Are all conservation measures for endangered species legitimate? Lines of thinking with the European hamster

Florian Kletty[1*], Marie Pelé[1], Fabrice Capber[2], Caroline Habold[1]

[1]UMR7178 Institut pluridisciplinaire Hubert Curien (IPHC), France, [2]Other, France

Submitted to Journal:
Frontiers in Ecology and Evolution

Specialty Section:
Conservation and Restoration Ecology

Article type:
Review Article

Manuscript ID:
536937

Received on:
27 May 2020

Revised on:
13 Oct 2020

Frontiers website link:
www.frontiersin.org

In review

Conflict of interest statement

The authors declare that the research was conducted in the absence of any commercial or financial relationships that could be construed as a potential conflict of interest

Author contribution statement

FK and MP equally contributed to this work as the first author.
All authors brought constructive thoughts and participated in the elaboration and the redaction of this review.
All authors contributed to manuscript revision, read and approved the submitted version

Keywords

Animal monitoring, Agriculture, Conservation measures, Animal Ethics, environmental ethics, Cricetus cricetus, Population reinforcement

In review

Abstract

Word count: 207

When dealing with the protection of an endangered species, it appears more and more important to address the ethical limits and the societal perception of the implemented conservation measures. This will be illustrated here through the example of conservation programs of the European hamster (Cricetus cricetus) in France. The main threats for this rodent are the impoverishment and fragmentation of its habitat due to recent changes in agricultural practices and urbanisation. Thus, the status of this species changed from harmful to endangered in only a few decades. This must lead to acceptance of the species by citizens and especially farmers paid to destroy this species until the 1990s while nowadays to protect it. To stem the decline, several measures have been taken through the last twenty years including population reinforcement, wild animal tracking, and implementation of suitable habitats. One can, therefore, discuss the efficiency of these measures and their integration in the entire socio-ecosystem. Population reinforcement and the questions that can arise from it will first be addressed. Secondly, in situ animal monitoring and implications of the methods used will be discussed. Third, we will deal with agricultural practices favourable to the species. Finally, we will highlight the links between European hamster conservation measures and wider problematics.

Contribution to the field

To cope with biodiversity decline, conservation measures are currently taken by policymakers. In this review, we address the ethical limits and the societal perception of such measures through the example of the conservation of the European hamster (Cricetus cricetus) in France. The main threats for this rodent are the impoverishment of its habitat due to recent changes in agricultural practices and spatial fragmentation. It is also important to point out that the status of this species shifted recently from a pest to a protected species. This leads to mentality changes and acceptance of the species by citizens and especially farmers. In practice, several measures are still taken to stem the decline: some hamsters are bred in captivity and released in the field, wild animals are captured and marked to be monitored. This implies stress and invasive procedures and the risks and benefits of such approaches need to be discussed. Then, we deal with the importance to modify the agricultural practices conducted in Alsace to make them favourable to the species. Finally, we highlight why European hamster conservation measures are not only a solution of species' protection but an entire improvement of the whole socio-ecosystem, including farmers.

Are all conservation measures for endangered species legitimate? Lines of thinking with the European hamster

Florian Kletty[†*1], Marie Pelé[†2], Fabrice Capber[3], Caroline Habold[1]

[†] These authors contributed equally to this work

[1] Université de Strasbourg, CNRS, IPHC UMR 7178, F-67000 Strasbourg, France

[2] ETHICS EA 7446, Lille Catholic University, Lille, Hauts-de-France, France

[3] Clinique Vétérinaire, 68000 Colmar, France

* **Correspondence:**
Florian Kletty
florian.kletty@iphc.cnrs.fr

In review

Keywords: population reinforcement, animal monitoring, agriculture, conservation measures, animal ethics, environmental ethics, *Cricetus cricetus*

Abstract

When dealing with the protection of an endangered species, it appears more and more important to address the ethical limits and the societal perception of the implemented conservation measures. This will be illustrated here through the example of conservation programs of the European hamster (*Cricetus cricetus*) in France. The main threats for this critically endangered rodent are the impoverishment and fragmentation of its habitat due to recent changes in agricultural practices and urbanisation. Thus, the status of this species changed from harmful to endangered in only a few decades. This must lead to acceptance of the species by citizens and especially farmers paid to destroy this species until the 1990s while nowadays to protect it. To stem the decline, several measures have been taken through the last twenty years including population reinforcement, wild animal tracking, and implementation of suitable habitats. One can, therefore, discuss the efficiency of these measures and their integration in the entire socio-ecosystem. Population reinforcement and the questions that can arise from it will first be addressed. Secondly, *in situ* animal monitoring and implications of the methods used will be discussed. Third, we will deal with agricultural practices favourable to the species. Finally, we will highlight the links between European hamster conservation measures and wider problematics.

1 Introduction

1.1 Conservation measures for animal populations' protection

Human beings currently impose a very strong selection pressure on organisms, forcing them to adapt, move away or die. The impact of our species on the environment is particularly visible among other things by the creation of urban areas (Alberti *et al.*, 2017), the fragmentation of the territory (Cheptou *et al.*, 2017), the increase in global temperatures (Beaumont *et al.*, 2011), the introduction of pathogens (Rogalski *et al.*, 2017) or the loss of native biodiversity by the introduction of invasive species (Colautti *et al.*, 2017). Thus, *Homo sapiens* become the main evolutionary force at the global level (Palumbi, 2001; Hendry *et al.*, 2017). We have entered the sixth mass extinction crisis with a higher rate ever compared to earlier mass extinctions. The acceleration of the disappearance of fauna and flora caused by human activities is an assertion often used to alert people. Then, every informed people agree that protecting biodiversity in all forms is a priority, just like reducing global warming.

Protecting the habitat of species, in particular by reducing the threats that affect it, is a first so-called *in situ* conservation measure. It aims at maintaining populations in the environment where the distinctive characteristics of the species have developed and in which they can continue to evolve with their prey or food resources, predators and parasites. In addition, by reinforcing populations in their environment, conservation measures appear to allow a long-term success. Their importance was underlined in international conventions and legislation (e.g. Convention on Biological Diversity, Rio Earth Summit of 1992).

However, in theory as in practice, whether natural or encouraged by humans, the restoration of biodiversity is not always self-evident. Indeed, when considering the animals and the ethics devoted to it, two concepts emerge. *Animal ethics* itself considers the animal as an individual and will then refer to the study of the moral responsibility of humans regarding animals taken as beings. It therefore poses "the classic questions of human duties towards animals, possible animal rights and, more generally, moral judgements to be made on our current treatment of animals" (Vilmer, 2008). Next comes *environmental ethics* which consider animal species as a whole, as building blocks of the ecosystems in which they live (Vilmer, 2008). These two ethics devoted to animals are different and are often brought to clash. Indeed, in a lot of situations, the interests of the individual appear to be opposed to the interests of the collective (e.g. population, species or ecosystem), since the protection of habitat may be the cause of deleterious actions on individuals. A perfect example is the plan of the Australian government to kill about 2 million feral cats by 2020 to preserve the native Australian fauna from a high level of predation due to felines. On the other hand, we cannot minimize the suffering of these cats that are shot, poisoned or trapped. The case of Australia is extreme but protecting biodiversity often lead to conflicts of interest between different social groups or ecosystem users. In France, a striking example of such conflicts is the return of the grey wolf (*Canis lupus*) from Italy, which has become a real 'sensitive case' in the light of a very strong public opinion on this issue. Indeed, the French grey wolf case is a natural recovery and was not the subject of any reintroduction or population support plan. From an ecological point of view, a return to equilibrium is possible but some believe that wolf has not its place any longer because of its role of top-level predator and thus, possible human

In review

This is a provisional file, not the final typeset article

competitor. Some lobbies do not hesitate to blame the carnivores for livestock slaughters leading to the rise of authorized shoots to 19% of the population of wolves in 2020.

Another example of ethics disagreement -and purpose of this paper- is the captive breeding of endangered species for the preservation of biodiversity. In Alsace (Northeast of France), several programs have been launched to preserve, reinforce or reintroduce animal emblematic species (white stork (*Ciconia ciconia*), Eurasian lynx (*Lynx lynx*), Western capercaillie (*Tetrao urogallus*), European otter (*Lutra lutra*)) of the region including the European hamster (*Cricetus cricetus*). Its case perfectly illustrates the gradient of consideration that humans can apply towards animals, from animal ethics to environmental ones. On one hand, the conservation plan aims at obtaining the recovery of the wild populations thanks to the release of hundreds of individuals bred in captivity –such action irrefutably affects the individuals- and the improvement of their living conditions by the establishment of 'hamster-friendly' cultures. On the other hand, these actions need to be sustainable by implementing practices that can reconcile environmental but also economic interests. However, the stakeholders here are numerous (scientists, NGO's, policymakers, farmers, citizens) and accession is not always easy. Thus, the ethical or environmental concerns of some may come up against others' view of the world that differed from the one they would have wished to promote more locally, notably within rural areas.

Through the European hamster case, we will here question different points to determine whether all conservation measures for endangered species are legitimate. At first, we will address population reinforcement and the questions that can arise from it. Secondly, *in situ* animal monitoring and implication of the methods used will be discussed. Third, we will deal with favourable agricultural practices that can be developed and the elements that can slow them. Finally, we will expose the interconnections of conservation measures for endangered species with other problematics and the benefits we can expect from them.

In review

1.2 The European hamster case: from agricultural pest to flagship species of Alsatian biodiversity

The European or common hamster is a small hibernating rodent found from Russia to the East of France, and more precisely in Alsace. European hamsters live in burrows dug in agricultural fields. It is a solitary species that only shows social interactions for the reproduction period from April to August. At the end of the summer, European hamsters prepare their next hibernation period – from October to April- hoarding food in their burrows.

Since the 1990 Bern Convention on the Conservation of European Wildlife and Natural Habitats, the European hamster is a strictly protected species (Annex II of Bern Convention). The common hamster was also included in the Annex IV of Habitats Directive (92/43/EEC) in 1993. Listed as Least Concern at the global level in the IUCN's red list of Threatened Species, European scientists urgently requested its reclassification as Vulnerable species for many years (24th International Hamster Workgroup meeting; Surov et al., 2016). It is only in 2020 that the common hamster obtained the status of Endangered Species (Banaszek et al., 2020). Indeed, its range has declined in almost all areas it was present during the last century, especially in western Europe but also more recently in central and eastern Europe (Stubbe and Stubbe, 1998; Surov *et al*., 2016). This is for example the case in Poland

and the Czech Republic where populations have already significantly decreased (Ziomek and Banaszek, 2007; Tkadlec et al., 2012). The common hamster has already disappeared or regressed in many provinces of Eastern Europe and Russia where it was present, and if the evolution of populations continues in the same way, more than 70% of the population could disappear in these provinces (see Surov *et al*., 2016). In the western part, for example in the territory regrouping Belgium, the Netherlands and the German land of North Rhine-Westphalia, the hamster has declined by more than 99% in recent decades (La Haye et al., 2012). Agricultural practices, habitat's fragmentation, fur trapping but also the impact of climate change and urban pollutions on the rate of reproduction of females have been identified as possible causes of such decline, even if the mechanisms are still difficult to identify for some (Stubbe and Stubbe, 1998; Monecke, 2014; Surov et al., 2016).~~(Stubbe and Stubbe, 1998; Monocke, 2013; Surov *et al*., 2016)~~.

In France, the common hamster is only present in Alsace where hamsters' trapping and killing were common until the 1990's. Since one individual can hoard up to more than ten kilograms of food in its burrow for hibernation (Nechay *et al.*, 1977) and with the explosion of population documented during the 20th century, one may understand that the European hamster was considered as an agricultural pest causing crop damage. At this time, farmers' children even earned pocket money for hamsters' fur. But during the 1970s, the habitat of the European hamster in Alsace began to change: agricultural practices evolved to single-crop farming, small villages expanded their urbanization plans, and more and more roads infrastructures appeared dividing the landscape. All of these factors converged to disastrous consequences on hamsters' populations in Alsace. The common hamster has disappeared from the vast majority of its historical Alsatian range and is now only present in 18 municipalities compared to the 329 municipalities in 1972 (Figure 1).

Moreover, the plans of protection (breeding programme and two National Action Plans) implemented in France at the beginning of the 2000s were considered as not sufficient by the European Union Court of Justice (EUCJ) which condemned France in 2011 for the non-respect of Habitats Directive (Case C-383/09). Indeed, as a Directive's State Member, France has the obligation to take all the measures necessary to establish a system of strict protection in their natural range of the animal species listed in this annex (O'Brien, 2015). Then, from the most hated animal in Alsace, the European hamster became the most protected one by international (Bern Convention), European (Habitats Directive) and national legislations in only a few decades. The European hamster was and is still the target of National Action Plans (NAP): a total of four NAPs cumulating 21 years of actions of conservation from 2000 to 2028 (Figure 1). Moreover, the status reversal of the common hamster has been so radical that feelings of human populations living with the hamster (farmers and citizens) were hatched leading the European hamster to become without any doubt the most controversial species in Alsace (Losinger et al., 2006; Méchin, 2007, 2011, 2013).

Alsace is one of the most agricultural regions of France counting 40% of exploited lands (Agreste, 2020). The maize culture is one of the most important, not only for alimentation or seeds but also for biofuel or bioplastic (Méchin, 2011). Yet, it has been shown that maize as monoculture negatively impacts the survival of European hamsters by a lack of protective cover part of the year, but also the behaviour of mothers who killed their pups at parturition because of a lack of vitamin B3 and essential amino acids (Tissier *et al.*, 2016a, 2017). Then, farmers were and are still the most impacted

In review

This is a provisional file, not the final typeset article

by conservation plans for the European hamster. However, the top-down policy-making process did not facilitate the relations between the different local actors since the animal as its protection was mostly felt as being imposed by others' decisions (politics and scientists) instead of being fully appropriated by farmers (Losinger et al., 2006; Méchin, 2013). Of course, the appearance of such group-conflicts and reactance processes are well-known to challenge the success of conservation plans (Lüchtrath and Schraml, 2015). On a larger scale, with larger mammals such as the European otter or the Eurasian lynx in France, the limiting factor appears to be only anthropic (Laurent, 2014). In these examples, fishers and hunters respectively do not accept the presence of those whom they regard as their direct competitors. Stakeholders as well. This led to a major ethical issue: shall we favour humans or animals? Why is it so difficult to favour both? And more importantly, how do we even get to the question of our legitimacy to choose between both?

When considering the protection of a species and more generally biodiversity, two approaches are possible. The first consists in the establishment of protected areas in which human activities are strongly regulated or prohibited, leading to land-use conflicts. There is no doubt that in any case, it will require permanent protection of animals and their habitat. A second approach involves integrating the protection of biodiversity and ecosystems into human socio-economic activities. Both strategies have been applied in the case of the European hamster.

Studies and surveys of hamsters' populations have been carried out in several European countries including Germany, Poland, Czech Republic, Netherlands, Belgium, Austria and France. The decreasing of most of the populations led to the setting of protected areas. For example, in 2002, protected areas have been created in the Netherlands to reintroduce a hamster population in a favourable habitat (Müskens et al., 2005; La Haye et al., 2010). Such conservation plans (habitat protection and restocking measures) have also been carried out in Belgium (Verbist 2007; Verbeylen *et al.*, 2007), in Poland where wild animals from Czech Republic have been released as genetic support for the Polish population of Jaworzno (NAP 2019-2028), as well as in Germany (please see Weinhold, 2008 for an inventory of measures for each Federal states). In Alsace, population reinforcements of European hamsters are carried out since 2000 in three priority restocking areas with animals coming from breeding facilities. Releases performed in these areas lead to good results and hamster's population grew the first years, but after this time hamster's population decreased again and remain still low. The reasons for this partial failure seem to be an attraction of predators since hamsters were concentrated in a small area but were absent elsewhere (Villemey *et al.*, 2013). Thus, these areas appeared for some as sanctuaries allowing protection managers to conduct their actions but also allowing the out-of-areas farmers to be not concerned by the hamsters' protection following the Not-In-My-BackYard (NIMBY) principle (Méchin, 2011).

A second and more hand-in-hand - or at least holistic strategy - has been developed in France in 2013 with the beginning of the European granted LIFE+ Alister project. Until its end in 2019, different actors such as farmers, scientists, NGOs, policymakers operated together to conduct discussions with hamster opponents, to breed and release individuals, to study the ecological needs and biology of the species, but also to investigate the social dimension of the ongoing hamster conservation plan and improve the popularity of the species. A similar strategy was established in Germany with the

In review

Feldhamsterland program leaded by the NGO Deutsche Wildtier Stiftung which aims at targeting the best measures to protect the German hamsters' populations in collaboration with farmers and citizens.

In Alsace, at the beginning of the LIFE+ Alister project, an important step was to identify negative and positive trends considering the public opinion concerning *Cricetus cricetus* and its protection plan. Indeed, even if the term 'pest' has been banned from the French legal vocabulary - and been replaced by the classification 'susceptible to cause significant damages (…)' - it is still a common word used by citizens to qualify the European hamster. In 1993, Micoud already asked the question 'How to get rid of so-called pests?'. A first process proposed by the author is the animal's rehabilitation meaning that its social representation must change positively. This step was and is still not easy considering the European hamster history in Alsace.

A first study focused on the image of the European hamster in articles of regional newspapers and websites (ACTeon, 2013). When concerning the European hamster, 52% of the articles showed positive arguments considering its protection whereas 37% appeared more negative about the rodent and 11% were neutral considering land and territory use mostly. People entailed in the protection of the European hamster also did not demonstrate the same level of perception. While the agents of its conservation kept the distance and stayed neutral, the European hamster was considered as a disaster for politics, and as a victim for the NGOs representatives (ACTeon, 2013). Still today, the European hamster is the figurehead of actions carried out by environmental NGOs or the totem of the eco-friendly 'tribe' as Méchin (2011) pointed it out. In 2014, a second study using questionnaires and interviews focused more on Alsatians' perception and knowledge about the European hamster (ACTeon, 2015). Results showed that a large majority of population questioned (90%, 700 persons) knew about the European hamster's critical situation but only 1 person on 5 was aware of the different protective action plans. More interestingly and in details, elder people knew the European hamster (96% of the more than 60 yo) but not its critical situation, conversely to youngest people who knew less the animal (66% of 18-30 yo) but its situation better (ACTeon, 2015). Benefiting from this knowledge, LIFE+ Alister project' partners conducted actions of communication towards civilians living close to the European hamster, notably targeting young public such as children. Regrettably, at the end of the program, the social image of the European hamster did not evolve so much but one may protest that 3 or 4 years are too short to measure the impact of the conducted actions at such big scale (ACTeon, 2019).

2 Population reinforcement

When the conservation status of a species becomes very bad somewhere or if populations are quickly decreasing, it can be necessary to reinforce them to avoid local extinction of the species. The reinforcement can occur in the residual area where individuals still survive, to increase their probability to subsist across time. It can also be done in the area between two sub-populations to maintain the connectivity between them and to increase the area of the presence of the species.

When talking about species conservation and especially with population reinforcements, genetic considerations have to be taken into account. Genetic diversity in populations has to be preserved to keep at a high level the fitness of the endangered species. For instance, it has been demonstrated that the habitat fragmentation of a small rodent-like the European hamsters can lead to low diversity in the population and threaten the species locally (Reiners *et al.*, 2011). If genetic

This is a provisional file, not the final typeset article

diversity decreases too much, it can be necessary to introduce animals from other phylogeographic groups to improve the survival chances of the population (Melosik *et al.*, 2017). But to be successful, there are other several prerequisites for population reinforcements to fulfil. We will examine these prerequisites in the next section and expose what has been done for the European hamster and the results that were obtained.

2.1 Pre-releasing requisites

The main goal of all wildlife release programs is to put back into their natural habitat animals that will be able to survive in suitable conditions with long-term resources and a minimum of disturbances. To achieve this goal, two pre-requisites appear of major importance: animals 'ready' to be released and suitable habitats. But before even thinking of releasing animals, we should give regard to the ethical question: are captive animals really able to return to the wild and thrive? Of course, we are not talking here about animals that spend their all lives in captivity in zoos or circus, but about animals that are specially bred to be freed, not or little used by humans. Even bred during a short period, animals can become more or less habituated to humans despite the efforts taken to avoid such a situation. Then, it might be important to consider (1) to only release individuals that are not habituated -or at least less habituated- or (2) to disaccustom individuals before the release. The first strategy seems adequate when considering young individuals shortly after weaning, mimicking a natural dispersion from their native burrow. For its part, the second strategy involves multiple stages. The animals can be released into temporary enclosures with vegetation to hide and with some additional food or preys to hunt. Another advantage, the fences protect them against natural predators or disturbance. Ideally, these enclosures should be installed in natural reserves or at least in protected and controlled areas. Thus, the animals will have time to gradually get used to their new life. Some may even breed in the enclosures and produce wild offspring never handled by humans that can be released on other plots afterwards. Depending on the species this step will take more or less time. In larger mammals, especially social animals, this step is essential to create groups. Solitary animals can spend a shorter time in the pre-release enclosure. In the case of the European hamster, releases were done in fields with unharvested wheat and surrounded by electrical fences, to provide food and limit predation during the first weeks of their free life. Unfortunately, sometimes these enclosures can become deadly traps if predators find their way in (Villemey *et al.*, 2013).

Furthermore, all species cannot be released the same way. If we talk about mammals, it might seem easier to free thousands of rodents with high reproduction rates than a few large mammals whose reproduction rates are lower. At the individual level, most rodents will certainly not survive very long but the species as a whole will probably make it out whereas the large mammals will be more successful in the short term but with an uncertain future, mainly due to human pressure (notably illegal hunting). In the case of the French European hamster, it is clear that one may ask why such a rather prolific species (1 to 3 gestations a year of 3 to 12 young) remains endangered after twenty years of conservation measures and more than three thousands of individuals released.

The answer to this question leads us to the second pre-requisite: the suitability of the habitat. Finding a natural environment suitable for released animals appears to be a real challenge nowadays in a continuously human-disturbed world. Living in crops, European hamsters' survival is clearly linked to agricultural management, notably the presence of vegetation cover to protect them against predators and provide food resources. This is only possible if farmers modify their agricultural practices (see the specific section below).

In Review

2.2 Reinforcement or habitat improvement: where is the priority?

The mortality of released European hamsters is still too high to allow a sustainable increase in the population. We can then question ourselves on the merits of such action knowing that freed animals will die massively because habitats are not suitable. Should we not first improve all habitats sustainably before releasing hundreds of individuals? On the other hand, habitat improvement is a long process. Can we do nothing to save the species in the meantime? Certainly not. Even if not easy, it seems preferable to strike the balance between both issues, animal and environmental ethics. Keeping the species under passive dependence preventing it from disappearing while working on environmental improvements is precisely what is done by the French hamster programs (LIFE+ Alister and NAP). Moreover, reinforcing populations while gradually improving habitat has many advantages and seems more suited to current societal constraints (see Table 1).

When populations have totally disappeared, the strategy may be different. Let us consider for example a well-studied species, the European otter (*Lutra lutra*). The French otter population underwent a continuous decline during the second part of the last century due to illegal hunting, habitat loss and water pollution (Kuhn and Jacques, 2011). The reintroduction of animals from remote geographical origins is not recommended, because of a risk of outbreeding depression ant potential reduction of the fitness and long-term survival of the population (Randi *et al.*, 2003). Thus, in this case, it appears more suitable to restore habitats and increase connectivity among residual animals via natural corridors. In the case of European otters, efforts to protect and rehabilitate such habitats have paid off and otters recolonized areas throughout France over the past twenty years with regional variations (Lemarchand *et al.*, 2016). But could this strategy of recolonization be applied to hamsters? Although the French hamster population is isolated from other residual European populations living in very different habitats, the solution could be similar on a local scale: protecting residual wild population nuclei and improving the surrounding habitats little by little to allow a natural recolonization. Again, the key issue is to change agricultural practices to find suitable crops for both hamsters (i.e. ecologically durable) and farmers (i.e. economically viable). This is what research is focusing on even if such strategy can take decades and requires considerable human and financial investments.

2.3 Problems risen by releasing programs

Releasing animals is accompanied by many constraints or problems. First, some people are strongly opposed to breeding in captivity. They consider that captivity is not acceptable and/or that breeding conditions in cages are not optimal. Secondly, the mortality level after release can be considered as too high from the animal ethics perspective, as already exposed above. Finally, the high number of individuals that reinforce core populations might pollute or dilute the genetic pool present in the wild population, and may be seen as a potential threat for its survival. These questions have to be kept in mind to minimize as much as possible potential problems, but have not been identified as prohibitive for European hamster restocking programs in France.

Another problem that can be encountered with releasing programs is the regulation of predators. For prey species like the hamster, predation pressure is a key determinant of their survival (Kayser *et al.*, 2003; La Haye *et al.*, 2010; Villemey *et al.*, 2013). Since many efforts are needed to breed and release animals, some people may ask for predator regulation to limit predation on released animals. Such a measure can be taken even though predation is a natural process, i.e. part of the food chain, and despite its low efficiency. Indeed, predator regulation has generally no significant and durable effect on the global predation rate of the prey (La Haye *et al.*, 2008; Treves *et al.*, 2016). The killing of predators can, however, be considered in programs like NAP since they result in the participation of

This is a provisional file, not the final typeset article

many stakeholders, including hunters (Virion and Thouvenot, 2019). It is sometimes a wiser choice to consider this possibility -while trying to convince to never apply it- than showing strong opposition to it, leading to group reactance.

2.4 Results of hamsters' releasing programs

Since the early 2000s hamsters are bred in France to participate in restocking programs. On one side, given the drop in hamster's population at this time and since the species is now still present in three distinct areas of the region, we can consider that it is a success. Furthermore, releasing allowed to maintain the species in the region and conserve genetic diversity (Reiners *et al.*, 2014). On the other side, populations are still not really increasing because of a high predation rate of released animals on some plots. An improvement of release protocols is currently under study. One way would be to limit the impregnation of the animals during captivity or prepare them for wildlife in pre-release enclosures (Virion and Thouvenot, 2019).

We cannot predict the situation we would face without this program, but we know that only one small part of the presence area in Alsace did not need and benefit from any restocking program, *i.e.* the area close to the city of Obernai. These last years, the Alsatian population started slightly to increase. However, this is not a demonstration of a general improvement of the situation since the area of presence of the species is still not increasing. Population increases only in a few areas where population reinforcements have been accompanied by habitat improvement during several years. This illustrates the benefits of a conjugate use of those two conservation measures, and a wider application is now needed.

Another illustration is the restocking programs that occurred in the Netherlands (Müskens et al., 2005; La Haye et al., 2010). There, the species was extinct in the wild in 2002, and restocking programs started the same year. Some hamsters' releases occurred in farmland reserves, *i.e.* fields bought by the government and managed by nature conservation organisations. Other ones occurred on fields where farmers signed a contract to implement measures favourable to hamsters. Both releases led to a nice increase in hamsters' population already during the first years.

3 *In situ* animals' monitoring

While studying an endangered species, monitoring individuals in the wild is often a necessity for several reasons. It can first help to assess the size and characteristic of the residual populations. It allows also to evaluate the benefits of the measures taken to protect the species. Last but not least, it is an important tool when studying *in situ* a population to better understand its biology or ecology, which is helpful to better protect it. The impact and a cost-benefit assessment have however to be evaluated, including ethical considerations. Kletty *et al.* (2019) summarized and compared the different methods available to monitor small mammals like the European hamster. Hereafter, we discuss some of them and their implications.

3.1 Capturing and tagging animals

The capture of an animal is a way to gather many data or information about it. It can be weighed and measured, and samples of faeces, hairs or blood can be taken for later analysis. At the same time, individual identification can be done allowing to recognize it later. Different methods can be used: i)

In review

photo-identification, if the species have fur or skin patterns that differ from one animal to another like with some felines or amphibians. ii) External tags like rings, bands, ear punches, toe clipping, tattoo. iii) Internal systems like passive integrated transponders (PIT) for radiofrequency identification (RFID).

Almost all these methods can have an impact on animals since they require animals to be trapped. This can cause stress, but also prevent the animal to perform its natural activity during the time of capture. The issue can be dramatic especially when they have new-borns that need protection, thermoregulation or regular feedings. The capture of an animal can also modify or prevent some behaviours at key periods like reproduction or disturb social groups (Minteer *et al.*, 2014). Even photo identification in some cases needs the capture of animals to take good pictures or specific parts of the body (like the belly of some amphibians).

The stress generated by handling procedures can be increased if there is additional pain linked to the method, and this can also affect other biological parameters like body condition or survival (Tamarin and Krebs, 1969; Pavone and Boonstra, 1985). However, knowledge about the biology of organisms and pain increase, encouraging scientists to question continuously the existing procedures.

In this sense, the use of PIT-tags is an interesting method. It is no more painful than a syringe injection, easy to use and works for life. Another advantage of PIT-tags is that it can be combined with automated identification recorders to monitor the presence or movements (*e.g.* wildlife underpasses or burrows), biological parameters (*i.e.* coupled with a weight-watcher) or behaviour (coupled with camera) of animals, without requiring their recapture (Tissier *et al.*, 2018a; Kletty *et al.*, 2019). Dying and ringing are other ways to gather information on the presence or behaviour of specific individuals since it allows a direct or indirect (*via* cameras) recognition. However, even if these methods are painless, they can sometimes bother the survival or fitness of individuals, as it has been shown in penguins (Culik *et al.*, 1993; Froget *et al.*, 1998; Saraux *et al.*, 2011).

All these methods of individual identification allow performing capture-mark-recapture (CMR) studies, which consist of capturing, tagging, releasing, and trying to recapture animals later. CMR is interesting to collect longitudinal information on individuals, evaluate survival and population size or dynamics (by integrating the rate of unknown individuals and performing statistic corrections or modelling) (Pradel, 1996; Bohec *et al.*, 2007).

Field studies on hamster populations in France are done with such CMR approach where all individuals captured, released or participating to experiments are identified with PIT-tags, with the use of RFID automatic antennas in different studies and situations. Earrings have also been used in a specific study to recognize individuals on camera traps pictures. At the time of capture, body mass and tibia length are measured, and material like faeces or hairs can be collected for genetic analysis. During periods where females can be lactating, special attention is given to minimize the time between the trapping of the animal and its release.

3.2 Transmitters to follow animals

Knowing the localization of specific individuals in the wild can provide valuable information, like home range or reproductive success. However, some ethical questions can arise with logger-transmitter equipment, especially intra-abdominal implantation of transmitters. The proximal issue with implantation is surgery that can cause suffering or even death. After surgery, implants can also affect on a long-term behaviour and the survival of animals. These questions have been assessed by Koehler *et al.* (1987) in a study carried out on four species of small rodents: they show a mortality risk

This is a provisional file, not the final typeset article

with surgery (14% in their study but they indicate how to improve it), but a good survival after the release (more than 94% after 1 month). Nowadays, survival after surgery is now much better and can reach 100% after implantation of transmitters for hamsters (Capber, 2011). Furthermore, some of the transmitters in Koehler *et al.* exceeded 10% of the mass of animals while it is now recommended not to exceed 3 to 5% (Macdonald and Amlaner, 1980; Theuerkauf *et al.*, 2007). In France, European hamsters are only implanted when their body mass exceeds 150g. The transmitter weighing 6.5g does therefore not exceed 4.3% of the body mass of the hamster and thus, it does never exceed the recommended range. It explains partially the good tolerance observed in the field. Furthermore, the transmitters do not seem to impair gestation (Capber, 2011). Thus, it is possible to implant loggers and transmitters without marked impact on the survival of individuals or on a population. However, since it is an invasive protocol - even moderate - it has to be used when expected benefits are high enough for the monitoring of equipped individuals, and only when necessary.

The use of external transmitters is also possible and does not require surgery, but it can have adverse effects on animals, like handicap (especially collars for hamsters, since they have cheek pouches), perturbation of its behaviour or survival impairment (Webster and Brooks, 1980; Theuerkauf *et al.*, 2007; Kletty *et al.*, 2019). Thus, if internal transmitters can be used, it seems to be a more suitable option.

Transmitter implantation and animal tracking may affect and disturb animals. On the other hand, the information gathered by such monitoring appears crucial to protect endangered populations and improve conservation measures. Once again, enlightened choices have to be made and the balance must be found to minimize the effects on individuals and the protection of the population.

In review

4 Modification of agricultural practices

In Alsace, intensive agriculture from the 1950s onwards led to the degradation of the agricultural ecosystem and the loss of biodiversity. As an illustration, the decline of the European hamster can be mainly attributed to the lack of protective and nutritional cover part of the year. Therefore, it is primordial to restore habitat quality to increase hamster's populations, and this ideally before the reinforcements (see Table 1).

4.1 What are hamster's needs?

The European hamster is an omnivorous rodent that can feed on a wide variety of food and that can adapt to different environments (Nechay *et al.*, 1977; Tissier *et al.*, 2019b). Despite this flexibility, nutrition requirements are often not met in its habitat to allow good development of the population. Maize cropping is deficient in essential amino acids and vitamins, whereas wheat monoculture that is however considered as a favourable crop, does not contain enough proteins to ensure a proper reproduction of hamsters (Tissier et al., 2016a, 2017, 2018b; Weitten et al., 2018). Protein-rich plants (legumes) or animals (invertebrates, voles, *etc.*) are interesting food supplies that cover these deficiencies. A diversity of food resources is, therefore, a key issue to restore hamsters' reproduction and increase the population.

The crop in which they live provides hamsters also a protective cover against predators. However, this cover can be reduced or removed by the work of farmers, like harvesting, mowing or ploughing, resulting in increased exposure to predation (La Haye *et al.*, 2010, 2014). It has also been

observed that such removing of the cover leads to an increased emigration of hamsters out of the concerned plots, threatening their survival (Kayser *et al.*, 2003; Kourkgy, 2019).

Last, the expansion of anthropogenic infrastructures especially roads, linked to unsuitable agricultural habitat like ploughed fields, limit the movement of animals and the connexion between different sub-populations (Tissier *et al.*, 2019a). To improve that, underpasses for wildlife have been constructed under highways and then improved with anti-predation devices to secure the crossing of small mammals (Tissier *et al.*, 2016b). To be more efficient in reconnecting residual populations safely, these underpasses need also to be surrounded by favourable habitats. Thus, agricultural practices have without doubt a key role in this habitat connectivity.

4.2 How to implement suitable habitats?

To offer to hamsters the diversity and quality of food they need, a first way could be to use less or no pesticides in the considered fields. Indeed, these products can have negative effects on hamsters' survival and reproduction, but also alter their food resources. Pesticides kill adventive plants and also other organisms, from soil bacteria and fungi to invertebrate macrofauna (Edwards and Thompson, 1973; Joy and Chakravorty, 1991), therefore reducing the diversity of food sources for hamsters and impairing their reproduction.

A second way to improve hamsters' habitat is to foster epigeous and endogenous fauna through adapted agricultural practices bringing them protection and food. Soil disturbance reduction (like ploughing or tillage suppression or reduction) can be important to increase soil organisms' biomass (Norris *et al.*, 2016; Chen *et al.*, 2020). This can be achieved by covering the soil with mulch or living cover, and the holding or the promotion of a maximum of carbonated matter on the fields (non-exported straws, manure, increased covercrops…). Promoting the presence of different crops at a reduced distance is also a solution (Sirami et al., 2019). This is especially true since the home range of female is only 0.2ha (Ulbrich and Kayser, 2004). The implementation of strips of two (or more) different crops on the same plot, (allowing mechanization and crop diversification at the same time), or simply creating long but small plots seeded with different crops, would increase plant diversity at a small scale. It would be also interesting to consider other innovative practices like relay cropping and crop associations, which bring diversity on a smaller scale (less than a meter). All of these possibilities would bring shelter for hamsters by the time of mowing or harvesting.

As mentioned above, the persistence of a cover along time is important for hamsters, as much for the shelter as for the food it brings. This can be achieved by seeding intercrop cultures like the ones seeded to catch nitrogen residuals. However, such crops usually grow too late to be beneficial for hamsters. The practice can be improved either with early implantation of the intercrop just after the harvest or by seeding directly a cover crop in an already growing one (*e.g.* clover under-seeded in wheat or maize).

What kind of agriculture functioning at a large scale could provide the different services and integrate the methods exposed above? Some of them can be filled with organic agriculture, which is moreover already well integrated by citizens. However, it still usually (but not always) works with monospecific crops and bare soils, especially for weed control. Other types of agriculture are rising and aim to develop healthier soils and more biodiversity in agricultural systems. We can find it under different names like soil conservation, conservation agriculture, agroecology, biodiversity-based agriculture, or ecologically intensive agriculture. Even if there are many variations in concrete applications of these innovative agricultures, they all rely on the same principles of - improving soil quality, - increasing the diversity of plants and habitats along time and space, and - integrating in a

In review

This is a provisional file, not the final typeset article

holistic approach the relations between the multiplicities of organisms living in the ecosystem (Duru *et al.*, 2015; Wezel *et al.*, 2018; Chabert and Sarthou, 2020).

4.3 Why is it so difficult to modify agricultural practices?

We know a lot of elements and practices that may be beneficial for hamsters, but the aim is not to implement them only on restricted areas, whereas its habitat is impoverished everywhere else. Instead, social and economic context should be taken into account to develop at a large scale, practices that would benefit all parties, including biodiversity and farmers.

First, it is necessary to understand that the solutions beneficial for farmland biodiversity are based on the modification of the actual agricultural practices. As with any change in habits, this is not easy to achieve. This is especially the case when it comes to change the relation a farmer has with its soil, when its management and especially ploughing is questioned. It has indeed been shown that this relation is a key element for farmers since it is one of the last element they still control, while many other competencies are delegated to external operators (Christen, 2011).

Developing innovative practices is also difficult since no turnkey solution exists, and while farmers are advised by agricultural consultants to perform conventional agriculture and use pesticides. To leave this system, they have to break away from usual structures, and to adapt what is known to their specific context and then try to find the best solutions. This implies a good understanding of ecological processes at work on the agricultural ecosystem. In general, only farmers with advanced agronomic knowledge develop agroecology-based practices. Anyway, the transition between conventional and biodiversity-based agriculture takes time, since it relies on long-term processes like soil biodiversity and carbon stock enhancing, or predator-prey balancing. The first years of transition can thus be particularly difficult for farmers since they face the disadvantages of the new practices but still not all the advantages (Fiorini et al., 2020). Therefore, there is risk associated and a cost to think outside the box.

Negative externalities in agriculture (*i.e.* indirect cost associated with agriculture like water pollution or biodiversity loss) (Catarino *et al.*, 2019) are generally not supported by farmers. Thus, agricultural practices that limit such externalities generally do not benefit from associated retributions for the efforts performed. There are exceptions for organic farming since it is well recognized and receive financial support especially for the conversion period to such agriculture (even if it is not always considered as sufficient). It would be interesting to extend such programs to farmers involved in agroecology since the positive externalities can be important, and because the cost paid by farmers to change the system is high.

To implement more biodiversity at a landscape scale and help hamster's population to survive, farmers have also to work together, which can modify their habits. They have indeed to decide together upon crop rotation of a defined area to maximise the surface of favourable crops where hamsters subsist and maintain coherence across space and time. Furthermore, the specific material that can be needed for conservation agriculture (like specific seed drills) is expensive and requires sometimes farmers to gather to reduce the associated cost. For those reasons, modification of practices to better integrate biodiversity can lead to a modification of the relations between farmers, which is not always easy and can require specific coordination.

Finally, the last hurdle we can talk about is associated with social perception. In our societies with task repartition, we delegate to farmers the production of our food. In that context, we can wonder if it is the consumers and not the farmers that would have the biggest responsibility in the ecological

In review

implications linked to agriculture. In one hand, farmers think usually that their actions are limited since they have to follow the law of the market, so it should be consumers that have to pay the right price if they want ecology to be considered. In the other hand, consumers think that farmers are responsible for diverse pollutions and should take the responsibilities linked to what and how they produce. Thus, an opposition develops between different groups: consumers and farmers, but also environmentalists, hunters, scientists, politics, *etc.* This is linked to the social identity theory and psychological reactance, as illustrated by Lüchtrath and Schraml (2015) in the context of hunter's opposition to large carnivores. They show that the different groups are in reactance with what can be proposed by others, to protect their social identity. Thus, it seems particularly important to build positive relationships to avoid such reactions of different groups of actors.

In the context of European hamster preservation in France, many of the difficulties cited above have been limited by the measures developed. The programs have been conducted with a great implication of farmers. They are not set aside while other stakeholders decide what has to be done, but they are involved in the studies, participate in the decisions, try new practices or propose possible improvements. Group-working needed to perform favourable crop rotation or agricultural trials lead to good relations, discussions and sharing between farmers and with other stakeholders. Furthermore, specific demonstrations or formations have been proposed in relation to conservation agriculture, especially with the help of the Agriculture Chamber of Alsace that is also implicated. Farmers are also encouraged by financial support especially for favourable crop implementation and specific material to share. They are also now encouraged to promote hamster's presence rather simply developing the means in favour of biodiversity, since a bonus is given for each favourable crop containing hamster's burrows. Thus, the protection of a small rodent helps to initiate or develop a transition toward more sustainable agriculture and a change in practices and states of mind.

4.4 The European Union: a leverage or a barrier for the conservation of the European hamster?

The European Union offers financing tools for the preservation of biodiversity, such as Life programs. After the condemnation of France by EUJC in 2011, the common hamster benefitted from such European funding (LIFE+ Alister program from 2013 to 2019) which, in our case, aimed to improve the habitat of the species, to find new areas favorable to the reintroduction of the species, and whose educational component to make the species known and welcomed by Alsatians was very important.

However, there were still obstacles to the implementation of some environmental measures that emerge from these programs, including the concern of not meeting consumers' demand and economic targets. Indeed, in their economic study, Eppink and Wätzold (2009) demonstrated that the measures for the protection of the common hamster in Mannheim area (Germany) implied important hidden costs notably linked to changes in development plans; the invisible costs being even higher than visible ones -directly associated with conservation measures. Moreover, the delay taken in the protection of the common hamster not only had a cost for the survival of the species but also a financial one. Indeed, proactivity in conservation domain (i.e. to start a programme of conservation before a species is endangered) allows to save a non-negligible amount of money compared to simple reactivity (Drechsler et al., 2011). It is therefore not only a question of preserving a living territory in terms of biodiversity but also in terms of economy. Thus, the LIFE+ Alister has sought to structure the protection of the common hamster around the ecological, but also economic and social development of the Alsace area.

This is a provisional file, not the final typeset article

585 Biodiversity has long been considered as a source but also as a constraint of economic activities,
586 notably when considering the EU's Common Agricultural Policy (CAP) (please see the review of
587 Simoncini *et al*., 2019). Despite an ambitious EU Biodiversity Strategy to 2020 (European commission,
588 2011), the elaboration of the 2014-2020 CAP did not enable the incorporation of suitable measures to
589 fulfill the objectives (Pe'er *et al*., 2014). 77% of the €86 billion EU budget for biodiversity during this
590 period came from the CAP, but this was not sufficient to stop the decline of farmland's biodiversity
591 (European court of auditors, 2020). Biodiversity was until recently not considered to be part of
592 agricultural areas, but this is slowly changing. The post-2020 CAP integrates more and new agro-
593 environmental measures: farmers will be encouraged firstly to design eco-schemes at the level of
594 agricultural landscapes, *i.e.* to implement hedges, rows of trees, field copses, ponds or fallow lands on
595 min. 10% of agricultural land (1st pillar of CAP post-2020) and secondly to implement measures that
596 preserve the environment, such as reducing the use of fertilizers (2nd pillar). However, this still does
597 not correspond to a real transition toward a sustainable and biodiversity-friendly agricultural model.
598 We recommend the implementation of policies that specifically promote the development of already
599 identified agricultural practices and farming models that allow a simultaneous consideration of food
600 production, biodiversity and human well-being (see for example (Duru et al., 2015; Valenzuela, 2016;
601 Boeraeve et al., 2020; Chabert and Sarthou, 2020). Concerning the French European hamster, studies
602 and conservation plans, including the Life+ Alister program and agro-environmental measures, played
603 a crucial role in the subsistence of viable populations and in the development of a more general context,
604 such as improving the farmland habitat and enhancing hamster's perception through society awareness.
605 This gives us an optimistic glimpse into the future.

606

607 **4.5 What about a successful increase in the population?**

608 Such successful increase is what happened with the bird symbol of Alsace, the white stork. This
609 species was protected in the 1970s since the survival of the regional population was severely
610 questioned. A reinforcement program occurred and was a success, since there are now more than 400
611 pairs. Despite this success, the white stork is still a subject of conversation, because the now numerous
612 individuals leaving near humans cause disturbances, like infrastructure damages, noise or dropping
613 nuisances. If the same success occurs with European hamsters, one can fear to come back to the
614 previous situation when it caused important damages to crops. However, we have now an improved
615 knowledge about predator-prey dynamics and ecosystem balancing, leading us to consider that
616 overpopulation can be avoided with natural regulation by predators. Ecosystem balancing seems thus
617 especially important in that scope to promote biodiversity while maintaining the production and other
618 services provided by farmland ecosystems.

619

620 **4.6 Other issues, same problems, same solutions**

621 Conservation measures and studies that have been carried out allowed a better knowledge of
622 the biology of the European hamster and its habitat, its needs and threats. In addition, gathering
623 information improved knowledge in many other scientific fields like ecology or nutrition that can be
624 transposed to other species (Monecke, 2014). Even if the French European hamster preservation plan
625 can sometimes be viewed as a lot of energy and money spent for only a 'small rodent', one may recall
626 the convergence with problems and solutions encountered in a large variety of domains.

627 The European hamster is not the only species endangered in agricultural areas. Many farmland
628 bird populations are decreasing since several decades (Donald et al., 2001; Heldbjerg et al., 2018;

In review

Stanton et al., 2018; Department for Environment, Food & Rural Affairs, 2019; Gaget et al., 2019). Invertebrate species are also concerned, with insects suffering a massive drop potentially linked to unsustainable agricultural practices (Benton *et al.*, 2002; Shortall *et al.*, 2009; Hallmann *et al.*, 2017). Therefore, conservation measures are widely developed to protect farmland species or taxa, involving various stakeholders. In France, this can be illustrated by the development of different specific national action plans (NAP) like the one for the little bustard (*Tetrax tetrax*) (Poirel, 2019), the one for pollinators (Gadoum and Roux-Fouillet, 2016) or the one for adventive plants (Cambecèdes et al., 2012). During the last European hamster NAPs, conservation measures for hamsters and associated innovative practices, have been identified to be highly beneficial not only for hamsters but also for a lot of other species including the above-cited ones (Wilson *et al.*, 2005; Liu *et al.*, 2015; Norris *et al.*, 2017; Zellweger-Fischer *et al.*, 2018).

Furthermore, these measures may also help to reduce soil erosion. This issue is of particular importance for farmers since the soil is the first support their production. Ground runoffs and mudflows can happen in sloping areas during rainy periods and also affect people outside the crops (material damages, water quality, safety) (Bronick and Lal, 2005; Heitz *et al.*, 2009). Soil erosion can be limited or avoided by improving soil quality and coverage, *i.e.* increasing soil biota, soil organic carbon content, and protecting it thanks to mulch or cover crops (Bronick and Lal, 2005; Seitz *et al.*, 2018). All these practices join the ones that are beneficial for the European hamster conservation.

Drinking water can be affected by nitrogen concentration and by a multiplicity of pesticide residuals as well, sometimes at high levels (APRONA, 2020). Surprisingly, water pollution is usually not the most negatively perceived by citizens, since it is not visible. Pesticides application is much more feared by people, especially when it occurred at the vicinity of habitations. Thus, agriculture with moderate or no use of pesticide would not only be beneficial for hamsters' biotope but also for its human neighbours, from a health and a sociological acceptance perspective.

Both citizens and hamsters need the development of an agriculture with more plant diversity, more cultivated or spontaneous biodiversity on crops, and more cover crops. Indeed, this participates to the creation of more attractive landscapes, thus increasing people's wellness (Hasund *et al.*, 2011).

The proportion of farmers in the population is getting smaller and smaller and the difficulties they met are going in the opposite direction. It is especially true since they face more and more extreme climatic conditions due to global climate change (Rosenzweig *et al.*, 2001; Fischer *et al.*, 2002). Conservation or biodiversity-based agriculture can be beneficial for that too, since it relies on the operation of many ecosystem services that increase the resilience of the agroecosystem (Armand *et al.*, 2009; Dainese *et al.*, 2019; Montoya *et al.*, 2020).

If innovative agricultural practices can help to adapt to climate change, they can also be beneficial to limit it. As explained previously, soil improvement is a key factor for the agricultural systems, and it relies on the increase of soil organic carbon. This organic carbon comes from the photosynthesis of plants, taking carbon dioxide from the air. This mechanism is important enough to have a significant effect on atmospheric CO2 concentration. This is for example what is promoted through the 4 per 1000 initiative since an increase of soil carbon of 0.4% each year in the 30 to 40 first centimetres of all agricultural soils would allow compensating global annual CO2 emissions (Rumpel *et al.*, 2020). This does not mean that we found the solution to solve the atmospheric CO2 problem or that we have not to reduce carbon emissions, but it shows that agriculture can significantly contribute to slow down the global change.

5 Conclusion

This is a provisional file, not the final typeset article

Conservation measures for endangered species are undoubtedly of great importance. It is crucial to take into consideration animal ethics as societal need in order to be as beneficial as possible. Furthermore, they have a much broader impact than only protecting the considered species or habitat. To be successful, they have to include the multiplicity of stakeholders concerned with the topic covered. This is well illustrated with the case of European hamster whose rescue deeply depends on modified and innovative agricultural practices developed by farmers. Moreover, these modifications consisting in more integration of biodiversity, soil and natural processes are not only a solution for species' protection but an entire improvement of farmers' socio-economic conditions, as well as citizens' well-being, and contribute to the planet health for sure. All of this implies to take into account the externalities (positive or negative) of the practices as their implementations, leading to the most holistic view possible. We recommend to stakeholders to use, to foster and to develop all the measures available that can promote agricultural biodiversity, and to assist in the development of a new agricultural model. These measures must also be taken at the level of several territories or countries. Concerning the common hamster, exchanges of experiences and ideas take place every year during the International Hamster Workgroup meeting, between scientists and field operators from countries where the species is present, which makes it possible to improve conservation actions and develop collaborations. This year, a first joint conservation program between France and Germany will be submitted to Europe, in order to implement on a larger scale measures to restore population levels and improve agricultural habitat.

In review

Acknowledgements

We would like to thank Sylvie Massemin for her skills and knowledge on the white stork. We thank also Charlotte Kourkgy and the French Office of Biodiversity for the provision of complementary information. We are grateful for the comments and advices of the two anonymous reviewers, which led to substantial improvements of this manuscript.

Conflict of Interest

The authors declare that this review was conducted in the absence of any commercial or financial relationships that could be construed as a potential conflict of interest.

Author Contributions

FK and MP equally contributed to this work as the first author.
All authors brought constructive thoughts and participated in the elaboration and the redaction of this review.
All authors contributed to manuscript revision, read and approved the submitted version.

References

ACTeon (2013). Étude d'image du hamster dans l'opinion publique. Strasbourg: Projet Life + Alister (LIFE12BIO/FR/000979).

712 ACTeon (2015). Le grand hamster d'Alsace. Connaissances et perceptions des Alsaciens. Strasbourg: Projet
713 Life + Alister (LIFE12BIO/FR/000979).

714 ACTeon (2019). Rapport final de l'évaluation des impacts sociaux, économiques et environnementaux des
715 actions menées par le projet LIFE+Alister. Strasbourg: Projet Life + Alister (LIFE12BIO/FR/000979).

716 Agreste (2020). Statistique agricole. Available at:
717 http://agreste.agriculture.gouv.fr/IMG/pdf/R44Me2001.pdf.

718 Alberti, M., Correa, C., Marzluff, J. M., Hendry, A. P., Palkovacs, E. P., Gotanda, K. M., et al. (2017). Global
719 urban signatures of phenotypic change in animal and plant populations. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.* 114,
720 8951–8956. doi:10.1073/pnas.1606034114.

721 APRONA (2020). ERMES Alsace 2016. *Aprona*. Available at: https://www.aprona.net/FR/nos-missions/suivi-
722 de-la-qualite-des-eaux-souterraines/ermes-alsace-2016.html [Accessed February 13, 2020].

723 Armand, R., Bockstaller, C., Auzet, A.-V., and Van Dijk, P. (2009). Runoff generation related to intra-field soil
724 surface characteristics variability: Application to conservation tillage context. *Soil Tillage Res.* 102,
725 27–37. doi:10.1016/j.still.2008.07.009.

726 Banaszek, A., Bogomolov, P., Feoktistova, N., La Haye, M., Monecke, S., Reiners, T. E., et al. (2020). Cricetus
727 cricetus. The IUCN Red List of Threatened Species 2020. *IUCN*. Available at:
728 https://dx.doi.org/10.2305/IUCN.UK.2020-2.RLTS.T5529A111875852.en.

729 Beaumont, L. J., Pitman, A., Perkins, S., Zimmermann, N. E., Yoccoz, N. G., and Thuiller, W. (2011). Impacts of
730 climate change on the world's most exceptional ecoregions. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.* 108, 2306–2311.
731 doi:10.1073/pnas.1007217108.

732 Benton, T. G., Bryant, D. M., Cole, L., and Crick, H. Q. P. (2002). Linking agricultural practice to insect and bird
733 populations: a historical study over three decades. *J. Appl. Ecol.* 39, 673–687. doi:10.1046/j.1365-
734 2664.2002.00745.x.

735 Boeraeve, F., Dendoncker, N., Cornélis, J.-T., Degrune, F., and Dufrêne, M. (2020). Contribution of
736 agroecological farming systems to the delivery of ecosystem services. *J. Environ. Manage.* 260,
737 109576. doi:10.1016/j.jenvman.2019.109576.

738 Bohec, C. L., Gauthier-Clerc, M., Grémillet, D., Pradel, R., Béchet, A., Gendner, J.-P., et al. (2007). Population
739 dynamics in a long-lived seabird: I. Impact of breeding activity on survival and breeding probability in
740 unbanded king penguins. *J. Anim. Ecol.* 76, 1149–1160. doi:10.1111/j.1365-2656.2007.01268.x.

741 Bronick, C. J., and Lal, R. (2005). Soil structure and management: a review. *Geoderma* 124, 3–22.
742 doi:10.1016/j.geoderma.2004.03.005.

743 Cambecèdes, J., Largier, G., and Lombard, A. (2012). Plan national d'actionsen faveur des plantes messicoles
744 2012-2017. Available at: http://www.fcbn.fr/pna-messicoles.

745 Capber, F. (2011). Intra-peritoneal radio-transmitter implants in European Hamsters. in *From fundamental*
746 *research to population management: refining conservation strategies for the European Hamster*
747 (Strasbourg).

In review

This is a provisional file, not the final typeset article

748 Catarino, R., Bretagnolle, V., Perrot, T., Vialloux, F., and Gaba, S. (2019). Bee pollination outperforms
749 pesticides for oilseed crop production and profitability. *Proc. R. Soc. B Biol. Sci.* 286, 20191550.
750 doi:10.1098/rspb.2019.1550.

751 Chabert, A., and Sarthou, J.-P. (2020). Conservation agriculture as a promising trade-off between
752 conventional and organic agriculture in bundling ecosystem services. *Agric. Ecosyst. Environ.* 292,
753 106815. doi:10.1016/j.agee.2019.106815.

754 Chen, H., Dai, Z., Veach, A. M., Zheng, J., Xu, J., and Schadt, C. W. (2020). Global meta-analyses show that
755 conservation tillage practices promote soil fungal and bacterial biomass. *Agric. Ecosyst. Environ.* 293,
756 106841. doi:10.1016/j.agee.2020.106841.

757 Cheptou, P.-O., Hargreaves, A. L., Bonte, D., and Jacquemyn, H. (2017). Adaptation to fragmentation:
758 evolutionary dynamics driven by human influences. *Philos. Trans. R. Soc. B Biol. Sci.* 372, 20160037.
759 doi:10.1098/rstb.2016.0037.

760 Christen, G. (2011). L'entrée de l'environnement dans le «champ» des pratiques agricoles. Available at:
761 http://gerihco.engees.unistra.fr/sites/default/files/pdf/CHRISTEN_Guillaume_2011.pdf.

762 Colautti, R. I., Alexander, J. M., Dlugosch, K. M., Keller, S. R., and Sultan, S. E. (2017). Invasions and extinctions
763 through the looking glass of evolutionary ecology. *Philos. Trans. R. Soc. B Biol. Sci.* 372, 20160031.
764 doi:10.1098/rstb.2016.0031.

765 Culik, B., Wilson, R., and Bannasch, R. (1993). Flipper-bands on penguins: what is the cost of a life-long
766 commitment? *Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser.* 98, 209–214. doi:10.3354/meps098209.

767 Dainese, M., Martin, E. A., Aizen, M. A., Albrecht, M., Bartomeus, I., Bommarco, R., et al. (2019). A global
768 synthesis reveals biodiversity-mediated benefits for crop production. *Sci. Adv.* 5, eaax0121.
769 doi:10.1126/sciadv.aax0121.

770 Department for Environment, Food & Rural Affairs (2019). Wild bird populations in the UK, 1970 to 2018.
771 Available at: https://www.gov.uk/government/statistics/wild-bird-populations-in-the-uk [Accessed
772 November 9, 2017].

773 Donald, P. F., Green, R. E., and Heath, M. F. (2001). Agricultural intensification and the collapse of Europe's
774 farmland bird populations. *Proc. R. Soc. Lond. B Biol. Sci.* 268, 25–29. doi:10.1098/rspb.2000.1325.

775 Drechsler, M., Eppink, F. V., and Wätzold, F. (2011). Does proactive biodiversity conservation save costs?
776 *Biodivers. Conserv.* 20, 1045–1055. doi:10.1007/s10531-011-0013-4.

777 Duru, M., Therond, O., Martin, G., Martin-Clouaire, R., Magne, M.-A., Justes, E., et al. (2015). How to
778 implement biodiversity-based agriculture to enhance ecosystem services: a review. *Agron. Sustain.*
779 *Dev.* 35, 1259–1281. doi:10.1007/s13593-015-0306-1.

780 Edwards, C. A., and Thompson, A. R. (1973). "Pesticides and the soil fauna," in *Residue Reviews: Residues of*
781 *Pesticides and Other Contaminants in the Total Environment* Residue Reviews., eds. F. A. Gunther
782 and J. D. Gunther (New York, NY: Springer), 1–79. doi:10.1007/978-1-4615-8493-3_1.

783 Eppink, F. V., and Wätzold, F. (2009). Shedding light on the hidden costs of the Habitats Directive: the case of
784 hamster conservation in Germany. *Biodivers. Conserv.* 18, 795–810. doi:10.1007/s10531-008-9476-3.

In review

785 European commission (2011). The EU Biodiversity Strategy to 2020. doi:10.2779/39229.

786 European court of auditors (2020). Special Report 13/2020: Biodiversity on farmland:CAP contribution has
787 nothalted the decline. Available at: https://eca.europa.eu/fr/pages/DocItem.aspx?did=53892.

788 Fiorini, A., Boselli, R., Maris, S. C., Santelli, S., Ardenti, F., Capra, F., et al. (2020). May conservation tillage
789 enhance soil C and N accumulation without decreasing yield in intensive irrigated croplands? Results
790 from an eight-year maize monoculture. *Agric. Ecosyst. Environ.* 296, 106926.
791 doi:10.1016/j.agee.2020.106926.

792 Fischer, G., Shah, M. M., and van Velthuizen, H. T. (2002). Climate Change and Agricultural Vulnerability.
793 Available at: http://pure.iiasa.ac.at/id/eprint/6670/ [Accessed February 20, 2020].

794 Froget, G., Gautier-Clerc, M., Le Maho, Y., and Handrich, Y. (1998). Is Penguin banding harmless? *Polar Biol.*
795 20, 409–413. doi:10.1007/s003000050322.

796 Gadoum, S., and Roux-Fouillet, J.-M. (2016). Plan national d'actions « France Terre de pollini-sateurs » pour
797 la préservation des abeilles et des insectes pollinisateurs sauvages 2016-2020. Available at:
798 http://pollinisateurs.pnaopie.fr/wp-
799 content/uploads/2018/07/3993_pagesdynadocs570e1d6156925.pdf.

800 Gaget, E., Fay, R., Augiron, S., Villers, A., and Bretagnolle, V. (2019). Long-term decline despite conservation
801 efforts questions Eurasian Stone-curlew population viability in intensive farmlands. *Ibis* 161, 359–
802 371. doi:10.1111/ibi.12646.

803 Hallmann, C. A., Sorg, M., Jongejans, E., Siepel, H., Hofland, N., Schwan, H., et al. (2017). More than 75
804 percent decline over 27 years in total flying insect biomass in protected areas. *PLOS ONE* 12,
805 e0185809. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0185809.

806 Hasund, K. P., Kataria, M., and Lagerkvist, C. J. (2011). Valuing public goods of the agricultural landscape: a
807 choice experiment using reference points to capture observable heterogeneity. *J. Environ. Plan.*
808 *Manag.* 54, 31–53. doi:10.1080/09640568.2010.502753.

809 Heitz, C., Spaeter, S., Auzet, A.-V., and Glatron, S. (2009). Local stakeholders' perception of muddy flood risk
810 and implications for management approaches: A case study in Alsace (France). *Land Use Policy* 26,
811 443–451. doi:10.1016/j.landusepol.2008.05.008.

812 Heldbjerg, H., Sunde, P., and Fox, A. D. (2018). Continuous population declines for specialist farmland birds
813 1987-2014 in Denmark indicates no halt in biodiversity loss in agricultural habitats. *Bird Conserv. Int.*
814 28, 278–292. doi:10.1017/S0959270916000654.

815 Hendry, A. P., Gotanda, K. M., and Svensson, E. I. (2017). Human influences on evolution, and the ecological
816 and societal consequences. *Philos. Trans. R. Soc. B Biol. Sci.* 372, 20160028.
817 doi:10.1098/rstb.2016.0028.

818 Joy, V. C., and Chakravorty, P. P. (1991). Impact of insecticides on nontarget microarthropod fauna in
819 agricultural soil. *Ecotoxicol. Environ. Saf.* 22, 8–16. doi:10.1016/0147-6513(91)90041-M.

820 Kayser, A., Weinhold, U., and Stubbe, M. (2003). Mortality factors of the common hamsterCricetus cricetus at
821 two sites in Germany. *Acta Theriol. (Warsz.)* 48, 47–57. doi:10.1007/BF03194265.

In review

This is a provisional file, not the final typeset article

Kletty, F., Tissier, M., Kourkgy, C., Capber, F., Zahariev, A., Chatelain, N., et al. (2019). A focus on the European hamster to illustrate how to monitor endangered species. *Integr. Zool.* 14, 65–74. doi:10.1111/1749-4877.12375.

Koehler, D. K., Reynolds, T. D., and Anderson, S. H. (1987). Radio-Transmitter Implants in 4 Species of Small Mammals. *J. Wildl. Manag.* 51, 105–108. doi:10.2307/3801638.

Kourkgy, C. (2019). Evaluation of innovative agricultural practices for Common hamsters: Results of 5 years of survey in the fields: the final results of the LIFE Alister program. in (Kerkrade, Netherlands).

Kuhn, R., and Jacques, H. (2011). "La Loutre d'Europe (Lutra lutra Linnaeus, 1758)," in *Encyclopédie des Carnivores de France* (Société Française pour l'Etude et la Protection des Mammiferes), 72.

La Haye, M. J. J., Muskens, G. J. D. M., Van Kats, R. J. M., and Kuiters, A. T. (2008). Is de hamster gebaat bij bejaging van de vos? *Levende Nat.* 109, 187–191.

La Haye, M. J. J., Müskens, G. J. D. M., Van Kats, R. J. M., Kuiters, A. T., and Siepel, H. (2010). Agri-environmental schemes for the Common hamster (Cricetus cricetus). Why is the Dutch project successful? *Asp. Appl. Biol.*

La Haye, M. J. J., Neumann, K., and Koelewijn, H. P. (2012). Strong decline of gene diversity in local populations of the highly endangered Common hamster (Cricetus cricetus) in the western part of its European range. *Conserv. Genet.* 13, 311–322. doi:10.1007/s10592-011-0278-x.

La Haye, M. J. J., Swinnen, K. R. R., Kuiters, A. T., Leirs, H., and Siepel, H. (2014). Modelling population dynamics of the Common hamster (Cricetus cricetus): Timing of harvest as a critical aspect in the conservation of a highly endangered rodent. *Biol. Conserv.* 180, 53–61. doi:10.1016/j.biocon.2014.09.035.

Laurent, A. (2014). "Le Lynx boréal Lynx lynx (Linnaeus, 1758)," in *Atlas de répartition des mammifères d'Alsace* Atlas de la Faune d'Alsace. (Strasbourg: GEPMA), 739.

Lemarchand, C., Geboes, A.-L., Rosoux, R., Hansen, E., Boulade, Y., and Libois, R. (2016). Diversité génétique de la loutre d'Europe (Lutra lutra) en FranceFocus sur le Massif central et la région Auvergne dans le cadre du Plan Régional d'Actions. *Mammal Res.* doi:DOI 10.1007/s13364-015-0258-5.

Liu, Y., Duan, M., Zhang, X., Zhang, X., Yu, Z., and Axmacher, J. C. (2015). Effects of plant diversity, habitat and agricultural landscape structure on the functional diversity of carabid assemblages in the North China Plain. *Insect Conserv. Divers.* 8, 163–176. doi:10.1111/icad.12096.

Losinger, I., Wencel, M.-C., and Migot, P. (2006). Réflexions autour de la gestion d'une espèce animale dans un écosystème agricole : le cas du grand hamster. *Nat. Sci. Sociétés* 14, S63–S64. doi:10.1051/nss:2006058.

Lüchtrath, A., and Schraml, U. (2015). The missing lynx — understanding hunters' opposition to large carnivores. *Wildl. Biol.* 21, 110–119. doi:10.2981/wlb.00068.

Macdonald, D. W., and Amlaner, C. J. (1980). "A Practical Guide to Radio Tracking," in *A Handbook on Biotelemetry and Radio Tracking*, eds. C. J. Amlaner and D. W. Macdonald (Pergamon), 143–159. doi:10.1016/B978-0-08-024928-5.50017-8.

In review

Méchin, C. (2007). "La gestion de l'espace rural et périurbain et les enjeux de sauvetage d'une espèce protégée : la situation du hamster commun (Cricetus cricetus L.) en Alsace," in *Actes de colloque: Les mondes ruraux à l'épreuve des sciences sociales, Dijon, INRA*, 373–385. Available at: https://hal.archives-ouvertes.fr/halshs-00197786/ [Accessed February 14, 2020].

Méchin, C. (2011). Une espèce protégée qui dérange: le Hamster commun (Cricetus cricetus L.) en Alsace. *Anthropozoologica* 46, 127–139. doi:10.5252/az2011n1a5.

Méchin, C. (2013). Stratégies et rôle des agriculteurs en Alsace concernant le Hamster commun (Cricetus cricetus L.). *Courr. Environ. INRA*, 12.

Melosik, I., Ziomek, J., Winnicka, K., Reiners, T. E., Banaszek, A., Mammen, K., et al. (2017). The genetic characterization of an isolated remnant population of an endangered rodent (Cricetus cricetus L.) using comparative data: implications for conservation. *Conserv. Genet.* 18, 759–775. doi:10.1007/s10592-017-0925-y.

Micoud, A. (1993). Comment en finir avec les animaux dits nuisibles. *Etudes Rural.*, 83–94.

Minteer, B. A., Collins, J. P., Love, K. E., and Puschendorf, R. (2014). Avoiding (Re)extinction. *Science* 344, 260–261. doi:10.1126/science.1250953.

Monecke, S. (2014). All things considered? Alternative reasons for hamster extinction. *Zool. Pol.* 58, 41–47. doi:10.2478/zoop-2013-0004.

Montoya, D., Gaba, S., de Mazancourt, C., Bretagnolle, V., and Loreau, M. (2020). Reconciling biodiversity conservation, food production and farmers' demand in agricultural landscapes. *Ecol. Model.* 416, 108889. doi:10.1016/j.ecolmodel.2019.108889.

Müskens, G. J. D. M., La Haye, M., and Van Kats, R. J. M. (2005). Re-establishment of a viable network-population of the common hamster in South-Limburg, the Netherlands: impact of crop management and survival strips on burrow distribution in the release sites. *12th Meet. Int. Hamsterworkgroup*.

Nechay, G., Hamar, M., and Grulich, I. (1977). The Common Hamster (Cricetus cricetus [L.]); a Review. *EPPO Bull.* 7, 255–276. doi:10.1111/j.1365-2338.1977.tb02727.x.

Norris, S. L., Blackshaw, R. P., Critchley, C. N. R., Dunn, R. M., Smith, K. E., Williams, J., et al. (2017). Intercropping flowering plants in maize systems increases pollinator diversity. *Agric. For. Entomol.* doi:10.1111/afe.12251.

Norris, S. L., Blackshaw, R. P., Dunn, R. M., Critchley, N. R., Smith, K. E., Williams, J. R., et al. (2016). Improving above and below-ground arthropod biodiversity in maize cultivation systems. *Appl. Soil Ecol.* 108, 25–46. doi:10.1016/j.apsoil.2016.07.015.

O'Brien, J. (2015). Saving the common hamster (Cricetus cricetus) from extinction in Alsace (France): potential flagship conservation or an exercise in futility? *Hystrix Ital. J. Mammal.* 26, 89–94. doi:10.4404/hystrix-26.2-11230.

Palumbi, S., R. (2001). Humans as the World's greatest evolutionary force. *Sci. New Ser.*, 1786–1790.

Pavone, L. V., and Boonstra, R. (1985). The effects of toe clipping on the survival of the meadow vole (Microtus pennsylvanicus). *Can. J. Zool.* 63, 499–501. doi:10.1139/z85-072.

In review

This is a provisional file, not the final typeset article

Pe'er, G., Dicks, L. V., Visconti, P., Arlettaz, R., Báldi, A., Benton, T. G., et al. (2014). EU agricultural reform fails on biodiversity. *Science* 344, 1090–1092. doi:10.1126/science.1253425.

Poirel, C. (2019). 3e plan national d'actions en faveur de l'Outarde canepetière (Tetrax tetrax) 2019-2028. Available at: http://www.consultations-publiques.developpement-durable.gouv.fr/projet-de-plan-national-d-actions-en-faveur-de-l-a2031.html.

Pradel, R. (1996). Utilization of Capture-Mark-Recapture for the Study of Recruitment and Population Growth Rate. *Biometrics* 52, 703–709. doi:10.2307/2532908.

Randi, E., Davoli, F., Pierpaoli, M., Pertoldi, C., Madsen, A. B., and Loeschcke, V. (2003). Genetic structure in otter (Lutra lutra) populations in Europe: implications for conservation. *Anim. Conserv. Forum* 6, 93–100. doi:10.1017/S1367943003003123.

Reiners, T., Bornmann, N., Wolters, V., and Encarnação, J. A. (2011). Genetic diversity of Common hamster populations (Cricetus cricetus) revealed by non-invasive genetics. Available at: https://www.academia.edu/30022133/Genetic_diversity_of_common_hamster_populations_revealed_by_non-invasive_genetics [Accessed February 20, 2020].

Rogalski, M., A., Camden, G., D., Shaw, C., L., Hufbauer, R., A., and Duffy, M. (2017). Human drivers of ecological and evolutionary dynamics in emerging and disappearing infectious disease systems | Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences. Available at: https://royalsocietypublishing.org/doi/full/10.1098/rstb.2016.0043 [Accessed February 14, 2020].

Rosenzweig, C., Iglesius, A., Yang, X. B., Epstein, P., and Chivian, E. (2001). Climate change and extreme weather events - Implications for food production, plant diseases, and pests. *NASA Publ.* Available at: https://digitalcommons.unl.edu/nasapub/24.

Rumpel, C., Amiraslani, F., Chenu, C., Garcia Cardenas, M., Kaonga, M., Koutika, L.-S., et al. (2020). The 4p1000 initiative: Opportunities, limitations and challenges for implementing soil organic carbon sequestration as a sustainable development strategy. *Ambio* 49, 350–360. doi:10.1007/s13280-019-01165-2.

Saraux, C., Bohec, C. L., Durant, J. M., Viblanc, V. A., Gauthier-Clerc, M., Beaune, D., et al. (2011). Reliability of flipper-banded penguins as indicators of climate change. *Nature* 469, 203–206. doi:10.1038/nature09630.

Seitz, S., Goebes, P., Puerta, V. L., Pereira, E. I. P., Wittwer, R., Six, J., et al. (2018). Conservation tillage and organic farming reduce soil erosion. *Agron. Sustain. Dev.* 39, 4. doi:10.1007/s13593-018-0545-z.

Shortall, C. R., Moore, A., Smith, E., Hall, M. J., Woiwod, I. P., and Harrington, R. (2009). Long-term changes in the abundance of flying insects. *Insect Conserv. Divers.* 2, 251–260. doi:10.1111/j.1752-4598.2009.00062.x.

Sirami, C., Gross, N., Baillod, A. B., Bertrand, C., Carrié, R., Hass, A., et al. (2019). Increasing crop heterogeneity enhances multitrophic diversity across agricultural regions. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.* 116, 16442–16447. doi:10.1073/pnas.1906419116.

Stanton, R. L., Morrissey, C. A., and Clark, R. G. (2018). Analysis of trends and agricultural drivers of farmland bird declines in North America: A review. *Agric. Ecosyst. Environ.* 254, 244–254. doi:10.1016/j.agee.2017.11.028.

In review

Stubbe, M., Stubbe, A. (1998). Der Feldhamster (Cricetus cricetus L.) als Beute von Mensch und Tier sowie seine Bedeutung für das Ökosystem [The European hamster (Cricetus cricetus L.) as prey of humans and animals as well as its importance to the ecosystem]. In: Stubbe M, Stubbe A (eds) Ökologie und Schutz des Feldhamsters [Ecology and protection of the European hamster]. Martin-Luther-Universität Halle-Wittenberg, Halle/Saale, p 81−86.

Surov, A., Banaszek, A., Bogomolov, P., Feoktistova, N., and Monecke, S. (2016). Dramatic global decrease in the range and reproduction rate of the European hamster Cricetus cricetus. *Endanger. Species Res.* 31, 119–145. doi:10.3354/esr00749.

Tamarin, R. H., and Krebs, C. J. (1969). Microtus Population Biology. II. Genetic Changes at the Transferrin Locus in Fluctuating Populations of Two Vole Species. *Evolution* 23, 183–211. doi:10.2307/2406785.

Theuerkauf, J., Rouys, S., and Chatreau, C. (2007). Mortality of radio-tracked wild rats in relation to transmitter weight and resilience of transmitters in relation to their design. *J. R. Soc. N. Z.* 37, 85–90. doi:10.1080/03014220709510538.

Tissier, M. L., Bousquet, C. A. H., Fleitz, J., Chatelain, N., Habold, C., and Handrich, Y. (2018a). An anti-predation device to facilitate and secure the crossing of small mammals in motorway wildlife underpasses. (II) Validation with the European hamster under semi-natural conditions. *Ecol. Eng.* 125, 106–110. doi:10.1016/j.ecoleng.2018.10.013.

Tissier, M. L., Habold, C., Kletty, F., Eidenschenck, J., Marchandeau, S., Handrich, Y., et al. (2019a). Concilier agriculture et préservation de la faune de plaine : le cas du grand hamster en Alsace. *Faune Sauvage* 322. Available at: http://www.oncfs.gouv.fr/IMG/file/publications/revue%20faune%20sauvage/Faune-sauvage-322-1T2019-Sommaire.pdf.

Tissier, M. L., Handrich, Y., Dallongeville, O., Robin, J.-P., and Habold, C. (2017). Diets derived from maize monoculture cause maternal infanticides in the endangered European hamster due to a vitamin B3 deficiency. *Proc R Soc B* 284, 20162168. doi:10.1098/rspb.2016.2168.

Tissier, M. L., Handrich, Y., Robin, J.-P., Weitten, M., Pevet, P., Kourkgy, C., et al. (2016a). How maize monoculture and increasing winter rainfall have brought the hibernating European hamster to the verge of extinction. *Sci. Rep.* 6, 25531. doi:10.1038/srep25531.

Tissier, M. L., Jumeau, J., Croguennec, C., Petit, O., Habold, C., and Handrich, Y. (2016b). An anti-predation device to facilitate and secure the crossing of small mammals in motorway wildlife underpasses. (I) Lab tests of basic design features. *Ecol. Eng.* 95, 738–742. doi:10.1016/j.ecoleng.2016.07.012.

Tissier, M. L., Kletty, F., Handrich, Y., and Habold, C. (2018b). Monocultural sowing in mesocosms decreases the species richness of weeds and invertebrates and critically reduces the fitness of the endangered European hamster. *Oecologia* 186, 589–599. doi:10.1007/s00442-017-4025-y.

Tissier, M. L., Marchandeau, S., Habold, C., Handrich, Y., Eidenschenck, J., and Kourkgy, C. (2019b). Weeds as a predominant food source: a review of the diet of common hamsters Cricetus cricetus in farmlands and urban habitats. *Mammal Rev.* 49, 152–170. doi:10.1111/mam.12149.

Tkadlec, E., Heroldová, M., Víšková, V., Bednář, M., and Zejda, J. (2012). Distribution of the common hamster in the Czech Republic after 2000: retreating to optimum lowland habitats. *J. Vertebr. Biol.* 61, 246–253. doi:10.25225/fozo.v61.i3.a9.2012.

In review

This is a provisional file, not the final typeset article

975 Treves, A., Krofel, M., and McManus, J. (2016). Predator control should not be a shot in the dark. *Front. Ecol.*
976 *Environ.* 14, 380–388. doi:10.1002/fee.1312.

977 Ulbrich, K., and Kayser, A. (2004). A risk analysis for the common hamster (Cricetus cricetus). *Biol. Conserv.*
978 117, 263–270. doi:10.1016/j.biocon.2003.12.006.

979 Valenzuela, H. (2016). Agroecology: A Global Paradigm to Challenge Mainstream Industrial Agriculture.
980 Horticulturae 2, 2. doi:10.3390/horticulturae2010002.

981 Verbeylen, G., Hens, M., Vercoutere, B. (2007). Inventory of burrows of the Common hamster (Cricetus
982 cricetus) in the province of Vlaams-Brabant (flanders, Belgium) in 2007. 15th Meeting of the
983 International Hamster Workgroup, Kerkrade Netherlands, Abstract book.

984 Verbist, V. (2007). Restocking and protection of the European hamster in Flanders, preliminary results. 15th
985 Meeting of the International Hamster Workgroup, Kerkrade Netherlands, Abstract book.

986 Villemey, A., Besnard, A., Grandadam, J., and Eidenschenck, J. (2013). Testing restocking methods for an
987 endangered species: Effects of predator exclusion and vegetation cover on common hamster
988 (Cricetus cricetus) survival and reproduction. *Biol. Conserv.* 158, 147–154.
989 doi:10.1016/j.biocon.2012.08.007.

990 Vilmer, J.-B. (2008). Éthique animale. Available at:
991 https://books.google.fr/books?hl=fr&lr=&id=PhALCwAAQBAJ&oi=fnd&pg=PT69&dq=ethique+animal
992 e&ots=q-
993 7qhNK8A7&sig=thK9_8YR7d7Bdl8CZCojMNBm2rM#v=onepage&q=ethique%20animale&f=false
994 [Accessed February 14, 2020].

995 Virion, M.-C., and Thouvenot, E. (2019). Plan national d'actions en faveur du Hamster commun Cricetus
996 cricetus et de la biodiversité de la plaine d'Alsace 2019-2028.

997 Webster, A. B., and Brooks, R. J. (1980). Effects of radiotransmitters on the meadow vole, Microtus
998 pennsylvanicus. *Can. J. Zool.* 58, 997–1001. doi:10.1139/z80-139.

999 Weitten, M., Tissier, M. L., Robin, J.-P., and Habold, C. (2018). Dietary proteins improve hibernation and
1000 subsequent reproduction in the European hamster, Cricetus cricetus. *Am. J. Physiol.-Regul. Integr.*
1001 *Comp. Physiol.* 315, R848–R855. doi:10.1152/ajpregu.00146.2018.

1002 Wezel, A., Goette, J., Lagneaux, E., Passuello, G., Reisman, E., Rodier, C., et al. (2018). Agroecology in Europe:
1003 Research, Education, Collective Action Networks, and Alternative Food Systems. *Sustainability* 10,
1004 1214. doi:10.3390/su10041214.

1005 Wilson, J. D., Whittingham, M. J., and Bradbury, R. B. (2005). The management of crop structure: a general
1006 approach to reversing the impacts of agricultural intensification on birds? *Ibis* 147, 453–463.
1007 doi:10.1111/j.1474-919x.2005.00440.x.

1008 Zellweger-Fischer, J., Hoffmann, J., Korner-Nievergelt, P., Pfiffner, L., Stoeckli, S., and Birrer, S. (2018).
1009 Identifying factors that influence bird richness and abundance on farms. *Bird Study* 0, 1–13.
1010 doi:10.1080/00063657.2018.1446903.

1011 Ziomek, J., and Banaszek, A. (2007). The common hamster, Cricetus cricetus in Poland: Status and current
1012 range. *Folia Zool.* 56, 235–242.

in review

1013

1014

In review

This is a provisional file, not the final typeset article

Figure legends

Figure 1: Hamster conservation in Alsace: from evolution of its presence to conservation plans between 1970 and 2028. Bars represent the number of municipalities where the European hamster is present in Alsace (France). Lower part of the figure represents timeline of principal events concerning conservation measures and decisions for the species

In review

Tables


Table 1: Pros and cons of the strategies considering different priorities for population reinforcement and habitat improvement

	Population reinforcement while improving habitat	**Habitat improvement followed by population reinforcement**
PROS	May be seen as a first 'trigger' step resulting to: - the maintenance of the population (no genetic loss) - a better perception/acceptance compared to a reintroduction if population extinct during this time - the maximization of the partners involvement (political and societal)	Derived from the necessity to solve the causes of the decline before reinforcing (otherwise it leads to a failure) resulting to: - a better perception of the conservation plan (seen as holistic instead of species-focused) - the maximization of the conservation efforts
CONS	Need to continue until the habitat has been sufficiently improved resulting to : - a possible long time before seeing positive or lasting effects of the reinforcements - a possible dispersion of actions and resources	May lead to the complete extinction of the population/species in the wild resulting to: - the ↓ of genetic diversity - the ↓ of politics stakes - the ↑ of administrative obligations - the ↓ of motivation of local actors - the ↓ of habits to live with this species

In review

This is a provisional file, not the final typeset article

Figure 1.JPEG



In review