Bio 373L Survival Guide

Christopher R. Peterson

2020-01-29

Contents

Preface

This book contains advice for students in the University of Texas at Austin's Field Ecology course. It will be updated throughout the semester. The first three chapters contain general guidelines for writing lab reports.

Chapter 1

Writing Lab Reports: Structure

1.1 Structure Overview

The main goal of scientific writing is to effectively communicate complicated concepts. Scientific manuscripts tend to follow a traditional structure that is intended to help an experienced reader navigate these concepts. Each section should answer a question:

- **Abstract**: Why should I read this?
- **Introduction**: Why did you do this?

- **Methods**: What did you do and where/with what did you do it?
- **Results**: What did you find?

- **Discussion**: What does it mean and why does it matter?
- **Literature Cited**: Doesn't really answer a question, but this is where you list the citations you used.

Greater detail is provided in the following sections.

1.2 Abstract

The abstract is a one paragraph summary that functions as an advertisement/elevator pitch for the rest of the paper. A reader should get a general idea about what you did and be interested in reading the rest of the paper. If it's more than 350 words, you need to shorten it.

While this section should cover the intro, methods, results, and discussion, you shouldn't re-use any language from those sections here. Instead, write a sentence or two from each that hits the important points without going into all of the details. Don't cite any figures, tables, or other literature in here.

Generally, this section is written last.

1.3   Introduction

The introduction section sets the stage for the work you are about to describe and should tell your reader *why* your research is interesting. You should begin by describing the broader ecological context that your research fits into, and review the relevant literature. It is a good idea to start generally and narrow the focus to the specific project you did.

For example, let's say you're writing a paper about the temperature tolerance of the three-eyed sandslider (*Trioptis cerastes*), a fictional snake species we're going to pretend is native to southwestern deserts. A reasonable introduction could discuss the following:

- Climate change in general.
- Severity and effects of climate change in deserts.
- Effects of higher temperature on ectotherm behavior.
- How you're investigating temperature tolerance with three-eyed sand-slider.

Alternatively, you could introduce the same paper in a completely different context:

- The evolution of animal activity budgets.
- Effects of temperature on foraging and reproductive behavior in ectotherms.
- How you're investigating temperature tolerance with three-eyed sand-slider.

There are many more potential ways to write this paper. The take home message is to set your specific project within the bigger picture of a large-scale concept, phenomenon, or issue.

The introduction should contain at least two paragraphs (with a minimum of three sentences each). At the end of the section, you should explicitly state your hypotheses and predictions. For example, going back to the temperature tolerance experiment, I could write, 'Thus, I hypothesize that *Trioptis cerastes* will have a higher temperature tolerance in the summer than in the winter due to acclimation to higher temperatures in the warmer months".

You should cite at least two peer-reviewed papers in this section. Please ensure these papers are actually relevant to what you're talking about and aren't just

tacked on to meet this requirement.

1.4 Methods

This section includes detailed information on your experimental setup, data collection procedures, and the statistical analyses you used. If your project focused on specific species or sites (e.g., BFL), you should start by describing these.

It is often useful to organize the methods section into sub-sections. For example, for the temperature tolerance example could have the following sub-sections:

- Study Region
- Study Organism
- Housing Conditions
- Experimental Design
- Statistical Analyses

You should always include a description of *all* of the statistical methods you used in the methods section. This includes the test(s) performed, the predictor (independent) and response (dependent) variables, the alpha level, and the program used.

Write each sub-section in chronological order. This and the results section are often the easiest to write first, so it's best to start with these two middle sections, and then work on the introduction and discussion.

1.5 Results

This is where you describe your observations and the results of any analyses. Make sure you do not include new methods (**including new statistical analyses**) in this section; these belong in the previous section. The most important results should be presented as figures or tables. However, they must also be described in the paragraph.

It is a good idea to organize this section into sub-sections as well, following the same system you used in the methods (some sub-sections from the methods may not need to be used in the results, but follow the organization as closely as possible).

1.5.1 Reporting statistics

In general, you should begin by presenting the relevant summary statistics (such as means for measured data and frequencies for categorical data). For example,

'The mean temperature tolerance was $39.2 \pm 0.45C$ for males and $37.1 \pm 0.25C$ for females.' Notice that the temperature has units (degrees Celsius) and that I put the standard deviation after the mean. This is good practice when reporting means.

When reporting statistical test results, state what they mean in words first, and then follow the statement with a parenthetical phrase containing the statistics. For example, 'Males tolerated significantly higher temperatures than females ($t = 1.96$, $df = 6$, $p = 0.04$)'. Notice that I included the computed t-statistic, the degrees of freedom and the p-value. All these should be reported when reporting t-test results. Note also that I indicated the direction of the difference, as well as its significance.

Here is another example: 'The number of escape behaviors performed increased significantly at high temperatures for all snakes ($\chi^2 = 8.43$, $df = 2$, $p = 0.001$)'. This is an example of how you would report chi-square test results. Again, the results are stated in words that have biological meaning and are followed by the calculated test statistic, the degrees of freedom and the p-value in parentheses.

If your statistical analyses did not find a significant difference, you still need to report this. For example: 'Although temperature tolerance was slightly higher for males than females, this difference was not statistically significant ($t = 0.657$, $df = 6$, $p = 0.14$).' Do not use the word "insignificant" in this context.

Be sure to state your results in a biologically meaningful manner. A common mistake is to write out the results in statistical terminology without any reference to their biological meaning. For example: 'A t-test resulted in a p-value of 0.03 meaning that we can reject the null hypothesis and accept the alternative.' While this is a correct statistical interpretation of the calculated p-value, it tells the reader nothing about the trees or ants or mushrooms that you were studying. Do not write up your results like this; it's unpleasant to read and you're just going to have to fix it in revisions.

1.5.2   Do not interpret your data here

Do not interpret your data in the results. That belongs in the discussion.

Do not consider explanations for your data in the results. That belongs in the discussion.

Do not consider how your data relates to your hypothesis in the results. That belongs in the discussion.

This is probably the most common mistake I've encountered in grading student lab reports.

1.6 Discussion

The discussion is where you should interpret your data and draw conclusions by comparing your data to what is known from the published literature. The organization of this section is a mirror-image of the introduction in terms of its organization: start narrowly, by discussing how your results relate to your original hypotheses and questions. Follow it up with a wider discussion of how these results fit into the broad concept with which you introduced the paper. This should not be a restatement of what you wrote in the introduction or in the results, but should be an exploration of the meaning of all those numbers you just crunched and what they might signify.

Be careful not to make unfounded statements. There are often many potential explanations for obtaining a particular result. One may seem more likely than the others, but this does not exclude the other explanations from being true if you haven't actually tested them. A good way to handle this is to mention the multiple alternative interpretations, express support for the one you think is most likely and explain why, then suggest a future experiment that could be done to test whether or not that is correct.

An example:

> 'Temperature tolerance was lower for females than for males. This could be due to the relative size of the two sexes. Females are the smaller sex, meaning that they would heat up faster than males due to a greater surface area:volume ratio (Loblaw and Bluth, 2005). Alternatively, the males could have a higher tolerance because their overall activity levels were elevated in the experimental enclosures. This may have caused them to begin with a higher internal temperature that acclimatized them to higher temperatures to start; however, this seems unlikely. Future work could address this by taking internal temperature readings before and after temperature tolerance trials.'

As in the introduction, you should cite at least two peer-reviewed papers in this section in a way that isn't obviously shoehorned in.

1.7 Literature Cited

You must use a minimum of **four** primary literature sources in your report, with at least two sources in both the introduction and discussion (although some sources are suitable to use in both). Use the sources to provide background, to aid in justification of performing the project, support for your interpretation of results, etc. In some cases, you should also cite a reference in the methods section (e.g., for a non-standard data collection technique or to provide information on a study site/species). Do not cite papers in results. All thoughts, ideas, concepts,

etc., that you didn't think up on your own must be cited in the text (failure to do this is considered plagiarism).

If you want to cite general facts or information from a study, it's generally best to present those facts with a parenthetical citation. E.g., "The point-quarter technique is an effective and reliable way to estimate canopy cover in the field (Smith et al., 2018)." Sometimes, you may want to discuss the specific details of a previous paper. Generally, it's a bad idea to start a sentence with "In one study, … (Hernandez et al., 2007). Instead, cite them directly:"Hernandez et al. (2007) discovered similar signs of succession in eastern hardwood forests…". If you have multiple sentences all drawn from the same source, just put the citation once at the end of the last of those sentences.

Please note that while there is a minimum of four primary literature sources, you are encouraged to add more. Bringing in information from extra papers can really strengthen your introduction/discussion. There will be a weekly thread on Canvas to share literature relevant to the lab report; you are expected to contribute two citations to it each week.

Please note that your sources need to be relevant to your lab report at more than just a surface level. For example, if your lab report is on the distribution of cottonwoods at BFL, a paper about the cottonwood's genomic structure is probably not going to be relevant.

1.8   Common Mistakes for particular sections

1.8.1   Introduction and Discussion

Null hypotheses are statistical tools used for certain tests (e.g., a null hypothesis for a chi-squared test would be that the groups are independent, or that there is no difference in the species proportions between the two age classes). These don't belong in the introduction or discussion. For these sections, you should present your biological hypotheses (e.g., "BFL is undergoing succession"). It is usually a good idea to include a concrete prediction of these hypotheses in the introduction as well (e.g., "BFL is undergoing succession, which will be indicated by a difference in the relative abundances of canopy and sapling trees").

1.8.2   Results

Don't cite papers in the results. You are presenting your results, not somebody else's. If you want to do this, it's probably something that should be in the discussion.

Tables are best for highly structured data. If there isn't much data to present, the data can usually just be presented in the text of the results. If there's a lot

of data, it is worth considering if a figure would be better.

Chapter 2

Writing Lab Reports: Style

It's easy to write a scientific report that confuses or bores the audience. Developing a style that keeps the reader following along can be a challenge, but it is a necessary one.

This chapter contains a number of stylistic suggestions that can improve your lab reports. There isn't 'one true style' for scientific writing, but I've found that these guidelines can help when you're starting out.

2.1   Be Concise

Parsimony is often held up as an ideal in science; if the evidence equally supports two explanations, we tend to prefer the simpler one. The same applies to scientific writing.

When grading previous student lab reports, I've noted a bad tendency to over-explain every single detail (particularly in the methods section). Avoid providing information that is unnecessary to understand the project, and don't over-describe straightforward tasks. If you have a long repetitive section, think of a way to express the same information in a shorter space.

Here's an example from a methods section that needs to be trimmed:

> "We created imaginary lines passing through each sample point that were parallel and perpendicular to the transect and used these lines to create four quadrants. One member of our group would carefully pace towards the closest canopy tree in each quadrant. This was repeated by the same group member for each sapling tree. Later, we converted our pace counts into meters by measuring the number of paces that group member took to walk ten meters. A different group member measured the diameter at breast height (DBH) of

> each canopy tree by holding up a ruler to the side of the tree. The third group member recorded the data."

The important information could be condensed into this:

> "We divided the area around each point into four quadrants, which were parallel and perpendicular to the transect. For each quadrant, we estimated the distance to the nearest canopy and sapling trees and recorded the diameter at breast height (DBH) of the canopy tree."

The same details apply for describing calculations or analyses. For standard or widely used procedures (such as a chi-squared test, or calculating relative abundance), you do not need to provide the formula that you used. In general, focus on what you did:

> "We used a chi-squared test to determine whether the proportions of the five most abundant species differed between canopy and sapling trees."

not the exact procedures you used to do it

> "We created a contingency table in Excel using pivot tables by ..., then calculated the expected values by ... From this we calculated the chi-square test statistic with the formula..., determined the degrees of freedom from ..., and calculated the p-value with the Excel function...".

A more specialized or non-standard calculation may need to be explained ("The density at a point was estimated as $N/\mathrm{sum}(x^2)$, where N was the number of quadrants with trees and x is the distance to the tree."), but should also not be over-explained.

The same applies to the results. If you did three similar analyses to different data sets, you should try to describe the outcomes in parallel. Instead of doing this:

> "Activity significantly increased with temperature in sample 1 (r = ..., t = ..., p = ...; Figure 1). ... Activity significantly increased with temperature in sample 2 (r = ..., t = ..., p = ...; Figure 2) ... Activity did not increase significantly in sample 3 (r = ..., t = ..., p = ...; Figure 3)."

You should consolidate:

> "Activity significantly increased with temperature in sample 1 (r = ..., t = ..., p = ...; Figure 1A) and sample 2 (r = ..., t = ..., p = ...; Figure 1B), but not in sample 3 (r = ..., t = ..., p = ...; Figure 1C)."

Similar advice applies to figures.

2.2 Sentence Structure

Your writing should flow. When moving between topics (or sub-topics), it is helpful to include transitional elements (words, phrases, or sometimes entire sentences) to help the reader follow your train of logic. This doesn't mean that you should start every few sentences in the Methods section with "Then, we [did something] …". Some good words and phrases to use include "Following ____," "Furthermore," "However," "Alternatively," and "Yet," etc. Note that transitions aren't necessary when you are starting a new section (e.g., Methods) or labeled sub-section.

Each sentence should serve a purpose (in terms of communicating information). If two or more sentences are doing the same job, try to combine them (or delete one). Conversely, sentences that are doing too much should be split.

Avoid garden-path sentences and lengthy sentences that require multiple reads to understand.

2.3 Passive Voice

While there are circumstances in which passive voice is useful, it is often misused in scientific writing. Many students feel that passive voice conveys a sense of objectivity. In many cases, it just obscures and adds unnecessary wordiness. This is particularly common in methods and results sections. You (in either the singular or plural sense) performed the observations or experiment; you did the calculations and analysis. You should take credit for it. If you are worried about starting every sentence with I/we, there are other ways to restructure your writing.

For the record, I am not banning the use of passive voice. It can be effectively used alongside active voice when appropriate. However, I'd recommend taking a look at your passive sentences and considering if active voice would make them more straightforward.

2.4 Word Choice

It's tempting to use longer, more technical sounding words when writing a scientific paper. This tends to make papers harder to read with no benefit. The same is doubly true for awkward multi-word phrases that can be replaced with one, simple word.

Two common offenders:

Utilize: In almost every case, **"use"** is the better choice. "Utilize" is really only applicable for situations in which the object being used was not designed for the

task to which it is being put. Even in that situation, "use" is still preferable. There are a few minor areas of biology where "utilize" is correct, but for now, stick to "use."

Approximately: use **"about."**

2.5   Scientific and Common Names

- Latin binomials should be italicized, with genus capitalized and specific epithet in lowercase (e.g., *Ulmus crassifolia*).

- Only write the full scientific name the first time it appears in a section; afterwards, you can abbreviate the genus (e.g., *U. crassifolia*). At that point, stick to the abbreviation; don't switch back and forth.
- Exception: You should never start a sentence with the abbreviated form.
- Don't capitalize common names except for proper nouns e.g., American elm, cedar elm, Ashe's juniper, sugar hackberry.

- The first time a species is mentioned, its scientific name should be given. If after that you want to just use the common name, that is fine, as long as you also gave the common name the first time.

- E.g., first time – '…..cedar elm (*Ulmus crassifolia*) was found in all three habitats…..'
- Later '….the prevalence of cedar elm could be due to….' OR '….the prevalence of *U. crassifolia* could be due to….

2.6   Other Grammar

- Put a comma after an introductory prepositional phrase. E.g., 'In the pasture habitat, cedar elm was…' or 'During the most recent drought, laurel cherry has…'
- I generally prefer Oxford commas. While you aren't required to use them, be consistent.
- Please only capitalize proper nouns, acronyms, and the appropriate parts of scientific names.

2.7   Commonly Confused Definitions

- Population and Community:

- A population is a collection of individuals of the same species in a particular geographic area. E.g., all the cedar elm individuals at BFL
- A community is a collection of individuals of different species found in a particular geographic area. E.g., all the trees found at BFL
- Random and Haphazard
- Truly random points would be pre-selected in the lab before heading outside using a random number generator and using those randomly selected numbers as our coordinates.
- Haphazardly selected points follow the colloquial definition of 'random.' It's sort of like the scientific vs. common usage of the word "theory."
- Affect and effect
- While there are nuances and exceptions, affect is generally a verb and effect is usually noun.

2.8 Significant Digits

We generally aren't using high-precision instruments. As such, you should round numbers with a large number of decimal places to an appropriate extent (Note that ecologists usually don't follow significant figures rules quite as strictly as chemists and physicists). Generally, p-values should be rounded to four digits (and noted as < 0.0001 if they're smaller than that), while test-statistics should probably have no more than two decimal places. For everything else, use your judgment.

2.9 Tenses

Make sure to use the appropriate tense in each part of the report. If you're reporting what you did (e.g. in the Methods) or what someone did in another study (e.g. in the Introduction or Discussion) then use the past tense. Also use the past tense in the Results, because the results were recorded/found in the past. However, when discussing context and theory currently held to be true (in the Introduction and Discussion), make sure to use the present tense. Future tense will typically only be used when suggesting a potential future follow-up study/studies, usually in a small section at the end of the Discussion.

Chapter 3

Figures and Tables

Good figures are one of the most important parts of a manuscript. When learning to write scientific papers, some might view figures as an afterthought. This is a mistake. The figure should tell a fairly complete story. Combined with its caption, the reader should be able to look at the figure immediately after reading the abstract and have a general sense of what's going on.

Tables are also an important part of a paper's results, but good figures are usually easier to interpret by the reader.

3.1   Captions

Figures and tables require captions that explain what they represent. Captions should be below figures and above captions. The first "sentence" of a caption shouldn't actually be a sentence; it's more of a description. See the various examples in this chapter for more details.

The caption should help the figure or table stand alone from everything else. If there are abbreviations or acronyms in the figure, they should be defined in the caption. If your figure is related to a statistical test, you should present the results of the test in the figure caption. If there's a line of best fit in a scatterplot figure, this means that a linear regression was performed behind the scenes; you should report the details.

Note that figures in your manuscript **should not have titles**. This information belongs in the caption.

3.2   Figures

Make sure the caption (and legend, if present) gives enough information that the reader can understand exactly what the figure/table represents without having to look at the text. DO refer to all tables/figures in the body of the text, and include them in order (i.e. the first table/figure the reader comes across should be called table 1/figure 1 and should be the first one referred to in the text).

Figures should communicate your results, not just present/summarize your data. A good figure tells a story. If there is a trend or pattern, it should be designed to emphasize it.

3.2.1   Specific Figure Guidelines

Figure design is communication, so you want to make the result/message as obvious as you can. The longer a reader has to stare at your figure before "getting it," the more likely they are to get bored or stop caring.

- Avoid large amounts of empty white space. For categorical data, you should remove categories that have no data unless their absence is somehow important and interesting.
- For example, if you are surveying trees and a species is not observed, there's no reason for it to be in the figure.
- Is your figure emphasizing what it should?
- If you're contrasting two groups, are they clearly contrasted? Could re-ordering the groups improve the contrast?
- If you're comparing groups of frequencies, you should order them from highest to lowest frequency.
- If you are trying to show a trend, is it being adequately emphasized?
- Please note that this doesn't mean cheating, or changing the data.
- The axes and legends should be clear.
- Often, the default axis or legend names will be the label of a specific cell or column. You can change these defaults.
- Consider how your figure will look to other people.
- How will it look if printed from a black and white printer?
  - Hint: the default blue and orange colors in Excel are indistinguishable in gray scale; the same is true for the default ggplot2 palette in R.
- How would it look to someone with color blindness? -If using R, the Viridis color scales work nicely for this.

Please remember that you should be writing your lab reports as if the reader (i.e., me) didn't know exactly what you did.

3.2.2 Be Concise

If you have multiple figures that conceptually belong together (e.g., the same measurements taken in three years), you should turn them into a single multi-panel figure. Label your the panels with letters in the upper left corner; the caption should explain how the panels are different.

3.3 Some Example Figures

3.3.1 General Formatting

Figure 3.1 is poorly formatted:

- The colors are hard to distinguish when printed and black and white;
- The axis and legend text are showing the default labels instead of informative values;
- There is a lot of white space, partially due to a bad y axis scale;
- The equation is in the figure instead of the caption;
- The caption is vague and uninformative;
- There is an unnecessary title;
- There are grid lines;

Figure 3.2 contains the same data, but has been reformatted to address these issues. Note the use of units in the axis labels, the formatting of scientific species names, the positioning of the legend to minimize whitespace, and the lack of a title and gridlines. This is also an example of how to plot data with a continuous response and a combination of continuous and categorical predictors.

Figure 3.3 is an example of a multi-panel figure; in the text, you should refer to parts of it as Figure 3.3A, 3.3B, etc.

3.3.2 Continuous response, categorical predictors

There are a number of options for representing continuous data grouped into multiple categories. You should avoid "dynamite" plots (Figure 3.4), which use a bar with error lines to represent a mean and standard error; these figures use a lot of space to provide very little information. A better option is to use box plots (Figure 3.5), which show the median, quartiles, range, and outliers of each group. Equivalently, you could use a group of histograms (Figure 3.6). A particularly effective way to visualize this type of dataset shows the distribution of the data and the summary statistics (Figure 3.7).

Figure 3.1: Petal width (X variable) vs petal length (Y variable). The regression is significant ($R^2 = 0.93$; $p < 0.0001$).

Figure 3.2: Association between petal width and petal length in three species of *Iris*. Petal length increases with petal width ((Petal Length) = 1.1 + 2.2*(Petal Width); $R^2 = 0.93$; $p < 0.0001$).

Figure 3.3: Association between sepal width and sepal length for A) *Iris setosa*, B) *I. versicolor*, and C) *I. virginica*. The association is not statistically significant ((Sepal Length) = 6.5 + -0.2*(Sepal Width); $R^2 = 0.01$; $p = 0.152$).

Figure 3.4: Mean sepal width for three species of *iris*, with standard errors. Sepal length differs significantly among species ($p < 0.0001$).

Figure 3.5: Distribution of sepal width for three species of *iris*. Sepal length differs significantly among species ($p < 0.0001$).

Figure 3.6: Distribution of sepal width for three species of *iris*. Sepal length differs significantly among species ($p < 0.0001$).

Figure 3.7: Distribution of sepal width, for three species of *iris*, with mean and standard errors in red. Sepal length differs significantly among species ($p < 0.0001$).

3.3.3 Categorical, count, or frequency responses

These sorts of data usually involve examining how counts or frequencies differ among groups; they're often associated with χ^2 tests. Generally, it's best to represent these sorts of data with bar graphs (avoid pie charts). When making a bar graph, it's a good idea to arrange your data to emphasize any trends. The species in Figure 3.8 are organized alphabetically, which obscures any trend. A better option is to organize by decreasing frequency of either total counts (like in Figure 3.9) or of one of the groups (Figure 3.10). These make it easier to detect patterns.


Figure 3.8: Number of *Anolis* captured from canopy and trunk perches.

An important consideration is whether to represent your data with counts or proportions (AKA frequencies – vary from 0 to 1). There are pros and cons to both approaches, but frequencies are usually better if the number of observations differs among your groups (compare Figure 3.11 with Figure 3.10). Be careful when calculating frequencies, because you may inadvertently end up making a graph that isn't answering the question you're trying to ask. For example, Figure 3.11 shows how anole frequencies differ between perch types, but Figure 3.12 shows the frequency at which each species occupies the two perches.

If there is some aspect of your data that you'd like to really emphasize, it can help to get more creative with your figures. For example, the most visually striking parts of Figure 3.13 are the colored sections of the bars, which correspond to

Figure 3.9: Number of *Anolis* captured from canopy and trunk perches.

Figure 3.10: Number of *Anolis* captured from canopy and trunk perches.

Figure 3.11: Frequency of *Anolis* species captured from canopy and trunk perches.

Figure 3.12: Perch frequency for 9 species of *Anolis*.

the direction and magnitude of the difference between perches for each species. Do note that making more complicated figures may require extra explanation in the caption.

Figure 3.13: Number of *Anolis* found at each perch position. The white bar indicates the count at the less frequent perch, the total height is the count at the more frequent perch, color indicates which perch the species was more common at, and the size of the colored regions indicates the difference between perches.

3.4 Tables

Tables are an effective addition to a manuscript when you have a lot of data in the text and want to present it to the reader in an organized fashion. They are particularly helpful when you have a lot of different kinds of data that would be hard to plot together. For example, see Table 3.1.

Tables are best for highly structured data. If there isn't much data to present, the data can usually just be presented in the text of the results. If there's a lot of data, it is worth considering if a figure would be better.

Table 3.1: Standard length of three populations of rainbow trout (*Oncorhynchus mykiss*) in Southern Appalachian streams. Group A was collected from the New River, group B from the Watauga River and group C from Winkler Creek.

Group	N	Mean	Std. Dev.	Min.	Max.
A	10	35.33	3.53	30.74	37.02
B	15	42.61	4.62	36.36	49.17
C	12	22.00	2.97	17.99	26.38

Chapter 4

Lab 1: Succession

Some guidelines

4.1 Results

You should provide data and analyses to address the following questions:

- What are the qualitative trends and characteristics of each habitat?
- How does the total density of canopy trees differ between habitats?
- Does relative abundance of each species differ between canopy and sapling trees? How consistent is this among habitats?

4.1.1 Canopy tree density

You can use the point-quarter method to estimate tree density at each site with a bit of math. Let x_i be the distance from your point to a sampled canopy tree. If you sampled 4 trees at a point, then the density in trees per square meters would be $\frac{4}{x_1^2+x_2^2+x_3^2+x_4^2}$. More generally, the density is $1/\text{mean}(x^2)$.

Calculate density for each sample point, and convert it to hectares (multiply by $10,000$ m^2/ha). How do densities compare between habitat types? Create a figure and compare the averages. Note that you won't be able to claim that one group is different unless you use statistical tests, such as a one-way ANOVA (this is optional).

Table 4.1: Abundance of most common canopy and sapling trees in the BFL old pasture habitat, Fall 2018.

	Carya illinoiensis	*Celtis spp.*	*Juniperus spp.*	*Quercus buckleyi*	*Quercus fus
Canopy	7	2	17	3	
Sapling	0	6	7	3	

4.1.2   Species by habitat and life stage

For each habitat, you will want to calculate the relative abundance of each tree species for canopy and sapling trees (i.e., number of Canopy species x in habitat y divided by total number of observed Canopy trees in y). Visualize the result for each habitat (a three-panel frequency plot would be the best way to go, with categories ordered by canopy abundance).

To test if the relative proportions in canopy and saplings are equivalent, you should construct contingency tables for each habitat (See Table 4.1 for an example). Restrict each table to the five most common species in each habitat. Contingency tables can be constructed with pivot tables in Excel or the table() function in R. Use chi-square tests to see if the proportions of species are different between canopy and saplings for each habitat.

4.2   Discussion

Some suggestions for discussion topics:

- How could differences in sapling/canopy relative abundances inform possible successional trends? Based on your results, what would you predict about future dominant species in the habitats?
- Did you observe anything else about the ecology or natural history of these areas that may help account for your results (e.g., drought stress, dead trees, invasive species, disease, etc)?
- What may be driving the differences in the habitat types? Considering the history of BFL may be helpful in explaining some of this.
- Develop a likely scenario for the past and future decades of tree population dynamics in the woodlands of BFL.
- How has drought and oak wilt affected the tree community at BFL? How might a scenario for succession based on currently healthy trees be changed if we include the information on stressed/dead trees?
- How could this line of research be expanded upon in future work?

4.3 General Comments (Post-Review)

4.3.1 Figures

Review the guidelines in the Figures chapter. Specifically:

- Don't use figure titles; anything that could go there should be in the caption instead.
- Use colors that will work in black and white,
- Number figures in the order they're cited in the main text; they should also be arranged in this order (e.g., figure 2 shouldn't be placed before figure 1).
- If the figure contains new data (which all of these should), it should be cited in the results.
- Figure numbers shouldn't have decimals in them (e.g., no Figures 1.1, 2.3, etc). If you have a multi-panel figure, refer to specific panels as Figure 1a, 1b, etc.
- If you have a multi-panel figure, there should be a single caption that explains what each of the panels are.
- Don't use bar plots for group means; boxplots or violin plots are usually better. This is a very inefficient way to present 3 data points, and it provides no information about the data's variability. Boxplots or violin plots are better options. (Note that bar plots are still fine for counts or proportions).
- No gridlines (see below)

To remove gridlines in excel, just click on them and delete them. Base plots in R (with the `plot()` function) shouldn't have they by default. To remove them with `ggplot2` figures, put this near the top of the code:

```r
install.packages("cowplot") # if you don't have this installed; run once
library(cowplot)
theme_set(theme_cowplot()) # this makes your ggplots look nicer until you restart R
# ggplot commands here
```

4.3.2 Write this like you're trying to publish it

You should write these reports as if you were writing a manuscript for a journal. Pretend it's not a class paper; don't say "For this lab, our assignment was…" or "the other students…" Write like it's a research project; you came up with the hypotheses and methods and the other students in the class are your collaborators.

When describing the data collection, you need to describe how all of this year's data was collected, for all groups. Instead of saying "we sampled three points in

per habitat," say "five groups each sampled three points per habitat." As part
of this, don't talk about combining your group's data with the rest.

Finally, you need to have a real title.

4.3.3   Describe the habitats

Since the different habitat types are an important part of this paper, you should
describe time in a reasonable amount of detail; this could go in the intro or
methods section, depending on how you wrote it.

4.3.4   The Analysis

Formally, the chi-squared test evaluates whether the rows and columns of a
contingency table are independent of each other. In the context of this project,
that's equivalent to testing whether the Canopy:Sapling ratio was equal for each
species OR if the prevalence of each species was the same for canopy and sapling
trees.

Several people misinterpreted the analysis as examining if there were more
canopy or sapling trees. This wouldn't work, because the chi-square test cannot
tell you anything about the actual number of trees and because the way you
collected the data (a fixed number of trees per point) was not set up to answer
this question.

The Chi-square analysis was often described incorrectly in the methods; an un-
familiar reader would not know what you were testing. When you're describing
the test, you don't necessarily need to state the null/alternative hypotheses, but
you need to make it clear what question you're answering with it.

It's also worth remembering that the data we collect is generally not incredibly
high percision. Our measurements generaly don't have the ability to distinguish
between a mean density of 437.11 and 437.14; depending on the sample size, we
may not even be able to distinguish between 437 and 442. Being overly precise
doesn't help matters. If your p-values are less than 0.0001, just report "p <
0.0001."

4.3.5   Keeping things in the right sections

Many people restated the methods used for their statistical analyses in the
results. For example:

`"I ran chi-squared tests, and they showed significant differences in the old quarry (ch`

Don't do this; instead, only provide the result. A better re-work of the above
sentence would be:

`"Species composition was significantly different between canopy and sapling trees in the old quar`

Don't put anything in the intro or methods that is actually a result. Many people listed the most common species found in each habitat in their "study area" sections. Since this was a major part of this lab, listing the dominant species should be accompanied by a citation to show evidence that this is already known. In general, if you find yourself saying that the most common species "were" something, then it sounds like you are talking about your own observations; if you say that they "are" or "have been" something, then it sounds like you're talking about more general patterns.

4.3.6   Basic style and format rules

- Don't capitalize things that don't need capitalization (e.g., the point-quarter technique).
- Most acronyms should be defined before their first use (though there are a few exceptions, like ANOVA).
- Don't say (p-value = x), say (p = x).
- If a paper has more than two authors, cite it as "(Smith et al., 2009)," not "(Smith, Johnson, Franks, and Brown, 2009).

4.3.7   Other Comments

- The "fisher test" is properly called Fisher's exact test (with "Fisher" capitalized).
- If you used a stats program for a bunch of different things (as you usually do w/ R or Excel), mention it at the end of the section, not the beginning.
- RStudio is an interface for doing analysis with R; if you used it, you should say you did your analysis in R.
- Sample points selected differently in pond/old pasture than in other habitats
- In the discussion, if you are listing several possible interpretations of your results, it's a good idea to put the most interesting one(s) ahead of the "this is all random noise" options.

Chapter 5

Lab 2: Woodland Heterogeneity

5.1   Questions and Hypotheses

1. What are the relationships between canopy, shrub, and ground cover?
2. How have the relative abundance of Canopy, Shrub, and Ground cover categories changed over time?
3. [Add one other hypothesis that you come up with]
4. Quantify the spatial mosaic: Use a map of BFL and number/color the canopy level at each point. Connect adjacent areas of the same number. If you do this by hand, scan or photograph it and include it in the Canvas submission.

Note that the "Calibration" step in the handout isn't included in this section; this is still something you need to do (see below), but it's a methods validation step, not a biological hypothesis.

5.2   Analysis

5.2.1   Calibrating canopy estimates

Since most of our analyses rely on subjective measurements, it would be good to calibrate how well the subjective category categories predict light measurements estimated by Gap Light Analyzer? Use linear regression on the current datasets, with subjective score as the predictor and percent openness as the response. Note that the structure of the data will almost certainly violate some of the assumptions of a linear regression test. We can still do this because this isn't a

hypothesis-driven analysis, but a prediction-driven one; provide the R^2 and fit equation, but not the p-values.

To run a regression in R, modify this code:

```
regression = lm(y ~ x, data = your_data_set) # adjust this for your regression
regression # this gives you the coefficients
summary(regression) # This includes R2 values
# Note that you should go with the "Multiple R-squared," not "Adjusted R-squared"
```

Create a figure for this analysis corresponding to these analyses, including the data points and trend lines. If you're using excel, please remember that the equation that appears after you add the trendline shouldn't be included in the resulting graph (it belongs in the caption and main text). If you're using `ggplot` in R, you can add a regression line to the graph by adding the following line to your figure code:

```
geom_smooth(method = "lm", se = FALSE, color = "grey")
# feel free to change color
```

One othe thing I'd recommend is spreading out the points on your x axis a little, since otherwise they will just be four vertical lines. In ggplot, you can do this by replacing `geom_point` with:

```
geom_jitter(height = 0, width = .25)
# changing width will spread the dots out more; just don't change height
```

5.2.2   Relationship between canopy and ground cover

Create four contingency tables examining the ground & shrub cover relationship; one for each level of canopy cover. Note that the cells of the tables should be a count (number of plots), not a relative proportion. Run chi-squared tests on each table. This is rather similar to what you did for the previous lab.

Re-create these tables with the relative number of plots per canopy cover type for each ground/shrub combination. You need to visually present this information in some way; you could try making a graph of some sort, or you could color the cells of the table to indicate the strength of the proportion. Note that adding color information to a table would turn it into a figure, and it should be referred to as such.

5.2.3   Historical Trends

How have the relative abundances of each category within the three cover types changed over time?
You don't need to do an analysis for this, but create a figure. Since this data changes over time, you should have time along the x axis of the figure.

Line plots and stacked box plots are two possible options. Multiple panels may be warranted.

Chapter 6

Lab 4:
Mark-Release-Recapture
with *Heliconius*

6.1 Questions and hypotheses

Primary Questions:

1. How does sampling intensity improve MMR estimates?
2. Does separating animals by sex alter our estimate of population size? What's the Sex ratio?
3. How does the Lincoln-Pearson model compare with alternate MMR methods?
4. Are the *Heliconius* populations in Hardy-Weinberg equilbrium for the Optix gene?

6.1.1 Wing Pattern and the Optix transcription factor

In the lab, we scored the orange/red/brown wing patterns. The mimetic phenotypes generated are key to the diversification of the genus, to predator protection niches, and to mutualism between sympatric species (Mullerian mimicry). The the Optix supergene locus controls expression of a transcription factor that affects coloration in wing patterns. A supergene locus controls expression of a transcription factor called Optix. One allele (F) accounts for the red, orange, red or brown scales in the distal forewing band (beyond the large wing cell). Another allele (H) controls the presence of such scales on the hind wing and/or on the proximal forewing in the cell region. Since the link between phenotype

and genotype is known, we can use observational data to infer whether the population is in Hardy-Weinberg equilibrium (HWE) for this trait.

Hardy_Weinberg assumptions:

- Mating is random
- No migration
- No natural selection
- No genetic drift (a.k.a., large populations)
- No mutation

Note that while several of the above assumptions are essentially impossible, in practice you can achieve near-HWE if migration, selection, drift, and mutation are small/weak enough to be ignored.

6.2   Analysis

The Lincoln-Pearson model:

If S_2 is the number of individuals collected in a sample period, M_1 is total number of previously marked individuals, and R_2 is the number of marked individuals who were recaptured, then you can estimate population size:

$$\hat{N} = \frac{S_2 M_1}{R_2}$$

6.2.1   Effect of sampling intensity on Lincoln-Pearson $\hat{N}$ estimates

We're going to simulate increased sampling estimates by pooling together estimates from each team. I'll be combining the the data from each group in all possible team combinations (e.g., one team: A, B, C, …; two teams: AB, AC, AD, …; three teams: ABC, ABD, BCD, …). For each combination, you'll need to calculate the Lincoln-Pearson population size estimate ($\hat{N}$). Create a figure showing the effect of sample size on $\hat{N}$.

6.2.2   Sex ratios

Estimate $\hat{N}$ separately for male and female butterflies; how does this sum compare with the estimate for all teams combined?

What is the sex ratio of the population? Does it differ from 50:50? Use a chi-square test to test this.

6.2.3 Comparison of Lincoln-Pearson with alternative method

In 1970-71, Larry Gilbert collected data on a natural population of Heliconius in Trinidad. We will use this method to estimate population sizes.

For each of the three sample periods, use a regression to model the relationship between the daily recapture proportion (x) and the cumulative number of individuals marked (y). Intuitively, a recapture rate of 1.0 would suggest that you've sampled pretty much the entire population; you could thus use this regression equation to estimate ($\hat{N}$) by evaluating it when $x = 1$. Create a multi-panel regression plot to go along with these methods.

Compare these estimates with the Lincoln-Pearson estimate from the day with the highest proportion of recaptures in the sampling period. Note that for each row of the Trinidad data, $S_2 = $ `total_captured`, $R_2 = $ `recaptures`, and $M_1 = $ (`cumulative_m` - `new_captures`).

6.2.4 Hardy-Weinberg

First, you'll want to get the observed numbers for each genotype; we'll call these N_{FF}, N_{FH}, and N_{HH}; the total sample size N is the sum of these. You can use the `table` command in R to calculate this.

From these observed genotypes, you can calculate the genotype frequency of F, which is just $\frac{N_{FF}+0.5N_{FH}}{N}$ let's call this p.

You can get your HWE expected genotypes by using p and $q = 1 - p$ to get your expected genotype frequencies, then multiplying them by N to get your expected counts.

From here, you have observed and expected counts and can run an chi-square test.

6.3 Discussion

You should address the following in your discussion:

- Our MMR data came from a closed population; briefly speculate about some of the potential problems with these estimates in an open, natural population (how would emigration/immigration or birth/death affect the estimates)? How might our study compare with data from a natural population?
- How well does the Lincoln-Pearson model compare with fractional reacpture estimation in a naural population? How different were your population estimates? What factors could help explain them?

- Think of some creative ways you could improve sampling in an MMR project? (Beyond just increasing the sample size).

- Don't forget to discuss your results from the sex ratio and genotype analyses.

Chapter 7

Lab 5: Ant Community Ecology

7.1 Questions and hypotheses

There are two primary topics we'll be investigating in this lab:

- What are the habitat preferences of imported fire ants (*Solenposis invicta*)?
- How do ant communities differ across habitats?

7.2 Analysis

We'll be doing examining habitat differences with a couple of contrasts with our various methods:

- Open (canopy cover 0 or 1) vs. Closed (canopy cover 2 or 3) canopies.
- Sparse (0/1) vs. dense (2/3) ground cover.
- Low vs. high disturbance
- Habitat types (Q/R/P)

7.2.1 *S. invicta* habitat preference

Compare the presence/absense of *S. invicta* for each contrast. For each, create a contingency table and run a chi-squared test. The columns should be the different habitat conditions; the table should have two rows (fire ants present, fire ants absent), and the cell contents should be the number of baits that meet those conditions.

You should also test if there's an interaction between canopy openness and disturbance (re: fire ant presence). This should also be tested with a chi-square test, with the contingency table's columns being the four combinations of openness and disturbance.

7.2.2 Ant community differences

We'll be using four methods to estimate and compare diversity of ants in different habitats at BFL: Jaccard's index of similarity, Cumulative curves of species, Rank abundance curves and Shannon's index of diversity. You can read about these methods in the Ecology Laboratory Manual by G.W. Cox or any other ecology book.

In general, you should use these methods to compare the above habitat characteristics. You don't have to do all of them for each method (that would be excessive), but I'd recommend using them to explore the data and report on some contrasts that you find interesting. For everything but the Jaccard, you should also look at the entire dataset as a whole.

7.2.2.1 Jaccard's index of similarity

This index provides an estimation of how similar species composition is between two communities (e.g., two places or times).

$$J = \frac{W}{A + B - W}$$

A and B are the richness (number of species present) of the two communities in question, and W is the number of species in common in both communities. J varies from 0 (nothing in common) to 1 (identical communities). You can also interpret J as the proportion of total species that are shared.

For these analyses, you should treat the community as the

7.2.2.2 Species Accumulation Curve

These curves show the amount of time/effort spent sampling for species against the total number of species observed. They provide information about the actual and potential species richness of a community, as well as a sense of how well a place has been sampled. The details of how to calculate this are a bit complicated, and are explained in the attached R script.

Plot each curve (for related curves, you should include them in the same figure). Does it appear that the habitat was fully sampled? Estimate the likely number of species in the habitat by extrapolating the curve.

7.2.2.3 Rank Abundance Curve

Rank abundance curves compare the abundance of each species to the rank-order of that abundance. These give you a visual representation of species richness and species evenness (measure of comparative relative abundance of species). Species evenness is derived from the slope of the line that fits the graph. A steep drop-off indicates low evenness as the high ranking species have much higher abundances than the low ranking species. A more gradual slope indicates high evenness as the abundances of different species are similar.

To create these, plot the number of ants found in each species with log10 scale on Y-axis. Organize the species along the x-axis from most to least abundant (See more in Cox pg 197).

7.2.2.4 Shannon Index

This index estimates the diversity of a species in a single place, combining information about the richness and relative abundance. The Shannon index (H') is calculated as:

$$H' = -\sum_{i=1}^{n} p_i \ln(p_i)$$

where p_i is the relative abundance of species i. The larger H', the higher the diversity. The exponential of the Shannon index is called the true Shannon diversity ($D_H = \exp(H')$); it can be interpreted as the number of species you'd expect in an equally diverse community that was perfectly even.

7.3 Discussion

In progress. This is a test.