A statistical approach to PVA validation: testing quasi-extinction estimation and the IUCN red list criteria

Overview

◆ Different validation approaches

◆ Example: a cross-validation study of state-space modeling of stochastic populations

◆ The database

◆ Some results

Methods for testing PVAs

|	
Compare mean or median predictions with observations	Subjective, ignores variability, single trajectories unlikely to be similar to mean
Compare observed vs predicted frequency of events	Only assesses average number or frequency of occurrences within a group, ignores variability
Compare probability distributions of population size or parameters	Assesses both the mean and variability, generally requires transformation of data to a standard variate, lots of data

Diffusion approximation PVA

reproduction

Survival to next age class

eggs → 1 → 2 → 3 → 4

Let reproduction and survival vary yearly

$$N_t = N_0 \exp(\mu t + \varepsilon t)$$
$$\text{where } \varepsilon \sim \text{Normal}(0, \sigma)$$

Basic Idea of DA PVA

# Parameters of a corrupted DA model – aka a state-space model

$$N_t = N_0 * \exp(\mu t + \varepsilon t) \text{ where } \varepsilon \sim N(0, \sigma)$$
$$N_t = N_0 * \exp(\varepsilon_s t) \text{ where } \varepsilon_s \sim f(0, \sigma_{np})$$

**Parameter that governs the median rate of decline.**

"Non-process error"

"Process error"

117 Time series 20-50 yrs long
# 72 are listed species

Legend:
- Birds
- Mammals
- Reptiles
- Insects
- Amphibs
- Fish

Cross-validation

Does the DA model predict the frequency of actual declines?

fraction of time series that dip below a threshold

threshold
(rel. to size at the start of the eval. period)

Observed in data

Do the projected population sizes follow the expected theoretical distribution?

IUCN Red List Criteria

- ◆ A: Population reduction in the form of either
    1. Observed X% decline over the last Y yrs
    2. Projected X% decline in next Y yrs or Z g
- ◆ B: Pop. fragmented or habitat contracting
- ◆ C: Population below some threshold &
    1. Declining and fragmented
    2. Projected X% decline within Y yrs
- • D: Less than X mature individuals
- • E: Extinction risk greater than X% in Y yrs

# Expected versus predicted % declines: criteria C1

Criteria: A2

Expected and Observed % declines

Quasi-extinction: Criteria E

Expected vs. Observed Quasi-extinction: Criteria E

Why does this seem to work?

- ◆ Simple model makes many simplifying assumptions
  - ◆ density-independence
  - ◆ no environmental correlation
  - ◆ no trends
  - ◆ diffusion approximation of age-structured population

Parameterization performance

- ◆ Using a Kalman filter estimator
  - ◆ Maximum likelihood estimator for mu, sigma2_p, sigma2_np
  - ◆ Using runsum-slope estimator

# Kalman vs slope 10 years of data

10 years of data; N = 226

Kalman vs slope with 20 yrs data

20 years of data; N = 112

Kalman vs slope 30 yrs of data

- ◆ Preliminary conclusions
  - ◆ State-space model does pretty well for 10-30 year projections
  - ◆ Kalman filter estimator does fine since a model with all error attributed to non-process error seems to characterize the 10-30 yr stochastic process pretty well
  - ◆ The slope estimator is prone to less errors when estimating the process error from a short time series. This would be important if doing a 100 yr projection from a 10 yr time series – which is probably a bad thing to do, however.

Comparison of Kalman and slope performance

	% 0 process error ests Kalman	% 0 process error ests Slope	Correlation between Kalman and slope
10 yrs	68%	21%	0.72
20 yrs	28%	1%	0.90
30 yrs	8%	0%	0.94