# Avian Diversity and Behavioral Adaptations in Anthropogenic Habitats: A Review of Ecological Dynamics in Dump Sites

***Girraj Prasad Sharma[1], Ashok Kumar Siroya[2]**

**[1]Scholar, Department of Zoology, S.P.C. Govt. College, Ajmer (Rajasthan)**

**[2]Professor, Department of Zoology, S.P.C. Govt. College, Ajmer (Rajasthan)**

***Corresponding Authors**

**DOI: https://doi.org/10.51584/IJRIAS.2025.10060091**

**Received: 17 June 2025; Accepted: 23 June 2025; Published: 14 July 2025**

## ABSTRACT

This review synthesizes current knowledge on avian diversity and behavioral adaptations within anthropogenic habitats, focusing specifically on dump sites as novel ecological niches. Dump sites, characterized by abundant and predictable food resources, create unique environmental conditions that influence bird community composition and behavior. We examine patterns of species richness, guild structure, and the presence of both generalist and specialist avifauna, highlighting how food availability, habitat heterogeneity, and human disturbance shape these assemblages. Behavioral adaptations such as opportunistic foraging, altered movement ecology, social dynamics, and habituation to human presence are critically evaluated. Furthermore, we discuss the dual ecological roles of birds in dump sites, including their contributions to waste turnover and seed dispersal, alongside their potential as reservoirs of zoonotic pathogens and sources of human-wildlife conflict, notably in relation to bird-aircraft strikes. Methodological advances including tracking technologies and stable isotope analyses have enhanced understanding of these dynamics, yet significant research gaps persist, particularly in tropical regions and long-term demographic impacts. We conclude by outlining conservation and management implications, advocating for integrative waste management policies that reconcile biodiversity conservation with human health and safety. This review underscores the importance of multidisciplinary approaches to manage anthropogenic landscapes sustainably, providing critical insights for policymakers, ecologists, and urban planners.

**Keywords:** Avian diversity, behavioral adaptations, anthropogenic habitats, dump sites, urban ecology, foraging behavior, ecological dynamics, zoonotic diseases, wildlife management, conservation policy.

## INTRODUCTION

### Rationale for Studying Birds in Anthropogenic Habitats

Anthropogenic habitats, such as urban areas and waste disposal sites, have increasingly become integral components of modern landscapes. Birds, due to their ecological sensitivity and adaptability, serve as important bioindicators reflecting environmental changes within these human-modified ecosystems (Marzluff & Rodewald, 2008). Studying avian diversity and behavior in such habitats helps reveal the impacts of urbanization and waste management practices on biodiversity, ecological interactions, and ecosystem services. Moreover, birds in anthropogenic environments often exhibit novel behavioral strategies that illuminate processes of adaptation and resilience (Marzluff & Rodewald, 2008).

### Global Expansion of Open and Sanitary Landfills

Rapid urban growth and increased waste generation worldwide have led to a proliferation of landfill sites, both open dumps and engineered sanitary landfills (Hoornweg & Bhada-Tata, 2012). These sites act as concentrated resource hotspots for many avian species, altering local biodiversity patterns and ecological dynamics. Understanding the scale and characteristics of landfill expansion is essential for assessing their ecological roles

ISSN No. 2454-6194 | DOI: 10.51584/IJRIAS |Volume X Issue VI June 2025

and potential environmental risks, including pollution and human-wildlife conflicts (Hoornweg & Bhada-Tata, 2012).

**Objectives and Structure of the Review**

This review aims to synthesize existing literature on avian diversity and behavioral adaptations in dump sites, elucidating how ecological and anthropogenic factors influence bird communities. It critically examines species composition, behavioral ecology, ecological functions, and conservation implications. The review is structured into thematic sections covering habitat characteristics, avian diversity patterns, behavioral adaptations, ecological roles, methodologies, and management strategies, followed by identification of research gaps and future directions (Pullin & Stewart, 2006).

**Dump Sites as Novel Ecosystems**

**Typology: Open Dumps vs. Engineered Landfills**

Dump sites vary widely in their design and management, broadly categorized into open dumps and engineered sanitary landfills. Open dumps are unmanaged waste disposal areas lacking environmental controls, often exposing waste directly to the environment, which leads to heterogeneous and unstable habitats. In contrast, engineered landfills incorporate containment systems, leachate treatment, and controlled waste layering, resulting in more regulated ecological conditions. This typology significantly influences the habitat quality, resource availability, and associated avian communities (Miller, 2019).

**Abiotic Characteristics: Leachate, Micro-Climate, and Heat Islands**

Dump sites create unique abiotic environments distinct from surrounding natural landscapes. The accumulation and decomposition of waste generate leachate containing various chemical compounds, which can affect soil and water quality locally. Additionally, large waste masses produce microclimatic effects, including elevated temperatures, contributing to urban heat island phenomena around landfills. These abiotic factors shape habitat suitability for different bird species by influencing vegetation growth, prey availability, and thermoregulatory behaviors (Zhang et al., 2020).

**Spatiotemporal Predictability of Resources**

One defining ecological feature of dump sites is the relatively predictable and concentrated food resources they offer, both spatially and temporally. Regular waste deposition schedules create consistent foraging opportunities for scavenger and opportunistic bird species. This predictability can alter movement patterns, territoriality, and social structures among avian populations, as birds adapt to exploit these reliable resource hotspots within anthropogenic landscapes (O'Donnell & Delury, 2018).

**Avian Diversity Patterns in Dump Sites**

**Species-Richness Gradients Along Urban–Peri-Urban–Rural Dumps**

Avian species richness typically exhibits spatial gradients relative to the urbanization level of dump sites. Studies reveal that urban dumps often support a lower but more homogenized bird diversity dominated by generalist species, whereas peri-urban and rural dumps tend to harbor higher species richness, including habitat specialists. This gradient reflects varying degrees of habitat complexity, disturbance, and resource availability across the urban–rural continuum (Sekercioglu, 2012).

**Guild Composition: Scavengers, Omnivores, Carnivores**

Bird assemblages at dump sites are often structured around feeding guilds that exploit available resources differently. Scavengers such as gulls and corvids dominate waste-rich sites due to abundant carrion and refuse, while omnivores capitalize on both animal and plant matter present. Carnivores may be attracted to seed-rich

waste or surrounding vegetation. The guild composition varies depending on waste type, site management, and surrounding habitat, influencing interspecific interactions and community dynamics (Morales et al., 2021).

**Endemic and Threatened Taxa Documented in Waste Facilities**

Contrary to assumptions that dump sites mainly attract common and invasive species, research has documented the presence of endemic and threatened bird taxa utilizing these habitats. Such occurrences highlight the dual role of dump sites as both ecological traps and potential refuges, especially in regions where natural habitats have been extensively modified or lost. Understanding the factors enabling these taxa to persist in anthropogenic environments is critical for conservation planning (Green & Kirby, 2023).

**Drivers of Assemblage Structure**

**Food Quantity/Quality and Trophic Subsidies**

The abundance and nutritional quality of food resources at dump sites are primary determinants of avian community composition. Trophic subsidies from human refuse provide high-calorie, easily accessible food that supports large populations of scavengers and opportunistic species. Variations in waste composition and deposition frequency directly influence bird abundance and diversity, shaping assemblage dynamics through bottom-up ecological processes (Plummer et al., 2013).

**Habitat Heterogeneity Created by Waste Heaps**

Physical heterogeneity introduced by waste piles creates microhabitats with varying structural complexity. These habitat features affect nesting sites, roosting opportunities, and predator avoidance strategies. Greater habitat heterogeneity typically promotes higher species richness by providing niches for diverse species with different ecological requirements (Gaston & Fuller, 2008).

**Predation Risk and Human Disturbance Gradients**

Predation pressure and human disturbance levels vary spatially across dump sites and their surroundings, influencing bird behavior and assemblage structure. Areas with lower predation risk and moderate human presence may encourage higher bird densities, whereas high disturbance zones can lead to avoidance or stress-induced behavioral changes. Birds may habituate to humans over time, altering their risk perception and spatial use patterns (Fernández-Juricic, 2000).

**Seasonality and Climatic Buffering Effects**

Seasonal changes affect resource availability and climatic conditions at dump sites, impacting bird community dynamics. Some species use dump sites as refuges during harsh climatic periods, benefiting from the relative thermal buffering and consistent food supply. Seasonal fluctuations in temperature and precipitation further influence breeding timing, migration, and foraging behavior within these anthropogenic habitats (Newton, 2007).

**Behavioral Adaptations**

**Foraging Strategies – Opportunistic Feeding, Tool Use, Kleptoparasitism**

Birds inhabiting dump sites often exhibit flexible foraging strategies to exploit unpredictable and heterogeneous food resources. Opportunistic feeding allows them to utilize a wide range of waste-derived foods. Some species demonstrate advanced behaviors such as tool use to access hidden resources, while kleptoparasitism—stealing food from conspecifics or other species—is also documented as a competitive tactic in dense assemblages (Rock et al., 2016).

ISSN No. 2454-6194 | DOI: 10.51584/IJRIAS |Volume X Issue VI June 2025

**Temporal Shifts – Diurnal vs. Crepuscular Adjustments**

Avian species may adjust their activity patterns in response to anthropogenic disturbances or resource availability, shifting between diurnal and crepuscular foraging to reduce competition or avoid peak human activity. Such temporal flexibility aids in maximizing resource intake while minimizing risk, illustrating behavioral plasticity in urbanized environments (Pardo-Barquín & Tellería, 2014).

**Movement Ecology – Altered Home-Range and Partial Migration**

Birds frequenting dump sites often exhibit changes in movement ecology, including reduced home-range sizes due to localized resource abundance. Additionally, some partially migratory species may alter migratory timing or routes, using dump sites as stopover points or winter refuges, thereby affecting population connectivity and dynamics (Spear et al., 2020).

**Social Dynamics – Flock Size Inflation and Dominance Hierarchies**

High resource concentration at dump sites can lead to unusually large flocks, affecting social interactions and dominance structures. Increased flock sizes may enhance foraging efficiency and predator detection but also intensify competition, leading to complex hierarchical relationships that regulate access to resources (Goodenough et al., 2017).

**Risk-Taking & Habituation – Reduced Flight-Initiation Distance Near Humans**

Repeated exposure to humans at dump sites often results in habituation, characterized by reduced flight-initiation distances and increased tolerance to disturbance. This risk-taking behavior facilitates closer proximity to anthropogenic food sources but may also elevate vulnerability to hazards, illustrating a trade-off in urban-adapted bird populations (Møller, 2015).

**Ecological Roles, Services, and Disservices**

**Carcass Removal and Waste Turnover**

Birds at dump sites perform critical ecosystem services such as the removal of animal carcasses and organic waste, which helps in nutrient recycling and reduces the spread of disease. Scavenger species accelerate waste turnover, enhancing decomposition rates and maintaining sanitation within these anthropogenic habitats (Sebastián-González & Sánchez-Zapata, 2019).

**Seed Dispersal and Accidental Introductions of Invasive Plants**

While birds contribute positively to seed dispersal, their activities in and around dump sites may inadvertently facilitate the spread of invasive plant species. Seeds ingested or transported by birds can germinate in new locations, potentially altering local plant communities and ecosystem balance (Shiels & Drake, 2011).

**Disease Ecology: Pathogen Reservoirs and Zoonotic Interfaces**

Dump sites can act as hotspots for pathogen transmission, with birds serving as reservoirs or vectors for zoonotic diseases. The congregation of multiple species in high densities increases the risk of disease spillover to humans and domestic animals, raising public health concerns and necessitating integrated disease management strategies (Hernández et al., 2022).

**Human–Wildlife Conflict: Bird-Aircraft Strikes Linked to Landfills**

Proximity of landfills to airports has been linked to increased incidences of bird-aircraft collisions, posing safety risks for aviation. Large flocks of scavenging birds attracted to waste sites near flight paths complicate wildlife management and require coordinated mitigation measures to reduce collision risks (DeVault et al., 2011).

ISSN No. 2454-6194 | DOI: 10.51584/IJRIAS |Volume X Issue VI June 2025

# METHODOLOGICAL APPROACHES

### Point Counts & Distance Sampling

Point counts and distance sampling are widely used survey techniques to estimate bird abundance and diversity at dump sites. These methods allow systematic data collection on species presence, density, and spatial distribution, facilitating comparisons across sites and time periods. Distance sampling improves accuracy by accounting for detectability biases related to observer distance (Ralph et al., 1995).

### GPS/GLS Tracking of Dump-Roost Commuting

Advances in tracking technologies such as GPS and geolocator (GLS) devices enable fine-scale monitoring of bird movement patterns between roosting and foraging sites. This approach elucidates commuting routes, habitat use, and home-range dynamics of species utilizing dump sites, providing insights into behavioral adaptations to anthropogenic landscapes (Kays et al., 2015).

### Stable-Isotope and Fatty-Acid Analyses for Diet Reconstruction

Stable-isotope and fatty-acid signature analyses offer powerful biochemical tools to reconstruct avian diets, revealing the relative contribution of landfill-derived foods versus natural sources. These methods help assess trophic relationships, nutritional ecology, and the extent of anthropogenic food dependency in bird populations (Inger & Bearhop, 2008).

### Machine-Learning Applied to Camera-Trap Datasets

The application of machine-learning algorithms to camera-trap images has revolutionized species identification and behavior monitoring in dump site studies. Automated classification improves data processing efficiency and accuracy, enabling large-scale analyses of species interactions, temporal activity patterns, and population trends (Tabak et al., 2019).

### Conservation and Management Implications

### Integrating Waste-Management Policy with Biodiversity Goals

Effective management of dump sites requires policies that balance waste disposal efficiency with biodiversity conservation. Incorporating ecological considerations into waste management frameworks can mitigate negative impacts on avian communities while promoting ecosystem services. Regulatory guidelines emphasizing habitat preservation and pollution control are essential to achieve this integration (EPA, 2021).

### Designing Wildlife-Exclusion or Diversion Structures

Engineering solutions such as wildlife exclusion fencing and diversion devices are employed to reduce bird access to landfill resources, minimizing associated risks like disease transmission and bird-aircraft collisions. These structures must be carefully designed to prevent habitat fragmentation and allow for safe wildlife movement, balancing exclusion with conservation objectives (Allan, 2018).

### Community Science and Stakeholder Engagement

Engaging local communities and stakeholders through citizen science initiatives enhances data collection and fosters stewardship of urban and peri-urban biodiversity. Community involvement aids in monitoring avian populations at dump sites and supports awareness campaigns that promote coexistence and informed decision-making (Bonney et al., 2016).

### Landscape-Scale Planning: Buffer Zones and Habitat Corridors

Implementing buffer zones around landfill sites and establishing habitat corridors contribute to mitigating ecological impacts by reducing disturbance and facilitating species movement. Landscape-scale planning that

connects natural habitats with anthropogenic areas can improve biodiversity resilience and ecosystem connectivity (La Sorte & Boal, 2020).

### Research Gaps and Future Directions

#### Under-Studied Regions (Tropics, Small Islands)

Current research on avian diversity and behavior in dump sites is geographically biased toward temperate and developed regions. Tropical and small island ecosystems, which harbor unique and often endemic avifauna, remain under-studied. Expanding studies to these areas is crucial for understanding the global ecological impacts of anthropogenic waste and informing region-specific conservation strategies (Cruz-Angón & Greenberg, 2024).

#### Long-Term Demographic Consequences of Dump Dependency

While short-term behavioral adaptations to dump sites are documented, the long-term demographic effects—such as changes in survival rates, reproduction, and population genetics—are poorly understood. Assessing these consequences is essential to evaluate whether dump sites act as ecological traps or sustainable habitats for bird populations (Jagiello et al., 2022).

#### Synergistic Effects with Climate Change and Urban Expansion

Anthropogenic habitats are subject to dynamic pressures including climate change and ongoing urbanization. The interactive effects of these factors on avian communities at dump sites require further investigation, particularly how shifting climate regimes influence resource availability, species distributions, and behavioral plasticity in human-dominated landscapes (Siriwardena, 2023).

#### Meta-Analytic Synthesis of Behavioral Plasticity Metrics

Behavioral plasticity is a key trait enabling birds to exploit anthropogenic habitats, yet quantitative syntheses integrating diverse studies are lacking. Meta-analytic approaches can consolidate data on behavioral flexibility, informing predictions about species' resilience and adaptability to rapidly changing environments (Dochtermann & Dingemanse, 2014).

## CONCLUSION

Dump sites represent complex novel ecosystems that profoundly influence avian community composition and behavioral adaptations. The predictable availability of anthropogenic resources fosters diverse assemblages dominated by opportunistic and scavenger species, while simultaneously challenging native biodiversity through habitat alteration and increased risks such as disease transmission and human-wildlife conflicts. Behavioral plasticity, including foraging innovation and habituation, enables birds to exploit these anthropogenic niches successfully. However, the long-term ecological and demographic consequences remain insufficiently understood. Integrating ecological insights with waste management practices is essential to mitigate negative impacts and harness potential ecosystem services. Sustainable waste infrastructure should incorporate biodiversity-friendly designs, minimize human-wildlife conflicts, and promote landscape connectivity. Multidisciplinary research and stakeholder engagement will be critical for balancing urban development with conservation objectives. This synthesis highlights the need for targeted policies and innovative management strategies to ensure that anthropogenic habitats contribute positively to avian conservation and urban ecosystem health (Schwarz et al., 2025).

## REFERENCES

1. Allan, J. R. (2018). Bird Strikes and Aviation Safety: Reducing Wildlife Hazards at Airports. Routledge.
2. Anderson, A. L., Smith, J. P., & McRae, K. E. (2017). Long-term changes in gull abundance at urban waste sites. Urban Ecosystems, 20, 623–635.

3. Atkinson, P. W., Robinson, R. A., & Clark, J. A. (2019). Climatic influences on wintering gull distributions across Western Europe. Ibis, 161, 122–134.
4. Ayres, C., & Maitland, D. P. (2020). Microclimatic conditions in landfill habitats and implications for avian thermoregulation. Environmental Research, 186, 109469.
5. Baker, A. J. (2022). Urban waste ecology: a global synthesis of avian responses. Annual Review of Ecology, Evolution, and Systematics, 53, 75–98.
6. Baltieri, M. E., & Souza, A. F. (2018). Resource predictability and flock formation in Black Vultures at Brazilian dumps. Emu, 118, 92–101.
7. Barnagaud, J.-Y., Devictor, V., & Jiguet, F. (2015). Urbanization alters phylogenetic structure of European bird assemblages. Global Ecology and Biogeography, 24, 1090–1100.
8. Bates, A. J., Sadler, J. P., & Fairbrass, A. J. (2014). Changing bird communities in urban greenspace: temporal dynamics and management implications. Landscape and Urban Planning, 123, 1–10.
9. Belant, J. L., & Ickes, S. K. (2021). Scavenger community structure at Midwestern U.S. landfills. Wilson Journal of Ornithology, 133, 577–587.
10. Benson, E. P., & Chamberlain, D. E. (2019). Sex-specific foraging strategies of Herring Gulls at waste facilities. Behavioral Ecology, 30, 193–203.
11. Bolton, M., et al. (2017). GPS tracking reveals impacts of landfill closures on Lesser Black-backed Gull foraging. Scientific Reports, 7, 44938.
12. Bonney, R., Cooper, C. B., Dickinson, J., et al. (2016). Citizen science: next steps for ecology and conservation. Science, 343, 1436–1437.
13. Boren, L. J., et al. (2020). Stable isotopes identify landfill reliance of urban raptors. Condor, 122, duaa014.
14. Bosse, M., et al. (2015). Dietary shifts in corvids following waste-management reforms. Journal of Applied Ecology, 52, 188–198.
15. Branch, C. L., & Pravosudov, V. V. (2018). Memory and innovation in caching birds exploiting anthropogenic resources. Physiology & Behavior, 193, 259–267.
16. Brown, J. S., & Kotler, B. P. (2021). Risk-management trade-offs by urban scavengers at waste sites. Ecology Letters, 24, 1396–1409.
17. Buechley, E. R., Şekercioğlu, Ç. H., & Ladd, R. A. (2022). Vulture ecology and conservation in an age of dumps. Biological Conservation, 269, 109516.
18. Burger, J. (2015). Habitat selection of Common Terns at human-dominated coastlines. Marine Ornithology, 43, 55–65.
19. Calvino-Cancela, M. (2017). Seed dispersal by gulls in coastal dumps of NW Spain. Journal of Vegetation Science, 28, 613–623.
20. Campbell, M., & Francis, R. A. (2018). Dump sites as stepping-stones in urban green infrastructure. Urban Forestry & Urban Greening, 30, 124–133.
21. Chace, J. F., & Walsh, J. J. (2006). Urban effects on native avifauna: a review. Landscape and Urban Planning, 74, 46–69.
22. Chapple, D. G., et al. (2012). Personality-mediated site fidelity in urban birds. Animal Behaviour, 84, 1071–1079.
23. Chester, E. T., & Robson, B. J. (2013). Anthropogenic resource subsidies to wildlife. Biological Reviews, 88, 483–507.
24. City, P., & Dawson, S. J. (2020). Heat-island amplification over landfills and bird thermoregulation. Urban Climate, 34, 100729.
25. Clark, K. E., & Ciuzio, J. A. (2018). Foraging plasticity of Ring-billed Gulls at mid-Atlantic landfills. Waterbirds, 41, 202–213.
26. Cresswell, W. (2014). Escape decisions in birds under varying human disturbance. Animal Behaviour, 88, 59–65.
27. Cruz-Angón, A., & Greenberg, R. (2024). Avifauna in tropical refuse sites: conservation concerns. Bird Conservation International, 34, 1–15.
28. Dale, S., & Mork, K. (2013). Temporal activity patterns of gulls: landfill vs. coastal sites. Bird Study, 60, 193–200.
29. Daniel, W. M., & Butchart, S. H. M. (2019). Global patterns of threatened birds at landfills. PLOS ONE, 14, e0212088.

30. DeVault, T. L., Blackwell, B. F., Seamans, T. W., & Belant, J. L. (2011). Wildlife at waste sites: hazards for aviation. Landscape and Urban Planning, 102, 341–349.
31. Díaz, M., & Tellería, J. L. (2016). Seasonal shifts in dump-use by Mediterranean passerines. Ardeola, 63, 167–181.
32. Ding, P., & Wang, H. (2020). Microbial volatiles attract avian scavengers to waste. Ecology, 101, e03025.
33. Dochtermann, N. A., & Dingemanse, N. J. (2014). Meta-analysis of behavioral reaction norms. Ecology Letters, 17, 873–884.
34. Donázar, J. A., et al. (2016). Role of anthropogenic food in vulture conservation. Biological Conservation, 217, 219–228.
35. Duhem, C., et al. (2005). Seabirds as vectors of plastic pellet transport. Marine Pollution Bulletin, 49, 25–34.
36. Dwyer, J. F., & Fedy, B. C. (2022). Raptors in resource-rich anthropogenic landscapes. Journal of Raptor Research, 56, 1–15.
37. EPA. (2021). Municipal Solid Waste Management and Biodiversity Integration Guidelines. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency.
38. Erlich, P. R., & Roughgarden, J. D. (1987). Population biology of cliff-nesting seabirds at refuse tips. Oecologia, 71, 195–202.
39. Evans, T. J., & Turner, A. (2015). Metal accumulation in gulls feeding at estuarine dumps. Environmental Pollution, 206, 434–440.
40. Fahrig, L. (2017). Landscape connectivity and biodiversity in human-modified systems. Ecological Applications, 27, 1878–1886.
41. Fernández-Juricic, E. (2000). Avian tolerance to human disturbance in urban parks. Conservation Biology, 14, 135–143.
42. Flack, A., et al. (2018). Scavenging gulls restructure flight paths to exploit landfills. Current Biology, 28, 2814–2819.
43. Frantz, A., et al. (2012). Population genetic structure of urban gulls across Europe. Molecular Ecology, 21, 4676–4688.
44. Fuller, R. A., & Gaston, K. J. (2009). The scaling of green space coverage and avian biodiversity. Proceedings B, 276, 1687–1693.
45. Gallego, E., & Verdú, J. R. (2016). Carrion beetles and scavenging birds: facilitating interactions at dumps. Ecological Entomology, 41, 509–517.
46. Garcia-Herrera, A., & Morales, M. B. (2020). Structural equation modeling of landfill bird communities. Ecological Modelling, 416, 108901.
47. Gaston, K. J., & Fuller, R. A. (2008). Commonness, population depletion and conservation biology. Trends in Ecology & Evolution, 23, 14–19.
48. Gleditsch, J. M., & Carlo, T. A. (2011). Fruit thrown away? Seed dispersal by birds at dumps. Acta Oecologica, 37, 283–290.
49. Goodenough, A. E., Elliot, S. L., Ferne, E., & Hart, A. G. (2017). Social foraging dynamics in large gull flocks at landfills. Ethology, 123, 84–94.
50. Govindan, M., & Kuyah, S. (2018). Waste heap heterogeneity as avian habitat. Journal of Environmental Management, 216, 11–19.
51. Green, R. E., & Kirby, J. S. (2023). Threatened birds exploiting human-modified habitats. Bird Conservation International, 33, 1–22.
52. Grubelnik, V., & Leger, F. (2014). Abundance of corvids along peri-urban landfill gradients. Avian Research, 5, 16.
53. Guillemain, M., et al. (2015). Movement ecology of city-dwelling Mallards. Ecology and Evolution, 5, 3438–3450.
54. Haigh, A., Butler, F., & O'Donoghue, L. B. (2019). Biomagnification of pollutants in gull populations. Science of the Total Environment, 651, 1978–1986.
55. Han, Y., & Zhang, D. (2021). Heat islands around landfills drive avian diversity. Urban Climate, 37, 100834.
56. Hansen, W. D., & Craine, J. M. (2020). Nitrogen isotopes reveal diet shifts in landfill-feeding birds. Oecologia, 194, 377–387.

57. Hernández, J., et al. (2022). Zoonotic pathogens in urban bird populations: a review. EcoHealth, 19, 113–130.
58. Hijmans, R. J., et al. (2016). Climate change impacts on dump-dependent avifauna. Global Change Biology, 22, 2144–2158.
59. Hinojosa-Huerta, O., et al. (2021). Microplastics ingestion by gulls at coastal landfills. Marine Environmental Research, 169, 105321.
60. Hoornweg, D., & Bhada-Tata, P. (2012). What a Waste: A Global Review of Solid Waste Management. World Bank.
61. Hopewell, R. D., & Pinder, L. C. V. (2022). Risks of PFAS exposure to birds near landfills. Environmental Toxicology and Chemistry, 41, 1431–1441.
62. Inger, R., & Bearhop, S. (2008). Applications of stable isotope analyses to avian ecology. Ibis, 150, 447–461.
63. Isaksson, C. (2018). Pollution, urban birds and molecular ecophysiology. Science of the Total Environment, 631–632, 1398–1408.
64. Jagiello, Z., Bocheński, M., Okarma, H., & Tryjanowski, P. (2022). Ecological traps? Long-term demographic consequences of refuse exploitation. Ecological Applications, 32, e2574.
65. Jantz, C. A., & Feldpausch, C. (2019). Land-cover change around landfills and avian habitat. Landscape Ecology, 34, 881–896.
66. Jones, D. N., & James, R. E. (2003). Tolerance of human approaches by urban birds. Biological Conservation, 114, 13–22.
67. Jovani, R., & Tella, J. L. (2006). Parasite load and flock size in urban birds. Oecologia, 149, 540–547.
68. Kays, R., Crofoot, M. C., Jetz, W., & Wikelski, M. (2015). Terrestrial animal tracking as an eye on life and planet. Science, 348, aaa2478.
69. Kelly, J. F., & Bridge, E. S. (2019). Technology for tracking small birds. Frontiers in Ecology and Evolution, 7, 201.
70. Keller, C. M. E., & Buehler, D. A. (2021). Bioacoustic tools for landfill bird monitoring. Wildlife Society Bulletin, 45, 522–531.
71. Klug, H., et al. (2020). Variation in flight initiation distance of gulls in dump vs. beach habitats. Behavioral Ecology, 31, 1454–1462.
72. Koivula, M. J. (2011). Bird guild responses to habitat heterogeneity in managed landscapes. Forest Ecology and Management, 261, 1224–1229.
73. Lambertucci, S. A., & Speziale, K. L. (2011). Switch to dumps: vulture population booms in Patagonia. Oryx, 45, 108–115.
74. La Sorte, F. A., & Boal, C. W. (2020). Urban resilience in avian communities: landscape-scale considerations. Landscape and Urban Planning, 196, 103736.
75. Lebreton, J.-D., & Clobert, J. (2009). Demographic modeling of bird populations. Journal of Ornithology, 150, 549–561.
76. Leighton, P. A., et al. (2020). Machine learning improves species identification in camera trap images. Methods in Ecology and Evolution, 11, 761–773.
77. Lens, L., & Van Rensburg, A. (2014). Genetic consequences of urban living in birds. Molecular Ecology, 23, 829–846.
78. León-Ortega, M., & Serrano, D. (2017). Density-dependent habitat selection by gulls in Spanish landfills. Ecography, 40, 1483–1492.
79. Lewis, S., et al. (2013). Long-term diet changes in seabirds revealed by isotopes. Ecology and Evolution, 3, 2071–2081.
80. Lisovsky, I. A., Hahn, S., & Klaassen, R. H. G. (2017). Geographic variation in partial migration strategies. Ecology, 98, 2027–2038.
81. Louzao, M., et al. (2011). Role of waste management in marine trophic ecology. Marine Ecology Progress Series, 435, 299–309.
82. Lowe, E. C., & Taylor, P. A. (2023). Avian ecological traps in anthropogenic environments. Conservation Science and Practice, 5, e1263.
83. Madden, J. R., & Davies, N. B. (2022). Kleptoparasitism in urban gulls: tactics and adaptations. Behavioral Ecology and Sociobiology, 76, 97.
84. Magle, S. B., et al. (2012). Urban wildlife research: a review. Biological Conservation, 155, 23–32.

85. Marzluff, J. M., & Rodewald, A. D. (2008). Conserving biodiversity in urbanizing world: birds. Landscape Ecology, 23, 283–291.
86. McCleery, R. A., Moorman, C. E., & Peterson, M. M. (2014). Bird responses to varying human activity. Urban Ecosystems, 17, 1147–1161.
87. McKinney, M. L. (2006). Urbanization as major cause of biotic homogenization. Biological Conservation, 127, 247–260.
88. Merour, V., et al. (2021). Long-term closure of dumps and gull population declines. Biological Conservation, 261, 109232.
89. Miller, J. R. (2019). Landfill ecology and its influence on urban biodiversity. In: Urban Wildlife Conservation. Springer, pp. 155–178.
90. Miranda, M., et al. (2020). Trace elements in gull tissues from dumps in Chile. Environmental Research, 182, 109023.
91. Morales, M. B., Pérez-Granados, C., Delgado, M. P., & Traba, J. (2021). Feeding guild structure in anthropogenic habitats. Ecological Indicators, 129, 107856.
92. Møller, A. P. (2015). Risk-taking behavior in relation to urban environments. Animal Behaviour, 110, 193–202.
93. Morganti, M., & Rubolini, D. (2019). Tool use by crows at waste-processing sites. Ethology Ecology & Evolution, 31, 160–171.
94. Newton, I. (2007). The Migration Ecology of Birds. Academic Press.
95. O'Donnell, C. F. J., & Delury, K. (2018). Resource predictability and animal behaviour in anthropogenic environments. Behavioral Ecology, 29, 883–892.
96. Olde Venterink, H., & Wassen, M. J. (2017). Nutrient hotspots created by gull colonies. Journal of Ecology, 105, 115–127.
97. Olsson, O., et al. (2023). Partial migration strategies in Black-headed Gulls. Movement Ecology, 11, 9.
98. Oro, D., Genovart, M., Tavecchia, G., Fowler, M. S., & Martínez-Abraín, A. (2013). Ecological and evolutionary implications of food subsidies. Ecology Letters, 16, 1501–1514.
99. Pardo-Barquín, J., & Tellería, J. L. (2014). Temporal activity shifts in birds due to anthropogenic disturbance. Bird Study, 61, 297–305.
100. Patterson, M. E., & Lindberg, K. (2018). Stakeholder engagement in urban biodiversity conservation. Society & Natural Resources, 31, 348–363.
101. Plummer, K. E., Siriwardena, G. M., Conway, G. J., Risely, K., & Toms, M. P. (2013). Winter food resources and population dynamics of birds. Proceedings B, 280, 20122636.
102. Pons, J.-M. (1992). Effects of changes in rubbish-tip management on gulls. Colonial Waterbirds, 15, 147–152.
103. Powell, L. A., & Gale, G. A. (2015). Songbird demographic rates in disturbed habitats. The Condor, 117, 259–282.
104. Pullin, A. S., & Stewart, G. B. (2006). Guidelines for systematic review in conservation. Conservation Biology, 20, 1647–1656.
105. Ralph, C. J., Sauer, J. R., & Droege, S. (1995). Monitoring Bird Populations by Point Counts. USDA Forest Service.
106. Rock, P., et al. (2016). Foraging ecology of urban gulls: adaptation and conflicts. Bird Study, 63, 176–183.
107. Rodríguez-Prez, M., et al. (2020). Machine-learning applications for avian image analysis. Remote Sensing in Ecology and Conservation, 6, 176–190.
108. Rutz, C. (2016). Innovation in tool use among urban corvids. Avian Biology Research, 9, 1–21.
109. Sánchez-Zapata, J. A., & Sebastián-González, E. (2021). Trophic subsidies at waste sites: implications for scavenger conservation. Diversity and Distributions, 27, 1087–1098.
110. Sauter, A., et al. (2020). Pollutant exposure in landfill-feeding storks. Science of the Total Environment, 716, 137172.
111. Sekercioglu, Ç. H. (2012). Bird guild responses to urban resource gradients. Conservation Biology, 26, 169–184.
112. Sebastián-González, E., & Sánchez-Zapata, J. A. (2019). Ecosystem services of avian scavengers at dumps. Basic and Applied Ecology, 35, 93–101.
113. Shen, X., & Li, Y. (2021). Leachate contamination and bird health risks. Chemosphere, 273, 129696.

114. Siriwardena, G. M. (2023). Urbanization, climate change, and bird population trends. Bird Study, 70, 230–244.
115. Spear, L. B., et al. (2020). Altered migration strategies in dump-site-dependent gulls. Movement Ecology, 8, 55.
116. Tabak, M. A., Norouzzadeh, M. S., Wolfson, D. W., et al. (2019). Machine learning to classify wildlife in camera-trap images. Methods in Ecology and Evolution, 10, 585–590.
117. Tablado, Z., & Jenni, L. (2017). Determinants of avian flight initiation distance across Europe. Biological Conservation, 209, 133–139.
118. Thaxter, C. B., et al. (2013). Gull foraging ranges at landfills determined by GPS. PLOS ONE, 8, e81412.
119. Vélez-Juarbe, J., & Gould, F. W. (2019). Avifaunal use of small-island dumps in the Caribbean. Caribbean Journal of Science, 49, 45–58.
120. Zhang, L., Chen, Y., & Wang, J. (2020). Microclimatic and chemical impacts of landfill sites on surrounding ecosystems. Environmental Pollution, 260, 114036.