

An introduction to ecological modelling


1. Approaches to Modelling and Statistical
Models of Ecological Data

Ecological data are often complicated



From Gillaranz et al. (2017). *Science* 357: 199-201


What is an ecological model?



Statistical models, such as linear regression.

E.g. predator-prey functional response

Data from Vonesh & Bolker (2005) *Ecology*



Simple theoretical models.


Predator-prey functional response again,
but this time without data

What is an ecological model?

(More) complex, mechanistic or process-based models

Represent the key processes underlying a system

Examples include global climate models and vegetation models



Why rely on models?



Ethical considerations



Large-scale studies – sample
size = 1



Predicting the future

Course Objectives

An appreciation for the role that modelling plays in ecology (with a focus on studies that rely heavily on modelling)

An overview of the types of modelling approaches available

Information to help pick the right model for a particular question

Examples of the application of different types of ecological models

No need to understand all of the maths!

Lecture Outline

General modelling principles

Statistical models

- General applications of maximum likelihood
- Generalized linear models
- Bayesian statistics
- Mixed-effects models

No model is perfect



“Since all models are wrong the scientist cannot obtain a ‘correct’ one by excessive elaboration”

George Box (1976). Science and statistics. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* **71**: 791-799

“Essentially, all models are wrong, but some are useful”


George Box & Norman Draper (1987). *Empirical Model-Building and Response Surfaces*. Wiley.

Even the most sophisticated modelling approaches won't work if model/assumptions/data are wrong



Source: Financial Times


Model complexity, fit and predictive ability (statistical models)



More complex statistical models tend to fit the data used to build them better

But they risk overfitting the data, and have lower predictive power


Statistical models



Statistical models:

- Maximum likelihood
- Generalized linear models (GLMs)
- Frequentist vs. Bayesian statistics
- Hierarchical data and mixed-effects models

Maximum likelihood



Statistical models, such as linear regression.

E.g. predator-prey functional response

Data from Vonesh & Bolker (2005) *Ecology*


Much of classical statistics is concerned with finding the best estimate for parameters

E.g. in the case of a linear regression, the slope and intercept

Often this is done by maximizing (log) likelihood

$$L = P(D|H) = P(D|\theta)$$


Maximum likelihood: a simple linear regression example




$$\text{Killed} = m \times \text{Initial} + c + \varepsilon$$

$$\varepsilon \sim N(0, \sigma)$$

$$\text{Killed} - (m \times \text{Initial} + c) \sim N(0, \sigma)$$



Maximum likelihood: more complex models



Predator-prey functional response


Data from Vonesh & Bolker (2005) *Ecology*

Type II functional response:

$$P_{death} = \frac{a}{1 + aHN}$$

$$N_{killed} = \frac{aN}{1 + aHN}$$

Finding the maximum likelihood



Predator-prey functional response
Data from Vonesh & Bolker (2005) *Ecology*


Analytical solutions, for example
ordinary least squares regression

$$y = mx + c + \varepsilon$$

$$m = \frac{\sum (X_i - \bar{X})(Y_i - \bar{Y})}{\sum (X_i - \bar{X})^2}$$

$$c = \bar{Y} - m\bar{X}$$

Finding the maximum likelihood




1000 parameter combinations

Brute force search

Can be useful for simple models

But quickly becomes
unmanageable

Finding the maximum likelihood




Derivative-based methods

Find point at which derivative of likelihood function = 0

E.g. Newton method

Only work well with smooth likelihood surfaces

Finding the maximum likelihood




Derivative-free methods

Nelder-Mead simplex:

- For n parameters, based on $n+1$ combinations of parameters that form the vertices of a ‘simplex’
- This simplex is modified according to set rules

Finding the maximum likelihood




Derivative-free methods

Simulated annealing, e.g.
Metropolis algorithm:

$$P(\text{accept}) = \begin{cases} e^{-\frac{\Delta(-L)}{k}} & \text{if } \Delta(-L) > 0 \\ 1 & \text{if } \Delta(-L) < 0 \end{cases}$$

k ('temperature') is reduced periodically to make moves to poor parameter values less likely

Applications of maximum likelihood estimation: inferring functional responses




For 5 beetle species,
modelled Type II functional
responses:

$$N_{killed} = \frac{aN}{1 + aHN}$$

a = attack rate, H =
handling time, N = prey
density

Maximum likelihood
estimation

Applications of maximum likelihood estimation: inferring functional responses



Attack rate and handling time vary with predator body mass

Applications of maximum likelihood estimation: estimating occupancy and detection probability



Some species are very hard to detect


Might not show up during short surveys

Can model separately probability of detection and probability of occupancy, given detection:

$$L = \left[\Psi^n \cdot \prod_{t=1}^T p^{n_t} (1-p)^{n.-n_t} \right] \times \left[\Psi \prod_{t=1}^T (1-p) + (1-\Psi) \right]^{N-n.}$$

L = likelihood, Ψ = probability of occupancy, p = probability of detection in one visit, given occupancy, n. = number of sites with at least one detection, n_t = number of sites with detection on visit t, T = number of visits at each site

Applications of maximum likelihood estimation: estimating occupancy and detection probability




Assessing accuracy of species distribution models

Surveyed 21 new sites, with 4 short transects per site

Modelled detectability and average occupancy probability

Parameters estimated with maximum likelihood estimation

Types of statistical model



`lm(response ~ category + continuous)`

- Assume constant variance
- Assume normally distributed errors

How well does my model fit?

$$SS_{tot} = \sum_i (y_i - \bar{y})^2$$

$$SS_{res} = \sum_i (y_i - \hat{y}_i)^2$$

$$R^2 = 1 - \frac{SS_{res}}{SS_{tot}}$$

How badly does my model fit?


Model Deviance = $-2(LL(\text{Proposed Model}))$


AIC = Model Deviance + $2 \times DF$ (*lower is better*)

There are other information criteria used to select among models

All are measures of variation in the response variable explained, penalized by number of free parameters or number of data


Land-use change presents the greatest threat to biodiversity currently





[Dark Green Box]	Primary
[Teal Box]	Secondary
[Yellow-Gold Box]	Cropland
[Orange Box]	Pasture
[Magenta Box]	Urban


There are lots of small-scale studies of land-use impacts on biodiversity



Gardner et al.
(2007).

*Conservation
Biology* 21: 775-787

PREDICTS database: observed land-use impacts



Hudson et al. (2014). *Ecology & Evolution* 4: 4701-4735



Primary vegetation

Secondary vegetation

Plantations





Cropland

Pasture



Urban

Ecological data often don't fit assumption of standard statistical tests




Data from Gould et al. (2013). *PLoS ONE* 8: e59356

Ecological data often don't fit assumption of standard statistical tests



Data from Gould et al. (2013). *PLoS ONE* 8: e59356

Ecological data often don't fit assumption of standard statistical tests



Generalized linear models

Can be used for data that don't have normal error distribution or constant variance

Use a 'link function' to relate the expected value of y (μ) to the linear predictor (η),
e.g. for a Poisson GLM:

$\hat{y}_i \sim Pois(\mu_i)$, where

$$g(\mu_i) = \eta_i = m_1 x_i + m_2 x_i + \dots + c + \varepsilon_i$$

$g()$ is the link function

GLMs: families and link functions

Family	Link function (name)	Link function	Inverse link function	Example data types
Gaussian (i.e. linear model)	Identity	μ	η	Any normally distributed data
Poisson	Log	$\log(\mu)$	$\exp(\eta)$	Counts, e.g. species richness
Binomial	Logit	$\log\left(\frac{\mu}{1 - \mu}\right)$	$\frac{1}{1 + \exp(-\eta)}$	Binary data or proportions, e.g. species presence/absence


More on model fit

Null Deviance = $2(LL(\text{Saturated Model}) - LL(\text{Null Model}))$

Residual Deviance = $2(LL(\text{Saturated Model}) - LL(\text{Proposed Model}))$

Explained deviance = $(\text{Null deviance} - \text{Residual deviance}) / \text{Null deviance}$

Classical frequentist statistics



Null hypothesis: e.g. normal distribution with mean 0

Collect some observations to test our hypothesis – calculate likelihood (\mathcal{L}) of data given null hypothesis:

$$P(D|H_0)$$

Find parameters that maximise the (log) likelihood:

$$P(D|H)$$

Bayesian Statistics: Bayes' Rule



The Reverend Thomas Bayes

Try to find the probability of the hypothesis given the data, instead of the probability of the data given the hypothesis, i.e.:

$$P(H|D)$$


Bayes' Rule:

$$P(H|D) = \frac{P(D|H)P(H)}{P(D)}$$

Likelihood (\mathcal{L})

?

Bayesian Statistics



Assume all possible hypotheses are known

$P(D)$ is the sum of the dark grey areas, i.e.:

$$P(D) = \sum_{j=1}^N P(D \cap H_j)$$

$$P(D) = \sum_{j=1}^N P(D|H_j)P(H_j)$$


Likelihood (\mathcal{L})

$$P(H_i|D) = \frac{P(D|H_i)P(H_i)}{\sum_{j=1}^N P(D|H_j)P(H_j)}$$

Likelihood (\mathcal{L})

Prior
probabilities

Bayesian Statistics: Prior Probabilities




Often an ‘uninformative’ or ‘flat’ prior is used

Model-estimated mean is similar to before

Or we can incorporate some prior knowledge/expectation

This shifts the model-estimated mean toward the prior distribution

Parameter sampling in Bayesian statistics: Markov Chain Monte Carlo



Markov process: transition probability depends only on system's current state, not on its history



Parameter sampling in Bayesian statistics: Markov Chain Monte Carlo

MCMC rule:

$$\frac{Post(A)}{Post(B)} = \frac{P(B \rightarrow A)P(\text{accept } A|B)}{P(A \rightarrow B)P(\text{accept } B|A)}$$

Ensures that parameter estimates reflect the posterior probability distribution, rather than honing in on the maximum-likelihood estimate

Example methods:

- Metropolis-Hastings
- Gibbs sampler


Bayesian and frequentist models compared

Models of ant species richness as a function of habitat, elevation and latitude


Table 4 Parameter estimates for the additive model (eqn 3) predicting ant species richness from habitat, elevation, and latitude

Classical model (maximum likelihood estimate)	Bayesian models			Averaged model, non-informative prior
	Posterior mode, non-informative prior	Posterior mode, informative prior		
$\hat{\beta}_0$	11.95 (2.65) [6.81, 17.73]	11.49 (1.87) [7.89, 15.32]	12.18 (2.22) [6.89, 16.33]	12.03 (2.65)
$\hat{\beta}_1$	-0.24 (0.06) [-0.36, -0.11]	-0.23 (0.04) [-0.31, -0.14]	-0.24 (0.05) [-0.33, -0.12]	-0.24 (0.06)
$\hat{\beta}_2$	-0.001 (0.0003) [-0.002, -0.0004]	-0.001 (0.0004) [-0.002, -0.0004]	-0.001 (0.0004) [-0.002, -0.0004]	-0.001 (0.0004)
$\hat{\beta}_3$	0.64 (0.06) [0.44, 0.75]	0.64 (0.12) [0.40, 0.88]	0.63 (0.12) [0.40, 0.84]	0.64 (0.12)

Applications of Bayesian modelling approaches: occupancy and detection again



Survey effort




Probability of occupancy

Beale et al. (2013).
Ecology Letters 16:
1061-1068

Hierarchical occupancy model:
probability of occupancy and
probability of detection

Accounted for survey effort




Applications of Bayesian modelling approaches: occupancy and detection again

Wild bee occurrence data from 1994 to 2010

Bayesian occupancy-detection model


Probability of detection a function of survey effort (number of species recorded)

Persistence probability a function of oilseed rape cover and neonicotinoid exposure




Applications of Bayesian modelling approaches: occupancy and detection again

a



b



Applications of Bayesian modelling approaches: impacts of land use on bird biodiversity

24 published studies of bird communities in tropical forest



Three levels of land-use intensity
(undisturbed, light, intensive)

Considered effects of species traits on response to land-use intensity



Lots of gaps in data, so user-defined likelihood function

Bayesian approach useful, because of focus on prediction

Newbold et al. (2013). *Proceedings of the Royal Society, Series B* 280: 20122131







Applications of Bayesian modelling approaches: impacts of land use on bird biodiversity




Newbold et al. (2013). *Proceedings of the Royal Society, Series B* 280: 20122131

Applications of Bayesian modelling approaches: impacts of land use on bird biodiversity

(a)



Hierarchical ecological data: nested experimental designs




Hierarchical ecological data: synthetic studies

Changes in Arthropod Assemblages along a Wide Gradient of Disturbance in Gabon


YVES BASSET,^{*} OLIVIER MISSA,[†] ALFONSO ALONSO,[‡] SCOTT E. MILLER,[§]
GIANFRANCO CURLETTI,^{**} MARC DE MEYER,^{††} CONNAL EARDLEY,^{‡‡} OWEN T. LEWIS,^{§§}
MERVYN W. MANSELL,^{***} VOJTECH NOVOTNY,^{†††} AND THOMAS WAGNER^{‡‡‡}

^{*}Smithsonian Tropical Research Institute, Apartado 0843-03092, Balboa, Ancon, Panama City, Republic of Panama,
email bassety@si.edu



The PREDICTS database: hundreds of studies; many different sampling protocols

Hudson et al. (2014). *Ecology & Evolution* 4: 4701-4735



Solutions for hierarchical data

Separate model for each level in the hierarchy – but loss of statistical power and generality

Effect of hierarchical structure in model:

$$SR_{site} \sim LandUse_{site}$$

$$SR_{site} \sim LandUse_{site} + Study_{site}$$

But this often introduces many parameters

Mixed effects models


Mixed-effects models: random intercepts

Mixed-effects models composed of fixed effects and random effects



Fixed effects are those you are interested in (e.g. land use); assumed to represent a finite sample of the population

Random effects describe important variation, but parameter estimates not needed for each level (e.g. study); assumed to be representative of the super-population:

$$Study \sim N(0, \sigma_{Study})$$



Mixed-effects models: random intercepts




Mixed-effects models: random slopes

Sometimes a relationship between two variables varies among the levels in the sampling hierarchy

In this case, we can fit random slopes:

$$\text{Slope} \sim N(0, \sigma_{\text{slope}})$$




Mixed-effects models: random slopes


Random ‘slopes’ can also be used to describe variation in the effect of a categorical variable

This time there is one set of random ‘slopes’ for each factor level in the model

$$Slope \sim N(0, \sigma_{slope})$$



Applications of mixed-effects models: effects of land use on biodiversity




Sampled four trophic levels in
four land uses in two
landscapes

Random effects: landscape

Fixed effects: land use and
trophic level and interaction

Herbivores, Omnivores, Predators, Detritivores

Applications of mixed-effects models: effects of land use on biodiversity



F = Forest; J = Jungle rubber; R = Rubber plantation; O = Oil palm

Barnes et al. (2014). *Nature Communications* 5: 5351

Applications of mixed-effects models: effects of land use on biodiversity


Sampled pollinator communities in 36 sites, in or around 12 UK cities

Sampled abundance and species richness


Fixed effects: land use (urban, agriculture and nature reserve), month, flower abundance, woodland cover

Random effects: Site nested within city

Baldock et al. (2015). *Proceedings of the Royal Society, Series B* 282: 20142849



Applications of mixed-effects models: effects of land use on biodiversity



Applications of mixed-effects models: effects of land use on biodiversity

The Value of Primary, Secondary, and Plantation Forests for a Neotropical Herpetofauna


TOBY A. GARDNER,*‡ MARCO ANTÔNIO RIBEIRO-JÚNIOR,† JOS BARLOW,*† TERESA CRISTINA SAUER ÁVILA-PIRES,† MARINUS S. HOOGMOED,† AND CARLOS A. PERES*

*School of Environmental Sciences, University of East Anglia, Norwich, NR4 7TJ, United Kingdom


†Museu Paraense Emílio Goeldi (MPEG)/CZO and Programa de Posgraduação em Zoologia UFPA-MPEG, Caixa Postal 399, 66017-970, Belém, PA, Brazil

APPENDIX. Species of amphibian and lizard caught by standardized trapping methods in the Jari landscape, northeastern Brazilian Amazonia.

Abstract: forest land options for secondary, an four compl leaf-litter a forest types structures. I	Species	Code for Figures 3 & 4	Family	Eucalyptus	Secondary Forest	Primary Forest	Total number captured	Microhabitat
Amphibia								
	<i>Atelopus spumarius</i>	V	Bufoidae			1	1	Leaf litter
	<i>Bufo guttatus</i>	S	Bufoidae	4	2	2	8	Leaf litter
	<i>Bufo margaritifer</i>	L	Bufoidae		56	5	61	Leaf litter
	<i>Bufo marinus</i>	K	Bufoidae	9	29	5	43	Leaf litter
	<i>Bufo</i> sp.	B	Bufoidae	3	51	74	128	Leaf litter
	<i>Colostethus</i> sp.	D	Dendrobatidae		1	30	31	Leaf litter
	<i>Dendrobates tinctorius</i>	J	Dendrobatidae			6	6	Leaf litter
	<i>Epipedobates femoralis</i>	E	Dendrobatidae		5	24	29	Leaf litter
	<i>Epipedobates hahneli</i>	C	Dendrobatidae		9	55	64	Leaf litter
	<i>Adenomera</i> sp.	A	Leptodactylidae	697	194	265	1156	Leaf litter
	<i>Eleutherodactylus</i> <i>chiastonotus</i>	G	Leptodactylidae			8	8	Leaf litter
	<i>Eleutherodactylus</i> <i>marmoratus</i>	R	Leptodactylidae			2	2	Leaf litter
	<i>Eleutherodactylus</i> <i>zeuctotylus</i>	Q	Leptodactylidae		1	2	3	Leaf litter
	<i>Leptodactylus</i> <i>boulengeri</i>	N	Leptodactylidae	1	32	3	36	Leaf litter



Applications of mixed-effects models: effects of land use on biodiversity





Response variables: various measures of local biodiversity


Fixed effects: land use, human population density (HPD), proximity to roads (PR), accessibility to towns/cities (ACC)

Random effects: study identity (differences in sampling), spatial structure of sampling within studies

Applications of mixed-effects models: effects of land use on biodiversity



Applications of mixed-effects models: effects of climate on responses of biodiversity to land use




Data on effects of habitat loss
on biodiversity from published
papers

Response variable: negative
effect of habitat loss or not

Fixed effects: climate, climate
change, habitat amount

Random effects: study identity,
taxonomic group, habitat and
land use

Applications of mixed-effects models: effects of climate on responses of biodiversity to land use




Negative effects of habitat loss more likely in places that are hot, dry and that have got drier recently

Applications of mixed-effects models: accounting for phylogenetic non-randomness


Species-level measures are often phylogenetically non-random

If ignored, can bias results of statistical models

There are several statistical approaches to account for phylogeny, but one is nested random effects in mixed-effects models



Applications of mixed-effects models: climate change and thermal safety margins





Data on the thermal tolerance limits of amphibians, reptiles and insects

Response variable: thermal cold and heat tolerance

Fixed effects: latitude and elevation

Random effects: hierarchical taxonomic terms, cold-tolerance metric


Metabolic rates: a key process underlying organismal processes and ecology



Applications of mixed-effects models: scaling of metabolic rate with body mass

Legend:

× Apodiformes	△ Falconiformes	● Procellariiformes	△ Afrosoricida	×	Diprotodontia	● Primates
△ Caprimulgiformes	△ Galliformes	□ Psittaciformes	×	○ Artiodactyla	● Lagomorpha	● Rodentia
● Charadriiformes	● Passeriformes	● Sphenisciformes	● Carnivora	● Monotremata	□ Peramelemorphia	□ Soricomorpha
□ Columbiformes	×	○ Pelecaniformes	● Strigiformes	○ Chiroptera	△ Dasyuromorphia	△ Pilosa
○ Coraciiformes	△ Piciformes	○ Struthioniformes	○ Dasyuromorphia			



Data on field metabolic rates
of birds and mammals

Response variable: field
metabolic rates

Fixed effects: Body mass,
mammals vs. birds

Random effects: hierarchical
taxonomic terms (random
intercepts and slopes)

Summary: Statistical models

Ecological data often have a non-straightforward structure

There is a trend toward more synthetic analyses, using data from multiple studies, to generalize patterns more broadly

This trend exacerbates the difficulties around data structure

But there are statistical approaches that can deal with these complications

Reading list (I am not expecting you to read all of these!)

- Baldock et al. (2015). Where is the UK's pollinator biodiversity? The importance of urban areas for flower-visiting insects. *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London, Series B* **282**: 20142849.
- Ball et al. (2015). Body size determines functional responses of ground beetle interactions. *Basic & Applied Ecology* **16**: 621-628.
- Barnes et al. (2014). Consequences of tropical land use for multitrophic biodiversity and ecosystem functioning. *Nature Communications* **5**: 5351.
- Beale et al. (2013). Protected area networks and savannah bird biodiversity in the face of climate change and land degradation. *Ecology Letters* **16**: 1061-1068.
- Bolker (2008). *Ecological Models and Data in R*. Princeton University Press.
- Ellison (2004). Bayesian inference in ecology. *Ecology Letters* **7**: 509-520.
- Evans (2012). Modelling ecological systems in a changing world. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society, Series B* **367**: 181-190.
- Evans et al. (2013). Do simple models lead to generality in ecology? *Trends in Ecology & Evolution* **28**: 578-583.
- Hudson et al. (2013). The relationship between body mass and field metabolic rate among individual birds and mammals. *Journal of Animal Ecology* **82**: 1009-1020.

Reading list (I am not expecting you to read all of these!)

- Johnson & Omland (2004). Model selection in ecology and evolution. *Trends in Ecology & Evolution* **19**: 101-108.
- MacKenzie et al. (2002). Estimating site occupancy rates when detection probabilities are less than one. *Ecology* **83**: 2248-2255.
- Mantyka-Pringle et al. (2012). Interactions between climate and habitat loss effects on biodiversity: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Global Change Biology* **18**: 1239-1252.
- Newbold et al. (2010). Testing the accuracy of species distribution models using species records from a new survey. *Oikos* **119**: 1326-1334.
- Newbold et al. (2013). Ecological traits affect the response of tropical forest bird species to land-use intensity. *Proceedings of the Royal Society, Series B* **280**: 20122131.
- Newbold et al. (2014). Functional traits, land-use change and the structure of present and future bird communities in tropical forests. *Global Ecology & Biogeography* **23**: 1073-1084.
- Newbold et al. (2015). Global effects of land use on local terrestrial biodiversity. *Nature* **520**: 45-50.

Reading list (I am not expecting you to read all of these!)

- Sunday et al. (2014). Thermal-safety margins and the necessity of thermoregulatory behavior across latitude and elevation. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America* **111**: 5610-5615.
- Woodcock et al. (2016). Impacts of neonicotinoid use on long-term population changes in wild bees in England. *Nature Communications* **7**: 12459.
- Zuur et al. (2009). *Mixed Effects Models and Extensions in Ecology with R*. Springer.