

Effect of Bush fire on Plant Seedlings in the University of Port Harcourt Biodiversity Conservation Center, Nigeria

ABSTRACT

We investigated the effect of fire on understory plant species density in University of Port Harcourt Biodiversity Centre four months after fire incident. Twenty four (4m x 4m) quadrats (14 burnt and 10 un-burnt or control) were mapped out. The plant seedlings were sampled, identified and the diversity, relative abundance, relative frequency, relative diversity, species importance value, family importance value and seedling density were determined. A total of 53 plant species belonging to 35 families were identified. The un-burnt (control) plots had 11 species with 9 plant families while the burnt (impacted) plots had 52 species and 33 families. Fabaceae and Rubiaceae families had the maximum number of species in the control plots, while Asteraceae, Poaceae and Fabaceae families had the maximum number of species in the burnt plots. Based on the habit of the plant species identified, there difference in the number of plant species, seedling density, relative abundance, species density and importance values (dominance) between the burnt and the control plots. In the burnt plots climbers, grasses, herbs, shrubs and trees had 8, 7, 21, 9 and 7 species respectively while in the control plots we recorded 2, 0, 2, 3 and 4 for climbers, grasses, herbs, shrubs and trees respectively but the relative abundance of climbers and trees in the control plots were less than that of burnt plots. This showed that fire stimulates the germination of certain seeds and promote the growth of certain plants in secondary succession and that the Centre has high potential of recovering from the fire incident.

Keywords: Understory species, density, diversity, Bush fire, species abundance

1. INTRODUCTION

Anthropogenic activities (deforestation, logging, forest fires and exploitation of natural resources) in the tropics have significant increased emission of greenhouse gases [1]. Fire changes the structure of forests base on its intensity and severity [2-3]. This could lead to changes in forest species composition, diversity and abundance [2; 4 - 9]. Intensive forest fire could significantly affect plant seeds and regeneration of such plant species [10; 11] and can change the community structure of such ecosystem [12 - 14]. Moderate bush fire leads to the accumulation of litter on the soil surface [15] and burning of litter in the forest floor increases the organic content and other nutrient composition of the soil and further changes soil chemical characteristics [3; 16 - 21]. In some situation, fire could be used in forest management [22 - 23]. Forest fire in most cases has negative effects on the ecosystem. Some of which include threat to the biodiversity and species extinction [24 - 26] and the ability of burnt forest to facilitate secondary succession or natural regeneration of indigenous species in its understory species could allow the restoration of biodiversity in degraded lands [27 - 28].

The University of Port Harcourt Biodiversity Centre is a forest conserved for over 50 years. It acts as carbon sink for the University Park and the adjoining communities. In January, 2016 the forest was

extensively burnt and most of the plant and animal species in the Centre were deeply affected. The fire also resulted to habitat destruction, death of several plant, animal and insect species especially the crawling insects. This also resulted in the fragmentation of the forest. It is against this background that we investigated the effect of the fire on the understory plant species in order to determine the seedling density, diversity, relative abundance, relative frequency, relative diversity, importance value indices and the potential/capacity of the forest to recover from the fire incident.

2. MATERIAL AND METHODS

2.1 Study area

The study area is located in University of Port Harcourt Biodiversity Center, Rivers State, Nigeria. This region contains natural and indigenous species and is a pure even-aged forest. In the study area, rainy season commences around April and extends to October. A little dry spell is experienced about the third or fourth week in August commonly called August break. This trend is however fast changing due to the current climate change regime. Dry season is experienced between November and March. The relative humidity values varied in the study area from 54.6 - 87.5%. Periods of very low humidity occur between December to February during the harmattan spell.

2.3 Data collection and analysis

Twenty four (4m x 4m) quadrats (14 burnt and 10 un-burnt or control) were mapped out (Figure 1). The plant seedlings were sampled and identified [29 – 31]. Inventory of plant seedlings in these quadrats were taken and the diversity, relative abundance, relative frequency, relative diversity, species importance value, family importance value and seedling density were determined [14; 32 – 37].

$$\text{Seedling density (ha}^{-1}\text{)} = \frac{\text{Total number of species in all plots} \times 10000}{\text{Total number of plots sampled}}$$

$$\text{Relative abundance (\%)} = \frac{\text{Total number of individuals of the species in all plots} \times 100}{\text{Total number of species sampled}}$$

In this study we calculated Species Importance Value (SIV) and Family Importance Value (FIV) as follows:

Species Importance Value (SIV) = Species relative frequency + Species relative density.

$$\text{Species relative abundance (\%)} = \frac{\text{Total number of individuals of the species in all plots} \times 100}{\text{Total number of species sampled}}$$

Where:

$$\text{Species relative density (\%)} = \frac{\text{Total number of individual of the species} \times 100}{\text{Total number of species sampled}}$$

Family Importance Value (FIV) = Family relative frequency + Family relative density.

Where:

$$\text{Family relative abundance(\%)} = \frac{\text{Total number of individuals of the family in all the plots} \times 100}{\text{Total number of species sampled}}$$

$$\text{Family relative density (\%)} = \frac{\text{Total number of individual species of the family} \times 100}{\text{Total number of plots sampled}}$$




Figure 1: Map showing the sample points

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

3.1 Results

3.1.1 Floristic Composition

In the study area, a total of 53 plant species belonging to 35 families were identified. The un-burnt (control) plots had 11 plant species with 9 plant families while the burnt (impacted) plots had 52 plant species and 33 families (Table 1). In the control plots, Fabaceae and Rubiaceae families had the maximum number of plant species, two species each while the other families had one plant species each. In burnt plots, Asteraceae and Poaceae families had five plant species each, Apocyanaceae (4 plant species), Fabaceae and Rubiaceae families (3 plant species each), Araceae, Commelinaceae, Convolvulaceae, Cyperaceae and Euphorbiaceae (2 plant species each) while the remaining families had one species each. Based on the habit of the plant species identified, we observed increase in number of plant species, seedling density, relative abundance, species density and importance values (dominance) between the burnt and the control plots. For instance, in the burnt plots climbers, grasses, herbs, shrubs and trees had 8, 7, 21, 9 and 7 plant species respectively while in the control plots we recorded 2, 0, 2, 3

and 4 for climbers, grasses, herbs, shrubs and trees respectively (Table 2) but the relative abundance of climbers and trees in the control plots were less than that of burnt plots.

3.1.2 Species Seedling density (ha^{-1})

The individual species seedling density in the burnt plots studied varied from 57 seedling ha^{-1} to 9091 seedling ha^{-1} . The maximum seedling density (seedling ha^{-1}) was recorded by *Digitaria* sp. while *Culcasia scandens*, *Elytropus chilensis*, *Indigofera* sp., *Ipomea involucreta*, *Ludwigia* sp., *Phyllanthus* sp., and *Smilax anceps* have the least seedling density 57 seedling ha^{-1} (Table 1). Other values recorded include; *Macrosphyra longistyla* (8977 seedling ha^{-1}); *Paliosota hirsute* (6364 seedling ha^{-1}); *Vigna* sp. (6136 seedling ha^{-1}); *Alchornea cordifolia* (5568 seedling ha^{-1}); *Paspalum* sp. (5227 seedling ha^{-1}); *Disotis* sp. (3977 seedling ha^{-1}); *Sterculia* sp. (3636 seedling ha^{-1}); *Platostoma* sp. (2614 seedling ha^{-1}); *Brachiaria lata* (2557 seedling ha^{-1}); Sedges (2159 seedling ha^{-1}); *Oldenlandia* sp. (1705 seedling ha^{-1}); *Funtumia* sp. (1591 seedling ha^{-1}); *Baphia nitida* (1307 seedling ha^{-1}); Unknown broad leaf (1193 seedling ha^{-1}), *Cissus* sp. (1136 seedling ha^{-1}), *Urena lobata* (1136 seedling ha^{-1}), *Acroceras zizanioides* (1023 seedling ha^{-1}), *Ipomea* sp. (966 seedling ha^{-1}), *Lindernia* sp. (909 seedling ha^{-1}), *Picralima nitida*, (795 seedling ha^{-1}), *Marantochloa cuspidata* (739 seedling ha^{-1}), *Coccinnia* sp. (682 seedling ha^{-1}), *Combretum platypterum*, *Panicum laxum*, *Setaria* sp., (568 seedling ha^{-1}), *Cleistopholis patens* (511 seedling ha^{-1}), *Crinum* sp. (455 seedling ha^{-1}), *Commelina* sp., *Spermacoce* sp., *Spigelia* sp. (398 seedling ha^{-1}), *Ageratum conyzoides* (341 seedling ha^{-1}), *Acioa* sp., *Adenia gumefera*, *Harungana madagascariensis*, and *Trema orientalis* (seedling ha^{-1} each), *Chromolene odorata* *Vernonia* sp, *Ficus* sp, and *Melastomastrum* sp, (227 seedling ha^{-1} each), *Elaeis guineensis* and *Mikamia cordata* (170 seedling ha^{-1} each), *Cleome* sp., *Cyathula prostrata* and *Tabernaemontana* sp. (114 seedling ha^{-1} each). The relative abundances followed the same sequence as seedling density and varied from 11.834% to 0.074%.

plants

102 **Table 1: Species seedling density, relative abundance, relative frequency, relative diversity and species importance value of the plant in**
 103 **the study area**

S/N	Species name	Family	SD (ha ⁻¹)	RA (%)	RF (%)	RD (%)	SIV
Unburnt (control) Plots							
1	<i>Picralima nitida</i> Durand & Hook.	Apocyanaceae	1042	3.521	5.556	9.837	15.393
2	<i>Elaeis guineensis</i> Jacq.	Araceae	1250	4.225	5.556	10.132	15.687
3	<i>Chromolenea odorata</i> (L.) R.M. King & H. Rob.	Asteraceae	1458	4.930	11.111	9.879	20.991
4	<i>Alchornea cordifolia</i> (Schum. & Thonn.) Müll.-Arg.	Euphorbiaceae	2917	9.859	11.111	8.558	19.669
5	<i>Baphia nitida</i> Lodd.	Fabaceae	6250	21.127	16.667	8.569	25.236
6	<i>Vigna</i> sp	Fabaceae	3125	10.563	8.333	8.947	17.280
7	<i>Spigelia</i> sp	Longaniaceae	1042	3.521	5.556	9.837	15.393
8	<i>Acroceras zizanioides</i> (Kunth) Dandy	Poaceae	8542	28.873	8.333	6.536	14.870
9	<i>Macrosphyra longistyla</i> (DC.) Hiern	Rubiaceae	1458	4.930	11.111	9.879	20.991
10	<i>Spermacoce</i> sp	Rubiaceae	2500	8.451	13.889	9.55	23.439
11	<i>Cissus</i> sp	Vitaceae	1042	3.521	5.556	9.837	15.393
Burnt Plots							
1	<i>Cyathula prostrata</i> (L.) Blume	Amarathaceae	114	0.148	0.741	0	0.741
2	<i>Crinum</i> sp	Amaryllidaceae	455	0.592	0.741	0	0.741
3	<i>Cleistopholis patens</i> (Benth.) Engl. & Diels	Annonaceae	511	0.666	2.963	3.765	6.728
4	<i>Funtumia</i> sp	Apocyanaceae	1591	2.071	1.481	1.956	3.437
5	<i>Picralima nitida</i> (Stapf) T.Durand & H.Durand	Apocyanaceae	795	1.036	2.963	3.952	6.915
6	<i>Elytropus chilensis</i> (A. DC.) Muell-Arg.	Apocyanaceae	57	0.074	0.741	0	0.741
7	<i>Tabernaemontana</i> sp	Apocyanaceae	114	0.148	1.481	3.982	5.463
8	<i>Culcasia scandens</i> P. Beauv.	Araceae	57	0.074	0.741	0	0.741
9	Unknown broad leaf	Araceae	1193	1.553	1.481	3.975	5.456
10	<i>Elaeis guineensis</i> Jacq.	Arecaceae	170	0.222	1.481	3.656	5.138
11	<i>Ageratum conyzoides</i> L.	Asteraceae	341	0.444	2.222	3.144	5.366
12	<i>Chromolenea odorata</i> (L.) R.M. King & H. Rob.	Asteraceae	227	0.296	2.222	3.768	5.99
13	<i>Vernonia</i> sp	Asteraceae	227	0.296	1.481	3.982	5.463
14	<i>Mikamia cordata</i> (Burm.f.) B.L. Rob.	Asteraceae	170	0.222	0.741	0	0.741
15	<i>Disotis</i> sp	Balsaminaceae	3977	5.178	2.222	2.886	5.108
16	<i>Acioa</i> sp	Chrysobalanaceae	284	0.370	1.481	3.866	5.347
17	<i>Cleome</i> sp	Cloemaceae	114	0.148	0.741	0	0.741
18	<i>Combretum platypterum</i> (Welw.) Hutch. & Dalziel	Combretaceae	568	0.740	0.741	0	0.741
19	<i>Paliosota hirsuta</i> (Thunb.) K. Schum	Commelinaceae	6364	8.284	3.704	3.418	7.122
20	<i>Commelina</i> sp	Commelinaceae	398	0.518	0.741	0	0.741
21	<i>Ipomea involucrata</i> P. Beauv.	Convolvulaceae	57	0.074	0.741	0	0.741
22	<i>Ipomea</i> sp	Convolvulaceae	966	1.257	2.963	3.41	6.373
23	<i>Coccinnia</i> sp	Cucurbitaceae	682	0.888	2.222	3.905	6.127

24	<i>Paspalum</i> sp	Cyperaceae	5227	6.805	2.222	2.636	4.858
25	Sedges	Cyperaceae	2159	2.811	0.741	0	0.741
26	<i>Phyllanthus</i> sp	Euphorbiaceae	57	0.074	0.741	0	0.741
27	<i>Alchornea cordifolia</i> (Schum. & Thonn.) Müll.-Arg.	Euphorbiaceae	5568	7.249	9.63	3.655	13.284
28	<i>Baphia nitida</i> Lodd.	Fabaceae	1307	1.701	4.444	2.942	7.387
29	<i>Indigofera</i> sp	Fabaceae	57	0.074	0.741	0	0.741
30	<i>Vigna</i> sp	Fabaceae	6136	7.988	4.444	2.462	6.906
31	<i>Harungana madagascariensis</i> Lam. ex Poiret	Hypericaceae	284	0.370	1.481	3.866	5.347
32	<i>Platostoma</i> sp	Lamiaceae	2614	3.402	3.704	1.387	5.091
33	<i>Lindernia</i> sp	Linderniaceae	909	1.183	1.481	3.8	5.282
34	<i>Spigelia</i> sp	Loganiaceae.	398	0.518	1.481	3.437	4.918
35	<i>Urena lobata</i> L	Malvaceae	1136	1.479	0.741	0	0.741
36	<i>Marantochloa cuspidata</i> (Roscoe) Milne-Redh.	Maranthaceae	739	0.962	1.481	1.558	3.039
37	<i>Melastomastrum</i> sp	Melastomataceae	227	0.296	0.741	0	0.741
38	<i>Ficus</i> sp	Moraceae	227	0.296	1.481	3.982	5.463
39	<i>Ludwigia</i> sp	Onagraceae	57	0.074	0.741	0	0.741
40	<i>Adenia gumefera</i> (Harv.) Harms.	Passifloraceae	284	0.370	0.741	0	0.741
41	<i>Acroceras zizanioides</i> (Kunth) Dandy	Poaceae	1023	1.331	2.222	3.144	5.366
42	<i>Brachiaria lata</i> (Schumach.) C.E.Hubb.	Poaceae	2557	3.328	1.481	0.612	2.094
43	<i>Digitaria</i> sp	Poaceae	9091	11.834	3.704	3.631	7.335
44	<i>Panicum laxum</i> Sw.	Poaceae	568	0.740	0.741	0	0.741
45	<i>Setaria</i> sp	Poaceae	568	0.740	0.741	0	0.741
46	<i>Macrosphyra longistyla</i> (DC.) Hiern	Rubiaceae	8977	11.686	6.667	3.256	9.923
47	<i>Oldenlandia</i> sp	Rubiaceae	1705	2.219	0.741	0	0.741
48	<i>Spermacoce</i> sp	Rubiaceae	398	0.518	1.481	3.437	4.918
49	<i>Smilax anceps</i> Willd.	Smilacaceae	57	0.074	0.741	0	0.741
50	<i>Sterculia</i> sp	Sterculiaceae	3636	4.734	2.222	3.202	5.425
51	<i>Trema orientalis</i> Linn. Blume	Ulmaceae	284	0.370	0.741	0	0.741
52	<i>Cissus</i> sp	Vitaceae	1136	1.479	4.444	3.328	7.773

Note: SD – Seedling density; RA – Relative abundance; RF – Relative frequency; RD – Relative diversity; SIV – Species importance value; ha – Hectare

3.1.3 Species Relative frequency

In the burnt plots, a total of 52 plant species were identified. Among the species *Alchornea cordifolia* had the highest relative frequency of 9.63%. This is followed by *Macrosphyra longistyla* (6.67%), *Vigna* sp, *Baphia nitida* Lodd. and *Cissus* sp (4.44% each), *Digitaria* sp, *Paliosota hirsuta* and *Platostoma* sp. (3.70% each), *Ipomea* sp, *Picralima nitida* and *Cleistopholis patens* (2.96% each), *Paspalum* sp, *Disotis* sp, *Sterculia* sp, *Acroceras* sp, *Coccinnia* sp, *Ageratum conyzoides* L. and *Chromoleneae odorata* (2.22% each), *Brachiaria lata*, *Funtumia* sp, Unknown broad leaf (Asteraceae), *Lindernia* sp, *Marantochloa cuspidata*, *Spermacoce* sp., *Spigelia* sp., *Acioa* sp., *Harungana madagascariensis*, *Vernonia* sp, *Ficus* sp., *Elaeis guineensis* and *Tabernaemontana* sp. (1.48% each). The least value 0.74% was recorded by Sedges, *Oldenlandia* sp, *Urena lobata*, *Combretum platypterum*, *Panicum laxum*, *Setaria* sp, *Crinum* sp., *Commelina* sp., *Adenia gumefera*, *Trema orientalis*, *Melastomastrum* sp, *Mikamia cordata*, *Cleome* sp., *Cyathula prostrata*, *Culcasia scandens*, *Elytropus chilensis*, *Indigofera* sp., *Ipomea involucreta*, *Ludwigia* sp., *Phyllanthus* sp. and *Smilax anceps*. In the unburnt (control) plots relative frequencies of the species were relatively higher than the burnt plots. *Baphia nitida* (16.67%) had the maximum relative frequency. The relative frequencies of the other species include; *Picralima nitida*, *Elaeis guineensis* *Spigelia* sp, and *Cissus* sp (5.56% each), *Vigna* sp and *Acroceras zizanioides* (8.33% each), *Chromoleneae odorata*, *Alchornea cordifolia* and *Macrophylla longistylis* (11.11% each) and *Spermacoce* sp (13.89%).

3.1.4 Species Relative diversity

Among the species sampled *Vernonia* sp., *Ficus* sp. and *Tabernaemontana* sp. had the maximum relative diversity of 3.98. This is followed by Unknown broad leaf (Araceae) and *Picralima nitida* (3.98 each), *Coccinnia* sp. (3.905), *Acioa* sp. and *Harungana madagascariensis* (3.87 each), *Lindernia* sp. (3.80), *Chromoleneae odorata* (3.77), *Cleistopholis patens* (3.77), *Elaeis guineensis* (3.67), *Alchornea cordifolia* (3.66), *Digitaria* sp. (3.63), *Spermacoce* sp. and *Spigelia* sp. (3.44 each), *Paliosota hirsuta* (3.42), *Ipomea* sp (3.41), *Cissus* sp (3.33), *Macrosphyra longistyla* (3.26), *Sterculia* sp (3.20), *Acroceras zizanioides* and *Ageratum conyzoides* L. (3.14 each), *Baphia nitida* (2.94), *Disotis* sp. (2.89), *Paspalum* sp. (2.64), *Vigna* sp. (2.46), *Funtumia* sp. (1.96), *Marantochloa cuspidata* (1.56), *Platostoma* sp. (1.39), *Brachiaria lata* (0.61) while Sedges, *Oldenlandia* sp., *Urena lobata*, *Combretum platypterum*, *Panicum laxum*, *Setaria* sp., *Crinum* sp., *Commelina* sp., *Adenia gumefera*, *Trema orientalis*, *Melastomastrum* sp., *Mikamia cordata*, *Cleome* sp., *Cyathula prostrata*, *Culcasia scandens*, *Elytropus chilensis*, *Indigofera* sp., *Ipomea involucreta*, *Ludwigia* sp., *Phyllanthus* sp. and *Smilax anceps* (0.0 each).

3.1.5 Burnt Area Species Importance Value (SIV)

The *Alchornea cordifolia* (13.28), *Macrosphyra longistyla* (9.92), *Cissus* sp. (7.77), *Baphia nitida* (7.39), *Digitaria* sp. (7.34), *Paliosota hirsuta* (7.12), *Picralima nitida* (6.92), *Vigna* sp. (6.91), *Cleistopholis patens* (6.73), *Ipomea* sp. (6.37), *Coccinnia* sp. (6.13), *Chromoleneae odorata* (5.99), *Vernonia* sp., *Ficus* sp. and *Tabernaemontana* sp. (5.46), Unknown broad leaf and *Sterculia* sp. (5.46), *Acroceras zizanioides* and *Ageratum conyzoides* (5.37 each), *Acioa* sp. and *Harungana madagascariensis* (5.35 each), *Lindernia* sp. (5.28), *Elaeis guineensis* (5.14), *Disotis* sp. (5.11), *Platostoma* sp. (5.09), *Spermacoce* sp. and *Spigelia* sp. (4.92), *Paspalum* sp. (4.86), *Funtumia* sp. (3.44), *Marantochloa cuspidate* (3.04), *Brachiaria lata* (2.09) and Sedges, *Oldenlandia* sp., *Urena lobata*, *Combretum platypterum*, *Panicum laxum*, *Setaria* sp., *Crinum* sp., *Commelina* sp., *Adenia gumefera*, *Trema orientalis*, *Melastomastrum* sp., *Mikamia cordata*, *Cleome* sp., *Cyathula prostrata*, *Culcasia scandens*, *Elytropus chilensis*, *Indigofera* sp., *Ipomea involucreta*, *Ludwigia* sp., *Phyllanthus* sp. and *Smilax anceps* (0.74 each) Table 2.

151 **Table 2: Composition of plant seedlings in the study area base on their habit**

Habit	No. of Species	SD (ha ⁻¹)	RA (%)	SIV
BURNT PLOTS				
Climbers	8	3839	5.97	38.02
Grasses	7	16785	26.1	31.86
Herbs	21	31293	48.65	50.78
Shrubs	9	8214	12.77	46.58
Trees	7	4196	6.52	32.78
CONTROL PLOTS				
Climbers	2	2422	21.83	61.47
Grasses	0	0	0	0
Herbs	2	1789	15.49	64.04
Shrubs	3	4298	38.73	58.15
Trees	4	1953	17.61	77.80

152 **Note:** SD – Seedling density; RA – Relative abundance; Sp. - species; SIV – Species importance value; ha – Hectare

153 3.1.6 Family relative diversity

154 The relative diversity of the different families of plant seedlings in the study area varied from 0.0 to 9.67 in
 155 burnt plots and 6.33 to 14.26 for control plots (Table 3). In the burnt plots, the relative diversities of the
 156 plant families include: Euphorbiaceae (9.67), Poaceae (7.97), Rubiaceae (7.86), Asteraceae (7.83),
 157 Fabaceae (6.64), Vitaceae (6.06), Apocyanaceae (5.98) Commelinaceae (5.59), Annonaceae (5.30),
 158 Convolvulaceae (4.70), Cyperaceae (4.52), Cucurbitaceae (4.36), Sterculiaceae (3.57), Balsaminaceae
 159 (3.22), Moraceae (2.80), Araceae (2.78), Chrysobalanaceae (2.72), Linderniaceae (2.67), Loganiaceae
 160 (2.42), Lamiaceae (2.27), Maranthaceae (1.10), Amarathaceae, Amaryllidaceae, Cloemaceae,
 161 Combretaceae, Malvaceae, Melastomataceae, Onagraceae, Passifloraceae, Smilaceae and Ulmaceae
 162 (0.0) while in the control plots we recorded; Fabaceae (14.26), Vitaceae (14.28), Asteraceae (12.72),
 163 Euphorbiaceae (11.02), Longaniaceae (9.13), Rubiaceae (6.67), Araceae (6.52), Poaceae and
 164 Apocyanaceae (6.33 each), Rubiaceae (2.72) Table 2. This indicates that the fire exposed the forest
 165 canopy and enhanced the germination of the seeds of the members of these families that are in the soil
 166 but were prevented from germination by the shed from the forest canopy.

167 3.1.7 Family Importance Value (FIV)

168 In the Burnt Sites, FIV varied from 0.81 to 21.05 while it ranged from 12.05 to 13.41. Euphorbiaceae
 169 family had the maximum FIV in the burnt sites. This is followed by Fabaceae (17.21), Rubiaceae (15.99),
 170 Poaceae (15.29), Asteraceae (14.33), Apocyanaceae (12.48), Vitaceae (10.93), Commelinaceae (9.65),
 171 Annonaceae (8.55), Convolvulaceae (7.95), Cyperaceae (7.78), Cucurbitaceae (6.80), Lamiaceae (6.33),
 172 Sterculiaceae (6.01), Balsaminaceae (5.66), Araceae (5.22), Moraceae (4.43), Chrysobalanaceae (4.35),
 173 Linderniaceae (4.30), Loganiaceae (4.044), Maranthaceae (2.72) and Amarathaceae Amaryllidaceae,
 174 Cloemaceae, Combretaceae, Malvaceae, Melastomataceae, Onagraceae, Passifloraceae, Smilaceae,
 175 Ulmaceae and Unknown (0.81 each). On the other hand, Fabaceae had the highest FIV in the control
 176 plots while other families include; Vitaceae (28.56), Asteraceae and Rubiaceae (24.15 each),
 177 Euphorbiaceae (22.45), Longaniaceae (17.70), Rubiaceae (15.24), Araceae (12.24), Poaceae and
 178 Apocyanaceae (12.05 each).

179 3.1.8 Family relative frequency (%)

180 In the burnt plots we observed that Euphorbiaceae (11.38%) had the highest relative frequency. This is
 181 followed by Fabaceae (10.57%), Rubiaceae (8.13), Poaceae (7.32), Asteraceae, Apocyanaceae (6.50%

each), Vitaceae (4.878%), Commelinaceae and Lamiaceae (4.065%), Annonaceae, Convolvulaceae, Cyperaceae (3.25 each), Cucurbitaceae, Sterculiaceae, Balsaminaceae, Araceae (2.44% each) and Moraceae, Chrysobalanaceae, Linderniaceae, Loganiaceae and Maranthaceae (1.63% each) while Amarathaceae, Amaryllidaceae, Cloemaceae, Combretaceae, Malvaceae, Melastomataceae, Onagraceae, Passifloraceae, Smilaceae, Ulmaceae and Unknown had the lowest relative frequency (0.81%) (Table 3). On the other hand, in the control plots Fabaceae (17.14%) which was the second largest in the burnt plots was had the maximum relative frequency. The relative frequencies of other families in the control plots include; Vitaceae (14.29%), Asteraceae Rubiaceae and Euphorbiaceae (11.43% each); Longaniaceae and Rubiaceae (8.57% each); Araceae, Poaceae and Apocyanaceae (5.71% each).

3.1.9 Family Seedling density

The seedling density in the control and burnt plots are relatively different. In burnt plots we had Poaceae (15987ha⁻¹), Rubiaceae (12829 ha⁻¹), Fabaceae (8684 ha⁻¹), Cyperaceae (8553ha⁻¹), Commelinaceae (7368ha⁻¹), Euphorbiaceae (6842ha⁻¹), Balsaminaceae (4605 ha⁻¹), Sterculiaceae (4211 ha⁻¹), Lamiaceae (3026 ha⁻¹), Apocyanaceae (2895 ha⁻¹), Vitaceae (1316 ha⁻¹), Malvaceae (1316), Convolvulaceae (1184 ha⁻¹), Asteraceae (1118 ha⁻¹), Linderniaceae (1053 ha⁻¹), Araceae and Maranthaceae (855 ha⁻¹), Cucurbitaceae (789 ha⁻¹), Combretaceae (658 ha⁻¹), Annonaceae (592 ha⁻¹), Amaryllidaceae (526 ha⁻¹), Loganiaceae (461 ha⁻¹), Chrysobalanaceae (329 ha⁻¹), Passifloraceae (329 ha⁻¹), Ulmaceae (329 ha⁻¹), Moraceae and Melastomataceae (263 ha⁻¹ each), Amarathaceae and Cloemaceae (132 ha⁻¹ each), Onagraceae, Smilaceae and Unknown (66 ha⁻¹ each). In the control plots the family densities are as follows: Rubiaceae (8542 ha⁻¹), Fabaceae (6250 ha⁻¹), Longaniaceae (3125 ha⁻¹), Euphorbiaceae (2917 ha⁻¹), Vitaceae (2500 ha⁻¹), Asteraceae (1458 ha⁻¹), Rubiaceae (1458 ha⁻¹), Araceae (1250 ha⁻¹), Poaceae and Apocyanaceae (1042 ha⁻¹ each). The family seedling densities in the burnt plots are relatively higher than in the control plots.

3.1.10 Family relative abundance (%)

The family relative abundance in the study area varied from 0.07% in the burnt plots to 28.78% in the control plots (Table 3). In the burnt plots, Poaceae (17.97%) had the maximum value while the values for the other families are as follows: Rubiaceae (14.42%), Fabaceae (9.76%), Cyperaceae (9.62%), Commelinaceae (8.284%), Euphorbiaceae (7.69%), Balsaminaceae (5.18%), Sterculiaceae (4.73%), Lamiaceae (3.40%), Apocyanaceae (3.25%), Vitaceae and Malvaceae (1.48% each), Convolvulaceae (1.33%), Asteraceae (1.26%), Linderniaceae (1.18%), Araceae and Maranthaceae (0.96%), Cucurbitaceae (0.89%), Combretaceae (0.74%), Annonaceae (0.67%), Amaryllidaceae (0.59%), Loganiaceae (0.52%), Chrysobalanaceae and Passifloraceae (0.37%), Ulmaceae (0.37%), Moraceae and Melastomataceae (0.30%), Amarathaceae and Cloemaceae (0.15% each), Onagraceae, Smilaceae and Unknown broad leaf (Araceae) (0.07% each). On the other hand, in the control plots, Rubiaceae (28.87%) had the maximum value while the values like Fabaceae Longaniaceae Euphorbiacea, Vitaceae, Asteraceae, Rubiaceae, Araceae had 21.13%, 10.56%, 9.86%, 8.45%, 4.93%, 4.93% and 4.23% respectively. Poaceae and Apocyanaceae had the least value 3.52%.

Table 3: Family seedling density, relative abundance, relative frequency, relative diversity and species importance value of the plant in the study area

S/N	Family	No. of genus	SD	SE	SDS (ha ⁻¹)	RA (%)	RF (%)	RD (%)	FIV
BURNT PLOTS									
1	Amarathaceae	1	0.00	0.00	132	0.15	0.81	0.00	0.81
2	Amaryllidaceae	1	0.00	0.00	526	0.59	0.81	0.00	0.81
3	Annonaceae	1	1.31	0.95	592	0.67	3.25	5.30	8.55
4	Apocyanaceae	3	1.48	0.71	2895	3.25	6.50	5.98	12.48
5	Araceae	3	0.69	0.63	855	0.96	2.44	2.78	5.22

6	Asteraceae	4	1.94	0.93	1118	1.26	6.50	7.83	14.33
7	Balsaminaceae	1	0.80	0.73	4605	5.18	2.44	3.22	5.66
8	Chrysobalanaceae	1	0.67	0.97	329	0.37	1.63	2.72	4.35
9	Cloemaceae	1	0.00	0.00	132	0.15	0.81	0.00	0.81
10	Combretaceae	1	0.00	0.00	658	0.74	0.81	0.00	0.81
11	Commelinaceae	1	1.38	0.86	7368	8.28	4.07	5.59	9.65
12	Convolvulaceae	2	1.16	0.84	1184	1.33	3.25	4.70	7.95
13	Cucurbitaceae	1	1.08	0.98	789	0.89	2.44	4.36	6.80
14	Cyperaceae	2	1.12	0.81	8553	9.62	3.25	4.52	7.78
15	Euphorbiaceae	2	2.39	0.91	6558	7.32	9.90	5.80	15.71
16	Fabaceae	3	1.64	0.64	8684	9.76	10.57	6.64	17.21
17	Lamiaceae	1	0.56	0.35	3026	3.40	4.07	2.27	6.33
18	Linderniaceae	1	0.66	0.95	1053	1.18	1.63	2.67	4.30
19	Loganiaceae.	1	0.60	0.86	461	0.52	1.63	2.42	4.04
20	Malvaceae	1	0.00	0.00	1316	1.48	0.81	0.00	0.81
21	Maranthaceae	1	0.27	0.39	855	0.96	1.63	1.10	2.72
22	Melastomataceae	1	0.00	0.00	263	0.30	0.81	0.00	0.81
23	Moraceae	1	0.69	1.00	263	0.30	1.63	2.80	4.43
24	Onagraceae	1	0.00	0.00	66	0.07	0.81	0.00	0.81
25	Passifloraceae	1	0.00	0.00	329	0.37	0.81	0.00	0.81
26	Poaceae	5	1.97	0.90	15987	17.97	7.32	7.97	15.29
27	Rubiaceae	3	1.94	0.84	12829	14.42	8.13	7.86	15.99
28	Smilacaceae	1	0.00	0.00	66	0.07	0.81	0.00	0.81
29	Sterculiaceae	1	0.88	0.80	4211	4.73	2.44	3.57	6.01
30	Ulmaceae	1	0.00	0.00	329	0.37	0.81	0.00	0.81
31	Vitaceae	1	1.50	0.84	1316	1.48	4.88	6.06	10.93
32	Hypericaceae	1	0.67	0.97	284	0.37	1.48	3.87	5.35
33	Unknown	1	0.00	0.00	66	0.07	0.81	0.00	0.81

UNBURNT OR CONTROL PLOTS

1	Poaceae	1	0.67	0.97	1042	3.52	5.71	6.33	12.05
2	Euphorbiaceae	1	1.17	0.85	2917	9.86	11.43	11.02	22.45
3	Fabaceae	2	1.52	0.85	6250	21.13	17.14	14.26	31.41
4	Asteraceae	1	1.35	0.98	1458	4.93	11.43	12.72	24.15
5	Vitaceae	1	1.52	0.94	2500	8.45	14.29	14.28	28.56
6	Araceae	1	0.69	1.00	1250	4.23	5.71	6.52	12.24
7	Rubiaceae	1	0.71	0.65	8542	28.87	8.57	6.67	15.24
8	Apocyanaceae	1	0.67	0.97	1042	3.52	5.71	6.33	12.05
9	Rubiaceae	1	1.35	0.98	1458	4.93	11.43	12.72	24.15
10	Longaniaceae	1	0.97	0.88	3125	10.56	8.57	9.13	17.70

Note: No. – Number; RA – Relative abundance; freq. – frequency; RF – Relative frequency; RD – Relative diversity; SD - Seedling density; SIV – Species importance value; ha – Hectare

3.2 DISCUSSION

Anthropogenic activities have strongly impacted on biodiversity at local and global levels and resulting in introduction of new species, reduction in indigenous species and species extinctions [15; 38 - 40]. In the same way, the changes in ecosystem productivity resulting from humans land use pattern also contribute to alteration in the nutrient cycle [40 - 41] and species diversity and productivity [42 - 47]. Some of these human induced activities include bush burning and has been practiced in many parts of the world as an accepted integral part of the traditional farming system [48; 49; 50]. In many countries, fire is used for hunting, clearing of agricultural land, maintaining grass lands, controlling pests and removing dry vegetation and crop residues to promote agricultural productivity [48] and in some cases a natural ecological tool [51]. However, fire has been noted to have adverse effects like soil degradation [17 - 21], encourages accumulation of litter on the surface of the soil [15] and threatens wild endangered species [24] in the ecosystem.

The findings of this study showed that burning affects species diversity, frequency and number of specimen per plot. For instance, in the burnt plots, the range (mean $\pm$ standard deviation) number of species per plot is 2 – 10 (6.389 ± 2.085) while in the control plots it is 3 – 8 (5.833 ± 1.507). Also, the number of plant families, genera and species in the burnt and control plots varied. In the burnt plots we had 33 plant families, 51 genera and 52 species. In contrast, the control plots had 10 families, 11 genera and 11 species. In a similar study, [52 - 54] have reported that bush burning results to reduction in plant species diversity, number of plant species per plot and in the total number of species per plot. Fire can also affect plant community by reducing the dominance of certain plant species or single species and on the other hand enhance the abundance of some other ones [12, 26, 54 - 57]. In our study, we noted that *Alchornea cordifolia* and *Micropulia longisata* were the dominant plants in the burnt plots while in the control plots, *Cissus* species was the dominant plant. Although *Alchornea cordifolia*, *Baphia nitida*, *Spermacoce* sp. and *Chromoleneae odorata* were the next dominant species in the control plots, there was an increase in the density of *Alchornea cordifolia* and other dominant species found in the burnt plots are not the dominant plants in the control plots (Tables 1 and 2). Furthermore, we observed that two of the species (*Elaeis guineensis* and *Chromoleneae odorata*) recorded in the control plots were not recorded in burnt plots but were replaced by other species. This confirms the fact that fire encourages the emergent of plant species suppressed by the forest canopy and support the ecology of secondary succession as reported by [52].

We also noted that fire increased richness of the plant species. This is evident as there are more plant species in the burnt plots than the control plots. This phenomenon has been reported by several authors [6; 57 – 59]. In their study Marozas [6] stated that surface fire leads to richness of land vegetation cover and preliminary substitute species generally help further richness. They also noted that most pioneer species appear in burnt regions within 1–3 years after a fire incident. In another study in Missouri Ozarks forests, North America, Hartmann and Heumann [57] observed that fire led to an increase in the understory species diversity. Also, Hutchinson [58] stated that fire led to an increase of herbaceous species diversity and Taft [60] reported that richness and diversity of understory species increased after fire. Thus the finding of our work is in line with these studies on the basis that we recorded increase in the number of plant species and seedling density of climbers, grasses, herbs, shrubs and trees in burnt plots. However, we recorded decrease in plant diversity during this study and this therefore support [7 – 8; 61], who observed that diversity of plant species reduced in the early years after a fire incident.

4. CONCLUSION

Vegetation structure is affected by fire. In some types of ecosystems this creates a process of renewal. Fire stimulates the germination of certain seeds and promote the growth of certain plants in secondary succession due to change in soil chemistry resulting from the burning of litter. This however reduces the dominance of individual plant species but decrease in the initial seedling density and dominance of herbs, shrubs and grasses.

REFERENCES

1. Watson, T.R, Noble, I.R., Bert-Bolin, R.H.N, Verarda, J.D. and Dokken, D.J. (2000) Land use, land use change and forestry. IPCC Special Report. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge. P. 375.
2. Rydgren, K., Økland R.H. and Hest, G. (2004) Disturbance severity and community resilience in a boreal forest. *Ecology* 85:1906–1915.
3. Lecomte, N., M. Simard, Y. Bergeron A. Larouche, H. Asnong and P.J.H. Richard, 2005. Effects of fire severity and initial tree composition on understory vegetation dynamics in a boreal landscape inferred from chronosequence and paleoecological data. *Journal of Vegetation Science* 16: 665–674.
4. Nguyen-Xuan, T., Bergeron, Y., Simard, D., Fyles, J.W. and Pare, D. (2000) The importance of forest floor disturbance in the early regeneration patterns of the boreal forest of western and central Quebec: a wildfire vs. logging comparison. *Canadian Journal of Forest Research* 30:1353–1364.
5. Sanyaolu, V. T. (2015) Effect of bush burning on herbaceous plant diversity In Lagos State Polytechnic, Ikorodu campus, Lagos - Nigeria. *Science World Journal* 10 (1):1-6
6. Marozas V., Racinkas J., Bartkevicius E. (2007) Dynamics of ground vegetation after surface fires in hemiboreal *Pinus sylvestris* forests. *Forest Ecology and Management* 250, 47–55.
7. Certini, G. (2005) Effects of fire on properties of forest soils: a review. *Oecologia* 143, 1–10.
8. Cassie L. Hebel, Smith J.E., Cromack, K. (2009) Invasive plant species and soil microbial response to wildfire burn severity in the Cascade Range of Oregon. *Applied Soil Ecology* 42: 150–159.
9. Abrahamson, W. G. (1984) Post-fire recovery of Florida Lake Wales Ridge vegetation. *American Journal of Botany* 71: 9-21.
10. Greene, D.F., Noel, J., Bergeron, Y., Rousseau M. and Gauthier, S. (2004) Recruitment of *Picea mariana*, *Pinus banksiana* and *Populus tremuloides* across a burn severity gradient following fire in the southern boreal forest of Quebec. *Canadian Journal of Forest Research* 34: 1845–1857
11. Peters, V.S., Macdonald, S.E. and Dale, M.R.T. (2005) The masting phenomenon in relation to fire is key to white spruce regeneration. *Ecology* 86:1744–1750.
12. Pyke, D.A., Brooks, M.L. and D'Antonio, C. (2010) Fire as a restoration tool: A decision framework for predicting the control or enhancement of plants using fire. *Restoration Ecology* 18(3): 274-284.
13. Moretti, M. and Barbalat, M. (2004) The effects of wildfire on wood-eating beetles in deciduous forests on the southern slope of the Swiss Alps. *Forest Ecology and Management* 187: 85–103.
14. Mehrdad, G.D., Mohammad N.A., Mohaddese S.P., Javad S.K. (2003) Effect of repeated fire on understory plant species diversity in Saravan forests, northern Iran. *Folia Forestalia Polonica*, series A 55(3):137–145
15. Legleiter, C.J., Lawrence, R.L. Fonstad, M.A., Marcu, W.A., Lindenmayer, R. and Franklin, J.F. (2002) *Conserving Forest Biodiversity: A Comprehensive Multiscaled Approach*, Island Press, Washington, DC.
16. Hart, S.C., DeLuca, T.H., Newman, G.S., MacKenzie, M.D. and Boyle, S.I. (2005) Post-fire vegetative dynamics as drivers of microbial community structure and function in forest soils. *Forest Ecology and Management* 220: 166–184.
17. Williams, R.J., Griffiths, A.D. and Allan, G. (2002) Fire regimes and biodiversity in the wet-dry tropical savanna landscapes of northern Australia. *Flammable Australia: the fire regimes and biodiversity of a continent*.
18. Levine, J.M. & D'Antonio, C.M. (2003). Forecasting biological invasions with increasing international trade. *Conservation Biology* 17: 322–326.
19. Creighton, M.L. and Santelices, R. (2003) Effect of wildfire on soil physical and chemical properties in a *Nothofagus glauca* forest. *Revista Chilena de Historia Natural* 76: 529-542.
20. Giacomo, C. (2005) Effects of fire on properties of forest soils: a review. *Oecologia* 143: 1–10
21. Ekinci, H. (2006) Effect of forest fire on some physical, chemical and biological properties of soil in Canakkale, Turkey. *International Journal of Agriculture and Biology* 8: 102–106
22. Bergeron, Y., Leduc, A., Harvey, B. and S. Gauthier, (2002) Natural fire regime: a guide for sustainable management of the Canadian boreal forest. *Silva Fennica* 36: 81–95
23. Snyman, H.A. (2003) Short – term response in productivity following an unplanned fire in a semi-arid rangeland of South Africa. *Journal of arid Environment* 39:645-666.

24. Robinson, A.C., Copely, B.P., Canty, P.D., Baker, L.M. and Nesbitt, B.J. (2003) A Biological Survey of Anangu Pitjantjatjara Yunkunytjatjara (APY) Lands, South Australia (1991-2003). Department of Environmental Heritage. South Australia.
25. Trainor C.R. and Woinarski, J.C.Z. (1994) Responses of lizards to three experimental fires in the savanna forest of kakadu national park. *Wildlife research* 21:131-148.
26. Bradstock, R.A., Tozer, M.G. and Keith, D.A. (1997) Effects of high frequency fire on floristic composition and abundance in a fire-prone heathland near Sydney. *Australian Journal of Botany* 45: 641-655.
27. Lugo, A.E., Parrotta, J.A. & Brown, S. (1993): Loss of species caused by tropical deforestation and their recovery through management. *Ambio* 22:106–109.
28. Parrotta, J. A., Turnbull, J.W. and Jones, N. (1997) Catalyzing native forest regeneration on degraded tropical lands. *Forest Ecology and Management* 99 (1-2):1–7.
29. Hutchinson, J. and Dalziel, J.M. (1954) *Flora of West Tropical Africa*. Revised by Keay, R.W.J. Vol. I Part I. Crown Agents for Oversea Governments and Administrations, London.
30. Akobundu, I.O. and Agyakwa, C. W. (1988) *A Handbook of West Africa Weeds*. 2nd ed. African Book Builders Ltd., Ibadan, Nigeria.
31. Akobundu, I. O., Ekeleme, I., Agyakwa, C. W. and Ogazie, C. A. (2016). *A handbook of West African Weeds*, 3rd Edn. International Institute of Tropical Agriculture (IITA), Ibadan. AfKAR Printing and Publishing Company Ltd. Ikeja, Nigeria.
32. Agbagwa, I. O. and Ekeke, C. (2011) Structure and Phyto-diversity of Fresh water swamp Forest in Oil-rich Bonny, Rivers State, Nigeria. *Research Journal of Forestry* 5(2): 66 - 77.
33. Festus, M.M., Mware, J.M., Joshua, C., Francis, S., George, K.T. (2015) Floristic Composition, Affinities and Plant Formations in Tropical Forests: A Case Study of Mau Forests in Kenya. *International Journal of Agriculture and Forestry* 5(2): 79-91 DOI: 10.5923/j.ijaf.20150502.02
34. Levine, J.M. (2000) Species diversity and biological invasions: relating local process to community pattern. *Science* 288:852–854.
35. Ibrahim M. A., Hashim A. E. and Abdul R. M. A. (2011) Effect of Forest Fires on Tree Diversity and some Soil Properties. *International Journal of Agriculture & Biology* 13(5): 659–664.
36. Ducey, M.J., Moser W.K. and Ashton, P.M.S. (1996) Effect of fire intensity on understory composition and diversity in a *Kalmia*-dominated oak forest, New England, USA. *Vegetation* 123: 81-90.
37. Seyed, M.R., Assadollah M., Rahmatollah R., and Farivar N. (2012) The Assessment of Plant Species Importance Value (SIV) in Beech (*Fagus orientalis*) Forests of Iran (A Case study: Nav District 2 of Asalem, Guilan Province). *International Research Journal of Applied and Basic Sciences* 3(2): 433-439.
38. Mack, R.N. and Erneberg, M. (2002) The United States naturalized flora: largely the product of deliberate introductions. *Annals of the Missouri Botanical Garden*, 89, 176–189.
39. Sax, D.F., Gaines, S.D. and Brown, J.H. (2002) Species invasions exceed extinctions on islands worldwide: a comparative study of plants and birds. *The American Naturalist* 160(6):766–783.
40. Vitousek, P.M., Mooney, H.A., Lubchenko, J. and Melillo, J.M. (1997). Human domination of earth's ecosystems. *Science* 277:494–499.
41. Tilman, D.J., Fargione, J., Wolff, B., D'Antonio, C., Dobson, A., Howarth, R. et al. (2001). Forecasting agriculturally driven global environmental change. *Science* 292, 281–284.
42. Rosenzweig, M.L. and Abramsky, Z. (1993) How are diversity and productivity related? In: *Species Diversity in Ecological Communities* (eds. Ricklefs, R.E. & Schluter, D.). University of Chicago Press, Chicago, IL, pp. 52–65.
43. Rosenzweig, M.L. (1995) *Species Diversity in Space and Time*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK.
44. Grace, J.B. (1999). The factors controlling species density in herbaceous plant communities: an assessment. *Perspectives in Plant Ecology, Evolution and Systematics* 2: 1–28.
45. Waide, R.B., Willig, M.R., Steiner, C.F., Mittelbach, G., Gough, L., Dodson, S.I., Juday, GP. and Parmenter, R. (1999). The relationship between productivity and species richness. *Annual Review of Ecology and Systematics*, 30, 257–300. DOI: 10.1146/annurev.ecolsys.30.1.257
46. Loreau, M., Naeem, S., Inchausti, P., Bengtsson, J., Grime, J.P., Hector, A. Hooper, D.U., Huston, M.A., Raffaelli, D., Schmid, B., Tilman, D. and Wardle, D.A. (2001). Biodiversity and ecosystem functioning: current knowledge and future challenges. *Science* 294:804–808.

- 389 47. Mittelbach, G.G., Steiner, C.F., Scheiner, S.M., Gross, K.L., Reynolds, H.L., Waide, R.B., Willig, M.R.,
390 Dodson, S.I. and Gough, L. (2001) What is the observed relationship between species richness and
391 productivity? *Ecology*, 82 (9):2381–2396.
- 392 48. Hough, J. (1993) Why burn the bush? Social approaches to bush fire management in West African
393 National Parks. *Biological Conservation* 65(1): 23-28. doi:10.1016/0006-3207(93)90192-4
- 394 49. Turner, M.G.; Hargrove, W.W., Garner, R.H. and Roe, W.H. (1994) Effects of fire on landscape
395 heterogeneity in yellow stone National park, Wyoming. *Journal of vegetation science* 5:731–742.
- 396 50. Cui, W. and Perera, A.H. (2008) What we do know about forest fire size distribution, and why is this
397 knowledge useful for forest management? *International Journal of Wild land Fire* 17: 234–244
- 398 51. Liu, D., Trager, B. and Balmes, J.R. (2001) The effect of smoke inhalation on lung function and
399 airway responsiveness in woodland fire fighters. *American Journal of Respiratory and Critical Care*
400 *Medicine* 146: 1469-73.
- 401 52. Birnin-Yauri, Y.A. and Aliero, B.C. (2008) Implication of bush burning on weed Species diversity,
402 Population density and Organic Matter content of soil in BirninYauri, Kebbi State, Nigeria. *Journal of*
403 *applied Science and Environmental Management* 12(1): 53-55.
- 404 53. Gandiwa, E. (2011) Effects of repeated burning on woody vegetation structure and composition in a
405 semiarid southern African savanna. *International Journal of Environmental Sciences* 2(2): 468- 471.
- 406 54. Akinsoji, A. (2013) Vegetation Dynamics of Fire Experimental plots at Olokemeji Forest Reserve,
407 Nigeria. *Journal of Biology, Agriculture and Horticulture* 3(16):128- 133.
- 408 55. Tramor and Woinarski, 1994
- 409 56. Paltridge, R. and Latz, P. (2009) Fire Management Plan for Mann Ranges and Musgrave Ranges fire
410 Management Region of Anangu Pitjara Pitjara Yankunytjatjara Land. A Report Prepared for Anangu
411 Pitjara Pitjara Yankunytjatjara Desert Wildlife Service. Alice Spring, Australia. Pp 3
- 412 57. Hartman, G.W., Heumann B. (2004) Prescribed fire effects in the Ozarks of Missouri: the Chilton
413 Creek Project 1996–2001. In: *Proceedings, 2nd International Wild-land Fire Ecology and Fire*
414 *Management Congress*. Orlando, FL: 2003 November 16–20.
- 415 58. Hutchinson T.F., Boerner R.E.J., Sutherland S., Sutherland E.K., Ortt M., Iverson L.R. 2005.
416 Prescribed fire effects on the herbaceous layer of mixed-oak forests. *Canadian Journal of Forest*
417 *Research* 35, 877– 890.
- 418 59. Whitehouse, E. and Mulyana, A.S. (2004) Coal fires in Indonesia. *International Journal of Coal*
419 *Geology* 59: 91–97.
- 420 60. Taft, J.B. (2003) Fire effects on community structure, composition, and diversity in a dry sandstone
421 barrens. *Journal of the Torrey Botanical Society* 130 (3):170–192.
- 422 61. Fattahi, B. and Tahmasebi, A. (2010) Fire influence on vegetation changes of Zagros mountainous
423 rangelands (Case study: Hamadan province). *Iranian Journal of Rangeland* 4 (2): 228–239