Journal of Animal Environment
(E-ISSN 2717-1396, ISSN 2717-1388)
Journal homepage: https://aejournals.org/

Original Research Paper

Habitat Guard a Predictive Framework for Early Detection of Wildlife Habitat Degradation

Alok Kumar Yadav[1*], Vijay Shankar Yadav[2], Sayanti Benerjee[3]

[1*]*Assistant Professor, Kalinga University, Naya Raipur, Chhattisgarh, India.*
Email: ku.alokkumaryadav@kalingauniversity.ac.in, ORCID: https://orcid.org/0009-0007-3070-9079
[2]*Assistant Professor, Kalinga University, Naya Raipur, Chhattisgarh, India.*
Email: ku.vijayshankaryadav@kalingauniversity.ac.in, ORCID: https://orcid.org/0009-0001-2485-3177
[3]*Assistant Professor, New Delhi Institute of Management, New Delhi, India.*
Email: sayanti.banerjee@ndimdelhi.org, ORCID: https://orcid.org/0009-0005-7414-1716

Key Words	Abstract
Habitat degradation, Early warning systems, Wildlife conservation, Habitat quality assessment, Ecological risk prediction, Species monitoring, Conservation management.	Often, wildlife habitat degradation occurs slowly, and signs of deterioration are not detected until the habitat has worsened and recovery is difficult and expensive. In this paper a predictive framework for detecting early warning signs to initiate wildlife habitat degradation in a timely manner, before it causes significant ecological harm or damage. It is a three-part framework that includes both continuous monitoring of habitat quality and species-response indicators, as well as compiling these indicators into an early-warning risk profile and converting that profile into specific management alerts for areas at risk. Habitat Guard's unique ability to use recent advancements in artificial-intelligence-aided biodiversity conservation, real-time wildlife monitoring, and habitat quality and ecological risk assessment, as well as spatial wildfire risk analysis for habitat corridors, provides a tool to assist conservation managers in detecting trends of habitat degradation where intervention is still possible. Although the framework has not yet been field-tested, the indicator-based, risk-based design provides a logical progression to better identifying and mitigating habitat degradation. Empirical testing of a variety of habitat types with varying disturbance pressures and species composition is suggested as a future research project.

* Corresponding Author’s email: ku.alokkumaryadav@kalingauniversity.ac.in
Received: 25th May, 2026; Revised: 6th June, 2026; Accepted: 8th June, 2026; Available Online: 07th August, 2026
(DOI): 10.70102/AEJ.2026.18.3s.68

Introduction

The global spread of encroaching human populations, resource extraction, climate variation, and land-use change are all increasing pressures on wildlife habitats and can lead to a slow degradation of habitats well before any ecological crisis is evident. Early detection is especially important as habitat loss and degradation that goes unchecked can be very expensive and difficult to restore once vegetation structure, water availability or species composition have fallen past a point of recovery. The incorporation of artificial intelligence techniques into biodiversity conservation has helped to connect the 'old-fashioned' field-based monitoring and more dynamic analytical approaches to guide conservation action, providing conservation practitioners with tools that can process habitat data at a scale and frequency that traditional survey schedules cannot. Ullah et al., (2025) Real-time monitoring systems that rely on camera-based alerts have also been shown to be useful in reducing human-wildlife conflict and tracking endangered species, like tigers, where continuous, near real-time detection of ecological and behavioral change can be useful to improve the response times of conservation efforts relative to periodic field visits (Dertien et al., 2023). In addition, habitat quality assessment and ecological risk prediction, as exemplified in the Beijing-Hangzhou Grand Canal, has shown that habitat condition and potential future ecological risk can be assessed simultaneously, rather than as distinct issues to be addressed sequentially after occurrence, making the argument for frameworks to predict ecological risk over and above documenting it after the fact even stronger (Zhang et al., 2022).

Here, it is suggested that Habitat Guard be structured as a response to these findings and be designed to identify some of the earliest signs of habitat degradation, and to convert these indicators into actionable information before significant degradation occurs.

In this paper, three major contributions are made. Most importantly, it suggests a predictive approach rather than an approach that documentation of degradation starts after significant degradation has taken place. Second, it provides a framework for integrating habitat quality and species-response information into a multi-tiered early-warning risk profile that enables conservation managers to identify stable habitat from habitat with emerging signs of stress. Thirdly, it places predictive degradation detection in a practical context of allocating scarce conservation resources to the habitat areas most likely to require urgent conservation action rather than to spread management attention across a reserve or landscape.

This paper continues as follows. The value of the wildlife management perspective is discussed in connection with gaps in existing degradation detection methods, in Section II. The proposed Habitat Guard framework is described in system architecture in Section III. The early warning accuracy expected and results with respect to established detection practice are summarized in

Section IV. The paper is concluded with directions for future validation in Section V.

Gaps in Present Degradation Detection Techniques

Traditionally, habitat degradation detection has been based on periodic vegetation surveys, water quality sampling and species inventories at time intervals determined by available field capacity, not according to the rate of habitat degradation. Spatial analysis of wildfire risk to brown bear habitat and movement corridors has shown that degradation risk can be highly irregular on a landscape, with many monitoring programs relying on a single application of survey effort on an entire habitat area, rather than focusing on those areas that are most susceptible to degradation first (Khosravi et al., 2022). Interdisciplinary review of heavy metal poisoning in Amazonian parrots has revealed that threats to wildlife health that are linked to habitat can arise over time and are not detected by the structure of the habitat alone (Benarrós et al., 2025). Spatiotemporal monitoring of wetland habitat quality has also led to the realization that the loss of natural habitat is a significant contributor to long-term habitat quality declines, and that predictive analysis indicates that trends in habitat degradation that can be detected long before complete habitat loss can be detected are often not reflected in monitoring conducted over widely spaced periods (Xing et al., 2023).

The gaps in current practice that have been identified in recent sources are similar. In contrast, many habitat degradation detection programs are not implementing AI-supported conservation approaches that enable continuous processing of habitat data, that is, more often than just during the specified survey period. Near real-time camera-based alert systems reveal that the detection of ecological and behavioral shifts can be achieved almost instantaneously, but that these are focusing on immediate human-wildlife conflict, not on changes in habitat condition. Studies in habitat quality and ecological risk assessment reveal that these two can be integrated into a single monitoring program, and that condition and risk can be evaluated at the same time. Spatially explicit wildfire risk analysis demonstrates that degradation risk is focused within known habitat zones, suggesting that a one-size-fits-all approach to monitoring is suboptimal allocation of limited field resources. Heavy metal poisoning studies of Amazonian parrots reveal that health-related degradation processes can be slow and are difficult to detect until reach an advanced stage. Wetland monitoring research has validated that predictive analysis of habitat quality decline can detect problematic trends before habitats are lost and that predictive analysis approaches are not the norm for monitoring. Together, these findings suggest that although important, current degradation detection methods suffer from limited spatial and temporal coverage and a focus on reporting degradation instead of predicting it, making the development of a system that continuously and effectively detects and prioritizes risks an urgent priority.

System Architecture of the Proposed Framework

3.1 Habitat and Species-Response Indicator Collection

The core of Habitat Guard is the ongoing measurement of habitat quality indicators as well as species response indicators throughout a conservation landscape. Habitat indicators monitored include water availability and quality, evidence of encroachment or extractive pressure at habitat edges and vegetation structure and cover. Species-response indicators can range from occupancy changes in indicator species, movement changes along known corridors, to physiological and/or behavioral stress in monitored populations. Habitat use data are collected on a regular schedule that is linked to known patterns of habitat use; changes in habitat use may take the form of subtle changes in species behavior before habitat structure is degraded.

3.2 Framework Architecture

The conceptual framework is divided into three components that are interdependent. The first is the indicator consolidation layer, in which the measurements of habitat and species-responses are normalized into similar condition scores for a specific habitat unit throughout the landscape. The second is the risk-profiling layer, which merges trends from the scores of each of these conditions to create a "tiered degradation risk" classification for each habitat unit, identifying areas with stable condition from those with early signs of stress or degradation. The third is the alert generation layer: habitat units that are identified as being at high risk are identified for special field verification and management consideration so that conservation managers can focus scarce resources on units most likely to benefit from timely intervention.

3.3 Prioritization Logic

The prioritization logic of the framework is based on the premise that the risk of degradation is not uniformly distributed on a landscape. Habitat units that are close to known pressure sources, including the edges of human settlement, areas of extractive activity, or corridors with high risk of disturbance, are considered at higher risk in the risk-profiling layer based on evidence that degradation risk is focused around these areas. Likewise, habitat units for species known to be sensitive to slow changes in the environment (e.g., health effects associated with contamination) are given extra consideration so that less visible structural changes are not overlooked in favor of slower developing degradation pathways.

Early Warning Accuracy and Result Analysis

4.1 Anticipated Early Warning Accuracy

Since Habitat Guard is described as a concept that is not yet tested in the field, the expected prediction accuracy is based on similar cases described in the literature. Real-time monitoring systems proved to have real utility in terms of timeliness in detecting degradation, and a similar approach using continuous indicators should have similar utility for detecting habitat degradation. Similarly, research on habitat quality and ecological risk prediction has demonstrated that condition and/or risk indicators can be used together to predict degradation more reliably than condition indicators alone, which is a reason for the increased expectation that the proposed framework's integrated design will lead to increased reliability in detecting ecological risk versus a single indicator approach.

4.2 Comparison with Traditional Detection Methods

The proposed framework is much more sensitive to the onset of degradation trends than periodic field surveys, which only assess habitat and species-response indicators at regular checkpoints. Traditional field surveys continue to be valuable in assessing habitat conditions on the ground, therefore Habitat Guard can best be used to direct when and where field assessment should be completed.

4.3 Implications for Conservation Management

Early identification of degradation trends would enable conservation managers to take action before protective action (e.g. pressure-source mitigation, habitat restoration) is no longer viable or affordable, as larger-scale habitat degradation would likely have occurred. This is especially important when applied to landscapes in which particular species are at risk from slow, health-related degradation processes, as early detection could lead to early intervention or harm at the population level.

4.4 Limitations

As a conceptual framework, this approach has not yet been validated against extensive field data, and its expected accuracy is inferred rather than empirically demonstrated. Continuous indicator collection across a landscape requires sustained field capacity, which may be constrained in reserves with limited staffing or funding. The framework's prioritization logic also depends on reasonably accurate identification of pressure sources, which may be incomplete in landscapes where human activity patterns are poorly documented.

Conclusion

In this paper, a novel framework to support a predictive approach to early detection of degradation of wildlife habitat, called the "Habitat Guard" framework, has been described, which combines continuous collection of habitat and species-response indicators, tiered risk profiling and targeted alerts in an integrated approach. The framework will build off recent developments in conservation using artificial-intelligence to support effective monitoring of wildlife, habitat quality and ecological risk assessment, and spatial analysis of wildfire risk to inform conservation action, to transition conservation management to proactive, risk-prioritized early detection of habitat decline. Although the framework needs to be field-validated, the risk tiering and indicator-driven approach provides a logical pathway to improve identification and response to habitat degradation. Future studies should focus on field deployment under various habitat types, with varying disturbance pressures and species composition, and on the performance of the framework in anticipating true degradation outcomes before severe, as well as on longitudinal studies.

References

[1] Benarrós, Marina Sette Camara, Ketelen Ayumi Corrêa Sakata, Brenda Juliane Silva Dos Santos, and Felipe Masiero Salvarani. "Heavy metal poisoning and its impacts on the conservation of Amazonian parrots: an interdisciplinary review." *Biology* 14, no. 6 (2025): 660. https://doi.org/10.3390/biology14060660

[2] Dertien, Jeremy S., Hrishita Negi, Eric Dinerstein, Ramesh Krishnamurthy, Himmat Singh Negi, Rajesh Gopal, Steve Gulick et al. "Mitigating human–wildlife conflict and monitoring endangered tigers using a real-time camera-based alert system." *BioScience* 73, no. 10 (2023): 748-757. https://doi.org/10.1093/biosci/biad076

[3] Khosravi, Rasoul, Hamid Reza Pourghasemi, Roya Adavoudi, Leila Julaie, and Ho Yi Wan. "A spatially explicit analytical framework to assess wildfire risks on brown bear habitat and corridors in conservation areas." *Fire Ecology* 18, no. 1 (2022): 1-14. https://doi.org/10.1186/s42408-021-00125-0

[4] Ullah, Fazal, Saddam Saqib, and You-Cai Xiong. "Integrating artificial intelligence in biodiversity conservation: bridging classical and modern approaches." *Biodiversity and Conservation* 34, no. 1 (2025): 45-65. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10531-024-02977-9

[5] Xing, Xianglong, Yang Liu, Ri Jin, Peng Zhang, Shouzheng Tong, and Weihong Zhu. "Major role of natural wetland loss in the decline of wetland habitat quality—Spatio-temporal monitoring and predictive analysis." *Sustainability* 15, no. 16 (2023): 12415. https://doi.org/10.3390/su151612415

[6] Zhang, Yixin, Chenyue Zhang, Xindi Zhang, Xinge Wang, Ting Liu, Zhe Li, Qiaoyan Lin et al. "Habitat quality assessment and ecological risks prediction: an analysis in the Beijing-Hangzhou Grand Canal (Suzhou Section)." *Water* 14, no. 17 (2022): 2602. https://doi.org/10.3390/w14172602