Disentangling the drivers of pollinator-mediated interactions between creosote bush (*Larrea tridentata*) and desert dandelion (*Malacothrix glabrata*).

Abstract

In arid ecosystems, the facilitative effects of shrubs can lead to concentrations of annual plants beneath the canopy. The indirect interactions that arise from the close spatial proximity of nurse-protégé relationships can have important implications for community structure and assembly. Creosote bush, *Larrea tridentata* is a dominant shrub of the Mojave Desert. Here, we test the capacity of creosote bush to influence the pollination of the annual understory during its phenological shift into flowering. Pollinator visitation rates to the phytometer desert dandelion were significantly lower as the understory of creosote bush, and when creosote bush entered into a full bloom, visitation rates declined significantly at both understory and nearby open microsites. Decreases in visitation was driven by syrphid flies and the responses of solitary bees. In this system, we found that *L. tridentata* has a positive ecological effect on the density and composition? of annual plants and the arthropod community but that it had indirect negative effects on the pollination? Or visitation to? of a representative flowering annual plant. The net outcome of interactions with foundation plant species can be negative or positive depending on the specific shrub function tested or the recipient taxa – yes but be cool to link to a bigger implication for Am Nat… - something about evo, co-evolutionary relationships etc or perhaps use the word trade-offs here – Am Nat likes that and you kind of need ir even in the thesis chapter too. These finding suggesting that the net outcome of associated with foundation plant species can be positive or negative depending on both the life-history stage of the protégé species tested and on the phenology of the foundation species. An increasing focus on further documenting this trade-offs will advance both facilitation theory and assessment of selection processes that can drive co-evolutionary relationships between shrubs, annual plants, and pollinators. – something like that – again – this is a really stellar study. Sell it a tiny bit and remind people the implications!!

Keywords: etc…

Introduction

Foundation species positively influence the structure of the surrounding plant communities by creating locally stable conditions for other species ([Ellison et al., 2005](#_ENREF_24)). In arid environments, foundation shrubs can act as keystone facilitators, directly benefiting associated understory annual plants via multiple mechanistic pathways across all life stages ([Filazzola and Lortie, 2014](#_ENREF_26)). These include stress amelioration ([McIntire and Fajardo, 2014](#_ENREF_48)), improved water and nutrient availability ([Franco et al., 1994](#_ENREF_30)), and seed trapping ([Flores and Jurado, 2003](#_ENREF_29)). Direct interactions between shrubs and annuals can be simultaneously facilitative and competitive ([Bertness and Callaway, 1994](#_ENREF_6); [Callaway and Walker, 1997b](#_ENREF_16); [Holzapfel and Mahall, 1999](#_ENREF_38)), and it has been proposed that the relative importance of negative versus positive effects covaries with abiotic stress ([Bertness and Callaway, 1994](#_ENREF_6); [Schafer et al., 2012](#_ENREF_73); [Tielbörger and Kadmon, 2000](#_ENREF_85)). These complex sets of interactions lead to patterns in species coexistence and structure plant communities ([Brooker et al., 2008](#_ENREF_10); [Valiente‐Banuet and Verdú, 2007](#_ENREF_88)). The facilitative effects of desert shrubs can lead to concentrations of annual plants beneath the shrub canopy ([Facelli and Temby, 2002](#_ENREF_25)). This close spatial proximity of shrubs and annuals undoubtedly gives rise to indirect interactions ([Sotomayor and Lortie, 2015](#_ENREF_80)). Indirect interactions pccur whenever a third species alters the interaction between two other species ([Callaway and Pennings, 2000](#_ENREF_14); [Callaway and Walker, 1997b](#_ENREF_16); [Wootton, 1994](#_ENREF_94)). If the associated annual is a flowering plant, then there is the capacity for the plants to interact indirectly via pollinators.

Interaction pathways that require co-blooming dominate the study of the underlying mechanisms of pollinator-mediated interactions – bit confusing. These studies are primarily extensions to optimal foraging theory ([Pyke, 1984](#_ENREF_63); [Pyke et al., 1977](#_ENREF_64)) with flowers as the central resources for which pollinators forage. Thus plants can become more attractive by combining their floral displays to increase net floral patch size ([Schemske, 1981](#_ENREF_74)) or to make the patch offering more diverse ([Ghazoul, 2006](#_ENREF_32)). Flowering desert shrubs offer concentrations of floral resources for foraging pollinators, and this can facilitate co-blooming annuals. Magnet species are particularly attractive to pollinators increasing local pollinator abundances that benefit their less attractive neighbours ([Laverty, 1992](#_ENREF_44); [Thomson, 1978](#_ENREF_84)). If shrubs concentrate pollinators that do not in turn visit their neighbours, competition or interference rather than facilitation will arise. Shrubs are salient features of desert scrub ecosystems due their large size and structural complexity relative to ephemeral plants and can also influence the pollination of associated plants via non-floral mechanistic pathways. Shrubs can facilitate their annual understory by improving conditions for pollinators by offering shelter or habitat. Alternatively, annuals growing under shrubs can be physically obscured from foraging pollinators or shaded thereby reducing visitation. For example, shading by the shrub *Lonicera* decreases pollinator visitation and pollen deposition to its understory annuals ([McKinney and Goodell, 2010](#_ENREF_49)). Consequently, direct and indirect shrub effects on other species function simultaneously to determine net outcomes. The balance of facilitative and competitive interactions can be further altered by life stage ([Bruno et al., 2003](#_ENREF_12); [Callaway and Walker, 1997a](#_ENREF_15); [Pugnaire et al., 1996](#_ENREF_62); [Rousset and Lepart, 2000](#_ENREF_68); [Valiente-Banuet et al., 1991](#_ENREF_87)). For example within some nurse-plant systems, young plants are facilitated during establishment but later compete with their nurses for resources ([Yeaton, 1978](#_ENREF_95)) – also a paper by Tielborger you can cite here. For plants, the life stage shift from vegetative growth to reproductive growth is a major event in resource allocation? (citation). Incorporating phenological shifts is likely a critical mediator of the sign of net outcomes with foundation plant species such as shrubs.

The Mojave Desert is a biodiversity hotspot supporting 659 species of bees ([Saul-Gershenz et al., 2012](#_ENREF_72)) and 1680 species of vascular plants ([Rundel and Gibson, 2005](#_ENREF_69)). Despite the celebrated biodiversity of Southwestern Deserts, pollinator-mediated interactions in this region are infrequently tested. Increases in intraspecific density can benefit the pollination of desert mustard *Lesquerella fendleri* ([Roll et al., 1997](#_ENREF_67)); however, interspecific studies have primarily focused on competition within cacti systems in the Sonoran Desert ([Fleming et al., 2001](#_ENREF_28)). Plant-pollinator systems in southwest deserts are home to rare obligate mutualisms such as the Joshua tree *Yucca brevifolia* and Yucca moths ([Pellmyr, 2003](#_ENREF_59)), and the senita cactus *Pachycereus schottii* and senita moths ([Fleming and Holland, 1998](#_ENREF_27)) and are often considered highly specialized. The degree of specialization of desert species? ecosystems is a subject of ongoing debate (Citation). Desert organisms, both plants and animals? are hypothesized to adapt to high environmental variability by generalizing resource use ([Chesson et al., 2004](#_ENREF_20)) and this hypothesis have been supported to an extent through pollination network studies ([Chacoff et al., 2012](#_ENREF_19)). Overall, few one-to-one relationships (i.e. matching between a single species of pollinator with a single species of plant) have been found with solitary bees ([Simpson and Neff, 1987](#_ENREF_79)). Other species of bees still visit even a rare? senita cactus ([Holland and Fleming, 2002](#_ENREF_37)). Despite the high number of specialist pollinators present in the Mojave, most plant species nonetheless interact through pollinators. Soo…? Implication – close the loop here – confused – is specialization important or not and does or does not matter to the topic at hand?

The purpose here was to examine both the direct and indirect effects of *Larrea tridentata* on the pollination (or do you mean general success – ie because you talk about facilitation of vegetative stages too so that is not pollination) of its annual understory. Single species of plants that are sensitive to environmental variation are called phytometers in plant science ([Clements and Goldsmith, 1924](#_ENREF_21)) and have been recommended as a tool to study the relative importance versus intensity of plant-plant interactions as well (Brooker et al paper) – and this makes me think – Can we calculate the importance measure that he proposed in addition to intensity?. We used the commonly co-occurring annual *Malacothrix glabrata* as a phytometer to measure variation in pollination services by environmental context*.* These species co-flower at beginning and ends of their bloom period ([Jennings, 2001](#_ENREF_42)), and it is thus a relevant species to examine changes in net interactions within a growing season. We hypothesize that desert shrubs can positively and negatively influence the net outcome of pollination for associated annual plants through effects of large floral offering and extent of co-blooming with the community in addition to directly facilitating vegetative performance measures at earlier life stages?. The following four predictions were tested: 1) visitation rates to an annual phytometer species differ under a shrub canopy relative to paired open microsites; 2) phenological stage of the shrub influences the net pollination rates to the phytometer species; 3) the relative abundances of the associated plant community with shrubs and measures of pollination success do not necessarily respond similarly. Could be revised even a bit more… Understanding interactions for pollination at a community level is critical for understanding potential impacts of any decline in pollinator populations. If shrubs facilitate their understory annuals, they can buffer pollinator declines, but if shrubs typically interfere with pollination for annuals, the sensitivity to change for the community increases. – hmmm not bad.

**Methods**

Study site

The study area has an extent of 0.07 km2, and is located in the mouth of Sunset Cove on the property of the Sweeney Granite Mountains Desert Research Station within the Mojave National Preserve in California (34°46'26.5"N 115°39'31.3"W). The cove is created by tall rock formations on three sides, gently sloping and widening to the south. The diverse shrub and cactus community includes *Larrea tridentata*, *Acamptopappus sphaerocephalus*, *Ambrosia salsola, Eriogonum fasciculatum, Cylindropuntia acanthacarpa, Cylindropuntia echinocarpa* and *Thamnosa montana*. The most common flowering annuals present during the study period were *Cryptantha sp, Phacelia fremontii, Eriophyllum wallacei, Gilia sp., Phacelia tanacetifolia, Malacothrix glabrata* and *Chaenactis fremontii*.

Phytometer species

We used the desert dandelion *Malacothrix glabrata* (*Asteraceae*) as a phytometer to measure pollination services. *M. glabrata* is an abundant, native annual wildflower that commonly co-occurs with *L. tridentata*. The flowerheads are dense with yellow corollas and grow up to 40 cm tall ([Morhardt and Morhardt, 2004](#_ENREF_55)). *M. glabrata* is insect-pollinated, including bees in the genus *Nomadopsis* ([Rutowski and Alcock, 1980](#_ENREF_70)) and *Anthidium* ([Wainwright, 1978](#_ENREF_92)) as well as short-winged flower beetles ([Cline and Audisio, 2010](#_ENREF_22)). Several of the 24 species of *Malacothrix* are self-compatible ([Davis and Philbrick, 1986](#_ENREF_23)), however the reproductive biology of *M. glabrata* has not been studied in detail.

Study species

Creosote bush, *Larrea tridentata* (Zygophyllaceae), has been a dominant flowering shrub of the southwestern United States for 25 000 years ([Betancourt et al., 1990](#_ENREF_7)). It is able to maintain photosynthesis even under high temperatures and low water potentials ([Barbour et al., 2007](#_ENREF_5)). This shrub species also primarily reproduces clonally leading to individuals that are exceptionally long lived. Clones that are over 1000 years old have been documented ([Vasek, 1980](#_ENREF_90)). The full pollinator guild contains 22 specialist pollinators and more than 80 generalists ([Minckley et al., 1999](#_ENREF_53)). The associated pollinator guilds are highly variable over space, and most shrubs will only interact with 20% of their full guild ([Cane et al., 2005](#_ENREF_17)). *L. tridentata* is one of the most reliable flowering plants in the Mojave because it has one of the lowest rainfall thresholds (12 mm) for blooming ([Bowers and Dimmitt, 1994](#_ENREF_9)). It produces copious nectar and pollen rich flowers ([Simpson et al., 1977](#_ENREF_78)) and provides critical resources to pollinators in drought years. *L. tridentata* functions as a benefactor species for other desert perennials such as *Opuntia leptocaulis*, ([Yeaton, 1978](#_ENREF_95)), *Peniocereus striatus* ([Suzán et al., 1994](#_ENREF_82)), and facilitates native annuals ([Schafer et al., 2012](#_ENREF_73)).

Study design

A total of 60 *L. tridentata* shrubs with developed floral buds and minimal perennial understory were chosen across the study site haphazardly (mean width: 336 cm, mean height: 209 cm). Paired shrub-open microsites were selected inside the dripline of the focal shrub and a minimum of 1.5 m away in an open area respectively. A microsite is defined as an area 0.5 by 0.5m that encompasses a representative density and richness of annual plants within a desert community (citation maybe)? Both microsites were sampled on the south side of the shrub to minimize shading and were paired to minimize variation due to environmental heterogeneity. To separate floral and non-floral interaction pathways, interactions were tested prior to focal shrubs blooming and repeated using the same shrubs after they had entered into full bloom. Shrubs with fewer than five open blooms were considered non-blooming (“pre-blooming”) because 5 is less than 1% of mean blooming observed throughout the season. The mean number of blooms of the ‘blooming’ treatment was 300.2 (min: 102, max: 1080). The repeated measures study design was chosen to measure relative changes in interactions with natural shrub phenology and to reduce between shrub variability. In two cases, a focal shrub did not bloom within the study period and was replaced by a different blooming shrub. These two cases were excluded from later RII calculations. CHECK for typos – I am going this really quickly but am seeing quite a few.

Visitation and Pollen Deposition

be more specific, *M. glabrata* were gathered from nearby (< 3 km) populations where they seasonally coexist with *L. tridentata.* These plants? were transplanted into 15 cm diameter black pots and one pot was placed at each microsite for a total of six shrub/open pairs per day. Conspecific floral density influences pollinator visitation ([Bosch and Waser, 2001](#_ENREF_8)). Therefore, transplants of similar size and habit were paired, and the flowerheads of *M. glabrata* were trimmed to equal numbers between paired microsites, but left to vary between replicates. The mean number of flowers per pot was 10 (min 6, max 20). Polaroid Cube+ HD video cameras (1080p) were used to record pollinator activity to each potted *M. glabrata*. Recording took place between 11:30 am and 3:30 pm (mean length: 1:19 hr:min). The use of video technology allows for higher temporal resolution and replication beyond what is possible using traditional *in situ* observations ([Lortie et al., 2012](#_ENREF_46)). Ten days of pre-blooming trials (60 shrub/open pairs) were conducted between April 10 and April 20 and ten days of blooming trials (60 shrub/open pairs) between April 21 and May 2. To test for any influence of naturally co-occurring annuals and blooming shrubs, heterospecific annual floral density was measured within a 0.25 m2 quadrat in each microsite and the number of heterospecific shrubs in bloom were counted within a 2 m radius of each microsite. The number of open blooms of each *L. tridentata* was counted at the same time.

A flower visit in video data was defined as an instance when an insect visitor touched the open side of a flower. A foraging instance was defined as one plant visit, measured between initial contact and when visitor departed from physical contact of the final flower and left the field of view. Visit duration included flower-to-flower travel time and multiple flowers were coded as a single foraging instance – all this is good but a bity confusing – if you can state more directly – be sweet. Total flowers is the sum of all flowers visited per replicate. Proportion of flowers visited is the number of unique flowers visited per foraging instance divided by the number of flowers in the field of vision. Floral visitors were identified to recognizable taxonomic units (RTU) including the following categories: honeybees, solitary bees, Lepidoptera, syrphid flies, bombyliid flies and other, which was comprised primarily of small beetles and muscoid flies. A total of five videos were omitted due to disturbance or battery failure.

To quantify pollen deposition by proximity to *L. tridentata*, stigma were excised from *M. glabrata* at a nearby site (3 km) with a naturally occurring, co-blooming population of *M. glabrata* and *L. tridentata* between April 31st and May 2nd, 2017. Three stigma from each of three flowers per *M. glabrata* (nine stigma per plant) growing under the dripline and in nearby open areas were collected generating a total of 298 stigma from 13 shrub/open pairs. Distance to the nearest *L. tridentata* and three nearest *M. glabrata* neighbours were also recorded, and the number of *M. glabrata* flowers per plant were counted. The stigmas were stored individually in micro-centrifuge tubes filled with denatured alcohol. The tubes were spun down in a centrifuge at 4200 rpm for 4.5 minutes and the pellet pipetted onto the slide. This along with the stigma were mounted in fuchsin jelly ([Kearns and Inouye, 1993](#_ENREF_43)). At 100 x magnification, a total of 10 longitudinal transects (18 mm long) of pollen were counted per slide. Heterospecific pollen grains were imaged using a Canon 60D SLR with 60mm macro lens into microscope afocally. Nice!

Community-level effects of shrub species

The arthropod communities were sampled to provide an estimate of pollinator availability for each microsite and to assess if *L. tridentata* acts as a foundation species for other taxa. Yellow, white, and blue coloured six-inch diameter plastic bowls filled with water with a few drops of dish detergent added to sample via pan trapping. Each study day, pan traps were set out by 10 am and collected by 5:30 pm. Arrays of three pan traps were deployed in a triangular shape at each microsite, marginally embedded in the ground to prevent disturbance. Total percent vegetation cover (a proxy for annual biomass) and annual species richness were recorded within a 0.25 m2 quadrat when the traps were laid out. Arthropod sampling was conducted within two days of the video test but never on the same day to avoid influencing visitation. Nine days (54 shrub/open pairs) of sampling were completed before blooming, and 10 days (60 shrub/open pairs) during full bloom.

Bees and syrphid flies were identified to species or genus ([Ascher and Pickering, 2015](#_ENREF_4); [Michener, 2000](#_ENREF_51); [Michener et al., 1994](#_ENREF_52); [Miranda et al., 2013](#_ENREF_54)). The majority of remaining individuals was identified to at least the taxonomic resolution of family ([Grissell and Schauff, 1990](#_ENREF_34); [Marshall, 2012](#_ENREF_47); [Teskey et al., 1981](#_ENREF_83); [Triplehorn and Johnson, 2005](#_ENREF_86)) Thysanoptera, Orthoptera and Arachnida which were left to order. Recognizable taxonomic unit (RTU) is a suitable approximation of traditional species richness ([Oliver and Beattie, 1993](#_ENREF_58)). Using RTU limits resolution compared with species-level identification, however many desert insect species have not been described and furthermore useful keys are often lacking. This method of categorizing diversity was a trade-off between maximizing resolution and speed given the high diversity of desert species. Related groups may be identified to different levels. E.g. wasps in the genus *Miscophus* and subfamily *Pemphredoninae* are both within the family *Crabronidae*. No individuals were double counted, and these groups were considered distinct, exclusive RTUs for diversity analyses. Nymphs were included in abundance analyses provided they could be identified at least to taxonomic order. Hemipteran nymphs that could not be identified to family were aggregated for diversity analyses. Mites (Acari) and springtails (Collembola) were excluded from all analyses due to biases in collection methods. The full dataset of 118 RTU is available online (KNB, Braun and Lortie, 2018). All physical specimens are archived at York University.

To determine which pollinators visited *L. tridentata* flowers during the study period, 15-minute observation periods were completed at 4 shrubs for 10 days pre-blooming (10 hours) and up to 6 shrubs per day for 10 days when blooming (14.5 hours). The same focal shrubs were observed but on different days than pan trap sampling and video trials. Due to the large size of the shrubs, it was not possible to accurately track flower visits per foraging instance, therefore only net foraging frequency was recorded. The identity and behaviour of the visitors were recorded and all? insects were collected to facilitate identification.

To determine if *L. tridentata* influences local microclimate, a total of 16 HOBO pendant data loggers were used to record micro-environmental conditions. Ground level temperature and light availability were recorded every 30 minutes between March 19th and May 14th, 2017 at eight microsite pairs. Daytime (9am to 9pm) and nighttime (9pm to 9am) averages and daily temperature variance were calculated.

Statistical Analysis

Visitation and Pollen Deposition

To test for evidence that *L. tridentata* mediates pollinator visitation to *M. glabrata*, generalized linear mixed-models (GLMM, lme4) using negative binomial error distributions with a loglink function to account for overdispersion were fit (citation to vignette for lme4). The number of foraging instances and total number of flowers visited were treated as response variables. Video length was log-transformed for the loglink function and used as an offset to maintain the count structure of the data. To test for the influence of conspecific floral density, the number of *M. glabrata* blooms was included as a factor in models. We did not standardize visitation to visits/hour/flower because this assumes that pollinators respond linearly to conspecific floral density and that the slope of the relationship does not change with treatment (Reitan and Nielson, 2006). The focal ‘replicate shrub + microsite’ (Rep ID) was used as a random effect to account for the repeated measures study design in all models. Interactive, additive, and intercept only models were compared by AIC and likelihood ratio tests with χ2 approximations (Table B1, B2). To test for the influence of heterospecific blooming annuals and shrubs, negative binomial GLMM (glmmTMB) with each covariate included to the additive model were used. A quasipoisson GLMM (glmmPQL, MASS) was used to explore which visitors were driving observed visitation patterns.

Gamma GLMM models (glmer, lme4) with visit duration and proportion of flowers visited per foraging instance as response variables tested for behavioural differences. Solitary bees and ‘other’ RTUs were subsetted to fit linear mixed models for both RTU using log-transformed visit duration as the response variable, and in all cases least-squares post hoc tests (lsmeans) were used on any significant interactions and the Rep ID was included as a random effect.

Quasipoisson models (MASS, glmmPQL) were fit with conspecific and heterospecific pollen deposition as response variables. Distance to *L. tridentata*, distance to the nearest conspecific neighbour and the number of *M. glabrata* flowers were modeled as predictors. The sample ID nested in the flower ID nested in the plant was used as a random effect. – first person OK of course but then you need to do all that way. I prefer not to use though.

Community-level shrub effects

Negative binomial GLMMs (lme4, glmer.nb) with arthropod abundance, percent annual cover, annual species richness and annual bloom density as response variables were used to test for relative shrub effects on the local community (citation to glmer package). Beetles from the family *Melyridae* made up 1217 of the 3384 total arthropods captured, therefore abundance models were fit with *Melyridae* excluded, included and individually to explore model sensitivities. Poisson GLMMs (lme4) were used to determine differences in arthropod species richness and bee abundance between the treatments, and negative binomial GLMMs? (lme4, glmer.nb) were? used to test for differences in bee richness. To test if *L. tridentata* individuals with more flowers were more attractive to pollinators, a quasipoisson GLM (glm) with visitation rates as the response and flower number as predictors. In all cases, least-squares *post hoc* tests (lsmeans) were used on any significant interactions, and the Rep ID was included as a random effect to control for repeated measures.

GLMM (glmer, lme4) with Gamma error distributions with mean daytime temperature, mean nighttime temperatures and daily temperature variance as response variables were used to test for the capacity of L. tridentata to create stable microclimates. The shrub ID + microsite as a random effect to control for the repeated measures.can you put in previous para and simplify the whole thing a bit – ie Generalized linear mixed models were used to examine… and family was fit according to these rules… (then citation to it)? Or leave all written out – ok too.

Redundancy analysis (RDA, vegan) order to test for shifts in the shrub microsite and associated annual communities influence on insect community composition. In order to separate the responses of the vegetation factors to the blooming factors from the effect of the blooming itself, the dataset was split into pre-blooming and blooming, and analyses were run separately on each subset. Arthropod abundances were Hellinger transformed to lower the weight of rare RTU ([Legendre and Gallagher, 2001](#_ENREF_45)). Microsite, percent annual cover, annual richness and heterospecific annual bloom density were used as constraining variables in the ordination. In order to test for the significance of the constraining variables in explaining the variation, a permutation ANOVA (anova.cca) was used on each RDA (Cite vegan package or MEE paper).

Ecological effect sizes

To compare the ecological effect of shrubs and blooming on five community response metrics (floral visitation of *M. glabrata*, arthropod abundance, arthropod species richness, percent annual cover and annual species richness), and to estimate the biological importance of statistically significant differences the effect size estimate RII was calculated ([Armas et al., 2004](#_ENREF_3)). The equation: was used. Treatments were shrub microsite or blooming, while the controls were open microsite or pre-blooming. Only paired microsites in the data were used to calculate effect sizes. This measure ranges from −1 to +1, is symmetric around 0, and negative values indicated relative competition whilst positives indicate facilitation (citation). To determine if the effect was significantly different from 0, 95% confidence intervals around mean values were bootstrapped (boot, R), stratified by the focal shrub ID to account for the repeated measures study design.

**Results**

Shrub effects on visitation rates and pollen deposition to phytometer species

A total of 697 flying insects visited 925 flowers (hereafter “pollinators”) to *M. glabrata* in 303 hours of video recording. No pollinators were observed in 61 of the 235 video observation periods. Foraging instance frequency and total floral visitation by pollinators to *M. glabrata* were significantly lower at the shrub microsite relative to open areas (Table 1) and were reduced at both microsites when *L. tridentata* entered full bloom. There was a positive effect of *M. glabrata* conspecific density on both the frequency of foraging bouts and floral visitation (Figure X, stats). There were RTU specific changes in the number of foraging instances and flowers visited with blooming is this redundant to last sentence? (Figure 1, Table 1). The frequency of flower visits by syrphids and solitary bees declined significantly with blooming (Table 1). There was no significant difference between RTU visiting the microsites (Figure 1, Table C1) nor were there significant interactions between RTU, microsite, and blooming (Table C1) on the total flowers visited.

There was no significant influence of heterospecific shrub blooming density on foraging instance frequency or total flowers visited (Table 2). There was a significant, positive effect of heterospecific annual floral density on foraging instances but not flowers visited (Table 2). Floral visitation rates (flowers/hr) were significantly correlated between paired shrub/open microsites (Pearson’s = 0.262, t = 2.8708, df = 112, p-value = 0.004898).

There was a negative effect of *L. tridentata* blooming on *M. glabrata* visit duration but no microsite effect (Table 5). This was driven by visitors in the ‘other’ category (Figure 2, Est: -1.0703, χ2: 12.274, t: -3.503, p = 0.000605). There was no difference in solitary bee visit duration between blooming treatments (Est: -0.9341, χ2: 1.9017, t: -1.379, p = 0.208). The proportion of flowers visited per visit decreased significantly with blooming at the shrub microsite only (Table 5), but there were no RTU specific response to blooming or microsite (Appendix B).

A total of 16209 grains of conspecific pollen and 1719 of heterospecific grains were recorded on larrea stigmas?. At the nearby site, there was no significant influence of proximity to *L. tridentata* or the number of conspecific flowers (Figure 3a) on conspecific pollen deposition, however there was a marginally significant effect of distance to nearest conspecific neighbour (Table 5). Heterospecific pollen deposition increased significantly with distance from *L. tridentata* (Figure 3b)*.* Conspecific and heterospecific pollen deposition were significantly correlated (Pearson’s = 0.15, t = 2.397, df = 229, p = 0.01).

Extended and community-level effects of shrub species.

A total of 3987 arthropods spanning 118 taxonomic groups (Table A1) were caught in 19 days of pan trapping. There was a positive effect of shrub microsite on both arthropod abundance (Melyridae excluded) and arthropod species richness and a negative effect of blooming (Table 6). Insect abundance (Melyridae excluded) was significantly correlated between paired shrub/open microsites (Pearson’s = 0.46, p < 0.001). Melyridae abundance was significantly lower at the shrub microsites, and decreased with blooming at the open microsite only (Appendix Cx). There was no significant difference in bee abundance or species richness caught in pan traps between any of the treatments (Table 6).

Percent cover of ground vegetation was significantly greater in shrub microsites (Table 6), and it decreased with blooming in the open microsite only. There was a significant decrease in heterospecific annual floral density with blooming, but there were no significant differences between the microsites (stats). There was also no significant difference in annual species richness between any of the treatments (stats). Shrubs had a competitive effect on floral visitation of *M. glabrata,* a facilitative effect on arthropod abundance, arthropod species richness, and on annual percent cover but no significant effect on annual plant richness (Figure 5A, stats). Blooming had a negative effect on floral visitation, arthropod abundance, and arthropod species richness. Blooming had a negative effect on annual percent cover at the open microsite only, but blooming did not have a significant effect on annual plant richness (Figure 5B). bit confusing…

Pollinator visitation to *L. tridentata* increased with floral abundance (Figure 5, GLM: Est: 0.0013408, χ2: 4.6383, p = 0.02283), and floral abundance and shrub height (Pearson’s = 0.335, t = 2.6659, df = 56, p = 0.01002) were correlated – so how do we know it was not height that mattered? Can you do a multiple regression to contrast these effects – perhaps stepwise?. *L. tridentata* received 197 floral visit over 15 hours of observations. Of 169 visits made by bees, *Apis mellifera* was the most frequent visitor (32%), *Centris* sp. (21%), *Hesperapis larrae* (18%) and *Megandrena enceliae* (7%) and other solitary bees (23%) including *Hoplitis* and *Megachile*.

Mean daytime temperatures were significantly lower (Figure 6, GLMM: Est: -0.064678, χ2:85.51, p <0.0001), and mean nighttime temperatures were significantly higher under the shrub canopy (GLMM: Est: 0.059203, χ2: 50.121, p <0.0001). Overall temperature variation was significantly lower in the shrub microsites (GLMM: Est: -0.27977, χ2: 523.38, p <0.0001).

Arthropod community composition was significantly influenced by microsite how? Can you be more specific? Lower or higher under shrubs? for both blooming treatments (Table 6). There was no significant effect of the annual understory. The constraining variables of the pre-blooming RDA explained more variation (12.5%) than blooming (4%). Only the pre-blooming RDA was significant (pre: F = 3.3448, Df = 4, p = 0.001, blooming: F = 1.1862, Df = 4, p = 0.118). out of curiosity – how do you decide? Do folks use AIC scores for contrasting RDAs etc or do you just use the percent variation?

**Discussion**

Net interaction theory proposes that both positive and negative interactions are common in most sets of interactions between different species in a system ([Callaway and Walker, 1997b](#_ENREF_16)). This study confirmed the role of the desert shrub *L. tridentata* as a foundation species in this system through its positive effects on annual and arthropod communities and its ability to stabilize microclimates. However, the net outcome of these interactions was both positive and negative depending on the specific mechanistic pathway and phenological stage of the shrub. *L. tridentata* interfered with the pollination of the representative phytometer species *M. glabrata* and this relative negative outcome of association was not alleviated when *L. tridentata* entered full bloom. The phenological shift into blooming by *L. tridentata* intensified competition with *M. glabrata* at both microsites rather than triggering facilitation via the magnet species effect.

Plants that employ a cornucopian flowering strategy produce abundant floral resources over an extended period of time, which attracts a wide range of pollinators to the area ([Gentry, 1974](#_ENREF_31); [Mosquin, 1971](#_ENREF_56)). This positive response by pollinators to the floral density of *L. tridentata* i.e. concentrations of floral resources was at a cost to *M. glabrata*. Pollinator visitation frequency and the foraging behaviour of pollinators changed in response to the large increase of floral resources by *L. tridentata*. The foraging strategies of many pollinator groups are centred around energetic considerations ([Heinrich and Raven, 1972](#_ENREF_36); [Pyke, 1984](#_ENREF_63)). When choosing between resources, bees commonly stay for a few visits before leaving to the superior resource ([Sowig, 1989](#_ENREF_81)), where the larger floral display ([Bosch and Waser, 2001](#_ENREF_8)) or richer rewards ([Robertson et al., 1999](#_ENREF_66)) will improve their foraging efficiency. We found that pollinator preferences of L. *tridentata* over *M. glabrata* were species-specific.Feral honeybees, *Apis mellifera,* were the most frequent floral visitors to *L. tridentata* but only visited *M. glabrata* prior to *L. tridentata* blooming. Honeybees prefer larger floral patches ([Sih and Baltus, 1987](#_ENREF_77)) and exhibit floral constancy; the facultative specialization on different flower species at different times by individuals ([Waser, 1986](#_ENREF_93)). Solitary bees also showed a behavioural response by shifting their preference to *L. tridentata*. Facilitation via honeybees and solitary bees has been documented in previous studies ([Albrecht et al., 2016](#_ENREF_1); [Bruckman and Campbell, 2016](#_ENREF_11)), however in most cases the magnet plant does not offer such disproportionately abundant resources as *L. tridentata* relative to the potted annuals.

*Eupeodes volucris* (Diptera: Syrphidae) was the most frequent floral visitor to *M. glabrata.* However *E. volucris* did not switch despite being known to visit *L. tridentata* ([Hurd Jr and Linsley, 1975](#_ENREF_39)). The additional bees attracted by *L. tridentata* may have competitively excluded Syrphids from the immediate area. Competition between Syrphids and other pollinators is understudied ([Inouye et al., 2015](#_ENREF_41)), but competition between bee species is better known. *Centris* sp. bees were frequent visitors to *L. tridentata* flowers during this study. They are territorial and are known to chase away other bees from shrubs ([Alcock et al., 1977](#_ENREF_2)). Similarly, honeybees can reduce visitation by solitary bees ([Shavit et al., 2009](#_ENREF_76)), through competitive displacement ([Cane and Tepedino, 2017](#_ENREF_18)). Alternatively, syrphid visitation may have declined due to changes in local abundances, particularly if their phenology is linked with annuals. *E. volucris* is multivoltine ([Vockeroth, 1992](#_ENREF_91)) but the phenology of *E. volucris* in desert systems has not been studied. Larval *E. volucris* are aphid predators and their phenology appears to be tied to prey availability rather than floral resource availability ([Iler et al., 2013](#_ENREF_40); [Noma and Brewer, 2008](#_ENREF_57))

There was evidence of facilitation by conspecific and heterospecific annual bloom density for visitation concurrent with interference by shrubs. Additional foundation species including *Acamptopappus sphaerocephalus*, *Opuntia sp*. and *Ericameria cooperi* entered into bloom alongside *L. tridentata* while annual floral density decreased, signifying a seasonal shift from annual floral dominance to shrub floral dominance. Phenological separation between annuals and shrubs is frequently observed in South Western desert ecosystems ([Cable, 1969](#_ENREF_13); [Halvorson and Patten, 1975](#_ENREF_35); [Jennings, 2001](#_ENREF_42)). Exploitation competition of early-blooming spring annuals by later-blooming cornucopia plants offering copious resources contributes to phenological divergence in the alpine (Mosquin, 1971). Conspecific pollen deposition did not differ between microsites suggesting that shrub interference alone may not decrease plant fitness. Thus the timing of blooming is critically important for competition avoidance, but also to benefit from co-blooming with conspecifics and facilitating heterospecifics.

The intensity of facilitation and competition depended on both the phenological stage of *L. tridentata* and the mechanism tested. Generally, the relative effect of blooming i.e. the temporal shift was greater than the effect of spatial association. In the Mojave Desert, substantial within season changes to the intensity of facilitation and competition between shrubs and annuals can occur ([Holzapfel and Mahall, 1999](#_ENREF_38)). Similarly, near the Negev desert the intensity of interactions between annuals varies with both life stage and temporal changes ([Schiffers and Tielbörger, 2006](#_ENREF_75)). Overall, *L. tridentata* had stronger effect on annual communities than arthropod communities. The positive influence of *L. tridentata* on annual cover via climate amelioration was maintained throughout the study period. Positive shrub effects on arthropods appear to be independent of the positive effects on annuals, and temporal changes were more pronounced for arthropods than annuals. Surprisingly, microsite became an unreliable predictor of arthropod community composition after blooming. Pollinators and arthropods are highly mobile, and these results indicate that the spatial scale needed to estimate arthropod diversity is altered by the phenological stage of foundation plants.

Association with a dominant, benefactor plant species can be positive in some respects but we found that facilitation in germination and early growth may come at a fitness cost via competition for pollination during reproductive life stages. Life-stage dependent tradeoffs within nurse-protégé associations between perennials are well documented, with facilitation in early life shifting to resource competition later in life ([Valiente-Banuet et al., 1991](#_ENREF_87); [Yeaton, 1978](#_ENREF_95)). Trade-offs between animal-mediated indirect interactions can also occur between life stages may be common, but are rarely documented. For example, thorny plants can facilitate for germination, but later compete through herbivory decoy effects ([Van Der Putten, 2009](#_ENREF_89)). Grass-tree (*Lilicae: Xanthorrhoea semiplana*) facilitates the pink-lipped spider orchid (*Orchidacae: Caladenia syn. Arachnorchis behrii*) by protecting it from herbivores but reduces its pollination services through non-floral interference ([Petit and Dickson, 2005](#_ENREF_60)). To our knowledge, our study is the first demonstration of a generally beneficial flowering nurse plant engaging in exploitation competition with its beneficiaries for pollinators. In arid environments, annuals invest more into reproduction than growth ([Petrů et al., 2006](#_ENREF_61)) and are often found concentrated under shrubs (Facelli and Temby, 2002), therefore germination-pollination tradeoffs should be common within plant communities in desert ecosystems. To quantify the net effects of facilitation it is necessary to consider fitness alongside density effects ([Tielbörger and Kadmon, 2000](#_ENREF_85)). Here we show the mechanisms by which a shrub can facilitate for density while decreasing fitness indirectly through effects on pollination.

Conclusions

The majority of research on plant-plant interactions focusses on a single life stage or a single measurement ([Goldberg et al., 2001](#_ENREF_33); [Tielbörger and Kadmon, 2000](#_ENREF_85)) which is inadequate for making conclusions about fitness levels within populations ([McPeek and Peckarsky, 1998](#_ENREF_50)). The extent of tradeoffs is underestimated in arid environments. These interactions and tradeoff are important for structuring desert communities. Shrubs had a net positive effect on annuals. ETC ETC. Will write after discussion finalized.

Literature Cited

Albrecht, M., Ramis, M.R., Traveset, A., 2016. Pollinator-mediated impacts of alien invasive plants on the pollination of native plants: the role of spatial scale and distinct behaviour among pollinator guilds. Biological Invasions 18, 1801-1812.

Alcock, J., Jones, C.E., Buchmann, S.L., 1977. Male mating strategies in the bee Centris pallida Fox (Anthophoridae: Hymenoptera). The American Naturalist 111, 145-155.

Armas, C., Ordiales, R., Pugnaire, F.I., 2004. Measuring plant interactions: a new comparative index. Ecology 85, 2682-2686.

Ascher, J., Pickering, J., 2015. Discover Life bee species guide and world checklist (Hymenoptera: Apoidea: Anthophila).

Barbour, M., Keeler-Wolf, T., Schoenherr, A.A., 2007. Terrestrial vegetation of California. Univ of California Press.

Bertness, M.D., Callaway, R., 1994. Positive interactions in communities. Trends in Ecology & Evolution 9, 191-193.

Betancourt, J.L., Van Devender, T.R., Martin, P.S., 1990. Packrat middens: the last 40,000 years of biotic change. University of Arizona Press.

Bosch, M., Waser, N.M., 2001. Experimental manipulation of plant density and its effect on pollination and reproduction of two confamilial montane herbs. Oecologia 126, 76-83.

Bowers, J.E., Dimmitt, M.A., 1994. Flowering phenology of six woody plants in the northern Sonoran Desert. Bulletin of the Torrey Botanical Club, 215-229.

Brooker, R.W., Maestre, F.T., Callaway, R.M., Lortie, C.L., Cavieres, L.A., Kunstler, G., Liancourt, P., Tielbörger, K., Travis, J.M., Anthelme, F., 2008. Facilitation in plant communities: the past, the present, and the future. Journal of Ecology 96, 18-34.

Bruckman, D., Campbell, D.R., 2016. Pollination of a native plant changes with distance and density of invasive plants in a simulated biological invasion. Am J Bot 103, 1458-1465.

Bruno, J.F., Stachowicz, J.J., Bertness, M.D., 2003. Inclusion of facilitation into ecological theory. Trends in Ecology & Evolution 18, 119-125.

Cable, D.R., 1969. Competition in the semidesert grass‐shrub type as influneced by root systems, growth habits, and soil moisture extraction. Ecology 50, 27-38.

Callaway, R.M., Pennings, S.C., 2000. Facilitation may buffer competitive effects indirect and diffuse interactions among salt marsh plants. American Naturalist 156, 416-424.

Callaway, R.M., Walker, L.R., 1997a. Competition and Facilitation A Synthetic Approach to Interactions in Plant Communities. Ecology 78, 1958-1965.

Callaway, R.M., Walker, L.R., 1997b. Competition and facilitation: a synthetic approach to interactions in plant communities. Ecology 78, 1958-1965.

Cane, J.H., Minckley, R., Kervin, L., Roulston, T.A., 2005. Temporally persistent patterns of incidence and abundance in a pollinator guild at annual and decadal scales: the bees of Larrea tridentata. Biological Journal of the Linnean Society 85, 319-329.

Cane, J.H., Tepedino, V.J., 2017. Gauging the effect of honey bee pollen collection on native bee communities. Conservation Letters 10, 205-210.

Chacoff, N.P., Vázquez, D.P., Lomáscolo, S.B., Stevani, E.L., Dorado, J., Padrón, B., 2012. Evaluating sampling completeness in a desert plant–pollinator network. Journal of Animal Ecology 81, 190-200.

Chesson, P., Gebauer, R.L., Schwinning, S., Huntly, N., Wiegand, K., Ernest, M.S., Sher, A., Novoplansky, A., Weltzin, J.F., 2004. Resource pulses, species interactions, and diversity maintenance in arid and semi-arid environments. Oecologia 141, 236-253.

Clements, F.E., Goldsmith, G.W., 1924. phytometer method in ecology.

Cline, A.R., Audisio, P., 2010. Revision of the new world short-winged flower beetles (Coleoptera: Kateretidae). Part I. Generic review and revision of Anthonaeus Horn, 1879. The Coleopterists Bulletin, 173-186.

Davis, W., Philbrick, R., 1986. Natural hybridization between Malacothrix incana and M. saxatilis var. implicata (Asteraceae: Lactuceae) on San Miguel Island, California. Madroño, 253-263.

Ellison, A.M., Bank, M.S., Clinton, B.D., Colburn, E.A., Elliott, K., Ford, C.R., Foster, D.R., Kloeppel, B.D., Knoepp, J.D., Lovett, G.M., 2005. Loss of foundation species: consequences for the structure and dynamics of forested ecosystems. Frontiers in Ecology and the Environment 3, 479-486.

Facelli, J.M., Temby, A.M., 2002. Multiple effects of shrubs on annual plant communities in arid lands of South Australia. Austral ecology 27, 422-432.

Filazzola, A., Lortie, C.J., 2014. A systematic review and conceptual framework for the mechanistic pathways of nurse plants. Global Ecology and Biogeography 23, 1335-1345.

Fleming, T.H., Holland, J.N., 1998. The evolution of obligate pollination mutualisms: senita cactus and senita moth. Oecologia 114, 368-375.

Fleming, T.H., Sahley, C.T., Holland, J.N., Nason, J.D., Hamrick, J., 2001. Sonoran Desert columnar cacti and the evolution of generalized pollination systems. Ecological Monographs 71, 511-530.

Flores, J., Jurado, E., 2003. Are nurse‐protégé interactions more common among plants from arid environments? Journal of Vegetation Science 14, 911-916.

Franco, A., De Soyza, A., Virginia, R., Reynolds, J., Whitford, W., 1994. Effects of plant size and water relations on gas exchange and growth of the desert shrub Larrea tridentata. Oecologia 97, 171-178.

Gentry, A.H., 1974. Flowering phenology and diversity in tropical Bignoniaceae. Biotropica, 64-68.

Ghazoul, J., 2006. Floral diversity and the facilitation of pollination. Journal of Ecology 94, 295-304.

Goldberg, D.E., Turkington, R., Olsvig-Whittaker, L., Dyer, A.R., 2001. Density dependence in an annual plant community: variation among life history stages. Ecological Monographs 71, 423-446.

Grissell, E.E., Schauff, M.E., 1990. A handbook of the families of Nearctic Chalcidoidea (Hymenoptera). A handbook of the families of Nearctic Chalcidoidea (Hymenoptera).

Halvorson, W.L., Patten, D.T., 1975. Productivity and flowering of winter ephemerals in relation to Sonoran Desert shrubs. American Midland Naturalist, 311-319.

Heinrich, B., Raven, P.H., 1972. Energetics and pollination ecology. Science 176, 597-602.

Holland, N.J., Fleming, T.H., 2002. Co-pollinators and specialization in the pollinating seed-consumer mutualism between senita cacti and senita moths. Oecologia 133, 534-540.

Holzapfel, C., Mahall, B.E., 1999. Bidirectional facilitation and interference between shrubs and annuals in the Mojave Desert. Ecology 80, 1747-1761.

Hurd Jr, P.D., Linsley, E.G., 1975. Some insects other than bees associated with Larrea tridentata in the southwestern United States. Proceedings of the Entomological Society of Washington.

Iler, A.M., Inouye, D.W., Høye, T.T., Miller‐Rushing, A.J., Burkle, L.A., Johnston, E.B., 2013. Maintenance of temporal synchrony between syrphid flies and floral resources despite differential phenological responses to climate. Global Change Biology 19, 2348-2359.

Inouye, D.W., Larson, B.M., Ssymank, A., Kevan, P.G., 2015. Flies and flowers III: ecology of foraging and pollination. Journal of Pollination Ecology 16, 115-133.

Jennings, W.B., 2001. Comparative flowering phenology of plants in the western Mojave Desert. Madroño, 162-171.

Kearns, C.A., Inouye, D.W., 1993. Techniques for pollination biologists. University press of Colorado.

Laverty, T.M., 1992. Plant interactions for pollinator visits: a test of the magnet species effect. Oecologia 89, 502-508.

Legendre, P., Gallagher, E.D., 2001. Ecologically meaningful transformations for ordination of species data. Oecologia 129, 271-280.

Lortie, C.J., Budden, A.E., Reid, A.M., 2012. From birds to bees: applying video observation techniques to invertebrate pollinators. Journal of Pollination Ecology 6, 125-128.

Marshall, S., 2012. Flies. The natural history and diversity of Diptera.

McIntire, E.J., Fajardo, A., 2014. Facilitation as a ubiquitous driver of biodiversity. New Phytologist 201, 403-416.

McKinney, A.M., Goodell, K., 2010. Shading by invasive shrub reduces seed production and pollinator services in a native herb. Biological Invasions 12, 2751-2763.

McPeek, M.A., Peckarsky, B.L., 1998. Life histories and the strengths of species interactions: combining mortality, growth, and fecundity effects. Ecology 79, 867-879.

Michener, C.D., 2000. The bees of the world. JHU press.

Michener, C.D., McGinley, R.J., Danforth, B.N., 1994. The bee genera of North and Central America (Hymenoptera: Apoidea). Smithsonian Institution Press.

Minckley, R.L., Cane, J.H., Kervin, L., Roulston, T., 1999. Spatial predictability and resource specialization of bees (Hymenoptera: Apoidea) at a superabundant, widespread resource. Biological Journal of the Linnean Society 67, 119-147.

Miranda, G., Young, A., Locke, M., Marshall, S., Skevington, J., Thompson, F., 2013. Key to the genera of Nearctic Syrphidae. Canadian Journal of Arthropod Identification 23, 351.

Morhardt, S., Morhardt, E., 2004. California desert flowers: an introduction to families, genera, and species. Univ of California Press.

Mosquin, T., 1971. Competition for pollinators as a stimulus for the evolution of flowering time. Oikos, 398-402.

Noma, T., Brewer, M.J., 2008. Seasonal abundance of resident parasitoids and predatory flies and corresponding soybean aphid densities, with comments on classical biological control of soybean aphid in the Midwest. Journal of Economic Entomology 101, 278-287.

Oliver, I., Beattie, A.J., 1993. A possible method for the rapid assessment of biodiversity. Conservation biology 7, 562-568.

Pellmyr, O., 2003. Yuccas, yucca moths, and coevolution: a review. Annals of the Missouri Botanical Garden, 35-55.

Petit, S., Dickson, C.R., 2005. Grass-tree (Xanthorrhoea semiplana, Liliaceae) facilitation of the endangered pink-lipped spider orchid (Caladenia syn. Arachnorchis behrii, Orchidaceae) varies in South Australia. Australian Journal of Botany 53, 455-464.

Petrů, M., Tielbörger, K., Belkin, R., Sternberg, M., Jeltsch, F., 2006. Life history variation in an annual plant under two opposing environmental constraints along an aridity gradient. Ecography 29, 66-74.

Pugnaire, F.I., Haase, P., Puigdefabregas, J., 1996. Facilitation between higher plant species in a semiarid environment. Ecology 77, 1420-1426.

Pyke, G.H., 1984. Optimal foraging theory: a critical review. Annual review of ecology and systematics 15, 523-575.

Pyke, G.H., Pulliam, H.R., Charnov, E.L., 1977. Optimal foraging: a selective review of theory and tests. The quarterly review of biology 52, 137-154.

Reid, A.M., Lortie, C.J., 2012. Cushion plants are foundation species with positive effects extending to higher trophic levels. Ecosphere 3.

Robertson, A.W., Mountjoy, C., Faulkner, B.E., Roberts, M.V., Macnair, M.R., 1999. Bumble bee selection of Mimulus guttatus flowers: the effects of pollen quality and reward depletion. Ecology 80, 2594-2606.

Roll, J., Mitchell, R.J., Cabin, R.J., Marshall, D.L., 1997. Reproductive Success Increases with Local Density of Conspecif ics in a Desert Mustard (Lesquerella fendleri) El Exito Reproductivo Incrementa con la Densidad Local de Coespecificos en la Mostaza del Desierto (Lesquerella fendleri). Conservation biology 11, 738-746.

Rousset, O., Lepart, J., 2000. Positive and negative interactions at different life stages of a colonizing species (Quercus humilis). Journal of Ecology 88, 401-412.

Rundel, P.W., Gibson, A.C., 2005. Ecological communities and processes in a Mojave Desert ecosystem. Cambridge University Press.

Rutowski, R.L., Alcock, J., 1980. Temporal variation in male copulatory behaviour in the solitary bee Nomadopsis puellae (Hymenoptera: Andrenidae). Behaviour 73, 175-187.

Ruttan, A., Filazzola, A., Lortie, C.J., 2016. Shrub-annual facilitation complexes mediate insect community structure in arid environments. Journal of Arid Environments 134, 1-9.

Saul-Gershenz, L., Millar, J., McElfresh, J., 2012. Mojave National Preserve. National Park Service U.S. Department of the Interior. , https://[www.nps.gov/moja/learn/nature/upload/201204MOJAscience.pdf](http://www.nps.gov/moja/learn/nature/upload/201204MOJAscience.pdf).

Schafer, J., Mudrak, E., Haines, C., Parag, H., Moloney, K., Holzapfel, C., 2012. The association of native and non-native annual plants with Larrea tridentata (creosote bush) in the Mojave and Sonoran Deserts. Journal of arid environments 87, 129-135.

Schemske, D.W., 1981. Floral convergence and pollinator sharing in two bee‐pollinated tropical herbs. Ecology 62, 946-954.

Schiffers, K., Tielbörger, K., 2006. Ontogenetic shifts in interactions among annual plants. Journal of Ecology 94, 336-341.

Shavit, O., Dafni, A., Ne'eman, G., 2009. Competition between honeybees (Apis mellifera) and native solitary bees in the Mediterranean region of Israel—Implications for conservation. Israel Journal of Plant Sciences 57, 171-183.

Sih, A., Baltus, M.-S., 1987. Patch size, pollinator behavior, and pollinator limitation in catnip. Ecology 68, 1679-1690.

Simpson, B., Neff, J., Moldenke, A., 1977. Reproductive systems of Larrea. Mabry, T, J,, Hunziker, J, H,, DiFeo, D, R,, jr ed (s). Creosote bush: biology and chemistry of Larrea in the New World deserts. Stroudsburg, Dowden, Hutchinson & Ross Inc, 92-114.

Simpson, B.B., Neff, J.L., 1987. Pollination Ecology in the Southwest. Aliso: A Journal of Systematic and Evolutionary Botany 11, 417-440.

Sotomayor, D.A., Lortie, C.J., 2015. Indirect interactions in terrestrial plant communities: emerging patterns and research gaps. Ecosphere 6, art103.

Sowig, P., 1989. Effects of flowering plant's patch size on species composition of pollinator communities, foraging strategies, and resource partitioning in bumblebees (Hymenoptera: Apidae). Oecologia 78, 550-558.

Suzán, H., Nabhan, G.P., Patten, D.T., 1994. Nurse plant and floral biology of a rare night‐blooming cereus, Peniocereus striatus (Brandegee) F. Buxbaum. Conservation Biology 8, 461-470.

Teskey, H., Vockeroth, J., Wood, D., 1981. Manual of Nearctic Diptera. Ottawa, Research Branch, Agriculture Canada, Monograph 27.

Thomson, J.D., 1978. Effects of Stand Composition on Insect Visitation in Two-Species Mixtures of Hieracium. American Midland Naturalist 100, 431-440.

Tielbörger, K., Kadmon, R., 2000. Temporal environmental variation tips the balance between facilitation and interference in desert plants. Ecology 81, 1544-1553.

Triplehorn, C., Johnson, N.F., 2005. Borror and delong’s introduction to the study of insects. Brooks. Cole, Belmont, California, USA.

Valiente-Banuet, A., Bolongaro-Crevenna, A., Briones, O., Ezcurra, E., Rosas, M., Nuñez, H., Barnard, G., Vazquez, E., 1991. Spatial relationships between cacti and nurse shrubs in a semi‐arid environment in central Mexico. Journal of Vegetation Science 2, 15-20.

Valiente‐Banuet, A., Verdú, M., 2007. Facilitation can increase the phylogenetic diversity of plant communities. Ecology letters 10, 1029-1036.

Van Der Putten, W.H., 2009. A multitrophic perspective on functioning and evolution of facilitation in plant communities. Journal of Ecology 97, 1131-1138.

Vasek, F.C., 1980. Creosote bush: long‐lived clones in the Mojave Desert. American Journal of Botany 67, 246-255.

Vockeroth, J., 1992. The flower flies of the subfamily Syrphinae of Canada, Alaska, and Greenland: Diptera, Syrphidae. Agriculture Canada.

Wainwright, C.M., 1978. Hymenopteran territoriality and its influences on the pollination ecology of Lupinus arizonicus. The Southwestern Naturalist, 605-615.

Waser, N.M., 1986. Flower constancy: definition, cause, and measurement. The American Naturalist 127, 593-603.

Wootton, J.T., 1994. The nature and consequences of indirect effects in ecological communities. Annual Review of Ecology and Systematics 25, 443-466.

Yeaton, R.I., 1978. A cyclical relationship between Larrea tridentata and Opuntia leptocaulis in the northern Chihuahuan Desert. The Journal of Ecology, 651-656.

Figures




Figure 1: The contribution of each recognizable taxonomic group (RTU) to the total number of flowers visited (weighted by video length) for each treatment.




Figure 2: RTU specific responses in visit duration before and during blooming at each microsite. The visit duration did not vary with microsite but showed a significant decrease with blooming. This was driven by pollinators in the ‘other’ category, which was comprised of primarily beetles and muscoid flies.



Figure 3: Heterospecific pollen deposition on the stigmas of Malacothrix glabrata increased with distance (in cm). There was a marginally significant effect of distance to nearest M. glabrata on conspecific pollen deposition. Mean distance to shrub was 1.83 m, mean distance to nearest conspecific neighbour was 0.79 m and mean number of flowers of M. glabrata was 7.




Figure 4: Pollinator visitation rates increased with the number of *Larrea tridentata* flowers.



Figure 5: Relative Interaction Index (RII) values for five community interaction metrics among two treatments: A) Microsite (Shrub – Open) B) Blooming (Pre-Blooming – Blooming). Values shown are means ± 95% bootstrapped confidence intervals. Values greater than zero indicate positive effects, while values that are significantly lower than zero indicate negative effects. Values that are not significantly different from zero are neutral.




Figure 6: Hobo Pendant Data Loggers recorded microenvironmental conditions for the extent of the study period. Values shown are mean hourly temperatures for all microsites (eight open and eight shrub) between March 17th and May 14th.

Tables

Table 1: Results from quasi-Poisson GLMM (MASS, glmmPQL) testing for RTU specific responses to blooming stage. The log-transformed length of video was used as an offset as a measure of exposure. The repID (shrub ID + microsite) was used a random effect to account for the repeated measures study design. Posthoc comparisons (lsmeans) contrasting RTU specific responses between pre-blooming and blooming were done on significant interactions. Significance was denoted at α = 0.05 and shown in bold.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Total flower visits | | |  | Foraging bouts | | |
|  | **Coeff** | **χ2** | **p** |  | **Coeff** | **χ2** | **p** |
| Microsite (shrub) | -0.337480 | 4.1903 | **0.040655** |  | -0.311383 | 4.6322 | **0.03137** |
| Blooming (bloom) | -1.729417 | 15.4730 | **< 0.0001** |  | -1.683054 | 12.2157 | **0.0004739** |
| RTU | NA | 197.0575 | **<0.0001** |  | NA | 217.5031 | **<0.00001** |
| Flowers.pot | 0.064325 | 7.8743 | **0.005014** |  | 0.042763 | 4.0741 | 0.4354 |
| RTU\*blooming | NA | 70.0222 | **<0.0001** |  | NA | 70.35 | **<0.0001** |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Contrast: Pre blooming vs blooming | | | | |  | | | |
| RTU | **Estimate** | **SE** | **t.ratio** | **p** | **estimate** | **SE** | **t.ratio** | **p** |
| Solitary bee | 1.7294 | .4419 | 3.914 | **0.0001** | 1.6831 | .4840 | 3.478 | **0.0005** |
| Bombyliidae | 0.04603 | .3886 | 0.118 | 0.9057 | 0.3956 | .3.5568 | 1.112 | 0.2662 |
| Honeybee | 24.9969 | 77838 | 0.000 | 0.9997 | 24.3349 | 65302.3 | 0.000 | 0.9997 |
| Lepidoptera | -2.4017 | 1.28900 | -1.862 | 0.0629 | -2.0771 | 1.0625 | -1.955 | 0.0508 |
| Other | -0.0197 | .2403 | -0.082 | 0.9347 | 0.1341 | .2065 | 0.64 | 0.5163 |
| Syrphid | 3.0563 | .3347 | 8.813 | **<0.0001** | 3.1228 | .3404 | 9.173 | **<0.0001** |

Table 2: Results from GLMM (glmmTMB) testing for the influence of heterospecific annual floral density and shrub blooming density on the frequency of pollinator floral visits and foraging bouts. The log-transformed length of video was used as an offset as a measure of exposure. The repID (shrub ID + microsite) was used a random effect in both models to account for the repeated measures study design. Significance was denoted at α = 0.05 and shown in bold.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Total flower visits | | | |  | Foraging bouts | | | |
|  | **Coeff** | **SE** | **z** | **p** |  | **Coeff** | **SE** | **z** | **p** |
| Microsite (shrub) | -0.3660 | 0.16944 | -2.160 | **0.03077** |  | -0.33019 | 0.14706 | -2.25 | **0.02475** |
| Blooming (bloom) | -1.2396 | 0.16353 | -7.581 | **<0.0001** |  | -1.24571 | 0.14513 | -8.58 | **<0.0001** |
| Flowers.pot | 0.08084 | 0.02711 | 2.981 | **0.00287** |  | 0.05943 | 0.02374 | 2.503 | **0.01230** |
| Heterospecific  annual bloom density | 0.04013 | 0.02342 | 1.713 | 0.08664 |  | 0.04086 | 0.01984 | 2.059 | **0.03950** |
| Microsite (shrub) | -0.3289 | 0.16998 | -1.935 | **0.05301** |  | -0.31539 | 0.14829 | -2.13 | **0.033435** |
| Blooming (bloom) | -1.1662 | 0.18601 | -6.269 | **<0.0001** |  | -1.20875 | 0.16707 | -7.24 | **<0.0001** |
| Flowers.pot | 0.07598 | 0.02703 | 2.811 | **0.00494** |  | 0.05296 | 0.02376 | 2.229 | **0.025799** |
| Heterospecific  blooming shrub density | -0.0494 | 0.04093 | -1.207 | 0.22744 |  | 0.03124 | 0.03744 | -0.84 | 0.403997 |

Table 3: Results from Gamma GLMM (lme4, glmer.nb) testing for differences visit duration and the proportion of flowers visited per visit in response to microsite (shrub and open) and blooming stage (pre-blooming and full bloom). The repID (shrub ID + microsite) was used a random effect in both models to account for the repeated measures study design. Significance was denoted at α = 0.05 and shown in bold. Non-significant interactions were excluded from all models.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Visit duration | | | | Proportion of flowers visited | | |
|  | **Coef** | | **χ2 value** | **p – value** | **Coef** | **χ2 value** | **p – value** |
| Microsite (shrub) | -0.047260 | 0.0464 | | 0.8295 | -0.03538 | 1.0051 | 0.46515 |
| Blooming (bloom) | -0.777931 | | 23.1788 | **<0.0001** | 0.0805 | 0.5335 | 0.31609 |
| Microsite \* Blooming | NA | | NA | NA | -0.20443 | 7.0691 | **0.00784** |

Table 4: Results from quasi-Poisson GLMM (MASS, glmmPQL) testing for the influence of *L. tridentata*, and two metrics of conspecific density on conspecific and heterospecific pollen deposition. Sample ID nested in flower ID nested in plant was used as a random effect to account for multiples samples coming from individual plants. Significance was denoted at α = 0.05 and shown in bold.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Conspecific Pollen Deposition | | | Heterospecific Pollen Deposition | | |
|  | **Coef** | **χ2** | **p** | **Coef** | **χ2** | **p** |
| Distance to *L. tridentata* | 0.0002 | 0.8803 | 0.3533 | 0.00130 | 23.7883 | **<0.0001** |
| Distance to *M. glabrata* | 0.0015 | 3.8146 | 0.0541 | -0.0014 | 2.1656 | 0.1411 |
| *M. glabrata* floral number | 0.0089 | 2.0027 | 0.1620 | -0.0122 | 2.3713 | 0.1236 |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Insect abundance (Melyridae: excluded) | | | Arthropod Species Richness | | | Bee abundance | | | Bee richness | | |
|  | **Coef** | **χ**2 | p | **Coef** | **χ**2 | p | **Coef** | **χ**2 | p | Coef | **χ**2 | p |
| Microsite | 0.406 | 15.49 | **<0.0001** | 0.1454 | 6.62 | **0.01** | 0.058 | 0.079 | 0.778 | -0.065 | 0.125 | 0.724 |
| Blooming | -0.396 | 13.59 | **0.00023** | -0.254 | 25.63 | **<0.0001** | -0.08 | 0.21 | 0.646 | -0.056 | 0.094 | 0.759 |
| Microsite \* Blooming | -0.277 | 3.455 | 0.063 | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
|  | **Percent cover** | | | **Annual Richness** | | | **Annual Bloom Density** | | | **Blooming shrub density within 2 m** | | |
|  | **Coef** | **χ**2 | p | **Coef** | **χ**2 | p | **Coef** | **χ**2 | p | **Coef** | **χ**2 | p |
| Microsite | 1.7599 | 165.4 | **<0.0001** | 0.0719 | 0.707 | 0.40 | -0.28 | 0.601 | 0.438 | 0.366 | 4.083 | **0.04331** |
| Blooming | -0.793 | 34.18 | **<0.0001** | 0.1407 | 2.701 | 0.10 | -1.36 | 13.36 | **0.0003** | 1.67 | 149.7 | **<0.0001** |
| Microsite \* blooming | 0.794 | 22.81 | **<0.0001** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |

Table 5: Results from GLMM testing for differences in arthopod, bee and plant communities in response to response to microsite (shrub and open) and blooming stage (full bloom and pre-blooming). Melyridae beetles comprised 1217/3384 individuals, models were fit with them excluded, included and individually. The repID (shrub ID + microsite) was used a random effect in all models to account for the repeated measures study design. Significance was denoted at α = 0.05 and shown in bold.

Table 6: Permutation test ANOVA on RDA testing for changes in influence of shrub microsite and understory annual vegetation on arthropod community composition with phenological shift into flowering of *Larrea tridentata*. The constraining variables of the pre-blooming RDA explained 12.5% of the total variation and the blooming RDA explained 4%.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Pre-blooming | | | | Blooming | | | |
|  | **Df** | **Variance** | **F** | **p** | **Df** | **Variance** | **F** | **p** |
| Microsite | 1 | 0.04396 | 9.5687 | **0.001** | 1 | 0.01074 | 2.0561 | **0.005** |
| Percent cover | 1 | 0.00688 | 1.4983 | 0.087 | 1 | 0.00507 | 0.9700 | 0.471 |
| Annual richness | 1 | 0.00443 | 0.9653 | 0.449 | 1 | 0.00701 | 1.3421 | 0.119 |
| Annual bloom density | 1 | 0.00619 | 1.3470 | 0.131 | 1 | 0.00197 | 0.3765 | 0.995 |

Appendix A

Table A1: A list of all RTU for Chapter 2. All RTU all exclusive and no individuals were double counted. 118 taxonomic groups were counted. The full dataset has been published openly (Braun and Lortie, 2018).

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Order | Superfamily | Family | Subfamily | Genus | Species | Total Collected |
| Aranae |  |  |  |  |  | 14 |
| Coleoptera |  | Buprestidae |  |  |  | 67 |
|  |  | Chrysomelidae |  |  |  | 7 |
|  |  | Coccinellidae |  |  |  | 6 |
|  |  | Curculionidae |  |  |  | 15 |
|  |  | Meloidae | Meloinae | Cysteodemus |  | 2 |
|  |  | Meloidae | Meloinae | Eupompha | Eupompha elegans | 3 |
|  |  | Meloidae | Meloinae | Lytta | Lytta auriculata | 3 |
|  |  | Meloidae | Meloinae | Lytta |  | 1 |
|  |  | Melyridae |  |  |  | 1243 |
| Diptera |  |  |  |  | Acalyptrate - Tiny | 1 |
|  |  | Anthomyiidae |  |  |  | 4 |
|  |  | Asilidae |  |  |  | 76 |
|  |  | Bombyliidae | Ussinae |  |  | 8 |
|  |  | Bombyliidae | Anthracinae | Aphoebantus |  | 2 |
|  |  | Bombyliidae |  |  |  | 23 |
|  |  | Calliphoridae |  |  |  | 1 |
|  |  | Canacidae |  |  |  | 1 |
|  |  | Cecidomyiidae |  |  |  | 55 |
|  |  | Chamaemyiidae |  |  |  | 1 |
|  |  | Chloropidae |  |  |  | 21 |
|  |  | Chyromyidae |  |  |  | 1 |
|  |  | Drosophilidae |  |  |  | 1 |
|  |  | Ephydridae |  |  |  | 12 |
|  |  | Heleomyzidae |  |  |  | 73 |
|  |  | Milichiidae |  |  |  | 10 |
|  |  | Muscidae |  |  |  | 3 |
|  |  | Mythicomyiidae |  |  |  | 258 |
|  |  | Phoridae |  |  |  | 17 |
|  |  | Pipunculidae |  |  |  | 8 |
|  |  | Richardiidae |  | Omomyia |  | 3 |
|  |  | Sarcophagidae |  |  |  | 22 |
|  |  | Sciaridae |  |  |  | 6 |
|  |  | Syrphidae | Syrphinae | Eupeodes | Eupeodes volucris | 19 |
|  |  | Syrphidae | Syrphinae | Toxomerus | Toxomerus marginatus | 1 |
|  |  | Tachinidae |  |  |  | 17 |
|  |  | Tephritidae |  |  |  | 7 |
|  |  | Therevidae |  |  |  | 4 |
| Hemiptera |  | Anthocoridae |  |  |  | 3 |
|  |  | Aphididae |  |  |  | 10 |
|  |  | Berytidae | Gampsocorinae |  | Pronotacantha annulata | 17 |
|  |  | Berytidae |  |  |  | 4 |
|  |  | Cercopidae |  |  |  | 6 |
|  |  | Cicadellidae |  |  |  | 351 |
|  |  | Delphacidae |  |  |  | 2 |
|  |  | Geocoridae |  |  |  | 14 |
|  |  | Membracidae |  |  |  | 1 |
|  |  | Miridae |  |  |  | 96 |
|  |  | Nymph |  |  |  | 176 |
|  |  | Pentamoidae |  |  |  | 6 |
|  |  | Reduviidae | Harpactorinae |  |  | 10 |
|  |  | Rhopadilae |  |  |  | 7 |
|  |  | Tingidae |  |  |  | 2 |
|  | Lygaeoidea |  |  |  |  | 21 |
|  | Psylloidea |  |  |  |  | 2 |
| Hymenoptera | Apoidea (Anthophila) | Andrenidae | Andreninae |  | Ancylandrena larreae | 1 |
|  |  |  | Andreninae | Andrena |  | 2 |
|  |  |  | Panurginae | Calliopsis |  | 1 |
|  |  |  | Andreninae |  | Megandrena encelia | 14 |
|  |  | Apidae | Apinae |  | Apis mellifera | 4 |
|  |  |  | Apinae | Diadasia |  | 12 |
|  |  |  | Apinae | Eucera |  | 2 |
|  |  |  | Apinae | Mellisodes |  | 4 |
|  |  | Andrenidae | Panurginae | Perdita |  | 1 |
|  |  | Colletidae | Colletinae | Colletes |  | 2 |
|  |  | Halictidae | Halictinae | Halictus |  | 7 |
|  |  |  | Halictinae | Lasioglossum |  | 72 |
|  |  | Megachilidae | Megachilinae | Anthidium |  | 4 |
|  |  |  | Megachilinae | Ashmeadiella |  | 4 |
|  |  |  | Megachilinae | Atoposmia |  | 1 |
|  |  |  | Megachilinae | Hoplitis |  | 1 |
|  |  |  | Megachilinae | Megachile |  | 1 |
|  |  |  | Megachilinae | Osmia |  | 9 |
|  |  | Melittidae | Dasypodainae | Hesperapis |  | 2 |
|  | Apoidea (wasps) | Crabronidae |  |  |  | 39 |
|  |  | Crabronidae | Pemphredoninae |  |  | 27 |
|  |  | Crabronidae | Astatinae | Dryudella |  | 1 |
|  |  | Crabronidae | Crabroninae | Miscophus |  | 25 |
|  |  | Sphecidae | Ammophilinae | Ammophila |  | 4 |
|  |  | Sphecidae |  |  |  | 1 |
|  | Chrysidoidea | Chrysididae |  |  |  | 12 |
|  |  | Dryinidae |  |  |  | 1 |
|  | Formicidoidea | Formicidae |  |  |  | 71 |
|  | [Pompiloidea](https://bugguide.net/node/view/787796) | Mutillidae |  |  |  | 11 |
|  |  | Myrmosidae |  |  |  | 1 |
|  |  | Pompilidae |  |  |  | 13 |
|  | [Vespoidea](https://bugguide.net/node/view/117329) | Vespidae | Eumeninae |  |  | 1 |
| Parasitica |  | Ceraphronidae |  |  |  | 6 |
|  |  | Megaspilidae |  |  |  | 1 |
|  | Ceraphronoidea |  |  |  | wingless | 1 |
|  |  | Platygastridae |  |  |  | 7 |
|  | Chalcidoidea | Chalcididae |  |  |  | 3 |
|  |  | Encrytidae |  |  |  | 23 |
|  |  | Eucharitidae |  |  |  | 2 |
|  |  | Eulophidae |  |  |  | 16 |
|  |  | Eupelmidae |  |  |  | 13 |
|  |  | Eurytomidae |  |  |  | 4 |
|  |  | Mymaridae |  |  |  | 1 |
|  |  | Perilampidae |  |  |  | 1 |
|  |  | Pteromalidae |  |  |  | 25 |
|  |  | Torymidae |  |  |  | 10 |
|  |  | Trichogrammatidae |  |  |  | 4 |
|  |  | Signiphoridae |  |  |  | 3 |
|  | [Cynipoidea](https://bugguide.net/node/view/14738) | Figitidae |  |  |  | 1 |
|  | Ichnuemoidea | Braconidae |  |  |  | 1 |
|  |  | Ichneumonidae | Tersilochinae |  |  | 1 |
|  |  | Ichneumonidae |  |  |  | 1 |
| Lepidoptera | Adeloidea |  |  |  |  | 1 |
| Lepidoptera |  | Nymphalidae |  |  |  | 2 |
| Lepidoptera |  | Papilionidae |  |  |  | 1 |
| Lepidoptera |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |
| Microcorphyia |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |
| Neuroptera |  | Chrysopidae |  |  |  | 1 |
| Orthoptera |  |  |  |  |  | 19 |
| Solifugae |  |  |  |  |  | 3 |
| Thysanoptera |  |  |  |  |  | 137 |
| Trichoptera |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |

Appendix B

Model selection from results of Table 1, full model of Table 1 and RTU interaction models for Table 3

Table B1: Likelihood ratio test comparison of random intercept model, additive and interaction GLMM negative binomial models for where total flower visits are the response variable. Null model is flowers.pot with the random intercept, additive is flower.pot + blooming + microsite and interaction in flowers.pot + blooming \* microsite.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Model | DF | AIC | BIC | Chisq | P > Chisq |
| Null | 4 | 1164.8 | 1178.6 |  |  |
| Additive | 6 | 1111.6 | 1132.3 | 57.1788 | <0.00001 |
| Interaction term | 7 | 1113.6 | 1137.8 | 0.0322 | 0.8576 |

Table B2: Likelihood ratio test comparison of random intercept model, additive and interaction GLMM negative binomial models for where total plant visits are the response variable. Null model is flowers.pot with the random intercept, additive is flower.pot + blooming + microsite and interaction in flowers.pot + blooming \* microsite.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Model | DF | AIC | BIC | Chisq | P > Chisq |
| Null | 4 | 1066.0 | 1079.8 |  |  |
| Additive | 6 | 1000.7 | 1021.5 | 69.2940 | <0.00001 |
| Interaction term | 7 | 1002.7 | 1026.9 | 0.0072 | 0.9326 |

Table B3: Results from negative binomial generalized linear mixed models (lme4, glmer.nb) testing for differences in the frequency of pollinator floral visits and foraging bouts in response to microsite (shrub and open) and blooming stage (pre-blooming and full bloom). Conspecific floral density was included as a predictor and the log-transformed length of video was used as an offset as a measure of exposure. The repID (shrub ID + microsite) was used a random effect in both models to account for the repeated measures study design. Significance was denoted at α = 0.05 and shown in bold. Non-significant interactions were excluded from all models.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Total flower visits | | | Foraging bouts | | |
|  | **Coeff** | **χ2** | **p** | **Coeff** | **χ2** | **p** |
| Microsite (shrub) | -0.3493 | 4.4979 | **0.03396** | -0.3258 | 5.1183 | **0.0237** |
| Blooming (bloom) | -1.2473 | 61.52 | **<0.0001** | -1.2513 | 76.883 | **<0.0001** |
| Flowers.pot | 0.0694 | 6.9013 | **0.0086** | 0.0474 | 4.1109 | **0.0426** |
| Microsite \* Blooming | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |

Table B4: Full models. Quasipoisson GLMM (glmmPQL, MASS) with three-way interaction term for RTU\*blooming\*microsite. This output from Wald’s Type 3 test. Total flower visits and foraging bouts as response. Rep ID as random effect.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Flower visits | | | Foraging bouts | | |
|  | **χ2** | Df | p | **χ2** | Df | p |
| Blooming | 16.3114 | 1 | **<0.0001** | 11.2812 | 1 | **0.0007829** |
| RTU | 121.683 | 5 | **<0.0001** | 131.340 | 5 | **<0.0001** |
| Microsite | 6.7008 | 1 | **0.009637** | 3.6569 | 1 | 0.0558390 |
| Flowers.pot | 9.4194 | 1 | **0.002147** | 4.5640 | 1 | **0.0326507** |
| Blooming:RTU | 56.9111 | 5 | **<0.0001** | 53.0033 | 5 | **<0.0001** |
| Blooming:microsite | 3.6394 | 1 | 0.056426 | 2.3436 | 1 | 0.1258002 |
| Rtu:microsite | 5.4996 | 5 | 0.357984 | 3.8289 | 5 | 0.5743031 |
| Blooming:RTU:  microsite | 7.5190 | 5 | 0.184812 | 4.1995 | 5 | 0.5210663 |

Table B5: GLMM models for proportions of flowers visited including Blooming \* RTU interaction to test for differences in RTU response to blooming stage

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Estimate | Std Error | Z | P |
| Blooming | -0.116064 | 0.140156 | -0.828 | 0.40761 |
| RTU.Bombylid | -0.247470 | 0.112323 | -2.203 | 0.02758 |
| RTU.Honeybee | 0.186243 | 0.240711 | 0.774 | 0.43910 |
| RTU.Lep | -0.329590 | 0.262264 | -1.257 | 0.20886 |
| RTU.Other | -0.300436 | 0.095633 | -3.142 | 0.00168 |
| RTU.Syrphid | -0.173276 | 0.085192 | -2.034 | 0.04196 |
| Blooming \* RTU.Bombylid | 0.202234 | 0.174650 | 1.158 | 0.24689 |
| Blooming\* RTU.Lep | 0.069411 | 0.297303 | 0.233 | 0.81540 |
| Blooming \* RTU.Other | 0.033465 | 0.153065 | 0.219 | 0.82693 |
| Blooming \* Syrphid | 0.006737 | 0.171338 | 0.039 | 0.96863 |

Table B6: GLMM models for proportions of flowers visited including Microsite \* RTU interaction to test for differences in RTU response to microsite

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Estimate | Std Error | Z | P |
| Microsite | -0.2956 | 0.1499 | -1.973 | 0.04852 |
| RTU.Bombylid | -0.3373 | 0.1226 | -2.752 | 0.00592 |
| RTU.Honeybee | 0.3531 | 0.2415 | 1.462 | 0.14375 |
| RTU.Lep | -0.4734 | 0.1472 | -3.215 | 0.00131 |
| RTU.Other | -0.4738 | 0.1117 | -4.243 | 2.2e-05 |
| RTU.Syrphid | -0.3421 | 0.1079 | -3.172 | 0.00152 |
| Microsite \* RTU.Bombylid | 0.2888 | 0.1717 | 1.682 | 0.09253 |
| Microsite \* RTU.Lep | 0.2057 | 0.2111 | 0.974 | 0.32988 |
| Microsite \* RTU.Other | 0.2655 | 0.1486 | 1.787 | 0.07399 |
| Microsite \* Syrphid | 0.3527 | 0.1410 | 2.502 | 0.01235 |

Table B7: Post-hoc constrast (lsmeans) on significant interaction from Table B6.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Proportion of flowers visited | | | |
| Contrast | **Estimate** | **SE** | **t.ratio** | **p** |
| Open, bee – shrub, bee | 0.2956276573 | 0.14985202 | 1.973 | 0.7122 |
| Open, bombylid – shrub, bombylid | 0.0067785545 | 0.12221348 | 0.055 | 1.0000 |
| Open, honeybee – shrub, honeybee | nonEst | NA | NA | **NA** |
| Open, lep – Shrub, lep | 0.0899409512 | 0.17203545 | 0.523 | 1.0000 |
| Open, other – Shrub, other | 0.0301074801 | 0.08727658 | 0.345 | 1.0000 |
| Open, syrphid – shrub, syrphid | -0.0570436624 | 0.08160285 | -0.699 | 0.9999 |

Appendix C

Table C1: GLMM for arthropod abundance – Melyridae included and Melyridae only.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Insect abundance (Melyridae: included) | | | Melyridae: abundance only | | |
|  | **Coef** | **χ2** | **p** | **Coef** | **χ2** | **p** |
| Microsite (shrub) | -0.09872 | 1.808 | 0.1787 | -1.1920 | 38.0394 | **0<0.0001** |
| Blooming (in bloom) | -0.39280 | 33.553 | **<0.00001** | -0.2989 | 3.3485 | 0.067267 |
| Microsite \* Blooming | NA | NA | NA | 0.6521 | 7.1290 | **0.007585** |

Table C2: Post-hoc contrasts interaction for abundance (Melyridae only) for microsite by

blooming. Significant is at alpha < 0.05 and indicated in bold.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Contrast | Estimate | SE | Z | p |
| pre,open - post,open | 0.2989089 | 0.1633482 | 1.830 | 0.2592 |
| pre,open - post,open | 1.1920062 | 0.1932688 | 6.168 | **<.0001** |
| pre,open - post,shrub | 0.8388073 | 0.1826136 | 4.593 | **<.0001** |
| post,open - pre,shrub | 0.8930973 | 0.1906721 | 4.684 | **<.0001** |
| post,open - post,shrub | 0.5398984 | 0.1799142 | 3.001 | **0.0143** |
| pre,shrub - post,shrub | -0.3531989 | 0.1815186 | -1.946 | 0.2090 |

Appendix D: Post-hoc contrasts

Table D1: Results from post-hoc test (lsmeans, Tukey’s) for the Gamma generalized linear mixed model on significant interaction for proportion of flowers visited. Significance was denoted at α = 0.05 and shown in bold. Proportion of flowers visited

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Proportion of flowers visited | | | |
| Contrast | **Estimate** | **SE** | **t.ratio** | **p** |
| pre,open - post,open | 0.03537548 | 0.04843350 | 0.730 | 0.8849 |
| pre,open - pre,shrub | -0.08050042 | 0.08029773 | -1.003 | 0.7479 |
| pre,open - post,shrub | 0.15930471 | 0.08775466 | 1.815 | 0.2660 |
| post,open - pre,shrub | -0.11587589 | 0.08384195 | -1.382 | 0.5106 |
| post,open - post,shrub | 0.12392924 | 0.09113159 | 1.360 | 0.5247 |
| pre,shrub - post,shrub | 0.23980513 | 0.05952906 | 4.028 | **0.0003** |