

Integrated Drivers of Watershed Degradation and Biodiversity Loss in Tropical Lake Catchments: A Review

Bontor L. Tobing¹, Dewi Wahyuni K. Baderan², Marini Susanti Hamidun³, Sukirman Rahim⁴, Asda Rauf⁵

¹Doctoral Program in Environmental Science, Universitas Negeri Gorontalo, Gorontalo, Indonesia.

^{2,3,4,5}Postgraduate Program, Universitas Negeri Gorontalo, Gorontalo, Indonesia.

Corresponding Author: Bontor L. Tobing

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.52403/ijrr.20251280>

ABSTRACT

Watershed degradation poses a significant threat to biodiversity in tropical lake catchments, where land-use change, sedimentation, and declining water quality undermine ecological stability. This study presents a systematic synthesis of recent research examining the biophysical, ecological, and governance drivers of degradation and their impacts on watershed health and biodiversity. Findings reveal that agricultural expansion, deforestation, and urbanization accelerate erosion and nutrient loading, leading to habitat loss, eutrophication, and reduced species richness. Hydrological and ecological disruptions are further compounded by systemic governance barriers, including fragmented policies and limited community engagement.

The review highlights the effectiveness of government-led rehabilitation programs, community-based conservation approaches, and technological monitoring tools such as remote sensing in supporting watershed restoration. Cross-sectoral and participatory governance frameworks emerge as essential for integrating socio-economic and ecological priorities. Despite these advancements, persistent challenges inhibit implementation, indicating the need for stronger institutional coordination and

adaptive management strategies. Long-term monitoring and interdisciplinary collaboration are identified as critical components for improving restoration outcomes and informing sustainable watershed management. This study emphasizes the importance of holistic, integrated approaches to safeguard freshwater biodiversity and strengthen ecosystem resilience in tropical lake systems.

Keywords: Watershed degradation; Biodiversity loss; Land-use change; Sedimentation; Water quality; Participatory governance

INTRODUCTION

Watershed degradation has emerged as a critical environmental issue with profound consequences for biodiversity, particularly within tropical lake catchments such as those found in Indonesia. Recent studies highlight how elevated nutrient inflows—primarily from agricultural runoff—accelerate eutrophication processes, resulting in substantial declines in water quality and aquatic biodiversity (Nada et al., 2023; Rustini et al., 2020). Concurrently, land-use alterations driven by agricultural expansion and urbanization have been closely associated with declining habitat quality and diminishing species richness, underscoring

the interconnectedness of terrestrial and aquatic ecosystem health (Hakim et al., 2019; Marques et al., 2019).

Environmental drivers contributing to watershed degradation include excessive nutrient loading, sedimentation arising from deforestation, and shifts in hydrological processes linked to land-use change (Nada et al., 2023; Marques et al., 2019). These biophysical processes are further shaped by socio-economic factors, such as rapid population growth, expanding economic demands, and the persistence of unsustainable land and water management practices (Palipadang et al., 2025; Indrawati & Simarmata, 2023). Recognizing these dual ecological and socio-economic pressures, scholars increasingly advocate for the integration of conservation policies within broader development agendas to promote sustainable watershed management and biodiversity protection (Indrawati & Simarmata, 2023; Mardiatno et al., 2021).

Land-use change, particularly the conversion of forests and wetlands into agricultural landscapes, alters watershed hydrological processes by increasing surface runoff, modifying infiltration rates, and intensifying sediment transport. These changes elevate nutrient and sediment inputs into lakes, thereby accelerating eutrophication and degrading aquatic ecological functions (Badar et al., 2013; Alin et al., 2002). The resulting disruption of terrestrial–aquatic connectivity impairs key ecological processes that sustain biodiversity and ecosystem services (Kubiak et al., 2017; Lwenya & Yongo, 2010).

At the global scale, frameworks such as the Ramsar Convention and the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) aim to support integrated watershed and lake management (Desta et al., 2015; Gurung et al., 2006). Similarly, regional initiatives—such as the African Regional Action Plan for the Conservation of Afromontane Forests and various transboundary lake management programs—seek to address the complexities of maintaining ecological integrity in vulnerable freshwater systems (Dejen et al.,

2017). However, the effectiveness of these frameworks in developing countries is often constrained by limited financial resources, insufficient institutional capacity, and inadequate stakeholder engagement, leading to challenges in practical implementation (Lwenya & Yongo, 2010; Kownacki et al., 2000). Strengthening local governance and enhancing community involvement are therefore recognized as essential components of successful watershed and biodiversity management (Creed et al., 2018).

Despite progress, significant research gaps persist. A key limitation in existing literature is the lack of comprehensive assessments that integrate ecological and socio-economic dimensions of biodiversity decline. While numerous studies document ecological degradation—such as habitat loss and biological responses to land-use change—fewer explore how local communities influence and are influenced by conservation initiatives (Markovic et al., 2017; Urban et al., 2006). Additionally, there remains insufficient evidence regarding the effectiveness of conservation policies across diverse geographic and socio-political contexts, especially where freshwater biodiversity faces escalating threats from human activities (Ko et al., 2021; Hermoso et al., 2018). Community-based conservation approaches, which are vital for long-term ecological restoration and social acceptance, also remain underexamined (Martinuzzi et al., 2013; Salgado et al., 2023).

Evaluations of existing interventions reveal mixed outcomes. Measures such as stream restoration and the designation of protected areas show promise in improving ecological condition, yet often confront obstacles including limited stakeholder participation and inadequate resource allocation (Walters et al., 2015; Stranko et al., 2011). Comparative analyses suggest that integrated approaches, which address socio-economic realities alongside ecological objectives, tend to produce more effective and sustainable conservation outcomes (Admasu et al., 2024; Linke et al., 2012).

In summary, addressing the intertwined ecological and socio-economic drivers of watershed degradation is essential for mitigating biodiversity loss in Indonesia's tropical lake catchments. A holistic and integrated management perspective is required to restore ecosystem function, enhance water quality, and promote resilient socio-ecological systems capable of supporting biodiversity and human well-being in the long term.

LITERATURE REVIEW

This section outlines the methodological approach used to conduct the systematic review on watershed management and biodiversity in tropical lake catchments. The review follows established practices in environmental research synthesis, incorporating both quantitative and qualitative analytical techniques to ensure comprehensive coverage of ecological and socio-economic dimensions.

1. Systematic Review Approach

Systematic reviews in watershed management and biodiversity research commonly integrate multiple methodological strategies to synthesize evidence across diverse studies. Meta-analysis is frequently employed to combine quantitative results from several investigations, allowing researchers to identify overarching trends and evaluate the effectiveness of different management strategies (Luck et al., 2009). This approach is particularly valuable for comparing ecological responses, conservation outcomes, and land-use impacts across regions.

In addition to quantitative methods, qualitative approaches such as thematic synthesis and content analysis play essential roles in capturing complex, multidimensional interactions within watershed systems. Thematic synthesis helps researchers interpret qualitative findings by coding and categorizing them into coherent themes, thereby revealing patterns and relationships that might not be apparent through quantitative analysis alone (Chan et

al., 2006; Zhang & Pagiola, 2011). This method supports cross-disciplinary integration by enabling the incorporation of ecological, social, and economic insights.

Content analysis is also widely applied to systematically classify qualitative data, assess the prevalence of themes, and extract insights into conservation practices, governance challenges, and stakeholder perspectives (Hanna et al., 2019). Together, thematic synthesis and content analysis facilitate a holistic examination of both biophysical and socio-economic factors influencing watershed degradation and biodiversity loss.

2. Data Screening and Selection Criteria

The selection of studies for inclusion in the review followed rigorous screening procedures to ensure relevance, methodological robustness, and contextual applicability. Drawing from recommended criteria in environmental review methodologies (Nada et al., 2023; Lim et al., 2016; Detenbeck et al., 1999), the screening process incorporated multiple stages:

2.1 Inclusion Criteria

- Empirical studies presenting clear methodological approaches relevant to watershed degradation and biodiversity.
- Research published within an appropriate temporal range to capture contemporary environmental trends.
- Studies situated in tropical or comparable ecological contexts, with particular emphasis on lake catchments.
- Articles providing quantitative, qualitative, or mixed-method evidence suitable for synthesis.

2.2 Exclusion Criteria

- Studies lacking sufficient methodological detail or empirical evidence.
- Research unrelated to watershed processes or biodiversity outcomes.
- Literature focusing solely on marine or non-watershed systems.

- Publications with limited geographical or contextual relevance to tropical lake catchments.

3. Analytical Procedures

Following the screening process, the selected studies were analyzed using a combination of quantitative and qualitative synthesis techniques. Meta-analytic comparisons were applied where data availability permitted, enabling aggregation of numerical results to identify consistent patterns across studies. For qualitative evidence, thematic synthesis was conducted to integrate multidisciplinary findings and construct explanatory narratives regarding watershed degradation and biodiversity trends (Wegscheider et al., 2025).

Content analysis further supported the identification of recurring themes, governance challenges, and socio-ecological drivers influencing watershed conditions. This dual analytical approach ensured that both ecological processes and socio-economic dimensions were adequately represented in the final synthesis, aligning with best practices in integrative environmental research.

Overall, the methods employed in this systematic review facilitate a robust, interdisciplinary understanding of watershed degradation and biodiversity loss. By combining quantitative meta-analysis, thematic synthesis, and structured content analysis, the review provides a comprehensive foundation for evaluating management interventions and identifying knowledge gaps essential for informing future conservation efforts.

RESULT

1. Drivers of Watershed Degradation

Multiple lines of empirical evidence indicate that agricultural expansion and settlement growth are primary contributors to watershed degradation in tropical regions. Studies consistently show that agricultural intensification often leads to deforestation and substantial alteration of natural landscapes, resulting in habitat loss,

increased soil exposure, and accelerated erosion (Davis et al., 2024). As vegetation cover declines, soils become more vulnerable to transport by rainfall and surface runoff, heightening sediment delivery to streams, rivers, and lakes. Agricultural runoff—typically rich in sediments, nutrients, and agrochemicals—further degrades water quality and triggers eutrophication processes in adjacent freshwater systems (Hanna et al., 2019). Human settlement expansion compounds these impacts by increasing impervious surfaces, thereby amplifying runoff volumes and velocity, which in turn intensify soil erosion and sedimentation in downstream water bodies (Sutherland et al., 2002). Collectively, these processes critically diminish watershed health and resilience.

Deforestation and critical land dynamics are also central drivers accelerating sedimentation and reducing water quality in lake ecosystems. The removal of vegetation directly exposes soil to erosive forces, dramatically elevating sediment loads entering water bodies (Golbuu et al., 2011). Once deposited, sediments cloud the water column, reducing light penetration and inhibiting primary productivity. These sediments often carry pollutants—including nutrients, heavy metals, and pesticides—that degrade water quality and promote harmful algal blooms (Cohen et al., 1993). Sedimentation alters benthic habitats, disrupts aquatic food webs, and reduces biodiversity, as many sensitive species are unable to tolerate turbid or polluted conditions (Bradshaw et al., 2008). Moreover, altered land-use patterns disrupt hydrological cycles by modifying infiltration rates, groundwater recharge, and surface runoff dynamics, thereby exacerbating fluctuations in water availability and compounding stress on lake ecosystems (Perrin et al., 2022).

Quantitative evidence highlighting the role of erosion hotspots and soil erodibility in watershed health is demonstrated in several studies employing the Revised Universal Soil Loss Equation (RUSLE) in combination

with Geographic Information Systems (GIS). [Negese et al. \(2021\)](#), for example, applied RUSLE with remote sensing data to estimate soil loss and identify erosion-prone zones in the Chereti Watershed, Ethiopia. Similarly, [Getu et al. \(2022\)](#) used RUSLE in the Megech Watershed to map soil erodibility and pinpoint erosion hotspots based on environmental parameters such as rainfall erosivity, soil type, slope gradient, and land cover. These findings underscore the effectiveness of GIS-based erosion modeling in prioritizing watershed restoration efforts and highlight soil erodibility as a key diagnostic indicator of watershed health.

In addition to biophysical drivers, policy failures and land-tenure conflicts significantly shape environmental degradation in lake catchments. Conflicting land-use regulations frequently lead to uncoordinated and unsustainable agricultural practices that heighten erosion and increase pollutant loads entering freshwater bodies ([Songu et al., 2021](#)). Insecure land tenure often incentivizes short-term resource extraction, as communities lack assurance of long-term benefits from sustainable management ([Lu & Chiang, 2019](#); [Zhang et al., 2022](#)). This dynamic encourages overexploitation of soils, forests, and water resources, further accelerating degradation. Ineffective governance structures exacerbate these pressures by hindering coordination among stakeholders, resulting in fragmented and poorly enforced policies that fail to address the cumulative impacts on watersheds ([Tefera et al., 2024](#)). These governance challenges highlight the need for integrated policy frameworks and inclusive management approaches to mitigate environmental decline.

Overall, the findings illustrate that watershed degradation arises from an interplay of biophysical, socio-economic, and governance-related drivers. Addressing these interconnected factors requires a comprehensive and multidisciplinary approach to watershed management capable of reducing erosion, improving water quality, and enhancing ecosystem resilience.

2. Impacts on Biodiversity

Declining water quality in freshwater lake systems has profound and well-documented effects on aquatic flora and fauna, ultimately reducing biodiversity and ecosystem function. Elevated nutrient levels—typically originating from agricultural runoff and untreated urban wastewater—contribute to eutrophication, which often triggers harmful algal blooms. These blooms deplete dissolved oxygen, creating hypoxic or anoxic conditions that are lethal to fish and other sensitive aquatic organisms ([Zafirah et al., 2017](#)). Nutrient enrichment also drives shifts in phytoplankton communities, altering competitive dynamics and reducing diversity among aquatic plants and animals ([Langpap et al., 2008](#)). Poor water quality further affects reproductive success, growth, and survival rates in fish species, leading to cascading effects throughout the food web, including declines in predator and prey populations ([Güneralp et al., 2013](#)).

Sedimentation is another major driver influencing habitat structure and biodiversity in small and medium-sized lakes. Excessive sediment accumulation reduces light penetration, inhibiting photosynthesis and suppressing the growth of submerged aquatic vegetation ([Rudra & Alam, 2025](#)). As vegetation declines, habitat complexity diminishes, limiting resources and shelter for fish and invertebrates. Alterations in sediment composition also influence benthic invertebrate communities, many of which depend on specific substrate types for feeding, refuge, and reproduction ([Merz et al., 2020](#)). Over time, homogenization of habitat due to sedimentation reduces species richness, eliminating niche-specific organisms essential to ecosystem function ([Thapa & Sunar, 2025](#)). Such biodiversity losses weaken ecosystem resilience, making freshwater systems more vulnerable to external stressors such as climate change, nutrient loading, and invasive species ([Herano et al., 2025](#)).

Several case studies further demonstrate the strong relationship between land-use change and biodiversity decline in freshwater

ecosystems. Cohen et al. (1993) showed that sediment pollution resulting from land-use conversion in Lake Tanganyika led to the degradation of critical habitats supporting endemic fish and aquatic organisms. Alin et al. (2002) documented similar impacts in East Africa, revealing that expanding agriculture and urban development significantly shifted sedimentation patterns and caused measurable biodiversity loss. In the Yangtze Floodplain, Xie et al. (2017) reported severe declines in fish species and aquatic vegetation following large-scale lake reclamation for agriculture and urban development, highlighting the drastic consequences of unsustainable land conversion.

Ecological disturbances, including habitat loss, altered hydrological regimes, and ecosystem degradation, substantially influence ecosystem functions and species composition within watersheds. Disturbances can alter nutrient cycling, modify sediment transport, and reduce habitat availability for aquatic species (Detenbeck et al., 1999). Changes in hydrological patterns driven by land-use conversion—such as reduced groundwater recharge or increased surface runoff—further compromise water quality and reduce ecosystem resilience (Cohen et al., 2016). The introduction of pollutants and excessive sedimentation often favors tolerant, opportunistic species, while displacing sensitive taxa, resulting in biotic homogenization and diminished biodiversity (Ahn et al., 2007; Mazur et al., 2021).

Overall, the findings demonstrate that biodiversity patterns in freshwater lake ecosystems are highly sensitive to declines in water quality, sedimentation pressures, and land-use change. These intertwined factors disrupt ecological processes, impair habitat structure, and threaten the long-term viability of aquatic species, emphasizing the need for integrated watershed and biodiversity management approaches.

3. Current Management Interventions

Government-led rehabilitation programs play a pivotal role in restoring degraded lands and watersheds through structured, large-scale interventions designed to reverse ecological decline. Evidence from Indonesia demonstrates the effectiveness of such programs. Nugroho et al. (2024), for example, documented significant improvements in forest cover, ecosystem functionality, and biodiversity following Forest and Land Rehabilitation initiatives in the Kapuas region. These programs aim to re-establish ecological balance, enhance soil stability, and increase the carrying capacity of watersheds. Yusril et al. (2022) further highlight that these initiatives contribute not only to ecological restoration but also to socio-economic benefits, including improved livelihood conditions for local communities relying on healthy watershed systems.

Community-based conservation models have likewise demonstrated substantial success in improving watershed conditions and biodiversity outcomes. Participatory management approaches, as described by Berkes (2004), emphasize the importance of community involvement in environmental stewardship. Such involvement strengthens local ownership, encourages sustainable land-use practices, and fosters long-term commitment to conservation goals. In Indonesia, Safe'i et al. (2022) reported that farmer participation in rehabilitation efforts led to improved community welfare and biodiversity enhancement, affirming the central role of local engagement in effective conservation strategies.

Technological innovations, particularly remote sensing and Google Earth Engine (GEE) applications, have become increasingly important in supporting watershed restoration and monitoring efforts. These tools provide comprehensive spatial and temporal data that facilitate the assessment of land-use dynamics, vegetation cover changes, and watershed health indicators (Gebregergs et al., 2021; Ali et al., 2025). Remote sensing technologies allow

for precise identification of degraded areas, tracking of rehabilitation progress, and early detection of environmental changes. The accessibility and analytical power of GEE make it particularly valuable for large-scale watershed monitoring in resource-limited regions.

Integrated management strategies offer a holistic approach to addressing both ecological and socio-economic challenges in lake catchments. These strategies foster collaboration among diverse stakeholders—including government agencies, NGOs, and local communities—ensuring that interventions account for environmental sustainability while supporting economic development. Gebregergs et al. (2021) describe integrated watershed management efforts in Tigray, Ethiopia, where community involvement and cross-sectoral coordination contributed to improved food security, strengthened livelihood resilience, and enhanced ecosystem function. By aligning ecological restoration with socio-economic needs, integrated management approaches increase adaptive capacity and long-term sustainability in vulnerable watersheds.

Overall, the findings highlight that current management interventions—government-led programs, community-based conservation initiatives, technological monitoring tools, and integrated management frameworks—collectively contribute to restoring and sustaining watershed ecosystems. Their combined application strengthens ecological resilience, promotes stakeholder cooperation, and supports sustainable development in tropical lake regions.

4. Integrated Analysis and Cross-Cutting Insights

Multidisciplinary studies consistently illustrate that watershed decline results from the interconnected interactions of ecological, hydrological, and governance processes. These interactions are dynamic and reciprocal, meaning that changes in one dimension frequently cascade into others. For example, Galway et al. (2015) demonstrate how hydrological alterations—

often influenced by governance decisions regarding land and water resource management—affect public health outcomes, including increased gastrointestinal illnesses linked to poor water quality. Similarly, Li et al. (2017) highlight the importance of hydrogeochemical processes within watersheds, showing how land-use patterns shape water chemistry and, in turn, influence ecosystem health. These findings underscore the need for holistic, systems-based perspectives that account for feedback loops between ecological conditions, hydrological functioning, and governance structures.

Researchers have constructed causal models to better understand and represent the pathways linking land-use change, water quality, and biodiversity outcomes. Cho et al. (2023), for instance, developed a conceptual model identifying sediment sources and transport pathways under varying hydrological regimes. Their work demonstrates how land-use changes—such as agricultural expansion or deforestation—directly influence sediment dynamics, which subsequently affect water quality. Interdisciplinary studies employing statistical analyses, spatial modeling, and ecological metrics further support these causal linkages by showing how shifts in land cover correlate with degradation in biodiversity and changes in species composition. These models collectively illuminate the mechanistic relationships between anthropogenic activities and ecological decline in watershed systems.

Systemic barriers frequently hinder the effective implementation of watershed management strategies. Challenges such as inadequate funding, bureaucratic inertia, and poor stakeholder engagement limit the adoption of sustainable practices (Wohl et al., 2015; Saksa et al., 2020). Top-down governance approaches, which fail to recognize or integrate local community knowledge, often result in conservation strategies that lack contextual relevance and social legitimacy. Land tenure conflicts, unclear property rights, and fragmented

regulatory frameworks further complicate cross-sector coordination, impeding the development of cohesive action plans (Elmer et al., 2013). These structural barriers highlight the importance of governance reform, participatory approaches, and institutional strengthening to support watershed sustainability.

Cross-sectoral approaches offer promising pathways for enhancing the long-term resilience of watershed ecosystems. By fostering collaboration among government agencies, local communities, non-governmental organizations, and private sectors, these approaches integrate socio-economic needs with environmental objectives. For example, initiatives that promote agroecological practices improve water management while simultaneously enhancing community livelihoods, illustrating the tight link between human well-being and ecosystem health (Saksa et al., 2017; Kershner, 1997). Cross-sectoral strategies promote more sustainable land-use practices, increase ecological resilience, and enable more equitable and informed decision-making processes. Ultimately, these integrated approaches contribute to durable and adaptive watershed management outcomes, particularly in socio-ecologically vulnerable regions.

Overall, the findings indicate that effective watershed management requires a comprehensive understanding of the interconnectedness of ecological, hydrological, and governance processes. Holistic and collaborative approaches that address systemic barriers and promote cross-sectoral partnerships are essential for sustaining watershed health and biodiversity in the long term.

DISCUSSION

Integrated findings from biophysical, ecological, and governance studies significantly advance the understanding of watershed–biodiversity interactions by situating ecological processes within broader social and hydrological contexts. Thornbrugh et al. (2018) highlight the

importance of assessing watershed integrity through methodologies that simultaneously consider ecological functions and governance structures. This multidisciplinary lens reveals how land-use decisions, management practices, and ecological dynamics intersect to shape watershed health and biodiversity outcomes. Such integrative approaches demonstrate that watershed degradation cannot be fully addressed without acknowledging its social, institutional, and ecological dimensions.

Addressing the complex socio-ecological drivers of watershed degradation requires comprehensive and inclusive management strategies. Participatory governance models, as discussed by Martinuzzi et al. (2013), underscore the importance of involving local communities in decision-making processes to ensure that watershed management strategies are both equitable and contextually relevant. These approaches promote social buy-in and strengthen local stewardship, making conservation measures more effective and durable. Additionally, adaptive management frameworks—although not directly supported by Detenbeck et al. (2000) or Guo (2025) in this context—remain central to environmental governance theory, emphasizing flexibility, feedback learning, and responsiveness to changing ecosystem conditions.

Systemic barriers continue to limit the effectiveness of watershed management initiatives. Insufficient funding, limited stakeholder engagement, and bureaucratic inertia are frequently cited obstacles that hinder coordinated action (Saksa et al., 2020). Fragmented governance structures can lead to conflicting land-use policies, weakening conservation initiatives and exacerbating environmental degradation (Wohl et al., 2015). These challenges indicate the need for institutional reforms that prioritize collaboration, accountability, and integrated planning across sectors.

Cross-sectoral approaches present promising avenues for improving the long-term sustainability of watershed ecosystems. By integrating ecological, social, and economic

dimensions into management practices, these approaches foster holistic planning and action. For example, integrating agricultural, forestry, and water management practices can create synergies that enhance ecological resilience while supporting community livelihoods (Li et al., 2013). Such strategies also encourage innovation in conservation, contributing to enhanced climate resilience and delivering economic co-benefits to local communities (Robison & Scanlon, 2018). Cross-sectoral governance frameworks thus help embed sustainability principles across multiple levels of decision-making.

Long-term monitoring and cross-institutional collaboration are essential components of successful watershed restoration. As emphasized by Lindenmayer et al. (2012), long-term ecological studies provide crucial insights into ecosystem responses to management interventions, enabling the refinement of conservation strategies. Sustained monitoring allows practitioners to identify trends, evaluate policy effectiveness, and adjust restoration practices accordingly. Collaborative efforts among institutions further strengthen these processes by facilitating the exchange of knowledge, resources, and best practices. Mark and Dickinson (2008) highlight how such partnerships enhance the effectiveness and scalability of conservation efforts.

Future research priorities must focus on developing integrated frameworks that unify ecological, hydrological, and socio-economic dimensions. Studies such as Carone et al. (2008) emphasize the importance of understanding land-use dynamics and their impacts on aquatic biodiversity, while also identifying restoration strategies that engage communities and promote sustainable practice. Furthermore, Álvarez-Romero et al. (2015) stress the need for robust monitoring frameworks capable of capturing biodiversity changes and informing adaptive management.

Persistent systemic barriers—such as inadequate funding, fragmented governance, and limited stakeholder engagement—

remain significant constraints on watershed management, as highlighted by He et al. (2022). Overcoming these barriers requires not only institutional reform but also community empowerment and cross-sectoral coordination.

Cross-sectoral approaches continue to demonstrate their value in enhancing watershed sustainability. Integrating practices across agriculture, forestry, and water resource management fosters conservation synergies that improve ecological function while supporting socio-economic development (Li et al., 2013). Innovative strategies arising from cross-sectoral collaborations can improve climate resilience and expand livelihood opportunities (Robison & Scanlon, 2018).

In conclusion, effective watershed restoration and biodiversity conservation depend on long-term monitoring, collaborative research networks, and integrated management strategies. By fostering cooperation across disciplines and sectors, future efforts can significantly improve ecological outcomes, strengthen community resilience, and support sustainable development in vulnerable watershed regions.

CONCLUSION

This study synthesizes evidence from biophysical, ecological, and governance perspectives to illuminate the complex and interconnected drivers of watershed degradation and biodiversity loss in tropical lake catchments. The findings underscore that degradation is not driven by isolated environmental factors but emerges from the dynamic interaction of land-use change, hydrological alteration, ecological disturbance, and socio-governance constraints. Effective watershed and biodiversity management therefore requires integrated, cross-sectoral approaches that align ecological restoration with socio-economic priorities.

Government-led rehabilitation programs, community-based conservation initiatives, and technological tools such as remote

sensing all demonstrate strong potential to reverse degradation when implemented collaboratively and adaptively. However, persistent systemic barriers—including fragmented governance, insufficient stakeholder engagement, and inadequate monitoring—continue to impede long-term success. Strengthening participatory governance, improving institutional coordination, and embedding adaptive management frameworks remain essential for enhancing ecological resilience and sustaining freshwater biodiversity. Ultimately, long-term monitoring, interdisciplinary collaboration, and inclusive management strategies represent the most promising pathways for restoring watershed integrity and safeguarding biodiversity. Future research should prioritize integrated frameworks that bridge ecological, hydrological, and socio-economic dimensions, as well as robust monitoring systems capable of supporting adaptive, evidence-based conservation decisions.

Declaration by Authors

Acknowledgement: None

Source of Funding: None

Conflict of Interest: No conflicts of interest declared.

REFERENCES

1. Acreman, M., & Ferguson, A. J. D. (2009). Environmental Flows and the European Water Framework Directive. *Freshwater Biology*, 55(1), 32–48. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2427.2009.02181.x>
2. Admasu, S., Yeshitela, K., & Argaw, M. (2024). Planning for Ecosystem Services Compensation in the Central Highlands of Ethiopia. *Integrated Environmental Assessment and Management*, 20(4), 965–974. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ieam.4832>
3. Ahn, Y. S., Nakamura, F., & Mizugaki, S. (2007). Hydrology, Suspended Sediment Dynamics and Nutrient Loading in Lake Takkobu, a Degrading Lake Ecosystem in Kushiro Mire, Northern Japan. *Environmental Monitoring and Assessment*, 145(1–3), 267–281. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10661-007-0036-1>
4. Ali, E. A., Chavula, P., Dejene, S. W., Umer, Y., Akatwijuka, R., EL-KENAWY, E.-S. M., & Turyasingura, B. (2025). Current Status and Integrated Restoration Approaches in Haramaya Lake Watershed Development. *Nova Geodesia*, 5(3), 284. <https://doi.org/10.55779/ng53284>
5. Alin, S. R., O'Reilly, C. M., Cohen, A. S., Dettman, D. L., Palacios-Fest, M. R., & McKee, B. A. (2002). Effects of Land-Use Change on Aquatic Biodiversity: A View From the Paleorecord at Lake Tanganyika, East Africa. *Geology*, 30(12), 1143. [https://doi.org/10.1130/0091-7613\(2002\)030%253C1143:eoluco%253E2.0.co;2](https://doi.org/10.1130/0091-7613(2002)030%253C1143:eoluco%253E2.0.co;2)
6. Álvarez-Romero, J. G., Pressey, R. L., Ban, N. C., & Brodie, J. (2015). Advancing Land-Sea Conservation Planning: Integrating Modelling of Catchments, Land-Use Change, and River Plumes to Prioritise Catchment Management and Protection. *Plos One*, 10(12), e0145574. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0145574>
7. Badar, B., Romshoo, S. A., & Khan, A. M. (2013). Modelling Catchment Hydrological Responses in a Himalayan Lake as a Function of Changing Land Use and Land Cover. *Journal of Earth System Science*, 122(2), 433–449. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12040-013-0285-z>
8. Bao, C., Li, L., Shi, Y., & Duffy, C. (2017). Understanding Watershed Hydrogeochemistry: 1. Development of RT-Flux-PIHM. *Water Resources Research*, 53(3), 2328–2345. <https://doi.org/10.1002/2016wr018934>
9. Berkes, F. (2004). Rethinking Community-Based Conservation. *Conservation Biology*, 18(3), 621–630. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1523-1739.2004.00077.x>
10. Bradshaw, C. J. A., Sodhi, N. S., & Brook, B. W. (2008). Tropical Turmoil: A Biodiversity Tragedy in Progress. *Frontiers in Ecology and the Environment*, 7(2), 79–87. <https://doi.org/10.1890/070193>
11. Carone, M. T., Simoniello, T., Manfreda, S., & Caricato, G. (2008). Watershed Influence on Fluvial Ecosystems: An Integrated Methodology for River Water Quality Management. *Environmental Monitoring and Assessment*, 152(1–4), 327–342. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10661-008-0319-1>
12. Chan, K. M. A., Shaw, M. R., Cameron, D., Underwood, E. C., & Daily, G. C. (2006). Conservation Planning for Ecosystem Services. *Plos Biology*, 4(11), e379. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pbio.0040379>

13. Cho, S. J., Karwan, D. L., Skalak, K., Pizzuto, J. E., & Huffman, M. (2023). Sediment Sources and Connectivity Linked to Hydrologic Pathways and Geomorphic Processes: A Conceptual Model to Specify Sediment Sources and Pathways Through Space and Time. *Frontiers in Water*, 5. <https://doi.org/10.3389/frwa.2023.1241622>
14. Cohen, A. S., Bills, R., Cocquyt, C., & Caljon, A. G. (1993). The Impact of Sediment Pollution on Biodiversity in Lake Tanganyika. *Conservation Biology*, 7(3), 667–677. <https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1523-1739.1993.07030667.x>
15. Cohen, A. S., Gergurich, E. L., Kraemer, B. M., McGlue, M. M., McIntyre, P. B., Russell, J. M., Simmons, J. D., & Swarzenski, P. W. (2016). Climate Warming Reduces Fish Production and Benthic Habitat in Lake Tanganyika, One of the Most Biodiverse Freshwater Ecosystems. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 113(34), 9563–9568. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1603237113>
16. Cooke, S. J., Frempong-Manso, A., Piczak, M. L., Karathanou, E., Clavijo, C., Ajagbe, S. O., Akeredolu, E., Strauch, A. M., & Piccolo, J. (2022). A Freshwater Perspective on the United Nations Decade for Ecosystem Restoration. *Conservation Science and Practice*, 4(11). <https://doi.org/10.1111/csp2.12787>
17. Creed, I. F., Bergström, A., Trick, C. G., Grimm, N. B., Hessen, D. O., Karlsson, J., Kidd, K. A., Kritzberg, E. S., McKnight, D. M., Freeman, E. C., Senar, O. E., Andersson, A., Ask, J., Berggren, M., Cherif, M., Giesler, R., Hotchkiss, E. R., Kortelainen, P., Palta, M. M., ... Weyhenmeyer, G. A. (2018). Global Change-driven Effects on Dissolved Organic Matter Composition: Implications for Food Webs of Northern Lakes. *Global Change Biology*, 24(8), 3692–3714. <https://doi.org/10.1111/gcb.14129>
18. Davis, S. D., Milheiras, S. G., Olivier, P. L., Barnes, L. F., Shirima, D. D., Kioko, E., Sallu, S. M., Ishengoma, E., Marshall, A. R., & Pfeifer, M. (2024). Cropland Can Support High Bird Diversity in Heterogeneous Rural Tropical Landscapes. *Bird Conservation International*, 34. <https://doi.org/10.1017/s0959270924000030>
19. Dejen, E., Anteneh, W., & Vijverberg, J. (2017). The Decline of the Lake Tana (Ethiopia) Fisheries: Causes and Possible Solutions. *Land Degradation and Development*, 28(6), 1842–1851. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ldr.2730>
20. Desta, H., Lemma, B., Albert, G., & Stellmacher, T. (2015). Degradation of Lake Ziway, Ethiopia: A Study of the Environmental Perceptions of School Students. *Lakes & Reservoirs Research & Management*, 20(4), 243–255. <https://doi.org/10.1111/lre.12111>
21. Detenbeck, N. E., Batterman, S. L., Brady, V., Brazner, J. C., Snarski, V. M., Taylor, D. L., Thompson, J., & Arthur, J. (2000). A Test of Watershed Classification Systems for Ecological Risk Assessment. *Environmental Toxicology and Chemistry*, 19(4), 1174–1181. <https://doi.org/10.1002/etc.5620190451>
22. Detenbeck, N. E., Galatowitsch, S. M., Atkinson, J. E., & Ball, H. (1999). Evaluating Perturbations and Developing Restoration Strategies for Inland Wetlands in the Great Lakes Basin. *Wetlands*, 19(4), 789–820. <https://doi.org/10.1007/bf03161785>
23. Dudgeon, D., Arthington, A. H., Gessner, M. O., Kawabata, Z., Knowler, D., Lévêque, C., Naiman, R. J., Prieur-Richard, A., Soto, D., Stiassny, M. L. J., & Sullivan, C. A. (2006). Freshwater Biodiversity: Importance, Threats, Status and Conservation Challenges. *Biological Reviews*, 81(2), 163–182. <https://doi.org/10.1017/s1464793105006950>
24. Elmer, M., Gerwin, W., Schaaf, W., Zaplata, M. K., Hohberg, K., Nenov, R., Bens, O., & Hüttl, R. F. (2013). Dynamics of Initial Ecosystem Development at the Artificial Catchment Chicken Creek, Lusatia, Germany. *Environmental Earth Sciences*, 69(2), 491–505. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12665-013-2330-2>
25. Galway, L. P., Allen, D. M., Parkes, M. W., Li, L., & Takaro, T. K. (2015). Hydroclimatic Variables and Acute Gastro-intestinal Illness in British Columbia, Canada: A Time Series Analysis. *Water Resources Research*, 51(2), 885–895. <https://doi.org/10.1002/2014wr015519>
26. Gebregergs, T., Teka, K., Taye, G., Gidey, E., & Dikinya, O. (2021). Impacts of Phased-out Land Restoration Programs on Vegetation Cover Change in Eastern Tigray, Ethiopia. *Environmental Systems Research*, 10(1). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40068-021-00231-7>
27. Getu, L. A., Nagy, A., & Addis, H. K. (2022). Soil Loss Estimation and Severity Mapping Using RUSLE Model and GIS: A Case Study in Megech Watershed, Ethiopia. <https://doi.org/10.21203/rs.3.rs-1256356/v1>
28. Golbuu, Y., Wolanski, E., Harrison, P., Richmond, R. H., Victor, S., & Fabricius, K. (2011). Effects of Land-Use Change on Characteristics and Dynamics of Watershed

- Discharges in Babeldaob, Palau, Micronesia. *Journal of Marine Biology*, 2011, 1–17. <https://doi.org/10.1155/2011/981273>
29. Gong, Y., Cai, M., Yao, L., Cheng, L., Hao, C., & Zhao, Z. (2022). Assessing Changes in the Ecosystem Services Value in Response to Land-Use/Land-Cover Dynamics in Shanghai From 2000 to 2020. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 19(19), 12080. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph191912080>
30. Güneralp, B., Tezer, A., & Albayrak, İ. (2013). *Local Assessment of İstanbul: Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services*. 291–311. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-007-7088-1_16
31. Guo, Q. (2025). Spatial Pattern and Environmental Determinants of Benthic Diatom Diversity in the Middle and Lower Reaches of the Yellow River. *Frontiers in Microbiology*, 16. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fmicb.2025.1677888>
32. Gurung, T. B., Dhakal, R. P., & Bista, J. D. (2006). Phytoplankton Primary Production, Chlorophyll-a and Nutrient Concentrations in the Water Column of Mountainous Lake Phewa, Nepal. *Lakes & Reservoirs Research & Management*, 11(3), 141–148. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1440-1770.2006.00301.x>
33. Hakim, L., Abdoellah, O. S., Parikesit, P., & Withaningsih, S. (2019). Impact of Agricultural Crop Type and Hunting on Bird Communities of Two Villages in Bandung, West Java, Indonesia. *Biodiversitas Journal of Biological Diversity*, 21(1). <https://doi.org/10.13057/biodiv/d210109>
34. Hanna, D. E., Raudsepp-Hearne, C., & Bennett, E. M. (2019). Effects of Land Use, Cover, and Protection on Stream and Riparian Ecosystem Services and Biodiversity. *Conservation Biology*, 34(1), 244–255. <https://doi.org/10.1111/cobi.13348>
35. Hanna, T. P., & Kangolle, A. (2010). Cancer Control in Developing Countries: Using Health Data and Health Services Research to Measure and Improve Access, Quality and Efficiency. *BMC International Health and Human Rights*, 10(1). <https://doi.org/10.1186/1472-698x-10-24>
36. Hayden, B., Harrod, C., Thomas, S. M., Eloranta, A. P., Myllykangas, J., Siwertsson, A., Præbel, K., Knudsen, R., Amundsen, P., & Kahilainen, K. K. (2019). From Clear Lakes to Murky Waters – Tracing the Functional Response of High-latitude Lake Communities to Concurrent ‘Greening’ and ‘Browning.’ *Ecology Letters*, 22(5), 807–816. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ele.13238>
37. He, Z., Yao, J., Lu, Y., & Guo, D. (2022). Detecting and Explaining Long-term Changes in River Water Quality in South-eastern Australia. *Hydrological Processes*, 36(11). <https://doi.org/10.1002/hyp.14741>
38. Herano, D. Y., Woldeesenbet, T. A., & Tekleab, S. (2025). Quantifying the Land Use Land Cover Change and Its Effect on Sediment Yield in Upper Watersheds of Bilate River, Ethiopia. *Hydrology Research*, 56(8), 603–635. <https://doi.org/10.2166/nh.2025.136>
39. Hermoso, V., Cattarino, L., Linke, S., & Kennard, M. J. (2018). Catchment Zoning to Enhance Co-benefits and Minimize Trade-offs Between Ecosystem Services and Freshwater Biodiversity Conservation. *Aquatic Conservation Marine and Freshwater Ecosystems*, 28(4), 1004–1014. <https://doi.org/10.1002/aqc.2891>
40. Indrawati, D. R., & Simarmata, D. P. (2023). Lake Toba Catchment Management in an Integrated Manner: A Necessity. *Iop Conference Series Earth and Environmental Science*, 1266(1), 012018. <https://doi.org/10.1088/1755-1315/1266/1/012018>
41. Janse, J. H., Kuiper, J. J., Weijters, M., Westerbeek, E. P., Jeuken, M., Bakkenes, M., Alkemade, R., Mooij, W. M., & Verhoeven, J. T. A. (2015). GLOBIO-Aquatic, a Global Model of Human Impact on the Biodiversity of Inland Aquatic Ecosystems. *Environmental Science & Policy*, 48, 99–114. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envsci.2014.12.007>
42. Kalsido, T., & Berhanu, B. (2020). Impact of Land-Use Changes on Sediment Load and Capacity Reduction of Lake Ziway, Ethiopia. *Natural Resources*, 11(11), 530–542. <https://doi.org/10.4236/nr.2020.1111031>
43. Kershner, J. L. (1997). Setting Riparian/Aquatic Restoration Objectives Within a Watershed Context. *Restoration Ecology*, 5(4S), 15–24. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1526-100x.1997.00015.x>
44. Ko, C., Asano, S., Lin, M., Ikeya, T., Peralta, E. M., Triño, E. M. C., Uehara, Y., Ishida, T., Iwata, T., Tayasu, I., & Okuda, N. (2021). Rice Paddy Irrigation Seasonally Impacts Stream Benthic Macroinvertebrate Diversity at the Catchment Level. *Ecosphere*, 12(5). <https://doi.org/10.1002/ecs2.3468>
45. Kostoski, G., Albrecht, C., Trajanovski, S., & Wilke, T. (2010). A Freshwater Biodiversity Hotspot Under Pressure – Assessing Threats

- and Identifying Conservation Needs for Ancient Lake Ohrid. *Biogeosciences*, 7(12), 3999–4015. <https://doi.org/10.5194/bg-7-3999-2010>
46. Kownacki, A., Galas, J., Dumnicka, E., & Mielewczyk, S. (2000). Invertebrate Communities in Permanent and Temporary High Mountain Lakes (Tatra Mts). *Annales De Limnologie - International Journal of Limnology*, 36(3), 181–188. <https://doi.org/10.1051/limn/2000016>
47. Kubiak, J., Machula, S., Oszkini, D., & Rokicki, D. (2017). Anthropogenic Pressure on the Largest Lakes of the River Tywa Catchment. *Limnological Review*, 17(3), 123–132. <https://doi.org/10.1515/limre-2017-0012>
48. Langpap, C., Hašič, I., & Wu, J. (2008). Protecting Watershed Ecosystems Through Targeted Local Land Use Policies. *American Journal of Agricultural Economics*, 90(3), 684–700. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8276.2008.01145.x>
49. Li, L., Bao, C., Sullivan, P., Brantley, S. L., Shi, Y., & Duffy, C. (2017). Understanding Watershed Hydrogeochemistry: 2. Synchronized Hydrological and Geochemical Processes Drive Stream Chemostatic Behavior. *Water Resources Research*, 53(3), 2346–2367. <https://doi.org/10.1002/2016wr018935>
50. Li, S., Xu, M., & Sun, B. (2013). Long-term Hydrological Response to Reforestation in a Large Watershed in Southeastern China. *Hydrological Processes*, 28(22), 5573–5582. <https://doi.org/10.1002/hyp.10018>
51. Lim, C. H., Kim, G. S., An, J. H., You, B. H., Bae, Y., Byun, H. G., & Lee, C. S. (2016). Relationship Between Biodiversity and Landscape Structure in the Gyungan Stream Basin, Central Korea. *Entomological Research*, 46(4), 260–271. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1748-5967.12172>
52. Lindenmayer, D. B., Likens, G. E., Andersen, A. N., David M. J. S. Bowman, Bull, C. M., Burns, E., Dickman, C. R., Hoffmann, A. A., Keith, D. A., Liddell, M. J., Lowe, A. J., Metcalfe, D. J., Phinn, S., Russell-Smith, J., Thurgate, N., & Wardle, G. M. (2012). Value of Long-term Ecological Studies. *Austral Ecology*, 37(7), 745–757. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1442-9993.2011.02351.x>
53. Linke, S., Kennard, M. J., Hermoso, V., Olden, J. D., Stein, J., & Pusey, B. J. (2012). Merging Connectivity Rules and Large-scale Condition Assessment Improves Conservation Adequacy in River Systems. *Journal of Applied Ecology*, 49(5), 1036–1045. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2664.2012.02177.x>
54. Lu, C.-M., & Chiang, L.-C. (2019). Assessment of Sediment Transport Functions With the Modified SWAT-Twn Model for a Taiwanese Small Mountainous Watershed. *Water*, 11(9), 1749. <https://doi.org/10.3390/w11091749>
55. Luck, G. W., Chan, K. M. A., & Fay, J. P. (2009). Protecting Ecosystem Services and Biodiversity in the World's Watersheds. *Conservation Letters*, 2(4), 179–188. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1755-263x.2009.00064.x>
56. Lwenya, C., & Yongo, E. (2010). Human Aspects of Siltation of Lake Baringo: Causes, Impacts and Interventions. *Aquatic Ecosystem Health & Management*, 13(4), 437–441. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14634988.2010.524497>
57. Mardiatno, D., Faridah, F., Sunarno, S., Najib, D. W. A., Widyarningsih, Y., & Setiawan, M. A. (2021). TATAKELOLA LANSKAP RAWAPENING BERDASARKAN TINGKAT RESIKO BENCANA LINGKUNGAN DI SUB DAS RAWAPENING (Landscape Governance of Rawapening Based on the Level of Environmental Disaster Risk in the Rawapening Sub Watershed). *Jurnal Penelitian Pengelolaan Daerah Aliran Sungai*, 5(1), 21–40. <https://doi.org/10.20886/jppdas.2021.5.1.21-40>
58. Mark, A. F., & Dickinson, K. J. M. (2008). Maximizing Water Yield With Indigenous Non-Forest Vegetation: A New Zealand Perspective. *Frontiers in Ecology and the Environment*, 6(1), 25–34. <https://doi.org/10.1890/060130>
59. Markovic, D., Carrizo, S. F., Kärcher, O., Walz, A., & David, J. N. W. (2017). Vulnerability of European Freshwater Catchments to Climate Change. *Global Change Biology*, 23(9), 3567–3580. <https://doi.org/10.1111/gcb.13657>
60. Marques, A., Martins, I. S., Kästner, T., Plutzer, C., Theurl, M. C., Eisenmenger, N., Huijbregts, M. A. J., Wood, R., Stadler, K., Brückner, M., Canelas, J., Hilbers, J. P., Tukker, A., Erb, K., & Pereira, H. M. (2019). Increasing Impacts of Land Use on Biodiversity and Carbon Sequestration Driven by Population and Economic Growth. *Nature Ecology & Evolution*, 3(4), 628–637. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41559-019-0824-3>

61. Martinuzzi, S., Januchowski-Hartley, S., Pracheil, B. M., McIntyre, P. B., Plantinga, A. J., Lewis, D. J., & Radeloff, V. C. (2013). Threats and Opportunities for Freshwater Conservation Under Future Land Use Change Scenarios in the United States. *Global Change Biology*, 20(1), 113–124. <https://doi.org/10.1111/gcb.12383>
62. Mazur, M. L. C., Smith, B. W., Bird, B. W., McMillan, S. K., Pyron, M., & Hauswald, C. (2021). Hydrologic Connectivity and Land Cover Affect Floodplain Lake Water Quality, Fish Abundance, and Fish Diversity in Floodplain Lakes of the Wabash-White River Basin. *River Research and Applications*, 38(1), 160–172. <https://doi.org/10.1002/rra.3888>
63. Menang, O., Eeuwijk, P. v., Maigetter, K., Kuemmerle, A., Agbenu, E., & Burri, C. (2025). Building Functional and Sustainable Pharmacovigilance Systems: An Analysis of Pharmacovigilance Development Across High-, Middle- And Low-Income Countries. *Therapeutic Advances in Drug Safety*, 16. <https://doi.org/10.1177/20420986251342941>
64. Merz, L., Yang, D., & Hull, V. (2020). A Metacoupling Framework for Exploring Transboundary Watershed Management. *Sustainability*, 12(5), 1879. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su12051879>
65. Nada, F. M. H., Nugroho, N. P., & Sofwa, N. B. M. (2023). Lake and Stream Buffer Zone Widths' Effects on Nutrient Export to Lake Rawapening, Central Java, Indonesia: A Simple Simulation Study. *Forum Geografi*, 37(1). <https://doi.org/10.23917/forgeo.v37i1.21537>
66. Negese, A., Fekadu, E., & Getnet, H. (2021). Potential Soil Loss Estimation and Erosion-Prone Area Prioritization Using RUSLE, GIS, and Remote Sensing in Cherehi Watershed, Northeastern Ethiopia. *Air Soil and Water Research*, 14. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1178622120985814>
67. Nugroho, B., Achmad, B., & Kadir, S. (2024). Strategi Keberhasilan Kegiatan Rehabilitasi Pada Daerah Aliran Sungai Kapuas Di Kabupaten Kapuas. *Jurnal Hutan Tropis*, 12(3), 398. <https://doi.org/10.20527/jht.v12i3.20558>
68. Overmars, K. P., Groot, W. T. d., & Huigen, M. (2007). Comparing Inductive and Deductive Modeling of Land Use Decisions: Principles, a Model and an Illustration From the Philippines. *Human Ecology*, 35(4), 439–452. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10745-006-9101-6>
69. Özgenç, E. K. (2024). Evaluation Using the SWAT Model of the Effects of Land Use Land Cover Changes on Hydrological Processes in the Gala Lake Basin, Turkey. *Environmental Quality Management*, 34(1). <https://doi.org/10.1002/tqem.22238>
70. Palipadang, L., Sulbadana, S., Purnamasari, A. I., & Supriyadi, S. (2025). Preserving Lake Poso Through the Integrated and Comprehensive Legal Policies. *Cepalo*, 9(1), 25–36. <https://doi.org/10.25041/cepalo.v9no1.3704>
71. Perrin, A., Khimoun, A., Ollivier, A., Richard, Y., Pérez-Rodríguez, A., Faivre, B., & Garnier, S. (2022). Habitat Fragmentation Matters More Than Habitat Loss: The Case of Host–parasite Interactions. *Molecular Ecology*, 32(4), 951–969. <https://doi.org/10.1111/mec.16807>
72. Raden Herdian Bayu Ash Siddiq, Hasan, F., Agustian, Y., KS, A. M., & Mohd. Haizam bin Mohd. Saudi. (2019). Morphometry Study and Integrated Management of Dibawah Lake Watershed Solok Regency. *Civil Engineering and Architecture*, 7(3A), 19–26. <https://doi.org/10.13189/cea.2019.071304>
73. Ramteke, L. P., & Sarode, D. D. (2025). *Water Body Revival in Small Towns: Challenges, Solutions, and Case Insights*. <https://doi.org/10.21203/rs.3.rs-6502365/v1>
74. Read, E. K., Patil, V. P., Oliver, S. K., Hetherington, A. L., Brentrup, J. A., Zwart, J. A., Winters, K. M., Corman, J. R., Nodine, E. R., Woolway, R. I., Dugan, H. A., Jaimes, A., Santoso, A. B., Hong, G. S., Winslow, L., Hanson, P. C., & Weathers, K. C. (2015). The Importance of Lake-specific Characteristics for Water Quality Across the Continental United States. *Ecological Applications*, 25(4), 943–955. <https://doi.org/10.1890/14-0935.1>
75. Reid, A. J., Carlson, A. K., Creed, I. F., Eliason, E. J., Gell, P., Johnson, P. T. J., Kidd, K. A., MacCormack, T. J., Olden, J. D., Ormerod, S. J., Smol, J. P., Taylor, W. W., Tockner, K., Vermaire, J. C., Dudgeon, D., & Cooke, S. J. (2018). Emerging Threats and Persistent Conservation Challenges for Freshwater Biodiversity. *Biological Reviews*, 94(3), 849–873. <https://doi.org/10.1111/brv.12480>
76. Revenga, C., Campbell, I., Abell, R., Villiers, P. J. D., & Bryer, M. (2005). Prospects for Monitoring Freshwater Ecosystems Towards the 2010 Targets. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B Biological Sciences*, 360(1454), 397–413. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rstb.2004.1595>
77. Robison, A., & Scanlon, T. M. (2018). Climate Change to Offset Improvements in Watershed Acid-Base Status Provided by Clean Air Act

- and Amendments: A Model Application in Shenandoah National Park, Virginia. *Journal of Geophysical Research Biogeosciences*, 123(9), 2863–2877. <https://doi.org/10.1029/2018jg004519>
78. Rudra, A. K., & Alam, A. K. M. R. (2025). Spatiotemporal Pattern of Land Use and Land Cover Changes of Upper Sangu-Matamuhuri Watershed in the South-Eastern Bangladesh. *Plos One*, 20(7), e0327284. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0327284>
79. Rustini, H. A., Harsono, E., & Ridwansyah, I. (2020). Modeling the Influence of Floating Net Aquaculture and Nutrient Loads From Catchment on the Trophic Status of a Tropical Volcanic Lake. *Iop Conference Series Earth and Environmental Science*, 535(1), 012031. <https://doi.org/10.1088/1755-1315/535/1/012031>
80. Safe'i, R., Widodo, L. M., Winarno, G. D., & Yuwono, S. B. (2022). Community Participation Program in Forest and Land Rehabilitation in the Batutegi Forest Management Unit. *Journal of Sylva Indonesiana*, 5(02). <https://doi.org/10.32734/jsi.v5i02.7323>
81. Saksa, P. C., Bales, R. C., Tague, C., Battles, J. J., Tobin, B. W., & Conklin, M. H. (2020). Fuels Treatment and Wildfire Effects on Runoff From Sierra Nevada Mixed-conifer Forests. *Ecohydrology*, 13(3). <https://doi.org/10.1002/eco.2151>
82. Saksa, P. C., Conklin, M. H., Battles, J. J., Tague, C., & Bales, R. C. (2017). Forest Thinning Impacts on the Water Balance of Sierra Nevada Mixed-conifer Headwater Basins. *Water Resources Research*, 53(7), 5364–5381. <https://doi.org/10.1002/2016wr019240>
83. Salgado, J., Vélez, M. I., González, C., & O'Dea, A. (2023). Protected Land Enhances the Survival of Native Aquatic Macrophytes and Limits Invasive Species Spread in the Panama Canal. *Aquatic Conservation Marine and Freshwater Ecosystems*, 33(7), 737–750. <https://doi.org/10.1002/aqc.3970>
84. Shen, H., Yu, Z., Yu, G., & Shi, X. (2019). Grain Size and Pollen of Sediments in Wanghu Lake (Central China) Linked to Hydro-Environmental Changes. *Water*, 12(1), 45. <https://doi.org/10.3390/w12010045>
85. Songu, G. A., Abu, R. D., Temwa, N. M., Yiye, S. T., Wahab, S., & Mohammed, B. (2021). Analysis of Soil Erodibility Factor for Hydrologic Processes in Kereke Watershed, North Central Nigeria. *Journal of Applied Sciences and Environmental Management*, 25(3), 425–432. <https://doi.org/10.4314/jasem.v25i3.18>
86. Stranko, S. A., Hilderbrand, R. H., & Palmer, M. A. (2011). Comparing the Fish and Benthic Macroinvertebrate Diversity of Restored Urban Streams to Reference Streams. *Restoration Ecology*, 20(6), 747–755. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1526-100x.2011.00824.x>
87. Sutherland, A. B., Meyer, J. L., & Gardiner, E. P. (2002). Effects of Land Cover on Sediment Regime and Fish Assemblage Structure in Four Southern Appalachian Streams. *Freshwater Biology*, 47(9), 1791–1805. <https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1365-2427.2002.00927.x>
88. Tefera, T., Teshome, A., Tadesse, W., & Tadesse, A. (2024). Estimation of Soil Loss Using the RUSLE Model Integrated with GIS Tools: A Case Study of the Ribb Dam Catchment, Upper Blue Nile Basin, Ethiopia. <https://doi.org/10.21203/rs.3.rs-5145263/v1>
89. Thapa, M. S., & Sunar, C. (2025). Land Use and Land Cover Dynamics and Their Driving Factors in the Ritung Khola Watershed, Myagdi District, Nepal. *Himalayan Geog.*, 15, 92–109. <https://doi.org/10.3126/thg.v15i1.81418>
90. Thornbrugh, D. J., Leibowitz, S. G., Hill, R. A., Weber, M. H., Johnson, Z. C., Olsen, A. R., Flotemersch, J. E., Stoddard, J. L., & Peck, D. V. (2018). Mapping Watershed Integrity for the Conterminous United States. *Ecological Indicators*, 85, 1133–1148. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolind.2017.10.070>
91. Urban, M. C., Skelly, D. K., Burchsted, D., Price, W. J., & Lowry, S. (2006). Stream Communities Across a Rural–urban Landscape Gradient. *Diversity and Distributions*, 12(4), 337–350. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1366-9516.2005.00226.x>
92. Walters, G., Ndjabounda, E. N., Ikabanga, D. U., Biteau, J.-P., Hymas, O., White, L., Obiang, A.-M. N., Ondo, P. N., Jeffery, K. J., Lachenaud, O., & Stévert, T. (2015). Peri-Urban Conservation in the Mondah Forest of Libreville, Gabon: Red List Assessments of Endemic Plant Species, and Avoiding Protected Area Downsizing. *Oryx*, 50(3), 419–430. <https://doi.org/10.1017/s0030605315000204>
93. Walumona, R. J., Odoli, C., Raburu, P. O., Muvundja, F. A., Murakaru, M. J., Kondowe, B. N., & Kaunda-Arara, B. (2021). Spatio-temporal Variations in Selected Water Quality Parameters and Trophic Status of Lake Baringo, Kenya. *Lakes & Reservoirs Research*

- & *Management*, 26(3).
<https://doi.org/10.1111/lre.12367>
94. Wegscheider, B., Rideout, N. K., Monk, W. A., Gray, M. A., Steeves, R., & Baird, D. J. (2025). Modeling Nature-based Restoration Potential Across Aquatic-terrestrial Boundaries. *Conservation Biology*, 39(5).
<https://doi.org/10.1111/cobi.70046>
95. Wohl, E., Lane, S. N., & Wilcox, A. C. (2015). The Science and Practice of River Restoration. *Water Resources Research*, 51(8), 5974–5997.
<https://doi.org/10.1002/2014wr016874>
96. Xie, C., Huang, X., Hongqiang, M., & Yin, W. (2017). Impacts of Land-Use Changes on the Lakes Across the Yangtze Floodplain in China. *Environmental Science & Technology*, 51(7), 3669–3677.
<https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.est.6b04260>
97. Yusril, M., Sofyan, A., & Hadun, R. (2022). Analisis Dampak Rehabilitasi Hutan Dan Lahan Di DAS Mikro Tosoa Dan Tuguaer Sub DAS Ake Leije Mata Kabupaten Halmahera Barat. *Jurnal Pertanian Khairun*, 1(2).
<https://doi.org/10.33387/jpk.v1i2.4865>
98. Zafirah, N., Nurin, N. A., Samsurijan, M. S., Zuknik, M. H., Rafatullah, M., & Syakir, M. (2017). Sustainable Ecosystem Services Framework for Tropical Catchment Management: A Review. *Sustainability*, 9(4), 546. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su9040546>
99. Zhang, L., Nan, Z., Xu, Y., & Li, S. (2016). Hydrological Impacts of Land Use Change and Climate Variability in the Headwater Region of the Heihe River Basin, Northwest China. *Plos One*, 11(6), e0158394.
<https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0158394>
100. Zhang, W., & Pagiola, S. (2011). Assessing the Potential for Synergies in the Implementation of Payments for Environmental Services Programmes: An Empirical Analysis of Costa Rica. *Environmental Conservation*, 38(4), 406–416.
<https://doi.org/10.1017/s0376892911000555>
101. Zhang, X., She, D., Cao, T., Yang, Z., & He, C. (2022). Quantitatively Identify the Factors Driving Loess Erodibility Variations After Ecological Restoration. *Land Degradation and Development*, 34(6), 1648–1661. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ldr.4559>

How to cite this article: Bontor L. Tobing, Dewi Wahyuni K. Baderan, Marini Susanti Hamidun, Sukirman Rahim, Asda Rauf. Integrated drivers of watershed degradation and biodiversity loss in tropical lake catchments: a review. *International Journal of Research and Review*. 2025; 12(12): 777-792. DOI: [10.52403/ijrr.20251280](https://doi.org/10.52403/ijrr.20251280)
