**Table S2.** Observed and estimated interaction richness for weekly plant-pollinator observations. We assessed our weekly plant-pollinator interaction sampling consistency and completeness by comparing the observed interaction richness with estimated interaction richness according to two non-parametric abundance based richness estimators, Chao 1 and ACE (abundance-based coverage estimator) (Lee & Chao 1994; Chao 2005). We used the Chao 1 and ACE richness estimators over other presence/absence richness estimators because our interaction data are inherently abundance based (Colwell & Coddington 1994; Gotelli & Colwell 2001; Chao 2005).

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Year** | **Week** | **Observed** | **Chao 1** | **Proportion sampled** | **ACE** | **Proportion sampled** |
| 2013 | 1 | 10 | 12 | 0.833 | 11 | 0.952 |
|  | 2 | 30 | 30 | 0.993 | 31 | 0.979 |
|  | 3 | 26 | 28 | 0.920 | 28 | 0.921 |
|  | 4 | 19 | 23 | 0.826 | 20 | 0.943 |
|  | 5 | 28 | 30 | 0.940 | 30 | 0.947 |
|  | 6 | 35 | 38 | 0.929 | 38 | 0.923 |
|  | 7 | 28 | 31 | 0.897 | 31 | 0.900 |
|  | 8 | 24 | 25 | 0.947 | 25 | 0.957 |
|  | 9 | 25 | 25 | 0.984 | 26 | 0.980 |
|  | 10 | 38 | 39 | 0.987 | 39 | 0.980 |
|  | 11 | 24 | 27 | 0.885 | 25 | 0.950 |
| 2014 | 1 | 15 | 19 | 0.781 | 17 | 0.879 |
|  | 2 | 13 | 26 | 0.510 | 16 | 0.839 |
|  | 3 | 31 | 35 | 0.883 | 33 | 0.926 |
|  | 4 | 30 | 55 | 0.550 | 32 | 0.936 |
|  | 5 | 47 | 63 | 0.745 | 53 | 0.894 |
|  | 6 | 30 | 31 | 0.962 | 32 | 0.950 |
|  | 7 | 51 | 58 | 0.887 | 55 | 0.921 |
|  | 8 | 46 | 58 | 0.793 | 50 | 0.915 |
|  | 9 | 64 | 74 | 0.861 | 71 | 0.899 |
|  | 10 | 56 | 72 | 0.775 | 61 | 0.923 |
|  | 11 | 33 | 35 | 0.936 | 35 | 0.951 |
|  | 12 | 29 | 30 | 0.954 | 30 | 0.954 |
|  | 13 | 43 | 53 | 0.811 | 46 | 0.929 |
|  | 14 | 45 | 53 | 0.847 | 47 | 0.950 |
|  | 15 | 30 | 36 | 0.824 | 32 | 0.935 |
| 2015 | 1 | 10 | 10 | 1.000 | 10 | 1.000 |
|  | 2 | 28 | 39 | 0.725 | 31 | 0.906 |
|  | 3 | 24 | 29 | 0.842 | 25 | 0.968 |
|  | 4 | 41 | 45 | 0.911 | 44 | 0.936 |
|  | 5 | 69 | 71 | 0.976 | 72 | 0.965 |
|  | 6 | 71 | 82 | 0.867 | 81 | 0.872 |
|  | 7 | 84 | 96 | 0.875 | 90 | 0.929 |
|  | 8 | 78 | 90 | 0.869 | 85 | 0.917 |
|  | 9 | 80 | 89 | 0.903 | 88 | 0.913 |
|  | 10 | 86 | 104 | 0.827 | 95 | 0.907 |
|  | 11 | 96 | 105 | 0.914 | 101 | 0.952 |
|  | 12 | 89 | 103 | 0.868 | 95 | 0.936 |
|  | 13 | 69 | 73 | 0.943 | 72 | 0.962 |
|  | 14 | 47 | 55 | 0.861 | 51 | 0.923 |
|  | 15 | 38 | 46 | 0.826 | 39 | 0.977 |
|  | 16 | 22 | 35 | 0.638 | 24 | 0.936 |
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