**Challenge paragraph:**

Our objective is to use ground beetles to study the long-term impacts of salvage-logging after a tornado. (1) First, we will compare the alpha-diversity of ground beetles between unsalvaged windthrow (hereafter: “windthrow”) and salvaged windthrow (hereafter: “salvaged”) management treatments, at three and ten years after the tornado. (2) Then we will compare the diversity of ground beetle body shapes between treatments using a functional alpha-diversity approach. (3) Furthermore, we will investigate whether the community composition of ground beetle species differs between treatments. (4) To explore mechanisms by which forest management impacts ground beetles, we will compare morphological traits of beetles caught in each treatment and compare functional community composition. (5) Additionally, we will evaluate the abundances of open-habitat adapted species versus forest adapted species. (6) To explore microclimatic factors relevant to ground beetles, we will compare the soil moisture, canopy openness, and ground cover types between windthrow and salvaged treatments.

**Methods**

Study site

Research was conducted at Powdermill Nature Preserve (PNR) in Rector, Westmoreland County, Pennsylvania (latitude: 40.159806558020556, longitude: -79.27176866978374). This preserve was established as the field research station for the Carnegie Museum of Natural History in 1956 and is largely temperate deciduous forest. The annual precipitation for the years 2012-2022 was between 45 and 70 in. with a mean of 53 in. (weather station: USC00362183) (“National Centers for Environmental Information: Past Weather,” n.d.). In June 2012, a tornado uprooted or snapped many canopy trees in two large areas of the forest, each about 120 × 480 m (Figure 1). These two areas are on north- or northwest-facing slopes, which were dominated by maple (*Acer spp*.), tuliptree (*Liriodendron tulipifera*), and black cherry (*Prunus serotina*) (Murphy et al. 2015), with an understory of predominately spicebush (*Lindera benzoin*) (Calinger et al. 2015). The tornado created patchy areas of canopy openness: the impacted areas had canopy openness values of 25% up to 90% (Slyder et al. 2020). The elevation of the impacted area ranges from around 1650 ft. to 1750 ft. A waterway, Laurel Run, is found along the west side of the impacted areas.

A map of a mountain

AI-generated content may be incorrect.

Figure 1. Map of the pitfall trap locations (need to add shapefiles of impacted areas)

From mid-summer through winter of 2013, half of each wind-disturbed area was salvage-logged using heavy machinery to remove both fallen and residual standing trees. In 2015, three transects were established across each area of forest impacted by the tornado (total 6 transects) (Figure 1). Transects were established across the windthrow and salvaged disturbances that extended 50 m into the surrounding undisturbed forest on each side. Along each transect, four plots were established: one plot in windthrow, one in salvaged, and two in the surrounding undisturbed forest. This resulted in a sample size of 24 plots, wherein all data collection occurred.

Ground-dwelling invertebrate sampling

Ground-dwelling invertebrates were sampled using barrier pitfall traps in 2015 and 2022, representing three and ten years post-tornado (two and nine years post-salvage). Barrier pitfall traps consisted of two pairs of plastic cups (each pair having an inner 500 mL cup and an outer 1 L cup) which were placed into the ground so that the lip of the cup was flush with the ground surface. The two pairs of cups were placed 1 m from each other, and garden edging (Suncast® eco edge) was placed between them to create a barrier. Cups were filled 4 cm high with propylene glycol (recreational vehicle and marine antifreeze, Peak Company Old World Industries, Clear Lake, Texas) with a few drops of detergent. Masonite board (100 cm2) was placed at 3 cm above each cup to prevent flooding from rain. Steel hardware cloth was secured over cups using 30 cm stakes to limit mammal disturbance.

Pitfall trap sampling was conducted continuously over the growing seasons in 2015 and 2022. Trap catch was collected every two weeks, and cups were refilled with propylene glycol. In 2015, pitfall traps were installed on May 27-28, and samples were collected on 9-10 June, 24-25 June, 8 July, 22 July, 5 August, and 17 August. In 2022, traps were installed on 1-2 June, and samples were collected on 15 June, 29 June, 13 July, 27 July, 11 August, 23 August, and 9 September. Between 2015 and 2022, plot 63 had to be moved by 27 m because of fallen debris, but the new location was still within the windthrow treatment. Trap catch was collected by pouring the sample through a fine mesh strainer and storing the contents in a specimen cup with 70% ethanol until sorting and identification.

Ground beetles (Carabidae) were identified to species using taxonomic keys (Lindroth 1961; Bousquet 2010; Freitag 1969; Bousquet and Messer 2010; Harden and Guarnieri 2017). Nomenclature followed Bousquet (2012). Species vouchers were deposited at the C. A. Triplehorn Insect Collection (OSUC), Museum of Biological Diversity, The Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio where each specimen was given a unique identifier label (Table 1).

Trait measurements

We selected eight morphological traits of beetles that have previously been shown to relate to habitat (Table 2) (Fountain-Jones, Baker, and Jordan 2015). These traits are body length, antenna length, eye protrusion, eye length, pronotum width, abdomen width, rear leg length, and rear trochanter length. Traits were measured under a dissecting microscope using an ocular micrometer to the nearest 0.1 mm. For each species, traits were measured on up to six individuals, three males and three females if possible (Fountain-Jones, Baker, and Jordan 2015). These individuals were chosen in a way that attempted to encompass the intraspecific variation in body size observed for the species. To control for variation in beetle body size, relative measurements of all morphological traits were calculated as their ratio to body length for each individual (Ribera et al. 2001). Trait measurements were averaged across individuals to calculate species-specific means.

In addition to measured traits, we utilized the literature to provide information for three additional traits: flight capability, water affinity, and forest affinity (Larochelle and Larivière 2003). Flight capability was coded as 1 if the species is flight-capable, 0 if the species is flight-incapable, and 0.5 if the species exhibits wing dimorphism. Water affinity was coded as 0 for xerophilous species, 1 for hygrophilous species, and 0.5 for intermediate species. Water affinity was treated as a physiological trait, because ground beetle species often have consistent humidity preferences in behavioral studies (Thiele 1977). Forest affinity was coded as “forest-specialist,” “open-habitat,” or “eurytopic” (meaning the species is found in forest clearings or in both forest and open habitats). We treated forest affinity as an ecological performance trait (following the terminology of Fountain-Jones et al. (2015)), and chose to exclude it from calculations of alpha- and beta- functional diversity.

**Table 2**. Morphological traits and literature-based traits used in this study. Forest affinity (the last trait) was excluded from calculations of alpha- and beta-functional diversity.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Trait** | **Connection to habitat** |
| Body length | Shorter body length was found for ground beetles caught in wind-disturbed forests, relative to undisturbed forests (Sklodowski and Garbalinska 2011). Body length is correlated with many other morphological traits (Barton et al. 2011). |
| Antenna length | Tactile hunter species, which rely on sense of touch more than vision, tend to have longer antennae (Bauer and Kredler 1993). Longer antenna length relative to body length was found for ground beetles caught under a tree, versus in the open (Barton et al. 2011). |
| Eye protrusion | A greater eye protrusion was found in a tree-climbing ground beetle, and it may allow partial overlap in the frontal visual field. However, greater eye protrusion might prevent a ground beetle from moving through thick vegetation or soil (Talarico et al. 2007). |
| Eye length | Diurnal ground beetle species and/or those adapted to open environments tend to rely on vision for predator avoidance or prey detection (Talarico et al. 2007), and thus might have longer eyes. |
| Pronotum width | A proportionally wider pronotum can be found in robust-bodied beetles, which tend to be found within open habitats (Barton et al. 2011). A narrow pronotum can be an adaptation to reaching prey within hard-to-reach crevices or shells. A narrow pronotum may also be related to the beetle having an unobstructed view behind its eyes (Forsythe 1991). |
| Abdomen width | Similar pattern to pronotum width (Barton et al. 2011). |
| Rear leg length | Open habitats seem to favor ground beetle species with shorter legs relative to body length (Barton et al. 2011). Ground beetles with longer legs may be weaker at pushing through dense substrates (Forsythe 1991). |
| Rear trochanter length | The rear trochanter connects to the femur of the rear leg. Ground beetles have a bean-shaped rear trochanter that allows them to move between narrow crevices between bark, leaf litter, or soil. The muscle in the rear trochanter allows the rear leg to create a force in the dorsal direction, which enlarges the space and allows the beetle to move through constricted areas. The trochanter is longer, on average, in species that push themselves through soil and underneath leaf litter. It is shorter in species that walk or run above the surface of the substrate (Talarico et al. 2007; Forsythe 1991). |
| Flight capability | Flight-capable species (macropterous and with fully developed flight musculature) can exploit patchy, temporary habitats. Conversely, flight incapable species may have higher fitness within stable habitats (Venn 2016). |
| Water affinity | Habitats vary in the saturation of the substrate with water, and water preference varies between ground beetle species, with some species found near riverbanks or other bodies of water, others found in moist leaf litter, and others found in dry soil. A preference for low humidity may be related to overwintering within tree stumps and logs, versus in the soil (Thiele 1977). |
| Forest affinity | Some ground beetle species tend to be caught in forests, underneath trees, whereas other species tend to be caught in fields, prairies, pastures, and other open habitats (Silverman et al. 2008). |

Forest floor environment

Environmental variables on the forest floor were quantified to assess differences among windthrow, salvaged, and undisturbed forest. Percentage canopy openness was measured using a spherical crown densiometer directly above the pitfall traps to assess light availability on the forest floor. Canopy openness was measured on 9-10 June and 5 August in 2015, and on 1-2 June in 2022. Percentage cover of ground-level vegetation, leaf litter, bare ground, fine woody debris (<10 cm diameter at the large end), coarse woody debris (>= 10 cm diameter), and rocks were estimated in two randomly selected 1 m2 quadrats around each pitfall trap. Understory vegetation height (m) was also measured in the quadrats. Ground cover estimates were collected on 9 June, 7 July, and 5 August in 2015, and on 1-2 June, 13 July, 11 August, and 6 September in 2022. Values from the two quadrats around each pitfall trap were averaged together for a site-level mean. Soil moisture was measured at three locations adjacent to each pitfall trap using a Dynamax Inc. (Houston, Texas) TH20 portable soil moisture meter with a Theta Probe ML2x sensor. Soil moisture measurements were taken biweekly when pitfall samples were collected. The three readings were averaged together for a single mean at each plot-date combination.

Statistical analysis

Data standardization:

Ground dwelling invertebrates vary in how much they move across the forest floor, and movement may be affected by forest management (Perry et al. 2021). Pitfall traps preferentially collect insects that are more active and mobile, and consequently the number of ground beetles caught in pitfalls is reported as activity-abundance, which emphasizes that insect sampling methods have inherent biases towards certain taxa (Gandhi et al. 2008).

To determine if our sampling effort was adequate to understand the ground beetle fauna at the site, we used species accumulation curves (SACs) and Chao estimators. For each year and treatment, we created an SAC with number of sampled plots in the x-axis. This was implemented using the *specaccum* function in the R package ‘vegan’ with the ‘random’ setting, which finds the mean SAC by permuting the order of the plots (Oksanen et al. 2024; R Core Team 2024). To estimate a lower bound on the true species richness of ground beetles, we used an asymptotic approach (Chao and Chiu 2016). We used the Chao1 estimator, which is a nonparametric estimator that gives a lower bound on the true species richness. This estimator incorporates the number of singletons and doubletons to estimate the number of undetected species and was implemented using the function “ChaoSpecies” using the R package “SpadeR” (Anne Chao et al. 2016).

Before doing further analyses, we accounted for occasional loss of trap catch due to animal disturbance. For each species, we divided the count over the entire trapping season by the number of days that the pitfall trap was operational (Sklodowski and Garbalinska 2011).

Taxonomic alpha-diversity

To investigate alpha-diversity at the plot level, we calculated species richness and Shannon diversity using the package “HillR” (Li 2018). Shannon diversity was calculated using the formula exp(-Σpiln(pi)), which is the same as the Hill number of order 1. This metric takes values between 1 and the species richness, depending on the degree to which the relative abundances are equal.

Functional alpha-diversity

We used trait data in combination with standardized counts of ground beetles to calculate functional alpha-diversity. First, we verified that our traits (after being standardized to body length) were not correlated with each other, evidenced by all pairs of traits having a Pearson correlation coefficient of less than \_\_\_\_. To further combat any trait redundancy, we performed a principal components analysis (PCA) (Swenson 2014). We first transformed the data by making it so each trait had a mean of 0 and a variance of 1 before running the PCA. After graphing the species onto the first two PC axes, we noticed that one rare species, *Notiophilus aeneus*, was far from any other point, potentially masking overall patterns. Thus, we removed this outlier from all calculations of functional diversity. The first PC axis was associated with \_\_\_\_\_. The second PC axis was associated with \_\_\_\_\_\_. … We kept the first \_\_\_ PC axes, which together explained \_\_% of the variance in the trait data. We used these \_\_\_ PC axes to calculate a Euclidean distance matrix between all ground beetle species in trait space. Finally, we calculated functional alpha-diversity for each plot by computing the weighted mean pairwise distance in trait space between species found at the plot. Each calculation of distance between a pair of species was weighted by the product of their relative abundances at the plot (Swenson 2014). The calculation was carried out using the function *mpd* in the R package “picante” (cite).

GLMMs

We tested whether forest management treatment (windthrow, salvaged, undisturbed forest) was correlated with plot-level ground beetle abundance, species richness, Shannon diversity, or functional alpha-diversity. We created separate models for each year of sampling (2015 and 2022). We included transect as a random effect to account for spatial structure in the data (we tested for spatial autocorrelation and found that \_\_\_\_\_\_). The response variables were tested for normality and homogeneity of variances across each treatment group.
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