

OPINION

Revisiting global trends in freshwater insect biodiversity: A reply

Roel van Klink^{1,2}  | Diana E. Bowler^{1,3,4}  | Konstantin B. Gongalsky^{5,6}  |
Jonathan M. Chase^{1,2} 

¹German Centre for Integrated Biodiversity Research Halle-Jena-Leipzig (iDiv), Leipzig, Germany

²Department of Computer Science, Martin Luther University-Halle Wittenberg, Halle, Germany

³Institute of Biodiversity, Friedrich Schiller University Jena, Jena, Germany

⁴Helmholtz Centre for Environmental Research – UFZ, Leipzig, Germany

⁵A.N. Severtsov Institute of Ecology and Evolution, Russian Academy of Sciences, Moscow, Russia

⁶M.V. Lomonosov Moscow State University, Moscow, Russia

Correspondence

Roel van Klink, German Centre for Integrated Biodiversity Research Halle-Jena-Leipzig (iDiv), Puschstrasse 4, Leipzig 04103, Germany.
Email: roel.klink@idiv.de

Funding information

Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft, Grant/Award Number: FZT 118; Russian Foundation for Basic Research, Grant/Award Number: 19-05-00245

[Correction added on 11 January 2021, after first online publication: The grant number of funding agency 'Russian Foundation for Basic Research' has been corrected.]

Abstract

Jähnig et al. make some useful points regarding the conclusions that can be drawn from our meta-analysis; however, some issues require clarification. First, we never suggested that there was a globally increasing trend of freshwater insect abundances, but only spoke of an average increasing trend in the available data. We also did not suggest that freshwater quality has improved globally, but rather that documented improvements in water quality can explain at least some of the trends we observed. Second, as we acknowledged, our data are not a representative set of freshwater ecosystems around the world, but they are what is currently accessible. Third, there is indeed no doubt that changes in abundance or biomass need not correlate with changes in other aspects of biodiversity, such as species richness or functional composition. Our analysis was specifically focused on trends in community abundance/biomass because it has been the subject of recent study and speculation, and is a widely available metric in long-term studies. To better understand the recent changes in freshwater insect assemblages, we encourage freshwater ecologists to further open their troves of data from countless long-term monitoring schemes so that larger and more comprehensive syntheses can be undertaken.

This article is categorized under:

Water and Life > Conservation, Management, and Awareness

KEYWORDS

arthropods, biomass, long-term, monitoring, water quality

The opinion piece by Jähnig et al. concerning our analysis of trends in freshwater and terrestrial insect abundances (Van Klink, Bowler, Chase et al., 2020) outlines the complexity underlying the changes of freshwater insect assemblages. Although we can agree with most of the points in their commentary, we disagree with some of the criticisms aimed specifically toward our article.

This is an open access article under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivs License, which permits use and distribution in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited, the use is non-commercial and no modifications or adaptations are made.

© 2020 The Authors. *WIREs Water* published by Wiley Periodicals LLC.

First, despite the phrasing in the media, we were careful to never mention a “global” increase in freshwater insect abundances. As figure 1 of our article clearly shows, the temporal trends of insect abundance and biomass were highly variable in both the terrestrial and freshwater realm. With 1,668 sites in total, most of which cover not even 1 m², and with the majority sampled in Europe and North America, it is impossible to discuss global trends. Therefore, we specifically only referred to the mean trend calculated from the available data. Similarly, we never suggested that water quality improvements were globally homogeneous. Instead, we indicated that the water quality improvements in Europe and North America since the 1960's (Bouraoui & Grizzetti, 2011; Keiser & Shapiro, 2019) could at least partially explain the trends we observed. However, even in these regions not all water bodies have improved in status (Vaughan & Ormerod, 2012). While there are probably multiple reasons why we found average increases in freshwater insect abundances, we believe it is reasonable to suggest that aspects of water quality improvement can explain some of these increases, as others have done (Outhwaite, Gregory, Chandler, Colen, & Isaac, 2020; Termaat, Van Grunsven, Plate, & Van Strien, 2015; Vaughan & Ormerod, 2012).

Second, the authors question the suitability of many of the data that we used, such as those about specific drivers of biodiversity change (in particular the onset or release of stressors), as their frequency in our dataset may not be representative of their global distribution. Of course, it would be ideal to have data on many insect taxa, representative of the type and magnitude of different environmental changes around the world, but such data simply do not exist. This is a well-known problem for any such large-scale biodiversity compilation and synthesis (e.g., BioTIME (Dornelas et al., 2018), PREDICTS (Hudson et al., 2017)) and these biases are an often-repeated argument against synthesis of global biodiversity time-series (Cardinale, Gonzalez, Allington, & Loreau, 2018; Gonzalez et al., 2016). However, we believe that synthesis of these biodiversity datasets is critical for developing a more complete understanding of biodiversity change, provided the limitations of the dataset are borne in mind.

Also, the issue of the baseline for assessing trends is a well-known problem for large scale syntheses of biodiversity data (Cardinale et al., 2018). To this end, we performed the subset analysis, repeating our trend estimates with increasing start year of the datasets (figure 3 in our article). Nevertheless, freshwater systems in many parts of the world have been altered by humans for centuries, if not millennia, and we only have a few decades of data. Depending on the start of the time series, it may be possible to find either an upward or downward trend. This in no way invalidates our results since we clearly stated the time frame and spatial coverage of our dataset.

The authors also raise concerns that noninsects (such as mollusks and crustaceans) could not be separated from insects in some of the datasets and may be responsible for driving the trends we found. While this problem was present in only a small subset of data we analyzed, we performed an additional sensitivity analysis to test whether this influenced our results. We obtained additional information from the authors of the original studies in order to exclude any organism not belonging to our target taxa (insects, arachnids, and springtails), and excluded all studies where we could not verify that at least 90% of the abundance or biomass consisted of our target taxa, as well as any ambiguous data (groups listed as “other taxa” which may have included both insects and noninsects). This came at the unfortunate cost of excluding data for many insects as well, and left 54 freshwater and 102 terrestrial datasets for analysis. Nonetheless, we still found an average increase of freshwater insects (+15.3% per decade CI: +4.07% to +28.03%), and a decline for terrestrial insects (−9.8% CI: −16.34% to −2.71%), both estimates well within the 80% credible intervals of our original estimates. The occasional inclusion of these other invertebrate groups did thus not affect our qualitative results.

Finally, Jähnig et al. correctly emphasize that changes in total abundance or biomass of an insect assemblage is only one aspect of change, and need not correlate with changes in other facets, such as species richness, composition, or conservation value. This is not unique to the freshwater realm and a lack of correlation in the change of different components of biodiversity is often expected (Chase et al., 2018). Regardless, we focused specifically on abundance and biomass trends because recent case studies reporting dramatic declines in these metrics in terrestrial ecosystems caused widespread concern among scientists and the wider public. There is no question that increases in insect abundances do not necessarily indicate improved habitat quality. Indeed, increased nutrient loading, sedimentation, disruption of food webs and climatic warming, can lead to increases in some groups of insects and thus of total insect abundances (e.g., Rugenski & Minshall, 2014; Shieh & Yang, 2000), as we explicitly stated.

In all, our analysis provides a necessary first step in moving beyond case studies to a broader understanding of the changes in insect assemblages around the world. We clearly agree with Jähnig et al. that much work remains to be done and we hope that our work stimulates further research on the state and trends in freshwater insect abundance and biodiversity. We share their hope for an increase in availability of data from existing monitoring schemes, as has been done in for example, Sweden (SLU, 2018) and New Zealand (Groker, 2018). Until then, the data that we compiled remain the best available and are available for further analysis (Van Klink, Bowler, Gongalsky, et al., 2020).

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Roel van Klink, Diana E. Bowler, and Jonathan M. Chase were funded by iDiv via the German Research Foundation (DFG FZT 118), and Konstantin B. Gongalsky was funded by the Russian Foundation for Basic Research (19-05-00245). Open access funding enabled and organized by Projekt DEAL.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST

The authors have declared no conflicts of interest for this article.

AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS

Roel van Klink: Conceptualization; writing-original draft. **Diana Bowler:** Conceptualization; writing-review and editing. **Konstantin Gongalsky:** Writing-review and editing. **Jonathan Chase:** Conceptualization; supervision; writing-review and editing.

ORCID

Roel van Klink  <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8125-1463>

Diana E. Bowler  <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7775-1668>

Konstantin B. Gongalsky  <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1600-8448>

Jonathan M. Chase  <http://orcid.org/0000-0001-5580-4303>

RELATED WIREs ARTICLE

[On the importance of very long-term water quality records](#)

REFERENCES

- Bourauoi, F., & Grizzetti, B. (2011). Long term change of nutrient concentrations of rivers discharging in European seas. *Science of the Total Environment*, 409(23), 4899–4916. <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.SCITOTENV.2011.08.015>
- Cardinale, B. J., Gonzalez, A., Allington, G. R. H., & Loreau, M. (2018). Is local biodiversity declining or not? A summary of the debate over analysis of species richness time trends. *Biological Conservation*, 219, 175–183. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biocon.2017.12.021>
- Chase, J. M., McGill, B. J., McGlenn, D. J., May, F., Blowes, S. A., Xiao, X., ... Gotelli, N. J. (2018, November 1). Embracing scale-dependence to achieve a deeper understanding of biodiversity and its change across communities. *Ecology Letters*, 21, 1737–1751. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ele.13151>
- Dornelas, M., Antão, L. H., Moyes, F., Bates, A. E., Magurran, A. E., Adam, D., ... Zettler, M. L. (2018). BioTIME: A database of biodiversity time series for the Anthropocene. *Global Ecology and Biogeography*, 27(7), 760–786. <https://doi.org/10.1111/geb.12729>
- Gonzalez, A., Cardinale, B. J., Allington, G. R. H., Byrnes, J., Endsley, K. A., Brown, D. G., ... Loreau, M. (2016). Estimating local biodiversity change: A critique of papers claiming no net loss of local diversity. *Ecology*, 97(8), 1949–1960. <https://doi.org/10.1890/15-1759.1>
- Groger, G. (2018). National river water quality network database (macro-invertebrates). <https://doi.org/10.15468/MFJETU>
- Hudson, L. N., Newbold, T., Contu, S., Hill, S. L. L., Lysenko, I., De Palma, A., ... Purvis, A. (2017). The database of the PREDICTS (projecting responses of ecological diversity in changing terrestrial systems) project. *Ecology and Evolution*, 7(1), 145–188. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ece3.2579>
- Keiser, D. A., & Shapiro, J. S. (2019). Consequences of the clean water act and the demand for water quality. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 134(1), 349–396.
- Outhwaite, C. L., Gregory, R. D., Chandler, R. E., Collen, B., & Isaac, N. J. B. (2020). Complex long-term biodiversity change among invertebrates, bryophytes and lichens. *Nature Ecology & Evolution*, 4, 384–392. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41559-020-1111-z>
- Rugenski, A. T., & Minshall, G. W. (2014). Climate-moderated responses to wildfire by macroinvertebrates and basal food resources in montane wilderness streams. *Ecosphere*, 5(3), 25. <https://doi.org/10.1890/ES13-00236.1>
- Shieh, S. H., & Yang, P. S. (2000). Community structure and functional organization of aquatic insects in an agricultural mountain stream of Taiwan: 1985–1986 and 1995–1996. *Zoological Studies*, 39(3), 191–202.
- SLU. (2018). Miljödata MVM. version 1.21.00. Retrieved from <https://miljodata.slu.se/mvm/Default.aspx>
- Termaat, T., Van Grunsven, R. H. A., Plate, C. L., & Van Strien, A. J. (2015). Strong recovery of dragonflies in recent decades in The Netherlands. *Freshwater Science*, 34(3), 1094–1104. <https://doi.org/10.1086/682669>
- Van Klink, R., Bowler, D. E., Chase, J. M., Comay, O., Driessen, M. M., Ernest, S. K. M., ... Wiedmann, J. (2020). A global database of long-term changes in insect assemblages. <https://doi.org/10.5063/F1ZC817H>
- Van Klink, R., Bowler, D. E., Gongalsky, K. B., Swengel, A. B., Gentile, A., & Chase, J. M. (2020). Meta-analysis reveals declines in terrestrial but increases in freshwater insect abundances. *Science*, 368(6489), 417–420. <https://doi.org/10.1126/SCIENCE.AAX9931>
- Vaughan, I. P., & Ormerod, S. J. (2012). Large-scale, long-term trends in British river macroinvertebrates. *Global Change Biology*, 18(7), 2184–2194. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2486.2012.02662.x>

How to cite this article: van Klink R, Bowler DE, Gongalsky KB, Chase JM. Revisiting global trends in freshwater insect biodiversity: A reply. *WIREs Water*. 2021;8:e1501. <https://doi.org/10.1002/wat2.1501>