

## TECHNICAL NOTE

# Non-random sampling measures the occurrence but not the strength of a textbook trophic cascade

Daniel R. MacNulty<sup>1</sup>  | Elaine M. Brice<sup>2</sup>  | Eric J. Larsen<sup>3</sup><sup>1</sup>Department of Wildland Resources and Ecology Center, Utah State University, Logan, Utah, USA<sup>2</sup>Department of Natural Resources and the Environment, Cornell University, Ithaca, New York, USA<sup>3</sup>Department of Geography and Geology, University of Wisconsin-Stevens Point, Stevens Point, Wisconsin, USA**Correspondence**

Daniel R. MacNulty, Department of Wildland Resources and Ecology Center, Utah State University, Logan, UT 84322, USA.

Email: [dan.macnulty@usu.edu](mailto:dan.macnulty@usu.edu)**Funding information**

National Science Foundation, Grant/Award Number: DGE-1633756; University of Wyoming-National Park Service Small Grant Program, Grant/Award Number: 1003867-USU; Utah State University Ecology Center &amp; Department of Wildland Resources; Yellowstone National Park

Editor: Kevin D. Lafferty

**Abstract**

Although sampling the five tallest young aspen in a stand is useful for detecting the occurrence of any aspen recruitment, this technique overestimates the population response of aspen to wolf reintroduction. Our original conclusion that random sampling described a trophic cascade that was weaker than the one described by non-random sampling is unchanged.

**KEYWORDS**

aspen, elk, predator indirect effect, preferred browsing height, sampling bias, trophic cascade, wolf

Understanding trophic cascades (indirect effects of predators on plants and abiotic processes) requires information about their occurrence and strength. A basic metric of trophic cascade strength in the study of wolves, elk and aspen in northern Yellowstone National Park has been the annual change in browsing and height of young aspen following wolf reintroduction. Knowledge about these annual changes has been based mainly on three time series that were built from 1 or 2 years of sampling the three or five tallest young aspen within a stand and retrospectively inferring past browsing and height using potentially inaccurate plant architecture techniques (reviewed in Brice et al., 2022).

Ripple and Beschta (2007) pioneered the ‘five tallest’ technique (hereafter, 5T sampling), and they described it as a ‘limitation’ because ‘data are only representative of the first recovering aspen (5 tallest per [stand]) and not an estimate of the aspen population response across Yellowstone’s northern winter range’ (Ripple & Beschta, 2007:518). Kauffman et al. (2013) further elaborated that ‘choosing the five tallest individuals for an evaluation of stand-level height and growth is...inherently biased’. Our study quantified the extent of this bias, revealing, for example, that 5T sampling overestimated

regeneration of overstory aspen by a factor of 4–7 compared to random sampling (Brice et al., 2022: figure 5). We concluded that 5T sampling overestimated the aspen population response to wolf reintroduction, confirming previous concerns about its limitations.

In their Comment, Painter et al. (2023) (hereafter Painter et al.) do not challenge our conclusion, acknowledging that our results demonstrate that the height of the typical young aspen has increased ‘more slowly than the tallest’ young aspen. Instead, Painter et al. describe the utility of 5T sampling for detecting the *occurrence* of a wolf-elk-aspen trophic cascade. They emphasize that ‘[t]he 5T method efficiently detected increases in heights of young aspen in stands that historically had been suppressed by elk browsing’. While we agree that 5T sampling allowed Ripple and Beschta (2007) to document ‘the first significant growth of young aspen in over half century’, the occurrence of a height increase says little about the strength of the wolf-elk-aspen trophic cascade, which was the central focus of Brice et al. (2022).

Painter et al. conflate the use of the 5T method for detecting trophic cascade *occurrence* (changes in browsing and height of young aspen) with measuring trophic cascade *strength* (rate of those changes across the aspen

population). Painter et al. focus on previous work that used the 5T method to detect change, whereas we focused on previous work that used the 5T method to describe the rate of change (Brice et al., 2022: table 1). Our results suggest that these published trends overestimate trends in the aspen population at large, affirming Ripple & Beschta's (2007) early acknowledgement that the 5T method does not provide a representative estimate of the aspen population response. Therefore, Painter et al.'s statement that “the results of Brice et al. actually supported the previous work they characterized as ‘biased’ and ‘exaggerated’” is not an accurate description of our results or their implications. We emphasize that our study characterized the 5T method as biased because it exaggerated estimates of population-level changes in browsing and height of young aspen compared to random sampling.

Painter et al. also rely on the traditional assumption that a negative correlation between browsing and height of young aspen is an exclusive indicator of browsing suppressing height of young aspen. We found that height of young aspen is both a cause and an effect of reduced browsing. It is a cause of reduced browsing because elk consume aspen at a ‘preferred browsing height’ beyond which browsing pressure decreases as height increases (Brice et al., 2022: figure 4a). Thus, a negative correlation between browsing and young aspen height is not reliable evidence of a wolf-elk-aspen trophic cascade because it does not represent an unambiguous causal link between reduced browsing and increased height of young aspen.

Furthermore, Painter et al.'s claim that height of young aspen is unrelated to leader length (an index of growth rate and site productivity) is contradicted by their data (Painter et al., 2015: appendix A, table A1) and our own (Figure 1). Together, these data suggest that young aspen height is at least partly a function of growth rate and site productivity.


In summary, we agree with Painter et al. that 5T sampling can efficiently detect the occurrence of new aspen recruitment. However, understanding the full scope and outcome of the wolf-elk-aspen trophic cascade requires more than knowing that it occurs. Knowledge about the strength of the cascade is also vital, and this requires a random sampling design that provides a representative estimate of the aspen population response to wolf-caused reductions in elk browsing pressure.

## AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS

D.R.M., E.M.B. and E.J.L. wrote the manuscript.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Our research was supported by the U.S. National Science Foundation (DGE-1633756), University of Wyoming-National Park Service Small Grant Program (1003867-USU), Yellowstone National Park, Utah State University Ecology Center and Department of Wildland Resources and the S.J. and Jessie E. Quinney Doctoral Fellowship.



**FIGURE 1** Positive relationship between the height and leader length (an index of growth rate and site productivity) of randomly sampled young aspen in northern Yellowstone National Park, 2007–2017. The sample was the same one described and analysed by Brice et al. (2022). For each young aspen, height was the distance from the base of the trunk to the tip of the leader (tallest) stem, and leader length was the current annual growth of the leader stem. Results are population-averaged fitted values and associated 95% confidence intervals from a generalized additive mixed model (GAMM) of height ( $N = 14,095$  leader stems, excluding 40 outliers with leader length  $> 100$  cm) as a cubic function of leader length (cm) and browse status (browsed vs unbrowsed) with crossed random intercepts for stand identity ( $N = 113$  stands) and year to account for (i) correlation between measurements taken on the same stand in multiple years and on multiple stands in the same year and (ii) unmeasured stand- and year-related effects. We treated the leader as the unit of analysis and used a GAMM with a gamma distribution and a log link to analyse height, which took only non-negative values that were strongly right-skewed. Rugs illustrate the distribution of the data.

We thank Dr. William Ripple for serving as principal investigator on the scientific research and collecting permits issued by Yellowstone National Park that authorized random sampling of young aspen during 1999–2009, and two anonymous reviewers for helpful comments.

## PEER REVIEW

The peer review history for this article is available at <https://www.webofscience.com/api/gateway/wos/peer-review/10.1111/ele.14344>.

## DATA AVAILABILITY STATEMENT

The data that support the findings of this study are openly available in Dryad at <https://doi.org/10.5061/dryad.2z34tmpnj>.

## ORCID

Daniel R. MacNulty  <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9173-8910>

Elaine M. Brice  <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6034-4065>

## REFERENCES

- Brice, E.M., Larsen, E.J. & MacNulty, D.R. (2022) Sampling bias exaggerates a textbook example of a trophic cascade. *Ecology Letters*, 25, 177–188.
- Kauffman, M.J., Brodie, J.F. & Jules, E.S. (2013) Are wolves saving Yellowstone's aspen? A landscape-level test of a behaviorally mediated trophic cascade: reply. *Ecology*, 94, 1425–1431.
- Painter, L.E., Beschta, R.L., Larsen, E.J. & Ripple, W.J. (2015) Recovering aspen follow changing elk dynamics in Yellowstone: evidence of a trophic cascade? *Ecology*, 96, 252–263.
- Painter, L.E., Beschta, R.L. & Ripple, W.J. (2023) Aspen recovery in northern Yellowstone: a comment on Brice et al. (2022). *Ecology Letters*.
- Ripple, W.J. & Beschta, R.L. (2007) Restoring Yellowstone's aspen with wolves. *Biological Conservation*, 138, 514–519.

**How to cite this article:** MacNulty, D.R., Brice, E.M. & Larsen, E.J. (2024) Non-random sampling measures the occurrence but not the strength of a textbook trophic cascade. *Ecology Letters*, 27, e14344. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1111/ele.14344>