Major interaction reorganizations punctuate the assembly of pollination networks

Lauren C. Ponisio, Marilia P. Gaiarsa, Claire Kremen

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 conservation biology. Using a nine-year dataset comprising nearly pollinator visitation records, we explore the assembly of plant-pollinator communities at native plant restorations in the Central Valley of California. We found that across years, species are highly dynamic in their network position, causing community assembly to be punctuated by major interaction reorganizations. In contrast, the non-assembling networks did not restructure as frequently. Across all communities, pollinator species were opportunistic in the flowers they visited. The most persistent and generalized species were also the most variable in their network positions, contrary to what is expected through prefereantial attachment theory. High species and interaction turnover was ubiquitous across assembling and non-assembling communities, though unique interactions turned over at higher rates in assembling hedgerows as the networks continually reorganized. Nestedness of assembling networks also increased through time, but there was no increase in robustness to simulated plant extinctions. The sensitivity of networks to cascading perturbations, however, increased as the communities assembled, at least partially due to accumulating species richness. Here we elucidate some of the mechanisms underlying plant-pollinator network assembly and restoration. We also provide further evidence that hedgerows are a valuable tool for promoting species conservation and ecosystem service provision in agricultural areas.

# Introduction

Species around the world are disappearing at an alarming rate. As species are lost, so are their interactions (Dunn et al. 2009; Barnosky et al. 2011). Because mutualistic interactions are essential for maintaining the diversity of their component guilds, these systems are particularly at risk from coextinction cascades. The nature of these cascades will depend on the interaction patterns within a community (J. Memmott, Waser, and Price 2004; Rezende et al. 2007; J. Bascompte and Stouffer 2009; Thébault and Fontaine 2010). To safeguard ecological function, it has become increasingly imperative to aid the recovery of lost interactions and component biodiversity and by facilitating the assembly of robust interaction networks via ecological restoration (Menz et al. 2010). However, we know very little about how ecological networks assemble in general, rendering restoration of interacting communities quite difficult.

Preferential attachment, the most widely explored mechanism of network assembly, (Barabási and Albert 1999), predicts that species entering a network are more likely to interact with species that are already well-connected (”the rich-get-richer” principle, Barabási and Albert 1999). In pollination systems — a particularly ubiquitous mutualism (J. Ollerton, Winfree, and Tarrant 2011; Klein et al. 2007) — some studies have found support for this assembly mechanism. Investigating the day-to-day, temporal assembly of a plant-pollinator network within a season, Olesen et al. (2008) found that phenologically new plant and pollinator species tended to interact with already well-connected species, potentially because these species are either more abundant or temporally persistent. Using a space-for-time substitution to study primary succession, Albrecht, Riesen, and Schmid (2010) also found evidence that assembly along a glacier foreland occurred through preferential attachment. Specifically, network nestedness (i.e, a core group of generalists interacts with both specialist and generalist species) increased as the community aged (Albrecht, Riesen, and Schmid 2010). An increase in nestedness could have occurred via the preferential attachment process, whereby specialist species attach to the well-connected, generalist core.

In contrast to the network build-up described by preferential attachment, significant reorganizations of interactions can also punctuate assembly (Peel and Clauset 2014). Such significant reorganizations of interactions, or network changing points, are observed in social networks that respond to abrupt shifts in the behavior of interactors (Peel and Clauset 2014). In ecological communities, such shifts may occur if, as new species colonize, resident species change their interaction partners to optimize their foraging effort. In plant-pollinator communities, theory predicts that pollinators optimize their use of floral resources to reduce interspecific competition and improve resource-use efficiency (Pyke 1984; Valdovinos et al. 2010; Valdovinos et al. 2013; Albrecht, Riesen, and Schmid 2010; Nico Blüthgen et al. 2007). No studies, however, have examined if network changing points occur during ecological network assembly and/or how these changes relate to species behavior.

Understanding network assembly is particularly relevant to ecological restoration, which is essentially ’applied succession’ (e.g., Parker 1997). In pollination systems, the time since an area was restored has been shown to affect the structure of networks (Forup et al. 2008; Devoto et al. 2012), suggesting that interactions change as a community develops. Understanding the mechanisms of network assembly will help guide community restoration. Facilitating network restoration is especially imperative in areas where species interactions provide essential ecosystem services, such as crop pollination. To ensure the continued provision of ecosystem services and to curb biodiversity loss, restoring pollinators and their interactions in agricultural landscapes is critical. To promote pollinator services in agriculture, some farmers plant strips of native plants along farm edges (hedgerows) ~~to help provide habitat for pollinators~~ without removing arable land from production. By providing habitat, hedgerows augment the richness, abundance and trait diversity of pollinators in agricultural landscapes (Morandin and Kremen 2013; C. Kremen and M’Gonigle 2015; L. C. Ponisio, M’Gonigle, and Kremen 2016), and promote the persistence and colonization of floral resource specialists (L. M’Gonigle et al. 2015). As the community assembles, it is important to understand how these new species are incorporated into the network as well as the consequences for interaction patterns and robustness.

We explore the process of network development using a nine-year dataset of plant-pollinator community assembly following hedgerow restoration in the highly simplified and intensively managed agricultural landscape of California’s Central Valley. We first determine whether the mechanism underlying network assembly represents a buildup of interactions as would be predicted by preferential attachment or significant reorganizations of interactions (i.e., network changing points). Even with changing points in interaction organization, networks could still assemble via preferential attachment if the network reorganizations were primarily driven by peripheral, temporally variable species while a stable, well-connected core of species persist. Therefore, we test whether the species that are most variable in their network position — and thus important contributors to network reorganizations — are less persistent and connected species. To further explore the mechanisms underlying the temporal dynamics of the networks, also we examine patterns in the species and interaction temporal turnover. Finally, we investigate whether networks assemble toward predictable interaction patterns, and the ramifications for the robustness of the networks to species extinction and cascading perturbations.

# Materials & Methods

## Study sites and collection methods

StudyHedgerows border large (ca. 30-hectare) crop fields and measured between 3–6 m wide and approximately 350 m long. 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 (Fig. S1 Menz et al. 2010; C. Kremen and M’Gonigle 2015; L. M’Gonigle et al. 2015).

We monitored independently assembling plant-pollinator interaction networks within five separate hedgerows (N=5); for controls, we monitored non-assembling communities within mature hedgerows (greater than 10 years since planting, N=29) and unrestored, weedy field margins (N=19). The mean distance between monitoring sites was km, and the minimum distance between sites sampled in the same year was 1 km. The entire area surveyed spanned almost km. The crop fields adjacent to all sites were similarly managed as intensive, high-input monoculture.

Monitoring of assembling hedgerows began in 2006 and continued through 2014. Surveys of these sites 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, mean samples per year). 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 and wind speed was below meters/second.

During each round of sampling, 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 and Clauset 2014) to identify fundamental reorganizations in large-scale interaction patterns. A change point is caused by a merge, split, fragmentation or formation of modules (also called 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 and Clauset (2014), we first defined a probability distribution over the networks using the generalized hierarchical random graph model (GHRG). The GHRG model captures both assortative and disassortative structure patterns at all scales in the network (Peel and Clauset 2014). A network is composed of vertices and edges . The GHRG model decomposes the vertices into a series of nested groups, the relationships among which are represented by the dendrogram . The tips of are the vertices of , and the probability that two vertices and connect is given by the parameter . The probability distribution of the network is thus defined as:

Where is the observed number of edges between vertices with the common ancestor , and is the total possible edges.

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

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

We next tested whether the change points occurring in maturing hedgerows were a component of the assembly process or a product of environmental shifts that lead to network reorganizations in all types of communities. We modeled the number of change points as successes and the total number of sample years at each site as trials, and used a generalized linear model with Binomial 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 (N=11). All statistical analyses 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 remained in relatively similar network positions through time, whereas others were more variable in their position and thus contributed more strongly to network reorganization. We tested whether the more persistent species with the highest degree (number of different interaction partners) were the most stable in their network positions, as would be expected if the networks were assembling via preferential attachment.

We calculated species persistence as the proportion of surveys in which a plant or pollinator is observed. Species observed consistently within and between years were 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 (L. M’Gonigle et al. 2015; L. C. Ponisio, M’Gonigle, and Kremen 2016). To represent network position variability, we computed the coefficient of variation of weighted closeness centrality (Freeman 1978) at each site through time. Closeness centrality represents the importance of a space by calcuating the path lengths to other vertices (species) in the network (Freeman 1978). The shorter the mean path length to other species, the higher the closeness centrality. 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, Bruun Brockhoff, and Haubo Bojesen Christensen 2014). We included random effects for species and sites. Because the degree and persistence of pollinators were strongly correlated, (, -value ), we included each explanatory variable in separate models. Plant degree and persistence were not significantly correlated, but we used the same models as we did for the pollinators for consistency. Because an approximately logarithmic increase in closeness centrality would also lead to high variability in closeness scores—as would be expected with assembly by preferential attachment—we also tested whether log closeness centrality 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 (L. M’Gonigle et al. 2015). Similarly, because species are turning over and pollinators are trying 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 that are unvisited in early years may appear to “colonize” the networks as they became 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 -diversity. Instead of calculating the variation in community composition across sites within a year, 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., L. C. Ponisio, M’Gonigle, and Kremen 2016). For example, the probability that two sites do not share any species is higher when there are few individuals at those sites. Following L. C. Ponisio, M’Gonigle, and Kremen (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 modeled as responses in a linear mixed model with site type as an explanatory variable and site as a random effect (Bates et al. 2014; Kuznetsova, Bruun Brockhoff, and Haubo Bojesen Christensen 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.  S2). We developed a method to examine the temporal turnover of interactions with weightings based on their similarity. We followed the algorithm of Ahn, Bagrow, and Lehmann (2010) to cluster all the interactions (edges) hierarchically 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, Bagrow, and Lehmann 2010; Kalinka and 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 and 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, Bruun Brockhoff, and Haubo Bojesen Christensen 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., J. Bascompte, Jordano, and Olesen 2006; J. Bascompte et al. 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 (N Blüthgen, Menzel, and Blüthgen 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 and Girvan 2004; Csardi and Nepusz 2006). 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 (N Blüthgen, Menzel, and Blüthgen 2006). It ranges from zero for generalized networks to one for specialized networks. We calculated standardized -scores so that nestedness, modularity and specialization metrics could be compared across communities. The -scores were calculated by generating an ensemble of 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 communities, we reshuffled the interactions between species but fixed the total number of interactions, species and interaction frequency distributions (Galeano, Pastor, and Iriondo 2009).

To test whether network modularity, nestedness, connectance or specialization changed linearly with assembly, we used 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 tested whether the changes in interaction patterns associated with network assembly affect the robustness of the network to species loss and cascading perturbations. Following J. Memmott, Waser, and Price (2004), we simulated 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 eliminated plants species based on their degree or abundance, and then calculated the number of pollinators that secondarily went extinct. The area below the extinction curve is an estimate of network robustness (J. Memmott, Waser, and Price 2004; Dormann, Gruber, and Fründ 2008).

We also explored how the robustness to cascading perturbations changed as the community assembled, using algebraic connectivity — the second smallest eigenvalue of the Laplacian matrix (Fiedler 1973) — as a proxy for network robustness (Gaiarsa et al., in prep). Algebraic connectivity relates to how difficult it is to turn a network into completely disconnected groups of species (Costa et al. 2007; Gibert et al. 2013). The larger the algebraic connectivity, the more sensitive a network is to cascading perturbations. Perturbations, such as the decrease in abundance of a plant or pollinator, can have negative consequences for the species in the network. For example, a decrease in abundance of a pollinator will diminish the pollination services it provides to plants. The affected plants would set less seeds, and decrease in abundance the subsequent year. Consequently, other pollinators that depended on those plant species would also be affected, and the effects of this perturbation would continue to propagate throughout the network. Alternatively, perturbations could also have a positive effect. For example, the increase in abundance of a plant species would lead to an increase in resource availability for the pollinators. The examples of negative perturbations (e.g., resource collapse, disease spreading, parasites), however, outnumber possible positive perturbations. It is important to note that both robustness and algebraic connectivity assume that the network is static. They do not account for the ability of species to alter their interaction depending on circumstances and the resource availability.

# Results

Over eight years and samples, we collected and identified wild bees and syrphids comprising species from genera. We observed unique interactions between plants and pollinators.

## Change point analysis

### Identifying change points

The majority () of the sites underwent at least one significant interaction reorganization (Fig. [fig:changePoints], [fig:changePoints2]). All five of the assembling hedgerows experienced network changing points, whereas only and 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, , CI , -value= ). Network assembly following restoration is thus punctuated by more interaction reorganizations than would be expected by environmental shifts alone that would effect all networks similarly.

### 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. [fig:cv], estimate of the slope of closeness centrality variability and persistence standard error of the estimate, , -value=; slope of closeness centrality variability and degree, , -value=). The slope of these relationships remained significant when the species with the top persistence and degree scores were dropped. In addition, plant persistence and degree were not significantly related to network position variability (Fig. [fig:cv]). 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 SE, pollinators: , -value=; plants , -value=). Through 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 had marginally significantly less pollinator turnover than field margins (Fig. [fig:beta], estimate SE of the difference in turnover between field margins and mature hedgerows, , -value=). When interactions were weighted by their similarity, both assembling and mature hedgerows had higher rates of turnover than field margins (Fig. [fig:beta], estimate SE of the difference in turnover between field margins and assembling hedgerows, , -value=; field margins and mature hedgerows, , -value=). 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. [fig:baci], estimate of the slope of nestedness through time SE, , -value=). All of the networks were significantly nested (-scores 2, Fig. [fig:baci]). Modularity decreased (Fig. [fig:baci]), though the slope was not significantly different from zero. In addition, none of the networks were significantly modular (-scores 2, Fig. [fig:baci]). Connectance decreased as the community assembled (Fig. [fig:baci], estimate of the slope of connectance through time standard error of the estimate, , -value=). Specialization also decreased, though the slope was only marginally significantly different from zero (estimate of the slope of specialization through time SE, , -value=). Most communities were more generalized than expected when interactions were randomized (Fig. [fig:baci]).

Both plant and pollinator species richness increased through time (Fig. [fig:baci], estimate of the slope of richness through time SE, pollinators: , -value=; plants: , -value=). Unsurprisingly, pollinator species are colonizing and persisting at the assembling hedgerows. Plant species richness in the networks is based on the flowers actually 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 previously unvisited plants attracting visitors as they mature and offer better rewards.

## Network robustness

Assembly did not effect the robustness of the networks to species extinction when species were removed incrementally by degree or abundance. In contrast, the sensitivity of networks to cascading perturbations, as measured by the algebraic connectivity of the network, increased as the network assembled (Fig. [fig:rob], estimate of the slope of sensitivity to cascading perturbations through time SE, , -value=).

# Discussion

We show that the temporal assembly of plant-pollinator networks following restoration is a highly dynamic process in which interactions often undergo significant reorganizations, or 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 time periods, consistently across all sites. However, network changing points in non-assembling communities are less frequent, and there are few consistent trends when change points occurred across all sites. Several sites had network changing points between years 2009 and 2011 (Fig. [fig:changePoints]). In California, 2011 marked the beginning of a multi-year drought. The assembling hedgerows were not sampled in 2010, so we cannot disentangle whether the point changes are due to skipping a year of monitoring or the drought. Interestingly, most assembling hedgerows did not undergo a significant interaction reorganization immediately after planting (i.e., the transition from weedy field margin to hedgerow). This result is consistent with the finding that hedgerow restoration takes several years to have an impact on the plant-pollinator communities in our study system, as well as with the observation that hedgerows do not begin to produce many flowers until – years following planting (Kremen and M’Gonigle, in prep).

~~In addition to finding multiple network organization changing points during assembly, we also found that these points assembled in ways that cannot be explained by preferential attachment.~~ With a preferential attachment process, we expect that the most persistent and high degree species would remain stable in the network core during assembly (Barabási and Albert 1999). 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 they were a member in 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 better able to exploit the limited floral resources in the intensively managed agriculture landscape, and thus also be the most persistent (in ant-plant mutualisms, Díaz-Castelazo et al. 2010). More persistent species usually have longer phenologies, so they can visit many different flowers, resulting in a higher degree (D. P. Vázquez et al. 2009; Fort, Vázquez, and Lan 2016). 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 both the other pollinator species that are present and the state of the plant community (MacLeod et al. 2016; Gómez and Zamora 2006; Waser et al. 1996). Thus, given the opportunity and ability to use different resources, species will often change their network positions (MacLeod et al. 2016).

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 generally be 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 therefore support more stable pollinator communities while also providing resources for rare and/or specialized species (C. Kremen and M’Gonigle 2015; L. M’Gonigle et al. 2015).

When we explored how 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, Riesen, and Schmid 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. However, 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 (L. M’Gonigle et al. 2015) accompanied by an increase in the diet breath of resident species. This would be expected if resident species were able to minimize their foraging time by expanding their diet breath as plant diversity increases with hedgerow maturation (Waser et al. 1996; Pyke 1984; Nico Blüthgen et al. 2007; Albrecht, Riesen, and Schmid 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.

Interestingly, however, the changes in network patterns associated with assembly did not effect the robustness of hedgerow communities to species loss. This is particularly surprising given the observed increase in nestedness, which is often associated with an enhanced in robustness to extinction (J. Memmott, Waser, and Price 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, so hedgerow networks may eventually reach sufficient levels of nestedness to gain the robustness advantage.

Contrary to general restoration goals, the susceptibility of networks to cascading perturbations increased as the communities assembled. Because network vulnerability to cascading perturbations, as measured by algebraic connectivity, is correlated with species richness, the increase in plant and pollinator richness following restoration is at least partially responsible for the increase in response to cascading effects. Connectance is also positively related to algebraic connectivity (Gibert et al. 2013), but because we observed a decrease in connectance, topological characteristics of the networks beyond species richness and connectance are needed to explain the increased sensitivity to perturbations spreading. These hedgerows were designed to provide floral resources for the largest number of pollinators across the growing season (Menz et al. 2010). The generalized nature of the floral community may explain why the networks tended to be more generalized than expected if interactions were randomly distributed across species (Fig. [fig:baci]). In addition, the design of the hedgerow plantings may have facilitated the emergence of a single, highly connected module in all of the networks (see [fig:changePoints2] for examples). This network configuration results in short path lengths (the distance between species in a network based on their shared partners), and thus, a perturbation in one species can more easily spread to other species. In order to promote more resilient communities, future restoration efforts should explore designing floral communities to promote more interaction partitioning using, for example, algorithms to optimize different network properties based on prior knowledge of pollinator floral preferences (M’Gonigle et al. 2016), and on desired network architectures that renders them more robust both to species loss and to cascading effects.

In general, plant-pollinator networks are highly dynamic, with high turnover of species and interactions both within and between seasons (Burkle and Alarcón 2011). Though our non-assembling communities experienced fewer network reorganizations than the assembling hedgerows, of field margins and of mature hedgerows underwent at least one changing point in network structure. Pollinators are also highly opportunistic (Petanidou et al. 2008; Diego P. Vázquez 2005; Albrecht, Riesen, and Schmid 2010), though trait complementarity such as tongue length and corolla depth impose some biophysical limits to the interactions between plants and pollinators (Vázquez, Chacoff, and Cagnolo 2009; D. P. Vázquez et al. 2009; M Stang et al. 2009; Martina Stang, Klinkhamer, and Van Der Meijden 2006; Santamaría 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 (D. P. Vázquez et al. 2009; Burkle and Alarcón 2011). Unlike in the broader food web literature, we have few assembly models of mutualistic network assembly (Valdovinos et al. 2013; Nuismer, Jordano, and Bascompte 2013; P. R. Guimarães, Jordano, and Thompson 2011). In addition, the few developed models often borrow their mechanisms from competitive interactions, leading to inaccurate biological assumptions (Holland, Okuyama, and DeAngelis 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 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 R. Guimarães Jr., 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.



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 perimeter of the network across years. In the assembling hedgerows, colored squares in the corner of each network represent the year of assembly. Asterisks indicate the year the hegdgerow was planted. Before that, the sites were weedy field margins.

[fig:changePoints]



[fig:changePoints2]



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 confidence intervals around the estimate.

[fig:cv]



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 where weighted by their similarity, both hedgerow types had higher turnover that unrestored field margins. Boxplots represent medians (black horizontal line) first and third quartiles (box perimeter) and extremes (whiskers).

[fig:beta]



Nestedness, plant richness and pollinator richness increased as the networks assembled. Specialization and modularity remained consistent across years, while connectance decreased. The nestedness, modularity and specialization scores represent -scores. Scores greater than or less than 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 confidence intervals around the estimate.

[fig:baci]



The robustness of networks to species extinction did not change with network assembly, but the sensitivity to cascading perturbations 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 confidence intervals around the estimate.

[fig:rob]

Ahn, Yong-Yeol, James P Bagrow, and Sune Lehmann. 2010. “Link Communities Reveal Multiscale Complexity in Networks.” *Nature* 466 (7307). Nature Publishing Group: 761–64.

Albrecht, Matthias, Matthias Riesen, and Bernhard Schmid. 2010. “Plant–pollinator Network Assembly Along the Chronosequence of a Glacier Foreland.” *Oikos* 119 (10). Wiley Online Library: 1610–24.

Almeida-neto, M, P Guimarães, PR Guimarães, RD Loyola, and W Ulrich. 2008. “A Consistent Metric for Nestedness Analysis in Ecological Systems: Reconciling Concept and Measurement.” *Oikos* 117: 1227–39.

Anderson, Marti J, Thomas O Crist, Jonathan M Chase, Mark Vellend, Brian D Inouye, Amy L Freestone, Nathan J Sanders, et al. 2011. “Navigating the Multiple Meanings of Diversity: A Roadmap for the Practicing Ecologist.” *Ecol. Lett.* 14 (1). Wiley Online Library: 19–28.

Barabási, Albert-László, and Réka Albert. 1999. “Emergence of Scaling in Random Networks.” *Science* 286 (5439). American Association for the Advancement of Science: 509–12.

Barnosky, Anthony D, Nicholas Matzke, Susumu Tomiya, Guinevere OU Wogan, Brian Swartz, Tiago B Quental, Charles Marshall, et al. 2011. “Has the Earth’s Sixth Mass Extinction Already Arrived?” *Nature* 471 (7336). Nature Publishing Group: 51–57.

Bascompte, J., and D. B. Stouffer. 2009. “The Assembly and Disassembly of Ecological Networks.” *Phil. Trans. R. Soc. B* 364: 1781.

Bascompte, J., P. Jordano, and J. M. Olesen. 2006. “Asymmetric Coevolutionary Networks Facilitate Biodiversity Maintenance.” *Science* 312: 431–33.

Bascompte, J., P. Jordano, C. J. Melián, and J. M. Olesen. 2003. “The Nested Assembly of Plant-Animal Mutualistic Networks.” *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA* 100: 9383–87.

Bates, D, M Maechler, B Bolker, and S Walker. 2014. *Lme4: Linear Mixed-Effects Models Using Eigen and S4*. <http://CRAN.R-project.org/package=lme4>.

Blüthgen, N, F Menzel, and N Blüthgen. 2006. “Measuring Specialization in Species Interaction Networks.” *BMC Ecol.* 6: 9.

Blüthgen, Nico, Florian Menzel, Thomas Hovestadt, Brigitte Fiala, and Nils Blüthgen. 2007. “Specialization, Constraints, and Conflicting Interests in Mutualistic Networks.” *Curr. Biol.* 17 (4): 341–46.

Burkle, L. A., and R. Alarcón. 2011. “The Future of Plant-Pollinator Diversity: Understanding Interaction Networks Across Time, Space, and Global Change.” *Am. J. Bot.* 98: 528.

Chao, Anne, Robin L Chazdon, Robert K Colwell, and Tsung-Jen Shen. 2005. “A New Statistical Approach for Assessing Similarity of Species Composition with Incidence and Abundance Data.” *Ecol. Lett.* 8 (2): 148–59.

Costa, L da F, Francisco A Rodrigues, Gonzalo Travieso, and Paulino Ribeiro Villas Boas. 2007. “Characterization of Complex Networks: A Survey of Measurements.” *Adv. Phys.* 56 (1). Taylor & Francis: 167–242.

Csardi, G, and T Nepusz. 2006. “The Igraph Software Package for Complex Network Research.” *InterJournal*, 1695.

Devoto, Mariano, Sallie Bailey, Paul Craze, and Jane Memmott. 2012. “Understanding and Planning Ecological Restoration of Plant–pollinator Networks.” *Ecol. Lett.* 15 (4). Wiley Online Library: 319–28.

Díaz-Castelazo, Cecilia, Paulo R Guimarães Jr, Pedro Jordano, John N Thompson, Robert J Marquis, and Víctor Rico-Gray. 2010. “Changes of a Mutualistic Network over Time: Reanalysis over a 10-Year Period.” *Ecology* 91 (3). Eco Soc America: 793–801.

Dormann, C., B. Gruber, and J. Fründ. 2008. “Introducing the Bipartite Package: Analysing Ecological Networks.” *R News* 8: 8.

Dunn, Robert R, Nyeema C Harris, Robert K Colwell, Lian Pin Koh, and Navjot S Sodhi. 2009. “The Sixth Mass Coextinction: Are Most Endangered Species Parasites and Mutualists?” *Proc. R. Soc. Lond. B* 276 (1670). The Royal Society: 3037–45.

Fiedler, Miroslav. 1973. “Algebraic Connectivity of Graphs.” *Czech. Math. J.* 23 (2). Institute of Mathematics, Academy of Sciences of the Czech Republic: 298–305.

Fort, Hugo, Diego P Vázquez, and Boon Leong Lan. 2016. “Abundance and Generalisation in Mutualistic Networks: Solving the Chicken-and-Egg Dilemma.” *Ecol. Lett.* 19 (1). Wiley Online Library: 4–11.

Forup, ML, KSE Henson, PG Craze, and J Memmott. 2008. “The Restoration of Ecological Interactions: Plant-Pollinator Networks on Ancient and Restored Heathlands.” *J. Appl. Ecol.* 45: 742–52.

Freeman, Linton C. 1978. “Centrality in Social Networks Conceptual Clarification.” *Soc. Networks* 1 (3). Elsevier: 215–39.

Galeano, Javier, Juan M Pastor, and Jose M Iriondo. 2009. “Weighted-Interaction Nestedness Estimator (WINE): A New Estimator to Calculate over Frequency Matrices.” *Environ. Model. Softw.* 24 (11). Elsevier: 1342–46.

Gibert, Jean P, Mathias M Pires, John N Thompson, and Paulo R Guimarães Jr. 2013. “The Spatial Structure of Antagonistic Species Affects Coevolution in Predictable Ways.” *Am. Nat.* 182 (5). JSTOR: 578–91.

Gómez, José M, and Regino Zamora. 2006. “Ecological Factors That Promote the Evolution of Generalization in Pollination Systems.” *Plant-Pollinator Interactions, NM Waser, J. Ollerton (Eds.). The University of Chicago Press, Chicago*, 145–66.

Graham, Catherine H, and Paul VA Fine. 2008. “Phylogenetic Beta Diversity: Linking Ecological and Evolutionary Processes Across Space in Time.” *Ecol. Lett.* 11 (12). Wiley Online Library: 1265–77.

Guimarães, P. R., P. Jordano, and J. N. Thompson. 2011. “Evolution and Coevolution in Mutualistic Networks.” *Ecol. Lett.* 14 (9): 877–85.

Holland, J Nathaniel, Toshinori Okuyama, and Donald L DeAngelis. 2006. “Comment on ‘Asymmetric Coevolutionary Networks Facilitate Biodiversity Maintenance’.” *Science* 313 (5795). American Association for the Advancement of Science: 1887b–7b.

Kaiser-Bunbury, Christopher N, Stefanie Muff, Jane Memmott, Christine B Müller, and Amedeo Caflisch. 2010. “The Robustness of Pollination Networks to the Loss of Species and Interactions: A Quantitative Approach Incorporating Pollinator Behaviour.” *Ecol. Lett.* 13 (4). Wiley Online Library: 442–52.

Kalinka, Alex T, and Pavel Tomancak. 2011. “Linkcomm: An R Package for the Generation, Visualization, and Analysis of Link Communities in Networks of Arbitrary Size and Type.” *Bioinformatics* 27 (14). Oxford Univ Press.

Kembel, SW, PD Cowan, MR Helmus, WK Cornwell, H Morlon, DD Ackerly, SP Blomberg, and CO Webb. 2010. “Picante: R Tools for Integrating Phylogenies and Ecology.” *Bioinformatics* 26: 1463–64.

Klein, AM, BE Vaissière, JH Cane, I Steffan-Dewenter, SA Cunningham, C Kremen, and T Tscharntke. 2007. “Importance of Pollinators in Changing Landscapes for World Crops.” *Proc. R. Soc. B* 274: 303–13.

Kremen, Claire, and Leithen K. M’Gonigle. 2015. “Small-Scale Restoration in Intensive Agricultural Landscapes Supports More Specialized and Less Mobile Pollinator Species.” *J. Appl. Ecol.* 52: 602–10.

Kuznetsova, Alexandra, Per Bruun Brockhoff, and Rune Haubo Bojesen Christensen. 2014. *lmerTest: Tests for Random and Fixed Effects for Linear Mixed Effect Models (Lmer Objects of Lme4 Package).* <http://CRAN.R-project.org/package=lmerTest>.

MacLeod, Molly, Mark A Genung, John S Ascher, and Rachael Winfree. 2016. “Measuring Partner Choice in Plant–pollinator Networks: Using Null Models to Separate Rewiring and Fidelity from Chance.” *Ecology*. Wiley Online Library.

Memmott, J., N. M. Waser, and M. V. Price. 2004. “Tolerance of Pollination Networks to Species Extinctions.” *Proc. R. Soc. Lond. B* 271: 2605–11.

Menz, MHM, RD Phillips, R Winfree, C Kremen, MA Aizen, SD Johnson, and KW Dixon. 2010. “Reconnecting Plants and Pollinators: Challenges in the Restoration of Pollination Mutualisms.” *Trends Plant Sci.* 16: 4–12.

Morandin, LA, and C Kremen. 2013. “Hedgerow Restoration Promotes Pollinator Populations and Exports Native Bees to Adjacent Fields.” *Ecol. Appl.* 23: 829–39.

M’Gonigle, Leithen K, Neal M Williams, Eric Lonsdorf, and Claire Kremen. 2016. “A Tool for Selecting Plants When Restoring Habitat for Pollinators.” *Conserv. Lett.* Wiley Online Library.

M’Gonigle, LK, LC Ponisio, K Cutler, and C Kremen. 2015. “Habitat Restoration Promotes Pollinator Persistence and Colonization in Intensively-Managed Agriculture.” *Ecol. Appl.* 25: 1557–65.

Newman, M. E. J., and M Girvan. 2004. “Finding and Evaluating Community Structure in Networks.” *Phys. Rev. E* 69: 026113.

Nuismer, Scott L., Pedro Jordano, and Jordi Bascompte. 2013. “Coevolution and the Architecture of Mutualistic Networks.” *Evolution* 67 (2): 338–54.

Olesen, J. M., J Bascompte, H Elberling, and P Jordano. 2008. “Temporal Dynamics in a Pollination Network.” *Ecology* 89: 1573.

Olesen, J. M., J. Bascompte, Y. Dupont, and P. Jordano. 2007. “The Modularity of Pollination Networks.” *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA* 104: 19891–96.

Ollerton, J, R Winfree, and S Tarrant. 2011. “How Many Flowering Plants Are Pollinated by Animals?” *Oikos* 120: 321–26.

Parker, V Thomas. 1997. “The Scale of Successional Models and Restoration Objectives.” *Restor. Ecol.* 5 (4). Wiley Online Library: 301–6.

Peel, Leto, and Aaron Clauset. 2014. “Detecting Change Points in the Large-Scale Structure of Evolving Networks.” *ArXiv Preprint ArXiv:1403.0989*.

Petanidou, T, SA Kallimanis, J Tzanopoulos, SP Sgardelis, and JD Pantis. 2008. “Long-Term Observation of a Pollination Network: Fluctuation in Species and Interactions, Relative Invariance of Network Structure and Implications for Estimates of Specialization.” *Ecol. Lett.* 11: 564–75.

Ponisio, Lauren C, Leithen K M’Gonigle, and Claire Kremen. 2016. “On-Farm Habitat Restoration Counters Biotic Homogenization in Intensively Managed Agriculture.” *Global Change Biol.* 22 (2). Wiley Online Library: 704–15.

Pyke, Graham H. 1984. “Optimal Foraging Theory: A Critical Review.” *Annu. Rev. Ecol. Evol. Syst.* JSTOR, 523–75.

R Core Team. 2015. *R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing*. Vienna, Austria: R Foundation for Statistical Computing. <http://www.R-project.org/>.

Ramos-Jiliberto, Rodrigo, Fernanda S Valdovinos, Pablo Moisset de Espanés, and Jose D Flores. 2012. “Topological Plasticity Increases Robustness of Mutualistic Networks.” *J. Anim. Ecol.* 81 (4). Wiley Online Library: 896–904.

Rezende, Enrico L, Jessica E Lavabre, Paulo R Guimarães, Pedro Jordano, and Jordi Bascompte. 2007. “Non-Random Coextinctions in Phylogenetically Structured Mutualistic Networks.” *Nature* 448 (7156). Nature Publishing Group: 925–28.

Santamaría, Miguel A, Luis AND Rodríguez-Gironés. 2007. “Linkage Rules for Plant–Pollinator Networks: Trait Complementarity or Exploitation Barriers?” *PLoS Biol.* 5. Public Library of Science: e31.

Stang, M, PGL Klinkhamer, N. M. Waser, I Stang, and Meijden E van der. 2009. “Size-Specific Interaction Patterns and Size Matching in a Plant-Pollinator Interaction Web.” *Ann. Bot.* 103 (1459–1469).

Stang, Martina, Peter GL Klinkhamer, and Eddy Van Der Meijden. 2006. “Size Constraints and Flower Abundance Determine the Number of Interactions in a Plant–flower Visitor Web.” *Oikos* 112 (1). Wiley Online Library: 111–21.

Thébault, Elisa, and Colin Fontaine. 2010. “Stability of Ecological Communities and the Architecture of Mutualistic and Trophic Networks.” *Science* 329 (5993). American Association for the Advancement of Science: 853–56.

Valdovinos, Fernanda S, Pablo Moisset de Espanés, José D Flores, and Rodrigo Ramos-Jiliberto. 2013. “Adaptive Foraging Allows the Maintenance of Biodiversity of Pollination Networks.” *Oikos* 122 (6). Wiley Online Library: 907–17.

Valdovinos, Fernanda S, Rodrigo Ramos-Jiliberto, Leslie Garay-Narváez, Pasquinell Urbani, and Jennifer A Dunne. 2010. “Consequences of Adaptive Behaviour for the Structure and Dynamics of Food Webs.” *Ecol. Lett.* 13 (12). Wiley Online Library: 1546–59.

Vázquez, D. P., N. Blüthgen, L. Cagnolo, and N. P. Chacoff. 2009. “Uniting Pattern and Process in Plant-Animal Mutualistic Networks: A Review.” *Ann. of Bot.* 103 (9): 1445–57.

Vázquez, Diego P, Natacha P Chacoff, and Luciano Cagnolo. 2009. “Evaluating Multiple Determinants of the Structure of Plant-Animal Mutualistic Networks.” *Ecology* 90 (8). Eco Soc America: 2039–46.

Vázquez, Diego P. 2005. “Degree Distribution in Plant-Animal Mutualistic Networks: Forbidden Links or Random Interactions?” *Oikos* 108 (2). Munksgaard International Publishers: 421–26.

Waser, N. M., L. Chittka, M. V. Price, N. M. Williams, and J. Ollerton. 1996. “Generalization in Pollination Systems, and Why It Matters.” *Ecology* 77: 1043.