

1 **Title:** Trends of ungulate species in Europe: not all stories are equal

2

3 **Authors:** Jacopo Cerri^{1,2*}, Roberta Chirichella^{2,3*}, Walter Arnold⁵, Luděk Bartoš⁶, Tomasz
4 Borowik², Juan Carranza⁷, Francesco Chianucci⁸, Sándor Csányi⁹, Göran Ericsson¹⁰, Marco
5 Heurich¹¹, Ilpo Kojola¹², Jyrki Puseenius¹², Atle Mysterud¹³, Boštjan Pokorny¹⁴, Krzysztof Schmidt²,
6 Nikica Šprem¹⁵, Joaquín Vicente¹⁶, Ajša Alagić¹⁴, Linas Balčiauskas¹⁷, Jim Casaer¹⁸, Sandra
7 Cellina¹⁹, Gundega Done²⁰, Slavomír Find'o²¹, Carlos Fonseca²², Dragan Gačić²³, Dime Melovski²⁴,
8 Jānis Ozoliņš²⁰, Haritakis Papaioannou²⁵, Tiit Randveer²⁶, Vesa Ruusila¹², Christine Saint-
9 Andrieux²⁷, Rauno Veeroja²⁸, Marco Apollonio^{2,4}

10

11 **Authors:**

- 12 1 - Mammal Research Institute, Polish Academy of Sciences, 17–230 Białowieża, Poland. j.cerri@ibs.bialowieza.pl
13 2 - Department of Veterinary Medicine, University of Sassari, via Vienna 2, I-07100, Sassari, Italy rchirichella@uniss.it
14 3 - Department of Humanities and Social Sciences, University of Sassari, via Roma 151, I-07100, Sassari, Italy
15 4 - National Biodiversity Future Center (NBFC), Piazza Marina, 61 - 90133 Palermo – Italy
16 5 - Research Institute of Wildlife Ecology, Vienna Veterinary University, Savoyenstraße 1, A-1160 Wien, Austria
17 6 - Ethology Group, Institute of Animal Science, Přátelství 814, Praha 10-Uhřetěves, 104 01, Czech Republic
18 7 - Wildlife Research Unit (UIRCP), University of Cordoba, Cordoba, 14071, Spain
19 8 - CREA - FL, Council for Agricultural Research and Economics, Research Centre for Forestry and Wood, Arezzo, Italy
20 9 - Hungarian University of Agriculture and Life Sciences (MATE), Institute for Wildlife Management and Nature Conservation, Gödöllő, Hungary
21 10 - Department of Wildlife, Fish and Environmental Studies, Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences (SLU), Umeå, Sweden
22 11 - Bavarian Forest National Park, Bavarian Forest National Park, Department for Conservation and Research, Freyunger Straße 2, 94481 Grafenau,
23 Germany
24 12 - Finnish Game and Fisheries Research Institute, Finland
25 13 - Centre for Ecological and Evolutionary Synthesis (CEES), Department of Biology, University of Oslo, P.O. Box 1066 Blindern, N-0316 Oslo,
26 Norway
27 14 - ERICo Velenje, Ecological Research and Industrial Co-operation, Koroška 58, 3320 Velenje, Slovenia and Environmental Protection College,
28 Trg mladosti 7, 3320 Velenje, Slovenia
29 15 - Faculty of Agriculture, Department of Fisheries, Apiculture, Wildlife Management and Special Zoology, University Zagreb, Zagreb, Croatia
30 16 - Instituto de Investigación en Recursos Cinegéticos (IREC), CSIC-UCLM-JCCM, Ciudad Real, Spain
31 17 - Institute of Ecology of Vilnius University, Akademijos 2, LT-08412 Vilnius-21, Lithuania
32 18 - Research Institute for Nature and Forestry, Scientific Institute of the Flemish Government, Gaverstraat 4, 9500 Geraardsbergen, Belgium

- 33 19 - Ingénieur, Biologiste au service de la nature - Le Gouvernement du Grand-Duché de Luxembourg - Ministère du Développement durable et des
34 Infrastructures - Administration de la nature et des forêts - 81, avenue de la Gare. L-9233 Diekirch
35 20 - State Forest Service, 13. Janvara Str. 15, Riga, LV-1932, Latvia
36 21 - Carpathian Wildlife Society, St. Tulska 29, SK-960 01 Zvolen, Slovakia
37 22 - Department of Biology/CESAM, University of Aveiro, Campus Santiago, 3810-193 Aveiro, Portugal
38 23 - Faculty of Forestry, University of Belgrade, 11000 Belgrade, Serbia
39 24 - Macedonian Ecological Society, Skopje, Macedonia
40 25 - University of Ioannina, Department of Environmental and Natural Resources Management, Laboratory of Ecology and Biodiversity
41 Conservation, Seferi 2, 30100 Agrinio, Greece
42 26 - Estonian Agricultural University, Kreutzwaldi 5, Tartu 51014, Estonia
43 27 - Office français de la biodiversité, 5 squares Félix Nadar - 94300 Vincennes, France
44 28 - Leading specialist of Nature Department, Estonian Environment Agency, Rõõmu tee 6, Tartu 50705, Estonia
45

46 **Corresponding authors:**

- 47 Jacopo Cerri, Mammal Research Institute, Polish Academy of Sciences, 17–230
48 Białowieża, Poland. j.cerri@ibs.bialowieza.pl
49 Roberta Chirichella, Department of Humanities and Social Sciences, University of Sassari, via
50 Roma 151, I-07100, Sassari, Italy. rchirichella@uniss.it
51
52

53 **Abstract**

54 Wild ungulates have deep impacts on socio-ecological systems, and analyzing large-scale
55 population trends in a multispecies set can identify their environmental and socio-economic drivers.
56 We collected annual hunting bags (n = 11,046, period 1975-2018) of 7 wild ungulates of high
57 management interest across 25 European countries. We identified different temporal trends in
58 hunting bags and for roe deer, red deer, wild boar, fallow deer, and mouflon, we also evaluated the
59 social and environmental drivers of their abundances.

60 Number of harvested red deer, fallow deer, and wild boar increased steadily across Europe, with
61 minor differences among countries, despite variations in land use and climate. On the contrary, roe
62 deer harvest has decreased in six European countries since the late 1990s, probably due to reduced
63 ecotone areas and locally also due to predation, intraspecific competition, and/or climate severity.
64 Northern chamois harvests in Austria and Switzerland have decreased markedly, probably due to
65 increasing temperatures, which decrease the survival of kids at high altitudes. Wild boar harvests
66 have decreased in Poland, Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania since the African Swine Fever outbreak in
67 2013-2014. Minor differences emerged between countries adopting different management regimes
68 for wild ungulates.

69 While many studies pointed out landscape changes as the cornerstone for the increase in wild
70 ungulates across Europe, our research emphasizes important species-specific differences. There is a
71 need to predict how landscape and climate change and the growing presence of large carnivores,
72 will affect populations of species already showing signs of decline, like European roe deer and
73 northern chamois.

74

75 **Keywords:** wild ungulates; hunting bags; time-series analysis; wildlife management; reforestation;
76 rural abandonment.

77 **Introduction**

78 The cumulative impact of human activities had driven most large mammals into severe declines and
79 regional extinctions by the end of the Holocene (i.e., in late 19th and early 20th centuries; Ripple et
80 al. 2015). As for wild ungulates living in the Global North, particularly in Europe, a prolonged
81 decrease started in the 18th century and lasted until the end of the II World War (Linnell and Zachos
82 2010; Putman et al. 2011; Beguin et al. 2016; Carpio et al. 2021). Some Central European countries
83 like Austria experienced a different trend in the XIX century but they shared the marked decrease
84 from the beginning of the XX century till the end of the War (Schwenk 1985). Since then, wild
85 ungulates have increased their geographical range and numbers, being nowadays generally
86 abundant and widespread (Apollonio et al. 2010).

87 The members of the Cervidae family, such as red deer (*Cervus elaphus*) and European roe deer
88 (*Capreolus capreolus*), as well as wild boar (*Sus scrofa*) are increasingly ubiquitous and abundant
89 in most European countries, accounting for over 90% of total wild ungulate biomass (Milner et al.
90 2006; Apollonio et al. 2010). These species can have strong ecological impacts (Fuller and Gill
91 2001; Carpio et al. 2021), as they can damage soil properties (Harada et al. 2020) and remove plant
92 biomass (Marchiori et al. 2012) or curtail forest regeneration (Côté et al. 2004; Pépin et al. 2006),
93 thus affecting also animal communities (Barasona et al. 2021; Dawson et al. 2024; Mori et al. 2020;
94 Oja 2017; Palmer et al. 2015; Rae et al. 2014) and ecological successions (Perea et al. 2014; Suzuki
95 2024). Moreover, wild ungulates transmit diseases to other wildlife, domestic ungulates and humans
96 (Gortazar et al. 2007), sometimes with major economic impacts, like in the case of the African
97 swine fever (hereinafter ASF; Bergmann et al. 2021). However, (native) wild ungulates are also
98 very important compositional part and key species of terrestrial ecosystems, where they have
99 several important ecological roles/functions which are essential for existence and functionality of
100 those ecosystems (Chiriboga et al. 2019; Pokorný and Jelenko 2014; Pokorný et al. 2017; Smit and

101 Putman 2011), but they also have several important values for humans (Csanyi et al. 2014; Pascual-
102 Rico et al. 2021).

103 In the respect of global changes that may influence population dynamics of wild ungulates, the
104 current situation in Europe stemmed from the synergy between three large-scale processes of
105 human land-use that started in the late 1940s: the exodus from rural to urban areas (Baudin and
106 Stelter 2022), which reduced human disturbance, increased the amount of land available to wild
107 ungulates and fostered a shift in wildlife value orientations that allowed the subsequent emergence
108 of conservation policies (Manfredo et al. 2020); the decrease in the amount of land used for
109 agricultural production and livestock breeding (Jepsen et al. 2015), which eased human pressures on
110 the environment and progressively increased biomass available to wild ungulates; the development
111 of institutions and laws that govern the reforestation of rural areas, the creation of protected areas,
112 the implementation of intensive wildlife management systems, and the reintroduction or
113 translocation of wild ungulates (Fuchs et al. 2015).

114 Understanding how these processes have influenced the population trends of different wild
115 ungulates, across European countries, is needed to manage them adequately. However, differences
116 between European countries, in terms of their environment and society, make it hard to completely
117 generalize the numerical and geographical expansion of wild ungulates.

118 In this study, we summarized large-scale population dynamics of wild ungulates, by using annual
119 hunting bags as a proxy of different species abundances across Europe and identified their most
120 relevant environmental and socio-economic drivers in a framework of human-wildlife coexistence
121 (Carpio et al. 2021). In particular, over the last few decades, wildlife agencies in Europe have: i)
122 managed common and widespread species with relevant hunting and commercial interest, such as
123 red deer, roe deer and wild boar, ii) conserved species with limited distribution but abundant local
124 populations such as moose (*Alces alces*) and northern chamois (*Rupicapra rupicapra*), iii) taken
125 decisions about controlling emerging diseases, like in the case of ASF in wild boar, or chronic

126 wasting disease in deer species, and iv) controlled introduced species with widespread (i.e., fallow
127 deer, *Dama dama*) or local (i.e., mouflon, *Ovis gmelini musimon*) distribution. In consequence,
128 these diverse practices could have had contrasting effects on the population demography of
129 different species.

130 This paper analyzes the population dynamics of seven ungulate species to identify species-specific
131 or species-country-specific differences in their trends and highlight their environmental and socio-
132 economic drivers. The results of this study can contribute to build a background to predict how
133 emerging factors like climate change as well as the recovery of large carnivores and (imported)
134 diseases could add to their influence in affecting populations of more widespread species.

135

136 **2. Methods**

137 *2.1 Data collection*

138 To quantify long-term trends in wild ungulate populations, we collected data about annual harvests
139 of wild ungulates across 25 European countries. Among these countries we selected the 19
140 countries that had hunting bag dataset starting from 1975 till 2018 for ungulate species. Although
141 some studies highlighted the potential limitations of hunting bags in reflecting the population
142 densities and temporal dynamics of wild ungulates (Pettorelli et al. 2007; Imperio et al. 2010), we
143 used this data as they were the only figures available for such a long-time span. In this paper, we do
144 not consider hunting bags as a direct indicator of population biological parameters but rather as an
145 index representing the interaction between environmental factors and the harvest rate of different
146 ungulate species, which can reflect long-term changes in populations (Massei et al. 2015; Aebischer
147 2019).

148 Data collection focuses on seven species that are regularly harvested or controlled to reduce their
149 impacts on human activities and ecosystems: European roe deer (17 countries), red deer (17), wild
150 boar (15), fallow deer (6), mouflon (6), northern chamois (6), and moose (6). For all these 7 species,

151 we collected hunting bags from 1975 to 2018. Moreover, we also compared the 1948 – 2018 trends
152 in roe and red deer hunting bags in Austria, Denmark, Sweden, and Switzerland to better understand
153 their simultaneous temporal evolution concerning forest structure (see the Discussion section).
154 Because individual countries have different living conditions and, therefore, very different ungulate
155 populations, we standardized counts in each country, by subtracting the mean and dividing by the
156 standard deviation. This allowed us to compare time series from different countries, represented as
157 standardized values of each time series, that would have been on different scales otherwise. We did
158 not divide hunting bags according to the area of each country (calculated bag densities), as this
159 value was larger than the distribution range of the various species, which for decades ago was often
160 unknown.

161

162 *2.2 Statistical analysis*

163 For each species, we used longitudinal cluster analysis (Den Teuling et al. 2021), based on Dynamic
164 Time Warping (DTW; Sardá-Espinosa 2019), to identify groups of countries with similar long-term
165 trends. The optimal number of clusters was identified by inspecting the silhouette index. As DTW
166 clustering does not allow us to compare a solution with two clusters against a solution with a single
167 cluster, we used a cutoff of 0.5 for the silhouette index: in case there were groups with truly
168 diverging long-term trends in each species, the silhouette index would have been higher than this
169 cutoff (for an explanation of these metrics, see Den Teuling et al. 2021).

170 Then, we also used the random forests algorithm (Breiman 2001) to quantify the effect of different
171 landscape and socio-economic dynamics on the temporal evolution of hunting bags. Wild ungulates
172 are generally deemed to be favored by forest cover, which can provide regular (Spitzer et al, 2020)
173 and pulsed (Bisi et al. 2018; Barrere et al. 2020; Touzot et al. 2020) food resources, a refuge against
174 human disturbance (Bonnot et al. 2013; Carbillet et al. 2020; Jasińska et al. 2021; Salvatori et al.
175 2023; Dupke et al. 2017), and shelter from temperatures above critical thresholds (van Beest et al.

176 2012; Ewald et al. 2014; Reiner et al. 2021, 2022; Kramer et al. 2022). Therefore, we also included
177 changes (1975-2018) in the proportion of forested areas of each country as a covariate in the model.
178 The amount of forest cover in each country was obtained by combining official data from the Food
179 and Agriculture Organization with data from forestry inventories of the various countries.
180 Moreover, as some ungulate species are also affected by the availability of understory and
181 secondary successions (Hewison et al. 2009; Reiner et al. 2023; Vannini et al. 2021; Zong et al.
182 2023), we also calculated the percentage of forests that in 1975 were less than 20 years of age. This
183 value was obtained from Vilén et al. (2012) and aimed to identify countries subjected to intense
184 afforestation policies in the 1950s and the 1960s. Moreover, in Europe, forest expansion followed
185 agricultural land abandonment, particularly in mountainous or marginal areas (MacDonald et al.
186 2000; Levers et al. 2018). Therefore, we also used changes in the percentage of the population
187 living in rural areas (<https://data.worldbank.org/indicator/SP.RUR.TOTL.ZS>) and changes in the
188 proportion of surface that was covered by croplands
189 (<https://data.worldbank.org/indicator/AG.LND.AGRI.ZS>) in individual countries as predictors in
190 our model.
191 In most cases, rural abandonment also corresponded to a decrease in the presence of livestock in the
192 environment, which can compete with wild ungulates for resources and transmit infectious and
193 parasitic diseases (Martin et al. 2011; Chirichella et al. 2014). Therefore, we also controlled for
194 differences in livestock units of each country
195 ([https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/statistics-explained/index.php?title=Glossary:Livestock_unit_\(LSU\)](https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/statistics-explained/index.php?title=Glossary:Livestock_unit_(LSU)))
196 between 1975 and 2018.
197 Finally, as European countries differ in their game management systems, we also controlled
198 different management policies' effects on wild ungulates. Namely, following Apollonio et al. (2010)
199 and Putman et al. (2011), we compared countries i) with a centralized, top-down approach, where
200 overall hunting quotas are established by national agencies and subsequently divided across regions,

201 *ii*) with a decentralized top-down approach, where national wildlife agencies fix overall quotas, but
202 their implementation is up to management districts, *iii*) where wildlife agencies define the
203 boundaries of management units, but these units are then entirely responsible for the determination
204 of hunting quotas, *iv*) countries with a “bottom-up” approach, where hunting quotas are determined
205 by each district and where districts could aggregate between them, and *v*) countries with a
206 “libertarian” approach, where hunting quotas are entirely up to landowners.

207 In random forests, we also controlled for the year of each hunting bag in each country to model
208 overall temporal trends, which could have been caused by unmeasured factors, such as climate
209 change (Myserud et al. 2010) or numerical increase of large carnivores (Chapron et al. 2014).

210 In random forest modeling, we did not model either the hunting bags of moose nor those of the
211 chamois, as we had too few countries and, therefore, little variation in model covariates. Moreover,
212 our analyses did not include variables representing climatic conditions. Although climate is a key
213 factor affecting the population dynamics of wild ungulates (Apollonio and Chirichella 2023;
214 Malpeli et al. 2024), which can be represented by indexes such as the North Atlantic Oscillation
215 (Myserud et al. 2003), climate conditions in Europe are not homogeneous either between, or within
216 countries. For example, they vary according to the latitude, elevation, or distance from the coast of
217 different areas. However, aggregating these gradients at the national scale would have resulted in
218 the so-called “ecological fallacy” and biased our findings (Salkeld and Antolin 2020).


219 All continuous predictors were converted to z-scores. As random forests average between multiple
220 regression trees, the relative importance of each predictor was measured as the decrease in node
221 impurities through the residual sum of squares. Statistical analyses were carried out using R (R Core
222 Team 2024).

223

224 **3. Results**

225 Between 1975 and 2018, Europe-wide hunting bags increased for all 7 studied species of ungulates
226 (Table 1, Fig. 1). This increase was considerable and yet quite heterogeneous among countries.
227 Even when excluding particularly extreme increases (Table 1), the median increase of harvest per
228 species during the 43-year study period was as follows: European roe deer (1.97 folds), red deer
229 (10.95), wild boar (10.20), fallow deer (5.58), mouflon (14.58), northern chamois (2.27), and moose
230 (1.33), respectively. In case of wild boar, it is worth mentioning that the species was absent from
231 Sweden until its accidental introduction in the wild during the late 1970s, but in 2018 a total of
232 112,352 wild boar were harvested (Fig. 2). Moreover, in Finland, approx. 1,000 roe deer were
233 culled in 2013; in 2023/2024, this number has risen to 16,555 individuals (Ilpo Kojola, personal
234 communication).

235



237 Fig. 1. Conditional effects plots, representing the evolution in the average number of harvested individuals, across the
238 different species, according to random forests. The number of harvested individuals was transformed to a Z-score and is
239 represented in terms of standard deviations, from the mean value of each country.

240

241 The only ungulates with an overall decrease in their harvests were northern chamois in Austria and
242 Switzerland, and moose in Lithuania (Table 1). Furthermore, in Poland, 560 moose were hunted in
243 1975, with harvests peaking in 1989 (1,670 individuals), but hunting was suspended in 2001 due to
244 the dramatic decline of the population (Bobek et al. 2005).

245 Longitudinal cluster analysis confirmed the pan-European, long-term increase in hunting bags.
246 Except for northern chamois, for which two groups of countries with clearly diverging trends
247 emerged, the Silhouette Index (hereinafter, SI) for a two-cluster solution was always below the
248 cutoff of 0.5 (Fig. 3). This indicates that clusters had poorly distinguished long-term trends, with
249 hunting bags in 2018 being consistently higher than those in 1975. However, the graphical
250 inspection of cluster centroids sometimes revealed different groups of countries concerning short-
251 term fluctuations or emerging differences.

252




Fig. 2. Relative increase in the number of wild ungulates, across European countries (see Table 1 for detailed data in particular countries). The relative increase indicates how larger the number of harvested individuals was in 2018, compared to 1975. To make comparisons clearer, we omitted those countries where harvests had increased more than 25 times (see the Results section).

When considering roe deer ($SI = 0.37$; Fig. 3), hunting bags have decreased since the late 1990s in Luxembourg, Norway, Switzerland, Slovenia, Sweden, and the autonomous province of Trento (Italy). On the other hand, in the rest of Europe, after a decrease in the late 1990s, roe deer harvests have boomed.

Harvests increased steadily across most of Europe in case of red deer ($SI = 0.37$; Fig. 3). However, in Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Slovakia, and Slovenia, harvests of this species peaked in the early 1990s, then decreased and subsequently increased again with a change point around 2010. In

some Eastern European countries, these patterns might occur at different levels due to the political changes after the collapse of socialism (1989/1990), as shown by Bragina et al. (2018). Wild boar experienced a steady increase across most of Europe. However, the increase in wild boar harvests was temporally lagged in Croatia, Poland, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, and Sweden, where it started after 1995. Noteworthy, in Poland and Baltic countries, wild boar harvests also decreased after 2013-2014, when an outbreak of ASF occurred in this area (Cwynar et al. 2019). Fallow deer had even less pronounced differences in long-term trends of its harvests ($SI = 0.23$; Fig. 3), which increased homogeneously across Europe. Homogeneity also characterized mouflon ($SI = 0.34$), whose harvests also increased markedly across the 6 European countries for which we had data. Luxembourg was the only country with a different trajectory, where harvests of mouflon boomed in the 1990s and then dropped in 2015. The only species characterized by well-distinguished opposite harvest trends in two groups of countries was northern chamois ($SI = 0.61$; Fig. 3). Harvests increased between 1975 and the early 1990s in Austria and Switzerland, where they subsequently declined in recent years. On the other hand, the number of harvested individuals continuously increased in France, Germany, Slovenia, and the autonomous province of Trento (Italy). As for moose harvests ($SI = 0.44$; Fig. 3), two groups of countries emerged. In Sweden, Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania, harvests increased until the late 1980s, declined until the mid-1990s, and increased again. Norway and Finland instead constituted a second group of countries with somewhat different temporal dynamics. In Norway, moose harvests increased until the late 1990s, then slightly declined. In Finland, on the other hand, harvests fluctuated highly, with two peaks, i.e. from 1980 to the mid-1990s and from 2000 to 2010, with two sharp declines in between (Fig. S2). Random forests predicted well hunting bags of roe deer ($R^2 = 0.81$; $MSE = 0.18$), red deer ($R^2 = 0.92$; $MSE = 0.07$), fallow deer ($R^2 = 0.94$; $MSE = 0.06$), wild boar ($R^2 = 0.90$; $MSE = 0.09$), and mouflon ($R^2 = 0.92$; $MSE = 0.08$). However, random forests also revealed species-specific

291 differences in the most important correlates of hunting bags (Table 2). Overall, hunting bags were
292 positively associated with the years within the time series, which aligns with the fact that each
293 species increased in the number of harvested individuals over time. The year of each hunting bag
294 was the most important predictor for red deer and wild boar.

295 However, the temporal component was not the most predictive factor for roe deer, mouflon, and
296 fallow deer. The change in % of forest cover of each country was the most important predictor for
297 roe deer and mouflon: hunting bags for these two species were much higher in those countries with
298 a marked increase in forest cover. The change in the percentage of the human population that lived
299 in rural areas was the most crucial factor predicting hunting bags in fallow deer, with peak in
300 countries with little rural depopulation. Other predictors seemed to have a comparatively smaller
301 effect (Table 2).

302 When comparing the trends of roe deer and red deer harvests with data from 1948 in Austria,
303 Denmark, Sweden, and Switzerland, we noticed that the two species exhibited two types of
304 connected trends. In the first case, there were years when roe deer harvests started stagnating or
305 declining, corresponding with a marked increase in red deer harvests. This happened in Switzerland
306 in 1980, Austria in the mid-1990s, and Denmark in the early 2010s. On the other hand, sometimes
307 the peak in roe deer harvests largely anticipated that of red deer. This was the case for Sweden,
308 where roe deer harvests started booming in the mid-1980s and those of red deer increased in the
309 2010s, and in Denmark, where roe deer harvests increased around 1980 and red deer in the early
310 2000s (Fig. 5).

311

312



314 Fig. 3. Cluster centroids and dendrograms for the various species: roe deer (a), red deer (b), wild boar (c), fallow deer
 315 (d), mouflon (e), northern chamois (f), moose (g). For temporal changes in moose harvests in Finland and Norway, see
 316 Fig. S2. The number of harvested individuals was transformed to a Z-score and is represented in terms of standard
 317 deviations, from the mean value of each country.

318

319




Fig. 4. Conditional effect plot, representing the change in the number of harvested roe deer according to time and relative change in forest cover.

4. Discussion

If we compare changes in large mammal distribution and abundance in Europe, we can appreciate a difference between ungulates and large carnivores. Chapron et al. (2014) reported that the success of large carnivores in Europe stemmed from coordinated legislation shared by many European countries (e.g., Council Directive 92/43/EEC; Bern Convention), context-specific management practices, and institutional arrangements. Instead, the general picture about wild ungulates in Europe suggests that these species could regain a landscape that had significantly changed when

human pressure shifted towards urbanized areas, while at the same time being intensively managed all over the continent. Our study shows that in the last decades, the trends of European ungulates' harvest (which is also a proxy of their abundance) increased, following socio-economic changes associated with the shift from rural economies, characterized by low production applied to large areas, to industrial and post-industrial economies. Indeed, according to our results, ungulates have experienced a significant increase in abundance in Europe, with a correspondent change in management issues like those related to the development of locally overabundant populations (Carpio et al. 2021; Valente et al. 2020).

Many previous studies have already confirmed that human development shapes wildlife populations (Tucker et al. 2021; Johnson et al. 2023), and in this context our approach revealed: *i*) marked country-specific differences in the long-term trend of cold-adapted species, *ii*) country based emerging differences for European roe deer and wild boar, *iii*) the complementary and sometimes opposite temporal development for deer species with a different ecology, *iv*) similarities and differences in the overall weight of environmental factors across different species or among different population of the same species. These results can be helpful in predicting how landscape, climate change, and emerging diseases could affect the dynamics of future wild ungulate populations.

First, for Alpine/boreal species like northern chamois and moose, we found evident variations in the temporal trend of their harvests between countries. In the case of northern chamois (*Rupicapra rupicapra rupicapra*), while harvests increased between 1975 and the early 1990s in Austria and Switzerland, where they subsequently declined, a permanent increase was revealed in France, Germany, Slovenia, and autonomous province of Trento (Italy). Indeed, the future of northern chamois conservation will further depend on several different environmental factors, with impacts on demography and life history traits that still need to be fully clarified (Chirichella et al. 2021; Corlatti et al. 2022). Available data and studies revealed the importance of environmental

heterogeneity in shaping the population dynamics of wild ungulates, especially in response to ongoing climatic and land use changes (Mason et al. 2014; Chirichella et al. 2021; Hoste et al. 2024; Reiner et al. 2021), concerning the expansion and increase of potential competitors (e.g., red deer: Corlatti et al. 2019; Donini et al. 2021), and predators (Chapron et al. 2014; Vogt et al. 2024). Another species with limited distribution but abundant local populations, i.e. moose, revealed country-specific patterns in dynamics (e.g., Bobek et al. 2005; Kojola et al. 2021). These results confirmed the importance of site-specific management/conservation issues to maintain sustainable populations of a species susceptible to human-caused disturbance, vehicle collisions, illegal killings, and rising temperatures (Janík et al. 2021). The best example of this is the moose population in Poland, where it –in spite of the lowest harvest rate in Europe– has faced almost complete extermination and where recovering populations are still limited by low environmental connectivity (Bluhm et al. 2023).

On the other hand, although our findings highlighted a long-term increase in the harvests of roe deer and wild boar, we also found emerging short-term differences. In the case of wild boar, some countries experienced an average reduction in hunting bags between 2013 and 2014. This differentiation could have been due to the impact of ASF in Poland, Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania (Cwynar et al. 2019). Recent data collected by the *ENETWILD* Consortium indicates a recovery of wild boar populations in the Baltic countries affected by ASF since 2019/2020 (*ENETWILD*-consortium, 2023; EFSA 2024). It will be interesting evaluating the effect of the impact wild boar abundance fluctuations due to ASF on habitats and communities, included other wild ungulates species (and their hunting and predation by large carnivores).

Another differentiation of harvest rates among countries occurred in the case of roe deer, whose hunting bags in 5 countries have declined since a peak in the early 1990s. This decline in roe deer harvests is likely to have been driven by changes in forest structures at the landscape scale (Fig. 4), and locally by the recovery of large carnivores as in the case of Eurasian lynx *Lynx lynx*; in Sweden

395 (Andrén and Liberg 2015). This point might be clarified when simultaneously considering the
396 harvests of roe and red deer over a long period. However, roe deer is still expanding its distribution
397 range in certain regions, like central and southern Iberia (Virgós and Telleria 1998). In Austria,
398 Denmark, Sweden, and Switzerland, where the harvest of these two species had been recorded from
399 1948, we noticed that the change points of the time series of the two species coincided and then
400 exhibited a symmetrical pattern: harvests of red deer always increased when those of roe deer
401 reached a plateau or even started declining (Fig. 5). Moreover, roe deer did not show an increase
402 comparable to that of red deer despite the steady increase of forest cover in Europe. The former is,
403 in fact, typical of pioneer species, linked to the early stages of forest development that provide
404 important resources like access to cover (Mysterud and Ostbye 1999) and high quality and diversity
405 forage, particularly at ecotones in proximity to open areas (Andersen et al. 1998; Saïd and Servanty
406 2005). On the contrary, red deer is more adapted to live among all different environments occupied,
407 in mature forests, forest-agriculture mosaics, and even in artificial conifer plantations, being a
408 mixed feeder with a better capacity to exploit poor quality forage (Hoffman 1989; Gordon and Prins
409 2019). A comparative analysis of the trends of the two species for the countries with available pre-
410 1975 data has shown a greater growth rate in roe deer in the pre-1975 period with a subsequent
411 slowdown. On the contrary, faster growth in the post-1975 period is noted for red deer, a species
412 able to benefit from the late successional stages of forests deriving from post-WW2 agriculture
413 decline (Mattioli et al. 2022). These symmetrical trends were already noticed in the Italian Alps
414 (Chirichella et al. 2017). Finding them in four countries indicates that similar dynamics could be
415 widespread across Europe and might produce a decline in roe deer populations over the next few
416 years. Moreover, locally, other factors like, for example, the influence of golden jackal (*Canis*
417 *aureus*) in the Balkans and Hungary (Bijl et al. 2024) or, in the case of the Danube and its
418 tributaries and in Central Europe, the increase of American liver fluke (*Fascioloides magna*), a non-
419 native liver parasite, could be important factor in the decline of roe deer (Csivincsik et al. 2023).

420 This shows that multifactorial processes are influencing single ungulate species distribution and
421 abundance in Europe.

422 The increase in forest area partially contributed to explaining red deer harvest dynamics, as reported
423 in other studies (e.g., Heurich et al. 2015; Chirichella et al. 2017). While in the case of wild boar,
424 due to the ecological adaptability and invasive potential of this species, it is more difficult to find a
425 primary driver of expansion and increase, the changes in the percentage of area covered by
426 croplands were found in our study to be most important after the temporal component. Indeed,
427 many studies reported the effect of different drivers (i.e., climate, both harshness, and warming;
428 habitat, agriculture, both current diversity and possible change; large carnivore presence and
429 abundance; hunting management practices; supplementary feeding) as limiting or promoting factors
430 in shaping wild boar populations dynamics (for a review, see Melis et al. 2006 and Scandura et al.
431 2022).

432 In our analysis, the temporal component was not the most predictive factor for roe deer, mouflon,
433 and fallow deer. The change in the percentage of forest area was the most relevant driver for roe
434 deer and mouflon: hunting bags for mouflon were much higher in those countries with a marked
435 increase in forest cover. Moreover, the percentage of area covered by croplands was also an
436 important factor driving the abundance of mouflon (see Garel et al. 2022, for a review about
437 mouflon).

438 Similarly, the change in the percentage of the human population that lived in rural areas was the
439 most important factor in predicting hunting bags in fallow deer. As De Marinis et al. (2022)
440 reported, fallow deer is one of the most widespread introduced mammals in Europe as it has been
441 established in most European countries; if they are not present in the wild, then they are kept in
442 farms, reserves, or parks (Bijl and Csányi 2022). Its distribution/density is, therefore, a direct
443 consequence of human activity (Bijl and Csányi, 2022; Masseti 1996, 2002; Sykes et al. 2011).

444 However, to date, the population dynamics of this species (and their drivers) have received poor
445 attention, especially in northern/central Europe and for free-ranging populations.
446 Climate shaped the distribution of European mammals (Santos et al. 2020), and its effects are
447 foreseen to become increasingly important (Levinsky et al. 2007). However, in this study we did not
448 investigate the effect of climatic factors over the population dynamics of European ungulates. This
449 choice was motivated by the mismatch between local climatic conditions in each country and our
450 country-level Nevertheless, considered that climate affects the distribution and dynamics of cold-
451 adapted ungulates (i.e. species with a low thermal neutral zone) (Lovari et al. 2020), as well as
452 those of species with a wide distribution (e.g., wild boar: Markov et al. 2022; deer species:
453 Apollonio and Chirichella 2023), we believe that it is important to address this gap to guide the
454 management of wild ungulates in European landscapes facing climate change.
455




Fig. 5. Temporal trends of roe deer (dashed line) and red deer (solid line) harvests, between 1948 and 2018, in four countries: Austria (top-left), Denmark (top-right), Sweden (bottom-left), and Switzerland (top-right). The number of harvested individuals was transformed to a Z-score and is represented in terms of standard deviations, from the mean value of each country.

5. Conclusion

A combination of reforestation, agricultural abandonment, and rural-urban migration has led to a situation where wild ungulates are widespread across Europe. Nevertheless, the main drivers of change differ among species, as well as between different socio-economic and environmental contexts. Wild ungulates are hunted in virtually all parts of their distributional range, including most protected areas (van Beeck Calkoen et al. 2020), with major differences between and within countries. Hunting seems to be the major source of mortality in wild ungulates and therefore the main anthropogenic driver of population density (Bassi et al. 2020; van Beeck Calkoen et al. 2023). In this context, it is extremely important not to generalize the increase in ungulates but to consider their local status and short-term fluctuations, to support proper management strategies for the different species. Our findings confirm the need for long-term national and international monitoring schemes, aiming to better understand the demography of wild ungulates (Carpio et al. 2021; ENETWILD consortium, 2023), which is essential to implement and/or improve policies for their science-based management and conservation.

CRediT authorship contribution statement

Marco Apollonio, Roberta Chirichella, Walter Arnold, Juan Carranza, Sándor Csányi, Göran Ericsson, Marco Heurich, Ilpo Kojola, Atle Mysterud, Boštjan Pokorny, Krzysztof Schmidt, Nikica Šprem, Joaquín Vicente - **Conceptualization**
Jacopo Cerri, Marco Apollonio, Roberta Chirichella, Francesco Chianucci - **Methodology**
Jacopo Cerri, Roberta Chirichella - **Software**

483 Walter Arnold, Luděk Bartoš, Tomasz Borowik, Juan Carranza, Sándor Csányi, Göran Ericsson,
484 Marco Heurich, Ilpo Kojola, Atle Mysterud, Boštjan Pokorny, Krzysztof Schmidt, Nikica Šprem,
485 Joaquín Vicente, Ajša Alagić, Linas Balčiauskas, Jim Casaer, Sandra Cellina, Gundega Done,
486 Slavomír Find'o, Carlos Fonseca, Dragan Gačić, Dime Melovski, Jānis Ozoliņš, Haritakis
487 Papaioannou, Tiit Randveer, Vesa Ruusila, Christine Saint-Andrieux, Rauno Veeroja - **Validation**
488 Jacopo Cerri, Roberta Chirichella, Francesco Chianucci - **Formal analysis**
489 Juan Carranza, Sándor Csányi, Göran Ericsson, Marco Heurich, Ilpo Kojola, Atle Mysterud,
490 Boštjan Pokorny, Krzysztof Schmidt, Nikica Šprem, Joaquín Vicente - **Investigation**
491 Marco Apollonio - **Resources**
492 Jacopo Cerri, Roberta Chirichella - **Data curation**
493 Jacopo Cerri, Marco Apollonio, Roberta Chirichella, Walter Arnold, Juan Carranza, Sándor Csányi,
494 Göran Ericsson, Marco Heurich, Ilpo Kojola, Atle Mysterud, Boštjan Pokorny, Krzysztof Schmidt,
495 Nikica Šprem, Joaquín Vicente **Writing – Original Draft**
496 Marco Apollonio, Walter Arnold, Luděk Bartoš, Tomasz Borowik, Juan Carranza, Francesco
497 Chianucci, Sándor Csányi, Göran Ericsson, Marco Heurich, Ilpo Kojola, Atle Mysterud, Boštjan
498 Pokorny, Krzysztof Schmidt, Nikica Šprem, Joaquín Vicente, Ajša Alagić, Linas Balčiauskas, Jim
499 Casaer, Sandra Cellina, Gundega Done, Slavomír Find'o, Carlos Fonseca, Dragan Gačić, Dime
500 Melovski, Jānis Ozoliņš, Haritakis Papaioannou, Tiit Randveer, Vesa Ruusila, Christine Saint-
501 Andrieux, Rauno Veeroja **Writing – Review & Editing**
502 Jacopo Cerri, Roberta Chirichella – **Visualization**
503 Marco Apollonio - **Supervision**
504 Marco Apollonio, Roberta Chirichella - **Project administration**
505 Marco Apollonio - **Funding acquisition**
506
507 **Data availability**
508 Data and software code are available from the Open Science Framework, at the following link:
509 <https://osf.io/uvfcs/>
510
511 **Funding**

RC and MA were funded under the National Recovery and Resilience Plan (NRRP), Mission 4 Component 2 Investment 1.4 - Call for tender no. 3138 of 16 December 2021, rectified by Decree no. 3175 of 18 December 2021 of Italian Ministry of University and Research funded by the European Union – NextGenerationEU; Award Number: Project code CN_00000033, Concession Decree no. 1034 of 17 June 2022 adopted by the Italian Ministry of University and Research, CUP J83C22000870007, Project title “National Biodiversity Future Center – NBFC”

Acknowledgments

We are grateful to Prof. Rory Putman and Prof. Reidar Andersen, for having pioneered large-scale research about the ecology and management of wild ungulates in Europe. We would also like to express our gratitude to prof. Sipke E. van Wieren Alterra and with dr. Reinhard Schnidrig, who shared data about the Netherlands and Switzerland.

Conflict of interest

The authors declare that they have no competing interests.

Ethical approval

Not applicable

References

- Aebischer NJ (2019) Fifty-year trends in UK hunting bags of birds and mammals, and calibrated estimation of national bag size, using GWCT’s National Gamebag Census. Eur J Wildl Res 65: 64. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10344-019-1299-x>
- Andersen R, *et al.* (1998) The European roe deer: the biology of success. Scandinavian University Press, Oslo.

537 Andrén H, Liberg O (2015) Large impact of Eurasian lynx predation on roe deer population
538 dynamics. *PLoS One* 10: e0120570. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0120570>

539 Apollonio M, *et al.* (2010) *European ungulates and their management in the 21st century*.
540 Cambridge University Press.

541 Apollonio M, Chirichella R (2023) Deer and climate change: impacts and perspectives. *Anim. Prod. Sci.* 63: 1573-1582. <https://doi.org/10.1071/AN22296>

542 Barasona JA, *et al.* (2021) Expansion of native wild boar populations is a new threat for semi-arid
543 wetland areas. *Ecol. Indic.* 125: 107563. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolind.2021.107563>

544 Barrere J, *et al.* (2020) How does oak mast seeding affect the feeding behavior of sympatric red and
545 roe deer? *Basic Appl. Ecol.* 47: 83-94. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.baae.2020.04.006>

546 Bassi E, *et al.* (2020) Relative impact of human harvest and wolf predation on two ungulate species
547 in Central Italy. *Ecol. Res.* 35: 662-674. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1440-1703.12130>

548 Baudin T, Stelter R (2022) The rural exodus and the rise of Europe. *J. Econ. Growth* 27: 365-414.
549 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10887-022-09206-4>

550 Beguin J, *et al.* (2016) Management of forest regeneration in boreal and temperate deer-forest
551 systems: challenges, guidelines, and research gaps. *Ecosphere* 7: e01488.
552 <https://doi.org/10.1002/ecs2.1488>

553 Bergmann H, *et al.* (2021) A review of environmental risk factors for African Swine Fever in
554 European wild boar. *Animals* 11: 2692. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ani11092692>

555 Bijl H, Csányi S (2022) Fallow deer (*Dama dama*) population and harvest changes in Europe since
556 the early 1980s. *Sustainability* 14: 12198. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su141912198>

557 Bijl H, *et al.* (2024) From invaders to residents: The golden jackal (*Canis aureus*) expansion in
558 Hungary since the mid-1990s. *PLoS One* 19, e0306489
559 <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0306489>

560

561 Bisi F, *et al.* (2018) Climate, tree masting and spatial behaviour in wild boar (*Sus scrofa* L.): insight
 562 from a long-term study. *Ann. For. Sci.* 75: 1-9. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13595-018-0726-6>
 563 Bluhm H, *et al.* (2023) Widespread habitat for Europe's largest herbivores, but poor connectivity
 564 limits recolonization. *Divers. Distrib.* 29: 423-437. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ddi.13671>
 565 Bobek B, *et al.* (2005) A moose recovery plan for Poland: main objectives and tasks. *Alces: A*
 566 *Journal Devoted to the Biology and Management of Moose* 41: 129-138.
 567 <https://www.alcesjournal.org/index.php/alces/article/view/417/499>
 568 Bonnot N, *et al.* (2013) Habitat use under predation risk: hunting, roads and human dwellings
 569 influence the spatial behaviour of roe deer. *Eur J Wildl Res* 59: 185-193.
 570 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10344-012-0665-8>
 571 Bragina EV, *et al.* (2018) Wildlife population changes across Eastern Europe after the collapse of
 572 socialism. *Front. Ecol. Environ.* 16: 77-81. <https://doi.org/10.1002/fee.1770>
 573 Breiman L (2001) Random forests. *Mach. Learn.* 45: 5-32.
 574 <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1010933404324>
 575 Carbillet J, *et al.* (2020) Under cover of the night: Context-dependency of anthropogenic
 576 disturbance on stress levels of wild roe deer *Capreolus capreolus*. *Conserv. Physiol.* 8: coaa086.
 577 <https://doi.org/10.1093/conphys/coaa086>
 578 Carpio AJ, *et al.* (2021) Wild ungulate overabundance in Europe: contexts, causes, monitoring and
 579 management recommendations. *Mamm. Rev.* 51: 95-108. <https://doi.org/10.1111/mam.12221>
 580 Chapron G, *et al.* (2014) Recovery of large carnivores in Europe's modern human-dominated
 581 landscapes. *Science* 346: 1517-1519. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1257553>
 582 Ramirez JJ, *et al.* (2019) Long-term effects of wild ungulates on the structure, composition and
 583 succession of temperate forests. *Forest Ecol. Manag.* 432: 478-488.
 584 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foreco.2018.09.049>

585 Chirichella R, *et al.* (2014) Competition between domestic and wild ungulates. Behaviour and
586 Management of European Ungulates Caithness Whittles Publishing, 110-23.

587 Chirichella R, *et al.* (2017) Alpine landscape and canopy cover from 1973 to 2011: are roe and red
588 deer population dynamics linked? Wildl. Res. 44: 504-513. <https://doi.org/10.1071/WR16232>

589 Chirichella R, *et al.* (2021) Contrasting effects of climate change on Alpine chamois. J. Wildl.
590 Manag. 85: 109-120. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jwmg.21962>

591 Corlatti L, *et al.* (2019) Long-term dynamics of Alpine ungulates suggest interspecific competition.
592 J. Zool. 309: 241-249. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jzo.12716>

593 Corlatti L, *et al.* (2022) Past, present, and future of chamois science. Wildl. Biol. 2022: e01025.
594 <https://doi.org/10.1002/wlb3.01025>

595 Côté SD, *et al.* (2004) Ecological impacts of deer overabundance. Annual Rev. Ecol. Evol. S. 35:
596 113-147. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.ecolsys.35.021103.105725>

597 Csányi S, *et al.* (2014) Valuing ungulates in Europe. In: Putman, R., Apollonio, M.
598 (Eds.). *Behaviour and Management of European Ungulates*. Dunbeath: Whittles Publishing, pp. 13-
599 45.

600 Cservicsik Á, *et al.* (2023) The Large American Liver Fluke (*Fascioloides magna*): A Survivor's
601 Journey through a Constantly Changing World. Parasitologia 3: 300-326.
602 <https://doi.org/10.3390/parasitologia3040031>

603 Cwynar P, *et al.* (2019) African swine fever status in Europe. Viruses 11: 310.
604 <https://doi.org/10.3390/v11040310>

605 Dawson BM, *et al.* (2024). Drastic changes in ground-dwelling beetle communities following high-
606 intensity deer culling: insights from an island ecosystem. Environ. Entomol. 53: 223-229.
607 <https://doi.org/10.1093/ee/nvae013>

608 De Marinis AM, *et al.* (2002). European fallow deer *Dama dama* Linnaeus, 1758. In Hackländer,
609 K., and F. E. Zachos (eds.) Handbook of the Mammals of Europe. Terrestrial Cetartiodactyla
610 (Section Editors: F. E. Zachos, L. Corlatti). Springer, Cham. 2022, 115.

611 Den Teuling N, *et al.* (2021). Clustering of longitudinal data: A tutorial on a variety of approaches.
612 *arXiv preprint arXiv:2111.05469*. <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2111.05469>

613 Donini V, *et al.* (2021) Disentangling demographic effects of red deer on chamois population
614 dynamics. *Ecol. Evol.* 11: 8264-8280. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ece3.7657>

615 Dupke C, *et al.* (2017) Habitat selection by a large herbivore at multiple spatial and temporal scales
616 is primarily governed by food resources. *Ecography* 40: 1014-1027.
617 <https://doi.org/10.1111/ecog.02152>

618 ENETWILD-consortium, *et al.* (2023) A guidance on how to start up a national wildlife population
619 monitoring program harmonizable at European level. *EFSA Supporting Publications* 20: 8218E.
620 <https://doi.org/10.2903/sp.efsa.2023.EN-8218>

621 European Food Safety Authority, *et al.* (2024) Epidemiological analysis of African swine fever in
622 the European Union during 2023. *EFSA Journal* 22: e8809. <https://doi.org/10.2903/j.efsa.2024.8809>

623 Ewald M, *et al.* (2014) LiDAR remote sensing of forest structure and GPS telemetry data provide
624 insights on winter habitat selection of European roe deer. *Forests* 5: 1374-1390.
625 <https://doi.org/10.3390/f5061374>

626 Fuchs R, *et al.* (2015) Gross changes in reconstructions of historic land cover/use for Europe
627 between 1900 and 2010. *Glob. Change Biol.* 21: 299-313. <https://doi.org/10.1111/gcb.12714>

628 Fuller RJ, Gill RM (2001) Ecological impacts of increasing numbers of deer in British woodland.
629 *Forestry* 74: 193-199. <https://doi.org/10.1093/forestry/74.3.193>

630 Garel M, *et al.* (2022). Mouflon *Ovis gmelini* Blyth, 1841. In Handbook of the Mammals of Europe
631 (pp. 1-35). Cham: Springer International Publishing.

632 Gordon IJ, Prins HH (2019) Browsers and grazers drive the dynamics of ecosystems. The ecology
 633 of browsing and grazing II, 405-445. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-25865-8_16
 634 Gortázar C, *et al.* (2007) Diseases shared between wildlife and livestock: a European perspective.
 635 Eur J Wildl Res 53: 241-256. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10344-007-0098-y>
 636 Harada K, *et al.* (2020). Legacy effects of sika deer overpopulation on ground vegetation and soil
 637 physical properties. Forest Ecol. Manag. 474: 118346. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foreco.2020.118346>
 638 Heurich M, *et al.* (2015) Country, cover or protection: What shapes the distribution of red deer and
 639 roe deer in the Bohemian forest ecosystem? PLoS One 10: e0120960.
 640 <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0120960>
 641 Hewison AM, *et al.* (2009). Landscape fragmentation influences winter body mass of roe deer.
 642 Ecography 32: 1062-1070. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1600-0587.2009.05888.x>
 643 Hofmann RR (1989) Evolutionary steps of ecophysiological adaptation and diversification of
 644 ruminants: a comparative view of their digestive system. Oecologia 78: 443-457.
 645 <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00378733>
 646 Hoste A, *et al.* (2024) Projection of current and future distribution of adaptive genetic units in an
 647 alpine ungulate. Heredity 132: 54-66. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41437-023-00661-2>
 648 Imperio S, *et al.* (2010) Investigating population dynamics in ungulates: do hunting statistics make
 649 up a good index of population abundance? Wildl. Biol. 16: 205-214. <https://doi.org/10.2981/08-051>
 650 Janík T, *et al.* (2021) The declining occurrence of moose (*Alces alces*) at the southernmost edge of
 651 its range raise conservation concerns. Ecol. Evol. 11: 5468-5483. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ece3.7441>
 652 Jasińska KD, *et al.* (2021). Habitat-Related Differences in Winter Presence and Spring—Summer
 653 Activity of Roe Deer in Warsaw. Forests, 12: 970. <https://doi.org/10.3390/f12080970>
 654 Jepsen MR, *et al.* (2015) Transitions in European land-management regimes between 1800 and
 655 2010. Land use policy 49: 53-64. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.landusepol.2015.07.003>

656 Johnson TF, *et al.* (2023) Socioeconomic factors predict population changes of large carnivores
657 better than climate change or habitat loss. Nat. Commun., 14: 74. [https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-022-35665-9)
658 [022-35665-9](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-022-35665-9)

659 Kojola I, *et al.* (2021) Calf/female ratio and population dynamics of wild forest reindeer in relation
660 to wolf and moose abundances in a managed European ecosystem. Plos one 16: e0259246.
661 <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0259246>

662 Kramer CJ, *et al.* (2022) Summer habitat use and movements of invasive wild pigs (*Sus scrofa*) in
663 Canadian agro-ecosystems. Can. J. Zool. 100: 494-506. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1139/cjz-2021-0116>

664 Levers C, *et al.*. 2018. Spatial variation in determinants of agricultural land abandonment in Europe.
665 Sci. Tot. Environ. 644: 95-111. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2018.06.326>

666 Levinsky I, *et al.* (2007) Potential impacts of climate change on the distributions and diversity
667 patterns of European mammals. Biodiv. Conserv. 16: 3803-3816.
668 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10531-007-9181-7>

669 Linnell J, Zachos F (2010) Status and distribution patterns of European ungulates: genetics,
670 population history and conservation. In: Ungulate Management in Europe: Problems and Practices,
671 pp 12–53.

672 Lovari S, *et al.* (2020). Climatic changes and the fate of mountain herbivores. Clim. Change 162:
673 2319-2337. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10584-020-02801-7>

674 MacDonald D, *et al.* (2000) Agricultural abandonment in mountain areas of Europe: environmental
675 consequences and policy response. J. Environ. Manag. 59: 47-69.
676 <https://doi.org/10.1006/jema.1999.0335>

677 Malpeli KC, *et al.* (2024) Existing evidence on the effects of climate variability and climate change
678 on ungulates in North America: a systematic map. Environ. Evid. 13, 8.
679 <https://doi.org/10.1186/s13750-024-00331-8>

680 Manfredo MJ, *et al.* (2020) The changing sociocultural context of wildlife conservation. *Conserv.*
681 *Biol.* 34: 1549-1559. <https://doi.org/10.1111/cobi.13493>

682 Marchiori E, *et al.* (2012) Wild red deer (*Cervus elaphus* L.) grazing may seriously reduce forage
683 production in mountain meadows. *Ital. J. Anim. Sci.* 11: e9 <https://doi.org/10.4081/ijas.2012.e9>

684 Markov N, *et al.* (2022). The wild boar *Sus scrofa* in northern Eurasia: a review of range expansion
685 history, current distribution, factors affecting the northern distributional limit, and management
686 strategies. *Mamm. Rev.* 52: 519-537. <https://doi.org/10.1111/mam.12301>

687 Martin C, *et al.* (2011) A survey of the transmission of infectious diseases/infections between wild
688 and domestic ungulates in Europe. *Vet. Res.* 42: 1-16. <https://doi.org/10.1186/1297-9716-42-70>

689 Mason TH, *et al.* (2014) Environmental change and long-term body mass declines in an alpine
690 mammal. *Front. Zool.* 11: 1-14. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12983-014-0069-6>

691 Massei G, *et al.* (2015) Wild boar populations up, numbers of hunters down? A review of trends
692 and implications for Europe. *Pest Manag Sci* 71: 492-500. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ps.3965>

693 Masseti M (1996) The postglacial diffusion of the genus *Dama* Frisch, 1775, in the Mediterranean
694 region. *Ricerche Biologia Selvaggina* 25: 7-29.

695 Masseti M (2002) Island of deer. Natural history of the fallow deer of Rhodes and of the terrestrial
696 and fresh water vertebrates of the Dodecanese, 2nd edn. Municipality of Rhodes, Greece.

697 Mattioli S, *et al.* (2022) Red deer *Cervus elaphus* Linnaeus, 1758. In *Handbook of the Mammals of*
698 *Europe*. Cham: Springer International Publishing.

699 Melis C, *et al.* (2006) Biogeographical variation in the population density of wild boar (*Sus scrofa*)
700 in western Eurasia. *J. Biogeogr.* 33: 803-811. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2699.2006.01434.x>

701 Milner JM, *et al.* (2006) Temporal and spatial development of red deer harvesting in Europe:
702 biological and cultural factors. *J. Appl. Ecol.* 43: 721-734. [https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2664.2006.01183.x)
703 [2664.2006.01183.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2664.2006.01183.x)

704 Mori E, *et al.* (2020) Impact of wild boar rooting on small forest-dwelling rodents. *Ecol. Res.* 35:
 705 675-681. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1440-1703.12113>
 706 Mysterud A, Østbye E (1999) Cover as a habitat element for temperate ungulates: effects on habitat
 707 selection and demography. *Wildl. Soc. Bull*, 385-394. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/3783905>
 708 Mysterud A, Sæther BE (2010) Climate change and implications for the future distribution and
 709 management of ungulates in Europe. *Ungulate management in Europe: problems and practices*,
 710 349-375.
 711 Mysterud A, *et al.* (2003) The response of terrestrial ecosystems to climate variability associated
 712 with the North Atlantic Oscillation. *Geoph. Monog. Series* 134: 235-262.
 713 <https://doi.org/10.1029/134GM11>
 714 Oja, R (2017) Consequences of supplementary feeding of wild boar: concern for ground-nesting
 715 birds and endoparasite infection (Doctoral dissertation, Universitatis Tartuenssis).
 716 <https://dspace.ut.ee/server/api/core/bitstreams/46377fb9-0523-40cc-a109-fb279c3624d0/content>
 717 Palmer G, *et al.* (2015). Nationwide trophic cascades: changes in avian community structure driven
 718 by ungulates. *Sci. Rep.* 5: 15601. <https://doi.org/10.1038/srep15601>
 719 Pascual-Rico R, *et al.* (2021) Usually hated, sometimes loved: A review of wild ungulates'
 720 contributions to people. *Sci. Tot. Env.* 801: 149652. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2021.14965>
 721 Pépin D, *et al.* (2006) Relative impact of browsing by red deer on mixed coniferous and broad-
 722 leaved seedlings—an enclosure-based experiment. *Forest Ecol. Manag.* 222: 302-313.
 723 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foreco.2005.10.034>
 724 Perea R, *et al.* (2014) Big game or big loss? High deer densities are threatening woody plant
 725 diversity and vegetation dynamics. *Biodiv. Cons.* 23: 1303-1318. [https://doi.org/10.1007/s10531-](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10531-014-0666-x)
 726 [014-0666-x](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10531-014-0666-x)

727 Pettoirelli N, *et al.* (2007) Aerial surveys vs hunting statistics to monitor deer density: the example
 728 of Anticosti Island, Quebec, Canada. *Wildl. Biol.* 13: 321-327. [https://doi.org/10.2981/0909-](https://doi.org/10.2981/0909-6396(2007)13[321:ASVHST]2.0.CO;2)
 729 [6396\(2007\)13\[321:ASVHST\]2.0.CO;2](https://doi.org/10.2981/0909-6396(2007)13[321:ASVHST]2.0.CO;2)
 730 Pokorny B, *et al.* (2017) Ecological value, importance and impacts of wild ruminants. *Gozdarski*
 731 *Vestnik* 75: 360-372. <http://dirros.openscience.si/IzpisGradiva.php?id=8108>
 732 Pokorny B, Jelenko I (2014) Ecological importance and impacts of wild boar (*Sus scrofa* L.).
 733 Zlatorogov Zbornik. 2: 2-30.
 734 https://clan.lovska-zveza.si/userfiles/Lovstvo/pdf/Zlatorogov_zbornik_2013.pdf
 735 Putman R, Apollonio M, Andersen R (Eds., 2011) *Ungulate management in Europe: problems and*
 736 *practices*. Cambridge University Press.
 737 Rae LF, *et al.* (2014) Multiscale impacts of forest degradation through browsing by hyperabundant
 738 moose (*Alces alces*) on songbird assemblages. *Diversi. Distrib.* 20: 382-395.
 739 <https://doi.org/10.1111/ddi.12133>
 740 R Core Team (2024) R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing. R Foundation for
 741 Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria. <https://www.R-project.org/>
 742 Reiner R, *et al.* (2023) Forest disturbances increase the body mass of two contrasting ungulates. *J.*
 743 *Appl. Ecol.* 60: 2177-2187. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1365-2664.14481>
 744 Reiner R, *et al.* (2021) Forests buffer the climate-induced decline of body mass in a mountain
 745 herbivore. *Glob. Change Biol.* 2716: 3741-3752. <https://doi.org/10.1111/gcb.15711>
 746 Reiner R, *et al.* (2022) Habitat and climate shape growth patterns in a mountain ungulate. *Ecol.*
 747 *Evol.* 12: e8650. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ece3.8650>
 748 Ripple WJ, *et al.* (2015) Collapse of the world's largest herbivores. *Sci. Adv.*, 1: e1400103.
 749 <https://doi.org/10.1126/sciadv.1400103>
 750 Saïd S, Servanty S (2005) The influence of landscape structure on female roe deer home-range size.
 751 *Landscape Ecol.* 20: 1003-1012. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10980-005-7518-8>

752 Salkeld DJ, Antolin MF (2020) Ecological fallacy and aggregated data: a case study of fried
 753 chicken restaurants, obesity and Lyme disease. *Ecohealth* 17: 4-12. [https://doi.org/10.1007/s10393-](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10393-020-01472-1)
 754 [020-01472-1](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10393-020-01472-1)

755 Salvatori M, *et al.* (2023) Crowded mountains: Long-term effects of human outdoor recreation on a
 756 community of wild mammals monitored with systematic camera trapping. *Ambio* 52: 1085-1097.
 757 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13280-022-01825-w>

758 Santos AM, *et al.* (2020) Current climate, but also long-term climate changes and human impacts,
 759 determine the geographic distribution of European mammal diversity. *Global Ecol. Biogeogr.* 29:
 760 1758-1769. <https://doi.org/10.1111/geb.13148>

761 Sardá-Espinosa A (2017) Comparing time-series clustering algorithms in r using the dtwclust
 762 package. *R package vignette*, 12, 41.
 763 <https://cran.r-hub.io/web/packages/dtwclust/vignettes/dtwclust.pdf>

764 Scandura M, *et al.* (2022) Wild Boar *Sus scrofa* Linnaeus, 1758. In *Terrestrial Cetartiodactyla*.
 765 Cham: Springer International Publishing.

766 Smit C, Putman R (2011) Large herbivores as ‘environmental engineers.’ In: Putman R, Apollonio
 767 M, Andersen R, eds. *Ungulate Management in Europe: Problems and Practices*. Cambridge
 768 University Press; 2011:260-283. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511974137.010>

769 Spitzer R, *et al.* (2020) Fifty years of European ungulate dietary studies: a synthesis. *Oikos* 129:
 770 1668-1680. <https://doi.org/10.1111/oik.07435>

771 Suzuki M (2024) Ecosystem transition due to deer overabundance: Insights from long-term studies
 772 and future considerations. *Ecol. Res.* 40: 3-19 <https://doi.org/10.1111/1440-1703.12537>

773 Sykes NJ, *et al.* (2011) New evidence for the establishment and management of the European
 774 fallow deer (*Dama dama dama*) in Roman Britain. *J. Archaeol. Sci.* 38 156–165
 775 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jas.2010.08.024>

776 Touzot L, *et al.* (2020). How does increasing mast seeding frequency affect population dynamics of
777 seed consumers? Wild boar as a case study. *Ecol. Appl.*, 30: e02134.
778 <https://doi.org/10.1002/eap.2134>

779 Tucker MA, *et al.* (2021) Mammal population densities at a global scale are higher in human-
780 modified areas. *Ecography* 44: 1-13. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ecog.05126>

781 Valente AM, *et al.* (2020) Overabundant wild ungulate populations in Europe: management with
782 consideration of socio-ecological consequences. *Mamm. Rev.* 50: 353-366.
783 <https://doi.org/10.1111/mam.12202>

784 van Beeck Calkoen ST, *et al.* (2023) Numerical top-down effects on red deer (*Cervus elaphus*) are
785 mainly shaped by humans rather than large carnivores across Europe *J. Appl. Ecol.* 60: 2625-2635.
786 <https://doi.org/10.1111/1365-2664.14526>

787 van Beeck Calkoen ST, *et al.* (2020) Ungulate management in European national parks: Why a
788 more integrated European policy is needed. *J. Environ. Manag.* 260: 110068.
789 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvman.2020.110068>

790 van Beest FM, *et al.* (2012) Temperature-mediated habitat use and selection by a heat-sensitive
791 northern ungulate. *Anim. Behav.* 84: 723-735. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.anbehav.2012.06.032>

792 Vannini C, *et al.* (2021) Land cover and weather jointly predict biometric indicators of phenotypic
793 quality in a large herbivore. *Ecol. Ind.* 128: 107818. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolind.2021.107818>

794 Vilén T, *et al.* (2012) Reconstructed forest age structure in Europe 1950–2010. *Forest Ecol. Manag.*
795 286: 203-218. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.foreco.2012.08.048>

796 Virgós E., Tellería JL (1998) Roe deer habitat selection in Spain: constraints on the distribution of a
797 species. *Can. J. Zool.* 76: 1294-1299. <https://doi.org/10.1139/z98-065>


798 Vogt K, *et al.* (2024) Estimating kill intervals for a specific prey species using location clusters
799 from GPS-collared Eurasian lynx (*Lynx lynx*). *Eur. J. Wildl. Res.* 70: 52.
800 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10344-024-01804-4>

801 Zong X, *et al.* (2023) Habitat visibility affects the behavioral response of a large herbivore to
802 human disturbance in forest landscapes. J. Env. Manag. 348: 119244.
803 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvman.2023.119244>

PREPRINT

804 **Supplementary figures**


805



807 Fig. S1. Evolution of the Silhouette index for a growing number of temporal trends, in each species. Higher value of the
808 index reflects more pronounced differences between long-term trends of cluster centroids. The horizontal line represents
809 the cutoff value of 0.5, which is the threshold to identify clusters with different long-term trends according to Den
810 Teuling et al. (2021).

811

812



814 Fig. S2. Temporal trends in harvested moose in Norway and Finland. The number of harvested individuals was
815 transformed to a Z-score and is represented in terms of standard deviations, from the mean value of each country.

PREPRINT

816 **Tables**

817

818 Table 1. Number of harvested individuals, for each species per country, in 1975 and 2018 (- = no data or not considered; / = no presence). For fallow
819 deer, data started in 1985. For moose in Poland, data were not considered as hunting was suspended in 2001. We also did not consider wild boar in
820 Sweden, whose population originated from a reintroduction in the late 1970s and was not hunted for years.

821

Country	Roe deer		Red deer		Wild boar		Fallow deer		Mouflon		Northern chamois		Moose	
	1975	2018	1975	2018	1975	2018	1985	2018	1975	2018	1975	2018	1975	2018
Austria	208,886	284,916	44,598	54,977	4,355	30,542	-	-	-	-	21,953	20,685	/	/
Croatia	4,204	16,160	1,674	3,933	2,418	29,599	-	971	-	497	12	87	/	/
Denmark	36,044	93,477	1,130	9,745	-	-	1,901	9,537	-	-	/	/	/	/
Estonia	16,390	24,146	5	2,757	4,977	4,761	-	-	-	-	/	/	5,441	7,163
Finland	-	-	-	-	/	/	-	-	-	-	/	/	12,285	58,190
France	59,426	586,464	6,709	65,275	45,830	747,367	217	1,331	191	2,784	2,815	12,407	/	/
Germany	787,806	1,206,445	44,517	77,212	120,831	599,862	24,127	65,226	1,869	7,214	2,131	4,843	/	/
Hungary	54,337	119,287	16,642	65,040	14,050	159,855	3,394	15,949	583	4,412	/	/	/	/
Italy (Trento)	2,119	4,185	9	2,287	-	-	/	/	2	270	541	2,985	/	/
Latvia	10,086	27,422	882	17,825	7,535	15,238	-	-	-	-	/	/	5,583	7,474
Lithuania	10,400	28,931	405	7,876	9,690	18,016	/	/	/	/	/	/	3,270	2,317
Luxembourg	4,493	7,016	131	426	972	7,777	-	-	2	119	/	/	/	/
Norway	5,240	29,520	3,807	43,800	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	10,218	30,600
Poland	47,100	210,133	10,200	95,365	40,400	266,047	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Slovakia	16,557	25,856	10,993	42,937	13,696	41,723	718	14,677	461	5,544	-	-	-	-
Slovenia	19,969	30,875	1,600	6,268	1,257	8,250	70	275	50	459	1,625	2,212	/	/
Spain	-	-	11,843	144,134	19,038	373,225	-	-	-	-	/	/	/	/
Sweden	61,349	99,165	138	11,267	-	112,352	2,849	50,449	-	-	/	/	51,544	83,059
Switzerland	39,377	42,389	3,552	12,081	489	6,997	/	/	-	-	13,358	11,192	/	/

822

823

824

825

826 Table 2. Relative importance of the various predictors, expressed as the decrease in node impurities through the residual sum of squares. This value
827 tells how well trees can split variables (the higher the better).

828

	Year	Changes in % of area covered by forests	Changes in livestock density	Changes in % of population countryside	Changes in % of area covered by croplands	% of forests which had 20 years of age or less in 1975	Management regime
Roe deer	0.19	0.65	0.07	0.12	0.12	0.13	0.04
Red deer	0.58	0.16	0.03	0.05	0.06	0.01	0.01
Wild boar	0.45	0.06	0.02	0.01	0.15	0.01	0.01
Fallow deer	0.22	0.03	0.01	0.33	0.08	0.01	0.01
Mouflon	0.14	0.26	0.01	0.04	0.17	0.00	0.00

829

830