EUROPEAN ACADEMIC RESEARCH
Vol. I, Issue 11/ February 2014

ISSN 2286-4822
www.euacademic.org

Impact Factor: 3.1 (UIF)
DRJI Value: 5.9 (B+)

Optimal Biodiversity and Ecosystem Functioning: A Complete Review on Standards, Relationships and Purpose of Management

I. B. MUHIT
Department of Civil Engineering
Chung-Ang University (CAU), Seoul
Korea
M. F. RAHMAN
Institute of Forestry and Environmental Sciences
University of Chittagong, Chittagong
Bangladesh
S. TASNEEM CHOWDHURY
Shaheed Ziaur Rahman Medical College, Bogra
Bangladesh

Abstract:

Through this paper the standard of optimal diversity of biosystems is proposed. As per this guideline, the optimal values of internal biosystems diversities are compared to their most extreme feasibility. A scientific model of a two-level population group framework in a nature's domain is investigated. The subsystems of the lower level are deciphered as populations while those of the upper level are interpreted as a neighborhood of one trophic level made up of these populations. The optimality criteria relate to the most extreme viability of resource use by the biosystems, which is conceivable to think about as a record of biological system working. Optimal values of diversity rely upon the power of resource stream and the instability and shakiness of nature's turf. Optimal species diversity expands in additional stable and "rich" situations, while optimal intra-population diversity abatements in additional stable situations and is autonomous of the intensity of resource flow. These inverse responses permit us to make a presumption of the distinctive parts of intra-population as well as species diversity in a fluctuating environment. Moreover, intra-population diversities is the groundwork of acclimatization to ecological unsteadiness, while species diversity empowers a community for utilizing resources to the most extreme and

successfully. The outcomes of our modeling satisfied the experimental biodiversity patterns and enable us to propose the guideline of optimal biodiversity as a working speculation correlative to different thoughts regarding interrelation between biodiversity and ecological functioning.

Key words: Biosystems, Optimal Diversity, Intra-Population Diversity, Biodiversity, Ecological Functioning.

For a long time of time the relationship between biodiversity and ecological functioning has been a center of environmental research. The results of test, observational and hypothetical examinations show that this interrelation is a critical wonder and is of essential imperativeness in nature assurance hypothesis and practice. D. Tilman brings up that diversity must now be added to the agenda of elements that impact environment functioning.

In this paper, extremal standards may prompt respectable profits in the examinations of interconnections between biological and ecological system and diversity. Consistent with these standards, biosystems tend to achieve just such states when their vital aspects connected with the survival, reasonability and advancement are extremal (most extreme or least relying upon their positive or negative values), for instance, the greatest vigor efficiency of an organism, the minimum mortality in the population, the most extreme total biomass of the community etc. These markers of viability are termed as optimality criteria. Upgraded attributes of biosystems are balanced, for example, to accomplish the compelling values of the optimality criteria. The extremal standards have got wide dispersion in biological science. There are a ton of samples of their fruitful provision in physiology, organic chemistry, embryology, development hypothesis, population flow and ecology. Then again, in the field of biodiversity research, the limits of this technique have not been utilized within full measure.

2. Standard of Optimal Biodiversity

In the field of biodiversity researches the two accompanying fundamental extremal approaches are conceivable. One approach is dependent upon the suspicion that the differing qualities of components of a biosystem (intricacy of a biosystem) are augmented. A case of such approach is the entropy extreme standard for communities (Levich 2000) which intimates the expansion of community complexity at altered volumes of resource utilization by distinctive species.

In this research, we propose the second approach called optimal diversity standard (Bukvareva and Aleshchenko 2005, Russian in original). This standard is dependent upon the recommendation that the diversity of components of a biosystem is identified with the crucial qualities which characterize its survival probability (viability). These crucial aspects tend to achieve their greatest and given their diversity value. Moreover, this esteem of diversity is optimal.

The framework is attempting to achieve a state with greatest viability and optimal diversity, at each passing moment of time. The point when the natural conditions are changed, the framework adjusts to those and transforms its parameters so the optimal esteem of its diversity additionally might be changed. We propose to join together both population and community levels in the idea of interconnection between biodiversity and biological as well as ecological functioning.

In this paper, we don't think about the techniques of raising of biosystem association levels and biosystem complication throughout the advancement. Our concern is the acclimatization of biosystem with categorical association levels to distinctive natural conditions.

3. Two-level "Populations-community" Model

Through this paper, we have showed operability of the standard

of optimal diversity by the illustration of models of two sorts of living frameworks - measurable and structural (as per the documentation of the two methods for shaping of a top-level control framework by A. Lyapunov (1980), which might be translated as model of phenotypic differing qualities of the population (Aleshchenko and Bukvareva 1991) and the optimal number of species in a group of one trophic level. As a next step we have advanced and explored a numerical model of two-level "populations-community" framework in which optimal differences is shaping at both levels throughout their interaction. Full depiction and scientific comparisons have been exhibited in past publications (Aleshchenko and Bukvareva 2010). Here we quickly rehash its fundamental lands.

Environment is described by the intensity of resource flow and by the ecological parameter that might be translated as any resource trademark for instance, light wave length, size of the prey et cetera) or as any natural variable that supplies resource utilization for instance, temperature, humidity, and so on.).

The lower level population is spoken to as the stochastic model which was examined by method of factual tests (Monte Carlo system). Different phenotype comprises the populations. The death rate is situated by exponential reliance with a steady mortality; with birth rate index multiplication is demonstrated by a logistic function, which is tediously diminishing with the development of population size. Phenotype trademark is the capacity of people to spread in a given natural conditions. The acknowledged ecological element compares with a positive phenotype at each passing moment of time, for which the given natural conditions are the most ideal. At this minute, an aggregation of phenotypes breeds around it. According to phenotypes the esteem of scattering of distribution of breeding at every moment might be translated as an index of the width of the zone of singular tolerance. At each one stage of its advancement, the esteem of dispersion of distribution of their

offspring serves as a record of diversity replicated by the populations. Individuals might spend some resource to maintain their presence and reproduction. The more remote the acknowledged ecological parameter is from the optimal value for a given phenotype, the more resource using by this phenotype. Throughout computer based examinations, populations vanish or achieve some stationary amount with definite phenotype diversity and with the level of resource utilization. The optimality criterion for population is its greatest size (biomass) at a fixed volume of accessible resource. This undertaking is proportionate to the minimization of resource using for every single person at a settled population size (biomass).

The upper level – community – is spoken to as the expository model which incorporates lower subsystems as capacities which were found by method of factual tests. The community comprises of populations which impart the accessible resources. Along these lines, we modeled a group of one trophic level. The amount of populations in the group is recognized as species diversity. The optimality paradigm/criterion for the community is the greatest of total amount of people (sum biomass) of all populations at a settled volume of accessible resource (this task is proportionate to the minimization of resource using by every population under the state of full utilization of the accessible resource).

4. Modeling Results

4.1. Population Stability Domain

The level of phenotypic diversity in the population breathtakingly impacts its stability. There is a range of diversity values at which the populations is stable in an environment. The point when the populations leaves this range for abatement or expand, it gets unstable. The reasons for population stability loss at the declination of phenotypic

diversity are self-evident: when the diversity is low, the realization probability of ideal ecological conditions decreases. Each phenotype class has a few individuals that's why, the stability loss at diversity growth occurs and so the probability of population extinction increases. In less stable situations, the stability range is decreased owing to the regions with low records of life commencement rate and phenotypic diversity.

4.2. Presence of Optimal Phenotypic and Species Diversity

The model trials uncover the presence of optimal values of phenotype differing qualities which compare to the most extreme populations size/biomass. Any instance of differences deviation from the optimal value accelerates abatement in population size or development of resource using. It is interesting to note that the optimal values of diversities in the investigated model are near the base outskirt of population strength. The result will unquestionably underline the risk of intra-population diversities abatement, when we assume that common populations have phenotypic diversities near optimal values. Indeed a slight abatement in the level of phenotypic diversities recreated by the population at each passing moment of time can prompt the loss of its stability. There emerge optimal values of species diversities (number of populations in a community) which compare to the greatest sum quantity/biomass of all population.

4.3. Movement of Values of Optimal Diversity and Population Size under Changes of Environment

Optimal values of intra-population and species diversities and additionally population size rely on upon the level of environment stability and the force of resource flow in the following way.

At the population level:

- The optimal values of intra-population diversity reduction in additional stable situations and are autonomous of the force of resource flow.
- The most extreme values of population numbers/biomass build in additional stable and "rich" situations.
- The base values of resource using for individuals abatement in additional stable situations and are free of the intensity of resource flow.

At the community level:

- The optimal values of species diversities expand in additional stable and "rich" situations
- The most extreme values of aggregate amount of people (sum biomass) of all populations change in the same way.

These outcomes recommend that populations that are acclimates to less stable situations have higher intra-population diversity and likewise higher resource using at equivalent population size (or easier population size at equivalent resource using, contingent upon optimality rule).

These outcomes additionally show that optimal values of diversity at distinctive progressive levels change in the inverse way as the level of ecological dependability differs: optimal intra-population differing qualities builds in less stable situations, yet optimal species differing qualities decreases.

5. Discussion

5.1. Criteria of Biodiversity Optimality and Ecosystem Functioning

We utilized within quintessence the same optimality criteria at population and group levels: the greatest quantity/biomass at an altered measure of accessible resource or the base using of resource at a settled aggregate quantity/biomass. These criteria are diminished to stand out – least using of a singular or

biomass unit could be acknowledged a viable measure of resource usage by the biosystem. The model populations and communities create the optimal inward diversity at which their viability is greatest. Such an optimality rule for biosystems appears sensible enough, in light of the fact that it is specifically connected to biosystem suitability.

The optimality criteria utilized can give a harsh gauge of the viability of environment working. In reality, for stationary communities which utilize all the resource accessible, the continually backed sum biomass or adequacy of resource usage might be a record for supporting and controlling environment administrations. These aspects are regularly connected as lists of biological community working in investigations and field observations (Mittelbach et al. 2001) (Spehn et al. 2005). Subsequently, we may assume that if a community is in an optimal state, environment working is most extreme.

5.2. Conceivable Mechanisms of Optimization of Diversity

Conceivable mechanism of enhancement of differing qualities all around biological, micro evolutionary and evolutionary methodologies are recognized by us in a divide publication (Bukvareva and Aleshchenko 2010). The brief description of main mechanism is described here. Improvement of species diversity in a neighborhood is going on in the methodology of its "self-gathering" from the accessible provincial species pool. The absence of species in the provincial pool for any sort of great environments may prompt humpbacked capacity of species number on some ecological inclination or might be remunerated by the arrangement of the intra species natural structures. Throughout progression best values change. Climax community in the schema of our model could be acknowledged as a community that uses each accessible opportunity to attain the optimal values of assorted qualities.

Enhancement of intra-population diversity can be

happened essentially because of progressions in the differing qualities of posterity. This parameter hinges on upon the level of hereditary assorted qualities in the population and the normal width of the response standard. "Tuning" assorted qualities inside the response standard does not oblige hereditary progressions and is the most labile component of optimization of phenotypic diversity. The point when environment stabilizes essential lessening in intra-population diversity could be rapidly accomplished by transforming more homotypic offspring. In moderate destabilization of nature's turf phenotypic diversity builds because of epigenetic parts inside the response norm. At amazing deviations of natural conditions posterity phenotypes may go past the past standard of response.

Further advancement of the phenotypic differing qualities may likewise happen because of progressions in intra-population hereditary diversity, however it clearly requires more time. Other population parameters that shape phenotypic assorted qualities - the width of the environmental tolerance of propagating phenotypes, the capacity of the resource uses and the greatest rate of population development - are species characteristics and their progressions happen in the evolutionary time scale. With an absence of animal communities in a territorial pool, enhancement of differing qualities can happen through the improvement of intra-specific sympatric environmental structures. The establishment of discrete intra-specific biological structures at heart contrasts from the expansion in differing qualities of persistent phenotypic conveyance. When we think about the natural structure of a community, in the first case intra-specific structures possess distinctive corners, in the second case the single specialty expands. Intra-specific sympatric structures could be spoken to as a dynamic framework, always tuning parameters of diversity as per changes of environment –when environment stabilizes the amount of discrete environmental

structures increments, when environment destabilizes these number reductions.

Common biosystems exist in a nature. They must consistently "tune" their parameters, incorporating differing qualities, as per the progressions occurring. We can expect that common undisturbed communities and populations existing in generally average environment are closest to the optimal diversity qualities. Any significant and quick (surpassing the pace of biosystems acclimatization time) ecological changing and unsettling influence of the biosystems will make them go amiss from their optimal state, and their adequacy and practicality will be decreased.

5.3. Does the Optimal Biodiversity Principle Agree to Empirical Data?

The optimal biodiversity standard predicts that characteristic groups which are acclimates to "rich" and stable situations comprise of countless with low intra-population diversity(experts), while community which are adjusts to "poor" shaky situations comprise of a little number of animal categories with high intra-population differing qualities (generalists). In "rich" shaky and "poor" stable situations, we want the medium level of species and, thusly, high and low intra-population diversity. We underline that these conclusions are made for undisturbed characteristic frameworks which exist in a common nature. Such an example of differences compares to general normal plans regarding diversity conveyance crosswise over common districts and climatic zones, offering grounds to respect the standard of optimal biodiversity as a working theory.

The derivation about expansion in optimal intra-population diversity in insecure environment relates to the origination of R. Macarthur about extending of natural specialty in additional variable conditions which underlies the "scope corner width hypothesis" (MacArthur 1972).

It is challenging to contrast specifically our outcomes and experimental confirmation on the grounds that the mind-greater part of examinations holds securely attached information about steadiness and power of the resource flow. All things considered a few parallels may be found, for instance, negative relationship between species extravagance and territory variability in little shake pools in Jamaica (Kolasa et al. 1998)

Investigations controlling species numbers and addressing an inquiry how biological system working relies on upon diversity show generally mean positive effect (Symstad et al. 2003). At the outset it appears that this explanation repudiates the optimal biodiversity guideline, as per which this reliance may as well have a unimodal ("humpbacked") structure. Be that as it may, we accept that no inconsistencies may be found here. As it is said, prior optimal values of diversity probably relate to undisturbed common groups in a nature's turf. An overwhelming majority of controlling investigations use fewer number of species than is ordinary for nature groups and hence reflect just the left climbing arm of optimal reliance (as such test community are in suboptimal state in view of absence of species diversity).

The other gathering of trials and field perceptions is pointed at an opposite capacity: how diversity relies on upon profit or, rather, richness of a site. Field perceptions frequently show humpbacked and positive reliance of diversity on productivity (Loreau et al. 2008). Our outcomes anticipate an increment in optimal diversity values and aggregate group biomass in additional "rich" conditions, which repudiate the humpbacked structure. We propose a couple of conceivable clarifications. Every last one of them intimates a contrast between profit and fruitfulness: the first is a property of the neighborhood, the second a property of the site. So the inquiry is: the manner by which diversity and productivity depends on upon fertility (Gessner et al. 2004)?

- We may assume that the improvement of environment is regularly joined by its destabilization (anthropogenic or characteristic), and a group alters at the same time to these two variables. As per our effects, these conformities will have inverse bearings: optimal diversity builds in additional "rich" situations yet reductions in unsteady situations. The whole of these techniques may give a humpbacked reliance under certain conditions. Concurrent advancement and destabilization of nature's turf can lead to the diminishment of species diversity as well as to the movement of species structure from K- to r-strategists and from masters to generalists. We see something like this in ruderal and anthropogenic community.
- One more description may be the species pool hypothesis, which assumes that high-rich environments are less ordinary than low- and medium-fruitful ones inside the explored biomes/regions, thus there are insufficient species decently acclimates to such natural surroundings in territorial pools.
- M. Partel and coauthors (2007) have indicated that the unimodal relationship is normal for mild locales, where high-fruitful territories have generally been uncommon, and species pools which are acclimates for such conditions are moderately little, however a positive relationship is regular for tropics, where high-prolific environments have been moderately regular and particularly species pools are truly rich. W. Cornwell and P. Crubb (2003) have exhibited that the crest in species lavishness for the fields of Central Europe (the most mainstream group sort in diversity profit examines) happens on supplement poor soils, while the top for backwoods is on nutrient rich soils. Therefore, species pool theory assumes that districts with generally ordinary high-ripe natural surroundings exhibit a

positive diversity fruitfulness relationship which relates to our effects.

Most tries different things with preparation show a diminishment of animal varieties diversity, which is like neighborhood changes at eutrophication. These cases may be deciphered as compelling variants of atypical conditions and ecological destabilization; subsequently a diminishing in species diversity is foreseeable in the setting of the guideline of optimal biodiversity.

6. "Diversity - Ecosystem Functioning - Environment" Relationship

Numerous authors have pointed at bidirectional interrelations between diversity and the fundamental aspects of biological system working (steadiness, size, and profit). Also, this is affected by natural conditions – the power of accessible resource flow and the level of ecological strength. So we have truly an inoperable plan where all things are interconnected with one another.

The optimal biodiversity rule changes this plan to a two-level self-optimizing progressive framework (populaces group) which conforms its parameters to the given natural conditions. Diversity at both progressive levels is the advanced parameter, in which optimal qualities give most extreme resource viability and biosystem feasibility. Environment parameters (precariousness and lavishness) administer optimal assorted qualities values and great values of biological system working records. Such a thought may help defeat a few obstructions in the commonsense requisition of "biodiversity-biological community working" theory in nature preservation; for instance to movement the plan of biodiversity protection points from most extreme differences and greatest environment working (Srivastava and Vellend 2000) to optimal ones.

7. Biodiversity and the Purpose of Management of Ecosystem Services

Biological community capacities may be gathered into three primary classes: the creation and support of ecological parameters suitable for human life nature's turf shaping capacities; the biomass taken by people from nature (ocean foods, timber, grains, fuel, crude materials for pharmaceutics and industry, and so on.) – Profitable functions (so-called biological system merchandise); data present in characteristic frameworks and their social, scientific, and instructive significance – data capacities.

This division of biological system capacities varies from that received for biological system administrations in the worldwide archives (e.g. Millennium Ecosystem Assessment 2005), however we propose to utilize it, since it is more advantageous for comprehension the organic and other characteristic techniques.

The fundamental qualities of the biosystems – their biomass and levels of the inward diversity – utilized within our model, can go about as the pointers of viability. The adequacy of environment administrations is in extricable associated with markers of natural diversity, in this manner it is important to think about the status and conceivable changes in biodiversity for improvement of the systems and methods of the biological system administration evaluation and utilizing. Henceforth, while confirming the destinations for administration of the environments capacities as a solitary complex, it is important to consider the progressions in biodiversity and biomass, which will occur if utilizing any given capacities (Table 1).

Functions of biodiversity	Purposes of management	Changes of biodiversity	Changes of continuously supported biomass
Productive	The maximum of biomass being steadily retrieved	Decrease in diversity	Decrease in continuously supported biomass
Environment -- forming	Effective and sustainable ecosystem functioning	Preservation of natural level of biodiversity	Preservation of natural level of biomass
Information	Getting information from natural system	Preservation of natural level of biodiversity	Preservation of natural level of biomass

Table 1. Management targets for the utilization of distinctive biological community capacities and biodiversity changes in this admiration

The utilization of diverse biodiversity capacities requires distinctive methodologies. It is indicated in the report "Millennium Ecosystem Assessment" of 2005, that weighty change in one capacity regularly accelerates decrease in an alternate. Hypothetically, this is the thing that you may need, since it is difficult to advance the framework immediately by numerous criteria, particularly when they repudiate one another. Also such inconsistencies do emerge in the administration of biodiversity.

The point when utilizing environment-forming and data capacities the administration destinations agree with the upkeep of regular levels of biodiversity and biomass, and when utilizing a profitable capacities administration targets repudiate this. Nature's turf framing capacities are most adequately and economically actualized by undisturbed peak characteristic biosystems, and any of their interruptions accelerate a debilitating of the regular environment regulation. Along these lines, the administration goal for utilizing of the earth framing capacities is to minimize the aggravations of

common frameworks. Also utilizing of generation capacity, unexpectedly, obliges recovering of biomass from the biological systems, which might be optimal on right on time and center phases of progression, portrayed by the most elevated gainfulness.

We can't yet figure out the precise quantitative relationships between qualities of diverse biological system administrations. Systems for investment assessment are sufficiently produced for gainful administrations just (timber, seafood, hides, and so on.). For different capacities, there are just unpleasant gauges.

For many years beneficial capacities of characteristic environments were the principle for mankind, however these days, the necessities are changing nature structuring functions (maintenance of the air parameters and stable atmosphere, smoothing of the amazing regular occasions, creation and assurance of soils from disintegration, water cleansing and stabilization of hydrological administration, and so on.) are more key for human. This comprehension ought to be the support for another natural strategy (Pavlov et al. 2010).

8. Conclusions

- The proposed rule of optimal biodiversity assumes that the optimal values of internal diversity of the biosystems (intra-population diversity and species diversity) relate to their most extreme suitability.
- The effects of numerical demonstrating have indicated the presence of optimal qualities which acquire greatest adequacy of resource usage at the population and community levels. Greatest adequacy of resource usage is conceivable to think about as a file of viability of the environment working.
- The optimal values of diversity at the population and community levels rely on upon natural insecurity in an inverse way: optimal species differing qualities builds in

additional stable situations, yet optimal intra-population diversity decreases. These outcomes talk about the distinctive part of intra-population and species diversity: intra-population diversity is the premise for acclimatization to natural unsteadiness, while species diversity empowers a community to utilize the resource to the most extreme and successfully. Along these lines, the rule of optimal biodiversity joins population and group levels in the notion of interconnection between biodiversity, environment working and natural conditions.

- The expectations of optimal biodiversity rule consent to general biodiversity examples and exact information of examinations and field perceptions. Appearing disagreement between unimodal (humpbacked) reliance of diversity on profit and our forecasts of its certain structure may be demonstrated by species pool speculation or by concurrent improvement and destabilization of nature's domain which movement optimal diversity values in the inverse headings. Accordingly, the optimal biodiversity rule may be proposed as a working speculation correlative to different plans regarding interrelation between biodiversity and natural working.
- The enhancement notion of the "diversity - environment working -nature" relationship may be utilized as a reciprocal approach as a part of new strategy of nature administration.

Acknowledgments:

The Authors wish to thank Prof. Dr. Chang-Su Shim of School of Civil and Environmental Engineering, Chung-Ang University (CAU, Republic of Korea), Dr. Md. Aktar Hossain of Institute of Forestry and Environmental Sciences, University of Chittagong (CU, Bangladesh) and Dr. G. M. Sadiqul Islam of Department of Civil Engineering,

Chittagong University of Engineering & Technology (CUET, Bangladesh) for their continuous support and inspiration throughout the work.

BIBLIOGRAPHY:

_____. 2005. Millennium Ecosystem Assessment. *Ecosystems and Human Wellbeing: Synthesis*. Washington, DC: Island Press.

Aleshchenko, G. M. and E. N. Bukvareva. 1991. "Model' fenotipich eskogoraznoobraziya populyacii v sluchainoisrede (Model of phenotypic diversity of population in stochastic environment)." Nauka, *Zhurnalobshcheibiologii* (Biology Bulletin Reviews) 52(4): 499-508 (in Russian, with English abstract).

Aleshchenko, G. M. and E.N. Bukvareva. 2010. "Two-Level Hierarchical Model of Optimal Biological Diversity." *Pleiades Publishing*, Biology Bulletin 37(1): 1–9.

Bukvareva, E. N. and G. M. Aleshchenko. 2005. "Printsip optimal 'nogoraznoobraziya biosistem (The principle of optimal diversity of biosystems)." Nauka, *Uspekhisovremennoibiologii* (Biology Bulletin Reviews) 125(4): 337-348 (in Russian, with English abstract).

Bukvareva, E. N. and G. M. Aleshchenko. 2010. "Optimizing of diversity of super organism systems as one of the mechanisms of their development in ecological, evolutionary, and micro evolutionary scopes." Nauka, *Uspekhisovremennoibiologii* (Biology Bulletin Reviews) 130(2): 115-129 (in Russian, with English abstract).

Cornwell, W. K. and P. J. Grubb. 2003. "Regional and local patterns in plant species richness with respect to resource availability." Wiley, *Oikos* 100: 417–428.

Gessner, M. O., P. Inchausti, L. Persson, D. G. Raffaelli, P. S. Giller. 2004. "Biodiversity effects on ecosystem

functioning: insights from aquatic systems." Wiley, *Oikos* 104: 419-422.

Kolasa, J., C. L. Hewitt, and J. A. Drake. 1998. "Rapoport's rule: an explanation or a byproduct of the latitudinal gradient in species richness?", Springer, Biodiversity and Conservation, vol. 7, pp. 1447-1455,1998.

Levich, A. P. 2000. "Variation modeling theorems and algo-coenoses functioning principles." *Ecological Modeling*. Elsevier 131: 207-227.

Loreau, M., S. Naeem, P. Inchausti, J. Bengtsson, J. P. Grime, A. Hector, D. U. Hooper, M. A. Huston, D. Raffaelli. 2001. "Biodiversity and ecosystem functioning: current knowledge and future challenges." *AAAS, Science* 294: 804-808.

Lyapunov, A. A. 1980. *Problemi teoretiches ko yiprikladnoy kibernetiki (Problems of Theoretical and Applied Cybernetics)*, Nauka, USSR (in Russian).

MacArthur, R. 1972. *Geographical ecology*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Mittelbach, G. G. et al. "What is the observed relationship between species richness and productivity?" *Ecological Society of America, Ecology* 82(9): 2381–2396.

Partel, M., L. Laanisto, and M. Zobel. 2007. "Contrasting plant productivity-diversity relationships across latitude: the role of evolutionary history." Ecological Society of America, *Ecology*. 88(5): 1091–1097.

Pavlov, D. S. B.R. Striganova, E.N. Bukvareva. 2010. "An Environment-Oriented Concept of Nature Use." *Pleiades Publishing*, Herald of the Russian Academy of Sciences 80(1): 74–82.

Spehn, E. M. et al. 2005. "Ecosystem effects of biodiversity manipulations in European grasslands." *Ecological Society of America*, Ecological Monographs 75(1): 37–63.

Srivastava, D. S. and M. Vellend. 2000. "Biodiversity-ecosystem function research: is it relevant to conservation?"

Annual Reviews, Annual Review of Ecology, Evolution, and Systematics 36: 267–294.

Symstad, A. J., F. S. Chapin III, D. H. Wall, K. L. Gross, L. F. Huenneke, G. G. Mittelbach, D. P. C. Peters, and D. Tilman. 2003. "Long-term and large-scale perspectives on the relationship between biodiversity and ecosystem functioning." *BioScience* 53: 89-98. American Institute of Biological Sciences

Tilman, D. 2000. "Causes, consequences and ethics of biodiversity." *Nature* 405: 208-211.