1 **A linkage between flowering phenology and fruit-set success of alpine plant**

2 **communities with reference to the seasonality and pollination effectiveness of bees**

3 **and flies**

4

5 **Yuki Mizunaga[1] & Gaku Kudo[1]**

6

7 [1]Faculty of Environmental Earth Science, Hokkaido University, Sapporo 060-0810,

8 Japan

9

10 Corresponding author: Y. Mizunaga

11 e-mail: mizunaga@ees.hokudai.ac.jp

12 fax: +81-11-706 4954

13

14

17

18 **Abstract**

19 To clarify the linkage between flowering phenology and pollination success in alpine

20 plant communities, we quantified the seasonality of flower visitors, the temporal

21 transition of floral resources, and the variation in pollination success of alpine plants in

22 northern Japan. Bumble bees, syrphid flies, and non-syrphid flies were the predominant

23 flower visitors. Foraging activity of bumble bees increased toward the late flowering

24 period reflecting the life-cycle of colony development. The activity of syrphid flies was

25 sensitive to ambient temperature, while that of non-syrphid flies remained high

26 throughout the season. Flower production of bee-pollinated plants fluctuated

27 significantly between years with a bimodal pattern peaking in the early and late periods,

28 while flower production of fly-pollinated plants was less variable between years.

29 Fruit-set success of bee-pollinated plants increased considerably from the early to the

30 late flowering period, while the trend for fly-pollinated plants was less marked. Three

31 times more visits of dipteran insects are necessary for fly-pollinated plants to achieve

32 fruiting success comparable to bee-pollinated plants. Bumble bees are potentially

33 excellent pollinators but the visitation frequency is low early in the season. Lower

34 pollination ability of dipteran insects may be compensated for by abundant flower visits.

35 The relationships between flowering phenology and fruit-set success of alpine plant

36 communities highly depend on the type of pollinators.

37

38 **Key words:** Alpine ecosystem, Bumble bee, Diptera, Flower production, Pollinator

39

Introduction

Hymenopteran and dipteran insects are common and important pollinators in high-altitude and high-latitude environments (Arroyo et al. 1982; Kevan and Baker 1983; Kudo 2016). Most plant species inhabiting these environments can be classified into bee-pollinated, fly-pollinated, or bee-and-fly-pollinated types (Yumoto 1986; Kudo 2016). Bumble bees have an annual social life-cycle and are important pollinators in alpine and boreal ecosystems because of their high pollen transportation ability and flower constancy (Heinrich 1979; Bingham and Orthner 1998; Willmer 2011). The foraging activity of bumble bees varies considerably within a growth season in parallel with the life-cycle of colony development and changes in the community of flowering plants (Pyke et al. 2011; Amsalem et al. 2015). Overwintered queen bees emerge from hibernation early in the summer at low frequency, while worker bees emerge in greater numbers in the middle of the season in keeping with the timing of colony development. In parallel with the seasonal dynamics of foraging activity, the pollination success of bee-pollinated plants varies significantly within and among species depending upon flowering time (Kudo 2006, 2016).

Dipteran insects are ubiquitous flower visitors across wide elevational and latitudinal ranges (Totland 1993, 1994; Elberling and Olesen 1999; Tiusanen et al. 2016), and their importance generally increases with environmental harshness at higher elevations and latitudes (Kevan 1972; Arroyo et al. 1982; McCall and Primack 1992; Elberling and Olesen 1999; Wagner et al. 2016). Although the pollination effectiveness of dipteran insects is assumed to be generally low because of their opportunistic floral visits and their low pollen uptake ability in comparison with hymenopteran insects

63 (Bischoff et al. 2013; Inouye et al. 2015; Orford et al. 2015), they can act as effective

64 pollinators when high visitation rates compensate for low pollination ability (Kearns

65 and Inouye 1994; Orford et al. 2015; Tiusanen et al. 2016). Furthermore, considerable

66 flower constancy is reported in syrphid flies (Goulson and Wright 1998; Campbell et al.

67 2010). A few studies have demonstrated the importance of fly pollination (Larson et al.

68 2001; Tiusanen et al. 2016), but comparative studies of pollination efficiency or of the

69 differences between dipteran pollinators and hymenopteran pollinators are limited

70 (Bischoff et al. 2013; Orford et al. 2015). Furthermore, the seasonal activity of dipteran

71 pollinators has rarely been compared with that of bumble bees in alpine habitats (Kudo

72 2016). Therefore, the relative importance of fly pollination and bee pollination should

73 be evaluated in the same environment.

74   The flowering phenology of alpine plant communities may be affected by various

75 selective forces (both of abiotic and biotic factors) acting on the reproductive success of

76 individual species (Rathcke and Lacey 1985; Kudo 2006). The flowering patterns of

77 alpine plants are strongly influenced by snowmelt regimes and thermal conditions, i.e.,

78 proximate cause of phenological variation (Holway and Ward 1965; Molau et al. 2005;

79 Kudo 2006). At the same time, biological interactions for pollinator acquisition may

80 regulate flowering patterns among species to maximize pollination success, i.e.,

81 ultimate cause of phenological variation (Rathcke and Lacey 1985). If there is a

82 significant difference in seasonal activity between dipteran and hymenopteran

83 pollinators, the flowering patterns of bee- and fly-pollinated species may differ and may

84 reflect seasonal trends in foraging activity specific to particular pollinator types (Kudo

85 2016).

86   The pollination success of alpine plants often reflects the seasonal activity and

87   pollination ability of pollinators (Kudo 2006; Kudo et al. 2011; Straka and Starzomski

88   2015). If the pollination ability of dipteran insects is generally low, the fruit-set success

89   of fly-pollinated plants may be lower than that of bee-pollinated plants in less plenty of

90   visits (Straka and Starzomski 2015). In contrast, the fruit-set success of bee-pollinated

91   plants may vary depending upon flowering time within the growth season, in keeping

92   with the life-cycle of the colony (Kudo et al. 2011). In other words, quantification of

93   seasonal trends of dipteran and hymenopteran pollinators, of flowering structure at

94   community scales, and of pollinator-specific fruit-set success are crucial for

95   understanding the structure and function of pollination systems in alpine ecosystems.

96   Because the flowering of alpine plants progresses along the snowmelt gradient,

97   pollinators can utilize the floral resources of specific plants for long periods by moving

98   short distances in parallel with the progress of snowmelt. Floral composition of alpine

99   plant communities drastically changes along the snowmelt gradient in which not only

100   different species but also same species indicate large variation in flowering time

101   dependent on the snowmelt pattern at micro-scale (Kudo 1991, 2006). Therefore,

102   availability of floral resources for pollinators highly varies spatiotemporally within a

103   local area. Under such a dynamics of flowering patterns, comparisons among plots

104   across the snowmelt gradient are necessary for understanding of plant–pollinator

105   interactions in the alpine ecosystem.

106   In this study, we examined the relative importance of bumble bees and dipteran

107   insects as pollinators of alpine plants, as well as the flowering pattern of alpine plants in

108   relation to pollination mode and seasonality of pollinator activity along the snowmelt

109   gradient in the Taisetsu Mountains, northern Japan. First, we compared the seasonal

110   trends in foraging activity between bumble bees and dipteran insects (syrphid and

111   non-syrphid flies), and their sensitivity to micro-climate conditions. We expected a

112   consistently increasing pattern of foraging activity in bumble bees reflecting their

113   life-cycle, but a diverse array of foraging patterns with a less-clear seasonal trend in

114   dipteran insects. Second, we quantified within-year and between-year patterns of flower

115   production (floral resources) at the community scale with reference to pollination mode.

116   We expected that the flowering pattern of bee-pollinated plants might have a more

117   distinctive seasonal trend than the flowering pattern of fly-pollinated plants if the

118   activity of dipteran insects did not exhibit clear seasonality. Third, we analyzed the

119   relationships between fruit-set success and flowering period with reference to

120   pollination mode. We expected that fruit-set rates of bee-pollinated plants might

121   increase in response to the life-cycle of bumble bees as the season progresses, while

122   seasonal variation in fruit-set rates of fly-pollinated plants would be less clear if the

123   seasonal trend of dipteran insects is obscure. Finally, we compared the relationships

124   between visitation frequency and fruit-set rates in bee-pollinated and fly-pollinated

125   plants to evaluate pollination effectiveness. We expected that the fruit-set rates of

126   bee-pollinated plants would increase more rapidly because of the higher pollination

127   ability of bumble bees in comparison to dipteran insects. Based on these analyses, we

128   discuss the phenological structure of pollination systems in alpine ecosystems.

129

130   **Materials and methods**

131   **Study site**

132   This study was conducted at an alpine site in the central part of Daisetsuzan National

133   Park (Taisetsu Mountains), Hokkaido, northern Japan (43° 33′ N, 142° 53′ E) in 2013

134 and 2014. Daisetsuzan National Park is the largest national park in Japan. Mt.

135 Asahidake is the highest peak (2291 m), and the tree line is located around 1500–1600

136 m elevation. The Taisetsu Mountains are characterized by cold and snowy winters, and

137 warm and wet summers. The annual mean temperature at 1700 m elevation is –1.8°C

138 and ranges from –16.1°C in January to 12.6°C in August (average of 2002–2013

139 measured at the weather station near the site). The plant growth season usually starts in

140 early June and lasts until mid-September. Monthly mean temperature during the

141 summer season is 8.7°C in June, 12.0°C in July, 12.6°C in August, and 7.8°C in

142 September. Monthly mean precipitation is 133 mm in June, 234 mm in July, 346 mm in

143 August, and 245 mm in September.

144   This study was conducted in six plots (designated O, A, B, C, D, and E; Fig. S1)

145 that were established in 1988 (Kudo and Hirao 2006; Kudo 2016). O plot (50 × 50 m) is

146 located in a fellfield on the plateau, where the soil surface is almost free of snow cover

147 during the winter due to strong winds. The remaining five 20 × 20 m plots, A to E, are

148 arranged on a southeast-facing slope along a snowmelt gradient between 1790–1910 m

149 elevation. Variation in snowmelt conditions largely reflects the heterogeneous winter

150 snow distribution that is determined by topographic features and slope direction. The

151 mean snowmelt time was early June at A plot, mid-June at B plot, early July at C plot,

152 late July at D plot, and early August at E plot (Table S1). The average day of snowmelt

153 during the last 27 years ranged from 4 June at A plot to 3 August at E plot. Because

154 these plots include typical alpine vegetation from fellfield to the bottom of the snowbed,

155 and so cover a wide range of snow conditions, phenological research across the plots

156 enables us to quantify the representative phenological structure of the alpine ecosystem

157 of this region (Kudo 1991, 2016; Kudo and Hirao 2006). All our research on flower

7

158 visitors and flowering situations (phenology and floral density) was conducted in 2013

159 and 2014.

160

161 **Frequency and seasonality of flower-visiting insects**

162 To determine the frequency and seasonality of flower visitors, insects foraging on

163 flowers and their visited flower species were recorded using a route census method by

164 walking slowly along a fixed route almost every week. The observation route was set

165 depending on the flowering situation in order to connect various plant communities

166 each week. Each observation period was 30 minutes, and we tried to sample more than

167 six times in every week. Because observations were not made under windy, foggy, or

168 rainy weather conditions, the number of observation sets varied to some extent. In total,

169 we made 53 sets of observations throughout the summer in 2013, and 43 sets in 2014.

170 Time, weather, and wind conditions were also recorded using the data of the weather

171 station. Insects observed on flowers were classified to the ordinal level as Diptera,

172 Hymenoptera, Lepidoptera, Coleoptera, or Hemiptera. Dipteran insects were further

173 classified into syrphid flies (Syrphidae), empidid flies (Empididae), and other flies, as

174 much as possible. Bumble bees were identified at the species level, and other

175 hymenopteran insects were classified into wasps, solitary bees, and others such as

176 Tenthredinidae, as much as possible. Lepidopteran insects were classified into

177 butterflies and moths, and species identification was also conducted for butterflies as

178 much as possible. We did not record grasshoppers or spiders because they were

179 accidental visitors with very low frequency and not apparently acting as pollinators.

180   Based on the observation records of flower visitors in previous surveys (Kudo

181 2016 and unpublished data), most entomophilous species growing at the study site were

182 grouped into one of three pollination types: predominantly bee-pollinated plants

183 (B-type; hymenopteran insects occupy >70% of all visitors), predominantly

184 fly-pollinated plants (F-type; dipteran insects occupy >70% of all visitors), and plants

185 pollinated by both bees and flies (BF-type; sum of hymenopteran and dipteran insects

186 occupy >70% of all visitors). Because the proportion of non-dipteran and

187 non-hymenopteran insects was very small, we recognized only these three pollination

188 types (Table S2).

189

190 **Seasonal dynamics of floral resources**

191 We quantified the seasonal dynamics of floral resources at the study site by recording,

192 almost every week, the flowering species in each plot and the flower numbers of

193 individual species within ten 2×2 m quadrats per plot that were set arbitrarily on floral

194 patches in each plot during flowering periods (i.e., 60 quadrats in each measurement at

195 most). Setting of quadrats was conducted to reflect averaging flowering situations in

196 each plot as possible. We counted individual flowers for most species except

197 umbelliferous and asteraceous species. For umbelliferous species, the number of small

198 umbels composing a compound umbellate inflorescence was recorded. For asteraceous

199 species, the number of heads was recorded instead of the number of florets. In total,

200 12-week records were accumulated in each year from early June to mid- or late

201 September. For weeks lacking data (it was six of 18 weeks in both years), we estimated

202 flower numbers by averaging the values from one week before and one week after.

203

204 **Fruit-set success of different pollination types under natural conditions**

9

205   To quantify variation in pollination success of the different pollination types across the

206   flowering season, fruit-set rates (fruits/flowers) were measured under natural conditions

207   for the common species in each plot. Individual plants and branches were marked using

208   the following three methods: by putting tags on stems for shrubby species, by setting 10

209   × 10 cm quadrats for mat-forming species, and by placing flags for herbaceous species.

210   For species with a wide distribution range along the snowmelt gradient, fruit-set success

211   was measured for multiple populations with different flowering periods. Fruit-set

212   measurements were replicated over 25 quadrats, 30 tags, or 30 flags per population. We

213   measured fruit-sets for 50 populations of 25 species in 2013, and for 56 populations of

214   27 species in 2014.

215

216   **Statistical analyses**

217   *Analyses of insect visitation frequencies and floral use patterns*

218   Seasonal dynamics of the number of flower visitors were analyzed under generalized

219   linear models (GLMs) postulating a negative-binomial error distribution with a log-link

220   function. Because bumble bees, non-syrphid flies, and syrphid flies were predominant

221   (90% of visitors in both years; see Results), the visitation frequencies of these groups

222   were analyzed. In the GLMs, the number of insect visits recorded during a 30-min

223   observation period was the response variable; year (2013, 2014), week number from 1

224   June (included as both a linear and quadratic term), and visitor group (bumble bees,

225   syrphid flies, non-syrphid flies) were included as explanatory variables. The model

226   included interaction terms between visitor group and temporal variables (week).

227   Furthermore, the frequency of each visitor group was analyzed separately by GLM to

228   clarify the factors affecting the activity of each insect group; year, air temperature, and

229   wind speed during the observation period were included as explanatory variables.

230   Weather data were recorded at the weather station (1700 m) located approximately 1.5

231   km from O plot. Air temperature and wind speed were measured every hour at 1.5 m

232   and 2 m above the ground, respectively. Wind speed was classified into three levels as

233   breeze (wind-L: <2 m s^{-1} hourly mean), moderate (wind-M: 2–5 m s^{-1}), and strong

234   (wind-H: >5 m s^{-1}) in 2014. Because the wind speed records were incomplete in 2013

235   due to mechanical trouble, we made approximate wind speed estimates based on

236   experience during the observations. In each GLM, best-fit model was selected by

237   Akaike's information criterion (AIC).

238   In order to clarify the differences in flower preference among the visitor groups,

239   floral use patterns were compared among visitor groups (bumble bee, other

240   hymenopteran insect, syrphid fly, non-syrphid fly, and butterfly) using a database of

241   floral visits of major insect groups in this area (G. Kudo, unpublished data; Table S2).

242   The database is based on field records collected over six years and includes the data

243   from this study for 2013 and 2014. For the calculation of floral use similarity across

244   insect groups, we performed non-metric multidimensional scaling (NMDS) based on

245   Chao distances using the vegan package (Oksanen et al. 2016).

246

247   *Yearly variation in floral resource dynamics*

248   The seasonal patterns of floral resources at the community scale (total number of

249   flowers of each species in each week) were divided into whole plants, bee-pollinated

250   plants (B-type), and fly-pollinated plants (F-type), and were compared between 2013

251   and 2014 by the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test. The seasonal patterns of floral resources

252   were also compared between B-type and F-type plants in each year.

253

Analysis of fruit-set success

255 First, fruit-set rates at the community scale under natural conditions were compared

256 among pollination types by GLMM, postulating a binomial error distribution with a

257 logit-link function using the lme4 package (Bates et al. 2015). In the GLMM, the

258 fruit-set success (ratio of fruit number to non-fruiting flower number) of individual

259 populations was an response variable; year (2013, 2014), peak flowering period of

260 individual populations (week number from 1 June), and pollination type of individual

261 species (B-, F-, BF-type) were included as explanatory variables; and plant species was

262 set as a random variable. Interactions between week and pollination type were included

263 in the GLMM. Peak flowering period in each population was defined as the week

264 number when flower number of the target species attained at the maximum in the plot.

265 When flowering occurred very late in the season (after 31 August), fruit maturation was

266 often restricted due to the short period for development, irrespective of pollination

267 success. Because we focused on the pollination function in this study, only populations

268 that bloomed during weeks 1–13 (from 1 June to 30 August) were included in the

269 analysis.

270 In order to clarify the pollination effectiveness of bumble bees and dipteran insects,

271 furthermore, we compared the relationships between visitation frequency at peak

272 flowering and fruit-set rates by fitting a logistic function. In this analysis, we separately

273 examined the relationships between bumble bee visitation frequency and fruit-set

274 success of B-type plants, and the relationship between visitation frequency of dipteran

275 insects (sum of syrphid and non-syrphid flies) and fruit-set success of F-type plants. To

276 fit the data, we used estimated visitation frequencies of bumble bees and dipteran

277   insects at weekly intervals and estimated fruit-set rates at the community scale at

278   weekly intervals in each year by the GLM or GLMM mentioned above. All analyses

279   were conducted in R version 3.2.4 (R Core Team 2016).

280

281   **Results**

282   **Seasonality of flower visitors**

283   In total, 4269 and 3908 insects were recorded throughout the survey periods in 2013 and

284   2014, respectively (Table 1). In 2013, hymenopteran insects comprised 36% of the total

285   and dipteran insects comprised 61%, while in 2014 hymenopteran insects comprised

286   24% and dipteran insects comprised 72%. The proportion of other insects was less than

287   5% in both years. Hymenopteran and dipteran insects are thus the predominant flower

288   visitors in this area. Approximately 84–86% of hymenopteran insects were bumble bees

289   (*Bombus* spp.). Visual identification of dipteran insects in the field was very difficult,

290   even to the family level, except for Syrphidae and Empididae spp. Syrphid flies

291   comprised 28% of all dipteran insects in 2013, but were 71% in 2014, indicating large

292   variation in syrphid fly numbers between years. Empidid flies comprised less than 3%

293   of dipteran insects, and most of the other flies were recognized as Anthomyiidae,

294   Muscidae, and Calliphoridae spp. We therefore grouped the dipteran insects into

295   syrphid and non-syrphid categories in the following analyses.

296   The visitation frequency of bumble bees was very low from June to early July

297   (week 1–6), increased from mid-July (week 7–8) to early August (week 10) in both

298   years, and decreased beginning in late August (week 12–13; Fig. 1). Overwintered

299   queen bees emerged in early June but at low frequency. The rapid increase in visitation

300   frequencies from mid-July to early August was due to the emergence of worker bees.

301　Although the number of workers decreased in late August, the reproductive castes

302　(males and new queens) appeared from late August to mid-September. Therefore, floral

303　visitation by bumble bees was observed at a consistent level until mid-September.

304　　　Seasonal trends in foraging activity were different between syrphid and

305　non-syrphid flies (Fig. 1). The visitation frequency of syrphid flies increased from

306　mid-July (week 7-8) to mid-August (week 12) in both years, but the frequency at peak

307　was much larger in 2014 than in 2013. The frequency of non-syrphid flies tended to

308　increase gradually as the season progressed, but they sometimes showed outbreaks at

309　unpredictable times from mid-August (week 12) to early September (week 14).

310　　　The GLM results indicated that the visitation frequency of flower visitors was

311　larger in 2014 than in 2013 and it generally increased toward later season but differently

312　among visitor group (Table 2). Bumble bees and syrphid flies clearly increased as the

313　season progressed with a peak in middle or late season, while the seasonal trend of

314　non-syrphid flies was obscure (i.e., a negative week × visitor group interaction; Table 2,

315　Fig. 1). A significant $week^2$ × visitor group interaction in syrphid flies indicates that the

316　peak season of foraging activity was different from bumble bees, i.e., it comes earlier

317　than that of bumble bees (Table 2, Fig. 1).

318　　　The GLM conducted for each visitor group indicated that the foraging activity of

319　syrphid flies was most sensitive to temperature (Table 3). Their visitation frequency was

320　negatively correlated with strong wind, while the effects of temperature and wind were

321　not significant or excluded by the model selection in bumble bees and non-syrphid flies.

322　The foraging activity of non-syrphid flies was independent on weather condition but

323　indicated a significant variation between years.

324   The NMDS ordination diagrams showed that the similarity in plant species visited

325   by insects was low between bumble bees and other hymenopteran insects within the

326   same order (Fig. S2). The similarity in floral resource use by syrphid and non-syrphid

327   flies was relatively high, but it was different between butterflies and other taxa.

328

329   **Temporal variation in floral resources**

330   In total, the flowering of 51 entomophilous species was observed over six plots (Table

331   S3). These species included 11 bee-pollinated plants (B-type), 19 fly-pollinated plants

332   (F-type), and 18 bee-and-fly-pollinated plants (BF-type) according to our observations

333   of flower visitors. No insect visits were observed in three species.

334   Snowmelt progressed from 4 June (A plot) to 19 August (E plot) in 2013, and from

335   26 May (A plot) to 2 August (E plot) in 2014 (Table S1). The progress of snowmelt in

336   2013 was later than usual in the late snowmelt locations. However, the snowmelt in

337   2014 was approximately one week earlier than usual at A plot and B plot, although it

338   proceeded as usual in other plots. The flowering period at the community scale was

339   longer in 2013, with flowering lasting from early June to late September, while

340   flowering in 2014 was largely finished by early September (Fig. 2).

341   The seasonal pattern of flower production in all plants varied between years

342   (Kolmogorov-Smirnov $D = 0.50$, $P = 0.022$; Fig. 2). Floral resources in 2013 tended to

343   increase in the later part of the season, while floral resources in 2014 reached a peak in

344   late July. Flower production in B-type plants significantly varied between years ($D =$

345   0.83, $P < 0.0001$; Fig. 2), exhibiting a bimodal pattern in 2013 (clear peaks early and

346   late in the season). In contrast, flower production in B-type plants was very small in

347   2014 throughout the season. The reason was that flower production of both

348 early-bloomers in the fellfield habitat (*Arctous alpinus* var. *japonicus*) and

349 late-bloomers in the snowbed habitat (*Phyllodoce caerulea* var. *yezoensis* and

350 *Phyllodoce aleutica*) was very small in 2014. Flower production of F-type plants was

351 relatively low in both years ($D = 0.33$, $P = 0.27$; Fig. 2). Seasonal trends in flower

352 production were significantly different between B-type and F-type plants in 2013 ($D =$

353 0.83, $P < 0.0001$), but the difference was not significant in 2014 ($D = 0.28$, $P = 0.49$).

354 These results suggest that yearly variation in floral resources at the community scale is

355 caused by fluctuations in flower production of B-type plants, mostly ericaceous shrubs.

356

357 **Temporal variation in fruit-set success**

358 Fruit-set success under natural conditions was measured in six species of B-type plants

359 in 2013 (10 populations) and eight species in 2014 (12 populations); in eight species of

360 F-type plants (14 populations in 2013 and 17 populations in 2014); and in 11 species of

361 BF-type plants (26 populations in 2013 and 27 populations in 2014). The GLMM

362 results for all plants indicate that fruit-set success at the community level was higher in

363 2014 and clearly increased with the delay in flowering period (Table 4). Fruit-set

364 patterns were significantly different between B-type and F-type plants: the slopes of the

365 fruit-set rates over the course of the seasons were steepest in B-type plants, and low in

366 F-type plants, especially in 2014 (Fig. 3). There was no significant difference in fruiting

367 patterns between B-type and BF-type plants.

368 The relationships between estimated pollinator frequency at flowering peak and

369 estimated fruit-set success at the community scale were fitted to logistic functions (Fig.

370 4). Both the bumble bee–B-type plant relationship and the dipteran insect–F-type plant

371 relationship were clear, indicating that fruit-set success in alpine plants strongly

372 depends on pollinator activity in both bee-pollinated and fly-pollinated species.

373 However, the sensitivity of fruit-set success to pollinator frequency was more apparent

374 in B-type plants, where fruit-set rates abruptly increased with the visitation frequency of

375 bumble bees and attain their maximum at values around 20 visits per 30 min. In contrast,

376 fruit-set rates of F-type plants gradually increase with the visitation frequency of

377 dipteran insects. These differences suggest a higher pollination ability in bumble bees

378 than that in dipteran insects.

379

380 **Discussion**

381 A series of surveys of alpine plant communities revealed that: (1) seasonal trends in the

382 foraging activity of flower visitors varied among bumble bees, syrphid flies, and

383 non-syrphid flies; (2) B-type and F-type plants showed different flowering patterns; (3)

384 fruit-set success increased as the season progressed in every type of plants but this trend

385 was most apparent in B-type plants; and (4) pollination ability of bumble bees was

386 higher than that of dipteran insects.

387

388 **Seasonal activity of flower visitors**

389 Visitation frequency of bumble bees consistently increased from the early to the middle

390 part of the growth season, as reported in previous studies (Kwak and Bergman 1996;

391 Kameyama and Kudo 2009; Pyke et al. 2011; Kudo 2014). This seasonal trend reflects

392 the life-cycle of the bumble bees: overwintering queens are available early in the season,

393 while workers increase with colony development as the season progresses (Pyke et al.

394 2011; Amsalem et al. 2015). Although the abundance of syrphid flies also attained its

395 maximum level in the middle of the season, their foraging activity was sensitive to

396 ambient temperature and wind conditions, and they showed large variation between

397 years. In contrast, the seasonal trend of non-syrphid flies was less marked in comparison

398 with other groups, and their frequency was independent of ambient temperature.

399 Previous studies have reported that the visitation frequency of dipteran insects

400 commonly depends on ambient temperature in the mountains of northern Europe and

401 North America (McCall and Primack 1992; Totland 1994). This discrepancy between

402 our result and previous reports might be in part because our observations of flower

403 visitors were conducted only under relatively suitable weather conditions. Nevertheless,

404 we detected differences in temperature dependence among pollinator groups. The

405 foraging activity of syrphid flies was most sensitive to weather conditions.

406   In this study, we grouped dipteran insects simply into syrphid and non-syrphid

407 species because their identification in the field was extremely difficult. However, there

408 are at least 21 species of syrphid flies alone in the Taisetsu Mountains (Konno 2006).

409 Although inter-specific variation in the life-cycles of syrphid species has been little

410 studied (but see also Rotheray and Gilbert 2011), seasonal trends in foraging activity

411 and pollination effectiveness may vary among dipteran species (Herrera 1987).

412 Visitation frequencies of syrphid and non-syrphid flies showed large variation within

413 and between years in our study, in comparison with bumble bees. Furthermore, we

414 detected a few outbreaks of syrphid flies (2014) and non-syrphid flies (2013) between

415 July and early September. It is known that insects with solitary and short life-cycles

416 tend to exhibit more variation in floral-resource-dependent population dynamics than

417 social insects such as bumble bees (Totland 1994; Crone 2013). Iler et al. (2013)

418 reported that the phenology of syrphid flies responded to yearly variation in snowmelt

419 time and cumulative temperature in North America. Syrphid flies may encompass a

420 more diverse array of life-cycles than bumble bees (Rotheray and Gilbert 2011).

421   The visitation frequency of dipteran insects was higher than that of bumble bees

422 throughout both seasons although bumble bees may be more important pollinators at

423 least in terms of pollen deposition per visit (Kerns and Inouye 1994). Dipteran insects

424 visit flowers not only for floral resources (pollen and nectar) but also for non-nutritive

425 reasons, such as warmth, shelter, and mating opportunities (Woodcock et al. 2014). In

426 subarctic-alpine regions, the proportion and abundance of dipteran flower visitors

427 increases with elevation and latitude (Elberling and Olesen 1999), indicating the high

428 generality of dipteran insects as pollinators in cold climates (Tiusanen et al. 2016).

429

430 **Flowering patterns of bee-pollinated and fly-pollinated plants**

431 The flowering patterns of alpine plant communities varied significantly between B-type

432 and F-type plants. B-type flowers showed a bimodal pattern with peaks in early and late

433 summer in 2013, a year during which the total flowering period extended from early

434 June to mid-September. The early flowering period corresponds to the active period of

435 overwintered queens, while the late flowering period corresponds to the active period of

436 workers. Similar flowering trend was reported also in a montane meadow in the Rocky

437 Mountains (Aldridge et al. 2011). However, flower production of B-type plants was

438 considerably reduced in 2014, with little seasonal variation and a short flowering period

439 from early June to mid-August. The shorter flowering period in 2014 was due to earlier

440 snowmelt than in 2013. The reduced monotonic flowering pattern in 2014 reflected the

441 intermittent mass flowering of some dominant shrubby species that only occurs during

442 certain years (e.g., small flower production of *A. alpinus* var. *japonicus* and *A. nana* in

443   fellfield sites and *Phyllodoce* spp. in snowbed sites). The B-type species at our site

444   consisted largely of ericaceous dwarf shrubs (Table S3). Ericaceous shrubs are a major

445   component of alpine, subarctic, and temperate heathlands in the Northern Hemisphere,

446   and they are important floral resources for bumble bees (Reader 1975, 1977; Rathcke

447   1988; Kudo and Suzuki 2002; Moquet et al. 2017). There are several reports of large

448   fluctuations in flower and fruit production between years in ericaceous shrubs (Selås

449   2000; Kasagi and Kudo 2003; Krebs et al. 2009). Therefore, the floral resources of

450   B-type plants vary significantly between years in alpine ecosystems of the northern

451   hemisphere.

452   On the other hand, yearly variation in the flower production of F-type plants was

453   much smaller in comparison with B-type plants. The F-type plants included various

454   families but many of them are herbaceous species (Table S3) as reported in other

455   mountain regions (Yumoto 1986; Iler et al. 2013). Interestingly, flower production of

456   F-type plants mainly occurred after early July, and floral density in June was very small.

457   This may reflect seasonal trends in the dipteran pollinators, especially syrphid flies.

458   Previous studies demonstrated that fly-pollinated plant species tend to bloom

459   simultaneously with large overlaps among species, probably due to enhanced pollinator

460   attraction (Yumoto 1986; Totland 1993), resulting in shorter and more concentrated

461   flowering patterns within plant communities. Because the frequency of flower visitors

462   was recorded on flowers, seasonal trend of pollinator activity might be not independent

463   of flowering phenology. In spite of this limitation, our data collected from all plant

464   species throughout the season across multiple years imply that the flowering patterns of

465   B-type and F-type plants may be related to the seasonal activity or life-cycles of bumble

466   bees and dipteran pollinators, respectively (e.g., Makrodimos et al. 2008).

467

Fruit-set patterns in relation to pollination type

Most entomophilous alpine plants rely on pollinators for seed production. In our

preliminary pollination experiment conducted for several species, fruit-set rates of

bagged plants were lower than fruit-set rates under natural pollination in every

pollination type (Fig. S3). This result indicates that seed production in alpine plants

strongly depends on pollination services from pollinators, irrespective of pollination

type. Therefore, variation in fruit-sets under natural conditions mainly reflects the

intensity of pollen limitation caused by spatiotemporal variation in pollinator

availability (Kudo and Suzuki 2002; Kameyama and Kudo 2009). Higher fruit-set

success in 2014 might be related to higher visitation frequencies of flower visitors,

especially syrphid flies (Tables 2, Fig. 1).

Clear increases in fruit-set success of B-type plants with seasonal progress

correspond to the seasonality of bumble bee activity and reflects the life-cycle of colony

development (Pyke et al. 2011). Fruit-set success of F-type plants also increased as the

seasons progressed, but its trend was less marked than the trend in B-type plants.

BF-type plants exhibited an intermediate pattern between B-type and F-type plants.

These differences in seasonal variation in fruit-set success may be related to the

seasonality of foraging activity of each pollinator type. Lower fruit-set success due to

pollen limitation has been reported in several early-blooming bee-pollinated species

both within (Kudo 1993; Kameyama and Kudo 2009) and among species (Kudo and

Suzuki 2002) in this area. Therefore, seed production of bee-pollinated alpine plants is

the most sensitive to flowering phenology, reflecting the life-cycle of the bumble bees.

490   Our study successfully revealed differences in pollination effectiveness between

491 bumble bees and dipteran insects, i.e., in their contributions to fruit-set per visit.

492 Fruit-set rates of B-type plants rapidly increased and saturated with increasing bumble

493 bee visitation frequencies (Fig. 4). In contrast, fruit-set rates of F-type plants gradually

494 and continuously increased with increases in the visitation frequencies of dipteran

495 insects (Fig. 4). These patterns indicate the higher pollination effectiveness of bumble

496 bees in comparison to dipteran insects. Nevertheless, F-type plants and B-type plants

497 showed generally similar fruit-set rates under natural pollination. It seems that the lower

498 pollination ability of dipteran insects may be compensated for by greater visitation

499 frequency (Kearns and Inouye 1994). In our estimation, saturated pollination success

500 (80% fruit-set rate) in B-type plants was attained through about 20 bumble bee visits per

501 30 min, while more than 60 dipteran visits per 30 min were needed to achieve similar

502 fruit-set rates in F-type plants (Fig. 4), indicating that about three times more dipteran

503 visits are necessary for fruiting success in F-type plants than in B-type plants.

504   In our study, about one-third of plant species were visited by both dipteran and

505 hymenopteran insects. The classification of pollination types in this study was simply

506 based on visitation frequency, not on the true pollination efficiency of individual insects.

507 Therefore, we cannot discriminate the contributions to seed production of dipteran and

508 hymenopteran pollinators in BF-type flowers. For example, *Rhododendron aureum*,

509 which was classified as a BF-type based on visitor composition, can set fruits only when

510 visited by bumble bees (Kudo et al. 2011). The pollination success of many BF-type

511 plants may thus be enhanced by a few visits from bumble bees rather than several visits

512 from dipteran insects (Herrera 1987).

513

514 **Conclusion**

515 Bumble bees and dipteran insects are the most common pollinators in alpine ecosystems,

516 but their foraging activity varies significantly during the flowering period. Although

517 bumble bees are effective pollinators in alpine ecosystems, their foraging activity is

518 consistently low early in the flowering period. Dipteran insects are ubiquitous

519 pollinators that exhibit diverse population dynamics, and their lower pollination ability

520 may be compensated for by abundant flower visits. To clarify the relative importance

521 and functional roles of dipteran and hymenopteran pollinators, however, further studies

522 are necessary based on more precise evaluations of pollination efficiency, pollen flows,

523 outcrossing rate, and genetic diversity of pollen load. Furthermore, yearly variations in

524 phenological matching between flowering time and the life-cycles of pollinators at the

525 community scale will be crucial for evaluating the robustness of plant–pollinator

526 interactions in alpine ecosystems (e.g., Aldridge et al. 2011).

527

533

534 **References**

535 Aldridge G, Inouye DW, Forrest JRK, Barr WA, Miller-Rushing AJ (2011) Emergence

536   of a mid-season period of low floral resources in a montane meadow ecosystem

537   associated with climate change. J Ecol 99:905-913

538   doi:10.1111/j.1365-2745.2011.01826.x

539   Amsalem E, Grozinger CM, Padilla M, Hefetz A (2015) Bumble bee sociobiology: the

540   physiological and genomic bases of bumble bee social behaviour. Adv Insect

541   Physiol 48:37-93 doi:10.1016/bs.aiip.2015.01.001

542   Arroyo MTK, Primack R, Armesto J (1982) Community studies in pollination ecology

543   in the high temperate Andes of central Chile. I. Pollination mechanisms and

544   altitudinal variation. Am J Bot 69:82-97 doi:10.2307/2442833

545   Bates D, Maechler M, Bolker B, Walker S (2015) Fitting linear mixed-effects models

546   using lme4. J Stat Soft 67:1-48 doi:10.18637/jss.v067.i01

547   Bingham RA, Orthner AR (1998) Efficient pollination of alpine plants. Nature

548   391:238-239 doi:10.1038/34564

549   Bischoff M, Campbell DR, Lord JM, Robertson AW (2013) The relative importance of

550   solitary bees and syrphid flies as pollinators of two outcrossing plant species in the

551   New Zealand alpine. Austral Ecol 38:169-176

552   doi:10.1111/j.1442-9993.2012.02389.x

553   Campbell DR, Bischoff M, Load JM, Robertson W (2010) Flower color influences

554   insect visitation in alpine New Zealand. Ecology 91:2638-2649

555   doi:10.1890/09-0941.1

556   Crone EE (2013) Response of social and solitary bees to pulsed floral resources. Am

557   Nat 182:465-473 doi:10.1086/671999

558   Elberling H, Olesen JM (1999) The structure of a high latitude plant-flower visitor

559   system: the dominance of flies. Ecography 22:314-323

560   doi:10.1111/j.1600-0587.1999.tb00507.x

561   Goulson D, Wright NP (1998) Flower constancy in the hoverflies *Episyrphus balteatus*

562   (Degeer) and *Syrphus ribesii* (L.) (Syrphidae). Behav Ecol 9:213-219

563   doi:10.1093/beheco/9.3.213

564   Heinrich B (1979) "Majoring" and "minoring" by foraging bumblebees, *Bombus*

565   *vagans*: an experimental analysis. Ecology 60:245-255 doi:10.2307/1937652

566   Herrera CM (1987) Components of pollinator "quality": comparative analysis of a

567   diverse insect assemblage. Oikos 50:79-90 doi:10.2307/3565403

568   Holway JG, Ward RT (1965) Phenology of alpine plants in northern Colorado. Ecology

569   46:73-83 doi:10.2307/1935259

570   Iler AM, Inouye DW, Høye TT, Miller-Rushing AJ, Burkle LA, Johnston EB (2013)

571   Maintenance of temporal synchrony between syrphid flies and floral resources

572   despite differential phenological responses to climate. Glob Chang Biol

573   19:2348-2359 doi:10.1111/gcb.12246

574   Inouye DW, Larson BMH, SSymank A, Kevan PG (2015) Flies and flowers III.

575   Ecology of foraging and pollination. J Pollination Ecol 16:115-133

576   Kameyama Y, Kudo G (2009) Flowering phenology influences seed production and

577   outcrossing rate in populations of an alpine snowbed shrub, *Phyllodoce aleutica*:

578   effects of pollinators and self-incompatibility. Ann Bot 103:1385-1394

579   doi:10.1093/aob/mcp037

580   Kasagi T, Kudo G (2003) Variations in bumble bee preference and pollen limitation

581   among neighboring populations: comparisons between *Phyllodoce caerulea* and

582   *Phyllodoce aleutica* (Ericaceae) along snowmelt gradients. Am J Bot 90:1321-1327

583   doi:10.3732/ajb.90.9.1321

584 Kearns CA, Inouye DW (1994) Fly pollination of *Linum lewisii* (Linaceae). Am J Bot

585   81:1091-1095 doi:10.2307/2445470

586 Kevan PG (1972) Insect pollination of high arctic flowers. Ecology 60:831-847

587   doi:10.2307/2258569

588 Kevan PG, Baker HG (1983) Insects as flower visitors and pollinators. Annu Rev

589   Entomol 28:407-453 doi:10.1146/annurev.en.28.010183.002203

590 Konno Y (2006) Species composition of anthophilous Diptera and Hymenoptera in the

591   Daisetsu Mountains. Japanese J Appl Entomol Zool 50:25-32

592   doi:10.1303/jjaez.2006.25

593 Krebs CJ, Boonstra R, Cowcill K, Kenney AJ (2009) Climatic determinants of berry

594   crops in the boreal forest of the southwestern Yukon. Botany 87:401-408

595   doi:10.1139/B09-013

596 Kudo G (1991) Effects of snow-free period on the phenology of alpine plants inhabiting

597   snow patches. Arct Alp Res 23:436-443 doi:10.2307/1551685

598 Kudo G (1993) Relationship between flowering time and fruit set of the entomophilous

599   alpine shrub, *Rhododendron aureum* (Ericaceae), inhabiting snow patches. Am J

600   Bot 80:1300-1304 doi:10.2307/2445714

601 Kudo G, Suzuki S (2002) Relationships between flowering phenology and fruit-set of

602   dwarf shrubs in alpine fellfields in northern Japan: a comparison with a subarctic

603   heathland in northern Sweden. Arct Ant Alp Res 34:185-190 doi:10.2307/1552470

604 Kudo G (2006) Flowering phenologies of animal-pollinated plants: reproductive

605   strategies and agents of selection. In: Harder LD, Barrett SCH (eds) Ecology and

606   evolution of flowers. Oxford University Press, New York, USA, pp 139-158

607   Kudo G, Hirao AS (2006) Habitat-specific responses in the flowering phenology and

608   seed set of alpine plants to climate variation: implications for global-change impacts.

609   Popul Ecol 48:49-58 doi:10.1007/s10144-005-0242-z

610   Kudo G, Hirao AS, Kawai Y (2011) Pollination efficiency of bumblebee queens and

611   workers in the alpine shrub *Rhododendron aureum*. Int J Plant Sci 172:70-77

612   doi:10.1086/657282

613   Kudo G (2014) Vulnerability of phenological synchrony between plants and pollinators

614   in an alpine ecosystem. Ecol Res 29:571-581 doi:10.1007/s11284-013-1108-z

615   Kudo G (2016) Landscape structure of flowering phenology in alpine ecosystems:

616   significance of plant-pollinator interactions and evolutionary aspects. In: Kudo G

617   (ed) Structure and function of mountain ecosystems in Japan. Springer, pp 41-62

618   doi: 10.1007/978-4-431-55954-2

619   Kwak MM, Bergman P (1996) Early flowers of *Bartsia alpina* (Scrophulariaceae) and

620   the visitation by bumblebees. Acta Bot Neerl 45:355-366

621   doi:10.1111/j.1438-8677.1996.tb00522.x

622   Larson BMH, Kevan PG, Inouye DW (2001) Flies and flowers: taxonomic diversity of

623   anthophiles and pollinators. Can Entomol 133:439-465 doi:10.4039/Ent133439-4

624   Makrodimos N, Blionis GJ, Krigas N, Vokou D (2008) Flower morphology, phenology

625   and visitor patterns in an alpine community on Mt Olympos, Greece. Flora

626   203:449-468 doi:10.1016/j.flora.2007.07.003

627   McCall C, Primack RB (1992) Influence of flower characteristics, weather, time of day,

628   and season on insect visitation rates in three plant communities. Am J Bot

629   79:434-442 doi:10.2307/2445156

630   Molau U, Nordenhäll U, Eriksen B (2005) Onset of flowering and climate variability in

631   an alpine landscape: a 10-year study from Swedish Lapland. Am J Bot 92:422-431

632   doi:10.3732/ajb.92.3.422

633   Moquet L, Vanderplanck M, Moerman R, Quinet M, Roger N, Michez D, Jacquemart

634   AL (2017) Bumblebees depend on ericaceous species to survive in temperate

635   heathlands. Insect Conserv Divers 10:78-93 doi:10.1111/icad.12201

636   Oksanen J, Blanchet FG, Friendly M, Kindt R, Legendre P, McGlinn D, Minchin PR,

637   Hara RBO, Simpson GL, Solymos P, Stevens MHH, Szoecs E, Wagner H (2016)

638   Vegan: community ecology package. R package version 2.4-1,

639   https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=vegan

640   Orford KA, Vaughan IP, Memmott J (2015) The forgotten flies: the importance of

641   non-syrphid Diptera as pollinators. Proc R Soc B 282:20142934

642   doi:10.1098/rspb.2014.2934

643   Pyke GH, Inouye DW, Thomson JD (2011) Activity and abundance of bumble bees

644   near Crested Butte, Colorado: diel, seasonal, and elevation effects. Ecol Entomol

645   36:511-521 doi:10.1111/j.1365-2311.2011.01295.x

646   Rathcke B, Lacey EP (1985) Phenological patterns of terrestrial plants. Ann Rev Ecol

647   Syst 16:179-214 doi:10.1146/annurev.es.16.110185.001143

648   Rathcke B (1988) Interactions for pollination among coflowering shrubs. Ecology

649   69:446-457 doi:10.2307/1940443

650   R Core Team (2016) R: a language and environment for statistical computing. R

651   foundation for statistical computing, Vienna. https://www.R-project.org

652   Reader RJ (1975) Competitive relationships of some bog ericads for major insect

653   pollinators. Can J Bot 53:1300-1305 doi:10.1139/b75-156

654   Reader RJ (1977) Bog ericad flowers: self-compatibility and relative attractiveness to

655   bees. Can J Bot 55:2279-2287 doi:10.1139/b77-259

656   Rotheray G, Gilbert F (2011) The natural history of hoverflies. Forrest Text, London

657   Selås V (2000) Seed production of a masting dwarf shrub, *Vaccinium myrtillus*, in

658   relation to previous reproduction and weather. Can J Bot 78:423-429

659   doi:10.1139/b00-017

660   Straka JR, Starzomski BM (2015) Fruitful factors: what limits seed production of

661   flowering plants in the alpine? Oecologia 178:249-260

662   doi:10.1007/s00442-014-3169-2

663   Tiusanen M, Hebert PDN, Schmidt NM, Roslin T (2016) One fly to rule them all–

664   muscid flies are the key pollinators in the Arctic. Proc R Soc B 283:20161271

665   doi:10.1098/rspb.2016.1271

666   Totland Ø (1993) Pollination in alpine Norway: flowering phenology, insect visitors,

667   and visitation rates in two plant communities. Can J Bot 71:1072-1079

668   doi:10.1139/b93-124

669   Totland Ø (1994) Influence of climate, time of day and season, and flower density on

670   insect flower visitation in alpine Norway. Arct Alp Res 26:66-71

671   doi:10.2307/1551879

672   Wagner J, Lechleitner M, Hosp D (2016) Pollen limitation is not the rule in nival plants:

673   a study from the European Central Alps. Am J Bot 103:375-387

674   doi:10.3732/ajb.1500214

675   Willmer P (2011) Pollination and floral ecology. Princeton University Press, Princeton

676   Woodcock TS, Larson BMH, Kevan PG, Inouye DW, Lunau K (2014) Flies and

677   flowers II: floral attractants and rewards. J Pollinat Ecol 12:63-94

678   Yumoto T (1986) The ecological pollination syndromes of insect-pollinated plants in an

679   alpine meadow. Ecol Res 1:83-95 doi:10.1007/BF02361207

680

Table 1. The number and species composition of flower visitors observed in 2013 and 2014. For bumble bees, caste numbers (queen/worker/male) are shown in parentheses.

Order	Family/Species	2013	2014
Hymenoptera	Apidae spp.		
	Bombus hypocrita sapporoensis	765 (22/701/42)	295 (19/248/28)
	Bombus beaticola moshkarareppus	499 (58/411/30)	451 (5/442/4)
	Bombus yezoensis	7 (0/7/0)	41 (0/41/0)
	Bombus hypnorum koropokkrus	4 (2/2/0)	3 (0/3/0)
	Bombus terrestris	17 (0/17/0)	0
	Tenthredinidae spp.	211	96
	Solitary bees (Halictidae or Andrenidae spp.)	43	6
	Wasps	0	27
	Subtotal	1546 (36.2%)	919 (23.5%)
Diptera	Flies (small)**	436	164
	Flies (medium)**	1327	527
	Flies (large)**	59	43
	Empididae spp.	50	81
	Syrphidae spp.	732	2016
	Subtotal	2604 (61.0%)	2831 (72.4%)
Lepidoptera	Nymphalidae (mainly *Aglais urticae connexa*)	63	116
	Papilionidae spp.	1	1
	Pieridae spp.	0	3
	Hesperiidae spp.	4	0
	Lycaenidae spp.	0	1
	Moths	18	8
	Subtotal	86 (2.0%)	129 (3.3%)
Hemiptera	Miridae spp.	24	0
	Anthocoridae spp.	0	22
	Other bugs	9	0
	Subtotal	33 (0.8%)	22 (0.6%)
Coleoptera	Staphylinidae spp.	0	4
	Elateridae spp.	0	1
	Other beetles	0	2
	Subtotal	0 (0%)	7 (0.2%)
Total		4269	3908

**mainly Anthomyiidae, Muscidae, or Calliphoridae spp.

Table 2. Results of GLM analysis for visitation frequency of bumble bees, non-syrphid flies, and syrphid flies. Year (2013, 2014), season (week) and pollinator type are included in the explanatory variables.

| Variables	Coefficient	Std. Error	z value	P level
Intercept (Bumble bee, Year 2013)	–10.97	0.77	–14.19	**<0.001**
Year (2014)	0.53	0.11	4.67	**<0.001**
Week	1.19	0.16	7.38	**<0.001**
Week^2	–0.048	0.008	–5.98	**<0.001**
Non-syrphid fly	6.13	0.93	6.59	**<0.001**
Syrphid fly	–0.62	1.03	–0.61	0.54
Week $\times$ Non-syrphid fly	–1.20	0.20	–5.94	**<0.001**
Week $\times$ Syrphid fly	0.31	0.22	1.42	0.16
Week^2 $\times$ Non-syrphid fly	0.054	0.010	5.31	**<0.001**
Week^2 $\times$ Syrphid fly	–0.023	0.011	–2.04	**0.041**

Table 3. Results of GLM analysis for visitation frequency of bumble bees (a), non-syrphid flies (b), and syrphid flies (c). Year (2013, 2014), air temperature, and wind speed* are included in the explanatory variables of full models. Best-fit models after parameter selection based on AIC are indicated.

| Variables	Coefficient	Std. Error	z value	P level
(a) Bumble bee frequency				
Intercept	1.95	0.62	3.13	**0.002**
Temperature	0.077	0.043	1.80	0.072
(b) Syrphid fly frequency				
Intercept (Year 2013, Wind-L)	−1.28	0.83	−1.56	0.12
Year (2014)	1.64	0.34	4.85	**<0.001**
Temperature	0.26	0.05	4.87	**<0.001**
Wind-M	−0.05	0.37	−0.15	0.88
Wind-H	−1.63	0.52	−2.16	**0.002**
(c) Non-syrphid fly frequency				
Intercept (Year 2013)	8.51	0.15	24.00	**<0.001**
Year (2014)	−0.57	0.22	−2.16	**0.009**

* Wind conditions were grouped into three classes: breeze (wind-L), moderate (wind-M), and strong (wind-H).

Table 4. Results of GLMM analysis for fruit-set success of plants of all pollination-types at the population level under natural pollination. Season (week), year (2013, 2014), and pollination type (B-, F-, BF-type) are explanatory variables, and plant species is a random variable.

| Variables	Coefficient	Std. Error	z value	P level
Intercept (Year 2013, B-type)	–2.23	0.57	–3.92	**<0.001**
Week	0.26	0.02	18.98	**<0.001**
BF-type	–0.25	0.74	–0.34	0.73
F-type	2.79	0.81	3.44	**0.006**
Year 2014	0.66	0.03	25.43	**<0.001**
Week × BF-type	0.04	0.03	1.70	0.088
Week × F-type	–0.19	0.03	–7.64	**<0.001**

Fig. 1 Seasonal patterns in the visitation frequencies of bumble bees (solid line), syrphid flies (chained line), and non-syrphid flies (broken line) in 2013 (a) and 2014 (b). Lines indicate the fit to the log-link functions, including the quadratic week variable. Refer to Table 2 for GLM results.

Fig. 2 Seasonal patterns in floral resources expressed as floral density per quadrat (2 m × 2 m) for all plants, B-type plants, and F-type plants in 2013 (a) and 2014 (b). Flowering patterns of all plants and B-type plants significantly varied between years, while flowering patterns of F-type plants were similar between years (see text for details).

Fig. 3 Relationships between fruit-set success under natural conditions and the major flowering periods of populations of individual pollination types (B-type, solid line; BF-type, chained line; F-type, broken line) in 2013 (a) and 2014 (b). Lines are fitted to the logistic function applied to each pollination type and each year. Refer to Table 4 for GLMM results.

(a) Bee-type plants

(b) Fly-type plants

Fig. 4 Relationships between pollinator frequency at flowering peak and fruit-set success at the community scale for the combination of bumble bees and B-type plants (a), and dipteran insects and F-type plants (b). Open circles and the solid line indicate 2013, and closed circles and the broken line indicate 2014. Lines are fitted to the logistic function applied to each year using estimated values of pollinator frequencies (Fig. 1) and community-scale fruit-set rates (Fig. 3).