Published in final edited form as:

Math Biosci. 2015 August ; 266: 73–84. doi:10.1016/j.mbs.2015.06.003.

Statistical validation of structured population models for *Daphnia magna*

Kaska Adoteye^{a,b}, H.T. Banks^{a,b}, Karissa Cross^c, Stephanie Eytcheson^c, Kevin B. Flores^{a,b}, Gerald A. LeBlanc^c, Timothy Nguyen^b, Chelsea Ross^a, Emmaline Smith^b, Michael Stemkovski^c, and Sarah Stokely^a

^aCenter for Research in Scientific Computation, North Carolina State University, Raleigh, NC, United States

^bDepartment of Mathematics, North Carolina State University, Raleigh, NC, United States

^cToxicology Program, Department of Biological Sciences, North Carolina State University, Raleigh, NC, United States

Abstract

In this study we use statistical validation techniques to verify density-dependent mechanisms hypothesized for populations of *Daphnia magna*. We develop structured population models that exemplify specific mechanisms, and use multi-scale experimental data in order to test their importance. We show that fecundity and survival rates are affected by both time-varying density-independent factors, such as age, and density-dependent factors, such as competition. We perform uncertainty analysis and show that our parameters are estimated with a high degree of confidence. Further, we perform a sensitivity analysis to understand how changes in fecundity and survival rates affect population size and age-structure.

Keywords

Sensitivity analysis; structured population model; uncertainty quantification; density-dependence; multi-scale data; *Daphnia magna*

1 Introduction

Structured population models (SPMs) are well characterized for describing aggregate ecological data across a wide variety of species [14, 18]. Numerous studies have emphasized the practical utility of SPMs in conservation biology [16, 22, 50, 51] and hazard assessments [25, 26, 49, 54] by making predictions of population decline or recovery. Importantly, SPMs have been used to analyze factors influencing the imperilment of endangered species populations [17, 29, 31, 33, 55].

Corresponding author: H.T. Banks (htbanks@ncsu.edu).

Publisher's Disclaimer: This is a PDF file of an unedited manuscript that has been accepted for publication. As a service to our customers we are providing this early version of the manuscript. The manuscript will undergo copyediting, typesetting, and review of the resulting proof before it is published in its final citable form. Please note that during the production process errors may be discovered which could affect the content, and all legal disclaimers that apply to the journal pertain.

The predictive value of a SPM, or of any mathematical model, relies on the degree of fidelity of the model to existing data and in the uncertainty in parameters estimated from that data. Several factors involving data information content can affect the uncertainty in parameters estimated for a structured population model. Beyond the usual issues in optimizing the measurement frequency, variance, and resolution of the structured variable (age/size), a central problem affecting SPM parameter uncertainty is that aggregate data may not support the simultaneous estimation of parameters describing multiple biological scales. This “individual dynamics/aggregate data” problem [9] arises due to the interrelation of individual dynamics and aggregate behavior described by SPMs. For example, the mathematical equations describing a fecundity rate in the model might involve a density-independent rate multiplied by a density-dependent rate. Since a lower density-independent rate can be compensated for by a higher density-dependent rate, the multiplication creates a correlation that contributes to a higher level of uncertainty when these rates are concurrently estimated.

An additional confounding factor in estimating parameters for SPMs is encountered when density-independent demographic rates are time- or age-dependent. For example, the rates describing fecundity and survival are known to vary with age in many species. In addition, these age-dependent rates may also be affected by exposure of the organism to exogenous chemicals or other stressful environmental conditions. Although SPMs can be readily modified to describe age-dependent demographic parameters, the accurate estimation of those parameters can be prohibited by practical limitations, e.g., computational tractability [3, 56]. Moreover, the individual dynamics/aggregate data problem is exacerbated because time-dependence is mathematically treated by extending a single parameter to a function described by several parameters.

One approach to redressing the “individual dynamics/aggregate data” problem is to collect, when feasible, demographic data from organisms grown in isolation. This data is then used to estimate density-independent parameters comprised in the demographic rates, which are then fixed in the population model. This enables the estimation of the remaining density-dependent parameters in the population model from longitudinal aggregate data. An added advantage to this approach is that age-dependent rates can also be estimated or directly represented by the collected organismal data, removing the rather complex problem of estimating these rates from aggregate data alone.

Here, we present this approach for estimating density- and age-dependent demographic rates in SPMs for *Daphnia magna*. This species of water flea has been characterized by the National Institutes of Health as a model organism for biomedical research [40]. *D. magna* is also widely used in ecotoxicology to assess the hazard of exogenous chemicals, e.g., pesticides, on ecosystems [35, 36, 52, 53]. These assessments, however, have mainly focused on endpoints below the population-level of biological organization, i.e., at the molecular, cellular, or organism levels. SPMs can be used to propagate organismal assessments to the population-level, thereby enabling the causal association of organismal responses to ecosystem adversity.

Among the recent literature, several mathematical models were developed to describe the longitudinal dynamics of daphnid populations. Erickson, et al. [23], formulated a SPM to investigate the impact of stochastic fecundity and survival on the ability of their model to describe data from pesticide treated populations. Importantly, the model from this study was calibrated to data that only captured the early population growth phase of daphnids. Thus, it has not been determined whether a SPM with stochastic demographics can accurately describe the long-term dynamics of daphnid populations, which is qualitatively different from the early growth phase [46]. Preuss, et al. [46], validated an individual-based model in order to predict the effect of variable algae concentration levels on daphnid population dynamics. Other recent efforts [19, 20, 21, 24] to develop daphnid SPMs have focused on qualitative analysis of the general population dynamics rather than model validation.

Here, we collected both individual and population-level data and developed multiple daphnid SPMs in order to test the importance of several biological assumptions. Specifically, we mathematically tested the validity of assuming a time-delay in density-dependent fecundity. We collected daily reproduction data on thirty daphnids to precisely investigate age-dependent fecundity rates for accurate representation in a SPM. We also validated a mathematical description of density-dependent survival and tested whether density-dependent fecundity and survival could be more accurately modeled as a function of total population length rather than the total population size. Our investigation of delayed density-dependent fecundity is motivated by previous experimental evidence found in [27, 45]; we note that this assumption has not been tested in the context of SPMs in recent literature and with modern daphnid culture methodology. We also collected precise growth rate data on thirty daphnids (starting at within 2-hours of birth) to calibrate our age-structured observations of juvenile and adult daphnids. We employed quantitative model comparison techniques to assess the validity of our underlying assumptions. Finally, we performed quantitative sensitivity and uncertainty analyses on the SPM with the most accurate biological assumptions among the SPMs we considered.

2 Methods

2.1 Population models

Each model we describe in the sections below is a specification of the following structured population model:

$$\begin{bmatrix} p(t+1, 1) \\ p(t+1, 2) \\ p(t+1, 3) \\ \vdots \\ p(t+1, i_{max}) \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} a(t, 1) & a(t, 2) & a(t, 3) & \dots & a(t, i_{max}) \\ b(t, 1) & 0 & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ 0 & b(t, 2) & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ \vdots & & \ddots & \dots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \dots & b(t, i_{max}-1) \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} p(t, 1) \\ p(t, 2) \\ p(t, 3) \\ \vdots \\ p(t, i_{max}) \end{bmatrix}. \quad (1)$$

The population is divided into one-day age classes, ranging from neonates at age $i = 1$ to a maximum lifespan at age $i = i_{max}$, where the number of daphnids of age i at a time t is $p(t, i)$. Here, we assume $i_{max} = 74$ based on our individual level experiments, and based on simulations of our models fit to experimental data, i.e., the maximum life span observed in

the simulations was always less than 74 days. The fecundity of each age class i is given by $a(t, i)$ and the survival probability is given by $b(t, i)$.

We generated several models to investigate the importance of several density-dependent mechanisms in modeling *D. magna* populations. Significance of the different mechanisms was assessed by using statistical comparison tests between different models fit to the same structured population data. We specified the functional forms for $a(t, i)$ and $b(t, i)$ in equation (1) to generate four different structured population models for this assessment, which we refer to as models A through D (Table 1). The four models we consider are organized by the sequential generalization of the functional forms for fecundity and survival, i.e., models A and D have the least and most number of parameters, respectively.

2.1.1 Delayed density-dependent fecundity—To evaluate the importance of delayed density-dependent fecundity, we generated models A and B (Table 1) with parameters $\theta = (\mu, q)$ to be estimated. In model A, we assume density-dependent fecundity for all daphnid age classes. We used a functional form for fecundity that decreases with total population size $N(t)$ [30] (see $a(t, i)$ in Table 1a). The strength of the density-dependent effect on fecundity is represented by the parameter q ; the fecundity is density-independent when $q = 0$. Model A assumes a density- and age-independent survival probability, i.e., the constant μ . We did not consider age-dependent survival here, thus the probability μ is the same for each age class. We will consider generalizations of μ in future work and note that constant survival probability has been used previously for structured population modeling of daphnids [27, 45].

Model B generalizes model A by considering a delayed effect of density on fecundity. This generalization is based on previous studies which showed that the number of offspring produced by gravid female daphnids in their current cohort was unaffected by increases in population density. Instead, increased population density had an effect on subsequent cohorts [27, 45]. Since daphnids in their reproductive stage produce neonates approximately every 3 days, we bounded the time-delayed fecundity effect, τ , between 0 and 6 days.

2.1.2 Density- and age-dependent survival—We next evaluated whether density and age were important factors for modeling survival in daphnid populations. To test this, we created model C (with parameters $\theta = (\mu, q, c)$ to be estimated), which generalizes model B by including a reduced fitness for daphnids classified as juveniles in our data, i.e., daphnids less than or equal to 4 days old (see Figure 1). This generalization is based on the observation that larger daphnids consume more algae than smaller daphnids [48]. The restriction of density-dependent survival to juvenile daphnids is in agreement with previous studies which suggested that the survival of adult daphnids is not affected by competition [41]. This competitive effect is likely an important consideration for the daphnids in our population experiments, since our populations were fed a constant amount of algae each day. Indeed, previous modeling studies have suggested that density-dependent daphnid survival rates would best be modeled as a function of age or size rather than as a constant [15, 28, 44, 46].

2.1.3 A density-dependent model with population length—Lastly, we evaluated whether total population length could more accurately capture the density-dependence of fecundity and survival than the total number of individuals in our daphnid populations. This consideration is in concordance with the generalization in model C, which relies on the observation that larger daphnids contribute more heavily to competition through resource depletion than smaller daphnids [48]. To test our hypothesis about population length dependency, we generated Model D (again with parameters $\theta = (\mu, q, c)$ to be estimated) by replacing the total population size, $N(t)$, in model C by total population length, $M(t)$ (see Table 1). To model total population length, we calculated a weighted population value using a function that relates age to size. Specifically, we found that the logistic function accurately models the average size of daphnids as a function of age based on fits to individual level experimental data (Figure 2). Consequently, we used the logistic function to weight the daphnid size in the model for the total population length $M(t)$ (see Table 1b).

2.2 Laboratory studies

We conducted two studies in the laboratory to generate data for refining and parameterizing our mathematical model. The first study was performed at the individual daphnid level to track the baseline fecundity and growth rates in isolation, i.e., density-independent rates. The second study was performed at the population-level, in duplicate, for 102 days. The individual level data was used to estimate the density-independent parameters used in our population model. The population data was then used to estimate the remaining density-dependent parameters. Cultured daphnids were maintained using previously described protocols and conditions [52]. Cultured daphnids were kept in media reconstituted from deionized water [1]. Cultured daphnids for both studies were maintained in an incubator maintained at 20 degrees Celsius with a 16-h light, 8-h dark cycle. The daphnids used in our study came from a colony that was maintained at North Carolina State University for over 20 years (clone NCSU1 [47]).

2.2.1 Individual study—Thirty daphnids were longitudinally observed to estimate population average rates of fecundity and growth. Less than 2-h old neonates were placed individually into 50mL beakers containing 40mL of media each. Media was changed daily. Daphnids were fed daily with 7.0×10^6 cells of algae (*Pseudokirchneriella subcapitata*) and 0.2 mg (dry weight) Tetrafin™ fish food suspension prepared as described previously [42]. The number of neonates produced by each individual daphnid was recorded and then removed daily. Fecundity measurements were performed until no daphnids remained (74 days). The size of each individual daphnid was measured with a digital microscope (Celestron, Torrance, CA, USA) at periodic intervals until they died, starting at less than two hours old. The major axis was used to determine size, since the maximum possible length was used to classify daphnids into different size classes, i.e., juveniles and adults (see below).

2.2.2 Population study—A 102-day population study was conducted, in replicate, using *D. magna*. Two beakers containing 1L of media each were both seeded with five 6-day-old female daphnids. We note that these daphnids did not reproduce prior to the beginning of the population study. Each 1L beaker was fed twice daily (at approximately 10 a.m. and 3 p.m.)

with 1.4×10^8 cells of algae (*P. subcapitata*) and 4 mg dry weight of fish food suspension. The media was changed and the number of daphnids were counted every Monday, Wednesday, and Friday through the first 40 days of the experiment and once weekly thereafter. During counting, daphnids were separated into two size classes (which we call the juvenile class and adult class) using a fine mesh net with a 1.62-mm pore size. The total number of daphnids was then counted for each size class. Importantly, we note that classification into the juvenile or adult group only defines the size of the daphnid, and does not define whether the daphnid had reached a reproductive stage.

2.3 Estimation of density-independent rates

We used data from our individual level study to estimate the density-independent fecundity rate, which we call $\alpha(i)$. We parameterized the function $\alpha(i)$ defined at age i by directly using the average number of neonates produced per daphnid per day observed in our individual level study (Figure 3). We note that we attempted to approximate $\alpha(i)$ using alternative formulations, e.g., periodic or piece wise constant functions estimated from the density-independent fecundity data. However, we found that using the data directly for $\alpha(i)$ resulted in the most accurate fits of the resulting population models to population data.

We used the individual level growth (size) data to estimate the relationship between age and size. We considered several functional forms for $f(i)$, the average size of a female daphnid at age i , within a nonlinear mixed effects model framework and found that the logistic equation

$f(i) = \frac{K Z_0 e^{r i}}{K + Z_0 (e^{r i} - 1)}$ most accurately fit the data for individual daphnid growth (Figure 2, Table 2). Based on the mean parameter values estimated with the nonlinear mixed effects model, we inferred that the daphnids classified as juveniles in our population experiments were less than or equal to 4 days old, and that adults were greater than 5 days old (Figure 1). The function $f(i)$ was also used to replace total population size with a model for total population length in model D. We note that we determined that the average size $f(i)$ was sufficient to replace the total population size, as opposed to using the full distribution of sizes obtained from the nonlinear mixed effects model, since the range of individual parameter values in Table 2 was too slim to merit more than a delta distribution approximation. Since the obtained distributions around K , r , and M_0 were so slim, we determined that using a distribution around K , r , and M_0 in the population model does not give improvement over using the averages of K , r and M_0 in $f(i)$.

2.4 Parameter Estimation

Parameters were estimated from the population data using a vector ordinary least squares (OLS) framework [9, 11]. For each model, we consider a vector of parameters θ to estimate. Based on our individual level modeling, the number of juveniles and adults are given by

$J(t, \theta) = \sum_{i=1}^4 p(t, i)$ and $A(t, \theta) = \sum_{i=5}^{i_{max}} p(t, i)$, respectively. The corresponding observation vector is given by $\mathbf{f}(t, \theta) = [J(t, \theta), A(t, \theta)]^T$. We assumed a constant statistical error model of the form

$$\mathbf{Y}_j = \mathbf{f}(t_j, \theta_0) + \mathcal{E}_j, \quad j=1, 2, \dots, n,$$

where $\mathbf{Y}_j$ is a random variable with realizations $\mathbf{y}_j$ (i.e., the data) and $\mathbf{f}(t_j, \theta_0)$ is the model observation with the hypothesized “true” parameter vector θ_0 . The error terms $\mathcal{E}_j$ are assumed independent and identically distributed (i.i.d) random variables with mean $E[\mathcal{E}_j] = 0$ and $V_0 = \text{var}(\mathcal{E}_j) = \text{diag}(\sigma_{1,0}^2, \sigma_{2,0}^2)$. An estimate, $\hat{\theta}$, for the true parameter vector θ_0 is obtained by implementing an iterative algorithm (see [9] for details).

The inverse problems were computed using two routines in Matlab. The first routine is a direct search algorithm implemented by Daniel Finkel as *direct*, which can be found at http://www4.ncsu.edu/~ctk/Finkel_Direct/. This was used with the following options: options.maxevals = 400; options.maxits = 400; options.maxdeep = 400; and the output was used as the initial condition for the gradient based Matlab search routine *lsqnonlin*. The routine *lsqnonlin* was run with the options ‘TolFun’ and ‘TolX’ set equal to 1e-20, and the option ‘MaxFunEvals’ set equal to 400. The output of *lsqnonlin* was then used as our parameter estimate $\hat{\theta}$.

2.5 Model Comparisons

2.5.1 Model Hypothesis Testing—We used a statistical model comparison test [7, 11] to evaluate the significance in considering various components, e.g., delayed density-dependence, for models A through C. Briefly, this methodology evaluates the significance of a χ^2 statistic generated by the residual sum of squares to test the null hypothesis, H_0 , that a certain parameter or set of parameters is not needed to describe the system. We note that this method requires nested models. For example, model A is “nested” in model B because model B reduces to model A when $\tau = 0$. If we can reject the null hypothesis H_0 then we conclude that the parameters in question cannot be taken equal to zero and infer that they are needed to accurately describe the data. For further details and previous applied examples of this methodology see [7, 32, 11].

2.5.2 Akaike Information Criteria—The Akaike Information Criterion (*AIC*) score gives an approximately unbiased form of the Kullback-Leibler Distance, or a measure of the distance between a model and the corresponding data [9]. The *AIC* score is used to compare the accuracy of different models to the same data set; a lower *AIC* score indicates higher accuracy. We note that the *AIC* score is applicable to more model comparisons than the χ^2 based test described above, since it does not require the compared models to be nested.

The *AIC* score for independent multivariate normally distributed observations in the case of nonlinear models is given by $AIC = n\nu \ln\left(\frac{RSS}{n\nu}\right) + n\nu(1 + \ln(2\pi)) + 2(p+1)$, where *RSS* is the residual sum of squares [9, 13]. The *AIC* score corrected for small sample size ($n/p < 40$, n = number of data points, p = number of parameters) in the case of multivariate observations (ν = number of observables) is given by $AIC_C = AIC + 2 \frac{\tilde{p}(\nu+p+1)}{n - (\nu+p+1)}$, where $\tilde{p}$ is the total number of unknown parameters estimated in the mathematical and statistical models. Here, we take $\tilde{p} = p$, since we do not estimate directly the variances $\sigma_{1,0}^2$ and $\sigma_{2,0}^2$ in addition to the p parameters for the mathematical model. We note that although this *AIC_C* formula was derived for multivariate linear regression models [12], the authors claimed that this formula

can be generalized to multivariate nonlinear regression models. We tacitly assume this can be done and hence use the above formulae for our AIC_C analysis here.

2.6 Parameter Uncertainty Quantification

We calculated standard errors and 95% confidence intervals for the estimated parameters $\hat{\theta}$ using asymptotic theory, and used bootstrapping for verification. We provide a brief description of the application of these two methods here, but for more details see [9, 11].

2.6.1 Asymptotic Theory—The observation variance V_0 in the vector OLS framework using a constant statistical error model is, given estimates $\hat{\theta}$, approximated by

$$V_0 \approx \hat{V} = \text{diag} \left(\frac{1}{n-p} \sum_{j=1}^n [\mathbf{y}_j - \mathbf{f}(t_j, \hat{\theta})][\mathbf{y}_j - \mathbf{f}(t_j, \hat{\theta})]^T \right).$$

The resulting approximation of the covariance matrix is given by

$$\hat{\Sigma}^n = \left(\sum_{j=1}^n D_j^T(\hat{\theta}) \hat{V}^{-1} D_j(\hat{\theta}) \right)^{-1},$$

where the $2 \times p$ matrix $D_j(\hat{\theta})$ is given by

$$D_j(\hat{\theta}) = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{\partial J(t_j, \hat{\theta})}{\partial \theta_1} & \cdots & \frac{\partial J(t_j, \hat{\theta})}{\partial \theta_p} \\ \frac{\partial A(t_j, \hat{\theta})}{\partial \theta_1} & \cdots & \frac{\partial A(t_j, \hat{\theta})}{\partial \theta_p} \end{pmatrix},$$

where $p = 2$ in Models A and B and $p = 3$ in Models C and D. Then asymptotic theory [9, 11] yields that the OLS estimator has a limiting distribution given approximately by a $\mathcal{N}(\hat{\theta}, \hat{\Sigma}^n)$ distribution.

We calculated standard errors and 95% confidence intervals [9, 11] in order to quantify the uncertainty in estimating each element of the parameter estimate $\hat{\theta}$ for our best model with vector observation $\mathbf{f}(t, \theta)$. The standard error and 95% confidence interval of the k^{th}

parameter $\hat{\theta}_k$ are given by $SE(\hat{\theta}_k) = \sqrt{\sum_{kk}^n}$ and $[\hat{\theta}_k - 1.96SE(\hat{\theta}_k), \hat{\theta}_k + 1.96SE(\hat{\theta}_k)]$, respectively [11].

2.6.2 Bootstrapping—Bootstrapping is implemented for an estimated parameter vector $\hat{\theta}$ by first calculating standardized residuals

$$\bar{r}_j^i = \sqrt{\frac{n}{n-p}} \left(y_j^i - f_i(t_j, \hat{\theta}) \right), \quad j=1, \dots, n,$$

where n is the number of data points, p is the number of parameters, $i = J$ or A represents either the juvenile or adult observation. Here, $f_J(t_j, \hat{\theta}) = J(t_j, \hat{\theta})$ and $f_A(t_j, \hat{\theta}) = A(t_j, \hat{\theta})$. Bootstrap sample points are created by sampling the standardized residuals for each observation (J or A) and adding them to the respective model solutions, either $J(t_j, \hat{\theta})$ or $A(t_j, \hat{\theta})$. We created $M = 1000$ simulated bootstrap data sets in this fashion and then conducted M inverse problems to fit the model to each of these simulated data sets. For the m^{th} simulated bootstrap data set, we then find the corresponding parameter estimate $\hat{\theta}^m$. The mean, variance, and standard errors for $\hat{\theta}$ are approximated by the following formulas [9]:

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{\theta}_{BOOT} &= \frac{1}{M} \sum_{m=1}^M \hat{\theta}^m, \\ \text{Var}(\hat{\theta}_{BOOT}) &= \frac{1}{M-1} \sum_{m=1}^M (\hat{\theta}^m - \hat{\theta}_{BOOT})(\hat{\theta}^m - \hat{\theta}_{BOOT})^T, \\ SE_k(\hat{\theta}_{BOOT}) &= \sqrt{\text{Var}(\hat{\theta}_{BOOT})_{kk}}.\end{aligned}$$

The 95 % confidence interval for each $\hat{\theta}_k$ is calculated as the range between the 25-th and 975-th entries in the ordered set of M parameter estimates from bootstrapping.

3 Results

3.1 Model Selection

When comparing models A and B we found that a 6 day time-delay on the effect of density on fecundity provided a significantly improved fit to the daphnid population data versus the non-delayed model for both population data sets ($P = 5.029\text{e-}4$, Replicate 1; $P = 3.219\text{e-}3$, Replicate 2, χ^2 -test, Figure 4). We note that we also tested whether larger τ values could provide a more accurate fit to population data but found no significant differences in fits to the population data when using $\tau = 6$ versus $\tau = 7$ or 8 ($P = .3071$, Replicate 1; $P = .1139$, Replicate 2, χ^2 -test).

We found that the inclusion of both density and age dependence in the survival probability $b(t, i)$ provided significantly improved fits to population data for one of the two replicates ($P = 1.615\text{e-}1$, Replicate 1; $P = 3.96\text{e-}2$, Replicate 2, χ^2 -test). Overall, these results suggest that model C is more appropriate for modeling our daphnid populations than model B, since it describes a wider range of observed biological dynamics.

We note that we also considered other models that did not significantly increase the accuracy of the model to experimental population data (results not shown). For example, we considered models in which the density-dependent effects were of different functional forms.

Using the AIC_C score, we found that model D better described the population data from both replicates than model C. For replicate 1, the AIC_C for models C and D were 656.47 and 635.32, respectively. For replicate 2, the AIC_C for models C and D were 690.18 and 663.24, respectively. The evidence ratio, based on the calculation of Akaike weights [13, p. 74–79], for model D versus model C was 3.918×10^3 for the replicate 1 data set. The evidence ratio for model D versus model C was 7.082×10^4 for the replicate 2 data set. These results

highly suggest that model D is better than model C at representing the population data from both replicates. Hence, dependence of birth and death demographics on population density is most likely a function of a total population length rather than the absolute number of daphnids counted regardless of size or age. See Figures 5 and 6 for fits of model D to the population data. Moreover, the parameter estimates for both replicates were strikingly similar, indicating that our validation of model D is repeatable despite the possibility of biological variability between population experiments.

3.2 Uncertainty Analysis

We quantified uncertainty in our parameter estimates for model D. Uncertainty quantification provides an estimation of the statistical confidence in each parameter for a given data set, where confidence is determined by estimating a distribution for each parameter. We calculated standard errors and 95% confidence intervals for each parameter using asymptotic theory and bootstrapping (Tables 3, 4, 5, and Figures 5, 6) along with the distributions obtained with bootstrapping (Figure 7). Both the results from asymptotic theory and bootstrapping support that the standard errors were low and the 95% confidence intervals were narrow for the parameter estimates in both replicates. These results indicate a high confidence that our model validation results are repeatable.

In order to investigate how well our model captures our data, given our observation error, we plotted our model with one standard deviation of observation error in Figure 5, and our model with close to two standard deviations of observation error in Figure 6. To be more specific, to make the solid black lines in Figures 5 and 6, we simulated our model using the parameter estimates $\hat{\theta}$. The data itself is shown as black open circles. Therefore, taking only the solid black lines and the open circles, one has a plot of simply our data and our model solutions with the estimated “true” parameter values.

The gray section in the top two plots of Figure 5 is the region $\mathcal{K}(t_j, \hat{\theta}) \pm \sigma_{1,0}$ for each experimental replicate, and the gray section in the middle two plots of Figure 5 is the region $A(t_j, \hat{\theta}) \pm \sigma_{2,0}$ for each experimental replicate. These gray regions represent the 68 % confidence bands, since they represent one standard deviation away from the model solution. Similarly, the gray section in the top two plots of Figure 6 is the region $\mathcal{K}(t_j, \hat{\theta}) \pm 1.96\sigma_{1,0}$ for each experimental replicate, and the gray section in the middle two plots of Figure 6 is the region $A(t_j, \hat{\theta}) \pm 1.96\sigma_{2,0}$. These represent the 95 % confidence bands, as they represent 1.96 standard deviations away from the model solution. Table 3 presents the values for $\sigma_{1,0}$ and $\sigma_{2,0}$, as well as the values $1.96\sigma_{1,0}$ and $1.96\sigma_{2,0}$ for reference.

In order to make this plot for the total population, we assumed that we used only one observation, the total population $N(t_j)$ at observation times t_j . Thus, our error model for the total population is now specified as

$$Y_j = f(t_j, \theta_0) + \mathcal{E}_j, \quad j=1, 2, \dots, n$$

where Y_j is a random variable with realizations $y_j = N(t_j)$ (i.e., the data), $f(t_j, \theta_0) = N(t_j, \theta_0) = \mathcal{K}(t_j, \theta_0) + A(t_j, \theta_0)$ is the discrete model solution with the hypothesized “true” parameter

vector θ_0 , where $N(t, \theta_0)$ is the total number of daphnids given by our model at time t . The error terms $\mathcal{E}_j$ are assumed to be i.i.d random variables with mean zero and variance

$$V_0 = \sigma_{N,0}^2. \text{ From our uncertainty quantification we have an estimate for our observation error } \hat{V}_0 = \hat{\sigma}_{N,0}^2.$$

Therefore, the gray section in the bottom two plots of Figure 5 is the region $N(t_j, \hat{\theta}) \pm \sigma_{N,0}$ for each experimental replicate. These gray regions represent the 68 % confidence bands, since they represent one standard deviation away from our model solution. The gray section in the bottom two plots of Figure 6 is the region $N(t_j, \hat{\theta}) \pm 1.96\sigma_{N,0}$ for each experimental replicate. These gray regions represent the 95 % confidence bands, since they represent 1.96 standard deviations away from the model solution. Table 3 also gives the values for $\sigma_{N,0}$ and $1.96\sigma_{N,0}$ for reference while Table 4 contains the obtained accuracy of our modeling effort using the 68 % confidence bands.

3.3 Parameter Sensitivities

We applied a sensitivity analysis to our best validated model (model D) to understand how changes in estimated parameters governing fecundity and survival affect population size and structure. We calculated the relative time-dependent sensitivity functions for juvenile, adult, and total population size (Figure 8). Interestingly, we observed that the maximum total population size for our two replicates was achieved on day 19, dividing the population dynamics into two phases, which we call the “early phase” and the “late phase” (Figure 9). In the early phase (≤ 19 days) of the population experiments, the population grows rapidly and exceeds its carrying capacity. In the late phase of the population experiments (> 19 days), the total population size converges towards steady state levels as an excess juvenile population rapidly dies off or progresses to the adult stage. Dividing our sensitivity analysis between these two phases revealed that the effect of increasing fecundity or survival is both temporally and life-stage dependent (Figure 10).

We found that the juvenile, adult, and total population sizes were most sensitive to changes in μ in both the early and late phase as compared to the other estimated parameters q and c . The sensitivity analysis indicates that increasing the survival parameter μ will increase the juvenile population in the early phase and decrease it in the late phase, whereas an increased μ increases the adult population size in both the early and late phase. Although increased survival increases the total population size in the early phase, the late phase is much less sensitive. These findings suggest that increases in the survival parameter μ will cause a shift in the population distribution towards the adult stage and that this shift mainly occurs during the early phase of population growth.

Our sensitivity analysis indicates that increasing q , the effect of density on fecundity, has a greater effect in the late phase of the population experiment than in the early phase for the juvenile, adult, and total population size. This result is expected, since a lower fecundity rate should lead to lower population sizes overall and within specific life stages. We hypothesize that the late phase is more heavily influenced by a decreased density-dependent fecundity rate than the early phase because of the time delayed effect. If so, this would imply that most

of the offspring in the early phase are produced by female daphnids whose fecundity has not yet been effected by density.

Lastly, our sensitivity analysis indicates that increasing c , the effect of density on the survival of juveniles, leads to lower numbers of juveniles and adults, and a lower total population size in the early phase. This relationship is more pronounced in the late phase for both the number of adults and total population size. Unexpectedly, our sensitivity analysis indicates that increasing the parameter c can cause the number of juveniles to increase during the late phase of the population experiments.

Taken together, these findings suggest that a higher density-dependent juvenile survival probability can cause a shift towards juveniles in the equilibrium age distribution of daphnid populations, even though the total population size decreases overall. Our results highlight the importance of mathematical modeling to understand non-intuitive temporal shifts in the age distribution of daphnid populations that may occur under environmental conditions that increase competition, e.g., if the amount of algae decreases.

4 Conclusions and Discussion

We tested several hypotheses concerning the significance of several biological assumptions in describing daphnid populations with a structured population model. One assumption we evaluated, delayed density-dependent fecundity, had been suggested previously [27, 45]. Importantly, this hypothesized mechanism was not quantitatively verified due to a lack of statistical comparison tools at the time they were proposed. We applied a χ^2 based model comparison test and found strong statistical evidence for a time delay in density dependent fecundity. We also found statistical evidence for the assumption that intraspecific competition mainly affects juvenile daphnids, previously suggested in [15, 28, 44, 46]. Lastly, we determined that the effect of density on daphnid demographics is more accurately modeled as a function of total population length, rather than total population size [27, 48]. Our findings indicate that the assumptions we investigated can improve the accuracy of future daphnid population modeling efforts and may provide increased accuracy in other daphnid models which may not have considered all of these assumptions [19, 20, 21, 23, 24, 27, 46].

We found that parameterizing the density-independent components of demographic rates with individual level data enabled the estimation of density-dependent parameters from aggregate structured population data. The most complex density-independent component that we discovered was for daphnid fecundity (Figure 3). Our data revealed a clear periodic pattern in the timing of offspring production in which daphnids begin releasing neonates at 9-days-old. Notably, the maximum offspring production rate is significantly higher in the first 4 broods than in subsequent broods ($P = 0.0011$, Mann-Whitney U-test). To the best of our knowledge, fecundity oscillations with a consistent frequency and time-dependent amplitude has not previously been observed for daphnids. We note that without employing individual level time-dependent fecundity data, our attempts to fit daphnid population data gave extremely poor results (data not shown). We suspect that the collection of similarly precise individual level data will be necessary to parameterize structured models from field

data of daphnid populations. For example, daphnids could be sampled in the field and cultured/observed under experimental conditions similar to their natural environment. Alternatively, one may be able to employ computational methods designed to estimate time-dependent rates from aggregate data alone [2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, 10]. However, these methods have only been previously applied to density-independent structured population models, and thus they remain largely untested and underdeveloped in density-dependent scenarios.

An underlying challenge in performing hazard assessments is to generate a highly repeatable baseline control for comparison. For our best validated model (Model D), the parameter estimates, uncertainty quantification, temporal variations in sensitivity patterns, and overall degree of accuracy to the data were all extremely similar between replicates (Figures 6 and 10, Tables 4 and 5). These results highlight the need for comprehensively evaluating biological assumptions about daphnid populations grown under non-stressed environmental conditions, i.e., the control case. Our results also suggest the need for further improvement, since Model D underestimated the early phase (< 19 days) growth rate and the time at which the peak size was reached for the juvenile population in the second replicate. One possible adjustment that may increase the accuracy of model D is to incorporate an age-dependent daphnid survival probability. From our sensitivity analysis, we infer that increasing the juvenile survival probability will likely remedy the underestimation of the early phase growth rate (Figure 10). For simplicity, we assumed a constant parameter μ for the density-independent survival probability in the modeling efforts reported here; however, this assumption is a current focus of our ongoing investigations.

Acknowledgments

This research was supported in part by the National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases under grant number NIAID R01AI071915-10, in part by the Air Force Office of Scientific Research under grant number AFOSR FA9550-12-1-0188, in part by the National Science Foundation under Research Training Grant (RTG) DMS-1246991, NSF Undergraduate Biomathematics grant number DBI-1129214, NSF grant number DMS-0946431, in part by the EPA under US EPA STAR grant RD-835165, and in part by the NIEHS under training grant ES7046.

References

1. Baldwin WS, LeBlanc GA. Identification of multiple steroid hydroxylases in *Daphnia magna* and their modulation by xenobiotics. *Environ Toxicol Chem.* 1994; 13:1013–1021.
2. Banks, HT.; Botsford, LW.; Kappel, F.; Wang, C. Modeling and estimation in size structured population models, LCDS-CCS Report 87-13, Brown University. Proc. 2nd Course on Mathematical Ecology; Trieste. December 8–12, 1986; Singapore: Word Press; 1988. p. 521-541.
3. Banks HT, Davis JL, Ernstberger SL, Hu S, Artimovich E, Dhar AK. Experimental design and estimation of growth rate distributions in size-structured shrimp populations. *Inverse Probl.* 2009; 25:095003.
4. Banks HT, Davis JL, Ernstberger SL, Hu S, Artimovich E, Dhar AK, Browdy CL. A comparison of probabilistic and stochastic formulations in modeling growth uncertainty and variability. *J Biological Dynamics.* 2009; 3:130–148.
5. Banks, HT.; Davis, JL.; Hu, S. A computational comparison of alternatives to including uncertainty in structured population models. In: Hu, X., et al., editors. *Three Decades of Progress in Systems and Control*. Springer; New York: 2010. p. 19-33.
6. Banks HT, Fitzpatrick BG. Estimation of growth rate distributions in size structured population models. *Quarterly of Applied Mathematics.* 1991; 49:215–235.

7. Banks HT, Fitzpatrick BG. Statistical methods for model comparison in parameter estimation problems for distributed systems. *Journal of Mathematical Biology*. 1990; 28:501–527.
8. Banks, HT.; Fitzpatrick, BG.; Potter, LK.; Zhang, Y. Estimation of probability distributions for individual parameters using aggregate population data. In: McEneaney, W.; Yin, G.; Zhang, Q., editors. *Stochastic Analysis, Control, Optimization, and Applications*. Birkhauser; Boston: 1989.
9. Banks, HT.; Hu, S.; Thompson, WC. *Modeling and Inverse Problems in the Presence of Uncertainty*. CRC Press; New York: 2013.
10. Banks, HT.; Kunisch, K. *Estimation Techniques for Distributed Parameter Systems*. Birkhausen; Boston: 1989.
11. Banks, HT.; Tran, HT. *Mathematical and Experimental Modeling of Physical and Biological Processes*. CRC Press; New York: 2009.
12. Bedrick, Edward J.; Tsai, Chih-Ling. Model selection for multivariate regression in small samples. *Biometrics*. 1994; 50:226–231.
13. Burnham, KP.; Anderson, DR. *Model Selection and Inference: A Practical Information-Theoretic Approach*. 2. Springer-Verlag; New York: 2002.
14. Caswell, H. *Matrix Population Models: Construction, Analysis, and Interpretation*. 2. Sinauer; Sunderland, MA: 2001.
15. Cleuvers M, Goser B, Ratte HT. Life-strategy shift by intraspecific interaction in *Daphnia magna*: change in reproduction from quantity to quality. *Oecologia*. 1997; 110(3):337–345.
16. Crouse DT, Crowder LB, Caswell H. A stage-based population model for logger-head sea turtles and implications for conservation. *Ecology*. 1987; 68:1412–1423.
17. Doak D, Kareiva P, Klepetka B. Modeling population viability for the desert tortoise in the western Mojave Desert. *Ecol Appl*. 1994; 4:446–460.
18. Doak, DF.; Morris, WF. *Quantitative Conservation Biology: Theory and Practice of Population Viability Analysis*. Sinauer; Sunderland, MA: 2002.
19. El-Doma M. A size-structured dynamics model of *Daphnia*. *Applied Mathematics Letters*. 2012; 25:1041–1044.
20. El-Doma M. Stability analysis of a size-structured population dynamic model of *Daphnia*. *International Journal of Pure and Applied Mathematics*. 2011; 70(2):189–209.
21. El-Doma, M. *Daphnia: Biology and Mathematics Perspectives*. Nova Science Publishers; Hauppauge, NY: 2014.
22. Endels P, Jacquemyn H, Brys R, Hermy M. Rapid response to habitat restoration by the perennial *Primula veris* as revealed by demographic monitoring. *Plant Ecol*. 2005; 176:143–156.
23. Erickson RA, Cox SB, Oates JL, Anderson TA, Salice CJ, Long KR. A *Daphnia* population model that considers pesticide exposure and demographic stochasticity. *Ecological Modeling*. 2014; 275:37–47.
24. Farkas JZ, Hagen T. Linear stability and positivity results for a generalized size-structured *Daphnia* model with inflow. *Applicable Analysis*. 2007; 86:1087–1103.
25. Forbes V, Calow P, Grimm V, Hayashi TI, Jager T, Katholm A, Palmqvist A, Pastorok R, Salvito D, Sibly RM, Spromberg J, Stark J, Stillman RA. Adding value to ecological risk assessment with population modeling. *Human Ecol Risk Assess*. 2011; 17:287–299.
26. Forbes V, Calow P, Grimm V, Hayashi T, Jager T, Palmqvist A, Pastorok R, Salvito D, Sibly R, Spromberg J, Stark J, Stillman RA. Integrating population modeling into ecological risk assessment. *Integrated Environ Assess Management*. 2010; 6:191–193.
27. Frank PW. Prediction of population growth form in *Daphnia pulex* cultures. *The American Naturalist*. 1960; 94(878):357–372.
28. Frank PW, Boll CD, Kelly RW. Vital statistics of laboratory cultures of *Daphnia pulex* as related to density. *Physiological Zoology*. 1957; 30(4):287–305.
29. Fujiwara M, Caswell H. Demography of the endangered North Atlantic right whale. *Nature*. 2001; 414:537–54. [PubMed: 11734852]
30. Guisande C. Reproductive strategy as population density varies in *Daphnia magna* (Cladocera). *Freshwater Biology*. 1993; 29(3):463–467.

31. Hole DG, Whittingham MJ, Bradbury RB, Anderson GQA, Lee PLM, Wilson JD, Krebs JR. Widespread local house-sparrow extinctions. *Nature*. 2002; 418:931–932. [PubMed: 12198534]
32. Huffman T, Link K, Nardini J, Poag L, Flores KB, Banks HT, Blasco B, Jungfleisch J, Diez J. A mathematical model of RNA3 recruitment in the Brome Mosaic Virus replication cycle. *International Journal of Pure and Applied Mathematics*. 2013; 89(2):251–274.
33. Kendall WL, Hines JE, Nichols JD. Adjusting multistate capture-recapture models for misclassification bias: Manatee breeding proportions. *Ecology*. 2003; 84:1058–1066.
34. Lampert W. Response of the respiratory rate of *Daphnia magna* to changing food conditions. *Oecologia*. 1986; 70(4):495–501.
35. LeBlanc GA, Rider CV. An integrated addition and interaction model for assessing toxicity of chemical mixtures. *Toxicological Sciences*. 2005; 87(2):520–528. [PubMed: 16002478]
36. LeBlanc GA, Wang YH, Holmes CN, Kwon G, Medlock EK. A transgenerational endocrine signaling pathway in crustacea. *PLoS One*. 2013; 8(4):e61715. [PubMed: 23613913]
37. Leslie PH. On the use of matrices in certain population mathematics. *Biometrika*. 1945; 33(3):183–212. [PubMed: 21006835]
38. MacArthur JW, Baillie WHT. Metabolic activity and duration of life. I. Influence of temperature on longevity in *Daphnia magna*. *Journal of Experimental Zoology*. 1929; 53(2):221–242.
39. Martinez-Jeronimo F, Villasenor R, Rios G, Espinosa F. Effect of food type and concentration on the survival, longevity, and reproduction of *Daphnia magna*. *Hydrobiologia*. 1994; 287:207–214.
40. National Institutes of Health. Daphnia Model Organisms for Biomedical Research. <http://www.nih.gov/science/models/daphnia/>
41. Neill WE. Experimental studies of microcrustacean competition, community composition and efficiency of resource utilization. *Ecology*. 1975; 56:809–826.
42. Olmstead AW, LeBlanc GA. The environmental-endocrine basis of gynandromorphism in a crustacean. *International Journal of Biological Sciences*. 2007; 3:77–84. [PubMed: 17205107]
43. Pietrzak B, Grzesuik M, Bednarska A. Food quantity shapes life history and survival strategies in *Daphnia magna* (Cladocera). *Hydrobiologia*. 2010; 643:51–54.
44. Porter KG, Orcutt JD Jr, Gerritsen J. Functional response and fitness in a generalist filter feeder, *Daphnia magna* (Cladocera: Crustacea). *Ecology*. 1983; 64(4):735–742.
45. Pratt DM. Analysis of population development in *Daphnia* at different temperatures. *The Biological Bulletin*. 1943; 85(2):116–140.
46. Preuss TG, Hammers-Wirtz M, Hommen U, Rubach MN, Ratte HT. Development and validation of an individual-based *Daphnia magna* population model: The influence of crowding on population dynamics. *Ecological Modeling*. 2009; 220:310–329.
47. Rider CV, Gorr TA, Olmstead AW, Wasilak BA, LeBlanc GA. Stress signaling: coregulation of hemoglobin and male sex determination through a terpenoid signaling pathway in a crustacean. *Journal of Experimental Biology*. 2005; 208:15–23. [PubMed: 15601873]
48. Ryther JH. Inhibitory effects of phytoplankton upon the feeding of *Daphnia magna* with reference to growth, reproduction, and survival. *Ecology*. 1954; 35(4):522–533.
49. Stark JD, Banks JE. Selective pesticides: are they less hazardous to the environment? *Bioscience*. 2001; 51:980–982.
50. Thomson DM. Matrix models as a tool for understanding invasive plant and native plant interactions. *Conserv Biol*. 2005; 19:917–928.
51. Vonesh JR, De la Cruz O. Complex life cycles and density dependence: assessing the contribution of egg mortality to amphibian declines. *Oecologia*. 2002; 133:325–333.
52. Wang YH, Kwon G, Li H, LeBlanc GA. Tributyltin synergizes with 20-hydroxyecdysone to produce endocrine toxicity. *Tox Sci*. 2011; 123:71–79.
53. Wang HY, Olmstead AW, Li H, LeBlanc GA. The screening of chemicals for juvenoid-related endocrine activity using the water flea *Daphnia magna*. *Aquatic Toxicology*. 2005; 74:193–204. [PubMed: 16046008]
54. Wennergren U, Stark JD. Modeling long-term effects of pesticides on populations: beyond just counting dead animals. *Ecol Appl*. 2000; 10:295–302.

55. Wilson PH. Using population projection matrices to evaluate recovery strategies for Snake River Spring and Summer Chinook salmon. *Conserv Biol.* 2003; 17:782–794.
56. Wood SN. Obtaining birth and mortality patterns using structured population trajectories. *Ecolog Monogr.* 1994; 64:23–24.

Author Manuscript

Author Manuscript

Author Manuscript

Author Manuscript

Highlights

- Model verification using statistical techniques and inverse problems
- Density dependent mechanism-based structured population models for *Daphnia magna*
- Model comparison techniques including Akaike Information Content based scores
- Uncertainty quantification for estimated parameters

Figure 1.

Calibration of the maximum size for classification of juveniles. We determined the maximum juvenile daphnid size by simulating the logistic growth curve with mean parameter values from the nonlinear mixed effects model (Figure 2, Table 2). The pore size of the mesh we used to separate juveniles from adults was 1.62 mm, and this value is plotted as a horizontal line. The vertical line gives the average daphnid age at which their major axis length is equal to the mesh pore size. Based on this calculation, we inferred that the maximum age at which daphnids can fit through the mesh was 4 days old. Thus, we chose to classify juveniles in our models as 4 days old.

Figure 2.

Results for nonlinear regression performed on individual level growth data using a logistic equation within a nonlinear mixed effects model (NLMEM). Growth data are represented by star symbols. Best model fits are drawn as lines for each individual. We collected data for thirty daphnids, but these plots show results for twenty four daphnids for which an adequate number of data was collected to fit a NLMEM. Nonlinear regression was performed using the *nlmefit* function in Matlab. We tested several models for growth, including logistic, gompertz, constant, and linear equations. Based on AIC_C values, it was determined that the logistic model provided the most accurate fit to the data. See Table 2 for estimated parameters and variances, including fixed effects and random effects.

Figure 3.

The number of neonates produced per female daphnid per day. Data were collected from thirty female daphnid whose birth was known to within two hours of accuracy. Daily data are represented by star symbols and connecting lines are drawn to show general trends. This data was used to parameterize the age-dependent function $a(i)$ (see Table 1).

Figure 4. The ordinary least squares (OLS) cost from the inverse problem performed on model B with $\tau \in \{0, 1, \dots, 6\}$ for each replicate. These results suggest that the optimal value for τ is 6 days, since it results in the smallest OLS cost.

Figure 5.

Results from fitting our discrete daphnid population model to adult and juvenile longitudinal data. Black lines: model simulation results using parameter estimates. Open circles: our data. Gray region: 68 % confidence band, with the error coming from our statistical model, which assumes constant error.

Figure 6.

Results from fitting our discrete daphnid population model to adult and juvenile longitudinal data. Black lines: model simulation results using parameter estimates. Open circles: our data. Gray region: 95 % confidence band, with the error coming from our statistical model, which assumes constant error.

Figure 7.

The parameter distributions obtained from bootstrapping for each estimated parameter (μ , q , c) and each replicate for model D.

Figure 8.

The relative time-dependent sensitivities for juveniles, adults, and the total population with respect to each of the estimated parameters (μ , q , c) for model D. Sensitivities were calculated for the number of juveniles $J(t)$ (top row), the number of adults $A(t)$ (middle row), and the total population size $N(t)$ (bottom row). The left column corresponds to μ , the middle column to q , and the right column to c . Solid lines: Replicate 1. Dashed lines: Replicate 2.

Figure 9.

Longitudinal data for the total population size for two population replicates. The vertical dashed line is at 19 days, and shows the division between the early phase and late phase dynamics.

Figure 10.

The average of the relative sensitivities during the early and late phases for juvenile, $J(t)$, adult, $A(t)$, and total population, $N(t)$, counts with respect to the survival parameter, μ , the effect of density on fecundity, q , and the effect of density on survival, c . Sensitivities are divided between the early phase of the population experiments (before the peak size is reached on day 19) and the late phase (after day 19).

Table 1

Descriptions of models, parameters, and variables with unknown parameters $\theta = (\mu, q)$ in Models A and B and $\theta = (\mu, q, c)$ in Models C and D to be estimated.

(a) Age-dependent fecundity, $a(t, i)$, and survival probability, $b(t, i)$ in equation (1).		
Model	$a(t, i)$	$b(t, i)$
A	$\alpha(i)(1 - q)^{M(t)}$	μ
B	$\alpha(i)(1 - q)^{M(t-\tau)}$	μ
C	$\alpha(i)(1 - q)^{M(t-\tau)}$	$\mu(1 - c)^{M(t)}$ if $i = 4$, μ if $i = 5$
D	$\alpha(i)(1 - q)^{M(t-\tau)}$	$\mu(1 - c)^{M(t)}$ if $i = 4$, μ if $i = 5$

(b) Parameter/Variable descriptions.		
Par./Var.	Description	Units
$p(t, i)$	Number of daphnids of age i	# of daphnids
$M(t)$	Total population size at time $t := \sum_{i=1}^{i_{max}} p(t, i)$	# of daphnids
q	Density-dependent fecundity constant	dimensionless
$\alpha(i)$	Density-independent fecundity rate	# neo.-daphnid ⁻¹ .day ⁻¹
μ	Density-independent survival probability	day ⁻¹
τ	Delay for density-dependent fecundity	days
c	Density-dependent survival constant	dimensionless
$M(t)$	Tot. pop. length at time $t := \sum_{i=1}^{i_{max}} p(t, i) \frac{K Z_0 e^{ri}}{K + Z_0 (e^{ri} - 1)}$	# · mm
K	Average maximum daphnid size (major axis)	mm
r	Average daphnid growth rate	mm/hour
Z_0	Average neonate size (major axis)	mm

Table 2

Mean parameter estimates and variances along with individual daphnid parameter estimates for the logistic equation using a nonlinear mixed effects model (see Figure 2).

(a) Mean values and variances (random effects) estimated for the logistic equation with a nonlinear mixed effects model.			
Parameter	K	r	M_0
Fixed Effect Mean Value	3.7346	0.0157	0.7333
Random Effect Variance	0.0010533	0.0048239	6.8978×10^{-7}

(b) Individual parameter estimates for each daphnid.			
Daphnid	K	r	M_0
1	3.6148	0.0157	0.7333
2	3.7342	0.0160	0.7333
3	3.6834	0.0156	0.7333
4	3.8267	0.0156	0.7333
5	3.6262	0.0162	0.7333
6	3.6340	0.0157	0.7333
7	3.8957	0.0169	0.7334
8	3.8895	0.0154	0.7333
9	3.8556	0.0152	0.7333
10	3.9009	0.0145	0.7333
11	3.8718	0.0170	0.7334
12	3.8482	0.0148	0.7333
13	3.6902	0.0140	0.7333
14	3.4604	0.0138	0.7333
15	3.7969	0.0150	0.7333
16	3.7530	0.0158	0.7333
17	3.7092	0.0162	0.7333
18	3.7758	0.0164	0.7333
19	3.7397	0.0159	0.7333
20	3.6688	0.0178	0.7334
21	3.6662	0.0153	0.7333
22	3.6387	0.0163	0.7334
23	3.7070	0.0166	0.7333
24	3.6806	0.0147	0.7333

Our estimates for the observation standard errors using asymptotic theory are shown here. For example, $\hat{\sigma}_{2,0}$ is what our uncertainty quantification returned as our best estimate for the standard deviation of the error seen in observing adult daphnids during data collection.

Table 3

	Replicate 1				
Value	$\hat{\sigma}_{1,0}$	$\hat{\sigma}_{2,0}$	$\hat{\sigma}_{N,0}$	$1.96\hat{\sigma}_{1,0}$	$1.96\hat{\sigma}_{N,0}$
Estimate	171.5502	81.1267	184.6778	336.2385	361.9683
	Replicate 2				
Value	$\hat{\sigma}_{1,0}$	$\hat{\sigma}_{2,0}$	$\hat{\sigma}_{N,0}$	$1.96\hat{\sigma}_{1,0}$	$1.96\hat{\sigma}_{N,0}$
Estimate	233.5445	91.6277	253.6872	457.7473	497.2268

Table 4

The percentage (% accuracy) and fraction of observed data points that were contained in the 68 % confidence bands of our model solution. Results are shown for the number of juveniles, number of adults, and total population size for each replicate

Daphnid Classification	Replicate	% Accuracy	Fraction
Juvenile	1	80 %	20/25
Adult	1	68 %	17/25
Total	1	84 %	21/25
Juvenile	2	84 %	21/25
Adult	2	84 %	21/25
Total	2	92 %	23/25

Table 5

Results from uncertainty quantification with asymptotic theory and bootstrapping for model D.

(a) Parameter estimates, asymptotic standard errors, and asymptotic 95% confidence intervals (C.I.) for model D.				
Replicate	Parameter	Estimate	Standard Error	95 % C.I.
1	μ	9.5051×10^{-1}	1.0428×10^{-2}	$(9.2889 \times 10^{-1}, 9.7214 \times 10^{-1})$
1	q	1.7206×10^{-3}	1.5426×10^{-4}	$(1.4007 \times 10^{-3}, 2.0405 \times 10^{-3})$
1	c	1.5153×10^{-4}	2.9689×10^{-5}	$(8.9972 \times 10^{-5}, 2.1310 \times 10^{-4})$
2	μ	9.8559×10^{-1}	8.1785×10^{-3}	$(9.6863 \times 10^{-1}, 1.0025)$
2	q	1.3542×10^{-3}	1.7762×10^{-4}	$(9.8590 \times 10^{-4}, 1.7225 \times 10^{-3})$
2	c	2.8005×10^{-4}	4.1701×10^{-5}	$(1.9358 \times 10^{-4}, 3.6652 \times 10^{-4})$

(b) Parameter estimates, bootstrap standard errors, and bootstrap 95% confidence intervals (C.I.) for model D.				
Replicate	Parameter	Estimate	Standard Error	95 % C.I.
1	μ	9.5051×10^{-1}	8.7505×10^{-3}	$(8.8922 \times 10^{-1}, 9.2551 \times 10^{-1})$
1	q	1.7206×10^{-3}	2.3202×10^{-4}	$(2.0358 \times 10^{-3}, 2.9980 \times 10^{-3})$
1	c	1.5153×10^{-4}	2.3608×10^{-5}	$(-4.8952 \times 10^{-5}, 4.8953 \times 10^{-5})$
2	μ	9.8559×10^{-1}	2.3660×10^{-2}	$(9.3715 \times 10^{-1}, 1.0355)$
2	q	1.3542×10^{-3}	3.2867×10^{-4}	$(6.8486 \times 10^{-4}, 2.0517 \times 10^{-3})$
2	c	2.8005×10^{-4}	9.7547×10^{-5}	$(8.3218 \times 10^{-5}, 4.8888 \times 10^{-4})$