

# The temporal assembly of plant-pollinator networks following restoration

Lauren C. Ponisio<sup>1/2</sup>, Marilia P. Gaiarsa<sup>3</sup>, Claire Kremen<sup>1</sup>

1. Department of Environmental Science, Policy, and Management  
University of California, Berkeley  
130 Mulford Hall  
Berkeley, California, USA  
94720
2. Department of Entomology  
University of California, Riverside  
417 Entomology Bldg.  
Riverside, California, USA  
92521
3. Departamento de Ecologia  
Universidade de Sao Paulo  
São Paulo, SP, Brazil  
05508-900

## Abstract

The ability of communities to maintain function in the face of species extinction is related to the structure of networks. Understanding network structure and how it relates to network assembly, therefore, is a priority for system-level conservation biology. Using a long-term data set comprising nearly 20,000 pollinator visitation records, we explore the assembly of plant-pollinator communities at native plant restorations in the Central Valley of California. Species are highly dynamic in their network position, causing assembly to be punctuated by significant reorganizations of interactions. Non-assembling mature hedgerows and weedy field margins did not undergo as many significant network reorganizations, suggesting environmental factors alone cannot account for the changes observed in assembling communities. Pollinator species were opportunistic in the flowers they visited. Indeed, the most persistent and generalized species were also the most variable in their network positions — the opposite of which would be expected by preferential attachment. High species and interaction turnover was ubiquitous across assembling and non-assembling communities, though unique interactions turnover at higher rates in assembling hedgerows as the networks continually reorganize. Nestedness of assembling networks also increased through time, but there was no increase in robustness to simulated plant extinctions. The resilience of networks to cascading perturbations, however, increased as the communities assembled, at least partially due to accumulating species richness. Our results elucidate some of the mechanisms underlying plant-pollinator network assembly and restoration, while providing further evidence that hedgerows are a valuable tool for promoting species conservation and ecosystem provision in agricultural areas.

community assembly, change points, specialization, nestedness, modularity, bipartite, preferential attachment

## 24 Introduction

25 Global change has created a severe biodiversity crisis, and as species are lost, so are their inter-  
26 actions (Dunn *et al.*, 2009; Barnosky *et al.*, 2011). Because mutualistic interactions are essential  
27 for maintaining the diversity their component guilds, these systems are particularly at risk from  
28 coextinction cascades. The nature of these cascades will depend on the interaction patterns within  
29 a community (Memmott *et al.*, 2004; Rezende *et al.*, 2007; Bascompte & Stouffer, 2009; Thébault  
30 & Fontaine, 2010). To safeguard function it has become increasingly imperative to aid the recovery  
31 of lost biodiversity and interactions through ecological restoration, and a key restoration aim is to  
32 facilitate assembly of robust interaction networks (Menz *et al.*, 2010). We know little, however,  
33 about how to re-assemble interacting communities through restoration, or the process of ecological  
34 network assembly more generally.

35 Preferential attachment, the most widely explored mechanism of network assembly, (Barabási &  
36 Albert, 1999), predicts that species entering a network are more likely to interact with species that  
37 are already well-connected (“the rich-get-richer” principle, Barabási & Albert, 1999). In pollina-  
38 tion systems — a particularly ubiquitous mutualism (Ollerton *et al.*, 2011; Klein *et al.*, 2007) —  
39 some studies have found support for this assembly mechanism. Investigating the day-to-day, tem-  
40 poral assembly of a plant-pollinator network within a season, Olesen *et al.* (2008) found that new  
41 species tended to interact with already well-connected species, potentially because these species  
42 are either more abundant or more temporally persistent. In addition, using a space-for-time sub-  
43 stitution to study primary succession along a glacier foreland, Albrecht *et al.* (2010) also found  
44 some evidence that assembly occurred through preferential attachment. Network nestedness, a  
45 pattern of interactions where a core formed by generalist species that interact with both specialist  
46 and generalist species, increased as the community aged (Albrecht *et al.*, 2010). Thus, an increase  
47 in nestedness could result from preferential attachment process where specialist species attach to  
48 the well-connected, generalist core.

49 In contrast to the ordered network build-up described by preferential attachment, significant reor-  
50 ganizations of interactions can punctuate assembly (Peel & Clauset, 2014). Such significant reor-  
51 ganizations of interactions, or network changing points, are observed in social networks responding  
52 to abrupt shifts in the behavior of interactors (Peel & Clauset, 2014). In ecological communities,  
53 such shifts may occur if, as new species colonize, resident species change their interaction part-  
54 ners to optimize their foraging effort. In plant-pollinator communities, theory predicts pollinators  
55 optimize their use of floral resources to reduce interspecific competition and improve resource-use  
56 efficiency (Pyke, 1984; Valdovinos *et al.*, 2010, 2013; Albrecht *et al.*, 2010; Blüthgen *et al.*, 2007).  
57 No studies, however, have examined whether changing points occur during ecological network  
58 assembly, and how these changes relate to the species behavior.

59 Understanding network assembly is particularly relevant to ecological restoration, which is es-  
60 sentially 'applied succession' (e.g., Parker, 1997). In pollination systems, the time since an area  
61 was restored has been shown to affect the structure of networks (Forup *et al.*, 2008a,b; Devoto  
62 *et al.*, 2012), suggesting interactions are evolving as the community develops. Understanding the  
63 mechanisms of network assembly will help to guide community restoration. Facilitating network  
64 restoration is especially imperative in areas where species interactions provide essential ecosystem  
65 services, such as crop pollination. In intensively managed agricultural landscapes, the demand  
66 for pollination services is the greatest (Kremen, 2008). However, honey bees, managed exten-  
67 sively around the world to provide crop pollination, are in global decline (Neumann & Carreck,  
68 2010; van Engelsdorp *et al.*, 2009). In addition, native pollinators, which are capable of providing  
69 sufficient crop pollination (Kremen *et al.*, 2002; Winfree *et al.*, 2007; Kremen *et al.*, 2004), are  
70 in short supply because these landscapes make poor habitats for pollinator populations (Kremen  
71 *et al.*, 2002). To ensure the continued provision of ecosystem services and curb biodiversity loss,  
72 it is critical to restore pollinators and their interactions in agricultural landscapes. To promote pol-  
73 linator services in agriculture, farmers may chose to plant strips of native plants along farm edges  
74 (hedgerows) to help provide habitat for pollinators without removing arable land from production.

75 Hedgerows augment the richness, abundance and trait diversity of pollinators in agricultural land-  
76 scapes (Morandin & Kremen, 2013; M’Gonigle *et al.*, 2015; Kremen & M’Gonigle, 2015; Ponisio  
77 *et al.*, 2016). In addition, hedgerows promote the persistence and colonization of floral resource  
78 specialists (M’Gonigle *et al.*, 2015). Little is known, however, about how new species are being  
79 incorporated into the network as the community assembles, or the consequences for interaction  
80 patterns and robustness.

81 We explore the process of network development using a nine year dataset of plant-pollinator com-  
82 munities assembly following hedgerow restoration in the highly simplified and intensively man-  
83 aged agricultural landscape of California’s Central Valley. We first determine whether the mecha-  
84 nism underlying network assembly is a smooth build up of interactions as would be predicted by  
85 preferential attachment, or punctuated by significant reorganizations of interactions (i.e., network  
86 changing points). Even with changing points in interaction organization, networks could still be  
87 assembling via preferential attachment if the network reorganizations were primarily driven the  
88 by peripheral, temporally variable species while a stable, well-connected core of species persist.  
89 We test whether the species that are most variable in their network position — and thus important  
90 contributors to network reorganizations — are less persistent and connected species. To further  
91 explore the mechanisms underlying the temporal dynamics of the networks, we examine patterns  
92 in the species and interaction temporal turnover. Lastly, we investigate whether networks are as-  
93 sembling toward predictable interaction patterns, and the ramifications for the robustness of the  
94 networks to species extinction and cascading perturbations.

## Materials & Methods

### Study sites and collection methods

We surveyed plant-pollinator interaction networks of assembling hedgerows communities (N=5), as well as in two types of non-assembling communities to serve as controls: unrestored, weedy field margins (N=19) and mature hedgerows (greater than 10 years since planting, N=29). The sites were located in the Central Valley of California in Yolo, Colusa and Solano Counties. This area is composed of intensively managed agriculture — primarily monocultures of conventional row crops, vineyards and orchards. Hedgerows we planted along field margins where they do not remove valuable land from production. Plantings are between are ca. 3–6 m wide and approximately 350 m long, bordering large (ca. 30–hectare) crop fields. Hedgerows consist of native, perennial, shrub and tree plantings including *Rosa californica*, *Cercis occidentalis*, *Ceanothus spp.*, *Heteromeles arbutifolia*, *Sambucus mexicana*, *Eriogonum spp.*, *Baccharis spp.*, *Salvia spp.* and others (Kremen & M’Gonigle, 2015; M’Gonigle *et al.*, 2015). The mean distance between monitoring sites was 15 km, and the minimum distance between sites of the same type sampled in the same year was 2 km. The entire area surveyed spanned almost 300 km<sup>2</sup>. The crop fields adjacent to all sites were similarly managed as intensive, high-input monoculture.

Monitoring began in 2006 and continued through 2014. Surveys of the assembling hedgerows began the year before the area was restored. For logistical reasons, no sampling of assembling hedgerows was conducted in 2010. Sites were sampled between two and five times per year (Tables S1-S3). In each round of sampling, the order in which sites were sampled was randomized. Surveys were conducted under sunny conditions when the temperature was above 21°C and wind speed was below 2.5 meters/second.

Flower-visitors to plants in hedgerows and unrestored controls were netted for one hour of active search time (the timer was paused when handling specimens). Honeybees (*Apis mellifera*) were

not collected because their abundance is determined largely by hive placement by bee-keepers. All other insect flower visitors that touched the reproductive parts of the flower were collected; however, here we focus only on wild bees and syrphids — the most abundant and effective pollinators in the system (representing 49 and 19 percent of records, respectively, C. Kremen, A. Klein and L. Morandin, unpublished data). Bee and syrphid specimens were identified to species (or morpho-species for some bee specimens in the genera *Nomada* and *Sphecodes*) by expert taxonomists.

Quantitative networks were generated for each site through time. To account for the unequal number of surveys between years (Tables S1-S3), we use the mean of the interactions between a pair of plants and pollinators across surveys within a year to represent interaction frequency.

## Change point analysis

### Identifying change points

We employed a change point detection method (Peel & Clauset, 2014) to identify fundamental reorganizations in large-scale interaction patterns. A change point is caused by a merge, split, fragmentation or formation of communities (also called modules or compartments). Change point detection methods have yet to be generalized to quantitative networks, so for this analysis we focused on qualitative (binary) networks. Following Peel & Clauset (2014), we first defined a probability distribution over the networks using the generalized hierarchical random graph model (GHRG). The GHRG model is able to capture both assortative and disassortative community structure patterns at all scales in the network (Peel & Clauset, 2014). A network  $G$  is composed of vertices  $V$  and edges  $E$ . The GHRG model decomposes the  $N$  vertices into a series of nested groups, the relationships among which are represented by the dendrogram  $T$ . The tips of  $T$  are the vertices of  $G$ , and the probability that two vertices  $u$  and  $v$  connect is given by the parameter  $p_r$ .

142 The probability distribution of the network  $G$  thus defined as:

$$P(G|T, p_r) = p_r^{E_r} (1 - p_r)^{N_r - E_r} \quad (1)$$

143 Where  $E_r$  is the observed number of edges between vertices with the common ancestor  $r$ , and  $N_r$   
144 is the total possible edges.

145 Using Bayesian posterior inference and techniques from phylogenetic tree reconstruction, we fit  
146 the GHRG model to the networks (Peel & Clauset, 2014). This is accomplished by using a Markov  
147 chain Monte Carlo (MCMC) procedure to first sample the posterior distribution of bipartitions,  
148 from which a consensus tree is derived (Peel & Clauset, 2014). We use  $\beta$  distributions with the  
149 hyperparameters  $\alpha = \beta = 1$  to define priors for  $p_r$ .

150 Once the GHRG model has been fit to the networks, we determine whether a change point occurred  
151 between two time slices. To detect a change point, we compare the fit of two models — one  
152 where a change point occurred between two networks, and one where no change occurred —  
153 using posterior Bayes factors. We chose a sliding window of length,  $w$ , of four, within which to  
154 find change points. Larger windows allow for more gradual changes, and four was the maximum  
155 possible with our maximum of eight years of data. Lastly, to calculate a  $p$ -value for the Bayes  
156 factors, we use parametric bootstrapping to numerically estimate the null distribution (Peel &  
157 Clauset, 2014). We employed code published online by L. Peel for the change point analysis.  
158 Analyses were conducted in Python 3.4.

159 We next test whether the change points occurring in maturing hedgerows were a component of  
160 the assembly process or a product of environmental shifts that lead to network reorganizations  
161 in all types of communities. We model the number of change points as successes and the total  
162 number of years each site was sampled as trials, and use a generalized linear model with Binomial  
163 error to test whether the probability of a change point occurring varied by site type. We used



standard techniques to determine whether the assumptions of the models were met for this and all subsequent models. For the non-assembling hedgerows and weedy field margins, only sites with five or greater survey years were included in this analysis. All statistical analysis were conducted in R 3.2.3 (R Core Team, 2015).

### **Characteristics of species that contribute to change points**

To further elucidate the nature of the change points, we examine the characteristics of the species that contributed to interaction reorganization. Some species remain in relatively similar network positions through time, whereas others are more variable in their position and thus contribute more strongly to network reorganization. We test whether the more persistent species with the highest degree (number of different interaction partners) are the most stable in their network positions, as would be expected if the networks were assembling via preferential attachment.

We calculate species persistence as the proportion of surveys in which a plant or pollinator is observed. Species observed consistently within and between years are thus maximally persistent. Weighted species degree is calculated from interaction observations from an extensive dataset from Yolo County (approx. 18000 interaction records) that included both the data included in this study and additional data from sites where we collected flower visitors using the same methods (M'Gonigle *et al.*, 2015; Ponisio *et al.*, 2016). To represent network position variability, we computed the coefficient of variation of weighted closeness at each site through time. Closeness describes the centrality of a species in the network by calculating path lengths to other vertices (species) in the graph. We use linear mixed models to test whether the species closeness variability (log) is related to the persistence or degree of that species (Bates *et al.*, 2014; Kuznetsova *et al.*, 2014). We included random effects for species, as well as site. Because the degree and persistence of pollinators were strongly correlated, ( $\rho = 0.84$ ,  $p\text{-value} < 2 * 10^{-16}$ ), we include each explanatory variable in the model separately. Plant degree and persistence were not signif-

icantly correlated, but we use the same models as we did for the pollinators for consistency. A linear increase in closeness, as might be expected with assembly by preferential attachment, would also lead to a high variability in closeness scores, so we test whether closeness increases through time.

## Species and interaction turnover

Reorganizations of network structure can be the result of species turnover or species changing their interaction partners (i.e., re-wiring). To better understand the mechanisms underlying the temporal dynamics of the assembling networks, we examined patterns of species and interaction turnover. For example, assembling networks may have higher rates of pollinator turnover than non-assembling communities because new pollinator species are colonizing and establishing themselves (M’Gonigle *et al.*, 2015). Similarly, if pollinators try to maximize their foraging efficiency based on the species present, interactions may turnover more quickly than in established communities. In addition, at assembling hedgerows, plants may “colonize” the networks as they become more attractive resources, and establish new interactions with pollinators.

To estimate the temporal species and interaction turnover, we use an approach similar to calculating spatial  $\beta$ -diversity. Instead of calculating the variation in community composition across sites within a year, however, we estimated turnover across years at a site. We first calculated the pairwise dissimilarity of plants, pollinators and interactions between years within each site using the Chao dissimilarity estimator that incorporates abundances, while also accounting for unobserved records (Chao *et al.*, 2005). Dissimilarity estimates can be affected by the total number of species and individuals sampled at a site (e.g., Ponisio *et al.*, 2016). For example, the probability that two sites do not share any species is higher when there are few individuals at those sites. Following Ponisio *et al.* (2016), we use null models that constrained species richness to estimate the deviation of the observed dissimilarity from that, which would be expected under a random community

assembly process. With the corrected dissimilarity values, we then calculated the multivariate dispersion of community composition across years (Anderson *et al.*, 2011). In order to test whether assembling hedgerows had more species and interactions turnover than non-assembling communities, the species and interaction temporal turnover estimates were included as response variables in a linear mixed model with site type as an explanatory variable along with site as a random effect (Bates *et al.*, 2014; Kuznetsova *et al.*, 2014).

Though species may turnover across years, some groups of species may essentially replace each other if they fill similar roles in the network, occupying the same network position and interacting with similar species. At non-assembling communities, species turnover may overestimate the temporal changes in the networks if the interactions occurring in one year are similar to those in the next year when they are weighted by the similarity of their constituent species (Fig. S1). We develop a method to examine the temporal turnover of interactions with weightings based on their similarity. We followed Ahn *et al.* (2010) algorithm to hierarchically cluster all the interactions (edges) across sites and years based on their similarity, and build a dendrogram. The interaction similarity is based how many plants and pollinators (vertices) two edges share (Ahn *et al.*, 2010; Kalinka & Tomancak, 2011). The more species edges shared in common, the shorter the branch length between them on the dendrogram. We next calculated the temporal turnover of interactions weighted by their similarity, as approximated by “phylogenetic” distance (Graham & Fine, 2008; Kembel *et al.*, 2010). We then use linear models to test whether the weighted turnover of interactions varied between assembling and non-assembling networks (Bates *et al.*, 2014; Kuznetsova *et al.*, 2014).

## Temporal changes in interaction patterns

### Network structure

Any changing points in network structure may contribute to the reorganization of the assembling networks into predictable interaction patterns. Pollination networks exhibit two main structural patterns — modularity (e.g., Olesen *et al.*, 2007) and nestedness (e.g., Bascompte *et al.*, 2006, 2003). In modular networks, interactions are insular, occurring within separate groups or “modules” more often than between modules. Modules in the network may fragment as the network assembles, enhancing modularity. Conversely, nested networks are like a pyramid of interactions, where there are some species that interact with many species, other species that interact with a subset of those species, and so on. If species entering the network tend to interact with the generalist base of the network pyramid as would be expected with preferential attachment, nestedness would increase through time. The connectance — the proportion of observed out of possible interactions — would decrease as new, specialist species, preferentially attach to the core. Lastly, the overall level of network specialization may change as the community assembles. Network-level specialization will increase if specialist species colonize the network or species begin to limit their interaction niche breath as the network assembles (Blüthgen *et al.*, 2006).

To evaluate network nestedness, we used the estimator weighted NODF (Almeida-Neto *et al.*, 2008). NODF evaluates whether species with fewer partners interact with subsets of partners with which more connected species interact (Almeida-Neto *et al.*, 2008). To estimate modularity, we use a hierarchical clustering algorithm (Newman & Girvan, 2004; Csardi & Nepusz, 2006). We calculated standardized z-scores so that nestedness and modularity metrics could be compared across communities. The z-scores were calculated by generating an ensemble of 999 randomly assembled communities, subtracting the mean of the statistic calculated across these communities from the observed value, and then dividing by the standard deviation. To assemble random com-

munities, we reshuffled the interactions between species but fixed the total number of interactions, species and interaction frequency distributions (Galeano *et al.*, 2009). We evaluate network specialization with the metric H2, which estimates the deviation of the observed interaction frequency between plants and pollinators from a null expectation where all partners interact in proportion to their abundances (Blüthgen *et al.*, 2006). It ranges from zero for generalized networks to one for specialized networks.

To test whether network modularity, nestedness, connectance or specialization changed linearly with assembly, we use linear mixed models with the descriptive network metrics as the response variable, year of assembly as the explanatory variable, and random effects of site and year. The number of species in a network affects the patterns of interaction possible, so we also examined the change in plant and pollinator species richness through time. We employ generalized linear mixed models with Poisson error to model richness. We scaled explanatory variables.

## **Network robustness**

Lastly, we test whether the changes in interaction patterns associated with network assembly affect the robustness of the network to species loss and to cascading perturbations. Following Memmott *et al.* (2004), we simulate plant species extinction and the subsequent extinction cascades of pollinator species. Because the reproduction of plant species is facilitated by active restoration efforts, it is unlikely the extinction of pollinator species would affect plant populations in the hedgerows. However, plants ceasing to bloom, for example in response to drought, will likely affect the pollinators that depend on them. We eliminate plant species based on their degree or abundance, and then calculate the number of pollinators that secondarily went extinct. The area below the extinction curve is an estimate of network robustness (Memmott *et al.*, 2004; Dormann *et al.*, 2008).

We also explored how the robustness to cascading perturbations changed as community assembled,

using algebraic connectivity — the second smallest eigenvalue of the Laplacian matrix (Fiedler, 1973) — as a proxy for network robustness (Gaiarsa et al., submitted). Algebraic connectivity relates to how difficult it is to turn a network into completely disconnected groups of species (Costa et al., 2007). The larger the algebraic connectivity, the more robust a network is to cascading perturbations, and the harder it is to break the community into isolated groups of species (Gaiarsa et al., submitted).

## Results

Over eight years and 747 samples, we collected and identified 19,547 wild bees and syrphids comprising 173 species from 50 genera. We observed 1,521 unique interactions between plants and pollinators.

### Change point analysis

#### Identifying change points

The majority (76%) of the sites underwent at least one significant interaction reorganization (Fig. 1, 2). All five of the assembling hedgerows experienced network changing points, whereas only 40% and 81% of non-assembling hedgerows and field margins, respectively, underwent significant interaction reorganizations. Assembling hedgerows had significantly more changing points than the non-assembling networks (estimate of the difference in the odds ratios between assembling and non-assembling networks, 3.316, 95% CI [1.314, 8.572],  $p$ -value= 0.0117). Network assembly following restoration is thus punctuated by more interaction reorganizations than would be expected by environmental shifts alone that would effect assembling and non-assembling networks equally.

## Characteristics of species that contribute to change points

In contradiction to the predictions of assembly by preferential attachment, both pollinator persistence and degree were positively related to network position variability (Fig. 3, estimate of the slope of closeness variability and persistence  $\pm$  standard error of the estimate,  $0.653 \pm 0.225$ ,  $p$ -value=0.009; slope of closeness variability and degree,  $0.008 \pm 0.002$ ,  $p$ -value=0.002). In addition, plant persistence and degree were not significantly related to network position variability (Fig. 3, estimate of the slope of closeness variability and persistence  $\pm$  SE,  $-2.063 \pm 3.091$ ,  $p$ -value=0.5; slope of closeness variability and degree,  $0.0018 \pm 0.002$ ,  $p$ -value=0.3). The variability of species network position was not the result of closeness linearly increasing through time, and, in fact, plant and pollinator closeness decreased slightly through time (Fig. S2, estimate of the slope of closeness through time  $\pm$  SE, pollinators:  $-0.0003 \pm 0.00005$ ,  $p$ -value= $2.7 * 10^{-12}$ ; plants  $-0.007 \pm 0.001$ ,  $p$ -value= $1.4 * 10^{-6}$ ). Though statistically significant, the slopes are so slight they may not be biologically significant.

## Species and interaction turnover

The rates of plant, pollinator and interaction temporal turnover were similar across assembling hedgerows, non-assembling hedgerows and field margins, though mature hedgerows has marginally significantly less pollinator turnover than field margins (Fig. 4, estimate  $\pm$  SE of the difference in turnover between field margins and mature hedgerows,  $-0.0498 \pm 0.026$ ,  $p$ -value=0.058). When interactions were weighted by their similarity, both assembling and mature hedgerows had higher rates of turnover than field margins (Fig. 4, estimate  $\pm$  SE of the difference in turnover between field margins and assembling hedgerows,  $0.115 \pm 0.027$ ,  $p$ -value=0.0002; field margins and mature hedgerows,  $0.082 \pm 0.024$ ,  $p$ -value=0.002). The weighted interaction turnover at assembling hedgerows, however, was not significantly higher than in non-assembling, mature

hedgerows.

## Temporal changes in interaction patterns

### Network structure

Network nestedness significantly increased with assembly (Fig. 5, estimate of the slope of nestedness through time  $\pm$  SE,  $1.834 \pm 0.6142$ ,  $p$ -value=0.022). Modularity decreased (Fig. 5), though the slope was not significantly different from zero (estimate of the slope of modularity through time  $\pm$  standard error of the estimate,  $-0.524 \pm 0.295$ ,  $p$ -value=0.124). Connectance decreased as the community assembled (Fig. 5, estimate of the slope of connectance through time  $\pm$  standard error of the estimate,  $-0.0434 \pm 0.0152$ ,  $p$ -value=0.03). In contrast, specialization remained constant (estimate of the slope of specialization through time  $\pm$  SE,  $0.003 \pm 0.015$ ,  $p$ -value=0.827).

Both plant and pollinator species richness increased through time (Fig. 5, estimate of the slope of richness through time  $\pm$  SE, pollinators:  $0.193 \pm 0.0729$ ,  $p$ -value=0.008; plants:  $0.212 \pm 0.0653$ ,  $p$ -value=0.001). Unsurprisingly, pollinator species are colonizing and persisting at the assembling hedgerows. Plant species richness is based on the flowers being visited by pollinators and not the presence of a particular plant species at a site. Thus, though some new plant species may establish themselves in the hedgerows, the increase in plant richness in the networks is likely due to plants attracting visitors, as they offer better rewards.

### Network robustness

Assembly did not effect the robustness of the networks to species extinction when species were removed incrementally by degree (Fig. 6, estimate of the slope of robustness through time  $\pm$  SE,



$6 * 10^{-5} \pm 4 * 10^{-3}$ ,  $p$ -value=0.987) or abundance ( $0.001 \pm 0.003$ ,  $p$ -value=0.65). In contrast, the robustness of networks to cascading perturbations, as measured by the algebraic connectivity of the network, increased as the network assembled (Fig. 6, estimate of the slope of robustness to cascading perturbations through time  $\pm$  SE,  $0.6814 \pm 0.272$ ,  $p$ -value=0.042).

## Discussion

We show that the temporal assembly of plant-pollinator networks following restoration is a highly dynamic process where interactions often undergo significant reorganizations, the so called changing points. If these network reorganizations were a product of environmental forces alone, we would expect to observe the same changing points at the same periods, consistently across all sites. However, network changing points in non-assembling communities are less frequent, and there are few consistent trends in when change points occurred across all sites. Several sites had network changing points between years 2009 and 2011 (Fig. 1). In California, 2011 marked the beginning of a multi-year drought. The assembling hedgerows were not sampled in 2010, so disentangling whether the changing points are due to skipping a year of assembly or the drought is not possible. Interestingly, most assembling hedgerows did not undergo a significant interaction reorganization immediately after a hedgerow was planted (i.e., the transition from weedy field margin to hedgerow). This result is consistent with the finding that in our study system, hedgerow restoration takes several years to have an impact on the plant-pollinator communities (Kremen and M’Gonigle, in prep).

In addition to finding multiple network organization changing points during assembly, the way in which these reorganizations occur was different from what is expected by preferential attachment. Based on a preferential attachment process, we expect that the most persistent and high degree species would remain stable in the network core during assembly. Surprisingly, however,

we encountered the opposite pattern. For example, the four most ubiquitous species in our study landscape — *Halictus ligatus*, *Halictus tripartitus*, *Lasioglossum (Dialictus) incompletum*, and *Toxomerus marginatus* — were the only species that changed which module (i.e., community) they were a member across years in all the assembling hedgerows. Because species degree and persistence were strongly correlated, it is difficult to disentangle the causal mechanism for why species with those characteristics are so variable in their network position. Generalized species may be able to better exploit the limited floral resources in the intensively managed agriculture landscape, and thus also be the most persistent. More persistent species usually have longer phenologies, so they can visit many different flowers, resulting in a higher degree. Either way, our result suggests that adaptable species can change their network position to utilize the most advantageous floral resources available, which may depend on the other pollinator species that are present, and the state of the plant community. Thus given the opportunity and ability to use different resources, species will often change their network positions.

Interestingly, though assembling hedgerows had more network reorganizations than non-assembling communities, pollinator species and interaction turnover occurred at similar rates across site types. Assembling hedgerows have higher turnover than non-assembling field margins only when interactions were weighted by their similarity. This is likely because though species and interactions are turning over at the field margins, species and interactions that fill similar roles in the network are replacing each other. In contrast, at the assembling hedgerows, unique interactions are turning over as the networks continually reorganize. Non-assembling mature hedgerow communities, however, had similar rates of weighted interaction turnover as assembling hedgerows but also the lowest pollinator turnover. Pollinator communities at mature hedgerows may be generally more stable, but rare and/or specialized pollinators could generate this pattern if they entered a community, formed unique interactions with plants that did not previously share pollinators, but did not persist in the networks. These species would not contribute strongly to network reorganization or species turnover, but would enhance weighted interaction turnover. Mature hedgerows may

thus both support more stable pollination communities and likely ecosystem services, while also providing resources for rare and/or specialized species (Kremen & M’Gonigle, 2015; M’Gonigle *et al.*, 2015).

When we explore the how the network-level interaction patterns changed through time, we found that nestedness did increase as the community assembled, as would be expected if colonizing, specialist species preferentially attached to a central, generalist core (Albrecht *et al.*, 2010). In addition, connectance decreased, as would be expected if the network is being colonized by specialist species and the overall mean number of interactions per species did not change. With preferential attachment, however, we would also expect specialization to increase, and we found no such trend. Furthermore, the frequent changing points in network organization, dynamic nature of species positions in the networks, and turnover of species and interactions all point to an assembly mechanism other than preferential attachment. The stable level of network-level specialization through the assembly process may be due to the increased colonization of specialized species (M’Gonigle *et al.*, 2015) accompanied by an increase in the diet breadth of resident species. This would be expected if resident species were able to minimize their foraging time by expanding their diet breadth as plant diversity increases with hedgerow maturation (Waser *et al.*, 1996; Pyke, 1984; Blüthgen *et al.*, 2007; Albrecht *et al.*, 2010). Such a change in pollinator behavior would also explain the increase in network nestedness. Because so many mechanisms give rise to the same patterns of interaction, additional tests are necessary to assess the contribution of different mechanisms to community assembly.

The changes in network patterns with assembly also increased the robustness of the networks to cascading perturbations – providing further evidence that hedgerows are a valuable tool for promoting species conservation and ecosystem provision in agricultural areas (M’Gonigle *et al.*, 2015; Ponisio *et al.*, 2016; Kremen & M’Gonigle, 2015). Because network vulnerability to cascading perturbations, as measured by algebraic connectivity, is correlated with species richness, the increase

and plant and pollinator richness following restoration is at least partially responsible for enhancing network robustness to cascading effects. The relationship between diversity and stability in networks has been the subject of considerable debate (e.g., May, 1972; Pimm, 1984; Montoya *et al.*, 2006). Our results provide one of the few empirical examples of how restoring species diversity contributes to enhancing network stability. Though these hedgerows were designed to promote floral resources across the growing season and not specifically to promote any specific network properties (Menz *et al.*, 2010), the pollinators assembled into resilient interaction patterns. With prior knowledge of the floral preferences of pollinators, future restoration efforts may also be able to incorporate promoting network stability into planning efforts (M'Gonigle *et al.*, 2016)

Interestingly, however, the robustness of hedgerow communities to species loss did not change with assembly. This is particularly surprising given the observed increase in nestedness, which is often associated with an enhanced robustness to extinction (Memmott *et al.*, 2004). Perhaps assembling hedgerows have yet to reach sufficient levels of nestedness to realize the benefits nestedness confers. Nestedness of the assembling hedgerows, however, did not asymptote within the eight years following restoration that the sites were surveyed, so hedgerow networks may eventually reach sufficient levels of nestedness to gain the robustness advantage.

Plant-pollinator networks, in general, are highly dynamic, with high turnover of species and interactions both within and between seasons (Burkle & Alarcón, 2011). Though our non-assembling communities experience fewer network reorganizations than the assembling hedgerows, 82% of field margins and 40% of mature hedgerows underwent at least one changing point in network structure. Pollinators are also highly opportunistic (Petanidou *et al.*, 2008; Vázquez, 2005; Albrecht *et al.*, 2010), though trait complementarity such as tongue length and corolla depth impose some biophysical limits to the interactions between plants and pollinators (Vázquez *et al.*, 2009; Vázquez *et al.*, 2009; Stang *et al.*, 2009, 2006; Santamaría & Rodríguez-Gironés, 2007). Such opportunism may buffer plant-pollinator communities from global change (e.g., Ramos-Jiliberto

*et al.*, 2012; Kaiser-Bunbury *et al.*, 2010), but our limited understanding of the assembly of these communities impedes making such predictions (Vázquez *et al.*, 2009; Burkle & Alarcón, 2011). Unlike in the broader food web literature, we have few mechanistic models of mutualistic network assembly (Valdovinos *et al.*, 2013; Nuismer *et al.*, 2013; Guimarães *et al.*, 2011). In addition, the few developed often borrow their mechanisms from competitive interactions, leading to inaccurate biological assumptions (Holland *et al.*, 2006). We need further development of mechanistic models of mutualistic systems to generate testable predictions, along with empirical exploration of network assembly. Plant-pollinator communities and mutualisms broadly are vital for biodiversity maintenance and essential ecosystem service provision. We must therefore understand the processes underlying their assembly to facilitate restoration and conservation.

## Acknowledgments

We would like to thank Paulo Guimarães, Aaron Clauset and Matthew Hutchinson for their invaluable discussions and comments, and Leto Peel for help with the change point analysis. We thank the growers and land owners that allowed us to work on their property. We also greatly appreciate the identification assistance of expert taxonomists Martin Hauser, Robbin Thorp and Jason Gibbs. This work was supported by funding from the Army Research Office (W911NF-11-1-0361 to CK), the Natural Resources Conservation Service (CIG-69-3A75-12-253, CIG-69-3A75-9-142, CIG-68-9104-6-101 and WLF-69-7482-6-277 to The Xerces Society), the National Science Foundation (DEB-0919128 to CK), The U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA-NIFA 2012-51181-20105 to Michigan State University). Funding for LCP was provided by an NSF Graduate Research Fellowship, the USDA NIFA Graduate Fellowship, and the Berkeley Institute for Data Science. Funding for MPG was provided by São Paulo Research Foundation (FAPESP, grant 2013/13319-5). We also appreciate the Santa Fe Institute for facilitating this international collaboration.

## References

- Ahn, Y.Y., Bagrow, J.P. & Lehmann, S. (2010). Link communities reveal multiscale complexity in networks. *Nature*, 466, 761–764.
- Albrecht, M., Riesen, M. & Schmid, B. (2010). Plant–pollinator network assembly along the chronosequence of a glacier foreland. *Oikos*, 119, 1610–1624.
- Almeida-Neto, M., Guimarães, P., Guimarães, P.R., Loyola, R.D. & Ulrich, W. (2008). A consistent metric for nestedness analysis in ecological systems: reconciling concept and measurement. *Oikos*, 117, 1227–1239.
- Anderson, M.J., Crist, T.O., Chase, J.M., Vellend, M., Inouye, B.D., Freestone, A.L., Sanders, N.J., Cornell, H.V., Comita, L.S., Davies, K.F. *et al.* (2011). Navigating the multiple meanings of  $\beta$  diversity: a roadmap for the practicing ecologist. *Ecol. Lett.*, 14, 19–28.
- Barabási, A.L. & Albert, R. (1999). Emergence of scaling in random networks. *Science*, 286, 509–512.
- Barnosky, A.D., Matzke, N., Tomiya, S., Wogan, G.O., Swartz, B., Quental, T.B., Marshall, C., McGuire, J.L., Lindsey, E.L., Maguire, K.C. *et al.* (2011). Has the earth’s sixth mass extinction already arrived? *Nature*, 471, 51–57.
- Bascompte, J., Jordano, P., Melián, C.J. & Olesen, J.M. (2003). The nested assembly of plant–animal mutualistic networks. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA*, 100, 9383–9387.
- Bascompte, J., Jordano, P. & Olesen, J.M. (2006). Asymmetric coevolutionary networks facilitate biodiversity maintenance. *Science*, 312, 431–433.
- Bascompte, J. & Stouffer, D.B. (2009). The assembly and disassembly of ecological networks. *Phil. Trans. R. Soc. B*, 364, 1781.

488 Bates, D., Maechler, M., Bolker, B. & Walker, S. (2014). *lme4: Linear mixed-effects models using*  
489 *Eigen and S4*. R package version 1.1-7.

490 Blüthgen, N., Menzel, F. & Blüthgen, N. (2006). Measuring specialization in species interaction  
491 networks. *BMC Ecol.*, 6, 9.

492 Blüthgen, N., Menzel, F., Hovestadt, T., Fiala, B. & Blüthgen, N. (2007). Specialization, con-  
493 straints, and conflicting interests in mutualistic networks. *Curr. Biol.*, 17, 341–346.

494 Burkle, L.A. & Alarcón, R. (2011). The future of plant-pollinator diversity: Understanding inter-  
495 action networks across time, space, and global change. *Am. J. Bot.*, 98, 528.

496 Chao, A., Chazdon, R.L., Colwell, R.K. & Shen, T.J. (2005). A new statistical approach for  
497 assessing similarity of species composition with incidence and abundance data. *Ecol. Lett.*, 8,  
498 148–159.

499 Costa, L.d.F., Rodrigues, F.A., Travieso, G. & Villas Boas, P.R. (2007). Characterization of com-  
500 plex networks: A survey of measurements. *Advances in physics*, 56, 167–242.

501 Csardi, G. & Nepusz, T. (2006). The igraph software package for complex network research.  
502 *InterJournal, Complex Systems*, 1695.

503 Devoto, M., Bailey, S., Craze, P. & Memmott, J. (2012). Understanding and planning ecological  
504 restoration of plant–pollinator networks. *Ecol. Lett.*, 15, 319–328.

505 Dormann, C., Gruber, B. & Fründ, J. (2008). Introducing the bipartite package: analysing ecolog-  
506 ical networks. *R News*, 8, 8.

507 Dunn, R.R., Harris, N.C., Colwell, R.K., Koh, L.P. & Sodhi, N.S. (2009). The sixth mass coex-  
508 tinction: are most endangered species parasites and mutualists? *Proc. R. Soc. Lond. [Biol]*, 276,  
509 3037–3045.

- van Engelsdorp, D., Evans, J., Saegerman, C., Mullin, C., Haubruge, E., Nguyen, B., Frazier, M.,  
Frazier, J., Cox-Foster, D., Chen, Y., Underwood, R., Tarpay, D. & Pettis, J. (2009). Colony  
collapse disorder: A descriptive study. *PloS one*, 4, 1–17.
- Fiedler, M. (1973). Algebraic connectivity of graphs. *Czechoslovak mathematical journal*, 23,  
298–305.
- Forup, M., Henson, K., Craze, P. & Memmott, J. (2008a). The restoration of ecological interac-  
tions: plant-pollinator networks on ancient and restored heathlands. *J. Appl. Ecol.*, 45, 742–752.
- Forup, M.L., Henson, K.S., Craze, P.G. & Memmott, J. (2008b). The restoration of ecological  
interactions: plant-pollinator networks on ancient and restored heathlands. *J. Appl. Ecol.*, 45,  
742–752.
- Galeano, J., Pastor, J.M. & Iriando, J.M. (2009). Weighted-interaction nestedness estimator (wine):  
a new estimator to calculate over frequency matrices. *Environmental Modeling & Software*, 24,  
1342–1346.
- Graham, C.H. & Fine, P.V. (2008). Phylogenetic beta diversity: linking ecological and evolutionary  
processes across space in time. *Ecol. Lett.*, 11, 1265–1277.
- Guimarães, P.R., Jordano, P. & Thompson, J.N. (2011). Evolution and coevolution in mutualistic  
networks. *Ecol. Lett.*, 14, 877–885.
- Holland, J.N., Okuyama, T. & DeAngelis, D.L. (2006). Comment on asymmetric coevolutionary  
networks facilitate biodiversity maintenance. *Science*, 313, 1887b–1887b.
- Kaiser-Bunbury, C.N., Muff, S., Memmott, J., Müller, C.B. & Caflisch, A. (2010). The robustness  
of pollination networks to the loss of species and interactions: a quantitative approach incorpo-  
rating pollinator behaviour. *Ecology Letters*, 13, 442–452.



532 Kalinka, A.T. & Tomancak, P. (2011). linkcomm: an r package for the generation, visualization,  
533 and analysis of link communities in networks of arbitrary size and type. *Bioinformatics*, 27.

534 Kembel, S., Cowan, P., Helmus, M., Cornwell, W., Morlon, H., Ackerly, D., Blomberg, S. &  
535 Webb, C. (2010). Picante: R tools for integrating phylogenies and ecology. *Bioinformatics*, 26,  
536 1463–1464.

537 Klein, A., Vaissière, B., Cane, J., Steffan-Dewenter, I., Cunningham, S., Kremen, C. & Tscharntke,  
538 T. (2007). Importance of pollinators in changing landscapes for world crops. *Proc. R. Soc. B*,  
539 274, 303–313.

540 Kremen, C. (2008). *Bee Pollinators in Agricultural Ecosystems*, New York: Oxford University  
541 Press, chap. Crop Pollination Services From Wild Bees, pp. 10–26.

542 Kremen, C. & M’Gonigle, L.K. (2015). Small-scale restoration in intensive agricultural landscapes  
543 supports more specialized and less mobile pollinator species. *J. Appl. Ecol.*, 52, 602–610.

544 Kremen, C., Williams, N., Bugg, R., Fay, J. & Thorp, R. (2004). The area requirements of an  
545 ecosystem service: crop pollination by native bee communities in California. *Ecol. Lett.*, 7,  
546 1109–1119.

547 Kremen, C., Williams, N. & Thorp, R. (2002). Crop pollination from native bees at risk from  
548 agricultural intensification. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA*, 99, 16812–16816.

549 Kuznetsova, A., Bruun Brockhoff, P. & Haubo Bojesen Christensen, R. (2014). *lmerTest: Tests*  
550 *for random and fixed effects for linear mixed effect models (lmer objects of lme4 package)*. R  
551 package version 2.0-11.

552 May, R.M. (1972). Will a large complex system be stable? *Nature*, 238, 413–414.

553 Memmott, J., Waser, N.M. & Price, M.V. (2004). Tolerance of pollination networks to species  
554 extinctions. *Proc. R. Soc. Lond. B*, 271, 2605–2611.

- Menz, M., Phillips, R., Winfree, R., Kremen, C., Aizen, M., Johnson, S. & Dixon, K. (2010).  
Reconnecting plants and pollinators: challenges in the restoration of pollination mutualisms.  
*Trends Plant Sci.*, 16, 4–12.
- M’Gonigle, L., Ponisio, L., Cutler, K. & Kremen, C. (2015). Habitat restoration promotes pollina-  
tor persistence and colonization in intensively-managed agriculture. *Ecol. Appl.*, 25, 1557–1565.
- M’Gonigle, L.K., Williams, N.M., Lonsdorf, E. & Kremen, C. (2016). A tool for selecting plants  
when restoring habitat for pollinators. *Conserv. Lett.*
- Montoya, J.M., Pimm, S.L. & Solé, R.V. (2006). Ecological networks and their fragility. *Nature*,  
442, 259–264.
- Morandin, L. & Kremen, C. (2013). Hedgerow restoration promotes pollinator populations and  
exports native bees to adjacent fields. *Ecol. Appl.*, 23, 829–839.
- Neumann, P. & Carreck, N.L. (2010). Honey bee colony losses. *J. Api. Res.*, 49, 1–6.
- Newman, M.E.J. & Girvan, M. (2004). Finding and evaluating community structure in networks.  
*Phys. Rev. E*, 69, 026113.
- Nuismer, S.L., Jordano, P. & Bascompte, J. (2013). Coevolution and the architecture of mutualistic  
networks. *Evolution*, 67, 338–354.
- Olesen, J.M., Bascompte, J., Dupont, Y. & Jordano, P. (2007). The modularity of pollination  
networks. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA*, 104, 19891–19896.
- Olesen, J.M., Bascompte, J., Elberling, H. & Jordano, P. (2008). Temporal dynamics in a pollina-  
tion network. *Ecology*, 89, 1573.
- Ollerton, J., Winfree, R. & Tarrant, S. (2011). How many flowering plants are pollinated by  
animals? *Oikos*, 120, 321–326.

577 Parker, V.T. (1997). The scale of successional models and restoration objectives. *Restoration*  
578 *ecology*, 5, 301–306.

579 Peel, L. & Clauset, A. (2014). Detecting change points in the large-scale structure of evolving  
580 networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1403.0989*.

581 Petanidou, T., Kallimanis, S., Tzanopoulos, J., Sgardelis, S. & Pantis, J. (2008). Long-term ob-  
582 servation of a pollination network: fluctuation in species and interactions, relative invariance of  
583 network structure and implications for estimates of specialization. *Ecol. Lett.*, 11, 564–575.

584 Pimm, S.L. (1984). The complexity and stability of ecosystems. *Nature*, 307, 321–326.

585 Ponisio, L.C., M’Gonigle, L.K. & Kremen, C. (2016). On-farm habitat restoration counters biotic  
586 homogenization in intensively managed agriculture. *Global Change Biol.*, 22, 704–715.

587 Pyke, G.H. (1984). Optimal foraging theory: a critical review. *Annu. Rev. Ecol. Evol. Syst.*, pp.  
588 523–575.

589 R Core Team (2015). *R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing*. R Foundation  
590 for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria.

591 Ramos-Jiliberto, R., Valdovinos, F.S., Moisset de Espanés, P. & Flores, J.D. (2012). Topological  
592 plasticity increases robustness of mutualistic networks. *J. Anim. Ecol.*, 81, 896–904.

593 Rezende, E.L., Lavabre, J.E., Guimarães, P.R., Jordano, P. & Bascompte, J. (2007). Non-random  
594 coextinctions in phylogenetically structured mutualistic networks. *Nature*, 448, 925–928.

595 Santamaría, L. & Rodríguez-Gironés, M.A. (2007). Linkage rules for plant–pollinator networks:  
596 Trait complementarity or exploitation barriers? *PLoS Biol.*, 5, e31.

597 Stang, M., Klinkhamer, P., Waser, N.M., Stang, I. & van der, M.E. (2009). Size-specific interaction  
598 patterns and size matching in a plant–pollinator interaction web. *Ann. Bot.*, 103.

- Stang, M., Klinkhamer, P.G. & Van Der Meijden, E. (2006). Size constraints and flower abundance determine the number of interactions in a plant–flower visitor web. *Oikos*, 112, 111–121.
- Thébault, E. & Fontaine, C. (2010). Stability of ecological communities and the architecture of mutualistic and trophic networks. *Science*, 329, 853–856.
- Valdovinos, F.S., Moisset de Espanés, P., Flores, J.D. & Ramos-Jiliberto, R. (2013). Adaptive foraging allows the maintenance of biodiversity of pollination networks. *Oikos*, 122, 907–917.
- Valdovinos, F.S., Ramos-Jiliberto, R., Garay-Narváez, L., Urbani, P. & Dunne, J.A. (2010). Consequences of adaptive behaviour for the structure and dynamics of food webs. *Ecology Letters*, 13, 1546–1559.
- Vázquez, D.P. (2005). Degree distribution in plant-animal mutualistic networks: forbidden links or random interactions? *Oikos*, 108, 421–426.
- Vázquez, D.P., Blüthgen, N., Cagnolo, L. & Chacoff, N.P. (2009). Uniting pattern and process in plant-animal mutualistic networks: a review. *Ann. of Bot.*, 103, 1445–1457.
- Vázquez, D.P., Chacoff, N.P. & Cagnolo, L. (2009). Evaluating multiple determinants of the structure of plant-animal mutualistic networks. *Ecology*, 90, 2039–2046.
- Waser, N.M., Chittka, L., Price, M.V., Williams, N.M. & Ollerton, J. (1996). Generalization in pollination systems, and why it matters. *Ecology*, 77, 1043.
- Winfree, R., Williams, N., Dushoff, J. & Kremen, C. (2007). Native bees provide insurance against ongoing honey bee losses. *Ecol. Lett.*, 10, 1105–1113.




Figure 1: Assembling hedgerow networks had more changing points (vertical red lines) than non-assembling hedgerows and weedy field margins (a representative sample of non-assembling sites are depicted here). In each network, plants and pollinators are represented by green and yellow circles, respectively, weighted by their degree. Each species has a consistent position in the network across years. In the assembling hedgerows, colored squares in the corner of each network represent the year of assembly. Before hedgerows are installed (when they are still field margins) the year of assembly is zero.




Figure 2: The community (i.e., module or compartment) membership between network changing points. Two representative assembling hedgerows are depicted. In the top panel, species are grouped by community. The bottom panels visualize the flow of species between communities between changing points.




Figure 3: The variation coefficient of network position, as represented by closeness, plotted against pollinator persistence and degree. Persistence and degree were positively related to network position variability in pollinators, but unrelated in plants. Points represent means for each species across sites. The solid line indicates the mean slope estimate and the dashed lines are the 95% confidence intervals around the estimate.




Figure 4: The species, interaction and weighted interactions turnover of plant-pollinator networks at non-assembling field margins sites, assembling hedgerows, and non-assembling, mature hedgerows. Rates of species and interaction turnover were similar between site types, though mature hedgerows has marginally significantly less pollinator turnover. However, when interactions were weighted by their similarity, both hedgerow types had higher turnover than unrestored field margins. Boxplots represent medians (black horizontal line) first and third quartiles (box perimeter) and extremes (whiskers).






Figure 5: Nestedness, plant richness and pollinator richness increased as the networks assembled. Specialization and modularity remained consistent across years, while connectance decreased. The left panels represent z-scores. Scores greater than  $\sim 2$  or less than  $\sim -2$  are significantly more or less structured than randomly assembled networks. Points are the metric value for each site at each year of assembly. The solid line indicates the mean slope estimate and the dashed lines are the 95% confidence intervals around the estimate.




Figure 6: The robustness of networks to species extinction did not change with network assembly, but the resilience to cascading perturbation increased. The robustness to species extinction is measured by incrementally removing species by degree, though removing species by abundance did not yield qualitatively different results. The robustness of networks to cascading perturbations is measured as the algebraic connectivity, the second smallest eigenvalue of the Laplacian matrix. Points are the value for each site at each year of assembly. The solid line indicates the mean slope estimate and the dashed lines are the 95% confidence intervals around the estimate.