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**Abstract**

1. Species

**Keywords:** imperfect

**Introduction**

* Occupancy models are powerful tools that take into account imperfect detection
  + Require standardized data collection and meeting specific assumptions
  + If violated- grave consequences on parameter estimation and ecological inference
  + However, researchers have come up with ways of using occupancy models for non-standardized methods typically used for opportunistic collections
  + For example, to use historical data, authors directly re-survey sites that were surveyed in historical periods or constrained analyses to locations where 2 or more sampling events occurred within a calendar year
  + Replication ensures that occupancy and detection can be estimated
* Opportunistic community science sampling, atlas data, historical museum records contain presence-only data, species non-detections must be inferred
  + One way to do this infer a non-detection for a particular species if a different species was observed at that same site on the same date
  + Issues that may arise in using community science with occupancy models:
    - 1. Sampling (taxonomic) bias
      * Particular species may be sampled more frequently than others because more is known about them or inference is desired on that species
      * Apidae is over-represented with many more records for this family than others
    - 2. Detection bias
      * Species detectability changes over time and space as a result of observers or number of surveys
      * Number of observers, quality of observers, length of survey, survey conditions
      * Solution: add covariates
      * Solution: filter the data by removing vistis with only a single observation
      * Solution: constrain analyses to species that meet some minimum number of observations
    - 3. Spatial bias
      * Particular locations are more easily visited
      * Some areas are never visited
    - 4. How to define a site?
      * Spatial resolution?
    - 5. A museum record is only a subset of a field collection
      * When and where was the specimen collected?
      * Sometimes common species are not curated
  + Scientists have been trying to use these data sets to learn about species distributions across space and time.
    - Describe population declines, etc.
    - Range shifts + contractions
    - This requires a lot of sampling
    - But these datasets can be used to learn other biologically relevant information.
  + Here, we are interested in exploring species interactions (bee-plant) and what kind of bias there is in documenting these relationships.
    - * What are the next steps for these aggregated databases?
      * What holes are there left in our biological understanding?
      * Which bees do we not have enough data for?
        + Only have data for large and common bees?
        + Taxonomic biases?
      * Looking at the number of collectors in the data- looking to see what they predominately collected
* Objectives
  + We are interested in determining if social bees are more generalist (and visit more flowers) than solitary bees.
  + We will be using a multi-species occupancy model for the analysis
    - We will estimate:
      * psi = The probability a bee species interacts with a plant species
      * p = The probability that a study documented the bee-plant interaction
  + Obj 1: We will be exploring hypotheses related to bee and flower characteristics that relate to the ecological process (i.e., what characteristics relate to a species degree of generalism?) and the detection process (i.e., what characteristics relate to species detectability?)
    - Bee
      * Size
      * Sociality
      * rare/common, pilosity, seasonality, coloration
      * Phenology
      * Physiology (the change in thermal position, thermal range)
      * Short vs long tongued
    - Flower
      * Shape
      * Size
      * Density
      * Color
    - Citation characteristics
      * Number of unique collectors per citation
      * List of collectors and determinors
    - Katja can identify who is a good taxonomist – like Robin and others- some confidence scale in the determination of the bees
      * Figure out how long they were in the island
      * Event date- when the observation occurred
    - if everyone is collecting in the spring, there is a chance they would miss winter and summer bees
* We can also ask the same question but from a plants perspective: which plants support the bee diversity?
* What are the keystone plants?
* Forbidden links- Bartomeaous model
  + - Some of those interactions that would never occur no matter what
    - Do some bees and flowers never interact because of their phenology?
    - If we see they are phenologically separated, we would have a huntch that would be the case
  + Obj 2: We will use a simulation study to determine how the assumptions we made in analyzing the dataset manifest in parameter bias.
    - Specifically, we will explore the following assumptions:
      * Assumption 1: We assume that each source citation had the opportunity to document all bee-plant interactions.
    - This means that we inferred non-detections for bee-plant interactions even when there is no evidence that each plant species was visited
  + Assumption 2: We assume that each bee species can interact with all plant species
    - We assume no forbidden links

**Methods**

*Data:*

* To do this, we are using the Globi interactions database in combination with bee and plant site checklists.
  + Observations are obtained from museum collections and research studies worldwide.
  + Studies vary in terms of objectives, study design, etc.
  + The Globi database consists of presence-only data.
* We have compiled bee & flower checklists for X number of sites, and subsetted the Globi database to those species.
  + Note that the Globi data does not need to geographically match with the bee & flower checklists of our sites.
  + Our questions relate to determining possible bee-flower interactions (but not specific to a site).
  + We use the checklists to retroactively assign species non-detections (similar to the Kery et al. 2009 paper where they ad hoc assigned bird non-detections using site checklists).
  + We are using different collections/source citations as the 'repeated survey' for each interaction.
  + In globi this will be, ecological studies (published papers), meta-analyses, different museums, and singleton observations from websites like iNaturalist.
  + We collapsed all opportunistic records by source citation- such that if a bee-plant interaction was ever documented, then it received a 1 (present) in the database, and all others were marked 0.
  + We are assuming that an observer COULD have encountered the bee-plant interaction.
  + We subset the data to a rectangular region around Santa Cruz Island, CA.

*Assumptions:*

* We do not explicitly consider space or time in the model
  + Data are collected worldwide across time, and these are records of any possible plant-bee interaction anywhere
  + Implicit assumption that bee-plant interactions are static and do not vary across space or time (i.e., no extinction or colonization events- a bee species always interacts with a plant species regardless of location and time)
* We assume that all bee and plant species occur across our entire geographic window, and that not all bee and plant species interact with one another
  + We do not explicitly consider phenology
  + We assume that the range of each bee and plant species is within the defined area
* We assume that each bee species can interact with all plant species
  + We assume no forbidden links
  + This assumption is tested with **the range part of the model**
* We assume that each source citation had the opportunity to document all bee-plant interactions.
  + we inferred non-detections for bee-plant interactions even when there is no evidence that each plant species was visited
  + This corresponds to a similar assumption made by Soroye et al. 2020 (also see Guzman et al. 2021)
  + This corresponds to the **visitation part** of the model
* What is the closed period of time over which surveys are occurring in this study? There is no space or time in the model
  + All bee-plant interactions remain consistent across all citations
  + i.e., a generalist bee remains generalist
  + Bees do not start interacting with new/different plants
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*Model:*

*Covariates*:

Detection part of the model

* Number of unique collectors per citation
* Robin Thorpe as a covariate 1/0
* List of collectors and determinors
  + - Katja can identify who is a good taxonomist – like Robin and others- some confidence scale in the determination of the bees
* How much time did these people spend in the field?
  + - Katja can get it from the RAMS records
    - Figure out how long they were in the island
    - Katja will reach out to the director- J Ready- to see if they have the information
    - Not sure how long they have been keeping track
* When the observation occurred
  + - Event date- when the observation occurred
    - Verbatium event date- for literature records might be filled out more- usually summer, not exact dates in their papers
    - Most will have this
    - The ones we will lose
    - Katja- if everyone is collecting in the spring, there is a chance they would miss winter and summer bees
* We won’t have any weather data for the historic data- like cloudy, or temperature, etc.
  + - There is a functional weather station
    - So we could get temperature, precipitation that year, and other environmental factors
* We likely don’t have enough data- but an interesting question- are bees using different floral resources in dry years than in wet years?
  + - In dry years, going to second or third favorite things
    - In wet years, might be able to go to favorite things
    - Specialization increases in dy years- related to nutrients rather than precipitation
    - Likely very dynamic – how strong the competition becomes
* Weather idea
  + - Smooshing space and time together
    - All interactions are in 1 space bin
    - Wondering how we would fit the yearly, temperature precipitation
* Flower size, shape, & color
  + - Bartomeous paper- flower type- tube, inflorecent- related to flower shape (clusters vs small)

Ecological part of the model

* Forbidden links- Bartomeaous model
  + Some of those interactions that would never occur no matter what
  + They try to take that into account by looking at compatiability of bee and flower biology
    - Type of bee and flower
    - Short vs long tongued
    - Do some bees and flowers never interact because of their phenology?
      * Katja says yes- there are bees that emerge really early in the year than miss flowers later in the year
      * No data for that
      * There isn’t a list of things that would never interact
      * We could persue understanding that
      * If we see a group of bees never on a plant and a group of bees on the plant- use a different dataset to look at the phenology of bees and plants- go to GBIF or something like that
      * If we see they are phenologically separated, we would have a huntch that would be the case
      * There might be a step where we ask that question
    - Looking at the majority of ultimate questions- not sure how much the forbidden links will be important
    - In terms of our discussion of data quality, and advancing biological thinking- good place
    - Might not be as important for our bigger questions
* Flower covariates
  + Predominate flower color
  + Flower size
    - Could be size or density
  + Plant trait database with a lot of that information
  + There are about 600 plants or so after they removed grasses
  + Big bees go to white flowers
  + Bartomeous paper- flower type- tube, inflorecent- related to flower shape (clusters vs small)
* Flower size, shape, & color
  + Flower size- bees don’t visit it as much, people don’t pay as much attention
  + Asters is associated with many interactions- importance of taking into account

*Simulation study*:

* We examine how our assumptions impact our inference.

**Results**

…..

**Discussion**

…..
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