

1 Network structure and phylogenetic signal in an artificially assembled
2 plant-pollinator community

3

4

5

6

7 **James E. Cresswell^{1*} and Laura Hernandez²**

8

9

10

11 *¹Biosciences, College of Life & Environmental Sciences, University of Exeter,*
12 *Hatherly Laboratories, Prince of Wales Road, Exeter, EX4 4PS, United Kingdom;*

13 *²Laboratoire de Physique Théorique et Modélisation, UMR8089 CNRS-University of*
14 *Cergy-Pontoise, 2 Avenue Adolphe Chauvin, 95302, Cergy-Pontoise Cedex, France;*

15

16 ORIGINAL ARTICLE

17

18 Running title: Structure of an artificial community

19

20 *Author for correspondence (j.e.cresswell@ex.ac.uk)

21

22

ABSTRACT

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

- *Background and Aims* Community ecologists are principally occupied with the proposition that natural assemblages of species exhibit orderliness and with identifying its causes. Plant-pollinator networks exhibit a variety of orderly properties, one of which is ‘nestedness’. Nestedness has been attributed to various causes, but we propose a further influence arising from the phylogenetic structure of the biochemical constraints on the pollen diets of bees. We use an artificial assemblage as an opportunity to isolate the action of this mechanism.
- *Methods* We analyzed a network describing interactions between 52 bee species and a collection of milkvetches (*Astragalus* spp.) and sainfoins (*Onobrychis* spp.) in a botanical garden in the northwest of the United States of America, whose papilionoid flowers were relatively similar in form.
- *Key Results* The network connections of both plants and pollinators were significantly nested. The network both carried phylogenetic signal, whereby related species tend to interact with the same mutualists, and exhibited phylogenetic reciprocity, whereby the partners of evolutionarily related species were, themselves, related.
- *Conclusions* The properties of the network that we studied are consistent with the proposition that nestedness is caused by the phylogeny of diet range in bees, but the claim is preliminary and we propose that valuable progress in understanding plant-pollinator systems may be made through applying the techniques of chemical ecology at the community scale.

- 1 **Key words:** chemical ecology, community structure, oligolecty, pollen, polylecty,
- 2 social bees, solitary bees

1 INTRODUCTION

2

3 Community ecologists are principally occupied with the proposition that natural
4 assemblages of species exhibit orderliness (Hutchinson, 1953). Formally, the
5 orderliness of a natural assemblage can be established by comparison with randomly
6 assembled communities, which are produced by computer algorithms (Connor and
7 Simberloff, 1979). If interactions among species are depicted as web diagrams
8 (Elton, 1927; Lindeman 1942), orderliness can be sought in the patterns that become
9 apparent (Briand and Cohen). For webs that depict trophic relationships, or food
10 webs, various generalizations emerge (Dunne, 2005). For example, food chains are
11 typically short and cycles are rare (Cohen, 1989). It is natural to ask after the causes
12 of these patterns. Some recurrent structural motifs that are attributable to their
13 relative stability when interactions affect the population dynamics of species (May,
14 1972), but it is important also to recognize that interactions between species are
15 based on individual-level mechanisms. For example, predator-prey relations depend
16 greatly on size relationships (whether it is feasible for a predator to subdue and eat a
17 certain prey) and on the economic decisions made by predators (whether it is
18 worthwhile for a predator to eat a certain prey; Elton, 1927) and some important
19 structural motifs of food webs are well explained by this (Beckerman *et al.*, 2006;
20 Petchey *et al.*, 2008). Mechanisms that arise from the intrinsic morphological and
21 physiological attributes of organisms could structure newly assembled communities
22 that lack the influences of biogeographic filters, which affect the likelihood that a
23 species colonizes the site, and ecological sorting, in which some species exclude
24 others through interspecific interactions, such as competition (Chave, 2009) and
25 predation (Holt, 2009). Here, we investigate orderliness in the interaction web of a

1 new, artificially assembled community of plants and their pollinators and seek its
2 causes in individual-based mechanisms.

3

4 Interactions between guilds of mutualists can be construed as ‘two-node’ networks
5 and depicted as bipartite graphs (Jordano, 1987). The networks have two kinds of
6 node with links that represent interactions only between nodes of different types. For
7 plant-pollinator communities, the two node types relate to the pollinators and the
8 plants. Plant-pollinator networks from a wide range of natural communities exhibit a
9 variety of recurrent statistical properties (Vásquez *et al.*, 2009), one of which is
10 ‘nestedness’ (Bascompte *et al.*, 2003; Patterson and Atmar, 1986). A mutualist
11 network exhibits nestedness when nodes vary in the number of partners they have
12 and the partners of any one node are a perfect subset of the partners of other nodes
13 of the same type. Nestedness implies that nodes in a particular layer with few
14 connections, or specialists, are connected to nodes in the other layer that are
15 themselves connected to highly connected generalists in the original layer. In effect,
16 this means that direct interactions between specialists are absent or rare and species
17 of the same guild interact indirectly through generalists. Strong nestedness therefore
18 indicates a high degree of organization in the community. As noted above, it is
19 natural to enquire about the causes of this striking structural motif and two ecological
20 mechanisms have been implicated as causes of nestedness in plant-pollinator
21 networks; ‘interaction neutrality’ (Krishna *et al.*, 2008), which occurs when the
22 probability of interaction between two species is the product of their relative
23 abundances; and ‘size matching’ (Stang *et al.*, 2006; Stang *et al.*, 2007), which
24 occurs when the proboscis length of a nectivorous pollinator species must exceed a
25 threshold to exploit the nectar of a particular plant species – the threshold being

1 determined by the depth of the nectary in that species' flowers. Here, we investigate
2 nestedness in a community where these two mechanisms are particularly weak.

3

4 The observations that we analyze were made on a collection of milkvetches
5 (*Astragalus* spp.) and sainfoins (*Onobrychis* spp.) in a botanical garden in the
6 northwest of the United States of America (Clement *et al.*, 2006). We term these
7 plants and their associated bee fauna the 'Pullman community' and we refer to the
8 associated network as the 'Pullman network'. Morphologically, the flowers of the
9 Pullman community are exceptionally homogeneous compared to those in a natural
10 community, because the species are distributed only between closely related clades
11 in the legume family (Wojciechowski *et al.*, 2004). Collectively, flowers vary among
12 these species in size, colour and arrangement on inflorescences, but their basic
13 geometry is remarkably constant (Herrera, 2005), because their flowers are simply
14 morphological variations on the papilionaceous (pea-flower) groundplan - a showy
15 banner petal, two keel petals that surround the joined stamens and pistil, and two
16 wing petals (Arroyo, 1981). Even though the *Astragalus* clade contains ten times as
17 many species as *Onobrychis*' clade (it is among the most species-rich genera of the
18 angiosperms, with approximately 2500 species), there is no distinctive morphological
19 innovation, floral or vegetative, to explain this (Sanderson and Wojciechowski, 1996).
20 Consequently, size matching originating in variation in floral morphology is unlikely to
21 be a strong cause of network nestedness. Interaction neutrality is also likely to be
22 weak, because the relative abundance of plant species was equal by virtue of the
23 constant size of the nursery beds. Why, then, should we expect the Pullman network
24 to be nested?

25

1 We propose a mechanism arising from the evolution of a pollen diet among bees.
2 The typical pollinator fauna of milkvetches and sainfoins in North America comprised
3 two kinds of social bees - the introduced honeybee (*Apis mellifera* L.) and native
4 bumblebees (*Bombus* spp.) - and various native solitary bees, such as digger bees
5 (*Anthophora* spp.), mason bees (*Osmia* spp.) and sweat bees (*Halictidae* spp.).
6 These bees land on the keel petals and thereby trip the flower's mechanism to reach
7 the nectar and pollen (Green and Bohart, 1975; Karron, 1987). The bee species in
8 the Pullman community have various levels of dietary specialization. Bees are
9 termed 'polylectic' if they collect pollen from a wide variety of flowers and 'oligolectic'
10 if the range of their pollen diet is narrow (Cane and Sipes, 2006). These dietary
11 variations can cause network nestedness as follows. Oligolecty is the likely ancestral
12 state in bees (Larkin *et al.*, 2008; Sedivy *et al.*, 2008) and polylecty is a derived trait
13 that emerges when a lineage develops the capacity to overcome certain 'constraints',
14 which are postulated to arise in pollen digestion and neurological limits on the
15 recognition and handling of flowers (Sedivy *et al.*, 2008). If the evolution of polylecty
16 merely extends the ancestral oligolectic diet, because lineages retain the ability to
17 use pollen from an ancestral host-plant (Larkin *et al.*, 2008), the ancestral oligolectic
18 diets will be a subset of the derived polylectic diets and nestedness will result. As
19 observed (Jordano *et al.*, 2006), nestedness will be widespread among plant-
20 pollinator communities, because oligolectic and polylectic species coexist in virtually
21 all bee faunas so far investigated (Sedivy *et al.*, 2008). If the plant species in the
22 Pullman community vary in pollen quality for different bees, and bees can
23 discriminate among their flowers based on this, we should expect nestedness in the
24 Pullman network. If we are correct in proposing that the overall similarity among
25 flowers in the Pullman community means that mechanical constraints (the feasibility

1 of visiting a flower) and neurological constraints (the feasibility of recognizing and
2 handling a flower) do not limit the dietary range of bees, an evaluation of nestedness
3 among pollinators is a test of the capacity for the biochemical attributes of pollen to
4 structure a plant-pollinator community.

5

6 Specialized pollination in plants is typically considered as being achieved through
7 morphological adaptations of the flower, such as long spurs that act as deep wells to
8 conceal nectar from all except the longest-tongued visitors, and these adaptations
9 function as 'filters' to exclude particular floral visitors (Johnson and Steiner, 2000). If
10 these filters are phylogenetically derived traits, then the 'pollinator diets' of
11 specialized plants will be subsets of an ancestral generalized diet, which could cause
12 nestedness. However, nestedness may arise despite morphological homogeneity
13 among flowers, if there are derived biochemical traits that also act as filters, such as
14 floral scent (Dotterl and Vereecken, 2010) and nectar allelochemicals (Shuttleworth
15 and Johnson, 2009). Potentially, the biochemical composition of pollen could be a
16 filter and its evolution could contribute to nestedness in the Pullman network. If we
17 are correct in proposing that morphological filters against bees are largely absent
18 among the flowers of the Pullman network, an evaluation of nestedness among
19 plants is a test of the capacity for biochemical attributes of pollen to structure a plant-
20 pollinator community.

21

22 The mechanism for generating nestedness that we propose has a phylogenetic
23 basis. If it operates on the Pullman network, we expect to detect strong phylogenetic
24 influence in other ways. We therefore evaluate the Pullman network for phylogenetic
25 signal, which is the tendency of evolutionarily-related species to resemble each other

1 more than species drawn at random from across the evolutionary tree (Blomberg and
2 Garland, 2002). In mutualist networks, the presence of phylogenetic signal means
3 that related species will tend to interact with the same subset of partner mutualists.
4 Phylogenetic signal is a recurring pattern in natural plant-pollinator networks
5 (Rezende *et al.*, 2007) and we therefore test for it in our artificial community. We
6 also test for a further phylogenetic influence on network structure, 'phylogenetic
7 reciprocity', which we define as the tendency of the partners of evolutionarily related
8 species to be, themselves, related.

9

10

11

MATERIALS AND METHODS

12

Study system

14 The plant-pollinator community that we analysed was described by Clement *et al.*
15 (2006). It was situated in two adjoining open field nurseries of the USDA's Western
16 Regional Plant Introduction Station in Pullman, Washington, USA (46°40' 13" N 117°
17 45' 8" W) among steppe vegetation comprising a mosaic of grasses, balsam root
18 (*Balsamorhiza sagitta* Pursh.; Asteraceae), lupines (*Lupinus* spp.; Fabaceae) and
19 various shrubs, such hawthorne (*Crataegus* spp.; Rosaceae) and rose (*Rosa* spp.;
20 Rosaceae). Each nursery contained a collection of species from a single genus: the
21 *Astragalus* nursery comprised 68 species and the *Onobrychis* nursery comprised 35
22 species. Individual plants were spaced 0.4 m apart in rows spaced 1.5 m apart.
23 Individuals from each plant species occupied adjacent positions. Bees in the
24 nurseries were censused on 18 occasions during 1989-93, which occurred between
25 May and June of each year. Selected plant species comprised between three and 18

1 flowering individuals and each was sampled for 15 minutes each day between each
2 between 11:00 and 15:00 by using insect nets to capture bees for subsequent
3 identification. Bees were collected both on flowers and while patrolling above and
4 around flowers.

5

6 To test the adequacy of the procedure for collecting bees, we examined whether
7 there was an asymptote in the species accumulation curve, i.e. the relationship
8 between the number of bee species collected and the number of plant species
9 sampled. We fitted a three-parameter asymptotic exponential curve to this
10 relationship (i.e. number of bee species collected = $a - be^{-c \times \text{plants}}$, where a and b are
11 fitted constants and plants is the number of plant species from which observations of
12 bees are included). To evaluate the sampling variability in the asymptotic values of
13 the number of bee species collected, we fitted this curve for each of 20 random
14 permutations of the order in which plant species were observed.

15

16 *Network nestedness*

17 We constructed a bipartite network for the Pullman community by linking plant
18 species to their floral visitors and we assumed that patrolling behaviour indicated of
19 floral utilization, so that all captured insects were taken to be flower visitors. To
20 quantify the Pullman network's level of nestedness, various statistical indices can be
21 used (Ulrich *et al.*, 2009), but most are so-called 'distance metrics' that evaluate the
22 nestedness of the entire network. Instead, we used an index that can quantify
23 separately the nestedness of each guild of mutualists (Burgos *et al.*, 2009). The
24 index is based on the Attack Tolerance Curve (ATC; Memmott *et al.*, 2004), which
25 indicates the response of a network to the elimination of a given fraction of species of

1 one guild, after which some species of the other guild may be left without connection
 2 and hence become extinct. Thus, the ATC relates the fraction of surviving species of
 3 one guild to the fraction of eliminated (attacked) species of the other guild. The ATC
 4 of a network depends on its level of nestedness and the attack strategy deployed
 5 against it. If the attack strategy eliminates species in one guild by beginning with the
 6 most highly connected and proceeding rankwise to the least connected, then
 7 perfectly nested networks have a distinctive, convex-shaped ATC signature. If,
 8 instead, elimination proceeds from the least connected, the ATC signature is
 9 concave. The quantitative difference between these two signatures can be used as
 10 an index of nestedness (Fig. 1; Burgos et al. 2009), as follows.

11

12 Let the robustness coefficient, R_A , be defined as the area under the ATC, which
 13 depends on the particular attack strategy, denoted by the subscript A . There are two
 14 alternative, extreme attack strategies: eliminate nodes of a given type rankwise
 15 starting from the highest degree, denoted $A = (+ \rightarrow -)$; and the opposite scheme,
 16 starting from the lowest degree, denoted $A = (- \rightarrow +)$, where a node's degree is the
 17 number of connections to it. In the case of perfect nestedness, the attack strategy ($-$
 18 $\rightarrow +$) yields $R_{(- \rightarrow +)} = 1$ and $(+ \rightarrow -)$ yields $R_{(+ \rightarrow -)} = \phi$. We define the nestedness
 19 coefficient, H , as the normalized difference between these robustness coefficients,
 20 i.e.

21

$$22 \quad H = (R_{(- \rightarrow +)} - R_{(+ \rightarrow -)}) / (1 - \phi). \quad (\text{Eq. 1})$$

23

24 This coefficient is correctly bounded, because $H = 1$ for perfect nestedness and H
 25 decreases for increasingly random networks, with $H = 0$ in the perfectly anti-nested

1 case. We determined the sampling distribution of H under the null hypothesis that
2 species interactions were allocated among nodes randomly and independently, but
3 with the proviso that the degree distributions are fixed in the attacked guild.
4 Biologically, we compare the observed nestedness of a guild to a randomized version
5 of itself, which is one that is connected at random to the available mutualist partners
6 who themselves have pre-defined diet breadths. Statistically, this makes our
7 significance tests more conservative than in a comparison between the observed
8 network structure and the collection of networks with completely randomized
9 connections (Ulrich et al.). These Monte Carlo randomizations were implemented in
10 Fortran95 (Koelbel *et al.*, 1994). For comparison with previous analyses (Jordano et
11 al. 2006), we also calculated a standard index of ‘nestedness temperature’, denoted
12 T (Atmar and Patterson, 1995) and report the nestedness coefficient, N , which is
13 calculated as $N = (100 - T)/100$.

14

15

16 *Phylogenetic signal*

17 Initially, we tested whether the clades of each guild were ecologically differentiated
18 by Analysis of Molecular Variance (AMOVA) as follows. We summarized the
19 observed pairwise direct interactions in the community as an adjacency matrix, \mathbf{K} ,
20 where the list of interactions for each species of one guild occupies a row and each
21 of the columns corresponds to a species of the other guild. Each element of \mathbf{K} is
22 identified by its location in the i^{th} row and j^{th} column and it takes the value of unity if
23 the i^{th} species of one guild interacts with the j^{th} species of the other guild, and zero
24 otherwise. For each species, the details of its interactions are a list of zeros and
25 ones, which is formally homologous to the binary haplotype data that is analysed by

1 population geneticists using AMOVA. Rather than seeking differentiation in
2 haplotypes among populations, we are seeking differentiation in interaction profiles
3 among clades, which were either genera (plants) or families (bees). We
4 implemented AMOVA and the PCA ordination in GenAlEx v. 6.41 (Peakall and
5 Smouse 2006).

6

7 If significant phylogenetic differentiation was detected, we then compared clades
8 within each guild pairwise as follows. First, we described the 'ecological similarity'
9 between each pair of species, a and b , by quantifying the level of similarity in their
10 array of partners using the simple matching coefficient, $S_{a,b} = M/C$, where M is the
11 number of matching partners, i.e. partners that visit both a and b , and C is the
12 number of partners compared, i.e. the set of partners of a and b . Consider a pair of
13 clades, denoted A and B , that comprise sets of species $\{a_1, a_2, \dots, a_m\}$ and $\{b_1, b_2, \dots,$
14 $b_n\}$ respectively. Within each clade, we calculated the mean ecological similarity of
15 all possible pairs of species, denoted $\langle S_{A,A} \rangle$ and $\langle S_{B,B} \rangle$, and calculated their grand
16 mean $\langle S^*_{\text{within}} \rangle$. We also calculated the ecological similarity between all possible
17 pairs of species drawn one per clade and calculated their grand mean $\langle S^*_{\text{between}} \rangle$.
18 By analogy to the F statistic in Analysis of Variance, we calculated the ratio $F^* =$
19 $\langle S^*_{\text{within}} \rangle / \langle S^*_{\text{between}} \rangle$, which takes a value greater than unity if the two clades are
20 differentiated in their mutualist partners. We tested the statistical significance of
21 deviations of F^* from unity by determining the critical values of the sampling
22 distribution of F^* under the null hypothesis that the composition of a species
23 interactions was independent of phylogeny. We pooled the $(m + n)$ species of clades
24 A and B and used a Monte Carlo randomization to assign them to two groups of size
25 m and n , respectively, and calculated F^* as described above. After at least 1000

1 iterations of this randomization, the 95th percentile of the resulting sampling
2 distribution of F^* served as the critical value for rejecting the null hypothesis with a
3 confidence level of $P < 0.05$, etc. Rather than applying this procedure to all possible
4 pairs of clades within a guild, which would inflate the rate of Type 1 error, we
5 proceeded in the style of an orthogonal contrast and compared each clade only with
6 its sister. These Monte Carlo randomizations were implemented in **R** (Ihaka and
7 Gentleman, 1996).

8

9

10 *Phylogenetic reciprocity*

11

12 We tested whether the Pullman network contained significant phylogenetic reciprocity
13 as follows. We defined the phylogenetic distance between two species in the same
14 mutualist guild as the number of cladistic bifurcations that are passed in travelling the
15 shortest route along the phylogenetic tree from one species to the other, with the
16 proviso that the total distance between any species and the root of the tree is equal,
17 i.e. that the distances are ultrametric. Thus, even if a species has no sister taxa
18 between itself and the root of the phylogeny, the phylogenetic distance between that
19 species and the root of the tree is taken to be equal to the greatest number of
20 bifurcations between any species and the root of the tree, etc., which in effect credits
21 both phyletic and cladistic evolutionary change in our quantification of phylogenetic
22 distance. For a given clade of one mutualist guild (genus for plants, family for bees),
23 we calculated the mean phylogenetic distance among its mutualist partners given the
24 observed topology of the network and of the phylogenetic tree, denoted $\langle d_{\text{obs}} \rangle$, as
25 follows.

1

2 Let \mathbf{K}' denote an adjacency matrix whose rows are a subset of those of the
 3 community's adjacency matrix, \mathbf{K} , such that it describes the mutualist network only
 4 for those species that belong to a designated clade. Let \mathbf{D} denote a lower
 5 triangular matrix, whose non-zero entries are each a phylogenetic distance among
 6 pairs of species of the other mutualist guild. The phylogenetic distances among the
 7 pairs of members of this guild linked through members of the other guild are the
 8 elements of \mathbf{W} , a matrix that is given by the product $\mathbf{K}_T \mathbf{K} \mathbf{D}$, where \mathbf{K}_T denotes the
 9 transpose of \mathbf{K} . The mean phylogenetic distance among the mutualist partners
 10 given the observed topology of the network and of the phylogenetic tree, $\langle d_{\text{obs}} \rangle$, is
 11 given by:

12

$$13 \quad \langle d_{\text{obs}} \rangle = \sum_{i,j} \mathbf{W} / k_{\text{total}} \quad (\text{Eq 2})$$

14 where k_{total} is the number of mutualist pairs that are connected through the network
 15 specified by \mathbf{K}' . To determine the sampling distribution of $\langle d \rangle$ under the null
 16 hypothesis that a clade interacts with its mutualists independently of their
 17 phylogenetic relatedness, we randomized the mutualist's phylogeny in relation to the
 18 network by permuting the labels of the rows and columns of \mathbf{D} , which maintains the
 19 topology of the phylogeny, but randomly connects it to the network. For each
 20 randomization, we used Eq 2 to calculate $\langle d_{\text{rand}} \rangle$, the mean phylogenetic distance
 21 among the connected mutualists given the observed topology of the network and the
 22 randomized phylogenetic tree. The Monte Carlo sampling distribution of $\langle d_{\text{rand}} \rangle$ was
 23 then obtained from at least 1000 permutations of the phylogenetic tree and its critical
 24 percentiles compared with $\langle d_{\text{obs}} \rangle$.

25

1 For bees, we used a published phylogeny (Danforth *et al.*, 2006) with the following
2 taxa including the species at the branch tips: Andrenidae, non-social Apidae
3 (Anthophora, Eucera), Social Apidae (*A. mellifera* and *Bombus* spp.), Colletidae,
4 Halictidae, and Megachilidae, which yielded a maximum ultrametric pairwise distance
5 between species of $d = 10$. For plants, we used a simple, unresolved tree with two
6 taxa, *Astragalus* spp. and *Onobrychis* spp., that included the species at the branch
7 tips, which yielded a maximum ultrametric distance of $d = 4$. These Monte Carlo
8 randomizations were implemented in **R** (Ihaka and Gentleman, 1996).

9

10

11

RESULTS

12

13 The field investigators collected 52 bee species that were associated with 37 plant
14 species. For bees, the fitted species accumulation curves were well described by
15 three-parameter asymptotic exponential relationships (mean r-squared = 0.97, SD =
16 0.016, $n = 20$) and these curves had an average asymptotic value of approximately
17 56.5 (SE = 1.94, $n = 19$). The observed species richness was significantly lower than
18 this (t -test, $t = 2.35$, $df = 19$, $P < 0.05$). These results indicate that the collections
19 from the nurseries had sampled almost all of the available bee species in the locality,
20 but that we estimate that about four bee species were missing from the network.

21

22 The community yielded 258 pairwise interactions (Fig. 2) from a potential of (52×37)
23 = 1924, which is a network density of 13.4%. Among bees, the mean number of
24 plant partners was 5.0 (SE = 0.70, $n = 52$; Fig.1) and the mean pairwise ecological
25 similarity was $\langle S \rangle = 0.12$ (SE = 0.004, $n = 2704$). Among plants, the mean number of

1 insect partners was 7.0 (SE = 0.90, n = 37; Fig. 1) and the mean pairwise ecological
2 similarity was $\langle S \rangle = 0.14$ (SE = 0.004, n = 1332).

3

4 *Nestedness*

5 According to the conventional index, the network is significantly nested (Fig. 3; $N =$
6 0.88 , $P < 0.05$). For both bees and plants, the Pullman network is significantly more
7 nested than randomized networks ($H \approx 0.55$, $P < 0.001$; Fig. 4), but the ATCs are
8 straight for both animals and plants, which implies that the system is at the order-
9 disorder transition.

10

11 *Phylogenetic signal*

12 Overall, the clades of bees were significantly differentiated in floral associations
13 (AMOVA, $\Phi_{PT} = 0.08$, $P = 0.013$) and there was significant pairwise differentiation
14 among some sister clades (Fig. 5). The two genera of plants were significantly
15 differentiated in their mutualistic partners; the mean pairwise ecological similarity
16 within genera was $\langle S_{\text{within}} \rangle = 0.17$ and the ratio of similarity between vs. within the
17 genera was $F^* = 1.68$ ($P < 0.001$).

18

19 *Phylogenetic reciprocity*

20 Phylogenetic reciprocity was evident among clades of both plant and animal
21 mutualists. The partners of various clades of bees were themselves significantly
22 closely related (Fig. 6a). This occurred when clades of bees had dietary preferences
23 for species of *Astragalus* (e.g. Megachilidae, Apidae). Similarly, the partners of the
24 plant genera were significantly closely related (Fig. 6b).

25

1

2

3

DISCUSSION

4

5 Despite its artificial origin, the Pullman network has some attributes in the normal
6 range for networks describing natural plant-pollinator communities, such its density
7 and degree distributions, but with respect to nestedness, it is special. The Pullman
8 network shows significant orderliness in this aspect, although networks from natural
9 systems are more strongly nested, particularly for the animal guild where $0.6 \leq H \leq$
10 0.75 (Burgos *et al.*, 2009). If we were to use a self-ordering algorithm to progress
11 step-wise towards a nested network starting from a random one, the network would
12 pass through an order-disorder transition, which is situated at the point where the
13 ATC curves are flat and $H = 0.5$ (Burgos *et al.*, 2009). The Pullman network is
14 almost precisely at this transition. Whatever factors are shaping the Pullman
15 network, we may say that they have brought it to a non-random state of incipient
16 nestedness. What are the factors responsible?

17

18 We have argued that neither interaction neutrality nor size matching are likely to be
19 strong causes of orderliness. The evenness in the abundances of plants in the
20 nursery beds that was intrinsic to the study's design undermines the influence of
21 interaction neutrality and, furthermore, certain results yield tangible evidence to
22 support our claim that size matching is also weak. Specifically, all but two of the
23 plant species were visited by at least one species of solitary bee. Solitary bees are
24 generally smaller than social bees, but it was apparently feasible for a small bee to
25 enter and exploit virtually any of the flowers in the Pullman community.

1 Consequently, we argue that there was no minimum size threshold that restricted
2 certain plants to only the larger insects. We have instead proposed that the
3 evolution of pollen diets in bee lineages (Sedivy *et al.*, 2008) could be a source of
4 nestedness, but what support for this 'dietary constraint hypothesis' is provided by
5 our analysis of the Pullman network?

6

7 When considered at the level of taxonomic family, many of the bee lineages
8 interacted with statistically distinct sets of plant partners, which is consistent with the
9 proposition that lineages experience dietary constraints. These sets were not sharply
10 defined, however, because the levels of pairwise dietary similarity among bee
11 species within lineages was relatively low, being only about 1.4 times greater than
12 the background pairwise similarity of c. 10% plant species in common. Furthermore,
13 we also found that the mutualist partners of bee lineages were themselves related,
14 which we termed phylogenetic reciprocity. When applied to families of bees with the
15 more narrow diets, this finding is a quantitative demonstration of the phenomenon of
16 oligolecty in the strictest sense, namely that the plants that comprise an oligolectic
17 diet shall be themselves taxonomically restricted (Cane and Sipes, 2006). When this
18 phylogenetic relatedness among plants is reflected in the biochemical similarity of
19 pollen (e.g. Weiner *et al.*, 2010), this too is consistent with the proposition that dietary
20 constraints limit the taxonomic scope of bee lineages for establishing partners. We
21 therefore postulate that biochemical constraints on bee diets make the network
22 orderly, but that they are only sufficiently powerful to bring the Pullman network to
23 incipient nestedness. Presumably, natural communities are more strongly nested
24 because of the additional contributions of size matching and interactive neutrality .

25

1 *Caveats and prospects*

2

3 Our description of the Pullman network is probably be missing a few bee species and
4 contains some inappropriate links, because patrolling bees were not distinguished
5 from flower visitors. However, we do not think that these inaccuracies bias our
6 analysis of nestedness (Araujo *et al.*, 2010; Vazquez *et al.*, 2009) and the pervasive
7 phylogenetic orderliness that we found in the network gives us confidence that it has
8 abstracted important aspects of biological reality.

9

10 We recognize that the structure of the Pullman network provides only weak support
11 for the hypothesis that its incipient nestedness originated in phylogenetically
12 arranged constraints on the pollen diets of insects, not least because it is possible to
13 invoke an alternative that fits the observed pattern equally well, namely that subtle
14 morphologically-based size matching had created the pattern. Formally, there are
15 nine criteria for scientifically implicating a factor as the cause of a biological effect
16 (Hill, 1965) and our hypothesis that dietary constraint causes nestedness meets only
17 three. Specifically, we have proposed a plausible mechanism, it is analogous to
18 other known mechanisms (e.g. the power of secondary chemicals to organize plant-
19 herbivore communities; Becerra, 2007), and it is coherent with known facts about
20 dietary selectivity in bees and the differentials among plant species in the nutritive
21 value of their pollens to bees (Roulston and Cane, 2002; Tasei and Aupinel, 2008).
22 However, our explanation fails to meet other key criteria, such as the need to show
23 that similar effects on nestedness occur consistently in a range of studies and that
24 the effect is demonstrated experimentally. However, these criteria help to identify
25 some requirements for further work, as follows. First, it will be important to

1 investigate nestedness in networks from additional communities where the
2 contribution of other mechanisms (e.g. size matching) is controlled, which is probably
3 most feasible in artificial plant communities. Second, besides the basic phenomenon
4 of oligolecty, some further particularities of the 'dietary constraint' hypothesis should
5 be investigated mechanistically. Specifically, its validity depends on the existence of
6 nestedness in the biochemical profiles of plant pollens and, furthermore, on the ability
7 of pollinators to make flower choices based on recognising this level of variation,
8 perhaps through associated floral volatiles (Raguso, 2008). In essence, we propose
9 that valuable progress in understanding plant-pollinator systems may be made
10 through applying the techniques of chemical ecology at the community scale, as has
11 been done elsewhere (Becerra, 2007).

12

13

14

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

15

16 L.H. is grateful for enlightening discussions with H.Ceva, E.Burgos and R.P.Perazzo
17 concerning nestedness and its measure. J.E.C. respectfully dedicates this work to
18 Beverly Rathcke, his PhD supervisor.

19

20

LITERATURE CITED

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

Araujo AIL, de Almeida AM, Cardoso MZ, Corso G. 2010. Abundance and nestedness in interaction networks. *Ecological Complexity* **7**:494-499.

Arroyo M. 1981. Breeding systems and pollination biology in Leguminosae. In: Polhill R, Raven P (eds) *Advances in Legume systematics, Part 2*. London: Royal Botanic Gardens, Kew.

Atmar W, Patterson BD. 1995. *The nestedness temperature calculator: a visual basic program, including 294 presence-absence matrices*. New Mexico: AICS Research, Inc.

Bascompte J, Jordano P, Melian C, Olesen J. 2003. The nested assembly of plant-animal mutualistic networks. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America* **100**:9383-9387.

Becerra JX. 2007. The impact of herbivore-plant coevolution on plant community structure. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America* **104**:7483-7488.

Beckerman A, Petchey O, Warren P. 2006. Foraging biology predicts food web complexity. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America* **103**:13745-13749.

1 **Blomberg SP, Garland T. 2002.** Tempo and mode in evolution: phylogenetic inertia,
2 adaptation and comparative methods. *Journal of Evolutionary Biology* **15**:899-
3 910.

4

5 **Briand F, Cohen J. 1984.** Community food webs have scale-invariant structure.
6 *Nature* **307**:264-267.

7

8 **Burgos E, Ceva H, Hernandez L, Perazzo RPJ. 2009.** Understanding and
9 characterizing nestedness in mutualistic bipartite networks. *Computer Physics*
10 *Communications* **180**:532-535.

11

12 **Cane J, Sipes S. 2006.** Characterizing floral specialization in bees: analytical
13 methods and a revised lexicon for oligolecty. In: Waser N, Ollerton J (eds)
14 *Plant-pollinator interactions*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 99-122.

15

16 **Chave J. 2009.** Competition, neutrality, and community organization. In: Levin S (ed)
17 *The Princeton guide to ecology*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

18

19 **Clement S, Griswold T, Rust R, Hellier B, Stout D. 2006.** Bee associates of
20 flowering *Astragalus* and *Onobrychis* genebank accessions at a Snake River
21 site in Eastern Washington. *Journal of the Kansas Entomological Society*
22 **79**:254-260.

23

1 **Cohen JE. 1989.** Food webs and community structure. In: Roughgarden J, May RM,
2 Levin SA (eds) *Perspectives in ecological theory*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton
3 University Press, 181-202.

4

5 **Connor E, Simberloff D. 1979.** The assembly of species communities: chance or
6 competition? *American Naturalist* **113**:791-833.

7

8 **Danforth BN, Sipes SD, Fang J, Brady SG. 2006.** The history of early bee
9 diversification based on five genes plus morphology. *Proceedings of the*
10 *National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America* **103**: 15118-15123

11

12 **Dotterl S, Vereecken NJ. 2010.** The chemical ecology and evolution of bee-flower
13 interactions: a review and perspectives. *Canadian Journal of Zoology* **88**:668-
14 697.

15

16 **Dunne J. 2005.** The network structure of food webs. In: Pascual M, Dunne J (eds)
17 *Ecological networks*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

18

19 **Elton C. 1927.** *Animal ecology*. London: Sidgwick and Jackson, Ltd.

20

21 **Green T, Bohart G. 1975.** The pollination ecology of *Astragalus cibarius* and
22 *Astragalus utahensis* (Leguminosae). *American Journal of Botany* **62**:379-386.

23

24 **Herrera J. 2005.** Phenotypic correlations among plant parts in Iberian Papilionoideae
25 (Fabaceae). *Annals Of Botany* **95**:345-350.

1

2 **Hill A. 1965.** The environment and disease: association or causation? *Proceedings*
3 *of the Royal Society of Medicine* **58**:295-300.

4

5 **Holt R. 2009.** Predation and community organization. In: Levin S (ed) *The Princeton*
6 *guide to ecology*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

7

8 **Hutchinson G. 1953.** The concept of pattern in ecology. *Proceedings of the*
9 *Academy of Natural Sciences of Philadelphia* **105**:1-12.

10

11 **Ihaka R, Gentleman R. 1996.** A language for data analysis and graphics. *Journal of*
12 *Computational and Graphical Statistics* **5**:299-314.

13

14 **Johnson SD, Steiner KE. 2000.** Generalization versus specialization in plant
15 pollination systems. *Trends in Ecology & Evolution* **15**:140-143.

16

17 **Jordano P. 1987.** Patterns of mutualistic interactions in pollination and seed
18 dispersal: connectance, dependence asymmetries, and coevolution. *American*
19 *Naturalist* **129**:657-677.

20

21 **Jordano P, Bascompte J, Olesen J. 2006.** The ecological consequences of
22 complex topology and nested structure in pollination webs. In: Waser N,
23 Ollerton J (eds) *Plant-pollinator interactions*. Chicago: University of Chicago
24 Press, 173-199.

25

1 **Karron J. 1987.** The pollination ecology of co-occurring geographically restricted and
2 widespread species of *Astragalus* (Fabaceae). *Biological Conservation*
3 **39**:179-193.

4
5 **Koelbel C, Loveman D, Schreiber R, Steele G, Zosel M. 1994.** *The high*
6 *performance Fortran handbook*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

7
8 **Krishna A, Guimaraes P, Jordano P, Bascompte J. 2008.** A neutral-niche theory of
9 nestedness in mutualistic networks. *Oikos* **117**:1609-1618.

10
11 **Larkin LL, Neff JL, Simpson BB. 2008.** The evolution of a pollen diet: Host choice
12 and diet breadth of *Andrena* bees (Hymenoptera : Andrenidae). *Apidologie*
13 **39**:133-145.

14
15 **Lindeman R. 1942.** The trophic-dynamic aspect of ecology. *Ecology* **23**:399-418.

16
17 **May R. 1972.** Will a large complex system be stable? *Nature* **238**:413-414.

18
19 **Memmott J, Waser NM, Price MV. 2004.** Tolerance of pollination networks to
20 species extinctions. *Proceedings Of The Royal Society Of London Series B*
21 **271**:2605-2611.

22
23 **Patterson B, Atmar W. 1986.** Nested subsets and the structure of insular
24 mammalian faunas and archipelagos. *Biological Journal of the Linnean*
25 *Society* **28**:65-82.

1

2 **Peakall R, Smouse P. 2006.** GENALEX 6: genetic analysis in Excel. *Molecular*
3 *Ecology Notes* **6**:288-295.

4

5 **Petchey O, Beckerman A, Riede J, Warren P. 2008.** Size, foraging, and food web
6 structure. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United*
7 *States of America* **105**:4191-4196.

8

9 **Raguso RA. 2008.** Wake Up and Smell the Roses: The ecology and evolution of
10 floral scent. *Annual Review of Ecology Evolution and Systematics* **39**:549-569.

11

12 **Rezende EL, Lavabre JE, Guimaraes PR, Jordano P, Bascompte J. 2007.** Non-
13 random coextinctions in phylogenetically structured mutualistic networks.
14 *Nature* **448**:925-926.

15

16 **Roulston TH, Cane JH. 2002.** The effect of pollen protein concentration on body
17 size in the sweat bee *Lasioglossum zephyrum* (Hymenoptera : Apiformes).
18 *Evolutionary Ecology* **16**:49-65.

19

20 **Sanderson M, Wojciechowski M. 1996.** Diversification rates in a temperate Legume
21 clade: are there "so many species" of *Astragalus* (Fabaceae)? *American*
22 *Journal of Botany* **83**:1488-1502.

23

- 1 **Sedivy C, Praz CJ, Muller A, Widmer A, Dorn S. 2008.** Patterns of host-plant
2 choice in bees of the genus *Chelostoma*: the constraint hypothesis of host-
3 range evolution in bees. *Evolution* **62**:2487-2507.
4
- 5 **Shuttleworth A, Johnson SD. 2009.** The importance of scent and nectar filters in a
6 specialized wasp-pollination system. *Functional Ecology* **23**:931-940.
7
- 8 **Stang M, Klinkhamer P, van der Meijden E. 2006.** Size constraints and flower
9 abundance determine the number of interactions in a plant–flower visitor web.
10 *Oikos* **112**:111–121.
11
- 12 **Stang M, Klinkhamer P, van der Meijden E. 2007.** Asymmetric specialization and
13 extinction risk in plant–flower visitor webs: a matter of morphology or
14 abundance? *Oecologia* **151**:442–453.
15
- 16 **Tasei JN, Aupinel P. 2008.** Nutritive value of 15 single pollens and pollen mixes
17 tested on larvae produced by bumblebee workers (*Bombus terrestris*,
18 Hymenoptera : Apidae). *Apidologie* **39**:397-409.
19
- 20 **Ulrich W, Almeida M, Gotelli NJ. 2009.** A consumer's guide to nestedness analysis.
21 *Oikos* **118**:3-17.
22
- 23 **Vásquez D, Blüthgen N, Cagnolo L, Chacoff N. 2009.** Uniting pattern and process
24 in plant–animal mutualistic networks: a review. *Annals Of Botany* **103**:1445-
25 1457.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

Vazquez DP, Chacoff NP, Cagnolo L. 2009. Evaluating multiple determinants of the structure of plant-animal mutualistic networks. *Ecology* **90**:2039-2046.

Weiner CN, Hilpert A, Werner M, Linsenmair KE, Bluthgen N. 2010. Pollen amino acids and flower specialisation in solitary bees. *Apidologie* **41**:476-487.

Wojciechowski M, Lavin M, Sanderson M. 2004. A phylogeny of legumes (Leguminosae) based on analysis of the plastid matK gene resolves many well-supported subclades within the family. *American Journal of Botany* **91**:1846-1862.

FIGURE LEGENDS

1

2

3 Fig. 1. Generic Attack Tolerance Curve (ATC) signatures for: (a) the strongly nested
 4 network; (b) the randomly structured network; and (c) the network at an order-
 5 disorder transition. Open symbols indicate the ATC for the attack strategy that
 6 proceeds stepwise from nodes of the lowest degree ($- \rightarrow +$) and closed symbols
 7 indicate the ATC for ($+ \rightarrow -$). Hatched areas indicate the magnitude of the numerator
 8 of the coefficient of nestedness, H . A thin line delineates an area under the ATC for
 9 ($+ \rightarrow -$) in the perfectly nested network, i.e. ϕ .

10

11 Fig 2. The Pullman network, whose nodes are comprised of 52 species of bee and
 12 37 species of *Astragalus* and *Onobrychis*. Links indicate presumed plant-pollinator
 13 interactions. The length of the histogram bar above or below each node indicates the
 14 number of links to that node, i.e. its degree, denoted by k . The names of some taxa
 15 are abbreviated as follows: Coll. = Colletidae; Andren. = Andrenidae; Antho. =
 16 *Anthophora*; Am = *Apis mellifera*. The species identity of each node is given in
 17 Appendix 1.

18

19 Fig. 3. Sorted adjacency matrix of the Pullman community with each plant species
 20 occupying a row, each bee species occupying a column, and plant-pollinator
 21 interactions indicated by filled cells at appropriate row-column intersections. The
 22 curve approximates the isocline of maximal nestedness for a network with identical
 23 degree distributions.

24

1 Fig 4. The Attack Tolerance Curves (ATCs) for bee species, given the stepwise
2 elimination of plant species, and plant species, given the stepwise elimination of bee
3 species. Open symbols indicate the ATC proceeding from nodes with the lowest
4 degree to the highest ($- \rightarrow +$) and closed symbols indicate ($+ \rightarrow -$). The unadorned
5 curve indicates the average ATC of randomized networks, but where the attacked
6 guild retains the observed degree distribution.

7




8 Fig. 5. The phylogenetic distribution of dietary differentiation between sister clades of
9 bees. Asterisked figures at a cladistic bifurcation indicate significant differentiation
10 between the clades so marked, while a filled circle indicates a non-significant test
11 result. Each figures at the junction of clades is the ratio of pairwise dietary similarity
12 between species within clades to the similarity between clades. A single asterisk
13 indicates that the ratio is significantly greater than unity with $P < 0.05$, two asterisks
14 indicate $P < 0.01$. The names of taxa are abbreviated as follows: Col = Colletidae;
15 Hal = Halictidae; And = Andrenidae; Meg = Megachilidae; Anth = solitary Apidae
16 (*Anthophora* and *Eucera*); and Soc = social Apidae (*A. mellifera* and *Bombus* spp.).
17 The mean pairwise dietary similarity between all pairs of bee species was $S = 0.10$.

18

19 Fig. 6. Phylogenetic reciprocity towards clades of bees (a) and plants (b). An
20 asterisked figure superimposed on a lineage indicates that the mean phylogenetic
21 distance among pairs of the clade's mutualist partners is significantly lower than in
22 random networks, while a filled circle indicates a non-significant test result. A single
23 asterisk indicates that the distance is significantly smaller with $P < 0.05$, two asterisks
24 indicate $P < 0.01$. The names of taxa are abbreviated as follows: Col = Colletidae;
25 Hal = Halictidae; And = Andrenidae; Meg = Megachilidae; Anth = solitary Apidae

1 (*Anthophora* and *Eucera*); Soc = social Apidae (*A. mellifera* and *Bombus* spp.); Ast =
2 *Astragalus* spp.; and *Ono* = *Onobrychis* spp.. The mean phylogenetic distance
3 between pairs of species in random networks is 2.94 for partners of bees and 7.34
4 for partners of plants.
5
6
7


Fraction of guild B lost




a.

b.


c.






Bees

Fraction lost



Plants



Fraction eliminated

