

Paine (1966)

1. p.66 Paine assumes the probability of bivalve consumption is proportional to abundance and predators exercise no preference in their choice. What would Holling have to say about this?
2. Think about Figs. 1-3 and the differences between the subwebs and data collection (not including the experimental data). Is Paine justified in concluding that “..tropical, or other, ecosystems are more diverse...” based on these study sites?
3. Now looking at the removal of *Pisaster* in Mukkaw Bay - do you think his results would have changed had he done the experiment in California?
4. p. 65. "Local species diversity is directly related to the efficiency with which predators prevent the monopolization of the major environmental requisites by one species." Was Paine successful in proving this hypothesis? Are you questioning anything?

Pierce and Ollason (1987)

5. Fig. 1 - someone explain this in simpler terms.
6. Is this a paper built on the inadequacy of words such as “optimal” or “fitness”?
7. p. 115, Argument 8 - If optimal foraging theory is not the vehicle for simulating or predicting foraging behavior then what is?
8. Their criticisms are presented in decreasing order of importance. Do you agree with this ranking? If not, what would you put first?
9. Even if all their arguments are valid, is optimal foraging theory still a “waste of time”?

Harley (2011)

10. Rocky intertidal communities again! Are there any issues with using these specific sites when conclusions are meant to be applied on a global scale?
11. What is the relationship between (A) and (B) in Fig. 4? What does this tell us that we didn't already get from Fig. 2?
12. p. 1124 and Fig. 3. “Prey species were able to occupy a hot, extralimital site if predation pressure was experimentally reduced, and local species richness more than doubled as a result.” This is the opposite of Paine's observations. Thoughts?