

# **Trophic Relationships among Five Species of Anura in the Colombian Caribbean Tropical Dry Forest: A Spatial and Temporal Approach**

Argelina Blanco-Torres, Marta Duré, María Argenis Bonilla-Gómez

## **Abstract**

Species of Bufonidae and Leptodactylidae are common in the Colombian tropical dry forest. Although some of them are associated with active foraging and consumption of termites and ants, their trophic ecology is mostly unknown. The diet of five anuran species of Bufonidae (*Rhinella horribilis*, *R. humboldti*) and the leptodactylid subfamily Leiuperinae (*Engystomops pustulosus*, *Pleurodema brachyops*, and *Pseudopaludicola pusilla*) was examined at six sites of the Colombian Caribbean in fragments of dry forest and different land uses. A total of 310 food items were identified. The greatest contribution was represented by Coleoptera, Hymenoptera (Formicidae), Isoptera, and Diptera. The species differed in number and volume of prey. Except for *Pseudopaludicola pusilla*, which behaves as a generalist predator, species had high intake of termites and ants. *Engystomops pustulosus* preferred termites, *Pleurodema brachyops* had high consumption of ants and termites, and the two bufonid species were myrmecophagous. Except for *Pseudopaludicola pusilla*, predator and prey size was related. Most species have overlapping diets (spatially and temporally) when analyzing food items identified at the order level. However, the richness of different prey within these orders allows the coexistence of species. The diet of these species presents similar trends in different habitats throughout their distribution area.

## **Keywords**

Amphibia, diet, niche overlap, resource partitioning, Spatiotemporal variation.

## References

1. Alfaro A.G., Álvarez T.A., Saravia M.S. 2001. Hábitos Alimenticios de *Bufo valliceps* bajo distintas condiciones con aportación al conocimiento de la ecología alimenticia de *Bufo marinus* y *Bufo marmoreus*. Revista de Zoología Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México 12:28–32. Google Scholar
2. Alves J.W., Pacheco R., Bernardo P.L. 2003. Feeding habits of the frogs *Pleurodema diplirostris* (Anura. Leptodactylidae) in Quaternary sand dunes of the Middle Rio Sao Francisco. Bahia. Brazil. *Phyllomedusa* 2:83–92. DOI Google Scholar
3. Angulo A., Rueda-Almonacid J.V., Rodríguez-Mahecha J.V., La Marca E. (Eds). 2006. Técnicas de Inventario y Monitoreo para los Anfibios de la Región Tropical Andina. Conservación Internacional. Serie manuales de campo No 2. Panamericana Formas e Impresos S.A., Bogotá D.C. Google Scholar
4. Arroyo S.B., Serrano-Cardozo V.H., Ramírez-Pinilla M.P. 2008. Diet, microhabitat and time of activity in a *Pristimantis* (Anura, Strabomantidae) assemblage. *Phyllomedusa* 7:109–119. DOI Google Scholar
5. Attademo A.M., Peltzer P.M., Lajmanovich R.C. 2007. Feeding habits of (Anura. Leptodactylidae) *Physalaemus biligonigerus* from soybean field of Córdoba Province. Argentina. *Russian Journal of Herpetology* 14:1–6. Google Scholar
6. Biavati G.M., Wiederhecker H.C., Colli G.R. 2004. Diet of *Epipedobates flavopictus* (Anura: Dendrobatidae) in a Neotropical Savanna. *Journal of Herpetology* 38:510–518. DOI Google Scholar
7. Blanco-Torres A., Bonilla-Gómez M.A. 2010. Partición de microhábitats entre especies de Bufonidae y Leiuperidae (Amphibia: Anura) en áreas con bosque seco tropical de la región Caribe-Colombia. *Acta Biológica Colombiana* 15:47–60. Google Scholar
8. Caldwell J.P., Vitt L.J. 1999. Dietary asymmetry in leaf litter frogs and lizards in a transitional northern Amazonian rain forest. *Oikos* 84:383–397. DOI Google Scholar

9. Colombian Institute of Hydrology, Meteorology and Environmental Studies. 2007. Catálogo Nacional de Estaciones. Accessible at: <http://www.ideam.gov.co/solicitud-de-informacion>. Google Scholar
10. Colwell R.K., Futuyma D.J. 1971. On the measurement of niche breadth and overlap. *Ecology* 52:567–576. DOI Google Scholar
11. Cope E.D. 1864. Contributions to the herpetology of tropical America. *Proceedings of the Academy of Natural Sciences of Philadelphia* 16:166–181. Google Scholar
12. Cope E. D. 1869. Sixth contribution to the herpetology of tropical America. *Proceedings of the Academy of Natural Sciences of Philadelphia* 20:305–312. Google Scholar
13. da Rosa I., Canavero A., Maneyro R., Naya D.E., Camargo A. 2002. Diet of four sympatric anuran species in a temperate environment. *Boletín de la Sociedad Zoológica del Uruguay* 13:12–20. Google Scholar
14. Das I. 1996. Folivory and seasonal changes in diet in *Rana hexadactyla* (Anura: Ranidae). *Journal of Zoology* 238:785–794. DOI Google Scholar
15. Díaz-Páez H., Ortiz J.C. 2003. Hábitos alimentarios de *Pleurodema thaul* (Anura, Leptodactylidae) en Concepción, Chile. *Gayana* 67:25–32. DOI Google Scholar
16. Dodd C.K. Jr. (Ed.). 2010. *Amphibian Ecology and Conservation: A Handbook of Techniques*. Oxford University Press, New York. Google Scholar
17. Duellman W., Trueb L. 1986. *Biology of Amphibians*. McGraw-Hill, New York. Google Scholar
18. Dunhan A.E. 1983. Realized niche overlap, resource abundance and intensity of interspecific competition. Pp. 261–280, in Huey R.B., Pianka E.R., Schoener T.W. (Eds), *Lizard Ecology: Studies of a Model Organism*. Harvard University Press, Cambridge. Google Scholar
19. Duré M.I. 2002. *Pseudopaludicola falcipes* (NCN). Diet. *Herpetological Review* 33:12. Google Scholar

20. Duré M.I., Schaefer E.F., Hammann M.I., Kehr A.I. 2009. Consideraciones ecológicas sobre la dieta, la reproducción y el parasitismo de *Pseudopaludicola boliviana* (Anura, Leptodactylidae) de Corrientes Argentina. *Phylomedusa* 3:121–131. Google Scholar
21. Emerson S.B. 1985. Skull shape in frogs - correlations with diet. *Herpetologica* 41:177–188. Google Scholar
22. Entsminger G.L. 2012. EcoSim Professional: Null modelling software for ecologists, Version 1. Available from: [www.garyentsminger.com/ecosim/index.htm](http://www.garyentsminger.com/ecosim/index.htm). Google Scholar
23. Escobar F. 1997. Estudio de la comunidad de coleópteros coprófagos (Scarabaeidae) en un remanente de bosque seco tropical al norte del Tolima, Colombia. *Caldasia* 19:419–430. Google Scholar
24. Feinsinger P., Spears E.E., Poole R.W. 1981. A simple measure of niche breadth. *Ecology* 62:27–32. DOI Google Scholar
25. Fitzinger L.J. 1826. Neue Classification der Reptilien nach ihren natürlichen Verwandtschaften. Nebst einer Verwandtschaftstafel und einem Verzeichnisse der Reptilien-Sammlung des K.K. Zoologischen Museums zu Wien. J.G. Heubner, Wien. DOI Google Scholar
26. Gallardo J.M. 1965. The species *Bufo granulosus* Spix (Salientia: Bufonidae) and its geographic variation. *Bulletin of the Museum of Comparative Zoology* 134:107–138. Google Scholar
27. González-Duran G., Gutiérrez-Cárdenas P.D.A., Escobar-Lasso S. 2012. *Physalaemus pustulosus* (Tungara Frog). Diet. *Herpetological Review* 43:124–125. Google Scholar
28. Gotelli N.J., Entsminger G.L. 2005. EcoSim: Null models software for ecology, Version 7. Available from: <http://garyentsminger.com/ecosim.htm>. Google Scholar
29. Gray J.E. 1825. A synopsis of the genera of reptiles and Amphibia, with a description of some new species. *Annals of Philosophy Series 2* 10:193–217. Google Scholar
30. Guzmán P.A., Salazar J.C. 2012. Una aproximación estadística para explorar la relación entre la morfometría de unas ranas colombianas y sus hábitos alimenticios. *Revista de la Facultad de Ciencias*

Universidad Nacional de Colombia, Sede Medellín 1:23–39. Google Scholar

31. Hammer O., Harper D.A.T., Ryan P.D. 2007. PAST - Paleontological Statistics, Version 1.73. Available from: <http://folk.uio.no/ohammer/past>. Google Scholar
32. Hensel R. 1867. Beiträge zur Kenntnis der Wirbelthiere Südbrasiliens. Archiv für Naturgeschichte 33:120–162. DOI Google Scholar
33. Heyer W.R., Bellin M.S. 1973. Ecological notes on five sympatric *Leptodactylus* (Amphibia, Leptodactylidae) from Ecuador. *Herpetologica* 29:66–72. Google Scholar
34. Hyslop E.J. 1980. Stomach contents analysis—a review of methods and their application. *Journal of Fish Biology* 17:411–429. DOI Google Scholar
35. Isaacs P., Hoyos J.M. 2010. Diet of the cane toad in different vegetation covers in the productive systems of the Colombian coffee region. *South American Journal of Herpetology* 5:45–50. DOI Google Scholar
36. Jacsik F.M. 2001. Ecología de Comunidades. Ediciones Universidad Católica de Chile, Santiago de Chile. Google Scholar
37. Jiménez de la Espada M. 1872. Nuevos batrácios americanos. *Anales de la Sociedad Española de Historia Natural*. Madrid 1:84–88. Google Scholar
38. Levins R. 1968. Evolution in Changing Environments: Some Theoretical Explorations. Princeton University Press, New Jersey. DOI Google Scholar
39. Lima A.P. 1998. The effect of size on the diets of six sympatric species of postmetaorphic litter anurans in Central Amazonia. *Journal of Herpetology* 32:392–399. Google Scholar
40. Linnaeus C. 1758. *Systema naturae per regna tria naturae, secundum classes, ordines, genera, species, cum characteribus, differential, synonymis, locis*, Tomus I. Editio decima, reformata. Laurentii Salvii, Holmiae. DOI Google Scholar

41. López J., Scarabotti P., Medrano M., Ghirardi R. 2009. Is the red spotted green frog *Hypsiboas punctatus* (Anura: Hylidae) selecting its preys? The importance of prey availability. *Revista de Biología Tropical* 57:847–857. Google Scholar
42. Macale D., Vignoli L., Carpaneto G.M. 2008. Food selection strategy during the reproductive period in three syntopic hylid species from a subtropical wetland of north-east Argentina. *Herpetological Journal* 18:49–58. Google Scholar
43. MacArthur R., Levins R. 1964. Competition, habitat selection, and character displacement in a patchy environment. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America* 51:1207–1210. DOI Google Scholar
44. Medianero E., Valderrama A., Barrios H. 2003. Diversidad de insectos minadores de hojas y formadores de agallas en el dosel y sotobosque del bosque tropical. *Acta Zoológica Mexicana (Nueva Serie)* 89:153–168. Google Scholar
45. Medina C.A., González F.A. 2014. Escarabajos coprófagos de la subfamilia Scarabaeinae. Pp. 194–213, in Pizano C., García H. (Eds.), *El Bosque Seco Tropical en Colombia*. Instituto de Investigación de Recursos Biológicos Alexander von Humboldt, Bogotá. Google Scholar
46. Meisel A., Perez G.J. 2007. La Guajira y el Mito de las Regalías Redentoras. Documentos de Trabajo sobre Economía Regional No. 86. Banco de la Republica, Cartagena de Indias. Google Scholar
47. Palacios-Vargas J.G., Castaño-Meneses G., Gómez-Anaya J.A., Martínez-Yrizar A., Mejía-Recamier B.E., Martínez-Sánchez J. 2007. Litter and soil arthropods diversity and density in a tropical dry forest ecosystem in Western México. *Biodiversity and Conservation* 16:3703–3717. DOI Google Scholar
48. Parker H.W. 1927. A revision of the frogs of the genera *Pseudopaludicola*, *Physalaemus*, and *Pleurodema*. *Annals and Magazine of Natural History Series 9* 20:450–478. DOI Google Scholar

49. Parmelee J.R. 1999. Trophic ecology of a tropical anuran assemblage. *Scientific Papers, Natural History Museum, The University of Kansas* 11:1–59. DOI Google Scholar
50. Pfeiffer W. 1996. Litter invertebrates. Pp. 137–181, in Reagan D.P., Waide R.B. (Eds.), *The Food Web of a Tropical Rain Forest*. University of Chicago Press, Chicago and London. Google Scholar
51. Pianka E.R. 1973. The structure of lizard communities. *Annual Review of Ecology and Systematics* 4:53–74. DOI Google Scholar
52. Pianka E.R. 1974. Niche relations of desert lizards. Pp. 292–314, in Cody M., Diamond J. (Eds.), *Ecology and Evolution of Communities*. Harvard University Press, Boston. Google Scholar
53. Pianka E.R., Parker W.S. 1975. Ecology of horned lizard: a review with special reference to *Phrynosoma platyrhinos*. *Copeia* 1975:141–162. DOI Google Scholar
54. Piatti L., Souza F.L. 2011. Diet and resource partitioning among anurans in irrigated rice fields in Pantanal, Brazil. *Brazilian Journal of Biology* 71:653–661. DOI Google Scholar
55. Pincheira-Donoso D. 2002. Nota sobre la alimentación de *Pleurodema bufonina* Bell, 1843 (Anura - Leptodactylidae). *Gayana* 66:77–80. DOI Google Scholar
56. Ruthven A.G. 1916. A new species of *Paludicola* from Colombia. *Occasional Papers of the Museum of Zoology, University of Michigan* 30:1–3. Google Scholar
57. Sanabria E., Quiroga L., Acosta J.C. 2007. Hábitos alimentarios de infantiles de *Pleurodema nebulosum* (Anura: Leptodactylidae) en Matagusanos, San Juan, Argentina. *Revista Peruana de Biología* 14:295–296. DOI Google Scholar
58. Santana A.S., Juncá F.A. 2007. Diet of *Physalaemus* cf. *cicada* (Leptodactylidae) and *Bufo granulosus* (Bufonidae) in a semideciduous forest. *Brazilian Journal of Biology* 67:125–131. DOI Google Scholar
59. Santos J.W.A., Damasceno R.P., Rocha P.L.B. 2003. Feeding habits of the frogs *Pleurodema diplirostris* (Anura. Leptodactylidae) in

- Quaternary sand dunes of the Middle Rio São Francisco, Bahia, Brazil. *Phyllomedusa* 2:83–92. DOI [Google Scholar](#)
60. Shannon C.E., Weaver W. 1949. The Mathematical Theory of Communication. Urbana, Illinois. [Google Scholar](#)
61. Toft C.A. 1980. Feeding ecology of thirteen syntopic species of anurans in a seasonal tropical environment. *Oecologia* 45:131–141. DOI [Google Scholar](#)
62. Toft C.A. 1981. Feeding ecology of Panamanian litter anurans: patterns in diet and foraging mode. *Journal of Herpetology* 15:139–144. DOI [Google Scholar](#)
63. Toft C.A. 1985. Resource partitioning in amphibians and reptiles. *Copeia* 1985:1–21. DOI [Google Scholar](#)
64. Toft C.A., Duellman W.E. 1979. Anurans of the lower Río Llullapichis, Amazonian Perú: a preliminary analysis of community structure. *Herpetologica* 35:71–77. [Google Scholar](#)
65. Tokeshi M. 1999. Species Coexistence – Ecological and Evolutionary Perspectives. Blackwell Science Ltd., Oxford. [Google Scholar](#)
66. Triplehorn C., Johnson N. 2005. Borror and DeLong's Introduction to the Study of Insects. Thomson Brooks/Cole, Belmont. [Google Scholar](#)
67. Vignoli L., Luiselli L. 2012. Dietary relationships among coexisting anuran amphibians: a worldwide quantitative review. *Oecologia* 169:499–509. DOI [Google Scholar](#)
68. Vitt L., Caldwell J. 2014. Herpetology, an Introductory Biology of Amphibians and Reptiles. Fourth Edition. Academic Press, San Diego. [Google Scholar](#)
69. Wells K.D. 2007. The Ecology and Behavior of Amphibians. University Chicago Press, Chicago. DOI [Google Scholar](#)
70. Werner F. 1896. Beiträge zur Kenntniss der Reptilien und Batrachier von Centralamerika und Chile, sowie einiger seltenerer Schlangenarten. *Verhandlungen der Kaiserlich-Königlichen*

Zoologisch-Botanischen Gesellschaft in Wien 46:344–365. Google Scholar

71. Whitfield S.M., Donnelly M.A. 2006. Ontogenetic and seasonal variation in the diets of a Costa Rican leaf-litter herpetofauna. *Journal of Tropical Ecology* 22:409–417. DOI Google Scholar

72. Wiegmann A.F.A. 1833. Herpetologischen Beyträge. I. Ueber die mexicanischen Kröten nebst bemerkungen über ihren verwandte Arten anderer Weltgegenden. *Isis von Oken* 26:651–662. Google Scholar