List of Tables

Tab. 1.1: Agricultural impacts on wildlife. —— **5**
Tab. 1.2: Wildlife management in agricultural landscapes (adapted from Verdade et al., 2014a). —— **7**
Tab. 2.1: Evolution of bibliographic production for 60 years in the Corumbataí river basin. —— **20**
Tab. 3.1: Demographic (urban and rural population), technological (rural labor and mechanization), financial (rural credit) and land-use (farmland in the state and forests inside farmlands) results concerning the 26 Brazilian states in 1960 and their variation (D) until the most recent survey (2010 for demographic data and 2006 for all other variables). Highlighted numbers are the three higher (+) and lower (-) values of each column. [A] Corroborate agricultural adjustment hypothesis (+ mechanization → - farmland → + forests in farms). [F] Corroborate "economic development path" of forest transition hypothesis (+ urban population → - rural population → - rural labor → - farmland → + forests in farms). —— **34**
Tab. 5.1: Main soil enzymes. Predicted function and activity. Adapted from Tabatabai (1994). —— **74**
Tab. 5.2: Ordination methods applied in ecological studies. Adapted from Jongman, ter Braak, & van Tongeren (1995). —— **80**
Tab. 6.1: Correlations of the textural and chemical properties of soil with the composite axes of soils derived from the PCA and with topographic characteristics of the 30 sampled plots. —— **93**
Tab. 6.2: Relationship between the axes of ordination of the Principal Coordinate Analysis (PCoA) and the land use type, fertility, and slope for the 30 sampled plots. The land use types (eucalyptus, forest and pasture) shown by different letters are significantly different. —— **95**
Tab. 6.3: Percentage of the explained variance (% VE) by environmental factors (land use, fertility, slope) for the two types of communities of woody plants, the principal gradient of the composition of the community, extracted by PCoA, and the original data of the community. The percentage of variance explained in the original data and the percentage of the variance captured by the axes of ordination times the percentage of the variance explained by the environmental variables on the two axes of ordination. —— **96**
Tab. 7.1: Names and code numbers of the 40 agricultural regions of the State of São Paulo. —— **117**
Tab. 7.2: Area (ha) used for the cultivation of cassava, yams and sweet potato in five municipalities of the Registro agricultural region and in four municipalities of the Pindamonhangaba agricultural region (both in São Paulo State) according to the LUPA 1995/1996 and 2007/2008 surveys. Data from São Paulo (2008a). —— **128**
Tab. 11.1: Population densities of capybaras in distinct environments. —— **180**
Tab. 12.1: Effect of the landscape structure on the richness and abundance of the ecological groups of fruit-feeding butterflies in a fragmented landscape in Southeastern Brazil. Values inside parentheses indicate the regression coefficients of the valid general linear models (Brito et al., 2014). —— **198**
Tab. 13.1: Number of streams (*m*) sampled on two seasons (Rainy and Dry samples) for stream fish species (S_{obs}) and estimates by extrapolation of sample size. S_{est} = Number of estimated species for $m_{R,D}$ and m_{extr} sample sizes. m_{extr} = sample sizes extrapolated over the *m* sampled. $-CL_{(95\%)}$ and $+CL_{(95\%)}$ = lower and upper Confidence Limits with 95% of probability. —— **212**
Tab. 13.2: Number of streams (*n*) sampled grouped by *DC* and *DB* predictors on two seasons (Rainy and Dry samples) for stream fish species (S_{obs}) and estimates by extrapolation of sample size. S_{est} = Number of estimated species for *m* and m_{extr} sample sizes. m_{extr} = sample sizes extrapolated over the *m* sampled. $-CL_{(95\%)}$ and $+CL_{(95\%)}$ = lower and upper Confidence Limits with 95% of probability. —— **213**
Tab. 13.3: Analysis of similarities (ANOSIM) results for comparisons among groups (*Sugarcane*, *Pasture* and *Forest*) of two predictors (*DC*, *DB*) for two samples of stream fish assemblages on the Rainy (*m* = 60 streams) and Dry (*m* = 58 streams) seasons. —— **214**

Tab. 13.4: Results for pairwise ANOSIM tests for the *DB* predictor on two samples of stream fish assemblages (Rainy and Dry seasons). The upper right triangle of the matrix presents the ANOSIM statistic *R*, while the lower left triangle presents the Bonferroni-corrected p values of the comparisons. —— **214**

Tab. 13.5: Results of the Similarity Percentage analysis (SIMPER) for pairwise comparisons of stream fish assemblage samples taken on the Rainy and Dry seasons. The percentage contribution to the overall dissimilarity between groups (Contr.) is presented for each taxon*, together with the mean abundance of the species in each group. Bold numbers highlight the most abundant species in each pairwise comparison. —— **216**

Tab. 14.1: Number of individuals of leaf-litter amphibians on a silvicultural landscape of Angatuba, state of São Paulo, Southeastern Brazil. —— **231**

Tab. 14.2: Estimated (r_{est}) and detected (r_{det}) species richness of leaf-litter amphibians on a silvicultural landscape of Angatuba, state of São Paulo, Southeastern Brazil. —— **232**

Tab. 15.1: Species richness detected (R_{det}) and estimated by non-parametric estimator bootstrap (R_{est}), number of detected individuals, number of exclusive species and Shannon index (H´) of agricultural landscapes of Southeastern Brazil. —— **248**

Tab. 15.2: Previous birds' surveys in altered environments of the state of São Paulo, Southeastern Brazil. —— **253**

Tab. 16.1: Percentages (%) of time allocated to activities by the study group in two month periods at the Cantareira State Park, SP, Brazil. —— **277**

Tab. 16.2: Percentage (%) of food items consumed by the study group in two month periods at the Cantareira State Park, SP, Brazil. —— **278**

Tab. 16.3: Tukey test results for the differences between two month periods measuring consumption of fruits by the study group in the Cantareira State Park, SP, Brazil. —— **278**

Tab. 16.4: Tukey test results for the differences between two month periods measuring consumption of flowers by the study group in the Cantareira State Park, SP, Brazil. —— **278**

Tab. 16.5: Plant species and the number of records of items consumed by the study group in Cantareira State Park, SP, Brazil. —— **279**

Tab. 16.6: Total phenol and tannin content in consumed items of plant species by the study group in Cantareira State Park, SP, Brazil. —— **282**

Tab. 16.7: Total phenol and tannin content in not consumed items of plant species by study group in Cantareira State Park, SP, Brazil. —— **282**

Tab. 16.8: Activity patterns for several species of the genus *Alouatta* (the social interaction category was unrelated; R = resting; F = feeding; M = moving). —— **284**

Tab. 16.9: Group size and home range of howler monkeys, *Alouatta fusca*, in Southeastern Brazil. —— **287**

Tab.17.1: Species detected and functional groups in the areas accessed in this study. —— **307**

Tab. 17.2: Summary of GLM Poisson and Binomial-Negative models. Group sets are: TSpp = Total Species, Occ = Total Occurrences, Herb = Herbivorous Occurrences, Omn = Omnivorous Occurrences, Carn = Carnivorous Occurrences, Ins = Insectivorous Occurrences; Independent variables are written with prefixes: A = Area, PE = Perimeter, PA = Perimeter/Area Ratio, FD = Fractal Dimension, AWFD = Area Weighted fractal Dimension; sugixes: NV = Native Vegetation, EU = Eucalypt Plantation; and spatial scales: 05 = 500 m buffer ratio, 10 = 1000 m buffer ratio, 15 = 1500 m buffer ratio, 20 = 2000 m buffer ratio, 25 = 2500 m buffer ratio, 30 = 3000 m buffer ratio. —— **308**