

Predator phylogenetic diversity decreases predation rate via antagonistic interactions

A. Andrew M. MacDonald; Diane S. Srivastava; Gustavo Q. Romero

Introduction

Predators can have strong top-down effects, both on community structure and ecosystem processes (Estes et al. 2011). The effects of all predators in a community (the predator assemblage) is often dependent on species composition, and can be more or less than the sum of effect sizes of individual predators (Sih, Englund, and Wooster 1998; Ives, Cardinale, and Snyder 2005). Detailed studies manipulating predator diversity have identified many direct and indirect mechanisms of predator interaction. For example, predators may differ in their preference for microhabitats resulting in spatial or temporal partitioning between predator species (Schmitz 2007). Even when predators occupy the same patch, they may feed on different prey species and so have additive top-down effects (Schmitz 2007). Non-additive effects of predator diversity occur when predators interact directly with each other, or indirectly via prey species, in a way that increases or decreases total predation. For example, antagonistic predator-predator interactions can reduce the top-down effects of a diverse consumer assemblage, e.g. when predators feed directly on each other (intra-guild predation) or modify the behaviour of predators or prey via non- consumptive (i.e. trait-mediated) interac-

tions (Sih, Englund, and Wooster 1998; Griswold and Lounibos 2006; Nyström et al. 2001). While there are many mechanisms potentially underlying predator compositional effects, we lack a means of predicting *a priori* which combinations are likely to have antagonistic versus synergistic effects on ecosystem functions.

The measurement of phylogenetic diversity has become a popular means for ecologists to make inferences about ecological and evolutionary mechanisms behind observed patterns in natural communities (Cavender-Bares et al. 2009). For example, phylogenetic diversity of plant communities is better correlated with productivity than is species richness or diversity (e.g. M. W. Cadotte et al. 2009; M. W. Cadotte, Cardinale, and Oakley 2008; Godoy, Kraft, and Levine 2014). Central to most ecological applications of phylogenetic diversity is the assumption that increased phylogenetic distance implies increased ecological dissimilarity – either in the form of differences in species niches, interactions, or functional traits. When these relationships occur, the resulting variation in ecologically-relevant traits and interactions could increase ecosystem function (D. S. Srivastava et al. 2012). Despite the prevalence of phylogenetic community ecology and the importance of predators to natural systems, the phylogenetic diversity of local predator assemblages has rarely been measured (L. Bersier and Kehrli 2008; Naisbit et al. 2011). Many studies of phylogenetic signal in predator traits focus on whole clades, rather than local assemblages (e.g. *Anolis* lizards (Knouft et al. 2006), warblers (Böhning-Gaese, Schuda, and Helbig 2003), treeboas (Henderson, Pauers, and Colston 2013) and wasps (Budriene and Budrys 2004)) making it difficult to connect these results to top- down effects at the scale of a local community. While these clade-specific studies often find weak evidence for phylogenetic signal in ecologically- relevant traits, stud-

ies at the level of the whole biosphere (Gómez, Verdú, and Perfectti 2010; L. Bersier and Kehrli 2008) demonstrate that related organisms often have similar interspecific interactions – i.e. related predators often consume similar prey. At the level of a community, the effect of a predator assemblage will depend on both the spatial distribution and trophic interactions of all predator species. Phylogeny may constrain species distributions when distant relatives have distinct fundamental niches, while close relatives are too similar to co-exist (Webb et al. 2002; Emerson and Gillespie 2008). The effects of other predators can also be important: during dispersal, predators may use cues of prey, competitors, or intra-guild predators when selecting a habitat patch (Chase and Shulman 2009; McCauley et al. 2008; D. S. Srivastava et al. 2008). After colonization, patterns of co-occurrence may be further modified by intraguild predation (L. P. Lounibos et al. 2008; Juliano 2009) or competition (Fincke, Yanoviak, and Hanschu 1997).

When predators do co-occur, their direct effects on each other and on their prey is determined by their diet breadth. Diet breadth (the diversity of prey species which predators consume) will depend on their feeding traits and nutritional requirements – both of which may be phylogenetically conserved. If this is the case, then predator assemblages with higher phylogenetic diversity will show greater complementarity and a stronger top-down effect on ecosystem function (Finke and Snyder 2008). For example, some predators are gape-limited, and can swallow any prey smaller than their mouth; these predators typically broaden their diet as they grow (e.g., larvae of Odonata) (E. Werner and Gilliam 1984). Such ontogenetic changes in diet breadth can radically influence food web structure (Moya-Laraño 2011). Other predators (e.g. Leeches, or Diptera:Tabanidae) are “piercing-sucking” predators (Bay

1974) and may be more general consumers at all life stages, since they can feed on larger prey individuals even at very early predator life stages. In some cases, predator diets may extend to include other predators, leading to direct negative interactions such as intraguild predation which may also have a phylogenetic signal (Pfennig 2000).

Indirect interactions among predators are common in many communities, which means that the total amount of top-down control cannot be predicted by summing the contributions of individual predator species (Sih, Englund, and Wooster 1998). For example, decreasing predator richness has been shown to increase herbivory in a three-level kelp food web (Byrnes et al. 2006). The complex traits that underlie such species interactions (“higher-order” interactions, Sih *et al.* (1998)) may also correlate with phylogeny; if so, then phylogenetic diversity will be a better predictor of ecosystem function than richness alone (M. W. Cadotte et al. 2009). For example, phylogenetically diverse assemblages of mycorrhizae increased primary productivity more than equally speciose treatments from the same lineage (Maherali and Klironomos 2007). The effect of predators on prey may also be non-additive, the result of indirect interactions either with prey species or other predators: prey species may respond to the presence of one predator by a behavioural shift that increases the predation by another predator population (Carey and Wahl 2010). These trait-mediated indirect effects (TMII, (E. Werner and Peacor 2003)) can be difficult to predict; however phylogenetic relatedness has been suggested as a possible means of predicting the combined effect of predators (Naisbit et al. 2011)

We used a series of observations, lab feeding trials, and manipulative field experiments to measure how the phylogenetic diversity of the predator assemblage predicts community com-

position and ecosystem function. We test three related hypotheses concerning co-occurrence patterns, diet similarity and top-down ecosystem effects of diverse predators, using a natural mesocosm: the community of invertebrates living within bromeliads. Bromeliads (Bromeliaceae) are epiphytic plants native to the Neotropics. Many bromeliad species contain water, detritus and a complex insect food web within their leaves; the decomposition of this detritus supplies nutrients for the bromeliad (Benzing 2000). The small size of these habitats permits direct manipulations of entire food webs, manipulations which would be difficult in most natural systems. Within this aquatic food web, damselfly larvae (e.g. *Leptagrion* spp., Odonata:Coenagrionidae) are important predators; their presence dramatically alters community dynamics (e.g. decreases insect emergence (Starzomski, Suen, and Srivastava 2010) and increases nutrient cycling (Ngai and Srivastava 2006)).

1. *species co-occurrence*: closely-related predators may occur together more frequently than less-related predators if there is a strong phylogenetic signal to habitat requirements. Alternatively, very closely related species may never co-occur because high overlap in ecological niches results in competitive exclusion.

2. *diet similarity*: similarity in diet (as measured by feeding trials) decreases with phylogenetic distance if diet is phylogenetically conserved. Alternatively, closely related species may have evolved different diets to allow coexistence.

3. *ecosystem-level effects*: Our experiments at the level of the whole habitat patch (i.e. a single bromeliad) allows us to examine direct and indirect effects of predator combinations.

- a) monoculture treatments allow us to assess the effect of each predator on a complete prey community and ecosystem function. Phylogenetic similarity among predators is predicted to correlate with similarity in single-species effects if related predators share similar trophic interactions (e.g. predation rate, diet breadth)
- b) By comparing treatments with pairs of predators to treatments which received a monoculture of each predator, we are able to estimate additive and nonadditive effects. If distance between species correlates with increasing difference, we will see an increase in these non-additive effects with phylogenetic distance. At the extreme, differences between predators may lead to IGP among predators.

Methods

Site and Species

We conducted all observations and experiments in Parque Estadual da Ilha do Cardoso (25°03' S, 47°53' W), a 22.5 ha island off the south coast of São Paulo state, Brazil. We worked in a closed coastal forest (*restinga*) the understory of which is mostly covered by *Quesnelia arvensis* Mez. (Bromeliaceae), a large terrestrial bromeliad that accumulates up to 2.8 L of rainwater in tanks formed by individual leaves. We used two datasets: an observational survey of insect diversity from 2008, and a manipulative experiment in 2010. Our observational survey found more than 47 species of macroinvertebrates in these aquatic communities (Romero and Srivastava 2010). This diversity encompasses multiple trophic and functional groups: filter feeders (Diptera:Culicidae); detritivores including shredders (Diptera:Tipulidae, Trichoptera), scrapers (Coleoptera:Scirtidae), and collectors (All

Diptera:Chironomidae, Syrphidae, Psychodidae). These species are the main prey for a diverse predator assemblage of at least three species of damselfly larvae (*Leptagrion* spp., Zygoptera:Coenagrionidae), two species of predatory Horse Fly larvae (Diptera:Tabanidae), and 2 species of leech (Hirudinidae). Other, smaller-bodied predators present include predatory midge larvae (Diptera:Chironomidae:Tanypodinae) and less abundant species such as Dytiscid beetles.

Distributional similarity: observational data

We investigated Question 1 above with observations of predator distribution among bromeliads, using a 2008 survey of bromeliad communities. Each bromeliad was dissected and washed to remove invertebrates and the resulting water was filtered through two sieves (250 and 850 μm), which removed particulate organic matter without losing any invertebrates. All invertebrates were counted and identified to the lowest taxonomic level possible. The body length of all individuals was measured, when possible for small and medium-sized taxa (< 1cm final instar) and always for large-bodied taxa (> 1 cm final instar).

Diet Similarity: feeding trials

We tested for similarity in predator diets (Question 2) using a series of laboratory feeding trials. We conducted 314 feeding trials of 10 predator taxa fed 14 prey taxa between March and April 2011. We covered all potential predator-prey pairs present in the experiment (described below), and attempted to perform all other trials whenever possible. However, due to the rarity of some taxa many predator-prey pairs were not possible; we tested 56

pairwise combinations. Most trials were replicated at least five times, but the number of replicates ranged from 1 to 11. We placed predators together with prey in a 50ml vial, with a leaf or stick for substrate. The only exception was the tabanid larvae, which we placed between two vertical surfaces to imitate the narrow space found in bromeliad leaf axils (their preferred microhabitat). Generally our trials contained a single predator and a single prey individual, except in the case of very small prey (*Elpidium* sp.) or predators (*Monopelopia* sp.) in which case we increased the density. We replicated each combination up to five times where possible, and allowed one day for predation to occur.

Community effect experiment

Our third question had two parts: a) how do predator species differ in their effects on the whole community and b) do predators show nonadditive effects in combination, and are these related to phylogenetic distance? We tested these questions with an experiment involving the four most common predators, paired to create a range of phylogenetic relatedness: two congeneric damselflies (*Leptagrion andromache* and *Leptagrion elongatum*), two insects (*L. elongatum* and a Tabanid predatory fly), and two invertebrates (*L. elongatum* and leeches). We used each of these pairs of predators, as well as each species in monoculture, and a predator-free control (8 treatments, n=5). Combinations were substitutive, maintaining the same amount of total predator metabolic capacity (see below) to isolate the effects of predator behaviour and traits. Substitutive experiments often hold total abundance constant, but when species differ substantially in body size - as in this experiment - allometric effects of body size on feeding rate can confound detection of effects based on trophic traits or

species interactions, and standardizing to community metabolic capacity is preferred (D. S. Srivastava and Bell 2009). This experiment allows the estimation of the effect of each predator species (monoculture treatments), as well as the detection of non- additive effects in predator combinations.

In February 2011, bromeliads between 90 and 200ml in capacity were collected, thoroughly washed to remove organisms and detritus and soaked for 12 hours in a tub of water. They were then hung for 48 hours to dry. One bromeliad dissected after this procedure contained no insects. Each bromeliad was supplied with dried leaves, simulating natural detritus inputs from the canopy. We enriched these leaves with ^{15}N by fertilizing five (Jabuticaba, *Plinia cauliflora*) plants with 40ml pot⁻¹ day⁻¹ of 5g L⁻¹ ammonium sulphate containing 10% atom excess of ^{15}N over 21 days. Whole leaves were then picked from plants and air-dried until constant weight, and then soaked for three days and the water discarded. About 1.5 g of leaves were placed in each bromeliad ($1.5006\text{g} \pm 0.0248$).

Each bromeliad was stocked with a representative insect community. The densities of each prey taxon were calculated from the 2008 observational dataset, using data from bromeliads of similar size to those in our experiment. All densities used were within the range of these calculated abundances, and all experimental bromeliads received the same insect community. Halfway through the experiment, insects were added to bromeliads a second time to simulate the continuous oviposition that characterizes the system. Throughout the experiment, all bromeliads were enclosed with a mesh cage topped with a malaise trap and checked daily for emergence of adults.

In this experiment we measured five response variables: production of fine particulate organic

190 matter (FPOM), decomposition of coarse detritus, bromeliad growth, uptake of detrital
191 nitrogen into bromeliad tissue, and survival of invertebrate prey (emerged adults + surviving
192 larvae). We analyzed each of these responses with ANOVA. For each pair of predator species
193 and each response type, we calculated the non-additive effect as the difference between
194 the response in bromeliads with both predator species (n=5) and the mean response in
195 bromeliads with either one of these two predator species (n=5 for each predator species). We
196 generated bootstrap confidence intervals for these nonadditive effects; confidence intervals
197 which do not overlap zero indicate a significant non-additive effect of a predator combination.

198 **Phylogenetic distance, metabolic capacity and niche overlap**

199 Our observational data contains data from 25 bromeliads, containing 14 predator taxa. These
200 include two groups of congeneric taxa – *Bezzia* sp. (Diptera:Ceratopogonidae) with two
201 species and *Leptagrion* sp. (Odonata:Coenagrionidae) with three – and two of confamilial
202 taxa – three species of Tabanidae and two of Empididae, all Diptera. Deeper divisions
203 were also present: three families of Diptera are represented by a single predator species
204 each (Dolichopodidae, Corethrellidae and Chironomidae) and the deepest taxonomic divide
205 is between all insects present and a species of predatory leech (Annelida:Hirudinidae).

206 We obtained node age estimates for all seven internal nodes of the tree, using www.timetree.org,
207 an online database of published molecular time estimates (Hedges, Dudley, and Kumar
208 2006). Most dates came from only a single study; where multiple dates were found we used
209 the median estimate: Insecta–Hirudina (543 to 700 Mya, n=5 studies), Odonata–Tabanidae
210 (151 to 543 Mya, n= studies) and Tabanidae–Diptera (106.2 to 474 Mya, n=7 studies).

Node age data was available for all but the youngest nodes, where either a lack of taxonomic information (e.g. Tabanidae) or a lack of phylogenetic study (e.g. *Leptagrion*) prevented more information from being included. These branches were left as polytomies, and were all assigned identical, arbitrary and short branch lengths (15 Mya).

Species co-occurrence is often measured in terms of non-random patterns of species presence/absence or abundance, but such measures will only be poorly related to the functional effects of species when species differ substantially in body size. Integrating the allometric relationship between body size and feeding rate (Brown et al. 2004; Wilby, Villareal, and Lan 2005) over all individuals of a species allows estimates of “metabolic capacity”, or the potential energy requirements of a species (D. S. Srivastava and Bell 2009). Metabolic capacity is equal to individual body mass raised to the power of 0.69 (an insect-specific exponent determined by Peters 19xx, (Chown et al. 2007)); this reflects the nonlinearity of feeding rate on body size across many invertebrate taxa. We used metabolic capacity to inform both our observational results and our experimental design (details below), with the exception of our feeding trial data. This is because the feeding trials were intended to measure which prey our predators ate, rather than their feeding rate (only the latter should scale with metabolic capacity).

Questions 1 and 2 above focus on similarity (“niche overlap”) between predator species. Question 1 hypothesizes that if habitat preference is phylogenetically conserved and competition between predators unimportant, then distributional similarity will decline with increased phylogenetic distance between a pair of predators. Question 2 hypothesizes that if diet is conserved, then diet similarity declines with increased phylogenetic distance between a pair

of predators. We evaluated both distributional and diet similarity between predators using Pianka's index of niche overlap (Pianka 1974):

$$O_{kl} = \frac{\sum_i^n p_{il}p_{ik}}{\sqrt{\sum_i^n p_{il}^2 \sum_i^n p_{ik}^2}}$$

For each pair of predators, p_{ik} and p_{il} represent the preference of predator k (or l) for resource or habitat i . When quantifying distributional similarity, $n=25$ bromeliads surveyed in the observational data; when quantifying diet similarity, the number of resources (n) is defined as the total number of prey species assayed with both predator taxa. In the survey data preference (p_{ik}) is defined as the proportion of a predator's total metabolic capacity found in a particular bromeliad, in diet trials it is the proportion of diet trials (see below) for each predator-prey combination that resulted in prey mortality.

We quantified the effect of phylogenetic distance on each of distributional and diet similarity. First, we calculated phylogenetic distance between each pair of species, then fit several functions to this relationship (linear, constant, and several appropriate nonlinear functions). We compared these models using AIC, selected the best model, and generated confidence intervals as appropriate (parametric or bootstrap for linear and nonlinear, respectively).

Results

Distributional similarity

Across all bromeliads, predator species differed widely in metabolic capacity, from 4.5×10^{-4} for a species of *Monopelopia* to 0.15 for large predatory flies in the family Tabanidae. Predators often co-occurred in bromeliads (4.4 ± 2.9 predator species per plant). However,

the niche overlap between the total metabolic capacity of pairs of predators did not show any relationship with phylogenetic distance between them ($F_{1,89}=2.3918$, $p=0.13$).

Diet similarity

Among the most common predator taxa (i.e. those used in our experiment, described below) the damselflies (*Leptagrion andromache* and *Leptagrion elongatum*) showed the highest rates of prey consumption (prey consumed in 94.3% and 67.7% of trials, respectively). All predators showed a very generalist diet breadth, consuming nearly all species offered to them. However, more phylogenetically distant predators differed in their preference of prey species, as measured by the niche overlap index ($F_{1,26}=5.98$, $p=0.022$, regression weighted by the number of prey species assayed.)


Ecosystem-level effects and phylogenetic distance

Predators had a large effect on prey survivorship: on average all predator treatments showed 51% lower prey emerging or surviving as larvae relative to the predator-free control. Nitrogen transport to bromeliad leaves was slightly decreased in bromeliads with predators relative to predator-free controls (-11%), and was only higher than the control in treatments including Tabanid predators. We found a similar pattern for plant growth: on average, predators had a -18% effect on growth of bromeliad leaves (leaf elongation in mm), though Tabanids seemed to create a slight increase. The decomposition of coarse detritus and production of fine organic matter showed no obvious pattern related to the presence of predators.


Predator combinations tended to have a non-additive effect on our response variables. Ap-

proximately 14% more prey survived in polyculture, on average, compared to all monocultures. Nitrogen uptake increased by (8%) and bromeliad growth by (11%). Production of fine particulate organic matter increased by 29% more when predators were present in combination.

We tested the hypothesis that increased phylogenetic distance between members of a predator pair results in a greater magnitude of nonadditive effect using randomization tests. We contrasted the differences of the mean individual predator treatments from the control with the mean difference of their pairwise combination from the control. We found the greatest effect for prey survival: while effects of *L. andromache* and *L. elongatum* in combination were quite similar to the effect of either alone, when *L. elongatum* was placed in the same plant as either a Tabanid larva or leeches, on average five more prey individuals (18% of total prey community) survived till the end of the experiment (Fig 3). This effect was smaller among the other variables, most of which showed confidence intervals from the randomization test which overlap zero.



289 **Figure 1:** Phylogenetic distance between predator pairs and their ecology. Each point
 290 represents a pair of predator species. Distributional similarity was quantified from the total
 291 metabolic capacity for each predator species in each bromeliad. Diet similarity is calculated
 292 from a series of feeding trials, and experimental similarity as the surviving prey community
 293 emerging from bromeliads. Similarity between each pair of predators was calculated using
 294 Pianka's index. Solid line shows the best fit non-linear model (see Appendix) and dashed
 295 lines show bootstrap 95% quantiles.



297 **Figure 2:** Adding predators reduces insect emergence, probably because they eat the prey.
 298 However, increasing predator number raises survival again. This is because the predators
 299 are interfering with each other.




Figure 3: Predator community composition, in monoculture and polyculture, and its effects on prey survival. Prey emergence is lowest when damselflies are paired together, but increases when damselflies are combined with other species.




Figure 4: Combinations of predators beyond congenics show a negative non-additive effect on predation rate. Points represent the mean difference between the means of two monocultures compared to the mean of a polycultures. The dashed line represents differences = 0, i.e. no nonadditive effect. These values are presented as differences from (predator free) controls; therefore zero indicates no significant non-additive effect. Relative to control (no predator) plants, bromeliads containing two predators which were not congeneric showed less predation

Table 1 Experimental results. We measured for community-level variables: total prey survival (both emerged adults and surviving larvae), the breakdown of coarse detritus, the production of fine particulate organic matter (FPOM), and the growth of the bromeliad itself. We considered our experimental design at several levels: comparing treatments with

predators to those without, contrasting predator species, comparing predator communities of 1 or 2 species, and considering the effects of phylogenetic distance between predators.

Response	Predator Presence	Identity	Richness	Pairwise PD
Total prey survival	$F_{1,10} = \mathbf{9.07}$	$F_{3,16} = 0.6$	$F_{1,5} = 1.96$	$F_{1,13} = \mathbf{7.64}$
Decomposition (g)	$F_{1,10} = 0.47$	$F_{3,15} = 1.29$	$F_{1,5} = 0.21$	$F_{1,13} = 0.4$
FPOM (g)	$F_{1,10} = 0.92$	$F_{3,16} = 0.42$	$F_{1,5} = 6.47$	$F_{1,13} = 1.35$
Bromeliad growth	$F_{1,10} = 0.51$	$F_{3,16} = 0.96$	$F_{1,5} = 0.49$	$F_{1,12} = 1.29$

Discussion

In our system, distantly related predators are no more likely to be similar in distribution than are close relatives (Question 1). We also tested whether diet similarity decreased with predator phylogenetic distance (Question 2), and found a stronger pattern: diet similarity declined with phylogenetic distance between two predators, in a nearly linear relationship. However, this difference in diet did not translate into a difference in the composition of animals surviving in bromeliads stocked with different predators (3a). We did find an effect of phylogenetic distance when predators were placed in pairs - specifically, when damselflies were paired with non-damselfly predators. This resulted in more prey animals surviving to the end of the experiment; this could be caused by a reduction in feeding rate when predator taxa are very dissimilar.

Do related organisms occur in different bromeliads?

Predator pairs showed only a weak relationship between phylogenetic distance and differences in distribution. Such differences could have been caused by different species either having different preferences for environmental variables, or antagonistic interactions with each other. The absence of any signal suggests that either patches do not differ in variables which matter to the predators, or that predator taxa do not have strong impacts on each other's distribution. The lack of a relationship is probably not due to a lack of variation in bromeliad communities: We know already (CITE) that bromeliads in this and other systems vary considerably in many habitat variables, such as detritus content, amount of sunlight, and habitat size. It is more likely that these predator species are habitat generalists. Organisms which live in small, fluctuation-prone habitats – especially if they are long-lived – may evolve a wide physiological tolerance to those environmental fluctuations. Therefore we would not expect a high degree of habitat specificity among these organisms.

Although we found some evidence for negative intraspecific effects in our experiment, these do not appear to limit predator distribution. This could be caused by a low encounter rate of predators in natural plants, especially in larger bromeliads than those used in our experiment. Additionally, negative effects could still be occurring in nature, but not resulting in mortality. Indeed, if animals are actually able to adjust their development times and feeding rates when conditions are unfavourable (and if the presence of a competing predator creates such unfavourable conditions), then we would expect to observe more frequent, not less frequent, co-occurrences of predators. Non-consumptive negative interactions need not result in dissimilar distributions.

In our experimental treatments with paired predators we observed little predator mortality; this suggests that predator indirect interactions might reduce predator feeding rates but do not necessarily result in predator mortality. Our observational data indicate that at the level of the patch (i.e. a single bromeliad) a wide range of predator phylogenetic diversity is possible, from very similar to very disparate. This justifies the phylogenetic diversities we used in our experimental communities, as these are within the range found in nature.

Do related organisms have similar diets?

Predators consumed very similar prey, except those most phylogenetically distinct. There were some slight taxon-specific diet preferences which accounted for this. Leeches and tabanids showed different patterns of consumption compared with *Leptagrion* predators: they consumed less frequently, and notably consumed prey in less than half of trials with *Culex* (leech) or *Scirtes* (Tabanid). This may be because these predators lack the strong jaws and “mask” of odonata, and these two prey species are particularly active (in the case of culicids) or difficult to handle (scirtids). Tabanids in particular differ in microhabitat use from odonates; living deep within leaf axils, where culicids are rarely found. One of our *Leptagrion* morphospecies showed a greater preference for harder-bodied prey species (i.e. Ostracoda, *Scirtes* and *Phylloicus*, which is a caddisfly.) All of these animals are consumed more frequently by this damselfly than by the other species of *Leptagrion*, while the other damselflies more frequently consumed *Culex* and *Polypedilum* prey. Thus, our data show some evidence of a phylogenetic basis for diet dissimilarity, based on the very different traits of these invertebrate taxa. Traits can be more important than phylogeny *per se* to a predator’s diet:

(Moody 1993) found that unrelated decapod species which were morphologically similar were also functionally similar. Similarly, (Rezende et al. 2009) found that both body size and phylogeny determined the food web “compartment” (shared predator-prey interactions) of a predator in a marine foodweb. In addition, our experimental results are consistent with high similarity among predator diets: all predator species had comparable effects on all response variables, including prey species survival.

Phylogenetic diversity and non-additive effects

Predator pairs which were more phylogenetically distant had a larger negative nonadditive effect on prey capture. This is contrary to our hypothesis that more distant predators would show an increase in prey capture via complementarity. *L. andromache* did not produce a negative effect in combination with *L. elongatum*, while more phylogenetically distinct predators did. It may be that these odonates have behavioural traits that reduce the probability of their interaction, for example each nymph occupying a single leaf-well. If this is the case, each damselfly may not experience many cues indicating the presence of other predators, resulting in no non-additive interaction.

Odonates can be sensitive to chemical cues of potential predators, which causes a decrease in feeding rate (Barry and Roberts 2014). However other research in bromeliads has demonstrated that it is physical contact with other organisms that reduces damselfly predation rate (Trish). If this is the case for *Leptagrion*, then when combined with leeches they may be responding to frequent contact with those very active predators. Tabanids, however, are rarely observed outside of a deep leaf axil – in this case, it may be chemical cues which

are responsible. There may also be a phylogenetic signal to the chemical cues which the damselflies perceive: i.e. close relatives (other *Leptagrion* sp. in this case) might induce less of an effect than other predators.

Interestingly, the pattern of induced defenses do not line up with predation risk, as observed in our feeding trials. In feeding trials with leeches, actual predation was rarely observed – except in one instance, where the damselfly ate the leech. However, trait-mediated indirect effects may not always reflect realized probability of predation: an animal may change behaviour when exposed to a “predator” which poses little threat (REF).

One limitation of our approach is the focus on a single focal predator, the odonate *Leptagrion elongatum*, which was common in all of our predator treatments. It is possible that this species is more sensitive to the presence of other predators, and therefore shows a larger trait-mediated indirect effect, than would other species in this community. However, this is the most common species in this community and our results indicate that its top-down effects are likely to be frequently reduced by the presence of other predators.

References

- Bay, EC. 1974. “Predator-Prey Relationships Among Aquatic Insects.” *Annual Review of Entomology*, no. 19: 441–53. <http://www.annualreviews.org/doi/pdf/10.1146/annurev.en.19.010174.002301>.
- Benzing, David H. 2000. *Bromeliaceae: Profile of an Adaptive Radiation*. Cambridge University Press. <http://www.amazon.com/Bromeliaceae-Adaptive-Radiation-David-Benzing/dp/0521430313>.

414 Bersier, L, and P Kehrli. 2008. "The Signature of Phylogenetic Constraints on Food-Web
 415 Structure." *Ecological Complexity* 5 (2): 132–39. doi:10.1016/j.ecocom.2007.06.013. <http://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S1476945X08000093>.
 416

417 Böhning-Gaese, K, M D Schuda, and a J Helbig. 2003. "Weak Phylogenetic Effects on
 418 Ecological Niches of Sylvia Warblers." *Journal of Evolutionary Biology* 16 (5): 956–65.
 419 <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/14635911>.

420 Brown, James H., James F. Gillooly, Andrew P. Allen, Van M. Savage, and Geoffrey B. West.
 421 2004. "Toward a Metabolic Theory of Ecology." *Ecology* 85 (7): 1771–89. doi:10.1890/03-
 422 9000. <http://www.esajournals.org/doi/abs/10.1890/03-9000>.

423 Budriene, A, and E Budrys. 2004. "Hunting Behaviour of Predatory Wasps (Hymenoptera:
 424 Vespidae: Eumeninae): Is the Distribution of Stinging Effort Phylogenetically Inherited
 425 or Dependent on the Prey." *Annales de La Société Entomologique de ...* 40 (4): 259–68.
 426 <http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/00379271.2004.10697424>.

427 Byrnes, Jarrett, John J Stachowicz, Kristin M Hultgren, a Randall Hughes, Suzanne V
 428 Olyarnik, and Carol S Thornber. 2006. "Predator Diversity Strengthens Trophic Cas-
 429 cades in Kelp Forests by Modifying Herbivore Behaviour." *Ecology Letters* 9 (1): 61–71.
 430 doi:10.1111/j.1461-0248.2005.00842.x. <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/16958869>.

431 Cadotte, Marc W., Bradley J Cardinale, and Todd H Oakley. 2008. "Evolutionary History
 432 and the Effect of Biodiversity on Plant Productivity." *Proceedings of the National Academy
 433 of Sciences of the United States of America* 105 (44): 17012–7. doi:10.1073/pnas.0805962105.
 434 [http://www.pubmedcentral.nih.gov/articlerender.fcgi?artid=2579369/&tool=pmcentrez/
 435 &rendertype=abstract](http://www.pubmedcentral.nih.gov/articlerender.fcgi?artid=2579369/&tool=pmcentrez/&rendertype=abstract).

436 Cadotte, Marc W., Jeannine Cavender-Bares, David Tilman, and Todd H Oakley. 2009.
 437 “Using Phylogenetic, Functional and Trait Diversity to Understand Patterns of Plant Com-
 438 munity Productivity.” *PloS One* 4 (5): e5695. doi:[10.1371/journal.pone.0005695](https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0005695). [http:](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/19479086)
 439 [//www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/19479086](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/19479086).
 440 Carey, Michael P, and David H Wahl. 2010. “Interactions of Multiple Predators
 441 with Different Foraging Modes in an Aquatic Food Web.” *Oecologia* 162 (2): 443–52.
 442 doi:[10.1007/s00442-009-1461-3](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00442-009-1461-3). <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/19777265>.
 443 Cavender-Bares, Jeannine, Kenneth H Kozak, Paul V a Fine, and Steven W Kembel. 2009.
 444 “The Merging of Community Ecology and Phylogenetic Biology.” *Ecology Letters* 12 (7):
 445 693–715. doi:[10.1111/j.1461-0248.2009.01314.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1461-0248.2009.01314.x). [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/19473217)
 446 [19473217](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/19473217).
 447 Chase, Jonathan M., and Rachel S. Shulman. 2009. “Wetland Isolation Facilitates Larval
 448 Mosquito Density Through the Reduction of Predators.” *Ecological Entomology* 34 (6): 741–
 449 47. doi:[10.1111/j.1365-2311.2009.01128.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2311.2009.01128.x). [http://doi.wiley.com/10.1111/j.1365-2311.2009.](http://doi.wiley.com/10.1111/j.1365-2311.2009.01128.x)
 450 [01128.x](http://doi.wiley.com/10.1111/j.1365-2311.2009.01128.x).
 451 Chown, S. L., E. Marais, J. S. Terblanche, C. J. Klok, J. R. B. Lighton, and T. M. Blackburn.
 452 2007. “Scaling of Insect Metabolic Rate Is Inconsistent with the Nutrient Supply Network
 453 Model.” *Functional Ecology* 21 (2): 282–90. doi:[10.1111/j.1365-2435.2007.01245.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2435.2007.01245.x). [http:](http://doi.wiley.com/10.1111/j.1365-2435.2007.01245.x)
 454 [//doi.wiley.com/10.1111/j.1365-2435.2007.01245.x](http://doi.wiley.com/10.1111/j.1365-2435.2007.01245.x).
 455 Emerson, Brent C, and Rosemary G Gillespie. 2008. “Phylogenetic Analysis of Community
 456 Assembly and Structure over Space and Time.” *Trends in Ecology & Evolution (Personal*
 457 *Edition)* 23 (11): 619–30. doi:[10.1016/j.tree.2008.07.005](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tree.2008.07.005). <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/>

458 pubmed/18823678.

459 Estes, James a, John Terborgh, Justin S Brashares, Mary E Power, Joel Berger, William J
460 Bond, Stephen R Carpenter, et al. 2011. “Trophic Downgrading of Planet Earth.” *Science*
461 (*New York, N.Y.*) 333 (6040): 301–6. doi:[10.1126/science.1205106](https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1205106). [http://www.ncbi.nlm.](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/21764740)
462 [nih.gov/pubmed/21764740](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/21764740).

463 Fincke, OM, SP Yanoviak, and RD Hanschu. 1997. “Predation by Odonates Depresses
464 Mosquito Abundance in Water-Filled Tree Holes in Panama.” *Oecologia* 112: 244–53. [http:](http://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s004420050307)
465 [//link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s004420050307](http://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s004420050307).

466 Finke, Deborah L, and William E Snyder. 2008. “Niche Partitioning Increases Resource
467 Exploitation by Diverse Communities.” *Science (New York, N.Y.)* 321 (5895): 1488–90.
468 doi:[10.1126/science.1160854](https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1160854). <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/18787167>.

469 Godoy, Oscar, Nathan J. B. Kraft, and Jonathan M. Levine. 2014. “Phylogenetic Related-
470 ness and the Determinants of Competitive Outcomes.” Edited by Jerome Chave. *Ecology*
471 *Letters*, April, n/a–/a. doi:[10.1111/ele.12289](https://doi.org/10.1111/ele.12289). <http://doi.wiley.com/10.1111/ele.12289>.

472 Gómez, José M., Miguel Verdú, and Francisco Perfectti. 2010. “Ecological Interac-
473 tions Are Evolutionarily Conserved Across the Entire Tree of Life.” *Nature* 465 (June).
474 doi:[10.1038/nature09113](https://doi.org/10.1038/nature09113). <http://www.nature.com/doifinder/10.1038/nature09113>.

475 Griswold, Marcus W, and L Philip Lounibos. 2006. “Predator Identity and Additive Effects
476 in a Treehole Community.” *Ecology* 87 (4): 987–95. [http://www.pubmedcentral.nih.gov/](http://www.pubmedcentral.nih.gov/articlerender.fcgi?artid=1820834/&tool=pmcentrez/&rendertype=abstract)
477 [articlerender.fcgi?artid=1820834/&tool=pmcentrez/&rendertype=abstract](http://www.pubmedcentral.nih.gov/articlerender.fcgi?artid=1820834/&tool=pmcentrez/&rendertype=abstract).

478 Hedges, S Blair, Joel Dudley, and Sudhir Kumar. 2006. “TimeTree: a Public Knowledge-

501 007-9103-2. [http://www.pubmedcentral.nih.gov/articlerender.fcgi?artid=2600435/&tool=](http://www.pubmedcentral.nih.gov/articlerender.fcgi?artid=2600435/&tool=pmcentrez/&rendertype=abstract)
502 [pmcentrez/&rendertype=abstract](http://www.pubmedcentral.nih.gov/articlerender.fcgi?artid=2600435/&tool=pmcentrez/&rendertype=abstract).

503 Maherali, Hafiz, and John N Klironomos. 2007. "Influence of Phylogeny on Fungal Commu-
504 nity Assembly and Ecosystem Functioning." *Science (New York, N.Y.)* 316 (5832): 1746–8.
505 doi:10.1126/science.1143082. <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/17588930>.

506 McCauley, Shannon J, Christopher J Davis, Rick a Relyea, Kerry L Yurewicz, David K Skelly,
507 and Earl E Werner. 2008. "Metacommunity Patterns in Larval Odonates." *Oecologia* 158 (2):
508 329–42. doi:10.1007/s00442-008-1141-8. <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/18781330>.

509 Moody, K. 1993. "Mechanisms of Predation Among Large Decapod Crustaceans of the Gulf
510 of Maine Coast: functional Vs. Phylogenetic Patterns." *Journal of Experimental Marine*
511 *Biology and Ecology* 168 (1): 111–24. doi:10.1016/0022-0981(93)90118-8. [http://linkinghub.](http://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/0022098193901188)
512 [elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/0022098193901188](http://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/0022098193901188).

513 Moya-Laraño, Jordi. 2011. "Genetic Variation, Predator-Prey Interactions and Food Web
514 Structure." *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London. Series B, Biological*
515 *Sciences* 366 (1569): 1425–37. doi:10.1098/rstb.2010.0241. [http://www.pubmedcentral.nih.](http://www.pubmedcentral.nih.gov/articlerender.fcgi?artid=3081571/&tool=pmcentrez/&rendertype=abstract)
516 [gov/articlerender.fcgi?artid=3081571/&tool=pmcentrez/&rendertype=abstract](http://www.pubmedcentral.nih.gov/articlerender.fcgi?artid=3081571/&tool=pmcentrez/&rendertype=abstract).

517 Naisbit, Russell E, Patrik Kehrli, Rudolf P Rohr, and Louis-Félix Bersier. 2011. "Phylo-
518 genetic Signal in Predator-Prey Body-Size Relationships." *Ecology* 92 (12): 2183–9. [http:](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/22352156)
519 [//www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/22352156](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/22352156).

520 Ngai, Jacqueline T., and Diane S. Srivastava. 2006. "Predators Accelerate Nutrient Cycling
521 in a Bromeliad Ecosystem." *Science* 314 (5801). American Association for the Advancement

of Science: 963. <http://www.sciencemag.org/content/314/5801/963.short>.

Nyström, P, O Svensson, B Lardner, C Brönmark, and W Granéli. 2001. “The Influence of Multiple Introduced Predators on a Littoral Pond Community.” *Ecology* 82 (4): 1023–39. doi:[http://dx.doi.org/10.1890/0012-9658\(2001\)082\[1023:Tiomip\]2.0.co;2](http://dx.doi.org/10.1890/0012-9658(2001)082[1023:Tiomip]2.0.co;2). [http://www.esajournals.org/doi/abs/10.1890/0012-9658\(2001\)082/%5B1023:Tiomip/%5D2.0.CO/%3B2](http://www.esajournals.org/doi/abs/10.1890/0012-9658(2001)082/%5B1023:Tiomip/%5D2.0.CO/%3B2).

Pfennig, Dw. 2000. “Effect of Predator-Prey Phylogenetic Similarity on the Fitness Consequences of Predation: A Trade-Off Between Nutrition and Disease?” *The American Naturalist* 155 (3): 335–45. doi:[10.1086/303329](https://doi.org/10.1086/303329). <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/10718730>.

Pianka, ER. 1974. “Niche Overlap and Diffuse Competition.” *Proceedings of the National Academy of ...* 71 (5): 2141–45. <http://www.pnas.org/content/71/5/2141.short>.

Rezende, Enrico L, Eva M Albert, Miguel a Fortuna, and Jordi Bascompte. 2009. “Compartments in a Marine Food Web Associated with Phylogeny, Body Mass, and Habitat Structure.” *Ecology Letters* 12 (8): 779–88. doi:[10.1111/j.1461-0248.2009.01327.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1461-0248.2009.01327.x). <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/19490028>.

Romero, Gustavo Q, and Diane S Srivastava. 2010. “Food-Web Composition Affects Cross-Ecosystem Interactions and Subsidies.” *The Journal of Animal Ecology* 79 (5): 1122–31. doi:[10.1111/j.1365-2656.2010.01716.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2656.2010.01716.x). <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/20584097>.

Schmitz, Oswald J. 2007. “Predator Diversity and Trophic Interactions.” *Ecology* 88 (10). Eco Soc America: 2415–26. <http://www.esajournals.org/doi/abs/10.1890/06-0937.1>.

Sih, Andrew, Goran Englund, and David Wooster. 1998. “Emergent Impacts of Multiple

543 Predators on Prey.” *Trends in Ecology & Evolution* 13 (9). Elsevier: 350–55. [http://](http://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S0169534798014372)
 544 linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S0169534798014372.

545 Srivastava, Diane S., and Thomas Bell. 2009. “Reducing Horizontal and Vertical Diversity
 546 in a Foodweb Triggers Extinctions and Impacts Functions.” *Ecology Letters* 12 (10): 1016–28.
 547 doi:[10.1111/j.1461-0248.2009.01357.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1461-0248.2009.01357.x). <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/19702635>.

548 Srivastava, Diane S., Marc W Cadotte, A. Andrew M. MacDonald, Robin G Marushia, and
 549 Nicholas Mirotchnick. 2012. “Phylogenetic Diversity and the Functioning of Ecosystems.”
 550 *Ecology Letters* 15 (7): 637–48. doi:[10.1111/j.1461-0248.2012.01795.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1461-0248.2012.01795.x). [http://www.ncbi.nlm.](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/22583836)
 551 [nih.gov/pubmed/22583836](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/22583836).

552 Srivastava, Diane S., M K Trzcinski, B a Richardson, and B Gilbert. 2008. “Why Are
 553 Predators More Sensitive to Habitat Size Than Their Prey? Insights from Bromeliad Insect
 554 Food Webs.” *The American Naturalist* 172 (6): 761–71. doi:[10.1086/592868](https://doi.org/10.1086/592868). [http://www.](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/18956977)
 555 [ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/18956977](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/18956977).

556 Starzomski, Brian M., Daryl Suen, and Diane S. Srivastava. 2010. “Predation and Fa-
 557 cilitation Determine Chironomid Emergence in a Bromeliad-Insect Food Web.” *Ecological*
 558 *Entomology* 35 (1): 53–60. doi:[10.1111/j.1365-2311.2009.01155.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2311.2009.01155.x). [http://doi.wiley.com/10.](http://doi.wiley.com/10.1111/j.1365-2311.2009.01155.x)
 559 [1111/j.1365-2311.2009.01155.x](http://doi.wiley.com/10.1111/j.1365-2311.2009.01155.x).

560 Webb, Campbell O., David D. Ackerly, Mark a. McPeck, and Michael J. Donoghue. 2002.
 561 “Phylogenies and Community Ecology.” *Annual Review of Ecology and Systematics* 33 (1):
 562 475–505. doi:[10.1146/annurev.ecolsys.33.010802.150448](https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.ecolsys.33.010802.150448). [http://arjournals.annualreviews.](http://arjournals.annualreviews.org/doi/abs/10.1146/annurev.ecolsys.33.010802.150448)
 563 [org/doi/abs/10.1146/annurev.ecolsys.33.010802.150448](http://arjournals.annualreviews.org/doi/abs/10.1146/annurev.ecolsys.33.010802.150448).

- 564 Werner, EE, and JF Gilliam. 1984. "The Ontogenetic Niche and Species Interactions in
565 Size-Structured Populations." *Annual Review of Ecology and Systematics*, no. 15: 393–425.
566 <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2096954>.
- 567 Werner, EE, and SD Peacor. 2003. "A Review of Trait-Mediated Indirect Interactions in
568 Ecological Communities." *Ecology* 84 (5): 1083–1100. [http://www.esajournals.org/doi/abs/
569 10.1890/0012-9658\(2003\)084/%5B1083:AROTII/%5D2.0.CO/%3B2](http://www.esajournals.org/doi/abs/10.1890/0012-9658(2003)084/%5B1083:AROTII/%5D2.0.CO/%3B2).
- 570 Wilby, A, SC Villareal, and LP Lan. 2005. "Functional Benefits of Predator Species Diversity
571 Depend on Prey Identity." *Ecological ...*, 497–501. [http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.
572 1111/j.0307-6946.2005.00717.x/full](http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.0307-6946.2005.00717.x/full).