



Relationships between wild bees, hoverflies and pollination success in apple orchards with different landscape contexts

Journal:	<i>Agricultural and Forest Entomology</i>
Manuscript ID:	AFE(2015)2403.R2
Wiley - Manuscript type:	Original Article
Date Submitted by the Author:	n/a
Complete List of Authors:	<p>Földesi, Rita; MTA Centre for Ecological Research, Lendület Ecosystem Services Research Group</p> <p>Kovács-Hostyánszki, Anikó; MTA Centre for Ecological Research, Lendület Ecosystem Services Research Group</p> <p>Kőrösi, Ádám; MTA-ELTE-MTM Ecology Research Group, Biological Institute, Eötvös Loránd University and Hungarian Natural History Museum, ; University of Würzburg, Field Station Fabrikschleichach, Biocenter</p> <p>Somay, László; MTA Centre for Ecological Research, Lendület Ecosystem Services Research Group</p> <p>Elek, Zoltan; MTA-ELTE-MTM Ecology Research Group, Biological Institute, Eötvös Loránd University and Hungarian Natural History Museum, ; MTA Centre for Ecological Research, Lendület Ecosystem Services Research Group</p> <p>Marko, Viktor; Corvinus University of Budapest, Department of Entomology</p> <p>Sárospataki, Miklós; Szent István University, Department of Zoology and Ecology</p> <p>Bakos, Réka; Szent István University, Department of Zoology and Ecology</p> <p>Varga, Ákos; Corvinus University of Budapest, Department of Entomology</p> <p>Nyisztor, Katinka; MTA Centre for Ecological Research, Lendület Ecosystem Services Research Group</p> <p>Báldi, András; MTA Centre for Ecological Research, Lendület Ecosystem Services Research Group</p>
Keywords:	ecosystem services, groundcover vegetation, honey bee, landscape heterogeneity, spatial scales
Abstract:	<p>1. Pollination is an important ecosystem service as many agricultural crops such as fruit trees are pollinated by insects. Agricultural intensification, however, is one of the main drivers resulting in a serious decline of pollinator populations worldwide.</p> <p>2. In this study pollinator communities were examined in twelve apple orchards surrounded by either homogeneous or heterogeneous landscape in Hungary. Pollinators (honey bees, wild bees, hoverflies) were surveyed in the flowering period of apple trees. Landscape heterogeneity was characterized in circles of 300, 500 and 1000 m radius around each orchard using Shannon's diversity and Shannon's evenness indices.</p> <p>3. We found that pollination success of apple was significantly related to the species richness of wild bees, regardless the dominance of honey bees.</p>

	<p>4. Diversity of the surrounding landscape matrix had a marginal positive effect on the species richness of hoverflies at 300m, positive effect on the species richness of wild bees at 500m radius circle, while evenness of the surrounding landscape enhanced the abundance of wild bees at 500m radius circle. Flower resources in the groundcover within the orchards supported honey bees.</p> <p>5. Therefore maintenance of semi-natural habitats within 500m around apple orchards is highly recommended to enhance wild pollinator communities and apple production.</p>

1 **Relationships between wild bees, hoverflies and pollination success in apple orchards**
2 **with different landscape contexts**

3

4 Rita Földesi^{a*}, Anikó Kovács-Hostyánszki^{a*}, Ádám Kőrösi^{b,c}, László Somay^a, Zoltán Elek^{a,b},
5 Viktor Markó^d, Miklós Sárospataki^e, Réka Bakos^e, Ákos Varga^d, Katinka Nyisztor^a, András
6 Báldi^a

7

8 ^a MTA Centre for Ecological Research, Lendület Ecosystem Services Research Group, H-
9 2163 Vácrátót, Alkotmány u. 2-4., Hungary

10 ^b MTA-ELTE-MTM Ecology Research Group, Biological Institute, Eötvös Loránd University
11 and Hungarian Natural History Museum, H-1117 Budapest, Pázmány Péter s. 1/C, Hungary

12 ^c Field Station Fabrikschleichach, Biocenter, University of Würzburg, D-96181
13 Rauhenegrab, Glashuettenstr. 5. Germany

14 ^d Department of Entomology, Corvinus University of Budapest, H-1118 Budapest, Ménesi út
15 44., Hungary

16 ^e Department of Zoology and Ecology, Szent István University, H-2100 Gödöllő, Páter K. u.
17 1., Hungary

18 * Both authors contributed equally in the preparation of the paper.

19

20 E-mail address for corresponding author: foldesri@gmail.com

21 Postal address: MTA Centre for Ecological Research, Institute of Ecology and Botany, H-
22 2163 Vácrátót, Alkotmány u. 2-4., Hungary

23 Phone number: +36-20-915-4461

24

25 Running title: Importance of wild pollinators in apple orchards

For Review Only

26 Abstract

27

28 1. Pollination is an important ecosystem service as many agricultural crops such as fruit trees
29 are pollinated by insects. Agricultural intensification, however, is one of the main drivers
30 resulting in a serious decline of pollinator populations worldwide.

31 2. In this study pollinator communities were examined in twelve apple orchards surrounded
32 by either homogeneous or heterogeneous landscape in Hungary. Pollinators (honey bees, wild
33 bees, hoverflies) were surveyed in the flowering period of apple trees. Landscape
34 heterogeneity was characterized in circles of 300, 500 and 1000 m radius around each orchard
35 using Shannon's diversity and Shannon's evenness indices.

36 3. We found that pollination success of apple was significantly related to the species richness
37 of wild bees, regardless the dominance of honey bees.

38 4. Diversity of the surrounding landscape matrix had a marginal positive effect on the species
39 richness of hoverflies at 300m, positive effect on the species richness of wild bees at 500m
40 radius circle, while evenness of the surrounding landscape enhanced the abundance of wild
41 bees at 500m radius circle. Flower resources in the groundcover within the orchards supported
42 honey bees.

43 5. Therefore maintenance of semi-natural habitats within 500m around apple orchards is
44 highly recommended to enhance wild pollinator communities and apple production.

45

46 Keywords: ecosystem services; groundcover vegetation; honey bee; landscape heterogeneity;
47 spatial scales

48

49 Introduction

50

51 Apple is one of the most important insect pollinated crops in the European Union, accounting
52 for 16% of the EU's total economic gains attributed to insect (particularly bee) pollination
53 (Leonhardt *et al.*, 2013). Most apple varieties are cross-pollinated and insect pollination not
54 only affects the quantity of apple production, but can also have marked impacts on the quality
55 of the fruits, influencing size, shape and their market price (Garratt *et al.*, 2014a). The most
56 common insect pollinator of apple is the honey bee (*Apis mellifera*); however, it is not the
57 most efficient one. It sometimes robs nectar from the apple flower without pollinating it, and
58 makes fewer contacts with the stigma of the apple flower, compared to certain solitary bees
59 (Delaplane & Mayer, 2000). Moreover the dramatic decline of honey bees in several
60 European countries has increased attention to other pollinating insects (Greenleaf & Kremen,
61 2006; Iler *et al.*, 2013). Species of some wild bee genera such as *Osmia*, *Andrena* and *Bombus*
62 are known to visit flowers at lower temperatures and deposit higher pollen loads than honey
63 bees (Bosch & Blas, 1994). Hoverflies (Syrphidae) have also been observed with pollen loads
64 containing a high proportion of compatible fruit pollen (Kendall, 1973).

65 In the temperate zone, pollinator insects are under threat from a number of limiting
66 factors, such as climate change (Rader *et al.*, 2013), human disturbance (Goulson *et al.*,
67 2008), agricultural intensification (Kearns *et al.*, 1998; Steffan-Dewenter *et al.*, 2005;
68 Fitzpatrick *et al.*, 2006; Memmott *et al.*, 2007), and landscape fragmentation (Aizen &
69 Feisinger, 2003; Diekötter & Crist, 2013), which leads to less effective pollination and
70 reduces agricultural production (Floyd, 1992; Garibaldi *et al.*, 2011a, 2013). Different species
71 or functional species groups respond differently to environmental change, and their spatial
72 and temporal complementarity can help to buffer pollination services to environmental
73 changes (Kremen *et al.*, 2002; Brittain *et al.*, 2013). Maintaining diverse communities,

74 however, requires appropriate orchard management practices (Morandin & Winston, 2005;
75 Gabriel *et al.*, 2010) and a heterogeneous landscape structure with certain amount of semi-
76 natural habitats in the surroundings to provide suitable foraging and nesting resources through
77 the year (Kremen *et al.*, 2002; Steffan-Dewenter, 2002; Holzschuh *et al.*, 2012). The
78 interaction between landscape structure and crop management variables often drives the
79 diversity and/or the abundance of wild pollinator communities (Holzschuh *et al.*, 2007;
80 Rundlöf *et al.*, 2008; Batáry *et al.*, 2011). On organic farms near natural habitats native bee
81 communities could provide full pollination services even for a crop with heavy pollination
82 requirements, without the intervention of managed honey bees (Kremen *et al.*, 2002). Organic
83 farms isolated from semi-natural habitats or intensively managed farms with high pesticide
84 input experience greatly reduced diversity and abundance of native pollinators, resulting in
85 insufficient pollination services and an increased need for managed beehives establishment
86 (Kremen *et al.*, 2002). On the one hand, semi-natural habitats provide potential nesting sites
87 and overwintering habitats (Kells *et al.*, 2001; Kells & Goulson, 2003), nectar and pollen
88 sources via flowering plants (Kraemer & Favi, 2005; Laubertie *et al.*, 2012), which are often
89 available in insufficient amount within the managed agricultural areas. On the other hand,
90 locally available food resources like naturally regenerated field margins, less intensive soil
91 management and the presence of groundcover vegetation within the orchards provide higher
92 species richness of flowering plants, which might result in higher pollinator richness and
93 abundance (Van Buskirk & Willi, 2004; Kuussaari *et al.*, 2011; Ricou *et al.*, 2014) and may
94 enhance fruit production (Brittain *et al.*, 2013).

95 Apple is the most important fruit tree in Hungary, as it provides 60 % of the total
96 Hungarian fruit production, and currently amounts to 400-600 thousand tons annually on
97 35,000 hectares (Apáti, 2010). The country, and the Central-Eastern European region in
98 general, harbour rich wild pollinator communities compared to the more intensively managed

99 Western European countries (Batáry *et al.*, 2010); however, the economic impact of the wild
 100 pollinator-groups in orchards is not well studied (but see Mallinger & Gratton, 2015). The
 101 decreasing trends in the species richness and abundance of pollinators call for urgent need to
 102 better understand the role of honey bees and wild pollinators in apple production, and to give
 103 evidence on the local and landscape scale effects on their communities. The aims of our study
 104 were to identify (1) which pollinators are present in apple orchards during the flowering
 105 period, (2) the effect of surrounding landscape context on the pollinator communities within
 106 the orchards, (3) the role of weed management and vegetation composition within the
 107 orchards, (4) the linkage between amount of pollinators and fruit production depending on the
 108 landscape context or local scale effects.

110 Material and methods

112 Study area

113 Research was conducted in twelve commercial apple orchards in county Szabolcs-Szatmár-
 114 Bereg, Hungary, 2012. The orchards were at least 5 km apart, planted in 2002 and had the
 115 same variety of apple trees (*Malus domestica*, Relinda cultivar) with similar management on
 116 3-7 hectares. The landscape structure in 1000 m radius around 6 orchards was homogeneous
 117 (>50% of arable field) and around 6 orchards heterogeneous (<30% of arable field). The
 118 landscape parameters within 1000, 500 and 300 m radius around the orchards were analyzed
 119 by CORINE Landcover maps (2006) and aerial photographs. We used different land-use
 120 categories to characterize the landscape structure such as orchard, forest, grassland, wetland,
 121 urbanised area and arable field. Landscape composition was characterized by the Shannon's
 122 Diversity Index ($SHDI = -\sum (P * \ln P)$, where P means the proportion of the buffer occupied
 123 by each land-use class defined before, and Shannon's Evenness Index ($SHEI = SHDI / \ln(m)$,

where m is the number of land-use classes present in the landscape (Shannon & Weaver, 1949).

Regarding management practices, insecticide (2-5 times/year) and fungicide (6-7 times/year) were applied in every orchard, mostly after the flowering period of apple, but in some orchards insecticide was used even before (in 7 orchards from the 12). In the tree rows herbicides (0-2 times/year) were used, alternatively the vegetation was mown or disc harrowed. In some orchards rotary tiller was used directly below the trees. The alleys between the tree rows were either left unmanaged or were managed with mechanical weed control (see also Appendix 1).

Inventory methods for pollinators

Pollinators (honey bees, wild bees, hoverflies) were sampled during the flowering period of the apple trees (26 April – 1 May 2012). Every orchard was visited two times on two different days, once in the morning (9-12 a.m.) and once in the afternoon (2-5 p.m.) to avoid the heat at midday ($>30^{\circ}\text{C}$), when most insects are inactive. At each visit eight trees per orchard (different trees at the two sampling occasions, i.e. 16 trees per orchard, altogether 192 trees) were observed for 15 minutes in a 2×2 m “window” of the canopy. We analyzed data from all of the 192 trees together, merged the data of the two sampling rounds and analysed them in one model. The well-recognizable pollinators (honey bees, some bumblebee species) were recorded on the field, others were counted and (if possible) captured by insect net for later determination in the laboratory. The collected insects were determined at species level by specialists. Since honey bee individuals were visiting several flowers in a row, and usually foraged for a long time on the same tree, they were counted only every five minutes during the observation period.

We assessed the number of apple blossoms in the observation window. The percentage of flowering plants in the undergrowth vegetation was assessed by visual observation in a 1 m radius circle below the centre of the canopy of the examined trees.

Measure of fruit production

We marked two branches of eight trees per orchard and approximately 30 flowers per branch were counted to calculate the fruit set. The number of developing green fruits was counted shortly after the end of flowering (June). Due to different reasons we lost data of many branches, so finally we included only 92 branches in the analysis.

Statistical analysis

We used the following response variables in our analysis: (i) *species richness* of hoverflies and wild bees (absolute richness according to the field data), (ii) *abundance* of honey bees and wild bees in apple orchards, and (iii) *pollination success* estimated as the number of green apples divided by the number of flowers at each selected branch.

Predictor variables acting at different spatial scales were applied as follows. At the level of trees, (square root transformed) number of apple flowers and flower cover (%) in the undergrowth beneath the observed apple trees were used. At the level of orchards, the presence of insecticide treatment and presence of mechanical soil management (both in 2012 before the flowering period, see Appendix 1) were used, as well as the Shannon diversity index (SHDI) and Shannon evenness index (SHEI) characterizing landscape composition in circles of 300, 500 and 1000 m radius around each orchard.

We constructed generalized linear mixed models (GLMM) for each response variable. Species richness was analysed at the level of orchards, because the number of captured and

identified wild bees and hoverflies was low at the level of individual apple trees, so here simple GLM was used without random effects. Consequently, here we only used predictors measured at the level of orchards. Pollinator abundance was analysed at tree level with orchard ID as a random factor. Data from the two sampling rounds (morning and afternoon observation) were treated separately during the analyses. Pollination success was analysed at branch level with hierarchical random factors (tree/orchard). Here species richness of hoverflies and wild bees and abundance of hoverflies, wild bees and honey bees were used as predictor variables. In models for the abundance and species richness a Poisson, and in the case of pollination success a normal error distribution was used, respectively.

We followed an automatic model selection procedure based on AICc values (Burnham & Anderson, 2002). First a full model was built for each response variable containing all predictors to be tested. If models contained landscape composition variables (abundance models), then a separate full model was constructed for each spatial scale to avoid using too many predictors and minimize multicollinearity. The list of full models can be found in Appendix 2. Then models with all possible combinations of predictors were fitted to the data and their AICc values were calculated. Parameter estimation and significance testing were done by averaging all models that had an AICc value not higher than the lowest AICc plus two ($\Delta AIC < 2$). In case of abundance models, where we had three full models according to the spatial scales, we accepted the estimation at only that scale where AICc values were the lowest, even if landscape variables were significant at other scales as well. We present the standard deviation of random effects and residuals of the best models (Appendix 3).

Statistical analysis was conducted using packages 'lme4' (Bates *et al.*, 2014) and 'MuMIn' (Barton, 2014) of the R 3.1.2 statistical software (R Core Team, 2014).

196 Results

197

198 Altogether we observed 1574 individuals of 28 bee species (1442 individuals of honey bees
199 and 132 individuals of wild bees including 104 and 28 individuals of solitary bees and
200 bumblebees, respectively). 30 individuals of 13 hoverfly species were caught and altogether
201 66 individuals were observed (Appendix 4).

202 *Species richness* of pollinators showed a high variance among orchards (Appendix 1).
203 We found no significant effects of any predictors on hoverfly species richness, it was only
204 marginally significant related to SHDI at 300 m. Species richness of wild bees was
205 significantly positively affected by SHDI at 500 m (Table 1, Fig. 1). The number of landscape
206 elements (polygons) at 500 m ranged between 15 and 54. The number of types of landscape
207 elements ranged between 5 and 12.

208 Pollinators' abundance was dominated by honey bees. *Honey bee abundance* was
209 significantly positively affected by the number of flowers on apple trees and percentage of
210 flowering plants in the undergrowth, but no landscape scale effect was detected (Table 1, Fig.
211 2). *Abundance of wild bees* was significantly positively affected by SHEI at 500 m (Table 1,
212 Fig. 3). Evenness at 500 m ranged from 0.54 to 0.88.

213 *Pollination success* was significantly positively influenced by the number of wild bee
214 species, but no other significant effects were revealed (Table 1, Fig. 4). Appendix 3 represents
215 the estimations for all models after model averaging.

216

217 Discussion

218

The importance of pollinators in orchards is well-known, but composition of pollinator communities and their effectiveness on apple pollination have only recently been studied (Garcia & Miñarro, 2014; Garratt *et al.*, 2014b). According to our results, the dominant pollinator in apple orchards was the honey bee, probably due to the numerous beehives established by beekeepers around the orchards. In apple-dominated landscapes the abundance of honey bee can be two to four times higher than in landscapes dominated by grasslands and forests (Marini *et al.*, 2012). In our study, the abundance of honey bees was associated with an increased number of apple flowers, but also by flowers in the groundcover vegetation below the trees. It means that ground management within the tree rows has an important influence on the number of honey bees, through the number of flowers in the undergrowth. Native flowers within managed cultivars are beneficial for insect pollinators through diversity of food resources that is important for flower visitor health (Alaux *et al.*, 2010), they improve stability of pollinator assemblages (Ebeling *et al.*, 2008), and can even mitigate negative effects of habitat management and/or habitat isolation from natural habitats (Carvalho *et al.*, 2012). Former studies suggested reduced fruit set because of pollen competition with co-flowering plants (Schüepp *et al.*, 2013) and the removal of the ground vegetation to avoid potential competition with fruit trees for pollinators (Somerville, 1999). However, it was contradicted by other studies, which emphasised the strong positive effects of additional flower resources on bee abundances within cherry orchard (Holzschuh *et al.*, 2012). The presence of honey bees is strongly connected to the position of beehives, but honey bees fly even 3-4 kilometres from the hive to reach mass-flowering foraging patches if possible (Brittain *et al.*, 2013). Unsurprisingly, we found that honey bee abundance was independent from the landscape context up to 1000m.

In contrast to honey bees, we found no direct link between undergrowth flower resources and wild bee abundance, which could be also the result of the only single sampling

event during the year, missing the observation of potential long-term beneficiaries of ground cover on wild bees. Abundance of solitary wild bees is usually more influenced by local effects due to their smaller foraging range. Nevertheless, according to former studies maintaining living ground cover within commercial orchards could provide habitat and resources for potential wild pollinators, particularly native bees (Saunders *et al.*, 2013), and could provide benefits for apple growers by improving pollination services (Garcia, 2014).

Wild pollinators were influenced significantly by the surrounding landscape structure. The species richness of hoverflies was marginally significant related to landscape structure in 300 m, while species richness of wild bees was enhanced by landscape diversity within 500 m radius circle. Wild bee abundance showed a positive change in 500 m by Shannon's evenness index. In our study, the number of different habitat types in 500m around the orchards ranged between five and twelve. Landscape diversity can increase with number of different habitat types, while evenness is independent from this and reflects only to the distribution of proportion that each habitat type occupies in the landscape. Thus the positive effect of evenness on wild bee abundance suggests that given a certain number of habitat types wild bees benefit, if none of the habitat types is dominant over the others. Several former studies showed negative or positive effects of habitat quantity and quality of the surroundings (Banaszak, 1992; Kleijn & Langevelde, 2006; Kennedy *et al.*, 2013; Shackelford *et al.*, 2013; but see Steffan-Dewenter *et al.*, 2002; Westphal *et al.*, 2003). The impact of landscape structure varies between pollinator groups according to their mobility and foraging behaviour (Steffan-Dewenter *et al.*, 2002; Steckel *et al.*, 2014). Gathmann and Tschardt (2002) found a maximum foraging range of solitary bees of 150 and 600 m, while according to Jauker *et al.* (2013) 250 m radius around the center of the calcareous grasslands was the best scale predicting bee species richness. Therefore the amount of flowers and suitable nesting places within the orchard and/or in the adjacent environment has a great influence on solitary bee

species richness and abundance. In contrast, Holzschuh *et al.* (2012) found wild bee visitation of cherry to increase with the proportion of high-diversity bee habitats in the surrounding landscape in 1 km radius. Although hoverflies can fly long distances and they do not have fix locations, their number is limited by resources. The food resource for adult hoverflies is an essential factor for maturation and laying eggs. Adults feed on nectar and pollen, and sometimes honeydew of aphids (Van Rijn *et al.*, 2013), while most of the larvae of hoverflies are predaceous. Therefore the adults may be most sensitive to prey density or host quality for oviposition as well (Sutherland *et al.*, 2001). Adults can disperse up to a few kilometres from the site of their eclosion (Rotheray *et al.*, 2009), but they do not generally disperse more than a few hundred meters from floral or prey resources (Wratten *et al.*, 2003; Blaauw & Isaacs, 2014), therefore higher landscape diversity and evenness in the adjacent environment might enhance their number (Macleod, 1999; Ricou *et al.*, 2014). Different land-use types such as grasslands, orchards, but also arable fields provide sufficient habitat for feeding, laying eggs and larval development (Röder, 1990; Schweiger *et al.*, 2007; Rotheray & Gilbert, 2011).

Although honey bees were observed in the highest abundance in the orchards, pollination success was influenced positively by the species richness of wild bees, even despite their low species number. Most solitary bees appear later in the year and in the case of bumblebees only queens are present in May (Michener, 2007). Positive effect of wild bees on crop pollination (e.g. apple, almond, cherry) has been already found in former studies (Williams & Thomson, 2003; Sheffield *et al.*, 2008; Garibaldi *et al.*, 2011b; Holzschuh *et al.*, 2012; Klein *et al.* 2012; Garratt *et al.*, 2014c). Similarly to our results, Holzschuh *et al.* (2012) found that although two thirds of all flower visitors were honey bees in cherry orchards, fruit set was related to wild bee visitation only, presumably due to their higher pollination efficiency. Our results correspond also with findings by Mallinger and Gratton (2015), who found similarly significant positive effect of wild bee species richness and no effect of honey

bee abundance on apple fruit set. Several wild bee species show greater efficiencies and start foraging at lower temperatures than do honey bees (Torchio, 1991). For example *Osmia* species fly longer distances and change rows more frequently than honey bees, of which pollination efficiency seems to be limited mostly by the frequency of contact with the stigma of the flower (Bosch & Blas, 1994). According to former studies on sunflower and almond, increased pollination success by wild bee species richness might be also the result of enhanced honey bee pollination efficiency by interaction with wild bees (Greenleaf & Kremen, 2006; Brittain *et al.*, 2013). In Brazil the presence of both stingless bee and honeybee improved apple fruit and seed number (Viana *et al.* 2014). In our study there was no relationship between hoverflies and pollination success, which could be explained by their low abundance that might be the result of the single sampling event. However, some other studies found adults might be successful pollinators of other crops (McGuire & Armbruster, 1991; Larson *et al.*, 2001; Jauker & Wolters, 2008).

Conclusion

Honey bee is usually the most dominant and considered as the most important species in pollinator communities. However, wild bees or other wild pollinators can be more effective in apple pollination regarding their often higher frequency of contact with the stigma of the flower compared to honey bees (Bosch & Blas 1994). This study demonstrated the importance of both surrounding landscape diversity in 300-500m radius circle and flower resources in the groundcover within the orchards to enhance pollinator communities. Although we found no direct link between apple pollination success and landscape composition, the positive effects of landscape diversity on wild bees in the surroundings around the orchards support the former evidence that low habitat diversity can translate via

319 reduced wild bee species richness into a decline of fruit set of an insect-pollinated crop
320 (Holzschuh *et al.*, 2012). Therefore maintenance of semi-natural habitats within 500 m around
321 orchards is strongly advised to enhance wild pollinator communities and apple production.

For Review Only

322 Acknowledgements

323

324 We are grateful to the colleagues of Institute of Ecology and Botany, Centre for Ecological

325 Research, Hungarian Academy of Sciences and Alexandra-Maria Klein for professional

326 advices. We thank Norbert Koczinger for allowing us to use his data, Zsolt Józán for the

327 identification of bees, and the farmers/owners for supporting our work and the helpful

328 advices. This study was supported financially by Hungarian Scientific Research Fund OTKA

329 101940 and “Lendület” project of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences. Kovács-Hostyánszki

330 A. was Bolyai and MTA Postdoctoral Fellow.

331

332 References

- 333 Aizen, M.A. & Feinsinger, P. (2003) Bees not to be? Responses of insect pollinator faunas and
334 flower pollination to habitat fragmentation, in: Bradshaw, G.A., Marquet, P.A. (Eds.),
335 How Landscapes Change: Human Disturbance and Ecosystem Fragmentation in the
336 Americas. Springer, Berlin, pp. 111–129.
- 337 Alaux, C., Ducloz, F., Crauser, D. & Le Conte, Y. (2010) Diet effects on honeybee
338 immunocompetence. *Biology Letters*, **6**, 562–565.
- 339 Apáti, F. (2010) Az almaágazat helyzete és kilátásai az üzemgazdasági adatok tükrében. [The
340 aspect of apple industry and outlooks in the light of the industrial data]. *Agrofórum*
341 *Extra*, **33**, 44–46.
- 342 Banaszak, J. (1992) Strategy for conservation of wild bees in an agricultural landscape.
343 *Agriculture, Ecosystems & Environment*, **40**, 179–192.
- 344 Barton, K. (2014) MuMIn: Multi-model inference. R package version 1.10.5. [http://CRAN.R-](http://CRAN.R-project.org/package=MuMIn)
345 [project.org/package=MuMIn](http://CRAN.R-project.org/package=MuMIn).
- 346 Batáry, P., Báldi, A., Kleijn, D. & Tschamntke, T. (2011) Landscape-moderated biodiversity
347 effects of agri-environmental management: a meta-analysis. *Proceedings of the Royal*
348 *Society B*, **278**, 1894–1902.
- 349 Batáry, P., Báldi, A., Sárospataki, M., Kohler, F., Verhulst, J., Knop, E., Herzog, F. & Kleijn,
350 D. (2010) Effect of conservation management on bees and insect-pollinated grassland
351 plant communities in three European countries. *Agriculture, Ecosystems & Environment*,
352 **136**, 35–39.
- 353 Bates, D., Maechler, M., Bolker, B. & Walker, S. (2014) lme4: Linear mixed-effects models
354 using Eigen and S4_. R package version 1.1-7, [http://CRAN.R-](http://CRAN.R-project.org/package=lme4)
355 [project.org/package=lme4](http://CRAN.R-project.org/package=lme4).

- 356 Blaauw, B.R. & Isaacs, R. (2014) Larger patches of diverse floral resources increase
357 insectpollinator density, diversity, and their pollination of native wildflowers. *Basic*
358 *and Applied Ecology*, **15**, 701–711.
- 359 Bosch, J. & Blas, M. (1994) Foraging behaviour and pollinating efficiency of *Osmia cornuta*
360 and *Apis mellifera* on almond (Hymenoptera, Megachilidae and Apidae). *Applied*
361 *Entomology and Zoology*, **29**, 1–9.
- 362 Brittain, C., Williams, N., Kremen, C. & Klein, A.M. (2013) Synergistic effects of non-Apis
363 bees and honey bees for pollination services. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B*,
364 **280**, 20122767.
- 365 Burnham, K.P. & Anderson, D.R. (2002) Model selection and multimodel inference. Springer,
366 New York.
- 367 Carvalheiro, L.G., Seymour, C.L., Nicolson, S.W. & Veldtman, R. (2012) Creating patches of
368 native flowers facilitates crop pollination in large agricultural fields: mango as a case
369 study. *Journal of Applied Ecology*, **49**, 1373–1383.
- 370 Delaplane, K.S. & Mayer, N.F. (2000) Crop Pollination by Bees. CABI Publishing,
371 Wallingford.
- 372 Diekötter, T. & Crist, T.O. (2013) Quantifying habitat-specific contributions to insect diversity
373 in agricultural mosaic landscapes. *Insect Conservation and Diversity*, **6**, 607–618.
- 374 Ebeling, A., Klein, A., Schumacher, J., Weisser, W. & Tschardtke, T. (2008) How does plant
375 richness affect pollinator richness and temporal stability of flower visits? *Oikos*, **117**,
376 1808–1815.
- 377 Fitzpatrick, Ú., Murray, T.E., Paxton, R.J., Breen, J., Cotton, D., Santorum, V. & Brown,
378 M.J.F. (2006) Rarity and decline in bumblebees—a test of causes and correlates in the
379 Irish fauna. *Biological Conservation*, **136**, 185–194.

- 380 Floyd, W.D. (1992) Political aspects of set-aside as a policy instrument in the European
 381 Community, in: Clarke, J. (Ed.), Set-aside. The British Crop Protection Council.
 382 Monographs Series No. 50. The Lavenham Press Limited, Lavenham, pp. 13–20.
- 383 García, R.R. & Miñarro, M. (2014) Role of floral resources in the conservation of pollinator
 384 communities in cider-apple orchards. *Agriculture, Ecosystems & Environment*, **183**,
 385 118–126.
- 386 Garibaldi, L.A., Aizen, M.A., Klein, A.M., Cunningham, S.A. & Harder, L.D. (2011a) Global
 387 growth and stability of agricultural yield decrease with pollinator dependence. *PNAS*
 388 *USA*, **108**, 5909–5914.
- 389 Garibaldi, L.A., Steffan-Dewenter, I., Kremen, C., Morales, J.M., Bommarco, R.,
 390 Cunningham, S.A., Carvalheiro, L.G., Chacoff, N.P., Dudenhöffer, J.H., Greenleaf,
 391 S.S., Holzschuh, A., Isaacs, R., Krewenka, K., Mandelik, Y., Mayfield, M.M.,
 392 Morandin, L.A., Potts, S.G., Ricketts, T.H., Szentgyörgyi, H., Viana, B.F., Westphal,
 393 C., Winfree, R. & Klein, A.M. (2011b) Stability of pollination services decreases
 394 with isolation from natural areas despite honey bee visits. *Ecology Letters*, **14**,
 395 1062–1072.
- 396 Garibaldi, L.A., Steffan-Dewenter, I., Winfree, R., Aizen, M.A., Bommarco, R., Cunningham,
 397 S.A., Kremen, C., Carvalheiro, L.G., Harder, L.D., Afik, O., Bartomeus, I., Benjamin,
 398 F., Boreux, V., Cariveau, D., Chacoff, N.P., Dudenhöffer, J.H., Freitas, B.M.,
 399 Ghazoul, J., Greenleaf, S., Hipólito, J., Holzschuh, A., Howlett, B., Isaacs, R.,
 400 Javorek, S.K., Kennedy, C.M., Krewenka, K.M., Krishnan, S., Mandelik, Y.,
 401 Mayfield, M.M., Motzke, I., Munyuli, T., Nault, B.A., Otieno, M., Petersen, J.,
 402 Pisanty, G., Potts, S.G., Rader, R., Ricketts, T.H., Rundlöf, M., Seymour, C.L.,
 403 Schüepp, C., Szentgyörgyi, H., Taki, H., Tschamtker, T., Vergara, C.H., Viana, B.F.,
 404 Wanger, T.C., Westphal, C., Williams, N. & Klein A.M. (2013) Wild Pollinators

- 405 Enhance Fruit Set of Crops Regardless of Honey Bee Abundance. *Science*, **339**,
406 1608–1611.
- 407 Garratt, M.P.D., Breeze, T.D., Jenner, N., Polce, C., Biesmeijer, J.C. & Potts, S.G. (2014a)
408 Avoiding a bad apple: Insect pollination enhances fruit quality and economic value.
409 *Agriculture, Ecosystems & Environment*, **184**, 34–40.
- 410 Garratt, M.P.D., Coston, D.J., Truslove, C.L., Lappage, M.G., Polce, C., Dean, R., Biesmeijer,
411 D.C. & Potts, S.G. (2014c) The identity of crop pollinators helps target conservation
412 for improved ecosystem services. *Biological Conservation*, **169**, 128–135.
- 413 Garratt, M.P.D., Truslove, C.L., Coston, D.J., Evans, R.L., Moss, E.D., Dodson, C., Jenner,
414 N., Biesmeijer, J.C. & Potts, S.G. (2014b) Pollination Deficits In UK Apple
415 Orchards. *Journal of Pollination Ecology*, **12**, 9–14.
- 416 Gathmann, A. & Tscharntke, T. (2002) Foraging ranges of solitary bees. *Journal of Animal*
417 *Ecology*, **71**, 757–764.
- 418 Goulson, D., Lye, G.C. & Darvill, B. (2008) Decline and conservation of bumble bees. *Annual*
419 *Review of Entomology*, **53**, 191–208.
- 420 Greenleaf, S.S. & Kremen, C. (2006) Wild bees enhance honey bees' pollination of hybrid
421 sunflower. *PNAS*, **103**, 13890–13895.
- 422 Holzschuh, A., Dudenhöffer, J.-H. & Tscharntke, T. (2012) Landscapes with wild bee habitats
423 enhance pollination, fruit set and yield of sweet cherry. *Biological Conservation*,
424 **153**, 101–107.
- 425 Holzschuh, A., Steffan-Dewenter, I., Kleijn, D. & Tscharntke, T. (2007) Diversity of flower-
426 visiting bees in cereal fields: effects of farming system, landscape composition and
427 regional context. *Journal of Applied Ecology*, **44**, 41–49.
- 428 Iler, A.M., Inouye, D.W., Høye, T.T., Miller-Rushing, A.J., Burkle, L.A. & Johnston, E.B.
429 (2013) Maintenance of temporal synchrony between syrphid flies and floral

- resources despite differential phenological responses to climate. *Global Change Biology*, **19**, 2348–2359.
- Jauker, F. & Wolters, V. (2008) Hover flies are efficient pollinators of oilseed rape. *Oecologia*, **156**, 819–823.
- Jauker, B., Krauss, J., Jauker, F., Steffan-Dewenter, I. (2013) Linking life history traits to pollinator loss in fragmented calcareous grasslands. *Landscape Ecology*, **28**, 107–120.
- Kearns, C.A., Inouye, D.W. & Waser, N.M. (1998) Endangered mutualisms: the conservation of plant-pollinator interactions. *Annual Review of Ecology and Systematics*, **29**, 83–112.
- Kells, A.R. & Goulson, D. (2003) Preferred nesting sites of bumblebee queens (Hymenoptera: Apidae) in agroecosystems. *Biological Conservation*, **109**, 164–174.
- Kells A.R., Holland J.M. & Goulson D. (2001) The value of uncropped field margins for foraging bumblebees. *Journal of Insect Conservation*, **5**, 283–291.
- Kendall, D.A. (1973) The viability and compatibility of pollen on insects visiting apple blossom. *Journal of Applied Ecology*, **10**, 847–853.
- Kendall, D.A. & Smith, B.D. (1975) The foraging behavior of honeybees on ornamental *Malus* ssp. used as pollinizers in apple orchards. *Journal of Applied Ecology*, **12**, 465–471.
- Kennedy, C.M., Lonsdorf, E., Neel, M.C., Williams, N.M., Ricketts, T.H., Winfree, R., Bommarco, R., Brittain, C., Burley, A.L., Cariveau, D., Carvalho, L.G., Chacoff, N.P., Cunningham, S.A., Danforth, B.N., Dudenhofer, J.H., Elle, E., Gaines, H.R., Garibaldi, L.A., Gratton, C., Holzschuh, A., Isaacs, R., Javorek, S.K., Jha, S., Klein, A.M., Krewenka, K., Mandelik, Y., Mayfield, M.M., Morandin, L., Neame, L.A., Otieno, M., Park, M., Potts, S.G., Rundlof, M., Saez, A., Steffan-Dewenter, I., Taki,

- 455 H., Viana, B.F., Westphal, C., Wilson, J.K., Greenleaf, S.S. & Kremen, C. (2013) A
456 global quantitative synthesis of local and landscape effects on wild bee pollinators in
457 agroecosystems. *Ecology Letters*, **16**, 584–599.
- 458 Kleijn, D. & van Langevelde, F. (2006) Interacting effects of landscape context and habitat
459 quality on flower visiting insects in agricultural landscapes. *Basic and Applied*
460 *Ecology*, **7**, 201–214.
- 461 Klein, A.M., Brittain, C., Hendrix, S.D., Thorp, R., Williams, N. & Kremen, C. (2012) Wild
462 pollination services to California almond rely on semi-natural habitat. *Journal of*
463 *Applied Ecology*, **49**, 723–732.
- 464 Kraemer, M.E. & Favi, F.D. (2005) Flower phenology and pollen choice of *Osmia lignaria*
465 (Hymenoptera: Megachilidae) in Central Virginia. *Environmental Entomology*, **34**,
466 1593–1605.
- 467 Kremen, C., Williams, N.M. & Thorp, R.W. (2002) Crop pollination from native bees at risk
468 from agricultural intensification. *PNAS*, **99**, 16812–16816.
- 469 Kuussaari, M., Hyvönen, T. & Härmä, O. (2011) Pollinator insects benefit from rotational
470 fallows. *Agriculture, Ecosystems & Environment*, **143**, 28–36.
- 471 Larson, B.M.H., Kevan, P.G. & Inouye, D.W. (2001) Flies and flowers: taxonomic diversity of
472 anthophiles and pollinators. *Canadian Entomology*, **133**, 439–465.
- 473 Laubertie, E.A., Wratten, S.D. & Hemptinne, J.L. (2012) The contribution of potential
474 beneficial insectary plant species to adult hoverfly (Diptera: Syrphidae) fitness.
475 *Biological Control*, **61**, 1–6.
- 476 Leonhardt, S.D., Gallai, N., Garibaldi, L.A., Kuhlmann, M. & Klein, A.M. (2013) Economic
477 gain, stability of pollination and bee diversity decrease from southern to northern
478 Europe. *Basic and Applied Ecology*, **14**, 461–471.

- 479 MacLeod, A. (1999) Attraction and retention of *Episyrphus balteatus* DeGeer (Diptera:
480 Syrphidae) at an arable field margin with rich and poor floral resources. *Agriculture,*
481 *Ecosystems & Environment*, **73**, 237–244.
- 482 Mallinger, R.E. & Gratton, C. (2015) Species richness of wild bees, but not the use of
483 managed honeybees, increases fruit set of a pollinator-dependent crop. *Journal of*
484 *Applied Ecology*, **52**, 323–330.
- 485 McGuire, A.D. & Armbruster, W.S. (1991) An experimental test for reproductive interactions
486 between two sequentially blooming *Saxifraga* species (Saxifragaceae). *American*
487 *Journal of Botany*, **78**, 214–219.
- 488 Memmott, J., Craze, P.G., Waser, N.M. & Price, M.V. (2007) Global warming and the
489 disruption of plant-pollinator interactions. *Ecology Letters*, **10**, 710–717.
- 490 Michener, C.D. (2007) The bees of the world, second ed. Johns Hopkins University Press,
491 Baltimore.
- 492 R Development Core Team, R (2014) A Language and Environment for Statistical
493 Computing, R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria. [http://www.R-](http://www.R-project.org)
494 [project.org](http://www.R-project.org).
- 495 Rader, R., James R., Bartomeus, I. & Winfree, R. (2013) Native bees buffer the negative
496 impact of climate warming on honey bee pollination of watermelon crops. *Global*
497 *Change Biology*, **19**, 3103–3110.
- 498 Ricou, C., Schneller, C., Amiaud, B., Plantureux, S. & Bockstaller, C. (2014) A vegetation-
499 based indicator to assess the pollination value of field margin flora. *Ecological*
500 *Indicators*, **45**, 320–331.
- 501 Rotheray, G.E. & Gilbert, F. (2011) The Natural History of Hoverflies. Forrest Text,
502 Ceredigion, UK.

- 503 Röder, G. (1990) Biologie der Schwebfliegen Deutschlands (Diptera: Syrphidae) [Biologie of
504 Germany's hoverflies (Diptera: Syrphidae)] Erna Bauer Verlag, Keltern–Weiler.
- 505 Rotheray, E.L., MacGowan, I., Rotheray, G.E., Sears, J. & Elliott, A. (2009) The conservation
506 requirements of an endangered hoverfly, *Hammerschmidtia ferruginea* (Diptera,
507 Syrphidae) in the British Isles. *Journal of Insect Conservation*, **13**, 569–574.
- 508 Rundlöf, M., Nilsson, H. & Smith, H.G. (2008) Interacting effects of farming practice and
509 landscape context on bumble bees. *Biological Conservation*, **141**, 417–426.
- 510 Saunders, M.E., Luck, G.W. & Mayfield, M.M. (2013) Almond orchards with living ground
511 cover host more wild insect pollinators. *Journal of Insect Conservation*, **17**, 1011–
512 1025.
- 513 Schüepp, C., Herzog, F. & Entling, M.H. (2013) Disentangling multiple drivers of pollination
514 in a landscape-scale experiment. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B*, **281**, 20132667.
- 515 Schweiger, O., Musche, M., Bailey, D., Billeter, R., Diekötter, T., Hendrickx, F., Herzog, F.,
516 Liira, J., Maelfait, J.P., Speelmans, M. & Dziock, F. (2007) Functional richness of
517 local hoverfly communities (Diptera, Syrphidae) in response to land use across
518 temperate Europe. *Oikos*, **116**, 461–472.
- 519 Shackelford, G., Steward, P.R., Benton, T.G., Kunin, W.E., Potts, S.G., Biesmeijer, J.C. & Sait,
520 S.M. (2013) Comparison of pollinators and natural enemies: a meta-analysis of
521 landscape and local effects on abundance and richness in crops. *Biological Reviews*,
522 **88**, 1002–1021.
- 523 Shannon, C.E. & Weaver, W. (1949) Mathematical Theory of Communication. University of
524 Illinois Press.
- 525 Sheffield, C.S., Westby, S.M., Smith, R.F. & Kevan, P.G. (2008) Potential of bigleaf lupine for
526 building and sustaining *Osmia lignaria* populations for pollination of apple. *The*
527 *Canadian Entomologist*, **140**, 589–599.

- 528 Somerville, D. (1999) Honey bees in cherry and plum pollination, *NSW Agriculture Agnote*
529 DAI 126.
- 530 Steckel, J., Westphal, C., Peters, M.K., Bellach, M., Rothenwoehrer, C., Erasmi, S., Scherber,
531 C., Tschardtke, T. & Steffan-Dewenter, I. (2014) Landscape composition and
532 configuration differently affect trap-nesting bees, wasps and their antagonists.
533 *Biological Conservation*, **172**, 56–64.
- 534 Steffan-Dewenter, I., Münzenberg, U., Buerger, C., Thies, C. & Tschardtke, T. (2002) Scale-
535 dependent effects of landscape context on three pollinator guilds. *Ecology*, **83**,
536 1421–1432.
- 537 Steffan-Dewenter, I., Potts, S.G. & Packer, L. (2005) Pollinator diversity and crop pollination
538 services are at risk. *Trends in Ecology and Evolution*, **20**, 651–652.
- 539 Sutherland, J., Sullivan, M. & Poppy, G. (2001) Oviposition behaviour and host colony size
540 discrimination in *Episyrphus balteatus* (Diptera: Syrphidae). *Bulletin of*
541 *Entomological Research*, **91**, 411–417.
- 542 Torchio, P.F. (1991) Bees as crop pollinators and the role of solitary species in changing
543 environments. *Acta Horticulturae*, **288**, 49–61.
- 544 Van Buskirk, J. & Willi, Y. (2004) Enhancement of farmland biodiversity within setaside land.
545 *Conservation Biology*, **18**, 987–994.
- 546 Van Rijn, P.C.J., Kooijman, J. & Wäckers, F.L. (2013) The contribution of floral resources
547 and honeydew to the performance of predatory hoverflies (Diptera: Syrphidae).
548 *Biological Control*, **67**, 32–38.
- 549 Viana, B.F., da Encarnação Coutinho J.G., Garibaldi L.A., Gastagnino G.L.B., Gramacho K.P.,
550 da Silva F.O. (2014) Stingless bees further improve apple pollination and production.
551 *Journal of Pollination Ecology*, **14**, 261–269.

552 Westphal, C., Steffan-Dewenter, I. & Tschardtke, T. (2003) Mass flowering crops enhance
553 pollinator densities at a landscape scale. *Ecology Letters*, **6**, 961–965.

554 Williams, N.M. & Thomson, J.D. (2003) Comparing pollinator quality of honey bees
555 (Hymenoptera: Apidae) and native bees using pollen removal and deposition
556 measures, in: Stickler, K., Cane, J.H. (Eds.), For nonnative crops, whence pollinators
557 of the future? Entomological Society of America Lanham, Maryland, USA.

558 Wratten, S.D., Bowie, M.H., Hickman, J.M., Evans, A.M., Sedcole, J.R. & Tylianakis, J.M.
559 (2003) Field boundaries as barriers to movement of hover flies (Diptera: Syrphidae)
560 in cultivated land. *Oecologia*, **134**, 605–611.

561

Table 1 Parameter estimates and AICc values of best models for each response variable. Significant predictors are bold. AICc weight indicates the probability that a given model is the best from a set of candidate models (models with $\Delta AICc < 2$).

Response variable	Predictors	Estimate	p-value	AICc	AICc weight	Random effect SD	Residual SD
Species richness	Hoverfly	SHDI300	1.175 (\pm 0.662)	0.076	48.6	0.55	
	Wild bee	SHDI500	1.000 (\pm 0.368)	0.007	76.6	~1	
Abundance	Honeybee	apple flower (sqrt)	0.069 (\pm 0.006)	<< 0.001	1153.4	0.39	0.347
		undergrowth flower	0.012 (\pm 0.002)	<< 0.001			
	Wild bee	SHDI500	-0.524 (\pm 0.324)	0.105	420.8	0.19	0.751
		SHEI500	6.480 (\pm 2.614)	0.013			
Pollination success		apple flower (sqrt)	0.032 (\pm 0.020)	0.101			
		Wild bee species richness	0.009 (\pm 0.004)	0.044	-177.2	0.51	0.052

566 Figure legends

567

568 Fig. 1. Relationship between landscape composition characterized by the Shannon's Diversity
569 Index (SHDI) at 500 m and the species richness of wild bees in the studied 12 apple orchards.
570 Each dot represents an orchard.

571

572 Fig. 2. Relationship between honeybee abundance and flower number on and flower cover in
573 the undergrowth beneath apple trees (number of apple flowers is square root transformed).
574 Honeybees were sampled at two times eight trees in the studied 12 apple orchards. Each dot
575 represents an individual apple tree.

576

577 Fig. 3. Relationship between landscape composition characterized by the Shannon's Evenness
578 Index (SHEI) at 500 m and the abundance of wild bees. Wild bees were sampled at two times
579 eight trees in the studied 12 apple orchards. Analysis was performed at tree level, but SHEI
580 500 had the same value for some orchards, while wild bee abundance was the same for
581 several trees. Therefore, each dot can represent several trees.

582

583 Fig. 4. Relationship between wild bee species richness and pollination success, estimated as
584 the number of green apples divided by the number of flowers at each selected branch. We
585 marked two branches of eight trees per orchard, and finally included 92 branches in the
586 analysis. Each dot represents one branch of an apple tree.

Figure 1




Figure 2




Figure 3




Figure 4

