

Hillebrand 2004

1. Explain why body mass and thermoregulation are negatively correlated.
2. Hillebrand concluded that restricting the analysis of scale to regional studies revealed weaker local than regional gradients. Do you think that researchers need to pull their focus out to more regional than local studies, or do local studies still contribute to the bigger picture? Are local studies skewing the perceived scale of biodiversity?
3. Discuss the constraints moving towards the poles that would lead to a decline in diversity.
4. How would human influence change the results if it was added as a variable? How would it be measured?
5. With all of the variables being considered in this article, were the overall results overwhelming? Should the study be reduced to focus more on individual variables?
6. The author suggests that a future central task in macroecology would be to evaluate β -diversity. Do you agree and why?
7. The freshwater realm is geographically isolated in small "freshwater islands" and it shows a weaker and flatter diversity gradient than terrestrial and marine realms (Figure 7). Why are the gradients for running waters (at local scale) stronger and steeper than for lakes? How do you explain the peak of large rivers in the tropics?

Colautti et al. 2004

1. Is it fair to conclude that there are generalities to be drawn across all non-indigenous species invasions and their enemies? Is this too broad of a subject matter?
2. Discuss regulatory release versus compensatory release (page 724). Which do you think poses more of an invasion threat? Do you have any examples of either?
3. Based on ISH (increased susceptibility hypothesis), the best strategy to reduce NIS would be the introduction of native enemies to newly founded populations. What do you think about this approach versus the current biocontrol practices?
4. Figure 1: Do you think the result would be the same regardless of the distance between the source region and the introduced range? When is host-switching more likely to occur?
5. "Studies that have explicitly compared range sizes with the number of co-occurring enemies for both introduced and native ranges of plant species have concluded that the best predictor of enemy diversity is the size of the host range, rather than status as native or introduced (Southwood et al. 1982; Clay 1995)" (page 725). Why do you think that is?
6. Are non-indigenous species clearly set apart from invasive species in the paper?