

working title Compatibility system and stigma size are the main predictors of heterospecific pollen effect

Jose B. Lanuza, Ignasi Bartomeus, Tia-Lynn Ashman, Romina Rader * ^{1,2,3}

¹US Environmental Protection Agency, Office of Research and Development, National Health and Environmental Effects Research Laboratory, Atlantic Ecology Division, 27 Tarzwell Drive Narragansett, RI, 02882, USA

²Big Name University, Department of R, City, BN, 01020, USA

³Estacion Biologica de Donana (EBD-CSIC), E-41092 Sevilla, Spain

* corresponding author: barragansljose@gmail.com

Pollinator sharing can have negative consequences for plant fitness with the arrival of foreign pollen. However, the costs of heterospecific pollen are not yet well understood. We conducted a glasshouse experiment to understand how phylogenetic relatedness and plant traits mediate the impacts of heterospecific pollen transfer. We conducted 1800 crosses by experimentally transferring pollen (50% and 100% ratio) with reciprocal crosses between 10 species belonging to three different families: Brassicaceae, Solanaceae and Convolvulaceae. Seed set was used as proxy of plant fitness. We found that for 65% of the treatments with 50% mix reduced seed set. Moreover, the reduction in seed set was dependent on the degree of relatedness and reproductive traits of the pollen recipient and not the pollen donor. Our results show that certain traits, particularly compatibility system, are critical in understanding the costs of heterospecific pollen.

Keywords: heterospecific pollen, plant reproduction, fitness, interspecific competition, phylogenetic distance.

INTRODUCTION

In most ecosystems, plant species normally coexist and share their floral visitors with other species Waser et al. (1996). From the plants' perspective, pollinator sharing can be positive for some plants Carvalheiro et al. (2014) or negative for others Pauw (2013), depending on the facilitation gradient. An increasing number of visits often correlates with higher chances of fertilization Engel and Irwin (2003). However this is not always the case, among these possible flower visitors there are also nectar robbers and pollen thieves Inouye (1980); Magrach et al. (2017). Receiving both sufficient quantity and quality deposited on the stigma is thus highly relevant to the pollination success of the plant Aizen and Harder (2007).

34 By visiting many plant species, many pollinators are responsible for conspecific pollen loss and the
35 transport of foreign pollen, both of which can have important detrimental effects on species fitness
36 Morales and Traveset (2008); Ashman and Arceo-Gómez (2013); Arceo-Gómez and Ashman (2016).
37 Foreign pollen arrival can play an important role in plant species fitness but outcomes are variable and
38 appear to be context dependent as there is not always a decrease in fitness Morales and Traveset (2008).
39 Some of this variation is likely due to the enormous variability of foreign pollen transferred across
40 systems ranging from 0 to 75 percent. However, most studies report ranges of heterospecific pollen
41 between 0 and 20 percent of the total pollen load Bartomeus et al. (2008) Montgomery and Rathcke
42 (2012); Ashman and Arceo-Gómez (2013); Fang and Huang (2013), yet even these relatively low
43 amounts of heterospecific pollen transferred can decrease fitness greatly Thomson et al. (1982). While
44 we now have some understanding of the impacts of heterospecific pollen quantity, we have less
45 understanding of other factors that could be driving the variation in impacts upon fitness. Ashman and
46 Arceo-Gómez (2013) postulated the first predictive framework that identifies a need to understand how
47 plant traits might mediate heterospecific pollen effect, whereby mating system and pollen size were
48 predicted to potentially mediate the impact of foreign pollen transfer on plant fitness. This concept is
49 supported by specific case studies, such as Tong and Huang (2016) that demonstrate an asymmetrical
50 effect in 6 species of *Pedicularis* whereby the pollen of long styled species was able to grow the full
51 length of the style on short styled species but not vice versa. While this suggests that the impacts of
52 heterospecific pollen may differ among pollen donor and recipient, few studies have been conducted to
53 ascertain whether this pattern is in fact a general trend or to identify the extent to which other plant
54 traits are critical to heterospecific pollen impacts.

55 Plant traits are crucial to understand heterospecific pollen effect but the multifactorial nature of the
56 traits that are involve in the pollen-pistil interaction make difficult to unravel what are the main traits
57 in driving the effect. These traits can be seen from a male perspective of both donor and recipient
58 where pollen size, pollen aperture number and pollen allelopathy are key components to understand the
59 outcome of foreign pollen arrival Murphy and Aarssen (1995); Ashman and Arceo-Gómez (2013). In
60 Ashman and Arceo-Gómez (2013) small pollen is predicted to cause a greater fitness decrease, although
61 this can be true there are also other possibilities to consider which can obscure a predictive framework
62 like big pollen can clogg small stigmas with fewer pollen grains, bigger stigmas are less likely to be

63 clogged by small pollen grains and bigger pollen can outcompete smaller pollen grains due to faster
64 pollen tube growth rate Williams and Rouse (1990). Moreover, to understand the different mechanical
65 or chemical effects of pollen also the female traits of the pollen recipient have to be considered, from
66 the literature these main traits are: stigma size, style length, number of ovules, incompatibility system
67 and also a structural trait such as flower morphology Montgomery and Rathcke (2012); Ashman and
68 Arceo-Gómez (2013); Tong and Huang (2016). For example, greater stigmatic area is positively
69 correlated with greater heterospecific pollen deposition Montgomery and Rathcke (2012) and therefore
70 possibly with an increase in negative effect. For species that are self-incompatible the barriers towards
71 heterospecific pollen are stronger than self-compatible species Ashman and Arceo-Gómez (2013).
72 Nonetheless, an effect of foreign pollen is a bit obscured by the variability within species, however
73 species that are strong selfers or strong outcrossers have less variability in mating systems and
74 predictions of effect could be more realistic (see figure 1 from Whitehead et al. (2018)). Although past
75 research has progress in the understanding of what traits can mediate the effect as we have shown here,
76 there are multiple traits involved and multiple possible scenarios still to be explored empirically for a
77 full understanding of the importance of heterospecific pollen effect in nature.

78 For the understanding at what level or intensity the interference of pollen can occur is important to
79 consider the relatedness of the interacting species. Closely related species are more likely to have
80 similar traits Letten and Cornwell (2015). The similarity in traits between closely related species can
81 lead to higher chances of ovule usurpation/abortion Arceo-Gómez and Ashman (2011) and therefore
82 studies predict and show a greater negative effect of closely related species Ashman and Arceo-Gómez
83 (2013); Arceo-Gómez and Ashman (2016). Few studies however, have focused on the impacts of
84 heterospecific pollen on fitness of distantly related species Galen and Gregory (1989); Neiland and
85 Wilcock (1999). Despite the fact that far related species are also able to decrease species fitness
86 (REFS). Yet, most insects and most stigmas have been found to carry multiple species of foreign pollen
87 with little attention to degree of relatedness (Arceo-Gómez and Ashman (2016); Fang and Huang
88 (2013). Understanding the role of foreign pollen from distantly related species thus deserves greater
89 attention. The relatedness of foreign pollen gives a first snapshot of where the pollen competition can
90 occur and therefore could be a proxy of effect. With that said, Arceo-Gómez and Ashman (2016) is the
91 only work which has proven a greater effect of close related species through a meta-analysis but with

low sample sizes and lack of significance. Therefore, there is a need to study the effect of heterospecific pollen of far and close related species at community level beyond single pairwise interactions.

Heterospecific pollen studies in nature have the complexity added of great environmental variability which can lead to confounding interpretations. Moreover, the great diversity of floral structures and small sizes of some of them such as Asteraceae species make tedious or almost impossible the studies of heterospecific pollen on the field. For this reason, we investigated how floral reproductive traits and relatedness mediate the impact of heterospecific pollen by creating an artificial co-flowering community in a glasshouse with 10 species belonging to three different families with different traits. Our study tries to answer the following question: To what extent do (i) floral reproductive traits and (ii) relatedness, mediate the impacts of heterospecific pollen on seed set.

METHODS

The study was conducted in a glasshouse at University of New England (Armidale, Australia) from November 2017 to March 2018. Rooms were temperature controlled depending on the requirements of the species with day and night temperature differences. The experimental design had species from three different families: Solanaceae, Brassicaceae and Convolvulaceae (**Table 1**). The different species of the study have different reproductive traits and different degree of relatedness where the reciprocal crossed between species them allow us to have multiple different scenarios of both. Moreover, the species selected have fast life cycle and low structural flower complexity in order to perform the different pollination treatments. For the purpose of the experiment all the species were considered as pollen recipient and as pollen donor (see interaction matrix, fig 2). Species were watered once or twice per day and fertilized weekly (NPK 23: 3.95: 14).

Table 1

Family	Genus	Species
Brassicaceae	Brassica	Brassica rapa
Brassicaceae	Brassica	Brassica oleracea

Family	Genus	Species
Brassicaceae	Eruca	Eruca versicaria
Brassicaceae	Sinapis	Sinapis alba
Convolvulaceae	Ipomoea	Ipomoea aquatica
Convolvulaceae	Ipomoea	Ipomoea purpurea
Solanaceae	Capsicum	Capsicum annuum
Solanaceae	Petunia	Petunia integrifolia
Solanaceae	Solanum	Solanum lycopersicum
Solanaceae	Solanum	Solanum melongena

114 Hand-pollination

115 Foreign pollen effect was studied through two different treatments, one with 50% conspecific pollen and
116 50% heterospecific pollen and a second one with 100% foreign pollen (N=10) this second I don't get,
117 maybe explain it's utility.. Therefore, 180 different combinations were performed with N=10 per
118 combination. Seed set was the proxy of effect for all our treatments. Moreover, hand cross pollination
119 (between individuals of the same species), hand self pollination, apomixis (bagged emasculated flowers)
120 and natural selfing were tested for each species (N=10). For the treatments with foreign pollen and
121 hand cross pollination, flowers were emasculated the day prior anthesis and hand pollinated next day
122 with a toothpick. Hand-pollination was conducted with 3-4 gentle touches on the stigma surface. The
123 mixes of pollen were realized on an eppendorf based on the pollen counts made with Neubauer chamber
124 (each anther was counted 4 times for 20 different anthers per species)-IB explain better and give a bit
125 more of detail. In order to confirm that the treatments applied were 50-50 percent pollen, for each focal
126 species the total stigmatic load of pollen was counted from one donor of each family (N=3).

127 Traits and evolutive distance

128 The traits measured for each species were pollen per anther, number of ovules, stigma width and length
129 and stigmatic area, style width and length, ovary width and length. Moreover stigma type explain was
130 tested. Pollen was counted for 20 anthers of each species with 4 replicates per sample with an

hemocytometer. Previously, anthers were squashed on a known solution with the pippete tip and
homogeneize with a vortex for 30 seconds. Ovule number was counted with the help of an
stereomicroscope and a small grid over a petri dish from 15 randomly selected flowers. The different
morphometrical traits were measured with a digital stereomicrospe. Levels of self incompatibility were
estimated by dividing the fruit set of hand self pollination by hand cross pollination Lloyd and Schoen
(1992).

Analysis

We used the statistical language R (R Core Team 2018) for all our analyses. Differences of seed set
between treatments and hand cross pollination for each species was tested through mixed linear models.
For the following analysis we scaled the values of seed production for all the species with mean 0 and sd
of 1. To test the effect of heterospecific pollen, we substracted to the seed set of hand cross pollination
the seed set of heterospecific pollen treatments. In order to see correlations between heterospecific
pollen effect and traits we performed Mantel test between the matrix of heterospecific pollen effect and
the distance matrix of each trait (euclidean distances). Moreover, Mantel test was also conducted
between heterospecific pollen effect and the square root of the matrix of phylogenetic distance due to
improvement in the statistical power (Letten & Cornwell 2014). all is here, but I would break it by
questions and give a bit more detail, to avoid overwhelm the reader We explored also the relations
between traits and heterospecific pollen effect through generalized mixed models where the response
variable was heterospecific pollen effect, the independent variable the different traits and the random
effects the different treatments per species [Here I think you should think if this controls for the non
independency of donors and recipients. I think not. Maybe look onto matrix regresions?). Moreover,
pairwise evolutive distances were calculated with MEGA7 for two kinds of markers: 1) Internal
transcribed spacer (ITS) and 2) ribulose-bisphosphate carboxylase (RBCL). The sequences of interest
were downloaded from NCBI GenBank and the phylogenetic tree constructed by maximum likelihood
with MEGA7. Make a section on how you contrsucted phylogeny.

I would explain three test. 0) treatment effects with GLM's, 1) Mantels: relative effects, 2) GLM's or
matrix models: Absolute effects and explain them in three independent paragraphs including a
rationale of why

160 RESULTS

161 Results of hand cross pollination, self hand pollination, natural selfing and apomixis are presented in
162 **Table 2.** Heterospecific pollen reduced seed set significantly with the 50-50% heterospecific pollen
163 treatments for 65% of the pairwise interactions $p < 0.05$. Across families we found a very similar effect
164 but when species were looked at species level they respond differently even within the same family
165 rephrase and maybe test statistically?, for instance for two species of the Brassicaceae family *Brassica*
166 *oleracea* and *Eruca versicaria* we found very contrasting effects of foreign pollen where for the first one,
167 all donors reduce seed set significantly and for the second, just two species did out of nine. The 100%
168 foreign pollen treatments barely produced seeds or fruits and just for *Sinapis alba* we did not find
169 significant differences between the hand cross pollination and one treatment with pollen from a
170 confamilial- IB Unclear. Solanaceae species with berry fruit type developed small fruits or even normal
171 fruits in some cases under which treatment. *S. lycopersicum* seems to produce small fruits (35% of the
172 treatments) independently of pollen and pollen donor due to also apomictic treatments did, never
173 normal size. *C. annuum* produced some fruits (9%) of both small and normal size and finally *S.*
174 *melongena* produced seedless normal fruits with just confamilial pollen (3%), for both species seems
175 that fruit formation was induced by pollen on the stigma because of lack of fruit production with
176 treatments that tested for apomixis. clarify this descriptive statistics part- Also a figure with a summary
177 of the treatments effect would be cool, or at least in the appendices

178 **Table 2.** Percentage of seeds produced per ovule for the ten species used in the experiment. The
179 treatments presented are hand cross pollination, hand self pollination, natural selfing and apomixis
180 (emasculated flowers). turn into a figure somehow?

Species	Cross	Self	Natural_selfing	Apomixis
Brassica oleracea	32.06897	0.0000000	0.00000	0
Brassica rapa	44.97041	0.0000000	0.00000	0
Eruca versicaria	23.75000	0.4166667	0.00000	0
Sinapis alba	43.33333	48.3333333	5.00000	15
Ipomoea aquatica	40.00000	30.0000000	20.00000	0
Ipomoea purpurea	31.66667	86.6666667	31.66667	0
Capsicum annuum	100.00000	66.2240664	23.48548	0
Petunia integrifolia	100.00000	24.7727273	0.00000	0
Solanum lycopersicum	90.38043	43.4782609	70.00000	0
Solanum melongena	60.47525	87.9702970	21.56436	0




Figure 1: Barplot with the different treatments that provide information of the reproductive biology of the ten species. The y axis is the proportion of ovules converted to seed in percentage. The different treatments (N=10) which are presented in the legend are, hand cross pollination, hand self pollination, natural selfing and apomixis. More information about these treatments can be found in Methods and Appendices.

Mantel test indicates that a possible?? It exists! correlation exist between heterospecific pollen effect and the evolutive relative distances, for ITS and RBCL markers we had r coefficients of 0.29 and 0.25 respectively $p < 0.05$ think on a figure - maybe using NMDS. Moreover, Mantel test indicates that also a possible?? correlation between stigma width and stigma type exist (stats??). Trait correlations were also explored with GLMM

I have done it at the moment just for Compatibility system Also I have to fix from mixed linear model to GLMM, just realize that




Figure 2: The effect of heterospecific pollen (scaled see set) is represented in function of the compatibility system (self/cross*100) for the the different species. Each coulored dot represents the interaction of a focal species with a different pollen donor.

188 [Compatibility index don't multiply per 100 from Lloyd](#)

189 **DISCUSSION**

190 Discussion

191 Herbs vs tress, annual vs perennial... Many flowers vs few flowered species; structural composition on
192 a system

193 What are the implications of the findings?

194 Ideas about pollen size in heterospecific pollen effect. (still have to develop it more...)

195 Let's classify pollen size in three groups in order to understand the interaction between pollen donor
196 and recipient: 1) Donor pollen size < Recipient pollen size 2) Donor pollen size = Recipient pollen size
197 3) Donor pollen size > Recipient pollen size

198 Now I try to develop each part

199 1) Donor pollen size < Recipient pollen size

200 Effect:

- 201 • Donor's pollen could clogg the stigma
- 202 • Chemical inhibition

203 Traits associated with bigger pollen of the recipient:

- 204 • Recipient's pollen have faster pollen tube growth (example with my data)
- 205 • Reduction in number of ovules (Also with my species)
- 206 • Big differences in pollen size can be traduced in low relatednes therefore less likely of pollen
207 germination on a far related stigma.

208 2) Donor pollen size = Recipient pollen size

- 209 • Very relatedness dependant this point

210 • Similar probabilities of taken space on the stigma

211 3) Donor pollen size > Recipient pollen size

212 Effect:

213 -In small stigmas big pollen grains can occupy great part of the stigmatic area.

214 -small pollen grains can get embedded

215 IB: Think also on using tree analysis to test if hp effect depends on complex trait combinations. Tree
216 analysis are great when two different strategies lead to the same outcome. This would never been pick
217 up by GLMs. The r package is `party`. You can see an example applied to birds is Sol et al 2010
218 Science. Ask me if you want more details or code examples.

219 CONCLUSIONS

220 ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

221 REFERENCES

222 Aizen, M. A., and L. D. Harder. 2007. Expanding the limits of the pollen-limitation concept: Effects of
223 pollen quantity and quality. *Ecology* 88:271–281.

224 Arceo-Gómez, G., and T.-L. Ashman. 2011. Heterospecific pollen deposition: Does diversity alter the
225 consequences? *New Phytologist* 192:738–746.

226 Arceo-Gómez, G., and T.-L. Ashman. 2016. Invasion status and phylogenetic relatedness predict cost
227 of heterospecific pollen receipt: Implications for native biodiversity decline. *Journal of Ecology*
228 104:1003–1008.

229 Ashman, T.-L., and G. Arceo-Gómez. 2013. Toward a predictive understanding of the fitness costs of

heterospecific pollen receipt and its importance in co-flowering communities. *American Journal of Botany* 100:1061–1070.

Bartomeus, I., J. Bosch, and M. Vilà. 2008. High invasive pollen transfer, yet low deposition on native stigmas in a carpobrotus-invaded community. *Annals of Botany* 102:417–424.

Carvalho, L. G., J. C. Biesmeijer, G. Benadi, J. Fründ, M. Stang, I. Bartomeus, C. N. Kaiser-Bunbury, M. Baude, S. I. Gomes, V. Merckx, and others. 2014. The potential for indirect effects between co-flowering plants via shared pollinators depends on resource abundance, accessibility and relatedness. *Ecology letters* 17:1389–1399.

Engel, E. C., and R. E. Irwin. 2003. Linking pollinator visitation rate and pollen receipt. *American Journal of Botany* 90:1612–1618.

Fang, Q., and S.-Q. Huang. 2013. A directed network analysis of heterospecific pollen transfer in a biodiverse community. *Ecology* 94:1176–1185.

Galen, C., and T. Gregory. 1989. Interspecific pollen transfer as a mechanism of competition: Consequences of foreign pollen contamination for seed set in the alpine wildflower, *polemonium viscosum*. *Oecologia* 81:120–123.

Inouye, D. W. 1980. The terminology of floral larceny. *Ecology* 61:1251–1253.

Letten, A. D., and W. K. Cornwell. 2015. Trees, branches and (square) roots: Why evolutionary relatedness is not linearly related to functional distance. *Methods in Ecology and Evolution* 6:439–444.

Lloyd, D. G., and D. J. Schoen. 1992. Self-and cross-fertilization in plants. i. functional dimensions. *International Journal of Plant Sciences* 153:358–369.

Magrach, A., J. P. González-Varo, M. Boiffier, M. Vilà, and I. Bartomeus. 2017. Honeybee spillover reshuffles pollinator diets and affects plant reproductive success. *Nature ecology & evolution* 1:1299.

Montgomery, B. R., and B. J. Rathcke. 2012. Effects of floral restrictiveness and stigma size on

253 heterospecific pollen receipt in a prairie community. *Oecologia* 168:449–458.

254 Morales, C. L., and A. Traveset. 2008. Interspecific pollen transfer: Magnitude, prevalence and
 255 consequences for plant fitness. *Critical Reviews in Plant Sciences* 27:221–238.

256 Murphy, S. D., and L. W. Aarssen. 1995. Reduced seed set in *Elytrigia repens* caused by allelopathic
 257 pollen from *Phleum pratense*. *Canadian Journal of Botany* 73:1417–1422.

258 Neiland, M., and C. Wilcock. 1999. The presence of heterospecific pollen on stigmas of nectariferous
 259 and nectarless orchids and its consequences for their reproductive success. *Protoplasma* 208:65–75.

260 Pauw, A. 2013. Can pollination niches facilitate plant coexistence? *Trends in ecology & evolution*
 261 28:30–37.

262 R Core Team. 2018. R: A language and environment for statistical computing. R Foundation for
 263 Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria.

264 Thomson, J. D., B. J. Andrews, and R. Plowright. 1982. The effect of a foreign pollen on ovule
 265 development in *Diervilla lonicera* (caprifoliaceae). *New Phytologist* 90:777–783.

266 Tong, Z.-Y., and S.-Q. Huang. 2016. Pre-and post-pollination interaction between six co-flowering
 267 *Pedicularis* species via heterospecific pollen transfer. *New Phytologist* 211:1452–1461.

268 Waser, N. M., L. Chittka, M. V. Price, N. M. Williams, and J. Ollerton. 1996. Generalization in
 269 pollination systems, and why it matters. *Ecology* 77:1043–1060.

270 Whitehead, M. R., R. Lanfear, R. J. Mitchell, and J. D. Karron. 2018. Plant mating systems often vary
 271 widely among populations. *Frontiers in Ecology and Evolution* 6:38.

272 Williams, E., and J. Rouse. 1990. Relationships of pollen size, pistil length and pollen tube growth
 273 rates in *Rhododendron* and their influence on hybridization. *Sexual Plant Reproduction* 3:7–17.

275 **List of Figures**

276	1	Barplot with the different treatments that provide information of the reproductive biology	
277		of the ten species. The y axis is the proportion of ovules converted to seed in percentage.	
278		The different treatments (N=10) which are presented in the legend are, hand cross	
279		pollination, hand self pollination, natural selfing and apomixis. More information about	
280		these treatments can be found in Methods and Appendices.	10
281	2	The effect of heterospecific pollen (scaled see set) is represented in function of the	
282		compatibility system (self/cross*100) for the the different species. Each coulored dot	
283		represents the interaction of a focal species with a different pollen donor.	11