



Mohamed, N. Z., Shahrul Anuar, M. S., & Jones, G. (2016). The potential significance of nectar-feeding bats as pollinators in mangrove habitats of Peninsular Malaysia. *Biotropica*, 48(4), 425-428. DOI: 10.1111/btp.12335

Peer reviewed version

License (if available):
CC BY-NC

Link to published version (if available):
[10.1111/btp.12335](https://doi.org/10.1111/btp.12335)

[Link to publication record in Explore Bristol Research](#)
PDF-document

This is the author accepted manuscript (AAM). The final published version (version of record) is available online via Wiley at <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/btp.12335/abstract>. Please refer to any applicable terms of use of the publisher.

University of Bristol - Explore Bristol Research

General rights

This document is made available in accordance with publisher policies. Please cite only the published version using the reference above. Full terms of use are available:
<http://www.bristol.ac.uk/pure/about/ebr-terms.html>

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21

Nor Zalipah, Shahrul Anuar and Jones Bats as Pollinators in Mangroves
The Potential Significance of Nectar-Feeding Bats As Pollinators in Mangrove Habitats of Peninsular Malaysia

Nor Zalipah Mohamed^{1,2,5}, Shahrul Anuar Mohd Sah^{3,4} and Gareth Jones¹

¹University of Bristol, School of Life Sciences, Life Sciences Building, 24 Tyndall Avenue, Bristol BS8 1TQ, UK

²Pusat Pengajian Sains Marin dan Sekitaran, Universiti Malaysia Terengganu, 21030 Kuala Terengganu, Terengganu, Malaysia

³Pusat Pengajian Sains Kajihayat, Universiti Sains Malaysia, 11800 Minden, Pulau Pinang, Malaysia

⁴Centre for Marine and Coastal Studies, Universiti Sains Malaysia, 11800 Minden, Pulau Pinang, Malaysia

Received: _____; revision accepted: _____

⁵Corresponding author; e-mail: zalipah@umt.edu.my

1 **ABSTRACT**

2 We tested the hypothesis that bats are effective pollinators of mangroves in Malaysia. Bats
3 (*Eonycteris spelaea*) visited flowers of two *Sonneratia* species frequently, and deposited large
4 quantities of conspecific pollen grains on stigmas. The bats are likely to be important pollinators
5 of the two mangrove species.

6 Kami telah menguji hipotesis bahawa kelawar adalah pendebunga yang berkesan bagi bakau di
7 Malaysia. Kelawar (*Eonycteris spelaea*) melawat bunga dua spesies *Sonneratia* dengan kerap, dan
8 meletakkan butir debunga konspesifik dalam kuantiti yang banyak ke atas stigma. Kelawar
9 berkemungkinan menjadi pendebunga penting bagi kedua-dua spesies bakau tersebut.

10 *Key words*: conspecific pollen grains; *E. spelaea*; pollen load; pollinator effectiveness;
11 *Sonneratia*.

12
13 Numerous studies have quantified the role of pollinators in pollination and the consequences for
14 plant mating systems (reviewed in Inouye *et al.* 1994, Ne'eman *et al.* 2010). Pollinators often
15 differ in the 'quality' and 'quantity' of the pollination services they provide (Schemske &
16 Horvitz 1984, Fishbein & Venable 1996): quality refers to the amount of pollen transferred per
17 visit and quantity refers to the visitation rate. Bats and hummingbirds for example can show
18 similar visitation rates, although bats are more effective pollinators as they consistently transfer
19 greater amounts of conspecific pollen (Muchhala 2006; 2007). However, potentially high rates of
20 conspecific pollen transfer may be reduced by high levels of interspecific pollen transfer
21 (Muchhala 2008), as bats may visit many plant species (Marshall 1983, Fleming *et al.* 2009,
22 Fleming & Kress 2013). Flower visitation rate has recently been highlighted as a poor proxy for
23 pollination efficiency (King *et al.* 2013), and the number of conspecific pollen grains deposited

1 on a virgin stigma (single-visit deposition, or SVD) is a more reliable measure of pollinator
2 effectiveness (Kandori 2002, Ne'eman *et al.* 2010, Stoepler *et al.* 2012, King *et al.* 2013). In this
3 study we determine whether bats are effective pollinators of mangrove tree species by
4 quantifying SVDs.

5 Mangrove apples (*Sonneratia* spp.) are widespread and often important components of
6 mangrove ecosystems in Indo-West Pacific regions (Duke 1992). *Sonneratia* species are
7 important for preventing coastal erosion and tidal damage (Mazda *et al.* 2006). In Malaysia,
8 *Sonneratia* trees are likely to be pollinated by nectarivorous bats that visit their flowers for nectar
9 and pollen to obtain sugar and protein nutrients respectively (Start & Marshall 1986, Marshall
10 1983, Watzke 2006). However, these flowers are also visited by several nocturnal and
11 crepuscular foragers such as moths, Diptera and Hymenoptera (Watzke 2006). The relative
12 contribution of bats as pollinators to the flowers compared with other visitors was previously
13 unknown. Here we aim to quantify the potential effectiveness of flower-visiting bats as
14 pollinators of *Sonneratia* trees from the quality and quantity components of pollinator
15 effectiveness. We hypothesised that bats are effective pollinators of *Sonneratia* trees by
16 transferring sufficient conspecific pollen grains (quality component) and we determine the
17 effects of repeated visits to flowers (quantity component) to evaluate whether repeated visits by
18 bats increase the amount of conspecific pollen deposited relative to heterospecific pollen.

19 The study was located in Terengganu, northeast Peninsular Malaysia (5° 40' N, 102° 43'
20 E), where *Sonneratia alba*, *S. caseolaris* and a hybrid between *S. ovata* and *S. alba* (M.
21 Kainuma, pers. comm.) occur. The hybrid (hereafter *Sonneratia* sp.) was rare and was not
22 monitored, though pollen grains from it were distinctive and included in analyses. The

1 *Sonneratia* flowers open only for a single night, and the stamens drop the next morning, features
2 typical of many bat-pollinated flowers.

3 On 35 nights in 2011 and 2012 we set mist-nets in front of flowering *Sonneratia* trees and
4 monitored them at least hourly between 1900 h (dusk) and 0700 h (sunrise) the next day. Pollen
5 grains were sampled by carefully rubbing the bat's body with cotton wool buds and were
6 preserved in vials containing 75 percent ethanol. Bats were identified to species following keys
7 in Kingston *et al.* (2006) and Francis (2008).

8 Stigmas were collected between May and November 2012. When measuring SVD,
9 observations were conducted from 1900 h until 2300 h, 2-5 m from the trees under moonlight
10 and dim light from headlamps. When a bat visited a flower, the stigma was removed
11 immediately. For total pollen deposition (TD) on stigmas, flowers that bloomed on the previous
12 night were examined between 0700 h to 0730 h to reduce the possibility of pollen deposition by
13 early morning visitors such as hymenopterans. In total, 37 stigmas (20 *S. caseolaris* and 17 *S.*
14 *alba*) were collected for SVD and 40 stigmas (20 for both *S. caseolaris* and *S. alba*) for TD
15 determinations. All stigmas were preserved in separate 1.5 ml centrifuge tubes containing 75
16 percent ethanol.

17 Identification of pollen was conducted by comparisons with reference material. For each
18 sample, 1 μ l of ethanol (from approximately 20 ml ethanol in vials and 1 ml ethanol in centrifuge
19 tubes, thoroughly shaken before extraction for pollen counts) was placed on a glass slide for light
20 microscopy. For each slide, the number of pollen grains for each morphotype (morphologically
21 distinguishable pollen type) was recorded. For each sample, pollen counts comprised 20
22 replicates of 1 μ l samples in ethanol (for pollen deposited on stigmas, the total number of pollen
23 grains was determined based on the ethanol volume). To achieve normality, the numbers of

1 pollen grains carried by bats and deposited on the stigmas were logarithmically transformed (log
2 base 10). All analyses were conducted in IBM SPSS Statistics v19.0 (Chicago, U.S.A). Mean \pm
3 SE are used throughout.

4 To observe the visitation frequency, we filmed bats visiting *Sonneratia* flowers between
5 March and December 2012 (324 flower-h for *S. caseolaris* and 288 flower-h *S. alba*) using 2-4
6 night shot surveillance cameras (1/3" SONY 420 TVL CCTV, Anyon Technology, Malaysia)
7 simultaneously. The cameras were set up approximately 1 m from flowers with the aid of
8 aluminium poles and connected to a digital video recorder (4 channel Crossfire CF1804, Belco,
9 Taiwan) recording between 1900 h and 0700 h the next morning.

10 We caught 137 flower-visiting bats of three species. About 85 percent of bats were cave
11 nectar bats (*Eonycteris spelaea*), which was disproportionately the most frequently captured
12 species ($\chi^2 = 170.69$, $df = 2$, $P < 0.001$). We also captured 18 lesser short-nosed fruit bats
13 *Cynopterus brachyotis* and a single Geoffroy's rousette (*Rousettus amplexicaudatus*). The bats
14 carried 11 morphotypes of pollen, of which six were identified to species and five to genera. The
15 species recorded were the three *Sonneratia* species (*Sonneratia* sp., *S. alba* and *S. caseolaris*),
16 *Ceiba pentandra*, *Melaleuca cajuputi* and *Oroxylum indicum*, while the five morphotypes
17 identified to genera were *Acacia* sp., *Durio* sp., *Eugenia* sp., *Musa* sp. and *Parkia* sp. Pollen
18 grains from the *Sonneratia* group (including *Sonneratia* sp. and non-viable *Sonneratia* spp.) were
19 the dominant pollen grains collected (Fig. 1). The total number of pollen grains collected from *E.*
20 *spelaea* was significantly higher than the number collected from *C. brachyotis* ($t = 6.92$, $df =$
21 144 , $P < 0.001$). *Eonycteris spelaea* carried significantly more conspecific than heterospecific
22 pollen grains (1796.97 ± 238.92 grains of conspecific and 533.84 ± 75.16 grains of
23 heterospecific pollen; Wilcoxon signed-rank test, $T = 1490.00$, $P < 0.001$), while *C. brachyotis*

1 carried almost equal numbers of con- and heterospecific grains (165.78 ± 63.61 conspecific and
2 135.44 ± 60.55 heterospecific pollen grains; Wilcoxon signed-rank test, $T = 50.00$, $P = 0.12$)
3 (Fig.2).

4 For *S. caseolaris* flowers, the number of pollen grains for SVD was significantly fewer
5 than TD ($t = -2.290$, $df = 38$, $P = 0.028$). The numbers of conspecific and heterospecific pollen
6 grains were not significantly different for SVD ($t = 1.597$, $df = 19$, $P = 0.127$) and TD ($t = 1.718$,
7 $df = 19$, $P = 0.102$). The number of conspecific pollen grains was also not significantly different
8 between SVD and TD ($t = 1.939$, $df = 38$, $P = 0.630$); the number of heterospecific pollen grains
9 however, was significantly higher for TD as compared to SVD ($t = 3.701$, $df = 38$, $P < 0.001$)
10 (Fig. 3). These results suggest that the increase in pollen deposition over the entire flowering
11 night is largely the consequence of more heterospecific pollen being deposited.

12 Conversely for *S. alba* flowers, the number of pollen grains for SVD was not
13 significantly different from the number deposited in TD ($t = 0.211$, $df = 35$, $P = 0.834$). The
14 number of conspecific pollen grains deposited on the stigmas was significantly lower than the
15 heterospecific pollen grains for both SVD ($t = -4.804$, $df = 16$, $P < 0.001$) and TD ($t = 6.170$, df
16 $= 19$, $P < 0.001$). The comparisons of pollen types for SVD vs. TD showed no significant
17 difference in the number of conspecific ($t = 0.402$, $df = 38$, $P = 0.690$) and heterospecific ($t =$
18 0.402 , $df = 35$, $P = 0.914$) pollen grains. These results suggest that pollen deposition does not
19 increase after the first pollinator visit in *S. alba*, and that pollen is dominated by heterospecific
20 grains both during the first visit and throughout the night.

21 From 68 observations of bats visiting flowers, 46 were by *E. spelaea* (identified by their
22 long snouts). There were 45 feeding visits by bats at eight *S. caseolaris* flowers during two
23 nights. We recorded 23 feeding visits by bats at nine *S. alba* flowers over five nights.

1 The bats visited several flower species, as demonstrated by the mixed pollen loads on
2 their bodies, as seen in other studies (Heithaus *et al.* 1975, Muchhala & Jarrin-V 2002, Watzke
3 2006). However, all bat species predominantly carried *Sonneratia* pollen (*S. alba*, *S. caseolaris*,
4 *Sonneratia* sp. and the non-viable *Sonneratia* spp.) so there was therefore little opportunity for
5 pollen wastage (Law & Lean 1999). Based on the number of conspecific pollen grains collected
6 while visiting *Sonneratia* flowers, *E. spelaea* is likely to be a more important pollinator of
7 *Sonneratia* species than *C. brachyotis*. Start and Marshall (1976) and Watzke (2006) recorded
8 *Sonneratia* spp. (*S. caseolaris* in the case of Watzke (2006)) as the most common pollen on *E.*
9 *spelaea*.

10 All the stigmas collected after the first bat visited the flowers (SVD) were positive for
11 pollen grains, indicating that the bats effectively transferred pollen from their bodies to the
12 stigmas while visiting the flowers. Moreover, pollen comprised numerous conspecific grains,
13 supporting our hypothesis that bats contribute an important quality component of pollinator
14 effectiveness. However, we cannot exclude the possibility that some of the pollen came from the
15 same flower, resulting in self-pollination.

16 For the quantity component, contrasting results were recorded for the two *Sonneratia*
17 species. For *S. caseolaris*, higher visitation by bats to the flowers was recorded (1-18 ($N = 8$),
18 with two flowers receiving 13 and 18 feeding visits), consistent with higher number of pollen
19 grains in TD than in SVD. For *S. alba* flowers however, SVD and TD were very similar, in
20 accordance with the low visitation rate to the flowers (between 1-6 visits ($N = 9$), with eight
21 flowers receiving 1-3 feeding visits only). Pollen load was higher for TD than SVD in *S.*
22 *caseolaris* which received frequent visits from bats over the night, but not for *S. alba* which
23 received few. Therefore, the relatively higher TD in *S. caseolaris* is probably partly due to

1 repeated pollinator visits to the same flowers (Quesada *et al.* 2004). On their first visit to the *S.*
2 *caseolaris* flowers, bats deposited similar quantities of conspecific and heterospecific pollen
3 grains onto the stigmas; however, multiple visits by bats to the flowers throughout the blooming
4 night resulted in more heterospecific pollen being deposited onto the stigmas. For both species
5 however, the number of conspecific pollen grains from SVD were sufficient to fertilise all the
6 ovules in the flowers (estimated in Nor Zalipah 2014). Furthermore, Nor Zalipah (2014) reported
7 that the number of seeds/fruit for *S. caseolaris* was 623.19 ± 60.62 ($N = 37$ fruits) and only 50.77
8 ± 3.71 ($N = 13$ fruits) for *S. alba*. Therefore a single visit by bats may be sufficient to initiate
9 fruit set. This is in contrast with the quantity component of pollinator effectiveness, in which
10 multiple visits to the same flowers reduced the quality of bats as pollinating agents as they may
11 deposit relatively more heterospecific pollen consequently (Muchhala *et al.* 2008).

12 Even though high visitation rates may sometimes indicate the effectiveness of pollinators
13 (Quesada *et al.* 2003, Arias-Coyotl *et al.* 2006), Srithongchuay *et al.* (2008) suggested that a
14 single visit by bats to the flowers of Indian trumpet, *Oroxylum indicum* is sufficient to initiate
15 fruit set. Repeated visits to the same flowers may also result in stigma blockage by transfer of
16 foreign pollen, subsequently reducing the reproductive success of the plant (Armbruster &
17 Herzig 1984, Fishman & Wyatt 1999, Caruso & Alfaro 2000, Bell *et al.* 2005,) by reducing the
18 chances of subsequently deposited conspecific pollen to fertilise the ovules. Multiple visits to the
19 same flower or plant also might result in geitonogamous crosses and set no fruit in self-
20 incompatible plants (Quesada *et al.* 2004, Arias-Coyotl *et al.* 2006). Recently, Acharya *et al.*
21 (2015) reported *E. spelaea* as effective pollinators of durian (*Durio zibethinus*) and bitter bean
22 (*Parkia speciosa*) in southern Thailand, from their high conspecific pollen deposition during
23 SVD, and also from their high visitation frequency to the flowers. Even though they did not

1 report the effect of multiple visits on pollen deposition, pollination of these two species by bats is
2 especially important because they promote cross-pollination by visiting multiple conspecific
3 trees throughout their feeding night.

4 Therefore, our study indicates that high visitation frequency does not necessarily confirm
5 the effectiveness of bats as pollinators: indeed, being the first visitors to flowers may be more
6 important in determining their effectiveness as pollinators (King *et al.* 2013). Therefore, based
7 on the number of conspecific pollen grains in SVD, bats are likely to be effective pollinators of
8 the two mangrove species, *S. alba* and *S. caseolaris* in Malaysia.

9

10 **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

11 This research was funded by Bat Conservation International in 2011. The field and lab studies
12 were also partly funded by a Fundamental Research Grant (FRGS) from Ministry of Higher
13 Education Malaysia and RUI-Universiti Sains Malaysia Grants. University Malaysia Terengganu
14 and Professor Shukor Md Nor of Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia provided logistical support
15 and equipment to conduct this research.

16

17 **LITERATURE CITED**

18 ACHARYA, P. R., P. A. RACEY, S. SOTTHIBANDHU, AND S. BUMRUNGSRI. 2015. Feeding behaviour
19 of the dawn bat (*Eonycteris splelaea*) promoted cross pollination of economically
20 important plants in Southeast Asia. *J. Pollinat. Ecol.* 15: 44-50.

21 ARIAS-COYOTL, E., K. E. STONER, AND A. CASAS. 2006. Effectiveness of bats as pollinators of
22 *Stenocereus stellatus* (Cactaceae) in wild, manged in situ, and cultivated populations in La
23 Mixteca Baja, central Mexico. *Am. J. Bot.* 93: 1675-1683.

- 1 ARMBRUSTER, W. S., AND A. L. HERZIG. 1984. Partitioning and sharing of pollinators by four
2 sympatric species of *Dalechampia* (Euphorbiaceae) in Panama. *Ann. Missouri Bot. Gard.*
3 71: 1-16.
- 4 BELL, J. M., J. D. KARRON, AND R. J. MITCHELL. 2005. Interspecific competition for pollination
5 lowers seed production and outcrossing in *Mimulus ringens*. *Ecology* 86: 762–771.
- 6 CARUSO, C. M., AND M. ALFARO. 2000. Interspecific pollen transfer as a mechanism of
7 competition: effect of *Castilleja linariaefolia* pollen on seed set of *Ipomopsis*
8 *aggregata*. *Can. J. Bot.* 78: 600-606.
- 9 DUKE, N. C. 1992. Mangrove floristics and biogeography. *In* A. I. Robertson and D. M. Alongi
10 (Eds.). *Tropical Mangrove Ecosystems*, pp. 63-100. American Geophysical Union,
11 Washington DC.
- 12 FISHMAN, L., AND R. WYATT. 1999. Pollinator-mediated competition, reproductive character
13 displacement, and the evolution of selfing in *Arenaria uniflora*
14 (Caryophyllaceae). *Evolution* 53: 1723-1733.
- 15 FISHBEIN, M., AND D. L. VENABLE. 1996. Diversity and temporal change in the effective
16 pollinators of *Asclepias tuberosa*. *Ecology* 77: 1061–1073.
- 17 FLEMING, T. H., C. GEISELMAN, AND W. J. KRESS. 2009. The evolution of bat pollination: a
18 phylogenetic perspective. *Ann. Bot.* 104: 1017-1043.
- 19 FLEMING, T.H., AND W. J. KRESS. 2013. *The Ornaments of Life, Coevolution and Conservation*
20 *in the Tropics*. The University of Chicago Press, Chicago.
- 21 FRANCIS, C. M. 2008. *A Field Guide to the Mammals of South-east Asia*. New Holland
22 Publishers Ltd., United Kingdom.

- 1 HEITHAUS, E. R., T. H. FLEMING, AND P. A. OPLER. 1975. Foraging patterns and resource
2 utilization in seven species of bats in a seasonal tropical forest. *Ecology* 56: 841-854.
- 3 INOUE, D. W., D. E. GILL, M. R. DUDASH, AND C. B. FENSTER. 1994. A model and lexicon for
4 pollen fate. *Am. J. Bot.* 81: 1517-1530.
- 5 KANDORI, I. 2002. Diverse visitors with various pollinator importance and temporal change in
6 the important pollinators of *Geranium thunbergii* (Geraniaceae). *Ecol. Res.* 17: 283-294.
- 7 KING, C., G. BALLANTYNE, AND P. G. WILLMER. 2013. Why flower visitation is a poor proxy for
8 pollination: measuring single-pollen deposition, with implications for pollination networks
9 and conservation. *Methods Ecol. Evol.* 4: 811-818.
- 10 KINGSTON, T., B. L. LIM, AND A. ZUBAID. 2006. Bats of Krau Wildlife Reserve. Penerbit
11 Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia, Bangi.
- 12 LAW, B. S., AND M. LEAN. 1999. Common blossom bats (*Syconycteris australis*) as pollinators in
13 fragmented Australian tropical rainforest. *Biol. Conserv.* 91: 201-212.
- 14 MARSHALL, A. G. 1983. Bats, flowers and fruit: evolutionary relationships in the Old
15 World. *Biol. J. Linn. Soc.* 20: 115-135.
- 16 MAZDA, Y., M. MAGI, Y. IKEDA, T. KUROKAWA, AND T. ASANO. 2006. Wave reduction in
17 mangrove forest dominated by *Sonneratia* sp. *Wetl. Ecol. Manag.* 14: 365-378.
- 18 MUCHHALA, N. 2006. The pollination biology of *Burmeistera* (Campanulaceae): specialization
19 and syndromes. *Am. J. Bot.* 93: 1081-1089.
- 20 MUCHHALA, N. 2007. Adaptive trade-off in floral morphology mediates specialization for
21 flowers pollinated by bats and hummingbirds. *Am. Nat.* 169: 494-504.
- 22 MUCHHALA, N. 2008. Functional significance of interspecific variation in *Burmeistera* flower
23 morphology: evidence from nectar bat captures in Ecuador. *Biotropica* 40: 332-337.


- 1 MUCHHALA, N., AND P. JARRIN-V. 2002. Flower visitation by bats in cloud forests of western
2 Ecuador. *Biotropica* 34: 387-395.
- 3 MUCHHALA, N., A. CAIZA, J. C. VIZUETE, AND J. D. THOMSON. 2008. A generalized pollination
4 system in the tropics: bats, birds and *Aphelandra acanthus*. *Ann. Bot.* 103: 1481–1487.
- 5 NE'EMAN, G., A. JURGENS, L. NEWSTROM-LLYODS, S. G. POTTS, AND A. DAFNI. 2010. A
6 framework for comparing pollinator performances: effectiveness and efficiency. *Biol. Rev.*
7 85: 435-451.
- 8 NOR ZALIPAH, M. 2014. The Role of Nectar-feeding Bats (Pteropodidae) in Pollination Ecology
9 of the Genus *Sonneratia* at Setiu Mangrove Areas, Terengganu, Malaysia. 'PhD
10 Dissertation', University of Bristol, UK.
- 11 QUESADA, M., K. E. STONER, V. ROSAS-GUERRERO, C. PALASIOS-GUEVARA, AND J. A. LOBO.
12 2003. Effect of habitat disruption on the activity of nectarivorous bats in a dry tropical
13 forest, implications for the reproductive success of the neotropical tree *Ceiba grandiflora*.
14 *Oecologia* 135: 400-406.
- 15 QUESADA, M., K. E. STONER, J. A. LOBO, Y. HERRERIAS-DIEGO, C. PALACIOS-GUEVARA, M. A.
16 MUNGUIA-ROSAS, K. A. O.-SALAZAR, AND V. ROSAS-GUERRERO. 2004. Effects of forest
17 fragmentation on pollinator activity and consequences for plant reproductive success and
18 mating patterns in bat-pollinated bombacaceous trees. *Biotropica* 36: 131-138.
- 19 SCHEMSKE, D. W., AND C. C. HORVITZ. 1984. Variation among floral visitors in pollination
20 ability: a precondition for mutualism specialization. *Science* 225: 519-521.
- 21 SRITHONGCHUAY, T., S. BUMRUNGSRI, AND E. SRIPAO-RAYA. 2008. The pollination ecology of
22 the late-successional tree, *Oroxylum indicum* (Bignoniaceae) in Thailand. *J. Tro. Eco.* 24:
23 477–484.

1 START, A. N., AND A. G. MARSHALL. 1976. Nectarivorous bats as pollinators of trees in west
2 Malaysia. *In* J. Burley, and B. T. Styles (Eds.). Variation, Breeding and Conservation of
3 Tropical Forest Trees, pp. 141-150. Academic Press, London,

4 STOEPLER, T. M., A. EDGE, A. STEEL, R. L. O'QUINN, AND M. FISHBEIN. 2012. Differential
5 pollinator effectiveness and importance in a milkweed (*Asclepias*, Apocynaceae) hybrid
6 zone. *Am. J. Bot.* 99: 448-458.

7 WATZKE, S. 2006. Ressourcennutzung und Paarungssystem der Nektarivoren Flughundart
8 *Macroglossus minimus* (Pteropodidae: Macroglossinae) in West-Malaysia. 'PhD
9 Dissertation', Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität München, Germany.

10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20



1

2

3 FIGURE 1. Number of pollen grains collected from each bat species. Error bars indicate SE.

4 Mean \pm SE are used throughout. Eosp = *Eonycteris spelaea*, Cybr = *Cynopterus brachyotis*,

5 Roam = *Rousettus amplexicaudatus*. N = number of pollen swabs. From the total captures, pollen

6 swabs were collected on 151 occasions, and only four captures were negative for pollen load on

7 bats' bodies at the time of capture (two individuals each of *E. spelaea* and *C. brachyotis*, caught

8 visiting *Sonneratia alba* trees). These four individuals were excluded from further analysis.

9 *Sonneratia* pollen grains consists of *Sonneratia* sp., *S. alba*, *S. caseolaris* and the non-viable

10 *Sonneratia* spp. (the non-viable *Sonneratia* spp. consists of non-viable pollen grains from the

11 three *Sonneratia* species given the uncertainties in identifying the grains to species. The non-

12 viable *Sonneratia* pollen grains were distinguished from the viable grains from their smaller size

13 and look translucent when observed under the light microscope). Others (non *Sonneratia* pollen


14 grains) consists of *Acacia* sp., *Ceiba pentandra*, *Durio* sp., *Eugenia* sp., *Melaleuca cajuputi*,

15 *Musa* sp., *Oroxylum indicum* and *Parkia* sp. From the total pollen grains collected from their

16 bodies, bats carried > 90 percent of *Sonneratia* pollen grains at their time of capture. The pollen


1 grains from non-bat-pollinated flowers (*Acacia* sp., *Eugenia* sp., and *M. cajuputi*) represented
2 only about 0.07 percent of the total pollen grains collected from the bats. *** ($P < 0.001$)
3 indicates a significant difference in the number of grains carried by *E. spelaea* and and *C.*
4 *brachyotis*.

5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23



1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11

FIGURE 2. Percentages of conspecific and heterospecific pollen grains collected from each bat species. Eosp = *Eonycteris spelaea*, Cybr = *Cynopterus brachyotis*, Roam = *Rousettus amplexicaudatus*. *N* = number of pollen swabs. *Eonycteris spelaea* carried significantly more conspecific than heterospecific pollen grains (***) $P < 0.001$.



1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15

FIGURE 3. Number of conspecific and heterospecific pollen grains on stigmas of the *Sonneratia* flowers from single visit deposition (SVD) by bats and total pollen deposition (TD) after the blooming night. Non-viable pollen grains from all three *Sonneratia* species in the study area were classified as ‘heterospecific pollen’ on the basis non-viable pollen contributes to reproductive interference by clogging the stigmas of the flowers. Sca = *S. caseolaris*, Sal = *S. alba*. Error bars indicate SE. Mean \pm SE are used throughout.