

RESEARCH PAPER

OPEN ACCESS

Comprehensive assessment of floral composition in restoration sites at mount Kitanglad, Brgy. Lirongan, Bukidnon: Analysis of diverse restoration initiatives

Renamarie P. Nacion^{*1}, Ruben F. Amparado¹, Jaime Q. Guihawan¹, Wella T. Tatil¹, Jerome L. Montemayor^{1,2}, Hilly Ann R. Quiaoit¹

¹Environmental Science Graduate Program, Department of Environmental Science, School of Interdisciplinary Studies, Mindanao State University, Iligan Institute of Technology, Iligan City, Philippines ²Executive Director at the Foundation for the Philippine Environment, Philippines

Article published on April 06, 2025

Key words: Floristic composition, Diversity indices, Biodiversity, Mt. Kitanglad, Restoration

Abstract

This study examines the floristic composition, biodiversity indices, and conservation status of the seven restoration sites in Mt. Kitanglad, Talakag Bukidnon. A total of 532 individual plants from 79 species and 37 families were recorded, with angiosperms comprising the majority of the flora. The Fabaceae, Asteraceae, and Poaceae families exhibited the highest species richness, with Calliandra calothyrsus and Acacia auriculiformis being particularly abundant due to their ecological roles in nitrogen fixation and weed suppression. Gymnosperms, notably Pinus merkusii, played as significant role in reforestation, while pteridophytes such as Nephrolepis bisserata served as indicators of environmental conditions. Biodiversity indices revealed distinct ecological patterns across sites, the Shannon-Wiener index ranged from 2.01 to 3.33, with riparian sites (RA1 and RA2) demonstrating the highest diversity and evenness, while areas dominated by Indigenous Forest Trees (IFT) exhibited lower diversity and greater species dominance. Simpson index values (0.73-0.94) further supported these findings, highlighting the balanced species distribution in riparian sites compared to IFTdominated areas. Evenness values ranged from 0.40 to 0.68, indicating varying species uniformity across sites, while dominance values (0.06-0.41) suggested a greater influence of select species in IFT areas. The conservation status assessment identifies 74 species as Least Concern, while Diplazium costulisorum and Sphaeropteris glauca were classified as Endangered. These findings emphasize the ecological significance of vegetated riparian zones in biodiversity conservation and ecosystem resilience. Restoration strategies should prioritize species diversity and structural complexity to enhance ecological stability and functionality in degraded landscapes.

*Corresponding Author: Renamarie 🖂 renamarie.nacion@g.msuiit.edu.ph

Introduction

The current state of biodiversity is a matter of urgency. According to Redford and Mace (2018), biodiversity refers to the range of genes, species, and ecosystems within a particular system. Tropical forests play a crucial role in mitigating climate change by sequestering substantial amounts of atmospheric carbon dioxide (Lumbres et al., 2023). These mountains in the Philippines, including the Mt. Kitanglad Range National Park (MKRNP), stand out due to their rich flora composition, comprising native and endemic species. Numerous studies have confirmed that plant biodiversity significantly impacts supporting and regulating ecosystem services (Chen et al., 2018; Peri et al., 2019a; Ma et al., 2020). However, deforestationinduced tropical forest fragmentation causes increased tree mortality (Reis et al., 2018), which facilitates more accessible access to interior forests and increases resource exploitation (Broadben et al., 2019).

The Mt. Kitanglad Range National Park (MKRNP) spans seven (7) municipalities and one (1) city in the province of Bukidnon. It is one of the protected areas and the last remaining frontiers of the Philippines (Saway and Mirasol, 2004). On November 9, 2000, Mt. Kitanglad Range Natural Park was designated as a protected area, and on October 29, 2009, it was designated as an ASEAN Heritage Park (NORDECO, 1998). Four indigenous tribes in the province of Bukidnon-the Manobo, Talaandig, Maranao, and Maguindanao-all have ancestral domains that include the MKRNP (Saway and Mirasol, 2004). MKRNP has 19 species of ferns and one species of fern allies, a new record in the Philippines, and supports a rich biodiversity of 661 plant species, including endangered, endemic, rare, or economically significant ones (Amoroso et al., 2011). However, despite its significance, it has been severely threatened by manmade activities such as slash-and-burn farming, illegal logging, eco-tourism, and agricultural intensification (Canoy and Suminguit, 2001).

To address this issue, various initiatives are being implemented to support climate change, including the National Greening Program (NGP), to restore 1.5 million hectares of degraded land with 1.5 billion trees, and has successfully planted approximately 1.83 billion seedlings across 2.18 million hectares of barren forestlands from 2011 to August 2022 (FMB, 2022). Another strategy to mitigate forest loss, forest and landscape restoration was developed to address this issue. Restoration is "any intentional activity that starts or hastens an ecosystem's recovery from a degraded state" (IPBES, 2014). The tropics worldwide require a focus on restoration (Brancalion et al., 2019). In addition to addressing various issues like soil stability and condition, water quality, habitat and biodiversity, human culture and recreation, and climate stability, restoration aims to re-establish a self-sustaining ecosystem (SERI, 2004; Crossman and Bryan, 2009; Barral et al., 2015; Alexander et al., 2016). This study aimed to assess and inventory the threatened, endemic, and economically important plants in Mt. Kitanglad Range Natural Park, Bukidnon. Specifically, this study (i) determined the diversity of the flora present in the different restoration sites, (ii) compared the diversity of flora across various restoration models, and (iii) assessed their conservation status.

Materials and methods

Study area and sampling sites

The study area consists of three approaches: restoration in the riparian area with IFT and Caribbean pine trees, restoration in the riparian area with IFT only, and restoration in the riparian area with vegetation (Table 1). This treatment includes various restoration strategies, which are categorized into sub-models based on the year of establishment, namely, as follows.

A. Riparian area with IFT and Caribbean pine trees

The riparian area with IFT and Caribbean pine trees has four (4) replicates labelled IFTC1, IFTC2, IFTC3, and IFTC4. The IFTC1 (8°3'31.8"N and 8°3'31.8"N) has matured Caribbean pines and bamboo, young *Saurauia elegans* (Choisy) fern.-Vill, and *Shorea negrosensis* Foxw. with high litter cover (branches and leaves) from matured Caribbean pine trees.

Site	Description	IFT planted/	Year	Land use
code		vegetation	established	
RA1	Riparian Areas with vegetation	Matured Caribbean Pine and dense grass vegetation	2020	Dense vegetation of Flemingia, cogon grass, <i>Lantana camara</i> L. 'Miss Huff', Matured Caribbean pine trees, and few <i>Callandra</i> <i>calothyrsus</i> nearby.
RA2	Riparian Area with vegetation	Matured N.nicobarica	2020	Dense shrub (wils sunflower, ferns, cogon grass, <i>Flemingia macrophylla</i>). There are also few IFT and <i>C. calothyrsus</i> observed in the area.
IFTC1	Riparian with young IFT and Caribbean Pines	Matured Caribbean Pines and Bamboo, Young <i>S. elegans</i> and <i>S. negrosensis</i>	2018	High litter cover (branch and leaves) from matured Caribbean Pine Trees
IFTC2	Riparian with young IFT and Caribbean Pines	Matured Caribbean Pines and Bamboo, Young <i>S. elegans</i> and <i>S. negrosensis</i>	2018	Vegetation are mostly ferns, Bamboo grass, and Caribbean Pine are also around. The area has litter cover
IFTC3	Riparian with young IFT and Caribbean Pines	Matured Caribbean Pines and young Saurauia elegans	2019	Dense litter cover, taller UFTs, and Bamboo grass and shrubs are present in the area.
IFTC4	Riparian with young IFT and Caribbean Pines	Young <i>S. elegans</i> and <i>C. evansii</i> , Matured bamboo	2019	Dense shrubs and ferns in the area, there are also few IFTs. Located adjacent to the bamboo grass, Pine trees are too far from the baseline point.
IFT	Riparian with IFT only	Bamboo grass and dense grass vegetation		Dense grass complex. Adjacent land has been cleared for agricultural purposes (Broccoli), Bamboo grass nearby, <i>C. calothyrsus</i> everywhere and other secondary trees, IFT nearby mature pine trees.

Table 1. Description of the study sites at Mt. Kitanglad, Lirongan, Talakag, Bukidnon

The IFTC2 (8°3.30.425"N and 124°48.40.047"E) has matured Caribbean pines and bamboo, young *S. elegans* and *S. negrosensis* with vegetation of mostly ferns, bamboo grass, and C. pine also present. The area has litter cover.

The IFTC3 (8°3'24.993"N and 124°48'33.987"E) has matured Caribbean pines and young *S. elegans* with dense litter cover, taller IFTs, bamboo grass, and shrubs are present in the area.

The IFTC4 (8°3.24.024"N and 124°48'34.097"E) has young *S. elegans* and *Castanopsis evansii* Elmer and matured bamboo with dense shrubs and ferns in the area, there are also few IFTs, located adjacent to bamboo grass. Pine trees are too far from the baseline point.

B. Riparian area with IFT only

The riparian area with IFT only has one (1) site which is labelled as IFT1 (8°3'15.936"N and 124°48'26.243"E). This area has bamboo grass and dense vegetation with dense complex. Adjacent land has been cleared for agricultural purposes (broccoli) with bamboo grass in the near vicinity, C. pine trees everywhere and other secondary trees, and IFTs.

C. Riparian area with vegetation

The Riparian without vegetation has two replicates, designated as RA1 and RA2. The RA1 (8°3'10.231"N and 124°48'39.582"E) has an elevation of 1,430 m and gently sloping. This has matured Caribbean Pine Tree and dense grass vegetation of *Flemingia macrophylla* (Willd.) Kuntze ex Merr., ferns, cogon grass, *Lantana camara* L., and a few *C. calothyrsus*.

The RA2 (8°2'44.115"N and 124°48'4.416"E) is gently sloping and has an elevation of 1,373 m. It has *Neoscortechinia nicobarica* and dense shrubs (wild sunflower, ferns cogon grass, *F. macrophylla*). Few IFT and *C. calothyrsus* have been observed in the area (Fig. 1).



Fig. 1. Location of the different restoration sites at Mt. Kitanglad, Lirongan, Talakag, Bukidnon, Philippines

Data collection

Field data collection

The Biodiversity Assessment and Monitoring System (BAMS) methodology prescribed by the Biodiversity Management Bureau (BMB) for all protected areas in the country was used for the survey/sampling (BMB, 2015). A modified belt transect method was employed wherein nine quadrats with 20 m \times 20 m was laid out along a 2-km transect at every 250 m interval. Trees at least 10 cm in diameter at breast height (DBH) inside the quadrats were identified, measured, and recorded. A 5 m x 5 m quadrat was constructed inside the 20 m \times 20 m quadrat. Within this quadrat, the number of individuals of intermediate species (shrubs, poles, and saplings) was counted. Moreover, the percentage cover of understory species (grasses and other plant species of less than 1 m) was also assessed inside a 1m x 1m quadrat built inside the $5m \times 5m$ quadrat.

Collection and identification of plant specimensData that were recorded in the field were as follows:(i) plant names from family down to species level; (ii)

diameter at breast height (cm) and total height (m) of species in the canopy; (iii) plant groups of observed plants; and (iv) GPS coordination of all corners of each segment and nested plots.

Identification and nomenclature were aided using the following: Images of each plant for identification were taken using a camera, and the photographic method was based on the manual of Co's Digital Flora in the Philippines, an online database. Other online databases were used for identifying species' nomenclature, such as the International Plant Names Index (www.ipni.org) and Plants of the World Online (www.plantsoftheworldonline.org). The assessment of the status of each species, whether threatened, endemic, rare, or economically important, were based on the IUCN listings/categories and Department Administrative Order 11 series of 2017, a national list of threatened Philippine plants (Fernando et al., 2008), and from some published floristic works and monographs.

Data analysis

The Shannon-Weiner Index (H') and Simpson's Index of Diversity (Wen *et al.*, 2010) were computed to calculate the species' diversity. The Shannon-Weiner index (H') was applied as a measure of both species' abundance, richness, and proportion of each species within the local community.

$H' = -\sum (n_1/N) \ln (n_1/N)$

Where n_i represents the number of individuals of species *i*, *N* is the number of individuals, and ln demotes the natural logarithm. This index measures species richness and evenness, providing insights into the ecosystem's overall diversity.

Additionally, Simpson's diversity index was complementary to evenness. It gives the probability that any two individuals are drawn randomly from an infinitely large community belonging to the same species. It is the common measure of dominance, with values ranging from 0 to 1- 1 representing infinite diversity and 0, no diversity (Barcelona Field Studies Center, 2018).

$D = 1 - \sum (n_1/N)^2$

Where D = Simpson's Index, $n_1 = number$ of individuals, N = total number of species

Pielous Evenness Index (J') was calculated in R studio using the standard formula $J' = \frac{H'}{\ln(S)'}$, where H'represents the Shannon-Wiener Diversity and Sdenotes species richness (Pielou, 1966).

Table 2. Classification of the diversity indices interpreted using the description proposed by Fernando (1998)

Relative value rating	Species diversity	Evenness (E')
-	(H')	
Very high	3.50 – above	0.75 - 1.00
High	3.00 - 3.49	0.50 - 0.74
Moderate	2.50 - 2.99	0.25 – 0.49
Low	2.00 - 2.49	0.15 – 0.24
Very low	0.00 - 1.99	0.05 - 0.14

Results and discussion

Floristic composition

The table below (Table 3) presents a comprehensive survey of the seven restoration sites in Mt. Kitanglad, revealing a remarkable diversity of plant species, comprising 532 individual plants from 79 species and 37 families. This diversity is particularly notable among the angiosperms that dominate the region's flora. The representation of angiosperms, comprising 336 species, underscores their ecological significance and adaptive strategies, enabling them to thrive across diverse environments within the surveyed area. Within the angiosperm group, families such as Fabaceae, Asteraceae, and Poaceae emerged as particularly rich in species, with 151, 38, and 24 individual plants, respectively. Among the Fabaceae family, Calliandra calothyrsus, Acacia auriculiformis, and Flemingia macrophylla have the greatest number of individual plants, comprising 70, 33, and 14, respectively. The A. auriculiformis and C. calothyrsus were recorded in multiple restoration sites. The A. auriculiformis is recognized by Boland et al. (1990) and Reza et al. (2019) as a preferred species for rehabilitation, while C. calothyrsus is widely utilized for weed suppression as a nurse species in plantations, intercropping systems, and alley cropping and also contributes to nitrogen cycling, nutrient retention, and soil conservation (Angima et al., 2002; Heuzé et al., 2017; Wambugu, 2002). As the most diverse plant family in the world (Beech et al., 2017), the high species richness within the Fabaceae family is consistent with its global prominence in various ecosystems due to its nitrogenfixing capabilities, which enhance soil fertility and contribute to the overall productivity of the ecosystems.

Elephantopus mollis, a member of the Asteraceae family, is recorded with 17 individuals, illustrating the family's adaptability across various habitats. The leaves and roots are traditionally utilized for their tonic, fever-reducing, expectorant, anti-inflammatory, soothing, wound-healing, anti-rheumatic, astringent, and diuretic properties (Setyawati *et al.*, 2015).

Family	Scientific name		English name	Numb	per of	individ	ual flor	a spec	ies pei	r plot	TNPS
				RA1	RA2	IFTC1	IFTC2	IFTC3	IFTC ₄	µIFT1	
Araliaceae	Aralia spinosa L.		Devil's walking stick	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	3
	Heptapleurum sp.			0	0	1	0	1	0	0	2
Asteraceae	Acmella uliginosa	Sw.	Mars Para Cress	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
	Ageratum conyzo	ides	Billy goat weed	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	2
	L. Pidana piloag I		Haim bagana tiak		0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Crassoconhalum		Padflower ragles	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	3
	crenidioides Bentl	ı	Reuliowei Tagieai	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	2
	Elephantonus mol	llis	Soft elephant's foot	6	3	1	2	2	0	3	17
	Kunth		boit diopitalit b toot	Ū	0	-	-	-	U	0	-/
	Galinsoga parvifle	ora L	. Potato weed	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	2
	Mikania micranth	ıa	Mile-a-minute	1	1	0	0	2	1	0	5
	Kunth										
	Tithonia diversifo	lia	Mexican sunflower	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	6
	(Hemsley) A. Gray	7									
Athyriaceae	Diplazium			2	2	0	0	0	0	0	4
Balcominacooo	Costulisorum	otala	Broad potalod Balama	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	
Daisaiiiiiaceae	DC	luiu	bioau petaleu baisilia	0	3	2	2	0	1	3	11
Bignoniaceae	Snathodea		African tulin	1	1	0	0	1	1	0	4
Digitoinaceae	campanulata P. B	eauv.	rintean tunp	1	1	Ū	0	1	1	U	4
Blechnaceae	Blechnopsis sp.			1	0	1	0	0	0	0	2
	Telmatoblechnum	1	Swamp fern	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
	serrulatum (Rich.)	-								
	Perrie, D.J. Ohlsen	n &									
	Brownsey	<i>.</i>									
Caryophyllaceae	Drymaria cordate	a (L.)	Tropical chickweed	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
	Willd ex Roem. &										
Crathanaga	Schult.		Anutong	10	_	0	4	-	0	4	00
Cynoracoao	Carer sp.		Allutolig	12	5	0	4	1	3	4	29
Cyperaceae	Cuperus hrevifolii	15		2	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
	Rottb.	10		5	1	Ū	0	U	U	U	4
	Scirpus sp.			1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
	Scleria terrestris I	L.	Nutrushes	1	1	0	0	0	0	2	4
Davalliaceae	Davallia			0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
	trichomanoides Sv	w.									
Dennstaedtiacea	Pteridium aquilin	ит	Common bracken	0	2	3	3	4	1	2	16
e D	(L.) Khun		Fern								
Dryopteridaceae	Dryopteris	_		0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
	(Kupzo) Li Bing 7	S bong									
Funhorbiaceae	(Kullze) Li bilig Zi Macaranaa	iiaiig Flenł	ant's ear	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	2
Luphorblaceae	tanarius (L)	ысрі	lant 5 car	U	T	0	0	0	U	1	2
	Müll. Arg.										
Fabaceae	Acacia	Earle	af acacia	0	23	2	0	5	3	0	33
	auriculiformis A.				-			-	-		
	Cunn. Ex Benth										
	Aeschynomene	Joint	vetch	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
	americana L.	.									
	Arachis pintoi	Pinto	oi peanut	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	3
	Krapov. & W.C.										
	Greg			14	6	0	05	0	-	0	70
	calothursus			14	0	9	25	0	/	9	/0
	Meisn.										
	Desmodium			0	4	1	0	1	1	0	7
	canescens (L.)			-	r	-	-	-	-	2	/
	DC.										
	Flemingia	Enok	i-mame	5	1	0	0	0	0	8	14
	macrophylla										
	(Willd.) Merr.										

Table 3. Family, scientific, and English names and the number of species in different restoration sites at Mt. Kitanglad, Talakag, Bukidnon

J. Bio. & Env. Sci. 2025

	<i>Gliricidia sepium</i> (Jaca) Walp	Madre de cacao	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
	Indigofera	Red nerinjy	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
	spicata Forssk. Mimosa diplotrica C. Wright ov	Giant sensitive plant	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
	Sauvelle Ptericarpus	Narra	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	2
Gentianaceae	indicus Willd. Gentiana	Willow gentian	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Hypoxidaceae	asciepiadea L. Curculigo capitulata	Ground orchids	0	2	0	1	0	0	0	3
Iridaceae	(Lour.) Kuntze Crocosmia x crocosmiiflora (Lemoine) N E Br	Montbretia	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	3
Lamiaceae	Hyptis capitata	False ironwort	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	2
Lythraceae	Cuphea carthagenensis (Jacq.) J.F.	Columbian waxweed	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Malvaceae	Sida rhombifolia L.	Cuban jute	3	2	0	0	0	1	0	6
	Urena lobata L.	Caesarweed	3	2	0	1	0	2	0	8
Melastomataceae	Melastoma sanguineum Sims		1	1	0	1	0	0	2	5
Moraceae	Ficus heteropleura		4	1	1	0	2	2	3	13
Musacaaa	Diume Musa sp		0	0	0	0	1	0	ი	6
Myrtaceae	Syzygium crassipes Gaertn., nom.		0	0	0	1	2	0	3 0	3
Nephrolepidacea e	Nephrolepis biserrata (Sw.) Schott	Giant sword fern	2	3	1	3	1	2	3	15
	Nephrolepis brownii (Desv.) Hovenkamp & Miyam	Asian sword fern	3	2	0	2	0	0	0	7
Orchidaceae	Spathoglottis		2	0	2	0	0	0	2	6
Pinaceae	Pinus merkusii Jungh & de	Pine tree	2	0	19	2	31	0	52	106
Piperaceae	Vriese Piper aduncum	Spiked pepper	2	1	0	0	0	0	2	5
Poaceae	Bambusa vulgaris Schrad. ex Wendl.	Common bamboo	1	0	0	2	0	0	0	3
	Brachiaria mutica (Forssk.) Stapf	Paragrass	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	2
	Cymbopogon citratus (DC.) Stapf	Lemon grass	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
	Cynodon dactylon (L.)	Bermuda grass	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	3
	Imperata cylindrica (L.)	Cogon grass	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	2

<i>anteus</i> A.Greef & uter ex Hodk. Renvoize		1	0	U	U	U	U	0	1
uter ex Hodk. Renvoize									
Renvoize									
lismenus	Basket grass	0	0	0	1	2	0	3	6
rtellus (L.)									
Beauv.									
spalum	Buffalo grass	2	0	2	0	0	2	0	6
ıjugatum P.J.									
rgius									
lygala niculata L.	Bubble gum plant	1	1	2	2	1	0	0	7
ymatosorus		0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
olopendria									
ırm.fil.)									
.Serm.									
tentilla indica	Mock strawberry	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
ndrews) Th.									
	A.1. I.				-	_		_	
bus	Atherton raspberry	1	1	1	0	0	1	0	4
<i>xinifolius</i> Poir					~		~	~	
ermacose		0	3	0	0	0	0	0	3
la ginella	Spiltomoggog	0	0	0			0	0	•
nariseina	Spikemosses	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	2
Reguy) Spring									
etrum	Night-blooming issmine	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
eturnum I	Tright-bioonning Jasinine	1	U	0	0	0	1	0	2
crothelunteris		0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
lei othetyptei a		0	U	0	0	U	U	1	1
ntana camara	Common lantana	2	2	2	1	1	1	1	10
		-	-	-	•	-	1	•	10
ichytarpheta naicensis (L.)	Blue porter weed	2	2	0	0	0	1	0	5
	Renvoize lismenus tellus (L.) Beauv. spalum ijugatum P.J. rgius lygala niculata L. ymatosorus olopendria urm.fil.) Serm. tentilla indica ndrews) Th. olf bus tentilla indica ndrews) Th. olf bus tentilla indica nariscina Beauv.) Spring strum cturnum L. acrothelypteris ntana camara naicensis (L.) bl	uter ex Hodk. Renvoize lismenus Basket grass tellus (L.) Beauv. spalum Buffalo grass yugatum P.J. rgius lygala Bubble gum plant niculata L. ymatosorus olopendria urm.fil.) Serm. tentilla indica Mock strawberry ndrews) Th. olf bus Atherton raspberry exinifolius Poir. ermacose evis Lam. laginella Spikemosses nariscina Beauv.) Spring strum Night-blooming jasmine cturnum L. acrothelypteris ntana camara Common lantana uchytarpheta Blue porter weed naicensis (L.)	uter ex Hodk. Renvoize lismenus Basket grass 0 tellus (L.) Beauv. spalum Buffalo grass 2 yigatum P.J. rgius lygala Bubble gum plant 1 niculata L. ymatosorus 0 olopendria urm.fil.) Serm. tentilla indica Mock strawberry 0 ndrews) Th. olf bus Atherton raspberry 1 exinifolius Poir. ermacose 0 vis Lam. laginella Spikemosses 0 nariscina Beauv.) Spring strum Night-blooming jasmine 1 cturnum L. acrothelypteris 0 ntana camara Common lantana 2 uchytarpheta Blue porter weed 2 naicensis (L.)	uter ex Hodk. Renvoize lismenus Basket grass 0 0 tellus (L.) Beauv. spalum Buffalo grass 2 0 yiugatum P.J. rgius lygala Bubble gum plant 1 1 niculata L. ymatosorus 0 1 blopendria urm.fil.) Serm. tentilla indica Mock strawberry 0 0 ndrews) Th. olf bus Atherton raspberry 1 1 txinifolius Poir. ermacose 0 3 vis Lam. laginella Spikemosses 0 0 nariscina Beauv.) Spring strum Night-blooming jasmine 1 0 cturnum L. acrothelypteris 0 0 ntana camara Common lantana 2 uchytarpheta Blue porter weed 2 naicensis (L.)	uter ex Hodk. Renvoize lismenus Basket grass 0 0 0 tellus (L.) Beauv. spalum Buffalo grass 2 0 2 ijugatum P.J. rgius lygala Bubble gum plant 1 1 2 niculata L. ymatosorus 0 1 0 olopendria Irm.fil.) Serm. tentilla indica Mock strawberry 0 0 0 odrews) Th. olf bus Atherton raspberry 1 1 0 odrews) Th. olf bus Atherton raspberry 1 1 1 1 ermacose 0 3 0 vis Lam. aginella Spikemosses 0 0 0 nariscina Beauv.) Spring strum Night-blooming jasmine 1 0 0 cturnum L. acrothelypteris 0 0 0 ntana camara Common lantana 2 2 2 achytarpheta Blue porter weed 2 2 0 naicensis (L.)	uter ex Hodk. Renvoize lismenus Basket grass $0 0 0 1$ tellus (L.) Beauv. Buffalo grass $2 0 2 0$ jugatum P.J. rgius lygala Bubble gum plant $1 1 2 2$ niculata L. ymatosorus $0 1 0 0$ lopendria rm.fil.) Serm. tentilla indica Mock strawberry $0 0 0 1$ isserm. tentilla indica Mock strawberry $1 1 1 0$ wiss Atherton raspberry $1 1 1 1 0$ tentinifolius Poir. ermacose $0 3 0 0$ vis Lam. l	uter ex Hodk. Renvoize lismenus Basket grass $0 0 0 1 2$ tellus (L.) Beauv. Seauv. Seauv. Syalum Buffalo grass $2 0 2 0 0$ jugatum P.J. rgius lygala Bubble gum plant $1 1 2 2 1$ niculata L. ymatosorus $0 1 0 0 0$ loopendria urm.fil.) Serm. tentilla indica Mock strawberry $0 0 0 1 0$ ndrews) Th. Serm. tentilla indica Mock strawberry $1 1 1 0 0$ winifolius Poir. ermacose $0 3 0 0 0$ vis Lam. laginella Spikemosses $0 0 0 1 1$ hight-blooming jasmine $1 0 0 0 0$ turnum L. terothelypteris $0 0 0 0 0 0$ ntana camara Common lantana $2 2 2 1 1$	uter ex Hodk. Renvoize lismenus Basket grass $0 0 0 1 2 0$ lellus (L.) seauv. spalum Buffalo grass $2 0 2 0 0 2$ yigatum P.J. rgius lygala Bubble gum plant $1 1 2 2 1 0$ niculata L. ymatosorus $0 1 0 0 0 0$ loopendria rm.fil.) serm. tentilla indica Mock strawberry $0 0 0 1 0 0$ loopendria rm.fil.) serm. tentilla indica Mock strawberry $1 1 1 0 0$ bus Atherton raspberry $1 1 1 0 0$ wis Lam. ermacose $0 3 0 0 0 0$ loginella Spikemosses $0 0 0 1 1 0$ loginella Spikemosses $0 0 0 0 1 1 0$ strum Night-blooming jasmine $1 0 0 0 0 0 1$ tcurrum L. icrothelypteris $0 0 0 0 0 0 0$ ntana camara Common lantana $2 2 2 1 1 1$ luchytarpheta Blue porter weed $2 2 0 0 0 1$	uter ex Hodk. Renvoize lismenus Basket grass 0 0 0 1 2 0 3 tellus (L.) Beauv. spalum Buffalo grass 2 0 2 0 0 2 0 jugatum P.J. rgius lygala Bubble gum plant 1 1 2 2 1 0 0 niculata L. ymatosorus 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 lopendria Irm.fil.) Serm. tentilla indica Mock strawberry 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 odrews) Th. If bus Atherton raspberry 1 1 0 0 1 0 visi Lam. aginella Spikemosses 0 3 0 0 0 0 1 0 ruracicina Beauv.) Spring strum Night-blooming jasmine 1 0 0 0 0 1 0 cturnum L. terothelypteris 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 1 1 Intana camara Common lantana 2 2 2 1 1 1 1 uchytarpheta Blue porter weed 2 2 0 0 0 1 0 naicensis (L.)

Asteraceae species are widespread due to their adaptive traits, including clusters of tiny, pollinatorattracting florets (capitula), self-pollination, and lightweight achenes that are dispersed by wind, supported by a pappus (Bhattacharyya, 2016; Purnomo *et al.*, 2016).

According to Fonseca and Venticinque (2018), the widespread distribution of Asteraceae across diverse environments underscores its exceptional resilience and adaptability, as this family thrives globally in nearly all ecological niches, tolerating variations in temperature, salinity, drought, solar radiation, and wind conditions (Bremer, 1994; Minaeifer *et al.*, 2015; Azizi *et al.*, 2018; Zhang *et al.*, 2021; Asif *et al.*, 2020; Abd E-Fatah *et al.*, 2022).

The study's findings on gymnosperms, particularly *Pinus merkusii* from the Pinaceae family, with the

highest individual count of 106 species, highlight the ecological importance of gymnosperms in these ecosystems. *P. merkusii*, typically found in high plains, also thrives in lowland and harsh soil conditions, which makes it a common choice for reforestation and rehabilitation (Imanuddin *et al.*, 2020). Despite gymnosperms generally exhibiting lower species diversity than angiosperms, *P. merkusii* stands out as a dominant species within the surveyed area.

Pteridophytes, comprising ferns and related plants, displayed moderate family and species diversity in the study area. Notable families among the pteridophytes include Thelypteridaceae, Nephrolepidaceae, Cyatheaceae, and which comprise 30, 29, and 22 individual plant species, of Nephrolepis respectively. The presence bisserata with 15 individuals underscores the ecological suitability of the habitat for pteridophytes. Zuquim (2015) and Dai et al. (2020) suggest that ferns are suitable indicators of environmental conditions due to their diverse adaptive strategies in response to changes in climate and soil factors. The diversity and distribution of ferns across the study sites highlight the complex ecological dynamics in these areas, making them valuable candidates for addressing critical issues in biodiversity assessment, monitoring, and restoration (Alcala et al., 2019; De Los Angeles and Buot, 2012, 2018). In summary, the diverse plant species composition across the surveyed restoration sites in Mt. Kitanglad underscores the complex ecological dynamics of the region, highlighting the critical roles of angiosperms, gymnosperms, and pteridophytes in maintaining ecosystem productivity, resilience, and biodiversity.

Flora diversity analysis

The figure below (Fig. 2) illustrates biodiversity across seven (7) different sites (RA1, RA2, IFTC1, IFTC2, IFTC3, IFTC4, and IFT) using four biodiversity indices: Shannon-Wiener index. Simpson index, Evenness, and Dominance. The Shannon-Wiener index results indicate а transparent gradient of species diversity among the sites, with riparian sites with vegetation (e.g., RA1 and RA2) demonstrating the highest values (3.14 to 3.33), indicating rich biodiversity. According to Fernando (1998), these values fall within the "high" category, indicating that these riparian sites support a diverse range of species, which is consistent with the high species numbers observed in the area. In many ecological studies conducted in the Philippines, H' values typically range from 1.5 to 3.5, with higher values indicating greater species diversity (Batani et al., 2023). Riparian forest plants possess various morphological and physiological adaptations that make them wellsuited to thrive in high-energy, wet environments (Barker et al., 2002; Merritt et al., 2010) and are crucial pathways for the movement of organisms between various landscapes, functioning as dispersal routes for both terrestrial and aquatic species (Ament et al., 2014; Bennett et al., 2014; Tonkin et al., 2018).



Fig. 2. The four (4) diversity indices of the even restoration sites at Mt. Kitanglad, Lirongan, Talakag, Bukidnon, Philippines

102 | Nacion *et al*.

The riparian areas with vegetation (RA1 and RA2) recorded the highest number of species (33 and 34), further supporting the notion of a balanced and healthy ecosystem. The C. calothyrsus is one of the most prominent species in the area. The HFI's restoration approach employs the Associated Climax-Pioneer Species (ACPS) Scheme to promote the reestablishment of Indigenous Forest Trees (IFTs), utilizing C. calothyrsus as a nurse species to develop dense canopy that inhibits cogon grass growth (Binayao III et al., 2021). According to Barral et al. (2017), C. calothyrsus supports the recovery of diverse plant communities and provides habitats for multiple species of flora and fauna. On the other hand, the A. auriculiformis species is also notable in these areas. It is described as a fast-growing tree species used in plantations in Asia and West Africa (Fonton et al., 2002; Tonouéwa et al., 2019). Fast-growing exotic species like A. auriculiformis and other Acacia varieties are widely applied in reforestation programs across degraded tropical and subtropical zones, such as in Southern Benin (Aoudji et al., 2017), Indonesia (Sutomo et al., 2016; Koutika and Richardson, 2019), South China and the Philippines (Lee and Woo, 2012).

This is followed by riparian areas with young IFT and Caribbean pines at four sites (e.g., IFTC1, IFTC2, IFTC3, IFTC4), and riparian areas with IFT only (IFT), ranging from 2.01 to 2.75. These values fall into the category of "low" index values, suggesting the lowest species diversity among the surveyed sites. This means these sites have fewer species or a more uneven distribution, with some species dominating while others are scarce.

The Simpson index estimates the probability that two individuals randomly selected from a sample belong to the same species; thus, a high Simpson index value indicates higher diversity. The graph shows that riparian areas with vegetation have the highest index values of 0.94 and 0.93, indicating that these sites have a relatively balanced species distribution, with no single species dominating the community. This also aligns closely with the findings of the Shannon-Weiner index, which means that the species in the area are relatively diverse and have a considerably even distribution of individuals among species. In contrast, the index values of riparian areas with young IFT and Caribbean Pines (IFTC1, IFTC2, IFTC3, and IFTC4) range from 0.73 to 0.90, while the riparian area with IFT only has the lowest index value of 0.73. This indicates that individuals from the same species are more frequently encountered, suggesting an uneven distribution where certain species predominate. The Simpson diversity index clearly demonstrates variation in species evenness across the sites, with riparian areas (RA1 and RA2) exhibiting the most diverse and balanced ecosystems. In contrast, the IFT area has the lowest species evenness.

The evenness (E') values across the surveyed sites indicate varying levels of species distribution uniformity. The evenness values of the seven sites range from 0.40 to 0.68, indicating notable differences in the uniformity of the species. High evenness values were observed in riparian areas with vegetation and in riparian areas with IFT and Caribbean Pines (IFTC1, IFTC2, and IFTC4), with corresponding evenness figures of 0.68, 0.64, 0.55, and 0.50, respectively. These evenness values are "high," indicating that these sites possess a relatively balanced species composition, of which the likelihood of any single species dominating the area is low. This also suggests a healthy and diverse ecosystem with a well-distributed presence of multiple species (Ulfah et al., 2019). In contrast, IFTC3 (E' = 0.40) and the IFT area (E' = 0.41) fall into the category "moderate" evenness category. These lower E' values suggest that these sites have a more uneven species distribution, where certain species are more prevalent or dominant. This unevenness could indicate competitive advantages for specific species within these areas, potentially due to environmental factors, resource availability, or other ecological pressures that allow certain species to outcompete others.

The data also depicts the Dominance values of the surveyed area. This measures the degree to which a few species dominate the ecosystem, with higher values indicating greater dominance by one or a few species. The provided data below show dominance values ranging from 0.06 to 0.41, indicating varying levels of dominance across the seven sites. The maximum dominance values were observed at 0.40-0.41, respectively, at IFTC3 and IFT, which implies that a small number of species are disproportionately abundant compared to others. P. merkusii, a gymnosperm species, predominantly thrives in riparian areas with young IFT and Caribbean Pines (IFTC3) as well as in riparian areas with IFT only (IFT), further confirming its status as the dominant species in these habitats. This species thrives across diverse natural habitats, ranging from lowlands to highlands, and exhibits strong growth performance at varying elevations. Due to its wide ecological adaptability, this species is commonly utilized as a pioneer plant in reforestation and rehabilitation programs (Imanuddin et al., 2020) as well as for production purposes (Bharali et al., 2012; Susilowati et al., 2016). This dominance of P. merkusii observed suggests a less balanced ecosystem that favors certain species over others. This was followed by the dominance indices at IFTC1, IFTC2, and IFTC4, ranging from 0.15 to 0.27, indicating intermediate levels of species dominance. The lowest dominance values were observed at sites RA1 and RA2, with values of 0.06 and 0.07, respectively. Thus, this low dominance aligns with the high evenness values observed at these sites, signifying a well-balanced ecosystem where no single species has an overwhelming presence.

Integrating these findings, the biodiversity indices across the seven surveyed sites reveal distinct patterns of species diversity, evenness, and dominance. Riparian areas with vegetation exhibit the most balanced and diverse ecosystems. In contrast, areas dominated by IFT exhibit reduced diversity and uneven species distribution, highlighting the ecological variability and dynamics of these restoration sites. According to Stieger and McKenzie (2024), riparian zones are among the most ecologically significant areas for biodiversity. These zones serve as essential interfaces between terrestrial and aquatic ecosystems, providing key ecological services (ES), including pollutant filtration from runoff, flood mitigation, enhancement of fish biodiversity and abundance, and the supply of plant and animal resources that contribute to recreation and well-being (Stieger and McKenzie, 2024). Similarly, Hanna et al. (2018) emphasize that riparian zones rank among the most biologically diverse and productive ecosystems worldwide, facilitating the movement of energy, nutrients, and organisms. The vegetation of these zones is vital for maintaining environmental stability and ecosystem health (Monteiro et al., 2016). Therefore, the findings underscore the critical role of vegetative riparian zones in supporting biodiversity, maintaining balance, and enhancing ecological ecosystem resilience. The higher species diversity and evenness in these areas highlight their ability to provide stable habitats and essential ecological functions. Conversely, the lower diversity and uneven species distribution in IFT-dominated areas suggest habitat limitations that restrict species interactions and overall ecosystem recovery. These findings underscore the importance of restoration strategies that foster vegetation diversity and structural complexity, thereby enhancing ecosystem resilience and functionality.

Conservation status and endemicity

A region's biodiversity is critical to its ecological health and stability. A survey assessed the conservation status of 352 individual plants within the seven areas. This report categorized these species according to the International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN) Red List criteria: Least Concern, Nearly Threatened, Threatened, Vulnerable, and Endangered. The findings provided valuable insights into the state of biodiversity of the restoration areas.

The Table 4 presents the number of species by conservation status for each sampling site. Among the 79 species surveyed, 74 were categorized as Least Concern. This group represents most of the species assessed, indicating that they currently face no immediate threat to their populations. The survey identified two species classified as Endangered: Diplazium costulisorum and Sphaeropteris glauca. The D. costulisorum was predominantly observed in riparian areas with vegetation (RA1 and RA2), whereas S. glauca was distributed across multiple sites, including riparian areas with vegetation, areas with Caribbean pines and IFT, and sites with IFT only. Both species are classified as pteridophytes and belong to the fern group. The presence of ferns reflects a forest ecosystem's ability to sustain diverse organisms while playing a crucial role in maintaining soil moisture, facilitating ecological succession as pioneer species, supporting food chain dynamics as primary producers, and contributing to soil nutrient enrichment (Fauziah et al., 2022; Majid et al., 2022; Pradipta et al., 2020). Additionally, they hold potential for use in medicine, food production, and ornamental horticulture (Mowata et al., 2020). Moreover, ferns are adaptable plants that can grow in diverse habitats, including terrestrial environments, aquatic ecosystems, and as epiphytes clinging to trees or rocks (Wardiah et al., 2019). The survey also identified one species, Syzygium crassipes,

categorized as Near Threatened. This species was found exclusively in the IFT2 area, indicating a limited distribution range.

The classification of this species highlights the importance of preserving its habitat to prevent further decline and potential reclassification into a higher threat category. P. merkusii was classified as Vulnerable, which is found in several areas: RA1, IFTC1, IFTC2, IFTC3, and IFT. The primary reasons for the decline in population size and likely include distribution logging, habitat conversion to agricultural land, timber extraction, clear-cutting, and frequent forest fires (FAO, 2010; Periera et al., 2015). Considering the ongoing threats and declining population, this species has been classified as Vulnerable on the IUCN Red List (Farjon, 2013). The broad distribution of this species indicates a need for comprehensive conservation measures to safeguard its population, including habitat protection and restoration initiatives.

Table 4. Conservation status and endemicity of each plant species in Mt. Kitanglad, Lirongan, Talakag, Bukidnon

Family Araliaceae Asteraceae	Scientific name		Endemicity				
	-	DAO	IUCN	Others	Ν	Ι	NA
		2017-11					
Araliaceae	Aralia spinosa L.	_	LC	-	-	-	\checkmark
	Heptapleurum sp.	-	-	-	\checkmark	-	-
Asteraceae	Acmella uliginosa Sw.	-	LC	-	-	-	\checkmark
	Ageratum conyzoides L	-	-	Secure/NT	-	-	\checkmark
	0 0			(Nature serve/AERP)			
	Bidens pilosa L.	-	-	NT(AERP)	-	-	\checkmark
	Crassocephalum crepidioides	-	-	NT(AERP)	-	\checkmark	-
	Benth.						
	Elephantopus mollis Kunth	-	-	NT(AERP)	-	-	\checkmark
	Galinsoga parviflora L.	-	-	NT(AERP)	-	-	\checkmark
	Mikania micrantha Kunth	-	LC	NT	-	-	\checkmark
				(AERP)			
	Tithonia diversifolia (Hemsley)	-	-	NT	-	-	\checkmark
	A. Gray			(AERP)			
Athyriaceae	Diplazium costulisorum	EN	-	-	\checkmark	-	-
-	(Copel) C. Chr.						
Balsaminaceae	Impatiens platypetala DC.	-	-	NT	\checkmark	-	-
				(AERP)			
Bignoniaceae	Spathodea campanulata P.	-	LC	-	-	-	\checkmark
	Beauv.						
Blechnaceae	<i>Blechnopsis</i> sp.	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Telmatoblechnum serrulatum	-	-	-	\checkmark	-	-
	(Rich.) Perrie, D.J. Ohlsen &						
	Brownsey						
Caryophyllaceae	Drymaria cordata (L.) Willd ex		-	NT	-	-	\checkmark
	Roem. & Schult.			(AERP)			

Cyperaceae Cares sp	Cyatheaceae	<i>Sphaeropteris glauca</i> (Wall.) Copel.	EN (as Cyathea contaminans)	LC		\checkmark	-	-
Scierio terrestris L -	Cyperaceae	Carex sp. <i>Cyperus brevifolius</i> Rottb.	-	- LC (synonym Kallinga brevifolia)	-	√ √	-	-
		Scirpus sp. Scleria terrestris L.	-	-	- NT	✓ ✓	-	-
International in minimum of the second se	Davalliacaaa	Davallia trichomanoidas Sw	_	_	(AERP)		_	_
Dryopteridaceae Dryopteris pseudoceanopteris (Kunze) Li Bing Zhang - </td <td>Dennstaedtiaceae</td> <td>Pteridium aquilinum (L.) Khun</td> <td></td> <td>LC</td> <td>_</td> <td>, ,</td> <td>_</td> <td>_</td>	Dennstaedtiaceae	Pteridium aquilinum (L.) Khun		LC	_	, ,	_	_
Interest Listing Lange IC NT V - - Fabaccae Macarranga tanarius (L) Müll, - LC -	Dryopteridaceae	Dryopteris pseudocaenopteris	-	-	-	✓	-	-
Arg. (AERP) Fabaceae Acacia auriculformis A. Cunn. - LC - -	Euphorbiaceae	(Kunze) Li Bing Zhang Macaranga tanarius (L) Müll.	-	LC	NT	\checkmark	-	-
Fabaceae Acacia auriculiformis A. Cunn, - LC - <td></td> <td>Arg.</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>(AERP)</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>		Arg.			(AERP)			
Aeschynomene americana L. - NT - NT - - (AERP) Arachis pintoi Krapov. & W.C. - - NT - - (AERP) Calliandra calothyrsus Meisn. - - ILC -	Fabaceae	<i>Acacia auriculiformis</i> A. Cunn. Ex Benth	-	LC	-	-	-	~
$\begin{tabular}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$		Aeschynomene americana L.	-	-	NT	-	-	\checkmark
		Arachis pintoi Krapov. & W.C.	-	-	(AERP) NT	-	\checkmark	-
$\begin{tabular}{l lllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllll$		Greg			(AERP)			
Desmodium canescens (L.) DC. -		Calliandra calothyrsus Meisn.	-	-	LC (insturalist)	-	-	\checkmark
Premingia macrophylla (Willa)-NT×Mert.(AERP)-CGliricidia sepium (Jacq.) WalpLCMinosa diplotrica C. Wright exNTMinosa diplotrica C. Wright exNT </td <td></td> <td>Desmodium canescens (L.) DC</td> <td>_</td> <td>_</td> <td>(inaturalist)</td> <td>-</td> <td>_</td> <td>1</td>		Desmodium canescens (L.) DC	_	_	(inaturalist)	-	_	1
$\begin{tabular}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$		Flemingia macrophylla (Willd.)	-	-	NT	\checkmark	-	-
Gardenda sepulm (Jacq.) Wap, Indigofera spicata Forssk, Mimosa diplotrica C. Wright ex Sauvelle Pitericarpus indicus Wild, CEIC NT (AERP)- -V /Gentianaceae Gentiana asclepiadea L. KuntzeNT <td></td> <td>Merr.</td> <td></td> <td>10</td> <td>(AERP)</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>		Merr.		10	(AERP)			
Indugged a Splituit Poisse. - - NT - - / Minosa diplotrica C. Wright ex - - NT - - / Sauvelle Prericarpus indicus Wild. CE EN - / / Prericarpus indicus Wild. CE EN - / / / Hypoxidaceae Curculigo capitulata (Lour.) - - NT / - / Hypoxidaceae Curcosmi a crocosmifilora - NT / - / / Iridaceae Hyptis capitata Jacq. - NT - - / / Lamiaceae Hyptis capitata Jacq. - - NT - - / Lythraceae Cuphea carthagenensis (Jacq.) - - NT / - - / Malvaceae Sida rhombifolia L. - IC - - / / Melastomataceae Heastoma sanguineum Sims - LC - / - - Myrtaceae		Guriciala sepilam (Jacq.) Walp.	-	IC	- NT	-	-	Ý
$\begin{tabular}{l lllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllll$		maigojera spicata Porssk.	-	-	(AERP)	-	-	v
Ptericarpus indicus Willd. CE EN - / - NT / Gentianaceae Gentiana asclepiadea L NT / - NT / Hypoxidaceae Carculigo capitulata (Lour.) - NT / - NT / NT / / Kuntze (AERP) Iridaceae Crocosmia x crocosmiiflora / NT NT - / - NT / (AERP) Lamiaceae Hyptis capitata Jacq NT NT - / - / (AERP) Lamiaceae Hyptis capitata Jacq NT - / NT - / - / / Lythraceae Cuphea carthagenensis (Jacq.) NT - / (AERP) Lythraceae Sida rhombifolia L NT / - / - NT / - / - / Melastomataceae Melastoma sanguineum Sims - LC - / NT / - / - / Moraceae Ficus heteropleura Blume - NT - / NT / - / - / Myrtaceae Musa sp NT - / / - / Nyrtaceae Syzygium crassipes Gaertn., NT - / / - / Nephrolepidaceae Nephrolepis biserrata (Sw.) - Secure / / Hovenkamp & Miyam Orchidaceae Spathoglottis plicata Blume - NT / / - / - / Nephrolepidaceae Nephrolepis biserrata (Sw.) - Secure / / Hovenkamp & Miyam Orchidaceae Pinus merkusii Jungh & de VU VU - / / - / / Pinaceae Pinus merkusii Jungh & de VU VU - / / - / / Pinaceae Piper aduncum L LC - / / / - / / Pinaceae Piper aduncum L LC - / / - / / - / / Pinaceae Piper aduncum L LC - / / / - / / Pinaceae Piper aduncum L / LC - / / / - / / Pinaceae Piper aduncum L / / - / / / - / / / - / / Pinaceae Piper aduncum L / / - / / - / / / - / / / - / / Pinaceae Piper aduncum L / / - / / - / / - / / - / / / - / / / - / / - / / - / / / - / / / / - / / / / - / / - / / / / - /		<i>Mimosa diplotrica</i> C. Wright ex	-	-	NT (AFRP)	-	-	4
Gentianaceae Gentiana asclepiadea L - - NT - - Hypoxidaceae Curculigo capitulata (Lour.) - - NT - - Hypoxidaceae Curculigo capitulata (Lour.) - - NT - - - Hypoxidaceae Curculigo capitulata (Lour.) - - NT -		Ptericarnus indicus Willd	CE	EN	(AERI) -	\checkmark	_	_
HypoxidaceaeCurculigo capitulata (Lour.) KuntzeNT \checkmark IridaceaeCurcosmia x crocosmiiflora (Lemoine) N.E.Br. Lamiaceae-NT \checkmark \checkmark IridaceaeHyptis capitata JacqNT \checkmark \checkmark ItythraceaeCuphea carthagenensis (Jacq.) J.F.MachrNT- \checkmark \checkmark -MalvaceaeSida rhombifolia L. Urena lobata LIC \checkmark \checkmark -MoraceaeFicus heteropleura Blume Schott-IC \checkmark <	Gentianaceae	Gentiana asclepiadea L.	-	-	NT	√	_	_
Hypoxidaceae Curculigo capitulata (Lour.) NT - (AERP) Kuntze (AERP) Iridaceae Crocosmia x crocosmiiflora - NT × (AERP) Lamiaceae Hyptis capitata Jacq NT × (AERP) Lamiaceae Hyptis capitata Jacq NT × (AERP) Lythraceae Cuphea carthagenensis (Jacq.) NT - × J.F.Macbr. (AERP) Malvaceae Sida rhombifolia L IC × - × (AERP) Urena lobata L IC × - × Moraceae Melastoma sanguineum Sims - IC - NT - × Musaceae Musa sp NT - × Myrtaceae Syzygium crassipes Gaertn., NT - × NT - × NT - × Myrtaceae Syzygium crassipes Gaertn., NT × Nephrolepib biservata (Sw.) Secure - × Nephrolepib sitervati (Desv.) NT × Hovenkamp & Miyam Orchidaceae Pinus merkusii Jungh & de VU VU - × Musaceae Pinus merkusii Jungh & de VU VU - × NT - × × NT - × × Pinaceae Pinus merkusii Jungh & de VU VU - × Wendl. (AERP) Pinaceae Piner aduncum L IC × - × Wendl. (AERP) Pinaceae Piner aduncum L VU - × NT - × × - × NT - × × - × NT - × × NT - × × NT - × × × NT - × × × NT - × × - × NT - × × × × × × NT - × × × × × × × × - × × - × × - ×	Contrainaceae				(AERP)			
Kunde(AERP)IridaceaeCrocosmia x crocosmiiflora-NT×(Lemoine) N.E.Br.(AERP)-NT×LamiaceaeHyptis capitata JacqNT×LythraceaeCuphea carthagenensis (Jacq.)NT×J.F. Macbr.(AERP)NT×MalvaceaeSida rhombifolia LIC×MelastomataceaeMelastoma sanguineum Sims-IC×MusaceaeMusa spNTMusaceaeMusa spMyrtaceaeSyzygium crassipes Gaertn., nom. cons.NT<	Hypoxidaceae	Curculigo capitulata (Lour.)	-	-	NT	\checkmark	-	-
(Lemoine) N.E.Br.(AERP)LamiaceaeHyptis capitata JacqNTLythraceaeCuphea carthagenensis (Jacq.)NTLythraceaeSida rhombifolia LNTMalvaceaeSida rhombifolia LNT	Iridaceae	Crocosmia x crocosmiiflora		-	(AERP) NT	-	-	\checkmark
Lamiaceae Hyptis capitata Jacq NT - NT NT (AERP) Lythraceae Cuphea carthagenensis (Jacq.) NT - (AERP) Malvaceae Sida rhombifolia L NT - NT (AERP) Urena lobata L LC (AERP) Urena lobata L LC		(Lemoine) N.E.Br.			(AERP)			
Lythraceae Cuphea carthagenensis (Jacq.) NT - V - J.F.Macbr. Malvaceae Sida rhombifolia L NT - V Urena lobata L IC V Melastomataceae Melastoma sanguineum Sims - IC - V Melastomataceae Melastoma sanguineum Sims - IC - V Musaceae Musa sp IC - V Myrtaceae Syzygium crassipes Gaertn., NT - V nom. cons. Nephrolepidaceae Nephrolepis biserrata (Sw.) Secure V Hovenkamp & Miyam Orchidaceae Spathoglottis plicata Blume NT V V Hovenkamp & Miyam Orchidaceae Pinus merkusii Jungh & de VU VU - VI - V Pinaceae Pinus merkusii Jungh & de VU VU - VI - V Nephrolepis schrad. ex - IC - V - V Musaceae Nusa sp V Myrtaceae Spathoglottis plicata Blume NT V Musaceae Nitre serve) Nephrolepis brownii (Desv.) V Hovenkamp & Miyam Orchidaceae Pinus merkusii Jungh & de VU VU - VI - V Pinaceae Pinus merkusii Jungh & de VU VU - VI - V Nephrolepis schrad. ex Piperaceae Piper aduncum L IC V - V Wendl. Brachiaria mutica (Forssk.) Stapf (AERP)	Lamiaceae	Hyptis capitata Jacq.	-	-	NT (AERP)	-	-	~
J.F. Macbr. (AERP) Malvaceae Sida rhombifolia L. - - NT ✓ - - Malvaceae Sida rhombifolia L. - - NT ✓ - - Welastomataceae Melastoma sanguineum Sims - LC - ✓ - - ✓ Moraceae Ficus heteropleura Blume - LC - ✓ - <t< td=""><td>Lythraceae</td><td>Cuphea carthagenensis (Jacq.)</td><td>-</td><td>-</td><td>NT</td><td>-</td><td>\checkmark</td><td>-</td></t<>	Lythraceae	Cuphea carthagenensis (Jacq.)	-	-	NT	-	\checkmark	-
MalvaceaeSida rhombifolia LNT✓NT✓(AERP)Urena lobata LI.CI.C-✓-✓✓✓		J.F.Macbr.			(AERP)			
Urena lobata LLCMelastoma sanguineum Sims-LCMoraceaeFicus heteropleura BlumeNTMusaceaeMusa spMyrtaceaeSyzygium crassipes Gaertn., nom. cons.NTNephrolepidaceaeNephrolepis biserrata (Sw.)Secure <td>Malvaceae</td> <td>Sida rhombifolia L.</td> <td>-</td> <td>-</td> <td>NT (AFRP)</td> <td>\checkmark</td> <td>-</td> <td>-</td>	Malvaceae	Sida rhombifolia L.	-	-	NT (AFRP)	\checkmark	-	-
MelastomataceaeMelastoma sanguineum Sims Ficus heteropleura BlumeIC-×MoraceaeFicus heteropleura BlumeNT×MusaceaeMusa sp(AERP)MyrtaceaeSyzygium crassipes Gaertn., nom. cons.NTNephrolepidaceaeNephrolepis biserrata (Sw.)Secure×Nephrolepib daceaeNephrolepis biserrata (Sw.)Secure×Nephrolepis brownii (Desv.)NT×Hovenkamp & MiyamNT×OrchidaceaeSpathoglottis plicata BlumeNT×PinaceaePinus merkusii Jungh & deVUVU-×VrieseICPoaceaeBambusa vulgaris Schrad. exSecure/NTBrachiaria mutica (Forssk.)LC </td <td></td> <td>Urena lobata L.</td> <td>_</td> <td>LC</td> <td>-</td> <td>-</td> <td>_</td> <td>\checkmark</td>		Urena lobata L.	_	LC	-	-	_	\checkmark
MoraceaeFicus heteropleura BlumeNT×MusaceaeMusa sp×MyrtaceaeSyzygium crassipes Gaertn., nom. cons.NT×Nephrolepis biserrata (Sw.)Secure×Nephrolepis biserrata (Sw.)Secure×Nephrolepis brownii (Desv.)×Hovenkamp & MiyamNT×OrchidaceaeSpathoglottis plicata BlumeNT×PinaceaePinus merkusii Jungh & deVUVU-×PiperaceaePiper aduncum LLC××PoaceaeBambusa vulgaris Schrad. exSecure/NT-××Brachiaria mutica (Forssk.)LC×××StapfNT-×-×StapfNT-×-StapfNT-× <td>Melastomataceae</td> <td>Melastoma sanguineum Sims</td> <td>-</td> <td>LC</td> <td>-</td> <td>\checkmark</td> <td>-</td> <td>-</td>	Melastomataceae	Melastoma sanguineum Sims	-	LC	-	\checkmark	-	-
MusaceaeMusa sp	Moraceae	Ficus heteropleura Blume	-	-	NT	\checkmark	-	-
MusaceaeMusa sp					(AERP)			
Myrtaceae Syzygium crassipes Gaertn., nom. cons. NT - × - <	Musaceae	Musa sp.	-	-	-	\checkmark	-	-
Nephrolepidaceae Nephrolepis biserrata (Sw.) - - Secure - - (Nature serve) Nephrolepis brownii (Desv.) - - - (Nature serve) -	Myrtaceae	<i>Syzygium crassipes</i> Gaertn., nom. cons.		NT	-	~	-	-
Nephrolepis brownii (Desv.) -	Nephrolepidaceae	Nephrolepis biserrata (Sw.) Schott	-	-	Secure	\checkmark	-	-
Hovenkamp & MiyamOrchidaceaeSpathoglottis plicata BlumeNT(AERP)PinaceaePinus merkusii Jungh & deVUVUVriesePiperaceaePiper aduncum LLCPoaceaeBambusa vulgaris Schrad. exSecure/NT-Brachiaria mutica (Forssk.)LCBrachiaria mutica (Forssk.)LCStapfNT-StapfNT-KapfStapf		Nephrolepis brownii (Desv.)	-	-	-	\checkmark	-	-
Orchidaceae Spathoglottis plicata Blume - - NT - - (AERP) Pinaceae Pinus merkusii Jungh & de VU VU VU -	0 111	Hovenkamp & Miyam			2			
PinaceaePinus merkusii Jungh & deVUVUVriesePiper aduncum LLCPoaceaeBambusa vulgaris Schrad. exSecure/NTWendl.(NatureServe/AERP)Brachiaria mutica (Forssk.)LCStapfCymbopogon citratus (DC.)NTStapf(AERP)NT	Orchidaceae	Spathoglottis plicata Blume	-	-	NT (AERP)	\checkmark	-	-
Piperaceae Piper aduncum L LC · · · Poaceae Bambusa vulgaris Schrad. ex Secure/NT · · Wendl. (NatureServe/AERP) Brachiaria mutica (Forssk.) LC · · · · Stapf Cymbopogon citratus (DC.) - · NT - · · Stapf	Pinaceae	<i>Pinus merkusii</i> Jungh & de Vriese	VU	VU	-	~	-	-
Poaceae Bambusa vulgaris Schrad. ex Secure/NT Wendl. (NatureServe/AERP) Brachiaria mutica (Forssk.) LC Stapf Cymbopogon citratus (DC.) - NT Stapf	Piperaceae	Piper aduncum L.	_	LC	_	_	-	\checkmark
Wendl. (NatureServe/AERP) Brachiaria mutica (Forssk.) LC ~ Stapf Cymbopogon citratus (DC.) NT - ~ - Stapf (AERP)	Poaceae	Bambusa vulgaris Schrad. ex	-	-	Secure/NT	-	-	·
Brachiaria mutica (Forssk.)LCStapfCymbopogon citratus (DC.)NTStapf(AERP)		Wendl.			(NatureServe/AERP)			
Cymbopogon citratus (DC.) NT Stapf (AERP)		<i>Brachiaria mutica</i> (Forssk.) Stapf		LC	-	-	-	\checkmark
		Cymbopogon citratus (DC.) Stapf	-	-	NT (AERP)	-	~	-

	Cynodon dactylon (L.) Pers.	-	-	NT	\checkmark	-	-
	$\mathbf{L}_{\mathbf{r}}$			(AERP)			
	Imperata cylinarica (L.)	-	-	N I (AEDD)	\checkmark	-	-
	P.Beauv.			(AERP)			
	Miscantnus x giganteus	-	-	NE (DRAF)	\checkmark	-	-
	J.M.Greef & Deuter ex Hodk. &			(PFAF)			
	Renvoize						
	Oplismenus hirtellus (L.)	-	-	NT	\checkmark	-	-
	P.Beauv.			(AERP)			
	Paspalum conjugatum P.J.	-	LC	-	-	-	\checkmark
	Bergius						
Polygalaceae	Polygala paniculata L.	-	LC	-	-	-	~
Polypodiaceae	Phymatosorus scolopendria	-	-	-	\checkmark	-	-
• •	(Burm.fil.) Pic.Serm.						
Rosaceae	Potentilla indica (Andrews) Th.	-	LC	-	\checkmark	-	-
	Wolf						
	Rubus fraxinifolius Poir.	-	LC	-	\checkmark	-	-
Rubiaceae	Spermacose laevis Lam.	-	LC	-	-	-	~
Selaginellaceae	Selaainella tamariscina	EN	_	_	~	-	-
	(P Beauv) Spring						
Solanaceae	Cestrum nocturnum L	_	LC	-	_	\checkmark	_
Thelynteridaceae	Macrothelunteris sp	_	-	_	1	_	_
Verbenaceae	I antana camara I	_	_	NT		_	./
ver Denaceae	Lanana cumara L.	-	-	(AEDD)	-	-	۷
	Stachutamhata jamajaansis (I)		IC	(ALKE)			,
	Vahl	-	LC	-	-	-	v

Notes: Scientific names are arranged by families and are classified based on status occurrence (Native= N, Introduced= I, Naturalized= NA), conservation status (LC- Least Concern; En- Endangered; Vu - Vulnerable; NE- Not Evaluated) based on the IUCN (2023) and the DENR-DAO 2017-11 (DENR 2019). Others denote the conservation status of each species based on other online classifications (AERP-Angiosperm Extinction Risk Prediction v1, iNaturalist, NatureServe).

Lastly, Ptericarpus indicus and Selaginella tamariscina, are two species identified as Endangered and found in areas IFCTC4, IFTC2, and IFTC3 (Fig. 3). The classification of these species reflects their critical status, which has a significant risk of extinction in the wild. P. indicus, commonly known as Narra, is classified as "Endangered" by the International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN, 2023) due to excessive harvesting and illegal logging and is designated as "Critically Endangered" in the Philippines according to the Philippine National Red List for Plants (DENR, 2017), prompting the implementation of various government and nongovernment programs aimed at addressing forest degradation, protecting key biodiversity species, and promoting sustainable livelihoods within communities (Posa et al., 2008; Von Kleist et al., 2021). These species' limited distribution and

specialized habitat needs require urgent conservation measures, including habitat protection, regulatory enforcement, and potentially ex-situ conservation.

The survey across the seven sites showcased a diverse range of plant life in the Table 4. Of the 79 species, 42 were identified as native, eight were introduced, and 29 were naturalized. The presence of these species underscores the region's rich biodiversity. They play critical roles in maintaining ecological balance, providing food and habitat for other organisms, and supporting the ecosystem's overall health; thus, their presence underscores the importance of protecting these areas to preserve the natural heritage and ensure the sustainability of the local biodiversity. Introduced and naturalized species may pose a danger to native species. There is a need to monitor and manage these species to mitigate any adverse impacts they may have on native species.



Fig. 3. Identified (a) Endangered, (b) Nearly Threatened, (c) Vulnerable, (d) Critically endangered, and (e) Endangered species in the seven restorations: a *Diplazium costulisirum & Sphaeropteris glauca*, b-*Syzygium crassipes*, c- *Pinus merkusii*, d-*Ptericarpus indicus*, e- *Selaginella tamariscinas*ites

However, alien species are being recorded in the area, such as *Mikania micrantha, Ageratum conyzoides, and Elephantopus mollis*, of which these species under the family Asteraces have also been documented to be invasive in the Northern and Southern American forest (UNEP, 2013). Asteraceae has been identified as an invasive alien plant family in China, posing significant threats to the diversity of native species and the stability of the ecosystem (Yang *et al.*, 2023). Similarly, in North Sumatra, this family is prominently represented among Invasive Alien Plant Species (IAP), with *Ageratum conyzoides* and *Chromolaena odorata* being particularly aggressive invaders (Huda *et al.*, 2022).

Assessing the conservation status of species and identifying native, introduced, and naturalized

plants across the surveyed sites highlights the urgency of implementing targeted conservation measures.

Conclusion

The survey of seven restoration sites in Mt. Kitanglad revealed substantial plant diversity, with 532 individual plant species, dominated by angiosperms in the Fabaceae, Asteraceae, and Poaceae families, underscoring their ecological importance and roles. The highest species diversity and even distribution were observed in riparian zones RA1 and RA2, indicated by high Shannon-Weiner and Simpson indices, suggesting resilient and balanced ecosystems. In contrast, IFTC and IFT sites exhibited lower diversity and greater species dominance, likely due to environmental pressures that favored specific species. The conservation assessment identified several threatened species, such as Syszygium crassipes and vulnerable P. merkusii, underscoring the need for targeted conservation efforts. Additionally, introduced species like M. micrantha, A. conyzoides, and E. mollis pose a risk to native flora, highlighting the importance of ongoing monitoring.

Recommendations

Further ecological studies and long-term biodiversity monitoring

Long-term biodiversity monitoring should be conducted to assess species regeneration and ecosystem changes over time. Research on soil composition, water availability, and climate factors will help improve restoration strategies. Additionally, studies on the ecological impact of invasive species can guide management efforts to prevent biodiversity loss.

$Conservation \ of \ endangered \ species$

Endangered species such as *Pterocarpus indicus* and *Selaginella tamariscina* require immediate conservation efforts. To prevent further population decline, habitat restoration, seed banking, and strict enforcement of policies against deforestation and land conversion should be implemented.

Community engagement and participation

Local communities' involvement in conservation initiatives is crucial. The community should participate in reforestation programs, biodiversity monitoring, and sustainable livelihood projects such as ecotourism and agroforestry. Establishing native tree nurseries can also provide a sustainable source of planting materials for restoration efforts. Encouraging participation through citizen science initiatives can empower residents to monitor plant species, report sightings of endangered flora, and track invasive species.

Reforestation and habitat restoration

Restoration programs should focus on planting native species, especially nitrogen-fixing plants like those in Fabaceae family, to enhance soil fertility to enhance soil fertility. Strengthening fire prevention measures and rehabilitating degraded riparian areas will further support ecosystem stability and species diversity.

Policy strengthening and institutional support

Government agencies, non-government organizations (NGOs), and research institutions should collaborate in developing stronger conservation policies. Securing financial support and establishing stricter legal protections for critical habitats will ensure sustainable forest restoration and biodiversity conservation efforts.

Environmental education and ecotourism

Promoting environmental education and ecotourism will increase awareness and encourage local participation in conservation. Organizing guided nature walks, workshops, and community-led biodiversity monitoring can foster a sense of responsibility toward protecting natural resources.

Invasive species management

Regular monitoring and removal programs should control the spread of invasive species such as *Mikania micrantha, Ageratum conyzoides,* and *Elephantupos mollis.* Replanting native species in affected areas can help restore ecological balance and protect native biodiversity from further threats.

Acknowledgements

The first author would like to thank the Department of Science and Technology - Accelerated Science and Technology Human Resource Development Program (DOST-ASTHRDP), Philippines, for the graduate research grant. Special thanks to her adviser for guidance, mentorship, and encouragement during the crucial stages of the research. To the Hineleban Foundation Incorporated (HFI) also, for allowing the researcher to conduct the study in their restoration area. Finally, the author is grateful for the support of family, friends, and colleagues, whose encouragement and patience provided the motivation and focus necessary to complete this work. Above all, the author wishes to express heartfelt gratitude to the almighty God, whose guidance, strength, and wisdom have been a constant source of inspiration and resilience throughout this research journey. This study is a testament to the collective efforts and contributions of all those acknowledged here.

References

[DENR] Department of Environment and Natural Resources. 2017. DAO 2017-11. https://www.philippineplants.org/dao-2017-11.pdf

[FAO] Food and Agriculture Organization. 2010. Global forest resources assessment. Main report. Forestry Paper 163. FAO, Rome, Italy.

[FMB] Forest Management Bureau -Department of Environment and Natural Resources. 2022. Philippine forests at a glance 2022 edition. Quezon City, Philippines.

Abd Elnaser T, Elkhiat YI, El-Azizi HM, Fatah E, Abd M, Elshibany AM, GamalEl Din SF. 2022. A cross-sectional study of the genital duct and renal anomalies in Egyptian cases of congenital absence of the vas deferens. Human Fertility **25**(4), 738–744.

Alcala AA, Delos Angeles M, Buot Jr IE. 2019. Fern species diversity across various land-use types of Mt. Makiling, Luzon Island, Philippines. Biodiversitas **20**(9), 2437–2445.

https://doi.org/10.13057/biodiv/d200902

Alexander S, Aronson J, Whaley O, Lamb D. 2016. The relationship between ecological restoration and the ecosystem services concept. Ecology and Society **21**.

Ament R, Callahan R, McClure M, Reuling M, Tabor G. 2014. Wildlife connectivity: Fundamentals for conservation action. Center for Large Landscape Conserv., Bozeman, Montana. https://doi.org/10.13140/RG.2.1.3958.0561

Amoroso V, Laraga S, Calzada B. 2011. Diversity and assessments of plants in Mt. Kitanglad Range Natural Park, Bukidnon, Southern Philippines. Garden's Bulletin Singapore **63**(1–2), 219–236.

Angima S, Stott DE, O'Neill MK, Ong CK, Weesies GA. 2002. Use of Calliandra–Napier grass contour hedges to control erosion in central Kenya. Agriculture, Ecosystems, and Environment 91(1–3), 15–23.

https://doi.org/10.1016/S0167-8809(01)00268-7

Aoudji AKN, Séhouéto C, Adégbidi A, Kaki RS, Ganglo JC. 2017. Production of *Acacia auriculiformis* A. Cunn. ex Benth. for reforestation in southern Benin. Reforesta **4**, 1–11.

https://doi.org/10.21750/REFOR.4.01.40

Asif M, Iqbal Z, Alam J, Majid A, Ijaz F, Ali N, Rahman IU, Hussain S, Khan A, Qadir G. 2020. Floristic inventory and biological spectra of Balakot, District Mansehra, Pakistan. Acta Ecologica Sinica **40**(3), 197–203.

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chnaes.2019.05.009

Azizi H, Sheidai M, Mozaffarian V, Noormohammadi Z. 2018. Genetic and morphological diversity in *Tragopogon graminifolius* DC. (Asteraceae) in Iran. Cytology and Genetics **52**, 75–79. https://doi.org/10.3103/S0095452718010024

Barker JR, Ringold PL, Ballman M. 2002. Patterns of tree dominance in coniferous riparian forests. Forest Ecology and Management **166**(1–3), 311–329.

https://doi.org/10.1016/s0378-1127(01)00683-1

Barral MP, Rey Benayas JM, Meli P, Maceira NO. 2015. Quantifying the impacts of ecological restoration on biodiversity and ecosystem services in agroecosystems: A global meta-analysis. Agriculture, Ecosystems and Environment **202**, 223–231.

Barral MP, Velarde SJ, Agasen EB. 2017. Effects of *Calliandra calothyrsus* on vegetation recovery in Mt. Kitanglad, Bukidnon, Philippines. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences **109**(2), 35–44.

Batani RS, Basbas AV Jr, Loncio RS, Napaldet JT. 2023. Floral diversity in a secondary forest managed by indigenous community: The case of Mt. Kili-kili in Benguet, Cordillera Central Range, Northern Philippines. Biodiversity **24**, 212–230. https://doi.org/10.1080/14888386.2023.2257190

Beech E, Rivers M, Oldfield S, Mith PP. 2017. Global tree search: The first complete global database of tree species and country distributions. Journal of Sustainable Forestry **36**(5), 454–489. https://doi.org/10.1080/10549811.2017.1310049

Bennett AF, Nimmo DG, Radford JQ. 2014. Riparian vegetation has disproportionate benefits for landscape-scale conservation of woodland birds in highly modified environments. Journal of Applied Ecology **51**(2), 514–523.

https://doi.org/10.1111/1365-2664.12200

Bharali S, Deka J, Saikia P, Khan ML, Paul A, Tripathi OP, Singha LB, Shanker U. 2012. *Pinus merkusii* Jungh et de Vries a vulnerable gymnosperm needs conservation. NeBio **3**, 94–95.

Bhattacharyya B. 2016. Botani sistematik. 2nd edition. Jakarta: Penerbit Buku Kedokteran EGC.

Binayao NKD III, de Luna CC, Limpiada AA. 2021. Evaluating the rehabilitation potential of *Calliandra (Calliandra calothyrsus* Meissn.) in degraded areas through landscape function analysis in Manolo Fortich, Bukidnon, Philippines. In: Natural Resource Governance in Asia, 39–54. Elsevier.

Biodiversity Management Bureau (BMB). 2016. Status of the Philippine biodiversity. BMB Official Website. http://bmb.gov.ph/388-protectionand-conservation-of-wildlife/facts-and-figures/786status-of-the-philippine-biodiversity

Brancalion PHS, Niamir A, Broadbent E, Crouzeilles R, Barros FSM, Almeyda Zambrano AM, Baccini A, Aronson J, Goetz S, Reid JL, Bernardo BN. 2019. Global restoration opportunities in tropical rainforest landscapes. Science Advances 5(7), eaav3223.

Bremer K. 1994. Asteraceae: Cladistics and Classification. Timber Press, Portland. https://doi.org/10.5860/choice.31-6037

Canoy MEL, Suminguit VJ. 2001. The indigenous peoples of Mt. Kitanglad Range Natural Park. Retrieved from http://www.socialwatch.org/sites/default/files/pdf/e n/articlef2001_phi.pdf

Chen S, Wang W, Xu W, Wang Y, Wan H, Chen D, Tang Z, Tang X, Zhou G, Xie Z, Zhou D, Shamgguan Z, Huang J, He JS, Wang Y, Sheng J, Tang L, Li X, Dong M, Wu Y, Wang Q, Wang Z, Wu J, Chaplin FS, Bai Y. 2018. Plant diversity enhances productivity and soil carbon storage. PNAS 115(16), 4027–4403. **Crossman ND, Bryan BA.** 2009. Identifying cost-effective hotspots for restoring natural capital and enhancing landscape multifunctionality. Ecological Economics **68**, 654–668.

Delos Angeles M, Buot IE Jr. 2018. Altitudinal zonation of ferns along the northeastern slope Mount Makiling, Philippines. Sylvatrop Technical Journal Philippine Ecosystem and Natural Resources **28**(2), 47–68. https://doi.org/10.7718/ijec.v16i1.1015

Delos Angeles MD, Buot IE Jr. 2012. Orders and families of Philippine pteridophytes. Journal of Nature Studies **11**, 19–33.

Farjon A. 2013. Pinus merkusii. The IUCN Red List of Threatened Species 2013, e.T32624A2822050.
https://doi.org/10.2305/IUCN.UK.2013-1.RLTS.T32624A2822050.en

Fauziah A, Hasanuddin, Andayani D, Nurmaliah C, Wardiah. 2022. Jenis Pteridophyta yang terdapat di kawasan wisata Brayeun Kecamatan Leupung Kabupaten Aceh Besar. Jurnal Jeumpa **9**(1), 705–711. https://doi.org/10.33059/jj.v9i1.5520

Fernando ES, Co LC, Lagunzad DA, Gruezo WSm BJ, Madulid DA, Zamora PM. 2008. Threatened plants of the Philippines: A preliminary list. Asia Life Sciences **3**, 1–52.

Fernando ES. 1998. Forest formations and flora of the Philippines. College of Forestry and Natural Resources, University of the Philippines Los Baños.

Fonseca CR, Venticinque EM. 2018. Biodiversity conservation gaps in Brazil: A role for systematic conservation planning. Perspectives in Ecology and Conservation **16**(2), 61–67. Fonton NH, Atindogbe G, Fandohan B, Lejeune P, Ligot G. 2012. Structure spatiale des arbres des savanes boisées et forêts claires soudaniennes: Implication pour les enrichissements forestiers. Biotechnologie Agronomie Société et Environnement 16(4).

Hanna DE, Tomscha SA, Ouellet Dallaire C, Bennett EM. 2018. A review of riverine ecosystem service quantification: Research gaps and recommendations. Journal of Applied Ecology 55(3), 1299–1311.

Heuzé V, Tran G, Doreau M, Lebas F, Smith T, Thiollet H. 2017. Calliandra (*Calliandra calothyrsus*). Feedipedia. INRAE, CIRAD, AFZ, and FAO. Retrieved from https://www.feedipedia.org/node/586

Huda MK, Pasaribu N, Syamsuardi S, Siregar ES. 2022. Diversity, risk and management feasibility of invasive alien plants in the border zone of Sicike-like Nature Tourism Park, North Sumatra, Indonesia. Biodiversitas Journal of Biological Diversity **23**(6).

Imanuddin R, Hidayat A, Rachmat HH, Turjaman M, Nurfatriani F, Indrajaya Y, Susilowati A. 2020. Reforestation and sustainable management of *Pinus merkusii* forest plantation in Indonesia: A review. Forests **11**(12), 1235. https://doi.org/10.3390/f11121235

IPBES. 2019. Global assessment report on biodiversity and ecosystem services of the Intergovernmental Science–Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services. Brondizio ES *et al.* (Eds.). IPBES Secretariat, Bonn, Germany.

IUCN Red List. 2022.

https://www.google.com/search?q=iucn+red+list+202 2+pdf

Koutika LS, Richardson DM. 2019. Acacia mangium Willd: Benefits and threats associated with its increasing use around the world. Forest Ecosystems **6**, 2. https://doi.org/10.1186/s40663-019-0159-1

Lee YK, Woo SY. 2012. Changes in litter decomposition, nitrogen mineralization and microclimate in *Acacia mangium* and *Acacia auriculiformis* plantation in Mount Makiling, Philippines. International Journal of Physical Sciences 7, 1976–1985. https://doi.org/10.5897/IJPS11.846

Lumbres RIC, Soriano DFC, Doyog ND, Raterta RA, Villarta SC Jr, Baoanan ZG. 2023. Biomass and carbon stock assessment of trees in the lowland evergreen forest of Mt. Iraya, Batanes, Philippines. Philippine Journal of Science **152**(1), 269–276.

Ma T, Deng X, Chen L, Xiang W. 2020. The soil properties and their effects on plant diversity in different degrees of rocky desertification. Sci Total Environ **736**, e139667.

Majid A, Ajizah A, Amintarti S. 2022. Keragaman Tumbuhan Paku (Pteridophyta) di Taman Biodiversitas Hutan Hujan Tropis Mandiangin. Al-Azhar Indonesia Seri Sains Dan Teknologi 7(2), 102– 113.

Merritt DM, Scott ML, Poff NL, Auble GT, Lytle DA. 2010. Theory, methods and tools for determining environmental flows for riparian vegetation: riparian vegetation-flow response guilds. Freshwater Biology 55, 206–225.

https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2427.2009.02206.x

Monteiro JA, Kamali B, Srinivasan R, Abbaspour K, Gücker B. 2016. Modelling the effect of riparian vegetation restoration on sediment transport in a human-impacted Brazilian catchment. Ecohydrology **9**, 1289–1303.

NORDECO, Department of Environment and Natural Resources (DENR). 1998. Integrating conservation and development in protected area management in Mount Kitanglad Range Range Natural Park, Philippines. Technical Report. Copenhagen: NORDECO and Manila: DENR. **Pereira S, Prieto A, Calama R, Diaz-Balteiro L.** 2015. Optimal management in *Pinus pinea* L. stands combining silvicultural schedules for timber and cone production. Silva Fennica **49**, 1226. https://doi.org/10.14214/sf.1226

Peri PL, Lasagno RG, Martínez PG, Atkinson R, Thomas E, Ladd B. 2019a. Soil carbon is a useful surrogate for conservation planning in developing nations. Sci Rep **9**, e3905.

Pielou EC. 1966. The measurement of diversity in different types of biological collections. Journal of Theoretical Biology **13**, 131–144.

Posa MRC, Diesmos AC, Sodhi NS, Brooks TM. 2008. Hope for threatened tropical biodiversity: Lessons from the Philippines. Bioscience **58**, 231– 240. https://doi.org/10.1641/b580309

Pradipta A, Saputri R, Ami SD, Walid A. 2020. Inventarisasi Jenis Tumbuhan Paku (Pteridophyta) di Desa Padang Pelasan Kabupaten Seluma. Jurnal Biosilampari: Jurnal Biologi **3**(1), 13–19. https://doi.org/10.31540/biosilampari.v3i1.948

Pradipta AR, Hariani SA, Novenda IL. 2023. Identifikasi Tumbuhan Paku Berdasarkan Letak dan Posisi Sorus dengan Ketinggian Berbeda di Kabupaten Bondowoso. Biologi Edukasi: Jurnal Ilmiah Pendidikan Biologi **15**(1), 18–28. https://doi.org/10.24815/jbe.v15i1.30490

Redford KH, Mace GM. 2018. Conserving and contesting. Rethinking Environmentalism: Linking Justice, Sustainability, and Diversity **23**, 23.

Reis SM, Marimon BS, Marimon JBH, Morandi PS, Oliveira EAD, Elias F, Carvalho DNE, de Oliveira B, da Silva Nogueira D, Umetsu RK, Feldpausch TR, Phillips OL. 2018. Climate and fragmentation affect forest structure at the southern border of Amazonia. Plant Ecology and Diversity 11(1), 13–25.

https://doi.org/10.1080/17550874.2018.1455230

Saway LA, Mirasol Jr FS. 2004. Decentralizing protected area management: A Mt. Kitanglad Range Natural Park experience. Earthscan, London, UK, pp. 269–281.

SERI. 2004. The SER International primer on ecological restoration. Science and Policy Working Group, Society for Ecological Restoration International.

Setyawati T, Narulita S, Bahri IP, Raharjo GT. 2015. A guidebook of invasive plant species in Indonesia. Bogor: Research, Development, and Innovation Agency, Ministry of Environment and Forestry, Republic of Indonesia. ISBN: 978-979-8452-66-6

Stieger M, Mckenzie P. 2024. Riparian landscape change: A spatial approach for quantifying change and development of a river network restoration model. Environmental Management.

https://doi.org/10.1007/s00267-024-02025-w

Susilowati A, Iswanto AH, Wahyudi I, Supriyanto S, Siregar IZ. 2016. Morphological and anatomical evaluation of grafted *Pinus merkusii*. Journal of Korean Wood Science and Technology **44**, 903–912.

Sutomo S, Etten EV, Wahab L. 2016. Proof of *Acacia nilotica* stand expansion in Bekol Savanna, Baluran National Park, East Java, Indonesia through remote sensing and field observations. Biodiversitas **17**(1), 96–101.

https://doi.org/10.13057/biodiv/d170114

Tonkin JD, Altermatt F, Finn D, Heino J, Olden JD, Pauls SU, Lytle DA. 2018. The role of dispersal in river network metacommunities: Patterns, processes, and pathways. Freshwater Biology **63**, 141–163. https://doi.org/10.1111/fwb.13037

Tonouéwa JFMF, Assédé ÉP, Biaou SS, Natta AK. 2019. Facteurs déterminant la productivité et la séquestration de carbone de *Acacia auriculiformis* A. Cunningham ex Benth. au Bénin. BOIS and FORÊTS DES TROPIQUES **342**, 17–28. Ulfah M, Fajri SN, Nasir M, Hamsah K, Purnawan S. 2019. Diversity, evenness and dominance index reef fish in Krueng Raya Water, Aceh Besar. IOP Conference Series: Earth and Environmental Science.

https://doi.org/10.1088/1755-1315/348/1/012074

UNEP. 2013. The enabling policy and institutional environment for invasive alien species management in the Philippines. Draft Report Submitted to CABI under the UNEP/GEF Project: Removing Barriers to Invasive Species Management in Production and Protection Forests in Southeast Asia (UNEP/GEF 0515 Project). Quezon City: Protected Areas and Wildlife Bureau - Department of Environmental and Natural Resources, 98 pages.

Von Kleist K, Herbohn J, Baynes J, Gregorio N. 2021. How improved governance can help achieve the biodiversity conservation goals of the Philippine National Greening Program. Land Use Policy **104**, 104312.

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.landusepol.2019.104312

Wen Y, Ye D, Chen F, Li S, Liang H. 2010. The changes of understory plant diversity in continuous cropping system of *Eucalyptus* plantations, South China. Journal of Forest Research **15**, 252–258.

Yang W, Sun S, Wang N, Fan P, You C, Wang R, Zheng P, Wang H. 2023. Dynamics of the distribution of invasive alien plants (Asteraceae) in China under climate change. Sci Total Environ **903**, 166260.

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2023.166260

Zhang C, Huang CH, Liu M, Hu Y, Panero JL, Luebert F, Gao T, Ma H. 2021. Phylotranscriptomic insights into Asteraceae diversity, polyploidy, and morphological innovation. Journal of Integrative Plant Biology **63**(7), 1273–1293.

https://doi.org/10.1111/jipb.13078

Zuquim G. 2015. Ferns and lycophytes in Amazonia: Diversity patterns and their usefulness as habitat indicators. University of Turku, Finland.