

White-rumped Vulture's habitat suitability prediction using MaxEnt in Arunachal Pradesh

ABSTRACT

Few reports showed that White-rumped vulture is present in Arunachal Pradesh. However, they were reported from few places only. Such sightings suggest that either the region is not explored completely or the habitats are not suitable for the species. Therefore, knowing and predicting the habitat suitability of WRV and revealing the relative contribution of environmental variables determining such distribution can be important for their protection and conservation. The present study was based on the current distribution of WRV in Arunachal Pradesh that we had surveyed from 2016 to 2020. We followed the road count and point count method to obtain primary occurrence data. Also, secondary data on occurrence records and data on environmental variables (landscape variables, anthropogenic variables, and climatic variables) were obtained and used. The data were processed using ArcMap. 29 occurrence records (filtered) and 11 environmental variables were used to build the prediction model using maximum entropy (MaxEnt). The MaxEnt predicted model showed high accuracy with area under the receiver operating characteristic curve value equals to 0.95 and True Skill Statistics value equals to 0.87. Of the total area, only 2629.63 km² (3.20 %) is suitable for WRV while the majority of the area is unsuitable (79542.84 km²) (96.79 %). The elevation (32.2%), land use land cover (31.7%), normalized difference vegetation index of November (26.7%) were the most influencing variables impacting the distribution of WRV. Among bioclimatic variables, the mean temperature of the warmest quarter and precipitation of the wettest quarter had the highest contribution. This work is the first attempt to understand the spatial distribution of WRV and the environmental factors associated to their distribution in the state. The findings can be relevant for designing conservation efforts to conserve this species in the state.

Keywords: White-rumped vulture, SDM, habitat, MaxEnt, Arunachal Pradesh

1. INTRODUCTION

White-rumped Vulture *Gyps bengalensis* is a medium-sized raptor with wide distribution range throughout the South-Asian countries, including India, and precisely to the tropical and sub-tropical regions [1,2]. They perform a crucial and commendable job of clearing the carrion, and thereby prevent the advent of any adverse consequences. They were once regarded as one of the most abundant raptor species in the world [3]. However, by the 1990s they have undergone unprecedented population decline and by 2000, they have been recognized as critically endangered species by IUCN [4,5]. Their decline in population can have serious impacts on the health of the environment (Pain et al., 2003). They are observed mostly in the plains and less frequently in hilly regions, mostly below 1000 m amsl [7,8]. However, they have been also recorded in higher regions up to 3100 m amsl in Nepal [9]. They prefer grasslands, scattered forest areas, semi-deserts, riverine forests, and regions near human habitation such as agricultural areas, dump yards, etc. [4].

Despite their wide geographic range in India, White-rumped Vultures (WRV) have been reported only from a few places in Arunachal Pradesh (study area), which suggested that they are found in patches, showing disjunct distribution. They were reported from Siang valley (Chettri et al. 2006; Katti et al. 1992), Mehao wildlife sanctuary [11], Seijusa [12], Namsai [12], Pakke tiger reserve [13], D'Ering memorial wildlife sanctuary [14–17], and Dehang-Debang biosphere reserve (Rangini et al., 2014). These meager sightings suggested that either majority of the area in the state is unexplored or has unsuitable habitats for WRV. Also, these sightings of WRV in few areas indicated that the regions favorable environment for WRV to survive. Complete information on distribution, habitat suitability,

and habitat preferences are lacking and are necessary for protection and conservation of WRV population in the state.

Species distribution modeling (SDM) is an effective tool to understand the habitat requirements of any species. It can help in predicting the habitat suitability, potential distribution of species, and importance of environmental variables in species distribution (Guisan & Zimmermann 2000; Pearson et al. 2004; Phillips et al. 2006; Drew et al. 2011; Thapa et al. 2018; Jha & Jha 2020). It uses georeferenced occurrence data and spatial environmental data related to climate, topography, vegetation, soil type, etc., and predicts the distribution of species and their suitable habitat. With the advancement in recent technologies, various tools and techniques have been developed to generate SDMs [22,24,25]. MaxEnt is a widely used and popular SDM tool that builds the prediction model based on species presence data only [18]. The output of MaxEnt gives a probabilistic map of habitat suitability, where each pixel value indicates the degree of habitat suitability of species under study [18,26].

Species survivability depends on the ability of the species to access and exploit resources of the habitat. The habitat quality and habitat suitability of any species can be related to the contribution of prevailing environmental factors. Habitat suitability depends on the assemblage of required features of environmental factors such as optimal climate and landscape condition. The distributions of birds, particularly vultures are strongly impacted by the food availability [27–31], elevation [32–34], climate [33,35–37], vegetation [38,39], and land use pattern [19,39,40]. Since Arunachal Pradesh has a landscape ranging from plain to high mountainous regions; it exhibits a wide range of climatic conditions and topography which may have a significant role in determining the distribution of WRV in Arunachal Pradesh. However, detailed information on WRV's occurrence points and suitable habitat are lacking from the state. Considering the above mentioned research gap and research significance, the present study aimed to predict habitat suitability of WRV and determine the relative contribution of environmental variables in the distribution of WRV in the state. The findings will help in understanding the biogeography of WRV and contribute as baseline information for future studies in the state. The findings can also help us to identify potential sites of the WRV, where reintroduction of WRV can be carried out in the state.

2. METHODOLOGY

Study area

The surveys were carried out throughout the landscape of Arunachal Pradesh (26°28' - 29°30' North to 91°30' - 97°30' East), covering an area of 83,743 km² (Figure 1). The state is bestowed with rich terrestrial biodiversity [41], which is supported by the state's rich forest covers, topographical elevation gradient, and varied climate regimes. The state has a forest cover of 66,687.78 km², which is 79.63 % of the state's total geographical area [42]. In terms of vegetation types, the state includes tropical forest, sub-tropical forest, pine forest, temperate forest, alpine forest, degraded forest, and grasslands. Topographically, the average elevation gradient ranges from 67 m to 6853 m (based on SRTM, Digital Elevation Model, 30 m, 2021). Depending upon the elevation, the state displays different climatic zones, and these ranges from sub-tropical to temperate climate. The lower regions of the state experience hot and humid climates, while the northern part experiences cold and dry climates. In the foothills, the maximum temperature can be up to 40°C during the summer. Average temperature ranges from 0° to 21°C and 22° to 31°C, during the winter and monsoon months, respectively. Moreover, the annual temperature varies from below 0°C to 31°C. The state receives overall rainfall from May to early October. The annual rainfall ranges from 2,000 mm to 8,000 mm [42].




Figure 1. Study area map (Arunachal Pradesh) with survey routes and point count stations

WRV occurrence data and Processing

Occurrence data were collected from surveys made during the study period from January, 2016 to May, 2020. We followed the road count method [43] and point count method [44] to record the occurrence of WRV in the state. 27 routes were laid on the state's motorable roadways (Figure 1) and a vehicle's speed approximately of 20-30 km/h was maintained throughout the survey. The literature review suggested that D'Ering memorial wildlife sanctuary (DEMWLS) has high potential for WRV's sighting. However, the sanctuary lack motorable roadway, therefore we followed point count method inside the sanctuary. 10 point count stations were fixed along the forest trails and a minimum of 30 minutes stay at each point was followed. For both the methods, surveys were carried out from 0800 hours in the morning to 1600 hours in the evening. A total of 28 georeferenced points (locations) of WRV occurrence were recorded by the end of the survey period. The coordinates were recorded using Garmin GPS. Since the study aims to predict the habitat suitability of WRV in the state; occurrence records of WRVs from other sources were also used. We collected 10 occurrence records from Global Biodiversity Information Facility (GBIF) (<https://www.gbif.org/>) and four occurrence records from a published paper [15]. Altogether, we have a total of 42 occurrence records. However, recording of points that are too close may result in sampling biases and cause overfitting of the models [45] and thereby affecting the model performance (i.e., accuracy and precision). Therefore, we used "spatially rarefy occurrence data for SDMs" tool from the SDMToolbox in ArcMap to filter the occurrence point. Points with distances less than one km between the two points were removed randomly [34]. Finally, after filtering only 29 occurrence points were left to be used in MaxEnt operation (Figure 2).




Figure 2. Occurrence records of WRV in Arunachal Pradesh

Environmental variables and Processing

SDM estimates the relationship between the species and its environment and predicts the habitat suitability of the species using the spatial information attached to the environmental variables [22]. The selection of the environmental variables is very much species-oriented and prefer to consider those with restrictive effect on species distribution. For this study, elevation, vegetation, land use land cover, human population density, livestock density and climate were considered. Digital elevation model (DEM) data were obtained from SRTM data (<https://earthexplorer.usgs.gov/>). Normalised Difference Vegetation Index (NDVI) estimates the density of greenness of an area on the land surface. It can be used as a proxy for ungulate forage availability [39]. NDVI data were obtained from MODIS data (<https://lpdaac.usgs.gov/products/mod13a3v006/>). Land use land cover (LULC) data were obtained from ESRI data (<https://livingatlas.arcgis.com/landcover/>). Human population density (HPD) data was obtained from SEDAC data (<https://sedac.ciesin.columbia.edu/data/set/gpw-v4-population-density-rev11>). Livestock census data was obtained from Livestock census, 2019, Directorate of Animal Husbandry & Veterinary, Government of Arunachal Pradesh. The livestock census data was then converted to livestock density (LD). Climatic data were obtained from WorldClim data (<https://www.worldclim.org/>). WorldClim provides the averaged weather data over 30 years (1970 to 2000). For this study, we considered bioclimatic variables (particularly, mean temperature of warmest quarter, mean temperature of coldest quarter, precipitation of wettest quarter, and precipitation of driest quarter). Bioclimatic variables are derived from monthly temperature and rainfall values (Fick & Hijmans 2017) and thus can act as more biologically meaningful variables. In total, we have 11 environmental variables (one DEM, three NDVIs, one LULC, one HPD, one LD, and four bioclimatic variables).

All the environmental variables layers were resampled to same spatial resolution and projection. The bioclimatic layer has “0.0083333333 x 0.0083333333” spatial resolution and “GCS_WGS_1984” projection. The DEM layer has “0.00027777778 x 0.00027777778” spatial resolution and “GCS_WGS_1984” projection. The DEM layer was resampled to “0.0083333333 x 0.0083333333” spatial resolution. 19 separate tiles of elevation data were mosaicked to cover the study area. The NDVI data have “926.6254331 x 926.6254331” spatial resolution and “sinusoidal grid” projection. The NDVI layers were projected to GCS_WGS_1984 projection and resampled to “0.0083333333 x 0.0083333333” spatial resolution. The LULC layer has “10 x 10” spatial resolution with “WGS_1984_UTM_Zone” projection. Two tiles of LULC were mosaicked to cover the study area. The LULC layer projection was changed to “GCS_WGS_1984” and resampled to “0.0083333333 x 0.0083333333” spatial resolution (Figure 3). HPD layer and LD layer have spatial resolution of “0.0083333333 x 0.0083333333” and GCS_WGS_1984 projection. Finally, all the layers were masked to the shapefile of study area. These processings were done in ArcMap 10.4. Furthermore, the layers

were converted to “ascii” format file. In many studies, a bias layer has been used to prevent sampling bias and to restrict the selection of background points during MaxEnt operation. So, we created a bias layer with same extent and resolution of bioclimatic data (formatted one) using the minimum convex polygon (MCP) and a buffer distance of 20 km in ArcMap.




Figure 3. LULC map (Rescaled to 1km resolution)

Modeling approach and procedure

For the present study, we chose maximum entropy (MaxEnt) for predicting habitat suitability of WRV in Arunachal Pradesh. The output quality of MaxEnt depends on the optimization or adjustment in different parameters of MaxEnt settings [46]. Akaike's information criterion (AIC) determines the fitness of the model statistically and the model with the lowest delta AIC_c (should equal zero) is the best fit model. Therefore, the delta AIC_c value was estimated using “ENMevaluate” command in R software [47,48] and the values of other parameters associated with the lowest delta AIC_c were selected and used in MaxEnt setting. In MaxEnt interface, we combined five parameters (linear, quadratic, product, threshold, and hinge features) under the features combination and selected “Cloglog” output format. Additionally, other setting parameters were optimized: random test percentage set to 25%, regularization multiplier set to 4, and maximum iteration set to 5000 times. Bootstrap replication run type was selected with replicates set to 10. Area Under the Receiver operating characteristic curve (AUC) (threshold independent) and True Skill Statistics (TSS) (threshold dependent) coefficient were used to evaluate the accuracy of the predicted model. Percentage contribution of variables table and jackknife analysis were used to evaluate each variables relative importance.

3. RESULTS

Model performance

Area Under the Receiver operating characteristic curve (AUC) was considered to evaluate the accuracy of the model. The average AUC of predicted model for habitat suitability of WRV in Arunachal Pradesh was greater than 0.9, which indicates that the prediction result has high accuracy ($AUC_{\text{training}} = 0.95$, $AUC_{\text{test}} = 0.95$) (Figure 4). Also, the threshold dependent validation test of predicted model indicated high predictive accuracy of the model ($TSS = 0.87$).




Figure 4. AUC report of training model prediction

Habitat suitability of WRV in Arunachal Pradesh

The predicted map of habitat suitability of WRV is continuous data with values ranging from 0 to 1 (lowest to highest probability of distribution). Therefore, we classified the output of MaxEnt into four classes of habitat suitability based on maximum training sensitivity plus specificity cloglog threshold ($=0.49$): unsuitable (< 0.49), Low suitable ($0.49 - 0.6$), moderate suitable ($0.6 - 0.8$), and high suitable (> 0.8). The suitable habitat of White-rumped vulture is predicted to cover 2629.63 km² which is only 3.20 % of the total area of Arunachal Pradesh. Further, only 0.67 % of the area has high suitability of habitat. A large portion of the area (79542.84 km²) is found to be unsuitable for the WRV (Table 1, Figure 5). The model result shows that the area with high suitability for WRVs are distributed in the regions of East Siang, Namsai, Lower Dibang Valley, Lohit, Changlang, Lower Siang, West Siang, Upper Subansiri, and Papumpare districts in Arunachal Pradesh.

Table 1. Habitat suitability class based on predictive probability range with area (km², %)

Habitat suitability class	Area (km ²)	% Area
Unsuitable (< 0.49)	79542.84	96.79
Low suitable ($0.49 - 0.6$)	865.41	1.05
Moderate suitable ($0.6 - 0.8$)	1209.97	1.47
High suitable (> 0.8)	554.24	0.67





Figure 5. Habitat suitability prediction of White-rumped vulture in Arunachal Pradesh

Relative contribution of environmental variables in distribution of WRV


Analysis of variable contributions table of model prediction showed that DEM is the most significant variable with 54.2% contribution in the distribution prediction. Followed by LULC (31.7%) and NDVI11 (26.7%). Rest of the variables showed little contribution (Bio10-2.2%, Bio16- 2.1%, HPD- 1.9%, Bio17- 1%, LD- 0.9%, NDVI2- 0.8%, NDVI6- 0.5%, and Bio11- 0.2%) (Table 2). Among the land use land cover components, built area, shrub, and bare area are found to be the most influential ones (Figure 6). The response curves of the predicted model showed that DEM and NDVIs are negatively correlated (Figure 6). Bio10, Bio11, Bio16, and Bio17 are positively correlated, whereas HPD and LPD didn't show the clear response to the distribution of this vulture. Adding to this, the Jackknife analysis (of regularised training gain) showed that NDVI11, DEM, NDVI2, LULC, and Bio10 are the five most influencing variables for the distribution of WRV in Arunachal Pradesh. The variable with highest gain, when used in isolation, is NDVI11, and the variable that decreases the gain the most when it is omitted, is LULC (Figure 7).

Table 2. Relative contribution of the environmental variables to the MaxEnt model


Code	Environmental variable	% contribution
DEM	Digital elevation model	32.2
LULC	Land use land cover	31.7
NDVI11	Normalised difference vegetation index, november	26.7
Bio10	Mean temperature of warmest quarter	2.2
Bio16	Precipitation of wettest quarter	2.1
HPD	Human population density	1.9
Bio17	Precipitation of driest quarter	1.0
LD	Livestock density	0.9
NDVI2	Normalised difference vegetation index, february	0.8
NDVI6	Normalised difference vegetation index, june	0.5
Bio11	Mean temperature of coldest quarter	0.2



(a)



(b)



(c)

Figure 6. Response curves showing the correlation between WRV's distribution and three most influencing variables: (a) Digital elevation model, (b) Land use land cover, and (c) Normalised difference vegetation index, November




Figure 7. Jackknife test of variable importance (regularised training gain)

4. DISCUSSIONS

Model performance

The performance of the model was evaluated using AUC and TSS. Our predicted model has an AUC value greater than 0.9 ($AUC_{\text{training}} = 0.95$) and TSS value = 0.87. In both the measures, a value near to 1 which indicates that the model is more accurate and is good to consider. The closer the AUC value to 1, the greater is the accuracy of model [18,49]. Also, TSS coefficient which values range from -1 to +1, where +1 indicates perfect agreement and values of zero or less indicate a performance no better than random [50].

Habitat suitability of WRV in Arunachal Pradesh

The predicted model shows that a very small portion, 2629.63 km² (3.20 %) of the total area is suitable for WRV under the present climatic conditions and landscape features. Such findings suggest that the WRV has very specific requirements for habitat preference in the state. Generally, WRVs are found in the region with lower altitude range (below 2700m amsl), nearby human settlement (built-up areas), open forest, and wooded savannah [1,4]. Our prediction reflects the same characteristics to the potential areas. Suitable habitats are found to be concentrated in the areas with lower elevation range, open forest, built-up areas, and waterbody availability in the state. In addition to the realised niche of WRV, other areas have also been selected as suitable habitat (i.e., the fundamental niche). These are due to the presence of similar climatic and other environmental variables conditions in those areas in the state. Majority of the areas in the state are covered with forests (Very dense forest (25.19 %), and moderately dense forest (36.49 %)) [42] and most parts of the unsuitable habitat are consisted of dense forest areas. The non-preference of dense forest by WRV is due to the fact that they need a clearer ground cover, where they can easily detect their food (carcass) at the ground. The finding of availability of suitable habitat is the prerequisite to initiate any conservation initiatives to protect WRV in the state.

Relative contribution of environmental variables in distribution of WRV

Environmental factors (variables) not only affect the growth and reproduction of vultures but also the behavior of the species. Among 11 selected variables, the analysis of variables contribution shows that the most important variables are the DEM (54.2%), LULC (31.7%) and NDVI11 (26.7%). The elevation can affect the distribution of WRV by determining the availability of their food resources [34]. Also, the elevation is related to the climatic condition of the area as there will be decrease in temperature with the increase in altitude and this can impact the reproduction success of vultures (endotherms). Our predicted model shows that all the potential areas fall within the range of average elevation of 67 m to 1047 m amsl. The response curve of DEM and WRV (probability of occurrence) showed a negative correlation (Figure 6). The land use land cover can be key determinants in influencing the distribution of vultures across their range. Habitats that are in or nearby built areas and nearby waterbody are more preferred by the WRVs [19,51]. This may be due to the fact that these areas can provide good opportunities for food sources in the form of cattle stock [9,31,52] and

dumpsites [53–55]. Our model response curve of LULC shows that the built area, shrubs and bare area are the three most influencing variables which determines the WRV distribution in the state (Figure 6). The normalized difference vegetation index (NDVI), indicates the degree and extent of greenness (which can be related to vegetation cover) and can have a significant role in presence of ungulates, thereby influencing the distribution of WRV in the state. In our predicted model, we observed that NDVI11 has a good contribution in WRV distribution in compare to NDVI6 and NDVI2 (Figure 6). On comparing three NDVIs, we observed lesser extent of greenery in NDVI11 to all the occurrence points. This suggests that there is sparse vegetation cover in the month of November, and thus less forage cover for ungulates which in turn increases the chance of more dead ungulates. The response curve of NDVI11 and WRV (probability of occurrence) showed a negative correlation (Figure 6). Temperature and precipitation can also influence both, the growth and reproduction in vulture [34,37,56]. However, in our predicted model we observed very small contribution percentage of temperature and precipitation in WRV distribution. Among the 4 bioclimatic variables, the Mean temperature of warmest quarter and precipitation of wettest quarter have the highest contribution with 2.2% and 2.1%, respectively (Table 2).

5. CONCLUSION

We used MaxEnt and sets of environmental variables to evaluate the suitable habitat distribution of WRV in Arunachal Pradesh. The model reveals that a very small portion of area 2647.07 km² (3.22 %) of the total area is suitable for WRV. Though it is a small portion, it still has enough space and requirements for the improvement of threatened status (globally recognised) and conservation of WRV in the state. Interestingly, within this suitable region there is obvious lack of overlap between the predicted model and realized niche of WRV, which suggests that there may be some factors which are inhibiting the expansion of realized niche or might have been responsible for the local extinction. Therefore, it is worth considering to identify those influencing factors so that right managements can be carried out. If so, then these fundamental niche can be utilised for reintroduction programs. Our results showed that the DEM, LULC and NDVI11 have the more contribution than other variables in distribution of WRV in the state. As a whole, the HPD and LD doesn't showed any strong positive or negative correlation. But it is also evident that all the distributed area of WRV have good number of human population and livestock population. This work is the first attempt to understand the spatial distribution of WRV and the environmental factors associated to their distribution in the state. The findings can act as baseline information for further analysis of WRV distribution and reintroduction program in the state.

REFERENCES

1. Ferguson-Lees J, Christie DA. Raptors of the world. Christopher Helm Publishers, an imprint of A&C Black Publishers Ltd, 36 Soho Square, London; 2001. 992 p.
2. BirdLife International. Threatened birds of Asia: the BirdLife International red data book. Collar NJ, Andreev A V., Chan S, Crosby MJ, Subramanya S, Tobias JA, editors. Cambridge, UK: BirdLife International; 2001. 3038 p.
3. Houston DC. Indian white-backed vulture *Gyps bengalensis*. Newton I, Chancellor RD, editors. Conservation studies on raptors. Cambridge: International Council for Bird Preservation. Technical Publication No. 5; 1985. 465–466 p.
4. BirdLife International. Species factsheet: *Gyps bengalensis* [Internet]. 2021 [cited 2021 Feb 3]. Available from: <http://www.birdlife.org/>
5. Prakash V. Status of vultures in Keoladeo national park, Bharatpur, Rajasthan, with special reference to population crash in *Gyps* species. J Bombay Nat Hist Soc. 1999;96(3):365–78.
6. Pain DJ, Cunningham AA, Donald PF, Duckworth JW, Houston DC, Katzner T, et al. Causes and effects of temporospatial declines of *Gyps* vultures in Asia. Conserv Biol. 2003;17(3):661–71.
7. Chakraborty R. Vultures are again in the city sky. Rec Zool Surv India. 2010;110:119–23.
8. Grimmett R, Inskipp C, Inskipp T. Birds of the Indian subcontinent. Christopher Helm, an imprint of Bloomsbury Publishing Pic, 50 Bedford Square, London WC1B 3DP; 2014. 528 p.
9. Baral N, Gautam R, Tamang B. Population status and breeding ecology of White-rumped Vulture *Gyps bengalensis* in Rampur Valley, Nepal. Forktail. 2005;21:87–91.
10. Chettri N, Rastogi A, Singh OP. Assessment of raptor migration and status along the Tsangpo-Brahmaputra corridor (India) by a local communities. Avocetta. 2006;30:61–8.
11. Katti M, Singh P, Manjrekar N, Sharma D, Mukherjee S. An ornithological survey in eastern

- Arunachal Pradesh, India. *Forktail*. 1992;7:75–89.
12. Singh P. Recent bird records from Arunachal Pradesh. *Forktail*. 1994;10:65–104.
 13. Datta A, Singh P, Athreya RM, Kartikeyan S. Birds of Pakhui wildlife sanctuary in western Arunachal Pradesh, north-east India. *Newsl Birdwatchers*. 1998;38(6):91–6.
 14. Biswas KK, Soren PC, Basu D, Chattopadhyay S, Bhuinya S. Observation on vertebrate fauna of D'ering Memorial Wildlife Sanctuary, Arunachal Pradesh. *Rec Zool Surv India*. 2005;105(3–4):169–88.
 15. Kumar A. Occurrence of two critically endangered species of Gyps vultures in D'Ering memorial wildlife sanctuary and adjacent areas, Arunachal Pradesh, India. *Berkut*. 2010;19(1&2):101–7.
 16. Mize D, Taba R, Chetry R, Payum T. Evaluation of the avian diversity survey in D'Ering memorial wildlife sanctuary, Arunachal Pradesh. *J Bioresour*. 2014;1(1):4–10.
 17. Rahmani AR, Islam MZ, Kasambe RM. Important bird and biodiversity areas in India: priority sites for conservation. 2nd ed. Ugra G, Maithreyi MR, editors. Bombay Natural History Society, Hornbill House, Shaheed Bhagat Singh Road, Mumbai; 2016. 209–318 p.
 18. Phillips SJ, Anderson RP, Schapire RE. Maximum entropy modeling of species geographic distributions. *Ecol Modell*. 2006 Jan;190(3–4):231–59.
 19. Jha KK, Jha R. Habitat suitability mapping for migratory and resident vultures: A case of Indian stronghold and species distribution model. *J Wildl Biodivers* [Internet]. 2020;4(3):91–111. Available from: <http://jwb.araku.ac.ir/>
 20. Drew CA, Wiersma YF, Huettmann F. Predictive species and habitat modeling in landscape ecology [Internet]. 1st ed. Springer-Verlag New York; 2011. 313 p. Available from: <https://www.springer.com/gp/book/9781441973894>
 21. Thapa A, Wu R, Hu Y, Nie Y, Singh PB, Khatiwada JR, et al. Predicting the potential distribution of the endangered Red panda across its entire range using MaxEnt modeling. *Ecol Evol*. 2018 Nov;8(21):10542–54.
 22. Guisan A, Zimmermann NE. Predictive habitat distribution models in ecology. *Ecol Modell*. 2000;135(2–3):147–86.
 23. Pearson RG, Dawson TP, Liu C. Modelling species distributions in Britain: a hierarchical integration of climate and land-cover data. *Ecography (Cop)* [Internet]. 2004 Jun;27(3):285–98. Available from: <http://doi.wiley.com/10.1111/j.0906-7590.2004.03740.x>
 24. Phillips SJ, Dudík M. Modeling of species distributions with Maxent: New extensions and a comprehensive evaluation. *Ecography (Cop)*. 2008;31(2):161–75.
 25. Elith J, Phillips SJ, Hastie T, Dudík M, Chee YE, Yates CJ. A statistical explanation of MaxEnt for ecologists. *Divers Distrib*. 2011;17(1):43–57.
 26. Ferrier S. Mapping spatial pattern in biodiversity for regional conservation planning: where to from here? Funk V, editor. *Syst Biol* [Internet]. 2002 Mar 1;51(2):331–63. Available from: <http://academic.oup.com/sysbio/article/51/2/331/1661495>
 27. Margalida A, García D, Cortés-Avizanda A. Factors influencing the breeding density of Bearded vultures, Egyptian vultures and Eurasian griffon vultures in Catalonia (NE Spain): Management implications. *Anim Biodivers Conserv*. 2007;30(2):189–200.
 28. Krüger SC, Simmons RE, Amar A. Anthropogenic activities influence the abandonment of bearded vulture (*Gypaetus barbatus*) territories in southern Africa. *Condor*. 2015;117(1):94–107.
 29. Klopfer PH, Hailman JP. Habitat selection in birds. In: Lehrman DS, Hinde RA, Shaw E, editors. *Advances in the Study of Behavior* [Internet]. Volume 1. Academic Press; 1965. p. 279–303. Available from: <https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S0065345408600601>
 30. Cody ML. Habitat selection in birds: the roles of vegetation structure, competitors, and productivity. *Bioscience* [Internet]. 1981 Feb;31(2):107–13. Available from: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/1308252>
 31. KC KB, Koju NP, Bhusal KP, Low M, Ghimire SK, Ranabhat R, et al. Factors influencing the presence of the endangered Egyptian vulture *Neophron percnopterus* in Rukum, Nepal. *Glob Ecol Conserv* [Internet]. 2019;20:e00727. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gecco.2019.e00727>
 32. Rodríguez B, Rodríguez A, Siverio F, Siverio M. Factors affecting the spatial distribution and breeding habitat of an insular cliff-nesting raptor community. *Curr Zool*. 2018;64(2):173–81.
 33. Abebe AF, Cai T, Wale M, Song G, Fjeldså J, Lei F. Factors determining species richness patterns of breeding birds along an elevational gradient in the Horn of Africa region. *Ecol Evol*. 2019;9(17):9609–23.
 34. Zhang J, Jiang F, Li G, Qin W, Li S, Gao H, et al. Maxent modeling for predicting the spatial distribution of three raptors in the Sanjiangyuan national park, China. *Ecol Evol*.

- 2019;9(11):6643–54.
35. Hawkins BA, Porter EE. Relative influences of current and historical factors on mammal and bird diversity patterns in deglaciated North America. *Glob Ecol Biogeogr*. 2003;12(6):475–81.
 36. Bridgeford P, Bridgeford M. Ten years of monitoring breeding Lappet-faced vultures *Torgos tracheliotos* in the Namib-Naukluft park, Namibia. *Vulture News*. 2003;48(March):3–11.
 37. Phipps WL, Diekmann M, MacTavish LM, Mendelsohn JM, Naidoo V, Wolter K, et al. Due south: a first assessment of the potential impacts of climate change on Cape vulture occurrence. *Biol Conserv* [Internet]. 2017;210:16–25. Available from: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.biocon.2017.03.028>
 38. Bamford AJ, Monadjem A, Hardy ICW. An effect of vegetation structure on carcass exploitation by vultures in an African savanna. *Ostrich*. 2009;80(3):135–7.
 39. Santangeli A, Spiegel O, Bridgeford P, Girardello M. Synergistic effect of land-use and vegetation greenness on vulture nestling body condition in arid ecosystems. *Sci Rep*. 2018;8(1):1–11.
 40. Rodríguez-Estrella R. Land use changes affect distributional patterns of desert birds in the Baja California peninsula, Mexico. *Divers Distrib*. 2007;13(6):877–89.
 41. Mishra C, Datta A. A new bird species from eastern Himalayan Arunachal Pradesh - India's biological frontier. *Curr Sci*. 2007;92(9):1205–6.
 42. Forest Survey of India. India state of forest report [Internet]. 16th ed. Vol. II. Forest Survey of India (Ministry of Environment Forest Forest and Climate Change); 2019. Available from: http://www.fsi.org.in/cover_2011/uttarakhand.pdf%5C
 43. Fuller MR, Mosher JA. Raptor survey techniques. In: Geron Pendleton BA, Millsap BA, Cline KW, Bird DM, editors. *Raptor management techniques manual*. National wildlife federation, Washington D.C.; 1987. p. 37–65.
 44. Bibby CJ, Burgess ND, Hill DA. Bird census techniques [Internet]. Elsevier; 1992. 257 p. Available from: <https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/C20090035314>
 45. Boria RA, Olson LE, Goodman SM, Anderson RP. Spatial filtering to reduce sampling bias can improve the performance of ecological niche models. *Ecol Modell* [Internet]. 2014;275:73–7. Available from: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolmodel.2013.12.012>
 46. Anderson RP, Gonzalez I. Species-specific tuning increases robustness to sampling bias in models of species distributions: An implementation with Maxent. *Ecol Modell* [Internet]. 2011;222(15):2796–811. Available from: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolmodel.2011.04.011>
 47. Muscarella R, Galante PJ, Soley-Guardia M, Boria RA, Kass JM, Uriarte M, et al. ENMeval: An R package for conducting spatially independent evaluations and estimating optimal model complexity for Maxent ecological niche models. *Methods Ecol Evol*. 2014;5(11):1198–205.
 48. Warren DL, Seifert SN. Ecological niche modeling in Maxent: The importance of model complexity and the performance of model selection criteria. *Ecol Appl*. 2011;21(2):335–42.
 49. Yang XQ, Kushwaha SPS, Saran S, Xu J, Roy PS. Maxent modeling for predicting the potential distribution of medicinal plant, *Justicia adhatoda* L. in Lesser Himalayan foothills. *Ecol Eng* [Internet]. 2013;51:83–7. Available from: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.ecoleng.2012.12.004>
 50. Allouche O, Tsoar A, Kadmon R. Assessing the accuracy of species distribution models: Prevalence, kappa and the true skill statistic (TSS). *J Appl Ecol*. 2006;43(6):1223–32.
 51. Kanaujia A, Kushwaha S. Relationship between water bodies and vulture populations in Bundelkhand, India. *Species*. 2014;11(27):6–19.
 52. Lu X, Ke D, Zeng X, Gong G, Ci R. Status, ecology, and conservation of the Himalayan griffon *Gyps himalayensis* (Aves, Accipitridae) in the Tibetan plateau. *Ambio*. 2009;38(3):166–73.
 53. Angelov I, Bougain C, Schulze M, Sariri T Al, McGrady M, Meyburg BU. A globally-important stronghold in Oman for a resident population of the endangered Egyptian vulture *Neophron percnopterus*. *Ardea*. 2020;108(1):73–82.
 54. Navaneethan B, Sankar K, Qureshi Q, Manjrekar M. The status of vultures in Bandhavgarh tiger reserve, Madhya Pradesh, central India. *J Threat Taxa*. 2015;7(14):8134–8.
 55. Kumar A, Mishra S, Yadav R, Sinha A, Kanaujia A. Vultures of Pilibhit Tiger Reserve (PTR), Uttar Pradesh. *Adv Biores*. 2018;9(2):135–44.
 56. Virani MZ, Monadjem A, Thomsett S, Kendall C. Seasonal variation in breeding Rüppell's vultures *Gyps rueppellii* at Kwenia, southern Kenya and implications for conservation. *Bird Conserv Int*. 2012;22(3):260–9.