

WILEY



The Interpretation and Misinterpretation of Mortality Rate Measures

Author(s): Douglas Sheil, David F. R. P. Burslem and Denis Alder

Source: *Journal of Ecology*, Apr., 1995, Vol. 83, No. 2 (Apr., 1995), pp. 331-333

Published by: British Ecological Society

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.com/stable/2261571>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <https://about.jstor.org/terms>



Wiley and *British Ecological Society* are collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Journal of Ecology*

JSTOR

The interpretation and misinterpretation of mortality rate measures

DOUGLAS SHEIL, DAVID F. R. P. BURSLEM and DENIS ALDER
Oxford Forestry Institute, Department of Plant Sciences, University of Oxford, South Parks Road, Oxford OX1 3RB, UK

Ecologists frequently measure and compare mortality rates and other count-dependent rates of change. The simplest measures employ mortality counts for predetermined populations over a defined census interval (e.g. Harper 1977; Putz & Milton 1983; Connell *et al.* 1984; Hubbell & Foster 1990; Turner 1990; Osunkoya *et al.* 1992). More complex formulations are required to allow comparison over varying time periods, because these measures require a knowledge or assumption of how probabilities of death change over time. In many ecological applications this probability is taken to be constant and can therefore be used to define a rate. In this paper we examine some potentially misleading discrepancies that occur in the recent ecological literature.

In its simplest form a constant mortality is modelled by exponential population decline:

$$\text{i.e. } dN/dt = -\lambda N \quad (1)$$

or, in the integrated form:

$$N_1 = N_0 e^{-\lambda t} \quad (2)$$

where N_0 and N_1 are population counts at the beginning and end of the measurement interval, t , and λ is a constant. This model was apparently applied by Swaine & Hall (1983) and also by Lieberman *et al.* (1985) who explicitly stated that ‘the annual mortality rate (λ) was calculated as the slope of the \log_e survivorship vs. time’. This statement implies that their ‘annual mortality’, λ , is defined as:

$$\lambda = \log_e(N_0/N_1)/t \quad (3)$$

or

$$\lambda = (\log_e N_0 - \log_e N_1)/t. \quad (4)$$

This formulation was adopted by the 7th Aberdeen/Hull Symposium on the dynamics of tree populations in tropical forest (Swaine & Lieberman 1987; Lieberman & Lieberman 1987; Manokaran & Kochummen 1987; Swaine *et al.* 1987), and is now a standard method for the calculation of mortality rates (e.g. Kitajima & Augspurger 1989; Swaine 1989; Lieberman *et al.* 1990; Clark & Clark 1992; Condit *et al.* 1993; Milton *et al.* 1994).

Another algebraic formulation of constant mortality is provided by explicit use of mortality per year, m , as the defining rate variable:

$$N_1 = N_0(1 - m)^t, \quad (5)$$

where m is readily calculated in the form:

$$m = 1 - (N_1/N_0)^{1/t}, \quad (6)$$

or if counts of stems lost (i.e. $N_0 - N_1$) are more conveniently used:

$$m = 1 - [1 - (N_0 - N_1)/N_0]^{1/t}. \quad (7)$$

This was the approach implied by Primack *et al.* (1985) and is detailed by Alder (in press).

A problem can be seen to arise when the ‘annual mortalities’ of Lieberman *et al.* (1985) and Swaine & Lieberman (1987), i.e. eqn 4, are compared against m (eqn 6). The two measures are related independently of time, and their equivalence can be derived from eqns 3 and 5 as:

$$\lambda = -\log_e(1 - m) \quad (8)$$

and

$$m = 1 - e^{-\lambda}. \quad (9)$$

λ can be shown to be an instantaneous measure of decline per unit of population (see eqn 1) and should not be called or considered an ‘annual mortality’. True annual mortality is defined correctly by eqns 6 and 7 above.

In reality the discrepancies are small except at high mortality rates, i.e. for low mortality rates the difference can be shown to be approximately $-m^2/2$ or $\lambda^2/2$ [by Taylor series expansion of $\log_e(1 + x)$]. For example, at 2% mortality the discrepancy is only 0.02%, while at 50% mortality the discrepancy rises to 19%. The difference between m and λ is shown in Fig. 1.

Clearly the problem becomes important when high mortality rates are encountered, e.g. in studies of seedling demography and following catastrophic events (Whitmore 1974; Kitajima & Augspurger 1989; Osunkoya *et al.* 1992). Indeed it can be shown that high rates measured over periods of less than one year may give rise to a λ (but not m) greater than 1, indicating the error in referring to λ as ‘annual mortality’.

Given the current interest in widespread and general comparisons of data from different studies (e.g. Phillips & Gentry 1994) the correct interpretation and definition of units of mortality (and turnover) is essential. Although λ remains an adequate and consistent measure of mortality we advocate the use of the more tangible




Fig. 1 The exponential mortality coefficient, λ , against true annual mortality, m (solid line). The 1:1 relationship is given for comparison (dashed line).

quantity provided by the true annual mortality estimate m (eqn 6). The λ measure should be referred to as the 'exponential mortality coefficient' and not as 'annual mortality'. We note that in many papers the method of mortality calculation is not stated explicitly, nor can it be checked or derived from the data presented (e.g. Primack & Lee 1991; Welden *et al.* 1991) or appears to be stated incorrectly (e.g. Korning & Balslev 1994). A statement that the annual mortality rate is derived according to the exponential model is not sufficient to distinguish λ from m , since both are consistent with this model.

Another measure of population decline is the half-life, i.e. the time that would be taken for a given population to lose 50% of all its individuals assuming, again, a constant probability of mortality. Half-lives can be calculated from both λ and m :

$$t_{0.5} = -\log_e 2 / \log_e (1 - m) \quad (10)$$

and

$$t_{0.5} = \log_e 2 / L. \quad (11)$$

Equation 11 is a clarification of that given by Swaine & Lieberman (1987).

We recommend m as a standard quantity for comparing annual mortality rates in plant ecology. The assumption of constant probability of mortality in itself requires critical evaluation (e.g. Mervart 1972) and is a suitable topic for future research.

Acknowledgements

This work was made possible through the funding of the Forestry Research Programme component of the Renewable Natural Resources Research Strategy of the Overseas Development Administration. We thank Peter Savill, Nick Brown, Howard Wright, and two reviewers for their comments.

References

- Alder, D. (in press) *Permanent Sample Plot Data Analysis and Growth Modelling for Mixed Tropical Forest*. Tropical Forestry Paper, Oxford Forestry Institute, Department of Plant Sciences, University of Oxford.
- Clark, D.A. & Clark, D.B. (1992) Life history diversity of canopy and emergent trees in a neotropical rain forest. *Ecological Monographs*, **62**, 315–344.
- Condit, R., Hubbell, S.P. & Foster, R.B. (1993) Mortality and growth of a commercial hardwood 'el cativo' *Priora copaifera*, in Panama. *Forest Ecology and Management*, **62**, 107–122.
- Connell, J.H., Tracey, J.G. & Webb, L.J. (1984) Compensatory recruitment, growth and mortality as factors maintaining rain forest tree diversity. *Ecological Monographs*, **54**, 141–164.
- Harper, J.L. (1977) *Population Biology of Plants*. Academic Press, London.
- Hubbell, S.P. & Foster, R.B. (1990) Structure dynamics, and equilibrium status of old-growth forest on Barro Colorado Island. *Four Neotropical Rainforests* (ed. A. H. Gentry), pp. 522–541. Yale University Press, New Haven, CT.
- Kitajima, K. & Augspurger, C.K. (1989) Seed and seedling ecology of a monocarpic tropical tree, *Tachigalia versicolor*. *Ecology*, **70**, 1102–1114.
- Korning, J. & Balslev, H. (1994) Growth rates and mortality patterns of tropical lowland tree species and the relation to forest structure in Amazonian Ecuador. *Journal of Tropical Ecology*, **10**, 151–166.
- Lieberman, D. & Lieberman, M. (1987) Forest tree growth and dynamics at La Selva, Costa Rica (1969–1982). *Journal of Tropical Ecology*, **3**, 347–358.
- Lieberman, D., Lieberman, M., Peralta, R. & Harstshorn, G.S. (1985) Mortality patterns and stand turnover rates in a wet tropical forest in Costa Rica. *Journal of Ecology*, **73**, 915–924.
- Lieberman, D., Harstshorn, G.S., Lieberman, M. & Peralta, R. (1990) Forest dynamics at La Selva, Biological Station (1969–1985). *Four Neotropical Rainforests* (ed. A. H. Gentry), pp. 509–521. Yale University Press, New Haven, CT.
- Manokaran, N. & Kochummen, K.M. (1987) Recruitment, growth and mortality of tree species in a lowland dipterocarp forest in Peninsular Malaysia. *Journal of Tropical Ecology*, **3**, 315–330.
- Mervart, J. (1972) Growth and mortality rates in the natural high forest of Western Nigeria. *Nigeria Forestry Information Bulletin (New Series)*, **22**, Department of Forestry, Ibadan, Nigeria.
- Milton, K., Laca, E.A. & Demment, M.W. (1994) Successional patterns of mortality and growth of large trees in a Panamanian lowland forest. *Journal of Ecology*, **82**, 79–87.
- Osunkoya, O.O., Ash, J.E., Hopkins, M.S. & Graham, A.W. (1992) Factors affecting survival of tree seedlings in North Queensland rainforests. *Oecologia*, **91**, 569–578.
- Phillips, O.L. & Gentry, A.H. (1994) Increasing turnover through time in tropical forests. *Science*, **263**, 954–958.
- Primack, R.B., Ashton, P.S., Chai, P. & Lee, H.S. (1985) Growth rates and population structure of Moraceae trees in Sarawak, East Malaysia. *Ecology*, **66**, 577–588.
- Primack, R.B. & Lee, H.S. (1991) Population dynamics of pioneer (*Macaranga*) trees and understorey (*Mallotus*) trees (Euphorbiaceae) in primary and selectively logged Bornean rain forests. *Journal of Tropical Ecology*, **7**, 439–458.
- Putz, F.E. & Milton, K. (1983) Tree mortality rates on Barro Colorado Island. *The Ecology of a Tropical Rain Forest* (eds E. G. Leigh, A. S. Rand & O. M. Windsor), pp. 95–108. Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Swaine, M.D. (1989) Population dynamics of tree species in tropical forests. *Tropical Forests, Botanical Dynamics, Speciation and Diversity* (eds L. B. Holm-Nielsen, I. C. Nielsen & H. Balslev), pp. 101–112. Academic Press, London.

- Swaine, M.D. & Hall, J.B. (1983) Early succession on cleared forest land in Ghana. *Journal of Ecology*, **71**, 601–627.
- Swaine, M.D. & Lieberman, D. (1987) Note on the calculation of mortality rates. *Journal of Tropical Ecology*, **3**, ii–iii.
- Swaine, M.D., Lieberman, D. & Putz, F.E. (1987) The dynamics of tree populations in tropical forest: a review. *Journal of Tropical Ecology*, **3**, 359–366.
- Swaine, M.D., Hall, J.B. & Alexander, I.J. (1987) Tree population dynamics at Kade, Ghana (1968–1982). *Journal of Tropical Ecology*, **3**, 331–345.
- Turner, I.M. (1990) Tree seedling growth and survival in a Malaysian rain forest. *Biotropica*, **22**, 146–154.
- Welden, C.W., Hewett, S.W., Hubbell, S.P. & Foster, R.B. (1991) Sapling survival, growth, and recruitment: relationship to canopy height in a neotropical forest. *Ecology*, **72**, 35–50.
- Whitmore, T.C. (1974) *Change with time and the role of cyclones in tropical rain forest on Kolombangara, Solomon Islands*. Commonwealth Forestry Institute Paper 46, Commonwealth Forestry Institute, Oxford.

Received 3 October 1994

revised version accepted 9 January 1995