



# Repeatability and Transparency in Ecological Research

## Citation

Ellison, Aaron. Forthcoming. Repeatability and transparency in ecological research. *Ecology* 90.

## Published Version

<http://esapubs.org/esapubs/journals/ecology.htm>

## Permanent link

<http://nrs.harvard.edu/urn-3:HUL.InstRepos:3123279>

## Terms of Use

This article was downloaded from Harvard University's DASH repository, and is made available under the terms and conditions applicable to Other Posted Material, as set forth at <http://nrs.harvard.edu/urn-3:HUL.InstRepos:dash.current.terms-of-use#LAA>

## Share Your Story

The Harvard community has made this article openly available.  
Please share how this access benefits you. [Submit a story](#).

[Accessibility](#)



23 meta-analysis and data synthesis. For two reasons, I respectfully suggest that Whittaker's critique  
24 is misplaced. First, of all the studies critiqued by Whittaker (2009), only Mittelbach *et al.* (2001)  
25 actually conducted a formal meta-analysis. The others, as pointed out by Whittaker (2009: ms. p.  
26 4, line 7) undertook extensive primary analyses but the authors did not conduct formal meta-  
27 analyses (Gurevitch and Hedges 1999). Second, and more importantly, if ecological synthesis is  
28 transparent – data, models, and analytical tools are available freely to the research community –  
29 then it should yield consistent, repeatable results. We may then disagree on the *interpretation* of  
30 the resulting synthesis, but at least we will be able to agree on the reproducibility of the results  
31 themselves.

32

### 33 REQUIREMENTS FOR REPEATABLE ECOLOGICAL SYNTHESIS

34 In a nutshell, ecological synthesis proceeds by assembling available datasets into a  
35 common, derived dataset and then applying one or more (statistical) models to this derived  
36 dataset to test the prediction of a hypothesis of interest (Ellison *et al.* 2006). Repeatability and  
37 reproducibility of ecological synthesis requires full disclosure not only of hypotheses and  
38 predictions, but also of the raw data, methods used to produce derived datasets, choices made as  
39 to which data or datasets were included in, and which were excluded from, the derived datasets,  
40 and tools and techniques used to analyze the derived datasets. Of all the papers under discussion  
41 by Whittaker (2009), Mittelbach *et al.*'s (2001) paper comes closest to achieving such  
42 transparency, although neither the raw data nor the derived dataset they analyzed are publicly  
43 available.

44 But achieving this level of disclosure and transparency is difficult. First and foremost,  
45 researchers must be committed to transparent production of ecological knowledge. We may be

46 blissfully unaware of our own intellectual biases, but there are no excuses for not making data,  
47 methods, and tools freely available in a timely fashion. Yet despite mandates from funding  
48 agencies and research networks that data be made available publicly (Arzberger *et al.* 2004), raw  
49 data are not easily accessed. Research teams can spend many weeks searching data archives only  
50 to find summary statistical tables, lists of means, or concise graphs. Contacting individual  
51 investigators may yield raw data in digital form or in yellowing notebooks, or it may yield  
52 nothing at all. Fortunately, archives of ecological data are growing (examples include ESA's data  
53 registry,<sup>2</sup> *Ecological Archives*,<sup>3</sup> the data repository of the National Center for Ecological  
54 Analysis and Synthesis [NCEAS],<sup>4</sup> the data archive of the Long Term Ecological Research  
55 Network<sup>5</sup>, and Oak Ridge's Distributed Active Archive Center<sup>6</sup> among many others), but  
56 archiving ecological data is not yet a requirement for publication in any journal. Ecologists also  
57 have developed standard methods for describing ecological datasets with *descriptive metadata*  
58 (Michener *et al.* 1997, Jones *et al.* 2006, Madin *et al.* 2008) that make it easier to interpret and  
59 hence re-use them. Software tools such as Morpho<sup>7</sup> that help investigators create descriptive  
60 metadata also are maturing.

61 But it is not enough simply to find a dataset and understand its origin and structure. Once  
62 datasets are obtained, it is usually necessary to transform the data into common units and scales  
63 (*e.g.*, species/ha or kg/ha). Interpolated values may need to be substituted for missing data, and  
64 methods of interpolation will vary among investigators (Ellison *et al.* 2006). Finally, and usually  
65 after still further manipulations and making decisions as to which data to include or exclude (*cf.*

---

<sup>2</sup> <<http://data.esa.org/esa/style/skins/esa/index.jsp>>

<sup>3</sup> <<http://www.esapubs.org/archive/>>

<sup>4</sup> <<http://knb.ecoinformatics.org/knb/style/skins/nceas/>>

<sup>5</sup> <<http://metacat.lternet.edu/knb/>>

<sup>6</sup> <<http://daac.ornl.gov/>>

<sup>7</sup> <<http://knb.ecoinformatics.org/morphoportal.jsp>>

66 Whittaker and Heegard 2003 and Appendix A of Whittaker 2009), a derived dataset is ready for  
67 analysis.

68 Each step – *e.g.*, digitization, rescaling, interpolation, inclusion or exclusion – requires  
69 individual judgment and provides an opportunity to introduce bias or error. If subsequent  
70 synthesis is to be repeatable, users must have confidence in the reliability of the derived dataset.  
71 Thus it is imperative that researchers document clearly each of the steps used to produce derived  
72 datasets. This *process metadata* – the documentation of the processes used to produce a dataset –  
73 provides one way to assess the reliability of a derived dataset (Osterweil *et al.* 2005, Ellison *et al.*  
74 2006). Storage of the original datasets *and* the processes applied to create the derived dataset  
75 provides the mechanism to reproduce it.

76 Such audit trails that include archived datasets and tools allow can allow future users to  
77 determine effects of changing particular processes on the structure and subsequent analysis of the  
78 derived dataset (Ellison *et al.* 2006). For example, Mittelbach *et al.* (2001) classified the  
79 relationship between species richness and productivity in one of five categories (unimodal  
80 humped or U-shaped, monotonic positive or negative, or no relationship) whereas Laanisto *et al.*  
81 (2008) classified this same relationship simply as unimodal or not. Whittaker and Heegard  
82 (2003) and Whittaker (2009) excluded data that Mittelbach *et al.* (2001) included. Gillman and  
83 Wright (2006) used some of the regression results reported by Mittelbach *et al.* (2001) but also  
84 reanalyzed some of the original datasets using different software and without specifying which  
85 data were reanalyzed. Clearly results will differ if the same data are classified differently; if  
86 different subsets of data are analyzed, or if individual datasets are treated differently. Importantly,  
87 we can assess these differences by running new analyses on available datasets. The resulting  
88 differences in approach to and analysis of the data may reflect differences in questions on the

89 part of the investigators, honest disagreements regarding the “best” available evidence (*sensu*  
90 Slavin 1995), or strongly held opinions regarding the most appropriate statistical analysis (*e.g.*,  
91 ordinary least-squares regression *versus* general linear models with a variety of error  
92 distributions and link functions). However, these differences and disagreements do not in and of  
93 themselves invalidate the activity of ecological synthesis.

94         It is equally important to document and whenever possible archive the statistical tools  
95 and models used for analysis and synthesis (Thornton *et al.* 2005); such an archival record  
96 should be a requirement for publication of any meta-analysis or data synthesis. The various  
97 authors critiqued by Whittaker (2009) all used different statistical tools (Table 1), and it would be  
98 impossible to repeat precisely any of the author’s analyses.

99         Documentation and archiving of analytical processes, including those processes used to  
100 create derived datasets and the statistical tools and models applied to them, is difficult, and  
101 software tools for such documentation and archiving are rudimentary. It may seem wasteful to  
102 archive software, but numerical precision of arithmetic operations changes with new integrated  
103 circuit chips and different operating systems, functions work differently in different versions of  
104 software, and implementation of even “standard” statistical routines differ among software  
105 packages (a widely unappreciated example of relevance to ecologists is the different sums-of-  
106 squares reported by SAS, S-Plus, and R for analysis of variance and other linear models  
107 (Venables 1998)). Finally, there are no standards for process metadata (Osterweil *et al.* 2005,  
108 Ellison *et al.* 2006) and no easy way to archive model code used by, or specific versions of,  
109 commercial software packages. While open-source software tools such as R (R Development  
110 Core Team 2007) is an attractive (and affordable) alternative, they evolve even more rapidly than  
111 their commercial counterparts, and regular changes in functionality of familiar routines are not

112 uncommon (implementation of the cor function for calculation of Pearson's correlation  
113 coefficient in early versions of R is a notorious example). But without archiving software, tools,  
114 and associated process metadata, it is unlikely that we will be able to accurately reproduce any  
115 ecological synthesis.

116

## 117 MOVING FORWARD

118 More and more ecologists are following federal guidelines (Office of Management and  
119 Budget Circular A-110)<sup>8</sup> and making their data freely available within a short time of collection  
120 and publication. Cultural impediments to data sharing among ecologists are disappearing as more  
121 and more ecologists recognize not only that sharing of data benefits the entire scientific  
122 enterprise (Baldwin and Duke 2005) but also results in successful collaborations and subsequent  
123 publications such as those facilitated by NCEAS.<sup>9</sup> Rapid development of data archiving and  
124 sharing tools has been facilitated by funding initiatives focused on development of software for  
125 production of descriptive metadata and distributed access to permanently and stably archived  
126 data.<sup>10</sup> There is increasing recognition that similar efforts must be undertaken to document  
127 analytical tools and processes and to archive the software tools themselves (Thornton *et al.* 2005,  
128 Ellison *et al.* 2006). Software tools in development for creating process metadata, including  
129 documentation of dataset provenance and storage of analytical tools applied to derived datasets,  
130 include Kepler (Ludäscher *et al.* 2006) and the Analytic Web (Osterweil *et al.* 2009). Ecologists  
131 should work with these software development teams, and others like them, to learn how better

---

<sup>8</sup> <<http://www.whitehouse.gov/omb/circulars/a110/a110.html>>; for analysis and agency-specific implementation of this regulation, see <<http://thecre.com/access/index.html>>

<sup>9</sup> <<http://nceas.ucsb.edu/products>>

<sup>10</sup> <<http://www.nsf.gov/dir/index.jsp?org=OCI>>



155 Baldwin, J. D., and C. Duke. 2005. Society summit on data sharing and archiving policies.  
156 Bulletin of the Ecological Society of America **86**:61-66.

157 Boose, E., A. M. Ellison, L. J. Osterweil, R. Podorozhny, L. Clarke, A. Wise, J. L. Hadley, and  
158 D. R. Foster. 2007. Ensuring reliable datasets for environmental models and forecasts.  
159 Ecological Informatics **2**:237-247.

160 Cardinale, B. J., D. S. Srivastava, J. E. Duffy, J. P. Wright, A. L. Downing, M. Sankaran, and C.  
161 Jouseau. 2006. Effects of biodiversity on the functioning of trophic groups and  
162 ecosystems. Nature **443**:989-992.

163 Clark, J. S., S. R. Carpenter, M. Barber, S. Collins, A. Dobson, J. A. Foley, D. M. Lodge, M.  
164 Pascual, R. Jr. Pielke, W. Pizer, C. Pringle, W. V. Reid, K. A. Rose, O. Sala, W. H.  
165 Schlesinger, D. H. Wall, and D. Wear. 2001. Ecological forecasts: an emerging  
166 imperative. Science **293**:657-660.

167 Ellison, A. M., L. J. Osterweil, J. L. Hadley, A. Wise, E. Boose, L. Clarke, D. R. Foster, A.  
168 Hanson, D. Jensen, P. Kuzeja, E. Riseman, and H. Schultz. 2006. Analytic webs support  
169 the synthesis of ecological datasets. Ecology **87**:1345-1358.

170 Gillman, L. N., and S. D. Wright. 2006. The influence of productivity on the species richness of  
171 plants: a critical assessment. Ecology **87**:1234-1243.

172 Gurevitch, J., and L. V. Hedges. 1999. Statistical issues in ecological meta-analyses. Ecology  
173 **80**:1142-1149.

174 Gurevitch, J., L. Morrow, A. Wallace, and J. Walsh. 1992. The meta-analysis of competition in  
175 field experiments. American Naturalist **140**:539-572.

176 Jones, M. B., M. P. Schildhauer, O. J. Reichman, and S. Bowers. 2006. The new bioinformatics:  
177 integrating ecological data from the gene to the biosphere. *Annual Review of Ecology,*  
178 *Evolution, and Systematics* **37**:519-544.

179 Jonsen, I. D., R. A. Myers, and J. M. Flemming. 2003. Meta-analysis of animal movement using  
180 state-space models. *Ecology* **84**:3055-3063.

181 Laanisto, L., P. Urbas, and M. Pärtel. 2008. Why does the unimodal species richness-productivity  
182 relationship not apply to a woody species: a lack of clonality or a legacy of tropical  
183 evolutionary history. *Global Ecology and Biogeography* **17**:320-326.

184 Ludäscher, B., I. Altintas, C. Berkeley, D. G. Higgins, E. Jaeger-Frank, M. Jones, E. Lee, J. Tao,  
185 and Y. Zhao. 2006. Scientific workflow management and the Kepler system. *Concurrency*  
186 *and Computation: Practice and Experience* **18**:1039-1065.

187 Madin, J. S., S. Bowers, M. P. Schildhauer, and M. B. Jones. 2008. Advancing ecological  
188 research with ontologies. *Trends in Ecology and Evolution* **23**:159-168.

189 Marczak, L. B., R. M. Thompson, and J. S. Richardson. 2007. Meta-analysis: trophic level,  
190 habitat, and productivity shape the food web effects of resource subsidies. *Ecology*  
191 **88**:140-148.

192 Michener, W. K., J. W. Brunt, J. J. Helly, T. B. Kirchner, and S. G. Stafford. 1997. Nongeospatial  
193 metadata for the ecological sciences. *Ecological Applications* **7**:330-342.

194 Mitchell-Olds, T., and R. G. Shaw. 1987. Regression analysis of natural selection: statistical  
195 influence and biological interpretation. *Evolution* **41**:1149-1161.

196 Mittelbach, G. G., C. F. Steiner, S. M. Scheiner, K. L. Gross, H. L. Reynolds, R. B. Waide, M. R.  
197 Willig, S. I. Dodson, and L. Gough. 2001. What is the observed relationship between  
198 species richness and productivity? *Ecology* **82**:2381-2396.

199 Osterweil, L. J., L. A. Clarke, A. M. Ellison, E. Boose, R. Podorozhny, and A. Wise. 2009. Clear  
200 and precise specification of ecological data management processes and dataset  
201 provenance. *IEEE Transactions on Automation Science and Engineering* **in press**.

202 Osterweil, L. J., A. Wise, L. Clarke, A. M. Ellison, J. L. Hadley, E. Boose, and D. R. Foster.  
203 2005. Process technology to facilitate the conduct of science. Pages 403-415 *in* M. Li, B.  
204 Boehm, and L. J. Osterweil, editors. *Lecture Notes in Computer Science - SPW 2005*.  
205 Springer-Verlag, Berlin, Germany.

206 Pärtel, M., L. Laanisto, and M. Zobel. 2007. Contrasting plant productivity-diversity  
207 relationships across latitude: the role of evolutionary history. *Ecology* -1091.

208 R Development Core Team. 2007. R: A language and environment for statistical computing. R  
209 Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria.

210 Slavin, R. E. 1995. Best evidence synthesis: an intelligent alternative to meta-analysis. *Journal of*  
211 *Clinical Epidemiology* **48**:9-18.

212 Thornton, P. E., R. B. Cook, B. H. Braswell, B. E. Law, W. M. Post, H. H. Shugart, B. T. Rhyne,  
213 and L. A. Hook. 2005. Archiving numerical models of biogeochemical dynamics. *Eos*  
214 **86**:431.

215 Vander Zanden, M. J., and W. W. Fetzner. 2007. Global patterns of aquatic food chain length.  
216 *Oikos* **116**:1378-1388.

217 Venables, W. N. 1998. Exegeses on linear models. Pages 1-25 *in* S-Plus User's Conference,  
218 Washington, DC.

219 Waide, R. B., M. R. Willig, C. F. Steiner, G. Mittelbach, L. Gough, S. I. Dodson, G. P. Juday, and  
220 R. Parmenter. 1999. The relationship between productivity and species richness. *Annual*  
221 *Review of Ecology and Systematics* **30**:257-300.

222 Walker, M. D., C. H. Wahren, R. D. Hollister, G. H. R. Henry, L. E. Ahlquist, J. M. Alatalo, M. S.  
223 Bret-Harte, M. P. Calef, T. V. Callaghan, A. B. Carroll, H. E. Epstein, I. S. Jónsdóttir, J.  
224 A. Klein, B. Magnússon, U. Molau, S. F. Oberbauer, S. P. Rewa, C. H. Robinson, G. R.  
225 Shaver, K. N. Suding, C. C. Thompson, A. Tolvanen, Ø. Totland, P. L. Turner, C. E.  
226 Tweedie, P. J. Webber, and P. A. Wookey. 2006. Plant community responses to  
227 experimental warming across the tundra biome. *Proceedings of the National Academy of*  
228 *Sciences, USA* **103**:1342-1346.

229 Warwick, R. M., and K. R. Clarke. 1993. Comparing the severity of disturbance: a meta-analysis  
230 of marine macrobenthic community data. *Marine Ecology Progress Series* **92**:221-231.

231 Whittaker, R. J. 2009. Meta-analyses and mega-mistakes: calling time on meta-analysis of the  
232 species richness-productivity relationship. *Ecology* **90**:000.

233 Whittaker, R. J., and E. Heegaard. 2003. What is the observed relationships between species  
234 richness and productivity? Comment. *Ecology* **84**:3384-3390.

235

Table 1. Analytical methods used in the syntheses of the species richness-productivity relationship.

<b>Author</b>	<b>Analytical method(s) used</b>	<b>Analytical tool(s) used</b>	<b>Comments</b>
Waide <i>et al.</i> (1999)	Linear and quadratic regressions	None specified	Not repeatable
Mittelbach <i>et al.</i> (2001)	Ordinary least-squares regression	SYSTAT 8.0	Possibly repeatable; current available version is 12.0
	Poisson regression	NAG Statistical Add-in for Excel	Not repeatable; software discontinued
	“Mitchell-Olds & Shaw test” (Mitchell-Olds and Shaw 1987)	None specified	Not repeatable; software unavailable (but algorithm available). Which of three tests proposed by Mitchell-Olds and Shaw) was also not specified.
	Chi-square Exact test	StatXact	Possibly repeatable; no version given.
	Meta-analysis using mixed-effects model	MetaWin 2.0	Repeatable; commercial software version still available

Whittaker and Heergard (2003)	Poisson regression	Not specified	Not repeatable
Gillman and Wright (2006)	Ordinary least-squares regression on “some” datasets of Mittelbach <i>et al.</i> (2001)	Software not specified; datasets re-analyzed not specified	Not repeatable
Pärtel <i>et al.</i> (2007)	Multinomial logit regression	Statistica 6.1	Possibly repeatable; current release is 8.0
Laanisto <i>et al.</i> (2008)	Fisher exact tests	Not specified	Possibly repeatable using available algorithms
	General linear model	Statistica 6.1	Possibly repeatable; current release is 8.0

---