

mm

Plant Ecology & Diversity

Volume 9 Number 3 June 2016

ISSN 1755-0874

# Plant Ecology & Diversity



Volume 9 Number 3 June 2016

 **Taylor & Francis**  
Taylor & Francis Group



## The macroecology of animal versus wind pollination: ecological factors are more important than historical climate stability

André Rodrigo Rech<sup>a</sup>, Bo Dalsgaard<sup>b</sup>, Brody Sandel<sup>c</sup>, Jesper Sonne<sup>b</sup>, Jens-Christian Svenning<sup>c</sup>, Naomi Holmes<sup>d</sup> and Jeff Ollerton<sup>d\*</sup>

<sup>a</sup>Educação do Campo Department, Universidade Federal dos Vales do Jequitinhonha e Mucuri (UFVJM), Diamantina, Brazil; <sup>b</sup>Center for Macroecology, Evolution and Climate, Natural History Museum of Denmark, University of Copenhagen, Copenhagen, Denmark;

<sup>c</sup>Section for Ecoinformatics and Biodiversity, Department of Bioscience, Aarhus University, Aarhus, Denmark; <sup>d</sup>Landscape and Biodiversity Research Group, School of Science and Technology, University of Northampton, Northampton, UK

(Received 15 February 2016; accepted 27 June 2016)

**Background:** The relative frequency of wind- and animal-pollinated plants is non-randomly distributed across the globe and numerous hypotheses have been raised for the greater occurrence of wind pollination in some habitats and towards higher latitudes. To date, however, there has been no comprehensive global investigation of these hypotheses.

**Aims:** Investigating a range of hypotheses for the role of biotic and abiotic factors as determinants of the global variation in animal vs. wind pollination.

**Methods:** We analysed 67 plant communities ranging from 70° north to 34° south. For these we determined habitat type, species richness, insularity, topographic heterogeneity, current climate and late-quaternary climate change. The predictive effects of these factors on the proportion of wind- and animal-pollinated plants were tested using correlations, ordinary least squares (OLS) and logistic regression analyses with information-theoretic model selection.

**Results:** The proportion of animal-pollinated plant species was positively associated with plant species richness and current temperature. Furthermore, in forest, animal pollination was positively related to precipitation. Historical climate was only weakly and idiosyncratically correlated with animal pollination.

**Conclusion:** Results were consistent with the hypothesised reduced chance for wind-transported pollen reaching conspecific flowers in species-rich communities, fewer constraints on nectar production in warm and wet habitats, and reduced relative effectiveness of wind dispersal in humid areas. There was little evidence of a legacy of historical climate change affecting these patterns.

**Keywords:** abiotic; biotic; community ecology; forest; mutualism; open vegetation; pollen dispersal; precipitation; species richness; temperature

### Introduction

Pollination is a fundamental ecological process that is crucial for the functioning of most terrestrial ecosystems (Kearns et al. 1998; Ollerton et al. 2011; Lever et al. 2014). Plants achieve pollen transfer among conspecifics using biotic (animal) and abiotic (wind and, rarely, water) pollen vectors. Wind pollination occurs in about 20% of angiosperm families and most groups of gymnosperms (Ackerman 2000), and an estimated 12.5% of all angiosperm species are wind pollinated (Ollerton et al. 2011). Wind pollination is a derived condition that has evolved independently more than 60 times within otherwise animal-pollinated clades (Ackerman 2000; Friedman and Barrett 2009; Hu et al. 2012), with occasional reversions to biotic pollination (e.g. Wragg and Johnson 2011).

Wind pollination is currently understood to be a reproductive strategy that evolves when pollinators become unpredictable or unavailable (Barrett et al. 1996; Culley et al. 2002; Friedman and Barrett 2009). Supporting this idea, the proportion of wind-pollinated plants is higher in the temperate zone (Culley et al. 2002; Ollerton et al.

2011), where climate is less stable seasonally (Cramer et al. 1999) and over longer glacial–interglacial time scales (Sandel et al. 2011). In temperate regions usually <80% of the plant species within a community are animal pollinated, whereas animal pollination is more common in the tropics where on average ≥90% of all co-occurring plants are pollinated by animals (Whitehead 1969; Regal 1982; Ollerton et al. 2011). Although this latitudinal pattern is already known, no study has quantitatively assessed the possible factors related to the global variation of community-level differences in wind vs. animal pollination (Barrett et al. 1996; Schemske et al. 2009; Ollerton et al. 2011).

The efficiency of wind and animal pollination may depend on the biotic and abiotic environment where plants occur. A number of testable hypotheses for geographic variation in wind vs. animal pollination have been put forward (Whitehead 1969; Culley et al. 2002). For instance, extensive, dense and species-rich forests with high canopy and low wind speeds are supposed to be unfavourable places for wind pollination because the chance of wind transporting pollen to a conspecific should

\*Corresponding author. Email: [Jeff.Ollerton@northampton.ac.uk](mailto:Jeff.Ollerton@northampton.ac.uk)

be rather low (Whitehead 1969; Regal 1982; Culley et al. 2002; Ollerton et al. 2006, 2011). Climate may also affect the efficiency of wind pollination. High humidity should make the cytoplasm of the pollen grains collapse or become heavier and cause them to clump, reducing pollen dispersal distance (Whitehead 1969; Niklas 1985). Additionally, high temperature and precipitation may increase productivity and support more nectar production for animal pollination.

Thus, both mean annual temperature and precipitation should correlate positively with the proportion of animal pollination. On the other hand, high temperature and precipitation seasonality may promote wind pollination as pollinator abundances will fluctuate through the year, becoming less reliable pollen vectors (Regal 1982), unless pollination is in synchrony with these seasonal fluctuations in pollinator abundances, thereby causing no measurable effect on pollination mode (McKinney et al. 2012). Finally, in topographically flat environments such as coastal plains wind pollination could be favoured due to more constant and fast winds. Likewise, wind pollination could be more frequent on islands because wind-pollinated plants are independent of pollinator colonisation to maintain reproduction (Kühn et al. 2006; Crawford et al. 2011).

Paleoclimate has been linked to ecological patterns, such as contemporary species distributions and endemism (Svenning and Skov 2007; Cárdenas et al. 2011; Sandel et al. 2011; Kissling et al. 2012), and the structure of interactions within communities of plants and pollinators (Dalsgaard et al. 2011, 2013; Groom et al. 2014). Past climatic instability may have broken up mutualistic associations between plant species and their pollinating animals (Dalsgaard et al. 2011, 2013; McKinney et al. 2012) that may have favoured wind pollination and could be related to the contemporary composition of plant communities.

Here, we use a global dataset to describe (1) latitudinal patterns in pollination mode, and (2) the relationships between putative contemporary and historical factors, and the proportion of animal vs. wind-pollinated species in plant communities around the world. Specifically, following on from the discussion of abiotic and biotic factors that other authors have presented, we test the following hypotheses:

- (1) Wind pollination is less frequent in closed forest habitats compared to more open habitats, such as grasslands.
- (2) Animal pollination is more frequent in areas with higher mean annual temperature and precipitation.
- (3) Conversely, wind pollination is more frequent in regions with lower temperature and greater seasonality of precipitation.
- (4) Animal pollination is more frequent in communities with high plant species richness.
- (5) Wind pollination is more frequent in topographically flat environments.
- (6) Animal pollination is less frequent on islands.
- (7) Wind pollination is more frequent in those areas of the world that have experienced greater climatic instability during the Quaternary.

## Materials and methods

### *Animal vs. wind pollination datasets*

The dataset was taken from 82 published and unpublished community-based assessments of the proportion of wind- and animal-pollinated species. These studies are censuses of all native angiosperm species in flower in a given community at a specific time. Gymnosperms were not considered by most of the published studies, hence we excluded gymnosperms from all communities. The latitudes ranged from 34° S to 70° N (Figure 1). When the same geographic coordinates were attributed to communities within the same vegetation type by the original authors, we pooled them together and used the mean of pollination mode proportion as a descriptor of the proportion of animal pollination for those coordinates. Doing this, we reduced the dataset to 67 data points for the spatial analysis (Appendix Table S1).

In some of the published community studies no species list was available, just data on the proportions of wind- and animal-pollinated species observed, preventing us from attributing genera or families to the data analysed by the original authors. For those studies having a species list, pollination mode at the genus level was highly correlated with those of families (Table 1). This does not mean that species within the same genus always have the same pollination mode. It implies that proportions were constant across taxonomic levels and therefore any higher level may be used; however at the species level more studies could be included in the analysis. For the published studies we followed the information provided by the original authors as to the pollination mode (wind or animal) of a given species. For our own field observations, flowers were assessed in terms of presence or absence of: mass pollen release when an inflorescence was shaken, reduced corolla and feathery stigmas (wind pollination); or large and colourful flowers with scent or nectar, and the presence and behaviour of potential flower visitors (animal pollination) (Figure 2; see also Table 1 in Friedman and Barrett 2009). We paid particular attention to species with small, dull flowers, e.g. some tropical trees, where only the presence of scent, nectar and/or insect visitation distinguished biotic from abiotic pollination.

The proportion of animal-pollinated plant species could be underestimated because some plant species that possess wind pollination traits can also be visited and sometimes pollinated by animals (Figueiredo and Sazima 2000). There might also be cases of obligatory self-pollinating and non-sexually reproducing species coded as wind or animal pollinated, though this should be a relatively minor and not spatially structured bias and, hence, should not affect our results (Ollerton et al. 2011). Similarly to Ollerton et al. (2011), we took a community-level approach as we were interested in the ecological question of how large a proportion






Figure 1. Geographic patterns of animal pollination in 67 communities surveyed across the world. Fitted curves are second order polynomials:  $r^2 = 0.28$ ,  $F_{2, 47}$ , 13.85,  $P < 0.001$ . On the map, dots were separated slightly within a small range to reduce the overlap of nearby sites.

Table 1. Correlations among the proportion of categories within each taxonomic level (e.g. % of wind-pollinated species vs % of wind-pollinated genera).

Taxa	Pearson correlation	t-Value	Degrees of freedom	P-value
Species and Genera	0.971	31.2131	59	<0.001
Species and Families	0.776	9.4789	59	<0.001
Genera and Families	0.836	11.7435	59	<0.001

of plant species in terrestrial communities are animal or wind pollinated, and the possible factors related to these proportions. However, first, we measured the phylogenetic signal for pollination mode by means of Phylogenetic Eigenvector Regression (PVR) considering the species lists where plants were identified to species level (Diniz-Filho et al. 2012). Species lists were available for 56 plant communities, including 1689 genera. Phylogenetic information was extracted at genus level from Phylomatic (R20120829 stored tree, Webb and Donoghue 2005) and the tree generated by using Phylocom (Webb et al. 2008). PVR was calculated by using a principal coordinate analysis (PCoA) of the phylogenetic

distance matrix and selecting the 50 first axes. Phylogenetic signal was obtained by the logistic regression coefficient ( $R^2$ ) between the selected phylogenetic eigenvectors and the binomial pollination mode (Diniz-Filho et al. 2012). Phylogenetic signal significance was tested by measuring PVR on 1000 randomisations of the pollination mode in the phylogeny. The analysis was carried out by using the package PVR for R (Santos et al. 2013). Since phylogenetic signal of pollination mode was very low (PVR for 50 eigenvectors = 0.0411;  $P = 0.47$ ;  $DF = 50$ ; Deviance = 50.2) no taxonomic correction was required. The low phylogenetic signal probably derives from two non-exclusive factors: (1) many independent origins of wind pollination; and (2) genera largely composed of species with one pollination mode having also a minority of species showing the other mode.

#### Correlates of pollination mode

For each site, we extracted variables of contemporary and historical climate conditions hypothesised to affect the degree of wind vs. animal pollination. Current climate descriptors included mean annual temperature (MAT), mean annual precipitation (MAP), temperature seasonality (MAT seasonality) and precipitation seasonality (MAP seasonality) extracted at 2.5 arc-minute resolution (approximately 16 km<sup>2</sup>) from the



Figure 2. Examples of species having traits representing wind (a–d) and animal (e–g) pollination used to classify plant species according to pollination mode in this study. (a) *Ambrosia artemisiifolia* L. (Asteraceae) a diclinous wind-pollinated plant with minute flowers that produce a large amount of pollen (Photo by Andrew Butko via Wiki images), (b) *Mercurialis annua* L. (Euphorbiaceae) a dioecious wind-pollinated plant species; the circle highlights the female flower and, in detail at the right side of the image, we show the inflorescence of a male individual (Photo by Hasan Yldirin), (c) *Olyra ciliatifolia* Raddi (Poaceae) female flower with feathery stigmas (Photo by Pedro Viana), (d) *Paspalum notatum* Flügge (Poaceae) showing the flexible white filaments; the arrow is pointing to the wide anther aperture (Photo by Pedro Viana), (e) *Turnera ulmifolia* L. (Passifloraceae) a 3D heterostyle species and a butterfly, one of its animal pollinators (Photo by André Rodrigo Rech), (f) *Couroupita guianensis* Aubl. (Lecythidaceae) with food (colourful) and pollination (white) specialised stamens (Photo by Hipolito Neto), (g) *Gongora bufonia* Lindl. (Orchidaceae) being pollinated by a male euglossine bee (*Eufriesea violacea*) when collecting scented oil from its labellum (Photo by Carlos Eduardo Coquinho).

WorldClim dataset ([www.worldclim.org](http://www.worldclim.org); Hijmans et al. 2005). As different climate change metrics may capture different effects of climate change (Garcia et al. 2014), we considered two measures of historical climate stability: (1) the velocity of mean annual temperature (MAT velocity) and that of mean annual precipitation (MAP velocity) between the Last Glacial Maximum (LGM) and the present and (2) the anomaly of mean annual temperature (MAT anomaly) and mean annual precipitation (MAP anomaly) between the LGM and the present (current minus LGM precipitation/temperature – i.e. positive values indicate wetter or warmer contemporary conditions, respectively). Velocities reflect the speed of climate change irrespective of the direction, integrating macroclimatic changes and local spatial topoclimate gradients (Loarie et al. 2009; Sandel et al. 2011), whereas anomalies reflect the direction of climate change. Paleoclimate estimates were obtained from the CCSM3 model (Collins et al. 2006; Otto-Bliesner et al. 2006), and statistically downscaled to 2.5 arc-minute resolution to match the current climate data (Hijmans et al. 2005).

In addition, we determined potentially important non-climate descriptors of local conditions at each site, including whether the site was on the mainland (coded as 0) or on an island (1), topographic heterogeneity, regional proportion

of tree cover, plant species richness, and whether the vegetation was forest (0;  $n = 16$ ) or open vegetation type (1; grassland, scrubland, and other low and open vegetation types,  $n = 51$ ). Topographic heterogeneity was calculated as the range of elevation values observed in a  $0.2^\circ \times 0.2^\circ$  window (ca. 20 km  $\times$  20 km) centred on the sampling location, using the WorldClim 1-km DEM (Farr et al. 2007). The regional proportion of tree cover was calculated as the average tree cover observed within a window of 64 km  $\times$  64 km around each site, based on the Vegetation Continuous Fields product applied to MODIS data (Hansen et al. 2003).

#### Statistical analyses

For all analyses, plant species richness, MAT anomaly, precipitation and temperature velocities were  $\log_{10}$  transformed; contemporary mean annual precipitation and topography were square root transformed; the proportion of regional tree cover was arcsine square root transformed. The proportion of animal-pollinated plant species in each community was arcsine square root transformed for OLS regression, but was left untransformed for logistic regression. All other variables were left untransformed.

First, the latitudinal pattern in pollination mode was tested with a quadratic regression between latitude and the proportion of animal pollination. Second, for all vegetation types, and separately for open vegetation types and forest, we tested the univariate associations between all predictor variables and between the proportion of animal-pollinated plant species and all predictor variables (Appendix Table S2). This identified predictor variables that were strongly intercorrelated. For all further analyses, we excluded temperature seasonality as it was strongly correlated with mean annual temperature ( $r = -0.73$ ,  $P < 0.001$ ,  $n = 67$ ), and we excluded the proportion of regional tree cover as it was unavailable for three island datasets and strongly correlated with contemporary precipitation ( $r = 0.73$ ,  $P < 0.001$ ,  $n = 64$ ; see Appendix Table S2). Due to the strong positive relationship between precipitation and the proportion of regional tree cover, we adjusted our above hypothesis of a unidirectional positive effect of precipitation on animal pollination. For forest, we still expected a positive correlation between precipitation and the proportion of animal pollination. For open vegetation types, on the other hand, we expected a less strong (or even zero) effect of precipitation due to the possible opposite effects of increasing precipitation (favouring animal pollination) and associated increasing fragmentation of

open vegetation communities surrounded by increasing amounts of forests as precipitation and regional tree cover coincide (increased fragmentation favouring wind pollination).

To test the study hypotheses, we used OLS and logistic regression, conducting information-theoretic model selection, as outlined by Diniz-Filho et al. (2008). In doing so, we tested the effect of both measures of historical climate stability, i.e. temperature/precipitation velocity and anomaly; the anomaly models generally performed the best (highest  $R^2$  and lowest AIC), so we focus the discussion on these models (but we also report models including velocity). First, we fitted models with all combinations of the explanatory variables: forest vs. open vegetation, insularity, plant species richness, contemporary precipitation, contemporary temperature, precipitation seasonality, topography and historical climate stability as measured by temperature and precipitation anomaly. Furthermore, due to the possible different effect of precipitation in open and forest vegetation, we included an interaction term between precipitation and forest vs. open vegetation. We then identified minimum adequate models (MAMs) among these as any model with  $\Delta AIC_c < 2$  ( $n = 67$ , 1023 alternative models; Table 2). When using temperature and precipitation velocity as a measure of climate stability, we excluded

Table 2. Contemporary and historical correlates (precipitation and temperature anomalies) of the proportion of animal-pollinated plant species in plant communities worldwide ( $n = 67$ ). The standardised regression coefficients are reported both for OLS and logistic regression, and reported for both an averaged model based on weighted  $w_i$  and minimum adequate models (MAMs), as in Diniz-Filho et al. (2008). For all MAMs based on OLS, we give  $AIC_c$ , Condition Number, Moran's I, and coefficients of determination ( $R^2$ ). Finally, " $R^2_{\text{species richness}}$ ", " $R^2_{\text{topography}}$ ", " $R^2_{\text{current climate}}$ " and " $R^2_{\text{historical climate}}$ " reflect the unique variation explained by species richness, topography, current climate and historical climate, respectively. Note that historical climate stability is represented by temperature and precipitation anomaly between 21,000 years ago and the present (current minus Last Glacial Maximum – LGM precipitation/temperature, i.e. positive values reflect areas having been drier or colder at LGM than at present). See Appendix Table 2 for similar calculations when using temperature and precipitation velocities as historical climate stability measures.

	OLS			Logistic		
	$\Sigma w_i$	Averaged	MAM <sup>†</sup>	$\Sigma w_i$	Averaged	MAM <sup>‡</sup>
Insularity	0.22	+0.02		0.96	−0.33	−0.33
Topography	0.84	+0.28	+0.28	1.00	+0.45	+0.42
Plant species richness	0.83	+0.23	+0.22	0.93	+0.24	+0.25
Open vegetation vs. forest	0.42	−0.22		1.00	+0.27	+0.29
MAP × Open vegetation vs. forest	0.64	+0.37	+0.18	1.00	+1.18	+1.23
MAP (Mean Annual Precipitation)	0.25	−0.05		1.00	+0.13	+0.18
MAT (Mean Annual Temperature)	1.00	+0.69	+0.74	1.00	+1.42	+1.34
MAP seasonality	0.31	−0.11		0.48	−0.17	
MAT anomaly	0.70	+0.25	+0.25	1.00	+0.84	+0.85
MAP anomaly	0.24	+0.00		0.51	+0.18	
AIC (Akaike Information Criterion) <sub>c</sub>			−73.29			668.9
Moran's Index			≤0.08 <sup>NS</sup>			
Condition Number			2.6			
$R^2$			0.49			
$R^2_{\text{species richness}}$			0.04			
$R^2_{\text{topography}}$			0.01			
$R^2_{\text{current climate}}$			0.36			
$R^2_{\text{historical climate}}$			0.02			

Notes: \*\*,  $P < 0.01$ ; \*,  $P < 0.05$ ; <sup>NS</sup>, non-significant. <sup>†</sup> three models were equally fit (i.e.  $\Delta AIC_c \leq 2$ ) containing the following variables, (1) Open vegetation vs. forest, plant species richness, MAT, MAP × Open vegetation vs. forest, topography, MAT anomaly; (2) plant species richness, MAT, topography, MAT anomaly; (3) Open vegetation vs. forest, plant species richness, MAT, topography, MAT anomaly. <sup>‡</sup> Three models were equally fit (i.e.  $\Delta AIC_c \leq 2$ ) containing the following variables, (1) Open vegetation vs. forest, insularity, plant species richness, MAT, MAP, MAP × Open vegetation vs. forest, MAP seasonality, topography, MAT anomaly; (2) Open vegetation vs. forest, insularity, plant species richness, MAT, MAP, MAP × Open vegetation vs. forest, MAP seasonality, topography, MAT anomaly; (3) Open vegetation vs. forest, insularity, plant species richness, MAT, MAP, MAP × Open vegetation vs. forest, topography, MAT anomaly, MAP anomaly.






Figure 3. The relationship between the proportion of animal-pollinated plant species per community and the most important and consistent predictors, (a) plant richness; (b) temperature; (c) precipitation. Open symbols illustrate open vegetation types whereas filled symbols illustrate forest communities. All relationships significant in simple univariate correlations are shown: all vegetation types ( $n = 67$ ; dashed line); open vegetation types ( $n = 51$ , dotted line) and forest ( $n = 16$ , full line). See Table 2 and Tables S1 and S2 for statistics.

topography as it is strongly correlated with velocities (Appendix S2), i.e. when using velocity as our historical climate variable we compared 511 models. We were unable to estimate velocities for one island data point, therefore in models using velocities there is one data point fewer.

Standardised regression coefficients are reported for both a multi-model average regression model based on weighted  $w_i$  and the MAMs (Diniz-Filho et al. 2008). We tested whether significant ( $P < 0.05$ ) positive spatial autocorrelation remained in OLS model residuals, tested using 10 distance classes and applying a permutation test with 10,000 iterations. As no spatial autocorrelation was found in our anomaly models that performed the best, we did not use spatial models. All correlations and OLS regression analyses were conducted using Spatial Analysis in Macroecology 4.0 (Rangel et al. 2010). Logistic model selection analyses were carried out in R (R Development Core Team 2014) using the “MuMIn” package (Barton 2015).

## Results

The proportion of animal-pollinated plants in a community decreased with latitude (Figure 1). This pattern appeared to be largely symmetrical across the equator, though there was a geographical bias to the distribution of the studies, and more data from Africa and Asia, in particular, are needed to confirm the observed pattern.

The models assessing the relative importance of the factors tested as determinants of the proportion of animal pollination showed that overall the explanatory power was considerably higher for current climate variables (ca.  $32\% < R^2 < 36\%$ ) than for species richness (ca.  $4\% < R^2 < 5\%$ ) and historical climate variables (ca.  $0\% < R^2 < 2\%$ ; Table 2 and Appendix S3). The proportion of animal pollination in both simple univariate correlations and in regression models was strongly and positively associated with current temperature and species richness (Figure 3; Table 2; Appendix S3). Furthermore, the interaction term between precipitation and vegetation type was included in the best-fit regression model (Table 2; Appendix S3), indicating that precipitation correlated strongly with the proportion of animal pollination in forest (Figure 3; Appendix S2). There were only weak associations with topography and temperature

anomaly and velocity (Table 2, Appendix S2). In addition to explaining little variation in pollination mode, topography and historical temperature anomaly/velocity associated positively with animal pollination in regression models (Table 2), but were unrelated in simple univariate correlations (Table S1). In logistic, but not in OLS, regression islands were found to have a lower proportion of animal pollination. Seasonality, precipitation anomaly and precipitation velocity were not statistically significant in simple univariate correlations nor were they included in any MAMs (Table 2 and Appendix S3).

## Discussion

The proportion of plant species using animal vs. wind pollination in a given community is non-random with respect to latitude, animal pollination being especially dominant in the tropics (Figure 1), confirming previous studies, but with a much larger and geographically widespread data set. We found that differences in the proportion of animal-pollinated species were associated mainly with current climate (Figure 3). Notably, temperature was overall positively related to the prevalence of animal pollination (partly supporting hypothesis 2) and in forests animal pollination was more frequent in areas with higher precipitation (supporting both hypothesis 1 and, in part, hypotheses 2 and 3). However, the “more wind pollination with greater precipitation seasonality” aspect of hypothesis 3 was not supported, perhaps due to the different nature of seasonality in the lowland tropics (wet, dry) compared with the temperate or high altitude zones (cold and warm). In addition to current climate, we found that communities with greater local plant species richness have a higher proportion of animal pollination (supporting hypothesis 4). On the other hand, providing only weak support of hypothesis 5, Kühn et al. (2006) showed that wind pollination in Germany is considerably more frequent in the flat landscapes of the north relative to other parts of the country, although it increases also towards the Southern Alpine uplands. This suggests that the effect of topography is scale- and context-dependent, which may explain its weak effect in our global analysis. Insularity also had only a minor influence on pollination-mode, with islands tending to have lower

proportions of animal pollination, but only when also taking climate into account (Table 2), which only partly supports hypothesis 6. In contrast to the strong associations with current factors (Table 2; Appendix S2), historical climate was associated only weakly and idiosyncratically with animal pollination, varying depending on using regression models or univariate correlations (Table 2 and Appendix S2), and therefore not supporting hypothesis 7. Overall, this suggests that the relative proportions of different pollination modes are more linked to current climate and ecological factors than to historical legacies.

Although these results support the greater influence of contemporary ecological factors over historical ones, it is not straightforward to determine the exact mechanism responsible for this pattern. For example, current precipitation was strongly related to the percentage of regional tree cover, hence, animal pollination is associated with both high precipitation and forest habitat. Wet forests clearly offer poor conditions for pollen dispersal, but it is difficult to disentangle whether this is because of mechanical restrictions imposed by dense vegetation or because air humidity decreases pollen dispersability, or both (Whitehead 1969; Niklas 1985). In open areas, especially in the tropics, the distribution of plant individuals tends to be sparse and floral resources less abundant. For example, an estimate of nectar energy available per hectare in the Atlantic rain forest in Brazil showed that forests produced twice as much floral energy as the nearby open “restinga” (coastal scrub) vegetation (Fonseca 2013; Fonseca et al. 2015). Moreover, the distribution of an Andean plant species was associated with a progressive disruption of its animal pollination mutualism accompanied by the gradual decrease in precipitation (Chalcoff et al. 2012). This illustrates the potential role of vegetation structure and precipitation in determining the functioning of animal-dependent mutualisms, but disentangling the roles of correlated factors is a major challenge for macroecology.

Interestingly, current climate may play a similar role for seed dispersal as there is also a pattern of higher importance of animal dispersers in rain forests, whereas in dry forests wind and self-dispersal are more common (Howe and Smallwood 1982; Jordano 2000; references therein). For instance, current precipitation patterns are largely correlated with the proportion of endozoochory across the Atlantic forest of Brazil, animals being more important dispersers in the wetter areas (Almeida-Neto et al. 2008), although large-scale studies are not available to confirm this hypothesis. One tentative joint explanation for the lower frequency of animal-pollinated and animal-dispersed plants at drier sites could be the higher metabolic costs of producing nectar and fleshy fruit, as was originally proposed only for fruit (Willson et al. 1989; Almeida-Neto et al. 2008). Associated with humidity, high temperature may also increase nectar production and therefore influence animal pollination, although, as temperature and temperature seasonality were found to be negatively correlated, we cannot rule out the possibility that seasonality promotes wind pollination (Regal 1982).

Another factor positively associated with animal pollination was plant species richness. Other trophic interactions between plants and animals respond to the bottom-up effect of plant species richness (Kissling et al. 2007; Scherber et al. 2010); for instance, in the neotropics the diversity of pollinating birds and bats is associated with their food plant species richness (Fleming 2005; Kissling et al. 2007). Meanwhile, as plant species richness increases, the density of conspecifics per unit area tends to decrease (Comita et al. 2010), which may also reduce the efficiency of pollen dispersion by wind (Whitehead 1969; Regal 1982). Plant species richness may also play an important role in sustaining pollinator communities (Ebeling et al. 2008; Dorado and Vázquez 2014) via two main mechanisms: (1) more plant species per unit area may ensure a more predictable and diverse food supply through complementarity (Waser and Real 1979; Rathcke 1983; Blüthgen and Klein 2011; Yang et al. 2013) and (2) more plant species also increases species redundancy within functional groups (“biodiversity insurance effect”), reducing the extinction risk of functionally specialised interactions (Bartomeus et al. 2013; Fründ et al. 2013). For instance, manipulative experiments have shown that high functional diversity of plants enhances the number of pollinators and the functional diversity of pollinators increases individual plant fitness and community persistence over time (Fontaine et al. 2006; Albrecht et al. 2012).

## Conclusions

We tested a range of previously proposed hypotheses and found that a subset of contemporary climate and ecological processes are the factors more strongly related to the global pattern of animal vs. wind pollination at the community level. The deduced limited influence of historical climate instability on the contemporary prevalence of animal and wind pollination is in contrast with previous findings of high importance of historical factors on the structuring of plant-pollinator interaction networks (Dalsgaard et al. 2011, 2013; Martín González et al. 2015) and the distribution of animal and plant life on earth (Svenning and Skov 2007; Cárdenas et al. 2011; Sandel et al. 2011; Kissling et al. 2012), but is in accordance with studies of the organisation of plant-frugivore interaction networks (Schleuning et al. 2014). In future studies, it would be interesting to examine if other measures of historical processes, e.g. geological differences or historical measures of plant migration rates, influence plant reproduction. The large-scale drivers of plant reproductive ecology will be better understood with similar studies also examining the respective roles of historical and contemporary factors on other processes, such as plant reproduction via autogamy and seed dispersal. In addition, to improve the certainties of the conclusions presented here will require additional sampling effort in Africa, Asia, Russia and oceanic islands, where so few data have been collected on plant reproductive ecology at the community level.



## Acknowledgements

Special thanks to Dr. Andrew Moldenke, who shared with us his great personal community assessments dataset, and to all the researchers who helped us during field work, pollination mode confirmation, community assessments and/or with extra data to perform this study. ARR was supported by FAPESP (2009/54491-0); CAPES (PDSE 0197/12-2); CNPq (140912/2010-0); Unicamp (FAPEX 519292) and Santander Universities. BD and JS acknowledge the Danish National Research Foundation for funding the Center for Macroecology, Evolution and Climate (grant-number DNRF96). JCS was supported by the European Research Council (ERC-2012-StG-310886-HISTFUNC). JO was supported by FAPESP; The Royal Society; The Leverhulme Trust; The British Ecological Society; Church and Co. PLC; EVOLINK; The Percy Sladen Memorial Fund; The Royal Entomological Society and the University of Northampton. NH was supported by the British Exploring Society.

## Disclosure statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the authors.

## Funding

ARR was supported by FAPESP [2009/54491-0]; CAPES [PDSE 0197/12-2]; CNPq [140912/2010-0]; Unicamp [FAPEX 519292] and Santander Universities. BD and JS acknowledge the Danish National Research Foundation for funding the Center for Macroecology, Evolution and Climate [Grant Number DNRF96]. JCS was supported by the European Research Council [ERC-2012-StG-310886-HISTFUNC]. JO was supported by FAPESP; The Royal Society; The Leverhulme Trust; The British Ecological Society; Church and Co. PLC; EVOLINK; The Percy Sladen Memorial Fund; The Royal Entomological Society and the University of Northampton. NH was supported by the British Exploring Society.

## Supplemental data

Supplemental data for this article can be accessed [here](#).

## Notes on contributors

André Rodrigo Rech is interested in the evolution of pollination mechanisms, plant–pollinator interactions and community organization of reproductive strategies.

Bo Dalsgaard is interested in geographical patterns of biodiversity, especially how historical and contemporary climate influence mutualistic plant–animal interactions.

Brody Sandel is interested in the influence of long-term climate stability on plant and animal communities from local to macroecological scales.

Jesper Sonne research interests cover a wide range within the fields of ornithology, evolution and macroecology. Jesper Sonne is particularly interested in neotropical bird communities and the importance of species interactions for patterns of biodiversity.

Jens-Christian Svenning is broadly interested in ecology and biogeography, with special focus on the impacts of past, present and future global change on biodiversity and ecosystems.

Naomi Holmes is a palaeoecologist who interested in the impacts of environmental change on biota in high latitude/altitude environments.

Jeff Ollerton's research interests span across the ecology, evolution and conservation of the Earth's biodiversity, with a particular emphasis on plant–pollinator interactions.

## References

- Ackerman JD. 2000. Abiotic pollen and pollination: ecological, functional, and evolutionary perspectives. *Plant Systematics and Evolution* 222:167–185.
- Albrecht M, Schmid B, Hautier Y, Müller CB. 2012. Diverse pollinator communities enhance plant reproductive success. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences* 279:4845–4852.
- Almeida-Neto M, Campassi F, Galetti M, Jordano P, Oliveira-Filho A. 2008. Vertebrate dispersal syndromes along the Atlantic forest: broad-scale patterns and macroecological correlates. *Global Ecology and Biogeography* 17:503–513.
- Barrett SCH, Emerson B, Mallet J. 1996. The reproductive biology and genetics of island plants [and discussion]. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences* 351:725–733.
- Bartomeus I, Park MG, Gibbs J, Danforth BN, Lakso AN, Winfree R, Eubanks M. 2013. Biodiversity ensures plant–pollinator phenological synchrony against climate change. *Ecology Letters* 16:1331–1338.
- Barton K. 2015. MuMIn: multi-model inference [Internet]. R package version 1.13.4. [cited 2015 Jul 1]. Available online at <http://cran.r-project.org/package=MuMIn>
- Blüthgen N, Klein A-M. 2011. Functional complementarity and specialisation: the role of biodiversity in plant–pollinator interactions. *Basic and Applied Ecology* 12:282–291.
- Cárdenas ML, Gosling WD, Sherlock SC, Poole I, Pennington RT, Mothes P. 2011. The response of vegetation on the Andean flank in western Amazonia to pleistocene climate change. *Science* 331:1055–1058.
- Chalcoff VR, Aizen MA, Ezcurra C. 2012. Erosion of a pollination mutualism along an environmental gradient in a south Andean treelet, *Embothrium coccineum* (Proteaceae). *Oikos* 121:471–480.
- Collins WD, Bitz CM, Blackmon ML, Bonan GB, Bretherton CS, Carton JA, Chang P, Doney SC, Hack JJ, Henderson TB, et al. 2006. The community climate system model version 3 (CCSM3). *Journal of Climate* 19:2122–2143.
- Comita LS, Muller-Landau HC, Aguilar S, Hubbell SP. 2010. Asymmetric density dependence shapes species abundances in a tropical tree community. *Science* 329:330–332.
- Cramer W, Kicklighter DW, Bondeau A, Iii BM, Churkina G, Nemry B, Ruimy A, Schloss AL. 1999. Comparing global models of terrestrial net primary productivity (NPP): overview and key results. *Global Change Biology* 5:1–15.
- Crawford DJ, Anderson GJ, Bernardello G. 2011. The reproductive biology of Island plants. In: Bramwell D, Caujapé-Castells J, editors. *The biology of island floras*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. p. 11–36.
- Culley TM, Weller SG, Sakai AK. 2002. The evolution of wind pollination in angiosperms. *Trends in Ecology & Evolution* 17:361–369.
- Dalsgaard B, Magård E, Fjeldså J, Martín González AM, Rahbek C, Olesen JM, Ollerton J, Alarcón R, Cardoso Araujo A, Cotton PA, et al. 2011. Specialization in plant–hummingbird networks is associated with species richness, contemporary precipitation and quaternary climate-change velocity. *PLoS One* 6:e25891.

- Dalsgaard B, Trøjsgaard K, González AMM, Nogués-Bravo D, Ollerton J, Petanidou T, Sandel B, Schleuning M, Wang Z, Rahbek C, et al. 2013. Historical climate-change influences modularity and nestedness of pollination networks. *Ecography* 36:1331–1340.
- Diniz-Filho JAF, Bini LM, Rangel TF, Morales-Castilla I, Olalla-Tárraga MÁ, Rodríguez MÁ, Hawkins BA. 2012. On the selection of phylogenetic eigenvectors for ecological analyses. *Ecography* 35:239–249.
- Diniz-Filho JAF, Rangel TFLVB, Bini LM. 2008. Model selection and information theory in geographical ecology. *Global Ecology and Biogeography* 17:479–488.
- Dorado J, Vázquez DP. 2014. The diversity–stability relationship in floral production. *Oikos* 123:1137–1143.
- Ebeling A, Klein A-M, Schumacher J, Weisser WW, Tschamtk T. 2008. How does plant richness affect pollinator richness and temporal stability of flower visits? *Oikos* 117:1808–1815.
- Farr TG, Rosen PA, Caro E, Crippen R, Duren R, Hensley S, Kobrick M, Paller M, Rodriguez E, Roth L, et al. 2007. The shuttle radar topography mission. *Reviews of Geophysics* 45:1–33.
- Figueiredo RA, Sazima M. 2000. Pollination biology of piperaceae species in Southeastern Brazil. *Annals of Botany* 85:455–460.
- Fleming TH. 2005. The relationship between species richness of vertebrate mutualists and their food plants in tropical and subtropical communities differs among hemispheres. *Oikos* 111:556–562.
- Fonseca LCN. 2013. Pollen transport of ornithophilous species and available energy for hummingbirds in an Atlantic Forest area, Núcleo Picinguaba/ PESH, Ubatuba, SP [PhD thesis]. Campinas (SP-Brazil): University of Campinas.
- Fonseca LCN, Vizentin-Bugoni J, Rech AR. 2015. Hummingbird-plant interactions and temporal nectar availability in a restinga from Southeast Brazil. *Anais da Academia Brasileira de Ciências* 87:2163–2175.
- Fontaine C, Dajoz I, Meriguet J, Loreau M. 2006. Functional diversity of plant–pollinator interaction webs enhances the persistence of plant communities. *PLoS Biology* 4:e1.
- Friedman J, Barrett SCH. 2009. Wind of change: new insights on the ecology and evolution of pollination and mating in wind-pollinated plants. *Annals of Botany* 103:1515–1527.
- Fründ J, Dormann CF, Holzschuh A, Tschamtk T. 2013. Bee diversity effects on pollination depend on functional complementarity and niche shifts. *Ecology* 94:2042–2054.
- García RA, Cabeza M, Rahbek C, Araújo MB. 2014. Multiple dimensions of climate change and their implications for biodiversity. *Science* 334:6183.
- Groom SVC, Stevens MI, Schwarz MP. 2014. Parallel responses of bees to Pleistocene climate change in three isolated archipelagos of the southwestern Pacific. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences* 281:20133293.
- Hansen MC, DeFries RS, Townshend JRG, Carroll M, Dimiceli C, Sohlberg RA. 2003. Global percent tree cover at a spatial resolution of 500 meters: first results of the MODIS vegetation continuous fields algorithm. *Earth Interactions* 7:1–15.
- Hijmans RJ, Cameron SE, Parra JL, Jones PG, Jarvis A. 2005. Very high resolution interpolated climate surfaces for global land areas. *International Journal of Climatology* 25:1965–1978.
- Howe HF, Smallwood J. 1982. Ecology of seed dispersal. *Annual Review of Ecology and Systematics* 13:201–228.
- Hu S, Dilcher DL, Taylor DW. 2012. Pollen evidence for the pollination biology of early flowering plants. In: Patiny S, editor. *Evolution of plant–pollinator relationships*. Cambridge (UK): Cambridge University Press. p. 165–236.
- Jordano P. 2000. Fruits and frugivory. In: Fenner M, editor. *Seeds: the ecology of regeneration in plant communities*. Wallingford (UK): CAB International. p. 125–166.
- Kearns CA, Inouye DW, Waser NM. 1998. Endangered mutualisms: the conservation of plant–pollinator interactions. *Annual Review of Ecology and Systematics* 29:83–112.
- Kissling WD, Eiserhardt WL, Baker WJ, Borchsenius F, Couvreur TLP, Balslev H, Svenning J-C. 2012. Cenozoic imprints on the phylogenetic structure of palm species assemblages worldwide. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 109:7379–7384.
- Kissling WD, Rahbek C, Böhning-Gaese K. 2007. Food plant diversity as broad-scale determinant of avian frugivore richness. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences* 274:799–808.
- Kühn I, Bierman SM, Durka W, Klotz S. 2006. Relating geographical variation in pollination types to environmental and spatial factors using novel statistical methods. *New Phytologist* 172:127–139.
- Lever JJ, Van Nes EH, Scheffer M, Bascompte J. 2014. The sudden collapse of pollinator communities. *Ecology Letters* 17:350–359.
- Loarie SR, Duffy PB, Hamilton H, Asner GP, Field CB, Ackerly DD. 2009. The velocity of climate change. *Nature* 462:1052–1055.
- Martín González AM, Dalsgaard B, Nogués-Bravo D, Graham CH, Schleuning M, Maruyama PK, Abrahamczyk S, Alarcón R, Araújo AC, Araújo FP, et al. 2015. The macroecology of phylogenetically structured hummingbird–plant networks. *Global Ecology and Biogeography* 24:1212–1224.
- McKinney AM, CaraDonna PJ, Inouye DW, Barr B, Bertelsen CD, Waser NM. 2012. Asynchronous changes in phenology of migrating broad-tailed hummingbirds and their early-season nectar resources. *Ecology* 93:1987–1993.
- Niklas KJ. 1985. The aerodynamics of wind pollination. *The Botanical Review* 51:328–386.
- Ollerton J, Johnson SD, Hingston AB. 2006. Geographical variation in diversity and specificity of pollination systems. In: Waser NM, Ollerton J, editors. *Plant–pollinator interactions, from specialization to generalization*. Chicago (IL): University of Chicago Press. p. 283–308.
- Ollerton J, Winfree R, Tarrant S. 2011. How many flowering plants are pollinated by animals? *Oikos* 120:321–326.
- Otto-Bliesner BL, Brady EC, Clauzet G, Tomas R, Levis S, Kothavala Z. 2006. Last glacial maximum and holocene climate in CCSM3. *Journal of Climate* 19:2526–2544.
- R Development Core Team. 2014. R, a language and environment for statistical computing [Internet]. R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria. [cited 2015 Mar 12]. Available online at <http://www.R-project.org>
- Rangel TFLVB, Diniz-Filho JAF, Bini LM. 2010. SAM: a comprehensive application for spatial analysis in macroecology. *Ecography* 33:46–50.
- Rathcke B. 1983. Competition and facilitation among plants for pollination. In: Real L, editor. *Pollination biology*. New York: Academic Press. p. 305–325.
- Regal PJ. 1982. Pollination by wind and animals: ecology of geographic patterns. *Annual Review of Ecology and Systematics* 13:497–524.
- Sandel B, Arge L, Dalsgaard B, Davies RG, Gaston KJ, Sutherland WJ, Svenning J-C. 2011. The influence of Late Quaternary climate-change velocity on species endemism. *Science* 334:660–664.
- Santos T, Diniz-Filho JA, Rangel T, Bini LM. 2013. PVR: computes phylogenetic eigenvectors regression (PVR) and phylogenetic signal-representation curve (PSR) (with null and Brownian expectations) [Internet]. R package version 0.2.1. [cited 2016 Feb 5]. Available online at <http://CRAN.R-project.org/package=PVR>
- Schemske DW, Mittelbach GG, Cornell HV, Sobel JM, Roy K. 2009. Is there a latitudinal gradient in the importance of biotic interactions? *Annual Review of Ecology, Evolution, and Systematics* 40:245–269.

- Scherber C, Eisenhauer N, Weisser WW, Schmid B, Voigt W, Fischer M, Schulze E-D, Roscher C, Weigelt A, Allan E, et al. 2010. Bottom-up effects of plant diversity on multitrophic interactions in a biodiversity experiment. *Nature* 468:553–556.
- Schleuning M, Ingmann L, Strauß R, Fritz SA, Dalsgaard B, Matthias Dehling D, Plein M, Saavedra F, Sandel B, Svenning J-C, et al. 2014. Ecological, historical and evolutionary determinants of modularity in weighted seed-dispersal networks. *Ecology Letters* 17:454–463.
- Svenning J-C, Skov F. 2007. Ice age legacies in the geographical distribution of tree species richness in Europe. *Global Ecology and Biogeography* 16:234–245.
- Waser NM, Real LA. 1979. Effective mutualism between sequentially flowering plant species. *Nature* 281:670–672.
- Webb CO, Ackerly DD, Kembel SW. 2008. Phylocom: software for the analysis of phylogenetic community structure and trait evolution. *Bioinformatics* 24:2098–2100.
- Webb CO, Donoghue MJ. 2005. Phylomatic: tree assembly for applied phylogenetics. *Molecular Ecology Notes* 5:181–183.
- Whitehead DR. 1969. Wind pollination in the angiosperms: evolutionary and environmental considerations. *Evolution* 23:28–35.
- Willson MF, Irvine AK, Walsh NG. 1989. Vertebrate dispersal syndromes in some Australian and New Zealand plant communities, with geographic comparisons. *Biotropica* 21:133–147.
- Wragg PD, Johnson SD. 2011. Transition from wind pollination to insect pollination in sedges: experimental evidence and functional traits. *New Phytologist* 191:1128–1140.
- Yang C-F, Wang Q-F, Guo Y-H. 2013. Pollination in a patchily distributed lousewort is facilitated by presence of a co-flowering plant due to enhancement of quantity and quality of pollinator visits. *Annals of Botany* 112:1751–1758.