

Imperial College London

CMEE MRes Project Proposal

**Integrating Body Size or Temperature Scaling with the
Neutral Theory of Biodiversity**
(a draft title)

Calum Pennington

Supervisors

Dr. James Rosindell (j.rosindell@imperial.ac.uk)

Dr. Samraat Pawar (s.pawar@imperial.ac.uk)

Committee Members (TBC)

Prof. Tim Barraclough

Dr. Rob Ewers

9 December 2016

1 **Proposal's Remit**

2 This is an initial proposal, put together at an early stage in the learning process. It will develop further,
3 as my knowledge and understanding of this exciting and intriguing area grows.

4 **Background**

5 **Neutral Biodiversity Theory**

6 Neutral Theory assumes that all individuals in a community are ecologically identical [Rosindell et al., 2011].
7 Its success at reproducing biodiversity patterns suggests that demographic stochasticity, rather than the
8 differences among species, is the key influence on diversity [O'Dwyer et al., 2009]. Neutral Theory is a
9 drastic simplification of reality. It provides a null model, from which to test whether the added complexity
10 of other mechanisms can explain biodiversity.

11
12 *Key parameters of a neutral model: random death, speciation, and dispersal.*

13 **Allometry and Metabolic Scaling**

14 Body size determines an organism's metabolic rate - the rate at which it expends energy (e.g. for growth
15 and reproduction). Thus, body size has a big impact on the structure and function of communities and
16 ecosystems. Specifically, metabolic rate scales as a power function with body mass [Sibly, 2012].

17
18 Scaling relationships are a powerful set of generalisations, which essentially assume all species of
19 the same size behave the same way. Like Neutral Theory, they give a quantitative starting point for
20 understanding the structure of a complex system. Fascinated by the simplicity and success of these
21 approaches, I am drawn to investigating the links between them, and the next layer of complexity.

22 **Overarching Purpose**

23 *Fundamental aim:* make simple assumptions about complex systems to see what can be explained by
24 models.

25
26 *Context:* quantify the effects of body size/temperature on biodiversity patterns, relative to demographic
27 stochasticity.

29 *Method:* use allometry or metabolic scaling to describe select neutral-model parameters.

30 **Potential Avenues**

31 **1) Estimate Extinction Rates after Habitat Loss**

32 Habitat loss is a primary threat to biodiversity, but the accurate estimation of extinction rates is unresolved
 33 [Halley and Iwasa, 2011]. The difficulty is partly due to 'extinction debt' - species are lost gradually, not
 34 immediately after habitat destruction [He and Hubbell, 2011].

35 In neutral models, death is a stochastic process. O'Dwyer et al (2009) instead described a size-
 36 structured simulation community, where individuals die with a size-dependent rate. The goal would be
 37 to:

- 38 • develop a time and spatially explicit hypothesis
- 39 • test whether you can generate more precise predictions of extinction rate by drawing on the meth-
 40 ods of O'Dwyer et al.

41 Introducing size variation to a simulation community changes the species biomass distribution pro-
 42 duced by a neutral model [O'Dwyer et al., 2009]. If it is too challenging to estimate extinction rates, a
 43 simpler alternative is to study changes to community structure after habitat loss.

44 **2) Predict Altitudinal Gradients of Biodiversity**

45 A prominent observation of biodiversity is the latitudinal diversity gradient - an increase in species rich-
 46 ness from the poles to the equator [Tittensor and Worm, 2016]. One hypothesised explanation is higher
 47 speciation rates - a result of higher temperature and thus faster physiological rates (higher mutation
 48 rates and shorter generations) [Sibly, 2012]. This gradient can be reproduced in simulation, by apply-
 49 ing a thermal effect to speciation rate (and, crucially, increasing community size towards the tropics)
 50 [Tittensor and Worm, 2016]. Species richness also follows elevational gradients. Temperature is the
 51 most evident factor that varies with altitude, generally decreasing at higher elevations [citation to be con-
 52 firmed]. This idea of varying speciation rates is contentious and requires further evaluation. It is also
 53 unreasonable to expect the mechanisms promoting latitudinal and elevational gradients to be the same.
 54 Alternative hypotheses and ways to parametrise a neutral model will be considered. E.g., the 'out of
 55 the tropics effect' [Jablonski et al., 2006] could be examined with a 'nearly' neutral model that considers
 56 fitness.

The goal would be to:

- add thermal effects to neutral model parameters
- run spatially explicit neutral simulations, to see if altitudinal, instead of latitudinal, gradients can be reproduced.

Initial Timeline

Task	Dec	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr onwards
In depth study of the two proposals to:					
i) substantiate & streamline the question					
ii) develop personal learning					
Write a draft introduction					
Assess the availability of empirical data					
Judge whether to incorporate this or pursue a purely theoretical approach					
Decide how to describe neutral model parameters using allometry/metabolic scaling					
Focus on planning methods					
Start building model and simulation					
Evaluate programming languages and select the best one for this task					
Develop my skills in using this language, so I can work with speed and accuracy		Ongoing			
Write up a draft methods					
Test and develop model and simulations					
Begin reviewing results					
Analyse results					
Begin writing up results					

Figure 1: Timeline of initial part of project

Budget

Printing - papers for reading; dissertation (£125)

Contingency - e.g. attending a conference (£375)

65 **References**

- 66 [Halley and Iwasa, 2011] Halley, J. M. and Iwasa, Y. (2011). Neutral theory as a predictor of avifaunal
67 extinctions after habitat loss. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 108(6):2316–2321.
- 68 [He and Hubbell, 2011] He, F. and Hubbell, S. P. (2011). Species-area relationships always overestimate
69 extinction rates from habitat loss. *Nature*, 473(7347):368–371.
- 70 [Jablonski et al., 2006] Jablonski, D., Roy, K., and Valentine, J. W. (2006). Out of the tropics: Evolution-
71 ary dynamics of the latitudinal diversity gradient. *Science*, 314(5796):102–106.
- 72 [O’Dwyer et al., 2009] O’Dwyer, J., Lake, J., Ostling, A., Savage, V., and Green, J. (2009). An integrative
73 framework for stochastic, size-structured community assembly. *Proceedings of the National Academy
74 of Sciences*, 106(15):6170–6175.
- 75 [Rosindell et al., 2011] Rosindell, J., Hubbell, S. P., and Etienne, R. S. (2011). The unified neutral theory
76 of biodiversity and biogeography at age ten. *Trends in ecology & evolution*, 26(7):340–348.
- 77 [Sibly, 2012] Sibly, R. M. (2012). *Metabolic ecology : a scaling approach*. Wiley-Blackwell, Chichester,
78 West Sussex Hoboken, NJ.
- 79 [Tittensor and Worm, 2016] Tittensor, D. P. and Worm, B. (2016). A neutral-metabolic theory of latitudi-
80 nal biodiversity. *Global Ecology and Biogeography*, 25(6):630–641.