## 9/10/20 Advanced Ecology-Population 1

Savage et al. (2004)

1. When resources are unlimited, $r_{\text {max }}$ population growth depends only on metabolic rate and the energy cost to replace+create individuals. Agree?
2. Low body temp has smaller $r$ but higher K (carrying capacity) given the same amount of resource. Is this intuitive?
3. $r_{\max }$ represents the maximum exponential growth rate when resources are not limiting. How then can the author justify using field study of fish to estimate $r_{\text {max }}$ ?
4. First I thought that the $r_{\max }$ would be defined at the optimal temperature of the species. But the author chose to separate out temperature from $r_{\text {max }}$, so species can have a range of $r_{\text {max }}$ depending on the temperature. At the thermal limits of the species it can have negative $r_{\text {max }}$. Is this definition of $r_{\text {max }}$ more conienvent?
5. While average body mass is a trait determined largely by the genetic makeup (in a stable age distribution), body temperature is less apparent, because body temperature is the result of the interaction between the environmental temperature and traits (insulation layer, ecto/endotherm, behavior). In addition, body temperature is affected by body mass and metabolic rate. While they did correct their data with mass/temp, Is treating body temperature as an independent variable appropriate?
6. Authors suggest that once data for $r_{\text {max }}$ have been corrected for mass and temperature, vastly different species (unicellular to vertebrates) can be generalized by a similar relationship between $r_{\text {max }}$ and temp/mass. Are you convinced?
7. The impression I got from the paper is: "we found this general trend using equations, but we have little interest about how or why it works". Could they've made it more relevant with evolutionary and ecological context?

## Barretto et al. (2018)

1. In figure 2D, the population numbers of both species are pretty similar in non-forested habitat across months. While they found a positive relationship between humidity and D. mexicanum population, they failed to find any for D. satanas. Could it be due to the smaller sample size of $D$. satanas?
2. In figure 2 E , humidity at the two ends of the x -axis is not matching up. How may that have affected their model?
(Non related question: the number of days in a month ranges from 28-31. How do you normalize the difference in days when presenting and analyzing such data?)
