

Human footprint differentially impacts genetic connectivity of four wide-ranging mammals in a fragmented landscape

Prachi Thatte  | Anuradha Chandramouli | Abhinav Tyagi | Kaushal Patel |
Phulmani Baro | Himanshu Chhattani | Uma Ramakrishnan

National Center for Biological Sciences,
Tata Institute of Fundamental Research,
Bangalore, India

Correspondence

Prachi Thatte, National Center for Biological
Sciences, Tata Institute of Fundamental
Research, Bellary Road, Bangalore 560065,
India.
Email: prachi.thatte@gmail.com

Funding information

Department of Atomic Energy, Government
of India; DeFries-Bajpai Foundation;
National Tiger Conservation Authority

Editor: Chris Burridge

Abstract

Aim: Maintaining connectivity is critical for long-term persistence of wild carnivores in landscapes fragmented due to anthropogenic activity. We examined spatial genetic structure and the impact of landscape features on genetic structure in four widespread species—jungle cat (*Felis chaus*), leopard (*Panthera pardus*), sloth bear (*Melursus ursinus*) and tiger (*Panthera tigris*).

Location: Our study was carried out in the central Indian landscape, a stronghold in terms of distribution and abundance of large mammals. The landscape comprises fragmented forests embedded in a heterogeneous matrix of multiple land use types.

Methods: Microsatellite data from non-invasively sampled individuals (90 jungle cats, 82 leopards, 104 sloth bears and 117 tigers) were used to investigate genetic differentiation. Impact of landscape features on genetic structure was inferred using a multimodel landscape resistance optimization approach.

Results: All four study species revealed significant isolation by distance (IBD). The correlation between genetic and geographic distance was significant only over a short distance for jungle cat, followed by longer distances for sloth bear, leopard and tiger. Overall, human footprint had a high negative impact on gene flow in tigers, followed by leopards, sloth bears and the least on jungle cats. Individual landscape variables—land use, human population density, density of linear features and roads—impacted the study species differently. Although land use was found to be an important variable explaining genetic structure for all four species, the amount of variation explained, and the optimum spatial resolution and the resistance values of different land use classes varied.

Main conclusions: As expected from theory, but rarely demonstrated using empirical data, the pattern of spatial autocorrelation of genetic variation scaled with dispersal ability and density of the study species. Landscape genetic analyses revealed species-specific impact of landscape features and provided insights into interactions between species biology and landscape structure. Our results emphasize the need for incorporating functional connectivity data from multiple species for landscape-level conservation planning.

This is an open access article under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits use, distribution and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

© 2019 The Authors. *Diversity and Distributions* published by John Wiley & Sons Ltd.

KEYWORDS

human footprint, landscape genetics, microsatellites, multispecies connectivity, resistance surface

1 | INTRODUCTION

Habitat destruction and fragmentation due to human footprint is degrading habitat quality and increasing extinction risk of mammals globally (Crooks et al., 2017). Dispersal and genetic exchange between habitat fragments is critical for reducing extinction risk, maintaining genetic diversity and persistence of subdivided populations (Moilanen & Nieminen, 2002; Thatte, Joshi, Vaidyanathan, Landguth, & Ramakrishnan, 2018). Maintaining connectivity is hence recognized as a key factor in conservation and management of endangered mammal species.

It is no surprise therefore that research on connectivity conservation has markedly increased over the last decade (Correa Ayram, Mendoza, Etter, & Salicrup, 2016). However, connectivity studies in mammals have largely focused on a single focal species, usually a large predator (Beier, Majka, & Spencer, 2008; Segelbacher et al., 2010; McRae, Hall, Beier, & Theobald, 2012; Dudaniec et al., 2013; Joshi, Vaidyanathan, Mondol, Edgaonkar, & Ramakrishnan, 2013; except in a few recent cases—Dudaniec et al., 2016; Wultsch et al., 2016; Marrotte et al., 2017). Conservation strategies based on information from a single species may not effectively capture varied ecological requirements for dispersal of other sympatric species (Brodie et al., 2015; Gangadharan, Vaidyanathan, & Clair, 2016).

Co-occurring species may respond differently to fragmentation based on the differences in body size, dispersal ability, generation time, home range size and distribution (Davidson, Hamilton, Boyer, Brown, & Ceballos, 2009; Gehring & Swihart, 2003). Landscape structure or configuration of habitat patches in a landscape may also determine response to fragmentation. Habitat association and the ability to move between habitat patches can further affect species response to fragmentation (Kierepka, Anderson, Swihart, & Rhodes, 2016). In summary, connectivity for different species may vary based on their biology, landscape structure and interaction between the two, even in the context of a single landscape.

Conservation strategies for a landscape need to factor in the different requirements of species to prioritize areas of maximum diversity as well as areas where the most endangered species are likely to persist in the long term. For long-term persistence, areas that facilitate dispersal of multiple species need to be protected. While opinion articles emphasize the importance of multispecies landscape genetics studies when developing guidelines for landscape-level conservation and management (Keller, Holderegger, Strien, & Bolliger, 2015; Richardson, Brady, Wang, & Spear, 2016), relatively few studies have compared connectivity for multiple species (e.g., Dudaniec et al., 2016; Engler, Balkenhol, Filz, Habel, & Rödder, 2014; Marrotte et al., 2017; Wultsch et al., 2016).

We studied genetic connectivity in four widespread species—jungle cat (*Felis chaus*), leopard (*Panthera pardus*), sloth bear (*Melursus*

ursinus) and tiger (*Panthera tigris*) in the Central Indian landscape. Classified as a global priority tiger conservation landscape, it is a stronghold in terms of mammal distribution and abundance (Jhala, Qureshi, & Gopal, 2015). Several studies have investigated tiger connectivity in the landscape (Joshi et al., 2013; Reddy, Cushman, Srivastava, Sarkar, & Shivaji, 2017; Sharma et al., 2013; Thatte, Joshi, et al., 2018; Yumnam et al., 2014). However, there is a dearth of information on habitat and population connectivity for other sympatric species (Dutta, Sharma, Maldonado, Panwar, & Seidensticker, 2015; Dutta et al., 2013).

Our study species vary in body size, dispersal ability, distribution and habitat association, traits that determine species sensitivity to habitat fragmentation (Davidson et al., 2009; Kierepka et al., 2016). Considerations based on these factors result in contradictory predictions in terms of expected spatial genetic structure for our study species (discussed below and represented in Figure 1).

Empirical evidence across taxa suggests that organisms with specific habitat requirements (and hence habitat association) are usually characterized by low gene flow resulting in strong genetic differentiation (Harvey, Aleixo, Ribas, & Brumfield, 2017; Khimoun et al., 2016; Kierepka et al., 2016; Stuart-Fox, Schneider, Moritz, & Couper, 2001; Zayed et al., 2006). Among our study species, tigers and sloth bears show stronger habitat associations (Das et al., 2014; Joshi et al., 2013; Kitchener & Dugmore, 2000; Puri, Srivathsa, Karanth, Kumar, & Karanth, 2015; Ramesh, Kalle, Sankar, & Qureshi, 2012; Yumnam et al., 2014), and hence, we expect them to have higher genetic differentiation than jungle cats and leopards (Athreya, Odden, Linnell, Krishnaswamy, & Karanth, 2013; Gray et al., 2016; Stein et al., 2016).

Dispersal ability of a species can also impact genetic structure. High dispersal ability of a species can homogenize genetic variation over space. Although species with low dispersal ability are likely to have low gene flow, their abundance in a given area is usually high (Jenkins et al., 2007; White, Ernest, Kerkhoff, & Enquist, 2007), resulting in low impact of genetic drift and hence low genetic differentiation. Species with moderate dispersal ability may show higher genetic differentiation: gene flow may not be high enough to homogenize genetic differentiation and lower abundances may promote genetic drift. Among our study species, median dispersal distance (calculated based on body size using allometric scaling equations (Bowman, Jaeger, & Fahrig, 2002; Sutherland, Harestad, Price, & Lertzman, 2000) is lowest for jungle cat (8 km), followed by sloth bear (13 km), leopard (35 km) and tiger (85 km) among the study species. Hence, we expect sloth bear and leopard to have higher genetic differentiation than tiger and jungle cat. Although there are no studies on mammals, such a relationship with dispersal ability has been found in insects (Peterson & Denno, 1998; Thomas, 2000).

Continuous and uniform population distribution has been shown to result in lower genetic differentiation (Cowled, Lapidge, Hampton,




FIGURE 1 Expected and observed spatial genetic structure. Expectations based on habitat association, dispersal ability and distributions of the study species

& Spencer, 2009; Llorens et al., 2017). Spatial patchiness can restrict gene flow and hence increase genetic differentiation. Sloth bears are the most widely distributed large carnivores in central India, followed by leopards and tigers (Jhala et al., 2015). Hence, we expect tigers to have highest genetic differentiation followed by leopard and sloth bear. Jungle cats are also likely to be widely distributed in central India (Gray et al., 2016) although no research studies have been carried out. Hence, we expect low genetic differentiation for jungle cats as well.

In summary, all three factors (habitat association, dispersal ability and distribution) predict jungle cats to have the lowest spatial genetic structure among the study species. Predictions for the other three study species are inconsistent. The above predictions ignore the potentially differential ability of the study species to navigate through human-modified landscape. In this paper, we seek to address the genetic structure predictions based on dispersal ability, habitat association and distribution with empirical data on four species and also investigate how landscape features impact their movement.

2 | METHODS

2.1 | Study area and sampling

With 34% forest cover, the central Indian landscape (CIL) is a stronghold in terms of mammal distribution and abundance (Jhala, Qureshi, Gopal, & Sinha, 2011; Yoganand, Rice, Johnsingh, & Seidensticker, 2006). About 8.5% of the forested area (~3% of the total study area) is protected. Despite being a global hotspot of carnivore habitat, the central Indian landscape has been changing rapidly (Venter et al., 2016). Similar to other tropical landscapes in the Americas, Asia and Africa, central India faces the threat of further habitat degradation due to anthropogenic activities (Crooks, Burdett, Theobald, Rondinini, & Boitani, 2011). Being a mineral-rich area, patches of forest have been cleared for mining. There are several railway lines and national and state highways crisscrossing through the landscape. There are five major urban

centres (with a population of >1 million) and several big towns. Villages surrounded by agricultural fields cover ~64% of the land area.

We collected non-invasive scat samples ($n = 1,025$), between November 2012 and April 2017, from forested areas inside and outside protected areas. Existing roads/trails were used to search for potential tiger, sloth bear, leopard and jungle cat scats, and fresh scats were collected. Each road/trail was sampled only once so as to reduce recaptures and maximize the area covered.

We sampled nine protected areas: out of which (1) Kanha Tiger Reserve (KTR), (2) Pench Tiger Reserve (PTR), (3) Bandhavgarh Tiger Reserve (BTR), (4) Achanakmar Tiger Reserve (ATR), (5) Nagzira-Navegaon Tiger Reserve (NN), (6) Satpura Tiger Reserve (STR), (7) Sitanadi-Udanti Tiger Reserve (S-U), (8) Panna Tiger Reserve (PAN) are International Union for the Conservation of Nature (IUCN) category II Protected Areas and (9) Tipeswar Wildlife Sanctuary (TIP) which is a IUCN category IV Protected Area. Nine territorial forest divisions outside these protected areas that fall under IUCN categories IV and VI were also sampled: (1) North and South Balaghat Forest Divisions, (2) North and South Balaghat Forest Divisions (1 and 2 are together referred to as BAL henceforth), (3) Bramhapuri Forest Division (BPR), (4) North Gondia Forest Divisions, (5) South Gondia Forest Divisions (4 and 5 are together referred to as GON henceforth), (6) Bhandara Forest Division (BHA), (7) Kawardha Forest Division (KAW), (8) Khairagarh Forest Division (KHA) and (9) South Seoni Forest Division (SEO). Tiger samples collected and used in this study were also a part of Thatte, Joshi, et al. (2018). The scat samples collected between 2012 and 2015 were stored in 30-mL-wide mouth bottles containing absolute alcohol. During 2016–17, samples were collected using swabs (HiMedia Inc.) and stored in vials containing Longmire's buffer (Longmire et al., 1997).

2.2 | Genotyping and population genetic analysis

In order to quantify genetic connectivity, we first extracted DNA from scat samples using QIAamp DNA Stool Mini Kit (QIAGEN Inc.)

and HiPurA Stool DNA Purification Kit (HiMedia). We then identified species using published primers for tiger, jungle cat and leopard and a species-specific primer that was designed for sloth bear (Farrell, Roman, & Sunquist, 2000; Thatte, Patel, & Ramakrishnan, 2018). Jungle cat positive samples were genotyped using 14 felid microsatellite loci (FCA126, FCA069, FCA672, FCA304, FCA628, FCA279, FCA232, msHDZ170, msFCA506, msFCA453, msF42, msFCA441, msFCA391 and msF41). For leopards, the same set of loci were used, except that msF115 was used instead of msF41. For sloth bears, a panel of 13 bear microsatellite loci was used (G10H, G10X, G10J, G10C, G10O, UarMu59, UarMu05, UarMu09, UarMu23, UarMu51, UarMu61, UarMu10 and UarMu64). G10O and UarMu10 were found to be homozygous for all the samples and hence were not used for analysis. Genotyping details for tigers are reported in Thatte, Joshi, et al. (2018). To minimize the impact of genotyping error, the genotyping procedure was repeated four times (four independent PCRs) for each sample, for each locus (Mondol et al., 2009). Genotyping error rates were calculated using GIMLET (Valière, 2002). Individual identification was conducted using the identity analysis module in the program CERVUS (Marshall, Slate, Kruuk, & Pemberton, 1998). Further, heterozygosity-based differentiation statistics were calculated using PopGenReport (Adamack & Gruber, 2014), MMOD (Winter, 2012) and HIERFSTAT (Goudet, 2005) in R (Ihaka & Gentleman, 1996). Interindividual genetic distances were calculated based on proportion of shared alleles (D_{PS} ; Bowcock et al., 1994) using the package “adegenet” (Jombart, 2008) in R.

2.3 | Isolation by distance, spatial autocorrelation and redundancy analysis

Isolation by distance (IBD), the correlation between genetic (D_{PS}) and geographic (Euclidean) distance, was calculated using Mantel's test function in “ecodist” (Goslee & Urban, 2007) package in R. Spatial autocorrelation analysis was carried out using GENALEX version 6.5 (Peakall & Smouse, 2012). Genetic and geographic pairwise distance matrices were correlated for a set of distance classes (5–125 km for jungle cat and 20–500 km for the other three species). The correlation coefficient (r) obtained for each distance class was plotted as a correlogram. The significance of r was tested against a null hypothesis ($r = 0$) by generating 95% confidence interval for each distance class (999 permutations, 99 bootstrap repeats). Redundancy analysis (RDA), a multivariate, ordination-based method was used to summarize the variation in individual allele frequencies that can be explained by spatial data. To perform RDA, we used the *vegan* 2.5-6 package (Oksanen et al., 2019) in R with allele frequencies as the response variable and orthogonal third-degree polynomials based on sample coordinates as the explanatory variables. We imputed missing values in genetic data using the most likely genotype at each locus across all individuals, as RDA requires complete data frames. We acknowledge that this may be of concern for loci with high variation, however

using mean allele frequency to impute missing values does not make sense for individual level data. We used ANOVA to assess the significance of RDA.

2.4 | Landscape genetics analysis

The relationship between the observed genetic structure and the landscape variables likely to affect gene flow in the study species was systematically evaluated using a multimodel inference and optimization approach (based on Shirk, Wallin, Cushman, Rice, & Warheit, 2010) described in the following sections.

2.4.1 | Landscape variables

We used four landscape variables to build resistance models for all the species—(1) land use land cover (LULC), (2) human population density, (3) roads and (4) density of linear features (Figure S2 and Table S1). We used Bhuvan (the geo-platform of the Indian Space Research Organization) land cover data (http://bhuvan.nrsc.gov.in/bhuvan_links.php) and reclassified it into four broad land cover types which were ranked in order of increasing resistance: (i) forest—this included mostly deciduous but also some evergreen forest, (ii) scrub and degraded forest—this category also included orchards and plantations, (iii) agriculture—includes zaid, rabi and kharif croplands, those with two or three crops every year, also fallow and wasteland and (iv) built-up areas—areas of human habitation that is non-agricultural and has buildings, roads and other infrastructure. The rank order of the categories was based on previous research (Joshi et al., 2013; Kitchener & Dugmore, 2000; Yumnam et al., 2014). A layer of human population density, developed at the Foundation for Ecological Research, Advocacy and Learning (FERAL), based on the 2011 census of India data was used for this study. We used the population density layer as a continuous variable. A vector layer of national highways, state highways and major public roads was reclassified into six categories based on the intensity of traffic on the road (based on Passenger Car Unit (PCU) data for 2006 from the Ministry of Road Transport and Highways. PCU is a measure of the impact of a vehicle on traffic and is calculated by converting vehicle units of different types of vehicles (e.g., trucks, buses, motorcycles) into passenger car units. For example, a motorcycle is equivalent to 0.5 passenger cars, whereas a bus is 3.5 PCUs. Road width (1, 2, 4 or 6 lanes) data were used wherever PCU data were not available. The following criteria were used for classification of roads (Indian Roads Congress, 2007, 2010): minor roads (PCU < 1,500), very low traffic roads (2,500–5,000 PCU—single lane roads), low traffic roads (5,000–10,000 PCU—intermediate lane roads), moderate traffic roads (10,000–25,000 PCU—2 lane roads), high traffic roads (25,000–55,000 PCU—4 lane roads) and very high traffic roads (>55,000 PCU—6 lane roads). In order to calculate the density of linear features, road (without traffic data), railway line and irrigation canal vector layers were combined into

a single polylines layer. This layer was developed at FERAL. The density of lines in each cell was calculated to generate a raster layer that was used for analysis.

These four landscape variables were used to carry out multi-scale landscape genetics modelling (described in the next section). Studies have shown that the spatial scale at which a landscape variable is measured can affect the species–landscape relationship (Jackson & Fahrig, 2015). The scale at which a species responds to the surrounding is unknown. The common approach for dealing with the scale problem is analysing the landscape variables at multiple scales using varying ecological neighbourhood sizes (Krishnamurthy et al., 2016; Zeller et al., 2016) or at varying resolutions (Zeller, McGarigal, & Whiteley, 2012). The two continuous variables, density of linear features and human population density, were analysed at multiple scales or ecological neighbourhoods (0.25, 0.5, 1, 2.5, 5, 10, 25 and 50 km) weighted by a Gaussian kernel using the “kernel2dsmooth” function from the smoothie package in R (Gilleland, 2013). All the transformed layers that represented different ecological neighbourhoods had a spatial resolution of 0.25 km. These ecological neighbourhoods ranged from less than the radius of the home range to more than the median dispersal distance (as suggested by Jackson & Fahrig, 2015), except for the tiger for which we did not have a neighbourhood size larger than its median dispersal distance. Allometric scaling equations (Bowman et al., 2002) based on body size and trophic level predict the radius of home range and median dispersal distance in the study species to be 0.6 and 8 km for jungle cat, 1.1 and 13 km for sloth bear, 2.9 and 35 km for leopard and 6.9 and 85 km for tiger, respectively. LULC, a categorical variable, was analysed at six different spatial resolutions (0.25, 0.5, 1, 2.5, 5 and 10 km).

2.4.2 | Multimodel optimization

We used a multimodel optimization approach to identify which landscape variables offer resistance to species movement, the magnitude of resistance (R_{\max}) for each contributing variable and the functional form or shape of the relationship between each variable and resistance (x). Genetic data were used as a response variable to infer the landscape resistance values and the functional form of the relationship between each variable and resistance. For each landscape variable, we explored a range of parameter values for R_{\max} and x and identified which combination of values best explained the genetic data. For each variable, six levels of maximum resistance ($R_{\max} = 2, 5, 10, 50, 100, 1,000$) and six levels of the shape parameter ($x = 0.01, 0.1, 1, 2, 5, 10$, Figure S3 represents the transformations) were evaluated. The shape parameter controlled the functional response between the landscape variable and resistance to gene flow—1 meant a linear relationship, while values less than and greater than 1 were nonlinear. For each combination of R_{\max} and x , cost distance between pairs of individuals was calculated. Cost distance is the modified Euclidean distance between two points that accounts for the resistance offered by

the landscape. Linear mixed effects (LME) models with a maximum likelihood population effects (MLPE) parameterization (Clarke, Rothery, & Raybould, 2002) were fitted to the data using the MLPE.lmm function from the ResistanceGA package (Peterman, 2018). Genetic distance was the response variable, cost distances were fixed effects, and individual identity in pairwise comparisons was the random effect. The top model was identified as the one with the lowest AIC score from the MLPE mixed effects model for each landscape variable. AIC score calculated from mixed models fit with restricted maximum likelihood have been shown to be unreliable (Clarke et al., 2002). Hence, following Shirk, Landguth, and Cushman (2018), we set REML = FALSE in the MLPE.lmm() function parameters to get a valid AIC score fit with maximum likelihood. In order to estimate the variance explained by the model, we calculated marginal R^2 (Nakagawa & Schielzeth, 2013) using the package MuMIn (Barton, 2009) in R.

For each landscape variable, we identified the scale and the combination of parameters (R_{\max} and x) of the best-fitting model. The best-fitting univariate models identified based on AIC values for each landscape variable were combined (additively) and optimized again in a multivariate context to account for interactions between different landscape variables for all the study species (Shirk et al., 2010). For multivariate optimization, we varied the model parameters (R_{\max} and x) for each landscape variable at a time, while holding the parameter values of the other variables constant. If the optimal parameters changed for a landscape variable in the multivariate context, we held the new model parameters constant and varied the parameters of the next variable. We repeated this process until the parameterization of all the variables stabilized.

3 | RESULTS

3.1 | Population genetic analysis

Out of the collected scat samples, based on genetic identification in the laboratory, 298 were tigers, 343 were sloth bears, 165 were jungle cats, and 138 were leopards. The remaining 81 samples either failed to amplify with any of the primers used or were from non-target species. Based on unique genotypes, we identified 117 tigers, 104 sloth bears, 92 jungle cats and 82 leopards (Figure 2). Of the 117, 116 tiger individuals were also a part of Thatte, Joshi, et al. (2018). Genotyping error rate, expected and observed heterozygosity (H_e and H_o respectively) and the probability of identity ($P(ID)$) are presented in Table 1. The $P(ID)$ (the probability of two different individuals having the same genotype) and the more conservative measure Sib $P(ID)$ (PID when all individuals in the population are assumed to be siblings) was low for all the species, indicating that even related individuals would have a very low probability of having identical genotypes. Sloth bear had lower heterozygosity and higher $P(ID)$ among the study species. The genetic differentiation estimated as F_{ST} and G_{ST} followed a




FIGURE 2 Study area and sampling. In the enlarged study area, protected areas are marked by black outline and genetically identified individuals of study species as coloured dots

TABLE 1 Genotyping error and allele frequency-based statistics

Species	Allelic dropout	False alleles	H_e	H_o	$P(\text{ID})$	Sib $P(\text{ID})$
Jungle cat (N = 90)	0.045	0.045	0.794	0.688	5.12×10^{-18}	0.92×10^{-6}
Leopard (N = 82)	0.049	0.018	0.778	0.607	4×10^{-18}	4.1×10^{-7}
Sloth bear (N = 104)	0.060	0.030	0.51	0.392	1.6×10^{-7}	1.4×10^{-3}
Tiger (N = 117)	0.062	0.019	0.723	0.524	1.48×10^{-11}	5.1×10^{-5}

Note: H_e and H_o represent the expected and observed heterozygosity, respectively. $P(\text{ID})$ represents the probability of two different individuals having the same genotype, and Sib $P(\text{ID})$ is the PID when all individuals in the population are assumed to be siblings.

pattern that was expected based on the spatial distribution of the species (Figure 1).

3.2 | Isolation by distance

All four study species displayed significant correlation between genetic and geographic distance (IBD for jungle cats $r = .055$, $p = .059$; for leopards $r = .213$, $p = .001$; for sloth bears $r = .061$, $p = .056$ and for tigers $r = .461$, $p = .001$). RDA results demonstrated that 24% of the total genetic variation was constrained by spatial variables for tiger, followed by 17% for leopards, 10% for sloth bears and 2%


for jungle cats (Figure S1). To examine the spatial extent of genetic structure, spatial autocorrelation analysis was carried out. IBD broke down at different distances for different species. IBD relationship broke down at distances beyond ~15 km for jungle cat, followed by ~40 km for sloth bear, ~60 km for leopard and ~140 km for tiger (Figure 3).

3.3 | Landscape genetic analysis

Overall among the study species, landscape variables were found to have the highest impact (based on marginal R^2 and the slope of

FIGURE 3 Spatial autocorrelation.

X-axis represents distance classes in km. Y-axis is the coefficient for the correlation between genetic and geographic distance for samples falling within each distance class. Dotted red lines represent the 95% confidence intervals

**TABLE 2** Univariate landscape genetics optimization

Species	Variable	R_{max}	x	AIC	Scale (km)	AIC null
JC	Human density	1,000	1	-8,168.29	5	-8,167.81
	LULC	1,000	10	-8,168.97	10	
	Roads	1,000	0.01	-8,168.34		
	Linear density	1,000	2	-8,169	25	
LPD	Human density	1,000	1	-5,595.08	10	-5,571.55
	LULC	1,000	5	-5,655.09	10	
	Roads	1,000	0.1	-5,586.22		
	Linear density	10	0.1	-5,578.62	0.5	
SB	Human density	1,000	2	-8,791.33	10	-8,789.47
	LULC	50	2	-8,794.12	0.25	
	Roads	5	0.01	-8,789.5		
	Linear density	1,000	2	-8,791.17	0.5	
TIG	Human density	50	2	-9,724.41	50	-8,616.83
	LULC	100	2	-10,189.8	0.5	
	Roads	1,000	2	-9,522.27		
	Linear density	1,000	2	-9,773.94	25 and 5	

Note: The table reports optimum parameters (R_{max} —maximum resistance and x —shape parameter) for each landscape variable, identified based on univariate optimization. The optimum spatial resolution for land use land cover (LULC) and ecological neighbourhood (scale) for density of linear features and human population density is also reported. AIC null represents the AIC values for isolation by distance (null) model.

the relationship) on tigers, followed by leopards, sloth bears and jungle cats. Land use land cover (LULC) was found to be the most important variable explaining genetic connectivity of all the study species, except jungle cat where it was the second most important variable. However, the resistance offered by different land use classes, strength of correlation and the optimum spatial resolution varied.

For jungle cat, although the maximum resistance offered by all the variables was inferred to be high based on univariate optimization, the model fit was very low (Table 2). Despite the low model fit, we combined the four variables (density of linear features, traffic intensity on roads, human population density and LULC) additively for multivariate optimization. On combining, the model improved marginally and the maximum resistance offered

Species	Variable	R_{max}	X	AIC	Marginal R^2
Jungle cat	Human density	2	0.5	-8,169.03	.0012
	LULC	50	10		
	Roads	100	5		
	Linear density	1,000	2		
Leopard	Human density	50	1	-5,621.34	.104
	LULC	500	5		
	Roads	1,000	1		
	Linear density	2	1		
Sloth Bear	Human density	0	0	-8,794.12	.034
	LULC	50	2		
	Roads	0	0		
	Linear density	0	0		
Tiger	Human density	0	0.01	-10,224.6	.456
	LULC	100	2		
	Roads	1,000	10		
	Linear Density	0	0.01		

Note: Optimum parameter values (R_{max} and x) based on model selection using MPLE and AIC value are represented in the table.

by the landscape variables (R_{max}) and the shape of the relationship between the landscape variable and the resistance offered (x) changed (Table 3). Human population density, on combining the layers, was found to offer no resistance to jungle cat movement, and only built-up areas offered resistance among the land use classes (Figure 4). Density of linear features was found to have a high negative impact. Despite the low model fit, the optimum model parameters were not sensitive to the model selection method (optimization was also carried out using partial Mantel's test. Data not presented).

For leopards, when the landscape variables were tested separately, LULC was found to be the most important variable affecting connectivity, followed by human population density, roads and density of linear features (Table 2). Nonlinear transformations ($x > 0.1$) for road traffic layer indicated that high resistance was offered by all roads, with low or high traffic. The optimum shape parameter value for the LULC layer ($x = 5$) suggested that high resistance is offered only by built-up areas. Univariate optimization identified 10 km as the optimum spatial resolution for the LULC layer (Figure S4), suggesting that forest cover is important at a broad scale. On combining the layers, the optimum parameters (R_{max} and x) identified based on univariate optimization changed. The maximum resistance offered by human population density reduced from 1,000 to 50 and by LULC from 1,000 to 500. Although the maximum resistance offered by roads and density of linear features did not change, their shape parameter did (Table 3).

For sloth bears, LULC was found to be the most important variable, with an optimal resolution of 0.25 km. Human population density, roads and density of linear features also explained variation after controlling for Euclidean distance, when tested independently. However, the support based on AIC scores was lower for these variables. On combining the layers, human population density, roads

TABLE 3 Multivariate landscape genetics optimization

and density of linear features did not explain the variation in genetic differentiation over and above the impact of LULC (Figure 5).

The effect of landscape on genetic connectivity of tigers was found to be higher than other species, as suggested by the high model fit (Table 3). LULC was the most important landscape variable explaining genetic differentiation based on univariate optimization. Density of linear features, human population density and traffic intensity on roads also explained variation after accounting for geographic distance (Table 2). LULC was important at a fine resolution (0.5 km), while human population density (50 km) and density of linear features (10 km) were important at larger scale for tigers. Density of linear features and human population density did not contribute to landscape resistance when all four variables were combined for multivariate optimization. Roads retained their high impact, with resistance increasing highly nonlinearly with increasing traffic ($R_{max} = 1,000$; $x = 10$).

4 | DISCUSSION

Understanding how anthropogenic features impact movement and connectivity of wild carnivores is important for their conservation and management. Conservation plans that incorporate data on multiple species are likely to be better than those based on a single umbrella species. Our objective was to understand how genetic variation is currently partitioned and how landscape features affect gene flow in jungle cat, leopard, sloth bear and tiger in the central Indian landscape. While the patterns of isolation by distance (slope and distance at which IBD becomes non-significant) were in agreement with expectations based on dispersal ability and density, species' distribution explained global genetic differentiation. Human footprint negatively impacted genetic connectivity in all four study species. The nature




FIGURE 4 Relationship of landscape features with resistance. X-axis represents each land use variable used. The categories for roads represent 1—no roads, 2—minor roads, 3—very low traffic roads, 4—low traffic roads, 5—moderate traffic roads, 6—high traffic roads and 7—very high traffic roads. Land use land cover categories were as follows: 1—forest, 2—degraded forest and scrub, 3—agriculture and 4—built-up. Density of linear features (m per pixel) and human population density (persons per square km), being continuous variables, had different maximum values at different resolutions (scales). The optimum scales for different species are different. Y-axis is the resistance offered by the different categories/values of the landscape variable

and scale of impact of individual landscape features were species specific. Our results provide insights into how species life history and ecology interact with the landscape features to shape spatial genetic structure and are important for conservation planning.

4.1 | Dispersal ability and density impact IBD patterns

All four study species revealed significant isolation by distance (IBD). IBD relationship broke down (correlation between genetic

and geographic distance was not significant) at distances beyond ~15 km for Jungle cat, ~40 km for sloth bear, ~60 km for leopard and ~140 km for tiger. Allometric scaling equations (Bowman et al., 2002) based on body size and trophic level predict the median dispersal distance in the study species to be in the same order—jungle cat (8 km), sloth bear (13 km), leopard (35 km) and tiger (85 km). Based on literature, the density at which the study species occur is also likely to follow the same order, with jungle cats likely to occur at high densities (0.4–1.5/km², Gray et al., 2016), followed by sloth bear (0.3–0.7/km², Garshelis & Smith, 1999), leopard (0.05–0.3/km², Kalle, Ramesh, Qureshi, & Sankar, 2011; Athreya et al., 2013)




FIGURE 5 Optimized resistance surface. Dark colours represent high resistance, and light colours represent low resistance. Purple dots in each map are the individual sample locations and green polygons are protected areas. ATR, Achanakmar Tiger Reserve; BOR, Bor Tiger Reserve; BTR, Bandhavgarh Tiger Reserve; CHH, Chhaprala Wildlife Sanctuary; KTR, Kanha Tiger Reserve; NN, Nagzira-Navegaon Tiger Reserve; NOR, Noradehi Wildlife Sanctuary; PAN, Panna Tiger Reserve; PTR, Pench Tiger Reserve; RAT, Ratapani Wildlife Sanctuary; SAN, Sanjay Tiger Reserve; STR, Satpura Tiger Reserve; SU, Sitanadi-Udanti Tiger Reserve; TATP, Tadoba Andhari Tiger Reserve; TIP, Tipeshwar Tiger Reserve; UK, Umred Karhandla Wildlife Sanctuary

and tiger (0.04–0.17/km², Karanth & Nichols, 1998; Karanth, Chundawat, Nichols, & Kumar, 2004; Kalle et al., 2011). The observed pattern of IBD breakdown is in accordance with what one would expect based on Wright's (1946) genetic neighbourhood size for the species. The neighbourhood size depends on density of individuals and species dispersal ability and is nonlinearly related to the spatial scale of autocorrelation. Although expected, such trend in breakdown of IBD has been rarely demonstrated with empirical data. It is interesting that we observe this trend despite the differential impact of landscape features on species' gene flow. Spatial autocorrelation of genetic variation accrues over time and can remain stable over long periods (Epperson, 2005). The relatively recent landscape change may have altered the pattern of isolation by distance expected based on a more or

less continuous historical distribution for all the study species. However, as observed in a recent analysis by Tucker et al. (2018) for dispersal distances in terrestrial mammals, despite high impact of human footprint, body mass and dietary guild may also explain significant variation in spatial autocorrelation of genetic variation.

4.2 | Distribution shapes spatial genetic structure

The partitioning of genetic variation, as measured using F_{ST} , G_{ST} and Mantel's r , was highest for the tiger, followed by leopard and then sloth bear and jungle cat (Figure 1). The observed spatial genetic structure can be expected based on the distribution of the species in the central Indian landscape. Sloth bears are the most widely

distributed large carnivores in central India, followed by leopard and then tiger (Jhala et al., 2015). Jungle cats are also widely distributed in central India; their habitat association suggests a more or less continuous distribution in the landscape, although no research has been carried out. Patchily distributed populations of species are expected to have low gene flow between patches and higher impact of drift (compared to semi-continuously distributed species) that could result in high genetic differentiation (Allendorf & Luikart, 2007). This has been demonstrated in a few recent studies on plants and birds. Two comparative studies on plants find that semi-continuously or continuously distributed populations have lower genetic differentiation than patchily distributed populations (Levy et al., 2016; Llorens et al., 2017). Robin, Vishnudas, Gupta, and Ramakrishnan (2015) studied an entire community of montane birds of the Western Ghats in India and found, with a few exceptions, highest genetic differentiation in montane-restricted species, while the widespread species showed no genetic differentiation. Although comparative studies in mammals are rare, continuously distributed populations have been shown to have low genetic differentiation (Brashear, Ammerman, & Dowler, 2015; Côté, Garant, Robert, Mainguy, & Pelletier, 2012; Cowled et al., 2009), unless the currently continuous population has a history of range shift or decline followed by spatial expansion (Haanes, Røed, Solberg, Herfindal, & Sæther, 2011). Ours is the first comparative study in mammals that demonstrates a relationship between distribution and spatial genetic structure.

4.3 | Human footprint impacts all four species

Landscape genetic analysis revealed that human footprint has an impact on connectivity of the study species in the landscape. LULC was an important variable that affected genetic connectivity in all four study species. While built-up areas had high impact on all the species, agriculture had a variable impact. Density of linear features offered high resistance to jungle cat gene flow, though the model fit was very poor. Density of linear features (highway, rivers and canals) has been shown to influence genetic connectivity of roe deer (*Capreolus capreolus*, Coulon et al., 2006) and has also been shown to affect abundance (Beazley, Snaith, Mackinnon, & Colville, 2004; Boulanger & Stenhouse, 2014) and occurrence (Wasserman, Cushman, Wallin, & Hayden, 2012) of mammals, which in-turn can impact genetic differentiation in a landscape (Llorens et al., 2017; Weckworth et al., 2013).

There has been a lot of focus on the effect of roads on wildlife populations (Laurance et al., 2014; Van Der Ree, Jaeger, Grift, & Clevenger, 2011). Roads have been shown to reduce gene flow in bighorn sheep (*Ovis canadensis*, Epps et al., 2005) and puma (*Puma concolor*, Ernest, Vickers, Morrison, Buchalski, & Boyce, 2014) among others. Most of these studies have been carried out on a single species (but see Frantz et al., 2012). Our results revealed differential impact of roads on our study species. Only roads with high intensity of traffic were found to offer high cost to tiger movement (results were consistent with individual-based analysis used in this study and

population-based analysis carried out with a subset of tiger samples from this study in Thatte, Joshi, et al., 2018). The resistance offered by roads increased linearly for leopards ($x = 1$) and nonlinearly for jungle cats ($x = 5$) with increasing traffic on roads, with maximum resistance offered by roads being higher for leopards than jungle cats. There are several roads crisscrossing through the central Indian landscape and 70% of them have low-to-medium traffic intensity. These low and medium traffic roads may not impact tiger connectivity but have a high negative impact on jungle cats and leopards. Our results emphasize the need to plan and install mitigation structures on not only national and state highways with high traffic but also on smaller roads.

Univariate optimization revealed that model fit varied for the same landscape variable (tested for the same species) at different scales (Figures S4). The optimum scale of the same landscape variable (as identified by univariate optimization) was different for the study species. For example, optimum scale of the human population density layer was 50km for tigers, while it was 10 km for leopard and sloth bear and 5 km for jungle cats.

4.4 | Low genetic differentiation and landscape genetics analysis

Simulation-based studies have found that landscape effects, inferred based on landscape genetic analyses, are most reliable when genetic differentiation is high (Shirk, Landguth, & Cushman, 2017; Zeller et al., 2016) and/or the resistance offered by the landscape is high (Jaquiere, Broquet, Hirzel, Yearsley, & Perrin, 2011). We found low genetic differentiation in jungle cats and sloth bears. Both these species are likely to have high effective population sizes, given their wide distribution in central India. When population size in habitat fragments is high, only a few successful dispersal events are required to counter genetic differentiation due to drift (Mills & Allendorf, 1996). Kekkonen et al. (2011) investigated genetic differentiation in house sparrows in a continuously distributed population. Although dispersal ability of sparrows is low (only 10% of ringed birds were found to disperse > 16 km), authors found negligible genetic differentiation across Finland (covering an area of 400 × 800 km). However, genetic differentiation was high between populations in Finland and Sweden that were separated by 40 km of open sea, a biogeographic barrier. In cases where there is a lack of discrete population boundaries and the genetic differentiation is low, it is a challenge to identify effect of landscape features on gene flow. The model fit in case of sloth bears and jungle cats was also poor. Poor model fit may not imply lack of landscape effects on connectivity in these species, but the inability of landscape genetics methods to detect those. However, low model fit along with low genetic differentiation may suggest a lack of absolute barriers in the landscape for the species. Our results highlight the need to combine different data sources and develop methods complementary to landscape genetics to understand the impact of landscape features on species with low genetic differentiation.

4.5 | Interactions between species life history, ecology and landscape structure

We see interesting genetic patterns in our data that are influenced by both species morphology and ecology. We found dispersal ability impacted spatial autocorrelation between genetic and geographic distance in the study species, while distribution seems to explain the genetic differentiation pattern. Often considered in isolation in comparative studies, species life history and ecological characteristics are likely to interact with each other and with landscape characteristics to shape spatial genetic structure. All three variables—habitat association, dispersal ability and distribution—predicted that jungle cats would show the lowest genetic differentiation among the study species and our results corroborated these expectations. Both tigers and sloth bears were expected to show high genetic differentiation based on two of the three variables. While tiger had the highest genetic structure among the study species and a strong effect of landscape features, sloth bears had low genetic differentiation and poor model fit in landscape genetic analysis. Sloth bears are likely to have a high effective population size owing to their high densities (Garshelis & Smith, 1999; Ratnayake, Manen, & Padmalal, 2007), ability to survive in small habitat patches (Bargali, Bargali, Akhtar, & Chauhan, 2012) and wide distribution in central India (Jhala et al., 2015). Hence, despite low-to-moderate dispersal ability, they are likely to experience low genetic drift resulting in low genetic differentiation. Additionally, sloth bear demographic decline has likely been gradual over the last few decades (Dharaiya, Bargali, & Sharp, 2016). On the other hand, models of tiger demographic history suggest they went through a population bottleneck ~200 years ago and lost 90% of the population (Mondol, Bruford, & Ramakrishnan, 2013). The high genetic structure observed in tigers, despite high dispersal ability, could also be due to a combination of demographic history of population decline and their current restricted distribution.

The observed patterns of connectivity in landscape genetic studies are likely to be a result of multiple interacting processes that influence gene flow and genetic drift. There is a dearth of conceptual and theoretical research investigating the interactions between the different variables including dispersal ability, habitat specialization, distribution and demographic history along with landscape characteristics (area and configuration) and their effect on gene flow and genetic drift (Balkenhol, Cushman, Waits, & Storfer, 2016).

4.6 | Conservation implications

Conservation tends to focus on large mammals in protected areas. While this is important, it may not be an effective conservation strategy for widely distributed and genetically well-connected populations of species like the jungle cat and sloth bear. For such species, conservation value of non-protected areas and small habitat fragments might be high despite being embedded in a human-dominated landscape. Along with delineating corridors between protected areas that are critical for persistence of species like the

tiger (Qureshi et al., 2014; Thatte, Joshi, et al., 2018), landscape-scale conservation strategies also need to factor in the requirements of species that are abundant outside protected areas and currently well connected. Considering the rapid rate of deforestation and anthropogenic development in forest and non-forest areas, it is important to realize the conservation value of modified habitats (Pardini et al., 2009) and non-protected areas for conserving multispecies connectivity. Mitigation measures on linear infrastructure also need to consider the needs of multiple species. While installing mitigation measures on wide roads with high traffic might be sufficient to maintain tiger connectivity, it may not be enough for leopards. For jungle cats, point corridors across roads may not be enough as it is the density of linear features that has a strong negative impact on its connectivity. Given the differential impacts, we acknowledge that conservation planning to maintain multispecies connectivity can be a challenge. Any planning approach that aims to conserve multiple species will be a compromise between what is best for each species individually and what is optimum and feasible when all species are considered together (Early & Thomas, 2007). Indeed, very few studies have tried to incorporate data on multiple species that differ in their connectivity pattern and dispersal ability into conservation planning exercises (but see Dudaniec et al., 2016; Early & Thomas, 2007; Magris, Treml, Pressey, & Weeks, 2016).

5 | CONCLUSION

Landscapes of high conservation value, especially in the tropics, have been changing rapidly due to fragmentation and degradation of habitat (Crooks et al., 2011; Elmhagen, Eriksson, & Lindborg, 2015; Newbold et al., 2015). Understanding the impact of fragmentation on multiple species and identifying strategies to maintain connectivity are critical to counter the negative impacts of fragmentation. By investigating how landscape features impact connectivity, studies like ours can help towards a proactive approach to conservation that can anticipate and prevent future species declines. Species persistence being one of the key goals of conservation planning (Pereira et al., 2010), a better conceptual understanding of how species interact with their landscape is imperative. Multispecies studies are also useful to gain insights into understanding how species traits interact with landscape characteristics to shape spatial genetic structure, linking ecological and evolutionary processes. Using a combination of empirical data on multiple species and spatially explicit simulations, future studies can work towards a conceptual and theoretical understanding of the interacting processes shaping spatial distribution of genetic variation.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We are thankful to the Maharashtra, Madhya Pradesh and Chhattisgarh Forest Departments for providing the necessary permissions (Letter numbers: Kramank/Takniki-I/1720, Kramank/Takniki-I/5100 and

Kramank/Takniki-I/1468 for Madhya Pradesh; No./Prabandh-71/13/2866 and Kramank/Wa.Pra./Prabandh-71/16/348 for Chhattisgarh; D-22(8)/Research/1344(2012-13) and D-22(8)/WL/CR-97(15-16)/2972/2016-17 for Maharashtra) and logistical support for this research. We sincerely thank the forest department staff, field assistants and volunteers for their help and support during the fieldwork. Two landscape layers used in this study, human population density and linear features density, were developed by Rajat Naik and Srinivas Vaidyanathan at Foundation for Ecological Research, Advocacy and Learning. We thank Dr. Christopher Burridge for sharing the code to perform redundancy analysis that we modified and used in this paper. We thank Shomita Mukherjee and Srinivas Vaidyanathan for helpful comments on the manuscript. We are grateful to the National Tiger Conservation Authority (NTCA) of India and the DeFries-Bajpai Foundation for partially funding this study. We thank the National Centre for Biological Sciences (NCBS) for institutional support. PT was supported by Council for Industrial and Scientific Research fellowship and NCBS. UR was supported by the DAE outstanding Scientist Award.

DATA AVAILABILITY STATEMENT

Genotypes of final set of individuals used for analysis will be uploaded on Dryad repository.

ORCID

Prachi Thatte  <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7828-3096>

REFERENCES

- Adamack, A. T., & Gruber, B. (2014). PopGenReport : Simplifying basic population genetic analyses in R. *Methods in Ecology and Evolution*, 5, 384–387.
- Allendorf, F. W., & Luikart, G. (2007). *Conservation and the genetics of populations*. Oxford, UK: Blackwell Publishing.
- Athreya, V., Odden, M., Linnell, J. D. C., Krishnaswamy, J., & Karanth, U. (2013). Big cats in our backyards: Persistence of large carnivores in a human dominated landscape in India. *PLoS ONE*, 8, e57872. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0057872>
- Balkenhol, N., Cushman, S. A., Waits, L. P., & Storer, A. (2016). Current status, future opportunities, and remaining challenges in landscape genetics. In N. Balkenhol, S. A. Cushman, A. T. Storer, & L. P. Waits (Eds.), *Landscape genetics: Concepts, methods, applications* (pp. 247–255). Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons Ltd.
- Bargali, H. S., Bargali, H. S., Akhtar, N., & Chauhan, N. P. S. (2012). The Sloth bear activity and movement in highly fragmented and disturbed habitat in central India. *World Journal of Zoology*, 7, 312–319.
- Barton, K. (2009). *Mu-MIn: Multi-model inference*. R Package Version 0.12.2/r18. <http://R-Forge.Rproject.org/projects/mumin/>
- Beazley, K. F., Snaith, T. V., Mackinnon, F., & Colville, D. (2004). Road density and potential impacts on wildlife species such as American moose in mainland Nova Scotia. *Proceedings of the Nova Scotian Institute of Science*, 42, 339–357. <https://doi.org/10.15273/pnsis.v42i2.3610>
- Beier, P., Majka, D. R., & Spencer, W. D. (2008). Forks in the road: Choices in procedures for designing wildland linkages. *Conservation Biology*, 22, 836–851.
- Boulanger, J., & Stenhouse, G. B. (2014). The Impact of roads on the demography of Grizzly bears in Alberta. *PLoS ONE*, 9, e115535. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0115535>
- Bowcock, A. M., Ruiz-Linares, A., Tomfohrde, J., Minch, E., Kidd, J. R., & Cavalli-Sforza, L. L. (1994). High resolution of human evolutionary trees with polymorphic microsatellites. *Nature*, 368, 455–457. <https://doi.org/10.1038/368455a0>
- Bowman, J., Jaeger, J. A. G., & Fahrig, L. (2002). Dispersal distance of mammals is proportional to home range size. *Ecology*, 83, 2049–2055. [https://doi.org/10.1890/0012-9658\(2002\)083\[2049:DDOMI\]2.0.CO;2](https://doi.org/10.1890/0012-9658(2002)083[2049:DDOMI]2.0.CO;2)
- Brashear, W. A., Ammerman, L. K., & Dowler, R. C. (2015). Short-distance dispersal and lack of genetic structure in an urban striped skunk population. *Journal of Mammalogy*, 96, 72–80. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jmammal/gyu004>
- Brodie, J. F., Giordano, A. J., Dickson, B., Hebblewhite, M., Bernard, H., Mohd-Azlan, J., ... Ambu, L. (2015). Evaluating multispecies landscape connectivity in a threatened tropical mammal community. *Conservation Biology*, 29, 122–132. <https://doi.org/10.1111/cobi.12337>
- Clarke, R. T., Rothery, P., & Raybould, A. F. (2002). Confidence limits for regression relationships between distance matrices: Estimating gene flow with distance. *Journal of Agricultural, Biological, and Environmental Statistics*, 7, 361–372. <https://doi.org/10.1198/108571102320>
- Correa Ayram, C. A., Mendoza, M. E., Etter, A., & Salicrup, D. R. P. (2016). Habitat connectivity in biodiversity conservation. *Progress in Physical Geography: Earth and Environment*, 40, 7–37. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0309133315598713>
- Côté, H., Garant, D., Robert, K., Mainguy, J., & Pelletier, F. (2012). Genetic structure and rabies spread potential in raccoons: The role of landscape barriers and sex-biased dispersal. *Evolutionary Applications*, 5, 393–404. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1752-4571.2012.00238.x>
- Coulon, A., Guillot, G., Cosson, J.-F., Angibault, J. M. A., Aulagnier, S., Cargnelutti, B., ... Hewison, A. J. M. (2006). Genetic structure is influenced by landscape features: Empirical evidence from a roe deer population. *Molecular Ecology*, 15, 1669–1679. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-294X.2006.02861.x>
- Cowled, B. D., Lapidge, S. J., Hampton, J. O., & Spencer, P. B. S. (2009). Measuring the demographic and genetic effects of pest control in a highly persecuted feral pig population. *The Journal of Wildlife Management*, 70(6), 1690–1697. [https://doi.org/10.2193/0022-541X\(2006\)70\[1690:MTDAGE\]2.0.CO;2](https://doi.org/10.2193/0022-541X(2006)70[1690:MTDAGE]2.0.CO;2)
- Crooks, K. R., Burdett, C. L., Theobald, D. M., King, S. R. B., Di Marco, M., Rondinini, C., & Boitani, L. (2017). Quantification of habitat fragmentation reveals extinction risk in terrestrial mammals. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, 114, 7635–7640. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1705769114>
- Crooks, K. R., Burdett, C. L., Theobald, D. M., Rondinini, C., & Boitani, L. (2011). Global patterns of fragmentation and connectivity of mammalian carnivore habitat. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, 366, 2642–2651. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rstb.2011.0120>
- Das, S., Dutta, S., Sen, S., Jijumon, A. S., Babu, S., Nagraj Kumara, H., & Singh, M. (2014). Identifying regions for conservation of sloth bears through occupancy modelling in north-eastern Karnataka, India. *Ursus*, 25, 111–120. <https://doi.org/10.2192/URSUS-D-14-00008.1>
- Davidson, A. D., Hamilton, M. J., Boyer, A. G., Brown, J. H., & Ceballos, G. (2009). Multiple ecological pathways to extinction in mammals. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, 106, 10702–10705. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.0901956106>
- Dharaiya, N., Bargali, H. S., & Sharp, T. (2016). *Melursus ursinus*. The IUCN Red List of Threatened Species 2016, eT13143A45033815. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2305/IUCN.UK.2016-3.RLTS.T13143A45033815.en>

- Dudaniec, R. Y., Rhodes, J. R., Worthington Wilmer, J., Lyons, M., Lee, K. E., McAlpine, C. A., & Carrick, F. N. (2013). Using multilevel models to identify drivers of landscape-genetic structure among management areas. *Molecular Ecology*, 22, 3752–3765. <https://doi.org/10.1111/mec.12359>
- Dudaniec, R. Y., Worthington Wilmer, J., Hanson, J. O., Warren, M., Bell, S., & Rhodes, J. R. (2016). Dealing with uncertainty in landscape genetic resistance models: A case of three co-occurring marsupials. *Molecular Ecology*, 25, 470–486. <https://doi.org/10.1111/mec.13482>
- Dutta, T., Sharma, S., Maldonado, J. E., Panwar, H. S., & Seidensticker, J. (2015). Genetic variation, structure, and gene flow in a Sloth Bear (*Melursus ursinus*) meta-population in the Satpura-Maikal landscape of central India. *PLoS ONE*, 10, e0123384. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0123384>
- Dutta, T., Sharma, S., Maldonado, J. E., Wood, T. C., Panwar, H. S., & Seidensticker, J. (2013). Fine-scale population genetic structure in a wide-ranging carnivore, the leopard (*Panthera pardus fusca*) in central India. *Diversity and Distributions*, 19, 760–771.
- Early, R., & Thomas, C. D. (2007). Multispecies conservation planning: Identifying landscapes for the conservation of viable populations using local and continental species priorities. *Journal of Applied Ecology*, 44, 253–262. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2664.2006.01268.x>
- Elmhagen, B., Eriksson, O., & Lindborg, R. (2015). Implications of climate and land-use change for landscape processes, biodiversity, ecosystem services, and governance. *Ambio*, 44, S1–S5. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13280-014-0596-6>
- Engler, J. O., Balkenhol, N., Filz, K. J., Habel, J. C., & Rödder, D. (2014). Comparative landscape genetics of three closely related sympatric Hesperid butterflies with diverging ecological traits. *PLoS ONE*, 9, e106526. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0106526>
- Epperson, B. K. (2005). Estimating dispersal from short distance spatial autocorrelation. *Heredity*, 95, 7–15. <https://doi.org/10.1038/sj.hdy.6800680>
- Epps, C. W., Palsbøll, P. J., Wehausen, J. D., Roderick, G. K., Ramey, R. R., & McCullough, D. R. (2005). Highways block gene flow and cause a rapid decline in genetic diversity of desert bighorn sheep. *Ecology Letters*, 8, 1029–1038. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1461-0248.2005.00804.x>
- Ernest, H. B., Vickers, T. W., Morrison, S. A., Buchalski, M. R., & Boyce, W. M. (2014). Fractured genetic connectivity threatens a southern California Puma (*Puma concolor*) population. *PLoS ONE*, 9, e107985. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0107985>
- Farrell, L. E., Roman, J., & Sunquist, M. E. (2000). Dietary separation of sympatric carnivores identified by molecular analysis of scats. *Molecular Ecology*, 9, 1583–1590. <https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1365-294x.2000.01037.x>
- Frantz, A. C., Bertouille, S., Eloy, M. C., Licoppe, A., Chaumont, F., & Flamand, M. C. (2012). Comparative landscape genetic analyses show a Belgian motorway to be a gene flow barrier for red deer (*Cervus elaphus*), but not wild boars (*Sus scrofa*). *Molecular Ecology*, 21, 3445–3457.
- Gangadharan, A., Vaidyanathan, S., & Clair, C. C. S. (2016). Categorizing species by niche characteristics can clarify conservation planning in rapidly-developing landscapes. *Animal Conservation*, 19, 451–461.
- Garshelis, D. L., & Smith, J. L. D. (1999). Estimating density and relative abundance of Sloth bears. *Ursus*, 11, 87–98.
- Gehring, T. M., & Swihart, R. K. (2003). Body size, niche breadth, and ecologically scaled responses to habitat fragmentation: Mammalian predators in an agricultural landscape. *Biological Conservation*, 109, 283–295. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0006-3207\(02\)00156-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0006-3207(02)00156-8)
- Gilleland, E. (2013). *Two-dimensional kernel smoothing: Using the R package smoothie*. NCAR Technical Note, pp 17.
- Goslee, S. C., & Urban, D. L. (2007). The ecodist package for dissimilarity-based analysis of ecological data. *Journal of Statistical Software*, 22, 1–19.
- Goudet, J. (2005). hierfstat, a package for r to compute and test hierarchical F-statistics. *Molecular Ecology Notes*, 5, 184–186. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1471-8286.2004.00828.x>
- Gray, T. N. E., Timmins, R. J., Jathana, D., Duckworth, J. W., Baral, H., & Mukherjee, S. (2016). *Felis chaus*. *The IUCN red list of threatened species*.
- Haanes, H., Røed, K. H., Solberg, E. J., Herfindal, I., & Sæther, B.-E. (2011). Genetic discontinuities in a continuously distributed and highly mobile ungulate, the Norwegian moose. *Conservation Genetics*, 12, 1131–1143. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10592-011-0214-0>
- Harvey, M. G., Aleixo, A., Ribas, C. C., & Brumfield, R. T. (2017). Habitat association predicts genetic diversity and population divergence in amazonian birds. *The American Naturalist*, 190, 631–648. <https://doi.org/10.1086/693856>
- Ihaka, R., & Gentleman, R. (1996). R: A language for data analysis and graphics. *Journal of Computational and Graphical Statistics*, 5, 299–314.
- Indian Roads Congress (2007). *IRC SP 073: Manual of standards and specifications for two laning of state highways*.
- Indian Roads Congress (2010) *Four-laning of highways through public private partnership: Manual of specifications & standards*.
- Jackson, H. B., & Fahrig, L. (2015). Are ecologists conducting research at the optimal scale? *Global Ecology and Biogeography*, 24, 52–63. <https://doi.org/10.1111/geb.12233>
- Jaquierey, J., Broquet, T., Hirzel, A. H., Yearsley, J., & Perrin, N. (2011). Inferring landscape effects on dispersal from genetic distances: How far can we go? *Molecular Ecology*, 20, 692–705. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-294X.2010.04966.x>
- Jenkins, D. G., Brescacin, C. R., Duxbury, C. V., Elliott, J. A., Evans, J. A., Grablow, K. R., ... Williams, S. E. (2007). Does size matter for dispersal distance? *Global Ecology and Biogeography*, 16, 415–425. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1466-8238.2007.00312.x>
- Jhala, Y. V., Qureshi, Q., & Gopal, R. (2015) *Status of tigers in India, 2014*.
- Jhala, Y. V., Qureshi, Q., Gopal, R., & Sinha, P. R. (2011) *Status of tigers, co-predators and prey in India, 2010*.
- Jombart, T. (2008). adegenet: A R package for the multivariate analysis of genetic markers. *Bioinformatics*, 24, 1403–1405. <https://doi.org/10.1093/bioinformatics/btn129>
- Joshi, A., Vaidyanathan, S., Mondol, S., Edgaonkar, A., & Ramakrishnan, U. (2013). Connectivity of tiger (*Panthera tigris*) populations in the human-influenced forest mosaic of central India. *PLoS ONE*, 8, e77980. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0077980>
- Kalle, R., Ramesh, T., Qureshi, Q., & Sankar, K. (2011). Density of tiger and leopard in a tropical deciduous forest of Mudumalai Tiger Reserve, southern India, as estimated using photographic capture-recapture sampling. *Acta Theriologica*, 56, 335–342. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13364-011-0038-9>
- Karanth, K. U., Chundawat, R. S., Nichols, J. D., & Kumar, N. S. (2004). Estimation of tiger densities in the tropical dry forests of Panna, Central India, using photographic capture-recapture sampling. *Animal Conservation*, 7, 285–290. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1367943004001477>
- Karanth, K. U., & Nichols, J. D. (1998). Estimation of tiger densities in India using photographic captures and recaptures. *Ecology*, 79, 2852–2862. [https://doi.org/10.1890/0012-9658\(1998\)079\[2852:EOTDI\]2.0.CO;2](https://doi.org/10.1890/0012-9658(1998)079[2852:EOTDI]2.0.CO;2)
- Kekkonen, J., Seppä, P., Hanski, I. K., Jensen, H., Väisänen, R. A., & Brommer, J. E. (2011). Low genetic differentiation in a sedentary bird: House sparrow population genetics in a contiguous landscape. *Heredity*, 106, 183–190. <https://doi.org/10.1038/hdy.2010.32>
- Keller, D., Holderegger, R., van Strien, M. J., & Bolliger, J. (2015). How to make landscape genetics beneficial for conservation management? *Conservation Genetics*, 16, 503–512. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10592-014-0684-y>
- Khimoun, A., Eraud, C., Ollivier, A., Arnoux, E., Rocheteau, V., Bely, M., ... Garnier, S. (2016). Habitat specialization predicts genetic response

- to fragmentation in tropical birds. *Molecular Ecology*, 25, 3831–3844. <https://doi.org/10.1111/mec.13733>
- Kierepka, E. M., Anderson, S. J., Swihart, R. K., & Rhodes, O. E., Jr. (2016). Evaluating the influence of life-history characteristics on genetic structure: A comparison of small mammals inhabiting complex agricultural landscapes. *Ecology and Evolution*, 6, 6376–6396. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ece3.2269>
- Kitchener, A. C., & Dugmore, A. J. (2000). Biogeographical change in the tiger, *Panthera tigris*. *Animal Conservation*, 3, 113–124. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1469-1795.2000.tb00236.x>
- Krishnamurthy, R., Cushman, S. A., Sarkar, M. S., Malviya, M., Naveen, M., Johnson, J. A., & Sen, S. (2016). Multi-scale prediction of landscape resistance for tiger dispersal in central India. *Landscape Ecology*, 31, 1355–1368. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10980-016-0363-0>
- Laurance, W. F., Clements, G. R., Sloan, S., Connell, C. S. O., Mueller, N. D., Goosem, M., ... Arrea, I. B. (2014). A global strategy for road building. *Nature*, 513, 229–232.
- Levy, E., Byrne, M., Coates, D. J., Macdonald, B. M., McArthur, S., & van Leeuwen, S. (2016). Contrasting influences of geographic range and distribution of populations on patterns of genetic diversity in two sympatric *Pilbara acacias*. *PLoS ONE*, 11, e0163995. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0163995>
- Llorens, T. M., Tapper, S.-L., Coates, D. J., McArthur, S., Hankinson, M., & Byrne, M. (2017). Does population distribution matter? Influence of a patchy versus continuous distribution on genetic patterns in a wind-pollinated shrub. *Journal of Biogeography*, 44, 361–374. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jbi.12843>
- Longmire, J. L., Maltbie, M., & Baker, R. J. (1997). Use of 'lysis buffer' in DNA isolation and its implications for museum collections. *Museum of Texas Tech University*, 163, 1–3.
- Magris, R. A., Treml, E. A., Pressey, R. L., & Weeks, R. (2016). Integrating multiple species connectivity and habitat quality into conservation planning for coral reefs. *Ecography*, 39, 649–664. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ecog.01507>
- Marrotte, R. R., Bowman, J., Brown, M. G. C., Cordes, C., Morris, K. Y., Prentice, M. B., & Wilson, P. J. (2017). Multi-species genetic connectivity in a terrestrial habitat network. *Movement Ecology*, 5, 21. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40462-017-0112-2>
- Marshall, T. C., Slate, J., Kruuk, L. E., & Pemberton, J. M. (1998). Statistical confidence for likelihood-based paternity inference in natural populations. *Molecular Ecology*, 7, 639–655. <https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1365-294x.1998.00374.x>
- McRae, B. H., Hall, S. A., Beier, P., & Theobald, D. M. (2012). Where to restore ecological connectivity? Detecting barriers and quantifying restoration benefits. *PLoS ONE*, 7, e52604. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0052604>
- Mills, L. S., & Allendorf, F. W. (1996). The one-migrant-per-generation rule in conservation and management. *Conservation Biology*, 10, 1509–1518. <https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1523-1739.1996.10061509.x>
- Moilanen, A., & Nieminen, M. (2002). Simple connectivity measures in spatial ecology. *Ecology*, 83, 1131–1145.
- Mondol, S., Bruford, M. W., & Ramakrishnan, U. (2013). Demographic loss, genetic structure and the conservation implications for Indian tigers. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, 280, 20130496. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2013.0496>
- Mondol, S., Ullas Karanth, K., Samba Kumar, N., Gopalaswamy, A. M., Andheria, A., & Ramakrishnan, U. (2009). Evaluation of non-invasive genetic sampling methods for estimating tiger population size. *Biological Conservation*, 142, 2350–2360. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biocon.2009.05.014>
- Nakagawa, S., & Schielzeth, H. (2013). A general and simple method for obtaining R² from generalized linear mixed effects models. *Methods in Ecology and Evolution*, 4, 133–142.
- Newbold, T., Hudson, L. N., Hill, S. L. L., Contu, S., Lysenko, I., Senior, R. A., ... Purvis, A. (2015). Global effects of land use on local terrestrial biodiversity. *Nature*, 520, 45–50. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nature14324>
- Oksanen, J., Blanchet, F. G., Friendly, M., Kindt, R., Legendre, P., McGinn, D., ... Wagner, H. (2019). *vegan: Community ecology package version 2.5-6*.
- Pardini, R., Faria, D., Accacio, G. M., Laps, R. R., Mariano-Neto, E., Pacioncia, M. L. B., ... Baumgarten, J. (2009). The challenge of maintaining Atlantic forest biodiversity: A multi-taxa conservation assessment of specialist and generalist species in an agro-forestry mosaic in southern Bahia. *Biological Conservation*, 142, 1178–1190. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biocon.2009.02.010>
- Peakall, R., & Smouse, P. E. (2012). GenAlEx 6.5: Genetic analysis in Excel. Population genetic software for teaching and research—an update. *Bioinformatics*, 28, 2537–2539. <https://doi.org/10.1093/bioinformatics/bts460>
- Pereira, H. M., Leadley, P. W., Proença, V., Alkemade, R., Scharlemann, J. P., Fernandez-Manjarrés, J. F., Walpole, M. (2010). Scenarios for global biodiversity in the 21st century. *Science*, 330, 1496–1501.
- Peterman, W. E. (2018). ResistanceGA: An R package for the optimization of resistance surfaces using genetic algorithms. *Methods in Ecology and Evolution*, 9, 1638–1647.
- Peterson, M. A., & Denno, R. F. (1998). The influence of dispersal and diet breadth on patterns of genetic isolation by distance in phytophagous insects. *The American Naturalist*, 152, 428–446. <https://doi.org/10.1086/286180>
- Puri, M., Srivathsa, A., Karanth, K. K., Kumar, N. S., & Karanth, K. U. (2015). Multiscale distribution models for conserving widespread species: The case of sloth bear *Melursus ursinus* in India. *Diversity and Distributions*, 21, 1087–1100.
- Qureshi, Q., Saini, S., Basu, P., Gopal, R., Raza, R., & Jhala, Y. V. (2014). *Connecting tiger populations for long-term conservation*.
- Ramesh, T., Kalle, R., Sankar, K., & Qureshi, Q. (2012). Factors affecting habitat patch use by sloth bears in Mudumalai Tiger Reserve, Western Ghats, India. *Ursus*, 23, 78–85.
- Ratnayake, S., van Manen, F. T., & Padmalal, U. K. G. K. (2007). Home ranges and habitat use of sloth Bears *Melursus Ursinus Inornatus* in Wasgomuwa National Park, Sri Lanka. *Wildlife Biology*, 13, 272–284. [https://doi.org/10.2981/0909-6396\(2007\)13\[272:HRAHUO\]2.0.CO;2](https://doi.org/10.2981/0909-6396(2007)13[272:HRAHUO]2.0.CO;2)
- Reddy, P. A., Cushman, S. A., Srivastava, A., Sarkar, M. S., & Shivaji, S. (2017). Tiger abundance and gene flow in Central India are driven by disparate combinations of topography and land cover. *Diversity and Distributions*, 23, 863–874. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ddi.12580>
- Richardson, J. L., Brady, S. P., Wang, I. J., & Spear, S. F. (2016). Navigating the pitfalls and promise of landscape genetics. *Molecular Ecology*, 25, 849–863. <https://doi.org/10.1111/mec.13527>
- Robin, V. V., Vishnudas, C. K., Gupta, P., & Ramakrishnan, U. (2015). Deep and wide valleys drive nested phylogeographic patterns across a montane bird community. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, 282, 20150861.
- Segelbacher, G., Cushman, S. A., Epperson, B. K., Fortin, M.-J., Francois, O., Hardy, O. J., ... Manel, S. (2010). Applications of landscape genetics in conservation biology: Concepts and challenges. *Conservation Genetics*, 11, 375–385. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10592-009-0044-5>
- Sharma, S., Dutta, T., Maldonado, J. E., Wood, T. C., Panwar, H. S., Seidensticker, J., ... Wood, T. C. (2013). Forest corridors maintain historical gene flow in a tiger metapopulation in the highlands of central India. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, 280, 20131506. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2013.1506>
- Shirk, A. J., Landguth, E. L., & Cushman, S. A. (2017). A comparison of individual-based genetic distance metrics for landscape genetics. *Molecular Ecology Resources*, 17, 1308–1317. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1755-0998.12684>

- Shirk, A. J., Landguth, E. L., & Cushman, S. A. (2018). A comparison of regression methods for model selection in individual-based landscape genetic analysis. *Molecular Ecology Resources*, 18, 55–67. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1755-0998.12709>
- Shirk, A. J., Wallin, D. O., Cushman, S. A., Rice, C. G., & Warheit, K. I. (2010). Inferring landscape effects on gene flow: A new model selection framework. *Molecular Ecology*, 19, 3603–3619. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-294X.2010.04745.x>
- Stein, A. B., Athreya, V., Gerngross, P., Balme, G., Henschel, P., Karanth, U., ... Ghoddousi, A. (2016). *Panthera pardus*. *The IUCN red list of threatened species*.
- Stuart-Fox, D. M., Schneider, C. J., Moritz, C., & Couper, P. J. (2001). Comparative phylogeography of three rainforest-restricted lizards from mid-east Queensland. *Australian Journal of Zoology*, 49, 119. <https://doi.org/10.1017/ZO00092>
- Sutherland, G. D., Harestad, A. S., Price, K., & Lertzman, K. P. (2000). Scaling of natal dispersal distances in terrestrial birds and mammals. *Conservation Ecology*, 4, 16. <https://doi.org/10.5751/ES-00184-040116>
- Thatte, P., Joshi, A., Vaidyanathan, S., Landguth, E., & Ramakrishnan, U. (2018). Maintaining tiger connectivity and minimizing extinction into the next century: Insights from landscape genetics and spatially-explicit simulations. *Biological Conservation*, 218, 181–191. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biocon.2017.12.022>
- Thatte, P., Patel, K., & Ramakrishnan, U. (2018). Rapid species identification of sloth bears from non-invasive samples: A PCR-based assay. *Ursus*, 29, 67–70. <https://doi.org/10.2192/URSUS-D-17-00024.2>
- Thomas, C. D. (2000). Dispersal and extinction in fragmented landscapes. *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London. Series B: Biological Sciences*, 267, 139–145.
- Tucker, M. A., Böhning-Gaese, K., Fagan, W. F., Fryxell, J. M., Van Moorter, B., Alberts, S. C., ... Mueller, T., (2018). Moving in the Anthropocene: Global reductions in terrestrial mammalian movements. *Science*, 359, 466–469.
- Valière, N. (2002). gimlet: A computer program for analysing genetic individual identification data. *Molecular Ecology Notes*, 2, 377–379. <https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1471-8286.2002.00228.x-i2>
- Van Der Ree, R., Jaeger, J. A. G., Van Der Grift, E. A., & Clevenger, A. P. (2011). Effects of roads and traffic on wildlife populations and landscape function effects of roads and traffic on wildlife populations and landscape function: Road ecology is moving toward larger scales. *Ecology and Society*, 16, 48. <https://doi.org/10.5751/ES-03982-160148>
- Venter, O., Sanderson, E. W., Magrath, A., Allan, J. R., Beher, J., Jones, K. R., ... Watson, J. E. M. (2016). Sixteen years of change in the global terrestrial human footprint and implications for biodiversity conservation. *Nature Communications*, 7, 12558. <https://doi.org/10.1038/ncomms12558>
- Wasserman, T. N., Cushman, S. A., Wallin, D. O., & Hayden, J. (2012). *Multi scale habitat relationships of Martes americana in northern Idaho, U.S.A.* USDA Forest Service RMRS Research Paper RMRS-RP-94.
- Weckworth, B. V., Musiani, M., DeCesare, N. J., McDevitt, A. D., Hebblewhite, M., & Mariani, S. (2013). Preferred habitat and effective population size drive landscape genetic patterns in an endangered species. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, 280, 20131756.
- White, E. P., Ernest, S. K. M., Kerkhoff, A. J., & Enquist, B. J. (2007). Relationships between body size and abundance in ecology. *Trends in Ecology & Evolution*, 22, 323–330. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tree.2007.03.007>
- Winter, D. J. (2012). MMOD: An R library for the calculation of population differentiation statistics. *Molecular Ecology Resources*, 12, 1158–1160.
- Wright, S. (1946). Isolation by distance under diverse systems of mating. *Genetics*, 31, 39–59.
- Wultsch, C., Waits, L. P., Kelly, M. J., Lizama, D., Correa, E., & Cruz, F. (2016). A comparative analysis of genetic diversity and structure in Jaguars (*Panthera onca*), Pumas (*Puma concolor*), and Ocelots (*Leopardus pardalis*) in fragmented landscapes of a critical Mesoamerican linkage zone. *PLoS ONE*, 11, e0151043. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0151043>
- Yoganand, K., Rice, C. G., Johnsingh, A. J. T., & Seidensticker, J. (2006). Is the sloth bear in India secure? A preliminary report on distribution, threats and conservation requirements. *Journal of the Bombay Natural History Society*, 103, 172–181.
- Yumnam, B., Jhala, Y. V., Qureshi, Q., Maldonado, J. E., Gopal, R., Saini, S., ... Fleischer, R. C. (2014). Prioritizing tiger conservation through landscape genetics and habitat linkages. *PLoS ONE*, 9, e111207. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0111207>
- Zayed, A., Packer, L., Grixti, J. C., Ruz, L., Owen, R. E., & Toro, H. (2006). Increased genetic differentiation in a specialist versus a generalist bee: Implications for conservation. *Conservation Genetics*, 6, 1017–1026. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10592-005-9094-5>
- Zeller, K. A., Creech, T. G., Millette, K. L., Crowhurst, R. S., Long, R. A., Wagner, H. H., ... Landguth, E. L. (2016). Using simulations to evaluate Mantel-based methods for assessing landscape resistance to gene flow. *Ecology and Evolution*, 6, 4115–4128. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ece3.2154>
- Zeller, K. A., McGarigal, K., & Whiteley, A. R. (2012). Estimating landscape resistance to movement: A review. *Landscape Ecology*, 27, 777–797. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10980-012-9737-0>

BIOSKETCHES

Prachi Thatte is interested in studying the factors influencing spatial distribution of genetic variation in species.

Uma Ramakrishnan uses genetic tools to understand how humans have affected the past and future evolutionary trajectory of endangered mammals and birds.

Author contributions: P.T. and U.R. conceived the idea. P.T., K.P., P.B. and H.C. carried out fieldwork for scat sample collection. P.T., K.P., P.B., H.C., A.T. and A.C. carried out lab work to generate genetic data. P.T. analysed the data and led the writing. U.R. supervised the project. All authors provided comments on the article.

SUPPORTING INFORMATION

Additional supporting information may be found online in the Supporting Information section.

How to cite this article: Thatte P, Chandramouli A, Tyagi A, et al. Human footprint differentially impacts genetic connectivity of four wide-ranging mammals in a fragmented landscape. *Divers Distrib*. 2020;26:299–314. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ddi.13022>