



Exceptional

F1000 Factor **10.3**

EndNote

The illusion of invariant quantities in life histories.

Nee S, Colegrave N, West SA, Grafen A

Science 2005 Aug 19 **309**(5738):1236-9 [[abstract on PubMed](#)] [[related articles](#)][[order article](#)]**Selected by** | Andrew Hector **NEW** / Mark Rees / Nigel Yoccoz / Andre de Roos / Sunetra Gupta

First evaluation 2 Sep 2005 | Latest evaluation 1 Nov 2005

▶ [Relevant Sections](#)

Faculty Comments

Faculty Member

Andrew Hector

University of Zürich,
Switzerland
ECOLOGY

Controversial

Comments

Nee and colleagues point out a fundamental flaw in a method

commonly used to examine life-history strategies. Apparent invariance in the dimensionless ratios of pairs of life-history traits can arise when one is a fraction of the other and X is essentially regressed on X. On log-log axes where X spans several orders of magnitude this inevitably leads to very high R-squares. It will be interesting to see if there are any implications for other areas, like macroecology, which also feature analyses of dimensionless ratios that span many orders of magnitude.

Evaluated 1 Nov 2005 **NEW**[cite this evaluation](#)

Mark Rees

University of Sheffield,
United Kingdom
ECOLOGY

Tech Advance

Controversial

This article demonstrates why the standard approach for testing for life history invariants is flawed.

For example, the standard approach for testing if offspring weight, w , is a constant fraction of mature weight, m , is to regress $\log(w)$ against $\log(m)$ and test if the slope is significantly different from unity. Unfortunately, when offspring weight is some random fraction of mature weight, say uniformly distributed between 0 and 1, then the expected slope is unity, and provided the data cover a wide range of mature weights, then the proportion of the variance explained will be high (>0.70). This result is problematic for the study of life history invariants and might provide an explanation for several other remarkably consistent patterns in a range of other fields.

Evaluated 21 Sep 2005

[cite this evaluation](#)

Nigel Yoccoz

University of Tromsø,

Reports the important finding that the careless use of ratios and regression analyses when analysing life history traits may lead to

Norway
ECOLOGY

 Controversial

spurious results. It is often tempting to use simple ratios or products of demographic parameters - e.g. mortality and age at maturity - and assess if such ratios or products vary among species, often by regressing one parameter against the other. This paper clearly shows that such an approach does not provide adequate statistical evidence for the existence of invariant ratio or product.

Evaluated 16 Sep 2005

[cite this evaluation](#)

Andre de Roos

University of Amsterdam,
Netherlands
ECOLOGY

 Tech Advance

 Controversial

After reading this excellent paper, you are bound to be sceptical about any study that attempts to infer understanding from a regression analysis of two log-transformed life history quantities. Most remarkably, the paper shows that such a regression analysis is bound to yield a high R^2 value, even when the data are not related to each other. In studies of life-history invariants, but also in the context of metabolic theory, the fact that a particular regression equation seems to fit data that span many orders of magnitude is forwarded as support for the theory. This paper basically shows that it is the other way around: the most important reason that the regression equation fits the data is not that the underlying equation applies, but that data spanning so many orders of magnitude are included in the analysis.

Evaluated 14 Sep 2005

[cite this evaluation](#)

Sunetra Gupta

University of Oxford,
United Kingdom
ECOLOGY

 Hypothesis

 Tech Advance

This paper deals the same blow to the theory of life history invariants as Wohler's synthesis of urea did to vitalism. It will transform the field. The accompanying Perspective is also a fine piece of writing (see Jong G, Science 2005, 309:1193-5 [PMID:16109870]).

Evaluated 2 Sep 2005

[cite this evaluation](#)

Faculty Comments

How to cite the Faculty of 1000 evaluation(s) for this paper

1) To cite all the evaluations for this article:

Faculty of 1000: evaluations for Nee S et al *Science* 2005 Aug 19 309 (5738) :1236-9
<http://www.f1000biology.com/article/16109879/evaluation>

2) To cite an evaluation by a specific Faculty member:

Andrew Hector: Faculty of 1000, 1 Nov 2005 <http://www.f1000biology.com/article/16109879/evaluation>

Mark Rees: Faculty of 1000, 21 Sep 2005 <http://www.f1000biology.com/article/16109879/evaluation>

Nigel Yoccoz: Faculty of 1000, 16 Sep 2005 <http://www.f1000biology.com/article/16109879/evaluation>

Andre de Roos: Faculty of 1000, 14 Sep 2005 <http://www.f1000biology.com/article/16109879/evaluation>

Sunetra Gupta: Faculty of 1000, 2 Sep 2005 <http://www.f1000biology.com/article/16109879/evaluation>

Published by  **BioMed Central**

© 1999-2005 Biology Reports Ltd unless otherwise stated < info@facultyof1000.com > Terms and conditions