



Research Article

Trade and ethnozoological use of African loriforms in the last 20 years

Magdalena S. SVENSSON^{a,*}, Daniel J. INGRAM^b, K. Anna I. NEKARIS^a, Vincent NIJMAN^a

^aNocturnal Primate Research Group & Oxford Wildlife Trade Research Group, Oxford Brookes University, Oxford, UK

^bSchool of Life Sciences, University of Sussex, Brighton, UK

Keywords:

angwantibos
ethnoprimateology
galagos
pottos
strepsirrhines
wildlife trade

Article history:

Received: 4 September 2015

Accepted: 4 November 2015

Acknowledgements

The authors thank everyone who filled out their online questionnaires and provided useful insights, and those who worked hard to collect data in the field. Thanks to J. Dewilde, C. Hicks, S.M. Denny, E. Al-Ghalib and the Lukuru Foundation for providing photographs and to E. Bersacola for help with editing and for commenting on a draft version of the paper. We thank Hystrix's Editor-in-Chief Dr. Giovanni Amori and two anonymous reviewers for their helpful comments and suggestions for improvement.

Abstract

Trade in primates is considered a major impediment to primate conservation globally. The bushmeat trade in West and Central Africa is considered largely unsustainable and represents one of the main threats to biodiversity. Furthermore, the use of primates in traditional practices and medicine includes a third of the African primate species. Little is known about the trade in the African mainland loriforms; pottos, angwantibos and galagos. Aiming to fill this knowledge gap we created an online survey, conducted a literature review, and analyzed CITES trade records, focusing on the last two decades. We obtained 188 questionnaire responses from researchers and people working in 31 different countries in sub-Saharan Africa. We found a total of 33 publications reporting on trade in African loriforms, and CITES records indicate that almost 2000 loriforms were traded internationally from African range countries. Fifty-three percent of respondents provided meaningful details about aspects of the trade in African loriforms from 50% of the range countries. Galagos were reported by respondents in larger numbers than pottos and angwantibos, and mainly occurred in the pet trade. Pottos were the most frequently mentioned taxon in the literature, when all trade types were combined. Across all of the sources (online survey, literature and CITES database), trade in pottos and angwantibos was reported from 12 countries, and galagos from 23 countries. Trade was reported to occur mainly within rural settings (64%), potentially indicating that demand is not high enough to fuel long distance trading. However, as seen in the Asian loriforms, once quantitative studies were conducted, the threat that trade posed became alarmingly apparent and is now considered a major impediment to their conservation. Our insight into the trade of African loriforms should be followed up with concerted studies, with an emphasis on quantifying trade to the species level.

Introduction

When establishing primate conservation and management strategies it is vital to take into account the cultural, social, economic and traditional roles primates play for humans, and to consider the interaction between humans and nonhuman primates (Lee, 2010; Alves, 2012). Ethnoprimateology attempts to integrate the interests and concerns of humans with those of primates (Lee, 2010; Alves, 2012). Interactions between humans and nonhuman primates have occurred throughout their coexistence; however, with a growing human population, more sophisticated hunting technologies, and increasing human access to isolated forest areas, primate populations are under more threat than ever (Bennett et al., 2002; Alves, 2012). Today, habitat loss and the unsustainable trade of primates are considered the main threats to primate conservation globally (Juste et al., 1995; Milner-Gulland and Bennett, 2003; Grieser-Johns and Thomson, 2005; Nijman, 2005; Strier, 2011; Nekaris, 2013a,b). The main types of trade in primates internationally and within countries (domestic) are those for bushmeat, biomedical use, traditional medicine and practices, and as pets, photo props or trophies (Alves et al., 2010; Nijman et al., 2011; Nekaris, 2013a,b; Bush et al., 2014; Nijman et al., 2015; Osterberg and Nekaris, 2015).

In Africa the trade in primates is thriving, with the bushmeat trade presenting the largest threat especially to forest-dwelling species (Cowlshaw and Dunbar, 2000; Brashares, 2003; Linder et al., 2013; Covey and McGraw, 2014; Schwitzer et al., 2014a). This is especially apparent in Central and West Africa, where 48 out of Africa's 111

species of primates are found to occur in the bushmeat trade (IUCN, 2014; Taylor et al., 2015). Among the most commonly recorded primate species in the bushmeat trade are the guenons (*Cercopithecus* spp.) and the vervets (*Cercocebus* spp.) (Fa et al., 2005; Albrechtsen et al., 2007; Cronin et al., 2010; Linder and Oates, 2011; Covey and McGraw, 2014). To illustrate the magnitude of the trade Fa and Brown (2009), in an overview of hunting across Africa, noted that on average primates comprised some 20% of all mammals hunted. Focusing on the Cross-Sanaga region of Nigeria-Cameroon, this amounts to ~250000 primates being extracted annually (Fa et al., 2006). In addition, 32% of the African primate species are traded for medicinal and traditional practices (Alves et al., 2010). Both in the bushmeat trade and the trade for traditional practices, diurnal and nocturnal primates are prominently traded (Fa et al., 2005; Albrechtsen et al., 2007; Alves et al., 2010; Cronin et al., 2010; Linder and Oates, 2011; Covey and McGraw, 2014; Svensson and Friant, 2014). In contrast, the trade in primates for pets in Africa appears to focus on the larger, diurnal primates (Van Lavieren, 2008; Kabasawa, 2009; Hicks et al., 2010; Stiles et al., 2013; Ebua et al., 2014; Healy and Nijman, 2014), whilst the smaller bodied (often nocturnal) primates are prominent in the pet trade in the Neotropics and Asia (Bairrão Ruivo et al., 2005; Nekaris et al., 2010; Parathian and Maldonado, 2010; Nijman et al., 2011).

Until the last decade, nocturnal species were often excluded from studies of trade, possibly because researchers could not identify them or considered them less threatened and not worth noting (Ratajszczak, 1997; Nekaris and Nijman, 2013; Svensson and Friant, 2014). New data reveal, however, that these cryptic primates are increasingly threatened by trade (Shepherd et al., 2005; Maldonado et al., 2009;

* Corresponding author

Email address: svensson_magdalena@hotmail.com (Magdalena S. SVENSSON)

Nijman and Nekaris, 2014). In the Neotropics, the owl monkey (*Aotus* spp.), is rarely hunted for food but is extracted from the wild to meet the demand for the pet trade (Parathian and Maldonado, 2010), and for biomedical research (Maldonado et al., 2009). One study in 2007–2008 estimated that annually 4000 owl monkeys were traded between Peru, Colombia and Brazil (Maldonado et al., 2009). In Asia, Shepherd et al. (2005) and Nijman et al. (2015) found slow lorises (*Nycticebus* spp.) to be amongst the most common primates in Indonesian animal markets. Slow lorises are traded in increasingly large numbers, both as pets and for traditional medicine, across Asia (Nekaris and Jaffe, 2007; Nekaris et al., 2010). No study has yet been able to quantify the total offtake of slow loris species, but quantified examples show that this trade is large and severe. For example, in one market town in Myanmar it was extrapolated that around 2000 Bengal slow lorises (*N. bengalensis*) were traded annually (Nijman et al., 2014). In Japan 74 slow lorises (mainly pygmy slow lorises (*N. pygmaeus*), greater slow lorises (*N. coucang*) and *N. bengalensis* were found in the pet trade during a 2-month period (Musing and Nekaris, 2015) and in Sumatra 714 *N. coucang* were found for sale over 66 market surveys (Shepherd, 2010). In Madagascar, political instability and disintegration of taboos have caused an increase in the use of lemurs for human consumption (Barrett and Ratsimbazafy, 2009; Schwitzer et al., 2014b), and the pet trade, with more than 28000 lemurs estimated to have been sold as pets since 2010 (Sussman et al., 2003; Reuter et al., 2015).

Svensson and Friant (2014) provided some of the first quantified evidence of trade in African lorisiforms, namely pottos (*Perodicticus* spp.) and angwantibos (*Arctocebus* spp.), mainly from Nigeria, and urged for further studies on trade of these species to understand the impact it has on them. Trade could very well be an overlooked threat to the other African lorisiforms (i.e. the galagos) as well. Until recently the true extent of species-richness in the African lorisiforms was underestimated, but at present at least 3 species of potto, 2 species of angwantibo and 18 species of galagos (*Euoticus* spp., *Galago* spp., *Galagoides* spp., *Otolemur* spp., *Sciurocheirus* spp.) are recognized (Nekaris, 2013a,b). All of these species are listed on the IUCN Red List as Least Concern, except for the Malawi galago (*Galagoides nyasae*) (listed as Data Deficient), mountain dwarf galago (*Galagoides orinus*) (Near Threatened) and Rondo dwarf galago (*Galagoides rondoensis*) (Critically Endangered) (Bearder, 2008; Butynski et al., 2008; Perkin et al., 2008). While deforestation and habitat conversion is generally identified as being a threat to these species, it is only for the West African potto (*Perodicticus potto*) and Calabar angwantibos (*Arctocebus calabarensis*) that hunting is listed as a threat, albeit a localized one (Oates and Bearder, 2008; Oates et al., 2008). So few data are available on these species, however, that even at long-term field sites such as Gombe Stream and Bwindi Impenetrable National Parks, it is not fully known which lorisiforms occur (Nekaris and Nijman, 2013). As such, extrapolating any threats across the whole range of any given species is virtually impossible due to a paucity of data.

While the domestic trade in African lorisiforms is inadequately documented, all international trade, being subjected to the provisions of the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES) should be properly registered. The Convention came into effect in 1975, and with Angola joining in 2013, all African primate range countries are now signatories. The African lorisiforms are listed on Appendix II of CITES, thus regulating their international trade (CITES 2015). In 2003 the African Union revised the African Convention on the Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources. Under this Convention Article IX exists to regulate domestic trade, possession of, or transportation of wildlife, or products from wildlife. The Convention also serves to enable the implementation and enforcement of CITES. Many African countries are yet to ratify the African Convention; the African Union is strongly encouraging all states to become members (IUCN Environmental Law Programme, 2004).

Aiming to fill the knowledge gap regarding domestic and international trade of African lorisiforms, we created an online survey, conducted a literature review, and analyzed international trade records

stored in the CITES trade database. Filling this knowledge gap will advance our understanding of trade, such that policies can be implemented on the ground with greater precision and potential success. In turn this also allows us to identify priorities for future research and management agendas. For practical reasons we restricted our research to the last 20 years, and aimed to answer the following questions: 1) In which mainland African countries are lorisiforms traded? 2) How frequently are individual species or genera of lorisiforms found in the trade, and is there any indication of the number of animals traded each year? 3) What are the main human uses of lorisiforms in Africa and how does this vary geographically?

Methods

Online survey

We compiled data using an online questionnaire created in SurveyMonkey (2015), collecting responses between 24 November 2014 and 17 July 2015. We chose to conduct the survey online as it is thought to be ideal for rapid assessments, allowing for anonymous, inexpensive and rapid collection of data (Couper et al., 2007). The downside of using an Internet-based method is that only those with access to the Internet can participate, and our choice of English may have precluded observers from Francophone countries to participate. Invitations to participate in the survey were distributed by e-mail and shared on the social media sites Facebook and Twitter. The target audience was people who had lived or worked for a minimum of at least one month in African countries. The questionnaire focused on observations of African lorisiforms in markets and/or other information pertaining to their trade. The questions were generally closed-ended, marking one of several boxes. All multiple-choice questions included an optional “other” category and a text field where descriptive qualitative data could be added for clarification purposes.

All respondents were informed of the purpose of the study and were able to withdraw at any moment. The questionnaires followed the ethical guidelines for Internet-mediated research as proposed by the British Psychological Society (2013).

Literature review

We conducted a systematic literature review of publications (journal articles, theses, book chapters, and unpublished reports) from studies that contained both quantitative and qualitative data on the trade of lorisiforms for bushmeat and on the ethnozoological uses of them. We used the following keywords in our online searches: trade*, pet*, bushmeat*, traditional medicine in combination with potto, angwantibo, galago or bushbaby; this search was conducted both in English and in French. Once we had an initial list, we then searched specifically for trade in African lorisiforms in country-specific reports. We used Google, Google Scholar and ISI Web of Science, as well as the OFF-TAKE database (www.offtake.org; Taylor et al., 2015), a database on the exploitation of terrestrial wild species that contains information on exploitation, harvest, and use. While a large number of languages are spoken in the African lorisiform range countries, we focused on the English and French literature only because of the prevalence of these languages in scientific reports coming out of Africa.

CITES trade database analysis

We downloaded data on the export of African lorisiforms from the CITES trade database for the period 1994–2013 (data from 2014 or 2015 was not yet available or incomplete) (CITES, 2015). For four 5-year periods we established the number of live individuals that were exported from range countries as well as the number of dead individuals. The latter was restricted to bodies, skins, and trophies as to avoid possible double counting (a skin and a skull exported on two separate occasions could be derived from the same individual). Again to prevent double counting, we excluded all re-exports (that is when an individual is exported by one country after it has been imported from another). Import data (reported by the importing country) and export data (reported by the African range country) did not always agree, and




Figure 1 – Locations of observation of trade in pottos and angwantibos (a) and galagos (b), including family distributions. • Online questionnaire responses; × Literature review findings.

here we cross-checked the data and included the largest overall totals by comparing data from importing and exporting countries. Finally, for all species we determined the proportion of wild-caught individuals (source code W; to which we added 11 individuals for which the origin was not known – source code U – and 1 that was confiscated – source code I), relative to those that were born in captivity (source codes R, F, C). This allowed us to compare the proportion of wild-caught vs captive-born loriforms exported from the different regions. By its very nature, the CITES trade database only holds records of international trade, trade that is reported (either by the importing Party and/or the exporting Party), and, to a lesser degree, seizure data. It does not hold information on domestic trade or the illicit trade.

Data analysis

All data were entered in an excel database, allowing us compare the reported usage of loriforms in trade and the settings in which trade was reported. We compared pottos and angwantibos with galagos for the number of publications and the number of countries from where trade has been reported relative to the number of countries in which both taxa occur. International trade volumes were compared with respect to species composition and 5-year time windows. We ran non-parametric statistics (Chi-square test χ^2), binominal and Fisher's exact probability tests) in SPSS version 21.0, accepting significance when $p < 0.05$ in a two-tailed test.

Species identification

African loriform taxonomy is far from resolved and especially when considering the 20 year time period covered by our research the number of species recognized has changed considerably. A classic example of this is the work by Charles-Dominique in the 1970s who studied Demidoff's dwarf galago (*Galagoides demidovii*) in Gabon, but only years later it was realized that his study species in fact comprised 2 species (*G. demidovii* and Thomas' dwarf galago *G. thomasi*) (Charles-Dominique, 1977; Wickings et al., 1998). While many respondents on the online survey were very specific with regards to species identification, others reported merely the presence of "pottos" or "small galagos" in trade, without specifying species details. The different species of potto and angwantibo have an allopatric distribution, and sympatric galagos often differ dramatically in size (Nekaris, 2013a,b); using locality information provided on the online survey in most cases we were able to narrow the identification down to the species level. When published literature used outdated taxonomies, we changed these into current taxonomies (Nekaris, 2013a,b), using information provided in the publication (e.g. when *Perodicticus potto* was mentioned for Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC) this was changed to Milne-Edward's potto (*P. edwardsi*) as this reflects our current understanding of potto taxonomy and distribution). Reports of exports or imports in the CITES trade database are conservative in the taxonomy employed, with for instance only one species of potto recognized – here we followed the same principle by correcting the species names as to reflect our current un-




Figure 2 – Observations of trade in African loriforms in urban or rural settings from 28 respondents, showing a preponderance of trade in rural settings; DRC = Democratic Republic of Congo.

derstanding of loriform taxonomy and distribution. In all cases where we were not able to identify or infer the species involved, we retained the record to the next most resolved taxonomic level.

Results

Responses, geographic coverage and reported use

We obtained 188 online questionnaire responses from researchers and people working in 31 countries in mainland Africa. Respondents identified themselves as wildlife researchers, field ecologists and biologists, veterinarians (or graduate students in these fields), sanctuary workers, journalists, gold miners or other African residents. Fifty-three percent (99/188) had observed or heard of usage and trade of African loriforms, and could provide meaningful details about aspects of the trade. Combined these respondents had worked in 21 countries, representing 50% of all African loriform range countries (Fig. 1). A smaller proportion of these (25/99) had observed African loriforms for sale first-hand in 11 countries (namely in Cameroon, DRC, Equatorial Guinea, Guinea, Ivory Coast, Liberia, Nigeria, Republic of Congo, Tanzania, Uganda and Zimbabwe).

The reported purpose of trade of African loriforms from respondents was in equal numbers for pets (62% of the respondents reporting trade, $N=61$), bushmeat (50% of the respondents, $N=49$), or traditional practices (46% of the respondents, $N=46$) ($\chi^2=3.29$, $df=1$, $p=0.07$). More respondents reported trade in loriforms to occur in rural settings (including along roads and village markets) than in urban settings (such as in wildlife markets in cities or at central bus stations) (18 vs 10 respondents: binominal test, $p=0.049$) (Fig. 2).

From our literature search we obtained a total of 33 publications (published since 1994) containing information/data on the trade in African loriforms. Combined, these covered the trade and use of loriforms in 38% of the range countries (Tab. 1, Fig. 1).

In total, trade in pottos and/or angwantibos was reported from 12 countries (12 from the literature, 8 from the online survey and 3 from the CITES trade database), and trade in galagos was reported from 23 countries (7 from the literature, 17 from the online survey and 16 from the CITES trade database). The sources for records of trade differed significantly between the two loriform taxa ($\chi^2=9.99$, $df=2$, $p=0.01$); the number of reports of trade in pottos and/or angwantibos from the literature was significantly higher ($\chi^2=9.16$, $df=1$, $p<0.01$), and, conversely, the number of countries that reported trade in pottos and/or angwantibos in the CITES trade database was significantly lower ($\chi^2=4.64$, $df=1$, $p<0.05$) than what was expected on the basis of a uniform distribution.

Trade in pottos and angwantibos

Twenty-four respondents indicated that they had knowledge of pottos and/or angwantibos in trade. In the literature, including all aspects of trade, pottos were the most frequently occurring taxon, being men-

Table 1 – Occurrence of trade in African mainland lorisiforms reported in the literature. B=bushmeat trade; P=pet trade; T=trade for traditional practices; n.r.=no usage reported; –=not present in this country.

Country	Pottos / Angwantibos	Galagos	Source
Benin	T	T	1
Cameroon	T, B	n.r.	2; 3; 4; 5; 6; 7; 8; 9
CAR	T, P	T	7
DRC	B	n.r.	10; 7
Equatorial Guinea	B	B	11; 12; 13; 14; 15; 16; 17
Gabon	T	n.r.	7
Guinea	B	B	18; 19
Ivory Coast	T, B	T	20; 21; 22
Liberia	B, P	n.r.	23; 24; 7
Mozambique	—	B	25
Nigeria	T, B, P	n.r.	26; 3; 7
Republic of Congo	T, B	n.r.	27; 28; 29; 7
South Africa	—	T, B	30
Uganda	T, B	n.r.	31
Zambia	—	T	32; 33

1) Djagoun et al., 2013; 2) King, 1994; 3) Fa et al., 2006; 4) Willcox and Nambu, 2007; 5) Abugiche, 2008; 6) Bobo et al., 2014; 7) Svensson and Friant, 2014; 8) Whytock et al., 2016; 9) Ngoufo et al., 2014; 10) Musibono et al., 2010; 11) Juste et al., 1995; 12) Fa and Garcia Yuste, 2001; 13) Keylock, 2002; 14) Oates et al., 2004; 15) Albrechtsen et al., 2006; 16) Albrechtsen et al., 2007; 17) Cronin et al., 2010; 18) Ziegler et al., 2002; 19) Gaubert et al., 2015; 20) Caspary, 1999; 21) Hofmann et al., 1999; 22) Yaokokore-Beibro et al., 2010; 23) Greengrass, 2011; 24) Bene et al., 2013; 25) Fusari and Carpaneto, 2006; 26) Akani et al., 2015; 27) Mbete et al., 2011; 28) Loubelo, 2012; 29) Mbete, 2012; 30) Whiting et al., 2011; 31) Olupot et al., 2009; 32) Alves et al., 2010; 33) Baskind and Birbeck, 2005.

tioned in 21 of the publications, followed by angwantibos, which were mentioned in 7 publications.

Golden angwantibos (*Arctocebus aureus*) were observed in the bushmeat trade in DRC and the Republic of Congo, and either *A. aureus* or *A. calabarensis* was observed as bushmeat in Cameroon (2 respondents). *Perodicticus potto* was observed in the bushmeat trade in Ivory Coast and Liberia, and possibly Nigeria, while *P. edwardsi* was observed in Cameroon, Republic of Congo, DRC and possibly in Nigeria. The East African potto (*P. ibeanus*) was observed in the bushmeat trade in Uganda. The numbers of pottos or angwantibos in the bushmeat trade were rarely quantified and if so, often varied widely even from similar regions. Occurrence of pottos and/or angwantibos in the bushmeat trade was reported in the literature from 12 countries, covering most of these species' ranges (Tab. 1, Fig. 1).

One respondent reported the presence of *A. calabarensis* in the pet trade in Cameroon (Fig. 3), whereas 7 respondents reported that *P. potto* was found in the pet trade in Liberia and Guinea, and *P. edwardsi* and *P. ibeanus* in DRC (Fig. 3). Data from the literature on pottos in pet trade is scarce with only *P. potto* reported as pets in Liberia, *P. edwardsi* in Nigeria and either *P. edwardsi* or *P. ibeanus* in DRC (Svensson and Friant, 2014).

Finally, both pottos and angwantibos are reportedly used for medicinal and/or traditional practices, the former in a range of countries, the latter in just a few. One respondent reported that *A. aureus* (burnt remains and skin) was being sold for traditional practices in the Republic of Congo. We found no report of angwantibos being used for medicinal or traditional practices in the post-1994 literature.

The skins and charred remains of *P. ibeanus*, offered for sale for traditional practices in DRC, was reported by 1 respondent, and another respondent reported skins and charred remains of *P. edwardsi* for sale in the Republic of Congo (Fig. 3). Eight publications reported on trade of pottos for traditional practices, including traditional medicine, ornamental use, and as protection charms, spanning 8 countries (Benin, Cameroon, Central African Republic (CAR), DRC, Ghana, Ivory Coast, Republic of Congo and Uganda). Reports from Ivory Coast, Nigeria, and CAR indicate that pottos are used by local people for protection and strength (Caspary, 1999; Ngoufo et al., 2014; Svensson and Friant, 2014). Reports from Cameroon, Nigeria, and Republic

of Congo mention potto parts (bones, skin, meat, etc.) as a cure to heal burns, whereas in Nigeria it is used to cure coughs and diseases such as gonorrhoea (King, 1994; Loubelo, 2012; Svensson and Friant, 2014).

Trade in galagos

Fifty-two respondents indicated that they had knowledge of galagos in trade. Twelve respondents had observed galagos for sale first-hand (in Cameroon, DRC, Equatorial Guinea, Ivory Coast, Nigeria, Tanzania, Uganda and Zimbabwe), but galagos traded for bushmeat was also reported (South Africa). Of the galagos, the northern lesser galago (*Galago senegalensis*) was mentioned most frequently in the 33 publications regarding all aspects of trade (N=5), followed by the Bioko squirrel galago (*Sciurocheirus alleni*) (N=4). Less frequently mentioned were *G. demidovii*/*G. thomasi* (N=3), thick-tailed greater galago (*Otolemur crassicaudatus*) (N=2) and southern lesser galago (*Galago moholi*) (N=2).

Garnett's greater galago (*Otolemur garnettii*) was observed in the bushmeat trade in Tanzania by 2 respondents; it was also reportedly fed to the hunting dogs on the Tanzanian island of Zanzibar during the tourist low season, when waste food was scarce. *Otolemur crassicaudatus* and *G. moholi* were observed in the bushmeat trade in Zimbabwe. The respondent from Zimbabwe reported on taboos against hunting/trading galagos, as people in the rural areas tend to believe they possess evil powers due to their red eye-shine. Occurrence of galagos in the bushmeat trade was reported in 10 publications, covering 5 countries of these species' ranges (Tab. 1, Fig. 1). Taboos against eating meat of African loriforms was also reported from Cameroon by King (1994) where it was believed that if pregnant women eat this meat they would give birth to "ugly and deformed" babies.

Based on the respondents' answers, galagos were the most frequent African loriform taxon in the pet trade (54%; N=32). Three respondents reported the presence of the Tanzania coast dwarf galago (*Galagoides zanzibaricus*), *G. senegalensis* and *O. garnettii* in the pet trade in Tanzania, mainly in urban situations, and 1 respondent reported the presence of *O. garnettii* in the pet trade in Kenya. These 4 respondents reported galagos to be common pets among the expat community in Kenya and Tanzania. Two respondents observed *G. moholi* in the pet trade in Zimbabwe and South Africa. The one respondent from South Africa further reported to hear people often talk about having had *G. moholi* as pets during their childhood. In Cameroon, galagos (unspecified taxa) were also reported to be sold as pets in urban settings, more specifically in Yaounde's city markets. We found no reports of galagos occurring in the pet trade in the literature.

Finally, galagos were reported by 20 respondents to be used in medicinal and/or traditional practices in Cameroon, CAR, Kenya, South Africa, Tanzania and Uganda. One respondent reported on *G. moholi* or *O. crassicaudatus* being sold for traditional practices in South Africa. Two respondents reported skins of *O. garnettii* in Tanzania and of unknown galago species in Cameroon being sold in traditional medicine markets. One respondent, native to Uganda, reported traditional healers using galagos in their practicing. Another respondent reported on the use of products from galagos by the Batwa people in Uganda. Batwa women would prepare a drink/food with the products from galagos for their husbands to consume and this was believed it would keep them from cheating. Six publications reported on the trade of galagos for traditional practices, including traditional medicine and as good luck and/or protection charms, spanning 4 countries (Benin, Ivory Coast, South Africa and Zambia) (Tab. 1). In the literature on traditional practices, *G. moholi* was mentioned in 2 publications and *G. senegalensis* in 2, whilst *O. crassicaudatus* was mentioned in 1. Out of the publications 3 reported that galagos were sold in traditional medicine markets but did not specify the usage (*O. crassicaudatus* in South Africa: Whiting et al., 2011; *G. senegalensis* in Benin: Djagoun et al., 2013; *G. senegalensis* in Ivory Coast: Yaokokore-Beibro et al., 2010). One publication reported on *G. moholi* being used to stop babies from crying and as a charm for love, as well as used by athletes to increase endurance (Zambia: Alves et al., 2010). One publication reported that some people believe that *G. moholi* could be used to treat



Figure 3 – (A) *Arctocebus aureus* hunted for bushmeat in Republic of Congo in 2010 (photograph courtesy of J. Dewilde). (B) Infant *Perodicticus ibeanus* in the pet trade in Northern DRC in 2008 (photograph courtesy of C. Hicks). (C) Family of *A. calabarensis* kept as pets in Cameroon in 2012 (photograph courtesy of S.M. Denny). (D) *Otolemur garnettii* for sale as pets in United Arab Emirates in 2009 (photograph courtesy of E. Al-Ghalib). (E) Skin of *P. ibeanus* for sale in Lusambo area, DRC in 2014 (photograph courtesy of Lukuru Foundation).

epilepsy (Zambia: Baskind and Birbeck, 2005). The traditional practices using African lorisiforms described in the literature and by the respondents refer mainly to current practices and beliefs.

International trade

Over the 20 years prior to 2013 a total of 1930 African lorisiforms were exported by African range countries, and reported to the CITES Secretariat (Tab. 2). The majority of these comprised live trade (i.e. 1876 individuals, or 97%). While the overall trade in dead lorisiforms is small, representing a mere 3% of all international trade, *G. senegalensis* is proportionally traded as dead specimens in larger numbers than all the other species combined ($\chi^2 = 5.11$, $df=1$, $p<0.05$). The different species are not traded internationally in equal numbers ($\chi^2 = 4204$, $df=8$, $p<0.0001$). When comparing pottos with angwantibos it is clear that the former is traded in significantly higher numbers than the latter ($\chi^2 = 6.43$, $df=1$, $p<0.01$) and when comparing all the galagos, it is clear that *G. senegalensis* is traded in larger volumes than all the other species combined ($\chi^2 = 3126$, $df=1$, $p<0.0001$). Twice, a single *G. zanzibaricus* was exported as trophies from Zimbabwe to the USA (1997) and the Dominican Republic (1999) (note that Zimbabwe is not a range county for *G. zanzibaricus* suggesting that perhaps another species was

involved). Only 10 angwantibos and 10 southern needle-clawed galagos (*Euoticus elegantulus*) were reportedly exported (both species from Cameroon to Japan in 1999) and only 25 *P. potto* (24 of which were exported from Guinea to the Czech Republic in 2008). Other species were traded in larger numbers, i.e. *G. moholi* (255 individuals), *G. demidoff* (460 individuals), and *G. senegalensis* (1002 individuals). The largest exporter of African lorisiforms is Guinea with 24 *P. potto*, 455 *G. demidoff* and 848 *G. senegalensis*; of these, 980 went to Japan. Zambia is the next largest exporter, with 180 *G. moholi* and 85 *O. crassicaudatus*, all being imported by Japan, followed by South Africa (29 *O. crassicaudatus*, 35 *G. senegalensis* and 67 *G. moholi*), which exported to at least 15 countries. The largest importer of African lorisiforms is Japan, with a combined total of 1325 individuals over the 20 year period; the next largest importer is the Czech Republic with 136 individuals. A further 21 countries imported smaller numbers.

Different numbers of African lorisiforms were traded in the four 5-year time periods between 1994 and 2013 ($\chi^2 = 2104.3$, $df=3$, $p<0.0001$). The highest numbers were reported for the period 1994-1998 (totaling 1336 individuals) and the lowest in 2009-2013 (25 individuals). For almost all species the largest numbers were traded in the 1990s, and from 2004 onwards only *G. senegalensis* is still traded in

Table 2 – Export of pottos, angwantibos and galagos out of African range countries (1994–2013), showing the number of live / dead specimens exported during four 5-year time periods and the proportion of trade that comprised wild-caught individuals.

Species	1994–1998	1999–2003	2004–2008	2009–2013	Wild-caught %
<i>Arctocebus</i> spp.	0 / 0	10 / 0	0 / 0	0 / 0	100
<i>Perodicticus</i> spp.	0 / 0	0 / 1	24 / 0	0 / 0	100
<i>Otolemur crassicaudatus</i>	98 / 6	24 / 2	10 / 0	5 / 2	95
<i>Euoticus elegantulus</i>	0 / 0	10 / 0	0 / 0	0 / 0	100
<i>Sciurocheirus alleni</i>	0 / 0	10 / 0	0 / 0	0 / 0	100
<i>Galago demidoff</i>	380 / 0	80 / 0	0 / 0	0 / 0	100
<i>Galago moholi</i>	190 / 1	39 / 1	14 / 0	10 / 0	80
<i>Galago senegalensis</i>	642 / 12	70 / 5	258 / 11	4 / 3	99
<i>Galago zanzibaricus</i>	0 / 0	0 / 1	0 / 0	0 / 0	100
<i>Galago</i> spp.	1 / 6	0 / 2	0 / 0	0 / 1	100

appreciable numbers (Tab. 2). In the most recent five years only small numbers were traded. The largest annual number of animals exported in recent years was in 2008 when 100 *G. senegalensis* were exported by Guinea to Thailand.

The vast majority of trade (95%) comprised wild-caught individuals, and only South Africa reported the export of captive-bred individuals: *O. crassicaudatus* (14), *G. senegalensis* (23) and *G. moholi* (55). These were all reported with a source code C, meaning that they are at least second generation offspring of parent stock that themselves were born in captivity, and none were reported with a source code F, indicating individuals born in a captive environment from wild-caught parent stock.

Discussion

The data we present here is an attempt to quantify the trade in African loriforms, how this varies between taxa and between countries, and how it may affect their conservation. Our findings show that trade of African loriforms is wide spread, with records from at least 24 countries, encompassing the entire geographic range of the major taxa (Fig. 1). Both families of the African loriforms are traded, although in seemingly small numbers compared to the nocturnal primates in Asia and the Neotropics, where for example in the tri-border area of Peru, Brazil and Colombia owl monkeys (*Aotus* spp.) were estimated to be traded in thousands annually (Maldonado et al., 2009), and in Asia where the annual trade of slow lorises (*Nycticebus* spp.) in certain markets can amount to several thousand individuals (Nijman et al., 2014). Once quantitative studies were conducted in Asia, the threat that trade posed became alarmingly apparent (Nekaris and Jaffe, 2007; Nijman and Nekaris, 2014; Nijman et al., 2014). Single events may also increase the trade of loriforms almost overnight, as in the case of the “tickling slow loris” video which went viral online in 2009 and caused an upsurge in the pet trade of the slow lorises (Nekaris et al., 2013).

Reports of trade in pottos and/or angwantibos occurred throughout their distribution (Fig. 1) except in the southernmost part of their range, i.e. southern DRC and northern Angola. Likewise, we found no records of trade of galagos in the northern part of their range. We do not think that the absence of reports from these areas indicate an absence of trade, rather its absence reflect the general low levels of focused research conducted in these often politically unstable regions.

Whilst the second research question, regarding the frequency that individual species or genera of loriforms are found in the trade, could not be quantifiably answered, it is evident from our online survey and literature review that both African loriform families do occur in all trades. The purposes for hunting and trading African loriforms described from the respondents were reported in equal numbers, but in the literature bushmeat was the most reported type of trade, and then pottos and/or angwantibos were the most commonly reported.

For bushmeat hunting, we found high levels of concordance between our online survey and that which has been reported in the literature, with indeed most of the trade being reported from Central and West Africa (Bowen-Jones and Pendry, 1999; Covey and McGraw, 2014; Fa et al., 2014; Taylor et al., 2015) and smaller numbers in South Africa

and Mozambique (Fusari and Carpaneto, 2006; Whiting et al., 2011). Perhaps unexpectedly, our study revealed the occurrence of loriforms in the East African bushmeat trade as well, albeit in small numbers. Previous studies on bushmeat hunting and trade have focused on Central and West Africa, whilst studies in South and East Africa focused more on trophy hunting (e.g. Caspary, 1999; Fa and Garcia Yuste, 2001; Fa et al., 2006; Bene et al., 2013; Taylor et al., 2015, reflecting differences in both economy and attitudes to wildlife).

The roles of taboos in the conservation of primates has been highlighted for different taxa from a range of countries (golden crowned sifaka (*Propithecus tattersalli*) and crowned lemur (*Lemur coronatus*) in Madagascar (Wilson et al., 1989; Vargas et al., 2002), black-and-white colobus (*Colobus polykomos*) and mona monkey (*Cercopithecus campbelli*) in Ghana (Fargey, 1992; Saj et al., 2006), Kloss’ gibbons (*Hyllobates klossi*) on the Mentawai Islands, Indonesia Mitchell and Tilson (1986), Javan slow loris (*Nycticebus javanicus*) on Java, Indonesia (Nijman and Nekaris, 2014), red faced spider monkey (*Ateles paniscus*) in Guyana (Luzar et al., 2012), black howler monkeys (*Alouatta pigra*) in Belize (Jones and Young, 2004)) but hitherto the role of taboos in the conservation of African loriforms has been rarely reported (but see Carpaneto and Germi, 1989, King, 1994 and Ngoufo et al., 2014). In Madagascar the tradition of not eating lemur meat due to taboos is weakening (Barrett and Ratsimbazafy, 2009), and there are some indications that taboos related to African loriforms are perhaps not as strong as they used to be (cf. Keylock, 2002). However, due to the lack of baseline data this is difficult to quantify.

Our research highlighted the apparent importance of the pet trade as a potential impediment to the conservation of African loriforms. The use as pets was the most reported trade of both pottos and galagos, and these taxa are kept as pets throughout Africa. While the pet trade in pottos has been highlighted before (Svensson and Friant, 2014), data from the online survey suggest that galagos are even more frequently kept as pets. In Africa, the pet trade in loriforms seems to be at least in part opportunistic, as a by-catch from hunting (Hicks et al., 2010; Svensson and Friant, 2014), although some targeted hunting does occur as well (Svensson and Friant, 2014). In our online survey the majority of galagos were reported to occur in the pet trade from Tanzania, Kenya and South Africa, where they were mainly reported to be kept by expats, or sold in urban locations (bus stations or city markets). Pottos and angwantibos on the other hand were more commonly reported to be traded in small village markets and along the roads, or infants kept by hunters who killed the adult pottos and/or angwantibos. Galagos park their infants whilst foraging and often these infants are believed to be abandoned, and consequently “rescued” (Nekaris, 2013a), thus providing an avenue into the pet trade.

From our online survey we found that most observations of African loriforms for sale were made in rural areas, which coincides with previous studies (Fa et al., 2006; Svensson and Friant, 2014). This seems to show that the trade in African loriforms is localized to villages, potentially indicating that demand is not high enough to fuel long-distance trade. But is the trade of African loriforms becoming more common and posing a major threat? A small number of respondents sug-

gested that African loriforms were likely considered too small to be sold in wildlife markets and that they were either eaten in the forest by the hunters as a “snack”, or brought home as food (Fig. 3). However, Svensson and Friant (2014) provided anecdotal evidence of a shift from larger to smaller game, including angwantibos, as a result of overhunting in the Republic of Congo.

Traditional uses varied throughout the ranges of the African loriforms, with pottos and/or angwantibos being used in mystical rituals, ornamental use and to give strength to the user, whereas galagos were used in traditional medicine and as good luck charms. As such pottos were mainly reported to be used by local people and traditional healers, whereas galagos, in addition, were used even by health care workers in hospitals (cf. Baskind and Birbeck, 2005).

The international trade in African loriforms from range countries, as reported to the CITES Secretariat, by and large comprises wild-caught individuals, thereby potentially having a negative impact on their conservation. Fortunately, the numbers traded internationally have clearly diminished in recent years, and only *G. senegalensis* is still traded in appreciable numbers. Japan stands out as one of the larger importers. Musing and Nekaris (2015) found that the demand for *Nycticebus* spp. as pets is increasing in Japan and the illegal import of these nocturnal species is on the rise. Although the low export numbers reported to CITES does not indicate a major threat to these primates and their conservation, it would be prudent to monitor trade of the African loriforms into Japan (both from range countries and elsewhere) to ensure it does not exceed agreed levels.

Research agenda and the road ahead

This study could be seen as a first preliminary attempt to quantify the nature and the magnitude of the trade in African loriforms, thereby raising perhaps more questions than it answers; the data we managed to compile do allow us to make suggestions for a future research agenda and to plan for the road ahead in terms of the management of loriforms throughout Africa. It is clear from our online survey and from the literature that there are clear deficiencies in identifying African loriforms in trade (as well as in the wild: Nekaris and Nijman, 2013). The inability to narrow down which species are traded in what quantities, because of taxonomic uncertainties and identification problems, may distort our understanding of the conservation of these African loriforms, and to what extent trade acts as an impediment to the conservation of individual species. While the trade and ethnozoological uses of African loriforms may appear to be small-scale, its impact may nevertheless be significant in certain areas and at certain times, especially when trade is considered in conjunction with other anthropogenic pressures.

Our data are parallel to those collected for Asian loriforms in the 1990s; at that point trade was not considered a threat to Asian loriforms and is now seen to be the greatest threat (Nekaris, 2013b). Our insight into the trade of African loriforms should be followed up with concerted studies, with an emphasis on quantifying trade to the species level. Further research is necessary to fill this knowledge gap, in particular more field studies to assess population size and trends of African loriforms, but also ensuring that these species are included in surveys monitoring off-take, including interviews with hunters/traders to better understand harvest and trade. The primary responsibility for this lies with the government agencies responsible for natural resource management, but it is clear that academic institutions both in range countries and elsewhere have a role to play. Further research would also aid in revising the IUCN Red List threat categories of the African loriforms, to potentially include hunting and trade as threats.

It must be ensured that the species that are traded are consistently and accurately identified and recorded. Different names/synonyms used by different parties (international conventions, national government agencies, NGOs, and academics) leads to confusion about the actual identity of the species, thus hampering traceability and assessment of the magnitude of the trade.

The use of African loriforms as nutritional resources, as pets and in traditional practices may have been sustainable in the past, but with

globalization and an ever increasing human population being dependent on a depleting natural resource base, this may no longer be the case. It seems imperative to quantify the use of African loriforms in at least a part of their range so as to be able to assess its potential impact. We also recommend further study on the existence of taboos prohibiting the use of these primates as they may exist “under the radar” to understand the role this might have for their conservation. Given the limited data we have on the occurrence and abundance of the African loriform taxa, we suggest to initiate these studies in Central Africa (DRC, Republic of Congo, CAR). ☞

References

- Abugiche S.A., 2008. Impact of hunting and bushmeat trade on biodiversity loss in Cameroon: a case study of the Banyang-Mbo Wildlife Sanctuary. B.Sc. thesis. Brandenburg University, Cottbus, Germany.
- Akani G.C., Amadi N., Eniang E.A., Luiselli L., Petrozzi F., 2015. Are mammal communities occurring at a regional scale reliably represented in “hub” bushmeat markets? A case study with Bayelsa State (Niger Delta, Nigeria). *Folia Primatol.* 64(1): 79–86.
- Albrechtsen L., Fa J.E., Barry B., MacDonald D.W., 2006. Contrasts in availability and consumption of animal protein in Bioko Island, West Africa: the role of bushmeat. *Environ. Conserv.* 32(4): 340–348.
- Albrechtsen L., MacDonald D.W., Johnson P.J., Castelo R., Fa J.E., 2007. Faunal loss from bushmeat hunting: empirical evidence and policy implications in Bioko Island. *Environ. Sc. Pol.* 10(7): 654–667.
- Alves R.R.N., 2012. Relationships between fauna and people and the role of ethnozoology in animal Conservation. *Ethnobiol. Conserv.* 1(2): 1–69.
- Alves R.R.N., Souto W.M.S., Barboza R.R.D., 2010. Primates in traditional folk medicine: a world overview. *Mamm. Rev.* 40(2): 155–180.
- Bairrão Ruivo E., Carroll J.B., Morales-Jiménez A.L., 2005. The silvery-brown tamarin (*Saguinus leucopus*) conservation project. *Neotrop. Primates* 13(3): 36–39.
- Barrett M., Ratsimbazafy J., 2009. Luxury bushmeat trade threatens lemur conservation. *Nature* 461(7263): 470.
- Baskind R., Birbeck G., 2005. Epilepsy care in Zambia: a study of traditional healers. *Epilepsia* 46(7): 1121–1126.
- Bearder S.K. 2008. *Galagoideus nyasae*. The IUCN Red List of Threatened Species 2008. Available from <http://dx.doi.org/10.2305/IUCN.UK.2008.RLTS.T136669A4325381.en>
- Bene J-C.K., Gamys J., Dufour S., 2013. Marketing channel of hunting products in northern Nimba County, Liberia. *Livestock Res. Rural Develop.* 25(1).
- Bennett E., Eves H., Robinson J., Wilkie D., 2002. Why is eating bushmeat a biodiversity crisis? *Conserv. Practice* 3: 28–29.
- Bobo K.S., Aghomo F.F.M., Ntumwel B.C., 2014. Wildlife use and the role of taboos in the conservation of wildlife around the Nkwende Hills Forest Reserve: south-west Cameroon. *J. Ethnobiol. Ethnomed.* 11(1): 1–23.
- Bowen-Jones E., Pendry S., 1999. The threat to primates and other mammals from the bushmeat trade in Africa, and how this threat could be diminished. *Oryx* 33(3): 233–246.
- Brashares J.S., 2003. Ecological, behavioural and life-history correlates of mammal extinctions in West Africa. *Conserv. Biol.* 17(3): 733–743.
- British Psychological Society, 2013. Ethics guidelines for Internet-mediated research. INF206/1.2013. British Psychological Society, Leicester, U.K. Available from <http://www.bps.org.uk/system/files/Publicfiles/inf206-guidelines-for-internet-mediated-research.pdf>
- Bush E.R., Baker S.E., MacDonald D.W., 2014. Global trade in exotic pets 2006–2012. *Conserv. Biol.* 28(3): 663–676.
- Butynski T.M., Perkin A., Bearder S.K., Ehardt C., 2008. *Galagoideus orinus*. The IUCN Red List of Threatened Species 2008. Available from <http://dx.doi.org/10.2305/IUCN.UK.2008.RLTS.T40651A10350054.en>
- Carpaneto G., Germe F., 1989. The mammals in the zoological culture of the Mbuti pygmies in north-eastern Zaire. *Hystrix* 1: 1–83.
- Caspary H.U., 1999. Wildlife utilization in Côte D’Ivoire and West Africa: potentials and constraints for development cooperation. Deutsche Gesellschaft für Technische Zusammenarbeit, Eschborn, Germany.
- Charles-Dominique P., 1977. Ecology and behaviour of nocturnal primates. New York Columbia Press, Columbia, USA.
- CITES, 2015. Member countries. Available from <http://www.cites.org/eng/disc/parties/index.php> [23 April 2015].
- Couper M., Kapteyn A., Schonlau M., Winter J., 2007. Noncoverage and nonresponse in an Internet survey. *Soc. Sci. Res.* 36(1): 131–148.
- Covey R., McGraw W.S., 2014. Monkeys in a West African bushmeat market: implications for Cercopithecoid conservation in eastern Liberia. *Trop. Conserv. Sci.* 7(1): 115–125.
- Cowlishaw G., Dunbar R.I.M., 2000. Primate conservation biology. University of Chicago Press, Chicago, IL, USA.
- Cronin D.T., Bucuma Meñe D., Butynski T.B., Echube J.M.E., Hearn G.W., Honarvar S., Owens J.R., Bohome C.P., 2010. Opportunities lost: The rapidly deteriorating conservation status of the monkeys on Bioko Island, Equatorial Guinea (2010). A report to the Government of Equatorial Guinea by the Bioko Biodiversity Protection Program. Drexel University, Philadelphia, PA, USA.
- Djagoun C.A., Akpona H.A., Mensah G.A., Nuttman C., Sinsin B., 2013. Wild mammals trade for zootherapeutic and mythic practices in Benin (West Africa): capitalizing species involved, provision sources, and implications for conservation. In: Alves R.R.N., Rosa I.L. (Eds). *Animals in traditional folk medicine*. Springer, Berlin Heidelberg, Germany. pp. 367–381.
- Ebua V.B., Agwafo T.E., Mbida M., Vaughan J., 2014. Rehabilitating captive wild-born yellow baboons (*Papio cynocephalus*) for re-introduction into the wild. *Int. J. Biodivers. Conserv.* 6(2): 159–170.
- Fa J.E., Brown D., 2009. Impacts of hunting on mammals in African tropical moist forests: a review and synthesis. *Mamm. Rev.* 39(4): 231–264.
- Fa J.E., Garcia Yuste J.E., 2001. Commercial bushmeat hunting in the Monte Mitra forests, Equatorial Guinea: extent and impact. *Anim. Biodivers. Conserv.* 24(1): 31–52.

- Fa J.E., Ryan S.F., Bell D.J., 2005. Hunting vulnerability, ecological characteristics and harvest rates of bushmeat species in afro-tropical forests. *Biol. Conserv.* 121(2): 167–176.
- Fa J.E., Olivero J., Farfán M.A., Márquez A.L., Vargas J.M., Real R., Nasi R., 2014. Integrating sustainable hunting in biodiversity protection in Central Africa: hot spots, weak spots, and strong spots. *PLoS ONE* 9: e112367.
- Fa J.E., Seymour S., Dupain J., Amin R., Albrechtsen L., McDonald D., 2006. Getting to grips with the magnitude of exploitation: bushmeat in the Cross-Sanaga river region, Nigeria and Cameroon. *Biol. Conserv.* 129(4): 497–510.
- Fargey P.J., 1992. Boabeng-Fiema Monkey Sanctuary – An example of traditional conservation in Ghana. *Oryx* 26(3): 151–156.
- Fusari A., Carpaneto G.M., 2006. Subsistence hunting and conservation issues in the game reserve of Gile, Mozambique. *Biodivers. Conserv.* 15(8): 2477–2495.
- Gaubert P., Njiokou F., Olayemi A., Pagani P., Dufour S., Danquah E., Nutsuakor M.E.K., Ngua G., Missouf A.-D., Tedesco P.A., Dernas R., Antunes A., 2015. Bushmeat genetics: setting up a reference framework for the DNA typing of African forest bushmeat. *Mol. Ecol. Resour.* 15(3): 633–651.
- Greengrass E., 2011. Exploring the dynamics of bushmeat hunting and trade in Sapo National Park. *Fauna and Flora International*, Cambridge, UK.
- Grieser-Johns A., Thomson J., 2005. Going, going, gone: the illegal trade in wildlife in East and Southeast Asia. *World Bank*. Washington, DC, USA.
- Healy A., Nijman V., 2014. Pets and pests: vervet monkey intake at a specialist South African rehabilitation centre. *Anim. Welfare* 23(3): 353–360.
- Hicks T.C., Darby L., Hart J., Swinkel J., January N., Menken S., 2010. Trade in orphans and bushmeat threaten one of the Democratic Republic of the Congo's most important populations of eastern chimpanzees (*Pan troglodytes schweinfurthii*). *Afr. Primates* 7(1): 1–18.
- Hofmann T., Ellenberg H., Roth H.H., 1999. Bushmeat: a natural resource of the moist forest regions of West Africa—with particular consideration of two duiker species in Côte d'Ivoire and Ghana. *Deutsche Gesellschaft für Technische Zusammenarbeit*, Eschborn, Germany.
- IUCN, 2014. Primate diversity by region. Available from http://www.primates-sg.org/primates_diversity_by_region/ [18 December 2014].
- IUCN Environmental Law Programme, 2004. An introduction to the African Convention on the Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources, IUCN, Gland, Switzerland and Cambridge, UK.
- Jones C.B., Young J., 2004. Hunting restraint by Creoles at the Community Baboon Sanctuary, Belize: a preliminary survey. *J. Appl. Anim. Welfare Sci.* 7(2): 127–141.
- Juste J., Fa J.E., Perez Del Val J., Castroviejo J., 1995. Market dynamics of bushmeat species in Equatorial Guinea. *J. Appl. Ecol.* 32(3): 454–467.
- Kabasawa A., 2009. Current state of the chimpanzee pet trade in Sierra Leone. *Afr. Study. Monogr.* 30(1): 37–54.
- Keylock N., 2002. The importance of hunting for bushmeat to a rural community in Equatorial Guinea. M.Sc. thesis. University of London, London, UK.
- King S., 1994. Utilisation of wildlife in Bakossiland, West Cameroon. *TRAFFIC Bull.* 14: 63–73.
- Lee P.C., 2010. Sharing space: can ethnoprimateology contribute to the survival of non-human primates in human-dominated globalized landscapes? *Am. J. Primatol.* 72(10): 1–7.
- Linder M.L., Oates J.F., 2011. Differential impact of bushmeat hunting on monkey species and implications for primate conservation in Korup National Park, Cameroon. *Biol. Conserv.* 144(2): 738–745.
- Linder M.L., Sawyer S.C., Brashares J.S., 2013. Primates in trade. In: Sterling E., Bynum N., Blair M. (Eds.). *Primate conservation and ecology: a handbook of techniques*. Oxford University Press, Oxford, UK, pp 323–345.
- Loubelo E., 2012. Impact des produits forestiers non ligneux (PFNL) sur l'économie des ménages et la sécurité alimentaire: cas de la République du Congo. PhD thesis. Université Rennes 2, Rennes, France.
- Luzar J.B., Silvius K.M., Fragoso J.M., 2012. Church affiliation and meat taboos in indigenous communities of gyanese Amazonia. *Hum. Ecol.* 40(6): 833–845.
- Maldonado A.M., Nijman V., Bearder S.K., 2009. Trade in night monkeys *Aotus* spp. in the Brazil-Colombia-Peru tri-border area: international wildlife trade regulations are ineffectively enforced. *Endanger. Species Res.* 9(2): 143–149.
- Mbete R.A., 2012. La consommation de la viande de chasse dans les ménages de Brazzaville, Congo. PhD thesis. Université de Liège, Liège, Belgium.
- Mbete R.A., Banga-Mboko H., Racey P., Mfoukou-Ntsakala A., Nganga I., Vermeulen C., Doucet J.-L., Hornick J.-L., Pascal L., 2011. Household bushmeat consumption in Brazzaville, the Republic of the Congo. *Trop. Conserv. Sci.* 4(2): 187–202.
- Milner-Gulland E.J., Bennett E.L., 2003. Wild meat: the bigger picture. *Trends Ecol. Evol.* 18(7): 351–357.
- Mitchell A.H., Tilson R.L., 1986. Restoring the balance: traditional hunting and primate conservation in the Mentawai Islands, Indonesia. In: Else J.C., Lee P.C. (Eds.). *Primate ecology and conservation*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK, pp 249–260.
- Musibono D.E., Kabangu F., Munzundu A., Kisangala M., Nsimanda I., Sinikuna M., Kileba A., 2010. Les différents traités environnementaux sont-ils appropriés pour les populations des pays en développement (Afrique)? *VertigO - la revue électronique en sciences de l'environnement*. Available from <http://vertigo.revues.org/9398>
- Musing L., Nekaris K.A.I., 2015. Crossing international borders: the trade of slow lorises, *Nycticebus* spp., as pets in Japan. *Asian Primates (In press)*.
- Nekaris K.A.I., 2013a. Family Galagidae (galagos). In: Mittermeier R.A., Rylands A.B., Wilson D.E. (Eds.). *Handbook of the mammals of the world*, Vol. 3. Lynx Edicions, Barcelona, Spain, pp. 184–209.
- Nekaris K.A.I., 2013b. Family Lorisidae (angwantibos, pottos and lorises). In: Mittermeier R.A., Rylands A.B., Wilson D.E. (Eds.). *Handbook of the mammals of the world*, Vol. 3. Lynx Edicions, Barcelona, Spain, pp 210–235.
- Nekaris K.A.I., Jaffe S., 2007. Unexpected diversity of slow lorises (*Nycticebus* spp.) within the Javan pet trade: implications for slow loris taxonomy. *Contrib. Zool.* 76(3): 187–196.
- Nekaris K.A.I., Nijman V., 2013. The ethics of conducting field research – do long-term great ape field studies help to conserve primates? In: Macclancy J., Fuentes A. (Eds.). *Ethics in the field*. Berghahn Books, New York, USA, pp 108–123.
- Nekaris K.A.I., Campbell N., Coggings T.G., Rode E.J., Nijman V., 2013. Tickled to death: analyzing public perception of "cute" videos of threatened species (slow lorises – *Nycticebus* spp.) on web 2.0 sites. *PLoS ONE* 8: e69215.
- Nekaris K.A.I., Shepherd C.S., Starr C.S., Nijman V., 2010. Exploring cultural drivers for trade via an ethnoprimateological approach: a case study of slow and slender lorises (*Nycticebus* and *Loris*) in south and southeast Asia. *Am. J. Primatol.* 72(10): 1–10.
- Ngoufo R., Yongyeh N.K., Obioha E.E., Bobo K.S., Jimoh S.O., Waltert M., 2014. Social norms and cultural services-community belief system and use of wildlife products in the northern periphery of the Korup National Park, south-western Cameroon. *Change and Adaptation in Socio-Ecological Systems* 1(1): 26–34.
- Nijman V., 2005. Hanging in the balance: an assessment of trade in orang-utans and gibbons in Kalimantan, Indonesia. *TRAFFIC Southeast Asia*, Petaling Jaya, Malaysia.
- Nijman V., Nekaris K.A.I., 2014. Traditions, taboos and trade in slow lorises in Sudanese communities in southern Java, Indonesia. *Endanger. Species Res.* 13: 79–88.
- Nijman V., Bergin D., van Lavieren E., 2015. Barbary macaques exploited as photo-props in Marrakesh's punishment square. *Swara*. July-Sept: 38–41.
- Nijman V., Shepherd C.R., Nekaris K.A.I., 2014. Trade in Bengal slow lorises in Mong La, Myanmar, on the Chinese border. *Primate Conserv.* 28: 139–142.
- Nijman V., Nekaris K.A.I., Donati G., Bruford M., Fa J.E., 2011. Primate conservation: measuring and mitigating trade in primates. *Endanger. Species Res.* 13: 159–161.
- Nijman V., Spaan D., Rode-Margono E.J., Wirdateti, Nekaris K.A.I., 2015. Changes in the primate trade in Indonesian wildlife markets over a 25-year period: Fewer apes and langurs, more macaques and slow lorises. *Am. J. Primatol.* doi:10.1002/ajp.22517
- Oates J.F., Bearder S.K., 2008. *Arctocebus calabarensis*. The IUCN Red List of Threatened Species 2008. Available from <http://dx.doi.org/10.2305/IUCN.UK.2008.RLTS.T2054A9211259.en>
- Oates J.F., Bergl R.A., Linder J.M., 2004. Observations on the bushmeat trade. *Advances Appl. Biodiv. Science*. 6: 79–90.
- Oates J.F., Butynski T.M., Kingdon J., Bearder S.K., Pimley E., De Jong Y., 2008. *Perodicticus potto*. The IUCN Red List of Threatened Species 2008. Available from <http://dx.doi.org/10.2305/IUCN.UK.2008.RLTS.T16629A6195697.en>
- Olupot W., McNeilage A.J., Plumtre A.J., 2009. An analysis of socioeconomics of bushmeat hunting at major hunting sites in Uganda. *Wildlife Conservation Society's Working Papers*, Kampala, Uganda.
- Osterberg P., Nekaris K.A.I., 2015. The use of animals as photo props to attract tourists in Thailand: a case study of the slow loris *Nycticebus* spp. *TRAFFIC Bull.* 27: 13–18.
- Parathian H.E., Maldonado A.M., 2010. Human-nonhuman primate interactions amongst Tikuna people: perceptions and local initiatives for resources management in Amacayacu in the Colombian Amazon. *Am. J. Primatol.* 72(10): 1–11.
- Perkin A., Bearder S.K., Honess P., Butynski T.M., 2008. *Galagoides rondoensis*. The IUCN Red List of Threatened Species 2008. Available from <http://dx.doi.org/10.2305/IUCN.UK.2008.RLTS.T40652A10350268.en>
- Ratajszczak R., 1997. Taxonomy, distribution and status of the lesser slow loris *Nycticebus pygmaeus* and their implications for captive management. *Folia Primatol.* 69(1): 171–174.
- Reuter K.E., Gilles H., Wills A.R., Sewall B.J., 2015. Live capture and ownership of lemurs in Madagascar: extent and conservation implications. *Oryx*. doi:10.1017/S003060531400074X
- Saj T.L., Mather C., Scotte P., 2006. Traditional taboos in biological conservation: the case of *Colobus vellerosus* at the Boabeng-Fiema Monkey Sanctuary, Central Ghana. *Soc. Sci. Inf.* 45(2): 285–310.
- Schwitzer C., Mittermeier R.A., Rylands A.B., Taylor L.A., Chiozza F., Williamson E.A., Wallis J., Clark F.E., 2014a. Primates in peril: the world's 25 most endangered primates 2012–2014. IUCN/SSC Primate Specialist Group, International Primatological Society, Conservation International & Bristol Conservation and Science Foundation, Arlington, VA, USA.
- Schwitzer C., Mittermeier R.A., Johnson S., Donati G., Irwin M., Peacock H., Ratsimbazafy J., Razafindramanana J., Louis E.E. Jr., Chikhi L., Colquhoun I.C., Tinsman J., Dolch R., LaFleur M., Nash S., Patel E., Randrianambinina B., Rasolofoharivelo T., Wright P.C., 2014b. Averting lemur extinctions amid Madagascar's political crisis. *Science*. 343: 842–843.
- Shepherd C.R., 2010. Illegal primate trade in Indonesia exemplified by surveys carried out over a decade in north Sumatra. *Endanger. Species Res.* 11(3): 201–205.
- Shepherd C.R., Sukumaran J., Wich S.A., 2005. Open season: an analysis of the pet trade in Medan, north Sumatra, 1997–2001. *TRAFFIC Southeast Asia*, Petaling Jaya, Selangor, Malaysia.
- Stiles D., Redmond I., Cress D., Nellemann C., Formo R.K., 2013. Stolen apes: the illicit trade in chimpanzees, gorillas, bonobos and orangutans. A rapid response assessment, United Nations Environment Programme, GRID-Arendal, Nairobi, Kenya.
- Strier K.B., 2011. Conservation. In: Campbell C.J., Fuentes A., MacKinnon K.C., Bearder S.K., Stumpf R.M. (Eds.). *Primates in perspective*. Oxford University Press, Oxford, UK, pp 664–675.
- SurveyMonkey, 2015. Free online survey software and questionnaire tool. Available from www.surveymonkey.com
- Sussman R.W., Green G.M., Porton I., Andrianasolondraibe O.L., Ratsirason J., 2003. A survey of the habitat of *Lemur catta* in southwestern and southern Madagascar. *Primate Conserv.* 19: 32–57.
- Svenson M.S., Friant S.C., 2014. Threats from trading and hunting of pottos and angwantibos in Africa resemble those faced by slow lorises in Asia. *Endanger. Species Res.* 23: 107–114.
- Taylor G., Scharlemann J.P.W., Rowcliffe M., Kumpel N., Harfoot M.B.J., Fa J.E., Melisch R., Milner-Gulland E.J., Bhagwat S., Abernethy K.A., Ajonina A.S., Albrechtsen L., Allebone-Webb S., Brown E., Bugiere D., Clark C., Colell M., Cowlshaw G., Crookes D., De Merode E., Dupain J., East T., Edderaï D., 2015. Synthesising bushmeat research effort in West and Central Africa: A new regional database. *Biol. Conserv.* 181: 199–205.
- Van Lavieren E., 2008. The illegal trade in Barbary macaques from Morocco and its impact on the wild population. *TRAFFIC Bull.* 21: 81–88.
- Vargas A., Jiménez I., Palomares F., Palacios M.J., 2002. Distribution, status, and conservation needs of the golden crowned sifaka (*Propithecus tattersalli*). *Biol. Conserv.* 108(3): 325–334.
- Whiting M.J., Williams V.L., Hibbitts T.J., 2011. Animals traded for traditional medicine at the Faraday market in South Africa: species diversity and conservation implications. *J. Zool.* 284: 84–96.

- Whytock R.C., Buji R., Virani M.Z., Morgan B.J., 2016. Do large birds experience previously undetected levels of hunting pressure in the forest of Central and West Africa? *Oryx* 50(1): 76–83. doi:10.1017/S0030605314000064
- Wickings E.J., Ambrose L., Bearder S.K., 1998. Sympatric populations of *Galagoide*s *demidoff* and *Galagoide*s *thomasi* in the Haut-Ogooué Region of Gabon. *Folia Primatol.* 69(1): 389–393.
- Willcox A.S., Nambu D.M., 2007. Wildlife hunting practice and bushmeat dynamics of the Banyangi and Mbo people of southwestern Cameroon. *Biol. Conserv.* 134(2): 251–261.
- Wilson J.M., Stewart P.D., Ramangason G.S., Denning A.M., Hutchings M.S., 1989. Ecology and conservation of the crowned lemur, *Lemur coronatus*, at Ankarana, N. Madagascar. *Folia Primatol.* 52(1–2): 1–26.
- Yaokokore-Beibro H.K., Kasse B.K., Soulemame O., Koue-Bi M.T., Kouassi P.K., Foua-Bi K., 2010. Ethnozoologie de la faune mammalogique de la foret classée de badenou (Korhogo, Côte-d'Ivoire). *Agronomie Africaine.* 22(2): 185–193.
- Ziegler S., Nikolaus G., Hutterer R., 2002. High mammalian diversity in the newly established National Park of Upper Niger, Republic of Guinea. *Oryx* 36(1): 73–80.

Associate Editor: D.G. Preatoni