**Larval Habitat Categorization Limitations**

The main limitation faced while categorizing the larval habitat data is the ambiguity of certain descriptions of habitats. For instance, reports on ground pools were simply categorized into a group called “ground pools” that excludes common ground pools such as rivers, lakes, streams, ponds, etc. It is possible that publications reporting ground pools were in fact describing a lake or stream which would have gone into a different group. This ties into a similar limitation: the definitions of water-holding containers and surface waters. Different countries and regions may have their own definitions for what constitutes a river, stream, brook, or tributary, and these lines are more blurry than clear in our categorization.

Other ambiguities we faced include dams, rock pools, and phytotelmata. Dams were particularly difficult because it was not clear if larvae were found on the dam structure (which would make it an artificial container) or in the water body that results from the dam (which would make it a reservoir). Furthermore, it was just assumed that publications were talking about a man-made dam and not a natural dam. Hence, any habitats related to dams and reservoirs were placed in the same category under the EUNIS code, J5.3, which entails “artificial non-saline standing waters.” Plant parts may not be as accurately portrayed because many publications stated “banana” or “Nepenthes” without further mention of which part of the plant larvae was collected from. In tune with Greeney 2001, we assumed banana and Nepenthes meant leaf axils and modified leaves respectively. Other data that lacks complete clarity are rock pools. Similar to the situation with ground pools, there are many types of rock holes including coral holes, tidal holes, cave rock holes, volcanic holes, limestone holes, streambed rock holes, etc. In cases where the type of rock pool is not mentioned, we categorized that in a broad group called “rock pools.” It is likely that publications may have found larvae in a specific type of rock pool (which would be categorized appropriately) but have collectively reported the habitat as rock pool which creates less specificity.

Another significant constraint was that certain groups of habitats may overlap. For instance, “drains” fall under the “seepage areas” category, while roadside associated pools and water bodies fall under “road networks.” Data reported as “roadside drains” would be applicable to both categories. Currently, I have assigned such reports to what I believe depicts the habitat best, but this may need further assessment and finetuning. Other examples of this limitation includes “irrigation channels from piggeries bacon factories sewage” which overlaps between “sewage” and “irrigation pools”, “pools in trampled ricefields” which overlaps between “trampled areas” and “croplands”, and “sluggish streams containing green algae” which overlaps between “streams” and “algal pools.”