International Journal of ChemTech Research
CODEN (USA): IJCRGG, ISSN: 0974-4290, ISSN(Online):2455-9555
Vol.12 No.05, pp 247-251, 2019

# Succinct insight of the Ecological Indices for plant species

**Ankush Ranglani[1], Indrajeet Sahu[1], Shubham Yadu[1], Gunjan Kalyani*[1]**

[1]Columbia Institute of Pharmacy, Near Vidhan Sabha, Village - Tekari, Raipur – 493111, Chhattisgarh, India

**Abstract :** ***Introduction:*** It is reasonably multifaceted to enumerate biodiversity, because of the colossal amount of indices predictable for this purpose. Ecological indices intend to epitomize the general attributes of communities that consent to compare different regions, taxa, and trophic levels as well. These indices are of simple significance for environmental monitoring and conservation. There is no accord about, for the indices for their appropriateness and information shared.

***Objective:*** Several common ecological/diversity indices in an array from simple to complex statistical analyses have been discussed in order to determine which indices are better apposite for definite analyses. The common diversity indices such as Species richness (S), Shannon's diversity (H'), Simpson's diversity(D1), Simpson's dominance (D2), Simpson's evenness (E), and Berger–Parker dominance (BP) have been discussed in this insight. The trait based measures of diversity allows having an insight whether or not they perform similarly to the superior studied species diversity. Path analysis can be employed for the determination whether compound indices detected additional liaisons between diversities of diverse organisms and traits than basic indices.

***Conclusion:*** Thus, this exhibited that common diversity indices emerge interchangeable in simple analyses. But when taking into account for the complex interactions, the preference of index can intensely amend the construal of results. Data mining for the identification of the index, producing the most momentous results should be circumvented. But at the same time allowing for analyses using multiple indices provides superior insight into the interactions in a system.

**Keywords:** Ecological indices, Common diversity indices, Plant species, Path analysis, path models.

## Introduction

Biodiversity symbolizes the multiplicity and heterogeneity ofeither organisms or traits at all hierarchical levels of life, ranging from molecules to ecosystems. In general, the focal point is onspecies diversity, butgenetic and chemical diversity, are also imperative andedifying. Even after making a decisionon which form of diversityto measure, the predicament that prevails is of quantifying biodiversity as there is no distinct index that sufficiently summarizes the concept [1].

**Gunjan Kalyani *et al* /International Journal of ChemTech Research, 2019,12(5): 247-251.**

**DOI=** http://dx.doi.org/10.20902/IJCTR.2019.120527

Richness (S)refers to the numeral of species or attributespresent. It is the effortless metric which is worn to signifydiversity [2], and thus it lingers as the generalwidespreadapplied index [3]

Intuitively, species ortrait abundance is furthermoresignificant for diversity, and thecomparative abundance of species can be integratedinto the indices embodying diversity. The commonest of theseindices was anticipated by Berger and Parker, and has amethodicalrelationship with the geometric string of the speciesabundance model [4], andtestimonies the relative abundance of solitary the mostprofuse species in the population [5].

There have been copious endeavours to generate compound indices that coalesce measures of richness andabundance. Principal among these are the Shannon'sdiversity (H') and Simpson's diversity (D1) indices, which diverge in their theoretical basis andelucidation [6]. H' has its groundwork ininformation theory and symbolizes the ambiguity aboutthe distinctiveness of an anonymousentity.

In a vastlyvariedand uniformlydisseminated system, an anonymous entity could fit in to any species, leading to a soaringambiguityin prophecyof its characteristics. In a reduced amount ofassorted systemsubjugated by one or a few species, it is easier to envisage theindividuality of an anonymous entityand there is not as much ofvagueness in the system [7]. This metric iswidespread in the ecological narrative, regardless of its abstractperception [8]. D1 isharmonizeof Simpson's innovative index and symbolizes theprospect that two arbitrarily chosen entity belongingto different species [9]. D2 is closelyinterrelated to D1, being the converse of Simpson's inventiveindex [10]. Together of these alterationsdole out to make the index amplified as diversity instinctivelyincreases. Although both are worn, D2 is more widespread[11].

**Objective**

The undertaking of such swot has commonly been to gain a better understanding of the human – environment relationship and the aspect affecting it and to stumble on the superior ways to portray plant knowledge patterns. Incidence based species richness, species accumulation curve and similarity measures have also been utilized to evaluate and envisage species richness, to appraise sampling effort and match up to the resemblance of species account for traditional ethnomedicinal data [12].

**Ecological Indices**

Twenty two different ecological indices can be categorized into;

- Richness Index (Inclusive of Margalef and Menhinick index)
- Diversity Index (Inclusive of Shannon and Waver Index, Simpson index Berger-Parker dominance index, McIntosh D, Fisher's Alpha and Hill diversity index),
- Evenness Indexes (Pielou J or E1, Buzas and Gibson or E2, Heip or E3, Hill or E4 and E5)
- Species Accumulation Curve
- Rarefaction
- Richness Estimators (Chao and Lee 1, abundance based coverage estimator, Incidence based coverage estimator, $I^{st}$ and $II^{nd}$ order jackknife. Hill's diversity numbers to compare proportions of rare, intermediate and common species [13].

Biological community is the set of individuals of all the species of an area which is inclusive of all the organisms present in the area. Extent of species diversity is one of the most imperative tools in the categorization of the communities. To each sample, community, or conversion between two communities, a value is associated that is referred toDiversity Index [14]. The study of diversity is done at three levels:

- **α – Diversity:**It is intra-community diversity. It can bemeasured in terms of species richness and evenness.
- **β – Diversity:** It is inter-community diversity and connotesthe change in species along a gradient of habitats.
- **γ – Diversity:** This is the highest level of diversity measurement. It is measured at the pooled communities.

There are quite a fewrestraints associated with the extent ofdiversity:

- Diversity of a habitat varies with day time and the season due to incursion and retreat of species.
- Sampling variations and veiled species causes variations in diversityindices.

- Diverse sampling methods and diversity measures yields altered diversity indices for the samearea.
- Mostofthemathematicalpostulationsintheformulationofdiversitymeasuresmaynotembraceexact [15].

## Discussion

**Hill's numbers** endows with a technique to illustrate the liaisoninvolving diversity indices and thestandards of N1 (Shannon – Wiener, base e), N2 (Reciprocalof Simpson's index, 1/D) and N" (Reciprocalof Berger – Parkerindex), corresponds with theevaluation of profuse,very profuse, and most profuse species in asample, respectively. The value of N" can beconstrued as quantify of the familiar species,N1 – N"can be elucidated as assess ofthe number of intermediate species, and N0 – N1 matches to a measure of rare ones [16].

**Michaelis – Mentenmeans estimators** were the paramount estimator becausethe curve loomed a horizontal asymptote.E1, also called the Shannon J0 or Pielou's J,is possibly the most numerous evenness index used; but is sturdilyexaggerated by species richness,and the totting up of rare species (or singletons)can significantly change the value of E1. Therefore it is recommended for the use of E1 and E2 (Buzas and Gibson E). A broad-spectrumpredicament with allmeasures of evenness, however, is that theypresuppose the totalityof number of species that couldprobably be sampled, is known [17].

The **Evenness Ratios** are observed or taken in to consideration as the observed species numbers ought tobe alwaysbeing less than true species richness, with theprobableexclusion of E4 and E5. E4 and E5 remaincomparatively constant with sampling disparitiesand hence tend to be self-determining of samplesize. This is for the reason that,E4 and E5 are calculated as ratios, where Sis in both the numerator and the denominator;thus in actual fact cancelling the brunt of the numberof species in the sample. However, E4 and E5 are not completelyunaffected by the outsized number of singletonswhich are found in undersized samples, inclusive of the samplescollected in the preliminary stages of research at a situatebefore an satisfactory sample size is mounted up [18].

**Rarefaction** provides a scheme of assessmentlinking different communities, wherebyeach community is 'rarefied' and back to an equalnumber of sampled specimens. It enables evaluating sampling efforts. Interpolation and sample-basedrarefaction eliminates the requirement for re-samplingmethods and thus authorizes anundeviating statistical assessmentof the species richness between sampledsets. Rarefaction curve can be utilized to evaluate samplingeffort and investigatedisparities in plant use parcategory of uses, for example, age and genderwithin unlike communities. Thus, it can advocated that such methods have theprobable to be broadened to species richnessbetween sites, as well as for the approximationof the number ofspecies with anabsolute census of the plantsused or trade being possible. Though rarefactioncan be constructive, it is very susceptible to theunderlying pattern of species abundance, this implies that with much lower species evennesswill often result in lower estimates of speciesdiversity than those with even abundances, despiteof species diversities in veracity are equal [18].

**Species Accumulation Curves (SAC)** are known toaugment the assessment of Ethnomedicinal studies and thus creates prospect for rationalsquabblesthat provides advancements in scientific and practical knowledge. This curve can also be wornas a way of estimatefor species richness. This is done commonly with fitting function such as the asymptotic Michaelis – Menten algorithmor Non – Asymptotic estimators suchas log – linear model. Thistechnique has been utilized to stumble on out the association betweenvillage studies and plants utilized in recoveries.SAC also provides an indication about adecline in the number of fresh species mentionedper interview. Further interviews are likely to draw outadditional less prominent species. SAC can be utilized to studythe traditional use of genotype and thus a comparison can be done it with nonparametric estimators of species richness. Thus, this curve hasbeen utilized to assess the expectedrichness of used and known plants bythe number of plant species [19].

The **Jackknife** is valuable because it is identifiedto decreasepreconception and for estimation of species richness.Another vitalfeature of the Jackknifeestimator of species richness is that theestimator is based on the incidence or dearthof a species in a given plot rather than on theprofusion of the species [20].

## Conclusion

In Ethnobotany there are many structures and outlines for collection of data which comprises of field auditions, factiontreatise andvisit to herbalist. Each and every informant oran event may have aptitude to engender a hugestatistics which in due coursefabricates a maze of rhetoricalinformation. With appreciation of this entanglement, now Ethnobotany has tailored scores of statistical advances that can solve the data matrixinto a logical conclusion. This study showsthat there are many quantitative approaches havebeen utilizing all over the world, out of whichsome of the techniques are well adapted by manyresearchers, while some techniques are regionspecific or rather objective specific. Two specificbranches namely Anthropology and Ecology significantlychipped in to build "*Quantitative Ethnomedicine*".In the current review, surplus diversity indices were compiled for the first time which provided a vital database for progressive researchers.This technical paperalso compiled the advancedinformation of assorted ecological methods, currently utilized in Quantitative Ethnomedicine.

## Acknowledgments

Corresponding Author (Gunjan Kalyani) is genuinely indebted to National Center for Natural Resources (NCNR), Pt. Ravishankar Shukla University, Raipur, Chhattisgarh which provided a stand up for rising. Corresponding Author is highly indebted to Prof. A.K. Pati, former Director of National Center for Natural Resources (NCNR), Pt. Ravishankar Shukla University, Raipur, Chhattisgarh, India and presently Vice Chancellor of G. M. University, Sambalpur, Odisha, India for his valuable suggestions. Honest gratitude towards the Co-Authors for their consent and contribution. Authors also express special and heartfelt thankfulness to Columbia Institute of Pharmacy, Raipur for providing a platform for enhancing the study skills.

### Conflict of Interest

Nil

## References

1. Barnes B, Zak D, Denton S, and Spurr S. Forest Ecology. Network, John Willey and sons, 1997, 577-613.
2. Bruening E. F. Patterns of Tree Species Diversity and Canopy Structure and Dynamics in Humid Tropical Evergreen Forest in Borneo and China in Holm-Nielson L. B (1982) Tropical Forest, Academic Press, New York, 1982.
3. Greige-Smith P. Pattern in Vegetation, Journal of Ecology, 1963, 67:755-707
4. Hulbert S. H. The Non-Concept of Species Diversity. A Critique and Alternative Parameters. Ecology, 1971, 52:577-586.
5. Kumar H. D Modern Concepts of Ecology. Vikas Publishing House PVT Ltd, New Delhi, 1996, 62-68.
6. Ludwig J. A. Statistical Ecology, John Willey and Sons, London, 1988.
7. Magurran A. E. Ecological Diversity and its measurement. Princeton University press, Princeton. NJ, 1988.
8. Okpiliya F. I. Degradation of Floral Diversity in the Tropical Rainforest Ecosystem of Boki, Nigeria. Unpublished Ph.D Thesis, University of Jos, 2004.
9. Peet R. K. The Measurement of Species Diversity. Ann. Review. Ecology System, 1974, 5: 285-307.
10. Pielou F. C. An Introduction to Mathematical Ecology. John Willey and Sons USA, 1975.
11. Rosenzweig M. L. Species Diversity in Space and Time. Cambridge University press, New York, NY, 1995.
12. Saunders D. A. Biological Consequences of Ecosystem Fragmentation: A Review of Conservation Biology, 1991, 5: 18-32.
13. Sheldon A. L. Equitability Indices: Dependent on Species Count. Ecology, 1968, 50:466-467
14. Simpson F. H. Measurement of Diversity. Nature, 1949, 163:688.
15. Solbrig O.T. The Origin and Function of Biodiversity, Environment, 1991, 33: 16-20, 34-38
16. Walker B.Diversity and Stability in Ecosystem Conservation in Conservation for the 21st Century. Oxford University Press, London, 1989.

17. Wilson E. O. ‘Biodiversity’ National Academic Press WWF Year Book, 1988.
18. Wilson E.O. The Diversity of Life. Belknap Press, Harvard University, Cambridge, Cambridge, 1992, 424.
19. Whittaker, R. K. Evolution and Measures of Species Diversity. Taveon, 1972, 21; 213-251.
20. Zahl. Jacknifing and Index of Diversity, Ecology, 1977, 58:907-909.

*****