

Uttar Pradesh Journal of Zoology

Volume 45, Issue 19, Page 270-284, 2024; Article no.UPJOZ.4179 ISSN: 0256-971X (P)

Assessment of Avifaunal Status, Diversity, and Conservation Implications in and around the Wetlands of Dharwad, Karnataka, India

Harshavardhan S. Jamakhandi ^a and Girish G. Kadadevaru ^{a*}

^a Department of Studies in Zoology, Karnatak University, Dharwad, Karnataka, India.

Authors' contributions

This work was carried out in collaboration between both authors. Both authors read and approved the final manuscript.

Article Information

DOI: https://doi.org/10.56557/upjoz/2024/v45i194526

Open Peer Review History:

This journal follows the Advanced Open Peer Review policy. Identity of the Reviewers, Editor(s) and additional Reviewers, peer review comments, different versions of the manuscript, comments of the editors, etc are available here: https://prh.mbimph.com/review-history/4179

Original Research Article

Received: 02/08/2024 Accepted: 04/10/2024 Published: 08/10/2024

ABSTRACT

The study shows an overall avifaunal diversity and status of selected wetlands in Dharwad district and conveys the presence/absence of bird species on habitat changes caused due to varying water levels (exposure/submergence of mudflats) and destruction of riparian vegetation such as the reed species. These wetlands have attracted bird species from local to migratory to forage, roost and breed in the area. The avifaunal diversity was found to fairly vary across the different wetlands. The data portrayed here are from the surveys during wintering months of 2017-18 and 2021-22. Line transects, point count and total count methods were used for surveying. Diversity indices (Beta, Shannon, Simpson, Evenness) and similarity matrices (Bray-Curtis cluster) were calculated using

Cite as: Jamakhandi, Harshavardhan S., and Girish G. Kadadevaru. 2024. "Assessment of Avifaunal Status, Diversity, and Conservation Implications in and Around the Wetlands of Dharwad, Karnataka, India". UTTAR PRADESH JOURNAL OF ZOOLOGY 45 (19):270-84. https://doi.org/10.56557/upjoz/2024/v45i194526.

^{*}Corresponding author: Email: kadadevarug@gmail.com;

Past 4 package. The Pearson correlation, beta diversity and Bray-Curtis's clustering were used to compare the wetlands for the similarity/dissimilarities in species composition. Overall, Shannon and Simpson diversity of the wetlands were H'=4.67 & D= 0.98 with total of 177 species, which portrays high degree of diversity. There were around 46 species of migrant birds and 133 resident species. The work also reports a few rare and coastal birds. The study suggests the management plans for the conservation of avifauna in and around the wetlands to prevent human disturbances and also considering the importance of faunal habitats before adopting lake developmental plans.

Keywords: Urban avifauna; wetland; biodiversity.

1. INTRODUCTION

Total wetland area in India is estimated to be 15.98 Mha, which is around 4.86 percent of the total geographic area of the country [1]. Wetlands are widely recognized as dynamic ecosystems with diverse attributes, including distinctive avifauna. It has been estimated that about 35% of global wetlands have been lost since 1970 [2]. The world's freshwater wetland is rich in species composition and serves as a habitat for about 40% of bird species and 12% of all animal species [3]. The microhabitats of a wetland provide rich and quality shelter and food for the avifauna populations throughout the year [4-6]. In also provide addition, wetlands essential ecological and economic services, including food and water source for domestic animals, climate change regulation, fish supply, recreational values, and medicinal plants [7,8]. Wetlands in urban settings fulfil additional environmental and social needs, which include storm-water retention of runoff from impervious surfaces, as well as removing pollutants and waste from water. The economic benefits include potentially reducing infrastructure costs, due to their ability to act as storm-water retention areas [9].

Wetland birds in particular are sensitive indicators of wetland conditions [9]. In urban areas the ecosystem of wetlands is the life support system, ensuring the effective functioning of the water cycle as they help recharge groundwater aguifers, cleanse polluted waters and act as sponges to mitigate floods [10]. In arid and semi-arid mid-latitudes, migratory shorebirds, waterfowl, and wading birds, rely on a limited number of important wetland areas (i.e., wetland habitat network) to connect continental movements supporting life-cycle annual events. Today, water development associated with many of these sites acts as drivers of urban development and irrigated agriculture supporting metropolitan centers and agricultural economies that account for 40% of global food production [11].

Wetland areas situated in dry and sub-humid places play an important role in supporting migratory bird species [12]. The degradation of wetlands can have significant conservation implications extending beyond the local scale when degradation affects migratory birds, which rely on wetlands for suitable habitat during the migration [13].

The presence or absence of birds may indicate the ecological conditions of wetland habitats and form an essential link between the food web and the nutrient cycle [14]. Avifauna is a highly diverse, conspicuous, and significant component of freshwater wetland ecosystems [15,16,17]. Moreover, birds may respond quickly to any change in habitat structure and climatic conditions [18-21]. The number of species and their relative abundance of birds depend upon wetland characteristics such as size, water level, quality of water, availability and distribution of food resources, and presence of suitable roosting and nursery sites [22].

Due to rapid urbanization, the birds' natural habitats have been lost, fragmented or modified with non-native vegetation to a larger extent, which affects community structure or distribution and other behavioural aspects [23-25].

In Karnataka, inland wetlands dominate, which account for 93.44% of the total wetland area [26]. Dharwad district (13507.14 km2) has a total wetland of 36 with area extent of about 44.0 km² [27].

The present study was undertaken to describe the avian species diversity, resident status and threat concerns wetlands of Dharwad district, Karnataka, India.

2. MATERIALS AND METHODS

Dharwad town and district of North Karnataka (15.417°N, 75.35°E; 727 m alt.) (Fig. 1), spans an area of 200 km2 and has 45 villages in five

talukas. Human population is just over 1.6 million. 1.2 million of them in the Hubli-Dharwad twin city area. Rainfall is about 90 cm per annum. most falling in July and ranging from June end to early September, with 27°C-36°C average temperature. West of the city is an undulating foothill of Western Ghats tract (400-800 m) with red to greyish-brown soil, and to the east the Deccan plain with red loams to black cotton soil. Flora is disturbed deciduous forest, reduced to low scrub, interspersed with cultivation. The tropical dry deciduous forest begins some 20km west of Dharwad. The surveys were conducted in Neersagar Chinnadakere Pond. reservoir. Devaragudihal lake, Navaloor lake, Kelgeri Lake, Toppalgatti lake, Adavisomapur lake, Magadi Bird conservation reserve and Bachanaki Reservoir. These are utilized for irrigation purposes, domestic use and few for recreational purposes as a part of city parks. The riparian zones and surrounding terrestrial vegetation around wetlands are used by resident and migratory birds for roosting, feeding and nesting.

2.1 Bird survey

The methodologies used for bird counts were both point & line transect methods. Line

transects of 50mtr each and the distance between each line transect & point was about 200mtrs and for point count 50mtr radius around each point and the perpendicular distance of 50mtrs from each line transect was observed by walking at a constant pace for both visual and auditory sightings. Total count was used for birds in open waters [28] and were counted at 2-3 scanning points selected based on pilot surveys. To count the large flocks, the flock size was broken into units of 20 individuals [29]. The survey was conducted mostly during dawn and duck hours. Avifauna was identified by sight and call, and individual counts were recorded. Equipment used for photography & observation was Nikon DSLR (D5200) with a 300mm Nikkor telephoto lens and Olympus Binocular 10x50.

Grimmett et al. [30], was used as a field guide for identification and for the information on distribution, resident status & occurrence status [25,30] were referred. IUCN [31], was used for the information on conservation status. The avifaunal data here were from the surveys of wintering months during 2017-18 and 2021-22. The individual encounters and habitat features, were noted. The human activities in and around the site were also observed for further interpretation.



Fig. 1. Map of study area showing the 9 selected wetlands of Dharwad district, Karnataka State, India

2.2 Data Analysis

Relative abundance of all bird species was calculated by the expression,

Relative abundance = $\frac{\text{No. of individuals of the species}}{\text{Total no. of individuals of all species}} X 100$

It is a measure of how common or rare a species is in relation to other species in a community.

The diversity and evenness were calculated by using the diversity indices, such as the Shannon-Wiener diversity index (which is a measure portraying diversity of a community by considering both species richness and evenness), Simpson diversity index (a measure of biodiversity which takes into account the number of species and how evenly individuals are distributed among them), Evenness (which is a measure of how similar the abundance of each species is in a given environment), beta diversity (measure of how species composition changes as one moves between different ecosystems, habitats, or communities) [28] and Bray-Curtis Cluster analysis (a method of classification that uses a distance measure to group objects based on their similarity) [32] using PAST 4 statistical software.

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

A total of 177 species of birds were recorded across all field sites from both winter counts. The Shannon and Simpson diversity index was H'= 1.97 and 1-D=. 0.4987. The diversity indices without the Bar-headed geese would be H'= 4.66 and 1-D= 0.9865 as Magadi bird conservation reserve receives over 3000-5000 individuals every winter which affects the diversity indices drastically (Table 1).

There were around 126 species of resident avifauna with Shannon index of H'= 4.338 which indicates high species richness and Simpson index 1-D= 0.9817 indicating high degree of heterogeneity. The species richness of both local and winter migrants is = 51. During the present study, we reported the occurrence of Great bittern (Botaurus stellaris) an elusive rare species, which is the first record from across dryland Karnataka.

Considering how often the species were observed in the area during the survey period, the frequency of occurrence of resident birds showed 14 species belonging to very common category, 68 to common category, 72 uncommon and 23 to rare category. Among winter migrants, 16 were under common category, 26 uncommon and 8 species were Rare in occurrence.

The data for the conservation status was referred from the IUCN Red list. From the total of 177 species, 168 species belong to the Least concern category (94.9%) among which 74 species show stable population trend, 42 species are under decreasing population trend and 26 species under increasing population trend. The remaining species have no proper 26 documentation on their population patterns. There were 6 species (3.39%) under the Near threatened category with decreasing population trend (Woolly-necked Stork (Ciconia episcopus), Painted Stork (Mvcteria leucocephala). Blackheaded Ibis (Threskiornis melanocephalus), Oriental Darter (Anhinga melanogaster), Blacktailed Godwit (Limosa limosa) and Malabar Pied-Hornbill (Anthracoceros coronatus)). 3 species under Vulnerable category (1.7%)with decreasing population trend (Lesser Adjutant Pochard (Leptoptilos javanicus), Common (Aythya ferina) and River Tern (Sterna aurantia)).

 Table 1. The total diversity of Avifauna in selected wetlands of Dharwad district with their frequency, conservation status and relative abundance

SI No	Common Name	Scientific Name	Count	Occurrence frequency	Conservati on status	Relative abundance
1	Bar-headed Goose	Anser indicus	5000	С	LC	70.54
2	Indian Spot-billed	Anas poecilorhyncha	99	С	LC	1.4
	Duck					
3	Rock Pigeon	Columba livia	60	VC	LC	0.85
4	River Tern	Sterna aurantia	57	С	VU	0.8
5	Painted Stork	Mycteria leucocephala	51	С	NT	0.72
6	Small Pratincole	Glareola lactea	50	UC	LC	0.71
7	Red-vented Bulbul	Pycnonotus cafer	46	VC	LC	0.65
8	Black-winged Stilt	Himantopus	45	VC	LC	0.63
	3	, himantopus				
9	Red-wattled Lapwing	Vanellus indicus	45	VC	LC	0.63

Jamakhandi and Kadadevaru;	Uttar Pradesh J. Zool., v	ol. 45, no. 19, pr	o. 270-284, 2024; Artic	cle no.UPJOZ.4179
		, -, -, -, -, -, -, -, -, -, -, -, -,	, - ,	

SI No	Common Name	Scientific Name	Count	Occurrence frequency	Conservati on status	Relative abundance
10	Eurasian Coot	Fulica atra	42	VC	LC	0.59
11	Eastern Cattle Egret	Bubulcus coromandus	41	VC	LC	0.58
12	Little Cormorant	Microcarbo niger	40	С	LC	0.56
13	Indian Cormorant	Phalacrocorax fuscicollis	39	UC	LC	0.55
14	Red-rumped Swallow	Cecropis daurica	37	С	LC	0.52
15	Indian Pond-Heron	Ardeola grayii	35	VC	LC	0.49
16	Barn Swallow	Hirundo rustica	34	UC	LC	0.48
17	Little Egret	Egretta garzetta	34	VC	LC	0.48
18	Asian Green Bee- eater	Merops orientalis	28	С	LC	0.4
19	Baya Weaver	Ploceus philippinus	28	UC	LC	0.4
20	Black-headed Ibis	Threskiornis melanocephalus	28	С	NT	0.4
21	Brahminy Starling	Sturnia pagodarum	28	UC	LC	0.4
22	Little Grebe	Tachybaptus ruficollis	28	С	LC	0.4
23	Wire-tailed Swallow	Hirundo smithii	28	С	LC	0.4
24	Lesser Whistling- Duck	Dendrocygna javanica	27	С	LC	0.38
25	Common Myna	Acridotheres tristis	25	VC	LC	0.35
26	Northern Pintail	Anas acuta	25	UC	LC	0.35
27	Red-whiskered Bulbul	Pycnonotus jocosus	25	VC	LC	0.35
28	Rose-ringed Parakeet	Psittacula krameri	25	С	LC	0.35
29	Gray Heron	Ardea cinerea	24	С	LC	0.34
30	House Crow	Corvus splendens	24	С	LC	0.34
31	White-browed Bulbul	Pycnonotus luteolus	24	С	LC	0.34
32	Ashy Prinia	Prinia socialis	23	VC	LC	0.32
33	Common Sandpiper	Actitis hypoleucos	23	С	LC	0.32
34	Garganev	Spatula querquedula	23	ŬĊ	LĊ	0.32
35	Eurasian Spoonbill	Platalea leucorodia	22	UC	LC	0.31
36	Black-headed	Emberiza melanocenhala	20	UC	LC	0.28
37	Gray-headed Swamphen	Porphyrio	20	С	LC	0.28
38	Wood Sandniner	Tringa glareola	20			0.28
30	Black Kite	Milvus migrans	19	C		0.20
40	Medium Earet	Ardea intermedia	19	C		0.27
41	Dusky Crag-Martin	Ptyonoprogne concolor	18	C		0.25
42	Purple Heron	Ardea nurnurea	17	C		0.20
43	Cotton Pyamy-Goose	Nettanus	15	ÜC.		0.21
40	Clossy Ibis	coromandelianus Plogadis faloinollus	15			0.21
44 15	Northern Shoualar	Spatula dupaata	15			0.21
40	Vollow wattlod	Vanallus malabarious	15			0.21
40	Lapwing	varielius malabaricus	15	00		0.21
47	Asian Openbill	Anastomus oscitans	14	C	LC	0.2
48	Blyth's Reed Warbler	Acrocephalus dumetorum	14	C	LC	0.2
49	Brahminy Kite	Haliastur indus	14	С	LC	0.2
50	Common Tailorbird	Orthotomus sutorius	14	С	LC	0.2
51	Bronze-winged Jacana	Metopidius indicus	13	С	LC	0.18
52	Indian Silverbill	Euodice malabarica	13	С	LC	0.18
53	Purple-rumped Sunbird	Leptocoma zeylonica	13	С	LC	0.18
54	Indian Robin	Copsychus fulicatus	12	С	LC	0.17
55	Jungle Myna	Acridotheres fuscus	12	С	LC	0.17
56	Large Gray Babbler	Argya malcolmi	12	С	LC	0.17
57	White-breasted	Amaurornis	12	С	IC	0 17

Jamakhandi and Kadadevaru; Uttar Pradesh J.	Zool., vol. 45, no.	19, pp. 270-284, 202	4; Article no.UPJOZ.4179
---	---------------------	----------------------	--------------------------

SI No	Common Name	Scientific Name	Count	Occurrence frequency	Conservati on status	Relative abundance
	Waterhen	phoenicurus		<i>i i</i>		
58	Laughing Dove	Spilopelia	11	VC	LC	0.16
50	1.501 0.50			0		0.40
59	Little Swift	Apus attinis	11	C	LC	0.16
60	Scaly-breasted Munia	Lonchura punctulata	11	С	LC	0.16
61	Blue-tailed Bee-eater	Merops philippinus	10	Ra	LC	0.14
62	Common Pochard	Avthva ferina	10	Ra	VU	0.14
63	Pale-billed	Dicaeum	10	UC	IC	0 14
00	Flowerpecker	enuthrorhynchos	10	00	20	0.1.1
C 4	Diad Kingfishar		10	0		0.4.4
64	Plea Kinglisher	Ceryle ruals	10			0.14
65	Plain Prinia	Prinia inornata	10		LC	0.14
66	Thick-billed	Dicaeum agile	10	UC	LC	0.14
	Flowerpecker					
67	Asian Koel	Eudynamys	9	С	LC	0.13
		scolopaceus				
68	Asian Woolly-necked	Ciconia episcopus	9	С	NT	0.13
	Stork					
69	Black Drongo	Dicrurus macrocercus	q	VC	LC	0.13
70	Long tailed Shrike	Lonius schoch	0	C C		0.10
70			3	0		0.13
/1	Red-naped Ibis	Pseudibis papiliosa	9	C	LC	0.13
72	Ruddy Shelduck	I adorna terruginea	9	UC	LC	0.13
73	Small Minivet	Pericrocotus	9	С	LC	0.13
		cinnamomeus				
74	Spotted Dove	Spilopelia chinensis	9	С	LC	0.13
75	White-throated	Halcvon smyrnensis	9	VC	IC	0.13
10	Kingfisher		0	10	20	0.10
76	Clamaraua Baad	Aarooonboluo	0	0		0.11
76	Clamorous Reed	Acrocephalus	0	C	LC	0.11
	vvarbier	stentoreus	_			
77	Common	Tringa nebularia	8	UC	LC	0.11
	Greenshank					
78	Great Egret	Ardea alba	8	UC	LC	0.11
79	Greater Coucal	Centropus sinensis	8	С	LC	0.11
80	Indian Peafowl	Pavo cristatus	8	Ĉ		0.11
00	Kontich Ployor	Aparhypobus	0	UС		0.11
01	Renusit i lovei	Anannynchus	0	00	LO	0.11
~~		alexandrinus	•	0	NIT	0.44
82	Oriental Darter	Anninga melanogaster	8	C	NI	0.11
83	Tree Pipit	Anthus trivialis	8	Ra	LC	0.11
84	Cinereous Tit	Parus cinereus	7	С	LC	0.1
85	Common Iora	Aegithina tiphia	7	С	LC	0.1
86	Eurasian Hoopoe	Upupa enons	7	С	LC	0.1
87	Marsh Sandniner	Tringa stagnatilis	7	ŬC.	I.C.	0.1
00	Nilgiri Elowerpeeker	Diogoum ochoolor	7			0.1
00			1	00		0.1
89		Antrius rutulus	1			0.1
90	Yellow-eyed Babbler	Chrysomma sinense	1	C	LC	0.1
91	Eurasian Collared-	Streptopelia decaocto	6	С	LC	0.08
	Dove					
92	Little Ringed Plover	Charadrius dubius	6	UC	LC	0.08
93	Oriental Magnie-	Consychus saularis	6	C		0.08
55	Robin	Copsyshids Sadians	U	5	20	0.00
04	Pod Avedovot	Amandava	6			0.09
94		Annanuava annanuava	0			0.00
95	Indian Swiftlet	Aerodramus unicolor	5		LC	0.07
96	Jungle Babbler	Argya striata	5	UC	LC	0.07
97	Large-billed Crow	Corvus macrorhynchos	5	С	LC	0.07
98	Little Stint	Calidris minuta	5	UC	LC	0.07
99	Purple Sunbird	Cinnvris asiaticus	5	С	LC	0.07
100	Spot-breasted Fantail	Rhinidura alboqularis	5	йс		0.07
100	Vollow footed Cross	Troron phoeniconter	5			0.07
101	rellow-looted Green-	r reron prioenicopterus	С		LU	0.07
	Pigeon		_			
102	Yellow-throated	Gymnoris xanthocollis	5	UC	LC	0.07
	Sparrow					
103	Zitting Cisticola	Cisticola juncidis	5	UC	LC	0.07

	Jamakhandi and Kadadevaru;	Uttar Pradesh J. Zool., vol	45, no. 19, pp. 270-284,	2024; Article no.UPJOZ.4179
--	----------------------------	-----------------------------	--------------------------	-----------------------------

SI No	Common Name	Scientific Name	Count	Occurrence frequency	Conservati on status	Relative abundance
104	Caspian Tern	Hydroprogra caspia	1	Pa		0.06
104	Common Kingfishor	Aloodo otthio	4	C		0.00
105		Alceuo allins	4			0.00
100		Gainnula chioropus	4			0.06
107	Eurasian wigeon	Mareca penelope	4	Ra		0.06
108	Gray Wagtail	Motacilla cinerea	4	C	LC	0.06
109	Gray-bellied Cuckoo	Cacomantis	4	UC	LC	0.06
		passerinus				
110	Malabar Lark	Galerida malabarica	4	UC	LC	0.06
111	Malabar Pied-Hornbill	Anthracoceros	4	UC	NT	0.06
		coronatus				
112	Olive-backed Pipit	Anthus hodgsoni	4	UC	LC	0.06
113	Pheasant-tailed	Hydrophasianus	4	UC	LC	0.06
	Jacana	chiruraus				
114	Pied Bushchat	Saxicola caprata	4	С	LC	0.06
115	Temminck's Stint	Calidris temminckii	4	ŬC.		0.06
116	Vernal Hanging-	Loriculus vernelis	1	Ra		0.00
110	Porrot	Lonculus vernais	-	πα	LO	0.00
447	Failot	Chlidaniaa huhrida	4	0		0.00
117			4			0.06
118	Yellow-billed Babbler	Argya aminis	4			0.06
119	Ashy Drongo	Dicrurus leucophaeus	3	C	LC	0.04
120	Common Babbler	Argya caudata	3	Ra	LC	0.04
121	Gray-breasted Prinia	Prinia hodgsonii	3	UC	LC	0.04
122	House Sparrow	Passer domesticus	3	С	LC	0.04
123	Indian Bushlark	Mirafra erythroptera	3	UC	LC	0.04
124	Indian Gray Hornbill	Ocyceros birostris	3	С	LC	0.04
125	Indian Paradise-	Terpsiphone paradisi	3	UC	LC	0.04
	Flycatcher		-			
126	Oriental Honey-	Pernis ntilorhynchus	3	LIC.	I C	0.04
120	buzzard		0	00	20	0.01
107	Siborian Stanochat	Savioola maurus	2	C		0.04
127	Siberian Stonechat	Saxicola Illaulus	3			0.04
120			3			0.04
129	vvnite-browed	Motacilla	3	C	LC	0.04
	Wagtail	maderaspatensis	-			
130	Brown-headed	Chroicocephalus	2	UC	LC	0.03
	Seagull	brunnicephalus				
131	Ashy Woodswallow	Artamus fuscus	2	Ra	LC	0.03
132	Asian Palm Swift	Cypsiurus balasiensis	2	UC	LC	0.03
133	Black-crowned Night	Nycticorax nycticorax	2	UC	LC	0.03
	Heron					
134	Blue-faced Malkoha	Phaenicophaeus	2	UC	LC	0.03
		viridirostris				
135	Bluethroat	Luscinia svecica	2	Ra	IC	0.03
136	Chestnut-tailed	Sturnia malabarica	2			0.03
100	Starling	Starma malabarica	2	00	20	0.00
107	Common Howk	Hierococowyverius	2			0.02
137		nierococcyx varius	2	00	LC	0.03
400			•			0.00
138	Common Woodshrike	Tephrodornis	2	UC	LC	0.03
		pondicerianus	-	-		
139	Coppersmith Barbet	Psilopogon	2	С	LC	0.03
		haemacephalus				
140	Crimson-backed	Leptocoma minima	2	UC	LC	0.03
	Sunbird					
141	Golden-fronted	Chloropsis aurifrons	2	UC	LC	0.03
	Leafbird				-	
142	Grav Francolin	Ortvaornis	2	С	LC	0.03
		nondicerianus	-	-		5.00
1/13	Green Sandniner	Tringa ochronus	2	LIC	10	0.03
140	Groon/Croonich	Dhyllosoonuo	2			0.03
144		r Hylloscopus	2		LU	0.05
4 45		nillaus/trochiloides	0	De		0.02
145	Green-winged Leal	Anas crecca	2	ка		0.03
146	Jundle Prinia	Prinia svivatica	2	UC:	1 C	0.03

SI No	Common Name	Scientific Name	Count	Occurrence frequency	Conservati on status	Relative abundance
147	Lesser Adjutant	l eptoptilos javanicus	2	UC	VU	0.03
148	Painted Francolin	Francolinus pictus	2	ÜC	LC	0.03
149	Pied Cuckoo	Clamator iacobinus	2	ŬĈ	LC	0.03
150	Plum-headed	Psittacula	2	ÜC	LC	0.03
	Parakeet	cvanocephala	_			
151	Stork-billed	Pelargopsis capensis	2	Ra	LC	0.03
	Kingfisher					
152	Western Marsh	Circus aeruginosus	2	С	LC	0.03
	Harrier					
153	Yellow Bittern	Ixobrvchus sinensis	2	Ra	LC	0.03
154	Asian Emerald Dove	Chalcophaps indica	1	Ra	LĊ	0.01
155	Black-hooded Oriole	Oriolus xanthornus	1	Ra	LC	0.01
156	Black-tailed Godwit	Limosa limosa	1	Ra	NT	0.01
157	Black-winged Kite	Elanus caeruleus	1	С	LC	0.01
158	Booted Warbler	lduna caligata	1	UC	LC	0.01
159	Brown-backed	Hirundapus giganteus	1	Ra	LĊ	0.01
	Needletail	,				
160	Common Cuckoo	Cuculus canorus	1	UC	LC	0.01
161	Crested Serpent-	Spilornis cheela	1	UC	LĊ	0.01
	Eagle					
162	Gravlag Goose	Anser anser	1	Ra	LC	0.01
163	Great Gray Shrike	Lanius excubitor	1	Ra	LC	0.01
164	Indian Nightjar	Caprimulgus asiaticus	1	UC	LC	0.01
165	Indian Pitta	Pitta brachyura	1	Ra	LC	0.01
166	Knob-billed Duck	Sarkidiornis melanotos	1	Ra	LC	0.01
167	Lesser Whitethroat	Curruca curruca	1	С	LC	0.01
168	Montagu's Harrier	Circus pygargus	1	С	LC	0.01
169	Oriental Skylark	Alauda gulgula	1	UC	LC	0.01
170	Paddyfield Warbler	Acrocephalus agricola	1	UC	LC	0.01
171	Rain Quail	Coturnix	1	UC	LC	0.01
		coromandelica				
172	Red-necked Falcon	Falco chicquera	1	Ra	LC	0.01
173	Rufous Woodpecker	Micropternus	1	UC	LC	0.01
	·	brachyurus				
174	Striated Heron	Butorides striata	1	UC	LC	0.01
175	Tickell's Blue	Cyornis tickelliae	1	UC	LC	0.01
	Flycatcher	-				
176	Western Yellow	Motacilla flava	1	С	LC	0.01
	Wagtail					
177	White Stork	Ciconia ciconia	1	Ra	LC	0.01

Jamakhandi and Kadadevaru; Uttar Pradesh J. Zool., vol. 45, no. 19, pp. 270-284, 2024; Article no.UPJOZ.4179

Table 2. The biodiversity indices of all the waterbodies under study

Waterbodies	Taxa_S	Individuals	Simpson_1-D	Shannon_H	Evenness_e^H/S
Adavisomapur Lake	75	500	0.9651	3.866	0.6364
Bachanaki Reservoir	29	214	0.8049	2.484	0.4136
Chinnadakere Pond	56	177	0.9789	3.96	0.9364
Devaragudihal Lake	101	598	0.9775	4.232	0.6814
Kelgeri Lake	53	200	0.9674	3.724	0.7819
Magadi Bird Sanctuary	59	5365	0.1313	0.4988	0.02791
Navaloor Lake	82	429	0.9764	4.099	0.7352
Neersagar	46	130	0.9795	3.863	1.034
Tolanakere	62	327	0.962	3.713	0.6607

3.1 Comparative Diversity within and between the Waterbodies

The data analysis suggests that the high degree of diversity and evenness was found to be in Neersagar due to even distribution of bird population and the lowest was in Magadi bird sanctuary due enormous accumulation of Bar headed goose (*Anser indicus*) during the months of November to February leading high dominance and low evenness in the community (Table 2). The mean standard deviation suggests that the Magadi bird sanctuary (28.84409 \pm 366.5047) has very high-density variation between species in the community due to the large occurrence of migrant Bar headed goose (*Anser indicus*) during winters whereas, Neersagar (0.6989247 \pm 1.439106) and Chinnadakere (0.9516129 \pm 1.895321) waterbodies have least density variations between the species in the community.

3.2 Beta Diversity

Beta diversity explains change in species composition and abundance across the study sites and change in number of species between the sites [33,34]. Also describing the species turnover [35]. The present data (Fig. 2) shows that Bachanaki Reservoir and Chinnadakere Pond has the value of 0.93 with Highest Dissimilarity (Values near 1.0), indicates that these wetlands are highly dissimilar in terms of species composition. Neersagar and Kelgeri Lake with a value of 0.35 have Lowest Dissimilarity (Values near 0.0), these wetlands are quite similar in species composition. This states that higher the pairwise values, more dissimilar two sites are [36].

Wetlands like Bachanaki Reservoir tend to be quite distinct from others, with high dissimilarity values, indicating different species compositions. On the other hand, wetlands like Adavisomapur Lake, Kelgeri Lake, and Devaragudihal Lake show relatively lower dissimilarity values, meaning they share more species and have similar ecological conditions. Wetlands with moderate to high dissimilarity (like Chinnadakere Pond and Bachanaki Reservoir) may require targeted conservation efforts to protect their unique species compositions.

3.3 Clustering of Sites

The Bray-Curtis similarity measure ranges from 0 (completely dissimilar) to 1 (completely similar) [37]. The Clustering was based on how soon the lines meet each other. The clusters described closeness between different sites.

Neersagar and Kelgeri Lake are clustered closely, indicating a relatively high similarity in their bird species compositions, which aligns with the earlier observation from the Whittaker beta diversity (Fig. 2). Aadavisomapur Lake is most similar to the first cluster of Kelgeri Lake and Neersagar, suggesting that the three wetlands relatively similar bird communities. have Navaloor Lake and Tolanakere are clustered together, indicating they share similar bird species and abundance. Chinnadakere Pond and Devaragudihal Lake form another cluster, indicating their similarity. Whereas, Magadi Bird Sanctuary and Bachanaki Reservoir appear to be outliers, showing higher dissimilarity to all other wetlands and to each other.



Fig. 2. Whittaker beta diversity pairwise comparison heatmap



Fig. 3. Bray- curtis cluster dendrogram

The y-axis shows the Bray-Curtis dissimilarity, with 0 representing no dissimilarity (completely similar) and 1 representing maximum dissimilarity. The closer the merging happens to the x-axis, the more similar the wetlands are.

The height at which the clusters are joined indicates the degree of dissimilarity between them. Wetlands that join together at a lower level of the y-axis are more similar in bird species composition than those that join at higher levels. (Fig. 3).

3.4 Other Observations

During the survey period, there were presence and absence of certain bird species. Due to raise in water levels in the wetlands post floods in 2018 and directing sewage canals from surrounding catchment areas through flood canals of the lakes, birds such as Little Tern (Sternulla albifrons), more abundance of Whiskered Tern (Chlidonias hybrida) and Plovers like Little ringed Plover (Charadrius dubius) and Kentish Plover (Charadrius alexandrinus) (Fig. 4), were never sighted as the mud flats were lost. Gaudet [38], mentions that lake water level fluctuates considerably from year to year, creating temporary mud flats, which are crucial for wading birds.

Shallow water bodies with variations in depth might be the factor for aggregation of birds

compared to deeper tanks, and support more species and greater densities [39,40]. Similarly, in our wetlands with shallow water banks harboured floating, submergent and emergent plants. It provides suitable site for the wetland birds with respect to their roosting, feeding and nesting needs. Vegetation like Nymphae sp., Nymphoides indica were used especially by Jacanas, Submerged vegetation like, Hydrilla sp., Chara sp., Vallisneria sp., Ceratophylum spp. were preferred by Eurasian Coot, Grey headed Swamphen, Cotton Teal, Indian Spotbilled Duck and Migratory ducks (Fig. 5). the high vegetation cover forms a suitable habitat for breeding birds and also for overall species richness [41].

The decline of the water levels aided growth of Eleocharis sp. Typha sp. and Cypersus sp. at the riparian zone along with submerged vegetation, which resulted in the assemblage of elusive birds like Crakes, Snipes and Bitterns. The species such as Ballion's Crake, Common/Pintail/Painted Snipes and Cinnamon/Yellow bittern were sighted during the survey period when the growth of Reed species was abundant (Fig. 6). Apart from the in the water level, anthropological raise disturbances such as clearing of the reed patches (Typha sp. and Cyperus sp.) for livestock fodder, destroyed the roosting and breeding grounds of both migrant and resident species.

Jamakhandi and Kadadevaru; Uttar Pradesh J. Zool., vol. 45, no. 19, pp. 270-284, 2024; Article no.UPJOZ.4179



Fig. 4. Some mudflats depended avifauna from the study wetlands: (A) Kentish plovers; (B) Little tern (left corner) & Whiskered terns; (C) Black winged Stilt; (D) Brown headed gull (left) & Caspian Terns



Fig. 5. Some marsh and aquatic vegetation depended avifauna from the study wetlands: (A) Black crowned night Heron; (B) Black headed Ibis & Purple Moorhen; (C) Garganey flock & Gray headed swamphen; (D) Western reef Heron

The vegetation diversity and richness of the wetland directly affect species diversity and richness of birds because it provides heterogeneous and suitable sites for foraging, nesting, and roosting [42,43,44].

There are several species in our study sites which portray significant information about the state of wetlands such as the Black winged Stilt which is considered to the indicator of polluted water body was found in high numbers in Navaloor lake, and this lake has the highest inflow of sewage. And contrast to it Lesser Adjutant is considered to be the indicator of less or undisturbed waterbody especially in terms of pollution and this species was only sighted in Adavisomapur lake and Magadi bird sanctuary which are least disturbed by human influence. Jamakhandi and Kadadevaru; Uttar Pradesh J. Zool., vol. 45, no. 19, pp. 270-284, 2024; Article no.UPJOZ.4179



Fig. 6. Some shoreline vegetation depended avifauna from the study sites: (A) Ballion's Crake; (B) Great Bittern; (C) Painted Snipes; (D) Cinnamon Bittern; (E) Yellow Bittern

Several species such as Little Grebe (Tachybaptus ruficollis), Indian Spot-billed Duck (Anas poecilorhyncha), Black-headed lbis (Threskiornis melanocephalus) being sensitive towards pollution levels and both of these species are in decent populations in all our wetlands but in reduced numbers in some wetlands indicating anthropologic influence in those sites. Bronze-winged Jacana (Metopidius Pheasant-tailed indicus) and Jacana (Hydrophasianus chirurgus) are only present in marshy wetlands with dense floating vegetation diversity, hence Adavisomapur lake, Bachanaki Reservoir, Chinnadakere Pond and Devaragudihal Lake lack these species due less or no floating vegetation. Species such as Asian Openbill Stork (Anastomus oscitans) and Painted Stork (Mycteria leucocephala) are large waders which feeds on mollusks, snails, and small aquatic animals, abundant fishes indicating healthy freshwater wetlands and also these species are usually present in wetlands with least human presence and accordingly only 4-5 wetlands out of the 9 wetlands under study constitutes these species.

Study by Chen et al. [45], suggests that the critical land use types such as medium grassland, tidal flat, and pond landscapes which will sustain diverse resources are important for

protecting and maintaining good bird species diversity in and around urban ecosystems. Hence wetland restoration projects should keep these pointers as the basis of design [46,47].

4. CONCLUSIONS

The study on avifaunal diversity in the selected wetlands in and around Dharwad district suggests that they support a good number of resident and migratory birds including generalist coastal and some rare species of birds. Among the sites Devaragudihal Lake had maximum species richness and Neersagar with most evenly distributed population, this may be due to the landscape heterogenicity with good amount of shallow water areas providing growth of hydrophytes, exposed mud flats and also might be due surrounding agroecosystems and woody landscapes. All of the wetlands surveyed are prone to anthropocentric activates at different frequencies and intensities like; release of domestic wastes. discharge of nonbiodegradable wastes, washing clothes and vehicles, extensive fishing, pumping of waters during the dry seasons and destruction of riparian zones/vegetation for fodder and unscientific lake developments for recreational purposes, causing irregularity, reduction and even resulting in complete absence of some

migratory species and few of the sensitive resident species. If this continues the biodiversity in the region decreases leading to ecosystem imbalances. leading to water quality deterioration, proliferation of invasive species as the balanced biodiversity will also be curbing the spread of invasive species. Proper attention is needed from the public as well as the local governing bodies towards the protection and conservation of these habitats, which can be promising sites for rich resident, migratory avifauna and related terrestrial aquatic fauna.

DISCLAIMER (ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE)

Author(s) hereby declare that NO generative AI technologies such as Large Language Models (ChatGPT, COPILOT, etc.) and text-to-image generators have been used during the writing or editing of this manuscript.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors thankfully acknowledge the Chairman, PG department of Zoology, Karnatak University, Dharwad for all facilities provided. The work is supported by UGC SAP II grants.

COMPETING INTERESTS

Authors have declared that no competing interests exist.

REFERENCES

- 1. Ρ, Shappell NW. Chakraborty Mukhopadhyay M, Onanong S, Rex KR, Snow D. Surveillance of plasticizers, bisphenol A, steroids and caffeine in surface water of River Ganga and Sundarban wetland along the Bay of Bengal: occurrence, sources, estrogenicity and ecotoxicological screenina risk assessment. Water Research. 2021;190: 116668.
- Darrah SE, Shennan-Farpón Y, Loh J, Davidson NC. Improvements to the wetland extent trends (WET) index as a tool for monitoring natural and humanmade wetlands. Ecological Indicators. 2019;99:294-298.
- Chakraborty SK, Sanyal P, Ray R. Introductory and basic eco-biological aspects of wetlands. in: wetlands ecology. Springer, Cham; 2023. Available:https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-09253-4_1

- Mitsch WJ, Gosselink JG. Wetlands. 4th ed. Hoboken: John Willey & Sons, Inc.,. 287–288. Wetlands. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons; 2007.
- Zakaria M, Rajpar MN, Sajap AS. Species diversity and feeding guilds of birds in Paya Indah Wetland Reserve, Peninsular Malaysia. International Journal of Zoological Research. 2009;5:86-100.
- Zeleke A, Gadisa T, Gebremichael G. Diversity and relative abundance of bird species of Sheko District, Bench Maji zone, Southwest Ethiopia. International Journal of Development & Research. 2015;5(4):3975–3979. Available:https://www.journalijdr.com/sites/ default/files/issue-pdf/3048.pdf.
- Houlahan JE, Keddy PA, Makkay K, Findlay CS. The effects of adjacent land use on wetland species richness and community composition. Wetlands. 2006;26(1):79-96.
- Asefa AG, Mengesha A, Shimelis, Mamo Y. Livestock grazing in afromontane grasslands in the northern bale mountains, Ethiopia: Implications for bird conservation. Science, Technology and Arts Research Journal. 2015;4(2):112-121.
- 9. Asomani-Boateng R. Urban wetland planning and management in Ghana: a disappointing implementation. Wetlands. 2019;39(2):251-261.
- Urban wetland/water bodies management guidelines. National mission for clean Ganga, School of planning & architecture, New Delhi; 2011; Available:https://nmcg.nic.in/writereaddata/ fileupload/40_Urban%20Wetlandwater%20 bodiesmanagement%20guidelines.pdf
- Eca U, Ece U, Eclac U, Escap U, Escwa U, World Health Organization (WHO). Water and climate change. UNESCO; 2020.
- 12. Convention on Biological Diversity; 2008. Available: www.cbd.int/doc/bioday/2007/ibd-2007report-en.pdf.
- 13. Webb EB, Smith LM, Vrtiska MP. Lagrange TG. Effects of local and landscape variables on wetland bird habitat use during migration through the Rainwater Basin. The Journal of Wildlife Management. 2010;74(1):109-119.
- 14. Amat JA, Green AJ. Waterbirds as bioindicators of environmental conditions. In: Hurford C, Schneider M, Cowx I. (eds)

Conservation Monitoring in Freshwater Habitats. Springer, Dordrecht; 2010. Available:https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4020-9278-7 5

- 15. Furness RW, Greenwood JJD, Jarvis PJ. Can birds be used to monitor the environment?" In Birds as monitors of environmental change. Springer, Dordrecht; 1993;1-41.
- 16. Kushlan JA. Colonial waterbirds as bioindicators of environmental change. Colonial waterbirds. 1993;223-251.
- Siva T, Neelanarayanan P. Diversity of Avifauna observed and recorded in Thinnanur Lake in Tiruchirappalli District, Tamil Nadu, India. Asian Journal of Conservation Biology. 2021;10(2):308-316.
- Fuller MR, Seegar WS, Howey PW. The use of satellite systems for the study of bird migration. Israel Journal of Zoology. 1995;41(3):243-252.
- 19. Gregory RD, Baillie SR. Large-scale habitat use of some declining British birds.Journal of Applied Ecology. 1998;35(5):785-799.
- Siriwardena GM, Baillie SR, Buckland ST et al. "Trends in the abundance of farmland birds: A quantitative comparison of smoothed Common Birds Census indices. Journal of Applied Ecology. 1998;35(1):24-43.
- 21. Krebs JR, Wilson JD, Bradbury RB. The second silent spring?. Nature. 1999;400(6745):611-612.
- 22. Wiens JA. The ecology of bird communities (Vol. 1). Cambridge University Press; 1989.
- 23. McKinney ML. Effects of urbanization on species richness: A review of plants and animals. Urban ecosystems. 2008;11(2): 161-176.
- 24. Leveau L, Isla FI, Bellocq MI. From town to town: Predicting the taxonomic, functional and phylogenetic diversity of birds using NDVI. Ecological Indicators. 2020;119: 106703.
- 25. McKinnon J, Philips K. A Field Guide to Birds of Sumatra, Java and Bali. Oxford University Press. 1993;391.
- 26. Ahalya N. Wetlands of Karnataka: Bioremediation Options. Energy and Wetlands Research Group Centre for Ecological Sciences, IISC; 2006.
- 27. Profile of Wetlands in Karnataka. Sálim Ali Centre for Ornithology and Natural History, Coimbatore (SACON); 2004.

- Bibby CJ, Burgess ND, DA Hill, Mustoe S. Bird census techniques. Academia Press, Belgium. 2000;302.
- Hodges JI. Wildlife counts: A computerized simulation for learning the skill of wildlife count estimation; 2014. DOI:www.wildlifecounts.com.
- Grimmett RC, Inskipp T Inskipp. Birds of the Indian Subcontinent 2nd ed. Christopher Helm, Oxford University Press. 2014;528.
- IUCN. The IUCN Red List of Threatened Species." Version 2022-2; 2022. Available:https://www.iucnredlist.org. Accessed on [October 2022].
- Michie MG. Use of the Bray-Curtis similarity measure in cluster analysis of foraminiferal data. Mathematical Geology. 1982;14:661–667. Available:https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01033 886
- Whittaker RH. Vegetation of the great smoky mountains. Ecological Monographs. 1956;26(1):1-80.
- Whittaker RH. Vegetation of the Siskiyou mountains, Oregon and California. Ecological Monographs. 1960;30:279-338.
- Whittaker RH. Evolution and measurement of species diversity. Taxon. 1972;21:213-251.
- Magurran AE. Ecological diversity and its measurement. Springer Science & Business Media; 1988.
- Bray JR, Curtis JT. An Ordination of the Upland Forest Communities of Southern Wisconsin. Ecological Monographs. 1957; 27(4):325-349.
- Gaudet JJ. Natural drawdown on Lake Naivasha, Kenya, and the formation of papyrus swamps. Aquatic Botany. 1977;3: 1-47.
- Helmers DL. Western Hemisphere Shorebird Reserve Network. Manomet, MA. 1992;58.
- 40. Colwell MA, Taft OW. Waterbird communities in managed wetlands of varying water depth. 2000;23(1):45–55.
- Porej D. egetation cover and wetland complex size as predictors of bird use of created wetlands of Ohio. 2004;151– 160. Available:https://kb.osu.edu/bitstream/hand

le/1811/95/5.04%20C%20 and%20Z%20Predictors.pdf?sequence=1

42. Kar JR, Roth RR. Vegetation structure and avian diversity in several New World areas.

The American Naturalist. 1971;105(945): 423-435.

43. Cody. Habitat selection in birds - the roles of vegetation structure, competitors, and productivity. BioScience. 1981;31(2):107–113.

Available:https://doi.org/info:doi/

- 44. Soderstrom B, Part T. Influence of landscape on farmland bird breeding in semi-natural pastures. Conservation Biology. 1999;14:522-533.
- 45. Chen A, Sui X, Wang D, Liao W. Landscape and avifauna changes as an

indicator of Yellow River Delta Wetland restoration. Ecological Engineering. 2016; 86162-173.

- 46. Canterbury GE, Martin TE, Petit DR, Petit LJ, Bradford DF. Bird communities and habitat as ecological indicators of forest condition in regional monitoring. Conservation Biology. 2000;14(2):544-558.
- Harisha MN, Hosetti BB. Diversity and distribution of avifauna of Lakkavalli range forest, Bhadra Wildlife Sanctuary, Western Ghat, India. Ecoprint. 2009;16:21–27.

Disclaimer/Publisher's Note: The statements, opinions and data contained in all publications are solely those of the individual author(s) and contributor(s) and not of the publisher and/or the editor(s). This publisher and/or the editor(s) disclaim responsibility for any injury to people or property resulting from any ideas, methods, instructions or products referred to in the content.

© Copyright (2024): Author(s). The licensee is the journal publisher. This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

Peer-review history: The peer review history for this paper can be accessed here: https://prh.mbimph.com/review-history/4179