

Table of contents

1	Introduction	
1.1	Theoretical background.....	1
1.2	Estimation of species richness.....	2
1.3	Comparison of species richness estimators.....	4
1.4	Integration in the RIVA project.....	7
1.5	Structure of the thesis.....	7
2	Study area and general methods	
2.1	Study sites and sampling design.....	9
2.2	Species groups and recording methods.....	11
3	Distributions of species' recording frequencies in field data	
3.1	Introduction.....	13
3.2	Methods and data.....	14
3.2.1	Species groups and trapping methods.....	14
3.2.2	Study sites and study periods.....	15
3.2.3	Spatial and temporal pooling of captures.....	16
3.3	Results.....	17
3.3.1	Effect of short-term sampling on species records.....	18
3.3.2	Recording effort.....	18
3.3.3	Species group and habitat.....	21
3.3.4	Heterogeneity of sites and periods.....	23
3.4	Discussion.....	25
3.4.1	Methods of sampling species.....	26
3.4.2	Influences on recording frequency distributions.....	26
3.4.3	Abundance distribution and recording probability of specimens.....	28
4	Factors affecting species' recording frequencies in simulation	
4.1	Introduction.....	30
4.2	Methods.....	31
4.2.1	Simulation.....	31
4.2.2	Heterogeneity in the simulation.....	32
4.2.3	Number of species records and curve shape index.....	34
4.3	Results.....	35
4.3.1	Effort.....	36

4.3.2	Sampling design.....	37
4.3.3	Niche width.....	38
4.3.4	Sites and periods.....	39
4.3.5	Combined sources of heterogeneity in samples.....	42
4.3.6	Species number.....	43
4.3.7	Number of species records and heterogeneity.....	43
4.4	Discussion.....	44
4.4.1	Factors affecting the distributions of recording frequencies.....	44
4.4.2	Comparison with experience from the field.....	46
4.4.3	Modeling recording frequencies to study species richness estimators.....	46
5	Accuracy and reliability of species richness estimators in simulation	
5.1	Introduction.....	48
5.2	Methods.....	49
5.2.1	Parameters to predict the performance of the estimators.....	49
5.2.2	Notation.....	50
5.2.3	Estimators.....	50
5.2.4	Simulation.....	53
5.2.5	Evaluation of the estimators.....	53
5.3	Results.....	55
5.3.1	Useful parameters for comparison.....	55
5.3.2	Performance of the estimators.....	56
5.3.3	Detailed comparison of the most promising estimators.....	62
5.3.4	Ranking the estimators by their performance.....	64
5.4	Discussion.....	68
5.4.1	Simulation.....	68
5.4.2	Factors affecting the accuracy of species richness estimation.....	69
5.4.3	Performance of the estimators.....	70
6	Estimators of standard error compared by simulation	
6.1	Introduction.....	73
6.2	Methods.....	73
6.3	Results.....	74
6.4	Discussion.....	77

7	Species richness estimators compared by means of field data	
7.1	Introduction.....	79
7.2	Methods.....	80
7.3	Results.....	81
7.3.1	Estimates relating to the number of species records and curve shape index.....	81
7.3.2	Effort and species group.....	83
7.3.3	Effects of sampling design and heterogeneity of sites and periods.....	86
7.4	Discussion.....	90
7.4.1	General discussion.....	90
7.4.2	Estimates based on field data in the light of the simulation.....	92
8	Discussion	
8.1	Comparison of species richness estimators.....	94
8.2	Selection of suitable species richness estimators.....	95
8.3	Species richness estimation to correct deficiencies in sampling design?.....	96
8.4	Future research.....	97
9	References	99
10	Summary	104
11	Zusammenfassung	108
12	Appendix: equations and derivations of the estimators	
12.1	Estimators based on the concept of coverage (<i>CoverX</i>).....	112
12.2	Moment estimator (<i>Moment</i>).....	119
12.3	Jackknife estimators (<i>JackknifeX</i>).....	119
12.4	Maximum Likelihood estimator (<i>MaxLike</i>).....	120
13	Danksagung	121

Tables

Table 1	Records of carabid beetles from the same study period, and different site groups.	23
Table 2	Correlation (Spearman rank correlation) of number of species records and two weather factors based on data from all study sites on which short term sampling was performed. Grey: significant correlation.	24
Table 3	Values of the basic parameters in the simulation.	34
Table 4	Combinations of estimators of and used in the simulation.	52
Table 5	Global ranks of the estimators in the simulation.	66
Table 6	Ranks of the estimators of standard error for each of the species richness estimators show which is the recommendable.	77

Figures

Figure 1	The task of species richness estimation in the RIVA design is marked by the gray background.	7
Figure 2	Location of the study area.	9
Figure 3	Positioning of the sampling sites by stratified random placement. The enlargement of site 16 shows the organization of each sampling site.	10
Figure 4	Water level changes on an exemplary study site. For details of the calculation see BÖHNKE & FOLLNER (2002).	11
Figure 5	Distributions of capture frequencies f , based on equal capture probabilities (p) of different height (population size: 60, number of samples: 8).	13
Figure 6	Concerted field periods of the RIVA-project (dark gray) and short time trapping periods (light gray).	15
Figure 7	Scheme for spatial and temporal pooling of species records.	17
Figure 8	Distributions of species' recording frequencies effected by different sampling effort in terms of increasing numbers of sites or traps.	19
Figure 9	Distributions of species' recording frequency due to an increasing number of heterogeneous periods.	20
Figure 10	Distributions of species' recording frequency due to an increasing number of heterogeneous periods.	20
Figure 11	Distributions of species' recording frequency due to an increasing plot size of the sampling plots.	21
Figure 12	Distributions of recording frequencies of four species groups recorded with similar effort and on the same sites and periods.	21
Figure 13	Numbers of recorded species from six very similar sites.	22
Figure 14	Recording frequencies and numbers of records of plant species for two groups of sites with different habitat types in terms of moisture.	22
Figure 15	Correlation of the coefficient of variation and the curve shape of the distribution of species' recording frequencies in epigeal spiders.	23
Figure 16	Correlation of numbers of captured specimens and recorded species.	24
Figure 17	Spatial versus temporal numbers of recorded species and specimens from the same sampling sites and sampling periods.	25
Figure 18	Design of the simple linear habitat model, which underlies the simulation. It defines the position of sites and traps relative to the habitat needs of the species.	31
Figure 19	Distribution of the relative frequencies of species' recording probabilities used in the simulation while dividing the range of the recording probabilities in 100 equal fractions.	32

Figure 20	Dependency of the curve shape of the distribution of species' recording frequencies on powers of e used for modeling the basic distribution of species' recording probabilities.	33
Figure 21	Curve shape indices (CSI) resulting from four different simulated distributions of species' recording frequencies.	35
Figure 22	Changes in the shape of the distribution curve of species' recording frequencies as a consequence of increasing recording effort in terms of increasing numbers of both sites and periods.	36
Figure 23	Groups of scenarios showing the effects of increasing numbers of traps per site on the distributions of recording frequencies and the CSI.	37
Figure 24	Groups of scenarios with increasing numbers of traps and periods respectively with traps used singly versus in groups of five traps per site.	38
Figure 25	Groups of scenarios with spatial versus temporal sampling design with the same effort and similar spatial and temporal heterogeneity.	38
Figure 26	Groups of scenarios with varying maximum niche width, minimum niche width, and range of the niche width with constant mean niche width. The gray marked points in the CSI curves refer to the distribution curves.	39
Figure 27	Effect of habitat range covered by the sites on the curve shape of the distribution of recording frequencies.	40
Figure 28	Effect of habitat ranges covered by sites and by traps inside the sites respectively on the CSI.	40
Figure 29	Effect of increasingly variable effectiveness of traps on the CSI and modified by the effect of the increasing sites' habitat range.	41
Figure 30	Distributions of recording frequencies originating from groups of scenarios with temporal heterogeneity affecting the species differently and using the sites (a) and the periods (b) as samples. The CSI curves show more of these scenarios and scenarios with temporal heterogeneity affecting all species equally (c).	41
Figure 31	Effect of combinations of different sources of heterogeneity on the CSI.	42
Figure 32	Effect of different species numbers on the CSI.	43
Figure 33	Effect of habitat width on the number of species records for spatial versus temporal sampling.	43
Figure 34	Effect of increasing effort on the number of species records and the CSI.	44
Figure 35	Structure of the simulation used to study the performance of the species richness estimators.	53
Figure 36	PCA plot showing the orientation of the parameters in relation to the first two axes (a) and the contribution of the factors to the total variance (b).	56
Figure 37	Performance of the estimators in a group of scenarios with increasing effort and, hence, increasing numbers of species records compared by mean percentage difference (a), percentage bias (b), and standard error (c).	57

Figure 38	Relative performance of the estimators in a group of scenarios with complex increasing heterogeneity (c) in relation to the number of species records (a) and the CSI (b).	59
Figure 39	Relative performance of the estimators in two groups of scenarios with different effects on the number of species records and CSI (c) in relation to the number of species records (a) and the CSI (b).	61
Figure 40	Relative performance of the estimators (b) in a group of scenarios with changing numbers of samples but constant effort (a).	62
Figure 41	Performance of <i>Cover3</i> in terms of the mean percentage difference of the estimates as a function of the number of species records and the CSI. The contour plots are interpolated on the basis of the data points shown.	62
Figure 42	Comparison of the performance of <i>Jackknife1</i> , <i>Jackknife2</i> , and <i>Cover1</i> in terms of the mean percentage difference of the estimates as a function of the number of species records and the CSI.	63
Figure 43	Comparison of the performance of <i>Jackknife1</i> , <i>Jackknife2</i> , and <i>Cover1</i> in terms of the percentage bias as a function of the number of species records and the CSI.	63
Figure 44	Comparison of the performance of <i>Jackknife1</i> , <i>Jackknife2</i> , and <i>Cover1</i> in terms of the standard error as a function of the number of species records and the CSI.	64
Figure 45	Performance of the estimators along an axis of increasing heterogeneity in terms of mean percentage difference (a), percentage bias (b), standard error (c) and weighted mean ranks of these criteria (d).	65
Figure 46	Comparison of the ranking for the spatial (a) versus the temporal (b) sampling in terms of weighted mean ranks in the case of increasing temporal heterogeneity.	66
Figure 47	Comparison of the estimators performance in terms of weighted mean ranks in a group of scenarios with increasing effort.	66
Figure 48	Ranges in terms of the number of species records and CSI for the four best estimators, over which they perform comparably best.	67
Figure 49	Comparison of the performance by percentage differences of three estimators of the standard error of species richness estimates of <i>Cover1</i> in terms of the number of species records and curve shape index (CSI).	75
Figure 50	Comparison of the performance by percentage differences of three estimators of the standard error of species richness estimates of <i>Jackknife1</i> in terms of the number of species records and curve shape index (CSI).	75
Figure 51	Performance by percentage differences of the estimator of the standard error of species richness estimates of <i>Jackknife1</i> of HELTSHE & FORRESTER (1983) in terms of the number of species records and curve shape index (CSI).	76
Figure 52	Comparison of the performance by percentage differences of three estimators of the standard error of species richness estimates of <i>Jackknife2</i> in terms of the number of species records and curve shape index (CSI).	76

Figure 53	Performance by percentage differences of one estimator of the standard error of species richness estimates of <i>Jackknife2</i> of BURNHAM & OVERTON (1978) in terms of the number of species records and curve shape index (CSI).	78
Figure 54	Interactions and influences of species characteristics, habitats, and sampling design on species richness estimation.	79
Figure 55	Comparison of the estimates of species numbers of nine different estimators for different numbers of species records (Ncap) and values of the curve shape index (CSI). The standard error ranges were calculated with the bootstrap method.	82
Figure 56	Relation between the number of samples and the number of species records, the CSI, and the numbers of estimated and counted species respectively using an example of molluscs.	83
Figure 57	Relation between the number of samples and the number of species records, the CSI, and the numbers of estimated and counted species respectively using the example of carabid beetles. The estimates are based on the same species records but used as spatial (a) and temporal (b) samples respectively.	84
Figure 58	Relation between the number of samples and the number of species records, the CSI, and the numbers of estimated and counted species respectively using the example of carabid beetles.	85
Figure 59	Comparison of the patterns of results of species richness estimators with data from different species groups from similar sites collected with comparable effort.	85
Figure 60	Comparison of the patterns of results from species richness estimators with mollusc data from groups of sites with different habitat.	86
Figure 61	Comparison of estimates of species richness for trapping data grouped to eight spatial versus 24 temporal samples.	87
Figure 62	Estimates of species richness based on trapping data from single traps compared to estimates based on the same data pooled for sites.	87
Figure 63	Comparison of the patterns of results from three estimators in terms of the number of species records and CSI for different periods and years from a group of moist sites.	88
Figure 64	Comparison of the estimates in terms of the number of species records and CSI for spatial versus temporal samples of two species groups from the same sites.	89