



## Sleeping-tree fidelity of spider monkey shapes community-level seed-rain patterns in continuous and fragmented rain forests

Journal:	<i>Journal Of Tropical Ecology</i>
Manuscript ID:	JTE-15-088.R4
Manuscript Type:	Full Paper
Date Submitted by the Author:	n/a
Complete List of Authors:	González-Zamora, Arturo; Universidad Veracruzana, Instituto de Investigaciones Biológicas; Instituto de Ecología A.C., División de Posgrado Arroyo-Rodríguez, Victor; Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, Instituto de Investigaciones en Ecosistemas y Sustentabilidad Escobar Sarria, Federico; Instituto de Ecología A.C, Red de Ecoetología Oyama, Ken; Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, Escuela Nacional de Estudios Superiores Aureli, Filippo; Liverpool John Moores University, 3Research Centre in Evolutionary Anthropology and Palaeoecology, School of Natural Sciences and Psychology. Stoner, Kathryn; New Mexico State University, Department of Fish, Wildlife, and Conservation Ecology
Keywords:	aggregated seed dispersal, Ateles, FRUGIVORY, forest fragmentation, Lacandona, PRIMATES, sleeping site

SCHOLARONE™  
Manuscripts

1  
2  
3  
4 **Short title:** Sleeping-tree fidelity shapes seed-rain patterns  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9

10 **Sleeping-tree fidelity of the spider monkey shapes community-level seed-**  
11 **rain patterns in continuous and fragmented rain forests**  
12  
13  
14  
15

16 Arturo González-Zamora\*<sup>§§</sup><sup>1</sup>, Víctor Arroyo-Rodríguez<sup>†</sup>, Federico Escobar<sup>‡</sup>, Ken  
17 Oyama<sup>†</sup><sup>§</sup>, Filippo Aureli<sup>\*\*</sup>, and Kathryn E. Stoner<sup>††</sup>  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22

23 \*División de Posgrado, Instituto de Ecología A.C., Xalapa, Veracruz, Mexico  
24  
25

26 <sup>†</sup>Instituto de Investigaciones en Ecosistemas y Sustentabilidad, Universidad Nacional Autónoma de  
27 México, Morelia, Michoacán, Mexico  
28  
29

30 <sup>‡</sup>Red de Ecoetología, Instituto de Ecología A.C., Xalapa, Veracruz, Mexico  
31  
32

33 <sup>§</sup>Escuela Nacional de Estudios Superiores, Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, Morelia,  
34 Michoacán, Mexico  
35

36 <sup>\*\*</sup>Instituto de Neuroetología, Universidad Veracruzana, Xalapa, Mexico, and Research Centre in  
37 Evolutionary Anthropology and Palaeoecology, Liverpool John Moores University, Liverpool,  
38 United Kingdom  
39  
40

41 <sup>††</sup>Department of Fish, Wildlife, and Conservation Ecology, New Mexico State University, Las  
42 Cruces, New Mexico, USA  
43  
44

45 <sup>§§</sup>Current address: Instituto de Investigaciones Biológicas, Universidad Veracruzana, Xalapa,  
46 Veracruz, Mexico  
47  
48  
49

50 <sup>1</sup>Corresponding author. Tel.: +52 (2281) 536279.  
51 E-mail address: toztlan@yahoo.com.mx  
52  
53  
54

55 **Keywords:** aggregated seed dispersal, *Ateles*, frugivory, forest fragmentation, Lacandona, primates,  
56 sleeping site  
57  
58  
59  
60

**ABSTRACT**

Repeated use of sleeping trees (STs) by frugivores promotes the deposition and aggregation of copious amounts of seed, thus having key implications for seed dispersal and forest regeneration. Seed-rain patterns produced by this behaviour likely depend on the frequency of use of these sites, yet this hypothesis has been poorly tested. We evaluated community-level seed-rain patterns produced by the spider monkey (*Ateles geoffroyi*) over 13 mo in latrines located beneath 60 STs in the Lacandona rain forest, Mexico. Because this primate is increasingly 'forced' to inhabit fragmented landscapes, we tested whether sleeping-tree fidelity (STF) differed among sites and between continuous and fragmented forests. We also tested whether seed-rain patterns were associated with STF within each site and forest type. STF was highly variable among STs (average = 7 mo, range = 1-12 mo), but did not differ among study sites or forest types. STF was positively associated with seed abundance, species diversity and species turnover. Nevertheless, STF tended to be negatively related to seed community evenness. These results are likely due to the most frequently used STs being in areas with greater food density. Our results demonstrate that site fidelity shapes community-level seed-rain patterns and thus has key ecological implications.

## INTRODUCTION

The repeated use of perches, roosting sites, reproductive sites and sleeping sites over time by frugivorous vertebrates promotes the deposition and aggregation of copious amounts of seed in these sites (Russo & Augspurger 2004, Wenny 2001). These behaviours have key implications for seed dispersal and forest regeneration (Jordano & Schupp 2000), particularly in tropical forests where up to 94% of woody plant species are dispersed by frugivorous animals (Jordano 1992). The importance of this spatially aggregated pattern of seed deposition for seed dispersal is largely dependent on site fidelity, that is, on the frequency of use of these sites over time (Russo & Augspurger 2004, Russo *et al.* 2006); yet, empirical evidence about this relationship is scarce.

Site fidelity is particularly common in territorial animals (Börger *et al.* 2008), such as Geoffroy's spider monkey (*Ateles geoffroyi*) (Chapman *et al.* 1995). This primate is a highly specialized frugivore (González-Zamora *et al.* 2009, Russo *et al.* 2005) that defends stable home ranges, within which the spider monkey concentrate its activities in areas of higher quality (i.e. the so-called 'core areas'; Asensio *et al.* 2012a). As multi-central place foragers (*sensu* Chapman *et al.* 1989), they feed on several plants located near sleeping trees (STs), and return to the same or different STs after their feeding excursions. An important fraction of seeds swallowed by these primates are defecated in latrines located beneath these STs (González-Zamora *et al.* 2014, Russo & Augspurger 2004, Russo *et al.* 2006), particularly beneath in those located within core areas, and hence, variation in sleeping-tree fidelity (STF) is expected to alter patterns of seed rain within latrines.

Here, we evaluated the frequency of use of 60 STs by *A. geoffroyi* and the seed-rain patterns produced by this primate during a 13-mo period in two continuous forest sites (CF)

1  
2  
3  
4 and three forest fragments (FF) in the fragmented Lacandona rain forest, Mexico. Because  
5  
6 the potential variation between continuous and fragmented forests in STF has not been  
7  
8 previously evaluated, we first tested whether STF (operationally defined as the number of  
9  
10 months each ST is used) differed among the five study sites and between forest types  
11  
12 (continuous and fragmented forests). For each study site and forest type, we assessed the  
13  
14 association between STF and six community-level attributes of seed assemblages  
15  
16 (Tuomisto 2010): abundance of seeds, species diversity of seeds (i.e. species richness,  
17  
18 exponential of Shannon's entropy and inverse Simpson concentration), community  
19  
20 evenness, and seed species turnover ( $\beta$ -diversity) between STs. This information has  
21  
22 critical ecological implications, as *A. geoffroyi* are increasingly forced to inhabit  
23  
24 fragmented landscapes (Ramos-Fernández & Wallace 2008), but we do not know if their  
25  
26 seed-dispersal services may be altered in forest fragments (but see Chaves *et al.* 2011,  
27  
28 González-Zamora *et al.* 2014).

29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
STF of spider monkeys is expected to be higher in forest fragments (González-  
Zamora *et al.* 2012), as the home ranges of these primates in fragments are smaller than in  
continuous forest sites (Chaves *et al.* 2012). Although it is reasonable to expect that the  
abundance and diversity of seeds increase with STF, such associations largely depend on  
food availability within the home range. Because the STs most frequently used are expected  
to function as key nodes within foraging networks routes that connect core areas (Di Fiore  
& Suarez 2007, Suarez *et al.* 2014), we predicted STF to be positively associated with seed  
abundance and with all four diversity metrics. Thus, differences between STs in re-use are  
expected to result in significant differences in species turnover (i.e. increasing  $\beta$ -diversity)  
between STs. Moreover, because the spider monkey shows high selectivity towards the

1  
2  
3  
4 consumption of a few genera of plants (Chapman 1988, Milton 1980, Russo *et al.* 2005)  
5  
6 and a large number of species are used opportunistically (González-Zamora *et al.* 2009,  
7  
8 Russo *et al.* 2005), we predicted STF to be negatively associated with community evenness  
9  
10 (i.e. with higher STF the seed rain will be dominated by a fewer species).  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15

## 16 METHODS

### 17 Study sites

18  
19 The Lacandona rain forest constitutes the south-western sector of the Mayan forest in  
20  
21 Mexico, and represents a priority area for biodiversity conservation in Mexico and  
22  
23 Mesoamerica (Myers *et al.* 2000). The area is located in the north-eastern portion of the  
24  
25 state of Chiapas, and is delimited by the Guatemalan border on the south and east, and by  
26  
27 the Chiapas highlands on the north and west. Annual precipitation averages 2850 mm, and  
28  
29 average monthly temperatures range between 24°C and 26°C. This region was originally  
30  
31 covered by over 1.4 million ha of rain forest, but deforestation between 1960 and 1990  
32  
33 resulted in the loss of 70% of the original forest cover (Arizpe *et al.* 1993).  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39

40 Within this region the Montes Azules Biosphere Reserve (MABR) was created in  
41  
42 1978 to protect biodiversity. Adjacent to the southern extreme of MABR, the Marqués de  
43  
44 Comillas Region (MCR) was colonized by humans about 40 y ago and since then MCR has  
45  
46 suffered the rapid loss and fragmentation of the original rain forest (Mora 2008). Currently,  
47  
48 MCR is dominated by different-sized rain forest patches, embedded in a matrix of cattle  
49  
50 pastures, agricultural lands (e.g. corn, oil palm, rubber) and human settlements. The study  
51  
52 was conducted in MCR (eastern side of the Lacantún River; 2039 km<sup>2</sup>) and MABR  
53  
54 (western side; 3312 km<sup>2</sup>).  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## Experimental design

Based on a recent study on the density and spatial distribution of sleeping sites, STs and latrines of the spider monkey (*Ateles geoffroyi*) in the region (González-Zamora *et al.* 2012, 2014), we selected 60 sleeping sites, each composed by one single ST, in two continuous-forest sites within MABR and three forest fragments in MCR (12 STs per study site). To increase the independence between the two continuous-forest sites, they were separated by 5 km from each other. The forest fragments FF1, FF2 and FF3 have an area of 1125, 33 and 30 ha, respectively, and were isolated  $\geq 24$  y ago and were immersed in an anthropogenic matrix of pastures and agricultural lands. The average distance between two fragments was 4.2 km (see further details in Gonzalez-Zamora *et al.* 2012, 2014). We do not have accurate information on the home range, population size/density and core area size of each primate's community. Yet a recent study in the same study sites reports that FF1 is occupied by a community of approximately 40 spider monkeys using a home range of 63 ha, whereas the communities from FF2 and FF3 have 30 and 39 individuals, respectively, and use the entire fragment area (Chaves *et al.* 2012). The average home-range size and community size in the continuous forest of the Lacandona rain forest is 68.4 ha and 40 individuals (Chaves *et al.* 2012). Unfortunately, we do not have data about the size of core areas in the study sites, but in Santa Rosa National Park, Costa Rica, Asensio *et al.* (2012b) estimated that spider monkeys use five core areas of 9.2 ha on average (range = 3.4–19.2 ha) that totalled 46.1 ha out of the 304 ha of the entire home range.

## Seed-rain patterns

1  
2  
3  
4 Each selected ST had a single latrine (Gonzalez-Zamora *et al.* 2012, 2014). The STs had a  
5 mean crown projection of approximately  $21 \pm 21$  m<sup>2</sup> (mean  $\pm$  SD). This indicates that each  
6 trap covered ca. 3% of the tree crown. Nevertheless, because we located the trap in the  
7 centre of the latrine, which had an average a diameter of 1.5 m (González-Zamora *et al.*  
8 2014), each trap covered approximately 60% of the latrine's area. Traps consisted of a  
9 circular 1.5-m-diameter PVC frame supporting a 0.5-m-deep open-topped nylon mesh bag  
10 suspended 1 m above the ground on three steel posts to prevent the possible predation of  
11 seeds by terrestrial vertebrates. In fact, we did not detect signs of seed predation (i.e. open  
12 husks, teeth marks) in the dispersed seed pool. Although seed traps also captured some  
13 fruits and seeds dispersed by wind or gravity, and would also capture seed dispersed by bird  
14 and bats, we only considered seeds completely immersed within monkey faeces. These  
15 seeds were easily identified in the field based on their typically stained appearance and  
16 characteristic adhesion of faecal matter (González-Zamora *et al.* 2014), thus limiting  
17 greatly the erroneous inclusion of seeds dispersed by wind, gravity, or other animals.  
18 Furthermore, we did not consider seeds  $< 5$  mm in length, which are known to be dispersed  
19 by a wider variety of seed dispersers, including small-to-medium terrestrial mammals, bats  
20 and birds (Janson 1983, Stoner *et al.* 2007), whereas seeds  $\geq 5$  mm in length are frequently  
21 dispersed by primates (Arroyo-Rodríguez *et al.* 2015, Chaves *et al.* 2011, González-  
22 Zamora *et al.* 2014).

23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49 During a 13-mo period (1 February 2011-28 February 2012) each trap was emptied  
50 once monthly, and the seeds were collected and afterwards washed for subsequent  
51 identification in the laboratory. All seeds were counted and identified to the species level  
52 based on (1) our own experience with the local flora (from seeds to adults) (Chaves *et al.*  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



1  
2  
3  
4 2011, 2012; González-Zamora *et al.* 2012); (2) assistance from a botanical expert familiar  
5  
6 with the flora of the region (G. Ibarra-Manríquez, Universidad Nacional Autónoma de  
7  
8 México, Morelia, Mexico) and a local parataxonomist; and (3) information from seed  
9  
10 catalogues (Ibarra-Manríquez & Cornejo-Tenorio 2010).  
11  
12  
13

### 16 **Sleeping-tree fidelity**

17  
18 Following Reichard (1998), STF was defined as the number of months each ST was used  
19  
20 during the study period. Given that all traps were checked at the end of each month, the  
21  
22 presence of faeces in the traps was used as an indicator of sleeping-tree use by spider  
23  
24 monkeys during that month. Since all traps were completely emptied each month, we  
25  
26 considered both fresh and old faeces as indicators of sleeping-tree use, thus avoiding the  
27  
28 possibility of overestimating STF. Although our definition of STF does not reflect  
29  
30 accurately the intensity of use of STs (i.e. it would be better to assess STF on a daily or  
31  
32 weekly basis), our results suggest however that our assessment of STF is an appropriate  
33  
34 approximation of the intensity of use, as all community attributes of the seed rain were  
35  
36 significantly related to STF.  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45

### 46 **Sample completeness**

47  
48 To assess the sample completeness within each ST, we employed the coverage estimator  
49  
50 ( $\hat{C}_n$ ) suggested by Chao & Jost (2012), which is a less biased estimator of sample  
51  
52 completeness:  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

$$\hat{C}_n = 1 - \frac{f_1}{n} \left[ \frac{(n-1)f_1}{(n-1)f_1 + 2f_2} \right]$$

where  $f_1$  and  $f_2$  are the number of species represented by one (singletons) and two (doubletons) individuals in the sample, respectively, and  $n$  is the total number of individuals in the sample. Sample completeness did not differ between sites (Kruskal-Wallis test,  $H = 6.7$ ,  $P = 0.14$ ; mean  $\pm$  SE:  $99\% \pm 1\%$ , range: 93%-100% per ST). This indicates that the seed sample was accurate with our sampling effort, and that our results are not biased by differences in sample completeness among sites (Chao & Jost 2012).

### Composition and structure of seed assemblages

Based on our hierarchically nested sampling design (i.e. 60 STs in five sites within two forest types), we calculated the total abundance and species diversity of seeds for each ST during the 13-mo period. Patterns of species diversity were analyzed using true diversity measures (i.e. number equivalents,  ${}^qD$ ). This analytical approach has been recognized as the most appropriate for diversity comparisons (Chao *et al.* 2012, Jost 2006, 2007; Tuomisto 2010). The formulas are detailed elsewhere (Chao *et al.* 2012, Jost 2006). We considered true diversities  ${}^0D$  (species richness),  ${}^1D$  (exponential of Shannon's entropy) and  ${}^2D$  (inverse Simpson concentration).  ${}^0D$  is not sensitive to species abundances and so gives disproportionate weight to rare species (Jost 2006, Tuomisto 2010).  ${}^1D$  weights each species according to its abundance in the community, and therefore can be interpreted as the number of 'common' (or typical) species in the community (Chao *et al.* 2012). Finally,  ${}^2D$  favours very abundant species, and can be interpreted as the number of 'dominant' species in the community (Chao *et al.* 2012, Jost 2010). These three diversity measures

1  
2  
3  
4 were calculated using raw estimators with the ‘entropart’ package for R (v. 3.1.1) (R Core  
5  
6 Team Development).  
7

8  
9 We also assessed differences in species dominance among latrines using the evenness  
10  
11 factor proposed by Jost (2010):  $EF_{0,2} = {}^2D/{}^0D$ . We used this measure because: (1) it is  
12  
13 calculated from true diversity measures; (2) it is independent of the number of species in  
14  
15 the sample; and (3) it is very easy to interpret. It ranges between 1 (when all species are  
16  
17 equally common) and nearly  $1/{}^0D$  (when the community is totally dominated by one  
18  
19 species), and can be interpreted as the proportion of dominant species in the community  
20  
21 (Jost 2010).  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27

## 28 **Statistical analyses**

29  
30 To assess whether STs can be considered independent samples, we used Mantel tests to  
31  
32 correlate the distance between STs with the difference in STF (i.e. differences in the re-use  
33  
34 of different STs). The P-values were calculated using the distribution of the R coefficients  
35  
36 obtained from 10000 permutations. Because the Mantel tests did not detect a significant  
37  
38 spatial autocorrelation of data sets within the continuous forest sites (CF1:  $r = -0.23$ ,  $P =$   
39  
40  $0.05$ ; CF2:  $r = -0.16$ ,  $P = 0.17$ ), nor within the forest fragments (FF1:  $r = 0.14$ ,  $P = 0.24$ ;  
41  
42 FF2:  $r = 0.02$ ,  $P = 0.87$ ; FF3:  $r = 0.10$ ,  $P = 0.41$ ), we considered the STs as replicates in the  
43  
44 following analyses.  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49

50 We first tested for differences in STF among sites and between forest types using  
51  
52 analyses of deviance (ANODE) with generalized linear models (GLM). As suggested for  
53  
54 count dependent variables (i.e. number of months), we used a Poisson error and a log link  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3  
4 function, and corrected for data overdispersion (Crawley 2002). We then used analyses of  
5  
6 covariance (ANCOVA) with GLMs to assess the association between each community-  
7  
8 level variable (abundance of seeds,  ${}^0D$ ,  ${}^1D$ ,  ${}^2D$ , and  $EF$ ; the dependent variable) and forest  
9  
10 type (categorical factor) and STF (continuous cofactor). The interaction of these two  
11  
12 explanatory variables (forest type  $\times$  STF) was included in the models to test if the slope of  
13  
14 the association between each response variable and STF differed between forest types. We  
15  
16 also used Mantel tests to evaluate if seed species turnover between STs within each  
17  
18 sampling site was related to the differences between STs in STF. The species turnover  
19  
20 between STs was calculated using multiplicative diversity decomposition of Hill numbers:  
21  
22  ${}^qD_\beta = {}^qD_\gamma / {}^qD_\alpha$  (Jost 2007). These metrics were calculated using the ‘entropart’ package for  
23  
24 R (<<http://CRAN.R-project.org/package=entropart>>.) to implement a function to construct  
25  
26 a matrix containing  $\beta$ -diversity values of each pairwise comparison within each sampling  
27  
28 site. Thus, for each ST pair,  ${}^qD_\gamma$  was the total (gamma) diversity of the two STs, and  ${}^qD_\alpha$   
29  
30 was the average alpha diversity per ST. This beta can be interpreted as ‘effective number of  
31  
32 completely distinct communities’ (Jost 2007). In our case, it ranged between 1 (when both  
33  
34 STs showed identical seed rains) and 2 (when the two STs were completely different from  
35  
36 each other).  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46

## 47 RESULTS

### 48 Sleeping-tree fidelity in continuous and fragmented forests

49  
50 Overall, STF of spider monkeys was highly variable among sites. It ranged from 3 to 10 mo  
51  
52 in continuous forest sites, and from 1 to 12 mo in forest fragments, but it did not differ  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3  
4 among sites (GLM;  $\chi^2 = 5.55$ ,  $df = 4$ ,  $P = 0.23$ ; Figure 1a) or between forest types ( $\chi^2 =$   
5  
6  
7 0.56,  $df = 1$ ,  $P = 0.45$ ; Figure 1b).  
8  
9

### 10 11 **Association between STF and seed-rain patterns**

12  
13  
14 The generalized linear models showed that STF was positively related to all community  
15  
16 attributes of the seed rain (Table 1; Figure 2). The interaction in the models (forest type  $\times$   
17  
18 STF) was not significant, indicating that this positive association was similar in both  
19  
20 continuous and fragmented forests (Figure 2).  
21  
22

23  
24 The Mantel tests showed that, in the smallest forest fragments (FF2 and FF3), species  
25  
26 turnover of seeds among STs increased with increasing inter-ST differences in STF (Table  
27  
28 2). This association was also significant in FF1, but only when considering  $\beta$ -diversity of  
29  
30 order 0 and 1 (i.e.  ${}^0D_\beta$  and  ${}^1D_\beta$ ). Yet, the Mantel tests did not detect a significant correlation  
31  
32 between inter-ST differences in STF and  $\beta$ -diversity for all order  $q$  (Table 2).  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37

## 38 **DISCUSSION**

39  
40 Contrary to our prediction, STF was similar in all study sites and did not differ between  
41  
42 continuous and fragmented forests. This was due to the large variation among STs.  
43

44  
45 Although STs were used by spider monkeys on average for 7 out of 13 mo, there was a  
46  
47 substantial variation across trees (range = 1-12 mo), which was relatively higher in forest  
48  
49 fragments than in continuous forest sites (Figure 1). Previous studies on the spider monkey  
50  
51 (Chapman *et al.* 1989, Russo & Augspurger 2004, Russo *et al.* 2006) and other primate  
52  
53 species (*Brachyteles arachnoides*: Bueno *et al.* 2013; *Hylobates lar*: Reichard 1998;  
54  
55 *Gorilla gorilla*: Rogers *et al.* 1998; *Lagothrix lagothricha*: Stevenson 2000) also indicated  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3  
4 that the use and re-use of STs can be highly variable, with some trees used for long periods,  
5  
6 while others only used occasionally (Anderson 1984, 2000; Reichard 1998, Teichroeb *et al.*  
7  
8 2012). In the case of the spider monkey, this pattern results from its temporal and spatial  
9  
10 foraging behaviour in different areas with a high concentration of food trees within the  
11  
12 home range (Asensio *et al.* 2012b, Ramos-Fernández *et al.* 2013), and then routinely  
13  
14 returning at night to the same or different STs located in proximity to these areas with  
15  
16 greater food density (i.e. multiple central-place foraging; *sensu* Chapman *et al.* 1989). This  
17  
18 behaviour allows the monkey to monitor the resources for future usage (Asensio *et al.*  
19  
20 2012a) and to move back to its STs using route-based mental maps (Di Fiore & Suarez  
21  
22 2007, Ramos-Fernández *et al.* 2004, Suarez *et al.* 2014), thus minimizing travel time  
23  
24 (Asensio *et al.* 2012b, Chapman 1989, Teichroeb *et al.* 2012). Yet, during territorial  
25  
26 defence (Chapman *et al.* 1995, Wallace 2008), or exploration to monitor feeding sites at a  
27  
28 great distance (Di Fiore & Suarez 2007, Ramos-Fernández *et al.* 2004, Valero & Byrne  
29  
30 2007) males of *A. Geoffroyi* can use STs for short periods because they usually do not return  
31  
32 to the same ST (Ramos-Fernández *et al.* 2004), possibly explaining the low fidelity found  
33  
34 for some STs in our study. Therefore, as reported for other primate species (Heymann  
35  
36 1995, Pontes & Soares 2005, Reichard 1998, Sigg & Stolba 1981, Silva Júnior *et al.* 2009,  
37  
38 Smith *et al.* 2007), the high variation in STF in the Lacandona rain forest is most likely  
39  
40 related to the spatial and temporal changes in the concentration and distribution of food  
41  
42 resources and sex differences in the use of space by the spider monkey.  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51

52 The relatively higher variation in STF in forest fragments than in continuous forest  
53  
54 sites can be related to food scarcity in forest fragments (Arroyo-Rodríguez & Mandujano  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3  
4 2006, Chaves *et al.* 2012). In particular, fruit availability is known to be lower in forest  
5  
6 fragments than in continuous forest because of the combination of both a lower density of  
7  
8 large food trees (dbh > 60 cm), which represent larger fruit patches (Chapman *et al.* 1992),  
9  
10 and smaller home-range sizes in fragments (Chaves *et al.* 2012). Thus, the spatial variation  
11  
12 in resource availability is expected to be higher in forest fragments than in continuous  
13  
14 forest. As consequence, in forest fragments, the STs that are located in areas with higher  
15  
16 availability of resources would be used relatively more often than in continuous forest sites,  
17  
18 whereas the STs that are located in areas with lower availability of resources would be used  
19  
20 relatively less intensively than in continuous forest sites. Consistent with this idea, we  
21  
22 found that in forest fragments 15 out of 36 STs were used for 9-12 mo and five were only  
23  
24 used for 1-3 mo. In continuous forest, however, all STs were used for between 3 and 10 mo  
25  
26 (Figure 1).  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31

32  
33  
34 The lower variation in STF in continuous than in fragmented forest can explain why  
35  
36 seed  $\beta$ -diversity between STs did not increase with increasing inter-tree differences in STF  
37  
38 in continuous forest sites. It is well known that the lack of variation in explanatory variables  
39  
40 (STF in our case) result in weaker associations between explanatory and response variables  
41  
42 (species turnover in our case) (Eigenbrod *et al.* 2011). As discussed above, the lower  
43  
44 variation in STF in continuous forest sites may be associated with higher availability of  
45  
46 resources in this sites when compared to the smallest fragments, which in turn can  
47  
48 contribute to reduce  $\beta$ -diversity between STs within the continuous forest. In contrast,  
49  
50 higher spatial variations in the availability of food resources may contribute to increase the  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3  
4 differences in STF in fragments, and also to significant compositional differentiations in  
5  
6 seed assemblages between sleeping trees (González-Zamora *et al.* 2014).  
7  
8  
9

10 In agreement with our predictions, STF was positively related to the abundance and  
11  
12 species diversity of seeds in all sites, indicating that the more often a ST is used, the more  
13  
14 seeds from a larger variety of species are deposited under it. Such associations can be  
15  
16 explained by the changes in the frugivorous diet along the year (Chaves *et al.* 2012,  
17  
18 González-Zamora *et al.* 2014) and by the spatial location of the STs in relation to foraging  
19  
20 routes used by spider monkeys (Di Fiore & Suarez 2007, Suarez 2003, Suarez *et al.* 2014),  
21  
22 resulting in an increase in the abundance and species diversity of seeds. In conclusion, our  
23  
24 results suggest that the spatial configuration of seed communities deposited in latrines  
25  
26 depends on the specific location of STs in foraging paths (Di Fiore & Suarez 2007), and by  
27  
28 the spatial and temporal variation in territory quality (Asensio *et al.* 2012a,b).  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33

34 STF was negatively related to community evenness in all study sites. As expected,  
35  
36 this finding can be related to the fact that the the seeds in the latrines below more frequently  
37  
38 used STs reflect the common feeding pattern of the species, i.e. there is a high selectivity  
39  
40 towards the consumption of a few genera of plants (Chapman 1988, Milton 1980, Russo *et*  
41  
42 *al.* 2005) and the opportunistic use of a large number of other fruit species (Dew 2008,  
43  
44 González-Zamora *et al.* 2009, Link *et al.* 2012, Nunes 1998, Russo *et al.* 2005), thus  
45  
46 reducing the number of common and dominant species, as well as the seed community  
47  
48 evenness.  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55

## 56 **Conclusions and implications for seed dispersal**

57  
58  
59  
60



1  
2  
3  
4 Our study demonstrates that STF is a key factor shaping the seed-rain patterns produced by  
5 the spider monkey below STs. Therefore, changes in STF (e.g. those associated with  
6 logging or habitat fragmentation) could have important implications for seed dispersal and  
7 forest regeneration. Of course, this constitutes a very important avenue for future research,  
8 as we still do not have data on seed germination, and seedling recruitment and growth in  
9 and around spider monkey latrines differing in re-use.  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18

19 Although we found no differences in STF between continuous and fragmented  
20 forests, further studies in highly fragmented landscapes are required to accurately test if  
21 STF can be altered in more fragmented landscapes. Deforestation in the study region is  
22 moderate (ca. 40% of remaining forest cover), and forest remnants still maintain most of  
23 their original vegetation composition and structure (Hernández-Ruedas *et al.* 2014), which  
24 may contributed to the apparent lack of differences in STF between forest types.  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33

34 If STF is higher in fragmented forests, our results indicate that the effectiveness of the  
35 spider monkey as a seed disperser (*sensu* Schupp 1993) would change as a result of the  
36 increased aggregation of seeds in latrines found in our study. Nevertheless, this will depend  
37 on the impact that such increase in seed/seedling aggregation has on seed germination and  
38 seedling recruitment. We can anticipate two alternative scenarios. First, because we found  
39 that STF is negatively related to community evenness, higher STF would result in a seed  
40 rain dominated by a few seed species. Thus, based on the Janzen-Connell model (Connell  
41 1971, Janzen 1970), we would expect higher seed predation (e.g. by rodents, insects, and/or  
42 pathogens) toward the most dominant species, which could reduce predation pressure on  
43 less abundant species allowing the recruitment of rare species in latrines that are more  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3  
4 frequently used. Second, an alternative scenario suggests that the low rate of seed arrival in  
5  
6 STs less frequently used may allow seeds to avoid the presence of biotic mortality agents,  
7  
8 offsetting the lower seed/seedling survival that is expected in such conditions (Bravo 2012,  
9  
10 Russo & Augspurger 2004). Since the seed community structure and composition can be  
11  
12 decisive for the initial stages of recruitment (Russo & Augspurger 2004, Schupp *et al.*  
13  
14 2010, Wang & Smith 2002), our results call for further studies to assess the persistence of  
15  
16 seeds and recruitment of seedlings under different levels of evenness in the seed bank of  
17  
18 latrines and to determine which of these two scenarios occurs with increasing STF.  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

#### 26 **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

27  
28 We are grateful to Sabrina Russo and two anonymous reviewers for the constructive  
29  
30 comments on an earlier version of this manuscript. This research was funded by the  
31  
32 Consejo Nacional de Ciencia y Tecnología, CONACyT grants (CB-2005-51043 and CB-  
33  
34 2006-56799) and the Dirección General de Asuntos del Personal Académico, DGAPA,  
35  
36 Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, UNAM (project IA-203111). AGZ thanks the  
37  
38 scholarship (Apoyos Complementarios para la Consolidación Institucional de Grupos de  
39  
40 Investigación) provided by CONACyT. KS thanks the UC MEXUS project. We thank  
41  
42 Rafael Lombera and Ana M. Gonzalez-Di Pierro for their invaluable help in the field. The  
43  
44 Instituto de Investigaciones Biológicas, UV, and Instituto de Investigaciones en  
45  
46 Ecosistemas y Sustentabilidad, UNAM, provided logistical support. This study would not  
47  
48 have been possible without the collaboration of Natura y Ecosistemas Mexicanos A.C. and  
49  
50 the local people in Chajul, Reforma Agraria, and Zamora Pico de Oro ejidos. We are  
51  
52 grateful to M. Lobato, H. Ferreira, A. Valencia, and A. Lopez for technical support.  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## LITERATURE CITED

- 1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9 ANDERSON, J. R. 1984. Ethology and ecology of sleep in monkeys and apes. *Advances in*  
10 *the Study of Behavior* 14:166–229.
- 11  
12  
13 ANDERSON, J. R. 2000. Sleep-related behavioural adaptations in free ranging anthropoid  
14 primates. *Sleep Medicine Reviews* 4:355–373.
- 15  
16  
17  
18 ARIZPE, L., PAZ, F. & VELÁZQUEZ, M. 1993. Cultura y cambio global: percepciones  
19 sociales sobre la deforestación en la Selva Lacandona. Pp. 69–89 in Miguel, A. P.  
20 (ed.). *La selva Lacandona: tierra de nadie, tierra de todos*. Centro Regional de  
21 Investigaciones Multidisciplinarias, Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México,  
22 Mexico City.
- 23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30 ARROYO-RODRÍGUEZ, V. & MANDUJANO, S. 2006. Forest fragmentation modifies  
31 habitat quality for *Alouatta palliata*. *International Journal of Primatology* 27:1079–  
32 1096.
- 33  
34  
35  
36  
37 ARROYO-RODRÍGUEZ, V., ANDRESEN, E., BRAVO, S. P. & STEVENSON, P. R.  
38 2015. Seed dispersal by howler monkeys: current knowledge, conservation  
39 implications and future directions. Pp. 111-139 in Kowalewski, M., Garber, P. A.,  
40 Cortés-Ortiz, L., Urbani, B. & Youlatos, D. (eds.). *Howler monkeys: behavior,*  
41 *ecology and conservation*. Springer, New York.
- 42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49 ASENSIO, N., SCHAFFNER, C. M. & AURELI, F. 2012a. Variability in core areas of  
50 spider monkeys (*Ateles geoffroyi*) in a tropical dry forest in Costa Rica. *Primates*  
51 53:147–156.
- 52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

- 1  
2  
3  
4 ASENSIO, N., LUSSEAU, D., SCHAFFNER, C. M. & AURELI, F. 2012b. Spider  
5  
6  
7 monkeys use high-quality core areas in a tropical dry forest. *Journal of Zoology*  
8  
9  
10 287:250–258.
- 11 BÖRGER, L., DALZIEL, B. D. & FRYXELL, J. M. 2008. Are there general mechanisms  
12  
13  
14 of animal home range behaviour? A review and prospects for future research.  
15  
16  
17 *Ecology Letters* 11:637–650.
- 18 BRAVO, S. P. 2012. The impact of seed dispersal by black and gold howler monkeys on  
19  
20  
21 forest regeneration. *Ecological Research* 27:311–321.
- 22  
23  
24 BUENO, R. S., GUEVARA, R., RIBEIRO, M. C., CULOT, L., BUFALO, F. S. &  
25  
26  
27 GALETTI, M. 2013. Functional redundancy and complementarities of seed dispersal  
28  
29  
30 by the last Neotropical megafrugivores. *PLoS ONE* 8:e56252.
- 31  
32  
33 CHAPMAN, C. A. 1988. Patterns of foraging and range use by three species of Neotropical  
34  
35  
36 primates. *Primates* 29:177–194.
- 37  
38  
39 CHAPMAN, C. A. 1989. Spider monkey sleeping sites: use and availability. *American*  
40  
41  
42 *Journal of Primatology* 18:53–60.
- 43  
44  
45 CHAPMAN, C. A., CHAPMAN, L. J. & MCLAUGHLIN, R. L. 1989. Multiple central  
46  
47  
48 place foraging by spider monkeys: travel consequences of using many sleeping sites.  
49  
50  
51 *Oecologia* 79:506–511.
- 52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60 CHAPMAN, C. A., CHAPMAN, L. J., WRANGHAM, R., HUNT, K., GEBBO, D. &  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65  
66  
67  
68  
69  
70  
71  
72  
73  
74  
75  
76  
77  
78  
79  
80  
81  
82  
83  
84  
85  
86  
87  
88  
89  
90  
91  
92  
93  
94  
95  
96  
97  
98  
99  
100  
101  
102  
103  
104  
105  
106  
107  
108  
109  
110  
111  
112  
113  
114  
115  
116  
117  
118  
119  
120  
121  
122  
123  
124  
125  
126  
127  
128  
129  
130  
131  
132  
133  
134  
135  
136  
137  
138  
139  
140  
141  
142  
143  
144  
145  
146  
147  
148  
149  
150  
151  
152  
153  
154  
155  
156  
157  
158  
159  
160  
161  
162  
163  
164  
165  
166  
167  
168  
169  
170  
171  
172  
173  
174  
175  
176  
177  
178  
179  
180  
181  
182  
183  
184  
185  
186  
187  
188  
189  
190  
191  
192  
193  
194  
195  
196  
197  
198  
199  
200  
201  
202  
203  
204  
205  
206  
207  
208  
209  
210  
211  
212  
213  
214  
215  
216  
217  
218  
219  
220  
221  
222  
223  
224  
225  
226  
227  
228  
229  
230  
231  
232  
233  
234  
235  
236  
237  
238  
239  
240  
241  
242  
243  
244  
245  
246  
247  
248  
249  
250  
251  
252  
253  
254  
255  
256  
257  
258  
259  
260  
261  
262  
263  
264  
265  
266  
267  
268  
269  
270  
271  
272  
273  
274  
275  
276  
277  
278  
279  
280  
281  
282  
283  
284  
285  
286  
287  
288  
289  
290  
291  
292  
293  
294  
295  
296  
297  
298  
299  
300  
301  
302  
303  
304  
305  
306  
307  
308  
309  
310  
311  
312  
313  
314  
315  
316  
317  
318  
319  
320  
321  
322  
323  
324  
325  
326  
327  
328  
329  
330  
331  
332  
333  
334  
335  
336  
337  
338  
339  
340  
341  
342  
343  
344  
345  
346  
347  
348  
349  
350  
351  
352  
353  
354  
355  
356  
357  
358  
359  
360  
361  
362  
363  
364  
365  
366  
367  
368  
369  
370  
371  
372  
373  
374  
375  
376  
377  
378  
379  
380  
381  
382  
383  
384  
385  
386  
387  
388  
389  
390  
391  
392  
393  
394  
395  
396  
397  
398  
399  
400  
401  
402  
403  
404  
405  
406  
407  
408  
409  
410  
411  
412  
413  
414  
415  
416  
417  
418  
419  
420  
421  
422  
423  
424  
425  
426  
427  
428  
429  
430  
431  
432  
433  
434  
435  
436  
437  
438  
439  
440  
441  
442  
443  
444  
445  
446  
447  
448  
449  
450  
451  
452  
453  
454  
455  
456  
457  
458  
459  
460  
461  
462  
463  
464  
465  
466  
467  
468  
469  
470  
471  
472  
473  
474  
475  
476  
477  
478  
479  
480  
481  
482  
483  
484  
485  
486  
487  
488  
489  
490  
491  
492  
493  
494  
495  
496  
497  
498  
499  
500  
501  
502  
503  
504  
505  
506  
507  
508  
509  
510  
511  
512  
513  
514  
515  
516  
517  
518  
519  
520  
521  
522  
523  
524  
525  
526  
527  
528  
529  
530  
531  
532  
533  
534  
535  
536  
537  
538  
539  
540  
541  
542  
543  
544  
545  
546  
547  
548  
549  
550  
551  
552  
553  
554  
555  
556  
557  
558  
559  
560  
561  
562  
563  
564  
565  
566  
567  
568  
569  
570  
571  
572  
573  
574  
575  
576  
577  
578  
579  
580  
581  
582  
583  
584  
585  
586  
587  
588  
589  
590  
591  
592  
593  
594  
595  
596  
597  
598  
599  
600  
601  
602  
603  
604  
605  
606  
607  
608  
609  
610  
611  
612  
613  
614  
615  
616  
617  
618  
619  
620  
621  
622  
623  
624  
625  
626  
627  
628  
629  
630  
631  
632  
633  
634  
635  
636  
637  
638  
639  
640  
641  
642  
643  
644  
645  
646  
647  
648  
649  
650  
651  
652  
653  
654  
655  
656  
657  
658  
659  
660  
661  
662  
663  
664  
665  
666  
667  
668  
669  
670  
671  
672  
673  
674  
675  
676  
677  
678  
679  
680  
681  
682  
683  
684  
685  
686  
687  
688  
689  
690  
691  
692  
693  
694  
695  
696  
697  
698  
699  
700  
701  
702  
703  
704  
705  
706  
707  
708  
709  
710  
711  
712  
713  
714  
715  
716  
717  
718  
719  
720  
721  
722  
723  
724  
725  
726  
727  
728  
729  
730  
731  
732  
733  
734  
735  
736  
737  
738  
739  
740  
741  
742  
743  
744  
745  
746  
747  
748  
749  
750  
751  
752  
753  
754  
755  
756  
757  
758  
759  
760  
761  
762  
763  
764  
765  
766  
767  
768  
769  
770  
771  
772  
773  
774  
775  
776  
777  
778  
779  
780  
781  
782  
783  
784  
785  
786  
787  
788  
789  
790  
791  
792  
793  
794  
795  
796  
797  
798  
799  
800  
801  
802  
803  
804  
805  
806  
807  
808  
809  
810  
811  
812  
813  
814  
815  
816  
817  
818  
819  
820  
821  
822  
823  
824  
825  
826  
827  
828  
829  
830  
831  
832  
833  
834  
835  
836  
837  
838  
839  
840  
841  
842  
843  
844  
845  
846  
847  
848  
849  
850  
851  
852  
853  
854  
855  
856  
857  
858  
859  
860  
861  
862  
863  
864  
865  
866  
867  
868  
869  
870  
871  
872  
873  
874  
875  
876  
877  
878  
879  
880  
881  
882  
883  
884  
885  
886  
887  
888  
889  
890  
891  
892  
893  
894  
895  
896  
897  
898  
899  
900  
901  
902  
903  
904  
905  
906  
907  
908  
909  
910  
911  
912  
913  
914  
915  
916  
917  
918  
919  
920  
921  
922  
923  
924  
925  
926  
927  
928  
929  
930  
931  
932  
933  
934  
935  
936  
937  
938  
939  
940  
941  
942  
943  
944  
945  
946  
947  
948  
949  
950  
951  
952  
953  
954  
955  
956  
957  
958  
959  
960  
961  
962  
963  
964  
965  
966  
967  
968  
969  
970  
971  
972  
973  
974  
975  
976  
977  
978  
979  
980  
981  
982  
983  
984  
985  
986  
987  
988  
989  
990  
991  
992  
993  
994  
995  
996  
997  
998  
999  
1000

- 1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60
- CHAPMAN, C. A., WRANGHAM, R. W. & CHAPMAN, L. J. 1995. Ecological constraints on group size: an analysis of spider monkey and chimpanzee subgroups. *Behavioral Ecology and Sociobiology* 36:59–70.
- CHAO, A. & JOST, L. 2012. Coverage-based rarefaction and extrapolation: standardizing samples by completeness rather than size. *Ecology* 93:2533–2547.
- CHAO, A., CHIU, C. H. & HSIEH, T. 2012. Proposing a resolution to debates on diversity partitioning. *Ecology* 93:2037–2051.
- CHAVES, O. M., STONER, K. E. & ARROYO-RODRÍGUEZ, V. 2011. Effectiveness of spider monkeys (*Ateles geoffroyi vellerosus*) as seed dispersers in continuous and fragmented rainforests in southern Mexico. *International Journal of Primatology* 32:177–192.
- CHAVES, O. M., STONER, K. E. & ARROYO-RODRÍGUEZ, V. 2012. Differences in diet between spider monkey groups living in forest fragments and continuous forest in Lacandona, Mexico. *Biotropica* 44:105–113.
- CRAWLEY, M. 2002. *Statistical computing: an introduction to data analysis using S-Plus*. John Wiley & Sons, Chichester. 772 pp.
- CONNELL, J. H. 1971. On the role of natural enemies in preventing competitive exclusion in some marine animals and in rain forest trees. Pp. 298–312 in den Boer, P. J. & Gradwell, G. R. (eds.). *Dynamics of populations*. Center for Agricultural Publication and Documentation, Wageningen.
- DEW, J. L. 2008. Spider monkeys as seed dispersers. Pp. 155–182 in Campbell, C. J. (ed.) *Spider monkeys. The biology, behavior and ecology of the genus Ateles*. Cambridge University Press, New York.

- 1  
2  
3  
4 EIGENBROD, F., HECNAR, S. J. & FAHRIG, L. 2011. Sub-optimal study design has  
5  
6 major impacts on landscape-scale inference. *Biological Conservation* 144:298-305.  
7  
8  
9 DI FIORE, A. & SUAREZ, S. A. 2007. Route-based travel and shared routes in sympatric  
10  
11 spider and woolly monkeys: cognitive and evolutionary implications. *Animal*  
12  
13 *Cognition* 10:317–329.  
14  
15  
16 GONZÁLEZ-ZAMORA, A., ARROYO-RODRÍGUEZ, V., CHAVES, O. M., SÁNCHEZ-  
17  
18 LÓPEZ, S. & STONER, K. E. 2009. Diet of spider monkeys (*Ateles geoffroyi*) in  
19  
20 Mesoamerica: current knowledge and future directions. *American Journal of*  
21  
22 *Primatology* 71:8–20.  
23  
24  
25 GONZÁLEZ-ZAMORA, A., ARROYO-RODRÍGUEZ, V., OYAMA, K., SORK, V.,  
26  
27 CHAPMAN, C. A. & STONER, K. E. 2012. Sleeping sites and latrines of spider  
28  
29 monkeys in continuous and fragmented rainforests: implications for seed dispersal  
30  
31 and forest regeneration. *PLoS ONE* 7:e46852.  
32  
33  
34 GONZÁLEZ-ZAMORA, A., ARROYO-RODRÍGUEZ, V., ESCOBAR, F., RÖS, M.,  
35  
36 OYAMA, K., IBARRA-MANRÍQUEZ, G. & STONER, K. E. 2014. Contagious  
37  
38 deposition of seeds in spider monkeys' sleeping trees limits effective seed dispersal in  
39  
40 fragmented landscapes *PLoS ONE* 9(2): e89346.  
41  
42  
43  
44 HERNÁNDEZ-RUEDAS, M. A., ARROYO-RODRÍGUEZ, V., MEAVE, J. A.,  
45  
46 MARTÍNEZ-RAMOS, M., IBARRA-MANRÍQUEZ, I., MARTÍNEZ, E.,  
47  
48 JAMANGAPE, J., MELO, F. P. L. & SANTOS, B. A. 2014. Conserving tropical tree  
49  
50 diversity and forest structure: the value of small rainforest patches in moderately-  
51  
52 managed landscapes. *PLoS ONE* 9(6): e98931.  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

- 1  
2  
3  
4 HEYMANN, E. W. 1995. Sleeping habits of tamarins, *Saguinus mystax* and *Saguinus*  
5  
6  
7 *fuscicollis* (Mammalia; Primates; Callitrichidae), in north-eastern Peru. *Journal of*  
8  
9 *Zoology* 237:211–226.
- 10  
11 IBARRA-MANRÍQUEZ, G. & CORNEJO-TENORIO, G. 2010. Diversidad de frutos de  
12  
13 los árboles del bosque tropical pefennifolio de México. *Acta Botánica Mexicana*  
14  
15 90:51–104.
- 16  
17  
18 JANSON, C. H. 1983. Adaptation of fruit morphology to dispersal agents in a Neotropical  
19  
20 forest. *Science* 219:187–189.
- 21  
22  
23 JANZEN, D. H. 1970. Herbivores and the number of tree species in tropical forests.  
24  
25  
26 *American Naturalist* 104:501–528.
- 27  
28 JORDANO, P. 1992. Fruits and frugivory. Pp. 105–156 in Fenner, M. (ed.). *Seeds: the*  
29  
30 *ecology of regeneration in plant communities*. CAB International, Wallingford.
- 31  
32  
33 JORDANO, P. & SCHUPP, E. W. 2000. Seed disperser effectiveness: the quantity  
34  
35 component and patterns of seed rain for *Prunus mahaleb*. *Ecological Monographs*  
36  
37 70:591–615.
- 38  
39  
40 JOST, L. 2006. Entropy and diversity. *Oikos* 113:363–375.
- 41  
42  
43 JOST, L. 2007. Partitioning diversity into independent alpha and beta components. *Ecology*  
44  
45 88:2427–2439.
- 46  
47  
48 JOST, L. 2010. The relation between evenness and diversity. *Diversity* 2:207–232.
- 49  
50 LINK, A., GALVIS, N., MARQUEZ, M., GUERRERO, J., SOLANO, C. &  
51  
52 STEVENSON, P. R. 2012. Diet of the critically endangered brown spider monkey  
53  
54 (*Ateles hybridus*) in an inter-andean lowland rainforest in Colombia. *American*  
55  
56 *Journal of Primatology* 74:1097–1105.
- 57  
58  
59  
60

- 1  
2  
3  
4 MILTON, K. 1980. *The foraging strategy of howler monkeys: a study in primate*  
5  
6 *economics*. Columbia University Press, New York. 165 pp.  
7  
8
- 9 MORA, F. 2008. Caracterización de la cobertura forestal en el Corredor Biológico  
10  
11 Mesoamericano-México: patrones espaciales en la pérdida y fragmentación de  
12  
13 bosques. Pp. 55–83 in Comisión Nacional para el Conocimiento y Uso de la  
14  
15 Biodiversidad (CONABIO). *Importancia del capital ecológico de la región Corredor*  
16  
17 *Biológico Mesoamericano-México*. Centro de Investigación en Geografía y  
18  
19 Geomática, CentroGEO, Mexico City.  
20  
21
- 22 MYERS, N., MITTERMEIER, R. A., MITTERMEIER, C. G., DA FONSECA, G. A. &  
23  
24 KENT, J. 2000. Biodiversity hotspots for conservation priorities. *Nature* 403:853–  
25  
26 858.  
27  
28
- 29 NUNES, A. 1998. Diet and feeding ecology of *Ateles belzebuth* at Maracá ecological  
30  
31 station, Roraima, Brasil. *Folia Primatologica* 69:61–76.  
32  
33
- 34 PONTES, A. R. & SOARES, M. 2005. Sleeping sites of common marmosets (*Callithrix*  
35  
36 *jacchus*) in defaunated urban forest fragments: a strategy to maxime food intake.  
37  
38 *Journal of Zoology* 26:55–63.  
39  
40
- 41 RAMOS-FERNÁNDEZ, G. & WALLACE, R. B. 2008. Spider monkey conservation in the  
42  
43 twenty-first century: recognizing risks and opportunities. Pp. 351–372 in Campbell, J.  
44  
45 C. (ed.). *Spider monkeys. The biology, behavior and ecology of the genus Ateles*.  
46  
47 Cambridge University Press, New York.  
48  
49
- 50 RAMOS-FERNÁNDEZ, G., MATEOS, J. L., MIRAMONTES, O., LARRALDE, H.,  
51  
52 COCHO, G. & AYALA-OROZCO, B. 2004. Lévy walk patterns in the foraging  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



- 1  
2  
3  
4 movements of spider monkeys (*Ateles geoffroyi*). *Behavioral Ecology and*  
5  
6 *Sociobiology* 55:223–230.  
7  
8  
9 RAMOS-FERNÁNDEZ, G., SMITH AGUILAR, S. E., SCHAFFNER, C. M., VICK, L. G.  
10  
11 & AURELI, F. 2013. Site fidelity in space use by spider monkeys (*Ateles geoffroyi*)  
12  
13 in the Yucatan Peninsula, Mexico. *PLoS ONE* 8:e62813.  
14  
15  
16 REICHARD, U. 1998. Sleeping sites, sleeping places, and presleep behavior of gibbons  
17  
18 (*Hylobates lar*). *American Journal of Primatology* 46:35–62.  
19  
20  
21 ROGERS, M. E., VOYSEY, B. C., MCDONALD, K. E., PARNELL, R. J. & TUTIN, C. E.  
22  
23 G. 1998. Lowland gorillas and seed dispersal: the importance of nest sites. *American*  
24  
25 *Journal of Primatology* 45:45–68.  
26  
27  
28 RUSSO, S. E. & AUGSPURGER, C. K. 2004. Aggregated seed dispersal by spider  
29  
30 monkeys limits recruitment to clumped patterns in *Virola calophylla*. *Ecology Letters*  
31  
32 7:1058–1067.  
33  
34  
35 RUSSO, S. E., CAMPBELL, C. J., DEW, L., STEVENSON, P. R. & SUAREZ, S. A.  
36  
37 2005. A multi-forest comparison of dietary preferences and seed dispersal by *Ateles*  
38  
39 spp. *International Journal of Primatology* 26:1017–1037.  
40  
41  
42 RUSSO, S. E., PORTNOY, S. & AUGSPURGER, C. K. 2006. Incorporating animal  
43  
44 behavior into seed dispersal models: implications for seed shadows. *Ecology*  
45  
46 87:3160–3174.  
47  
48  
49 SCHUPP, E. W. 1993. Quantity, quality and the effectiveness of seed dispersal by animals.  
50  
51 *Vegetatio* 107:15–29.  
52  
53  
54 SCHUPP, E. W., JORDANO, P. & GÓMEZ, J. M. 2010. Seed dispersal effectiveness  
55  
56 revisited: a conceptual review. *New Phytologist* 188:333–353.  
57  
58  
59  
60

- 1  
2  
3  
4 SIGG, H. & STOLBA, A. 1981. Home range use and daily march in a hamadryas baboon  
5  
6 troop. *Folia Primatologica* 36:40–75.  
7  
8  
9 SILVA JÚNIOR, W. M., MEIRA-NETO, J. A. A., DA SILVA FLÁVIA, M. C.,  
10  
11 RODRIGUES DE MELO, F., SANTANA MOREIRA, L., FERREIRA BARBOSA,  
12  
13 E., DIAS, L. G. & SILVA PERES, C. A. 2009. Habitat quality of the woolly spider  
14  
15 monkey. *Folia Primatologica* 80:295–308.  
16  
17  
18 STONER, K. E., RIBA-HERNÁNDEZ, P., VULINEC, K. & LAMBERT, J. E. 2007. The  
19  
20 role of mammals in creating and modifying seedshadows in tropical forests and some  
21  
22 possible consequences of their elimination. *Biotropica* 39:316–327.  
23  
24  
25 SUAREZ, S. A. 2003. *Spatio-temporal foraging skills of white-bellied spider monkeys*  
26  
27 (*Ateles belzebuth belzebuth*) in the Yasuni National Park, Ecuador. Doctoral  
28  
29 dissertation, State University of New York at Stony Brook, Stony Brook.  
30  
31  
32 SUAREZ, S. A., KARRO, JOHN., KIPER, J., FARLER, D., MCELROY, B., ROGERS, B.  
33  
34 C., STOCKWELL, B. & TAYLOR, Y. 2014. A comparison of computer-generated  
35  
36 and naturally occurring foraging patterns in route-network-constrained spider  
37  
38 monkeys. *American Journal of Primatology* 76:460–471.  
39  
40  
41  
42 SMITH, A. C., KNOGGE, C., HUCK, M., LÖTTKER, P., BUCHANAN-SMITH, H. M. &  
43  
44 HEYMANN, E. W. 2007. Long term patterns of sleeping site use in wild saddleback  
45  
46 (*Saguinus fuscicollis*) and mustached tamarins (*S. mystax*). *American Journal of*  
47  
48 *Physical Anthropology* 134:340–353.  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

- 1  
2  
3  
4 STEVENSON, P. R. 2000. Seed dispersal by woolly monkeys (*Lagothrix lagothricha*) at  
5  
6 Tinigua National Park, Colombia: dispersal distance, germination rates, and dispersal  
7  
8 quantity. *American Journal of Primatology* 50:275–289.  
9  
10  
11 TEICHROEB, J. A., HOLMES, J. A. & SICOTTE, P. 2012. Use of sleeping trees by ursine  
12  
13 colobus monkeys (*Colobus vellerosus*) demonstrates the importance of nearby food.  
14  
15  
16 *Primates* 53:287–296.  
17  
18  
19 TUOMISTO, H. 2010. A diversity of beta diversities: straightening up a concept gone  
20  
21 awry. Part 1. Defining beta diversity as a function of alpha and gamma diversity.  
22  
23  
24 *Ecography* 33:2–22.  
25  
26 VALERO, A. & BYRNE, R. W. 2007. Spider monkey ranging patterns in Mexican  
27  
28 subtropical forest: do travel routes reflect planning? *Animal Cognition* 10:305–315.  
29  
30  
31 WALLACE, R. B. 2008. Towing the party line: territoriality, risky boundaries and male  
32  
33 group size in spider monkey fission–fusion societies. *American Journal of*  
34  
35 *Primatology* 70:271–281.  
36  
37  
38 WANG, B. C. & SMITH, T. B. 2002. Closing the seed dispersal loop. *Trends in Ecology*  
39  
40 *and Evolution* 17:379–385.  
41  
42  
43 WENNY, D. G. 2001. Advantages of seed dispersal: a re-evaluation of directed dispersal.  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

**Table 1.** Effect of sleeping-tree fidelity (STF) of *Ateles geoffroyi* on five community-level seed-rain patterns produced by this primate below sleeping trees located in two forest types (continuous forest and forest fragments) in the Lacandona rain forest, Mexico. The effect of STF, forest type and the interaction between the two was tested with Generalized Linear Models.

Response variable/factors	df	$\chi^2$	P
Abundance of seeds			
STF	1	31.3	<0.001
Forest type	1	3.91	0.048
Forest type $\times$ STF	1	0.74	0.389
Species richness			
STF	1	40.4	<0.001
Forest type	1	0.01	0.891
Forest type $\times$ STF	1	0.36	0.547
Exponential Shannon entropy			
STF	1	19.4	<0.001
Forest type	1	0.27	0.602
Forest type $\times$ STF	1	0.002	0.963
Inverse Simpson concentration			
STF	1	11.8	<0.001
Forest type	1	1.42	0.233
Forest type $\times$ STF	1	0.44	0.506
Evenness factor			
STF	1	10.6	0.001
Forest type	1	3.33	0.068
Forest type $\times$ STF	1	0.002	0.966

**Table 2.** Correlations between species  $\beta$ -diversity of seeds between sleeping trees and inter-tree differences in sleeping tree fidelity in two continuous forest sites (CF) and three forest fragments (FF) in the Lacandona rain forest, Mexico. The correlation coefficients were calculated with Mantel tests (\* $P < 0.05$ ; \*\*  $P < 0.001$ , after applying a stringent Bonferroni correction to reduce the likelihood of type I statistical errors).  ${}^qD_\beta$  represents the species turnover between sleeping trees, considering three orders  $q$  (0, 1 and 2), which determine the sensitivity of each  $\beta$ -diversity component to the relative abundances.

$\beta$ -diversity component	CF1	CF2	FF1	FF2	FF3
${}^0D_\beta$	-0.001	0.182	0.374**	0.542**	0.400**
${}^1D_\beta$	0.003	-0.052	0.244*	0.385**	0.453**
${}^2D_\beta$	0.083	-0.125	0.175	0.302*	0.523**

1  
2  
3  
4  
5 **Figure legends**  
6  
7  
8

9 **Figure 1.** Sleeping-tree fidelity of *Ateles geoffroyi* in continuous (CF) and fragmented (FF)  
10 forests in the Lacandona region, Mexico. Differences among sites (a) and between forest  
11 types (b) are shown.  
12  
13  
14  
15

16  
17  
18  
19  
20 **Figure 2.** Effects of sleeping-tree fidelity of *Ateles geoffroyi* on five community-level  
21 attributes of seed assemblages in continuous (CF) and fragmented forests (FF) in the  
22 Lacandona region, Mexico. a) Abundance of seeds, b) Species richness, c) Exponential  
23 Shannon's entropy, d) Inverse Simpson concentration and e) Evenness factor.  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60




Figure 1




Figure 2