Research Vidyapith International Multidisciplinary Journal

(International Open Access, Peer-reviewed & Refereed Journal)

(Multidisciplinary, Monthly, Multilanguage)

*** Vol-3* *Issue-4* *April 2026***

www.researchvidyapith.com **ISSN (Online): 3048-7331**

Conservation Biology: Strategies and Challenges in Protecting Endangered Species

Dr. Fatma Zohra Khatoon

M.Sc., PH.D, Department of Zoology, Magadh University, Bodh Gaya, Bihar

Article Info: *(Recieved- 28/01/2026, Accept- 20/02/2026, Published- 02/04/2026)*

DOI- 10.70650/rvimj.2026v3i4005

Abstract

Conservation biology plays a vital role in protecting endangered species and maintaining global biodiversity. Rapid industrialization, urbanization, habitat destruction, climate change, pollution, overexploitation of natural resources, and invasive species have significantly increased the risk of species extinction across the world. This research paper examines the major threats faced by endangered species and evaluates the scientific strategies and conservation interventions used to address these challenges. Habitat protection and restoration, captive breeding, species reintroduction, genetic management, and community participation are identified as key approaches for biodiversity conservation. The importance of monitoring systems, population assessment methods, and data-driven decision-making in developing effective conservation plans. International cooperation, environmental policies, and adaptive management frameworks are essential for achieving long-term conservation success. Furthermore, socio-economic and political barriers, including limited funding, lack of awareness, and weak policy implementation, continue to hinder conservation efforts.

Keywords- Conservation Biology, Endangered Species, Biodiversity Conservation, Habitat Restoration, Climate Change, Wildlife Protection, Sustainable Ecosystems.

1. Introduction

Human activities are driving a global biodiversity crisis. Current estimates suggest that approximately 40% of all species face the threat of extinction in the coming decades unless urgent action is taken. Conservation biology combines scientific research and practical interventions to address this seemingly intractable problem. At its core lie two fundamental questions: Which species are in danger and what should be done to help them? These questions cannot be answered without a clear understanding of the threats to biodiversity and how these threats interact. Conservation practitioners have developed a variety of evidence-based tools and strategies for alleviating some of the principal threats to biodiversity, yet the effective implementation of these strategies will require confronting many socio-political and economic challenges.

Biodiversity is understood to refer to the sum total of variation across all levels of biological organization, from genetic, species, and community diversity through to diversity among ecosystems and landscapes. Conservation biologists, however, have focused their efforts primarily on the protection of species at risk of extinction, and this aspect of conservation biology occupies the remainder of this discussion. The population sizes of many species have decreased to such an extent that their long-term persistence is no longer assured, and current biodiversity loss is occurring more rapidly than any past extinction event in human history. Although the International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN) Red List provides one clear measure of risk, such formal assessments represent only a relatively small subset of all species – almost 90% of the birds, mammals, and amphibians listed by the IUCN, for instance, are expected to be declining – and considerable uncertainty surrounds the status of the millions of plant, fungi, and invertebrate species that share the planet with us.

2. Threats to Endangered Species

The main drivers threatening species are habitat loss, climate change, overexploitation, pollution, invasive species, and disease (Venter et al., 2006). Habitat loss causes 84% of species in Canada to decline and remains the single most important factor in most assessments. Since the industrial revolution, terrestrial and freshwater ecosystems have lost 50% of their biota. Oceanic ecosystems are 90% stock exploited. Habitat destruction and degradation occur due to agriculture, urban development, harvesting of natural resources, and climate change. Destructive resource extraction affects global biodiversity. Species introgression from the anthropogenic vector leads to the co-extinction of native species. Breeding programs aim to reduce the genetic erosion in wild populations and maintain viable populations in captive conditions.

2.1. Habitat Loss and Fragmentation

The United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) investigated the problems facing endangered species and uncovered that habitat alteration was the main cause of species being brought to the threshold of extinction (Mullu, 2016). Initially, forests and woodlands were cleared for agriculture. Human settlements led to further deforestation and convulsions of the landscape that eroded biological diversity. Today, habitat loss still remains the most urgent threat, responsible for 55%-69% of extinctions on all continents except for Oceania. Many types of habitat loss, degradation, and fragmentation may be evident within a single area. Further review work classified human-caused habitat loss into land transformation, alteration, and modification. Such processes include the transformation of natural habitats into urban environments. As a result of the transformation process, the landscape differs sharply from that at a pre-transformation stage, when the territory was occupied essentially only by the former natural ecosystems.

The UNEP study stated that habitat fragmentation became the second most serious cause of extinction globally. Habitat fragmentation occurs likewise in a habitat under heavy disturbance but without a complete change of cover type. Many islands along the Ethiopian coast were formed as a consequence of the last oceanic transgression. Investigations in habitat destruction generate a vast literature on theoretical and computational approaches to control problems for dynamic species management. In the past, location and management efforts were restricted to exclusively natural habitats and water bodies, similar to the Clem region in the 1940s. The study of habitat fragmentation has gained increasing interest and is a priority of several international organizations, stressing the urgent need to protect endangered species and their remaining habitats. Habitat modification is indeed one big issue.

2.2. Climate Change

Climate change affects the persistence of most species on the planet, both directly and indirectly. Global mean surface temperature has increased by approximately 1°C

(M Hagerman & MA Chan, 2009). As the planet warms, climate will change fundamentally, and biogeographically patterns of temperature, precipitation, moisture balance, and extreme events will be radically altered across the Earth. Species already restricted to marginal habitats will be threatened. In many regions, ranges will shift outside protected areas, especially shifting up in elevation or pole ward. Existing protected areas will need to be conserved and modified, new protected areas created, or species moved in a massive bioengineering operation (E. Camacho, 2016). Coastal and subsiding lowland regions and freshwater systems will be particularly imperilled because climate changes and sea level rise will expose them to unprecedented salinity levels. Ocean warming will cause mass loss of coral reefs and important ecosystems dependent on them, with subsequent loss of many species. Marine species translocate to brackish freshwater and terrestrial environments with sensible salinity regimes may stand a chance.

2.3. Overexploitation and Pollution

Human population growth has contributed significantly to the decline of many species. Overexploitation is one of the most significant direct threats to species, affecting a wide array of terrestrial and aquatic taxa. It comprises the unsustainable exploitation of wild plant and animal species by harvest and trade. On the one hand, some species are harvested for food, medicine, and other products, causing general decline in the population. Other species are collected for pets, zoos, and as exotic plants, without sufficient knowledge of how local populations will be affected. Pollutants in air, land, and water also affect biodiversity and habitat loss (Naeem et al., 2006) (W. S. Challender et al., 2023).

2.4. Invasive Species and Disease

Invasive species impose serious threats to conservation via a variety of mechanisms. Such species may displace native organisms, alter habitats, transmit diseases, or degrade ecosystem function. Invasive species may introduce pathogens into naïve wildlife populations or enhance the spread of infectious agents already present in the environment. The risk of exotic disease outbreaks is often magnified following intentional or inadvertent translocations of wildlife across jurisdictional boundaries. Since the mid-1970s, the global trade in wild species has accelerated, propelled by diverse factors, including the establishment of the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species (CITES), rapid expansion of international trade in general, and increasing demand for biodiversity in a wide range of sectors (The World Conservation Union, 2000).

3. Monitoring and Data-Driven Decision Making

Monitoring and data-driven decision making are foundational to effective conservation management. Uncertainties regarding the extent of threats and the expected impact of potential conservation measures constitute major obstacles to successful action. By quantifying the consequences of these uncertainties for threatened species, a better understanding of the most effective response to avoid extinction can be achieved (T. Buxton et al., 2020). Forecasts of population changes and the expected effects of possible interventions form the basis of quantitative threat assessment frameworks that guide conservation planning efforts. These frameworks allow the investigation of which protection measures hold the greatest potential to avert immediate risk. Furthermore, the expected consequence of each measure on the population trajectory enables prioritization of actions that lead to the desired goal in the shortest time frame. The overall capacity of an area to deliver a recovery in numbers and the range of viable actions to facilitate that recovery can also be incorporated into an integrated planning framework.

3.1. Population Assessment Methods

Reliable population assessment is a cornerstone for effective prioritization and allocation of conservation resources and interventions (T. Sterner, 2009). There exist diverse methods of population assessment for monitoring both terrestrial and aerial species (Meijaard et al., 2011). Capture-recapture techniques derive basic population parameters from the frequency of marked individuals or the number of recaptures. A natural variant of catch–mark–release methods is the so-called removal method, where the focus is on the removal of individuals. In these cases, some form of hidden dynamic model relating the removal data to the parameters of interest underlies the inference. While the aforementioned methods yield estimates for mean population size, frequency of measurement remains crucial for analysing population dynamics, i.e. detecting the presence of trends and estimating indicators about the trends themselves.

A common non-invasive population assessment technique applied to social species is the estimation of the number of calls (border calls for terrestrial species, song for aerial species) received in relation to an indexed baseline of habitat occupancy determined on the focus area, complementary to beach counts of marine turtles. Additionally, survey data represent a usual complementary approach.

3.2. Threat Assessment Frameworks

Assessing and scoring biological and anthropogenic threats can simplify conservation planning. A straightforward framework evaluates status under four categories: whether threats to a species increased, remained unchanged, decreased, or were eliminated ("Free and open" foundation). For each, a "sufficient" approach also records population patterns since 1990: whether numbers decreased to extinction threshold, remained stable or increased, or rebounded after substantial prior declines (W. Malcom et al., 2016). Combined results inform the relative effectiveness of different conservation activities, structuring priorities when resource constraints restrict overall efforts.

4. Conservation Strategies and Interventions

Globally, approximately 109,000 species are considered endangered, reflecting at least a 10% loss of population or 10% decreased habitat extent (H. Heywood, 2019). These represent only a fraction of Earth's biodiversity; nevertheless, they are significant. Between 1980 and 2010, biodiversity loss doubled. Unsustainable land development led to 80% of deforestation, agriculture expanded over 50%, and 73% of marine resources became overshot or collapsed. Conservation strategies and interventions using the best available science restore biodiversity, a life-support system essential for humanity.

Habitat protection and restoration remain the most effective conservation practice. Ecosystems underpin species and biological communities. Stable hydrology and soil fertility support ecosystem services such as erosion control, nutrient cycling, and pollution filtration. These services buffer against climate change. Even a 10% habitat loss undermines species reintroduction success. High connectivity between remaining biomes is likewise vital for dispersal and migration across patches, while large minimum viable populations are needed to withstand stresses expected this century.

4.1. Habitat Protection and Restoration

Maintaining or restoring habitat remains one of the most effective conservation interventions across taxa and ecosystems. With few exceptions, population recovery occurs only in environments protected from human activities or restored to conditions conducive to population recovery, including the re-establishment of habitat-forming guilds. Protecting remaining habitat can be accomplished through the establishment of new protected areas or the enhancement of existing ones by strengthening legislation, enforcement, and management (Volis, 2019). Protective measures related to remaining habitat can include prevention or reduction of invasive species, regulation of human access to sensitive habitat, and curtailment or removal of water diversions and related infrastructure. Habitat restoration helps to reverse land degradation, increase ecosystem service provision, enhance habitat quality, accelerate ecological succession, and improve connectivity between remaining natural habitats. Conservation-oriented restoration targets habitats degraded rather than entirely destroyed, addresses critical limiting factors for population recovery, and can be effectively carried out in synergy with other conservation interventions.

4.2. Captive Breeding and Reintroduction

The Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) and 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development recognize species loss as a major global challenge. The last 50 years have seen over 500 terrestrial vertebrate species extirpated or extinct, and the current extinction rate is up to 1,000 times higher than before large-scale human impact. Human-induced species decline is driven by habitat destruction, climate change, pollution, invasive species, and overexploitation. As a consequence, more than 38,000 species are threatened with extinction according to the IUCN Red List, and current models project that at least 320,000 terrestrial species could be committed to extinction in the coming decades.

4.3. Assisted Colonization and Genetic Management

Assisted colonization involves relocating a species to a suitable environment beyond its historical range to mitigate climate threats that cannot be addressed at its native location. For isolated populations with low dispersal or connectivity, managed relocation can safeguard against climate forerunners such as extreme weather events, sea-level rise, or wildfire. Genetic management can reduce inbreeding and enhance evolutionary capacity through translocation of compatible individuals or common-garden experiments for selective breeding (R. Onley et al., 2021). Seasonal translocation can also benefit threatened species such as amphibians or fishes that are tied to environmental refugee. Species under immediate threat from habitat destruction or invasive red fire ants benefit from combining these approaches, capitalizing on species-specific knowledge and minimizing any remaining uncertainties. The interaction of anthropogenic climate drivers and extreme climate events alters the fundamental climate niche of many species, including amphibians, making a prioritization exercise that incorporates future climatic suitability mandatory. Recent iterations of received knowledge can broaden conservation efforts beyond Australia to the wider Asia-Pacific region.

4.4. Community Engagement and Environmental Justice

The successful implementation of any conservation strategy ultimately hinges on the enabling environment in which these strategies are executed. Despite the technological advances in monitoring endangered species and habitat protection efforts, even the most sophisticated initiatives remain vulnerable if the socio-political conditions are non-conducive. Sustainable conservation efforts must therefore foster, at a minimum, the free prior informed consent of those who theoretically own the resources (M. Kiria et al., 2014). Engaging communities in anthropogenic threats faced by biodiversity, including addressing their perspectives on these threats as well as on conservation actions taken, is therefore critical. A successful community engagement strategy recognizes that local stakeholders are often at the margins of decision making processes. Awareness raising activities also need to pay serious attention to providing adequate and scientifically sound biodiversity information. The provision of opportunities by the conservation community needs to match locally perceived real needs, which are not necessarily just about biodiversity conservation. Conservation efforts, thus, need to inject themselves in the wider development debate (Amrock, 2006).

5. Evaluation of Conservation Outcomes

Despite growing concern over biodiversity loss, few evaluations of species conservation efforts exist that could inform future actions. The definition of success differs significantly among conservation practitioners, scientists, and policy-makers, depending on subjective values (C. Bottrill et al., 2011). Improving understanding of what constitutes successful conservation would enhance the body of knowledge regarding failed and successful conservation actions and assist in the sustainable prioritization of past projects along with ongoing and future initiatives (M.R. Meredith et al., 2017). Several criteria have emerged for gauging success—species persistence within the target area (i.e. occurrence and population size), ecological improvements within the target area (e.g. habitat restoration), landscape-level threat mitigation connected to a project, financial return on investment, social capital, and direct actions that could gauge the progression of project outcomes.

5.1. Metrics of Success

Conservation success is rarely definitively measured or communicated, despite extensive investment and effort (M.R. Meredith et al., 2017). Significantly, conservation success relates to the impact of conservation actions, including process measures such as species management (audits, monitoring, training, and capacity development) and site management (threat mitigation, habitat restoration, resource management), as well as outcome measures like population recovery (project completion and species persistence), species management (population assessments, surveys, reintroductions), and habitat restoration (monitoring responses to restoration). Moreover, success also depends on aligning these process and outcome indicators; misalignment can lead to achieving one set of goals at the expense of others. Different views on success influence conservation efforts, especially in community-based projects which emphasise social processes, sustainable livelihoods, and local stakeholder welfare. The focus on ecosystem services highlights the importance of conservation in benefitting human well-being.

6. Challenges in Implementation

Conservation efforts are precluded by financial, administrative, technical, and other barriers. Socio-economic obstacles can obstruct efforts to register endangered species, secure safeguards, solicit funding, and sustain action. Engagement with relevant socio-economic, cultural, and political stakeholders is crucial (H. Heywood, 2019).

Biological and ecological considerations, methodological limitations of data sets, and socio-political alternatives compromise population models of endangered species, reducing the statistical basis guiding extinction projects. The thorough incorporation of global pressures, jeopardized ecosystem goods and services, model uncertainty, and insurance policies into pre-release risk assessments would render extinction interventions more acceptable to regulators and funding organizations.

6.1. Resource Constraints and Prioritization

Conservation actions are constrained by limited resources, necessitating prioritization of species and activities. Addressing resource limitations and informing prioritization decisions are crucial aspects of conservation planning. A comprehensive review indicated that approximately 50% of funding in threatened species recovery plans is dedicated to research and monitoring activities (T. Buxton et al., 2020). These initiatives are vital for understanding new threats, assessing population status, evaluating intervention effectiveness, and adapting strategies to on-going environmental change. Plans must strive for a careful balance between securing adequate investment for site-based or translocation interventions and funding essential research and monitoring.

Significant unmet funding requirements for species threatened by extinction persist in various regions (Brazill-Boast et al., 2018). These requirements encompass both comprehensive conservation plans and investment in general financial instruments linked to project implementation. A systematic and inclusive planning framework is essential for increasing the overall likelihood of successful recovery in the face of stringent resource constraints.

6.2. Socio-political Barriers and Compliance

The loss of biodiversity poses significant threats to societal well-being, highlighting the importance of species protection in conservation biology. However, implementation faces substantial hurdles, particularly socio-political barriers. Such obstacles may arise from lack of political will, competing societal priorities, inadequate scientific data, or restricted stakeholder consultations. Moreover, politicians are often motivated by prosociality, seeking genuine support for their own causes before assisting others (W. Davis et al., 2006). The situation is exacerbated by a perception of conservations' wider social benefits being greatest for less affluent stakeholder segments, a political parameter rarely addressed (C. Rose et al., 2018).

7. Case Studies

Endangered species are often divided into groups associated with large populations (greater than forty thousand) and small populations (fewer than five thousand). Smaller populations are more endangered in various ways due to habitat degradation, environmental stochasticity, and threats from human activities. Severe forecast of extinction rates is also associated with smaller populations. Detailed case studies of three ecosystems support this association: the Hawaiian Archipelago (island endemics), the Rocky Mountain Region (migratory corridors), and the Amazonian Biome (smallholder- and indigenous-managed lands). Many conservation strategies address broader groups of targeted species but detailed case studies provide critical locality-specific details required for implementation. Multiple criteria and threats influencing conservation efforts also differ widely across taxa.

7.1. Island Endemics

Small islands are often viewed as havens of biodiversity; however, total species richness is frequently low due to their limited size, environmental heterogeneity, and restricted habitat types. Nevertheless, small islands usually exhibit high levels of endemism—the ratio of endemic species to total species is greater than on large islands. For instance, 53% of the total flora of Malta is endemic (Deidun, 2010). Island endemics occupy unique ecological niches and are particularly prone to extinction. The vast majority of these are non-migratory and, given that invasive species often proliferate in islands of high endemism with scant biodiversity protection (e.g., Kauai, Hawaii), the extinction of island endemics follows rapid sequences (Rønsted et al., 2022).

7.2. Migratory Corridors

Migration is among the most common patterns of animal behavior (L. Fischman, 2011). Protecting migratory corridors is crucial for maintaining populations of migratory species. Corridors link core habitats, facilitate the spread of individuals to new areas, allow access to seasonal resources, and serve as avenues for species to adjust to climate change. The patterns of migration vary widely among species, and emerging research reveals the ability of populations to modify migrations in response to anthropogenic changes. Unfortunately, time-lags in policy response hinder targeted migratory corridor establishment that would accommodate such changes. Privately owned land poses additional challenges to conservation. Information-sharing, connectivity, and sociocultural factors remain under-explored dimensions of migration science. Prioritizing investment in these areas may enhance the conservation of species that exhibit, or could potentially develop, migratory behavior.

8. Conclusion

Effective conservation strategies and interventions have been documented to reverse trends of decline for many species. These approaches target the most substantial threats identified through monitoring and data-driven decision making, which is vital for successful such conservation initiatives. Although protected areas are the most widely recognized conservation instrument, habitat protection and restoration outside of reserves can be equally important. This is especially true for island endemics, since it is rare and often infeasible to protect entire ecosystems on islands without also securing additional, species-specific interventions, and for migratory corridors, where standard methods of habitat protection cannot be applied given that animals are only present within them sporadically. Coordination of complementary approaches, although difficult for extensively traveled networks of surface routes or multiscale smallholder landscapes, can enhance the contribution of large-scale corridor initiatives to effective conservation. Community engagement is essential for all conservation strategies and interventions: without clear recognition of the interdependence of social and environmental dimensions of sustainability, many of the proposed solutions are unlikely to gain traction within target populations. Policies that promote environmental sustainability on smallholder and Indigenous-managed lands yield conservation benefits for increased biodiversity; nevertheless, such arrangements need to be accompanied by secure land tenure and access to naturally regulating ecosystem services whose depletion in surrounding areas threatens long-term viability. On a par with knowledge of the distribution and abundance of threatened species, systematic assessment of the threat matrix they confront is crucial for identifying effective interventions and allocating limited resources to significant cumulative measures because it is rarely feasible to tackle and mitigate every threat. Policy instruments, such as legally mandated assessment statements accompanying any project likely to impact a listed endangered species and associated habitat, can motivate stakeholders to undertake precautionary assessments of significant species in priority areas proactively and elevate the conservation agenda. Changes in the priority area for systematic analyses at which accompanied measures are required can inform active collection of knowledge still lacking elsewhere. Through comprehensive, large-scale modeling and mapping of multiple priority and hazard factors at continental scales to design tests that facilitate complementary, wide-ranging, and conducive-to-implementation conservation actions in systematically selected regions, monitor-controlled outcomes from pilot implementations performed as field-ready change protocols in continentally targeted picture areas help to ascertain efficacy. (H. Heywood, 2019).

Author's Declaration:

I/We, the author(s)/co-author(s), declare that the entire content, views, analysis, and conclusions of this article are solely my/our own. I/We take full responsibility, individually and collectively, for any errors, omissions, ethical misconduct, copyright violations, plagiarism, defamation, misrepresentation, or any legal consequences arising now or in the future. The publisher, editors, and reviewers shall not be held responsible or liable in any way for any legal, ethical, financial, or reputational claims related to this article. All responsibility rests solely with the author(s)/co-author(s), jointly and severally. I/We further affirm that there is no conflict of interest financial, personal, academic, or professional regarding the subject, findings, or publication of this article.

References:

1. Venter, O., N. Brodeur, N., Nemiroff, L., Belland, B., J. Dolinsek, I., & W.A. Grant, J. (2006). Threats to Endangered Species in Canada.
2. Mullu, D. (2016). A Review on the Effect of Habitat Fragmentation on Ecosystem.
3. M Hagerman, S. & MA Chan, K. (2009). Climate change and biodiversity conservation: impacts, adaptation strategies and future research directions. ncbi.nlm.nih.gov
4. E. Camacho, A. (2016). Managing Ecosystem Effects in an Era of Rapid Climate Change.
5. Naeem, S., S. Waples, R., & Moritz, C. (2006). Preserving Nature.
6. W. S. Challender, D., J. Cremona, P., Malsch, K., E. Robinson, J., T. Pavitt, A., Scott, J., Hoffmann, R., Joolia, A., E. E. Oldfield, T., K. B. Jenkins, R., A. Conde, D., Hilton-Taylor, C., & Hoffmann, M. (2023). Identifying species likely threatened by international trade on the IUCN Red List can inform CITES trade measures. ncbi.nlm.nih.gov
7. A Chornesky, E., M Bartuska, A., H Aplet, G., O Britton, K., Cummings-Carlson, J., W. Davis, F., Eskow, J., R Gordon, D., W Gottschalk, K., A Haack, R., J. Hansen, A., N Mack, R., J Rahel, F., A Shannon, M., A Wainger, L., & Bently Wigley, T. (2005). Science Priorities for Reducing the Threat of Invasive Species to Sustainable Forestry.
8. Vander Wal, E., Garant, D., Calmé, S., A Chapman, C., Festa-Bianchet, M., Millien, V., Rioux-Paquette, S., & Pelletier, F. (2014). Applying evolutionary concepts to wildlife disease ecology and management. ncbi.nlm.nih.gov
9. T. Buxton, R., Avery-Gomm, S., Lin, H. Y., A. Smith, P., J. Cooke, S., & R. Bennett, J. (2020). Half of resources in threatened species conservation plans are allocated to research and monitoring. ncbi.nlm.nih.gov
10. Bayraktarov, E., Ehmke, G., O'Connor, J., Burns, E. L., Nguyen, H. A., McRae, L., Possingham, H. P., & Lindenmayer, D. B. (2019). Do big unstructured biodiversity data mean more knowledge?.
11. T. Sterner, R. (2009). The Economics of Threatened Species Conservation: A Review and Analysis.
12. Meijaard, E., Mengersen, K., Buchori, D., Nurcahyo, A., Ancrenaz, M., Wich, S., Suci Utami Atmoko, S., Tjiu, A., Prasetyo, D., Nardiyono, undefined, Hadiprakarsa, Y., Christy, L., Wells, J., Albar, G., & J. Marshall, A. (2011). Why Don't We Ask? A Complementary Method for Assessing the Status of Great Apes. ncbi.nlm.nih.gov
13. W. Malcom, J., M. Webber, W., & Li, Y. W. (2016). A simple, sufficient, and consistent method to score the status of threats and demography of imperiled species. ncbi.nlm.nih.gov
14. H. Heywood, V. (2019). Conserving plants within and beyond protected areas - still problematic and future uncertain.
15. J. Fontaine, J. (2011). Improving our legacy: Incorporation of adaptive management into state wildlife action plans.
16. Volis, S. (2019). Conservation-oriented restoration – a two for one method to restore both threatened species and their habitats. ncbi.nlm.nih.gov
17. A. BrichieriColombi, T., A. Lloyd, N., M. McPherson, J., & Moehrenschlager, A. (2019). Limited contributions of released animals from zoos to North American conservation translocations. ncbi.nlm.nih.gov
18. Jule, K. (2013). Effects of Captivity and Implications for Ex-situ Conservation: with special reference to red panda (Ailurus fulgens).
19. R. Onley, I., E. Moseby, K., & J. Austin, J. (2021). Genomic Approaches for Conservation Management in Australia under Climate Change. ncbi.nlm.nih.gov
20. M. Kiria, E., N. Ayonga, J., & Ipara, H. (2014). Promoting Effective Community Participation in Land Use Planning and Manageme.

Cite this Article-

'Dr. Fatma Zohra Khatoon', "Conservation Biology: Strategies and Challenges in Protecting Endangered Species", Research Vidyapith International Multidisciplinary Journal, ISSN: 3048-7331 (Online), Volume:3, Issue:4, April 2026.