

# Comparative analysis of woody vegetation population parameters in disturbed and undisturbed sites of a secondary montane forest

## ABSTRACT

Secondary montane forests ~~is~~are created by disturbances either natural or artificial, causing open canopies. ~~It is~~They are characterized by discontinuous canopy layers with short trees but dense understory. ~~It is an~~They are important resources in relation to economic and ecological values, however, they face over-exploitation. The objective of this study was to compare regeneration, forest structure and species diversity between disturbed and undisturbed sites of ~~the~~ South-West (SW) Mau forest ~~in~~, Kenya. ~~Nested-A nested~~ research sampling design was used, whereby, plots of 500 by 500 m were laid down. In disturbed sites, 500 by 500 m plots were laid at 100 m from the forest edge and towards the interior for undisturbed sites in Itare, Maramara and Ndoinet blocks of the forest. In disturbed sites, a total of 41 canopy openings were randomly selected to constitute sample units. In undisturbed sites, 19 sample plots of 30 by 20 m were randomly nested. Regeneration was determined by tossing two quadrats; 1 by 1 (8 times) and 5 by 5 (4 times) m for seedlings and saplings; respectively and ~~the~~ population ~~was~~ taken per sample unit. The diameter (dbh) was measured using ~~a~~ diameter calliper (for small trees with dbh <65 cm) and diameter tape for trees with dbh > 65cm while height was measured using ~~a~~ Suunto clinometer. Species diversity was determined using Shannon Weiner Diversity Index and Simpson's Diversity Index. Wilcoxon rank sum test with continuity correction was used to compare the three woody vegetation population parameters in disturbed and undisturbed sites of the forest. Results showed a significant difference in forest structure between disturbed and undisturbed sites of the forest ( $P = 0.01$ ,  $P$  value adjustment method: BH). It was concluded that *Piper capensis*, *Ribes spp.* and ferns which invaded disturbed sites influenced woody vegetation population parameters ~~through~~by influencing microsite conditions. Enrichment planting was then recommended in disturbed sites to conserve biodiversity within the forest.

**Keywords:** Canopy; Disturbances; Forest structure; *Piper capensis*; Regeneration; Species diversity; Understory

## 1.0 INTRODUCTION

Tropical montane forests are important resources due to eco goods and services that accrue from them [1, 2]. Examples of the importance include; hydrological, biodiversity conservation, endemism protection and carbon sequestration [3]. They are heterogeneous in forest structure and floristic composition of plant communities [2]. However, these forest types experience disturbances especially from ~~the~~ anthropogenic origin [1, 2] creating another type of forest called secondary montane forests. Secondary montane forests ~~is~~are rapidly spreading around the globe [4] which is important as it helps to alleviate ~~the~~ impacts of deforestation and contributes to forest conservation [5]. ~~It is an~~They are important resources in relation to ~~the~~ economic and ecological values that ~~it~~they provide [6].

Despite ~~its~~ importance, ~~the~~ secondary montane forest ~~is~~ ~~are~~ facing threats, hence, ~~is~~ ~~are~~ characterized by discontinuous canopy layers with short trees (<15 m in height) but with a dense understory. Other characteristics include; numerous lianas and bent trunks [7], ~~and~~ increased species diversity triggered by ~~the~~ coexistence of ~~shade shade~~-tolerant and shade ~~intolerant-intolerant~~ species [4, 5, 8]. Such discontinued canopy favours invasion by alien species and herbs which may affect regeneration and succession by indigenous species [6]. Secondary montane forests regenerate mostly through natural processes (secondary succession) following disturbances— of original forests [3]. However, successional development results ~~into~~ ~~the~~ recovery of plant species that are affected by disturbances (artificial and human sources), consequently, ~~influence~~ ~~influencing on~~ biodiversity [6]. Studies have been done to determine woody vegetation population parameters (regeneration, forest structure and species diversity) in disturbed sites of a secondary montane forest [9], however, a comparison with undisturbed sites has not been done specifically in SW Mau forest.

Nevertheless, secondary montane forests ~~is~~ ~~are~~ driven by disturbances ~~are~~; natural or artificial. Natural disturbances are, however, ~~a~~ characteristics of all natural forest ecosystems. They can be defined as discrete events that ~~alters~~ forest structure and composition [8] and which are not ~~from the~~ anthropogenic origin [10]. Examples entail; tree falls, landslides [4], ~~wildfires~~, senescence, pests, snagging, diseases, ~~and~~ droughts all resulting ~~into~~ tree mortality [11]. Artificial disturbances on the other hand are due to human activities which do not retain forest structural complexity, connectivity and landscape heterogeneity [10]. Artificial disturbances have resulted ~~into~~ ~~the~~ loss of species diversity in natural forest ecosystems. This has often been linked to human population growth, agriculture [4], industries and construction, consequently, over-exploitation of the forests [1, 12]. Even though human disturbances, such as, deforestation is the major ~~ones~~, there are other sporadic disturbances, such as, pollution [7, 2]. Disturbances have resulted ~~into~~ ~~the~~ dwindling of forest resources, thus, open canopies. ~~From in~~ the past decades, there has been increasing demand ~~of for~~ forest resources in Kenya resulting ~~into~~ increased pressure on ~~the~~ Mau forest in Kenya. Closed canopies have been converted into open canopies, hence, termed as disturbed in some parts of the forest [12].

Disturbances are the determinants of forest dynamics and biodiversity both at ~~the~~ local and regional scale, therefore, crucial in creating natural communities in forest ecosystems [10]. Moderate disturbances are known to increase species diversity. This hypothesis is, however, debated by other researchers who still doubt it [10]. Secondary montane forest species tend to resemble the initial species diversity before disturbances after 45 years of natural recovery, hence, stability in forests. Secondary montane forest ~~is~~ ~~are~~, therefore, highly resilient and recover fast after disturbances such as commercial logging. Such forest ~~is~~ ~~are~~, however, known to take a longer duration for trees to have a large ~~diameter~~ (dbh) as well as for saplings of shade-tolerant species to fully develop into large trees [8].

A previous study was done on a secondary montane forest and how canopy openings in disturbed sites influence regeneration, forest structure and species diversity in SW [9]. Nevertheless, there has not been a comparison with undisturbed sites. Other studies have also affirmed that understanding processes such as regeneration can be vital since disturbed forests are quickly spreading [4]. Therefore, comparison can help in deriving a conclusion on which site; disturbed or undisturbed conserve biodiversity as well as increases species diversity and improve forest structural development. This can go hand in hand with microsite conditions gradient ~~in relation to~~ ~~concerning~~ canopy cover/openness as demonstrated by Ocholla *et al.* [13]. The study, therefore, focused to bridge the lacuna by comparing regeneration, forest structure and species diversity between disturbed and

**Comment [PP1]:** Not sure if this can be under natural. Maybe it needs some explanation

**Comment [PP2]:** It can make sense if there can be examples as well just to balance up and cement the difference

**Comment [PP3]:** This can not be a location and maybe its not complete

**Comment [PP4]:** Maintain one form of referencing

undisturbed parts of SW Mau forest which is a secondary montane forest. Understanding the relationship between the two sites can help in biodiversity protection and conservation.

## 2.0 MATERIALS AND METHODS

### 2.1 Site Description

The study was conducted in the South-West (SW) Mau forest reserve (0°15'S- 0°47'S, 35°28'E - 35°69'E), one of the blocks of Mau forest in Kenya [14]. It is the largest remnant indigenous forest block of Mau and the home of the Ogiek community. It occupies an area of 60,000 ha and has an elevation of 2100-3300 m asl [15]. SW Mau forest has three blocks; Ndoinet, Maramara and Itare. Since 1997, the forest has been experiencing adverse human disturbances, such as, deforestation [12], consequently, resulted into its reduction from 84,000 ha to 60,000 ha in the area [15, 16, 17].

**Comment [PP5]:** Write in full and the abbreviation. This should be the case throughout the document

**Comment [PP6]:** Include additional one or two disturbances not just one

### 2.2 Research and Sampling Design

A nested research sampling design was used, whereby, a plot of 500 by 500 m was demarcated in disturbed parts of Ndoinet, Itare and Maramara blocks at 100 m from the forest edge. Likewise, another plot of 500 by 500 m was laid towards the interior (undisturbed). In undisturbed sites, sub-sample plots of 30 by 20 m were randomly nested 19 times in the main plots; Itare 5, Maramara 6 and Ndoinet 8. In disturbed sites, a total of 41 canopy gaps (Itare 13, Maramara 11 and Ndoinet 17) were randomly selected to constitute the sample units.

Regeneration was determined by tossing two quadrats; 1 by 1 (8 times) and 5 by 5 (4 times) m for seedlings and saplings, respectively, and population size was taken per sample units. Trees with dbh >3 cm were considered for forest structure. The diameter (dbh) was measured using a diameter calliper (for small trees with dbh <65 cm) and diameter tape (for large trees, dbh >65 cm) while height was taken using a Suunto clinometer. To determine the complexity of the forest structure, Holdridge's Complexity Index [18] was used;

**Comment [PP7]:** How did you arrive at these numbers. Is it part of the Nested research sampling design. If yes, say so and if not explain.

$$HC = (A \times d \times n \times h) / 1500 \text{ m}^2 \dots\dots\dots (i)$$

Where;

HC = Holdridge's Complexity Index, A = basal area (m<sup>2</sup>), d = tree density/1500 m<sup>2</sup>, n= number of species/1500 m<sup>2</sup>, h = mean tree height in meters.

To determine species diversity, species from the two sites (disturbed and undisturbed) were identified and names inventoried. Two indices were used;

- a) Simpson's Diversity Index (1-D) for species dominance [19];

$$D = \sum \left( \frac{n_i}{n} \right)^2 \dots\dots\dots (ii)$$

- b) Shannon-Weiner's Diversity Index (H') for species diversity [20]

$$H' = \sum_{i=1}^s (P_i) \ln(P_i) \dots\dots\dots (iii)$$

Where,

H' = Shannon-Wiener's Diversity Index, S= number of genera, Pi= ni/n; ni= total number of individuals of species i, n= total number of all the individuals, ln= natural log<sub>10</sub> of Pi, D=Simpson's Diversity Index.

### 2.3 Data analysis

Data from this study was analyzed using RStudio and Microsoft Office Excel. Results were displayed using descriptive statistics and inferential statistics to test hypotheses. Wilcoxon rank sum test with continuity correction was used to compare woody vegetation population parameters in disturbed and undisturbed sites of SW Mau forest.

$$W_c = \sum_{i=1}^N \delta_i R_{i+} \dots\dots\dots (iv)$$

Where;

$W_{c=}$  Wilcoxon Rank Sum,  $N=m+n$  clusters in group 1 and 2,  $R_{i+}$ = total sum of rank in group i;  $\sum_{j=1}^z R_{ij}$ ,  $\delta_{i=1}$  [21].

### 3.0 RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

#### 3.1 Comparing regeneration between disturbed and undisturbed sites of SW Mau forest

Two growth levels were used to determine regeneration in the two study sites; seedlings and saplings. Disturbed sites recorded the highest frequency of regeneration (2035). Undisturbed sites on the other hand recorded (1163). Among the regenerating species, *Psydrax schimperiana* was the common species both in disturbed (428) and undisturbed (233) sites, *Tabernaemontana stapfiana* and *Macaranga kilimandscharica* then followed (Table 1).

Table 1: Frequency percentage of species regeneration in disturbed and undisturbed sites of SW Mau forest.

Species	Disturbed sites	Undisturbed sites
<i>Acacia lahai</i>	2(0.10)	-----
<i>Acacia mearnsii</i>	24(1.18)	24(2.06)
<i>Albizia gummifera</i>	89(4.37)	36(3.10)
<i>Allophylus abyssinicus</i>	46(2.26)	151(12.98)
<i>Dombeya torrida</i>	-----	1(0.09)
<i>Dovyalis abyssinica</i>	3(0.15)	1(0.09)
<i>Dracaena steudneri</i>	13(0.64)	1(0.09)
<i>Ehretia cymosa</i>	13(0.64)	21(1.81)
<i>Ekebergia capensis</i>	1(0.05)	-----
<i>Macaranga kilimandscharica</i>	322(15.82)	171(14.70)
<i>Maytenus ovatus</i>	-----	2(0.17)
<i>Maytenus rotudos</i>	29(1.43)	-----
<i>Maytenus undata</i>	-----	5(0.43)
<i>Millettia dura</i>	20(0.98)	3(0.26)
<i>Morella salicifora</i>	15(0.73)	9(0.77)
<i>Neoboutonia macrocalyx</i>	128(6.29)	17(1.46)
<i>Others</i>	11(0.54)	20(1.72)
<i>Pittosporum viridiflorum</i>	4(0.20)	-----
<i>Podocarpus latifolius</i>	65(3.19)	12(1.03)
<i>Polycias fulva</i>	-----	4(0.34)
<i>Polycias capensis</i>	2(0.10)	-----
<i>Prunus africana</i>	18(0.88)	-----
<i>Psydrax schimperiana</i>	428(21.03)	233(20.03)
<i>Rapanea melanophloes</i>	34(1.67)	45(3.90)
<i>Schefflera abyssinica</i>	3(0.15)	-----
<i>Schefflera volkensii</i>	3(0.15)	-----
<i>Syzygium guineensis</i>	261(12.83)	64(5.50)
<i>Tabernaemontana stapfiana</i>	339(16.66)	165(14.19)
<i>Teclea nobilis</i>	1(0.05)	7(0.60)
<i>Trichilia emitica</i>	99(4.86)	149(12.81)
<i>Trichocladus elipticus</i>	4(0.20)	-----
<i>Vunqueria madagascariensis</i>	-----	5(0.43)
<i>Xymalos monospora</i>	13(0.64)	10(0.86)
<i>Zanthoxylum gilletii</i>	45(2.21)	7(0.60)
<b>Disturbed 29</b>	<b>2035(100.00)</b>	<b>1163(100.00)</b>

## Undisturbed 25

Values indicated in brackets represent the count %

However, there was no significant difference in regeneration between disturbed and undisturbed sites of SW Mau. Pairwise comparisons using the Wilcoxon rank sum test with continuity correction reported that  $P=0.58$  *P value adjustment method: BH*. ~~Null~~ ~~The null~~ hypothesis was, therefore, rejected.

**Comment [PP8]:** Any explanation as to why?

Disturbed sites recorded a higher number of seedlings and saplings compared with undisturbed sites. The study corroborated with other findings [6, 22] that disturbed sites avail resources, consequently favouring species regeneration. Disturbed sites are characterized by open canopies, hence, crucial for regeneration and this implies that open canopies promotes population growth [23, 24]. The study was again similar to other studies that open canopies found in disturbed sites are dominated by shade intolerant species [3] which in this case were *Piper capensis*, *Ribes spp.* and ferns which influenced colonization by climax species.

**Comment [PP9]:** What could be the reason or contributing factor?

~~Increased~~ ~~The increased~~ rate of regeneration in disturbed sites ~~were~~ attributed to the availability of microsite conditions, such as, light [13] which could be used by the seedlings for photosynthesis, thus, ~~increased-increasing~~ seed germination, growth and establishment [25]. Similar results were demonstrated by Ronoh *et al.* [26] that grazing in SW Mau resulted ~~into~~ increased regeneration due to nutrients availed in form of manure [7]. However, this study was contrary to that reported by Tinya *et al.* [27] that disturbed sites are represented by scanty regeneration due to harsh environmental conditions, such as, extreme temperatures.

However, there was no significant difference in regeneration between disturbed and undisturbed sites of SW Mau ~~Forest~~. This could be because, sprouting seedlings in disturbed sites could have been affected by incessant disturbances such as animal trampling as reported by Ronoh *et al.* [26] and Zhang and Yi [22]. In addition, disturbed sites were invaded by *Piper capensis*, a light demanding species [19] utilizing resources which could have been used by woody species to regenerate. Disturbed sites usually report low regeneration due to unfavourable environmental conditions such as low moisture availability and increased temperatures [Tinya *et al.* [27]. Also, undisturbed sites are known to have low microsite conditions such as light due to shading, hence, reduced regeneration [23].

**Comment [PP10]:** Be consistent in the reference format throughout the document. It should either be a number or all the names of the reference

**Comment [PP11]:** Refer to PP10

### 3.2 Comparing forest structure between disturbed and undisturbed sites of SW Mau ~~F~~forest

Height and dbh were used as a measure of forest structure. ~~Seedling~~ ~~The seedling~~ was the highest growth level in disturbed sites (1511) compared with undisturbed sites (849) ~~as presented in~~ (Table 2). However, ~~the~~ emergent layer was recorded least ~~in relation~~ ~~to~~ ~~concerning~~ frequency in the two sites.

**Comment [PP12]:** What are these numbers representing, be specific.

**Comment [PP13]:** Any explanation why?

Table 2: Growth levels of woody vegetation in SW Mau Forest

Level	Diameter (%)	Height (%)
Seedlings	63.49(58.03)	63.49(58.03)
Sapling	20.80(21.60)	20.80(21.60)
U. canopy	2.73(2.94)	2.73(2.94)
M. canopy	10.92(13.47)	10.92(13.47)
E. layer	2.06(3.96)	2.06(3.96)
Total	100-00	100-00

100-00

100-00

*Bolded values represent undisturbed while unbolded represent disturbed sites. U. represent Under, M. represent Main While E. represent Emergent.*

Undisturbed sites, however, recorded higher mean in tree diameter (24.9 cm) and height (26.3 m) compared with disturbed sites (24.1 cm and 23.9 m) [as can be observed in Figure 1](#).




Figure 1: Physiognomic appearance of the forest (dbh and height) (%) in SW Mau Forest. Dbh was measured in [centimetres \(cm\)](#) while height was ~~measured~~ in [metres \(m\)](#).

Pairwise comparisons using [the](#) Wilcoxon rank sum test with continuity correction was used to test for [the](#) significant difference in the forest structure between disturbed and undisturbed sites of SW:  $P = 0.01$ , *P* value adjustment method: BH. Forest structure between disturbed and undisturbed sites of SW Mau Forest was not the same, [the](#) null hypothesis was, thus, rejected.

Disturbed sites recorded a [more](#) complex structure than undisturbed sites. Seedlings' and saplings' growth levels were higher in disturbed sites than in undisturbed sites, hence, congruent with other studies [28]. However, undisturbed sites exhibited increased mean in tree height and dbh. Similar results were reported by [Huang et al.](#) [29] and demonstrated that this could be due to [a gradient](#) in resources between the two sites, thus, variation in tree growth and development [13]. Structurally, disturbed sites were again dominated by *Piper capensis* which formed a generally uniform canopy layer, hence, congruent with previous studies [3]. Variations in tree growth results in vegetation layering due to differences in tree heights and species diversity [30].

~~Main~~ [The main](#) canopy and emergent layers were also high in undisturbed sites, consequently, closed canopy yet ~~less~~ [few](#) seedlings [28]. This could be related to competition for light among other resources, therefore, trees [invest](#) more in height rather than crown development [31]. Disturbed sites on the other hand recorded low stem and height mean. This could be related to less light competition due to open canopies, hence, more [investment](#) in lateral branches [6] [31]. Canopy openings in disturbed sites influences microsite conditions which affect forest structure [32]. [The openings](#) allow for light penetration which facilitates [the](#) growth rate of seedlings and saplings. [The study](#) was, however, contrary to the demonstration of [Tinya et al.](#) [28] who reported increased dbh and height in disturbed sites.

The study reported a significant difference in forest structure in disturbed and undisturbed sites of SW [Mau Forest](#). This could be related to [the](#) invasion of the forest by *Piper capensis*:

Comment [PP14]: I find this explanation to be confusing. Consider reviewing this

Comment [PP15]: Reffer to PP10

Comment [PP16]: What was the gradient difference if this was determined?

Comment [PP17]: Find a better word to use that is scientific

Formatted: Highlight

Formatted: Highlight

Comment [PP18]: Repeated statement or fact in this section.

Comment [PP19]: Reffer to PP10

an invasive species suppressing seedlings of woody species in disturbed sites, therefore, similar to other findings [29]. However, the results were against the demonstrations by Tinya *et al.* [28] who reported an insignificant difference in forest structure between clear-cut and closed canopies.

**Comment [PP20]:** Use a better word to describe this situation in a scientific way.

### 3.3 Species diversity in disturbed and undisturbed sites of SW Mau Forest

A total of 29 families, 31 genera and 34 species were recorded in disturbed sites while 24 families, 26 genera and 27 species were reported in undisturbed sites. However, 11 species were reported in disturbed sites but absent in undisturbed sites (Table 3). Also, 4 species were present in undisturbed sites but not in disturbed sites. The species included; *Vangueria madagascariensis*, *Maytenus undata*, *Cassipourea malosana* and *Olea capensis*.

Table 3: Species diversity in SW Mau Forest.

Family	Genus	Species	Disturbed	Undisturbed
Alariaceae	<i>Polyscias</i>	<i>P. capensis</i>	+	-
Alariaceae	<i>Polyscias</i>	<i>P. fulva</i>	+	+
Apocynaceae	<i>Tabernaemontana</i>	<i>T. stapfiana</i>	+	+
Araliaceae	<i>Schefflera</i>	<i>S. volkensii</i>	+	-
Asparagaceae	<i>Dracaena</i>	<i>D. steudneri</i>	+	+
Boraginaceae	<i>Ehretia</i>	<i>E. cymosa</i>	+	+
Celastraceae	<i>Maytenus</i>	<i>M. rotundos</i>	+	-
Celastraceae	<i>Maytenus</i>	<i>M. ovatus</i>	+	+
Celastraceae	<i>Maytenus</i>	<i>M. undata</i>	-	+
Ebenaceae	<i>Diospyros</i>	<i>D. abyssinica</i>	+	-
Euphorbiaceae	<i>Macaranga</i>	<i>M. kilimandscharica</i>	+	+
Euphorbiaceae	<i>Neoboutonia</i>	<i>N. macrocalyx</i>	+	+
Fabaceae	<i>Millettia</i>	<i>M. dura</i>	+	+
Fabaceae	<i>Acacia</i>	<i>A. lahai</i>	+	-
Fabaceae	<i>Acacia</i>	<i>A. mearnsii</i>	+	+
Flacourtiaceae	<i>Dovyalis</i>	<i>D. abyssinica</i>	+	+
Flacourtiaceae	<i>Dovyalis</i>	<i>D. macrocalyx</i>	+	-
Hamamelidaceae	<i>Trichocladus</i>	<i>T. ellipticus</i>	+	-
Meliaceae	<i>Trichilia</i>	<i>T. emitica</i>	+	+
Meliaceae	<i>Ekebergia</i>	<i>E. capensis</i>	+	-
Mimosaceae	<i>Albizia</i>	<i>A. gummifera</i>	+	+
Monimiaceae	<i>Xymalos</i>	<i>X. monospora</i>	+	+
Myricaceae	<i>Morella</i>	<i>M. salicifora</i>	+	+
Myrtaceae	<i>Syzygium</i>	<i>S. guineensis</i>	+	+
Oleaceae	<i>Olea</i>	<i>O. capensis</i>	-	+
Others	<i>Others</i>	<i>Others</i>	+	+
Pittosporaceae	<i>Pittosporum</i>	<i>P. viridiflorum</i>	+	-
Podocarpaceae	<i>Podocarpus</i>	<i>P. latifolius</i>	+	+
Primulaceae	<i>Rapanea</i>	<i>R. melanophloes</i>	+	+
Rhamnaceae	<i>Rhamnus</i>	<i>R. prinoides</i>	+	-
Rhizophoraceae	<i>Cassipourea</i>	<i>C. malosana</i>	-	+
Rosaceae	<i>Prunus</i>	<i>P. africana</i>	+	-
Rubiaceae	<i>Psydrax</i>	<i>P. schimperianus</i>	+	+
Rubiaceae	<i>Vangueria</i>	<i>V. madagascariensis</i>	-	+

Rutaceae	<i>Zanthoxylum</i>	<i>Z. gillettii</i>	+	+
Rutaceae	<i>Teclea</i>	<i>T. nobilis</i>	+	+
Sapindaceae	<i>Allophylus</i>	<i>A. abyssinicus</i>	+	+
Sterculiaceae	<i>Dombeya</i>	<i>D. torrida</i>	+	+
29	31	34		
24	26	27		

**Key:** + represent present while - represent absent. Others represent tree species whose identity are not known

Disturbed sites recorded a high species diversity using Shannon Weiner Diversity Index ( $H'=2.71$ ) followed by undisturbed sites ( $H'=2.55$ ) as observed in (Figure 2). However, Shannon Equitability Index was equal in the two sites ( $HE=0.77$ ). Simpson's species dominance was also high in disturbed sites ( $D=0.90$ ) followed by undisturbed sites ( $D=0.87$ ).




Figure 2: Species diversity, evenness and dominance in SW Mau Forest

Pairwise comparisons using the Wilcoxon rank sum test with continuity correction gave a  $P$  value of 0.62 using the  $P$  value adjustment method: BH. This was above 0.05, hence, the null hypothesis failed to be rejected. It was concluded that there was no significant difference in species between disturbed and undisturbed sites of the SW Mau forest.

Higher species diversity was reported in disturbed sites. This was similar to the findings of Kovács *et al.* [33] who reported that disturbed sites are in most cases characterized by canopy gaps which avail resources such as sunlight to tree species, consequently, promote promoting species diversity. Light in the gaps is known to sieve species influencing species colonization. Species diversity in disturbed sites could also be high due to the easiness in of seed dispersal without obstruction. Additionally, species whose mother plants were not spotted could also be found in disturbed sites [34]. This was also related to light seed dispersion, such as by the wind, thereby, high species diversity, therefore, congruent with the findings by Tinya *et al.* [28]. Undisturbed sites on the other hand reported low species diversity which could be related to low regeneration. This could be linked to shading by the closed canopy which could have affected light penetration [29]. Furthermore, closed canopy results into debris accumulation on the forest floor hindering seed settlement and reducing seed germination [35].

There was a non-significant difference in species diversity between disturbed and undisturbed sites of the SW Mau forest. This was attributed to *Piper capensis* which utilizes canopy gap opportunity to grow fast adversely affecting species colonization, hence, similar to other studies [3, 36, 29]. These results were also similar to the findings from SW Mau

Comment [PP21]: Refer tgo PP10

Comment [PP22]: Has this fact been proved scientifically elsewhere and if yes, include the reference. If not, consider not including it here as it maybe misleading.

Formatted: Highlight

Comment [PP23]: Refer to PP10

Forest, whereby, herbaceous plants resulted in a low number of regeneration due to a closed canopy [5, 13]. This, therefore, made no difference since both disturbed and undisturbed sites had closed canopies [29]. The invasive species created a uniform canopy cover in disturbed sites, consequently reducing species colonization just as in undisturbed sites [22].

**Comment [PP24]:** Sounds like a conclusion

#### 4.0 CONCLUSION

Results from disturbed and undisturbed sites, showed that forest structure was significantly different in the two sites. This could be due to canopy ruggedness in undisturbed sites but an almost uniform canopy in disturbed sites due to the invasion by *Piper capensis* in the open spaces of disturbed sites. On the other hand, there was no significant difference in regeneration and species diversity between the two sites. This was attributed to dense canopy cover formed by *Piper capensis* and other invasive species which closed canopy openings in disturbed sites. This could have deprived species of important resources for growth and development. Enrichment planting is, therefore, recommended in disturbed sites for biodiversity conservation.

#### REFERENCES

1. Hethcoat MG, King BJ, Castiblanco FF, Ortiz-Sepúlveda CM, Achiardi FCP, Edwards FA. The impact of secondary forest regeneration on ground-dwelling ant communities in the Tropical Andes. *Oecologia*. 2019;191(2):475–82.
2. Oswaldo J, Donoso D, Cedillo H, Bermúdez F, Omar C. Floristic Groups, and Changes in Diversity and Structure of Trees, in Tropical Montane Forests in the Southern Andes of Ecuador. 2021 Aug 24;13(9):2–13.
3. Aragón S, Salinas N, Nina-Quispe A, Qquellon VH, Paucar GR, Huaman W. Aboveground biomass in secondary montane forests in Peru: Slow carbon recovery in agroforestry legacies. *Glob Ecol Conserv*. 2021; 28:2–11.
4. Mottl O, Plowman NS, Novotny V, Gewa B, Rimandai M, Klimes P. Secondary succession has surprisingly low impact on arboreal ant communities in tropical montane rainforest. *Ecosphere*. 2019;10(8):1–17.
5. Sharma SB, Kumar S, Hegde N. Biomass and carbon recovery of secondary forest in a Montane Subtropical Forest of North Eastern India. *Trop Ecol* [Internet]. 2022 Jun 22 [cited 2023 Jan 3]; Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s42965-022-00246-w>
6. Grau HR, Arturi MF, Brown AD, Aceñolaza PG. Floristic and structural patterns along a chronosequence of secondary forest succession in Argentinean subtropical montane forests. *For Ecol Manag*. 1997;95(2):161–71.
7. Gomes EPC, Mantovani W, Kageyama PY. Mortality and recruitment of trees in a secondary montane rain forest in Southeastern Brazil. *Braz J Biol*. 2003 Feb;63(1):47–60.
8. Fan K, Xu Y, Liu P, Zang R. Recovery of Logged Tropical Montane Rainforests as Potential Habitats for Hainan Gibbon. *Forests*. 2021 Jun;12(6):7–11.
9. Inoti SK, Obwoyere GO, Ocholla JA. Influence of Gap Size on Regeneration, Structure and Species Diversity of Woody Vegetation in a Secondary Montane Forest Reserve, Kenya. *Asian J Environ Ecol*. 2022 Oct 28;19(3):20–31.
10. Zhu J, Mao Z, Hu L, Zhang J. Plant diversity of secondary forests in response to anthropogenic disturbance levels in montane regions of northeastern China. *J For Res*. 2007;12(6):403–16.

**Comment [PP25]:** Consider numbering this section as well for easy referencing.

11. Abbas S, Nichol JE, Fischer GA, Wong MS, Irteza SM. Impact assessment of a super-typhoon on Hong Kong's secondary vegetation and recommendations for restoration of resilience in the forest succession. *Agric For Meteorol.* 2020 Jan; 280:2–8.
12. Ronoh DK, Sirmah PK, Hitimana J, Mullah CJA. Variation in Regeneration Density and Population Structure of *Prunus africana* Across Human Disturbance Gradient in South West Mau Forest, Kenya. *Int J Nat Resour Ecol Manag.* 2018;3(1):1–8.
13. Ocholla JA, Inoti SK, Obwoyere GO. Determining the influence of gap size on three selected microsite conditions in Southwestern Mau Forest reserve, Kenya. *dynamics.* 2022; 11:12.
14. Kinjanjui JM, Karachi M, Ondimu KN. Natural regeneration and ecological recovery in Mau Forest complex, Kenya. *Open J Ecol.* 2013;3(6):417–22.
15. Wanyama I, Pelster DE, Arias-Navarro C, Butterbach-Bahl K, Verchot LV, Rufino MC. Management intensity controls soil N<sub>2</sub>O fluxes in an Afrotropical ecosystem. *Sci Total Environ.* 2018; 624:769–80.
16. Černecká L, Mihál I, Gajdoš P, Jarčuška B. The effect of canopy openness of European beech (*Fagus sylvatica*) forests on ground-dwelling spider communities. *Insect Conserv Divers.* 2020;13(3):250–61.
17. Butynski TM, De Jong Ya. Game-proof Barrier Feasibility Study, Report prepared for ISLA/IDH by Rhino Ark Charitable Trust. 2016;63–5.
18. Holdridge LR, Grenke WC. Forest environments in tropical life zones: a pilot study. *For Environ Trop Life Zones Pilot Study.* 1971;739–47.
19. Hammond ME, Pokorný R. Diversity of Tree Species in Gap Regeneration under Tropical Moist Semi-Deciduous Forest: An Example from Bia Tano Forest Reserve. *Diversity.* 2020 Aug;12(8):2–17.
20. Shannon CE. A mathematical theory of communication. *Bell Syst Tech J.* 1948;27(3):379–423.
21. Rosner B, Glynn RJ, Lee MLT. Extension of the Rank Sum Test for Clustered Data: Two-Group Comparisons with Group Membership Defined at the Subunit Level. *Biometrics.* 2006;62(4):1251–9.
22. Zhang M, Yi X. Seedling recruitment in response to artificial gaps: predicting the ecological consequence of forest disturbance. *Plant Ecol.* 2021;222(1):81–92.
23. Devagiri GM, Khaple AK, Mohan S, Venkateshamurthy P, Tomar S, Arunkumar AN. Species diversity, regeneration and dominance as influenced by canopy gaps and their characteristics in tropical evergreen forests of Western Ghats, India. *J For Res.* 2016;27(4):799–810.
24. Przepióra F, Loch J, Ciach M. Bark beetle infestation spots as biodiversity hotspots: Canopy gaps resulting from insect outbreaks enhance the species richness, diversity and abundance of birds breeding in coniferous forests. *For Ecol Manag.* 2020; 473:1–11.
25. Berdugo MB, Dovciak M. Bryophytes in fir waves: Forest canopy indicator species and functional diversity decline in canopy gaps. *J Veg Sci.* 2019;30(2):235–46.
26. Ronoh DK, Sirmah PK, Hitimana J, Mullah CJA. Variation in Regeneration Density and Population Structure of *Prunus africana* Across Human Disturbance Gradient in South West Mau Forest, Kenya. *Int J Nat Resour Ecol Manag.* 2018;3(1):1–8.
27. Tinya F, Márialigeti S, Bidló A, Ódor P. Environmental drivers of the forest regeneration in temperate mixed forests. *For Ecol Manag.* 2019; 433:720–8.
28. Tinya F, Kovács B, Prättälä A, Farkas P, Aszalós R, Ódor P. Initial understory response to experimental silvicultural treatments in a temperate oak-dominated forest. *Eur J For Res.* 2019;138(1):65–77.
29. Huang W, Pohjonen V, Johansson S, Nashanda M, Katigula MIL, Luukkanen O. Species diversity, forest structure and species composition in Tanzanian tropical forests. *For Ecol Manag.* 2003;173(1–3):11–24.

30. Hitimana J, Kiyiapi JL, Njunge JT. Forest structure characteristics in disturbed and undisturbed sites of Mt. Elgon Moist Lower Montane Forest, western Kenya. *For Ecol Manag.* 2004;194(1–3):269–91.
31. Fotis AT, Morin TH, Fahey RT, Hardiman BS, Bohrer G, Curtis PS. Forest structure in space and time: Biotic and abiotic determinants of canopy complexity and their effects on net primary productivity. *Agric For Meteorol.* 2018; 250:181–91.
32. Bagaram MB, Giuliarelli D, Chirici G, Giannetti F, Barbati A. UAV remote sensing for biodiversity monitoring: are forest canopy gaps good covariates? *Remote Sens.* 2018;10(9):1–19.
33. Kovács B, Tinya F, Németh C, Ódor P. Unfolding the effects of different forestry treatments on microclimate in oak forests: results of a 4-yr experiment. *Ecol Appl.* 2020;30(2):1–14.
34. César RG, Moreno VS, Coletta GD, Chazdon RL, Ferraz SF, De Almeida DR. Early ecological outcomes of natural regeneration and tree plantations for restoring agricultural landscapes. *Ecol Appl.* 2018;28(2):373–84.
35. Fischer G, Balaguera-López HE, Cleves-Leguizamo JA. Impact of soil temperature on fruit species within climate change scenarios. *Rev Colomb Cienc Horticolas.* 2022;16(1):2–10.
36. Johnson DJ, Magee L, Pandit K, Bourdon J, Broadbent EN, Glenn K. Canopy tree density and species influence tree regeneration patterns and woody species diversity in a longleaf pine forest. *For Ecol Manag.* 2021; 490:1–10.