

Comparing the thermal suitability of nest-boxes and tree-hollows for the conservation-management of arboreal marsupials



Jessica A. Rowland ^{*}, Natalie J. Briscoe, Kathrine A. Handasyde

School of BioSciences, The University of Melbourne, Parkville, 3010, Victoria, Australia

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received 20 July 2016

Received in revised form 22 December 2016

Accepted 2 February 2017

Available online 9 March 2017

Keywords:

Tree-hollow

Nest-box

Microclimate

Thermal habitat quality

Endotherms

Temperate zone

ABSTRACT

Hundreds of species rely on tree-hollows for shelter and breeding, however land-clearing has reduced their availability worldwide. While nest-boxes are deployed extensively in hollow-deficient habitats, their thermal value for arboreal marsupials compared to tree-hollows is unclear, particularly in temperate environments. We analysed thermal regimes in nest-box and tree-hollow pairs during summer and winter environmental conditions. Using a biophysical model, we quantified the relative suitability of den-sites for several marsupial species, estimating the impact of microclimates (and ambient conditions) on predicted heat-production and heat-loss. Nest-box temperatures were strongly influenced by ambient temperatures and solar radiation, whereas tree-hollows buffered external temperature fluctuations. On average, nest-boxes reached maximum temperatures 8 °C higher than tree-hollows in summer, and 3 °C higher in winter, with maximum temperatures of 52 °C recorded in nest-boxes, compared to 38 °C in tree-hollows. During summer, estimated heat-loss required by marsupials was 1.5–2.4 times higher in nest-boxes than tree-hollows. Conversely, predicted winter heat-production requirements were slightly lower in nest-boxes (0.95–0.97 of hollow requirements). Our study emphasises the importance of retaining tree-hollows as thermal refuges for hollow-dependent marsupials in temperate zones to reduce thermoregulatory costs during heat-events. Current nest-box designs are likely of limited value during high temperatures and solar radiation loads if they consistently reach temperatures exceeding species upper critical temperatures, however may provide suitable microclimates during winter. With increasing and more prolonged heat-events predicted under climate change, future conservation-management programs should focus on improving nest-box thermal properties to enhance suitability for wildlife.

© 2017 Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved.

1. Introduction

Tree-hollows form essential habitat for hundreds of species worldwide, particularly birds and mammals (Goldingay, 2009; Goldingay, 2011; Scott et al., 1980). For many vertebrates, tree-hollows are critical for shelter, breeding and predator protection (Gibbons and Lindenmayer, 2002; Wesolowski, 2002), however, widespread land-clearing has dramatically reduced their availability (Eyre et al., 2010). Hollows large enough for arboreal mammals can take at least 100 years to develop (Gibbons et al., 2000; Wormington and Lamb, 1999). Ongoing habitat loss combined with time-lags in hollow-development, will likely maintain the deficit of tree-hollows (Gibbons et al., 2008; Veski et al., 2008). This is of major concern for hollow-dependent species, as den availability and quality can impact survival, growth and reproduction (Catry et al., 2011; Dawson et al., 2005).

To compensate for tree-hollow loss, nest-boxes have been deployed by wildlife managers, individuals and community groups to support a range of hollow-dependent species (Beyer and Goldingay, 2006; Goldingay and Stevens, 2009; British Trust for Ornithology, 2016). Nest-boxes can be highly valuable for conservation (Durant et al., 2009; Goldingay et al., 2015). However, low occupancy (Lindenmayer et al., 2009) and suboptimal cavity temperatures (Catry et al., 2011) can limit their value. While there has been considerable research into how nest-box design and placement influence occupancy, surprisingly few data are available on the thermal suitability of nest-boxes, despite thermal properties likely being a key direct driver of their value for wildlife (Sedgely, 2001).

For endotherms, inappropriate den temperatures almost certainly have acute and long-term impacts, influencing survival during extreme conditions, and increasing costs associated with thermoregulation. Endotherms have an optimal range of environmental temperatures (thermo-neutral zone: TNZ) within which thermoregulatory costs are minimal (Lovegrove et al., 1991). Below their TNZ, metabolic heat-production (thus energy costs) increase, while above the TNZ, water costs rise because evaporative heat-loss is used to avoid overheating (Dawson, 1969). Hollow-dependent species can minimize

^{*} Corresponding author at: Centre for Integrative Ecology, School of Life and Environmental Sciences, Deakin University, Burwood, 3125, Victoria, Australia.

E-mail addresses: jrowlan@deakin.edu.au (J.A. Rowland), nbriscoe@unimelb.edu.au (N.J. Briscoe), kathrine@unimelb.edu.au (K.A. Handasyde).

thermoregulatory costs by selecting dens providing temperatures closest to their TNZ.

Den microclimates influence breeding success and survival. Due to high thermoregulatory costs, animals experiencing unfavorable microclimates are likely to invest fewer resources in growth and reproduction (García-Navas et al., 2008). Tree swallow (*Tachycineta bicolor*) chicks in cooler nests have lower survival, slower growth rates, and smaller body size than those in warmer nests (Dawson et al., 2005). However, higher temperatures are not always beneficial: extreme den temperatures during a heat-wave led to 22% juvenile mortality in a lesser kestrel (*Falco naumanni*) population, with heat-related deaths occurring over two days when ambient temperatures exceeded 39 °C (Catry et al., 2011). Some evidence suggests that arboreal marsupials may avoid dens experiencing temperature extremes (Goldingay, 2015; Isaac et al., 2008a), which is almost certainly related to factors discussed above.

Despite the potentially high fitness consequences of denning in thermally sub-optimal microclimates, the thermal suitability of nest-boxes across seasons has not been comprehensively studied across the range of environments where they are deployed. The few previous studies suggest that thermal properties of empty nest-boxes and tree-hollows differ significantly, with tree-hollows buffering extremes in daily temperature fluctuations more than nest-boxes (Isaac et al., 2008b; McComb and Noble, 1981). However, Isaac et al. (2008b) only compared nest-box microclimates to tree-hollows during summer in a tropical climate, and McComb and Noble (1981) only compared microclimates in a few pairs of nest-boxes and tree-hollows across seasons in a humid subtropical climate. Minimal research has examined the thermal suitability of nest-boxes in temperate Australia, a region that experiences a wide temperature range, has undergone extensive habitat loss, and has had many nest-boxes installed (Harper et al., 2005; Lindenmayer et al., 2003).

Artificial and natural dens differ in structure, which is likely to drive differences in their thermal properties. Characteristics that influence nest-box temperatures include their insulative properties (relating to wall thickness and construction materials), orientation, and level of solar exposure (Charter et al., 2010; García-Navas et al., 2008; Goldingay, 2015). Temperatures in tree-hollows are also influenced by their structure (including wall thickness, cavity size and entrance area), in addition to tree health (Coombs et al., 2010; Paclík and Weidinger, 2007). Such differences in tree-hollow and nest-box properties may create disparities in their suitability for wildlife under different environmental conditions, between seasons or times of day (Vel'Ký et al., 2010). To maximise the success of nest-boxes for conservation it is essential to understand the drivers of variation in cavity temperatures.

While nest-box temperatures are likely to differ from those in tree-hollows, it is important to determine whether these translate to biologically meaningful differences in fitness for species using them. Few studies have examined the fitness consequences of denning in nest-boxes, and these focused predominantly on reproductive success in birds (e.g. Charter et al., 2010; Dawson et al., 2005), with little information about arboreal hollow-dependent mammals. Overall, studies of den microclimates rarely relate differences in temperature to eco-physiological consequences for species (although see Willis and Bringham, 2005; Willis and Bringham, 2007), important information for predicting and testing drivers of fitness.

We investigated how daily fluctuations in thermal microclimates differed between nest-boxes and tree-hollows across seasons in a temperate environment. We also examined factors influencing daytime den temperatures. We determined the relative thermal suitability of nest-boxes for four hollow-dependent marsupial species across seasons by estimating the energy and water costs of denning in nest-boxes, tree-hollows, or outside in a sheltered position, using a biophysical model that predicts how morphology, physiology and behaviour interact with the environment to determine animals' metabolic rate and rate of evaporative heat-loss (Porter and Kearney, 2009). Our research will inform management decisions regarding nest-box design and

installation, with a particular focus on understanding daily fluctuations in cavity temperature during extreme conditions.

2. Materials and methods

2.1. Study area and species

We conducted this research in the Strathbogie Ranges, (36°79' S, 145°80' E) Victoria, Australia (Fig. S1). The area has an average altitude of c. 570 m above sea level (a.s.l) and high annual rainfall (c. 1000 mm). It experiences considerable thermal variation, with temperatures exceeding 40 °C during summer and falling below 0 °C during winter. Temperatures range from a mean monthly maximum of 27.4 °C in February to a minimum of 1.7 °C in July (Bureau of Meteorology Climate Data, 2015).

This region has experienced substantial habitat loss and fragmentation (Martin and Handasyde, 2007), but retained some eucalypt-dominated open sclerophyll forest, which provides habitat for arboreal marsupials that rest in tree-hollows during the day. These include sugar gliders (*Petaurus breviceps*), common ringtail possums (*Pseudocheirus peregrinus*, henceforth common ringtail), greater gliders (*Petauroides volans*), common brushtail possums (*Trichosurus vulpecula*, common brushtail), and mountain brushtail possums (*Trichosurus cunninghami*, mountain brushtail) (Downes et al., 1997). Greater gliders and brushtail possums use a suite of tree-hollows solitarily (Harper, 2006; Lindenmayer et al., 2004; Martin, 2005), while common ringtails typically rest in small groups in dreys or tree-hollows (Pahl, 1987). Nest-box use has been recorded for common ringtails, both brushtail spp. (Harper et al., 2005; Lindenmayer et al., 2003) and sugar gliders (Menkhorst, 1984; Goldingay et al., 2015).

2.2. Comparison of den thermal microclimates

We compared daytime thermal microclimates of nest-boxes, tree-hollows, and ambient conditions during two summer periods (27/11/2014 to 3/01/2015 and 2–27/02/2015 between 06:00–20:30 h) and winter periods (29/06/2014 to 2/08/2014 and 7/06/2015 to 5/07/2015 between 07:30–17:30 h). Sampling periods within each season had similar environmental conditions (Fig. S2).

We selected 41 tree-hollows spread over 150 km² (Fig. S1), ranging from 481 to 674 m a.s.l. We considered tree-hollows suitable if the entrance and cavity were large enough to accommodate common ringtails (Beyer and Goldingay, 2006), <5.5 m high (for safety), and in live trees. Dead trees were excluded as their thermal properties may differ (Paclík and Weidinger, 2007; Wiebe, 2001). We used hollows in *Eucalyptus* trees with entrances opening on the trunk (n = 20) or tree-base (n = 21) to reflect the natural range used by wildlife (K. Handasyde unpublished data, based on radio-tracking data for brushtail spp.). We measured the entrance orientation (measured as °, converted into cardinal direction: north, n = 13; east, n = 13; south, n = 7; west, n = 8), entrance height above ground (to the nearest 5 mm), and DBH (mean ± sd: 1.3 ± 0.5 m). Hollows varied in structure: entrance area range 38.48–30,210 cm²; cavity depth range 18–140 cm; and cavity volume range 0.002–5.655 m³.

We installed 40 plywood nest-boxes (300 × 370 × 475 mm, 17 mm thick) between February and June 2014. One nest-box was relocated after the first two sampling periods (it was too dangerous to access) and paired with a different base-hollow for the remaining periods. Nest-boxes were painted dark-green, consistent with common practice. Each nest-box was mounted on a tree within 17 m (mean ± sd, 8.1 ± 2.7 m) of a tree-hollow, with the entrance at the same height and orientation, and similar canopy cover (mean difference ± sd, 5.8 ± 4.1%; $t_{39} = 1.36$, $P = 0.18$). We calculated canopy openness above each den by analyzing hemispherical photos, taken with a fisheye lens (Sigma 8 mm 6.3, Japan) attached to a full frame camera (Canon 5D MkII, Japan), using Gap Light Analyzer (Version 2.0) (Beckschäfer et al.,

2013). We initially covered nest-box entrances with wire-mesh to exclude wildlife (02/2014 to 3/01/2015), then uncovered entrances to allow access (from 4/01/2015). After nest-box entrances were uncovered, we checked each den (nest-boxes and tree-hollows) for occupants using a camera (Nikon Coolpix P310, Japan) on a pole (summer: 15 days; winter: 20 days). Animals were not further disturbed after determining occupation status.

Using thermal data loggers (Thermochron iButton; Alfa-Tek, Bayswater, Australia) mounted in plastic mesh or holders, we recorded cavity temperatures ($^{\circ}\text{C}$; ± 0.5) simultaneously in each nest-box and tree-hollow, as well as ambient temperature (T_a), at 30-min intervals during all sampling periods. iButtons were positioned on the back wall of each nest-box suspended by string 2 cm below the entrance (25.5 cm above cavity base and 22 cm from lid), with the temperature recording side facing into the cavity. This central location aimed to minimize the impact of sun and wind exposure and reduce the chance of animals sitting on the logger, while sampling the temperature adjacent to the upper half of the body of larger species (brushtail possums); logger position may have a minor effect on the recorded temperatures due to temperature gradients in nest-boxes (Goldingay, 2015). We secured iButtons in each tree-hollow away from the entrance and near where a marsupial might rest; the exact position varied with tree-hollow structure. To record T_a , iButtons were placed in permanent shade behind each nest-box, facing away from adjacent surfaces.

2.3. Statistical analysis

Occupied dens (3/70 den checks), and those deemed likely to be occupied during the non-monitoring period, indicated by atypical jumps in temperature (over 10°C), were examined separately. We also excluded records when iButtons were ejected from dens or faulty (seven during 29/06/2014 to 2/08/2014; one during 27/11/2014 to 3/01/2015).

Daily maximum (T_{denMAX}), mean (T_{denMEAN}) and minimum (T_{denMIN}) cavity temperatures, and maximum hourly difference between den temperature and T_a during daylight hours were calculated for each nest-box (T_{boxDIFF}) and tree-hollow (T_{holdIFF}). To examine the effect of den-type, weather and den characteristics on cavity temperatures across seasons, we fitted linear mixed-effects models with the package 'nlme' (Pinheiro et al., 2015) using the software 'R' (R Core Team, 2014). We included den-type within site as a random effect to account for repeated measures in each den and spatial correlations, and fit a corARMA correlation structure, assuming correlation across days for each den. For models with only categorical predictors, we fit a varIdent variance structure (Zuur et al., 2009). For models with continuous predictors, a variance structure was fitted based on Akaike's Information Criteria (AIC), as multiple structures were appropriate (Zuur et al., 2009). Where residuals plots indicated deviations from homoscedasticity or normality, variables were log or square-root transformed.

We constructed models for each response variable to determine the effect of den-type on cavity temperatures across seasons. We tested the effect of T_a and solar exposure (proportion canopy openness $\times$ total daily solar radiation over 24 h, kWh m^{-2}) on den temperatures (T_{denMAX} and T_{denMEAN}) in summer and winter. Because minimum temperatures predominantly occurred very early in the morning, and were thus more likely influenced by exposure to cold sky rather than solar radiation, we included canopy openness rather than solar exposure as a predictor for T_{denMIN} . We also analysed the relationship between den and site characteristics on both T_{boxDIFF} and T_{holdIFF} during summer and winter. Models included site openness (%), cardinal direction (aspect), den height, tree DBH, and hollow type (for T_{holdIFF} only).

Continuous predictor variables were standardised (mean subtracted, then divided by the standard deviation) to allow each model to be fitted without the scale of predictors altering their influence on the results (Quinn and Keough, 2002). We selected model predictors and interactions between predictors using AIC (Burnham and Anderson, 2004), where the best-fitting model for each analysis had the lowest

AICc. Full models only included interactions that were deemed biologically relevant; for example, interactions between DBH and aspect were excluded, as this was not considered meaningful.

2.4. Modeling eco-physiological consequences of thermal microclimates

We used the model of Porter and Kearney (2009) to calculate the metabolic rate that would allow an endotherm to maintain core temperature, given the environmental conditions (denning during the day in nest-boxes, tree-hollows, and outside under ambient conditions) and its traits for four marsupial species (see below). We assumed heat-loss was required when the predicted metabolic rate to maintain homeothermy was below the basal metabolic rate (i.e. we calculated how much additional heat must be lost to allow the animal to maintain its basal metabolic rate and core temperature). As panting is a key mechanism of heat-loss for marsupials (Robinson and Morrison, 1957), respiratory heat-loss was only included in heat-loss estimates when animals were not actively offloading heat.

To parameterize the model, we estimated morphological characteristics of an average adult female common brushtail, mountain brushtail, greater glider and common ringtail, and the environmental conditions in each denning location (Table S1). Using museum specimens ($n = 9$ – 21 for each species, Museum Victoria collection), we measured body length (mm) to estimate values for posture (ratio of body length:width) when denning, and ventral and dorsal fur depth using vernier calipers (to the nearest mm). We simulated behavioural responses to temperature by gradually altering posture and fur depth to minimize costs; posture changed from curled in a near-perfect sphere (1.001) with fur as the average of dorsal fur depth for cold conditions, to fully uncurled with the average of dorsal and ventral fur depth for high temperatures. For animals resting outside, we assumed a sheltered position, with the modeled wind-speed 50% of wind-speed recorded in the open. We calculated seasonal daytime heat-production and heat-loss costs (MJ) for each den and outside under ambient conditions for each species by summing estimated daily values across summer and winter.

3. Results

3.1. Comparison of temperatures in nest-boxes and tree-hollows

For dens unoccupied by an animal, T_{denMAX} in nest-boxes was 8.0°C higher on average than tree-hollows in summer, 3.0°C higher in winter, and showed greater variation (Fig. 1; Table S2). The highest nest-box temperature recorded was 52.1°C in summer and 41.1°C in winter, whereas tree-hollows reached 38.1°C in summer and 20.7°C in winter. T_{denMEAN} was also higher in nest-boxes than tree-hollows: 3.6°C higher in summer and 1.2°C in winter (Fig. 1; Table S2). Conversely, across both seasons, daytime T_{denMIN} remained higher in tree-hollows (lowest -3.5°C) than nest-boxes (lowest -5.4°C) (Fig. 1; Table S2).

The limited data we were able to collect suggested that occupied dens were warmer than unoccupied dens. During summer, one tree-hollow containing cockatoo chicks for approximately 29 days, was substantially warmer ($T_{\text{denMEAN}} 27.2^{\circ}\text{C}$) when occupied than when unoccupied (18.1°C) under similar ambient conditions. A common brushtail occupied one tree-hollow on two separate days. Under similar ambient conditions, T_{denMEAN} on an occupied day (22.5°C) was considerably warmer than on the previous and following days (18.5°C), when the den was unoccupied. A sugar glider occupying a different tree-hollow had a negligible effect on den temperature. No nest-box use was recorded during the study.

3.2. Effect of weather and habitat characteristics on den temperatures

The effects of T_a and solar exposure were dependent on den-type: nest-box temperatures responded more strongly to changing environmental conditions than tree-hollows (Fig. 2; Table 1). During both




Fig. 1. Daily daytime a) mean, b) maximum, and c) minimum temperature within nest-boxes and tree-hollows during summer ($n = 65$ days) and winter ($n = 60$ days) sampling periods in the Strathbogie Ranges, Victoria. Nest-boxes had significantly higher T_{denMAX} and $T_{denMEAN}$, and significantly lower T_{denMIN} than tree-hollows during both summer and winter. See Table S2 for statistical analyses.

seasons, T_{denMAX} , $T_{denMEAN}$ and T_{denMIN} increased substantially more in nest-boxes as T_a increased compared to tree-hollows (Fig. 2a, c; Table 1), leading to greater disparity in temperature between den-types at higher T_a . For example, based on the fitted models, during an average summer day (T_a 28 °C, daily solar exposure 1.5 kWh m²), nest-boxes were predicted to be 9 °C warmer than tree-hollows (31.4 °C versus 22.3 °C respectively). Under extreme recorded weather conditions (40 °C, 4.1 kWh m²), the predicted difference between den-types rose to 19.6 °C (45.7 °C versus 26.1 °C). T_{denMAX} and $T_{denMEAN}$ in nest-boxes also increased as exposure to solar radiation increased, but decreased

slightly in tree-hollows (Fig. 2b, d; Table 1). During summer, T_{denMIN} increased slightly more with increasing T_a at sites with higher canopy openness (Table 1). For $T_{holDIFF}$ and $T_{boxDIFF}$, canopy openness, den aspect, den height, tree DBH and hollow-type (for $T_{holDIFF}$ only) had little impact on den temperatures as the null models had the best fit (Table 1).

3.3. Predicted eco-physiological consequences of den temperatures

Estimates of TNZs from the biophysical model for the four arboreal marsupials were similar to those previously observed (see Table S1).




Fig. 2. The modeled fixed-effects of ambient temperature (a, c) and solar exposure (b, d) on mean daytime temperatures of tree-hollows and nest-boxes during summer (a, b) and winter (c, d) in the Strathbogie Ranges, Victoria, (holding other variables at the mean value). Grey bars represent 95% confidence intervals. See Table 1 for statistical analyses.

Table 1

Parameter estimates for models of effect of den-type and ambient conditions on maximum (T_{denMAX}), mean (T_{denMEAN}) and minimum (T_{denMIN}) daytime den temperature, and den and site characteristics on maximum daytime temperature difference (T_{holDIFF} and T_{boxDIFF}). Variables included in models for T_{denMAX} , T_{denMEAN} and T_{denMIN} were: Den-type (nest-box, tree-hollow), ambient temperature, and solar exposure or canopy openness above each den. Variables included in full models for T_{holDIFF} and T_{boxDIFF} included: canopy openness, den height, aspect, tree DBH, and hollow type (for T_{holDIFF} only). Coefficients (95% CI) for best fitting models and interactions are presented (lowest AIC_c). Response variables for T_{boxDIFF} and T_{denMAX} were log transformed to meet model assumptions.

Response variable	Predictor variables	Summer	Winter
T_{denMAX}	(Intercept)	3.39 (3.36, 3.41)	2.35 (2.31, 2.38)
	Den-type (Hollow)	−0.32 (−0.35, −0.28)	−0.30 (−0.35, −0.26)
	T_{aMAX}	0.14 (0.14, 0.15)	0.27 (0.27, 0.28)
	Solar exposure	0.03 (0.03, 0.04)	0.10 (0.09, 0.11)
	Den-type (Hollow): T_{aMAX}	−0.05 (−0.05, −0.04)	−0.10 (−0.11, −0.09)
T_{denMEAN}	Den-type (Hollow): Solar exposure	−0.05 (−0.05, −0.04)	−0.18 (−0.19, −0.17)
	(Intercept)	23.29 (22.98, 23.6)	8.2 (7.9, 8.4)
	Den-type (Hollow)	−3.82 (−4.26, −3.38)	−1.0 (−1.36, −0.69)
	T_{aMEAN}	3.43 (3.39, 3.46)	1.89 (1.84, 1.94)
	Solar exposure	0.86 (0.81, 0.91)	1.15 (1.10, 1.21)
T_{denMIN}	Den-type (Hollow): T_{aMEAN}	−1.38 (−1.44, −1.32)	−0.54 (−0.61, −0.48)
	Den-type (Hollow): Solar exposure	−1.28 (−1.37, −1.20)	−1.08 (−1.14, −1.01)
	(Intercept)	13.84 (13.54, 14.13)	4.95 (4.73, 5.16)
	Den-type (Hollow)	2.54 (2.12, 2.96)	1.00 (0.71, 1.30)
	T_{aMIN}	3.85 (3.79, 3.90)	2.39 (2.32, 2.46)
T_{holDIFF}	Canopy openness	0.19 (−0.02, 0.40)	–
	Den-type (Hollow): T_{aMIN}	−1.26 (−1.45, −1.28)	−0.79 (−0.88, −0.70)
	T_{aMIN} : Canopy openness	0.12 (0.08, 0.16)	–
	(Intercept)	2.93 (2.53, 3.32) ^a	1.34 (1.13, 1.54) ^b
	(Intercept)	1.45 (1.33, 1.57) ^c	0.98 (0.91, 1.05)

^a Model AIC_c < 2 lower than competing models with either DBH or hollow type.

^b Model AIC_c < 2 lower than competing models with either den height or hollow type.

^c Model AIC_c < 2 lower than competing models with openness.

This suggests that the model captures key heat exchange processes for these species.

Den-type (nest-box, tree-hollow, none/outside) had a strong effect on estimated heat-loss required for all species (Table 2; Table S3). During summer, total heat-loss required in nest-boxes was approximately double that required in tree-hollows (e.g. 2.4 and 1.5 times higher for common brushtails and common ringtails, respectively), and 1.3–2.3 times higher compared to resting outside for all species (Table 2; Table S3). During summer, the predicted average daytime heat-loss (calculated as the % basal metabolic heat-production required to be lost via evaporative cooling) for mountain brushtails was higher in nest-boxes (29.5%) than in tree-hollows (10.5%), with mean hourly rates of heat-loss required in nest-boxes up to 5.4 times that required in tree-hollows.

Heat-loss requirements were higher for larger species, with higher predicted heat-loss required for mountain brushtails than common ringtails when resting in nest-boxes during summer (29.5% and 10.3% of basal metabolic rate, respectively, Table 2). During winter, predicted heat-loss required was typically slightly lower in nest-boxes, and similar between tree-hollows or resting outside (Table 2; Table S3).

The total predicted daytime heat-production (MJ) required during winter for animals in tree-hollows was 1.04–1.05 times that in nest-boxes, but marginally higher in nest-boxes during summer for most species (Table 2; Table S3). Predicted daytime heat-production (% basal) for common ringtails in winter was lower in nest-boxes (187.7%) than tree-hollows (197.0%), with the highest costs predicted for an animal resting outside (203.4%).

Table 2

Total predicted daytime heat-loss and heat-production (mean ± 95% confidence intervals, MJ) for arboreal marsupials denning in nest-boxes, tree-hollows, or outside under shaded ambient conditions in the Strathbogie Ranges, Victoria, during summer (n = 37 sites; 53 days) and winter (n = 32; 49 days). See Table S3 for statistical analyses.

Species	Summer			Winter		
	Nest-box	Tree-hollow	Ambient	Nest-box	Tree-hollow	Ambient
<i>Heat-loss (MJ)</i>						
Common brushtail	3.53 (3.33, 3.74)	1.50 (1.43, 1.57)	2.58 (2.46, 2.69)	0.98 (0.97, 0.99)	1.04 (1.03, 1.05)	1.04 (1.04, 1.05)
Mountain brushtail	5.54 (5.30, 5.79)	2.65 (2.50, 2.81)	4.27 (4.12, 4.43)	1.24 (1.23, 1.26)	1.30 (1.29, 1.31)	1.30 (1.29, 1.31)
Greater glider	1.94 (1.82, 2.07)	0.85 (0.82, 0.88)	1.40 (1.34, 1.47)	0.62 (0.61, 0.62)	0.66 (0.65, 0.66)	0.65 (0.65, 0.66)
Common ringtail	1.25 (1.17, 1.34)	0.85 (0.83, 0.86)	1.00 (0.97, 1.03)	0.84 (0.83, 0.85)	0.90 (0.89, 0.914)	0.92 (0.908, 0.93)
<i>Heat-production (MJ)</i>						
Common brushtail	25.04 (25.02, 25.07)	24.93 (24.90, 24.95)	25.27 (25.24, 25.31)	19.17 (19.03, 19.31)	20.08 (19.94, 20.22)	20.37 (20.26, 20.48)
Mountain brushtail	34.18 (34.16, 34.19)	34.16 (34.15, 34.18)	34.28 (34.26, 34.29)	22.69 (22.57, 22.81)	23.51 (23.35, 23.66)	23.75 (23.64, 23.87)
Greater glider	16.52 (16.50, 16.53)	16.37 (16.35, 16.40)	16.62 (16.60, 16.64)	12.69 (12.59, 12.79)	13.32 (13.23, 13.42)	13.40 (13.32, 13.48)
Common ringtail	15.24 (15.16, 15.31)	15.94 (15.72, 16.17)	16.22 (16.11, 16.32)	15.40 (15.27, 15.54)	16.16 (16.05, 16.27)	16.69 (16.60, 16.78)

4. Discussion

Nest-boxes support a range of hollow-dependent wildlife, particularly birds (Catry et al., 2011) and mammals (Durant et al., 2009), across a wide range of ecosystems globally (Charter et al., 2010; Harper et al., 2005; Isaac et al., 2008b). Despite the widespread use of nest-boxes, their thermal value has received little attention. Our study demonstrates that thermal properties of nest-boxes and tree-hollows differ substantially. We found that nest-boxes can experience highly fluctuating temperatures that are likely to pose risks for wildlife during very hot weather. Our modeling showed that eco-physiological costs of thermoregulation are likely to be considerably higher for arboreal marsupials in nest-boxes compared to tree-hollows during summer, but marginally lower during winter. These findings highlight the importance of retaining tree-hollows as thermal refugia. Although nest-boxes clearly provide valuable habitat for arboreal marsupials under many environmental conditions, we found that during hot weather they provide inadequate protection from extreme daytime temperatures, a critical issue with the predicted increase in heat-waves with climate change (Coumou and Rahmstorf, 2012).

4.1. Nest-box and tree-hollow thermal profiles

In our study, nest-boxes reached greater daytime temperature extremes than tree-hollows, consistent with the few previous studies examining natural versus artificial den temperatures (Isaac et al., 2008b; McComb and Noble, 1981). We found that nest-box microclimates responded more strongly to changes in ambient temperature and solar radiation than tree-hollows, which may largely be attributed to differences in physical structure. Tree-hollows large enough for the possums at our site typically occurred in trees over 1 m DBH (Martin, 2005). While this can vary among tree species (Gibbons et al., 2000; Wormington and Lamb, 1999), wood surrounding tree-hollows will generally be much thicker than nest-box walls. Tree-hollows with thicker walls have greater heat-retaining capacity (Coombs et al., 2010), and slower rates of heat-gain from the external environment due to low thermal inertia (Derby and Gates, 1966). Our results are consistent with this: nest-box cavities heated and cooled faster than tree-hollows, indicating that nest-boxes have lower insulative capacity. However, our results are based on empty dens, and the thermal properties of occupied dens may show some differences. Dens provide wildlife with protection from daily temperature fluctuations and extremes (Cooper, 1999). Our study indicates that nest-boxes of one commonly used design may have limited capacity to perform this critical function under extreme conditions, with wildlife being exposed to substantially hotter daytime temperatures in nest-boxes than in tree-hollows, even in temperate environments. Retaining large trees and reforestation are therefore vital in regions experiencing large daily and seasonal temperature fluctuations and high average temperatures, because nest-boxes of commonly used designs are unlikely to provide suitable thermal microclimates throughout the whole year.

Along with ambient temperature, solar radiation influenced daytime den temperatures, particularly in nest-boxes. Higher solar exposure (calculated from daily solar radiation and canopy openness) increased daytime temperatures in nest-boxes. Conversely, temperatures in tree-hollows decreased when solar exposure was high, possibly due to higher transpiration rates (water-loss) as radiation heated the leaves (Gates, 1964; Mehajan et al., 2008), enhancing water flow through the trunk to heighten cooling (Vines, 1968). However, further research is required, as factors governing tree-trunk temperatures, and thus tree-hollow temperatures, are not well understood. We also analysed several physical traits typically used when examining den temperature profiles (e.g. Isaac et al., 2008a), however none showed strong relationships with den temperatures. A few studies have found that orientation affects nest-box temperatures in fields (Ardia et al., 2006; Butler et al., 2009), however, in our study, orientation had minimal effect, consistent

with Stamp et al. (2002) who also worked in forests. Den height also had no effect on cavity temperatures, possibly because canopy openness (thus solar exposure) did not differ with height above the ground across the range measured here. In contrast with Isaac et al. (2008a) who found that maximum daytime temperatures were lower in hollow-bearing trees with larger DBH, in our study, which focused on comparing nest-boxes with the natural range of tree-hollows available, DBH had minimal impact on den temperatures. Collectively, our results suggest that canopy openness may be more influential than orientation in regulating exposure to solar radiation in forested environments, particularly for nest-boxes. In regions prone to high ambient temperatures, nest-boxes should be installed in sites with high canopy cover to reduce excessive heating from solar exposure.

4.2. Modeled eco-physiological consequences for arboreal marsupials

Our study revealed seasonal differences in the value of natural and artificial dens for arboreal marsupials due to variation in thermal microclimates. Nest-box use was predicted to substantially increase heat-loss requirements in summer, and therefore the potential for heat-stress and dehydration, but slightly reduce energy requirements in winter. Marsupials predominantly rely on evaporative heat-loss to maintain homeothermy at temperatures above their TNZ (Robinson and Morrison, 1957). Water-loss rates can increase substantially at high ambient temperatures (Dawson, 1969), and evaporative heat-loss may not be sufficient to maintain homeothermy. In addition, free-water can be limited during the hot, dry conditions typical of temperate Australian summers. Under such conditions, dehydration and heat-stress are more likely for animals in nest-boxes than in tree-hollows, where evaporative heat-loss is predicted to be 1.5–2.4 times higher. Estimates of heat-loss required in our study were based on temperatures in empty dens, however the expected added thermal impact of occupation by an endotherm (Kearney et al., 2011; J. Rowland, unpublished data) would inflate eco-physiological costs over summer. Under high ambient temperatures, animals may avoid nest-boxes reaching high temperatures (Goldingay, 2015) and trade-off predator protection to avoid acute heat-stress if suitable shelter is not available (Havera, 1979). Alternatively, wildlife using thermally unsuitable nest-boxes may experience reduced growth and body condition, and high mortality rates, particularly juveniles (Catry et al., 2011). Temperature-related mortality and reduced fitness are important to address in the future because conservation-management programs using nest-boxes often target endangered species (e.g. Leadbeater's possum: Lindenmayer et al., 2009). Nest-boxes can contribute to species conservation, but may also contribute further to population declines during rare, but increasingly frequent, catastrophic heat events, which can cause substantial mortality (Catry et al., 2011). Investing in improved nest-box designs to buffer extreme temperatures is of high-priority to ensure nest-boxes are of maximum value for wildlife.

During winter, the predicted heat-production costs required for thermoregulation were slightly lower for marsupials in nest-boxes compared to tree-hollows, and highest when resting outside. This is because nest-boxes were typically warmer than tree-hollows during the day, thus animals occupying tree-hollows spent more time exposed to temperatures below their TNZ (98.7–100% versus 90.1–99.8%, respective). Further, animals resting outside are subjected to wind, increasing convective heat-loss, and thus energy costs required to maintain homeothermy (Dawson and Brown, 1970). Cooler dens are probably most challenging for smaller mammals and juveniles that are more susceptible to hypothermia due to their increased thermal conductance and/or poor thermoregulatory capabilities (Aschoff, 1981; Holloway and Geiser, 2000; Porter and Kearney, 2009). Higher cumulative energy costs from resting in colder microclimates may also cause progressive decline in body condition when food availability is low (Speakman, 1997) or foraging restricted (e.g. during rain: Van den Oord et al., 1995). In our study, heat-production costs were calculated for

unoccupied dens, thus costs in occupied dens are likely lower than predicted here. Energy costs may be further reduced in occupied well-insulated tree-hollows where more heat is likely to be retained, or if multiple animals den together (e.g. mountain brushtails: Martin, 2005; sugar gliders: Durant et al., 2009). A systematic study is required to fully understand all factors driving thermal differences in tree-hollow temperatures.

The relative value of nest-boxes and tree-hollows for particular species' depends on their physiology, morphology and behaviour. In general, larger mammals with thicker fur are more sensitive to high temperatures than smaller species with thinner fur (Blanckenhorn, 2000; Phillips and Heath, 1995; Robinson and Morrison, 1957), with the converse true in cold environments. This is evident in the predicted relative costs (i.e. % basal heat-production or heat-loss required) for mountain brushtails (large, thick fur) compared to common ringtails (smaller, thinner fur) (see Table 2). However, larger animals have higher energy and water reserves, increasing their ability to withstand high physiological costs over short periods (McKechnie and Wolf, 2010). Den use patterns also influences the relative value of nest-boxes. While we focused on arboreal marsupials exhibiting diurnal den use, our finding that nest-boxes had lower minimum temperatures than tree-hollows (mean nighttime temperature 8.46 °C and 10.96 °C respectively) and more closely tracked ambient conditions, suggests that nest-boxes may provide lower thermal quality habitat than tree-hollows for temperate species denning nocturnally, including many birds species (Goldingay and Stevens, 2009).

4.3. Conservation implications for hollow-dependent species

Our biophysical modeling provided a useful method for estimating the relative costs of denning in nest-boxes versus tree-hollows for endotherms. We showed that nest-boxes and tree-hollows vary in their temperature regimes and thermal value for several arboreal hollow-dependent marsupials across seasons, with the largest disparities occurring when thermoregulatory costs are highest. Our study provides new information about fitness consequences of differing thermal microclimates of natural versus artificial dens. Our results indicate that tree-hollows generally provide better microclimates for endotherms, however nest-boxes are still valuable during milder environmental conditions. While we only assessed one nest-box design, our findings are broadly applicable to nest-boxes used globally for various species. However, more research is needed on the thermal properties of artificial hollows, including nest-boxes with different dimensions that target different species (Beyer and Goldingay, 2006), variation in construction materials (e.g. timber vs. clay pots, Catry et al., 2011), and those designed to more closely mimic tree-hollow properties (e.g. chainsaw cavities, Hurley and Harris, 2014).

The persistence of hollow-dependent species worldwide, under both current and future climates, requires long-term conservation-management that prioritises retaining large, hollow-bearing trees and habitat regeneration. However, the increasing global deficiency of tree-hollows (Gibbons et al., 2008; Vesk et al., 2008) means that nest-boxes will be increasingly important, thus we must ensure these are of the highest-value for wildlife. Clear guidelines for nest-box design and deployment based on scientific evidence of their suitability for target species and prevailing environmental conditions are critical to inform conservation decisions. We recommend that in environments prone to high temperatures, nest-boxes should be installed in shaded sites to limit high cavity temperatures and adverse impacts on inhabitants. Future efforts should be directed at improving nest-box design and deployment to improve their quality as habitat, especially to buffer against large temperature fluctuations. Actions should include altering surface thermal reflectance (S.R. Griffiths, J.A. Rowland, unpublished data) and increasing the insulative value of nest-boxes, along with installing nest-boxes with differing thermal properties to enable

animals to select thermally suitable dens under different environmental conditions.

Acknowledgements

We thank landowners for kindly allowing us access to their properties, and several field volunteers, particularly Susan Pepper, Peter Rowland, and Monique Winterhoff. We thank Museum Victoria for providing specimens, and Michael Kearney and John Baumgartner for providing an R version of the biophysical model. This research was approved by The University of Melbourne Science Animal Ethics Committee, and conducted under a permit from the Department of Environment & Primary Industries, Victoria, Australia. NJB was supported by NERP Environmental Decisions Hub and NESP Threatened Species Recovery Hub.

Appendix A. Supplementary data

Supplementary data associated with this article can be found in the online version, at <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.biocon.2017.02.006>. These data include the Google map of the most important areas described in this article.

References

- Ardia, D.R., Pérez, J.H., Clotfelter, E.D., 2006. Nest box orientation affects internal temperature and nest site selection by tree swallows. *J. Field Ornithol.* 77, 339–344.
- Aschoff, J., 1981. Thermal conductance in mammals and birds: its dependence on body size and circadian phase. *Comp. Biochem. Physiol. A Physiol.* 69, 611–619.
- Beckschäfer, P., Seidel, D., Kleinn, C., Xu, J., 2013. On the exposure of hemispherical photographs in forests. *Forest-Biogeosciences and Forestry*. 6, pp. 228–237.
- Beyer, G.L., Goldingay, R.L., 2006. The value of nest-boxes in the research and management of Australian hollow-using arboreal marsupials. *Wildl. Res.* 33, 161–174.
- Blanckenhorn, W.U., 2000. The evolution of body size: what keeps organisms small? *Q. Rev. Biol.* 75, 385–407.
- British Trust for Ornithology, 2016. National Nest Box Week, Norfolk, viewed 1 June 2016. <https://www.bto.org/about-birds/nnbw>.
- Bureau of Meteorology Climate Data, 2015. Strathbogie North Station 082043. Available at: <http://www.bom.gov.au/climate/data/index.shtml>.
- Burnham, K.P., Anderson, D.R., 2004. Multimodel inference understanding AIC and BIC in model selection. *Sociol. Methods Res.* 33, 261–304.
- Butler, M.W., Whitman, B.A., Dufty Jr., A.M., 2009. Nest-box temperature and hatching success of American kestrels varies with nest-box orientation. *The Wilson Journal of Ornithology* 126, 778–782.
- Catry, I., Franco, A., Sutherland, W.J., 2011. Adapting conservation efforts to face climate change: modifying nest-site provisioning for lesser kestrels. *Biol. Conserv.* 144, 1111–1119.
- Charter, M., Meyrom, K., Leshem, Y., Aviel, S., Izhaki, I., Motro, Y., 2010. Does nest-box location and orientation affect occupation rate and breeding success of barn owls *Tyto alba* in a semi-arid environment? *Acta Ornithologica* 45, 115–119.
- Coombs, A.B., Bowman, J., Garraway, C.J., 2010. Thermal properties of tree cavities during winter in a northern hardwood forest. *J. Wildl. Manag.* 74, 1875–1881.
- Cooper, S.J., 1999. The thermal and energetic significance of cavity roosting in mountain chickadees and juniper titmice. *Condor* 101, 863–866.
- Coumou, D., Rahmstorf, S., 2012. A decade of weather extremes. *Nat. Clim. Chang.* 2, 491–496.
- Dawson, T., 1969. Temperature regulation and evaporative water-loss in the brush-tailed possum *Trichosurus vulpecula*. *Comp. Biochem. Physiol.* 28, 401–407.
- Dawson, T.J., Brown, G.D., 1970. A comparison of the insulative and reflective properties of the fur of desert kangaroos. *Comp. Biochem. Physiol.* 37, 23–38.
- Dawson, R.D., Lawrie, C.C., O'Brien, E.L., 2005. The importance of microclimate variation in determining size, growth and survival of avian offspring: experimental evidence from a cavity nesting passerine. *Oecologia* 144, 499–507.
- Derby, R.W., Gates, D.M., 1966. The temperature of tree trunks-calculated and observed. *Am. J. Bot.* 53, 580–587.
- Downes, S.J., Handasyde, K.A., Elgar, M.A., 1997. The use of corridors by mammals in fragmented Australian eucalypt forests. *Conserv. Biol.* 11, 718–726.
- Durant, R., Luck, G.W., Matthews, A., 2009. Nest-box use by arboreal mammals in a peri-urban landscape. *Wildl. Res.* 36, 565–573.
- Eyre, T.J., Butler, D.W., Kelly, A.L., Wang, J., 2010. Effects of forest management on structural features important for biodiversity in mixed-age hardwood forests in Australia's subtropics. *For. Ecol. Manag.* 259, 534–546.
- García-Navas, V., Arroyo, L., José Sanz, J., Díaz, M., 2008. Effect of nestbox type on occupancy and breeding biology of tree sparrows *Passer montanus* in Central Spain. *Ibis* 150, 356–364.
- Gates, D.M., 1964. Leaf temperature and transpiration. *Agron. J.* 56, 273–277.
- Gibbons, P., Lindenmayer, D., 2002. *Tree-Hollows and Wildlife Conservation in Australia*. CSIRO Publishing, Collingwood.

- Gibbons, P., Lindenmayer, D., Barry, S., Tanton, M., 2000. Hollow formation in eucalypts from temperate forests in southeastern Australia. *Pac. Conserv. Biol.* 6, 218–228.
- Gibbons, P., Lindenmayer, D., Fischer, J., Manning, A., Weinberg, A., Seddon, J., Ryan, P., Barrett, G., 2008. The future of scattered trees in agricultural landscapes. *Conserv. Biol.* 22, 1309–1319.
- Goldingay, R.L., 2009. Characteristics of tree-hollows used by Australian birds and bats. *Wildl. Res.* 36, 394–409.
- Goldingay, R.L., 2011. Characteristics of tree-hollows used by Australian arboreal and scansorial mammals. *Australian Journal of Zoology* 59, 277–294.
- Goldingay, R.L., 2015. Temperature variation in nest-boxes in eastern Australia. *Australian Mammalogy* 37, 225–233.
- Goldingay, R.L., Stevens, J.R., 2009. Use of artificial tree-hollows by Australian birds and bats. *Wildl. Res.* 36, 81–97.
- Goldingay, R.L., Ruegger, N.N., Grimson, M.J., Taylor, B.T., 2015. Specific nest-box designs can improve habitat restoration for cavity-dependent arboreal mammals. *Restor. Ecol.* 23, 482–490.
- Harper, M.J., 2006. Home range and den use of common brushtail possums (*Trichosurus vulpecula*) in urban forest remnants. *Wildl. Res.* 32, 681–687.
- Harper, M.J., McCarthy, M.A., van der Ree, R., 2005. The use of nest-boxes in urban natural vegetation remnants by vertebrate fauna. *Wildl. Res.* 32, 509–516.
- Havera, S.P., 1979. Temperature variation in a fox squirrel nest-box. *J. Wildl. Manag.* 43, 251–253.
- Holloway, J.C., Geiser, F., 2000. Development of thermoregulation in the sugar glider *Petaurus breviceps* (Marsupialia: Petauridae). *J. Zool.* 252, 389–397.
- Hurley, V.G., Harris, G.J., 2014. Simulating natural cavities in Slender Cypress Pine (*Callitris gracilis murrayensis*) for use by Major Mitchell's Cockatoo (*Lophochroa leadbeateri leadbeateri*): A report to the Department of Environment and Primary Industries.
- Isaac, J., de Gabriel, J., Goodman, B.A., 2008a. Microclimate of daytime den-sites in a tropical possum: implications for the conservation of tropical arboreal marsupials. *Anim. Conserv.* 11, 281–287.
- Isaac, J.L., Parsons, M., Goodman, B.A., 2008b. How hot do nest-boxes get in the tropics? A study of nest-boxes for the endangered mahogany glider. *Wildl. Res.* 35, 441–445.
- Kearney, M., Ferguson, E., Fumei, S., Gallacher, A., Mitchell, P., Woodford, R., Handasyde, K., 2011. A cost-effective method of assessing thermal habitat quality for endotherms. *Austral Ecol.* 36, 297–302.
- Lindenmayer, D., MacGregor, C., Cunningham, R., Incoll, R., Crane, M., Rawlins, D., Michael, D., 2003. The use of nest-boxes by arboreal marsupials in the forests of the Central Highlands of Victoria. *Wildl. Res.* 30, 259–264.
- Lindenmayer, D.B., Pope, M.L., Cunningham, R.B., 2004. Patch use by the greater glider (*Petauroides volans*) in a fragmented forest ecosystem. II. Characteristics of den trees and preliminary data on den-use patterns. *Wildl. Res.* 31, 569–577.
- Lindenmayer, D.B., Welsh, A., Donnelly, C., Crane, M., Michael, D., Macgregor, C., McBurney, L., Montague-Drake, R., Gibbons, P., 2009. Are nest-boxes a viable alternative source of cavities for hollow-dependent animals? Long-term monitoring of nest-box occupancy, pest use and attrition. *Biol. Conserv.* 142, 33–42.
- Lovegrove, B.G., Heldmaier, G., Ruf, T., 1991. Perspectives of endothermy revisited: the endothermic temperature range. *J. Therm. Biol.* 16, 185–197.
- Martin, J.K., 2005. Behavioural ecology of the bobuck (*Trichosurus cunninghami*). PhD Thesis. The University of Melbourne.
- Martin, J.K., Handasyde, K.A., 2007. Comparison of bobuck (*Trichosurus cunninghami*) demography in two habitat types in the Strathbogie Ranges, Australia. *J. Zool.* 271, 375–385.
- McComb, W.C., Noble, R.E., 1981. Microclimates of nest-boxes and natural cavities in bot- tomland hardwoods. *J. Wildl. Manag.* 45, 284–289.
- McKechnie, A.E., Wolf, B.O., 2010. Climate change increases the likelihood of catastrophic avian mortality events during extreme heat waves. *Biol. Lett.* 6.2, 253–256.
- Mehajan, P.V., Oliveira, F.A.R., Macedo, I., 2008. Effect of temperature and humidity on the transpiration rate of the whole mushrooms. *J. Food Eng.* 84, 281–288.
- Menkhorst, P.W., 1984. Use of nest boxes by forest vertebrates in Gippsland: acceptance, preference and demand. *Wildl. Res.* 11, 255–264.
- Paclík, M., Weidinger, K., 2007. Microclimate of tree cavities during winter nights: impli- cations for roost site selection in birds. *Int. J. Biometeorol.* 51, 287–293.
- Pahl, L.L., 1987. Survival, age-determination and population age structure of the common ringtail possum, *Pseudocheirus peregrinus*, in a *Eucalyptus* woodland and a *Leptospermum* thicket in Southern Victoria. *Aust. J. Zool.* 35, 625–639.
- Phillips, P., Heath, J., 1995. Dependency of surface temperature regulation on body size in terrestrial mammals. *J. Therm. Biol.* 20, 281–289.
- Pinheiro, J., Bates, D., DebRoy, S., Sarkar, D., R Core Team, 2015. nlme: linear and nonlinear mixed-effects models. R Package Version. 3 :pp. 1–122. <http://CRAN.R-project.org/package=nlme>.
- Porter, W.P., Kearney, M., 2009. Size, shape, and the thermal niche of endotherms. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.* 106, 19666–19672.
- Quinn, G.P., Keough, M.J., 2002. Experimental Design and Data Analysis for Biologists. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- R Core Team, 2014. R: a Language and Environment for Statistical Computing. R Founda- tion for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria (URL <http://www.R-project.org/>).
- Robinson, K.W., Morrison, P.R., 1957. The reaction to hot atmospheres of various species of Australian marsupial and placental animals. *J. Cell. Physiol.* 49, 455–478.
- Scott, V.E., Whelan, J.A., Svoboda, P.L., 1980. Cavity-nesting birds and forest management. General Technical Report INT. 86, pp. 311–324.
- Sedgeley, J.A., 2001. Quality of cavity microclimate as a factor influencing selection of ma- ternity roosts by a tree-dwelling bat, *Chalinolobus tuberculatus*, in New Zealand. *J. Appl. Ecol.* 38, 425–438.
- Speakman, J., 1997. Factors influencing the daily energy expenditure of small mammals. *Proc. Nutr. Soc.* 56, 1119–1136.
- Stamp, R.K., Brunton, D.H., Walter, B., 2002. Artificial nest-box use by the north island saddleback: Effects of nest-box design and mite infestations on nest site selection and reproductive success. *New Zealand Journal of Zoology* 29, 285–292.
- Van den Oord, Q.G.W., Wijk, E.J.A., Lugton, I.W., Morris, R.S., Holmes, C.W., 1995. Effects of air temperature, air movement and artificial rain on the heat-production of brushtail possums (*Trichosurus vulpecula*): an exploratory study. *N. Z. Vet. J.* 43, 328–332.
- Vel'Ký, M., Kaňuch, P., Křištin, A., 2010. Selection of roosting vegetation in the great tit, *Parus major*, during the winter period. *Ethol. Ecol. Evol.* 22, 305–310.
- Vesk, P.A., Nolan, R., Thomson, J.R., Dorrough, J.W., Nally, R.M., 2008. Time lags in provi- sion of habitat resources through revegetation. *Biol. Conserv.* 141, 174–186.
- Vines, R.G., 1968. Heat transfer through bark, and the resistance of trees to fire. *Aust. J. Bot.* 16, 499–514.
- Wesołowski, T., 2002. Anti-predator adaptations in nesting marsh tits *Parus palustris*: the role of nest-site security. *Ibis* 144, 593–601.
- Wiebe, K.L., 2001. Microclimate of tree cavity nests: is it important for reproductive suc- cess in Northern Flickers? *Auk* 118, 412–421.
- Willis, C.K.R., Brigham, R.M., 2005. Physiological and ecological aspects of roost selection by reproductive female hoary bats (*Lasiurus cinereus*). *J. Mammal.* 86, 85–94.
- Willis, C.K.R., Brigham, R.M., 2007. Social thermoregulation exerts more influence than microclimate on forest roost preferences by a cavity-dwelling bat. *Behav. Ecol. Sociobiol.* 62, 97–108.
- Wormington, K., Lamb, D., 1999. Tree-hollow development in wet and dry sclerophyll eu- calypt forest in South-East Queensland, Australia. *Aust. For.* 62, 336–345.
- Zuur, A.F., Ieno, E.N., Walker, N.J., Saveliev, A.A., Smith, G.M., 2009. In: Gail, M., Krickeberg, K., Samet, J.M., Tsiatis, A., Wong, W. (Eds.), Mixed-Effects Models and Extensions in Ecology With R. Springer Science and Business Media, New York, NY.