

# UC Santa Cruz

## UC Santa Cruz Previously Published Works

### Title

We agree with Larkin et al. 2019: restoration is context specific

### Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/1r38x611>

### Journal

Proceedings of the Royal Society B, 286(1907)

### ISSN

0962-8452

### Authors

Jones, Holly P  
Jones, Peter C  
Barbier, Edward B  
[et al.](#)

### Publication Date

2019-07-24

### DOI

10.1098/rspb.2019.1179

Peer reviewed

## Invited reply



**Cite this article:** Jones HP *et al.* 2019 We agree with Larkin *et al.* 2019: restoration is context specific. *Proc. R. Soc. B* 20191179. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2019.1179>

Received: 21 May 2019

Accepted: 21 June 2019

**Author for correspondence:**

Holly P. Jones

e-mail: [hjones@niu.edu](mailto:hjones@niu.edu)

The accompanying comment can be viewed at <http://dx.doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2018.2928>.

# We agree with Larkin *et al.* 2019: restoration is context specific

Holly P. Jones<sup>1</sup>, Peter C. Jones<sup>2</sup>, Edward B. Barbier<sup>3</sup>, Ryan C. Blackburn<sup>2</sup>, Jose M. Rey Benayas<sup>4,5</sup>, Karen D. Holl<sup>6</sup>, Michelle McCrackin<sup>7</sup>, Paula Meli<sup>4,8</sup>, Daniel Montoya<sup>9,10</sup> and David Moreno Mateos<sup>4,11,12</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Department of Biological Sciences and Institute for the Study of the Environment, Sustainability, and Energy, and <sup>2</sup>Department of Biological Sciences, Northern Illinois University, DeKalb, IL, USA

<sup>3</sup>Department of Economics and Finance, University of Wyoming, 1000 E University Ave, Laramie, WY, USA

<sup>4</sup>Fundación Internacional para la Restauración de Ecosistemas, Madrid, Spain

<sup>5</sup>Departamento de Ciencias de la Vida, Universidad de Alcalá, Alcalá de Henares, Spain

<sup>6</sup>Environmental Studies Department, University of California, Santa Cruz, CA, USA

<sup>7</sup>Baltic Sea Centre, Stockholm University, Stockholm, Sweden

<sup>8</sup>Natura y Ecosistemas Mexicanos A.C., Mexico DF, Mexico

<sup>9</sup>Centre for Biodiversity Theory and Modeling, Station D'Ecologie Experimentale du CNRS, Moulis, France

<sup>10</sup>Centre INRA de Dijon, Dijon Cedex, France

<sup>11</sup>Basque Center for Climate Change – BC3, Bilbao, Spain

<sup>12</sup>IKERBASQUE, Basque Foundation for Science, Bilbao, Spain

HPJ, 0000-0002-5512-9958

Q1

We welcome the opportunity to further discuss our analysis and conclusions [1] that Larkin *et al.*'s [2] (hereafter LEA) comment provides. In this response, we first discuss mischaracterizations and criticisms of our analyses, then highlight how the main conclusions from both LEA's and our analyses are similar, and end with further discussion of what both analyses suggest for restoration and conservation moving forward.

LEA contend that the response ratio is 'fundamentally flawed'; given its prominence in the restoration [3–5] and meta-analysis literatures [6–8], we suggest that the matter of its usefulness or lack thereof is far from settled and leave it to meta-analysis statisticians to discuss its utility. For those interested, both LEA and we consulted with meta-analysis statisticians who came to different conclusions (see published reviews of LEA's comment). We further direct readers to the reviews of LEA's comment for a more in-depth response to their criticisms on the choice of variables to calculate response ratios, of how to treat response ratios that overshoot recovery goals, exclusion of invasive species disturbances, and of minimal sample size calculations.

We appreciate LEA's point that data analyses are sensitive to outliers, and this is particularly true in meta-analysis. The reason for removing outliers from a dataset is that they exert undue influence on the statistical analysis. In our analysis, the data were almost always removed as outliers for the resilience metric because the authors had measured recovery over a period of hours or days, which highly inflated recovery rates. Thus, we do not find it surprising that when LEA included outliers, their results differed slightly from ours. We contend that leaving these inflated recovery rates in the analysis highlights differences that are a result of mathematical anomalies (rates being higher because of a very small denominator) rather than biological realities. We appreciate LEA catching the error we made in the outlier removal process, which resulted in us excluding three papers that should have been included. We ran the models again with the correct outliers removed and it did not change our conclusions.

LEA used a completely different statistical methodology to analyse less than half of our original dataset; they only included studies that had two time points of data after the disturbance was removed. Generalized Estimating Equations, unlike our methods, are not likelihood based and they are semiparametric (meaning they have some nonparametric components). So, the LEA analysis has different assumptions and approaches than our analysis. We find it striking

64 that despite the different approach, LEA's results are remark-  
65 ably similar to our own (see fig. 3 in [1] and supp. fig. 1 in  
66 [2]). But, because the statistical approaches are different and  
67 because of the inclusion of outliers, their approach gives  
68 some *p*-values stating significant differences, despite substan-  
69 tial overlap of nearly all confidence intervals.

70 We agree with a number of the points made by LEA.  
71 Defining passive versus active restoration is particularly diffi-  
72 cult and confounding, which LEA highlight, has been  
73 reviewed in the literature [9–11], and we extensively  
74 discussed in our original paper. It would be useful if restor-  
75 ation ecologists could come to a consensus on a specific  
76 way to categorize the difference. However, the debate persists  
77 because it is so difficult to do so as restoration actions exist  
78 along a continuum. We debated heavily among authors the  
79 definitions we would use and analysed data using a variety  
80 of definitions. When we changed various categories of restor-  
81 ation types to passive or active (e.g. changing reconnecting  
82 hydrology to active), we still found no differences between  
83 the two categories.

84 Despite having contributed to the ongoing debate about  
85 this definition, we wonder if that debate detracts from a  
86 potentially more important point, namely that short-term  
87 restoration approaches cannot and should not replace conser-  
88 vation or long-term investment in ecosystem restoration.  
89 Conservation of relatively undisturbed habitat will continue  
90 to be critical, given the restoration debt recovering ecosystems  
91 face [12] and how little full recovery ecosystems have  
92 achieved [1]. As LEA point out, there is considerable focus  
93 on the short-term benefits of low-cost projects, and well-pub-  
94 licated and ambitious targets for the amount of area to be  
95 restored, such as the Aichi target of restoring 15% of  
96 degraded ecosystems. Focusing on the area committed to  
97 restoration over the short term comes at the expense of pursu-  
98 ing restoration that achieves improved biodiversity and  
99 ecosystem services over the long term [13].

## 102 References

- 105 1. Jones HP *et al.* 2018 Restoration and repair of  
106 Earth's damaged ecosystems. *Proc. R. Soc. B* **285**,  
107 20172577. (doi:10.1098/rspb.2017.2577)
- 108 2. Larkin D, Buck R, Fieberg J, Galatowitsch S. 2019  
109 Q3 Revisiting the benefits of active approaches for  
110 restoring damaged ecosystems. *Proc. R. Soc. B*
- 111 3. Benayas JM, Newton AC, Diaz A, Bullock JM. 2009  
112 Enhancement of biodiversity and ecosystem services  
113 by ecological restoration: a meta-analysis. *Science*  
114 **325**, 1121–1124. (doi:10.1126/science.1172460)
- 115 4. Crouzeilles R, Ferreira MS, Chazdon RL, Lindenmayer  
116 DB, Sansevero JB, Monteiro L, Iribarrem A, Latawiec  
117 AE, Strassburg BB. 2017 Ecological restoration  
118 success is higher for natural regeneration than for  
119 active restoration in tropical forests. *Sci. Adv.* **3**,  
120 e1701345. (doi:10.1126/sciadv.1701345)
- 121 5. Miller SW, Budy P, Schmidt JC. 2010 Quantifying  
122 macroinvertebrate responses to in-stream habitat  
123 restoration: applications of meta-analysis to river  
124 restoration. *Restor. Ecol.* **18**, 8–19. (doi:10.1111/j.  
125 1526-100X.2009.00605.x)
- 126 6. Côté IM, Mosqueira I, Reynolds JD. 2001 Effects of  
127 marine reserve characteristics on the protection  
128 of fish populations: a meta-analysis. *J. Fish Biol.*  
129 **59**, 178–189. (doi:10.1111/j.1095-8649.2001.  
130 tb01385.x)
- 131 7. Johnson DW, Curtis PS. 2001 Effects of forest  
132 management on soil C and N storage: meta  
133 analysis. *For. Ecol. Manage.* **140**, 227–238. (doi:10.  
134 1016/S0378-1127(00)00282-6)
- 135 8. Hedges LV, Gurevitch J, Curtis PS. 1999 The meta-  
136 analysis of response ratios in experimental ecology.  
137 *Ecology* **80**, 1150–1156. (doi:10.1890/0012-  
138 9658(1999)080[1150:TMAORR]2.0.CO;2)
- 139 9. McDonald T, Gann G, Jonson J, Dixon K. 2016  
140 International standards for the practice of ecological  
141 restoration—including principles and key concepts.  
142 (Society for Ecological Restoration: Washington, DC,  
143 USA). Soil-Tec, Inc, © Marcel Huijser, Bethanie  
144 Walder.
- 145 10. Reid JL, Fagan ME, Zahawi RA. 2018 Positive site  
146 selection bias in meta-analyses comparing natural  
147 regeneration to active forest restoration. *Sci. Adv.* **4**,  
148 eaas9143. (doi:10.1126/sciadv.aas9143)
- 149 11. Holl KD, Aide TM. 2011 When and where to actively  
150 restore ecosystems? *For. Ecol. Manage.* **261**,  
151 1558–1563. (doi:10.1016/j.foreco.2010.07.004)
- 152 12. Moreno-Mateos D *et al.* 2017 Anthropogenic  
153 ecosystem disturbance and the recovery debt. *Nat.*  
154 *Commun.* **8**, 8–13. (doi:10.1038/ncomms14163)
- 155 13. Lee SY, Hamilton S, Barbier EB, Primavera J,  
156 Lewis RR. 2019 Better restoration policies are  
157 needed to conserve mangrove ecosystems. *Nat. Ecol.*  
158 *Evol.* **3**, 870–872. (doi:10.1038/s41559-019-0861-y)

We highlight that in spite of differing opinions regarding statistical approaches, LEA's major conclusions are consistent with ours. Meta-analysis allows us to glean generalities from many studies across the globe on a particular topic. Such coarse resolution is difficult then to apply to on-the-ground projects, a point we emphasized in our original paper, and LEA repeated in theirs. As we both stated, restoration projects are context-specific, and restoration strategies should be tailored to overcome specific barriers in individual sites, taking into account local ecological and socioeconomic conditions.

Moving forward, both LEA and our analyses point to the need to continue evaluating what is working in restoration, what isn't, and where the largest potential for sustained, large-scale, and cost-effective restoration gains exist. The United Nations just declared the next decade the 'Decade of Ecosystem Restoration'. If we are to get restoring ecosystems right in the next decade, then it is critical that we identify where active restoration efforts are most needed, where ecosystems themselves are resilient and only need to be unencumbered by further disturbance, and where we need to conserve ecosystems because they are unlikely to recover with or without active restoration. Our analysis was a first global inquiry into these questions, but we agree with LEA that looking deeper is required. We encourage future studies that drill down into specific disturbances, ecosystems, and socio-political contexts to further illuminate how and where we can maximize the benefits of restoration.

**Data accessibility.** This article has no additional data.

**Authors' contributions.** H.P.J. and P.C.J. designed the response, H.P.J. wrote the response; all authors edited the response.

**Competing interests.** We declare we have no competing interests.

**Funding.** We received no funding for this study.

Q2