Widespread use of traditional techniques by local people for hunting the yellow-footed tortoise (*Chelonoidis denticulatus*) across the Amazon

Aline Santos Tavares[1,2], Pedro Mayor[3,4,5,6], Luiz Loureiro[1], Michael P. Gilmore[7], Pedro Perez-Peña[8], Mark Bowler[9,] Lísley Pereira Lemos[1,10], Magdalena S. Svensson[11], K. Anna Isola Nekaris[11], Vincent Nijman[11], João Valsecchi[1,5,10], Thais Queiroz Morcatty[1,10,11]*

[1] Instituto de Desenvolvimento Sustentável Mamirauá, Estrada do Bexiga, 2584, 69553-225, Tefé, Amazonas Brazil.

[2] Laboratório de Ecologia de Peixes, Departamento de Genética, Ecologia e Evolução, Instituto de Ciências Biológicas, Universidade Federal de Minas Gerais, Brazil.

[3] Faculty of Veterinary, Department of Animal Health and Anatomy, Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona (UAB), Barcelona, Spain.

[4] Museo de Culturas Indígenas Amazónicas, Iquitos, Peru

[5] ComFauna, Comunidad de Manejo de Fauna Silvestre en la Amazonía y en Latinoamérica, Iquitos, Peru

[6] Postgraduate Program in Animal Health and Production in Amazonia, Federal Rural University of the Amazon (UFRA), Belém, Brazil

[7] School of Integrative Studies, George Mason University, Virginia, USA.

[8] Instituto de Investigaciones de la Amazonía Peruana - IIAP, Iquitos Peru.

[9] Suffolk Sustainability Institute, Waterfront Building, Neptune Quay, Ipswich, IP4 1QJ, UK.

[10] RedeFauna– Rede de Pesquisa para Estudos sobre Diversidade, Conservação e Uso da Fauna na Amazônia, Manaus, Amazonas, Brazil.

[11] Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, Oxford Brookes University, Oxford, OX3 0BP, UK.

*corresponding author: tatamorcatty@gmail.com

Abstract. Understanding the repertoire of hunting techniques used by traditional peoples in tropical forests is crucial for recognizing the role of traditional knowledge in hunting activities as well as assessing the impact of harvests on game species. We describe the hunting techniques used across Amazonia by Indigenous and non-Indigenous Peoples for hunting yellow-footed tortoises (*Chelonoidis denticulatus*), one of the most hunted species in the biome. We interviewed 178 local people in 25 communities living in seven study areas in the Peruvian and Brazilian Amazon, and used a Principal Coordinate Analysis (PCoA) and Analysis of Similarity (ANOSIM) to compare the hunting techniques among study areas and age of interviewees. Four different techniques were described; trapping with bait (47%; n=122) was the most cited and alleged to be the most cost-effective technique. Among the baits used, 93% involved the use of wild species as rotten meat. Hunting with dogs was also frequently cited (36%; n=92) and involved eight different dog-training strategies. The hunting techniques recorded were not significantly different among ethnic groups or generations. The consonance among the technique repertoire likely reflects a shared knowledge still in use across different cultural groups. There is a potential for applying the hunting techniques to large scale community-based monitoring and management programs, but the impact on additional species affected, such as species intentionally captured to be used as bait should be considered. Local assessments and community-based management plans that incorporate traditional ecological knowledge are recommended to guarantee the maintenance of livelihoods and ensure the species' conservation in Amazonia.

Keywords: chelonian, cross-culture comparison, traps, traditional ecological knowledge, wild meat.

Introduction

Rituals and cultural customary practices are underpinned by Traditional Ecological Knowledge (Berkes et al. 2000). This is particularly true of hunting practices which involve several techniques employed by local people to optimize harvest rates (Hames 1989). Hunting practices have been improved over generations through gradual development of TEK regarding population trends and behavior of target species as well as environmental dynamics (Barboza et al. 2014; Berkes et al. 2000). Therefore, techniques used for hunting and population management can be perceived as a feature of TEK (Ohmagari and Berkes 1997).

Documenting TEK associated with hunting techniques in tropical forests can contribute to the involvement of local knowledge and practices for the sustainable engagement with wildlife, both locally in community-based management programs and scaling them up to international conservation agendas (Chandler et al. 2017; Dobson et al. 2019; van Vliet et al. 2018). The international agreement intended to guide management of protected areas worldwide 'The Promise of Sydney', developed at the IUCN World Parks Congress 2014, already explicitly recommends the involvement of local people and their practices in the monitoring and management of natural resources (Sandwith et al. 2014).

Understanding and documenting TEK regarding hunting techniques can also help to improve scientific research methods. The lack of appropriate methods for capturing certain animal species hinders the collection of scientific data to support informed conservation strategies and decision-making. Since traditional techniques have evolved to maximize the harvest of animals with the least amount of effort possible, they can be useful to researchers during fieldwork. Studies on secretive species with low detectability can be especially benefited by this knowledge (Huntington 2000; El Bizri et al. 2016).

In order to include traditional hunting techniques in community-based management programs or in the development of novel scientific methods, it is crucial to understand changes in TEK (Álvares 1997; Berkes 2008; Menzies and Butler 2010). In the past several decades, for example, with increased access to modern tools, different cultures have abandoned traditional hunting techniques (Hames 1979; Mena et

al. 2000; Redford and Robinson 1987). In the Amazon, blowguns used to be the most popular technique for hunting arboreal prey, whereas spears were used for large terrestrial animals; currently, both techniques have been replaced by firearms (Mena at al. 2000). Such changes are particularly noticeable in younger generations that have distanced themselves from local traditions due to increased access to urban centers, presence of missionary activities, and establishment of a formal education system that does not value local knowledge (Ohmagari and Berkes 1997; Reyes-García et al. 2013). In some instances, the loss of traditional hunting knowledge can be the result of a perception that TEK does not effectively prepare young people to deal with the new socioeconomic realities and conditions they currently face (Reyes-García et al. 2013).

TEK related to hunting techniques and practices may also vary considerably among different cultures. For instance, hunting can be performed in solitary or group expeditions (Welch 2014). The time spent hunting and the financial resources needed for acquiring and maintaining hunting tools (such as shotguns or snares) are also critical correlates of adherence to a particular technique (Dobson et al. 2019). Local cosmology and taboos can also dictate techniques used or avoided during hunting; with avoidance being especially related to those techniques that may deplete stocks of target species (Colding and Folke 2001). Food preferences can influence target species and management practices as well (Berkes et al. 2000), which ultimately determine the hunting techniques developed and used.

In this study, we chose the yellow-footed tortoise (*Chelonoidis denticulatus*) as a model for better understanding how traditional hunting practices vary among different ethnic groups (Indigenous and non-Indigenous) and generations. Notably, this is one of the most commonly-hunted species across the Amazon for which no ammunition or weapon is required for its capture (Morcatty and Valsecchi 2015; Peres 2000; van Vliet et al. 2014), but the traditional knowledge associated with hunting this elusive and little-studied species is still poorly known and understood. We also discuss the hunting techniques in terms of possible impacts on other taxa, and their potential for improving scientific research methods.

Study Areas and Cultural Context

This study was conducted in seven locations in the Peruvian and Brazilian Amazon, totaling 25 communities sampled (Figure 1). Four locations are inhabited by Indigenous groups and three are inhabited by non-Indigenous people (Table 1). The non-Indigenous people interviewed are traditional Amazonian peoples, resulting from a mix of indigenous ethnicities and immigrant ancestry from different origins due to the processes of colonization of the Amazon. The communities sampled are located in or hunt within the territory of the following areas: (1) Pucacuro National Reserve (Pucacuro NR) (02°42'25"S 75°06'30"W) located on the Pucacuro River, Peru; (2) Pacaya-Samiria National Reserve (Pacaya-Samiria NR) (5°15'00''S 74°40'00''W), located at the confluence of the Marañón and Ucayali Rivers, Peru; (3) Maijuna-Kichwa Regional Conservation Area (Maijuna-Kichwa RCA) (3.1°S, 72.9°W), situated along the Sucusari River, Peru; (4) Yavarí-Mirín River basin (04°19'5''S, 71°57'33''W), Peru; (5) Amanã Sustainable Development Reserve (Amanã SDR) (01°54'00''S, 64°22'00''W), located between the Negro and Japurá Rivers, Brazil; (6) Mamirauá Sustainable Development Reserve (Mamirauá SDR) (03°08'S, 64°45'W), located at the confluence of the Solimões and Japurá Rivers, Brazil; and (7) Auatí-Paraná Extractive Reserve (Auatí-Paraná ER) (2°0'58"S, 66°25'10"W), located in the northern bank of the Auatí-Paraná River, Brazil. Further details of the sampled communities can be found in Table 1.

Apart from Mamirauá SDR and Pacaya-Samiria NR, which comprise exclusively white-water flooded forests, the study areas comprise upland forests, floodplain forests and swamps. Both Indigenous and non-Indigenous people interviewed maintain their habits intrinsically related to nature and rely on subsistence activities that include swidden-fallow agriculture, hunting, fishing, and the gathering of

various forest products. To generate income, community members may sell agricultural products, domesticated animals, a variety of non-timber forest products, and game meat.

Data collection

Between May 2014 and October 2015, we conducted interviews with a pre-set semi-structured questionnaire to 178 randomly selected heads of household, living in the 25 sampled communities (Table 1). When both men and women were available in the same household, we interviewed the man. We interviewed 131 men and 47 women. The interviewees' ages ranged between 18 and 77 years old (average = 44 years). In these interviews, we asked the interviewees the following questions: their age, whether they actively hunt tortoises, what hunting techniques they know or use for hunting tortoises, and what technique they consider to be the most efficient. We also asked the interviewees to describe the application of the techniques in the field. If any technique involved dogs, we asked what strategies they know or use to train dog to detect tortoises. If the technique involved baits, we asked what bait they know or use for capturing tortoises. When the bait mentioned involved animal products, although we did not ask whether they used it as sub-product of wild meat hunting or whether they killed animals specifically intended to use them as bait, we recorded this information accordingly. The species used as bait were taxonomically identified based on local names and cross-checked with the expected occurrence for the region according to taxonomic guides and specialists. In cases where the identification involved similar species occurring in sympatry, such as for sloth and some plant species, the most abundant taxon expected to occur in the region was considered.

Respondents were free to participate or leave the study at any stage; all visited household heads agreed to participate. All interviewees were provided with an Informed Consent Form detailing the project aims and guaranteeing that we would not disclose their identity. The study was approved by the Instituto Chico Mendes de Conservação da Biodiversidade (License SISBIO 40358-3) and the Committee on the

Ethical Use of Animals and Plants for Research of the Mamirauá Institute (Protocol no. 001/2011 and 010/2013).

Data Analysis

We used descriptive statistics to analyze the data on the use and efficiency of the different tortoise hunting techniques. We used a Principal Coordinate Analysis (PCoA) with Gower Similarity Coefficient and a posteriori Analysis of Similarity (ANOSIM) to assess the difference in the use of hunting techniques cited according to their cultural background (Indigenous *vs* non-Indigenous People), their ethnicity (non-Indigenous, Kichwa, Maijuna, Kukama-Kukamilla, and Yagua), and the interviewee age . For assessing whether there was a generational change on traditional knowledge of tortoise hunting techniques, we divided the age of interviewees into three classes: ≤ 29 years old, 30-49 years old, and ≥ 50 years old (hereafter generations) (Table 1). We used QGIS 2.18 for building the map and *vegan* R-package in R 3.5.1 software for all statistical analyses. The significance of the ANOSIM analysis was considered when $p < 0.05$, indicating that the probability of the result occurring by chance was less than 5%. We used QGIS 2.18 for building the map.

Results

Most Cited Hunting Techniques

Interviewees reported four different techniques used specifically for hunting tortoises in the Amazon: trapping with bait, hunting with dogs, active searching and visiting fruiting trees. Trapping with bait was the most frequently recorded, and the most frequently cited as the most efficient technique (n=122 and n=52, respectively); followed by hunting with dogs (n=92) and active searching (n=22; Figure 2). Trapping with bait and hunting with dogs were the most widespread techniques, cited by interviewees in

all localities and ethnicities sampled; while visiting fruiting trees was cited by all groups except Yaguas and Maijunas.

According to the interviewees, eight different types of dog-training were mentioned (Table 2). The most cited training technique was giving certain herbs to the dog to smell right before going hunting (34%, n=39). Some training techniques also incorporated timing with the phase of the moon (Table 2). Although not frequently cited, training may involve parts of other animals, such as ant nests, jaguar whiskers (*Panthera onca*), or a burned gold tegu lizard (*Tupinambis teguixin*).

The majority (n=129, 93%) of the 139 reports on baits employed in traps consisted of rotten meat, viscera, or other animal products. The remaining baits cited were fruits: yellow mombin (*Spondias mombin*; n=5), marirana (*Couepia* sp.; n=2), muru-muru (*Astrocaryum murumuru*; n=2) and peach palm (*Bactris gasipaes*; n=1). Many hunters (n=50) reported using by-products of animals hunted for consumption, such as skin and viscera as bait. A similar number of hunters (n=49) intentionally kill animals specifically to be used as bait; especially those not usually consumed by the local people (due to local taboo or taste preference) or with special characteristics that allow a longer decomposition time. By-products from white-lipped peccary (*Tayassu pecari*) was most commonly reported (n=8). Only a few hunters claimed to use tapir (*Tapirus terrestris*; n=3), deer (*Mazama gouazoubira* and *M. americana;* n=2), capybara (*Hydrochoerus hydrochaeris*; n=2), domestic poultry, agouti (*Dasyprocta* spp.), and tortoise (n=1) by-products as bait. Another 34 hunters reported using any hunting by-products and did not specify the species. Among those animals recorded as being killed intentionally for use as bait, the most commonly reported were caimans (65%; n=32); both the spectacled caiman (*Caiman crocodilus;* n=4) and the black caiman (*Melanosuchus niger;* n=3) were specified. A small number of hunters (n=12) reported killing primates as bait; when specified, the woolly monkey (*Lagothrix* spp.) was cited three times, while the large-headed capuchin monkey (*Sapajus macrocephalus*) and red howler monkey (*Alouatta seniculus*) were cited once each. Other species were also occasionally reported being

specifically killed for use as bait: snakes three times, and both the sloth (either *Bradypus variegatus* or *Choloepus* sp.) and southern tamandua (*Tamandua tetradactyla*) were cited once each. In addition to by-products of animals hunted for consumption and animals hunted intentionally for use as bait, fish was also reported as bait for tortoise hunting, though by fewer hunters (n=29). The species cited are often not prized for consumption, for example electric eels (Family Gymnotidae) and armored catfish (Family Loricariidae).

Most of the tortoise hunters (42 out of 46) said they hunt tortoises actively, while only four considered tortoise hunting as mainly opportunistic. The traditional knowledge associated with tortoise hunting did not differ among generations (Figure 3a; ANOSIM: r=0.015, p=0.16). In addition, we also observed great similarity between the hunting techniques mentioned among Indigenous ethnic groups and non-Indigenous people (Figure 3b-c; ANOSIM: r=0.0003, p=0.42).

Description of Hunting Techniques

According to our interviewees, 'trapping with bait' consists of going into the forest, hanging baits using ropes or fibers extracted from a tree trunk, and waiting for the smell of the bait to attract tortoises. It is also common to build a wooden corral around the bait or dig a hole in the ground below the hanging meat or fruit in which the tortoises may be caught. The trap can be checked a few hours or days later, depending on the size and type of the bait offered.

'Active searching' consists of the hunter walking through the forest looking for tortoises in micro-habitats commonly used by the species. For instance, hunters said they often search for tortoises under fallen trees, since tortoises spend considerable time in such shelters. During the peak of the dry season, hunters focus their search for tortoises in forest ponds; and during the peak of the flooding season, when in flooded forest, hunters look for tortoises on branches of the trees above the water. Hunters usually use their machete or a wooden branch as a tool for their search, in a way that they can reach shelters and dense

vegetation without risking contacting venomous animals, such as snakes. According to the interviewees, the tortoises are identified by the noise of the tool hitting the carapace.

The 'use of dogs' specialized in tortoise hunting, according to our interviewees, is always preceded by training (for more details see Table 2). There are several variations on the training across cultural background and locations; but they basically involve rubbing the dog's muzzle in, feeding the dog with, or encouraging the dog to play with different materials. Only after the training the dog is taken into the forest to hunt tortoises.

Finally, 'visiting fruiting trees' consists of identifying tree species tortoises prefer feeding on and anticipate its phenology. During fruiting periods, hunters go to those previously recorded trees and search a few meters around them. Tree species for which fruits were claimed to be consumed by tortoises were the yellow mombin (*S. mombin*), marirana (*Couepia* sp.), muru-muru (*A. murumuru*) and ambé vine (*Philodendron fragrantissimum*).

Discussion

Our findings showed that TEK related to tortoise hunting is largely shared among hunters from different ethnicities in the Peruvian and Brazilian Amazon. The similarities in the composition of hunting techniques among distinct ethnic background may have resulted from ancient or modern cultural co-evolution among the studied groups or multiple convergences on the same techniques (Migliano et al. 2020; Murray et al. 2006). Historically, throughout the Amazon basin, Indigenous Peoples were semi-nomadic and migrated long distances. Later, in the post-colonial period, vast numbers of rubber workers migrated to the Amazon and occupied indigenous territories (Alexiades 2009). Those pre- and post-colonial migrations and cumulative encounters among different groups promoted multiple opportunities for combination of different knowledge aiming at hunting improvement, which may have resulted in a

shared knowledge of hunting techniques (Migliano et al. 2020). Our study is consistent with such cultural crossover leading to communities with different cultural backgrounds and as far as 1,300 kilometers of linear distance can have the same hunting repertoire in Amazonia. However, some of the most common hunting techniques are also likely to be discovered independently. Hunters butcher large hunted mammals before transporting them, leaving viscera in the forest, which will subsequently attract tortoises. Hunters' observations of these unintentional experiences may lead to the adoption of baiting methodologies.

Although there has been reported a generational erosion regarding TEK in the Amazon (e.g. loss of ethnobotanical knowledge, Reyes-García et al. 2013), we did not find evidence of a change in TEK associated with tortoise hunting between generations in the studied localities. The techniques recorded require an understanding of tortoise distribution in the forest, with regards to slope, elevation and shelter (Tavares et al. 2019), tortoise feeding behavior, or the location and phenology of specific fruiting trees attractive to tortoises (Wang et al. 2011). However, all this TEK related to hunting techniques is not static, and future losses may still happen due to unpredictable environmental, social and economic pressures that local inhabitants are, and will be, continuously exposed (Álvares 1997; Berkes 2008; Menzies and Butler 2010).

We highlight the importance of considering the impacts of hunting not only on the species targeted for consumption, but also on other species harvested or affected by the hunting techniques. Two of the described techniques for hunting tortoises – trapping with bait and hunting with dogs – involve the use of other species, which has already led to conservation concerns by other researchers (Álvarez 1995). Meat from caimans (*M. niger* and *C. crocodilus*), together with Amazon river dolphins (*Inia geoffrensis*), are also traditionally used as bait for catfish (*Calophysus macropterus*) fishing in the Amazon (Brum et al. 2015); but in the case of the dolphin, the publicity of its use led to a temporary ban of the commercialization of the catfish in Brazil and Colombia due to possible impacts on dolphin populations (Asher 2018). Further research and monitoring should document the offtake of bait animals for hunting

tortoises. If a potential imperilment of any key species by use as bait is detected, rules at local or national level should be developed to avoid overexploitation. The impacts of each technique for hunting tortoise have to be contemplated in those plans, and local arrangements developed in order to promote the sustainability of hunting (e.g. for turtles Vieira et al. 2019).

TEK of Indigenous and non-indigenous peoples, when combined with scientific knowledge, can provide more efficient methods for faster and more reliable research on hunted species in tropical forests (El Bizri et al. 2016; Gadgil et al. 1993; Huntington 2000). Assessing population trends of tortoises, for instance, may guide decision-making for their management, but depends on locating tortoises readily and at a low cost in the field. Current tortoise survey methods, such as linear transects and active searching, have low capture rates (e.g. Guzmán and Stevenson 2008), which could be much improved by using baited traps inspired by the technique used by Amazonian people. The efficacy against conventional survey methods could be tested considering the particularities of the environment and the type of bait used. Given that the yellow-footed tortoise is currently listed as Vulnerable by the IUCN and threatened by overexploitation through most of its range (Morcatty and Valsecchi, 2015), and much of the information about its biology and ecology still comes from studies in captivity (Ferrara et al. 2017), this represents a valuable opportunity for the study of the species in the wild.

Turning trapping with bait into a standardized method may also facilitate the establishment of community-based population monitoring for assessing hunting sustainability (El Bizri et al. 2016; Gadgil et al. 1993; Huntington 2000). The fact that the people from different cultures are familiar with the method throughout the Amazon is a great opportunity. For instance, the widespread traditional fishing techniques for catching the giant arapaima fish (*Arapaima gigas*) have been incorporated into community-based monitoring methods for estimating their abundance and, ultimately, defining the fishing quotas for the species' consumption and commercial exploitation in the Amazon (Castello et al. 2009).

The overexploitation of yellow-footed tortoises in Amazonia is a conservation concern (Morcatty and Valsecchi, 2015). While the traditional methods of hunting them have been sustainable in the historical context of Amazonia, increasing road access and fragmentation, and increasing supply of wild meat to urban centers have increased pressure on wildlife populations (Espinosa et al. 2014; El Bizri et al. 2020). Incorporating TEK in its hunting management can be an alternative to propitiate more efficient and integrative strategies to conserve both wildlife and local peoples' livelihoods (Lertzman 2009). Apart from the Yavari-Mirín River basin, all sampled locations in our study are protected areas, which have, or are developing, management plans for the sustainable use of resources. Community management strategies developed by local people have sometimes included restrictions on the use of methods deemed too efficient by those communities (e.g. Berkes et al. 2000; Vieira et al. 2015). For example, Maijuna communities already restrict the use of *barbasco* fish poison, made from the roots of *Lonchocarpus* sp. (M. Gilmore and M. Bowler, personal observations). In other Amazonian regions, local rules also restrict hunting in mineral licks or using dogs in order to promote sustainable hunting (Montenegro 2004; Vieira et al. 2015; Vieira et al. 2019). Using such strategies to manage tortoise hunting will need to be combined with methods of monitoring tortoise populations, such as those we recommend, to ensure the persistence of this important source of nutrients and income, and to guarantee food sovereignty for Amazonian communities.

Scholarship Program, a program of the Wildlife Conservation Society, the Christensen Conservation Leaders Scholarship, and by the Wildlife Conservation Network Scholarship Program through the Sidney Byers Scholarship award.

References Cited

Alexiades, M. N. 2009. Mobility and Migration in Indigenous Amazonia: Contemporary Ethnoecological Perspectives-an Introduction. In *Mobility and Migration in Indigenous Amazonia: Contemporary Ethnoecological Perspectives*, edited by M.N. Alexiades, pp.1-43, Environmental Anthropology and Ethnobiology Series, Berghahn Books, Oxford, UK.

Álvarez, J. 1995. A previous unknown (and sad) form of exploitation of Black Caiman. *Crocodile Specialist Group Newsletter* 14:2.

Álvarez, J. 1997. Estado Actual de la Fauna Silvestre en la Propuesta Reserva Comunal del Pucacuro. In *Manejo de Fauna Silvestre en la Amazonía,* edited by T. En Fang, R.E. Bodmer, R. Aquino and M. H. Valqui, pp.93-103, UNAP-University of Floridaundp -GEF, La Paz.

Asher, C. 2018. Hunting, fishing causing dramatic decline in Amazon river dolphins. Mongabay. Available at: https://news.mongabay.com/2018/06/hunting-fishing-causing-dramatic-decline-in-amazon-river-dolphins. Accessed on May 13, 2020).

Barboza, R. S. L., M. S. L. Barboza, and J. C. B. Pezzuti. 2014. Estava Pescando de Malhadeira, Vi na Praia uns Cascos Brilhando, Era Luar, Abeirei a Terra e Fui Pegar: Práticas De Pesca De Quelônios Na Várzea Amazônica (Santarém-Pa). *Amazônica - Revista de Antropologia* 5:622. DOI:10.18542/amazonica.v5i3.1583.

Berkes, F., J. Colding, C. Folke, 2000. Rediscovery of Traditional Ecological Knowledge as adaptive management. *Ecological Applications* 10:1251-1262. DOI:10.1890/1051-0761(2000)010[1251:ROTEKA]2.0.CO;2.

Berkes F. 2008. La pesquería de pequeña escala: alternativas al manejo convencional de recursos. In *El Manejo de las Pesquerías en Ríos Tropicales de Sudamérica,* edited by: D. Pinedo and, C. Soria, pp. 443-459. Centro de Investigaciones para el Desarrollo. Otawa, Canadá.

Brum, S. M., V. M. F. da Silva, F. Rossoni, and L. Castello. 2015. Use of dolphins and caimans as bait for *Calophysus macropterus* (Lichtenstein, 1819) (Siluriforme: Pimelodidae) in the Amazon. *Journal of Applied Ichthyology* 31:675-680. DOI:10.1111/jai.12772.

Castello, L., J. P. Viana, G. Watkins, M. Pinedo-Vasquez, and V. A. Luzadis. 2009. Lessons from Integrating Fishers of Arapaima in Small-Scale Fisheries Management at the Mamirauá Reserve, Amazon. *Environmental Management* 43:197–209. DOI:10.1007/s00267-008-9220-5.

Colding, J., and C. Folke. 2001. Social taboos: "Invisible" systems of local resource management and biological conservation. *Ecological Applications* 11:584-600. DOI:10.1890/1051-0761(2001)011[0584:STISOL]2.0.CO;2.

Chandler, M., L. See, K. Copas, A. M. Z. Bonde, B. C. Lopez, F. Danielsen, J. K. Legind, S. Masinde, A. J. Miller-Rushing, G. Newman, A. Rosemartin, and E. Turak. 2017. Contribution of Citizen Science Towards International Biodiversity Monitoring. *Biological Conservation* 213:280-294. DOI:10.1016/j.biocon.2016.09.004.

Vieira, M. A. R. M., E. M. Muhlen, and G. H. Shepard. 2015. Participatory Monitoring and Management of Subsistence Hunting in the Piagaçu-Purus reserve, Brazil. *Conservation and Society* 13: 254–264. DOI:10.4103/0972-4923.170399

Vieira, M.A.R. M., F. de Castro, and G.H. Shepard. 2019. Who Sets the Rules? Institutional Misfits and Bricolage in Hunting Management in Brazil. *Human Ecology* 47:369–380. DOI:0.1007/s10745-019-00080-0.

Dobson, A. D. M., E. J. Milner-Gulland, D. J. Ingram, and A. Keane. 2019. Framework for Assessing Impacts of Wild Meat Hunting Practices in the Tropics. *Human Ecology* 47:449–464. DOI:10.1007/s10745-019-0075-6.

El Bizri, H. R., Morcatty, T. Q., Valsecchi, J., Mayor, P., Ribeiro, J. E., Vasconcelos Neto, C. F., Oliveira, J. S., Furtado, K. M., Ferreira, U. C., Miranda, C. F., Silva, C. H., Lopes, V. L., Lopes, G. P., Florindo, C. C., Chagas, R. C., Nijman, V., and Fa, J. E. 2020. Urban Wild Meat Consumption and Trade in Central Amazonia. *Conservation Biology* 34(2):438-448. DOI:10.1111/cobi.13420

El Bizri, H. R., L. W. S. Araújo, W. S. Araújo, L. Maranhão, and J. Valsecchi. 2016. Turning the Game around for Conservation: Using Traditional Hunting Knowledge to Improve the Capture Efficiency of Amazon Lowland Pacas. *Wildlife Biology* 22:1–6. DOI:10.2981/wlb.00127.

Espinosa, S., L.C. Branch, and R.Cueva. 2014. Road development and the geography of hunting by an amazonian indigenous group: Consequences for wildlife conservation. *PLoS ONE* 9:1-21. DOI:10.1371/journal.pone.0114916.

Ferrara, C. R., C. K. Fagundes, T. Q. Morcatty, and R. C. Vogt. 2017. *Quelônios Amazônicos: Guia de Identificação e Distribuição*. Wildlife Conservation Society.

Gadgil, M., F. Berkes, and C. Folke. 1993. Indigenous Knowledge for Biodiversity Conservation. *Ambio* 22:151–56. DOI:10.2307/4314060.

Guzmán, A. and P. Stevenson. 2008. Seed dispersal, habitat selection and movement patterns in the Amazonian tortoise, *Geochelone denticulata*. *Amphibia-Reptilia* 29:463-472. DOI:10.1163/156853808786230442.

Hames, R. 1979. A comparison of the efficiencies of the shotgun and the bow in neotropical forest hunting. Human Ecology 7:219-252. DOI:10.1007/BF00889493.

Hames, R. 1989. Time, efficiency, and fitness in the Amazonian protein quest. *Research in Economic Anthropology* 11:43-85.

Huntington, H. P. 2000. Using Traditional Ecological Knowledge in Science: Methods and Applications. *Ecological Applications* 10:1270-1274. DOI:10.1890/1051-0761(2000)010[1270:UTEKIS]2.0.CO;2.

IUCN. 2019. The IUCN Red List of Threatened Species. Version 2019-2. [web page] URL: http://www.iucnredlist.org.

Lertzman, K. 2009. The Paradigm of Management, Management Systems, and Resource Stewardship.mattos*Journal of Ethnobiology* 29:339-359. DOI:10.2993/0278-0771-29.2.339.

Mena, V.P., J.R. Stallings, J.B. Regalado, and R.L. Cueva, 2000. The sustainability of current hunting practices by the Huaorani. In *Hunting for sustainability in Tropical Forests,* edited by J.G. Robinson, and E.Bennett, pp.57-78. Columbia University Press, New York, USA.

Menzies C. R. and C. Butler. 2010. Understanding Ecological Knowledge. *Traditional Ecological Knowledge and Resource Management* 1–272.

Migliano, A. B., F. Battiston, S. Viguier, A. E., Page, M. Dyble, R. Schlaepfer, D. Smith, L. Astete, M. Ngales, J. Gomez-Gardenes, V. Latora, and L. Vinicius. 2020. Hunter-Gatherer Multilevel Sociality Accelerates Cumulative Cultural Evolution. *Science Advances* 6:eaax5913. https://doi.org/10.1126/sciadv.aax5913.

Montenegro, O. 2004. Natural licks are keystone resources for wildlife and people in Amazonia. Doctoral Dissertation, University of Florida, Florida, United States. Available at: http://etd.fcla.edu/UF/UFE0008440/montenegro_o.pdf.

Morcatty, T. Q. and J. Valsecchi. 2015. Social, Biological, and Environmental Drivers of the Hunting and Trade of the Endangered Yellow-Footed Tortoise in the Amazon. *Ecology and Society* 20:3. DOI:10.5751/ES-07701-200303.

Murray, G., B. Neis, and J.P. Johnsen. 2006. Lessons Learned from Reconstructing Interactions Between Local Ecological Knowledge, Fisheries Science, and Fisheries Management in the Commercial Fisheries of Newfoundland and Labrador, Canada. *Human Ecology* 34:549–571. DOI:10.1007/s10745-006-9010-8.

Ohmagari, K. and F. Berkes. 1997. Transmission of Indigenous Knowledge and Bush Skills among the Western James Bay Cree Women of Subarctic Canada. *Human Ecology* 25:197–222. DOI:10.1023/A:1021922105740.

Peres, C.A. 2000. Effects of Subsistence Hunting on Vertebrate Community Structure in Amazonian Forests. *Conservation Biology* 14:240–53. DOI:10.1046/j.1523-1739.2000.98485.x.

Redford, K. H. and J. G. Robinson. 1987. The Game of Choice: Patterns of Indian and Colonist Hunting in the Neotropics. *American Anthropologist* 89:650–67. DOI:10.1525/aa.1987.89.3.02a00070.

Reyes-García, V., M. Guèze, A.C. Luz, J. Paneque-Gálvez, M. J. Macía, M. Orta-Martínez, J. Pino, and X. Rubio-Campillo. 2013. Evidence of Traditional Knowledge Loss among a Contemporary Indigenous Society. *Evolution and Human Behavior* 34:249–57. DOI:10.1016/j.evolhumbehav.2013.03.002.

Sandwith, T., E. Enkerlin, K. MacKinnon, D. Allen, A. Andrade, T. Badman, T. Brooks, P. Bueno, K. Campbell, J. Ervin, D. Laffoley, T. Hay-Edie, M. Hockings, S. Johansson, K. Keenleyside, P. Langhammer, E. Mueller, T. Smith, M. Vierros, L. Welling, and S. Woodley. 2014.The Promise of Sydney: an editorial essay. *Parks: The International Journal for Protected Area Managers* 20.1:7–18. DOI:10.2305/IUCN.CH.2014.PARKS-20-1.TS.en.

Tavares, A. S., T. Q. Morcatty, J. Zuanon, and W. E. Magnusson. 2019. Influence of Body Size, Topography, Food Availability and Tree-Fall Gaps on Space Use by Yellow-Footed Tortoises (*Chelonoidis Denticulatus*) in Central Amazonia. *PLoS ONE* 14:1–18. DOI:10.1371/journal.pone.0211869.

Van Vliet, N., M.Q. Mesa, D. Cruz-Antia, L.N. Aquino, J. Moreno, and R. Nasi. 2014. The uncovered volumes of bushmeat commercializedin the amazonian trifrontier between Colombia, Peru & Brazil. *Ethnobiology and Conservation* 3:1-11. DOI:10.15451/ec2014-11-3.7-1-11.

van Vliet, N., L. L'haridon, J. Gomez, L. Vanegas, F. Sandrin, and R. Nasi. 2018. The Use of Traditional Ecological Knowledge in the Context of Participatory Wildlife Management: Examples from Indigenous Communities in Puerto Nariño, Amazonas-Colombia. In *Ethnozoology Animals in Our Lives*, edited by: R.R.N. Alves, U. P. Albuquerque, pp. 497-512. Academic Press, Cambridge, MA.

Wang, E., C. I. Donatti, V. L. Ferreira, J. Raizer and J. Himmelstein. 2011. Food Habits and Notes on the Biology of Chelonoidis Carbonaria (Spix 1824) (Testudinidae, Chelonia) in the Southern Pantanal, Brazil. *South American Journal of Herpetology* 6:11–19. DOI:10.2994/057.006.0102.

Welch, J. R. 2014. Xavante Ritual Hunting: Anthropogenic Fire, Reciprocity, and Collective Landscape Management in the Brazilian Cerrado. *Human Ecology* 42:47–59. DOI:10.1007/s10745-013-9637-1.