

Comment on article by Gelfand et al.

Jay M. Ver Hoef*

I have enjoyed reading the paper by Gelfand et al. (2005). My congratulations go to the authors, as they have given us an important advance in the science of modeling species diversity. First, I would like to emphasize the importance of this topic. I fully agree with the authors that species diversity has been a central concept in ecology for many years, yet the mechanisms that determine species diversity are still enigmatic. How then has this paper helped us?

One of the first problems in assessing species diversity is to know where a species occurs. While this may seem simple, it is actually very difficult. The authors have a very fine data set that was systematically sampled in a very interesting, diverse part of the world, where high species diversity is compacted into a relatively small space. One of the questions that I want to ask is, “Can the methods of Gelfand et al. (2005) be used more generally?” That is, can I use them in Alaska? Alaska is a rather large state, but if we consider plants, being far to the north, it is not really very diverse. We know of only about 1600 different plant species in Alaska. Rhode Island has more plant species (2600). The methods of Gelfand et al. (2005) are fairly complex, but in principle it seems that they could be adapted for hundreds (perhaps thousands) of different plant species as computational power increases. However, for a more general application, there are problems with species presence data that do not occur for Gelfand et al. (2005). Sampling has not occurred uniformly over my state, or any large geographic area that I know of. For example, I’m pretty sure that if we added a covariate such as distance to the nearest university, there would be a highly significant, negative regression coefficient when modeling species presence or diversity. The reason is clear. For years, botany professors have been sending out legions of graduate students and classes to collect plants, and they stay relatively close to home. Thus, not all zeros are created equal. This is known as ascertainment bias in the epidemiology literature. Gelfand et al. (2005) have done an outstanding job in distinguishing other factors that do create zeros, such as transformed landscapes. This is an important step, but it is information that is relatively easy to gather as compared to effort. Eventually, it will be important to solve the effect of effort (ascertainment bias).

Now, what about prior information? Gelfand et al. (2005) use a hierarchical model with vague priors. This makes sense, given the complexity of the model. Eliciting priors from most plant collectors that I know would be very difficult. It would be hard for them to make sense of priors on parameters in a model with the complications of the potential and transformed surfaces, hidden random effects, etc. Still, these same plant collectors have a wealth of prior knowledge; they have spent years crawling through the bushes. Early in my career I collected plants as my job, and I lived by the maps drawn in Hulten’s (1968) *Flora of Alaska*. It was a big deal to extend any of the species ranges drawn in his book. Plant collectors, such as Hulten, simply used their experience and

*National Marine Mammal Laboratory, Seattle, WA, jay.verhoef@noaa.gov