

# JCU ePrints

This file is part of the following reference:

**Moore, Leslie Allan (2010) *Niche differentiation, rarity, and commonness in the sympatric Australian white-tailed rats: *Uromys caudimaculatus* and *Uromys hadrourus**. PhD thesis, James Cook University.**

Access to this file is available from:

<http://eprints.jcu.edu.au/17434>



**NICHE DIFFERENTIATION, RARITY, AND COMMONNESS IN  
THE SYMPATRIC AUSTRALIAN WHITE-TAILED RATS:  
*UROMYS CAUDIMACULATUS* AND *UROMYS HADROURUS***

**Thesis submitted by**

**Leslie Allan MOORE**

**March 2010**

**Thesis submitted  
for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy  
School of Marine and Tropical Biology,  
James Cook University  
North Queensland**

**STATEMENT OF ACCESS**

I, the undersigned, the author of this thesis, understand that the following restriction placed by me on access to this thesis will not extend beyond three years from the date on which the thesis is submitted to the University. I understand that James Cook University will make it available for use within the University Library and, by microfilm or other means, allow access to users in other approved libraries. All users consulting this thesis will have to sign the following statement:

In consulting this thesis I agree not to copy or closely paraphrase it in whole or part without written consent of the author; and to make proper written acknowledgement for any assistance which I have obtained from it.

.....

Leslie Allan MOORE

.....

Date

**STATEMENT ON SOURCES****DECLARATION**

I declare that this thesis is my own work and has not been submitted in any form for another degree or diploma at any university or other institution of tertiary education. Information derived from the published work of others has been acknowledged in the text and a list of references is given.

.....

Leslie Allan MOORE

.....

Date

## ABSTRACT

A major problem in characterising rarity traits is that rare species are less studied than common species. Consequently, little is known about their distribution, ecology, demography, or behaviour, and their categorisation as rare may simply be a result of scarcity of data. In particular, there is a lack of comparative studies of closely-related rare and common species, an issue addressed by this thesis. My research investigated niche differentiation, rarity, and commonness in two sympatric species of rainforest rodents in the genus *Uromys*, one of which is common while the other is extremely rare, and endeavoured to provide insights into why this is so. This is an increasingly important question as continuing habitat destruction, fragmentation, and over-exploitation threaten the existence of many rare species and significantly decrease populations of what were once common species. The primary aim of the thesis is to clarify the ecological characteristics that make a species more prone to rareness and thus vulnerable to extinction. Prior to this study little was known of the ecology of the rare Pygmy White-tailed Rat *Uromys hadrourus* and, surprisingly, only basic distribution and population data was available for its sister species the common Giant White-tailed Rat *Uromys caudimaculatus*. To obtain the data necessary to facilitate an ecological comparison of the two species, a capture-mark-recapture program was conducted. Using the results from this study, niche differentiation analyses were used to compare the ecological and behavioural traits of the two *Uromys* species. The characteristics recognised in the literature as potentially predisposing a species to rarity were examined in light of the niche analyses.

### **Niche differentiation**

There is significant niche differentiation between *Uromys caudimaculatus* and *U. hadrourus* but the two species do not appear to occupy completely independent ecological niches. There is overlap in diet with *U. hadrourus* exploiting some of the softer large-fruited seeds also utilised by *U. caudimaculatus*. However, the larger size and strong jaws of *U. caudimaculatus* enable the species to exploit hard-seeded rainforest fruits inaccessible to other rainforest rodents, including *U. hadrourus*. Both species feed on insects by tearing open decomposing logs and stumps; they also chew the bark of tree buttresses to feed on the sap weeping from the fresh edges of the scars. However, a significant part of the diet of *U. hadrourus* was obtained from aerial tree roots, a dietary resource not utilised by *U. caudimaculatus*. Aerial roots primarily occurred on the lower trunks of trees located on the densely vegetated lower slopes,

along streams and gullies, and in the wetter areas of the forest. The ability to climb is a significant niche difference between the two *Uromys* species. The scansorial ability of *U. caudimaculatus* allows it to access resources in the tree canopy (food and refuges/nesting sites) that are unavailable to the terrestrial *U. hadrourus*. However, the structure of the hind foot indicates that *U. hadrourus* was almost certainly scansorial at some stage of its evolution.

Differences in body size are also significant. *Uromys caudimaculatus* is one of the largest species in the genus with a mean body weight three times that of *U. hadrourus*, the smallest representative of the genus. The larger body size of *U. caudimaculatus* brings with it a number of ecological advantages; fewer predators and competitors and the ability to easily break into hard seeds inaccessible to other small mammals. The smaller size of *U. hadrourus* makes it more vulnerable to predation than the larger *U. caudimaculatus*. Further niche differentiation was evident in the habitat utilised by *U. caudimaculatus*, which did most of its foraging in the abundant open-understorey forest. In contrast, *U. hadrourus* was only recorded in the spatially rare and densely-vegetated forest occurring on the lower slopes, along gullies, and 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> order streams.

Differences in behaviour may also play a part in niche differentiation with indications that *U. hadrourus* is more sedentary than *U. caudimaculatus* and that the breeding season of *U. caudimaculatus* may be longer with juveniles dispersing away from the natal area more quickly than juvenile *U. hadrourus*.

### **Rarity Characteristics**

Of the nine ecological variables examined, three were identified as characterising natural rarity in the small mammal assemblage. These comprised habitat specificity, low dispersal ability, and specialism. While it is difficult to determine whether any one of these three characteristics is a precursor of, or makes a greater contribution to species' rarity, it is more probable that natural rarity depends on a 'flexible' amalgam of the three traits. Although possibly an important *cause* of rarity in some species, it is equally plausible that specialism may evolve as a *consequence* of rarity. It is also likely that abundance and habitat specificity are strongly regulated by energy (resource) requirements and availability, varying with individual species' ecology and life-history traits. Dispersal ability is fundamentally interrelated with both habitat specificity and specialism and there are indications that it plays an important role in the maintenance of rarity in this north Queensland assemblage of rainforest small mammals. There

were significantly negative associations between three sets of variables: (1) *Abundance - Body Size*; (2) *Habitat - Body Size*; and (3) *Specialism Index - Body Size*, indicating body size has little to do with population density, habitat specificity, or the degree of specialism in this small mammal assemblage.

Predation risk is an unknown factor in habitat specificity-dispersal-specialism characteristics of rare species, but there is ample evidence that predation can force changes in species' habitat use. Animals commonly choose among habitats that differ both in foraging return and mortality hazard, and strong predator pressure has been shown to account for low abundance and small range size of many species. Using the two *Uromys* as examples of this model, the larger *U. caudimaculatus*, being less at risk of predation, may have chosen to forage in habitat which maximises its foraging gain; while the smaller and more vulnerable *U. hadrourus* may have forgone the benefits of increased foraging gain in favour of reducing predation levels by using less risky habitat.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Going back to university as a mature student is a brave and difficult undertaking, particularly in the sciences. The hordes of bright young faces seated in lecture theatres, all with few wrinkles and possessing a seemingly natural ownership of the learning environment, is a daunting experience. The strength or otherwise of ones self image and worth is sorely tested, particularly given the almost miraculous transition from a previously secure position of held knowledge and respect to that of a 'lowly' student with no former identity or knowledge worth knowing. Of course there are also the financial and emotional burdens of trying to study full-time while supporting your family and adapting to the absence of a predictable salary, and the persistent companionship of stress and overwork. In these latter difficulties, at least, a mature student is not alone, as this world has been the domain of university students for aeons.

I owe thanks to my wife Nicole and son Nicholas who put up with a constantly tired and sweaty husband-Dad covered in rat and leech bites; Chris Johnson and David Blair who were my supportive supervisors; Diane Bailey in JCU Administration who was always ready to assist when problems arose; and the 'Alans' of the School Stores and Purchasing Section who never tired of giving advice and service. My gratitude goes to John Winter for his support for my work and the generous way he provided me with references and other important material. Thanks also go to Steve Williams who kindly allowed me to use his predictive distribution mapping of the Australian *Uromys*. My sincere thanks also go to my two reviewers who made many comments and suggestions and in doing so helped me produce a better thesis.

This PhD project was supported by an Australian Postgraduate Research Award for three and a half years. The School of Marine and Tropical Biology of the James Cook University supported me with finance and field equipment for which they have my grateful thanks. All research procedures reported in this thesis received the approval of the James Cook University Ethics Committee (Permit No: A897\_04) and were carried out under the conditions outlined in Queensland Parks and Wildlife Scientific Permits WISP04634307 and WITK04557907.

---

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**


---

<b>ABSTRACT</b>		<b>iv</b>
<b>ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS</b>		<b>vii</b>
<b>CHAPTER 1.</b>	<b>INTRODUCTION AND AIMS OF STUDY</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1	Origins of Australian rodents.....	4
	1.1.1 Mosaic-tailed Rats .....	5
	1.1.2 Distribution and taxonomy of the Genus <i>Uromys</i> .....	6
1.2	Study species.....	10
	1.2.1 Giant White-tailed Rat <i>Uromys caudimaculatus</i> .....	10
	1.2.2 Pygmy White-tailed Rat <i>Uromys hadrourus</i> .....	14
1.3	Previous small mammal studies in north Queensland.....	20
1.4	Aims of this study.....	22
1.5	Diversity and abundance of sympatric species.....	23
	1.5.1 Ecological niche concept and niche differentiation.....	24
	1.5.2 Types of niche differentiation.....	26
	1.5.3 Field studies of niche differentiation in sympatric species.....	29
	1.5.4 Discussion of niches.....	33
	1.5.5 Unified neutral theory of biodiversity and biogeography.....	34
1.6	Rarity and Commonness.....	38
	1.6.1 The definition and characterisation of rarity.....	38
	1.6.2 Discussion of rarity and commonness.....	50
1.7	Structure of thesis.....	52
<b>CHAPTER 2.</b>	<b>STUDY AREA AND METHODS</b>	<b>55</b>
2.1	Study area.....	55

2.2	Study grids.....	57
	2.2.1 Vegetation.....	59
	2.2.2 Climate.....	61
2.3	General methods.....	62
2.4	Sampling Design.....	64
	2.4.1 Trapping grid format.....	64
2.5	Identification of study species.....	66
2.6	Animal handling and measurements.....	73
	2.6.1 Criteria for aging small mammals.....	73
	2.6.2 Reproductive condition criteria.....	76
2.7	Spooling and radio tracking.....	77
2.8	Diet assessment.....	79
2.9	Habitat mapping.....	80
2.10	Cyclone damage.....	82
2.11	Sampling effort in main habitat types.....	82
	2.11.1 Cage traps.....	83
	2.11.2 Elliot traps.....	83
2.12	Statistical analyses.....	84
	2.12.1 Analysis of species diversity and richness.....	84
	2.12.2 Adequacy of sample effort.....	86
	2.12.3 Rarefaction and Sample Interpolation.....	87
2.13	Capture-Mark-Recapture (CMR).....	87
	2.13.1 Open populations – Full Jolly-Seber Method.....	88
	2.13.2 Open populations – Constant probability of capture.....	89
	2.13.3 Closed population models.....	90
	2.13.4 Tests for equal catchability.....	91
	2.13.5 Estimating population densities.....	92
	2.13.6 Mean grid movement index (MGMI).....	94
<b>CHAPTER 3.</b>	<b>TRAPPING RESULTS AND SPECIES DIVERSITY</b>	<b>95</b>
3.1	Overall results of live-trapping study.....	95
3.2	Results of grid trapping.....	99
	3.2.1 Small mammal captures and seasonal trends.....	99

	3.2.2	Grid capture rates.....	101
	3.2.3	Trapping session differences.....	102
	3.2.4	Trap success.....	102
3.3		Species diversity, richness, and, abundance.....	102
	3.3.1	Species diversity.....	104
	3.3.2	Species richness.....	104
	3.3.3	Grid differences and similarities.....	105
	3.3.4	Comparison of diversity with other NQ studies.....	107
	3.3.5	Summary.....	111
<b>CHAPTER 4. SMALL MAMMAL POPULATION DYNAMICS</b>			<b>113</b>
4.1		Northern Bush Rat <i>Rattus fuscipes coracius</i> .....	113
	4.1.1	Grid captures.....	113
	4.1.2	Population density.....	115
	4.1.3	Adult body weights.....	115
	4.1.4	Breeding.....	116
	4.1.5	Annual population demography.....	118
	4.1.6	Mean minimum age (longevity).....	119
	4.1.7	Capture-Mark-Recapture analysis (CMR).....	120
4.2		Cape York Rat <i>Rattus leucopus cooktownensis</i> .....	122
	4.2.1	Population density.....	123
	4.2.2	Adult body weights.....	124
	4.2.3	Breeding.....	124
	4.2.4	Annual population demography.....	125
	4.2.5	Mean minimum age (longevity).....	125
	4.2.6	Capture-Mark-Recapture analysis (CMR).....	125
4.3		Fawn-footed Melomys <i>Melomys cervinipes</i> .....	126
	4.3.1	Population density.....	127
	4.3.2	Adult body weights.....	128
	4.3.3	Breeding.....	129
	4.3.4	Annual population demography .....	130
	4.3.5	Capture-Mark-Recapture (CMR).....	131
	4.3.6	Mean minimum age (longevity) .....	133

4.4	Musky Rat-kangaroo <i>Hypsiprymnodon moschatus</i> .....	133
	4.4.1 Population density.....	134
	4.4.2 Adult body weights.....	135
	4.4.3 Breeding.....	136
	4.4.4 Annual population demography.....	137
	4.4.5 Mean minimum age (longevity).....	138
	4.4.6 Capture-Mark-Recapture analysis (CMR).....	138
4.5	Other species.....	140
	4.5.1 Rusty Antechinus <i>Antechinus adustus</i> .....	140
	4.5.2 Atherton Antechinus <i>Antechinus godmani</i> .....	142
	4.5.3 Yellow-footed Antechinus <i>Antechinus flavipes</i> .....	146
	4.5.4 Long-nosed Bandicoot <i>Perameles nasuta</i> .....	147
	4.5.5 Northern Brown Bandicoot <i>Isodon macrourus</i> .....	147
	4.5.6 Long-tailed Pygmy-possum <i>Cercartetus caudatus</i> .....	147
	4.5.7 Tree Mouse <i>Pogonomys sp.</i> .....	147
	4.5.8 Grassland Melomys <i>Melomys burtoni</i> .....	148
	4.5.9 House Mouse <i>Mus musculus</i> .....	148
4.6	Habitat preferences of small mammal assemblage.....	148
	4.6.1 Species-habitat inter-relationships .....	151
4.7	Abundance versus Biomass.....	154
4.8	Comparison with other studies.....	157
	4.8.1 Summary.....	164
<b>CHAPTER 5.</b>	<b>ECOLOGY AND POPULATION DYNAMICS OF THE GIANT WHITE-TAILED RAT <i>UROMYS CAUDIMACULATUS</i></b>	<b>166</b>
5.1	Trapping results.....	166
	5.1.1 Grid captures.....	166
	5.1.2 Population density.....	169
	5.1.3 Capture-Mark-Recapture analysis (CMR).....	170
	5.1.4 Body size.....	172
	5.1.5 Young.....	173
	5.1.6 Breeding.....	175
	5.1.7 Division between juveniles, subadults, and adults.....	176

	5.1.8 Annual population demography.....	177
	5.1.9 Diet.....	178
	5.1.10 Habitat use.....	181
	5.1.11 Spooling analysis.....	182
	5.1.12 Additional ecological data.....	183
	5.1.13 Discussion.....	186
<b>CHAPTER 6.</b>	<b>ECOLOGY AND POPULATION DYNAMICS OF THE PYGMY WHITE-TAILED RAT <i>UROMYS HADROURUS</i></b>	<b>189</b>
6.1	Trapping results.....	189
	6.1.1 Division between juveniles, subadults, and adult.....	190
	6.1.2 Grid captures.....	190
	6.1.3 Population density.....	192
	6.1.4 Capture-Mark-Recapture analysis (CMR).....	193
	6.1.5 Annual population demography.....	195
	6.1.6 Body size.....	196
	6.1.7 Spooling analysis.....	198
	6.1.8 Breeding.....	202
	6.1.9 Young.....	206
	6.1.10 Diet.....	208
	6.1.11 Feeding platforms.....	214
	6.1.12 Refuges and nest hollows.....	215
	6.1.13 Home range marking.....	218
	6.1.14 Habitat use.....	224
	6.1.15 Additional ecological data.....	229
6.2	Discussion.....	232
<b>CHAPTER 7.</b>	<b>NICHE DIFFERENTIATION IN THE AUSTRALIAN <i>UROMYS</i></b>	<b>234</b>
7.1	Niche differentiation.....	234
	7.1.1 Abundance, density, population size, body size, and biomass..	234
	7.1.2 Foraging behaviour.....	237
	7.1.3 Summary of pes morphology comparisons.....	243
	7.1.4 Microhabitat preferences of the two <i>Uromys</i> sp.....	245
	7.1.5 Comparison of habitat preference with coexisting assemblage	248

	7.1.6 Mobility (MGMI).....	251
	7.1.7 Breeding cycles.....	251
	7.1.8 Parental Care and juvenile growth rates.....	253
	7.1.9 Population demography.....	253
	7.1.10 Diet.....	256
	7.1.11 Behaviour.....	256
	7.1.12 Mean minimum age (longevity).....	257
	7.1.13 Predation.....	257
7.2	Discussion.....	257
	7.2.1 Comments.....	260
<b>CHAPTER 8.</b>	<b>CHARACTERISTICS OF RARE AND COMMON MANMAL SPECIES</b>	<b>262</b>
8.1	Rarity characteristics at a species level.....	262
	8.1.1 Abundance.....	262
	8.1.2 Geographic range size.....	263
	8.1.3 Habitat specificity.....	265
	8.1.4 Specialism (Microhabitat preferences).....	266
	8.1.5 Categorisation of rarity - Rabinowitz <i>et al.</i> 1986.....	268
	8.1.6 Dispersal ability.....	269
	8.1.7 Resource usage index (RUI).....	272
	8.1.8 Reproductive investment.....	274
	8.1.9 Competitive ability.....	275
	8.1.10 Body size.....	275
8.2	Discussion.....	276
	8.2.1 Rarity categorisation of mammal assemblage.....	276
	8.2.2 Relationships between ecological variables .....	276
	8.2.3 What ecological variables best characterised rare species.....	280
	8.2.4 What ecological variables best characterised common species	282
<b>CHAPTER 9.</b>	<b>CONCLUSION</b>	<b>285</b>
	<b>REFERENCES</b>	<b>291</b>

## APPENDIX 1

	Detailed pes morphology of north Queensland rodents	329
	<b>LIST OF FIGURES</b>	
Figure 1.1	Phylogeny of <i>Uromys</i> by Groves and Flannery (1994).....	7
Figure 1.2	Distribution of <i>Uromys</i> in Australasia (Groves & Flannery 1994).....	8
Figure 1.3	Size comparisons of genus <i>Uromys</i> .....	9
Figure 1.4	Adult female <i>Uromys caudimaculatus caudimaculatus</i> .....	11
Figure 1.5	Predicted distribution of <i>Uromys caudimaculatus</i> (Williams 2006).....	12
Figure 1.6	Adult female <i>Uromys hadrourus</i> .....	16
Figure 1.7	Predicted distribution of <i>Uromys hadrourus</i> (Williams 2006).....	17
Figure 1.8	Pes colouration of <i>Uromys hadrourus</i>	18
Figure 2.1	Location of study area.....	56
Figure 2.2	Location of trapping grids.....	58
Figure 2.3	Vegetation types in study area (Stanton and Stanton 2006).....	59
Figure 2.4	Examples of vegetation and landscapes on trapping grids.....	60
Figure 2.5	Study area rainfall 2004-2006.....	62
Figure 2.6	Pre-cyclone vegetation on study grids (December 2005).....	63
Figure 2.7	Cyclone damage on study grids (March 2006) .....	63
Figure 2.8	Trapping grid format.....	65
Figure 2.9	Comparison of juvenile <i>Uromys caudimaculatus</i> and <i>U. hadrourus</i> ....	68
Figure 2.10	Study area rodents.....	69
Figure 2.11	Study area marsupials (1).....	70
Figure 2.12	Study area marsupials (2) ( <i>Antechinus</i> ).....	71
Figure 2.13	Spoiled <i>Uromys hadrourus</i> waiting release.....	79
Figure 2.14a-c	Broad vegetation types on grids.....	81
Figure 2.15	Trapping grid showing the effective trapping area ( <i>W</i> ).....	93
Figure 3.1	Species composition of mammal assemblage.....	97
Figure 3.2	Session captures at Grid 3 showing species and trap-day data.....	100
Figure 3.3	Mean and SE of mammal captures per trapping session.....	101
Figure 3.4	Shannon Weiner species accumulation curves for individual grids.....	104

Figure 3.5	Species accumulation based on number of trapping grids.....	105
Figure 3.6	Bray-Curtis similarity dendrogram.....	107
Figure 4.1	<i>Rattus fuscipes</i> grid captures by trapping session.....	114
Figure 4.2	<i>Rattus fuscipes</i> mean trapping session captures ( $\pm$ SE).....	114
Figure 4.3	<i>Rattus fuscipes</i> mean trapping session weights.....	116
Figure 4.4	<i>Rattus fuscipes</i> annual breeding cycle.....	117
Figure 4.5	<i>Rattus fuscipes</i> annual population demography.....	118
Figure 4.6	<i>Rattus fuscipes</i> minimum age analysis.....	119
Figure 4.7	<i>Rattus leucopus</i> captures per 100 trapnights .....	123
Figure 4.8	<i>Rattus leucopus</i> breeding observations.....	124
Figure 4.9	<i>Rattus leucopus</i> annual population demography.....	125
Figure 4.10	<i>Melomys cervinipes</i> grid captures per trapping session.....	126
Figure 4.11	<i>Melomys cervinipes</i> trapping session captures.....	127
Figure 4.12	<i>Melomys cervinipes</i> trapping session weights.....	129
Figure 4.13	<i>Melomys cervinipes</i> annual breeding cycle.....	130
Figure 4.14	<i>Melomys cervinipes</i> annual population demography.....	131
Figure 4.15	<i>Hypsiprymnodon moschatus</i> trapping session capture means.....	134
Figure 4.16	<i>Hypsiprymnodon moschatus</i> male and female captures.....	136
Figure 4.17	<i>Hypsiprymnodon moschatus</i> annual breeding cycle .....	137
Figure 4.18	<i>Antechinus adustus</i> trapping session captures.....	141
Figure 4.19	<i>Antechinus adustus</i> annual breeding cycle.....	142
Figure 4.20	<i>Antechinus godmani</i> trapping session captures.....	143
Figure 4.21	<i>Antechinus godmani</i> monthly variation in weight.....	144
Figure 4.22	<i>Antechinus godmani</i> weight changes March to June.....	145
Figure 4.23	<i>Antechinus godmani</i> annual breeding cycle.....	146
Figure 4.24	Trapping session biomass of captured mammal species.....	156
Figure 4.25	Locations of study sites for Laurance (1994) and Moore (2009).....	159
Figure 4.26	Comparison of 'gridlet' trapping and 'wide-grid' trapping formats.....	161
Figure 5.1	<i>Uromys caudimaculatus</i> trapping session captures on grids.....	168
Figure 5.2	<i>Uromys caudimaculatus</i> mean & SE trapping session captures.....	169
Figure 5.3	<i>Uromys caudimaculatus</i> juvenile growth rate regression.....	175
Figure 5.4	<i>Uromys caudimaculatus</i> annual breeding cycle.....	176
Figure 5.5	<i>Uromys caudimaculatus</i> annual population demography.....	178

Figure 5.6	<i>Uromys caudimaculatus</i> – example of bark chewing.....	180
Figure 5.7	<i>Uromys caudimaculatus</i> tree hollow.....	183
Figure 5.8	<i>Uromys caudimaculatus</i> – distances moved between trap locations...	185
Figure 6.1	<i>Uromys hadrourus</i> trapping session grid captures.....	191
Figure 6.2	<i>Uromys hadrourus</i> annual population demography.....	195
Figure 6.3	<i>Uromys hadrourus</i> frequency histogram of weights.....	196
Figure 6.4	<i>Uromys hadrourus</i> spooling at Grid 3.....	200
Figure 6.5	<i>Uromys hadrourus</i> annual breeding cycle.....	203
Figure 6.6	Movements of spooled adult <i>Uromys hadrourus</i> 7 September 2005...	204
Figure 6.7	Spooling showing <i>Uromys hadrourus</i> male-female interaction.....	205
Figure 6.8	Territory marking by <i>Uromys hadrourus</i> family party.....	207
Figure 6.9	<i>Uromys hadrourus</i> diet – fruit and fungi.....	211
Figure 6.10	<i>Uromys hadrourus</i> diet – bark and aerial root chewing.....	212
Figure 6.11	<i>Uromys hadrourus</i> diet – insect predation.....	213
Figure 6.12	<i>Uromys hadrourus</i> tree feeding platform.....	214
Figure 6.13	<i>Uromys hadrourus</i> – old fruit germinating in tree feeding platforms....	215
Figure 6.14	<i>Uromys hadrourus</i> den hollow at base of tree.....	216
Figure 6.15	<i>Uromys hadrourus</i> den hollow in buttress root.....	217
Figure 6.16	<i>Uromys hadrourus</i> den hollow in creek bank.....	217
Figure 6.17	<i>Uromys hadrourus</i> den hollow in tree trunk.....	218
Figure 6.18	<i>Uromys hadrourus</i> log territory marker .....	220
Figure 6.19	<i>Uromys hadrourus</i> shrub territory marker.....	221
Figure 6.20	<i>Uromys hadrourus</i> hard surface territory markers.....	222
Figure 6.21	<i>Uromys hadrourus</i> log crossing over creek.....	223
Figure 6.22	<i>Uromys hadrourus</i> drinking site in buttress hollow.....	224
Figure 6.23	<i>Uromys hadrourus</i> – Histogram of trap location Habitat by Grid.....	226
Figure 6.24	Typical <i>Uromys hadrourus</i> habitat at Grid 3 (pre-cyclone).....	227
Figure 6.25	Logs and dense understorey typify <i>Uromys hadrourus</i> habitat.....	227
Figure 6.26	<i>Uromys hadrourus</i> habitat on Thornton peak (Winter 1984).....	228
Figure 6.27	Trap location habitat for <i>Uromys hadrourus</i> & <i>Antechinus godmani</i> ....	229
Figure 7.1	<i>Uromys caudimaculatus</i> and <i>Uromys hadrourus</i> Jolly-Seber .....	235
Figure 7.2	Comparison of mean body weight for mammal assemblage.....	236
Figure 7.3	Comparison of rodent foot structures.....	240

Figure 7.4	Typical sitting posture of <i>Uromys hadrourus</i> .....	242
Figure 7.5	Habitat at trap locations for <i>U. caudimaculatus</i> and <i>U. hadrourus</i> .....	247
Figure 7.6	Comparison of distance of trap locations from nearest stream or gully	248
Figure 7.7	Boxplots of trap location habitat for the mammal assemblage	250
Figure 7.8	Comparison of <i>U. caudimaculatus</i> and <i>U. hadrourus</i> breeding cycles	252
Figure 7.9	Proportion of adults to non-adults in the Australian <i>Uromys</i> .....	254
Figure 7.10	Annual cycle of juvenile <i>U. caudimaculatus</i> and <i>U.hadrourus</i> .....	255
<b>LIST OF TABLES</b>		
Table 1.1	Worldwide distribution of <i>Uromys</i> species.....	7
Table 1.2	Rabinowitz <i>et al.</i> (1986) categorisation of rarity.....	40
Table 2.1	Trappable mammals species in study area.....	72
Table 3.1	Breakdown of trapping effort.....	96
Table 3.2	Total number of captures for all species.....	98
Table 3.3	Small mammal captures on the three trapping grids.....	99
Table 3.4	Comparison of Shannon Weiner indices for the three trapping grids...	103
Table 3.5	Species diversity and evenness of the three trapping grids.....	106
Table 3.6	Comparison of species diversity with other NQ studies.....	108
Table 3.7	Margelef's <i>D</i> index of species diversity for three different studies.....	109
Table 3.8	Species differences and similarities between the three studies.....	110
Table 4.1	<i>Rattus fuscipes</i> full Jolly-Seber analysis.of grid populations.....	121
Table 4.2	<i>Rattus fuscipes</i> fully Jolly-Seber population size estimates.....	122
Table 4.3	<i>Melomys cervinipes</i> full Jolly-Seber analysis.....	132
Table 4.4	<i>Melomys cervinipes</i> population estimates .....	133
Table 4.5	<i>Hypsiprymnodon moschatus</i> population estimates (Const. P. & S)....	139
Table 4.6	Ch-square tests of species' trap location habitat.....	149
Table 4.7	Pearson product moment correlation: Species-Habitat .....	152
Table 4.8	Species total capture numbers compared to mean sample biomass	155
Table 4.9	Comparison of rare species captures from three NQ studies.....	158
Table 5.1	<i>Uromys caudimaculatus</i> trapping session captures .....	167
Table 5.2	<i>Uromys caudimaculatus</i> mean & SD trapping session captures.....	168
Table 5.3	<i>Uromys caudimaculatus</i> population density per trapping session.....	170

Table 5.4	<i>Uromys caudimaculatus</i> Jolly-Seber grid population estimates.....	171
Table 5.5	<i>Uromys caudimaculatus</i> Jolly-Seber population estimates.....	172
Table 5.6	Adult <i>Uromys caudimaculatus</i> morphological measurements.....	173
Table 5.7	Linear regression of juvenile <i>Uromys caudimaculatus</i> weights .....	174
Table 5.8	Identified food items of <i>Uromys caudimaculatus</i> .....	180
Table 5.9	$\chi^2$ frequencies for <i>Uromys caudimaculatus</i> habitat association.....	181
Table 5.10	Distance travelled between captures for <i>Uromys caudimaculatus</i> .....	186
Table 6.1	Breakdown of individual <i>Uromys hadrourus</i> captures.....	189
Table 6.2	Trapping session captures of <i>Uromys hadrourus</i> .....	191
Table 6.3	<i>Uromys hadrourus</i> trapping session grid captures.....	192
Table 6.4	<i>Uromys hadrourus</i> population density per trapping session.....	193
Table 6.5	Jolly-Seber session estimates (Const. P & S) of <i>Uromys hadrourus</i> ...	194
Table 6.6	Morphological measurements of <i>Uromys hadrourus</i> .....	197
Table 6.7	Sample size of spooled <i>Uromys hadrourus</i> .....	198
Table 6.8	Breakdown of travel mode for spooled <i>Uromys hadrourus</i> .....	199
Table 6.9	<i>Uromys hadrourus</i> spooling analysis data sheet.....	201
Table 6.10	Capture-recapture weights of juvenile <i>Uromys hadrourus</i> .....	208
Table 6.11	Identified diet items of <i>Uromys hadrourus</i> .....	210
Table 6.12	Streams and gullies distance categories.....	225
Table 6.13	Distance of trap locations from streams and gullies .....	224
Table 6.14	Minimum age analysis of adult <i>Uromys hadrourus</i> .....	231
Table 7.1	Pes morphology of rodent assemblage.....	241
Table 8.1	Mammal assemblage population densities (animals/hectare).....	263
Table 8.2	Approximate geographic range sizes of mammal assemblage.....	264
Table 8.3	Habitat usage by the small mammal assemblage.....	265
Table 8.4	Specialism Index based on trap location habitat.....	267
Table 8.5	Rarity categorisation <i>sensu</i> Rabinowitz <i>et al.</i> 1986.....	269
Table 8.6	Calculation of resource usage index.....	274
Table 8.7	Rarity categorisation of small mammal assemblage.....	277
Table 8.8	Spearman Rank Correlation of ecological variables.....	279

## BOXES

Box 1	Reproductive codes and age categories.....	77
-------	--------------------------------------------	----