intercept of the linear predictor was omitted (cell means method: Kéry, 2010) to facilitate comparison of expected values among treatments. For the convergence of the models for some genus/species, we excluded the data from CC sites where no calls were recorded. Considering the linear increase in bat activity with survey effort, we added a logarithmically transformed form of the number of survey nights [$\log(\text{survey nights})$] as an offset term [$\exp(x + \log(\text{survey nights})) = (\text{survey nights}) * \exp(x)$].

Although duplicate recordings were rare, multiple bat detectors at the same site could have observed the same individual over a short period (i.e., pseudo-replication). Moreover, three samples from the same site in the same period may have exhibited similar values due to factors other than the treatments or pseudo-replication (e.g., landscape composition and seasonal behavior of bats; Vasko et al., 2020; Froidevaux et al., 2021). In contrast, the variation in bat activity among samples could be large even for the same site and period due to local-scale environments (e.g., the amount of prey or roost resources; Akasaka et al., 2010). Therefore, we added two random effects: *SeasonSite ID*, which accounted for differences in bat activity among sites and seasons and for pseudo-replication among samples; and *Sample ID*, which accounted for large variations among samples for bat activity, i.e.,

overdispersion. The following equation was used to analyze bat activity at sampling point *i* during survey period *j* (*Activity_{ij}*):

$$\log(\text{Activity}_{ij}) = \beta_i \times \text{treatment}_i + \text{SeasonSite ID}_{ij} + \text{Sample ID}_{ij} + \log(\text{survey night}_{ij}),$$

where β is a coefficient. In preliminary analyses, we confirmed that the model incorporating these two random effects performed better (lowest Akaike information criterion value) than models with other possible combinations (Appendix S2). We calculated the 95% confidence intervals of each coefficient. We interpreted the difference as significant when the intervals did not overlap between the two treatments. In addition, to compare the conservation effectiveness between MR and HR, we calculated the increases in the activity of cluttered-space and edge species at MR and HR sites compared to that at CC sites, using the expected values of activity (i.e., the estimates of the mean value) derived from the constructed models.

For all genera/species in this study, fewer buzzes were recorded than passes (Appendix S3). In addition, the numbers of buzzes and passes were highly correlated (*Murina* spp.: $r = 0.997$, *Myotis* spp.: $r = 0.793$, *Nyctalus* spp.: $r = 0.874$). Thus, we focused only on passes for the analyses. Appendix S3 describes the results on buzzes in the preliminary analyses and the comparisons with those for passes.

We conducted sensitivity analyses to examine the effects of any temporal autocorrelation, which may have originated from the situation in which many calls of the same individual were recorded in the same place in a short duration. We constructed models using data where multiple series of calls of the same species within 1 min were counted as one. Because these estimates were almost identical to those using the original data, we used the original data for the analyses (Appendix S4).

In the analysis of genus richness, the increase in the richness with the number of survey nights may not be directly proportional and could level off when most genera were recorded. In preliminary analyses, we confirmed that the effects on results of differences in the numbers of survey nights were negligible (Appendix S5). We removed *Sample ID*, which accounted for overdispersion, from random variables because the variation among samples was smaller than the variation in the activity of each group/genus (Appendix S2). Thus, the following equation was used to analyze genus richness:

$$\log(\text{Richness}_{ij}) = \beta \times \text{treatment}_i + \text{SeasonSite ID}_{ij},$$

where *Richness* is the genus richness during each survey period at each sampling point. We performed all of these analyses using “lme4” ver. 1.1.27 (Bates et al., 2015) in R ver. 4.1.0 (R Core Team, 2021).

3. Results

The following eight genera of bats were recorded: four genera of cluttered-space species (*P. sacrimontis*, *B. pacifica*, *Murina* spp., and *Rhinolophus* spp.), one genus of edge species (*Myotis* spp.), and three genera of open-space species (*Nyctalus* spp., *E. nilssonii*, and *Vespertilio* spp.). The most frequently recorded genus was *Myotis* spp. (total number of recorded passes: 14,959). The most recorded genus of cluttered-space species was *P. sacrimontis*, followed by *Murina* spp., *B. pacifica*, and *Rhinolophus* spp. (total number of passes for each species: 2,050, 505, 168, and 8, respectively). Of the open-space species, most passes were recorded for *Nyctalus* spp., followed by *E. nilssonii* and *Vespertilio* spp. (total number of passes for each species: 6,633, 681, and 152, respectively).

For genus richness and the activity of cluttered-space species, the values were highest at the UP sites, followed by the HR, MR, and CC sites. The values were significantly higher at the UP, HR, and MR sites than at the CC sites (Fig. 2a, b, Table S6a, b in Appendix S6). Cluttered-space species were less active at MR sites than in UPs, and their activity at HR sites tended to be low, but the difference from UPs was not significant (Fig. 2b, Table S6b). This pattern mainly reflected that of




Fig. 2. Genus richness and the activity of each group in each treatment: (a) genus richness, (b) activity of cluttered-space species, (c) activity of edge species (*Myotis* spp.), and (d) the activity of open-space species. Closed dots and solid bars indicate the expected values (estimates of the mean value) and 95% confidence intervals, respectively. Red translucent dots represent each observation, where the color becomes darker when similar values are recorded. The letters of the alphabet attached to the right shoulder of the bar indicate statistical significance, and two treatments with a significant difference do not contain the same letter. Abbreviations: CC, clear-cut; MR, medium-level retention of dispersed broad-leaved trees; HR, high-level retention of dispersed broad-leaved trees; UP, unharvested plantation control. (For interpretation of the references to color in this figure legend, the reader is referred to the web version of this article.)

P. sacrimontis, but the activity of this species did not differ significantly between the MR and CC sites (Fig. 3a, Table S7a in Appendix S7). Meanwhile, *B. pacifica* was more active at the UP, HR, and MR sites than at the CC sites, and there were no significant differences among sites, except at CC sites (Fig. 3b, Table S7b). *Murina* spp. and *Rhinolophus* spp. were not detected at CC sites, and the differences among the other sites were not significant (Fig. 3c, d, Table S7c, d). Furthermore, no buzzes of cluttered-space species were recorded at CC sites (Fig. S3.1 in Appendix S3). For cluttered-space species, the increases in activity were predicted to be 0.49 and 1.66 passes/night at the MR and HR sites compared to the CC sites, respectively, indicating that HR was 3.41 times more effective than MR for the conservation of the activity of these species.

Edge species (*Myotis* spp.) exhibited a pattern similar to that of cluttered-space species. The expected activity was highest in UPs, followed by the HR, MR, and CC sites, and the values were higher at UP and HR sites than at CC sites (Fig. 2c, Table S6c). In contrast to cluttered-space species, the activity of edge species at HR sites was comparable to that at UP sites, and the activity at MR sites did not differ significantly from that at the other sites (Fig. 2c, Table S6c). For edge species, the increases in activity were 2.48 and 15.04 passes/night for the MR and HR sites compared to the CC sites, respectively, indicating that HR was 6.07 times more effective than MR for conserving the activity of these species.

For open-space species, the expected activity was highest at HR sites, followed by the UP, MR, and CC sites, and the values were significantly higher at the HR and UP sites than at the CC sites (Fig. 2d, Table S6d). This pattern mainly reflected that of *Nyctalus* spp., but the activity of this species in UPs did not differ significantly from that at CC sites (Fig. 4a, Table S7e). The activity of *E. nilssonii*, was higher at the UP and HR sites than at the CC sites (Fig. 4b, Table S7f). *Vespertilio* spp. was not detected

at the CC sites, and the differences among the other sites were not significant (Fig. 4c, Table S7g).

4. Discussion

4.1. Effects of plantation clear-cutting on cluttered-space and edge species

Our results imply that clear-cutting *Todo* fir plantations negatively impacted the activity of cluttered-space and edge species of bats, decreasing the observed genus richness. The habitat preferences of each bat species are strongly associated with their flight morphology. Cluttered-space species with broad wings and high-frequency calls are adapted to flying in cluttered spaces and forage in forest interiors (Norberg and Rayner, 1987; Müller et al., 2012). *Myotis* spp., with intermediate morphologies between cluttered- and open-space species, were edge species at our sites, and their activity generally increased in the small canopy gaps created by natural or artificial disturbances (e.g., Humes et al., 1999; Fukui et al., 2011). In the region near our study sites, cluttered-space and edge species avoid treefall gaps with an area of 1 ha (Fukui et al., 2011). For these two groups with low-speed flight adapted to forested areas, large open spaces would present a high risk of being caught by predators or a high cost of flying due to wind (Limpens and Kapteyn, 1991; Grindal and Brigham, 1999). Therefore, clear-cut land is likely unsuitable for foraging or commuting activities for both cluttered-space and edge species. Although we did not compare the habitat functions of plantations and broad-leaved natural forests, maintaining mature plantations would assist the conservation of these two groups.




Fig. 3. Activity of each genus of cluttered-space species in each treatment: (a) *Plecotus sacrimontis*, (b) *Barbastella pacifica*, (c) *Murina* spp., and (d) *Rhinolophus* spp. Note that the outlier value of the activity at the medium-level retention (MR) site (54.50 passes/night) is not shown in (c). See details in Fig. 2.

4.2. Effects of dispersed broad-leaved tree retention on cluttered-space and edge species

We found that retaining dispersed broad-leaved trees mitigated the negative impacts of conifer-plantation harvesting on cluttered-space and edge species (Fig. 2b, c). To our knowledge, this is the first study to show the effectiveness of dispersed retention for bat conservation. Two previous studies on bats showed only the effectiveness of retaining small unharvested patches (i.e., aggregated retention; Hogberg et al., 2002; Law and Law, 2011). Although Law and Law (2011) also evaluated the effects of dispersed retention in Tasmania, they concluded that dispersed tree retention on a 10% basal-area basis was less effective than aggregated retention. Compared to their study, the number of retained trees in our study was higher (maximum 27% on a basal area basis). In addition, the value of retained trees compared to harvested trees may have been higher in our study than in their study, in which eucalyptus trees were retained and harvested, because broad-leaved trees are considered to have higher values for bats, e.g., as a source of prey insects, than conifer trees (Yui and Ishii, 1994; Ohsawa, 2007). For these reasons, the effects of retention would have been easy to detect in this study.

Dispersed trees in harvested areas likely provide forest-dependent species with suitable environments for activity and rest (Franklin et al., 1997). Our results support this assumption, in that cluttered-space species were more active at the retention sites than at the clear-cut sites (Fig. 2b; Fig. 3). Some of the spaces within or close to the canopies of retained broad-leaved trees can support the activity of cluttered-space species. In particular, *B. pacifica* and *Murina* spp. use not only cluttered spaces but also small open spaces or edges (Dewa, 2010; Russo et al., 2015, 2020). Dispersed retention would be more effective for

these species with higher tolerance to decreased tree density (Fig. 3b, c). In contrast, *P. sacrimontis* exhibited relatively low activity at the retention sites (Fig. 3a). A closely related species, Common long-eared bat (*Plecotus auratus*) flies slowly and catches insects from surfaces while hovering, and thus has a strong preference for the forest interior (Entwistle et al., 1996). Even high-level retention sites may therefore be inferior habitats for *P. sacrimontis* compared to unharvested plantations.

Edge species (*Myotis* spp.) were more active at high-level retention sites than at clear-cut sites (Fig. 2c). Studies have indicated that the activity of this group is high in thinned forests or small clear-cut areas (Humes et al., 1999; Dodd et al., 2012). In retention forestry, the spaces around the retained trees likely function as edges, as expected by Baker et al. (2013). However, retaining 50 trees/ha would be insufficient for this group, and no significant effects were detected for medium-level retention sites. Conversely, unharvested plantations had similar activity levels to those of high-level retention sites. In the unharvested plantations, the trees were spaced regularly and linearly and the tree density had been managed by thinning (Akashi et al., 2017). There was no dense understory (i.e., dwarf bamboo) that suppressed the other plant species in these plantations (Akashi et al., 2021). Therefore, the unharvested plantations provided suitable environments for the flight of edge species under canopies. Our results indicate that retaining 100 broad-leaved trees/ha maintained habitat function for edge species (*Myotis* spp.) at a level comparable to that of an unharvested Todo fir plantation.

4.3. Responses of open-space species to harvesting

Unexpectedly, the activity of open-space species was relatively high




Fig. 4. Activity of each genus of open-space species in each treatment: (a) *Nyctalus* spp., (b) *Eptesicus nilssonii*, and (c) *Vespertilio* spp. See details in Fig. 2.

at the high-level retention and unharvested plantation sites (Fig. 2d). Some studies have suggested that open-space bat species (mainly *Nyctalus* spp. in the study area) are less sensitive to disturbances because they fly over canopies (e.g., Menzel et al., 2005; Müller et al., 2013). The habitat function of unharvested forests for open-space species can be high in some regions or for some species, e.g., *Nyctalus leisleri* (Waters et al., 1999) and *E. nilssonii* (Kaňuch et al., 2008). It has also been reported that open-space species frequently use conifer forests (Patriquin and Barclay, 2003; Ober et al., 2020; Buchholz et al., 2021). Mature conifer plantations may therefore have a high value for open-space species.

In contrast, the pattern of lower activity at clear-cut sites may be explained by a biased distribution of prey resources at clear-cut sites or the preferences of each bat species for the forest edge. Studies have shown that the density of prey insects is higher near the edges of forest and clear-cut areas (Grindal and Brigham, 1999; Burford et al., 1999). Therefore, prey resources for bats may have been scarce around our sampling points at clear-cut sites 40 m from the forest edges. In addition, *Nyctalus* spp., treated as an open-space species, may actually prefer the open spaces near edges, as is the case for *Nyctalus noctula* (Rachwald, 1992; Heim et al., 2018). The relatively high activity of *Nyctalus* spp. at the high-level retention sites supports this assumption (Fig. 4a, Appendix S3, Table S7e). Future research should examine bat activity or behavior considering distances from linear edges created between unharvested and harvested forests to understand the effects of harvesting on this group.

4.4. Limitations and future direction

Our assessment offers a snapshot of the period just after harvesting;

thus, the annual variations and long-term changes in the response of bats to retention forestry remain to be determined. Toyoshima et al. (2013), focusing on birds in Hokkaido, showed that young plantations created by clear-cutting functioned as early successional environments (i.e., open habitats) for approximately 10 years. For cluttered-space and edge species of bats, their activity in clear-cut areas will likely be low for more than 10 years after harvesting. In contrast, retention forestry may foster more rapid recovery of the activity of these groups than clear-cutting (Fedrowitz et al., 2014). The survival and growth of retained trees and their effect on bat activity should be monitored (Rosenvald et al., 2019).

Furthermore, it is unclear how retention forestry can be used to conserve bats at the individual-tree and landscape scales. At the individual-tree scale, tree characteristics (e.g., size and species), microhabitats (e.g., cavities and barks), or location can affect bat roost use and activity (Crampton and Barclay, 1998; Froidevaux et al., 2022). Large broad-leaved trees with cavities make promising roosts (Kikuchi et al., 2013; Yui and Ishii, 1994). It is essential to identify retention targets with high habitat functions to improve conservation effectiveness (Asbeck et al., 2021). At a larger scale, retention forestry can create more complex mosaic landscapes, where some features of old-growth forests (i.e., trees with higher ages than the rotation cycle) are maintained in each stand. In general, individual bats have a large home range and multiple roosts across stands (Crampton and Barclay, 1998; Ancillotto et al., 2022). It is therefore important to determine whether retention forestry enhances the suitability of the forest for bat commuting and roosting, and supports bat communities across the whole landscape.

4.5. Implications for conservation and forest management

Genus richness and the activity of cluttered-space and edge species were higher at high-level retention sites than at clear-cut sites, and the values did not differ significantly between the high-level retention and unharvested plantation sites. Thus, we recommend adopting the retention of >100 broad-leaved trees/ha for the management of conifer planted forests in areas with a high priority for the conservation of cluttered-space or edge species of bats. This strategy may be easier to apply in regions where broad-leaved trees are more common within plantations due to better natural regeneration and lower management intensity. In Japan, this could include cool regions using Pinaceae as the planted tree species or snowy regions with unsuccessful plantations (Masaki et al., 2004; Yamaura et al., 2019).

However, retaining large numbers of trees in all harvested compartments could lead to an increase in the area harvested to meet wood demands because the wood production per area will decrease as the number of trees retained increases (Yoshida et al., 2005; Santaniello et al., 2017). This could explain why a minimum retention amount in each harvested compartment has been proposed in previous studies, e.g., 5–10% (Gustafsson et al., 2012) and 10 snags/ha (Newton, 1994), and applied in practice to managed forests in many regions, e.g., northern Europe (Gustafsson et al., 2012; Kuuluvainen et al., 2019). However, in this study, the increase in bat activity due to high-level retention was predicted to be 3.4 and 6.1 times that of medium-level retention for cluttered-space and edge species, respectively, despite there being only twice the number of retained trees. Therefore, in areas where there is a need to reconcile bat conservation and forestry, retaining a large number of trees (greater than 100 trees/ha) only in compartments with a high conservation value could be more practical than retaining a small number of trees (<50 trees/ha) in each of many compartments (cf. ‘Triad’ zoning; Betts et al. 2021). To conserve biodiversity more effectively and prepare more options for forest managers, it would be worthwhile to consider a conservation goal not only for each harvested compartment but also for each area of landscape containing multiple stands.

5. Data availability statement

The datasets generated and analyzed during the current study are available from the corresponding author on reasonable request.

CRediT authorship contribution statement

Nanoka Teshima: Conceptualization, Methodology, Investigation, Formal analysis, Writing – original draft. **Kazuhiro Kawamura:** Conceptualization, Methodology, Investigation, Formal analysis, Writing – original draft. **Takumi Akasaka:** Conceptualization, Methodology, Investigation, Formal analysis, Writing – review & editing. **Satoshi Yamanaka:** Conceptualization, Methodology, Investigation, Formal analysis, Writing – review & editing. **Futoshi Nakamura:** Conceptualization, Writing – review & editing, Project administration.

Declaration of Competing Interest

The authors declare that they have no known competing financial interests or personal relationships that could have appeared to influence the work reported in this paper.

Acknowledgments

We thank the officials of the Fishery and Forestry Department of Hokkaido Prefecture and the local branch of the Sorachi Forest Office for their help with the REFRESH project. We greatly appreciated Dr. D. Fukui for providing useful comments on the bat fauna around the study area, and two anonymous reviewers for providing a lot of helpful

comments. We were also grateful to the members of the Ecosystem Management Group of Hokkaido University, who assisted with the research and provided valuable comments. This study was supported by the Japan Society for the Promotion of Science [17J01767].

Appendix A. Supplementary material

Supplementary data to this article can be found online at <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foreco.2022.120300>.

References

- Akasaka, T., Yanagawa, H., Sasaki, Y., Yano, M., Yamaguchi, Y., 2004. Bats fauna of Hidaka and Tokachi districts, central and south-eastern Hokkaido. (2) Records of bats in Meto area, Ashoro, north-eastern Tokachi (in Japanese). *J. Jpn. Wild. Res. Soc.* 30, 9–14. <https://doi.org/10.18987/jjwrs.30.0.9>.
- Akasaka, T., Akasaka, M., Yanagawa, H., 2010. Relative importance of the environmental factors at site and landscape scales for bats along the riparian zone. *Landsc. Ecol. Eng.* 6 (2), 247–255. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11355-010-0105-4>.
- Akashi, N., Tsushima, T., Unno, A., Nagasaka, A., Nagasaka, Y., Ohno, Y., Nitta, N., Watanabe, I., Minamino, K., Yamada, K., Ishihama, N., Takiya, M., Tsuda, T., Takeuchi, F., Ishizuka, W., Fukuchi, M., Yamaura, Y., Ozaki, K., Hironaka, Y., Inari, N., 2017. Composition of trees before harvesting in the Retention Experiment for plantation FoREstry in Sorachi, Hokkaido (REFRESH) sites (in Japanese with English abstract). *Bullet. Hokkaido Forestry Res. Inst.* 54, 31–45. <https://agri.knowledge.affrc.go.jp/RN/2010911825.pdf>.
- Akashi, N., Nitta, N., Ohno, Y., 2021. Effect of forest management on understory vascular plants in planted *Abies sachalinensis* forests. *For. Ecol. Manage.* 497, 119521. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foreco.2021.119521>.
- Ancillotto, L., Palmieri, A., Canfora, C., Nastasi, C., Bosso, L., Russo, D., 2022. Spatial responses of long-eared bats *Plecotus auritus* to forestry practices: Implications for forest management in protected areas. *For. Ecol. Manage.* 506, 119959. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foreco.2021.119959>.
- Asbeck, T., Großmann, J., Paillet, Y., Winiger, N., Bauhus, J., 2021. The use of tree-related microhabitats as forest biodiversity indicators and to guide integrated forest management. *Curr. Forestry Rep.* 7 (1), 59–68. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40725-020-00132-5>.
- Baker, S.C., Spies, T.A., Wardlaw, T.J., Balmer, J., Franklin, J.F., Jordan, G.J., 2013. The harvested side of edges: Effect of retained forests on the re-establishment of biodiversity in adjacent harvested areas. *For. Ecol. Manage.* 302, 107–121. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foreco.2013.03.024>.
- Bates, D., Maechler, M., Bolker, B., Walker, S., 2015. Fitting Linear Mixed-Effects Models Using lme4. *J. Stat. Softw.* 67, 1–48. <https://doi.org/10.18637/jss.v067.i01>.
- Betts, M.G., Phalan, B.T., Wolf, C., Baker, S.C., Messier, C., Puettmann, K.J., Green, R., Harris, S.H., Edwards, D.P., Lindenmayer, D.B., Balmford, A., 2021. Producing wood at least cost to biodiversity: Integrating Triad and sharing-sparing approaches to inform forest landscape management. *Biol. Rev.* 96, 1301–1317. <https://doi.org/10.1111/brv.12703>.
- Brockerhoff, E.G., Jactel, H., Parrotta, J.A., Quine, C.P., Sayer, J., 2008. Plantation forests and biodiversity: oxymoron or opportunity? *Biodivers. Conserv.* 17 (5), 925–951. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10531-008-9380-x>.
- Buchholz, S., Kelm, V., Ghanem, S.J., 2021. Mono-specific forest plantations are valuable bat habitats: implications for wind energy development. *Eur. J. Wildl. Res.* 67, 1. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10344-020-01440-8>.
- Burford, L.S., Lacki, M.J., Covell Jr., C.V., 1999. Occurrence of moths among habitats in a mixed mesophytic forest: Implications for management of forest bats. *For. Sci.* 45, 323–332. <https://doi.org/10.1093/forestscience/45.3.323>.
- Castano-Villa, G.J., Estevez, J.V., Guevara, G., Bohada-Murillo, M., Fontúrbel, F.E., 2019. Differential effects of forestry plantations on bird diversity: a global assessment. *For. Ecol. Manage.* 440, 202–207. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foreco.2019.03.025>.
- Chakravarty, R., Ruedi, M., Ishtiaq, F., 2020. A recent survey of bats with descriptions of echolocation calls and new records from the western Himalayan region of Uttarakhand, India. *Acta Chiropt.* 22, 197–224. <https://doi.org/10.3161/15081109ACC2020.22.1.019>.
- Charbonnier, Y., Barbaro, L., Theillout, A., Jactel, H., Renou, M., 2014. Numerical and functional responses of forest bats to a major insect pest in pine plantations. *PLoS ONE* 9 (10), e109488. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0109488>.
- Charbonnier, Y.M., Barbaro, L., Barnagaud, J.-Y., Ampoorter, E., Nezan, J., Verheyen, K., Jactel, H., 2016. Bat and bird diversity along independent gradients of latitude and tree composition in European forests. *Oecologia* 182 (2), 529–537. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00442-016-3671-9>.
- Chaudhary, A., Burivalova, Z., Koh, L.P., Hellweg, S., 2016. Impact of forest management on species richness: global meta-analysis and economic trade-offs. *Sci. Rep.* 6, 1–10. <https://doi.org/10.1038/srep23954>.
- Crampton, L.H., Barclay, R.M.R., 1998. Selection of roosting and foraging habitat by bats in different-aged aspen mixedwood stands. *Conserv. Biol.* 12 (6), 1347–1358. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1523-1739.1998.97209.x>.
- Demarais, S., Verschuyf, J.P., Roloff, G.J., Miller, D.A., Wigley, T.B., 2017. Tamm review: Terrestrial vertebrate biodiversity and intensive forest management in the US. *For. Ecol. Manage.* 385, 308–330. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foreco.2016.10.006>.

- Dewa, H., 2010. Faunal survey of bats in the river bed of Teshio river basin (Otoineppu, Bifuka, Shimokawa and Shibetsu), in northern Hokkaido, Japan (in Japanese with the English abstract). *Rishiri Stud.* 29, 25–33.
- Dodd, L.E., Lacki, M.J., Britzke, E.R., Buehler, D.A., Keyser, P.D., Larkin, J.L., Rodewald, A.D., Wigley, T.B., Wood, P.B., Rieske, L.K., 2012. Forest structure affects trophic linkages: How silvicultural disturbance impacts bats and their insect prey. *For. Ecol. Manage.* 267, 262–270. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foreco.2011.12.016>.
- Endo, K., 1967. Hunting flies of *Myotis frater kaguyae* (in Japanese with English abstract). *J. Mamm. Soc. Jpn.* 3, 64–67. <https://doi.org/10.11238/jmammocjapan1952.3.64>.
- Entwistle, A.C., Racey, P.A., Speakman, J.R., 1996. Habitat exploitation by a gleaning bat, *Plecotus auritus*. *Philos. Trans. R. Soc. Lond. Ser. B Biol. Sci.* 351, 921–931. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rstb.1996.0085>.
- FAO, 2006. Global Planted Forests Thematic Study: Results and Analysis. Planted Forests and Trees Working Paper 38, Rome.
- FAO, 2020. Global Forest Resources Assessment 2020: Main report. Rome. <https://doi.org/10.4060/ca9825en>.
- Fedrowitz, K., Koricheva, J., Baker, S.C., Lindenmayer, D.B., Palik, B., Rosenvald, R., Beese, W., Franklin, J.F., Kouki, J., Macdonald, E., 2014. Can retention forestry help conserve biodiversity? A meta-analysis. *J. Appl. Ecol.* 51, 1669–1679. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1365-2664.12289>.
- Forestry Agency, 2017a. Proportion of forests to land area and of plantations to forest area in each prefecture in Japan (in Japanese). <https://www.rinya.maff.go.jp/j/keikaku/genkyou/h29/1.html>.
- Forestry Agency, 2017b. *Jushu-betsu reikyu-betsu menseki* [Forest area of each species and each age class] (in Japanese). <https://www.rinya.maff.go.jp/j/keikaku/genkyou/h29/4.html>.
- Forestry Agency, 2020. Annual reports on forest and forestry in Japan for fiscal year 2019 (in Japanese [English summary was available]). <https://www.rinya.maff.go.jp/j/kikaku/hakusyo/r1hakusyo/attach/pdf/index-1.pdf>.
- Franklin, J.F., Berg, D.F., Thornburg, D., Tappeiner, J.C., 1997. Alternative silvicultural approaches to timber harvesting: variable retention harvest systems. In: Kohm, K.A., Franklin, J.F. (Eds.), *Creating a Forestry for the 21st Century: The Science of Ecosystem Management*. Isl. Press, Washington, DC, pp. 111–140.
- Froidevaux, J.S., Barbaro, L., Vinet, O., Larrieu, L., Bas, Y., Molina, J., Calatayud, F., Brin, A., 2021. Bat responses to changes in forest composition and prey abundance depend on landscape matrix and stand structure. *Sci. Rep.* 11, 1–13. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-021-89660-z>.
- Froidevaux, J.S.P., Laforge, A., Larrieu, L., Barbaro, L., Park, K., Fialas, P.C., Jones, G., 2022. Tree size, microhabitat diversity and landscape structure determine the value of isolated trees for bats in farmland. *Biol. Conserv.* 267, 109476. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biocon.2022.109476>.
- Fukui, D., Agetsuma, N., Hill, D.A., 2004. Acoustic identification of eight species of bat (Mammalia: Chiroptera) inhabiting forests of southern Hokkaido, Japan: potential for conservation monitoring. *Zool. Sci.* 21 (9), 947–955. <https://doi.org/10.2108/zsj.21.947>.
- Fukui, D., Hirao, T., Murakami, M., Hirakawa, H., 2011. Effects of treefall gaps created by windthrow on bat assemblages in a temperate forest. *For. Ecol. Manage.* 261 (9), 1546–1552. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foreco.2011.02.001>.
- Grindal, S.D., Brigham, R.M., 1999. Impacts of forest harvesting on habitat use by foraging insectivorous bats at different spatial scales. *Écoscience* 6 (1), 25–34. <https://doi.org/10.1080/11956860.1999.11952206>.
- Gustafsson, L., Baker, S.C., Bauhus, J., Beese, W.J., Brodie, A., Kouki, J., Lindenmayer, D. B., Löhmus, A., Pastur, G.M., Messier, C., 2012. Retention forestry to maintain multifunctional forests: a world perspective. *Bioscience* 62, 633–645. <https://doi.org/10.1525/bio.2012.62.7.6>.
- Hartley, M.J., 2002. Rationale and methods for conserving biodiversity in plantation forests. *For. Ecol. Manage.* 155 (1–3), 81–95. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-1127\(01\)00549-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-1127(01)00549-7).
- Heim, O., Lenski, J., Schulze, J., Jung, K., Kramer-Schadt, S., Eccard, J.A., Voigt, C.C., 2018. The relevance of vegetation structures and small water bodies for bats foraging above farmland. *Basic Appl. Ecol.* 27, 9–19. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.baee.2017.12.001>.
- Hogberg, L.K., Patriquin, K.J., Barclay, R.M.R., 2002. Use by bats of patches of residual trees in logged areas of the boreal forest. *Am. Midl. Nat.* 148, 282–288. [https://doi.org/10.1674/0003-0031\(2002\)148\[0282:UBBOPO\]2.0.CO;2](https://doi.org/10.1674/0003-0031(2002)148[0282:UBBOPO]2.0.CO;2).
- Humes, M.L., Hayes, J.P., Collopy, M.W., 1999. Bat activity in thinned, unthinned, and old-growth forests in Western Oregon. *J. Wildl. Manage.* 63, 553–561. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3802642>.
- Kakizawa, H., Yamaura, Y., Kuriyama, K. (Eds.), 2018. *Retention Forestry: Harvesting Trees while Conserving Biodiversity* (in Japanese). Tsukiji-shokan, Tokyo.
- Kaňuch, P., Danko, S., Celuch, M., Kristín, A., Pjenčák, P., Matis, S., Šmíd, J., 2008. Relating bat species presence to habitat features in natural forests of Slovakia (Central Europe). *Mamm. Biol.* 73 (2), 147–155. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.mambio.2006.12.001>.
- Kawamura, K., Yamaura, Y., Soga, M., Spake, R., Nakamura, F., 2021. Effects of planted tree species on biodiversity of conifer plantations in Japan: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *J. For. Res.* 26 (3), 237–246. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13416979.2021.1891625>.
- Kéry M., 2010. Introduction to WinBUGS for Ecologists: a Bayesian Approach to Regression, ANOVA, Mixed Models and Related Analyses. Academic Press, New York. <https://doi.org/10.1016/C2009-0-30639-X>.
- Kikuchi, K., Akasaka, T., Yamaura, Y., Nakamura, F., 2013. Abundance and use of cavity trees at the tree- and stand-levels in natural and plantation forests in Hokkaido, Japan. *J. For. Res.* 18 (5), 389–397. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10310-012-0358-x>.
- Kruskop, S.V., Kawai, K., Tiunov, M.P., 2019. Taxonomic status of the barbastelles (Chiroptera: Vespertilionidae: *Barbastella*) from the Japanese archipelago and Kunashir Island. *Zootaxa* 4567, 461–476. <https://doi.org/10.11646/zootaxa.4567.3.3>.
- Kuuluvainen, T., Lindberg, H., Vanha-Majamaa, I., Keto-Tokoi, P., Punttila, P., 2019. Low-level retention forestry, certification, and biodiversity: case Finland. *Ecol. Process.* 8, 1–13. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s13717-019-0198-0>.
- Law, B.S., Law, P.R., 2011. Early responses of bats to alternative silvicultural treatments in wet eucalypt forests of Tasmania. *Pacific Conserv. Biol.* 17, 36–47. <https://doi.org/10.1071/PC110036>.
- Law, B., Park, K.J., Lacki, M.J., 2016. Insectivorous bats and silviculture: balancing timber production and bat conservation. In: Voigt, C.C., Kingston, T. (Eds.), *Bats in the Anthropocene: Conservation of Bats in a Changing World*. Springer International Publishing, Cham, pp. 105–150. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-25220-9_5.
- Limpens, H.J.G.A., Kapteyn, K., 1991. Bats, their behaviour and linear landscape elements. *Myotis* 29, 39–48.
- Lindbladh, M., Lindström, Å., Hedwall, P.-O., Felton, A., 2017. Avian diversity in Norway spruce production forests—How variation in structure and composition reveals pathways for improving habitat quality. *For. Ecol. Manage.* 397, 48–56. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foreco.2017.04.029>.
- Lindenmayer, D.B., Franklin, J.F., Löhmus, A., Baker, S.C., Bauhus, J., Beese, W., Brodie, A., Kiehl, B., Kouki, J., Pastur, G.M., Messier, C., Neyland, M., Palik, B., Sverdrup-Thygeson, A., Volney, J., Wayne, A., Gustafsson, L., 2012. A major shift to the retention approach for forestry can help resolve some global forest sustainability issues. *Conserv. Lett.* 5 (6), 421–431. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1755-263X.2012.00257.x>.
- Loeb, S.C., 2020. Qualitative synthesis of temperate bat responses to silvicultural treatments—where do we go from here? *J. Mammal.* 101, 1513–1525. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jmammal/gyaa089>.
- López-Bedoya, P.A., Magura, T., Edwards, F.A., Edwards, D.P., Rey-Benayas, J.M., Lövei, G.L., Noriega, J.A., 2021. What level of native beetle diversity can be supported by forestry plantations? A global synthesis. *Insect Conserv. Divers.* 14 (6), 736–747. <https://doi.org/10.1111/icad.12518>.
- Masaki, T., Ota, T., Sugita, H., Oohara, H., Otani, T., Nagaike, T., Nakamura, S., 2004. Structure and dynamics of tree populations within unsuccessful conifer plantations near the Shirakami Mountains, a snowy region of Japan. *For. Ecol. Manage.* 194 (1–3), 389–401. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foreco.2004.03.002>.
- Masuda, K., Matsui, T., Fukui, D., Fukui, K., Machimura, T., 2017. Bat species classification by echolocation call using a machine learning system (in Japanese with English abstract). *Mammalian Sci.* 57, 19–33. <https://doi.org/10.11238/mammaliansci.57.19>.
- McPadden, T.N., Dirzo, R., 2018. Opening the silvicultural toolbox: A new framework for conserving biodiversity in Chilean timber plantations. *For. Ecol. Manage.* 425, 75–84. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foreco.2018.05.028>.
- Menzel, J.M., Menzel Jr., M.A., Kilgo, J.C., Ford, W.M., Edwards, J.W., McCracken, G.F., 2005. Effect of habitat and foraging height on bat activity in the Coastal Plain of South Carolina. *J. Wildl. Manage.* 69, 235–245. [https://doi.org/10.2193/0022-541X\(2005\)069<0235:EOHAFH>2.0.CO;2](https://doi.org/10.2193/0022-541X(2005)069<0235:EOHAFH>2.0.CO;2).
- Mori, A.S., Kitagawa, R., 2014. Retention forestry as a major paradigm for safeguarding forest biodiversity in productive landscapes: A global meta-analysis. *Biol. Conserv.* 175, 65–73. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biocon.2014.04.016>.
- Morris, A.D., Miller, D.A., Kalcounis-Rueppell, M.C., 2010. Use of forest edges by bats in a managed pine forest landscape. *J. Wildl. Manage.* 74 (1), 26–34. <https://doi.org/10.2193/2008-471>.
- Müller, J., Mehr, M., Bässler, C., Fenton, M.B., Bothorn, T., Pretzsch, H., Klemmt, H.-J., Brandl, R., 2012. Aggregative response in bats: prey abundance versus habitat. *Oecologia* 169 (3), 673–684. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00442-011-2247-y>.
- Müller, J., Brandl, R., Buchner, J., Pretzsch, H., Seifert, S., Strätz, C., Veith, M., Fenton, B., 2013. From ground to above canopy—Bat activity in mature forests is driven by vegetation density and height. *For. Ecol. Manage.* 306, 179–184. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foreco.2013.06.043>.
- Newton, I., 1994. The role of nest sites in limiting the numbers of hole-nesting birds: A review. *Biol. Conserv.* 70 (3), 265–276. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0006-3207\(94\)90172-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/0006-3207(94)90172-4).
- Norberg, U.M., Rayner, J.M.V., 1987. Ecological morphology and flight in bats (Mammalia: Chiroptera): wing adaptations, flight performance, foraging strategy and echolocation. *Philos. Trans. R. Soc. Lond. B Biol. Sci.* 316, 335–427. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rstb.1987.0030>.
- Ober, H.K., Jones, G.M., Gottlieb, I.G.W., Johnson, S.A., Smith, L., Brosi, B.J., Fletcher, R. J., 2020. Bat community response to intensification of biomass production for bioenergy across the southeastern United States. *Ecol. Appl.* 30 (7) <https://doi.org/10.1002/eap.v30.710.1002/eap.2155>.
- Ohdachi, D.S., Ishibashi, Y., Iwasa, M.A., Saitoh, T. (Eds.), 2009. *The Wild Mammals of Japan*. Shokadoh Book Sellers, Kyoto.
- Ohsawa, M., 2007. The role of isolated old oak trees in maintaining beetle diversity within larch plantations in the central mountainous region of Japan. *For. Ecol. Manage.* 250 (3), 215–226. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foreco.2007.05.017>.
- Paillet, Y., Bergés, L., Hjältén, J., Ódor, P., Avon, C., Bernhardt-Römermann, M., Bijlsma, R.-J., De Bruyn, L., Fuhr, M., Grandin, U., Kanka, R., Lundin, L., Luque, S., Magura, T., Matesanz, S., Mészáros, I., Sebastián, M.-T., Schmidt, W., Standovář, T., Tóthmérész, B., Uotila, A., Valladares, F., Vellak, K., Virtanen, R., 2010. Biodiversity differences between managed and unmanaged forests: Meta-analysis of species richness in Europe. *Conserv. Biol.* 24, 101–112. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1523-1739.2009.01399.x>.
- Pastur, G.J.M., Vanha-Majamaa, I., Franklin, J.F., 2020. Ecological perspectives on variable retention forestry. *Ecol. Process.* 9, 12. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s13717-020-0215-3>.

- Patriquin, K.J., Barclay, R.M.R., 2003. Foraging by bats in cleared, thinned and unharvested boreal forest. *J. Appl. Ecol.* 40 (4), 646–657. <https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1365-2664.2003.00831.x>.
- Payn, T., Carnus, J.-M., Freer-Smith, P., Kimberley, M., Kollert, W., Liu, S., Orazio, C., Rodriguez, L., Silva, L.N., Wingfield, M.J., 2015. Changes in planted forests and future global implications. *For. Ecol. Manage.* 352, 57–67. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foreco.2015.06.021>.
- Rachwald, A., 1992. Habitat preference and activity of the noctule bat *Nyctalus noctula* in the Białowieża Primeval Forest. *Acta Theriol. (Warsz)* 37, 413–422.
- R Core Team, 2021. R: A language and environment for statistical computing. R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria.
- Rosenvald, R., Löhmus, A., 2008. For what, when, and where is green-tree retention better than clear-cutting? A review of the biodiversity aspects. *For. Ecol. Manage.* 255 (1), 1–15. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foreco.2007.09.016>.
- Rosenvald, R., Löhmus, P., Rannap, R., Remm, L., Rosenvald, K., Runnel, K., Löhmus, A., 2019. Assessing long-term effectiveness of green-tree retention. *For. Ecol. Manage.* 448, 543–548. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foreco.2019.06.034>.
- Russo, D., Di Febbraro, M., Cistrone, L., Jones, G., Smeraldo, S., Garonna, A.P., Bosso, L., 2015. Protecting one, protecting both? Scale-dependent ecological differences in two species using dead trees, the rosalia longicorn beetle and the barbastelle bat. *J. Zool.* 297 (3), 165–175. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jzo.12271>.
- Russo, D., Salinas-Ramos, V.B., Ancillotto, L., 2020. Barbastelle Bat *Barbastella barbastellus* (Schreber, 1774). In: Hackländer K., Zacos F.E. (Eds.), *Handbook of the Mammals of Europe*. Springer, Cham. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-65038-8_43-1.
- Rydell, J., Entwistle, A., Racey, P.A., 1996. Timing of foraging flights of three species of bats in relation to insect activity and predation risk. *Oikos* 76, 243–252. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3546196>.
- Santaniello, F., Djupström, L.B., Ranius, T., Weslien, J., Rudolphi, J., Sonesson, J., 2017. Simulated long-term effects of varying tree retention on wood production, dead wood and carbon stock changes. *J. Environ. Manage.* 201, 37–44. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvman.2017.06.026>.
- Sato, M., Murayama, Y., Maeda, K., Dewa, H., 2008. Distribution of Bats in Bifuka, Northern Hokkaido (in Japanese with the English abstract). *Rishiri Stud.* 27, 27–32.
- Spake, R., Yanou, S., Yamaura, Y., Kawamura, K., Kitayama, K., Doncaster, C.P., 2019. Meta-analysis of management effects on biodiversity in plantation and secondary forests of Japan. *Conserv. Sci. Pract.* 1 (3), e14. <https://doi.org/10.1111/csp2.2019.1.issue-310.1111/csp2.14>.
- Starbuck, C.A., Amelon, S.K., Thompson, F.R., 2015. Relationships between bat occupancy and habitat and landscape structure along a savanna, woodland, forest gradient in the Missouri Ozarks. *Wildl. Soc. Bull.* 39 (1), 20–30.
- Sugai, S., Kondo, N., Souma, K., Masuko, T., 2011. Bat fauna in three river basins originating in Mt. Mokoto, Hokkaido (in Japanese with English abstract). *J. Agric. Sci. Tokyo Univ. Agric.* 56, 155–161. <https://agriknowledge.affrc.go.jp/RN/2030814630.pdf>.
- Toyoshima, Y., Yamaura, Y., Mitsuda, Y., Yabuhara, Y., Nakamura, F., 2013. Reconciling wood production with bird conservation: a regional analysis using bird distribution models and forestry scenarios in Tokachi district, northern Japan. *For. Ecol. Manage.* 307, 54–62. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foreco.2013.07.006>.
- Vasko, V., Blomberg, A.S., Vesterinen, E.J., Suominen, K.M., Ruokolainen, L., Brommer, J.E., Norrdahl, K., Niemelä, P., Laine, V.N., Selonen, V., Santangeli, A., Lilley, T.M., 2020. Within-season changes in habitat use of forest-dwelling boreal bats. *Ecol. Evol.* 10 (9), 4164–4174. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ece3.6253>.
- Waters, D., Jones, G., Furlong, M., 1999. Foraging ecology of Leisler's bat (*Nyctalus leisleri*) at two sites in southern Britain. *J. Zool.* 249 (2), 173–180. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1469-7998.1999.tb00755.x>.
- Węgiel, A., Grzywiński, W., Ciechanowski, M., Jaros, R., Kalcounis-Rüppell, M., Kmiecik, A., Kmiecik, P., Węgiel, J., 2019. The foraging activity of bats in managed pine forests of different ages. *Eur. J. For. Res.* 138 (3), 383–396. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10342-019-01174-6>.
- Yamanaka, S., Yamaura, Y., Sayama, K., Sato, S., Ozaki, K., 2021. Effects of dispersed broadleaved and aggregated conifer tree retention on ground beetles in conifer plantations. *For. Ecol. Manage.* 489, 119073. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foreco.2021.119073>.
- Yamaura, Y., Oka, H., Taki, H., Ozaki, K., Tanaka, H., 2012. Sustainable management of planted landscapes: lessons from Japan. *Biodivers. Conserv.* 21 (12), 3107–3129. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10531-012-0357-4>.
- Yamaura, Y., Akashi, N., Unno, A., Tsushima, T., Nagasaka, A., Nagasaka, Y., Ozaki, K., 2018. Retention Experiment for Plantation Forestry in Sorachi, Hokkaido (REFRESH): A large-scale experiment for retaining broad-leaved trees in conifer plantations. *Bull. For. For. Prod. Res. Inst.* 17, 91–109. <https://doi.org/10.20756/ffpri.17.1.91>.
- Yamaura, Y., Lindenmayer, D., Yamada, Y., Gong, H., Matsuura, T., Mitsuda, Y., Masaki, T., 2019. A spatially-explicit empirical model for assessing conservation values of conifer plantations. *For. Ecol. Manage.* 444, 393–404. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foreco.2019.04.038>.
- Yoshida, T., Hasegawa, M., Taira, H., Noguchi, M., 2005. Stand structure and composition of a 60-year-old larch (*Larix kaempferi*) plantation with retained hardwoods. *J. For. Res.* 10 (5), 351–358. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10310-005-0154-y>.
- Yoshikura, S., Yasui, S., Kamijo, T., 2011. Comparative study of forest-dwelling bats' abundances and species richness between old-growth forests and conifer plantations in Nikko National Park, central Japan. *Mammal Study* 36 (4), 189–198. <https://doi.org/10.3106/041.036.0402>.
- Yui, M., Ishii, N., 1994. *Ringyo to yasei-choju tono kyozone ni mukete* [For coexistence of forestry and wild birds and mammals] (in Japanese). J-FIC, Tokyo.