

## FORUM ARTICLE

### Exploring the concept of niche convergence in a land without rodents: the case of weta as small mammals

Melissa J. Griffin, Steve A. Trewick\*, Priscilla M. Wehi and Mary Morgan-Richards

Ecology Group, Institute of Natural Resources, Massey University, Private Bag 11-222, Palmerston North, New Zealand

\*Author for correspondence: [s.trewick@massey.ac.nz](mailto:s.trewick@massey.ac.nz)

Published on-line: 21 March 2011

**Abstract:** The distinctiveness of New Zealand's large endemic orthopterans and lack of small mammals in our forest ecosystems led to the description of weta as ecologically equivalent to rodents in other countries. We review the use of this metaphor and the characteristics, such as diet and reproductive behaviour, given to support it. We note, however, that species are rarely specified when comparisons are made, thereby neglecting the ecological diversity of both weta and rodents. We suggest that if these taxa are to be compared, the details of their ecology are important and the scale of their influence in an ecosystem must be taken into account. We consider in particular the relevance of the 'invertebrate mouse' cliché in understanding evolutionary ecology in New Zealand and find it misleading. We show that reproductive potential and scale of change in population size differ greatly between mice and tree weta. We find that endothermic mice (*Mus musculus*) have a metabolic rate almost 20 times faster than ectothermic tree weta (*Hemideina* sp.), an intrinsic rate of increase some 275 times higher, and consume a high quality diet dominated by seeds and invertebrates and devoid of leaves, in contrast to tree weta diets. Comparative quantitative analyses of the influence of different animals on ecosystem services, biomass, nutrient cycling and energy turnover of forests in New Zealand and elsewhere will contribute to interpretation of the evolutionary history of the New Zealand biota.

**Keywords:** Anostomatidae; ecosystem function; invertebrate mice; New Zealand; niche; omnivory

## Introduction

The fauna of New Zealand is widely recognised as distinctive and unusual in terms of composition and ecology (Daugherty et al. 1993; Trewick & Morgan-Richards 2009; Wallis & Trewick 2009 and refs therein). An example of this distinctiveness is the prominent place in New Zealand's culture of certain Orthoptera and in particular members of the family Anostomatidae, known as weta<sup>1</sup> (Johns 1997; Trewick & Morgan-Richards 2009). Four groups of weta are present in the New Zealand anostomatid fauna; all are flightless and nocturnal, and comprise 11 species of giant weta (*Deinacrida*), seven tree weta species (*Hemideina*), three tusked weta species (*Anisoura*, *Motuweta*) and approximately 40 species of ground weta (*Hemiandrus*). The prominence of these large crickets in New Zealand contrasts with a natural absence of small mammals, which in other parts of the world are a major component of terrestrial ecosystems. This perhaps explains why a comparison of these very different animals has been made. In this paper we review the uses of the weta/rodent or weta/small mammal comparison and consider its relevance and value in understanding the evolutionary ecology of New Zealand.

Immediately prior to the arrival of humans (c. 13th century AD; Wilmshurst & Higham 2004) New Zealand had few native mammals. Although at least one, probably flightless, small mammal was present in the mid-Miocene (Worthy et al. 2006), abundant Holocene and late Pleistocene bone deposits

collected in caves, swamps and dunes provide strong evidence that terrestrial mammals were absent in more recent times (Worthy & Holdaway 2002). Thus, the recent evolutionary history of New Zealand's biota has proceeded without a well-developed mammalian fauna. Inferred outcomes of this situation include a relatively high diversity of flightless birds and the occupation by non-mammalian taxa of ecological niche space utilised by mammals elsewhere in the world (Diamond 1990). For example, some small birds, such as the now extinct Stephens Island wren, *Traversia lyalli*, are said to have had a niche parallel to that of small mammals such as mice and rats (Diamond 1990). At the other size extreme, New Zealand moa (Dinornithiformes) have been described as occupying the niche of ungulates (Ramsay 1978), and the unique characteristics of the kiwi (*Apteryx* spp.) have seen it given the status of honorary mammal (Calder 1978). There are, however, few data that explicitly explore or test the accuracy or relevance of such descriptions.

Probably the most frequently cited example of putative niche convergence involves the comparison of weta with rats (Ramsay 1978; Southern 1979; Daugherty et al. 1993), mice (Fleming 1973, 1977; King 1974, 1991; Ramsay 1978; Southern 1979; Daugherty et al. 1993), rodents (Ramsay 1978; Stevens 1980; Daugherty et al. 1993; Guignion 2005), and small mammals generally (Fleming 1973; Southern 1979; Duthie et al. 2006; King et al. 2011) including voles (Fleming 1977; King 1974). In the more recent literature, most authors simply acknowledge these comparisons without necessarily

<sup>1</sup> The Maori name weta is applied to Orthoptera of two species-rich cricket families, Anostomatidae and Rhaphidophoridae, but the latter are usually called 'cave weta'. Cave weta have not been compared to small mammals.

supporting such a treatment (e.g. Trewick & Morgan-Richards 2005; Watts et al. 2008a, b; Gibbs 2010), whereas at least one author marginalised the proposition, stating that when Pacific rats (*Rattus exulans*) invaded New Zealand, the 'rodent niche was empty' (Gibbs 2009). We believe that comparisons between weta and various small mammals might be useful if they lead to a better understanding of niche convergence, or the ecology and potential ecosystem services of weta within the New Zealand forest ecosystem, including diet and seed dispersal studies, as seeds are an important part of rodent diet (Trewick & Morgan-Richards 2004).

## Basis for the metaphor

Reference to weta as equivalent to some form of small mammal is first attributed to H.N. Southern in 1964 (Fleming 1973; Ramsay 1978). Since then various characteristics of weta have been used as putative evidence for their rodent-like nature. These include nocturnal foraging (Fleming 1977; Ramsay 1978; Stevens 1980; Daugherty et al. 1993; McIntyre 2001), occupation of diverse habitats (Fleming 1977), retreat to daytime roosts (Fleming 1977; Stevens 1980; Daugherty et al. 1993), frass similar in size to rodent droppings (Fleming 1977; Ramsay 1978; Southern 1979; Stevens 1980; Daugherty et al. 1993), combined biomass (Ramsay 1978; Daugherty et al. 1993), polygamous reproduction (Ramsay 1978; Daugherty et al. 1993), omnivory (Ramsay 1978; McIntyre 2001), relatively large individual size (McIntyre 2001), nocturnal terrestrial activity (McIntyre 2001) and seed dispersal (Duthie et al. 2006). Each of these features characterise only partially or inconsistently the subjects being compared and are founded on few if any data.

## Validity of the metaphor: weta as small mammals

An initial and important difficulty with the comparison of weta with small mammals is that it is vague. Reference to small mammals (e.g. Duthie et al. 2006) is misleading because there are many species in this diffuse group (Pough et al. 2005). Even reference to rodents potentially encompasses an ecologically diverse range of species. Among approximately 5000 species of mammals (Delany 1974; Stoddart 1979) there are some 1814 rodents, ranging in size from 4 g to 50 kg (Ellenbroek 1980; Pough et al. 2005), and most are described as small mammals. Similarly, the species of weta used in the metaphor vary; tree (*Hemideina* sp.) and giant weta (*Deinacrida* sp.) are often cited in comparisons (e.g. Southern 1979; Daugherty et al. 1993; Morgan-Richards 1997), but generalisation as 'weta' is also commonplace (e.g. Fleming 1973; King 1991; Burns 2006). Failure to qualify which species are being discussed means that interesting diversity in weta habits is not addressed. For instance diet, which is a commonly used parameter in ecological niche construction, cannot be addressed using this loose terminology. Ground weta (*Hemidrus* sp.) and tusked weta (*Anisoura*, *Motuweta*) are primarily predators or scavengers of animal foods (Cary 1983; Winks et al. 2002), whereas tree and giant weta are unusual among their family in eating leaves (Green 2005; Trewick & Morgan-Richards 2005; Wilson & Jamieson 2005; Wehi & Hicks 2010). The diets of small mammals are similarly diverse; 7 g common

shrews (*Sorex araneus*) consume terrestrial arthropods and earthworms (Malmquist 1985), whereas 15 g house mice (*Mus domesticus*) are omnivores with a large proportion of their diet consisting of seeds when available (Badan 1986; Tann et al. 1991). The various species of weta range in size from less than one gram to more than 50 g. Small mammals that also span this range include the common shrew, *Sorex araneus*, and pygmy shrew, *S. minutus* (7 g and 4 g respectively; Dickman 1988), *Mus musculus* (15 g; Hamilton & Bronson 1985) and the bank vole, *Myodes glareolus* (23 g; Verhagen et al. 1986). The largest weta are about one-third the size of the smallest rat (*Rattus exulans*) in New Zealand (130 g; McCallum 1986).

## Does the phrase 'invertebrate mice' help our science or our understanding?

Although the comparison of weta to a particular mammal is not consistent, the phrase 'invertebrate mice' has become a popular cliché (e.g. King 1974; Fleming 1977; Ramsay 1978) and many authors have applied it even when making non-mouse comparisons (e.g. King 1974; Fleming 1977, referred to voles). Despite this inconsistency, we shall focus here on mice (*Mus*) and tree weta (*Hemideina*). Tree weta species have allopatric or parapatric distributions (their ranges rarely overlap) and this suggests the biology of each species is very similar and thus subject to competitive exclusion where they meet (Trewick & Morgan-Richards 1995, 2004, 2005). In contrast, the co-occurrence of tree weta and introduced mice in New Zealand suggests they are not in competition for resources. Major differences between tree weta and mice limit the usefulness of this comparison and may also allow them to exist in sympatry. The fecundity, energetics, and abundance of tree weta and mice are very different and putative similarity of some other traits provides only partial insight because the scale of influence within an ecosystem may be very different (Table 1). For instance, while mice and tree weta have some similarity in their predation of seeds (e.g. in New Zealand, tree weta *Hemideina thoracica* and mice *Mus* spp. both eat seeds of kauri and rimu; Mirams 1957; Beveridge 1964; Badan 1986; Ruscoe et al. 2004), the quantitative effect that each has upon the tree species is likely to differ.

**Table 1.** Summary of the differences between tree weta (*Hemideina* spp.) and the mouse (*Mus* spp.). (Data from: <sup>a</sup>Miller 1999; <sup>b</sup>Rowe 2009; <sup>c</sup>Ruscoe et al. 2004; <sup>d</sup>Townsend et al. 1997, Moller 1985; <sup>e</sup>Wyman 2009).

	Mouse	Tree weta
Weight	15 g	8 g
Rate of population growth	r-selected	k-selected
Metabolic rate (ml g <sup>-1</sup> h <sup>-1</sup> O <sub>2</sub> )	2.27 <sup>a</sup>	0.114 <sup>b</sup>
Density (per hectare)	8–28 <sup>c</sup>	180–5000 <sup>d</sup>
Diet (per night/per hectare)	8000–28 000 seeds <sup>c</sup> 34–120 g arthropods <sup>a</sup>	20–500 g leaves <sup>c</sup>

## Fecundity

Although body mass of Orthoptera and rodents converge at about the size of small mice, the attributes of large insects and small mammals are nevertheless very different. Tree weta and mice are at different ends of their respective distributions, and this highlights a difference that is expressed in their reproductive capacity. Small Orthoptera (such as *Gryllidae* crickets) often exhibit a 'boom or bust lifestyle' like many small mammals; whereas larger Orthoptera, such as weta, tend to have slower growth and lower replacement rates (Whitman 2008).

The potential reproductive rate of mice far exceeds that of weta. Wild female mice (*Mus musculus*) become sexually mature at about 60–70 days old (Bronson 1984), have a 3-week gestation period, a litter size averaging six offspring and the ability to become pregnant soon after giving birth (Pelikan 1981). The reproductive characteristics of mice compared with other mammals can be characterised as r-selected, with a high intrinsic rate of increase (MacArthur & Wilson 1967). In contrast, tree and giant weta take about one year to reach sexual maturity, and once adult, probably experience just one breeding season and are thus, compared with many smaller Orthoptera, K-selected (MacArthur & Wilson 1967). Although details of weta reproduction are scarce, for two tree weta species held in captivity (*Hemideina thoracica*, *H. crassidens*), between 34 and 120 eggs per female were laid over approximately 6 weeks and hatching rates were between zero and 70% (Morgan-Richards, unpubl. data). Two wild-caught adult female tusked weta (*Motuweta isolata*) laid 153 eggs in captivity before death, although only 21 juveniles were recovered and 15 reared to adults (Stringer 1998). Using the tusked weta example, assuming 76 eggs per female and 100% fertility and survival, and an equal sex ratio, we calculated that a pair of tusked weta could in theory increase to 109 000 in 3 years. During the same time period a pair of mice (*Mus musculus*) could generate a population of over 30 million. The mouse intrinsic rate of increase is thus around 275 times greater than the weta.

The reproductive capacity of mice (and many other rodents) is highly responsive to short-term changes in resource availability (also a characteristic of r-selected species; MacArthur & Wilson 1967). As mice are not limited to seasonal breeding they can respond to food abundance at any time of the year (Brockie 1992). For example, in New Zealand, seed masting of *Nothofagus* beech stimulates a rapid increase of mice (King 1983; Choquenot & Ruscoe 2000; Ruscoe et al. 2005). There is no evidence that any weta do or could respond to such resource fluctuations in this way.

## Metabolism

One reason that mice have such a high growth rate and responsive reproductive rate is that they are endothermic. Mammals expend a large proportion of the energy they consume maintaining their high body temperature (Bennett & Ruben 1979; Pough et al. 2005). Small mammals, such as mice, are at the physiological limits for vertebrate endotherms (cf. reptiles and amphibians) because their relatively large surface area to volume ratio results in inefficiency, compared with larger endotherms, and requires consumption of disproportionately large amounts of food to maintain their metabolic rate (Pough 1980; Pough et al. 2005). While some large mammals are leaf eaters, leaves do not appear to be sufficiently high quality food sources for small mammals. In this respect elephants could be considered a more appropriate mammalian equivalent of

giant weta (*Deinacrida* spp.), in contrast to mice that consume a range of energy-rich foods, including insects and seeds. Ectotherms use solar energy as a heat source, so most of the energy they ingest goes to growth and reproduction (Pough 1980; Pough et al. 2005). This greater energy conversion efficiency means that insects such as tree weta and giant weta can exist in thermodynamically demanding temperate and alpine environments even when consuming mainly leaves (e.g. Trewick & Morgan-Richards 1995; Sinclair et al. 1999; Joyce et al. 2004). However, the ability to survive in these circumstances is accompanied by relatively slow growth of individuals and populations. Even if tree weta and mice consumed the same types of food (which does not appear to be the case), their respective effects on the environment would be different.

The different energy requirements of these animals are reflected in their metabolic rates. Wild house mice have an average resting metabolic rate of  $2.27 \text{ ml g}^{-1} \text{ h}^{-1} \text{ O}_2$ , and to sustain this, mice in New Zealand need to consume about  $91 \text{ kJ day}^{-1}$  (Miller 1999). On a diet of seeds alone, this equates to  $3 \text{ g dry weight per day of rimu (Dacrydium capressinum)}$  seeds ( $30 \text{ kJ g}^{-1}$  rimu seed; Ruscoe et al. 2004) or approximately 970 seeds (Ruscoe et al. 2004). An invertebrate-only diet requires  $4.3 \text{ g day}^{-1}$  (dry mass; Miller 1999). One investigation of mice in New Zealand found that they ate a mixed diet of adult arthropods, larva of Lepidoptera and seeds in exotic pine (*Pinus radiata*) plantations and native kauri (*Agathis australis*) forests (Badan 1986). Diets of mice and ship rats on Rangitoto Island were shown to consist primarily of invertebrates, with tree weta (*Hemideina thoracica*) being the most common species consumed (Miller & Miller 1995).

Equivalent information on weta is scarce. However, comparable data for *Romalea guttata*, a large, herbivorous, North American grasshopper, where females weigh up to 6 g (similar to the weight of adult tree weta and *Mus musculus*), are available (Hadley & Quinlan 1993). In this case, resting metabolic rate measured at  $25^\circ\text{C}$  was found to be  $0.125 \text{ ml g}^{-1} \text{ h}^{-1} \text{ O}_2$  (Hadley & Quinlan 1993). Recent investigation into the metabolism of tree weta (*Hemideina crassidens*, *H. thoracica*) yielded a similar estimate of  $0.114 \text{ ml g}^{-1} \text{ h}^{-1} \text{ O}_2$  at  $16^\circ\text{C}$  (Rowe 2009). This is about 0.05 the rate in mice. Individual tree weta (*H. crassidens*, *H. thoracica*) in captivity consume approximately 30 times less food than a mouse (average of 0.1 g (wet weight) of leaf material per weta per night at  $14^\circ\text{C}$ ; Wyman 2009).

## Environmental impacts

There are clearly major reproductive and thermodynamic differences between mice and tree weta and we expect these to be reflected in the impact of these animals on the ecosystem they occupy. However, there are currently few data for comparison even in terms of population densities of mice and weta. The data that do exist indicate considerable variation in space and time. For example, mouse densities range from 8 to 28 per hectare in Waitutu Forest, South Island, New Zealand (Ruscoe et al. 2004). In contrast, estimates of tree weta densities range from 180 weta  $\text{ha}^{-1}$  on Banks Peninsula, South Island (Townsend et al. 1997) to over 5000 weta  $\text{ha}^{-1}$  on an island lacking native and introduced predators (Moller 1985). Thus we infer that each night mice may be consuming 8000–28 000 tree-seeds or 60–220 g (wet weight, assuming 80% water) of arthropods per hectare, while at the same time tree weta may be eating between 20 and 500 g of leaf material.

Although tree and giant weta appear to disperse and

also predate seeds like some mammals (Duthie et al. 2006; Wyman et al. 2010), their influence depends on the number of seeds consumed and destroyed and the distance travelled. In tree weta the number of seeds eaten is probably low, the proportion destroyed high and the distance travelled minimal (Wyman et al. 2010), so their importance as seed dispersers is likely to be low compared with other animals such as mice and native birds. However, data for comparison of the actual amount consumed by various animals or even home range size are few. For example, estimates of mouse home ranges of between 250 and 470 m<sup>2</sup> (Maly et al. 1985; Mikesic & Drickamer 1992) are not directly equivalent to data showing nightly movements of tree weta of <12 m (Kelly 2006).

## Conclusion

The usefulness of the comparison between the ecological niches of weta and mice (and other small mammals) is constrained by unspecific terminology and the superficial nature of initial comparisons, which obscure much of the ecological and evolutionary distinctiveness of weta. The very different metabolic and reproductive rates and diets of these animals (e.g. mice vs tree weta) likely mean they have significantly different impacts on ecosystems (summarised in Table 1). Persistence of the invertebrate-mouse cliché, despite a lack of supporting evidence for similarity, can best be attributed to lack of knowledge of weta. Thus studies of weta reproductive strategies and mate choice, population size and dynamics, fecundity, dietary repertoire, nutrient optimisation, and resource partitioning among weta taxa deserve close attention. Suitable data on these would also enable comparisons with taxa related to weta that co-occur with native mammals in other parts of the world (e.g. Australia).

Quantification of the effects that different weta species have on seed predation and dispersal, pollination, predation, and nutrient/energy cycling is critical and would enable comparison with other animals in New Zealand ecosystems. The co-occurrence of weta and introduced rodent species in New Zealand today provides the experimental framework for comparative analyses of the ecological niches occupied by weta species and the energetics of New Zealand ecosystems. This will in turn contribute to better interpretation of the evolutionary history of the New Zealand biota and provide an empirical basis for testing what are, in many cases to date, ad hoc interpretations.

## Acknowledgements

We thank Niki Minards for her helpful comments on the manuscript and George Gibbs for getting us started. Two anonymous referees helped improve the manuscript. PMW is funded by New Zealand Foundation for Research Science and Technology postdoctoral fellowship MAUX0905. MJG is supported by a grant from the Entomological Society of New Zealand.

## References

Badan D 1986. Diet of the house mouse (*Mus musculus* L.) in two pine and a kauri forest. *New Zealand Journal of*

- Ecology* 9: 137–141.
- Bennett AF, Ruben JA 1979. Endothermy and activity in vertebrates. *Science* 206: 649–654.
- Beveridge AE 1964. Animal modification of native vegetation: Dispersal and destruction of seed in central North Island podocarp forests. *Proceedings of the New Zealand Ecological Society* 11: 48–56.
- Brockie RE 1992. A living New Zealand forest. Auckland, David Bateman. 172 p.
- Bronson FH 1984. Energy allocation and reproductive development in wild and domestic house mice. *Biology of Reproduction* 31: 83–88.
- Burns KC 2006. Weta and the evolution of fleshy fruits in New Zealand. *New Zealand Journal of Ecology* 30: 405–406.
- Calder WA 1978. The kiwi. *Scientific America* 239: 132–142.
- Cary PRL 1983. Diet of the ground weta *Zealandosandrus gracilis* (Orthoptera: Stenopelmatidae). *New Zealand Journal of Zoology* 10: 295–297.
- Choquenot D, Ruscoe WA 2000. Mouse population eruptions in New Zealand forests: the role of population density and seedfall. *Journal of Animal Ecology* 69: 1058–1070.
- Daugherty CH, Gibbs GW, Hitchmough RA 1993. Mega-island or micro-continent? New Zealand and its fauna. *Trends in Ecology & Evolution* 8: 437–442.
- Delany MJ 1974. The ecology of small mammals. London, Edward Arnold. 60 p.
- Diamond JM 1990. New Zealand as an archipelago: An international perspective. In: Towns DR, Daugherty CH, Atkinson IAE eds *Ecological restoration of New Zealand islands*. Wellington, Department of Conservation. Pp. 3–8.
- Dickman CR 1988. Body size, prey size and community structure in insectivorous mammals. *Ecology* 69: 569–580.
- Duthie C, Gibbs G, Burns KC 2006. Seed dispersal by weta. *Science* 311 (5767): 1575.
- Ellenbroek FJM 1980. Interspecific competition in the shrews *Sorex araneus* and *Sorex minutus* (Soricidae: Insectivora): a population study of the Irish pygmy shrew. *Journal of Zoology (London)* 192: 119–136.
- Fleming CA 1973. Foreword. In: Williams GR ed. *The natural history of New Zealand: an ecological survey*. Wellington, Reed.
- Fleming CA 1977. Sir William Macleay memorial lecture, 1976: the biogeographic basis of national cultures. *Proceedings of the Linnean Society of New South Wales* 101: 218–236.
- Gibbs GW 2009. The end of an 80-million year experiment: a review of evidence describing the impact of introduced rodents on New Zealand's 'mammal-free' invertebrate fauna. *Biological Invasions* 11: 1587–1593.
- Gibbs G 2010. Do New Zealand invertebrates reflect the dominance of birds in their evolutionary history? *New Zealand Journal of Ecology* 34: 152–157.
- Green C 2005. Using artificial refuges to translocate and establish Auckland tree weta *Hemideina thoracica* on Korapuki Island, New Zealand. *Conservation Evidence* 2: 94–95.
- Guignion CA 2005. Behavioural displays, acoustic and chemosensory communication in the middle island tusked weta *Motuweta isolata* (Orthoptera: Anostostomatidae). Unpublished MSc thesis, University of Canterbury,

- Christchurch, New Zealand. 139 p.
- Hadley NF, Quinlan MC 1993. Discontinuous carbon dioxide release in the eastern lubber grasshopper *Romalea guttata* and its effect on respiratory transpiration. *Journal of Experimental Biology* 177: 169–180.
- Hamilton GD, Bronson FH 1985. Food restriction and reproductive development in wild house mice. *Biology of Reproduction* 32: 773–778.
- Johns PM 1997. The Gondwanaland weta: family Anostostomatidae (formerly in Stenopelmatidae, Hemicidae or Mimmermidae): nomenclatural problems, world checklist, new genera and species. *Journal of Orthoptera Research* 6: 125–138.
- Joyce SJ, Jamieson IG, Baker R 2004. Survival of adult mountain stone weta *Hemideina maori* (Orthoptera: Anostostomatidae) along an altitude gradient as determined by mark-recapture. *New Zealand Journal of Ecology* 28: 55–61.
- Kelly CD 2006. Movement patterns and gallery use by the sexually dimorphic Wellington tree weta. *New Zealand Journal of Ecology* 30: 273–278.
- King CM 1974. Stoats, weasels and ferrets. In: Knox R ed. *New Zealand natural heritage*, Vol. 3. Hong Kong, Hamlyn. Pp. 845–853.
- King CM 1983. The relationships between beech (*Nothofagus* sp.) seedfall and populations of mice (*Mus musculus*), and the demographic and dietary response of stoats (*Mustela erminea*), in three New Zealand forests. *Journal of Animal Ecology* 52: 141–166.
- King CM 1991. Body size–prey size relationships in European stoats *Mustela erminea*: A test case. *Holarctic Ecology* 14: 173–185.
- King P, Milicich L, Burns KC 2011. Body size determines rates of seed dispersal by giant king crickets. *Population Ecology* 53: 73–80.
- MacArthur RH, Wilson EO 1967. *The theory of island biogeography*. Princeton, Princeton University Press. 203 p.
- Maly MS, Knuth BA, Barrett GW 1985. Effects of resource partitioning on dispersal behavior of feral house mice. *Journal of Mammalogy* 66: 148–153.
- Malmquist MG 1985. Character displacement and biogeography of the pygmy shrew in Northern Europe. *Ecology* 66: 372–377.
- McCallum J 1986. Evidence of predation by kiore upon lizards from the Mokohinau Islands. *New Zealand Journal of Ecology* 9: 83–87.
- McIntyre ME 2001. The ecology of some large weta species in New Zealand. In: Field LH ed. *The biology of wetas, king crickets and their allies*. Wallingford, CAB International. Pp. 225–242.
- Mikesic DG, Drickamer LC 1992. Effects of radotransmitters and fluorescent powders on activity of wild house mice (*Mus musculus*). *Journal of Mammalogy* 73: 663–667.
- Miller AP 1999. Ecological energetics of feral house mice (*Mus musculus*) inhabiting coastal sand dunes. Unpublished MSc thesis, University of Otago, Dunedin, New Zealand.
- Miller CJ, Miller TK 1995. Population dynamics and diet of rodents on Rangitoto Island, New Zealand, including the effect of a 1080 poison operation. *New Zealand Journal of Ecology* 19: 19–27.
- Mirams RV 1957. Aspects of the natural regeneration of the kauri (*Agathis australis* Salisb.). *Transactions and Proceedings of the Royal Society of New Zealand* 84: 661–680.
- Moller H 1985. Tree wetas (*Hemideina crassicuris*) (Orthoptera: Stenopelmatidae) of Stephens Island, Cook Strait. *New Zealand Journal of Zoology* 12: 55–69.
- Morgan-Richards M 1997. Intraspecific karyotype variation is not concordant with allozyme variation in the Auckland tree weta of New Zealand, *Hemideina thoracica* (Orthoptera: Stenopelmatidae). *Biological Journal of the Linnean Society* 60: 423–442.
- Pelikan J 1981. Patterns of reproduction in the house mouse. *Symposia of the Zoological Society of London* 47: 205–230.
- Pough FH 1980. The advantages of ectothermy for tetrapods. *The American Naturalist* 115: 92–112.
- Pough FH, Janis CM, Heiser JB 2005. *Vertebrate life*. 7th edn. Saddle River, NJ, Pearson Prentice Hall.
- Ramsay GW 1978. Invertebrate mice. *New Zealand Entomologist* 6: 400.
- Rowe C 2009. Understanding the distribution limits of tree weta (*Hemideina crassidens* and *Hemideina thoracica*) with respect to cold hardiness. Unpublished PgDip thesis. Massey University, Palmerston North, New Zealand.
- Ruscoe WA, Wilson D, McElrea L, McElrea G, Richardson SJ 2004. A house mouse (*Mus musculus*) population eruption in response to rimu (*Dacrydium cupressinum*) seedfall in southern New Zealand. *New Zealand Journal of Ecology* 28: 259–265.
- Ruscoe WA, Elkinton JS, Choquenot D, Allen RB 2005. Predation of beech seed by mice: effects of numerical and functional responses. *Journal of Animal Ecology* 74: 1005–1019.
- Sinclair BJ, Worland MR, Wharton DA. 1999. Ice nucleation and freezing tolerance in New Zealand alpine and lowland weta, *Hemideina* spp. (Orthoptera: Stenopelmatidae). *Physiological Entomology* 24: 56–63.
- Southern HN 1979. Population processes in small mammals. In: Stoddart DM ed. *Ecology of small mammals*. London, Chapman Hall. Pp. 63–101.
- Stevens GR 1980. *New Zealand adrift*. Wellington, AH & AW Reed. 442 p.
- Stoddart DM ed. 1979. *Ecology of small mammals*. London, Chapman Hall. 386 p.
- Stringer I 1998. Translocation of Middle Island tusked weta *Motuweta isolata*, The Mercury Islands, New Zealand. *Conservation Evidence* 2: 83–85.
- Tann CR, Singleton GR, Coman BJ 1991. Diet of the house mouse, *Mus domesticus*, in the Mallee wheatlands of north-western Victoria. *Wildlife Research* 18: 1–12.
- Townsend JA, Brown B, Stringer IAN, Potter MA 1997. Distribution habitat and conservation status of *Hemideina ricta* and *H. femorata* on Banks Peninsula, New Zealand. *New Zealand Journal of Ecology* 21: 43–49.
- Trewick SA, Morgan-Richards M 1995. On the distribution of tree weta in the North Island, New Zealand. *Journal of the Royal Society of New Zealand* 25: 485–493.
- Trewick SA, Morgan-Richards M 2004. Phylogenetics of New Zealand's tree, giant and tusked weta (Orthoptera: Anostostomatidae): evidence from mitochondrial DNA. *Journal of Orthoptera Research* 13: 185–196.
- Trewick SA, Morgan-Richards M 2005. After the deluge: mitochondrial DNA indicates Miocene radiation and Pliocene adaptation of tree and giant weta (Orthoptera: Anostostomatidae). *Journal of Biogeography* 32: 295–309.

- Trewick SA, Morgan-Richards M 2009. New Zealand biology. In: Gillespie RG, Clague DA eds Encyclopedia of islands. Berkeley, CA, University of California Press. Pp. 665–673.
- Verhagen R, Leirs H, Tkachenko E, Van der Groen G 1986. Ecological and epidemiological data on Hantavirus in bank vole populations in Belgium. Archives of Virology 91: 193–205.
- Wallis GP, Trewick SA 2009. New Zealand phylogeography: evolution on a small continent. Molecular Ecology 18: 3548–3580.
- Watts C, Stringer I, Sherley G, Gibbs G, Green C 2008a. History of weta (Orthoptera: Anostomatidae) translocation in New Zealand: lessons learned, islands as sanctuaries and the future. Journal of Insect Conservation 12: 359–370.
- Watts CH, Thornburrow D, Green CJ, Agnew WR 2008b. Tracking tunnels: a novel method for detecting a threatened New Zealand giant weta (Orthoptera: Anostomatidae). New Zealand Journal of Ecology 32: 92–97.
- Wehi PM, Hicks BJ 2010. Isotopic fractionation in a large herbivorous insect, the Auckland tree weta. Journal of Insect Physiology 56: 1877–1882.
- Whitman DW 2008. The significance of body size in the Orthoptera: a review. Journal of Orthoptera Research 17: 117–134.
- Wilmshurst JM, Higham TFG 2004. Using rat-gnawed seeds to independently date the arrival of Pacific rats and humans in New Zealand. The Holocene 14: 801–806.
- Wilson CG, Jamieson IG 2005. Does melanism influence the diet of the mountain stone weta *Hemideina maori* (Orthoptera: Anostomatidae)? New Zealand Journal of Ecology 29: 149–152.
- Winks CJ, Fowler SV, Ramsay GW 2002. Captive-rearing of the Middle Island tusked weta. Science for Conservation 197. Wellington, Department of Conservation. 34 p.
- Worthy TH, Holdaway RN 2002. The lost world of the moa: prehistoric life of New Zealand. Christchurch, Canterbury University Press. 718 p.
- Worthy TH, Tennyson AJD, Archer M, Musser AM, Hand SJ, Jones C, Douglas BJ, McNamara JA, Beck RMD 2006. Miocene mammal reveals a Mesozoic ghost lineage on insular New Zealand, southwest Pacific. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences 103: 19419–19423.
- Wyman TE 2009. Tree weta as herbivores and seed dispersers (*Hemideina crassidens*, *H. thoracica*). Unpublished BSc (Hons) thesis. Massey University, Palmerston North, New Zealand.
- Wyman TE, Trewick SA, Morgan-Richards M, Noble ADL 2010. Mutualism or opportunism? Tree fuchsia (*Fuchsia excorticata*) and tree weta (*Hemideina*) interactions. Austral Ecology: doi: 10.1111/j.1442-9993.2010.02146.x.

Editorial Board member: Angela Moles

Received 24 September 2010; accepted 16 December 2010