Title

Hairiness: the missing link between pollinators and pollination

Authors

Jamie R. Stavert[1*], Gustavo Liñán[2], Jacqueline R. Beggs[1], Brad G. Howlett[3], David E. Pattemore[4], and Ignasi Bartomeus[5]

*Corresponding author: jamie.stavert@gmail.com

Corresponding author ORCID ID: 0000-0002-2103-5320

[1] Centre for Biodiversity and Biosecurity, School of Biological Sciences, The University of Auckland, Auckland, New Zealand

[2] Instituto de Microelectrónica de Sevilla (IMSE-CNM), Avda. Américo Vespucio s/n, Isla de la Cartuja, E-41092 Sevilla, Spain

[3] The New Zealand Institute for Plant & Food Research Limited, Christchurch, New Zealand

[4] The New Zealand Institute for Plant & Food Research Limited, Hamilton, New Zealand

[5] Estación Biológica de Doñana (EBD-CSIC), Integrative Ecology Department. Avda. Américo Vespucio s/n, Isla de la Cartuja, E-41092 Sevilla, Spain

Abstract

Background. Functional traits are the primary biotic component driving organism influence on ecosystem functions; in consequence traits are widely used in ecological research. However, most animal trait-based studies use easy-to-measure characteristics of species that are at best only weakly associated with functions. Animal-mediated pollination is a key ecosystem function and is likely to be influenced by pollinator traits, but to date no one has identified functional traits that are simple to measure and have good predictive power.

Methods. Here, we show that a simple, easy to measure trait (hairiness) can predict pollinator effectiveness with high accuracy. We used a novel image analysis method to calculate entropy values for insect body surfaces as a measure of hairiness. We evaluated the power of our method for predicting pollinator effectiveness by regressing pollinator hairiness (entropy) against single visit pollen deposition (SVD) and pollen loads on insects. We used linear models and AIC_C model selection to determine which body regions were the best predictors of SVD and pollen load.

Results. We found that hairiness can be used as a robust proxy of SVD. The best models for predicting SVD for the flower species *Brassica rapa* and *Actinidia deliciosa* were hairiness on the face and thorax as predictors ($R^2 = 0.98$ and 0.91 respectively). The best model for predicting pollen load for *B. rapa* was hairiness on the face ($R^2 = 0.81$).

Discussion. We suggest that the match between pollinator body region hairiness and plant reproductive structure morphology is a powerful predictor of pollinator effectiveness. We show that pollinator hairiness is strongly linked to pollination – an important ecosystem

function, and provide a rigorous and time-efficient method for measuring hairiness. Identifying and accurately measuring key traits that drive ecosystem processes is critical as global change increasingly alters ecological communities, and subsequently, ecosystem functions worldwide.

Introduction

Trait-based approaches are now widely used in functional ecology, from the level of individual organisms to ecosystems (Cadotte et al. 2011). Functional traits are defined as the characteristics of an organism's phenotype that determine its effect on ecosystem level processes (Naeem & Wright 2003; Petchey & Gaston 2006). Accordingly, functional traits are recognised as the primary biotic component by which organisms influence ecosystem functions (Gagic et al. 2015; Hillebrand & Matthiessen 2009). Trait-based research is dominated by studies on plants and primary productivity, and little is known about key traits for animal-mediated and multi-trophic functions, particularly for terrestrial invertebrates (Didham et al. 2016; Gagic et al. 2015; Lavorel et al. 2013).

Most animal trait-based studies simply quantify easy-to-measure morphological characteristics, without a mechanistic underpinning to demonstrate these "traits" have any influence on the ecosystem function of interest (Didham et al. 2016). This results in low predictive power, particularly where trait selection lacks strong justification through explicit ecological questions (Gagic et al. 2015; Petchey & Gaston 2006). If the ultimate goal of trait-based ecology is to identify the mechanisms that drive biodiversity impacts on ecosystem function, then traits must be quantifiable at the level of the individual organism, and be inherently linked to an ecosystem function (Bolnick et al. 2011; Pasari et al. 2013; Violle et al. 2007).

Methodology that allows collection of trait data in a rigorous yet time-efficient manner and with direct functional interpretation will greatly enhance the power of trait-based studies. Instead of subjectively selecting a large number of traits with unspecified links to ecosystem functions, it would be better to identify fewer, uncorrelated traits, that have a strong bearing on the function of interest (Carmona et al. 2016). Selecting traits that are measurable on a continuous scale, would also improve predictive power of studies (McGill et al. 2006; Violle et al. 2012). However, far greater time and effort is required to measure such traits, exacerbating the already demanding nature of trait-based community ecology (Petchey & Gaston 2006).

Animal-mediated pollination is a multi-trophic function, driven by the interaction between animal pollinators and plants (Kremen et al. 2007). A majority of the world's wild plant species are pollinated by animals (Ollerton et al. 2011), and over a third of global crops are dependent on animal pollination (Klein et al. 2007b). Understanding which pollinator traits determine the effectiveness of different pollinators is critical to understanding the mechanisms of pollination processes. However, current traits used in pollination studies often have weak associations with pollination function and/or have low predictive power. For example Larsen, Williams & Kremen (2005) used body mass to explain pollen deposition by solitary bees even when the relationship was weak and non-significant. Many trait-based pollination studies have subsequently used body mass or similar size measures, despite their low predictive power. Similarly, Hoehn et al (2008) used spatial and temporal visitation preferences of bees to explain differences in plants reproductive output. They found significant relationships (i.e. low *P* values) between spatial and temporal visitation preferences and seed set, but with small R^2 values, suggesting these traits have weak predictive power. To advance trait-based pollination research we require traits that are good predictors of pollination success.

Observational studies suggest that insect body hairs are important for collecting pollen that is used by insects for food and larval provisioning (Holloway 1976; Thorp 2000). Hairs facilitate active pollen collection, e.g., many bees have specialised hair structures called scopae that are used to transport pollen to the nest for larval provisioning (Thorp 2000). Additionally, both bees and flies have hairs distributed across their body surfaces which act to passively collect pollen for adult feeding (Holloway 1976). Differences in the density and distribution of hairs on pollen feeding insects likely reflects their feeding behaviour, the types of flowers they visit, and whether they use pollen for adult feeding and/or larval provisioning (Thorp 2000). However, despite anecdotal evidence that insect body hairs are important for pollen collection and pollination, there is no proven method for measuring hairiness, nor is there evidence that hairier insects are more effective pollinators.

Here, we present a novel method based on image entropy analysis for quantifying pollinator hairiness. We define pollination effectiveness as single visit pollen deposition (SVD): the number of conspecific pollen grains deposited on a virgin stigma in a single visit (King et al. 2013; Ne'eman et al. 2010). SVD is a measure of an insects' ability to acquire free pollen grains on the body surface and accurately deposit them on a conspecific stigma. We predict that hairiness, specifically on the body parts that contact the stigma, will have a strong association with SVD. We show that the best model for predicting pollinator SVD for pak choi *Brassica rapa* is highly predictive and includes hairiness of the face and thorax dorsal regions as predictors, and the face region alone explains more than 90% of the variation. Similarly, the best model for predicting SVD for kiwifruit *Actinidia deliciosa* includes the face and thorax ventral regions and has good predictive power. Our novel method for measuring hairiness is rigorous, time efficient and inherently linked to pollination function. Accordingly, this method could be applied in diverse trait-based pollination studies to progress understanding of the mechanisms that drive pollination processes.

Materials and Methods

Imaging for hairiness analysis

We photographed pinned insect specimens using the Visionary Digital Passport portable imaging system (Figure 1). Images were taken with a Canon EOS 5D Mark II digital camera (5616 x 3744 pix). The camera colour profile was sRGB IEC61966-2.1, focal length was 65mm and F-number was 4.5. We used ventral, dorsal and frontal shots with clear illumination to minimise reflection from shinny insect body surfaces. All photographs were taken on a plain white background. Raw images were exported to Helicon Focus 6 where they were stacked and stored in .jpg file format.

Image processing and analysis

We produced code to quantify insect pollinator hairiness using MATLAB (MathWorks, Natick, MA, USA), and functions from the MATLAB Image Processing ToolBox. We quantified relative hairiness by creating an entropy image for each insect photograph, and computed the average entropy within user-defined regions (Gonzales et al. 2004). To calculate entropy values for each image we designed three main functions. The first function allows the user to define up to four regions of interest (RoIs) within each image. The user can define regions by drawing contours as closed polygonal lines of any arbitrary number of vertexes. All information about regions (location, area and input image file name) is stored as a structure in a .mat file.

The second function executes image pre-processing. We found that some insects had pollen grains or other artefacts attached to their bodies, which would alter the entropy results. Our pre-processing function eliminates these objects from the image by running two filtering processes. First, the function eliminates small objects with an area less than the user definable threshold (8 pixels by default). For the first task, each marked region is segmented using an optimized threshold obtained by applying a spatially dependant thresholding technique. Once each region has been segmented, a labelling process is executed for all resulting objects and those with an area smaller than the minimum value defined by the user are removed. Secondly, as pollen grains are often round in shape, the function eliminates near-circular objects. The perimeter of each object is calculated and its similarity to a circle (S) id defined as:

$$S = \frac{4\pi \cdot Area}{Perimeter^2}$$

Objects with a similarity coefficient not within the bounds defined by the user (5% by default) are also removed from the image. Perimeter calculation is carried out by finding the object’s boundary, and computing the accumulated distance from pixel centre to pixel centre across the border, rather than simply counting the number of pixels in the border. The entropy filter will not process objects that have been marked as “deleted” by the pre-processing function. This initial pre-processing provides flexibility by allowing users to define the minimum area threshold and the degree of similarity of objects to a circle. Users can also disable the image pre-processing by toggling a flag when running the entropy filter.

Once pre-processing is complete, each image is passed to the third function, which is the entropy filter calculation stage. The entropy filter produces an overall measure of randomness within each of the user defined regions on the image. In information theory, entropy (also expressed as Shannon Entropy) is an indicator of the average amount of information contained in a message (Shannon 1948). Therefore, Shannon Entropy, H, of a discrete random variable X that can take *n* possible values $\{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n\}$, with a probability mass function $P(X)$ is given by:

$$H(X) = -\sum_{i=1}^{n} P(x_i) \cdot Log_2(P(x_i))$$

When this definition is used in image processing, local entropy defines the degree of complexity (variability) within a given neighbourhood around a pixel. In our case, this neighbourhood (often referred to as the structuring element) is a disk with radius r (we call the radius of influence) that can be defined by the user (7 pixels by default). Thus for a given pixel in position (*i*,*j*) in the input image, the entropy filter computes the histogram G_{ij} (using 256 bins) of all pixels within its radius of influence, and returns its entropy value H_{ij} as:

$$H_{ij} = -G_{ij} \cdot log_2(G_{ij})$$

where G_{ij} is a vector containing the histogram results for pixel (*i*,*j*) and (·) is the dot product operator. Using default parameters, our entropy filter employs a 7 pixel (13 x 13 neighbourhood) radius of influence, and a disk-shaped structuring element, which we determined based on the size of hairs. Therefore, in the entropy image, each pixel takes a value of entropy when considering 160 pixels around it (by default). We determined the optimal radius of influence for the entropy filter by running our entropy function with the radius of influence set as a variable parameter. We then visually compared the contrast in areas of low vs. high hairiness in the resulting entropy images (i.e. Figure 1). We found that a 7 pixel radius of influence gave the best contrast between low and high hairiness areas for our species set. Hair thickness values across species typically ranged between 3.5-4.5 pixels and therefore, the 7 pixel radius of influence is approximately two times the width of a hair.

The definition of the optimum radius of influence depends on the size of the morphological responsible for the complexity in the RoI. This is defined not only by the physical size of these features but also by the pixel-to-millimetre scaling factor (i.e. number of pixels in the sensor plane per mm in the scene plane). Thus, although 7 pixels is the optimum in our case to detect hairs, the entropy filter function takes this radius as an external parameter which can be adjusted by the user to meet their needs.

The entropy filter function is a process that runs over three different entropy layers (E_R, E_G, E_B), one for each of the camera's colour channels (Red, Green, and Blue), for each input image. These three images are combined into a final combined entropy image E_S, where each pixel in position (i,j) takes the value $E_{S(i,j)}$:

$$E_{S(i,j)} = E_{R(i,j)} \cdot E_{G(i,j)} \cdot E_{G(i,j)}$$

Once entropy calculations are complete, our function computes averages and standard deviations of E_S within each of the regions previously defined by the user, and writes the results into a .csv file (one row per image). Entropy values produced by this function are consistent for different photos of the same region on the same specimen (Supporting Information 6; Table S2). The scripts for the image pre-processing, region marking and entropy analysis functions are provided, along with a MATLAB tutorial (Supporting Information 1-4).

Hairiness as a predictor of SVD and pollen load

Chris Cutler 2016-10-29 6:23 PM
Comment [1]: Is this supposed to be a second-level heading without text? If so, the next heading ("Model flower floral biology and pollinator collection") and others should be a different format. Or, should this heading be removed?

Model flower floral biology and pollinator collection

We used pak choi *Brassica rapa* var. *chinensis* (Brassicaceae) and kiwifruit *Actinidia deliciosa* (Actinidiaceae) as model flowers to determine if our measurement of insect hairiness is a good predictor of pollinator effectiveness.

Both *B. rapa* and *A. deliciosa* are important mass flowering global food crops (Klein et al. 2007a; Rader et al. 2009). *B. rapa* has an actinomorphic open pollinated yellow flower with four sepals, four petals, and six stamens (four long and two short) (Walker et al. 1999). The nectaries are located in the centre of the flower, between the stamens and the petals, forcing pollinators to introduce their head between the petals. *B. rapa* shows increased seed set in the presence of insect pollinators and the flowers are visited by a diverse assemblage of insects that differ in their ability to transfer pollen (Rader et al. 2013). *A. deliciosa* is dioecious with individual plants producing either male or female flowers. Flowers are large (4-6 cm in diameter) and typically have 5-9 white/cream coloured petals (Devi et al. 2015). Flowers have multiple stamens and staminodes with yellow anthers. Female flowers have a large stigma with multiple branches that form a brush-like structure. Both male and female flowers do not produce nectar but both produce pollen, which acts as a reward to visitors. Like *B. rapa*, *A. deliciosa* flowers are visited by a diverse range of insects that differ in their ability to transfer pollen, and seed set is increased in the presence of insect pollinators (Craig et al. 1988).

We collected pollinating insects for image analysis during the summer of December 2014 – January 2015. Insects were chilled immediately and then killed by freezing within 1 day and stored at -18°C in individual vials. All insects were identified to species level with assistance from expert taxonomists.

Image processing

We measured the hairiness of 10 insect pollinator species (*n*=8-10 individuals per species), across five families and two orders. This included social, semi-social and solitary bees and pollinating flies. Regions marked included: 1) face; 2) head dorsal; 3) head ventral; 4) front leg; 5) thorax dorsal; 6) thorax ventral; 7) abdomen dorsal and 8) abdomen ventral. All entropy analysis was carried out using our image processing method outlined above.

Single visit pollen deposition (SVD) and pollen load

For *B. rapa* we used SVD data for insect pollinators presented in Rader et al. (2009) and Howlett et al. (2011); a brief description of their methods follows.

Pollen deposition on stigmatic surfaces (SVD) was estimated using manipulation experiments. Virgin *B. rapa* inflorescences were bagged to exclude all pollinators. Once flowers had opened, the bag was removed, and flowers were observed until an insect visited and contacted the stigma in a single visit. The stigma was then removed and stored in gelatine-fuchsin and the insect was captured for later identification. SVD was quantified by counting all *B. rapa* pollen grains on the stigma. Mean values of SVD for each species are used in our regression models.

To quantify the number of pollen grains carried (pollen load), sensu Howlett et al. (2011), collected insects while foraging on *B. rapa* flowers. Insects were captured using plastic vials containing a rapid killing agent (ethyl acetate). Once dead, a cube of gelatine-fuchsin was used to remove all pollen from the insect’s body surface. Pollen collecting structures (e.g., corbiculae, scopae) were not included in analyses because pollen from these structures is not available for pollination. Slides were prepared in the field by melting the gelatine-fuchsin cubes containing pollen samples onto microscope slides. *B. rapa* pollen grains from each sample were then quantified by counting pollen grains in an equal-area subset from the sample and multiplying this by the number of equivalent sized subset areas within the total sample.

We measured SVD for *A. deliciosa* (*n* = 8-12 per pollinator species). SVD measurements were taken for insect movements from staminate to pistillate flowers, using a method that differed from *B. rapa*. Individual pistillate buds were enclosed within paper bags 2-3 days prior to opening, and were later used as test flowers to evaluate pollen deposition by flowering visiting species. Each bag was secured using a wire tie (coated in plastic) that was gently twisted to exclude pollinators from visiting the opening flowers. Following flower opening, the bag was removed and the flower pedicel abscised where it joined the vine. The test flower was then carefully positioned using forceps to hold the pedicel 1-2 cm from a staminate flower containing a foraging insect, avoiding any contacting between flowers. If the test flower was visited by an insect, we allowed it to forage with minimal disturbance until it moved from the flower on its own accord. The first stigma touched by the foraging insect was then lightly marked near its base using a fine black felt pen. We then placed the marked stigma onto a slide and applied a drop of Alexander stain (Dafni 2007). Alexander stain was used due to its effectiveness to stain staminate and pistillate pollen differently (pistillate pollen - green-blue, staminate pollen - dark red) (Goodwin & Perry 1992).

Statistical analyses

We used linear regression models and AIC$_C$ (small sample corrected Akaike information criteria) model selection to determine if our measure of pollinator hairiness is a good predictor of SVD and pollen load. We constructed global models with SVD or pollen load as the response variable, body region as predictors and body length as an interaction i.e. SVD or pollen load ~ body length * entropy face + entropy head dorsal + entropy head ventral + front leg + entropy thorax dorsal + entropy thorax ventral + entropy abdomen dorsal + entropy abdomen ventral. Global linear models were constructed using the lm(stats) function. We excluded other body size measurements from models as they had high correlation coefficients (Pearson's r > 0.7) with body length. AIC_C model selection was carried out on the global models using the function glmulti() with fitfunction = "lm" in the package *glmulti*. We examined heteroscedasticity and normality of errors of models by visually inspecting diagnostic plots using the *glmulti* package (Crawley 2002). Variance inflation factors (VIF) of predictor variables were checked for the best models using the vif() function in the *car* package. All analyses were done in R version 3.2.4 (R Development Core Team 2014).

Chris Cutler 2016-10-29 6:18 PM

Comment [2]: What were these? Not clear above that other body size measurements were done, or how these were done. Was this only length? If so, just say "length", not "body size"

Results

Body hairiness as a predictor of SVD

For SVD on *B. rapa*, the face and thorax dorsal regions were retained in the best model selected by AIC_C, which had an adjusted R^2 value of 0.98. The subsequent top models within 10 AIC_C points all retained the face and thorax dorsal regions and additionally included the abdomen ventral (adjusted $R^2 = 0.98$), head dorsal (adjusted $R^2 = 0.98$), and thorax ventral (adjusted $R^2 = 0.97$) and front leg (adjusted $R^2 = 0.97$) regions respectively (Table 1; Figure 2). The model with the face region included as a single predictor had an adjusted R^2 value of 0.88, indicating that this region alone explained a majority of the variation in the top SVD models.

The best model for predicting SVD on *A. deliciosa* included the face and thorax ventral regions as predictors (adjusted $R^2 = 0.91$) (Table 1; Figure 3). However, the subsequent top four models were within two AIC_C points of the best model and therefore cannot be discounted as the potential top model. The face, thorax ventral, head ventral and abdomen ventral regions were retained in four of the five top models, which indicates that hairiness of the face and ventral regions is important for pollen deposition on *A. deliciosa*.

Body hairiness as a predictor of pollen load

The best model for pollen load retained the face region only and had an adjusted R^2 value of 0.81 (Figure 4; Table 1). The subsequent best models retained the abdomen dorsal (adjusted R^2 value of 0.73), the face and head dorsal (adjusted $R^2 = 0.83$), the face and abdomen dorsal (adjusted $R^2 = 0.82$) and the abdomen dorsal and front leg (adjusted $R^2 = 0.8$) regions respectively.

Discussion

Here we present a rigorous and time-efficient method for quantifying hairiness, and demonstrate that this measure is an important pollinator functional trait. We show that insect pollinator hairiness is a strong predictor of SVD for the open-pollinated flower *B. rapa*. Linear models that included multiple body regions as predictors had the highest predictive power; the top model for SVD retained the face and thorax dorsal regions. However, the face region was retained in all of the top models, and when included as a single predictor, had a very strong positive association with SVD. In addition, we show that hairiness, particularly on the face and ventral regions, is a good predictor of SVD for *A. deliciosa*, which has a different floral morphology, suggesting our method could be suitable for a range of flower types. Hairiness was also a good predictor for pollen load, and the face region was again

Chris Cutler 2016-10-29 4:56 PM
Deleted: indicating

Chris Cutler 2016-10-29 4:56 PM
Deleted: is likely to

retained in the top model for *B. rapa*. The abdomen dorsal, head dorsal and front leg regions were also good predictors of pollen load and were retained in the subsequent top models. Our results validate the importance of insect body hairs for transporting and depositing pollen. Surprisingly, we did not find strong associations between SVD and body size, and top models did not contain the body length interaction. Similarly, body length was not retained in the top models for pollen load. This indicates that our measure of hairiness has far greater predictive power than body size for both SVD and pollen load.

Chris Cutler 2016-10-29 6:19 PM

Comment [3]: As mentioned by reviewer 2, this is not really clear in the M&M or Results. In the M&M there is a brief mention " We excluded other body size measurements from models as they had high correlation coefficients…" but it is not clear what, if or how other body metrics were measured and tested. Statements in the M&M of what this body size metric(s) was (was only length considered?), and how is was measured are needed. I relaize that only top models were presented, but a statement in the Results reiterating that the relationship was weak between SVD/pollen load and body size / body length would be useful as a link to this point in the Discussion.

When deciding on which body regions to measure hairiness, researchers may first need to assess additional pollinator traits, such as flower visiting behaviour. This is because the way in which insects interact with flowers influences what body parts most frequently contact the floral reproductive structures (Roubik 2000). For some open pollinated flowers, such as *B. rapa*, facial hairs are probably the most important for pollen deposition because the face is the most likely region to contact the anthers and stigma. However, for flowers with different floral morphologies, facial hairs may not be as important because the floral reproductive structures have different positions relative to the insect's body structures. For example, disc-shaped flowers tend to deposit their pollen on the ventral regions of pollinators, while labiate flowers deposit their pollen on the dorsal regions (Bartomeus et al. 2008). We found that hairiness on the face and ventral regions of pollinators was most important for pollen deposition on *A. deliciosa* flowers. The reproductive parts of *A. deliciosa* form a brush shaped structure and therefore are most likely to contact the face and ventral surfaces of pollinators. Accordingly, where studies focus on a single plant species i.e. crop based studies, it is important to consider trait matching when selecting pollinator body region(s) to analyse (Butterfield & Suding 2013; Garibaldi et al. 2015).

It is important to consider that pollinator performance is a function of both SVD and visitation frequency, and these two components operate independently (Kremen et al. 2002; Mayfield et al. 2001). Here, we focus on a single trait that is important for pollinator efficiency (SVD), but to calculate pollinator performance researchers need to measure both efficiency and visitation rate. Additional pollinator traits related to visitation rate, as well as other behavioural traits such as activity patterns relative to the timing of stigma receptivity (Potts et al. 2001) and foraging behaviour, e.g., nectar vs. pollen foraging (Herrera 1987; Javorek et al. 2002; Rathcke 1983), may be important for predicting pollination performance. In some circumstances it might also be important to consider trait differences between male and female pollinators, particularly for some bee species. Male and female bees may have different pollen deposition efficiency due to differences in their foraging behaviour and resource requirements. For example, female bees are likely to visit flowers to collect pollen for nest provisioning while males simply consume nectar and pollen during visits (Cane et al. 2011). For some flowers, male bees have a similar pollination efficiency compared to females (e.g., summer squash *Cucurbita pepo*; Cane et al. 2011) while for others, female bees are more effective than males (e.g., lowbush blueberry *Vaccinium angustifolium*; Javorek et al. 2002).

For community-level studies that use functional diversity approaches, our method could be used to quantify hairiness for several body regions and weighted to give better representation of trait diversity within the pollinator community. This is necessary where plant communities contain diverse floral traits i.e. open-pollinated vs. closed-tubular flowers (Fontaine et al. 2006). Hairs on different areas of the insect body are likely to vary in relative importance for pollen deposition depending on trait matching (Bartomeus et al. 2016). Our method requires hairiness to be measured at the individual-level (Figure S1), which makes it an ideal trait to use in new functional diversity frameworks that use trait probabilistic densities rather than trait averages (Carmona et al. 2016; Fontana et al. 2016). Combining predictive traits, such as pollinator hairiness, with new methods that amalgamate intraspecific trait variation with multidimensional functional diversity, will greatly improve the explanatory power of trait-based pollination studies.

One of the greatest constraints to advancing trait-based ecology is the time-demanding nature of collecting trait data. This is because ecological communities typically contain many species, which have multiple traits that need to be measured and replicated (Petchey & Gaston 2006). To improve the predictive power of trait-based ecology and streamline the data collection process we must firstly identify traits that are strongly linked to ecosystem functions and secondly, develop rigorous and time-efficient methodologies to measure traits at the individual level. We achieve this by providing a method for quantifying a highly predictive trait at the individual-level, in a time-efficient manner. Our method also complements other recently developed predictive methods for estimating difficult-to-measure traits that are important for pollination processes i.e. bee tongue length; Cariveau et al. (2016).

Predicating the functional importance of organisms is critical in a rapidly changing environment where accelerating biodiversity loss threatens ecosystem functions (McGill et al. 2015). Our novel method for measuring pollinator hairiness could be used in any studies that require quantification of hairiness, such as understanding adhesion in insects (Bullock et al. 2008; Clemente et al. 2010) or epizoochory (Albert et al. 2015; Sorensen 1986). It is also a much needed addition to the pollination biologist’s toolbox, and will progress the endeavour to standardise trait-based approaches in pollination research. This is a crucial step towards developing a strong mechanistic underpinning for trait-based pollination research.

Acknowledgements

We would like to thank Estación Biológica de Doñana for hosting JS while developing the methodology for this paper. We would also like to thank David Seldon, Adrian Turner and Iain McDonald for assistance photographing insect specimens, Anna Kokeny for help collecting specimens and Stephen Thorpe for assistance identifying specimens. We thank Patrick Garvey and Greg Holwell for fruitful discussions and insightful comments on the earlier manuscript. We also thank Sam Read, Brian Cutting, Heather McBrydie, Alex Benoist, Rachel L'helgoualc'h and Simon Cornut for assistance in field work. This research was supported by the University of Auckland, BeeFun project PCIG14-GA-2013-631653 and MBIE C11X1309 Bee Minus to Bee Plus and Beyond: Higher Yields From Smarter, Growth-focused Pollination Systems.

Chris Cutler 2016-10-29 6:24 PM
Comment [4]: Good comments were received from the reviewers. Consider acknowledging them!

References

Albert A, Auffret AG, Cosyns E, Cousins SAO, D'Hondt B, Eichberg C, Eycott AE, Heinken T, Hoffmann M, Jaroszewicz B, Malo JE, Mårell A, Mouissie M, Pakeman RJ, Picard M, Plue J, Poschlod P, Provoost S, Schulze KA, and Baltzinger C. 2015. Seed dispersal by ungulates as an ecological filter: A trait-based meta-analysis. *Oikos* 124:1109-1120. 10.1111/oik.02512

Bartomeus I, Bosch J, and Vilà M. 2008. High invasive pollen transfer, yet low deposition on native stigmas in a *Carpobrotus*-invaded community. *Annals of botany* 102:417-424.

Bartomeus I, Gravel D, Tylianakis JM, Aizen MA, Dickie IA, and Bernard-Verdier M. 2016. A common framework for identifying linkage rules across different types of interactions. *Functional Ecology*. 10.1111/1365-2435.12666

Bolnick DI, Amarasekare P, Araujo MS, Burger R, Levine JM, Novak M, Rudolf VH, Schreiber SJ, Urban MC, and Vasseur DA. 2011. Why intraspecific trait variation matters in community ecology. *Trends in Ecology & Evolution* 26:183-192. 10.1016/j.tree.2011.01.009

Bullock JM, Drechsler P, and Federle W. 2008. Comparison of smooth and hairy attachment pads in insects: friction, adhesion and mechanisms for direction-dependence. *The Journal of experimental biology* 211:3333-3343.

Butterfield BJ, and Suding KN. 2013. Single-trait functional indices outperform multi-trait indices in linking environmental gradients and ecosystem services in a complex landscape. *Journal of Ecology* 101:9-17. 10.1111/1365-2745.12013

Cadotte MW, Carscadden K, and Mirotchnick N. 2011. Beyond species: functional diversity and the maintenance of ecological processes and services. *Journal of Applied Ecology* 48:1079-1087. 10.1111/j.1365-2664.2011.02048.x

Cane JH, Sampson BJ, and Miller SA. 2011. Pollination value of male bees: the specialist bee Peponapis pruinosa (Apidae) at summer squash (Cucurbita pepo). *Environmental Entomology* 40:614-620.

Cariveau DP, Nayak GK, Bartomeus I, Zientek J, Ascher JS, Gibbs J, and Winfree R. 2016. The allometry of bee proboscis length and its uses in ecology. *PLoS ONE* 11:e0151482. 10.1371/journal.pone.0151482

Carmona CP, de Bello F, Mason NWH, and Lepš J. 2016. Traits Without Borders: Integrating Functional Diversity Across Scales. *Trends in Ecology & Evolution*. 10.1016/j.tree.2016.02.003

Clemente CJ, Bullock JM, Beale A, and Federle W. 2010. Evidence for self-cleaning in fluid-based smooth and hairy adhesive systems of insects. *The Journal of experimental biology* 213:635-642.

Craig JL, Stewart AM, Pomeroy N, Heath A, and Goodwin R. 1988. A review of kiwifruit pollination: where to next? *New Zealand Journal of Experimental Agriculture* 16:385-399.

Crawley MJ. 2002. Statistical computing: an introduction to data analysis using S-Plus.–J. *Statistical computing: an introduction to data analysis using S-Plus*.

Dafni A. 2007. *Pollination ecology. A practical approach*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Devi I, Thakur BS, and Garg S. 2015. Floral morphology, pollen viability and pollinizer efficacy of kiwifruit. *International Journal of Current Research and Academic Review* 3:188-195.

Didham RK, Leather SR, and Basset Y. 2016. Circle the bandwagons – challenges mount against the theoretical foundations of applied functional trait and ecosystem service research. *Insect Conservation and Diversity* 9:1-3. 10.1111/icad.12150

Fontaine C, Dajoz I, Meriguet J, and Loreau M. 2006. Functional diversity of plant-pollinator interaction webs enhances the persistence of plant communities. *PLoS Biology* 4:0129-0135.

Fontana S, Petchey OL, Pomati F, and Sayer E. 2016. Individual-level trait diversity concepts and indices to comprehensively describe community change in multidimensional trait space. *Functional Ecology* 30:808-818. 10.1111/1365-2435.12551

Gagic V, Bartomeus I, Jonsson T, Taylor A, Winqvist C, Fischer C, Slade EMS-D, I., Emmerson M, Potts SG, Tscharntke T, Weisser W, and Bommarco R. 2015. Functional identity and diversity predict ecosystem functioning better than species-based indices. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences* 282:20142620. http://dx.doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2014.2620

Garibaldi LA, Bartomeus I, Bommarco R, Klein AM, Cunningham SA, Aizen MA, Boreux V, Garratt MPD, Carvalheiro LG, Kremen C, Morales CL, Schüepp C, Chacoff NP, Freitas BM, Gagic V, Holzschuh A, Klatt BK, Krewenka KM, Krishnan S, Mayfield MM, Motzke I, Otieno M, Petersen J, Potts SG, Ricketts TH, Rundlöf M, Sciligo A, Sinu PA, Steffan-Dewenter I, Taki H, Tscharntke T, Vergara CH, Viana BF, and Woyciechowski M. 2015. EDITOR'S CHOICE: REVIEW: Trait matching of flower visitors and crops predicts fruit set better than trait diversity. *Journal of Applied Ecology* 52:1436-1444. 10.1111/1365-2664.12530

Gonzales RC, Woods RE, and Eddins SL. 2004. *Digital image processing using MATLAB*: Pearson Prentice Hall.

Goodwin RM, and Perry JH. 1992. Use of pollen traps to investigate the foraging behaviour of honey bee colonies in kiwifruit orchards. *New Zealand Journal of Crop and Horticultural Science* 20:23-26.

Herrera CM. 1987. Components of pollinator" quality": comparative analysis of a diverse insect assemblage. *Oikos*:79-90.

Hillebrand H, and Matthiessen B. 2009. Biodiversity in a complex world: consolidation and progress in functional biodiversity research. *Ecology Letters* 12:1405-1419. 10.1111/j.1461-0248.2009.01388.x

Hoehn P, Tscharntke T, Tylianakis JM, and Steffan-Dewenter I. 2008. Functional group diversity of bee pollinators increases crop yield. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences* 275:2283-2291.

Holloway BA. 1976. Pollen-feeding in hover-flies (Diptera: Syrphidae). *New Zealand Journal of Zoology* 3:339-350. 10.1080/03014223.1976.9517924

Howlett BG, Walker MK, Rader R, Butler RC, Newstrom-Lloyd LE, and Teulon DAJ. 2011. Can insect body pollen counts be used to estimate pollen deposition on pak choi stigmas? *New Zealand Plant Protection* 64:25-31.

Javorek S, Mackenzie K, and Vander Kloet S. 2002. Comparative pollination effectiveness among bees (Hymenoptera: Apoidea) on lowbush blueberry (Ericaceae: Vaccinium angustifolium). *Annals of the Entomological Society of America* 95:345-351.

King C, Ballantyne G, and Willmer PG. 2013. Why flower visitation is a poor proxy for pollination: measuring single-visit pollen deposition, with implications for pollination networks and conservation. *Methods in Ecology and Evolution* 4:811-818. 10.1111/2041-210X.12074

Klein A-M, Vaissiere BE, Cane JH, Steffan-Dewenter I, Cunningham SA, Kremen C, and Tscharntke T. 2007a. Importance of pollinators in changing landscapes for world crops. *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London B: Biological Sciences* 274:303-313.

Klein AM, Vaissiere BE, Cane JH, Steffan-Dewenter I, Cunningham SA, Kremen C, and Tscharntke T. 2007b. Importance of pollinators in changing landscapes for world crops. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences* 274:303-313.

Kremen C, Williams NM, Aizen MA, Gemmill-Herren B, LeBuhn G, Minckley R, Packer L, Potts SG, Roulston T, Steffan-Dewenter I, Vázquez DP, Winfree R, Adams L, Crone EE, Greenleaf SS, Keitt TH, Klein AM, Regetz J, and Ricketts TH. 2007. Pollination and other ecosystem services produced by mobile organisms: A conceptual framework for the effects of land-use change. *Ecology Letters* 10:299-314.

Kremen C, Williams NM, and Thorp RW. 2002. Crop pollination from native bees at risk from agricultural intensification. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America* 99:16812-16816.

Larsen TH, Williams NM, and Kremen C. 2005. Extinction order and altered community structure rapidly disrupt ecosystem functioning. *Ecology Letters* 8:538-547. 10.1111/j.1461-0248.2005.00749.x

Lavorel S, Storkey J, Bardgett RD, de Bello F, and Berg MP. 2013. SPECIAL FEATURE: FUNCTIONAL DIVERSITY A novel framework for linking functional diversity of plants with other trophic levels for the quantification of ecosystem services. *Journal of Vegetation Science* 24:942-948.

Mayfield MM, Waser NM, and Price MV. 2001. Exploring the ‘most effective pollinator principle’ with complex flowers: bumblebees and *Ipomopsis aggregata*. *Annals of botany* 88:591-596.

McGill BJ, Dornelas M, Gotelli NJ, and Magurran AE. 2015. Fifteen forms of biodiversity trend in the Anthropocene. *Trends in Ecology & Evolution* 30:104-113. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.tree.2014.11.006

McGill BJ, Enquist BJ, Weiher E, and Westoby M. 2006. Rebuilding community ecology from functional traits. *Trends in Ecology & Evolution* 21:178-185. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.tree.2006.02.002

Naeem S, and Wright JP. 2003. Disentangling biodiversity effects on ecosystem functioning: deriving solutions to a seemingly insurmountable problem. *Ecology Letters* 6:567-579. 10.1046/j.1461-0248.2003.00471.x

Ne'eman G, Jürgens A, Newstrom-Lloyd L, Potts SG, and Dafni A. 2010. A framework for comparing pollinator performance: effectiveness and efficiency. *Biological Reviews* 85:435-451. 10.1111/j.1469-185X.2009.00108.x

Ollerton J, Winfree R, and Tarrant S. 2011. How many flowering plants are pollinated by animals? *Oikos* 120:321-326.

Pasari JR, Levi T, Zavaleta ES, and Tilman D. 2013. Several scales of biodiversity affect ecosystem multifunctionality. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 110:10219-10222.

Petchey OL, and Gaston KJ. 2006. Functional diversity: back to basics and looking forward. *Ecology Letters* 9:741-758. 10.1111/j.1461-0248.2006.00924.x

Potts SG, Dafni A, and Ne'eman G. 2001. Pollination of a core flowering shrub species in Mediterranean phrygana: variation in pollinator diversity, abundance and effectiveness in response to fire. *Oikos* 92:71-80.

R Development Core Team. 2014. R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing. (2014).

Rader R, Edwards W, Westcott DA, Cunningham SA, and Howlett BG. 2013. Diurnal effectiveness of pollination by bees and flies in agricultural *Brassica rapa*: Implications for ecosystem resilience. *Basic and Applied Ecology* 14:20-27. 10.1016/j.baae.2012.10.011

Rader R, Howlett BG, Cunningham SA, Westcott DA, Newstrom-Lloyd LE, Walker MK, Teulon DAJ, and Edwards W. 2009. Alternative pollinator taxa are equally efficient but not as effective as the honeybee in a mass flowering crop. *Journal of Applied Ecology* 46:1080-1087. 10.1111/j.1365-2664.2009.01700.x

Rathcke B. 1983. Competition and facilitation among plants for pollination. *Pollination biology*:305-329.

Roubik DW. 2000. Deceptive orchids with Meliponini as pollinators. *Plant Systematics and Evolution* 222:271-279. 10.1007/bf00984106

Shannon C. 1948. A mathematical theory of communication. *Bell System Technical Journal* 3:379-423. 10.1002/j.1538-7305.1948.tb01338.x.

Sorensen AE. 1986. Seed dispersal by adhesion. *Annual Review of Ecology and Systematics*:443-463.

Thorp RW. 2000. The collection of pollen by bees. *Pollen and pollination*: Springer, 211-223.

Violle C, Enquist BJ, McGill BJ, Jiang L, Albert CH, Hulshof C, Jung V, and Messier J. 2012. The return of the variance: intraspecific variability in community ecology. *Trends in Ecology & Evolution* 27:244-252. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.tree.2011.11.014

Violle C, Navas M-L, Vile D, Kazakou E, Fortunel C, Hummel I, and Garnier E. 2007. Let the concept of trait be functional! *Oikos* 116:882-892. 10.1111/j.0030-1299.2007.15559.x

Walker B, Kinzig A, and Langridge J. 1999. Plant attribute diversity, resilience, and ecosystem function: the nature and significance of dominant and minor species. Ecosystems2: 95-113. New York: Springer-Verlag.