

COMMENT

Insights from regional and short-term biodiversity monitoring datasets are valuable: a reply to Daskalova *et al.* 2021

SEBASTIAN SEIBOLD,^{1,2,3} TORSTEN HOTHORN,⁴ MARTIN M. GOSSNER,^{5,6}
NADJA K. SIMONS,⁷ NICO BLÜTHGEN,⁷ JÖRG MÜLLER,^{8,9}
DIDEM AMBARLI,^{1,10} CHRISTIAN AMMER,¹¹ JÜRGEN BAUHUS,¹²
MARKUS FISCHER,¹³ JAN C. HABEL,¹⁴ CATERINA PENONE,¹³
PETER SCHALL,¹¹ ERNST-DETLEF SCHULZE¹⁵ and
WOLFGANG W. WEISSER¹

¹Terrestrial Ecology Research Group, Department of Ecology and Ecosystem Management, Technical University of Munich, Freising, Germany, ²Ecosystem Dynamics and Forest Management Group, Department of Ecology and Ecosystem Management, Technical University of Munich, Freising, Germany, ³Berchtesgaden National Park, Berchtesgaden, Germany, ⁴Department of Biostatistics, Epidemiology, Biostatistics and Prevention Institute, University of Zurich, Zurich, Switzerland, ⁵Forest Entomology, Swiss Federal Research Institute WSL, Birmensdorf, Switzerland, ⁶ETH Zurich, Department of Environmental Systems Science, Institute of Terrestrial Ecosystems, Zurich, Switzerland, ⁷Ecological Networks, Department of Biology, Technical University of Darmstadt, Darmstadt, Germany, ⁸Field Station Fabrikshleichach, Department of Animal Ecology and Tropical Biology, Julius-Maximilians-University Würzburg, Rauhenbrach, Germany, ⁹Bavarian Forest National Park, Grafenau, Germany, ¹⁰Department of Agricultural Biotechnology, Faculty of Agriculture, Düzce University, Düzce, Turkey, ¹¹Silviculture and Forest Ecology of the Temperate Zones, University of Göttingen, Göttingen, Germany, ¹²Chair of Silviculture, Institute of Forest Sciences, Faculty of Environment and Natural Resources, University of Freiburg, Freiburg, Germany, ¹³Institute of Plant Sciences, University of Bern, Bern, Switzerland, ¹⁴Evolutionary Zoology, Biosciences, Salzburg University, Salzburg, Austria and ¹⁵Max Planck Institute for Biogeochemistry, Jena, Germany

Abstract. 1. Reports of major losses in insect biodiversity have stimulated an increasing interest in temporal population changes. Existing datasets are often limited to a small number of study sites, few points in time, a narrow range of land-use intensities and only some taxonomic groups, or they lack standardised sampling. While new monitoring programs have been initiated, they still cover rather short time periods.

2. Daskalova *et al.* 2021 (Insect Conservation and Diversity, 14, 1-18) argue that temporal trends of insect populations derived from short time series are biased towards extreme trends, while their own analysis of an assembly of shorter- and longer-term time series does not support an overall insect decline. With respect to the results of Seibold *et al.* 2019 (Nature, 574, 671–674) based on a 10-year multi-site time series, they claim that the analysis suffers from not accounting for temporal pseudoreplication.

3. Here, we explain why the criticism of missing statistical rigour in the analysis of Seibold *et al.* (2019) is not warranted. Models that include ‘year’ as random effect, as suggested by Daskalova *et al.* (2021), fail to detect non-linear trends and assume that consecutive years are independent samples which is questionable for insect time-series data.

4. We agree with Daskalova *et al.* (2021) that the assembly and analysis of larger datasets is urgently needed, but it will take time until such datasets are available. Thus, short-term datasets are highly valuable, should be extended and analysed continually to provide a more detailed understanding of insect population changes under the influence of global change, and to trigger immediate conservation actions.

Correspondence: Sebastian Seibold, Terrestrial Ecology Research Group, Department of Ecology and Ecosystem Management, Technical University of Munich, Freising, Germany. E-mail: sebastian.seibold@tum.de

Key words. Arthropod, biodiversity, insect decline, land use, time series.

Appropriate statistical analysis

We would like to thank Daskalova *et al.* (2021) for critically reanalysing our published data set (Seibold *et al.*, 2020). The credibility and public acceptance of science depends on a culture of rigorous peer review, both before and after publication of a study. In essence, the critique of Daskalova *et al.* (2021) hinges on the point whether the variable ‘year’, which Seibold *et al.* (2019) included as a continuous variable to test for linear changes over time and for analysing effects of land-use measures on temporal trends, should also be included as a random effect. In principle, adding a random term for time (i.e. year) would account for the fact that several measurements taken in the same year are simultaneously affected by year-to-year variation in environmental conditions. Daskalova *et al.* (2021) re-analysed the data of Seibold *et al.* (2019) using a modelling approach presented in VanLeeuwen *et al.* (1996), which includes a normal random intercept with a common variance to each year. However, the units of random terms in this model are assumed to be independent from each other (VanLeeuwen *et al.*, 1996). This assumption is questionable for insect time-series data. Yearly changes in insect population size have been shown to depend on density-independent factors such as winter and spring temperature (Andrewartha & Birch, 1954; Pöyry *et al.*, 2011), but there is also substantial evidence for density-dependent effects (Turchin, 1995). Thus, consecutive years do not represent a random set of samples (Zuur *et al.*, 2017). In addition, the model presented in the study by VanLeeuwen *et al.* (1996) was developed to deal with multiple observations from the same site in the same year, in contrast to the analysis of Seibold *et al.* (2019) with only one observation per site and year. Therefore, applying such a model to the data of Seibold *et al.* (2019) is inappropriate. Rather than using a random effect for each year, the models presented by Seibold *et al.* (2019) adjust for year-to-year variation in environmental conditions directly, by including annual and site-specific temperature and precipitation, two major drivers of insect populations. Compared with the model in the study by Daskalova *et al.* (2021; their Supporting Information fig. S1) the models in the study by Seibold *et al.* (2019; their fig. 1) show a better model fit, indicating that weather conditions and land-use parameters indeed explain considerably more variation than simply including year as random factor.

If a model includes ‘year’ both as continuous fixed effect and as random effect, as suggested by Daskalova *et al.* (2021), potential nonlinear developments over time are subsumed by the random effect. It is not surprising that such models fail to detect temporal trends, if nonlinear developments over time occurred. To investigate the occurrence of nonlinear effects, we fitted a model using fixed treatment contrasts, comparing each year to the reference 2008 instead of the random intercepts and including land-use and weather variables as in the original models of Seibold *et al.* (2019) (for details, see Supplementary information). We used 95% sequential confidence intervals for each of

the six models, which compare the mean change between two subsequent years, either directly or on the log scale for Poisson models. In line with the descriptive analysis (fig. 1 in the study by Seibold *et al.*, 2019), a decrease from 2008 to 2009 and further from 2009 to 2010 can be observed for the grassland models (Fig. 1). This shows that non-linear developments over time occurred and that high arthropod numbers in 2008 contributed to the overall decline in grasslands but are not solely responsible for it. No indication could be found that high arthropod numbers in 2008 were caused by some kind of artefact (Supplementary Information S3 in the study by Seibold *et al.* (2019)). Our reanalysis shows that biomass and species numbers in forests also decreased over time, although in later years (Fig. 1). Both the analysis of Seibold *et al.* (2019), which approximated non-linear developments over time by an overall fixed trend effect of ‘year’, and the refined analysis presented here provide evidence for a decline in arthropod numbers. We would also like to point out that the analysis of gamma diversity in Seibold *et al.* (2019), which showed a decline in overall species number across all study sites for forests and grasslands, is not affected by these considerations, as the bootstrapping approach allows comparisons between individual years and inference based on comparison of confidence intervals (Schenker & Gentleman, 2001). Thus, both the more complex reanalyses presented here and the analysis of gamma diversity in the study by Seibold *et al.* (2019) confirm that arthropods declined in both grasslands and forests, in all but one metric, i.e. arthropod abundance in forests. Finally, we want to stress that even the reanalyses of Daskalova *et al.* (2021), with limited power to detect temporal trends, found significant declines in arthropods in at least one metric in both grasslands and forests, supporting the overall finding of arthropod decline in both habitats.

Regional and global patterns

Daskalova *et al.* (2021) proceed by analysing a heterogeneous global dataset of aquatic and terrestrial time series from the BioTIME database (Dornelas *et al.*, 2018) and by reanalysing the data compilation from the meta-analysis by van Klink *et al.* (2020). From these analyses, they report declines in abundance of terrestrial insects in the data of van Klink *et al.* (2020), and in biomass of aquatic invertebrates in the BioTIME data. Although Daskalova *et al.* (2021) acknowledge that declines ‘could potentially be occurring in certain parts of the world and/or for specific taxa’, their main conclusion is that there was no evidence for an overall decline of invertebrates. It is not surprising that there are places where invertebrate biomass, abundance or species numbers have not declined, as reported also by van Klink *et al.* (2020). But it is also important to analyse such datasets in more detail with regard to differences between regions, habitat types and taxa instead of focussing only on overall trends. Seibold *et al.* (2019) were careful in drawing




Fig. 1. Temporal patterns of arthropods in 150 grasslands and 30 forests in Germany based on data from Seibold *et al.* (2019). Mean change between two subsequent years, either directly for biomass or on the log scale for abundance and species number, based on models using fixed-treatment contrasts comparing each year to the reference 2008 and presenting simultaneous 95% sequential confidence intervals. Models contained temperature, precipitation, local land-use intensity, cover of arable field and cover of grasslands within 1000 m radius as covariates and site nested in region as random effects to account for the nested structure of study sites within three regions. Poisson models contained an observation-specific random effect to account for overdispersion.

conclusions from their dataset and neither extrapolated results beyond a Central European perspective nor beyond the studied time period (2008–2017). Regional observations should be taken seriously and conservation measures should be implemented in regions where insects are declining (Harvey *et al.*, 2020), even if this might not reflect a global trend. For taxa such as birds and mammals, for which long term, standardised and global

datasets exist, major losses in biodiversity are undisputed (Ceballos *et al.*, 2015; Diaz *et al.*, 2019), but such datasets do not exist for invertebrates. Nevertheless, there is an increasing number of studies that reported declines in the long (Habel *et al.*, 2016; Soroye *et al.*, 2020), medium (Hallmann *et al.*, 2017; Welti *et al.*, 2020) and short (Seibold *et al.*, 2019) term and investigated their drivers. Short-term studies may be

more likely to find extreme trends, as pointed out by Daskalova *et al.* (2021), but long-term studies often suffer from less standardised sampling or opportunistic site selection limiting their ability to detect trends and underlying drivers (Habel *et al.*, 2016; Kunin, 2019). The strength of the data of Seibold *et al.* (2019) is the well-selected underlying gradient of land-use intensity at local and landscape scale, replicated in three regions, which allowed inferences about the drivers of the observed declines. The fact that an increasing number of studies is now published, which differ in study system, results and insights, suggests that the scientific process is intact. Seibold *et al.* (2019) have been very careful in phrasing their findings, as did e.g. Hallmann *et al.* (2017) and many others. Thus, we disagree with Daskalova *et al.* (2021) that studies reporting a decline have been alarmist. However, as put succinctly by Lindenmayer *et al.* (2013), the purpose of monitoring cannot be the passive observation of species decline until extinction. Instead, monitoring should inform actions, and in a first step this includes publishing and discussion of results.

Conclusions

In conclusion, we disagree with Daskalova *et al.* (2021) that the results of Seibold *et al.* (2019) are based on flawed statistics and suggest that their model structure with ‘year’ as both fixed and random factor requires some caution in interpretation. We agree, however, that observational data have to be interpreted with great care, especially when time series are short. Nevertheless, short time series also contribute important knowledge about arthropod population trends, particularly if monitoring is highly standardised, well-replicated and conducted along environmental gradients relevant for decision makers as in the case of Seibold *et al.* (2019). Hence, we believe that it is important to publish findings irrespective of whether observed trends are negative, positive or neutral, as long as sampling and statistical analysis are sound.

Acknowledgements

Open Access funding enabled and organised by ProjektDEAL. WOA Institution: Technische Universität München Blended DEAL: ProjektDEAL. Open access funding enabled and organised by Projekt DEAL.

DATA AVAILABILITY STATEMENT

Data are available from <https://www.bexis.uni-jena.de/PublicData/PublicDataSet.aspx?DataSetId=25786> which is a permanent data deposit of the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft.

Supporting information

Additional supporting information may be found online in the Supporting Information section at the end of the article.

Appendix S1: Supporting information

References

- Andrewartha, H.G. & Birch, L.C. (1954) *The Distribution and Abundance of Animals*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Ceballos, G., Ehrlich, P.R., Barnosky, A.D., García, A., Pringle, R.M. & Palmer, T.M. (2015) Accelerated modern human – induced species losses: entering the sixth mass extinction. *Science Advances*, **1**, 1–6.
- Daskalova, G.N., Phillimore, A.B. & Myers-Smith, I.H. (2021) Accounting for year effects and sampling error in temporal analyses of population and biodiversity change. *Insect Conservation and Diversity*, **14** (1), 149–154.
- Diaz, S., Settele, J. & Brondizio, E. (2019) *Summary for Policymakers of the Global Assessment Report on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services of the Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services*. IPBES. https://www.ipbes.net/sites/default/files/downloads/spm_unedited_advance_for_posting_hfn.pdf.
- Dornelas, M., Antão, L.H., Moyes, F., Bates, A.E., Magurran, A.E., Adam, D., Akhmetzhanova, A.A., Appeltans, W., Arcos, J.M., Arnold, H., Ayyappan, N., Badihi, G., Baird, A.H., Barbosa, M., Barreto, T.E., Bässler, C., Bellgrove, A., Belmaker, J., Benedetti-Cecchi, L., Bett, B.J., Bjorkman, A.D., Błazewicz, M., Blowes, S. A., Bloch, C.P., Bonebrake, T.C., Boyd, S., Bradford, M., Brooks, A.J., Brown, J.H., Bruelheide, H., Budy, P., Carvalho, F., Castañeda-Moya, E., Chen, C.A., Chamblee, J.F., Chase, T.J., Siegwart Collier, L., Collinge, S.K., Condit, R., Cooper, E.J., Cornelissen, J.H.C., Cotano, U., Kyle Crow, S., Damasceno, G., Davies, C.H., Davis, R.A., Day, F.P., Degraer, S., Doherty, T.S., Dunn, T.E., Durigan, G., Duffey, J.E., Edelist, D., Edgar, G.J., Elahi, R., Elmendorf, S.C., Enemar, A., Ernest, S.K.M., Escribano, R., Estiarte, M., Evans, B.S., Fan, T.Y., Turini Farah, F., Loureiro Fernandes, L., Farneda, F.Z., Fidelis, A., Fitt, R., Fosaa, A. M., Daher Correa Franco, G.A., Frank, G.E., Fraser, W.R., García, H., Cazzolla Gatti, R., Givan, O., Gorgone-Barbosa, E., Gould, W.A., Gries, C., Grossman, G.D., Gutierrez, J.R., Hale, S., Harmon, M.E., Harte, J., Haskins, G., Henshaw, D.L., Hermanutz, L., Hidalgo, P., Higuchi, P., Hoey, A., van Hoey, G., Hofgaard, A., Holeck, K., Hollister, R.D., Holmes, R., Hoogenboom, M., Hsieh, C.H., Hubbell, S.P., Huettmann, F., Huffard, C.L., Hurlbert, A.H., Macedo Ivanauskas, N., Janík, D., Jandt, U., Jazdzewska, A., Johannessen, T., Johnstone, J., Jones, J., Jones, F.A.M., Kang, J., Kartawijaya, T., Keeley, E.C., Kelt, D.A., Kinneer, R., Klanderud, K., Knutsen, H., Koenig, C.C., Körtz, A.R., Král, K., Kuhn, L.A., Kuo, C.Y., Kushner, D.J., Laguionie-Marchais, C., Lancaster, L.T., Min Lee, C., Lefcheck, J.S., Lévesque, E., Lightfoot, D., Lloret, F., Lloyd, J.D., López-Baucells, A., Louzao, M., Madin, J.S., Magnússon, B., Malamud, S., Matthews, I., McFarland, K., McGill, B., McKnight, D., McLarney, W., Meador, J., Meserve, P.L., Metcalfe, D.J., Meyer, C. F.J., Michelsen, A., Milchakova, N., Moens, T., Moland, E., Moore, J., Mathias Moreira, C., Müller, J., Murphy, G., Myers-Smith, I.H., Myster, R.W., Naumov, A., Neat, F., Nelson, J.A., Paul Nelson, M., Newton, S.F., Norden, N., Oliver, J.C., Olsen, E.M., Onipchenko, V.G., Pabis, K., Pabst, R.J., Paquette, A., Pardede, S., Paterson, D.M., Pélissier, R., Peñuelas, J., Pérez-Matus, A., Pizarro, O., Pomati, F., Post, E., Prins, H.H.T., Priscu, J.C., Provoost, P., Prudic, K.L., Pulliainen, E., Ramesh, B.R., Mendivil Ramos, O., Rassweiler, A., Rebelo, J.E., Reed, D.C., Reich, P.B., Remillard, S.M., Richardson, A.J., Richardson, J.P., van Rijn, I., Rocha, R., Rivera-Monroy, V.H., Rixen, C., Robinson, K.P., Ribeiro Rodrigues, R., de Cerqueira Rossa-Feres, D., Rudstam, L., Ruhl, H.,

- Ruz, C.S., Sampaio, E.M., Rybicki, N., Rypel, A., Sal, S., Salgado, B., Santos, F.A.M., Savassi-Coutinho, A.P., Scanga, S., Schmidt, J., Schooley, R., Setiawan, F., Shao, K.T., Shaver, G.R., Sherman, S., Sherry, T.W., Siciński, J., Sievers, C., da Silva, A.C., Rodrigues da Silva, F., Silveira, F.L., Slingsby, J., Smart, T., Snell, S.J., Soudzilovskaia, N.A., Souza, G.B.G., Maluf Souza, F., Castro Souza, V., Stallings, C.D., Stanforth, R., Stanley, E.H., Mauro Sterza, J., Stevens, M., Stuart-Smith, R., Rondon Suarez, Y., Supp, S., Yoshio Tamashiro, J., Tarigan, S., Thiede, G.P., Thorn, S., Tolvanen, A., Teresa Zugliani Toniato, M., Totland, Ø., Twilley, R. R., Vaitkus, G., Valdivia, N., Vallejo, M.I., Valone, T.J., van Colen, C., Vanaverbeke, J., Venturoli, F., Verhey, H.M., Vianna, M., Vieira, R.P., Vrška, T., Quang Vu, C., van Vu, L., Waide, R.B., Waldock, C., Watts, D., Webb, S., Wesolowski, T., White, E.P., Widdicombe, C.E., Wilgers, D., Williams, R., Williams, S.B., Williamson, M., Willig, M.R., Willis, T.J., Wipf, S., Woods, K.D., Woehler, E.J., Zawada, K., Zettler, M.L. & Hickler, T. (2018) BioTIME: a database of biodiversity time series for the Anthropocene. *Global Ecology and Biogeography*, **27**, 760–786.
- Habel, J.C., Segerer, A., Ulrich, W., Torchyk, O., Weisser, W.W. & Schmitt, T. (2016) Butterfly community shifts over two centuries. *Conservation Biology*, **30**, 754–762.
- Hallmann, C.A., Sorg, M., Jongejans, E., Siepel, H., Hofland, N., Schwan, H., Stenmans, W., Müller, A., Sumser, H., Hörren, T., Goulson, D. & De Kroon, H. (2017) More than 75 percent decline over 27 years in total flying insect biomass in protected areas. *PLoS ONE*, **12**, e0185809.
- Harvey, J.A., Heinen, R., Armbrrecht, I., Basset, Y., Baxter-Gilbert, J.H., Bezemer, T.M., Böhm, M., Bommarco, R., Borges, P.A.V., Cardoso, P., Clausnitzer, V., Cornelisse, T., Crone, E.E., Dicke, M., Dijkstra, K.-D.B., Dyer, L., Eilers, J., Fartmann, T., Forister, M.L., Furlong, M.J., Garcia-Aguayo, A., Gerlach, J., Gols, R., Goulson, D., H., J.-C., Haddad, N.M., Hallmann, C.A., Henriques, S., Herberstein, M.E., Hochkirch, A., Hughes, A.C., Jepsen, S., Jones, T.H., Kaydan, B.M., Kleijn, D., Klein, A.-M., Latty, T., Leather, S.R., Lewis, S.M., Lister, B.C., Losey, J.E., Lowe, E.C., Macadam, C.R., Montoya-Lerma, J., Nagano, C.D., Ogan, S., Orr, M.C., Painting, C.J., Pham, T.-H., Potts, S.G., Rauf, A., Roslin, T.L., Samways, M.J., Sanchez-Bayo, F., Sar, S.A., Schultz, C.B., Soares, A.O., Thancharoen, A., Tschamtké, T., Tylianakis, J.M., Umers, K.D.L., Vet, L.E.M., Visser, M.E., Vujic, A., Wagner, D.L., WallisDeVries, M.F., Westphal, C., White, T.E., Wilkins, V.L., Williams, P.H., Wyckhuys, K.A.G., Zhu, Z.-R., de Kroon, H. (2020) International scientists formulate a roadmap for insect conservation and recovery. *Nature Ecology & Evolution*, **4**(2), 174–176. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/s41559-019-1079-8>.
- van Klink, R., Bowler, D.E., Gongalsky, K.B., Swengel, A.B., Gentile, A. & Chase, J.M. (2020) Meta-analysis reveals declines in terrestrial but increases in freshwater insect abundances. *Science*, **368**, 417–420.
- Kunin, W.E. (2019) Robust evidence of declines in insect abundance and biodiversity. *Nature*, **574**, 641–642.
- Lindenmayer, D.B., Piggott, M.P. & Wintle, B.A. (2013) Counting the books while the library burns: why conservation monitoring programs need a plan for action. *Frontiers in Ecology and the Environment*, **11**, 549–555.
- Pöyry, J., Leinonen, R., Söderman, G., Nieminen, M., Heikkinen, R. K. & Carter, T.R. (2011) Climate-induced increase of moth multivoltinism in boreal regions. *Global Ecology and Biogeography*, **20**, 289–298.
- Schenker, N. & Gentleman, J.F. (2001) On judging the significance of differences by examining the overlap between confidence intervals. *The American Statistician*, **55**, 182–186.
- Seibold, S., Gossner, M.M., Simons, N.K., Blüthgen, N., Müller, J., Ambarli, D., Ammer, C., Bauhus, J., Fischer, M., Habel, J.C., Linsenmair, K.E., Nauss, T., Penone, C., Prati, D., Schall, P., Schulze, E.D., Vogt, J., Wöllauer, S. & Weisser, W.W. (2019) Arthropod decline in grasslands and forests is associated with landscape-level drivers. *Nature*, **574**, 671–674.
- Seibold, S., Gossner, M.M., Simons, N., Blüthgen, N., Müller, J., Ambarli, D., Ammer, C., Bauhus, J., Fischer, M., Fürstenau, C., Habel, J.C., Linsenmair, K.E., Nauss, T., Ostrowski, A., Penone, C., Prati, D., Schall, P., Schulze, E.-D., Vogt, J., Wöllauer, S. & Weisser, W. (2020): Arthropod data from 150 grassland plots, 2008–2017, and 140 forest plots, 2008–2016, used in "Arthropod decline in grasslands and forests is associated with drivers at landscape level", Nature. v1.3.11. Biodiversity Exploratories Information System. Dataset. <https://doi.org/10.25829/bexis.25786-1.3.11>
- Soroye, P., Newbold, T. & Kerr, J.T. (2020) Climate change contributes to widespread declines among bumble bees across continents. *Science*, **87**, 685–688.
- Turchin, P. (1995) Population regulation: old arguments and a new synthesis. *Population Dynamics: New Approaches and Synthesis* (ed. by N. Cappuccino and P.W. Price Cambridge: Academic Press, pp. 19–40.
- VanLeeuwen, D.M., Murray, L.W. & Urquhart, N.S. (1996) A mixed model with both fixed and random trend components across time. *Journal of Agricultural, Biological, and Environmental Statistics*, **1**, 435–453.
- Welti, E.A.R., Roeder, K.A., De Beurs, K.M., Joern, A. & Kaspari, M. (2020) Nutrient dilution and climate cycles underlie declines in a dominant insect herbivore. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, **117**, 7271–7275.
- Zuur, A.F., Ieno, E.N. & Saveliev, A.A. (2017) *Beginner's Guide to Spatial, Temporal and Spatial-Temporal Ecological Data Analysis with R-INLA*. Highland Statistics Ltd., Newburgh, UK.

Accepted 9 December 2020

Editor/associate editor: Raphael Didham