Spatiotemporal changes in flying insect abundance and their functional diversity as a function of distance to natural habitats in a mass flowering crop

Benoît Geslin, Melissa Oddie, Morgane Folschweiller, Gaëlle Legras, Colleen L. Seymour, F.J.Frank van Veen, Elisa Thébault

► To cite this version:

Benoît Geslin, Melissa Oddie, Morgane Folschweiller, Gaëlle Legras, Colleen L. Seymour, et al.. Spatiotemporal changes in flying insect abundance and their functional diversity as a function of distance to natural habitats in a mass flowering crop. *Agriculture, Ecosystems and Environment*, 2016, 229, pp.21-29. 10.1016/j.agee.2016.05.010 . hal-01327223

HAL Id: hal-01327223

<https://hal.sorbonne-universite.fr/hal-01327223>

Submitted on 6 Jun 2016

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

ORIGINAL PAPER

Spatiotemporal changes in flying insect abundance and their functional diversity as a function of distance to natural habitats in a mass flowering crop

Benoît Geslin^{a,b}, Melissa Oddie^c, Morgane Folschweiller^{b,d}, Gaëlle Legras^{b,e}, Colleen L. Seymour^{f,g}, F.J. Frank van Veen^c and Elisa Thébault^b

^a Institut Méditerranéen de Biodiversité et d'Ecologie marine et continentale (IMBE), Aix Marseille Université, CNRS, IRD, Avignon Université, Faculté des Sciences et Techniques St-Jérôme, Avenue Escadrille Normandie Niémen, Case 421, F-13 397 Marseille Cedex 20, France

^b Institute of Ecology and Environmental Sciences - IEES Paris (UMR 7618, UPMC, CNRS, IRD, INRA, UPEC, Paris Diderot), Université Pierre et Marie Curie, 7 quai St Bernard, 75005 Paris, France

^c Centre of Ecology and Conservation, College of Life and Environmental Sciences, University of Exeter, Penryn Campus, Penryn, Cornwall, TR10 9FE, UK

^d Laboratoire de Zoologie, University of Mons, Mons, Belgium

^e University of French Polynesia - UMR-241 EIO (UPF, IRD, Ifremer, ILM) Papeete, French Polynesia

^f South African National Biodiversity Institute, Kirstenbosch Gardens, PVT Bag X7, Claremont, 7735, South Africa

^g DST/NRF Centre of Excellence at the Percy FitzPatrick Institute of African Ornithology, Department of Biological Sciences, University of Cape Town, Rondebosch, 7701

Corresponding author: Benoît Geslin

E-mail: benoit.geslin@imbe.fr

27 **Abstract**

28 To meet the dietary requirements of a burgeoning human population, the demand for animal-
29 dependent crops continues to grow. To meet the demand, intensive farming practices are used.
30 The gains in food production associated with agricultural intensification may be offset by its
31 detrimental effects on pollinator populations through natural habitat fragmentation and
32 pesticide use. Abundance and species richness of pollinators have been found to decrease with
33 increasing distance to natural habitat in agroecosystems, reducing crop yields. A key aspect of
34 crop pollination lies in the diversity of functional traits (functional diversity, FD) of flower-
35 visitor communities within crop fields. Higher FD allows improved pollination success
36 through complementarity between flower-visitors' morphology, phenology and behaviour.
37 Many studies reported negative effects of increasing distance to natural habitats on the
38 abundance and richness of flower-visitor communities, but the link between FD and natural
39 habitat isolation is less well understood. Also, a more complete understanding of the
40 functional traits of flower-visitor communities within crops should consider potential
41 variations through time. Differences in resources availability between seasons are important
42 in tropical areas and could modify ecological responses of flower-visitor communities to
43 isolation. In this study, we surveyed the Hymenoptera and Diptera communities within mango
44 orchards of South Africa using pan traps at 100m, 200m and at the maximal distance possible
45 from any natural habitat. We measured the response of insect abundance, wing span and body
46 size as well as functional diversity to habitat isolation during mango flowering (dry season),
47 and during the wet season (after mango fruit harvest). Flying insect abundance decreased with
48 increasing distance to natural habitat during mango flowering, but no effect was detected
49 during the wet season. FD of flying insects declined with increasing distance to natural habitat
50 in both sampling periods. Insects captured during mango flowering were smaller but had

higher wing length/body length ratios than those caught during the wet season. This study highlights that mango orchards are more inhospitable for flying insects during mango flowering. This effect might be due to low palatability of mango flowers, or pesticide use in mango fields. In order to maintain a high FD of flower-visiting species, and reduce the detrimental effects of habitat isolation to ultimately ensure better crop pollination, we propose establishment of patches of resource-rich habitats combined with judicious use of pesticides within orchards.

Keywords

Body size, Flower-visitors, Functional diversity, Isolation from natural habitat, Mangoes, Morphological traits, Wing span

1. Introduction

To ensure nutritional security to a burgeoning human population, the demand for animal-pollinated crops is continually increasing (Eilers et al. 2011; Ehrlich and Harte, 2015). To meet this demand, agricultural production has intensified in recent decades through conversion of large areas to monocultures, with concomitant loss of natural and semi-natural areas, and increasing use of agrochemicals (Tscharntke et al. 2005; Kennedy et al. 2013). However, given the reported negative effects of agricultural intensification on pollinator populations (Kremen et al. 2002; Vanbergen et al. 2013), the benefits of intensification for animal-pollinated crop yield might be negated by ensuing pollinator loss (Garibaldi et al. 2011a; Leonhart et al. 2013; Deguines et al. 2014). By pollinating crops, insects provide a critical ecosystem service estimated to be worth more than €153 billion worldwide (Klein et al. 2003; Gallai et al. 2008; Winfree 2008). The decline of pollinators owing to agricultural intensification therefore raises concerns for food security (Aizen et al. 2008; Garibaldi et al. 2011a) and highlights the need for sustainable agriculture that ensures agricultural production whilst conserving biodiversity (Garibaldi et al. 2015, 2016).

In agricultural landscapes, natural areas provide habitat for wild insects and constitute sources of flower-visitors for crops (Kennedy et al. 2013; Morandin and Kremen, 2013). Many flower-visitors, such as bees, are central place foragers and usually visit plants close to their nests (Cresswell et al. 2000). As distant resources are more energetically costly to visit than proximate resources, it is predicted that flowers isolated from natural areas will be less frequently visited (Schmid-Hempel et al. 1985, 1986; Steffan-Dewenter and Tscharntke 1999). In croplands, species richness of flower-visitors, visitation rates, and pollination services all tend to decline with distance to natural areas (e.g. Ricketts et al. 2008; Carvalheiro et al. 2010; Garibaldi et al. 2011b). Whether or not flower-visitors disperse from natural habitats into the adjacent crop depends on many factors such as floral resource abundance,

floral reward level or type of management (e.g., Kennedy et al. 2013). In this respect, pollinator functional traits can be key. Most studies on the effect of distance to natural patches of vegetation have not considered flower-visitor traits or their functional diversity (e.g. Ricketts et al. 2008; Farwig et al. 2009; Carvalheiro et al. 2010, 2012; Garibaldi et al. 2011b; but see Jauker et al. 2009; Williams et al. 2010; Benjamin et al. 2014). Yet traits such as flower-visitor body size are likely to affect pollination success as these traits can influence insect behaviour, foraging distances and pollen deposition (Hoehn et al. 2008). For example, foraging distance is primarily dictated by pollinator body size, and small flower-visitors will forage closer to their nests (Araújo et al. 2004; Greenleaf et al. 2007; Benjamin et al. 2014). Moreover, several studies have shown that functional diversity (FD) of flower-visitor communities enhances pollination by providing complementary pollination services, for example through niche partitioning of resource use in time and space (Fontaine et al. 2006; Hoehn et al. 2008; Albrecht et al. 2012; Fründ et al. 2013). Studying the effects of isolation from natural areas on traits and FD of flower-visitors can thus shed light on the factors which affect both crop pollination and the persistence of diverse flower-visitor communities in agro-ecosystems, informing effective land management strategies (Williams et al. 2010; Benjamin et al. 2014).

Temporal dynamics of agricultural landscapes are also important. Cultivated areas exhibit particularly large temporal variations in floral resources which could affect flower-visitor communities (Westphal et al. 2003). Mass flowering crops such as mangoes (*Mangifera indica* L., Anacardiaceae) constitute a super-abundant floral resource during a short period of time, representing a resource pulse for flower-visitors (Orford et al. 2015). The relationship between increasing distance to natural habitat and flower-visitor communities has been mostly explored during crop mass flowering (e.g. Holzschuh et al. 2011) but negative effects of distance on flower-visitors are likely to be stronger when the crop is not flowering, because

113 only flowering weeds then provide resources in cultivated fields. Seasonal variation of wild
114 floral resources and flower-visitor communities also contribute to temporal variation of
115 agroecosystems. Spatiotemporal turnover in flower-visitor assemblages varies between and
116 within years in temperate and tropical ecosystems (Oertli et al. 2005; Rollin et al. 2015;
117 Samnegård et al. 2015), with temporal changes in abundance or even functional traits of
118 flower-visitors varying because of food and nesting requirements (Tylianakis et al. 2005;
119 Rollin et al. 2015). Flower-visitor assemblages might respond differently to agricultural
120 perturbations in different seasons (Samnegård et al. 2015). For example, in tropical
121 environments, resources are more scarce and patchily-distributed during the dry season
122 relative to the wet season. Greater mobility may therefore be advantageous to crop flower-
123 visitors during the dry season (see Samnegård et al. 2015).

124 To explore those questions, we studied the response of potential flower-visitors (hereafter
125 referred to as “flying insects”) to increasing distance from natural vegetation in mango
126 orchards in north-eastern South-Africa in two different seasons. Mango is one of the most
127 important tropical fruits produced in the world, and is economically important for income and
128 employment-creation in the region (FAO, 2010). Research conducted in our study area in the
129 past has found clear effects of distance on pollination (Carvalho et al. 2010, 2012), pest
130 control (Henri et al. 2015) and bird assemblages (Ehlers Smith et al. 2015).

131 We used pan-traps to survey flying insects during mango flowering in the dry season (winter),
132 and during the wet season (summer, when mango is not flowering), along transects of
133 increasing distance to natural habitat. We hypothesised that the number of flying insects
134 caught in traps would decrease with distance to natural vegetation. If isolation from natural
135 areas is the only cause of the decrease in flying insect abundance, the effect should be
136 consistent between seasons. We also measured wing span and body length of each flying
137 insect and investigated distance effects on flower-visitor functional-trait diversity. We

138 hypothesised a decline of the FD with increasing distance from natural areas in both seasons,
139 since species loss caused by isolation is likely to result in loss of trait diversity. Finally, given
140 links between size and flight abilities, we predicted that average insect body size would be
141 larger with increasing distance to natural area.

2. Materials and Methods

2.1 Study site

Our study site was situated in the Kruger to Canyons Biosphere Region, Limpopo Province, South Africa. This region includes agricultural areas and also two large protected areas (Kruger National Park and Blyde River Canyon reserve; 24° 24'S 30°50'E). The entire area retains more than 50% of intact vegetation unaffected by anthropogenic perturbations (Coetzer et al. 2013).

Other than tourism, agriculture is an important source of employment in the area. Although in some areas, there are small subsistence farms, in our study area, the farms are composed of sets of large blocks of monoculture stands of mango, citrus or avocado. Mango farms consisted of multiple plots of 0.66 to 3 ha (mean $\pm$ sd= 1.39 $\pm$ 0.87) separated by windbreaks of tall *Casuarina sp.* trees. All the study farms provided similar water and nutrient supply and made intensive use of herbicides (e.g., glyphosphates) and insecticides (neonicotinoids or organophosphates). The sets of blocks of mango plantation are bordered by patches of natural vegetation that vary in size, but are usually at least 250 m wide. These patches of natural vegetation have not been ploughed, and differ from natural vegetation in neighbouring Kruger National Park in that livestock have replaced wild herbivores. The vegetation in the area is Granite Lowveld (Mucina and Rutherford, 2006), a savannah in which the woody component is dominated by *Acacia (Senegalia) nigrescens* and *Sclerocarya birrea*, with a herbaceous layer that includes *Digitaria eriantha*, *Panicum maximum* and *Aristida congesta*.

The primary flower-visitors to mango in this area include Diptera (mostly Calliphoridae and Empididae families), and Hymenoptera (*Apis mellifera*, *Ceratina* spp. bees and species of *Camponotus*, *Monomorium* and *Tetramorium* ants; Carvalheiro et al. 2010, 2012). Mango is self-compatible, but only to a small extent: a bagging experiment found that there was 21% fruit set for inflorescences from which pollinators had been excluded (100% of fruit set in

open inflorescences see Carvalheiro et al. 2010). Mango flowers do produce nectar, but only a small amount of pollen (Eardley et al. 2007).

The first surveys were performed during mango flowering (July-August 2013, dry season hereafter), with maximum temperatures averaging around 26°C and minima of 9°C. The lack of rain during this time means that few flowering species are in bloom for flower-visiting insects. We selected five mango farms separated from each other by between three to thirteen kilometres. Within each farm, we established two transects perpendicular to the edge between mango and natural vegetation. Along each transect, we sampled insects at 5 sampling points, at 50m from the edge with mango in the natural vegetation, at the field edge (0m) and at 100, 200m and the maximal distance possible from any natural habitat within mango orchards. Distance to natural vegetation was measured as the distance from each set of traps within the blocks of mango to the border of the nearest patch of natural vegetation. During April-May 2014, we re-sampled insects in two transects in each of the three most accessible farms. April-May coincides with the end of the wet season, when maximum and minimum temperatures average 29°C and 12°C, respectively, and floral resources are fairly abundant, having flourished during the rains.

At each sampling point, three coloured pan traps (radius=7.25 cm, depth=5 cm) painted with UV-reflecting paints (yellow, blue and white) were placed and filled with 400 ml of water and a drop of detergent (surfactant). Although pan trap sampling is known to under-sample some insect groups like large bees (*Bombus*, *Colletes*), this method is nevertheless considered the most efficient method to sample flying flower-visitors (Roulston et al. 2007; Westphal et al. 2008, Nielsen et al. 2011). It allows sampling of a large number of points simultaneously and uniformly, obtaining standardized estimates of flower visitor abundance and diversity.

2.2 Data collection

In dry and wet seasons, we performed three sampling sessions in each transect (one every two weeks) where traps were set out in the field for 24 hours before being collected (N = 720 pan traps). Traps were set on warm sunny days (minimum of 15°C, no wind and clear sky). Once collected, insects were stored in 70% ethanol before being rinsed, identified at the order level and measured. We focused on potential pollinators including Hymenoptera, Lepidoptera and Diptera, which are groups that are considered as mango pollinators (Sung et al. 2006). Morphometric measures of insects were also taken, *i.e.* wing length (distance between the wing tips) and body length using digital callipers (Digit-Cal MK IV 599-571, Brown and Sharpe, USA, 0.01 mm). Finally, we assessed the number of mango flowers and wild flowers in a perimeter of 15 meters around each sampling point. Within mango orchards, the herbaceous cover was dominated by non-native weeds (e.g. *Tridax procumbens* (L.) and *Bidens pilosa* (L.), both Asteraceae). Since mangoes exhibit “big bang” flowering with a massive number of flowers per tree, we estimated the number of mango flowers by counting the number of flowers on three different panicles and multiplying the average by the number of panicles for each tree (a mature tree has 600-1000 panicles; Manning, 1995; Sung et al. 2006).

2.3 Functional Diversity

Our dataset was comprised of individual insects, and not species, so we calculated functional diversity of the individuals found in our samples. We used order, body length, wing span and the ratio of body length to wing length as traits. Order was represented as a binary variable of one or zero for each of three categories (Diptera, Hymenoptera or Lepidoptera), and therefore order was represented by three “traits”. We therefore down-weighted order to one third the value of the other traits to avoid biasing the analysis.

We calculated the FDis (Functional Dispersion, Laliberté and Legendre 2010) measure of functional diversity, using the FD package in R (Laliberté et al. 2010). In this case, FDis is the mean distance of individuals to the centroid calculated for all individuals in multidimensional trait space. FDis is not affected by species richness (in our case, abundance), and is able to handle missing values and qualitative as well as quantitative traits (Laliberté and Legendre 2010).

2.4 Data analysis

We assessed how functional diversity and the value of each of the traits used to calculate functional diversity (i.e. body length, wing length, and ratio of wing length over body length) changed with season and habitat. Although functional diversity is a measure of the variation in these traits, changes in the average values of traits yields insights into how the traits themselves are affected by habitat and season. These two analyses therefore produce complementary information.

We assessed the effects of sampling season (dry or wet season), habitat (natural vegetation or mango fields) and distance to natural habitat, as well as the interactions between season and distance or habitat effects, on flower abundance, abundance and traits of flying insects and on flying insect functional diversity. To do so, for each response variable, we performed a model averaging approach which allows comparison of all possible submodels from a global model containing all the predictors of interest, in order to identify the best set of models describing the observed variation (Grueber et al. 2011). With this approach, it is possible to account for model uncertainty and to assess the relative importance of various predictor variables.

To analyse patterns in flower abundance, traits of flying insects and functional diversity FDis, we used linear mixed-effect models on log-transformed response variables (except for FDis) using distance to natural vegetation, sampling season, type of habitat, interactions between

distance and sampling season, and interactions between type of habitat and sampling season as fixed variables. Farm, transect nested within farm and date of sampling were included as random effects to avoid pseudo-replication (Crawley, 2007). Additionally, in models with insect traits as a response variable, we included insect order as a random effect to account for differences in trait values between orders.

To assess variations in abundance of flying insects, we carried out generalized linear mixed-effect models (GLMER) with a Poisson distribution and a log-link using the same fixed and random variables with the addition of flower abundance as a fixed variable. We included flower abundance as an explanatory variable because pan-traps are known to be less attractive to flower-visitors in resource-rich sites relative to resource-poor sites (Wilson et al. 2008). The GLMERs were corrected for overdispersion by including observation-level random factors (Harrison 2014).

For each response variable, we selected the set of models according to the Akaike information criterion (AIC). More precisely, we kept the models that were within the range of four highest AIC units and we used these "top models" to estimate the mean effects and confidence intervals of each predictor variable using model averaging (natural average method, Grueber et al. 2011). We also measured the relative importance of each predictor variable which is expressed as the relative sum of the Akaike weights across all top models in which the variable appears (relative importance is equal to 1 for variables present in all top models). Additionally, we calculated the marginal R^2 values (fixed effects) and conditional R^2 values (R^2 both fixed and random effects) to assess the amount of variance explained by the best model (i.e. with highest AIC; Johnson 2014). All analyses were performed using the R statistical interface (v 3.1.0, R Development Core Team, 2014); mixed models were conducted using the package lme4 (Bates et al. 2014) and model comparison and averaging were performed with the functions dredge, get.models and model.avg (package MuMIn;

Barton 2016). Model predictor variables were also centered and standardized with the function standardize (package arm; Gelman and Su, 2015) to facilitate comparison between the relative strengths of parameter estimates (Grueber et al. 2011). R^2 values were calculated with the function r.squared GLMM (package MuMIn; Barton 2016).

3. Results

3.1. Abundance of flowers

Distance to natural vegetation, as well as habitat type, sampling season and their interactions (habitat×season and distance×season), were included in all top models describing the response of flower abundance (Table 1). As expected, the abundance of flowers was greater in mango fields in the dry than in the wet season, whereas we observed more flowers in the nearby natural vegetation during the wet season (see parameter estimate and confidence interval of the interaction between sampling season and habitat type in Table 1, Figure 1A). Flower abundance was far higher in the mango fields than in the natural vegetation during the dry season (Figure 1A), given that we did not observe any flowers in the neighbouring natural vegetation in any of the sampling sessions in the five farms over the dry season. The abundance of flowers also increased with increasing distance from natural vegetation (Figure 1A). The interaction between distance and season had only 35% relative importance to other predictor variables and the confidence interval for this parameter estimate included 0. Thus there was little evidence that the effect of distance from natural vegetation on flower abundance differed between seasons.

3.2 Abundance of flying insects

Distance to natural vegetation, sampling season, and the interaction between these two variables, were included in all top models describing the response of abundance of flying

insects (Table 1). The abundance of flying insects was far higher during the wet season than the dry season, which was expected since we captured 798 insects in the five farms during the dry season but captured 1719 insects in only three of these farms during the wet season. Abundance of flying insects declined with increasing distance from natural vegetation, but only during the dry season (Table 1, Figure 1B). The difference in abundance of flying insects between the two sampling periods was also more pronounced in mango fields (see parameter estimate and confidence interval of the interaction between sampling season and habitat type in Table 1), but there was weaker evidence for this effect (55% relative importance). Lastly, there was very little evidence of an effect of flower abundance on the abundance of flying insects (39% relative importance to distance and season, and the confidence interval for this parameter estimate included 0).

3.3 Functional diversity

Distance to natural vegetation and sampling season were included in all top models describing the response of functional diversity (Table 1). Functional diversity of flying insects was higher in the wet season than during the dry season and FD declined with increasing distance from natural vegetation in both seasons (Figure 1C). Functional diversity was also higher in nearby natural vegetation than in mango fields (79% relative importance to distance and season, Table 1). The interaction between distance and season had only 23% relative importance and the confidence interval for this parameter estimate included 0. Thus, there was little evidence that the negative effect of distance from natural vegetation on functional diversity differed between seasons.

3. 4 Insect traits

Only sampling season was included in all top models describing the responses of body length, wing span and ratio of wing span to body length of flying insects (Table 2). Both body length and wing span of flying insects were on average smaller during the dry than during the wet season, whereas the ratio of wing span to body length was larger during the dry season (Figure 2). Body length and wing span of flying insects also differed between habitat types, insects being on average larger in natural vegetation than in mango fields (Figure 2, Table 2). Although body length and wing span of flying insects tended to decrease with increasing distance to natural vegetation during the dry season (Figure 2), this effect was not significant (the confidence interval for the corresponding estimate included 0). There was very little evidence of any effect of habitat type and distance to natural vegetation on the ratio of wing span to body length of flying insects (Table 2). In addition, the marginal R^2 of the models were very low (about 0.02, see Table 2), indicating that on average variance in insect traits explained by effects of distance, habitat type and sampling season was only 2% whereas random factors (which represented insect order, as well as sample position and date) explained between 40 and 50% of the variation.

4. Discussion

This study highlights that mango orchards are more inhospitable for flying insects during the dry (mango flowering) than during the wet season, despite the abundance of mango flowers available in the orchards. We found declines in insect abundance with increasing distance to natural areas during the dry season whereas no pattern was found during the wet season. The functional diversity (FD) of flying insects declined with increasing distance to natural habitat in both sampling periods, however, and insects were on average smaller in mango orchards than in natural vegetation. Taken together, our results suggest impacts on crop yield, given that as a rule, rate of flower visitation (Vázquez et al. 2005, Garibaldi et al. 2013) and functional diversity (Fontaine et al. 2006, Hoehn et al. 2008, Albrecht et al. 2012, Fründ et al. 2013) increase crop fruit set. Creating patches of habitat rich in native floral resources that flower before and during mango flowering within orchards could mitigate the detrimental effects of isolation from natural habitats and increase mango production (Carvalho et al. 2012).

4.1 Seasonal variation in flying insect abundance

Agricultural landscapes show strong temporal variation in the floral resource offer. Mass flowering crops, during their flowering season, are expected to exert a strong magnet effect on pollinators from adjacent areas (Blitzer et al. 2012). We did not find this effect, however, and this was somewhat surprising, given that there are few other floral resources in the landscape at this time. It is possible that this pulse of floral resources is too short-lived to enable invertebrate populations to respond to this sudden availability in floral resources. This finding highlights the importance of considering seasonal variation in the value of agricultural patches for pollinators.

356 The decline in insect abundance with increasing distance to natural vegetation that we
357 observed during the dry season is a pattern that has been observed in numerous studies in
358 agricultural systems (e.g. Ricketts et al. 2008; Garibaldi et al. 2011b). This pattern appears
359 stronger in tropical than temperate regions (Ricketts et al. 2008) and has been particularly
360 well documented by Carvalheiro et al. (2010) in our study system. This latter study notably
361 showed that even in a biodiversity rich area, with a high proportion of intact natural habitat,
362 the abundance of flying insects was impacted by isolation from natural habitats, which in turn
363 impacted crop fruit set. Because several flying insects such as bees are central place foragers
364 (*i.e.* individuals that return to their nests after foraging (for nectar and/or pollen; Williams and
365 Kremen, 2007), this decline in insect abundance with increasing distance to natural area is
366 commonly attributed to the distance from nesting sites and foraging resources available in
367 natural habitats (e.g. Ricketts et al. 2008; Farwig et al. 2009; Williams et al. 2010; Garibaldi
368 et al. 2011b; Samnegård et al. 2015).

369 But intriguingly, in complete contrast to the dry season when mango is flowering, we did not
370 observe any effect of distance to natural area on insect abundance during the wet season.
371 These contrasting results might be explained by the seasonal dynamics of wild floral
372 resources and pollinator communities. Flying insects were more abundant and had higher
373 functional diversity during the wet than dry season, which is expected since the wet season
374 coincides with spring/summer, when more floral resources are available and temperatures are
375 higher. The link between plant richness and abundance and flower-visitor richness and
376 abundance has been well documented in the scientific literature for croplands (e.g., Holzschuh
377 et al., 2007; Kennedy et al., 2013). The higher diversity of native flowering plant during the
378 wet season, and the increasing availability of weed flowers with increasing distance from
379 natural vegetation within mango orchards might explain the absence of a relationship between
380 isolation from natural habitat and insect abundance. It is also worth noting that mango flowers

yield only small amounts of pollen, although they do offer some nectar (Eardley et al. 2007), and so are not very attractive to many insects (Free and Willams 1976). Thus, the lack of attractiveness of mango mass flowering might explain the strong negative effect of isolation from natural habitat we observed during the dry season. This idea is supported by an earlier study in which small planted patches of native flowering plants within mango orchards were associated with an increased abundance of flower-visitors to mango flowers, which mitigated to some extent the effects of isolation (Carvalho et al. 2012).

In addition to the limitations in floral resources, alternative explanations exist that might explain seasonal variation in distance effects on flying insects in the crop. Pesticides are used in mango fields, even during mango flowering. Many studies have reported on the negative effect of pesticides on flower-visitors (Henry et al. 2012; Goulson et al. 2015; Stanley et al. 2015), and Carvalho et al. (2012) also previously highlighted the detrimental effect of pesticide use on flying insect along gradients of increasing distance to natural area in our study system. Varying pesticide applications might thus also explain the different effects of distance to natural area on insect abundance between the two sampling seasons.

Pan-traps are widely considered to provide accurate surveys of bee assemblages (Roulston et al. 2007, Westphal et al. 2008, Geslin et al. 2016), but are also prone to some bias. Pan-traps under-sample large insects and their attractiveness can vary with the amount of flowers locally present (Wilson et al. 2008, Popic et al. 2013). The relative attractiveness of pan-traps decreases as floral resources increase because pan traps compete with flowers for flying insect attention. However, it is unlikely that our results are an artefact of pan-trapping. We included floral abundance as an explanatory variable in our statistical models, and this variable did not have a significant effect on insect abundance. Secondly, in both seasons, more flowers were observed in mango orchards compared to natural habitats and the decline in insect abundance

with increasing distance to natural habitat was observed uniquely during the dry season, with the same capture method.

4.2 Functional diversity

Although flying insect abundance decreased with increasing distance from natural habitat during the dry season only, declines in functional diversity with increasing isolation were consistent in the two sampling seasons. A recent study highlighted that farmed landscapes were detrimental to the maintenance of functional-trait diversity of flying insects (Forrest et al. 2015), and our findings support this view.

FD is increasingly recognized as being more important than species diversity to ecosystem functioning (Gagic et al. 2015) and has been suggested to be the major component of diversity (Tilman et al. 1997; Hulot et al. 2000; Hoehn et al. 2008). The main reason for the importance of FD lies in the complementarity of pollination services through niche partitioning of resource use in time and space (Fontaine et al. 2006; Hoehn et al. 2008; Albrecht et al. 2012; Fründ et al. 2013). The value of greater FD to pollination services has been demonstrated both experimentally (Fontaine et al. 2006) and empirically (Hoehn et al. 2008), and a recent example in apple orchards highlighted that fruit and seed set was mainly mediated by bee FD (Martins et al. 2015, but see Garibaldi et al. 2015).

The loss of FD with increasing isolation can reduce the efficiency of pollination (Forrest et al. 2015; Wood et al. 2015) reducing yield for trees at the centre of mango orchards. Carvalheiro et al. (2010, 2012), demonstrated that agricultural production and proximity to natural habitat are positively correlated in the mango orchards we studied. Yet, easily implementable management practices might ameliorate, to some extent, the negative effects of isolation. Creating patches of flowering rich habitat has been shown to increase crop yield in mango orchards (Carvalheiro et al. 2012). FD of flying insects has been shown to improve with only

modest enhancements of floral diversity (Orford et al. 2016). Given that isolation from natural habitat together with loss of flower-visitor abundance and diversity are now well established as critical drivers of limitation in crop yield (Garibaldi et al. 2016), we encourage the establishment of those simple management practices to enhance food production.

4.3 Traits of flying insects

In contrast to functional diversity, there was weak evidence of distance effects on average insect trait values, and the traits were only weakly affected by habitat type. Although a large part of the variance in insect traits was related to size differences between orders, sampling season had also a significant effect on flying insect average body length and wing span. During the dry season in tropical environments, resources are scarcer and more patchily-distributed compared to the wet season (Samnegård et al. 2015). Because the foraging range of flying insects is positively correlated with their body size (Araújo et al. 2004; Greenleaf et al. 2007), we initially hypothesized that we would trap larger flying insect during the dry season. However, our results show that insects were smaller during the dry season. This finding is more consistent with the findings of Wray et al. (2014), who found large-bodied species to be favoured by increasing availability of floral resources (although this was in a landscape context of urbanisation). Indeed, large-bodied species may have larger resource needs and smaller population sizes (Kremen and McGonigle, 2015), which could disadvantage them during the dry season. We nevertheless did detect a greater ratio of wing to body length during the dry season, which might indicate greater mobility of insects relative to their size than during the wet season. Insect size differences between seasons might also arise from differences in climatic conditions such as temperature. Some studies reported that higher wing to thorax size ratios could be selectively advantageous at lower temperatures (e.g., Azevedo et al. 1998), which is in agreement with what we found during the dry/winter season.

Species turnover between seasons likely explains the difference in insect sizes between seasons. The distribution of insect body size/tongue size has been found to closely match the distribution of flower corolla tube depth (Agosta and Janzen 2005, Stang et al. 2006; 2009) and to determine the abundance of interactions in pollinator webs (Stang et al. 2006, Geslin et al. 2013). The distribution of the size of insects might be due to the predominance of flowers with short corollas during the dry season because mango flowers, as well as the dominant non-native weeds *T. procumbens* and *B. pilosa* have short corollas. This is supported by the fact that the few large individuals of flying insect we found during the dry season were trapped in natural habitat where plants such as *Grewia* spp., have flowers that present a more tubular and deep corolla structure. Finally, we observed larger insects, in both seasons, in the natural vegetation compared to mango orchards. Some studies have found large-bodied flying insects to be more prone to extinction in response to land use intensity and habitat loss (Larsen et al. 2005, Bartomeus et al. 2013; Rader et al 2014), whereas others have found non-significant effects (Williams et al. 2010), and several authors found small insects to be more negatively affected by isolation and habitat loss than larger ones (Bommarco et al. 2010; Öckinger et al. 2010; Jauker et al. 2013). Here, large-bodied species seemed more sensitive to agricultural perturbations than small bodied ones and were thus less abundant in mango orchards. Moreover, flowers within mango orchards may be less attractive to large bodied insects because of the nectar and pollen offerings of mango flowers relative to wild flower species.

5. Conclusion

Our study provides new evidence of the detrimental effects of isolation from natural habitats, even in a biodiversity rich area, on abundance and functional diversity of flying insects in different seasons. Although these deleterious effects were season-dependent for insect

abundance (i.e. negative effects of distance from natural vegetation only during crop
flowering), functional diversity declined consistently with increasing distance from natural
habitat in both dry and wet seasons. This study thus sheds a light on the importance of
providing patches of resource-rich habitat within orchards over the year to mitigate the
detrimental effects of isolation and maintain functionally-diverse insect communities. Such
management practices are easily achievable in mango orchards and should be encouraged.
Finally, this study also underlines the temporal variability within a year of patch use by flying
insect communities within an agricultural landscape. Agricultural landscapes and mechanisms
that structure flying insect communities should thus be studied at various spatial and temporal
scales. We encourage new studies regarding links between morphological traits of insects and
agricultural intensification, contributing to a synthesis that can untangle the relative
importance of temporal and spatial contexts, crop and management practices.

493 **Acknowledgments**

494 We are grateful to Floriane Flacher, Lavhelesani Simba, Lyndre Nel, Anne-Sophie Bonnet-
495 Lebrun, Pierre Quévieux, Thomas Aubier and Kejun Zou for their help with data collection.

496 BG thanks Lucas A. Garibaldi and Boris Leroy for useful discussions. This work was
497 supported by the European Commission Marie Curie *International Research Staff Exchange*
498 *Scheme* (IRSES) ('NETWORK' project, Grant agreement: PIRSES-GA-2012-318929). .

References

- Agosta, S.J., Janzen, D.H., 2005. Body size distributions of large Costa Rican dry forest moths and the underlying relationship between plant and pollinator morphology. *Oikos* 108, 183–193. doi:10.1111/j.0030-1299.2005.13504.x
- Aizen, M. A., Garibaldi, L.A., Cunningham, S. A., Klein, A.M., 2008. Long-term global trends in crop yield and production reveal no current pollination shortage but increasing pollinator dependency. *Curr. Biol.* 18, 1572–5. doi:10.1016/j.cub.2008.08.066
- Albrecht, M., Schmid, B., Hautier, Y., Müller, C.B., 2012. Diverse pollinator communities enhance plant reproductive success. *Proc. Biol. Sci.* 279, 4845–52. doi:10.1098/rspb.2012.1621
- Araújo, E., Costa, M., 2004. Body size and flight distance in stingless bees (Hymenoptera: Meliponini): inference of flight range and possible ecological implications. *Brazilian J. Biol.* 64, 563–568.
- Azevedo, Ricardo BR, Avis C. James, Jennie McCabe, and L. Partridge. 1998. Latitudinal variation of wing: thorax size ratio and wing-aspect ratio in *Drosophila melanogaster*. *Evolution* 5: 1353-1362.
- Bartomeus, I., Park, M.G., Gibbs, J., Danforth, B.N., Lakso, A.N., Winfree, R., 2013. Biodiversity ensures plant-pollinator phenological synchrony against climate change. *Ecol. Lett.* 16, 1331–8. doi:10.1111/ele.12170
- Barton K., 2016. MuMIn: Multi-Model Inference. R package version 1.15.6. <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=MuMIn>
- Bates, D., M. Maechler, B. Bolker, and S. Walker., 2014. lme4:Linear mixed-effects models using Eigen and S4. R package version 1.1-5.

Benjamin, F., R. Reilly, J., Winfree, R., 2014. Pollinator body size mediates the scale at
 which land use drives crop pollination services. *J. Appl. Ecol.* 51, 440–449.
 doi:10.1111/1365-2664.12198

Blitzer, E.J., Dormann, C.F., Holzschuh, A., Klein, A.M., Rand, T.A., Tscharntke, T., 2012.
 Spillover of functionally important organisms between managed and natural habitats.
Agric. Ecosyst. Environ. 146, 34–43. doi:10.1016/j.agee.2011.09.005

Bommarco, R., Biesmeijer, J.C., Meyer, B., Potts, S.G., Pöry, J., Roberts, S.P.M., Steffan-
 Dewenter, I., Ockinger, E., 2010. Dispersal capacity and diet breadth modify the
 response of wild bees to habitat loss. *Proc. Biol. Sci.* 277, 2075–2082.
 doi:10.1098/rspb.2009.2221

Carvalheiro, L.G., Seymour, C.L., Veldtman, R., Nicolson, S.W., 2010. Pollination services
 decline with distance from natural habitat even in biodiversity-rich areas. *J. Appl. Ecol.*
 47, 810–820. doi:10.1111/j.1365-2664.2010.01829.x

Carvalheiro, L.G., Seymour, C.L., Nicolson, S.W., Veldtman, R., 2012. Creating patches of
 native flowers facilitates crop pollination in large agricultural fields: mango as a case
 study. *J. Appl. Ecol.* 49, 1373–1383. doi:10.1111/j.1365-2664.2012.02217.x

Coetzer, K.L., Erasmus, B.F.N., Witkowski, E.T.F., Reyers, B., 2013. The race for space:
 Tracking land-cover transformation in a socio-ecological landscape, South Africa.
Environ. Manage. 52, 595–611. doi:10.1007/s00267-013-0094-9

Crawley, M. (2007). *The R book*. John Wiley and Sons Ltd., Chichester, UK, 949 pp.

Cresswell, J.E., 2000. A comparison of bumblebees' movements in uniform and aggregated
 distributions of their forage plant. *Ecol. Entomol.* 25, 19–25. doi:10.1046/j.1365-
 2311.2000.00230.x

545 Deguines, N., Jono, C., Baude, M., Henry, M., Julliard, R., Fontaine, C., 2014. Large-scale
 546 trade-off between agricultural intensification and crop pollination services. *Front. Ecol.*
 547 *Environ.* 12, 212–217. doi:10.1890/130054
 548 Eardley, C., B. Gemmill-Herren, M. Gikungu, R. Kagioya, W. Kinuthia, P. K. Kwapong, D.
 549 Mar-tins, L. Njoroge, and G. Tribe. 2007. Crops, browse and pollinators in Africa: an
 550 initial stock-taking. FAO, Rome.
 551 Eilers, E.J., Kremen, C., Smith Greenleaf, S., Garber, A.K., Klein, A.-M., 2011. Contribution
 552 of pollinator-mediated crops to nutrients in the human food supply. *PLoS One* 6, e21363.
 553 doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0021363
 554 Ehlers Smith, Y.C., Ehlers Smith, D.A., Seymour, C.L., Thébault, E., van Veen, F.J.F., 2015.
 555 Response of avian diversity to habitat modification can be predicted from life-history
 556 traits and ecological attributes. *Landsc. Ecol.* 30, 1225–1239. doi:10.1007/s10980-015-
 557 0172-x
 558 Ehrlich, P.R., Harte, J., 2015. Opinion: To feed the world in 2050 will require a global
 559 revolution. *PNAS* 112, 14743–14744. doi:10.1073/pnas.1519841112
 560 Farwig, N., Bailey, D., Bochud, E., Herrmann, J.D., Kindler, E., Reusser, N., Schüepp, C.,
 561 Schmidt-Entling, M.H., 2009. Isolation from forest reduces pollination, seed predation
 562 and insect scavenging in Swiss farmland. *Landsc. Ecol.* 24, 919–927.
 563 doi:10.1007/s10980-009-9376-2
 564 Forrest, J.R.K., Thorp, R.W., Kremen, C., Williams, N.M., 2015. Contrasting patterns in
 565 species and functional-trait diversity of bees in an agricultural landscape. *J. Appl. Ecol.*
 566 52, 706–715. doi:10.1111/1365-2664.12433
 567 Free, J.B., Williams, I.H. 1976. Insect pollination of *Anacardium occidentale* L., *Mangifera*
 568 *indica* L., *Blighia sapida* Koenig and *Persea americana* Mill. *Tropical Agriculture*, 53,
 569 125–139.

570 Fründ, J., Zieger, S.L., Tscharntke, T., 2013. Response diversity of wild bees to overwintering
571 temperatures. *Oecologia* 173, 1639–1648. doi:10.1007/s00442-013-2729-1

572 Fontaine, C., Dajoz, I., Meriguet, J., Loreau, M., 2006. Functional diversity of plant-pollinator
573 interaction webs enhances the persistence of plant communities. *PLoS Biol.* 4, e1.
574 doi:10.1371/journal.pbio.0040001

575 Gagic, V., Bartomeus, I., Jonsson, T., Taylor, A., Winqvist, C., Fischer, C., Slade, E.M.,
576 Steffan-dewenter, I., Emmerson, M., Potts, S.G., Tscharntke, T., Weisser, W.,
577 Bommarco, R., 2015. Functional identity and diversity of animals predict ecosystem
578 functioning better than species-based indices.
579 doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2014.2620

580 Gallai, N., Salles, J.-M., Settele, J., Vaissière, B.E., 2008. Economic valuation of the
581 vulnerability of world agriculture confronted with pollinator decline. *Ecol. Econ.* 68,
582 810–821. doi:10.1016/j.ecolecon.2008.06.014

583 Garibaldi, L. A, Aizen, M. A, Klein, A.M., Cunningham, S. a, Harder, L.D., 2011a. Global
584 growth and stability of agricultural yield decrease with pollinator dependence. *Proc.*
585 *Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.* 108, 5909–5914. doi:10.1073/pnas.1012431108

586 Garibaldi, L. A, Steffan-Dewenter, I., Kremen, C., Morales, J.M., Bommarco, R.,
587 Cunningham, S. A, Carvalheiro, L.G., Chacoff, N.P., Dudenhöffer, J.H., Greenleaf, S.S.,
588 Holzschuh, A., Isaacs, R., Krewenka, K., Mandelik, Y., Mayfield, M.M., Morandin, L.
589 A, Potts, S.G., Ricketts, T.H., Szentgyörgyi, H., Viana, B.F., Westphal, C., Winfree, R.,
590 Klein, A.M., 2011b. Stability of pollination services decreases with isolation from
591 natural areas despite honey bee visits. *Ecol. Lett.* 14, 1062–72. doi:10.1111/j.1461-
592 0248.2011.01669.x

593 Garibaldi, L. a, Steffan-Dewenter, I., Winfree, R., Aizen, M. a, Bommarco, R., Cunningham,
594 S. A, Kremen, C., Carvalheiro, L.G., Harder, L.D., Afik, O., Bartomeus, I., Benjamin, F.,

595 Boreux, V., Cariveau, D., Chacoff, N.P., Dudenhöffer, J.H., Freitas, B.M., Ghazoul, J.,
 596 Greenleaf, S., Hipólito, J., Holzschuh, A., Howlett, B., Isaacs, R., Javorek, S.K.,
 597 Kennedy, C.M., Krewenka, K.M., Krishnan, S., Mandelik, Y., Mayfield, M.M., Motzke,
 598 I., Munyuli, T., Nault, B. a, Otieno, M., Petersen, J., Pisanty, G., Potts, S.G., Rader, R.,
 599 Ricketts, T.H., Rundlöf, M., Seymour, C.L., Schüepp, C., Szentgyörgyi, H., Taki, H.,
 600 Tscharnkte, T., Vergara, C.H., Viana, B.F., Wanger, T.C., Westphal, C., Williams, N.,
 601 Klein, A.M., 2013. Wild pollinators enhance fruit set of crops regardless of honey bee
 602 abundance. *Science* 339, 1608–11. doi:10.1126/science.1230200

603 Garibaldi, L. A., Bartomeus, I., Bommarco, R., Klein, A.M., Cunningham, S. A., Aizen, M.
 604 A., Boreux, V., Garratt, M.P.D., Carvalheiro, L.G., Kremen, C., Morales, C.L., Schüepp,
 605 C., Chacoff, N.P., Freitas, B.M., Gagic, V., Holzschuh, A., Klatt, B.K., Krewenka, K.M.,
 606 Krishnan, S., Mayfield, M.M., Motzke, I., Otieno, M., Petersen, J., Potts, S.G., Ricketts,
 607 T.H., Rundlöf, M., Sciligo, A., Sinu, P.A., Steffan-Dewenter, I., Taki, H., Tscharnkte, T.,
 608 Vergara, C.H., Viana, B.F., Wojciechowski, M., 2015. Trait matching of flower visitors
 609 and crops predicts fruit set better than trait diversity. *J. Appl. Ecol.* 52, 1436–1444.
 610 doi:10.1111/1365-2664.12530

611 Garibaldi, L.A., Carvalheiro, L.G., Vaissiere, B.E., Gemmill-Herren, B., Hipolito, J., Freitas,
 612 B.M., Ngo, H.T., Azzu, N., Saez, A., Astrom, J., An, J., Blochtein, B., Buchori, D.,
 613 Garcia, F.J.C., Oliveira da Silva, F., Devkota, K., Ribeiro, M. d. F., Freitas, L.,
 614 Gaglianone, M.C., Goss, M., Irshad, M., Kasina, M., Filho, A.J.S.P., Kiill, L.H.P.,
 615 Kwapong, P., Parra, G.N., Pires, C., Pires, V., Rawal, R.S., Rizali, A., Saraiva, A.M.,
 616 Veldtman, R., Viana, B.F., Witter, S., Zhang, H., 2016. Mutually beneficial pollinator
 617 diversity and crop yield outcomes in small and large farms. *Science* 351, 388–391.
 618 doi:10.1126/science.aac7287

619 Gelman A., Su Y-S., 2015. arm: Data Analysis Using Regression and Multilevel/ Hierarchical
620 Models. R package version 1.8-6. <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=arm>

621 Geslin, B., Gauzens, B., Thébault, E., Dajoz, I., 2013. Plant Pollinator Networks along a
622 Gradient of Urbanisation. PLoS One 8, e63421. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0063421

623 Geslin, B., Le Féon, V., Kuhlmann, M., Vaissière, B.E., Dajoz, I., 2016. The bee fauna of
624 large parks in downtown Paris , France. Ann. la Société Entomol. Fr.
625 doi:10.1080/00379271.2016.1146632

626 Greenleaf, S.S., Williams, N.M., Winfree, R.,
627 Kremen, C., 2007. Bee foraging ranges and their relationship to body size. Oecologia
628 153, 589–596. doi:10.1007/s00442-007-0752-9

629 Goulson, D., Nicholls, E., Botias, C., Rotheray, E.L., 2015. Bee declines driven by combined
630 stress from parasites, pesticides, and lack of flowers. Science (80-.). 347, 1255957–
631 1255957. doi:10.1126/science.1255957

632 Grueber, C.E., Nakagawa, S., Laws, R.J. & Jamieson, I.G., 2011 Multi- model inference in
633 ecology and evolution: challenges and solutions. J. of Evo. Biol., 24, 699–711

634 Henri, D.C., Jones, O., Tsiattalos, A., Thébault, E., Seymour, C.L., van Veen, F.J.F., 2015.
635 Natural vegetation benefits synergistic control of the three main insect and pathogen
636 pests of a fruit crop in southern Africa. J. Appl. Ecol. 52, 1092–1101. doi:10.1111/1365-
637 2664.12465

638 Henry, M., Béguin, M., Requier, F., Rollin, O., Odoux, J.-F., Aupinel, P., Aptel, J.,
639 Tchamitchian, S., Decourtye, A., 2012. A common pesticide decreases foraging success
640 and survival in honey bees. Science 336, 348–50. doi:10.1126/science.1215039

641 Hoehn, P., Tscharntke, T., Tylianakis, J.M., Steffan-Dewenter, I., 2008. Functional group
642 diversity of bee pollinators increases crop yield. Proc. Biol. Sci. 275, 2283–91.
doi:10.1098/rspb.2008.0405

643 Holzschuh, A., Steffan-dewenter, I., Kleijn, D., Tscharntke, T., 2007. Diversity of flower-
 644 visiting bees in cereal fields : effects of farming system, landscape composition and
 645 regional context 41–49. doi:10.1111/j.1365-2664.2006.01259.x

646 Holzschuh, A., Dormann, C.F., Tscharntke, T., Steffan-Dewenter, I., 2011. Expansion of
 647 mass-flowering crops leads to transient pollinator dilution and reduced wild plant
 648 pollination. *Proc. Biol. Sci.* 278, 3444–51. doi:10.1098/rspb.2011.0268

649 Hulot, F. D., Lacroix, G., Lescher-Moutoué, F. & Loreau, M., 2000 Functional diversity
 650 governs response to nutrient enrichment. *Nature*, 405, 340-344.

651 Jauker, F., Diekötter, T., Schwarzbach, F., Wolters, V., 2009. Pollinator dispersal in an
 652 agricultural matrix: opposing responses of wild bees and hoverflies to landscape
 653 structure and distance from main habitat. *Landsc. Ecol.* 24, 547–555.
 654 doi:10.1007/s10980-009-9331-2

655 Johnson, P.C.D., 2014. Extension of Nakagawa & Schielzeth's R² GLMM to random slopes
 656 models. *Methods Ecol. Evol.* 5, 944–946. doi:10.1111/2041-210X.12225

657 Kennedy, C.M., Lonsdorf, E., Neel, M.C., Williams, N.M., Ricketts, T.H., Winfree, R.,
 658 Bommarco, R., Brittain, C., Burley, A.L., Cariveau, D., Carvalheiro, L.G., Chacoff, N.P.,
 659 Cunningham, S.A., Danforth, B.N., Dudenhöffer, J.-H., Elle, E., Gaines, H.R., Garibaldi,
 660 L.A., Gratton, C., Holzschuh, A., Isaacs, R., Javorek, S.K., Jha, S., Klein, A.M.,
 661 Krewenka, K., Mandelik, Y., Mayfield, M.M., Morandin, L., Neame, L.A., Otieno, M.,
 662 Park, M., Potts, S.G., Rundlöf, M., Saez, A., Steffan-Dewenter, I., Taki, H., Viana, B.F.,
 663 Westphal, C., Wilson, J.K., Greenleaf, S.S., Kremen, C., 2013. A global quantitative
 664 synthesis of local and landscape effects on wild bee pollinators in agroecosystems. *Ecol.*
 665 *Lett.* 16, 584–599. doi:10.1111/ele.12082

666 Klein, A.-M., Steffan-Dewenter, I., Tscharntke, T., 2003. Fruit set of highland coffee
 667 increases with the diversity of pollinating bees. *Proc. Biol. Sci.* 270, 955–61.
 668 doi:10.1098/rspb.2002.2306

669 Klein, A.-M., Vaissière, B.E., Cane, J.H., Steffan-Dewenter, I., Cunningham, S. A, Kremen,
 670 C., Tscharntke, T., 2007. Importance of pollinators in changing landscapes for world
 671 crops. *Proc. Biol. Sci.* 274, 303–13. doi:10.1098/rspb.2006.3721

672 Kremen, C., M’Gonigle, L.K., 2015. Small-scale restoration in intensive agricultural
 673 landscapes supports more specialized and less mobile pollinator species. *J. Appl. Ecol.*
 674 n/a–n/a. doi:10.1111/1365-2664.12418

675 Kremen, C., Williams, N.M., Thorp, R.W., 2002. Crop pollination from native bees at risk
 676 from agricultural intensification. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.* 99, 16812–16816.
 677 doi:10.1073/pnas.262413599

678 Laliberté, E., Legendre, P. 2010. A distance-based framework for measuring functional
 679 diversity from multiple traits. *Ecology* 91: 299-305

680 Laliberté, E., Legendre, P., Bill Shipley, 2010. Measuring functional diversity (FD) from
 681 multiple traits, and other tools for functional ecology. [http://cran.r-](http://cran.r-project.org/web/packages/FD/FD.pdf)
 682 [project.org/web/packages/FD/FD.pdf](http://cran.r-project.org/web/packages/FD/FD.pdf)

683 Larsen, T.H., Williams, N.M., Kremen, C., 2005. Extinction order and altered community
 684 structure rapidly disrupt ecosystem functioning. *Ecol. Lett.* 8, 538–547.
 685 doi:10.1111/j.1461-0248.2005.00749.x

686 Leonhardt, S.D.S., Gallai, N., Garibaldi, L.A., Kuhlmann, M., Klein, A.-M., 2013. Economic
 687 gain, stability of pollination and bee diversity decrease from southern to northern
 688 Europe. *Basic Appl. Ecol.* 14, 461–471. doi:10.1016/j.baae.2013.06.003

689 Manning, R. 1995. Honeybee pollination technical data. Western Australia Department of
 690 Agriculture, Bulletin No. 4298

691 Martins, K.T., Gonzalez, A., Lechowicz, M.J., 2015. Pollination services are mediated by bee
 692 functional diversity and landscape context. *Agric. Ecosyst. Environ.* 200, 12–20.
 693 doi:10.1016/j.agee.2014.10.018

694 Morandin, L. A., Kremen, C., 2013. Hedgerow restoration promotes pollinator populations
 695 and exports native bees to adjacent fields. *Ecol. Appl.* 23, 829–839. doi:10.1890/12-
 696 1051.1

697 Mucina L., Rutherford M. C., 2006, The vegetation of South Africa, Lesotho and Swaziland
 698 *Strelitzia* 19. South African National Biodiversity Institute, Pretoria. 807pp.

699 Nielsen, A., Steffan-Dewenter, I., Westphal, C., Messinger, O., Potts, S.G., Roberts, S.P.M.,
 700 Settele, J., Szentgyörgyi, H., Vaissière, B.E., Vaitis, M., Woyciechowski, M., Bazos, I.,
 701 Biesmeijer, J.C., Bommarco, R., Kunin, W.E., Tscheulin, T., Lamborn, E., Petanidou, T.,
 702 2011. Assessing bee species richness in two Mediterranean communities: Importance of
 703 habitat type and sampling techniques. *Ecol. Res.* 26, 969–983. doi:10.1007/s11284-011-
 704 0852-1

705 Öckinger, E., Schweiger, O., Crist, T.O., Debinski, D.M., Krauss, J., Kuussaari, M., Petersen,
 706 J.D., Pöyry, J., Settele, J., Summerville, K.S., Bommarco, R., 2010. Life-history traits
 707 predict species responses to habitat area and isolation: a cross-continental synthesis.
 708 *Ecol. Lett.* 13, no–no. doi:10.1111/j.1461-0248.2010.01487.x

709 Ollerton, J., Winfree, R., Tarrant, S., 2011. How many flowering plants are pollinated by
 710 animals? *Oikos* 120, 321–326. doi:10.1111/j.1600-0706.2010.18644.x

711 Oertli, S., Müller, A., Dorn, S., 2005. Ecological and seasonal patterns in the diversity of a
 712 species-rich bee assemblage (Hymenoptera: Apoidea: Apiformes. *Eur. J. Entomol.* 102,
 713 53–63. doi:10.1016/j.biocon.2005.05.014

714 Orford, K.A., Vaughan, I.P., Memmott, J., 2015. The forgotten flies: the importance of non-
 715 syrphid Diptera as pollinators. *Proc. Biol. Sci.* 282, 20142934–.
 716 doi:10.1098/rspb.2014.2934

717 Orford, K.A., Murray, P.J., Vaughan, I.P., Memmott, J., 2016. Modest enhancements to
 718 conventional grassland diversity improve the provision of pollination services. *J. Appl.*
 719 *Ecol. Online Only* doi:10.1111/1365-2664.12608

720 Popic, T.J., Davila, Y.C., Wardle, G.M., 2013. Evaluation of common methods for sampling
 721 invertebrate pollinator assemblages: net sampling out-perform pan traps. *PLoS One* 8,
 722 e66665. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0066665

723 R Development Core Team, 2014. R: A language and environment for statistical computing.
 724 R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria. URL: <http://www.r-project.org>.

725 Rader, R., Bartomeus, I., Tylianakis, J.M., Laliberté, E., 2014. The winners and losers of land
 726 use intensification: pollinator community disassembly is non-random and alters
 727 functional diversity. *Divers. Distrib.* 20, 908–917. doi:10.1111/ddi.12221

728 Ricketts, T.H., Regetz, J., Steffan-Dewenter, I., Cunningham, S. A, Kremen, C., Bogdanski,
 729 A., Gemmill-Herren, B., Greenleaf, S.S., Klein, A.M., Mayfield, M.M., Morandin, L. A,
 730 Ochieng', A., Potts, S.G., Viana, B.F., 2008. Landscape effects on crop pollination
 731 services: are there general patterns? *Ecol. Lett.* 11, 499–515. doi:10.1111/j.1461-
 732 0248.2008.01157.x

733 Rollin, O., Bretagnolle, V., Fortel, L., Guilbaud, L., Henry, M., 2015. Habitat, spatial and
 734 temporal drivers of diversity patterns in a wild bee assemblage. *Biodivers. Conserv.*
 735 doi:10.1007/s10531-014-0852-x

736 Roulston, T.H., Smith, S.A., Brewster, A.L., Farm, B.E., Lane, B.F., 2007. A Comparison of
 737 Pan Trap and Intensive Net Sampling Techniques for Documenting a Bee
 738 (Hymenoptera : Apiformes) *J. Kansas Entomol. Soc.* 80, 179–181.

739 Samnegård, U., Hambäck, P. A, Eardley, C., Nemomissa, S., Hylander, K., 2015. Turnover in
 740 bee species composition and functional trait distributions between seasons in a tropical
 741 agricultural landscape. *Agric. Ecosyst. Environ.* 211, 185–194.
 742 doi:10.1016/j.agee.2015.06.010

743 Schmid-Hempel, P., Kacelnik, A., Houston, A.I., 1985. Honeybees maximize efficiency by
 744 not filling their crop. *Behav. Ecol. Sociobiol.* 17, 61–66. doi:10.1007/BF00299430

745 Schmid-Hempel, P., & Schmid-Hempel, R., 1986. Nectar-collecting bees use distance-
 746 sensitive movement rules. *Animal behaviour*, 34, 605-607. doi:10.1016/S0003-
 747 3472(86)80131-2

748 Stang, M., Klinkhamer, P.G.L., Waser, N.M., Stang, I., van der Meijden, E., 2009. Size-
 749 specific interaction patterns and size matching in a plant-pollinator interaction web. *Ann.*
 750 *Bot.* 103, 1459–1469. doi:10.1093/aob/mcp027

751 Stang, M., Klinkhamer, P.G.L., Van Der Meijden, E., 2006. Size constraints and flower
 752 abundance determine the number of interactions in a plant-flower visitor web. *Oikos*
 753 112, 111–121. doi:10.1111/j.0030-1299.2006.14199.x

754 Stanley, D.A., Garratt, M.P.D., Wickens, J.B., Wickens, V.J., Potts, S.G., Raine, N.E., 2015.
 755 Neonicotinoid pesticide exposure impairs crop pollination services provided by
 756 bumblebees. *Nature* 528, 548–550. doi:10.1038/nature16167

757 Steffan-Dewenter, I., Tschardtke, T., 1999. Effects of habitat isolation on pollinator
 758 communities and seed set. *Oecologia* 121, 432–440.

759 Sung, I., Lin, M., Chang, C., Cheng, A., Chen, W., 2006. Pollinators and Their Behaviors on
 760 Mango Flowers in Southern Taiwan. *Formos. Entomol.* 170, 161–170.

761 Tilman, D., Knops, J., Wedin, D., Reich, P., Ritchie, M., Siemann, E., 1997. The influence of
 762 functional diversity and composition on ecosystem processes. *Science.* 277, 1300–1302.
 763 doi:10.1126/science.277.5330.1300

764 Tscharntke, T., Klein, A.M., Kruess, A., Steffan-Dewenter, I., Thies, C., 2005. Landscape
 765 perspectives on agricultural intensification and biodiversity - Ecosystem service
 766 management. *Ecol. Lett.* doi:10.1111/j.1461-0248.2005.00782.x
 767 Tylianakis, J.M., Klein, A.M., Tscharntke, T., 2005. Spatiotemporal variation in the diversity
 768 of hymenoptera across a tropical habitat gradient. *Ecology* 86, 3296–3302.
 769 doi:10.1890/05-0371
 770 Vanbergen, A.J., and the Pollinator Initiative, 2013. Threats to an ecosystem service:
 771 pressures on pollinators. *Front. Ecol. Environ.* 11, 251–259. doi:10.1890/120126
 772 Vázquez, D.P., Morris, W.F., Jordano, P., 2005. Interaction frequency as a surrogate for the
 773 total effect of animal mutualists on plants. *Ecol. Lett.* 8, 1088–1094. doi:10.1111/j.1461-
 774 0248.2005.00810.x
 775 Westphal, C., Steffan-Dewenter, I., Tscharntke, T., 2003. Mass flowering crops enhance
 776 pollinator densities at a landscape scale. *Ecol. Lett.* 6, 961–965. doi:10.1046/j.1461-
 777 0248.2003.00523.x
 778 Westphal, C., Bommarco, R., Carré, G., Lamborn, E., Morison, N., Petanidou, T., Potts, S.G.,
 779 Roberts, S.P.M., Szentgyörgyi, H., Tscheulin, T., Vaissière, B.E., Woyciechowski, M.,
 780 Biesmeuer, J.C., Kunin, W.E., Settele, J., Steffan-Dewenter, I., 2008. Measuring bee
 781 diversity in different European habitats and biogeographical regions. *Ecol. Monogr.* 78,
 782 653–671. doi:10.1890/07-1292.1
 783 Winfree, R., 2008. Pollinator-dependent crops: an increasingly risky business. *Curr. Biol.* 18,
 784 R968–9. doi:10.1016/j.cub.2008.09.010
 785 Williams, N.M., Crone, E.E., Roulston, T.H., Minckley, R.L., Packer, L., Potts, S.G., 2010.
 786 Ecological and life-history traits predict bee species responses to environmental
 787 disturbances. *Biol. Conserv.* 143, 2280–2291. doi:10.1016/j.biocon.2010.03.024

788 Williams, N.M., Kremen, C., 2007. Resource distributions among habitats determine solitary
789 bee offspring production in a mosaic landscape. *Ecol. Appl.* 17, 910–921.
790 doi:10.1890/06-0269

791 Wilson, J.S., Griswold, T., Messinger, O.J., 2008. Sampling Bee Communities
792 (Hymenoptera : Apiformes) in a Desert Landscape : Are Pan Traps Sufficient ? *J. Kansas*
793 *Entomol. Soc.* 81, 288–300.

794 Wood, S. a., Karp, D.S., DeClerck, F., Kremen, C., Naeem, S., Palm, C. A., 2015. Functional
795 traits in agriculture: agrobiodiversity and ecosystem services. *Trends Ecol. Evol.* 30,
796 531–539. doi:10.1016/j.tree.2015.06.013

Table 1: Model selection for flower abundance, insect abundance and functional diversity. N corresponds to the number of models selected in the top 4AIC_c, R^2_m and R^2_c correspond respectively to the marginal and conditional R^2 values of the best model. Est. corresponds to the parameter estimate (for centralized and standardized predictor variables), CI to its 95% confidence interval and Imp. to the parameter relative importance. * Mango field was the reference habitat and § the dry season was the sampling season of reference.

	Flower abundance ($N = 2$ models) $R^2_m = 0.40$; $R^2_c = 0.68$			Insect abundance ($N = 6$ models) $R^2_m = 0.54$; $R^2_c = 0.67$			Functional diversity ($N = 6$ models) $R^2_m = 0.32$; $R^2_c = 0.41$		
Parameter	Est.	CI	Imp.	Est.	CI	Imp.	Est.	CI	Imp.
Intercept	2.867	(2.056, 3.679)		1.402	(1.120, 1.683)		0.069	(0.059, 0.082)	
Habitat *	-2.563	(-3.033, -2.093)	1.00	0.255	(-0.082, 0.592)	0.68	0.017	(0.0002, 0.033)	0.79
Season §	-1.427	(-1.756, -1.098)	1.00	1.393	(1.033, 1.751)	1.00	0.048	(0.033, 0.063)	1.00
Distance	0.538	(0.187, 0.889)	1.00	-0.632	(-0.940, -0.325)	1.00	-0.026	(-0.042, -0.011)	1.00
Habitat X Season	2.363	(1.632, 3.093)	1.00	-0.517	(-0.962, -0.072)	0.55	0.015	(-0.007, 0.038)	0.45
Distance X Season	0.326	(-0.346, 0.999)	0.35	0.687	(0.227, 1.148)	1.00	-0.006	(-0.036, 0.023)	0.23
Flower abundance				-0.119	(-0.328, 0.089)	0.39			

Table 2: Model selection for body length, wing span and ratio of wing span over body length. Same legend as Table 1. * Mango field was the reference habitat and § the dry season was the sampling season of reference.

	Body length (N = 7 models)			Wing span (N = 7 models)			Ratio of wing span over body length (N = 5 models)		
	$R^2_m = 0.037$; $R^2_c = 0.45$			$R^2_m = 0.015$; $R^2_c = 0.54$			$R^2_m = 0.02$; $R^2_c = 0.40$		
Parameter	Est.	CI	Imp.	Est.	CI	Imp.	Est.	CI	Imp.
Intercept	0.556	(0.271, 0.840)		0.805	(0.433, 1.177)		0.248	(0.155, 0.342)	
Habitat*	0.049	(0.0007, 0.097)	0.89	0.052	(0.006, 0.099)	0.93	-0.0004	(-0.013, 0.013)	0.24
Season§	0.168	(0.112, 0.225)	1.00	0.126	(0.067, 0.186)	1.00	-0.042	(-0.061, -0.022)	1.00
Distance	-0.047	(-0.109, 0.014)	0.68	-0.018	(-0.095, 0.028)	0.52	0.002	(-0.011, 0.015)	0.28
Habitat X Season	-0.023	(-0.10, 0.053)	0.32	-0.008	(-0.097, 0.048)	0.32	0.003	(-0.019, 0.025)	0.07
Distance X Season	0.060	(0.004, 0.117)	0.53	0.016	(-0.011, 0.109)	0.32	-0.009	(-0.028, 0.009)	0.10

Figures

Figure 1: Effect of distance to the natural habitat (m), habitat type and sampling period on: A. abundance of flowers (log+1), B. abundance of insects, and C. functional diversity of insects. Lines represent model predicted values. In all panels, mango flowering period (dry season) is represented in dark grey and mango non-flowering period (wet season) is represented in light grey.

Figure 2: Relationship between body length (mm) and wing span (mm) of flying insects (A), and effect of distance to the natural habitat (m) and habitat type on insect body length (B). Mango flowering period (dry season) is represented in dark grey and mango non-flowering period (wet season) is represented in light grey.