

Instructions for submitting an abstract

You are invited to submit an abstract before December 15th. **Acknowledgment of receipt will be sent automatically. If you do not receive any acknowledgment, please contact us again.**

For talks, a maximum of two abstracts will be accepted for each speaker. All authors of accepted abstracts must register and be paid in full by the early registration deadline (currently February 2018). Authors failing to comply with this rule will not be included in the Conference Programme.

Oral (spoken) presentations will be limited to 20 minutes: 15 minutes for presentation and 5 minutes for questions. Contributed oral presentations will be grouped by topic. If your abstract is accepted but cannot be accommodated as an oral presentation, we may offer you the opportunity to present a poster. All oral presentation rooms will be equipped with a computer and a data projector. Poster presenters will receive general instructions on poster format once the abstract is accepted. Detailed information and instructions on presentations at the meeting will be available to presenters several months before the meeting.

Proposals must contain the following information:

Talk or poster presentation?	Talk
Language of the presentation	English
Title of the presentation (limited to 150 characters including spaces)	Comparison of the effects of even and uneven-aged forest management on biodiversity; a meta-analysis
Author's name	Meelis Seedre
• affiliation	<i>Southern Swedish Forest Research Centre, Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences—SLU, Box 49, 230 53 Alnarp, Sweden</i>
• complete contact information	<i>SLU, Box 49, 230 53 Alnarp, Sweden</i>
• e-mail address	Meelis.Seedre@slu.se
Abstract (limited to 150 words)	Uneven-aged forestry is an alternative forest management system where at least 30% of trees are always left unharvested and forest has a multi age and size structure. Selective cutting, a method that is used to create and manage uneven-aged forest, is thought to be less harmful to biodiversity compared to clearcut forestry that results even-aged forests. However, studies have conflicting results and the benefits are not clear. Through systematic term search and subsequent systematic literature search we identified 90 studies (from 3219) that compare these management systems. At first, we performed a qualitative review that highlighted the importance of landscape context. Generally, clearcuts are used by species preferring open habitat and partially cut forest by species preferring closed habitat. We saw that it is possible to also extract data for a quantitative analysis. Currently, we are extracting data to perform a meta-regression to explore the effects of these management systems further.
Required support for French/English	French