Jueves 24 de septiembre 2020

Los mosquitos son oportunistas, muchas especies. Generalistas no son lo mismo que oportunistas. Se parte del hecho de que los mosquitos son oportunistas. En ambientes urbanos la dieta de los mosquitos cambia a humanos, porque mucho del resto de sus hospederos se mueren por culpa de los humanos.

Especies de mosquitos que pasan el filtro humano y si siguen con la misma dieta o cambian.

“mosquitoes” AND (“blood meal sources” OR “blood feeding patterns”) AND “landscape”

Bases de datos: web of science, scopus. Si no hay suficientes artículos optar por Google Scholar. Especializarse en el trópico, específicamente en el neotrópico.

Distribución geográfica, cambio de dieta y relación a nivel paisaje.

Especie, ambiente (paisaje: urbano, rural, etc.), huésped (fuente sanguínea), año, coordinates

Intentar encontrar papers que lleguen hasta nivel de especie del huésped (fuente sanguínea)

Hacer una red cuyos nodos sean los huéspedes (fuentes sanguíneas).

Por cuestión de reducción de huéspedes naturales, por causas de reducción de paisaje como la antropogénica, se espera que haya una mayor especialización en la dieta de los mosquitos en ambientes urbanos que en rurales o silvestres.

Sacar análisis de éste artículo: Species-level drivers of mammalian ectoparasite faunas (Dáttilo et al., 2020) - [https://doi.org/10.1111/1365-2656.13216](https://meet.google.com/linkredirect?authuser=0&dest=https%3A%2F%2Fdoi.org%2F10.1111%2F1365-2656.13216)

Diptera as vectors of pathogens to neotropical vertebrates – otra posible idea (utilizar boxplots del artículo de Dáttilo)

Sábado 26 de septiembre 2020

“mosquitoes” AND (“blood meal sources” OR “blood feeding patterns”) AND “landscape”

* “mosquitoes” AND (“blood meal sources” OR “blood feeding patterns”) AND “landscape” AND (“feeding source” OR “feeding pattern”) – 0 WoS results, 3 Scopus results, 108 Google Scholar results
* “mosquitoes” AND (“blood meal sources” OR “blood feeding patterns”) AND “landscape” – 3 WoS results, 5 Scopus results, 454 Google Scholar results – **best keyword option**
* “mosquitoes” AND “blood meal sources” AND “landscape” – 1 WoS result, 2 Scopus results, 237 Google Scholar results

Lunes 28 de septiembre de 2020

"mosquito" AND ("blood" OR "host") AND ("feeding" OR "foraging") AND ("landscape" OR "deforestation") – 56 en WoS, 36 en Scopus, 25,200 en Google Scholar.

“precipitin” AND “ELISA” AND “bloodmeal identification” OR “blood meal identification”

Martes 14 de diciembre de 2020

Buscar con cambio de uso de suelo (“land use change”, “fragmentation”)

Utilizar sólo las de “diet” AND “mosquito” y sacar las que tengan perturbado y silvestre y huéspedes

Buscar en español y en google scholar

Reportar duplicados

Cluster análisis de especies de huéspedes de mosquitos entre ambientes antropizados y silvestres. Ver composición con análisis de disimilitud – con las 16 especies de las que se tienen los dos datos. Utilizar vegan para matriz de disimilitud.

Ponerle número a la diferencia que hay en la composición de huéspedes entre mosquitos antropizados y silvestre. Diversidad: riqueza (número de especies), abundancia (número de individuo o biomasa de huéspedes), composición (elenco de huéspedes, comparar similitud de especies entre ambientes antropizados y silvestres – y comparar la abundancia de huéspedes de estos huéspedes). La dimensión de riqueza no se ve afectada por el cambio de uso de suelo, sólo afecta la biomasa (en los antropizados hay una comunidad más homogénea de especies de mosquitos). Diversidad de recambio de especies (beta, turnover).

Reportar abundancia – composición de huéspedes

Cuántas especies hay compartidas entre ambientes: antropizado y silvestre. Análisis de disimilitud (¿matriz de disimilitud?). Diversidad beta, el recambio de especies de huéspedes entre mosquitos.

Índice H2 – para medir red de interacción: tiene que ver con la especialización, sobrelape de nicho.

BMC 60-70 mil pesos. PLOS 40 mil pesos. Insects 36 mil pesos. Acta Tropica. Journal of Medical Entomology (ESA) – 30 mil pesos. Medical and Veterinary Entomology.

* Buscar en Scholar, WoS, Scopus, Scielo: mosquito  AND (diet  OR diet change) y mosquito AND diet – y en español – y de los términos de búsqueda que ya tenemos. Citar método PRISMA (el que nos enseñó Romeo pero cuya cita se origina en  Moher et al., 2009), método PICO (Population, Intervention, Control, Outcome; Richardson, Wilson, Nishikawa, & Hayward, 1995) o PECO (Population, Exposure, Comparator, Outcome; Haddaway, Bernes, Jonsson, & Hedlund, 2016). PICO/PECO must be understood as: population refers to the specific system investigated, rather than a human population (e.g. farms in boreo-temperate systems); intervention/exposure refers to either a management practice or some other environmental factor (e.g. soil tillage using mouldboard ploughing); comparator refers to the factor with which an intervention/exposure is compared (e.g. before tillage or untilled control group), although SMs may not always require the presence of a comparator; outcome refers to the variable being measured (e.g. soil carbon concentration) (Haddaway et al., 2016).

Podemos apoyarnos en PICO y PECO para justificar ante Romeo que hacer una búsqueda con dos palabras clave (ej. mosquito AND diet) no está estandarizado, mejor hacer una búsqueda con la mayor cantidad de *campos* de palabras clave (son cuatro campos en total: la población de estudio (ej. mosquito), la exposición o intervención (ej. paisaje, ambiente), el control o comparador (ej. antropizado vs. silvestre) y el resultado (ej. los bloodmeal source hosts). Un buen ejemplo de esto viene en la Tabla 1 del artículo de Grames et al. 2019:

Conduct and import the naive search (Grames et al., 2019; S1):

When writing a naive search, the first step is to clearly articulate the research question. This serves as the basis for identifying concept groups and naive search terms. In our case, the research question is "What processes lead to the decline in black-backed woodpecker occupancy of post-fire forest systems with time since fire?" Although the exact concept groups needed for a review will vary on a case-by-case basis, the PICO (Population Intervention Control Outcome) model used in public health and medical reviews can be transformed to work for ecology. Instead of a population, we have a study system; intervention becomes predictor variables; outcome becomes response variables. The control category doesn't translate well to ecological reviews and can generally be omitted from the search. In our case, we are interested in either the predictor (processes) or response (occupancy) variables in our system (woodpeckers in post-fire forest systems), so our search will combine the concept groups as ( (processes OR occupancy) AND fire AND woodpecker ). The "OR" operator will include all hits that have either a process term or an occupancy term. The "AND" operator will require all hits to also have a term both the fire and woodpecker category. The parentheses work just like basic order of operations; items inside parentheses are considered before items outside of parentheses.

We truncated terms to include word forms by adding an asterisk (\\*) to the end of a word stem. For example, occup\\* will pick up occupancy, occupance, occupied, occupy, occupying, etc... We included alternate spellings (i.e. colonization and colonisation) when possible, though we did not truncate one letter earlier because coloni\\* would also pick up colonies or colonial, which has a different meaning altogether. Because there are multiple ways to describe nest success, we represented this concept with two groups of terms separated by W/3. This operator forces a word to occur within a certain number of words to another word (in this case, 3 words). By combining the OR operator with W/3, we can get any articles that include the concept of nesting and success next to each other. For example, an article about "success of nestlings" would be captured because the terms occur within three words of each other and nest\* captures nestlings. Because we want our naive search to be discrete (i.e. only capture results most relevant to our question to yield better keyword suggestions), we decided to only include birds in the tribe Dendropicini. We included both common names (woodpecker, sapsucker) and genus names to capture studies which used only latin species names. The bird terms were only searched in the full text because study systems are often not specified in the title, abstract, or keywords. Genus names were truncated to account for studies that refer to groups with the suffix "-ids".

Naive search: ( (occup\\* OR occur\\* OR presen\\* OR coloniz\\* OR colonis\\* OR abundan\\* OR "population size" OR "habitat suitability" OR "habitat selection" OR persist\\*) OR ( (nest\\* OR reproduct\* OR breed\\* OR fledg\\*) W/3 (succe\\* OR fail\\* OR surviv\\*) ) OR ( surviv\\* OR mortalit\\* OR death\\* ) OR ( "food availab\\*" OR forag\\* OR provision\\*) OR ( emigrat\\* OR immigrat\\* OR dispers\\*) ) AND (fire\\* OR burn\\* OR wildfire\\*) ) AND (woodpecker\\* OR sapsucker\\* OR Veniliorn\\* OR Picoid\\* OR Dendropic\\* OR Melanerp\\* OR Sphyrapic\\*)

Searches were conducted on 10/22/18 with no date restrictions. We searched two databases on Web of Science (BIOSIS Citation Index and Zoological Record) and Scopus. Number of hits were as follows: BIOSIS (212), Zoological Record (179), and Scopus (592).

Although other databases could also be used, the import functions of this package are set up to work with commonly used databases and platforms in ecology or with .bib or .ris files from other databases. Instructions on how to export files to match what litsearchr is expecting are viewable with usable\_databases().

The original export files should not be altered at all - none of the columns need to be removed and default headers should be left alone. These are used as signatures to detect which database a file originated from. If one of your naive searches results in more than 500 hits and you need to export multiple files from BIOSIS or Zoological Record, they can be left as separate files and don't need to be manually combined -litsearchr will do this for you. However, note that if your naive search returns more than 500 hits, the search terms are likely too broad. This lack of specificity may mean that the updated search terms returned by litsearchr will not adequately capture the desired level of inference.

Optionally, if you want to return extremely specific keywords, you can conduct a critical appraisal of your naive search results to remove articles that you know aren't relevant to your question. However, if these articles are relatively rare, their keywords should be filtered out by litsearchr as unimportant.

All results of naive searches should be placed into a single directory. The results of the black-backed woodpecker example searches are included in the package in ./inst/extdata/ [Note: you may need to change the directory reference depending on your current working directory.]

Posibles palabras para nuestra búsqueda ingenua:

“mosquito\*” AND (“landscape” OR “deforestation” OR “soil use change” OR “logging”) AND (“blood\*” OR “blood meal” OR “blood meal source\*” OR “host” OR “blood feeding” OR “feed\*” OR “forag\*”)

Búsqueda ingenua reducida:

“mosquito\*” AND ((“blood\*” OR “blood meal”)

Las bases de datos que Eliza Grames recomienda utilizar son:

#> 1 Web of Science BIOSIS Citation Index

#> 2 Web of Science Zoological Record

#> 3 Scopus Scopus

#> 4 EBSCO Academic Search Premier

#> 5 EBSCO Agricola

#> 6 EBSCO GreenFILE

#> 7 EBSCO OpenDissertations

#> 8 EBSCO CAB Abstracts

#> 9 EBSCO MEDLINE

#> 10 EBSCO Science Reference Center

#> 11 ProQuest Earth, Atmospheric & Aquatic Science Database?

#> 12 ProQuest ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global?

#> 13 ProQuest NTIS Database (National Technical Information Service)

#> 14 NDLTD Networked Digital Library of Theses and Dissertations

#> 15 OATD Open Access Theses and Dissertations

#> 16 OpenThesis OpenThesis

#> 17 CAB Direct (all databases)

#> 18 WorldCat OAIster

#> 19 WorldCat WorldCat

#> 20 Science.gov Science.gov

#> 21 IngentaConnect IngentaConnect

#> 22 PubMed PubMed

Los de las lagartijas (Putman & Tippie, 2020) utilizaron ProQuest para sacar trabajos de literatura gris, ¿tal vez podemos utilizar este como alternativa a Google Scholar? ProQuest es una de las bases de datos a la que tiene acceso la biblioteca de la BUAP.

* ArcView empalmar sitios de estudio y capas de vegetación primaria (silvestre) y perturbado (urbano, vegetación secundaria y agroecosistemas), para distinguir ambos paisajes.

De dónde hay que descargar las capas shapefile. ¿Dónde podemos descargar los shapefiles del índice de perturbación humana que mencionaron Romeo y Toño, ése índice son polígonos .shp que se pueden descargar? Sino, ¿de qué página descargar los polígonos: WorldClim, CHELSEA?

* Normas editoriales de review de Insects (MDPI).

Reviews: These provide concise and precise updates on the latest progress made in a given area of research. Systematic reviews should follow the PRISMA guidelines. Review articles should be comprehensive and submitted by authors who are in the field. The main text of review papers should be around 4000 words at minimum and include at least two figures or tables.

PRISMA checklist: <http://prisma-statement.org/documents/PRISMA%202009%20checklist.pdf> Uno de los criterios que menciona son PICOS - participants, interventions, comparison, outcome, study design - (que es como el PECO: population, exposure, comparison, outcome)

PRISMA flow diagram (el que nos mostró Romeo con Nakagawa 2017): <http://prisma-statement.org/documents/PRISMA%202009%20flow%20diagram.pdf>

Review manuscripts should comprise the front matter, literature review sections and the back matter. The template file can also be used to prepare the front and back matter of your review manuscript. It is not necessary to follow the remaining structure. Structured reviews and meta-analyses should use the same structure as research articles and ensure they conform to the PRISMA guidelines.

Ya descargué la plantilla para artículos de Insects MDPI, aunque ahí se especifica que el formato para reviews es más flexible: <https://drive.google.com/file/d/1qTpn6YyBoSgIlfBZl2xcWFt2ZXL2XHEv/view?usp=sharing>

* Poner n de bloodengorged mosquitos en la base de datos de Excel.
* Matriz de disimilitud (vegan en R) para ver diversidad beta de huéspedes entre ambientes silvestres y antropizados de las 16 especies de mosquito para las que tenemos registros en ambos ambientes.

21 diciembre 2020

Nos quedamos con las búsquedas que hizo Lupita. 2137 artículos total, 557 duplicados y 1580 únicos.

Nos quedamos con WoS y Scopus.

Seguimos PRISMA y PECO.

-Terminar de revisar la base de datos final

-Actualizar los gráficos

-Agregar el número de total de mosquitos bloodengorged

-Disimilitud en huéspedes (buscar matrices de disimilitud)

-Hacer el mapa